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Abstract

This thesis examines the political relations between England and the Iberian Peninsula, from the accession of Henry II of England to the death of Alfonso X of León-Castile, an episode in diplomatic history that remains largely unexplored. This period, spanning over a century and a half, was punctuated by a series of key political events. The study of these sheds light upon the diplomatic complexities of the period.

Chapter One explores the historiography and the particularities of Spanish documentary sources. Chapter Two analyses the use of the word *Hispania* in thirteenth-century chronicles and charters, in an attempt to discover how the term was used and to whom it referred. Chapters Three examines the close relations between the crown of Aragón and the vicomté of Béarn in the twelfth century, while the following chapter looks at the unification of Catalonia and Aragón and the implications of the marriage between Eleanor of England and Alfonso VIII of Castile. Chapter Five explores the impact of Richard I and John’s alliances with Navarre. As León-Castile consolidated its power in the Peninsula, there was a shift of alliances, reflected on Anglo-Iberian relations. Chapter Six explores the particular circumstances that brought about the treaty of 1254 between Henry III of England and Alfonso X of Castile. No study of the political relations of the period would be complete without examination of the impact of the imperial controversy and interregnum upon relations between Henry III of England (the brother of a claimant) and Alfonso X of Castile (a claimant in his own right). Finally, Chapter Eight studies the failed marriage of the *infante* Sancho of Castile and Gilhelme (Willemina), the
younger daughter of the vicomte of Béarn, Gaston VII. This involved negotiations between Edward I of England, Philip III of France and Alfonso X of Castile.
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Introduction

Spain is different. Its exceptionalism remains hard-wired into the modern narrative of medieval history. This is not to suggest that Spain, or Spanish difference, has been neglected. Historians have been drawn to the history of medieval Iberia by its unique confluence of cultures, languages and traditions. Subjects such as the *reconquista*, or the supposed tradition of *convivencia*, continue to attract widespread attention. By contrast, Spain's medieval diplomatic or political history has been side-lined. Spain was (and is) divided from the rest of Europe by the Pyrenees. Its coastlines on the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, viewed by modern historians as vectors of communication, functioned in the Middle Ages very much as barriers. Even so, Spain and the Spanish kingdoms played a distinguished role in medieval diplomacy. Those few studies devoted to Spanish medieval diplomacy have for the most part focussed upon France, the closest neighbour, or Sicily, the eventual object of Spanish conquest, rather than upon relations with more distant powers such as England or the German Empire. In particular, it has been only in very recent times that Hispanists have begun to appreciate the wealth of the English chancery and Exchequer sources and the ways in which such sources can be applied to the history of medieval Spain.

Geography was, and remains, a key factor in the political history of Spain, both Christian and Muslim. Just as the valley of the river Po determined the history of Lombardy and northern Italy, so the valley of the Ebro, flowing to the Mediterranean from Cantabria in the north-west, dominates the history of Catalonia, Aragón and Navarre. To the north, the Pyrenees acted, then as now, as a natural frontier with
neighbouring Gascony and Toulouse. The Pyrenean range itself was a region of forests and pasture, whose people even today are neither entirely 'Spanish' nor 'French'. Key passes, like Somport in Aragón, were crucial to commerce and pilgrimage. Lacking the rich agricultural resources that made other regions prosperous, northern Spain relied instead upon livestock, horse breeding and sheep-husbandry. Transhumant sheep-farming ensured a regular traffic, even at peasant level, across the mountains. And where peasants led, their lords were sure to follow, attempting to secure domination over both ends of a trans-Pyrenean phenomenon. To this extent, the Pyrenees were a far from impermeable barrier. In particular, the Spanish kingdoms looked to expansion northwards towards the Atlantic coast and the regions of southern Gascony controlled, in theory, by the dukes of Aquitaine, later (from 1154 onwards) by the Plantagenet dynasty of English kings founded by Henry II.

On Spain's eastern coast, the Mediterranean allowed the county of Barcelona to engage in commercial and military exchanges with Europe and Africa. It also allowed the Muslim kingdoms of Morocco and the Maghreb to send military aid to al-Andalus. In much the same way, the Atlantic Ocean provided a commercial route to northern markets, in particular to the disputed Basque ports such as San Sebastian and Bayonne, unsurprisingly disputed between Castile, Navarre and the kings of England. The major geographical feature of this region was the Guadiana river, at this time navigable as far as Mérida.¹ To the north of Mérida lay another range of mountains, enclosing the city of Toledo itself protected by the Tajo (Tagus) river, flowing south-west towards Portugal via Santarém and Lisbon.

The far south, which until the conquest of Seville in 1248 remained under Muslim control, was for the most part hot and arid. Through to the fall of Seville, the Andalusian kingdoms had been protected, to the north and north-east, by the Sierra Morena that shielded Córdoba and Seville (on the Guadalquivir river) and Jaén (in the highlands). This was and remains a haven for the cultivation of citrus fruits.

The western side of the Peninsula was dominated by the Atlantic Ocean and irrigated (here travelling from south to north) by the Sado, Tajo, Mondego, Douro, Lima and Minho Rivers. Porto/Oporto stands at the mouth of the Douro. North of the Minho river, yet another mountainous range, the Cantabrian Cordillera, extends from north-eastern Galicia through Navarre.

Iberian geography played a major role in local politics. It did not, however, isolate the kingdoms of Navarre, Aragón or Catalonia from Gascony and southern France. Rather, the Iberian pursuit of expansion, the desire for trade and for footholds on the Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts, served to forge ties between the Spanish kingdoms and their northern neighbours. The outcome here was a bewildering series of alliances and wars, with an equally bewildering variety of Spanish kings. The fact that many of these kings shared the same names, and that their kingdoms were in themselves the product of infighting between closely-related dynasties, has done much to dissuade modern historians from any proper attempt to disentangle the history of such wars and alliances.
Only one thirteenth-century Spanish king has captured modern attention to the extent that he can, in any sense, be considered 'well known'. Alfonso X of Castile, 'The Wise', has received considerable attention not only for works of learning and piety, but for his claim to the imperial throne. His verses, the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, have attracted widespread notice. By contrast, his relations with the English kings, Henry III and Edward I, have been comparatively neglected. For all other relations between English and Spanish kings, before or after Alfonso, comparative neglect yields place to near-total ignorance, especially in the case of Aragón and Catalonia, but extending, with one or two minor exceptions, to the histories of Navarre, León and Castile.

Before the twelfth century, there were few if any recorded political exchanges between the kings of what we now call Spain, Portugal and England. That is not to say that the rulers of these kingdoms were unaware of each other’s existence. On the contrary, as early as Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologies*, we find an awareness of the world beyond Iberia. It is difficult to pinpoint the exact cause for the lack of more vigorous diplomatic exchange. Amongst the various possibilities, records of such exchanges may have been lost, or alternatively Iberian and English kings may deliberately avoided the sort of enduring foreign alliances that tend to leave an archival trace. From the twelfth century onwards it is possible to build a clearer picture of these contacts, often involving Gascony, ruled by the kings of England as dukes of Aquitaine following the marriage of Henry II and the duchess Eleanor. Gascony undoubtedly attracted the attention of the ruling dynasties of Catalonia, Aragon, and Navarre. A turning point in Anglo-Iberian relations occurred in 1177 with the marriage of Alfonso VIII of Castile to Eleanor, daughter of Henry II of
England. From this point onwards, Castile joined the other Spanish kingdoms as a major focus of Anglo-Iberian concerns.

In what follows, I make no claim to have written a comprehensive history of Anglo-Spanish relations, even across the period that chiefly concerns me, in essence from the reign of Henry I of England through to the death of Alfonso X of Castile, from c.1130 to c.1280. Economic, cultural and literary influences lie for the most part beyond my range of interests, even though each of these fields will inevitably be touched on below. My task has been a humbler one: to survey the political relations between Spanish and English kings, to trace alliances, treaties, breaches in relations, marriage contracts and other diplomatic initiatives over a period of roughly one hundred and fifty years. In turn, such Anglo-Spanish relations cannot and should not be viewed from an entirely two-dimensional Anglo-Spanish perspective. Such relations were refracted through a series of local influences, in particular via the kings of France and the nobility of southern Gascony, all of whose concerns must be comprehended if we are to arrive at a properly three dimensional (indeed, on occasion, at a four or even five-dimensional) map of the diplomatic landscape. The drawing of this map itself requires a relentlessly factual approach to the sources. Very often I have found myself tracing a year by year narrative of events, dry as dust in its own right, yet never before attempted and, I trust, of usefulness in the longer term to those who wish to understand the context of Anglo-Spanish relations in the centuries that led, after 1350, to John of Gaunt's bid for the throne of Castile.

The constant interchange and metamorphosis of the Spanish kingdoms, as they strove to exert dominance over their neighbours and struggled against the Muslim kingdoms
of al-Andalus, further complicate my analysis of their political fortunes. Political relations were not straightforward, and were often dominated by short-lived alliances embodied in treaties themselves the products of local or temporary concerns linked to the complicated Iberian political scene. Thus Catalo-Aragonese relations with the kings of England were often dictated by alliances with Béarn and the other counties of the central Pyrenees. In the case of Navarre, it was claims to lordships beyond the Pyrenees, the so-called ‘ultrapuertos’, that determined wider relations with England and the dukes of Aquitaine. Elsewhere, alliances forged between the Hispanic and Muslim kingdoms of the Peninsula impacted on Anglo-Spanish relations, as was to be revealed, for example, during the reign of the English King John. Marriage alliances, too, played no small part in these relations, with the marriages by a daughter of Henry II of England, and a son of Henry III, crucial in the ongoing relations between England and Castile over the century after 1170.

For our knowledge of the past, we depend upon the surviving archival record. Spanish archives have survived chaotically and in many cases in less abundance than those of the English crown. Amongst the best-kept records are the ones kept in the Arxiu de la Corona d’Aragó in Barcelona, however even there much of the diplomatic correspondence has been lost. Much material that in England is in public custody, in Spain it survives only in cumbersome or inaccessible private and ecclesiastical archives. It is with the archival contrasts that this study should perhaps begin.

Medieval Spain has attracted widespread attention. Cultural historians have studied the various religious groups (Christians, Jews and Moslems) that shared the peninsula, highlighting convivencia as a key factor in Iberian history. In Spain, there has been a
surge in regional studies, many of which have contributed to our economic, material, and artistic understanding of Iberian affairs. However, there has been a comparative lack of interest in diplomatic history. As a result, the diplomatic exchanges between the English chancery and the Iberian kingdoms have been side-lined. As previously noted, only two particular crises in Anglo-Iberian relations have been studied in any detail: the marriages Alfonso VIII and Eleanor of Castile in the 1170s, and of Edward of England and Eleanor of Castile eighty years later. Even here, a large part of the detail has been overlooked. Lacking reliable contemporary Spanish narrative sources, we are obliged instead to turn to the scattered correspondence between the English and Spanish royal houses. Such exchanges were not limited to England and often involved Gascony, which was held by the king of England as duke of Aquitaine. Gascony shared frontiers with Navarre and Aragón and Gascon lands were often influenced and on occasion claimed by Spanish kings. To further complicate matters, following the marriage of Alfonso VIII and Eleanor, Castile also advanced claims, albeit contentious, to the whole of Gascony south of the Garonne, posing a new threat to Plantagenet rule in the south. English resources expended in alleviating these pressures tended merely to anger the King’s English subjects and draw a yet more serious wedge between the ruling Plantagenet dynasty and England's baronial elite. Of particular concern here was the vicomté of Béarn, in Gascony. For this, no narrative sources survive. Even the surviving diplomatic correspondence of England, Castile and France supplies only a limited impression of Béarn's encounters with Spanish kings. The vicomté did, however, enjoy close ties with Catalonia-Aragón, significant for all that the documentation recording these ties remains woefully thin. Any effort to reconstruct a narrative of these connections leads to an account that is inevitably patchy and incomplete. It remains worth attempting, nonetheless, in order
to understand the dramatic changes that occurred in the thirteenth century when
vicomte Gaston VII of Béarn chose to strengthen his ties with León-Castile, becoming
the vassal of king Alfonso X while at the same time repudiating his former ties with
Catalonia-Aragón. This had deep impact on Anglo-Castilian relations, causing
uneasiness in the already troubled parts of Gascony where Henry III was obliged to
appease the local nobility. The Béarnaise alliance coincided with, and indeed help
reactivate, yet further Castilians claim to Gascony, that in turn helped bring about the
marriage alliance between Edward and Eleanor, thereby recruiting Henry III of
England as a powerful supporter of Alfonso X’s planned African crusade. The
disturbances in Gascony coupled with the Castilian threat forced Henry III to draw on
yet further English financial resources. As the thirteenth century progressed,
Castilian-Béarnaise ties persisted. Henry III of England, and Philip III and IV of
France, tightened control over their lands and vassals, which in turn complicated
relations between the Castilian, French and English crowns. Facing internal problems
in Castile and resistance to any marriage alliance with Guilhelm of Béarn, Sancho IV
of Castile (heir to the throne following the death of his elder brother Fernando de la
Cerda), was forced to look elsewhere for a bride.

While Gascony and its affairs played an important role in Anglo-Iberian relations,
these were not the only issues discussed between the royal courts. Equally important
was the controversy over succession to the Holy Roman Empire that saw both
Alfonso X of Castile and Richard of Cornwall lay claim to the succession of the
emperor Frederick II. This issue sparked a vibrant correspondence between Henry
III’s court and Alfonso’s chancery. The debate, which had at its heard the Castilian
King's own conception of empire and his attempts to promote Castilian supremacy
even outside the peninsula, was destined to end in stalemate. Alfonso faced fierce opposition, both from his nobles and from outside forces. It was, nonetheless, Alfonso’s attempts to promote his imperial claims that led to a correspondence, written in the vernacular, between Castile and, Alfonso’s brother-in-law, King Edward I of England.

This thesis explores these and other aspects of Anglo-Iberian diplomacy, showing the wide range of encounters between the courts of England and Spain.
Chapter One: An Introduction to Iberian History and Sources

Current Works On Iberian History

Anglophone scholarship has contributed enormously to the understanding of medieval Iberia. Amongst the first such contributions was that of Emily Procter, who devoted much of her career to studying the reign of Alfonso X, his chancery and Cortes.² Peter Linehan has published prolifically both on the Spanish Church and on the historiography of medieval Spain. His Spanish Church and the Papacy marked a revolution in Hispanic studies, calling into question the assumption, almost universal until then, that the Spanish church was the most obedient of the papacy’s many daughters. On the contrary, Linehan revealed, the relations between Rome and Spain, especially during the reign of Fernando III of Castile, were nuanced and set about with all manner of local complications.³ Linehan has also revealed the extent to which the ‘Spanish Church’ itself is too simplistic a term to comprehend a wide variety of local experiences, united only by the willingness of the rulings houses of Iberia to promote their own offspring to archbishoprics and other positions of ecclesiastical authority.⁴ Linehan’s work has also allowed a wider historiographical perspective upon the world of medieval Spanish studies, demonstrating, for example, the ways in which such concepts as feudalism or the reconquista have attracted

² ‘Cortes’: the council confirmed by members of the royal family and nobles from the kingdom, and which dealt with legal and financial matters: E.S. Procter, ‘Materials for the Reign of Alfonso X of Castile, 1252-84’, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 14 (1931), 39-63; idem, Alfonso X of Castile (Oxford: 1951); idem, ‘The Towns of Leon and Castille as Suitors before the King’s Court in the Thirteenth Century’, EHR, 74 (1959), 1-22; idem, Curia and Cortes in León and Castile 1072-1295 (Cambridge: 1980).
³ Fernando III was king of Castile from 1217, and from 1230 king of León.
excessive attention at the expense of other, more humdrum but nonetheless fundamental concerns. In all of this, the history of twentieth-century Spain, and in particular the experience of a dictatorship inclined to emphasize both the exceptionalism and the pious virtue of the Spanish past, must not be allowed to warp our understanding of medieval historical realities.

Amongst those working on Spain within the North American academic community, Joseph O’Callaghan, has focussed on the reign of Alfonso X, looking at his legal reforms, his cultural activity and in the process contributing to our understanding of the *reconquista* and its interpretation both then and now. More recently, he has explored the Castilian yearning for the Strait of Gibraltar and its crusading efforts, from the reign of Alfonso X to 1492. Once again, there are prejudices brought to the American study of the Spanish past against which the historian must constantly be on their guard. The old ideas, familiar to readers of H.C. Lea, of Spain as the mother both of totalitarianism and of religious persecution, via a distinctively ‘Spanish’ Inquisition, have themselves been challenged by a more recent generation of North American Hispanists. Walking alongside Tom Bisson and David Nirenberg and his theories on the relationship between power and persecution, Teófilo Ruíz has looked

---

at the changes that expulsion of the Moslems brought to Castile from the eleventh to
the fourteenth centuries, as well as the broader structures of Castilian royal power.9

The late Alan Deyermond, whose studies ranged from El Cantar del Mio Cid to La
Celestina has helped the Anglophone world to explore the rich intricacies of medieval
Spanish literature. Thomas Bisson, meanwhile, has focused on the Catalo-Aragonese
kingdom in the twelfth century, approaching these studies not originally as a
Hispanist but as a student of southern French history, concerned with the emergence
of representative assemblies within those regions of southern France that bordered the
Pyrenean kingdoms. This, and Bisson’s interest in the central control of currency,
drew him to the archival resources of the Archivo de la Coróna de Aragón and in turn
to a wider appreciation of the extent to which twelfth- and thirteenth-century Spanish
documents could throw light upon the wider ebb and flow of medieval European
history. Bisson’s studies have shed light upon the complicated relations between the
Aragonese crown and kings of France, from whom Aragon held considerable estates.
Most notably, the experience of the Aragonese and Catalan peasantry has been
employed by Bisson as a model for the wider relations between the powerful and the
powerless in medieval society.10

Relatively little has been written in English about diplomatic relations between
England and the medieval Iberian kingdoms, at least until the fourteenth century and
the career of John of Gaunt and his troubled relation with the Trastámaras. In part,

9 T.F. Ruiz, From Heaven to Earth : The Reordering of Castillian Society, 1150-1350 (Princeton, N.J.;
Oxford: 2004); idem, Sociedad y Poder Real en Castilla (Burgos en la Baja Edad Media) (Barcelona:
10 T.N. Bisson, Medieval France and Her Pyrenean Neighbours (London: 1989); idem, The Medieval
Crown of Aragon. A Short History (Oxford: 2000); idem, Tormented Voices: Power, Crisis, and
this reflects more general problem in Hispanic studies. Given the relevance of such themes as *reconquista* and *convivencia*\(^\text{11}\) to a Spain, in the twentieth century acutely aware of its role both as guardian of the faith and as crucible of cultural and political change, it is perhaps not surprising that, especially after 1936, ideas have tended to crowd out facts, from the range of subjects that English-speaking Hispanists have been prepared to tackle. Diplomatic history is often related as nothing but a catalogue of facts, so that it has been a not unexpected casualty of the Hispanists’ concern with theory. Bucking these trends, Nicholas Vincent has explored the role that Spanish influence may have played in the politics of King John’s reign, both in England and southern France.\(^\text{12}\) He has also charted the vicissitudes of Anglo-Navarrese relations in the first half of the thirteenth century and the tensions triggered by determination of the kings of Navarre to extend their otherwise land-locked authority north of the Pyrenees.\(^\text{13}\) The late Richard Benjamin brought to light important evidence for the relations between Spain and Richard I of England, specifically in the context of Richard’s prolonged war against the counts of Toulouse. In particular, Benjamin was the first to unearth a significant peace treaty of the 1180s preserved in the Aragonese royal archives.\(^\text{14}\) John Gillingham has followed suit here with a fine forensic exploration of Richard’s relations with his wife, Berengaria, and her father, the King of Navarre.\(^\text{15}\) Anthony Goodman has analysed the treaty of 1254 between Alfonso X of León-Castile and Henry III of England and the negotiations that led to Alfonso’s

---

\(^\text{11}\) Perhaps the best well-known and more accessible work on *convivencia* is late María Rosa Menocal’s work. cf. M.R. Menocal, *The Ornament of the World* (New York: 2002).


abandonment of his claims to Gascony and the marriage of Edward, Henry’s son, to Eleanor, Alfonso’s half-sister.\textsuperscript{16}

More has been written on English pilgrims to the shrine of St James of Compostela. Derek Lomax drew attention to the copious references to twelfth-century English pilgrims travelling to the Spanish shrine.\textsuperscript{17} Robert Brian Tate has recognized the importance of the ports of Gascony, in particular Bordeaux, as key routes for English pilgrims going to Spain.\textsuperscript{18} A register of English pilgrims to Compostela, from 1107 to 1484, drawn mostly from records of the English royal chancery, has been compiled by Constance Mary Storrs.\textsuperscript{19}

Commercial relations between England and the Iberian kingdoms, particularly Castile, have been summarily outlined by Wendy Childs, who has focused her attention on the period stretching from the late thirteenth to the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{20} Within an Iberian context, Olivia Remie Constable has explored the commercial exchanges between Muslims and Christians, before 1500.\textsuperscript{21}

Anglophone scholars have also published translations of Spanish chronicles, including the \textit{Chronicle of Alfonso X} (\textit{Crónica de Alfonso X}), the \textit{Pilgrim’s Guide to Compostela}, the \textit{Chronicle of San Juan de la Peña}, the \textit{Book of Deeds of James I of

\textsuperscript{18} R. Brian Tate, \textit{Pilgrimages to St. James of Compostela from the British Isles During the Middle Ages} (London: 2003).
\textsuperscript{19} C.M. Storrs, \textit{Jacobean Pilgrims From England to St. James of Compostella. From the Early Twelfth to the Late Fifteenth Century} (London: 1998).
\textsuperscript{20} W.R. Childs, \textit{Anglo-Castilian Trade in the later Middle Ages} (Manchester: 1978).
Aragon (Llibre dels Feyts), and the Siete Partidas, making these texts more widely available to English-speaking readers. The critical edition of the De expugnatione Lyxbonensi, housed in Corpus Christi Cambridge, has revealed the participation of English crusaders in the conquest of Lisbon in 1147.\textsuperscript{22} Robert MacDonald’s publication of the Espéculo, a legal treatise composed between 1255-60 by Alfonso X of León-Castile, has furthered our understanding of the legal reforms initiated by Alfonso VIII of Castile (1158-1214) and continued by Alfonso X.\textsuperscript{23}

Until very recently, Spanish historians tended to focus upon Spain’s relations with France rather than with England. A few exceptions should be noted. José Manuel Rodríguez García, for example, has studied the role of England in Alfonso X’s plans to launch a north African Crusade.\textsuperscript{24} From a Navarrese perspective, María Raquél García Arancón has researched the disputes between Theobald I of Navarre and Henry III over Gascony in the 1240s.\textsuperscript{25} Susana Herreros Lopetegui has published a fine study of Navarre’s claims to land north of the Pyrenees, paving the way for the doctoral research of Susana Aparicio Rosillo into the relations between Navarre and the aristocracy of southern Gascony.\textsuperscript{26} Martin Alvira Cabrer and Pascal Buresi have noted the emergence of the claim by the kings of Castile to rule as lords of what was

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} J.M. Rodríguez García, ‘Henry III (1216-1272), Alfonso X of Castile (1252-1284) and the Crusading Plans of the Thirteenth Century (1245-1272)’, in England and Europe in the Reign of Henry III, ed. B. Weiler, 99-120.
\item \textsuperscript{25} M.R. García Arancón, ‘Navarra e Inglatera a mediados del siglo XIII’, Príncipe de Viana, 50 (1989), 111-50.
\item \textsuperscript{26} S. Herreros Lopetegui, Las tierras navarras de Ultrapuertos (siglos XII-XVI) (Pamplona: 1998); S. Aparicio Rosillo, ‘Navarra en la política de Gascuña desde finales del siglo XII hasta 1328. Análisis del complejo panorama nobiliario. Sus métodos de pervivencia y adaptación’, tesis doctoral (Universidad Pública de Navarra, 2010).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
otherwise regarded by the kings of England as the Plantagenet territory of Gascony.27

More recently still, José Manuel Cerda has focused on the consequences for later Anglo-Castilian relations of this Gascon dowry, allegedly promised to Alfonso VIII of Castile when he married Eleanor the daughter of Henry II of England.28

Diplomatic Sources

Any attempt to write the history of diplomatic relations between England and Spain is fraught with two difficulties. The first is conceptual. As will very soon become apparent, Anglo-Spanish relations cannot be isolated from their broader European context, so that the historian of those relations is necessarily required to study not only England’s relations with Navarre, but Navarre’s with the county of Blois-Champagne, and Blois-Champagne’s with France; not only England’s relations with Castile, but Alfonso X’s claims to be recognized as claimant to the Holy Roman Empire and thence to a position as King of Germany in direct rivalry with that of Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III of England. The consequence here is to transform what begin with the appearance of a simple chessboard relationship between two countries, into a far more complicated three- or even four-dimensional game. Secondly, there is the problem of sources. Much as one might wish for parity between English and Spanish documentation, the study that follows is necessarily based to a very large extent upon sources surviving in English rather than in Spanish

archives. Much of the diplomatic archive of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century
kingdoms of León and Castile has been lost. Some material lies still ‘undiscovered’ in
private or ecclesiastical archives to which scholars are rarely granted access. The task
of the diplomatic historian is further complicated here because, throughout the
thirteenth century, Castile had no capital city. Its itinerant court instead had three
notaries or notarial departments, issuing documents in León, Castile and Seville.
Even the scant documentation that survives is scattered across a bewildering variety
of local and ecclesiastical archives.29 Ironically, Castile’s foreign relations, difficult
to trace from specifically Castilian archives, instead have to be teased out from the
better-preserved archives of Barcelona and Navarre. This in turn, however, merely
adds a further layer of complication to an already complicated situation. The three or
four-dimensional chess of Anglo-Spanish-French-imperial relations is here raised to a
multi-dimensional story of relations within medieval Iberia, between the peninsular’s
half dozen distinct Christian kingdoms. As if this were not enough, the close personal
relationships between the ruling dynasties of the Kingdom, and the willingness of
these families to adopt only a limited range of personal names, risks overwhelming
the reader with a multitude of Alfonsos or Fernandos, variously numbered and ruling
over rival Spanish principalities.30

As for specifics, although a significant number of documents from the military orders
and other ecclesiastical institutions, particularly the military order of Santiago, are to
be found in the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid, the diplomatic history of
Castile is best traced from non-Castilian archives, especially the archives of France,

30 See Appendix A for a comprehensive timeline of Iberian, English and French monarchs.
England, and to a lesser extent Aragón.\textsuperscript{31} For this reason, I have focused my attention very closely upon the English chancery rolls and upon published Aragonese documents, including, from 1257, the registers of the King of Aragon’s outgoing correspondence.\textsuperscript{32}

The papal registers, surviving from 1198, have their own significant role to play, documenting both ecclesiastical and political affairs and thereby contributing to our knowledge of diplomatic relations. Many of these papal letters are to be found not only in the standard series of papal registers, published since the 1880s by the École française de Rome, but in more recent editions, compiled afresh from the Vatican registers by the Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos.

Castile, Navarre and Aragón all bordered France, with the ruling families of Navarre and Aragón holding (or claiming to hold) lands north of the Pyrenees. Aragón had interests in Montpellier, Toulouse and Provence. Navarre was, from 1234, placed under the rule of the counts of Blois-Champagne. Like the king of Castile, the kings of Navarre also lay claim to interests in the lands north of the Pyrenees, the so-called ultrapuertos, lying beyond the ‘gates’ of Spain. Even as early as the reign of Sancho VII (1194-1234), the kings of Navarre were accepting the homage of several French lords, amongst them the vicomtes of Tartas (1196), the lords of Gramont (1202-3), and Raymond-Guillaume, vicomte of Soule (1234 and 1244).\textsuperscript{33} Some of these nobles also owed homage to the English kings, for lands held in Plantagenet Gascony. The Archivo General de Navarra in Pamplona is richly supplied with documentary

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 44.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Cf. J.-A. Brutails, Documents des Archives de la Chambre des Comptes de Navarre (1196-1384) (Paris: 1890), nos. 1,2,4, 6 and 8.
evidences for this period, rendered accessible in print via the various editions and calendars published since the 1980s in the series ‘Fuentes documentales medievales del País Vasco’. These can be supplemented from archives surviving in France, particularly in the ‘Trésor des chartes’ of the medieval kings of France now preserved in the Archives nationales in Paris. Here, too, the vast majority of such sources are now available in print, either in the printed edition of the Layettes du Trésor des chartes, or in the various editions of French royal charters or chancery registers, including those for Philip Augustus edited by Michel Nortier and others, both as the Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste and in the 1992 edition, as yet still unindexed, of Philip’s Registres. It is an unfortunate consequence of the lack or urgency with which the Académie française proceeds that these editions are still unmatched by equivalent editions of the charters or diplomatic correspondence of kings Louis VIII, Louis IX or Philip III.

The handful of contemporary narrative sources for Spain, although contributing more widely to Spanish history, shed little or no light upon the foreign relations of either Castile or Aragón. For example, the legal treaties written or commissioned by Alfonso X of Castile, the Espéculo and the Siete Partidas, are of critical significance for Spanish legal history but add virtually nothing to our understanding of Castile’s foreign relations. The Estoria de España or Primera Crónica General, which ends with the reign of Fernando III (1230-52), although important as a model for later Spanish chronicles, barely mentions the relations between León-Castile and England, and is almost entirely restricted to the affairs of the Iberian Peninsula, its mythical

genesis, its rulers and their marriages. Likewise uninformative on affairs outside Spain, the Historia de rebus Hispaniae, commissioned by Fernando III and written by the Navarrese archbishop of Toledo, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, spans the period from Biblical times to the early thirteenth century, placing great emphasis on the history of the Goths and Spain’s early Christian monarchies.\textsuperscript{35} The Llibre dels Feyts (Book of Deeds) dictated by Jaime (Jaume) I (1213-1276) of Aragón is a unique contemporary source for the history of the relations between Castile, Navarre and Aragón during the thirteenth century. However, it has several major gaps, including virtually all mention of diplomatic relations beyond the confines of Iberia.\textsuperscript{36}

Later narrative sources such as the Crónica de Alfonso X, commissioned by Alfonso XI of Castile (1312-50), although offering little information on the early years of the reign of Alfonso X, supply important insights into the conflict of the 1270s between the king and his nobles. The Portuguese version of the Cronica Geral de Espanha de 1344, which spans the period from Noah to the reign of Fernando III, is largely confined to Iberian concerns. The Cronica de San Juan de la Peña, commissioned by Pedro (Pere) IV of Aragón (1336-87), was compiled from several Castilian sources and intended to rival Alfonso X’s General Estoria. It was composed in part to defend the kings of Aragon against what many nobles claimed were their customary rights, and is therefore of little use as a source for the foreign relations of the Aragonese crown, not least because to a large extent it merely duplicates the chronicle of Jiménez de Rada.\textsuperscript{37} As is so often the case with Castilian chronicles, much of the

more significant material for our study is found not in the earliest works, directly
derived from Castilian chancery sources, but from much later narratives themselves
infected with hearsay and national myth-making. The *Anales of the Corona de
Aragón*, written in the sixteenth century by Jerónimo Zurita, are thus deeply
unreliable for relations between the Iberian kingdoms and thirteenth-century England,
even though they contain several references to English kings.

More helpful are the English chroniclers Roger Howden and Matthew Paris. These
are invaluable for the relations between England, Navarre and Castile. Howden
reproduced documents that would otherwise be entirely lost to us, relating to Henry
II’s arbitration of the Castilian-Navarrese disputes of 1176. Paris tells us a great
deal both about Anglo-Navarrese warfare in the 1240s and about the Castilian claims
to Gascony in the 1250s.

The English chancery records remain by far the richest source of information
regarding contacts between Spain and England. The preserve a wide variety of
documentation: ambassadorial credences, safe-conducts, commercial licences,
petitions, complaints from merchants –both English and Spanish–, ratification of
truces, alliances, letters regarding the arrangement of royal marriages, peace treaties,
payments to Spanish diplomats and commands for the pensions and other provisions
for foreign diplomats arriving to England. I have been able to identify over 1,000
such entries in the English charter, patent, close and liberate rolls concerning the
different Iberian kingdoms. In addition, because both Castile and Navarre bordered

---

38 *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols, Rolls Series (London: 1868-71), ii,
124-8.
39 For example *CM*, v, 365.
with Gascony, held by the English kings, the Gascon Rolls of the English royal chancery are an essential source for Anglo-Iberian relations.

**Unpublished Sources**

I have conducted most of my research in the United Kingdom, mostly in the National Archives, the Institute of Historical Research, the Bodleian Library and the Taylor Institution at Oxford, and in the British Library, working for the most part with printed sources. The British Library boasts a small but significant collection of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Spanish charters, amongst which are a handful of the more splendid ‘privilegios rodados’ from the reign of Alfonso X. Several archival collections from diverse Spanish regions have been digitalized and made available either through PARES (Portal de Archivos Españoles) or via the Digital Library of the Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia. Other such efforts include the ‘Proyecto Carmesi’ that has digitalized over 6,000 medieval documents concerning the region of Murcia.

I twice visited the Archivo de la Corona de Aragón (Arxiu de la Corona d’Aragó) in Barcelona, where I was able to spend a couple of weeks consulting unpublished papal

---

40 ‘Privilegio rodado’: a ‘solemn privilege in which the subscription of the king is accompanied by a ‘signum’; this takes the form of a complicated circular device, called the ‘signo rodado’ or ‘rueda’ […] It was customary in the redaction of such documents to add, after the subscription of the king, those of other members of the royal family, the bishops, the ‘ricoshombres’, the masters of the military orders, certain of the great officials, and the ‘vasallos del Rey’. They are usually of great size and were written on fine quality parchment: Procter, ‘Materials for the Reign of Alfonso X of Castile, 1252-84’, 41-42.


42 Proyecto Carmesi: http://www.regmurcia.com/servlet/s.SI?METHOD=FRMSENCILLA&sit=c,373,m,139,serv,Carmesi
letters and material prior to the reign of Jaime I. I also visited the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid.

**Iberian Particularities**

One of the several problems facing students of Spanish medieval history is the coexistence of several kingdoms, both Christian and Muslim, whose boundaries were in constant flux and which did not always share a common law. With regards to language, Latin was in most cases, the preferred medium of diplomatic exchange. Yet even Latin was forced to incorporate specifically Spanish terms, often deriving from the various Romance vernaculars, sometimes from Arabic.\(^43\) In addition, from the late twelfth century onwards, Spanish chancery documents were increasingly written in one or other of the Spanish vernaculars. Indeed, as Roger Wright has shown, the use of Romance languages in written business exchanges can be traced as far back as the tenth century when (c. 957) we find a list of cheeses (‘kesos’) written in a Leonese monastery.\(^44\) Public documents were increasingly written in Castilian from the thirteenth century onwards. Amongst the first is a document that survives in its original form, written in 1223, in the reign of Fernando III of León-Castile. According to Roger Wright, the use of the vernacular here was intended to render such documents more ‘widely understood’.\(^45\) Below, I shall suggest other reasons why Spanish kings may have sought to privilege the vernacular over Latin, not least their desire to prove that Spanish was as noble or high-status a language as French.

---

'Public' (notarial) documents written in Castilian became increasingly common, so that by 1252, the year of Fernando III’s death, they were approaching the norm rather than exception.46 The use of Romance, especially Castilian, in private documents can be traced from at least 1219 and enjoyed a similar upwards trajectory.47

Whereas the English royal chancery, at least to judge from its enrolments, stuck to Latin for the majority of diplomatic exchanges, from the thirteenth century onwards, Romance became increasingly the language of choice of the Castilian court in its correspondence with other rulers. The protocol and eschatocol retained their Latin formulae, while the main body of the text was written in Romance lacking Latin formality. The assumption, through to the 1230s, is that documents originally drafted in romance were then translated into Latin by clerks skilled in such translation.48 Even thereafter, in Castile, Latin remained the official language for international diplomacy. Navarre followed suit. From the first decade of the thirteenth century, romance was employed in official Navarrese documents such as the Fuero General de Navarra, written in Navarrese romance rather than in Latin.49 The same trend can also be seen in Portugal, where documents were increasingly written in the vernacular, with an upward trend here from c.1250 onwards.50 What little we know of pleading in the Cortes and the royal law courts, likewise suggests widespread use of the vernacular, however much the documentary evidences of such courts may have been composed in Latin.

46 Ibid., 126.
47 J. González, Reinado y diplomas de Fernando III (Córdoba: 1983), i, 513.
49 Wright, Late Latin, 237-8.
In Catalonia, Romance was used to write sermons as well as notarial documents. The earliest surviving are six sermons known as the *Homilies d’Orgayà* written in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. We also have an eleventh-century oath written in Catalan.\(^{51}\) In 1215, the Fourth Lateran Council decreed that grammar, and it must be presumed Latin grammar, should be taught to clerics. Across the Iberian Peninsula, however, the decrees of the 1215 as of all subsequent ecumenical councils, were slow to circulate and had little immediate effect.\(^{52}\) It was not until the legation of the papal legate Jean d’Abbeville, in 1228, that such reforms were implemented, and even then with relatively little success.\(^{53}\) In Aragón, the Lateran statutes, including the insistence on Latin learning, were not implemented until 1239.\(^{54}\) Under Alfonso X, Castile opted increasingly for romance. By contrast, in his father-in-law’s kingdom of Catalonia-Aragón, Latin remained predominant. For the entire reign of Jaime I (1216-68), and allowing for regional variations, the use of romance in chancery documents never surpassed 5%.\(^{55}\) Even so, the *Llibre del repartiment de Mallorca* (1230) a book, much like William the Conqueror’s *Doomsday Book*, detailing the new lands of the crown of Aragon in the newly conquered territories of Majorca, although originally written in Latin and Arabic, was very swiftly translated into Catalan. Since Jaime I was keen to demonstrate Catalan superiority, it became the vernacular version that was the preserved as the more accurate and exquisitely written.\(^{56}\)

\(^{51}\) The sermon is written in Latin and is followed by a translation and commentary in Romance’: Wright, *Late Latin*, 148.

\(^{52}\) Linehan, *The Spanish Church and the Papacy*, 16.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 35-53.

\(^{54}\) Wright, *Late Latin*, 256-7.


\(^{56}\) R. Soto i Company, ed., *Còdex Català del llibre del repartiment de Mallorca* (Barcelona: 1984), 32.
Although romance was increasingly used in official documents, treaties and negotiations between the Iberian rulers continued for the most part to be written in Latin, with a few notable exceptions. Amongst the first treaties to be drafted in the Castilian vernacular was the peace between Castile and León of 26 March 1206, which survives in its original form as a single-sheet charter. On 2 February 1231, when Sancho VII of Navarre adopted Jaime I of Catalonia-Aragón, in an attempt to secure the succession to his kingdom, the agreement was drafted in the Navarrese vernacular. Peace negotiations between England and Navarre in the 1240s seem to have been conducted, and written, in a combination of French dialects, in particular in the French of Blois-Champagne, the native land of the kings of Navarre. There should be nothing surprising in this. English administration in Gascony, for example, was conducted at this time in a combination of French, Latin and Gascon, with Gascon increasingly predominant both in court proceedings and in written records.

The early thirteenth century saw experimentation with romance writing, as Iberian confidence in their own vernaculars grew. The vernaculars also impacted upon official documents, which, although still mostly written in Latin, employed verbal echoes derived from the vernacular spoken languages. By the end of the thirteenth century, at least in Castile, the vernacular had itself come to rival Latin as a language not only of speech but also of written record.

58 The treaty failed to secure Jaime I’s recognition as heir to the Navarrese throne, and Navarre was inherited by the son of Sancho’s sister by her marriage to Theobald of Champagne: J.M. Jimeno Jurío et al., Archivo General de Navarra (1194-1234) (Donostia: 1998), no. 234.
60 Wright, Late Latin, 241-4.
61 Ibid., 244.
Alfonso X, Castilian and Latin

During the reign of Alfonso X of Léon-Castile the number of chancery documents written in romance rocketed. A significant number of the king’s diplomatic letters to other kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula were composed and recorded in the vernacular. In 1245, for example, amidst his negotiations to marry Yolanda, the daughter of Jaime I of Aragon, Alfonso addressed the Aragonese king in a letter begun in Latin but thereafter continued in Castilian.\(^{62}\) By contrast, Fernando III, Alfonso’s father, had addressed the Aragonese king exclusively in Latin.\(^{63}\)

Not only did Alfonso X adopt Castilian as a standard language of diplomacy. He also reissued the privileges issued by his predecessors in the form of inspeximus or vidimus charters composed in Castilian, yet embodying the recital of Latin originals (Appendix B).\(^{64}\) During the second half of the twelfth century, although Latin remained predominant, we find occasional uses of the vernacular in diplomatic correspondence between the other Spanish kings.\(^{65}\) According to the *Espéculo*, a legal text predating the more famous *Siete Partidas*, Alfonso X stated that when the ‘messengers of the king travelled outside the kingdom they are to carry with them letters written in Latin, so that other kings, counts or great men may understand them.’\(^{66}\) The text then explains the various kinds of document and their proper

---

\(^{62}\) ACA, Cancillería Real, Cartas Reales, Jaime I, caja 1, no. 101.

\(^{63}\) Ibid., no. 120.

\(^{64}\) BL Additional Charter 24804; ACA, Cancillería Real, Cartas Reales, Jaime I, caja 1, nos, 99, 101, 125.


\(^{66}\) MacDonald, ed., *Espéculo. Texto jurídico atribuido al Rey de Castilla Don Alfonso X, el Sabio*, IV.xii.34.
protocol, content, and eschatocol. It specifies the correct way to phrase a safe-
protocols and contents. For example, it sets out the terms of a standard safe-conduct,
supplying the model in Castilian, but with clear provision for translation into Latin
should this be deemed necessary.67 For the first time, Latin and Romance were
officially sanctioned for the writing of official letters, as Alfonso X demanded that his
chancellor knew how to ‘read and write both Latin and Castilian’.68 Perhaps to
demonstrate the high status that he now expected Castilian to command, Alfonso X
addressed his fellow Iberian kings increasingly not in Latin, but in Castilian
vernacular. As had been the case in the treaty of Cabreros with León a century
before, the vernacular was here being used for political purposes, much as in the writs
and boundary clauses of the pre-Conquest Anglo-Saxon royal chancery, to
demonstrate the equality of Castilian to all rival written languages.

Set against the bulk of the diplomatic correspondence between the Iberian courts and
the kings of England written in Latin, we find a small handful written in romance.
The earliest recorded instance occurs in 1249, in the list of complaints against Henry
III’s subjects in Gascony, reported to commissioners attempting to make peace
following the Anglo-Navarrese war of the 1240s.69 From 1238 onwards, the
Navarrese chancery had itself begun to use romance, increasingly reserving Latin for
ecclesiastical use and for only the most solemn of diplomatic exchanges. Theobald IV
of Champagne, who became king Theobald I of Navarre in 1234, was himself a native

67 *A los reyes, et a los condes o a otros grandes omnes de ffuera de los rregnos que la carta vieren,
como les ffaze ssaber que el enbia tal omne en ssu mandado et que les rruega que quando pasare por
lass sus tierras o por los ssus logares, quell den ellos sseguro guiamjento e yda et a benjda a el et a ssus
omnes con todas ssus cosas; et ququer de bien et de onrra quflagan, que ge lo agradesçera mucho’:
Ibid., IV.xii.35-41.
68 R.I. Burns et al., eds., Las Siete Partidas (Philadelphia: 2001), II.ix.iv; Wright, Late Latin and Early
Romance, 259.
69 García Arancón, *Archivo General de Navarra (1234-1253) II. Comptos y Cartularios Reales*, no. 35.
French speaker so that French also became a language used by the chancery in its dealings with non-Navarrese subjects.\(^70\) The 1249 documents may have been kept by the Navarrese chancery for the use of the king and therefore written in romance while a Latin copy, no longer extant, was sent to Henry III. Alternatively, the document was intended, from the start, to be communicated in the vernacular. Looking a little further forwards, a series of letters written by Alfonso X and his son, the infante Sancho [IV], survive in the National Archives in London, written and dispatched in Castilian.\(^71\) Five such letters are recorded between April 1279 and January 1282, just months before Alfonso X and his son became permanently estranged over the succession to the throne. These letters also coincide with the career of Geoffrey de Everley, an English clerk, working at the Castilian chancery, who, it has been suggested, may have translated them for the benefit of Edward I.\(^72\) This is not to accept Pierre Chaplais’ suggestion that Castilian notaries and chancellors had such poor Latin by the time that they were obliged to write in the vernacular rather than in Latin.\(^73\) Rather, the choice of language reflects Castile’s increasing confidence, not least as a result of its recent successes against the Muslim kingdoms of Iberia. By sending letters in the vernacular to the English king, Alfonso and his son, Sancho, were promoting Castile’s status within the wider world of Christendom.


\(^{71}\) PRO, SC1/16/6-9; 12; see Annex.

\(^{72}\) See below, 337-8.

\(^{73}\) P. Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London: 2003), 133 n. 371.
Chapter Two: Hispania

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and for a very long time before this, the term ‘Hispania’ was used in the Iberian Peninsula as well as in the Western Christian world. But how are we to interpret it? No longer the popular synonym for ‘Spain’ that it was during the tainted years of Franco’s dictatorship, ‘Hispania’ continues to ruffle feathers amongst Spanish scholars. Its use cannot be ignored as it appears constantly in medieval writing, from the papal and kingly courts to the works of Matthew Paris and Rodriguez de Rada. It was used to identify individuals and to refer to a general geographical area. So the question remains: of what did ‘Hispania’ consist in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries?

The term was inherited from the Roman world. Strabo in his Geography explained that during the Roman Period, ‘Hispania’ and ‘Iberia’ were used indifferently to refer to the land beyond the Pyrenees, that we today call the Iberian Peninsula.74 By Strabo’s time (c. 24 BC), ‘Hispania’ had been divided into three provinces: Hispania Cisterior, Lusitania and Baetica.75 By the third century, Hispania was further divided into five provinces: Terraconensis, Carthaginensis, Baetica, Lusitania and Gallaecia, and later subdivisions continued to multiply thereafter. It was this system of nomenclature and territorial divisions that would later be adopted by the Roman Catholic Church. In the fifth century (c. 476), the Visigoths gained control over Hispania, but the essential territorial divisions remained roughly the same until the Muslim invasion of the peninsula, between 711-8. What happened next is not

74 Strabo explains that formerly Iberia was the land between the Pyrenees and the Ebro River (the name deriving from Ibero). However after the Roman conquest the terms Iberia and Hispania became synonyms. H.C. Hamilton, ed., The Geography of Strabo (London: 1903), III, iv, 19.
75 Ibid., 20.
relevant here, as our main concern is rather with the medieval conception of
‘Hispania’ and its use in documents.

The Mythical Genesis of the Imperium Hispanorum

According to several Iberian chronicles, such as the thirteenth-century General
Estoria of Alfonso X ‘the Wise’, the fourteenth-century Crónica Geral de Espanha,76
the Chronicle of San Juan de la Peña77 and the Grant Cronica de Espanya78, Europe
and the peninsular kingdoms had their origin in the time of the Scriptures. After the
Flood, the sons of Noah repopulated the earth. The two sons of Japheth, himself the
son of Noah, settled in Cádiz, also known as the Island of Hercules,79 from where
they populated the Iberian Peninsula. Japheth’s descendants inherited different parts
of Europe, and it was from his fifth son Magoth (‘Magog’) that the Goths, Vandals,
Suevis, and Alans descended. From Gomer, Japheth’s fourth son, came the people
that populated Galicia (‘Galiza’), while other sons of Japheth populated all the
different parts of Europe, including England, Ireland, Greece, Germany and France.80

The Iberian Peninsula was, in this telling, a semi-mythical location, the site of the
tower of Hercules built when the legendary hero journeyed from Africa to Spain, a

76 The Crónica Geral (Portuguese version) was a slightly later version of the original Castilian version,
which unfortunately has not survived in full. Cf. D. Catalán, Edición crítica del texto español de la
Crónica de 1344 que ordenó el Conde de Barcelos don Pedro Alfonso, (Madrid: 1970).
77 Commissioned by Pedro IV of Catalonia–Aragón (1336-1387).
78 Written by Juan Fernández de Heredia –counselor of King Pedro IV of Aragón.
80 Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344, Ch. iv, 5-25, pp. 11-13. Also see Isidore of Seville, History of
the Goths, Vandals and Suevi (Leiden: 1970), I, 1, p. 3.
story taken not from Scripture but ultimately from Herodotus. This mythic narration of Iberian origins suggests an aspiration towards greatness and a desire to instruct men in ‘good customs’ as well as in ‘the famous deeds of the ancients’. The grand exaltation of the past of the Iberian Peninsula was interwoven with the classical story of Troy as a prologue to ‘Hispania’s incorporation into the Roman Empire. From this mythical introduction emerged, almost triumphantly, a detailed description of the peninsula’s geography, complete with rivers, mountains and even its diverse regional products.

The Iberian chronicles also spoke of the Christian conversion of the peninsula. The mid-thirteenth-century poem of Fernán González retold Isidore of Seville’s Historia Gothorum, describing how the Goths, the ancestors of the later counts of Castile, converted to Christianity. Once converted, the Visigoths ruled their land peacefully until it was plagued by the Muslim invasion, after 711. The poem, written around the mid-thirteenth century may have echoed the triumphalism of the Iberian kingdoms (León, Castile, Navarre and Aragón) that under Alfonso VIII of Castile (1158-1214) had recently defeated the Almohad armies in the epic battle at Las Navas de Tolosa.

---

82 Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344, vii, 22-23.
83 ‘Os muy nobles barones e de grande entendimento, que scriveron as estorias antigas das cavalarías e dos outros nobres feitos e acharon os saberes e as outras cousas da façanhas que os homenes podem aprender os boos costumes e saberr os famosos feitos que fazerom os antigos...’: Ibid., Prólogo, 4-5, p. 3.
84 Ibid., xi-xiii, 34-42.
85 Count of Castile c. 970.
86 Isidore of Seville, History of the Goths, Vandals and Suevi, i, 8-15, pp. 5-9.
88 Ibid., 71-76, pp. 167-169.
The poem, which underlined Castile’s supremacy and its struggle to break free from León, tells the story from the Gothic kings to Fernán González, count of Castile in the tenth century. The poem, preserved in a thirteenth-century manuscript at the Escorial, exalts Castile and tells of its fight against the Muslim kingdoms and its struggle to break free from the kingdom of León and Navarre. By c. 1135, Alfonso VII of Castile had assumed the title imperator of Spain, previously used by Alfonso VI (1077) and by Fernando I (1039). The Spanish historian, Ramón Menéndez Pidal, considered that the imperial title somehow echoed the unction that the Gothic kings received. Was this what King Fernando I of León-Castile wanted to restore, when on 22 June 1039, he was consecrated emperor in Castile, León and Asturias (‘imperator in Castella et in Leone et in Astorga’), or rather was he creating a new model for future kings to follow?

This Iberian empire implied no particular relationship to the Holy Roman Emperor or German emperors, nor did the Pope protest the Spanish use of an imperial title. Nevertheless, this does not mean the Pope expressly approved it, or that it was recognized by other European monarchs outside the Iberian Peninsula. King Ramiro I of Aragón recognized Fernando I’s of León-Castile imperial claim in 1039. The title certainly implied superiority. It seems to have been associated with the Kings of León and/or Castile, as Alfonso VI (from 1077) and Alfonso VII (from 1111) made extensive use of it. In 1109, after his marriage to Urraca of Castile,

---

90 Ibid., 11.
91 'Regnante me rege Ranimiro, gratia Dei, in Aragone et in Suprarbi; frate meo Garseano in Pampilona; et Fredelandus imperator in Castella et in Leone et in Astorgas'. (I King Ramiro [I] reigning, by the grace of God, in Aragón and Sobrarbe; my brother García [IV Sánchez] in Pamplona; and Fernando [I] emperor in Castile and León and in Asturias’): Ibid., 9. Menéndez Pidal reports he was unable to find evidence that Navarre accepted the ‘supremacy’ of León-Castile to the other kingdoms, but after analyzing various chancery records and chronicles, including the Crónica Silense, arrives at the conclusion that León-Castile was considered dominant. Ibid., 9-13.
Alfonso I of Aragón and Pamplona also claimed to be emperor of Spain or ‘Hispania’ (‘Dei gratia Ispanie imperator’)\(^92\), but continued to use the title ‘king’ (‘Dei gratia rex’).\(^93\) For Gaines Post, the use of an imperial title was a reflection of an incipient ‘Spanish nationalism in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries’\(^94\) a conception now held to be anachronistic and misleading. However, the fact that the title was increasingly adopted by Leonese-Castilian monarchs (even by marriage) may point to the increasing power, that from the eleventh century onwards, this once small kingdom started to acquire.

**Image has been removed**

Fernando II of León (1157-1188), son of Alfonso VII of León-Castile (K. 1126-57) who had himself used the title ‘Emperor of Spain’ from 1135, also claimed the title as can be seen in this *signum* depicting a rampant lion. From a *privilegio rodado* issued by Fernando II of León on 26 October 1184: AHN, Clero Secular-Regular, Car.494, no. 13, available online at [http://pares.mcu.es](http://pares.mcu.es), December 2012.

**Thirteenth-Century Hispania**

**The Church**

In the *Liber censuum*, compiled under Clement III (1187-1191) and his successor Celestine III (1191-1198) as an attempt to order the financial administration of the Roman Church, Christendom was divided geographically. The reader here inevitably

\(^92\) Alfonso I also used the titles: ‘Dei gratia imperator’ (San Esteban 1110, no. 38), ‘Dei gratia imperator et rex tocius Aragonis et Navarre et in parte Castelle’ (Ascedio de Haro July 1124, no. 128), in J.A. Lema Pueyo, *Colección diplomática de Alfonso I de Aragón y Pamplona* (1104-1134) (San Sebastián: 1990).

\(^93\) For example in documents Ibid., no. 90 (Zaragoza January 1119), no. 153 (Huesca May 1125), and no. 168 (Uncastillo February 1127).

stumbles upon ‘Hispania’. The term was applied to almost the whole of the peninsula, and its ecclesiastical divisions usually followed a similar pattern to that established by the Romans (Appendix C). Thus ‘Hispania’ incorporated modern-day Spain and Portugal, and in the Middle Ages the kingdoms of León, Portugal, Castile, Aragón, Navarre, and the county of Catalonia. This was never made clearer than when, on 16 April 1215/6, Innocent III ordered the archbishops and bishops throughout Spain (‘archiepiscopis et episcopis per Hispaniam’) to recognize Rodrigo, archbishop of Toledo, as Primate throughout all Spain (‘primatus… per universa Hispaniarum’), a title which had been already confirmed in 1145 to Raimundo of Toledo.

In addition, each Iberian ruler used the term ‘Hispania’ to describe the geographical location of his or her lands. Most notable was the case of Alfonso I (Dei gratia imperator), king of Navarre and Aragón, and by his marriage to Urraca also king of León, who in 1122 granted Centule II of Bigorre the castle of Rueda ‘in Hispania’ (‘…dono uobis in Yspania illo castello de Rota cum sua villa…’), Tarrazona, and 200 ‘cauallerias de honore in Ispania’ as soon as the king could obtain them (‘quando ego illas acquirere’). In 1143, count Ramón Berenguer IV, married to Petronilla of Aragón, granted properties to the Order of the Temple of Huesca. The count lauded the military order for fighting the Muslims (‘mauros’) in ‘Hispania’ (‘Idcirco ad exaltandam Christi ecclesie ad exercendum officium milicie in Ispanie regione contra

---

98 Lema Pueyo, Diplomática de Alfonso I, no. 109.
In this document, ‘Hispania’ seems not limited to the Christian kingdoms, but rather to encompass the whole of the peninsula.

In his *Historias minores*, the archbishop of Toledo, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (c. 1240), portrays ‘Hispania’ as a major character in his narrative. The work tells of the people who entered the peninsula (‘Hispanias’) from the time of Hercules, including Romans, Vandals, Suevs, Alans, Silingi, and finally the Arabs. From Hercules, the calamities of Hispania, says Jiménez de Rada, have increased and God has more or less withdrawn his mercy from it. On the other hand, in the preface of his *Chronicon mundi*, Lucas de Tuy, a contemporary of the archbishop, chose to describe Hispania as a geographical entity rather than as a character. His description was intended to celebrate the region, portrayed as an idyllic place of fresh air, fertile soil, abundant animal life, and plentiful rivers and springs. While the two contemporary authors had different political goals, ‘Hispania’ was in both cases conceived of as a geographical place, a place with a history of invasions, but still a physical entity regardless of the variety of its past or current inhabitants. This is how we must think of Hispania as employed in documentary evidence of the twelfth

---

99 BL, Additional Charters, 16512.


101 ‘...quorum reges successionibus prosecutus usque ad eos qui Hispanie calamitatibus adiecerunt, genealogie euloria supputauit, ut sicat Hispania, que Dei misericordiam perfuoriter uix atendit, a tot tempestibus iam respirans, quantum debet diuine gracie inclinare. Set proh dolor!’: Ibid.


103 Lucas, bishop of Tuy, a contemporary of Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, defended the primacy of Seville, without much success, by insisting that it had been established since the time of St Isidore. The archbishop of Toledo, on the other hand much success in claiming the primacy of his see, which he sustained, existed since the time of St. Eugene. Cf. P. Linehan, *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain* (Oxford: 1993), 355-384.
and thirteenth centuries, not as a political entity in itself, but rather a geographical
location, perhaps best thought of, but not limited, to the Iberian Peninsula as a whole.
The term ‘Hispania’ was also used as a means of referring to a collective entity
extending beyond more than one kingdom of the Peninsula. On 7 July 1226, Henry
III sent a letter to the Master of the Temple in three kingdoms of Spain (‘tribus regnis
Hispanicae’) to answer his query about a ship he had previously asked about.\textsuperscript{104} The
Order of the Temple had divided the peninsula into three: Catalonia-Aragón
(including Provence), Portugal, and León-Castile, a division itself reflected in Henry’s
letter.

\textbf{Hispania and the English Chronicles}

Outside the Iberian Peninsula, the term was also used to describe geographical
location, sometimes with additional details pointing to a particular region or kingdom
within ‘Hispania’. In 1177, following the arbitration delivered by Henry II in the
dispute between the kings of Castile and Navarre, Howden tells us that the to envoys
of the kings of Spain (‘nunciis predictorum regum hispaniae’) were to inform their
masters of Henry’s intention to go on pilgrimage to Compostela.\textsuperscript{105} Here ‘Hispania’
clearly refers to both Castile and Navarre. Ralph of Diceto tells of how Ireland was
conquered via the Iberian Peninsula (‘et pervenerunt ad Hyspaniam’) and of how
there are still parts there that speak the language of the Navarrese (‘Pars eorum quae
remansit in Hybernia Navarri vocatur, et adhuc eadem utuntur lingua’).\textsuperscript{106} When
writing about the proposed marriage (1184) between the count of Flanders and a

\textsuperscript{105} W. Stubbs, ed., \textit{Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis} (London: 1867), i, 156.
\textsuperscript{106} Idem, ed., \textit{Radulfi de Diceto Decani Lundoniensis Opera Historica} (London: 1876), i, 34.
daughter of the king of Portugal, Diceto uses the word ‘Hyspanicis’ apparently referring to Portugal as part of ‘Hispania’. ¹⁰⁷

When Gerald of Wales, in his *De Instructione principis* (c. 1200) commented on the marriage of Henry II’s three daughters, he stated that they had been sent to several parts of Europe (‘Europae partes oppositas destinavit’). Johanna had been sent to Sicily. Mathilda had married Henry duke of Saxony (‘Saxonii’), and Eleanor had been sent to ‘Hispania’ to marry Alfonso VIII, king of Toledo and Castile (‘ad Hispaniam, secundam et sequentem, regi Toletano et Castellae Anfulso’). ¹⁰⁸ Here ‘Hispania’ clearly refers to Castile, but Gerald still it necessary to explain the detail. Later, he also states that Henry’s domains in Gascony stretch as far as ‘the Pyrenees of Hispania’ (‘Pyreneeos Hyspaniae montes’) bordering with the Iberian kingdoms, although this reference provides little by way of the sort of clear border that modern-day historians would prefer to map. ¹⁰⁹

*Matthew Paris*

*Image has been removed*

Matthew Paris’ depiction of the arms of Castile.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., II, i, p. 157.
Perhaps the chronicler who sheds most light on the use of the term is Matthew Paris. In 1252, rumors reached him of the death of Fernando II of León-Castile. The monk lamented the death of the illustrious Fernando who was king of all Hispania (‘qui dicitur propter sui eminentiam rex Hispaniae totius’) and who had defeated the Muslims of Spain (‘post praecella gesta sua et super infidels Hispaniae conquisitiones maximas’).\textsuperscript{110} Having clarified who he is talking about, the king of Castile, Matthew no longer refers to him by this title, but chooses to enhance his standing by calling him king of Spain (‘Hispania’) a choice that seems to heighten Fernando’s prestige.

In 1254, Edward, Henry III’s son, married Eleanor of Castile, Alfonso X’s sister, at Burgos. This gave Matthew Paris, their contemporary, the opportunity to list the titles that Alfonso bore. The marriage was a grand occasion, no doubt, that not only put an end to the threat of war between the two kingdoms, but also extinguished the Castilian claim to Gascony. For Matthew Paris, this was an opportunity to elaborate on the splendour of the event. The chronicler described Alfonso as ‘rex Hispaniae’, a great king who bore many titles (‘Alfonsus Dei gratia rex Castellae, legionis, Galleciae, Toleti, Murciae, Cordubae, et Jehenni’). These lands, Matthew reported, were all subject to Christian rule (‘Christianis subduntur’) and brought rule, in addition, over two tributary Muslim kingdoms (‘duos reges Sarracenos sibi tributarios’).\textsuperscript{111} Perhaps it was Alfonso’s forest of titles that led Paris to brand him as king of ‘Hispania’, a title that Alfonso himself never used. Within Matthew’s "Cronica", the title seems to imply prestige and perhaps reflects the closer relations that were assumed to exist between Henry III and Castile than between England and the other Iberian kingdoms.

\textsuperscript{110}CM, v, 311.
\textsuperscript{111}Ibid., 399.
When describing the arrival of Eleanor (‘regis Hispanie soror’) and Edward in London, Matthew tells us that, on King Henry’s orders, they were received with great pomp (‘magno comitatu et pompa’). The people dressed in festive apparel greeted Eleanor. Her apartments were decorated in the most exquisite way, in the fashion of the archbishop of Toledo, with tapestries, like a temple. Even the floor was decorated, following the ‘Spanish’ (‘Hispanis’) tradition. However, some chuckled at the display of Hispanic extravagance with which she was greeted.\footnote{\textit{Et cum enisset illa nurus nobilissima ad hospitium sibi assignatum, invenit illud, sicut electi Tholetani hospitium, olosercis pallis et tapetis, ad similitudinem temple appensis, etiam pavimentum aulaeis redimitum, Hispanis secundum patriae suae forte consuetudinem hoc procurantibus, ita ut fastus superfluitas in populo sannas moveret et cachinnos’}: Ibid., 513.} Paris himself seems to have frowned on such lavishness lamenting, in the midst of a serious revolt over Henry’s expenditure to claim the Sicilian throne for his younger child, Edmund, that the king treated his own people far less generously.\footnote{\textit{Doluerunt igitur Anglici inconsolabiliter, quod inter omnes nations plus caeteris coram rege suo proprio viluerunt, et eisdem exterminium immineret irreparabile’}: Ibid., 514.}

Even so, when narrating the whole debacle, Matthew avoids describing Alfonso as king of Castile, but rather refers to him as ‘rex Hispanie’.\footnote{\textit{Ibid., 396-7, 449-50.}} Nor did England’s relations with the Castilian king end with the marriage of Edward. In 1257, after a disputed election, Richard of Cornwall, was crowned king of the Romans. Alfonso also considered himself a rightful claimant, according to Matthew Paris adding to his title as ‘rex Hispanie’ a claim to be ‘electum in regem Romanorum sive Alemaniae’.\footnote{\textit{Ibid., 657-8.}} Alfonso, says Paris, threatened to attack Richard with French, Aragonese and Navarrese forces.\footnote{\textit{Rex igitur Alemanniae, in quieta possession stabilitus, minas merito contempsit regis Hispaniae, quamvis terribiliter comminaretur quod hostiliter superveniret cum fortitudine regum Francorum, Arragonom, et Navariae’}: Ibid., 657.

Curiously, Paris preferred not to include these two kingdoms as parts of ‘Hispania’. But even Matthew Paris conceded that
‘Hispania’ extended beyond the frontiers of Castile or the other Christian kingdoms, in 1258 informing his readers that the ‘Saracens of Spain’ (‘Sarraceni Hispaniae’) had attempted to take Cordova (Córdoba).\textsuperscript{117}

The most damning of Matthew’s references to ‘Hispania’ was perhaps that where the chronicler sought deliberately to disparage Alfonso of Castile. Following the wedding of Edward and Eleanor in Burgos, Paris reflected on the problems that the Castilian claims to Gascony had caused Henry III, whose expenditure, he claimed had exceeded two million pounds in a fruitless expedition to a Gascony which was his to start with (‘prius suum erat’). Always contemptuous of the king’s foreign advisors, Matthew Paris was highly critical of Henry’s Spanish alliance. Henry, explained the chronicler, had surrounded himself with insidious men and nations, amongst these the ‘Spanish’ (‘Hispanorum’) who were of wretched morals and religious practices, the dregs of mankind, with ugly faces to boot.\textsuperscript{118}

**Practical Problems**

Chancery records are as imprecise as the chroniclers and often use ‘Hispania’ to describe both geographical place and as a toponym (‘Hispanus’) attached to people.\textsuperscript{119} In some cases, context may supply a clue as to the exact place to which a document refers. Such is the case with three safe-conducts addressed to the seneschal of Gascony and Poitou in 1219-20 for the safe-passage of Berengaria, former queen of

\textsuperscript{117} In fact in 1258, no such thing happened. It was not until 1264, that mudéjares (Muslims living under Christian rule) of Murcia and Seville rebelled against Alfonso X, so Matthew Paris (d. 1259) must have been misinformed or the passage added after his death.

\textsuperscript{118} ‘Novit insuper dominus rex Hispanorum mores et religionem, quoniam sunt hominum peripsima, vultu deformes, cultu despicabiles, moribus detestabiles’. CM, v, 450.

\textsuperscript{119} 15 January 1256, 100s. to Arnold of Hispania for his expenses homewards; CLR 1251-60, 266.
Richard I, who is said to have been returning to Hispania (‘ad transitum faciendum si voluerit per partes Pictavie et Wasconie versus Hyspanniam’). In this case, we know she must have been returning to her brother’s court in Navarre.\(^{120}\)

In other cases, where we cannot identify the people or places involved, the term ‘Hispania’ adds to the uncertainty. On 28 June 1242, Henry III issued a license to the merchant Fulk of Oléron to buy horses from ‘Hispania’ to take to Oléron and nowhere else.\(^{121}\) It was not uncommon for the king to buy horses from the Iberian Peninsula. However, horses came at a premium and were controlled goods, together with mares, hides, cattle, pigs, goats, sheep, hawks, and falcons Alfonso VIII of Castile had ruled on export restrictions for such goods at the Cortes of Toledo in 1207, no doubt with the ever-present fear that unrestricted exports might end up in the hands of the Moslem enemies of Christian Spain.\(^{122}\) In fact, the need for royal licenses often proves useful in tracing such transactions.\(^{123}\) Because of this continuing threat, horses, wood, metal and weapons were amongst the restricted items listed in papal letters of 1234 in favour of the town’s folk of Quesada, in Jaen.\(^{124}\) Yet, the trade in these precious commodities was by no means closed. Because horses, in particular, were regarded as a valuable and potentially dangerous weapon, special papal licenses were issued to allow or restrict the trade of horses with the Muslim kingdoms of the south of the peninsula. Spanish destriers were in high demand and in 1242 and again in 1243, Henry III requested horses from Fernando III, while from the Bay of Biscay

\(^{120}\) CPR 1216-1225, 189, 228-9.  
\(^{121}\) CPR 1232-1247, 310.  
horses were being shipped into La Rochelle, for the use of Louis IX.\textsuperscript{125} In 1244, the order of St James was allowed to trade horses, weapons and grain in exchange for either property or Christian hostages.\textsuperscript{126} On 6 February 1243, Henry III asked Fernando III for permission to withdraw six destriers (commonly used for warfare) from the lands of a certain Dominic Paschal and Peter Croesat.\textsuperscript{127}

Even though there were tight controls on horse-trading, many such Anglo-Spanish transactions are impossible to trace. On 16 March 1254, while a Castilian invasion of Gascony loomed, Henry III’s chancery issued a safe-conduct for a certain Geoffrey de Almathi to go through Gascony into Spain (‘Hispania’) with another knight and to return with men and harness.\textsuperscript{128} On this occasion, it is highly unlikely that Henry III was buying the harnesses from Castile, with which he was on the verge of war. Only the week after, on 24 March, the king asked his subjects for help as he did not anticipate a treaty with Castile and feared that an invasion of Gascony was inevitable.\textsuperscript{129} The most likely scenario is that Geoffrey and his companion were crossing over to Navarre or Aragón to recruit help against, what seemed at the time, to be an imminent Castilian invasion. Also bordering with Gascony was Aragón, which was, like Henry III, preparing for a possible war with Castile and could have provided

\textsuperscript{125} Renouard, ‘Chevaux’, 574.
\textsuperscript{126} ‘…cum itaque, sicut insinuantes vobis accepirimus, interdum sarraceni castra seu munitiones in quibus morantur volentes prodere christianis equos, arna, frumentum vel animalia pro predictis castris et municionibus sibi dar exigit ab eisdem quod sic, absque majori dampno, equorum, armorum, frumenti seu animalium, ut de strage fidelium tacetur predicta divino cultui applicari, nos vestris supplecitionibus inclinati, ut de cetero munitionis et castra sarracenerorum predictorum exhibitione, verum eidem acquirere, cultuincon per frumentum et animalia chistianis a sarracenis ipsi in captivitate detentos redimere valeatis, auctoritate vobis presentium indulgemus…’: A. Quintana Prieto, La documentación pontificia de Inocencio IV (1243-1254) (Rome: 1987), no. 51.
\textsuperscript{127} CPR 1232-1247, 362.
\textsuperscript{128} CPR 1247-1258, 277.
\textsuperscript{129} CPR 1247-1258, 279-80.
Henry III with harnesses or horses.\textsuperscript{130} The kings of Aragón could also issue bans on horse-trading.\textsuperscript{131} However, because at this time, trade with Aragón was reasonably undisturbed by the hostilities between Gascony and Castile, Henry III licensed certain merchants from Aragón to trade freely in Gascony, so long as there was no threat of war between them.\textsuperscript{132}

If commerce in such well-regulated commodities as horses is often difficult to trace, other merchants and their products are quite impossible to track. On 4 August 1228, H. the son of Aucher was ordered to pay the remaining money he held in his custody for the wines and other products sold by merchants from Spain (‘mercatorum de Hyspania’).\textsuperscript{133} In January 1231, there is another puzzling record in the Close Rolls of Henry III ordered the sheriff of Sussex to free a ship from \textit{Baona}, most likely Bayonne but just possibly Baiona (or Bayona) in Pontevedra in modern-day Galicia, which was loaded with goods from ‘Hispania’ intended for market in London.\textsuperscript{134}

By the second half of the thirteenth century, ‘Hispania’ began to be translated in vernacular documents as ‘Spain’ (‘Espana’ -España), whilst retaining its significance as a generic term for the entire landmass south of the Pyrenees. For example, when in the 1280s Castile was plunged into a bitter war following the disputed succession between Alfonso’s second son Sancho and the son of his dead first-born, Fernando de

\textsuperscript{130} 12 February 1282, a safe-conduct to Anthony Bek and others to buy horses in Aragón and Hispania: \textit{CPR 1281-1292}, 11. Navarre also provided the English king with horses, as in 1310: \textit{CPR 1307-1313}, 290.

\textsuperscript{131} In 1249, Jaime I issued a ban against horses leaving the island of Majorca: A. Huici Miranda et al., eds., \textit{Documentos de Jaime I de Aragón} (Zaragoza: 1976-1988), no. 499.

\textsuperscript{132} 3 December 1253: \textit{CPR 1247-1258}, 255.

\textsuperscript{133} ‘Mandatum est H. filio Aucher’ quod residuum denariorum quod est in custodia sua, qui venerunt de Grimmesby de vinis et aliis mercandiis mercatorum de Hyspania venditis Rimundo Willelmi, per talliam faciat liberari usque ad festum Sancti Michaelis, ut tunc plenius posit ei responderi de denariis qui restant adhuc de denariis receptis de vinis que fuerunt apud Beverlacum et alibi: \textit{Close Rolls 1227-31}, 71.

\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Close Rolls 1227-31}, 466.
la Cerda, supported by France, various Castilian nobles sought help from Navarre. Most, including the de Haro’s supported Sancho, but others, like the Lara family continued to support the succession of Alfonso de la Cerda. The kingdom came close to collapse. On 13 October 1281, at Estella (Navarre), possibly in an effort to safeguard his Navarrese lands, Lope Díaz de Haro, lord of Biscay, became vassal of Philip III of France. Lope promised 300 armed knights with their horses (‘trezientos cavailleros guisados de cavaillos e armas’) for forty days to serve in Gascony, Navarre or in Catalonia or Aragón or ‘in all of Spain (‘e que faga yo este servicio en Gascoyna, en Navarra e en Cathaloyna e en Aragon e en toda Espanya’). Curiously, Lope Díaz does not explicitly refer to Castile, although Castile is surely the region where his assistance might most readily be expected.135

In chronicles the same is true. By the end of Alfonso X’s reign, in Castile ‘Hispania’ was rendered as ‘España’ (Spain) by the translator of the Estoria delos godos the vernacular version of Jimenez de Rada’s Historia de rebus Hispanie. Aengus Ward has shown that the translation must be dated within the last twelve years of Alfonso X’s reign (c. 1274-84) due to the historical references that appear in it but not in the archbishop of Toledo’s work.136

In all of this, there are interesting parallels and contrasts to be drawn between the uses of the term ‘Hispania’, and the equally powerful ideas of ‘Anglia’ or ‘Brittania’.  

---

135 G. Daumet, Mémoire sur les relations de la France et la Castille de 1255 à 1320 (Paris: 1913), no. 17, 178-80. On the holdings of the de Haro family in Navarre, cf. M.I. Zabalza Aldave, Archivo General de Navarra (1274-1321), II. Documentación Real (Donostia: 1997), nos. 10, 67-8. The homage responded to the French assertion of Jeanne of Navarre’s rights and the threat of an Aragonese invasion, so that although it mentions the right of the infantes de la Cerda, it must be considered in relation to French protection of Jeanne’s rights. This agreement followed one between Eschivat of Beaumarchais, 6 April 1276, by which Lope Díaz promised along with other ‘ricoshombres’ to protect the kingdom from a Castilian invasion: Ibid., no. 10.

‘Anglia’ as a synonym for our modern understanding of ‘England’ emerged as early as the time of Alfred, indeed perhaps as early as the writing of the Venerable Bede, himself no stranger to the ‘Hispania’ of Isidore of Seville. Even so, the term ‘Britannia’ continued to trouble twelfth and thirteenth-century writers, implying sometimes more, sometimes less than would be comprehended within our modern understanding of ‘Great Britain’. In the eyes of English chroniclers and chancery clerks, ‘Hispania’ remained a distant place, of several kings and kingdoms, often at war with itself, divided between Christian and Moslem zones of influence, with a dangerously exposed frontier linking it to Africa and thence not only to a different continent but to the dangerous hordes of savages and religious zealots believed to inhabit the wider unknown. In what follows, we must always be on our guard against assuming an identity between modern and medieval ideas of ‘Spain’. Spain, as is so often the watchword of modern Hispanists, ‘is and was different’.
Chapter Three: Béarn and the Iberian Peninsula

[Gascony is] a land rich in white bread and excellent red wine, strewn with forests and meadows, and with streams and healthy springs. The Gascons are fast in words, loquacious, given to mockery, libidinous, drunkards, prodigal in food, ill-dressed, and rather careless in the ornaments they wear. However, they are well-trained in combat and generous in the hospitality they provide for the poor.  

Codex Calixtinus

Strictly speaking, this thesis is concerned with Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1150-1280. To understand these relations, we must nonetheless begin with an earlier period, and in particular with the relationships between the rulers of Spain and the lords of southern Gascony that hereafter were to prove so crucial in establishing links between Spanish and Plantagenet zones of influence. The ‘feeble’ hold that the dukes of Aquitaine had over Gascony (only annexed to Aquitaine in 1059) allowed the native lords a greater power in the region, drawing them closer to Navarre and Aragón.  

In the particular case of Béarn, throughout the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, the vicomtes of Béarn looked to Aragón as a protector, participated in Aragonese military enterprises against the Muslims of al-Andalus, and held lands from the peninsular kings. The aftermath of the Albigensian Crusade forced Catalonia-Aragón to shift its focus from the French Midi to the Iberian Peninsula and the Balearic Islands, changing its relationship with Béarn.  

As a result, Gaston VII vicomte of Béarn (1229-1290) shifted his alliances in the Iberian Peninsula from Aragón to Castile, as circumstances dictated. With regards to his Gascon holdings, he

strengthened his alliances with the duke of Gascony, King Henry III of England, and later with his son, Edward I. At the same time, Béarn drew closer to the French crown. The consequences here were to place Gaston VII and his successors in a pivotal position on the frontier between zones of Plantagenet, Capetian and Spanish influence.

Béarn, traditionally regarded as part of Aquitaine, was until the administration of Gaston VII (1229-1290) a vassal and close ally of the kings of Aragón. Thereafter, although treated as part of Aquitaine, it enjoyed only loose ties to the Plantagenet rulers. Benoît Cursente has noted the ‘marginal’ position occupied by the vicomté in ‘L’éspace Plantagenêt’ during this period.140 Béarn, close neighbour of Aragón was at the time more closely allied with the Iberian kingdoms than with Plantagenet Aquitaine. Such ties were further strengthened during the reign of Alfonso I of Pamplona-Aragón (1104-1134), when the vicomte actively participated in the king’s conquest of Zaragoza (1118). Subsequently, the vicomtes of Béarn increasingly played a part in Aragonese and, from 1137, Catalan politics, as they formed an alliance with the Moncada family. By contrast, contacts with the Plantagenet court were sporadic at best.141 It was not until the administration of Gaston Fébus (1343-1391) that a central Béarnaise administration was created, so that the history of Béarn between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries must be built up through a scattered and partial collection of Spanish, French or English sources. Its study is further complicated through the lack of original béarnaise documents, as the earliest cartulary of the region, the *Cartulary of Sauvelade*, has only partially survived in the

---

141 Cf. Ibid.
seventeenth-century Béarnaise history by Pierre de Marca. To some extent compensating for these losses, yet at the same time presenting its own problems of documentary transmission, the Fors de Béarn containing the customs of the vicomté, from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries, offers an invaluable source for the study of the legal history of the region. There is a relative abundance of documents surviving in Spanish archives, mostly in Aragón and Navarre, that can help build an image of Béarn. The present chapter attempts to explore Béarn’s close relations with Aragón from the mid-twelfth century, contrasted with its far looser ties to the Plantagenet court (Appendix D and E).

The vicomté of Béarn was bordered to the east by Bigorre, and to the north by Armanac, Tursan and Chalosse (dépt. Landes). To the west were Dax, Soule and Navarre. To the south it was separated by the Pyrenees from Navarre and Aragón, so that its proximity to the Iberian courts was determined both by geography and through language. Because of Béarn’s mountainous nature, transhumant husbandry rather than agrarian plenty remained the basis of agricultural prosperity. Thus it is not surprising that it shared interests with neighbouring Navarre and Aragón.

Alfonso I, King of Pamplona and Aragón

Béarnaise participation in Iberian affairs dates from at least the eleventh century. From the early twelfth century, decades before Henry II became duke of Aquitaine
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143 P. Ourluc et al., eds., Les fors anciens de Béarn (Paris: 1990). They were ratified in 1288 by Gaston VII de Béarn. Ibid., 143.
through his marriage to Eleanor (18 May 1152), Béarn and the Iberian Peninsula already had a vibrant political and commercial relationship, often strengthened by marital alliances (see the appendices below including the Genealogy of the Vicomtes de Béarn). Throughout this period, the Béarnaise were an important element in the Spanish crusade against the Muslims in the Peninsula.

In November 1095, pope Urban II preached the First Crusade. A wave of enthusiasm gripped Western Christendom as it launched an unprecedented campaign against the Muslim hold on the Holy Land. The venture culminated, on 15 July 1099, with the capture of Jerusalem. After the success in the Holy Land, French crusaders turned their eyes to the Iberian Peninsula whose Christian rulers were still wrestling against the Almoravids. Amongst the nobles who participated in the First Crusade were duke Guillaume IX (1086-1127) of Gascony and Aquitaine, and his vassal, vicomte Gaston IV of Béarn, who accompanied the duke in the sieges of Nicaea, Antioch, and in the assault against Jerusalem itself. Back in Europe, crusading enthusiasm reverberated amongst the Pyrenean nobility, where Gaston IV, vicomte of Béarn (1088-31), and his brother, Centule II, comte of Bigorre, mustered armies to aid their Aragonese neighbours in their fight against the Muslims of al-Andalus.

This was not the first time that French nobles had aided their Iberian neighbours. Even so, this was arguably the first example of such joint efforts establishing long-term effects. French and in particular, Norman participation in the Spanish

---

146 Ibid., la vicomté de Béarn et le problème de sa souveraineté. Des origines a 1620 (Monein: 2009), 34.
147 A Franco-Aragonese contingent fleetingly seized Barbastro from Muslim control (1065), only to be recaptured months later. The definitive capture of Barbastro came only in 1100. Cf. Bull, Knightly piety and the lay response to the First Crusade: the Limousin and Gascony, c.970 - c.1130 (Oxford:
Reconquista went back to the eleventh century, certainly as far back as April 1073 when Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) had stated the conditions binding those who, like the count of Rouncy, participated in the Christian fight against the Muslim kingdoms of Iberia. Perhaps, the best-documented case of Anglo-Norman participation in such endeavours is that of Rotrou II of Perche (1099-1144), to whom Orderic Vitalis dedicated a passage in his Historia Ecclesiastica. In recent years, there has been an upsurge of interest in Rotrou's participation in the campaigns led by Alfonso I of Pamplona-Aragón (1104-34) against the Almoravids. Rotrou’s presence in the Peninsula is documented from 1122 onwards, when he appears as senior or count of Tudela. Thereafter, Alfonso I granted him several estates in the Ebro area. Rotrou was cousin of Alfonso I of Aragón, and his participation in Spanish affairs has been seen both as a search for booty and as the discharging of a family obligation. Rotrou’s Iberian enthusiasms supply a context for the case that particularly concerns us here: that of the vicomtes of Béarn.

Gaston IV, vicomte of Béarn

149 The counts of Perche already had interests in England before the twelfth century, but the marriage of Rotrou II (1099-1144) to Henry I’s illegitimate daughter Matilda brought them further interests. Later, Geoffrey III (1191-1202), Rotrou III eldest son, married Matilda (July 1189), daughter of Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, thus she was the niece of Richard I of England, from whom he received an important marriage portion. Cf. Chibnall, ed., The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis (Oxford: 1978), VI, xiii, 1-6; Thompson, Power and Border Lordships in Medieval France: the County of the Perche, 1000-1226 (Woodbridge: 2002), 59-60; 71-8; Nelson, ‘Rotrou of Perche and the Aragonese Reconquest’, Traditio, 26 (1970); Villegas-Aristizabal, ‘Norman and Anglo-Norman participation in the Iberian Reconquest c. 1018 - c.1248’ (PhD, University of Nottingham, 2007), 108-128. The title of the king of Navarre (rex Navarrae) only came into use until the reign of Sancho VI (1150-94), when he stopped using the title of king of Pamplona.
150 Lacarra y de Miguel, Documentos para el estudio de la reconquista y repoblación del Valle del Ebro (Zaragoza: 1982-5), no. 91.
151 Ibid.; Ibid., ‘Los franceses en la reconquista y repoblación del valle del Ebro en tiempos de Alfonso el Batallador’, Cuadernos de Historia, 2 (1968), 68-9; Thompson, Perche, 73.
Exhibited in the museum of the basilica del Pilar in Saragossa is the ivory horn ('olifant') of Gaston IV of Béarn: a reminder of Béarnaise participation in the Aragonese reconquista. After returning from the Holy Land, where he had fought alongside Raymond IV of Toulouse and Robert of Flanders, Gaston IV and his brother, Centule II of Bigorre, actively participated in the conquest of Saragossa led by Alfonso I of Navarre-Aragón.

Ties between Gascon lords and the Spanish kingdoms were not new. However, a clearer picture of such connections begins to emerge, from c.1100 onwards. In many cases, these relations rested on a foundation supplied by strategic marriage alliances. According to Marcus Bull, such alliances were a way for the Iberian kingdoms to ‘limit military aid from France’, at the same time as strengthening Iberian influence over the French Midi. Marriage also secured military help against rival kingdoms in times of conflict. It strengthened commercial partnerships. At some time c.1085, Gaston, the son of the vicomte Centule V of Béarn (I of Bigorre), married Talesa (Talèse, Taresa), daughter of Sancho Ramírez, señor de Aybar, natural son of Ramiro I of Navarre and brother of the future King Sancho I of Aragón and V of Navarre. At the time, Centule already held Ara and Peña in Aragón. In 1086, the marriage alliance secured for Centule V and his son, Gaston, Sancho’s oath (‘sacramentum’) to defend his vassal (‘meus homo’) from bodily harm save against Sancho’s lord

154 Bull, Knightly Piety, 89.
155 Bull considers Sancho de Aybar’s peregrination to Jerusalem (‘…pergere in viam sepulchri domini Iesuchristi causa orationis ad Sanctum Joanem…) as a ‘family connection with Gaston’s participation on the First Crusade’, however it is difficult to see this as a motivation for this participation in the Crusade and then in the conquest of Saragossa in 1118. Cf. Ibid., 94; Lema Pueyo, Alfonso I el Batallador rey de Aragón y Pamplona (1104-1134) (Gijón: 2008), 85-6; Ibarra y Rodríguez, ed., Documentos correspondientes al reinado de Sancio Ramires (1907-1913), ii, no. 76.
(‘dominus meus’), Alfonso VI of León-Castile, Guy of Poitiers or his son, William.\footnote{From 1077, Alfonso VI of León-Castile used the title ‘Emperor of Spain’. Ravier et al., eds., \textit{Le cartulaire de Bigorre (XI-XIII siècle)} (Paris: 2005), no. 25.}

It is also possible that this marriage prompted the comte of Bigorre to honour his duties to Sancho, in a territorial agreement signed with Raymond-Guilhem I, vicomte of Soule (1080-88), in which Gaston promised his help against all men, save the king of Pamplona and the count of Gascony (‘…excepto rege Pampilonie et comite Gasconie’).\footnote{Ibid., no. 43; ibid.} Following the marriage (c.1113 X June 1114), Gaston appears in the records as lord (‘senior’) of Barbastro (‘vicecomes Guaston in Barbastro’). However, it is impossible to determine whether he received this honour as a result of marriage or as a reward for his military assistance to the Iberian king.\footnote{Ubieto Arteta, \textit{Los tenentes}, 224; Lacarra y de Miguel, ‘Franceses en la reconquista’, 67; Durán Gudiol, \textit{Colección diplomática de la catedral de Huesca} (Zaragoza: 1965), no. 112.}

Béarnaise interests were not limited to military assistance. The vicomtes of Béarn also shared religious interests with bordering Aragón. Of particular significance here is the hospital of Santa Cristina de Somport (‘Summo portu’). From the time of Sancho III ‘el Mayor’ (1004-1035) of Castile, Pamplona and Aragón, and subsequently of Ramiro I (1035-1069) of Aragón, the hospital was a key stopping point for pilgrims going to Compostela and for merchants crossing the Pyrenees.\footnote{Ubieto Arteta, ‘Los caminos que unían a Aragón con Francia durante la Edad Media’, in \textit{Les communications dans la Péninsule Ibérique au Moyen-Age}. Actes du Colloque de Pau 28-29 mars 1980, \textit{Collection de la Maison des Pays Ibériques} (Paris: 1981), 24. The route was mostly used by Italian, Provencal and people from the Languedoc. Melczer, ed., \textit{Pilgrim’s Guide}, 85 n. 9.}

The circumstances of its foundation remain a matter of controversy, although some scholars have suggested that it was entrusted to the Order of the Holy Sepulchre, in order to guard the ‘communications’ between Béarn and Aragón.\footnote{Buesa, ‘Los caminos de Santiago. Aragón, Somport y Jaca’, in \textit{Los caminos de Santiago. Arte, Historia y Literatura} (Zaragoza: 2005), 17.} Somport lay on the chief road south from the béarnaise town of Oloron, an important commercial
The Hospital’s importance was such that the *Codex Calixtinus* (c. 1140-1173) describes it as one of ‘three columns essential for the support of (God’s) poor’, in the same league as the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem and the Alpine refuge of St-Bernard de Mountjoux. Failing to name the founder, the *Codex* further states that ‘therefore, he who had built those places, no matter who he may be, will partake, without any doubt, of the kingdom of God’.163

As a result of its importance and to enhance its standing, the hospital of Santa Cristina was richly endowed with property by the vicomtes of Béarn. In 1104, Talesa donated to the Hospital the ‘pardina’ of Nueveciercos, with all its lands and rents, for the redemption of her soul and of the souls of her parents (‘pro redemptione anime meae vel parentum meorum’).164 A decade later, in July 1116, Pope Paschal II (1099-1118) confirmed the privileges and donations granted by Gaston IV to the Hospital.

Because of this confirmation, Gaston has traditionally been identified as Somport’s founder, an identification that, as Antonio Ubieto Arteta has shown, is not supported by the existing documentation.165 Whoever its founder was, Santa Cristina continued
to attract Béarnaise support. The vicomtes gave further lands and privileges and, on 13 June 1128, entrusted the hospital with the perpetual government (‘in perpetuum gubernandum comiserunt’) of the unidentified hospice of Silva Fageti.\(^{166}\)

From 1117, whether because of the marriage alliance to Talesa, or because of the furore that followed the First Crusade, Gaston IV of Béarn and Centule II of Bigorre, enthusiastically aided Alfonso I of Navarre-Aragón against the Muslim Almoravids who held the Ebro Valley (see Map 1 - The Almoravids).

**The Almoravids**

The Almoravids emerged from the 1060s onwards as a major new force within the Muslim world. Their hold over the Maghreb was based upon a religious revival that attracted the Berber tribes. From 1062 to 1086, Yusuf ibn Tasufin (1061-1106) was engaged in a relentless battle for the north of Africa. Having successfully conquered Fez, he reorganized the region’s administration and established his capital in Marrakesh. Yusuf then focused on al-Andalus, the Muslim kingdoms in the Iberian Peninsula.

On 23 October 1086, Yusuf ibn Tasufin arrived in Seville with a contingent of African Berber forces to wage a war against the Christian advance in the Peninsula.

\(^{166}\) The donation came after the death of Centule (d. 1128), taken by Ubieto Arteta to be the son of Gaston IV and Talesa, who succeeded his father in 1130 and died in Fraga in 1134. The document probably alludes to the death of Centule II of Bigorre, brother of Gaston IV of Béarn (‘…Notum sit presentibus atque futuris quoniam Gasto bearnensium uicecomes et uxor eius nomine Talesa inspirante spiritus sancti gratia pro sua suorumque parentum ac Centulli filii sui nuper defuncti eterna redemptione.’): Kiviharju, Colección diplomática, no. 37; cf. Ubieto Arteta, ‘Somport’, 270-1; On other properties of the Santa Cristina cf. A. Canellas López, ‘El cartulario de Santa Cristina de Somport’, in Homenaje al profesor Juan Torres Fontes (Murcia: 1987), 210.
His armies defeated Alfonso VI of León-Castile (king of León from 1065, and of León Castile from 1072-1109) in the battle of Zalaca (Sagrajas). Regardless of the setback, Alfonso VI continued to make treaties with the *taifa* kings, who often plotted against the forces sent from Marrakesh by Yusuf (as was the case with Yusuf’s failed campaign of 1088).

Yusuf took it upon himself to strengthen the Almoravid hold over al-Andalus. To achieve this, he established new bylaws governing, what he perceived, as the traitor *taifas* who had allied with the Christian kingdoms. Despite the earlier Muslim setback of 1088, a third campaign was launched in 1090 taking Granada and Málaga. The following year (1091), Yusuf conquered Seville, Almería, Badajoz and Lisbon.

By 1094, the balance of power was delicately poised. In the east of the Peninsula, Valencia fell to the famous Rodrigo Diaz de Vivar, ‘el Cid’, while in the west, Lisbon was again retaken by the Leonese. 167 In 1097, Yusuf returned from Morocco. Alfonso VI who was on his way to Saragossa was forced back to Consuegra, where his army was defeated. 168 Slowly, the Almoravid forces started to recover the territories held by the Cid. By 1097, Cuenca, held by the Cid’s nephew, fell to Yusuf while the Cid’s son was killed in battle. Two years later, on 10 July 1099, ‘el Cid’ died, as Almoravid forces continued their advance against the Christian kingdoms.

On 5 May 1102, despite Alfonso VI’s help, Doña Jimena, the Cid’s widow, was

---

167 There seems to have been a shifting frontier in Lisbon, as in 1111 it was retaken by the Almoravids, again in 1137 Christians try to take Lisbon but are pushed back by Yusuf’s forces. It is only until October 1147, that king Alfonso Henriques and Anglo-Norman crusader force conquer Lisbon that it would remain in the hands of the Christian kingdoms. For an account of the Anglo-Norman crusade in 1147 cf. Osbernus et al., *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi. The conquest of Lisbon* (New York: 2001).

168 However, Consuegra was taken in 1099.
unable to retain Valencia. That same year, Abu-al Hasan Ali was named as Yusuf’s heir in Córdoba.

When, in 1106, Ali succeeded as Almoravid ruler, the Ebro valley was largely under Almoravid control. The following year (1107), Ali travelled to al-Andalus. The frontier with Aragón was, until 1110, defended by the ruler of Saragossa, Ahmad al-Mustain II (last ruler of the Banu Hud dynasty), allowing Ali and the Almoravids to continue their expansion in the central area of the Peninsula. In May 1108, Ali’s forces took Uclés and the castles of Huete, Ocaña and Cuenca in Castile. Under Yusuf, Saragossa had been allowed to remain a taifa state, but in January 1110, when al-Mustain died fighting in Valtierra against the Christian forces, Saragossa came under the control of Muhammad ibn al-Hayy, governor of Fez. Without a military or political presence in the city, Saragossa soon became an Aragonese target. To counter this, from June, al-Hayy resided in Saragossa where he ruled over its territories, as well as Valencia and Lérida (Lleida). In 1115, Ali named Abu Bakr ibn Ibrahim ibn Tifilwit as governor of Saragossa, who attempted to take Barcelona but was forced back. Between late 1116 and early 1117, Ibn Tifiwit died. Saragossa was left without an army to defend it. The city itself was governed by Ibn Taayyast (Abu Ishaq Ibrahim), one of Yusuf’s brothers, who had taken control of the region of Valencia. Taayyast chose not to reside in Saragossa and settled in Seville instead, paving the way for the forces of Alfonso I to take the city. Finally, on 22 May 1118, Alfonso I and his Gascon allies laid siege to Saragossa.\(^{169}\)

Saragossa

On 8 July 1117, Alfonso I, accompanied by Gaston IV of Béarn and his brother, Centule II of Bigorre, prepared to besiege the city of Saragossa. The Gascon brothers, with the help of the bishops of Pamplona, Arlés, Auch, Lescar, Bayonne, and Barbastro, all of whom had preached the military expedition against Saragossa, had recruited men from across the Pyrenees. Accompanied by Bernard comte of Comminges, Pierre vicomte of Gabarret (the son-in-law of Gaston IV), Auger vicomte of Miramont or Tursan, Arnald of Levadan, and Guy de Lons, bishop of Lescar, Alfonso I, Gaston and Centule marched towards the city. Orderic Vitalis, a contemporary witness, recalled the events in his Historia Ecclesiastica. Unsurprisingly, albeit with several caveats, he exalted the participation of the Norman, Rotrou de Perche. The Christian armies soon overpowered the city’s dwindling defences. By December, Saragossa had fallen to the besieging army, as the Almoravid emir, Aby Tahir Tamin, failed to send sufficient aid.

170 Lacarra y de Miguel, Documentos, no. 6.
Alfonso I rewarded Gaston’s participation by naming him señor (‘senior’) of Saragossa (either shortly after the conquest or in early 1119). Other Gascons were also granted lands. However, these grants did not result in the long-term establishment of a French population. Most of the newly conquered lands were sold shortly after. Their new lords, explains Stalls, owed their power in Aragón to Alfonso and their kinship ensured they were faithful servants of the king. But they did not exercise a tight control over property or people, as they were not required to licence or warrant transactions in either land or property. Such lords received only the revenues of their holdings, and lacked a firm control over them, thus strengthening the royal establishment and control of the land. For this reason, land tenure in Aragón, during the twelfth century, was far from secure. As a result, there were frequent surrenders and confiscations of land, which, in most cases, went undisputed by the nobility.

From the conquest of Saragossa in 1118, until 1123, Alfonso I and his Gascon allies were immersed in a relentless reconquest of the Ebro Valley. In February 1119, they took Tudela. It is possible that Gaston and Centule participated in the campaign, but evidence remains inconclusive, as there are considerable gaps in the surviving documentation. It is also possible that Rotrou de Perche participated, at least in the campaign against Tudela. However, he only appears in charters dated before 1121.

---

174 Lacarra y de Miguel, Documentos, no. 57; Lema Pueyo, Diplomática de Alfonso I, no. 94. In another source he appears as lord of Saragossa and Uncastillo in 1118, but thereafter the only other mention of him as lord of Uncastillo is until 1124. Sangorrín y Diest-Garcés, ed., El libro de la cadena del consejo de Jaca. Documentos Reales, Episcopales y Municipales de los siglos X, XI, XII, XIII, y XIV (Zaragoza: 1920), no. 11. Cf. Zurita, Anales, I, xlii.
176 Stalls, Possessing the Land, 128-9; 150-1.
177 Zurita, Anales, I, xliii; Chibnall, ed., The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, xiii, 4. In 1121, on a donation to the church of St Mary in Tudela, Retrou appears as senior of Tudela Lacarra y de Miguel, Documentos, no. 80. Thompson incorrectly dates it in 1123. Thompson, Perche, 73. Retrou
In March 1120, a slave revolt in Cordoba forced Ali to travel to al-Andalus. The fractured Almoravid resistance allowed Alfonso I’s army to advance further into the Ebro valley.

Meanwhile, ties between bordering Gascony and Pamplona-Aragón tightened. In May 1122, Alfonso I was at Morlaàs, the capital of Béarn, where Centule II of Bigorre swore allegiance to the king. In return, and for his support in fighting the Almoravids, Centule received Tarrazona, the castle and town of Rueda, half of the ‘honore’ [caualleria de honore] held by Galindo Sanchez in Belchite, half of Santa María de Albarracín, when Alfonso could conquer it (‘quando Deus omnipotens eam mihi dederit’), and 200 ‘cauallerias de honore in Ispania’ when the king could obtain them (‘quando ego illas acquire’). In return, Centule became Alfonso I’s vassal ‘by mouth and hand’ (‘et facio me uuestro homine de bocca et de manus’).

Naturally, Gaston IV was there to witness the settlement. As José A Lema Pueyo has explained, the nature of Alonso’s visit to Béarn is unknown, as the scarce documentation allows only for speculation. It is nonetheless possible that he was

could not have been granted Tudela in 1119, because on 13 December in a carta de población of Belchite, Aznar Aznarez was named as senior in Tudela. Lacarra y de Miguel, Documentos, no. 58.  
178 Guichard, Al-andalus, 98.  
179 Caualleria de honore (honore), a term used in Navarre and Aragón. The king was to pay 500 sueldo jaquense for every caualleria held by a noble. It was a fixed payment to those who held castles or towns from the king. Therefore, 200 cauallerias de honore would have been 100,000 sueldos jaquenses that Alfonso I would have to pay Centule II. The honor is usually held during the life of the beneficiary, but the king retains the right to take it away. Cf. Utrilla Utrilla, ‘La nobleza aragonesa y el Estado en el siglo XIII: composición, jerarquización y comportamientos políticos’, in La sociedad en Aragón y Cataluña en el reinado de Jaime I (1213-1276) (Zaragoza: 2009), 206 and 213.  
180 Hec est carta testamenti quam facio ego comiti don Centullo de Bigorra et de Lorda ad uos seniori meo domno Adefonso imperatori, filio regis Sancii et regine Felicie. Placui mihi libenti animo et spontanea uoluntate et facio me uestro homine de bocca et de manus et recognosco per uos et per uestra manu toto illo honore quod hodie habeo uel in antea adquirere potuero cum Dei auxilio. Et ut uobis sedeam fidelissimo et ueridico vassallo quomodo fidelis vassallo debet esse ad suum seniorem per bonam fidem sine ullo malo ingenio’: Lema Pueyo, Diplomática de Alfonso I, no. 109-10; Lacarra y de Miguel, Documentos, no. 82; cf. Zurita, Anales, I, xlvi.
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looking to strengthen his relation with the Gascon lords, as he later travelled to Soule, where he met with the vicomte. 181

Religious Zeal

In 1122 or 1123, Alfonso I created the confraternity of Belchite, which seems to have predated that of Monreal del Campo (1124), in which Gaston de Béarn actively participated. 182 Both were lay military associations, endorsed by members of the Church, and dedicated to fight against the Muslim occupation of Spain. The reconquista had been already supported by the papacy, with Pope Calixtus II (1119-1124) encouraging Spanish bishops, kings and princes to fight against the Muslims of al-Andalus. On 20 April 1121-4, the Pope had extended to those who participated in such efforts the crusader’s indulgence granted to those who participated in the crusade to the Holy Land (‘omnibus enim in hac expedition constanter militantibus, eandem peccatorum remissionem, quam orientalis ecclesie defensoribus fecimus…’). 183

Lay military organizations were not new to the Peninsula. In the early eleventh century, the bishop and canons of Vic created a lay military chapter known as levites to protect the castles, which the counts of Barcelona had granted the Church. In the 1090s, the archbishop of Vic created a confraternity to aid in the conquest of Tarragona. Like the milites of Belchite and Monreal they were also called to join the

182 The confraternity of Belchite seems to have been created to defend the newly conquered Saragossa, but as with that of Monreal we lack an exact date for its creation, however Ubieto Arteta suggests it was created between February and May 1122 in a reunion between Alfonso I, the archbishops of Toledo and Auch, and the bishops of Zaragoza, Huesca, Roda-Barbastro, Calahorra, Trazona, Osma, Lescar, Sigüenza and Segovia. Ubieto Arteta, ‘la creación de la Cofradía militar de Belchite’, Estudios de Edad Media de la corona de Aragón, V (1952), 434. Also cf. Lourie, ‘The Confraternity of Belchite, the Ribat, and the Temple’, Viator, 13 (1982).
183 Mansilla, Documentación pontificia, no. 62.
war against the Almoravids. A document signed by the archbishop of Auch, and the bishops of Alfonso’s kingdom granted a forty-day absolution from penance to those who provided a monthly contribution to the ‘militia’ of Monreal. In his foundation charter, Alfonso I credited the Holy Spirit with the grace that had inspired him to found the militia (‘inspirante et cooperante Spiritus Sancti’) as well as the council and help of vicomte Gaston (‘consilio et auxilio uicecomitis Gastonis’) and other good men. Its purpose, he stated, was to fight against, and triumph over, the Muslims ‘from this side of the sea’ (i.e. from al-Andalus), in order to open the way to Jerusalem (‘debellatis et superatis omnibus de citra mare Sarracenis, iter aperire ad transfretandum Ierosolimam’). Like the militia of Jerusalem (the later Order of the Temple), the members of Alfonso’s militia were exempted from paying the quinta, a tax on the fifth of the spoils of war (‘a quinta sit libera et injenua, quemadmodo milicia confraternitatis Iherosolimitana’).

We know very little about the confraternities of Monreal and Belchite, the latter subsequently absorbed by the Temple. However, their foundation displayed Alfonso’s piety and his military drive that won him the title of ‘el Batallador’ (the battler) amongst the Iberian kingdoms. His religious zeal was further echoed in his testament, in which he bequeathed his kingdom to the Order of the Temple, the Holy Sepulchre, and to the Hospital of St John. As yet further proof of the close connections between Spain and Gascony, this testament was drafted in October 1131, when Alfonso I had been at the siege of Bayonne for at least a year, from October

---

186 Ibid., Diplomática de Alfonso I, no. 241 (no. 242 in ancient Catalan).
1130-31, almost certainly in support of his ally, the count of Toulouse, Alphonse Jourdain, who was at war with William IX of Aquitaine.\textsuperscript{187} Alfonso VII of Léon-Castile also had vested interests in Toulouse, and after Alfonso’s death, Alphonse of Toulouse is said to have received a lordship from the king.\textsuperscript{188} Offering an alternative reconstruction of events, Joseph O’Callaghan has suggested that the King attended the siege of Bayonne on behalf of Gaston de Béarn. But this seems unlikely, as Alfonso is known to have supported the counts of Toulouse, since 1108 when he signed an agreement with Alphonse’s brother, Bertrand (who died in Tripoli in 1112), by which the count ceded to Alfonso the cities of Bèziers, Narbonne, and Rodez and other cities if Alfonso would support him against William IX, Duke of Aquitaine who had married Philippa of Toulouse (1094) and who claimed the county.\textsuperscript{189}

Gaston’s role as an ally and advisor to Alfonso was closely connected to his piety which went hand-in-hand with the role he played in Alfonso’s \textit{reconquista}, apparently drawing Béarn closer to the Iberian kingdom than to the dukes of Aquitaine. This situation would continue throughout the twelfth and into the thirteenth century.

**Gaston IV’s Diplomatic and Military Activity**

Gaston IV’s influence at the court of Alfonso I increased, as did the number of lordships he held from him. By 1124, he held Saragossa, Uncastillo and Huesca.\textsuperscript{190}


\textsuperscript{188} CAI, i, 50, p. 185 n. 126; p. 192.


\textsuperscript{190} Lema Pueyo, \textit{Diplomática de Alfonso I}, no. 126.
In addition, the vicomte also became a leading figure in Aragonese diplomacy. In 1127, Alfonso I marched into León claiming León-Castile as a result of his marriage to Urraca (Queen of León-Castile). Upon her death (1126), León-Castile had been inherited by her son Alfonso VII, but Alfonso I laid claim to the kingdom. According to the Chronica Adelfonsi Imperatoris, the king of Pamplona-Aragón intended to fortify Nájera, Castrojeriz and other castles, but realized that ‘the Lord was with the king of León (Alfonso VII)’. Alfonso I’s forces retreated, but were forced into battle with the Leonese. Alfonso I sent Gaston de Bearn and Centule de Bigorre to the court of Alfonso VII of León. The king of León accepted their terms, by which Alfonso I of Aragón was to return the lands he had taken within 40 days. In 1129, Alfonso I broke the treaty and ‘plundered’ the Leonese lands, besieging Morón and Medinaceli. Alfonso VII, once again, forced back the invading forces.

In 1130, Gaston was on his way to the region of Valencia when he engaged in battle with the Almoravids. Pierre Guichard, has suggested that Alfonso I saw Valencia as the starting point for a trans-Mediterranean crusade to the Holy Land. Gaston’s forces lost the battle. The leaders of the Christian army, Gaston and bishop Esteban of Jaca, were captured and killed. The vicomte was decapitated and his head sent to the ruler of Granada, the principal Muslim authority in al-Andalus. There it was paraded through streets and markets, until it was finally sent to Marrakesh. Gaston’s body was buried in the church of Santa María la Mayor in Saragossa and his

191 Alfonso VII was the son of Urraca and her first husband, count Raymond of Burgundy.
192 CAI, I, 9-17.
193 Guichard, Al-andalus, 105.
olifant and sword handed over to the basílica del Pilar. His son, Centule VI (1131-1134) inherited the vicomté of Béarn and received Gaston’s lands in Aragón.

The Aftermath of Alfonso I’s Death

Centule VI continued to participate in Alfonso I’s enterprises. However, his short career ended on 17 July 1134, when he died in battle at Fraga, fighting the Almoravids. A few months later, on 7 September 1134, Alfonso I died childless. Centule’s nephew, Pierre III de Gabarret, son of Guiscard de Béarn and Pierre de Gabarret II, who had also participated in the campaign against Saragossa, inherited Centule’s Béarnaise lands.

Alfonso’s death was followed by great turmoil, as nobles of Navarre and Aragón refused to carry out the king’s testament in which he had bequeathed the kingdom to the military orders. Aragón and Navarre were once again separated. In both kingdoms the nobles speedily elected new kings, in response to the looming threat of a Leonese invasion by Alfonso VII. In Navarre, García Ramírez (1134-1150) was elected king of Pamplona. Meanwhile in Aragón, the nobles summoned Ramiro [II],

---

194 Zurita, Anales, I, xliv; Balaguer, ‘La vizcondesa de Bearn Doña Talesa y la rebelión contra Ramiro II en 1136’, Estudios de Edad Media de la corona de Aragón, V (1952), 98; the olifant survives, but the sword was later lost, cf. Lema Pueyo, Alfonso I, 243.
195 By August 1130, his son Centule appears as lord of Saragossa and Uncastillo. Ibid., Diplomática de Alfonso I, no. 228-9.
196 Zurita, Anales, I, lii.
197 In 1110, his marriage to Urraca of Castile was annulled, three years later Alfonso I repudiated her. Afterwards he made no attempts to remarry and failed to name an heir. Lourie suggests that Alfonso I may have been infertile. In addition, she considers that perhaps Alfonso I considered his brother Ramiro as a possible heir to the throne. Lourie, ‘The Will of Alfonso I, "El Batallador", king of Aragon and Navarre: A Reassessment’, Speculum, 50 (1975), 639-43.
Alfonso’s brother, a Benedictine monk, abbot of San Pedro el Viejo of Huesca and bishop elect of Roda-Barbastro, to the throne.\(^{198}\)

In Rome, the failure to carry out Alfonso’s will, at least in Aragón, angered pope Innocent II, who called upon Alfonso VII of Léon-Castile to ensure that the testament was enforced.\(^{199}\) The Leonese king seized the opportunity and marched into Saragossa (1135).\(^{200}\) By September, García Ramírez held Saragossa from Alfonso VII.\(^{201}\) Talesa, the widow of Gaston of Béarn, was stripped of the lands she held in the city, but retained the important stronghold of Uncastillo, which guarded the roads between Navarre and Aragón.\(^{202}\) Amidst political turmoil, Ramiro II married Agnes (Inés) of Poitou, daughter of Duke William (Guillaume) IX of Aquitaine through his alliance with Philippa of Toulouse. Alfonso VII of León-Castile granted Saragossa to count Ramón Berenguer IV, count of Barcelona (1136).\(^{203}\) According to the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*, the count received Saragossa and together with ‘the nobles who dwelled in the whole of Gascony’ and Montpellier, paid homage to

---

\(^{198}\) García Ramírez and his successors may have not been expressly attacked by the papacy, but neither did he or his successor were considered as *rex*, but as a *dux*; according to Martín Duque, it was not until the triumphant battle of Alarcos (1195), against the Muslims that the papacy used *rex* for the Navarrese king. Martín Duque, ‘La restauración de la monarquía navarra y las Órdenes Militares (1134-1194)’, Príncipe de Viana, 63 (2002), 855-6.


\(^{200}\) It is recalled in surviving documentation as ‘anno quod intrauit rex Adelfonsus imperator de Lione in Caragoça’: Lacarra y de Miguel, *Documentos*, no. 259.

\(^{201}\) A charter from 13 November 1135 recalls: ‘in ipso anno quando Adefonsus rex imperator dedit Saragoza ad don Garzia rege’: Ibid., no. 260.

\(^{202}\) Ibid., no. 257. Around November 1134, Alfonso VII and García Ramírez met in Nájera where after paying homage to the Leonese king García was recognized king of Pamplona. Alfonso VII in return received the Rioja. *CAI*, i, 63, p. 190-1.

\(^{203}\) Fittingly, a document dated 3 July 1136 is dated ‘anno quando imperator reddidit Zaracoza ad rege Ramiri et uxori sue’: Lacarra y de Miguel, *Documentos*, no. 266.
Alfonso VII of Castile. This latter homage seems unlikely, and cannot be corroborated in the documents. Rather, it seems to be a later addition to support Alfonso VIII’s claim to Gascony. Because the author of the Chronica is unknown, it is impossible to know whether his claims are in merely late additions to whatever source it was from which he was copying. However, although Gascons were present in the court of Castile, as was the case with Raymond Archbishop of Toledo (c. 1127-1152), founder of the school of translators of Toledo, the idea that Gascony now paid homage to the kings of Castile seems most improbable.

Ramiro’s and Agnes had a daughter, Petronilla (Peronella, Peyronela). Shortly after her birth, on 11 August 1137, Ramiro bequeathed the throne of Aragón and his daughter to count Ramón Berenguer IV of Barcelona, and returned to monastic life.

**Ramón Berenguer IV**

During the rule of Ramiro II, Saragossa and Uncastillo, formerly held by the vicomte of Béarn, changed hands. Until at least January 1135, Talesa held Uncastillo. However, by 1137, Saragossa had been granted to the noble Guillem Azanarez, and Uncastillo to an Aragonese named Frontín, who seems to have been close to Ramiro. Under Ramón Berenguer’s rule, new lands were granted to the vicomte of Béarn, Pierre, who participated in several of the count’s campaigns, most notably the

---

204 CAI, i, 67-8.
206 LFM, no. 7.
207 Balaguers, Elevación de Ramiro II, no. 4.
208 Lacarra y de Miguel, Documentos, nos. 274-5. According to Belaguer, it is possible that this man took control of Uncastillo in 1136, prompting a Béarnaise retaliation against him and the rule of Ramiro II, however evidence remains sketchy at best. Balaguers, ‘Vizcondesa de Bearn’, 100-2.
expedition into Lérida (Lleida), as a result of which he was granted Osca and Bespen in Catalonia.\textsuperscript{209}

It is likely that Talesa retained influence and lands in Saragossa, because on 10 July 1144, she bequeathed all her family possessions in Saragossa and Sobradiel (‘omnem meam hereditatem quam habeo in Caragoça et in terminis ejus et in Supratel similiter’) to the Order of the Temple, for the soul of her late husband, Gaston IV, who had who obtained these lands ‘through the shedding of blood and with triumphant glory’ and for her own soul and the remission of her sins (‘pro anima domini mei Gaston vicecomitis, qui eam adquisivit cum sanguinis effusione et gloria triumphali, et pro anima mea similiter et remissione omnium peccatorum nostrorum’).\textsuperscript{210} Talesa, who may have died between 1152 and 1154, was not the only French noble to donate part of her Aragonese possessions to the Temple. The counts of Bigorre and the Norman Rotrou de Perche also gave land and property to the Order.\textsuperscript{211}

In April 1154, following the deaths both of Guiscard of Béarn (‘mortua vicecomitissa Bearnensis nomine Guiscarda’), Talesa’s daughter, and of Pierre II of Béarn (‘olim defuncti’), a group of Béarnaise nobles and the young Gaston V (1153-1170) gathered in Canfranc to pay homage to Ramón Berenguer IV as count-king of Catalonia-Aragón (‘fecerunt ei hominium sacramenta et fidelitates, eligentes eum sibi in dominium et rectorem salva fidelitate filiorum Petri vicecomitis Bearnensis olim

\textsuperscript{209} Bofarull y Mascaro, \textit{Colección de documentos inéditos del Archivo General de la Corona de Aragón}, Vol. iv (Barcelona: 1850), no. 60.
\textsuperscript{210} Albon, ed., \textit{Cartulaire du Temple}, no. 338.
\textsuperscript{211} On 1148, the counts of Bigorre donated the town of Bordéres, close to Tarves, and their property in Zaragoza to the Temple. Lacarra y de Miguel, \textit{Documentos}, no. 352; cf. García Mouton, ‘Los franceses en Aragón (siglos XI-XIII)’, 68.
defuncti’). Ramón Berenguer became Gaston’s guardian and regent. This was quite possibly the first time that a vicomte of Béarn had paid homage to a foreign sovereign.212 Shortly afterwards, Henry [II] became duke of Aquitaine (1152) and titular ruler over Gascony. On 19 December 1154, he was crowned king of England. The apparent independence of Béarn might suggest either that it was not considered as part of Gascony, or that Gascony itself remained a relatively insignificant part of Aquitaine, allowing Aragón to stake a claim to at least part of Gascony north of the Pyrenees.

The First Anglo-Spanish Alliance?

And so it is that we come to the first of what was to prove a long succession of Anglo-Spanish alliances. In 1159, during Ramón Berenguer’s regency of the vicomté, an important alliance was forged between the count of Barcelona and Henry II of England against Raymond V, count of Toulouse who was supported by Eleanor’s former husband, king Louis VII of France. Henry sought to claim Toulouse on behalf of his wife, while the count of Barcelona remained in pursuit of a feud with Toulouse over the county of Provence.213 It is possible that Béarnaise resources were mustered for Henry’s 1159 expedition to Toulouse. However, this remains mere speculation.

212 Bofarull y Mascaró, Documentos inéditos, no. 81; Tucoo-Chala, Vicomté de Béarn, 39-42 and no. 5. According to Balaguer, Talesa’s death has occasionally been dated in Jaca, on 1154, before Pentecost (23 May) ‘anno quando fuit mortua vicecomitissa de Bearne in Iacca.’ However, this is more likely to be Guiscard’s death.

The campaign against Toulouse drew Henry II and Ramón Berenguer IV closer.

According to Robert of Torigny, a betrothal between Henry’s younger son, Richard, and Ramón Berenguer’s daughter was agreed: when the young people should reach the appropriate age for marriage, Richard would receive the duchy of Aquitaine (‘…tempore opportune esset ducturus, et rex ducatum Aquitaniae illis exactis nuptiis concessurus’).\(^{214}\) In his *Anales*, Zurita elaborates the details here, which according to him took place in 1160, in the castle of *Blavia* (Blaye)\(^{215}\), where Henry II agreed to give Richard the county of Guyenne/Gascony following his marriage.\(^{216}\) Assuming that the chroniclers are correct, Richard, who was born on 8 September 1157, was only an infant, while Dulce, born circa 1160, may have been even younger. It is also possible that the count had another daughter, Leonor, who may have been promised in marriage to Richard.\(^{217}\) Her death, and that of Ramón Berenguer, could explain why the marriage proposal was not brought to completion.

If the chronicles are correct, the projected marriage could have been an attempt by Henry to secure his Gascon holdings, most of which were, as we have seen, under the direct influence of the Catalan-Aragonese ruler, rather than that of the duke of Aquitaine. The chroniclers provide few details on the grant to Richard. Even so, there is not enough evidence to suggest that Henry was prepared to alienate Gascony. Indeed, quite the contrary. In the future, Henry II assigned only ‘movable property’

---


\(^{215}\) *Castrum Blaviam* in Torigny.

\(^{216}\) Zurita, *Anales*, II, xvii. It is worth considering if Zurita, writing between 1562-80, was mistaking Guyenne with Gascony as was the case from the fifteenth century onwards. Cf. Harris, *Valois Guyenne: A Study of Politics, Government, and Society in Late Medieval France* (Woodbridge: 1994), 8.

\(^{217}\) Bofarull y Mascaró, *Los Condes de Barcelona vindicados, y cornología y genealogía de los Reyes de España considerados como soberanos independientes en su marca*, Vol. ii (Barcelona: 1836), 194.
as marriage portions to his sons or daughters at the time of their marriages. This, as with the earlier elaborations by Castilian chroniclers, suggests that later Spanish sources sought to rewrite the twelfth-century past in order to prove the validity of Castile’s later, highly questionable, claims to rule in Gascony.

The friendship between Henry II and Ramón Berenguer lasted beyond the fleeting campaign against Toulouse. At Huesca, on 4 August 1162, the count of Barcelona drafted his testament. In it, he entrusted Henry II with the protection of his children (‘dimisit omnem suum honorem, ac filios, in bajulia tuicione, defencione, domini Enrici Regis Anglie’). Naturally, the highest nobles of the kingdom, including Guillem de Moncada, vicomte of Béarn, witnessed the document. As the count’s ally, Henry II was aware of Ramón Berenguer's death, perhaps even that he had been entrusted with the protection of the young Alfonso. Just after the death of the count, on 27 September (1162), young Alfonso II and Fernando II of León renewed their alliance against Navarre. Fernando became the young king’s protector against all men, save the king of England.

Ramón Berenguer was interested in expanding Catalo-Aragonese influence beyond Béarn. In his testament, he bequeathed to his younger son Pere (Pedro) the counties of Carcassonne, Narbonne, Cerdagne, and the lands that the lord of Trencavel used to hold and which this same lord had granted to Ramón Berenguer (‘quem Trencavellus

---

220 Torigny, Chronica, iv, 215.
tenebat et per eum habebat’). Ramón, another of Ramón Berenguer’s sons, who changed his name to Ramón Berenguer IV of Provence (1167), was to hold the said counties from the count’s firstborn, Ramón (Raymundo), heir to Catalonia and Aragón, who, upon accession to the throne, following Aragonese tradition, changed his name to Alfonso [II] (‘tali pacto, ut hec omnia supra scripta que ei dimisit prefatus Petrus teneat et habeat per Raymundum fratrem suum majorem et inde faciat ei hominium et fidelitatem et serviat ei’).222

222 On Ramón Berenguer’s claims to those lands see his testament Bofarull y Mascaró, Condes de Barcelona, 207-9. Alfonso pursued the claims to the Occitanian counties and commissioned an inquiry into the matter of Carcassonne. Graham-Leigh, Albigensian Crusade, 12-13.
Chapter Four: The Catalo-Aragonese Connections of the Vicomté of Béarn

Alfonso II of Catalonia-Aragón, Alfonso VIII of Castile and Henry II of England

Catalonia and The Languedoc

When Alfonso II of Catalonia-Aragón succeeded to the throne, he was only an infant so that his tutor, Guillem Ramón II de Moncada, seneschal (*dapifer*) of Barcelona, had a crucial role to play.\(^{223}\) His influence over Catalanian politics was both political and military, so much so that when the count was away, it fell to the *dapifer* to command the military forces and to carry the count’s sword when on campaign. He also presided over the count’s court and acted as a royal delegate.\(^{224}\) During the king’s infancy, Guillem Ramón II conducted the diplomatic exchanges with Navarre and Castile, managing to keep an eye on Béarn as well. He was a senior political figure and assisted Ramón Berenguer IV with several other matters, including a journey to meet Frederick Barbarossa at Turin, in 1162, to discuss Barcelona’s claim over the county of Provence.\(^{225}\)

After the marriage of Petronilla to Ramón Berenger IV of Catalonia, the trans-Pyrenean interest of the two Iberian *kingdoms* merged (see Map Aragón 1050-1327).

---

\(^{223}\) *Dapifer* was the highest office a noble could hold in the court of the count of Barcelona. J. Miret y Sans, ‘La casa de Montcada en el vizcondado de Bearn’, *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, 2 (1901-2), I, 49-50.


As had been the case between Aragón and Béarn, language was not the only binding factor between Catalonia and the Languedoc: marital alliances and similarities between political systems were also key factors. While Aragón held interests in Béarn and Bigorre, Catalonia had longstanding claims in the Languedoc. As Frederick Cheyette has explained, by the eleventh century Carcassonne, Beziers-Albi-Nîmes, Comminges, Foix, Couserans, Bigorre, Barcelona and Navarre shared common family ties. The rulers of all these Occitan counties styled themselves counts, and it was common for them to be ruled as multiple counties, not always by counts descended from a single ruling dynasty.

---

227 Ibid., 827-8.
As Barcelona’s power grew, its rulers claimed possession of several of the counties of southern France, either through kinship or through other means, sometimes diplomatic sometimes, as was the case with Carcassonne, through a sale. The latter, may have been a strategy concocted by the Catalan chancery rather than the account of an actual transaction, as the ‘owner’ had yet to take control over the lordship (see Image, ‘Sale of Carcassonne’). After the death of comte Roger of Carcassonne (1067), who died without heirs, Ramón Berenguer I of Barcelona had claimed lordship of the county. The other powerful claimant here was Ermengard, Roger’s sister, married to Raymond-Bernard, also known as ‘Trencavel’, vicomte of Albi, Nîmes, and Béziers (1070). It was Bernard Ato, son of Ermengard and Raymond-Bernard, who took possession of the county. However, Barcelona continued to press its claim. The possession of Carcassonne remained unsettled when Alfonso II ascended the throne. Barcelona argued that Carcassonne had been sold to Ramón Berenguer I (1067-70) by Ermengard and her husband, and then granted back to them as a fief by the count of Barcelona.

Sale of Carcassonne in the Liber Feudorum Maior

Liber Feudorum Maior, f. 83bis r, in ACA, Cancillería Real, Registros, no. 1, in http://www.pares.es

230 The ‘sale’ has been extensively studied by F Cheyette, who has argued against the Catalan version of events, which has been widely accepted by historians. Ibid.
The Catalan claim to Provence resulted from the second marriage of Ramón Berenguer III (1097-1131) to Dolça (Dulce) of Provence. Their first-born son, Ramón Berenguer IV, inherited Barcelona, while a younger son, Berenguer Ramón, inherited Provence.\textsuperscript{231} In his testament Ramón Berenguer III of Barcelona stipulated that Provence was to be regarded as a vassal lordship of the counts of Barcelona.\textsuperscript{232} However, when in 1166, Ramón Berenguer III of Provence was killed in the siege of Nice, leaving no heirs, the count of Toulouse, Raymond V, took advantage of the situation to claim Provence. In 1167, Alfonso II seized the region on the advice of his ally and tutor, Guilhelm VII of Montpellier. Alfonso assigned Provence to his younger brother, Pedro, who thereafter styled himself Ramón Berenguer IV of Provence, claiming to hold the county from the count-king.\textsuperscript{233} This dispute rekindled relations between the Angevin court and Catalonia-Aragón. In fulfilment of Ramón Berenguer IV’s last wish, Henry II acted as titular tutor to the young Alfonso II of Catalonia-Aragón, at the very least helping to re-establish the Anglo-Aragonese alliance against Toulouse. In 1173, Henry called upon his protégé, Alfonso II (who from 1167 also held Provence), and Hubert, count of Maurine, to make a peace agreement with their old enemy, Raymond V of Toulouse.\textsuperscript{234} The agreement was signed on 11 February (1173) at Montferrand, promising not to employ foreigners against Alfonso or his lands (‘gentes extraneas et logadiras non habebo… vel auxilio

\textsuperscript{231} He ruled Provence under the name of Ramón Berenguer III of Provence. J.L. Shneidman et al., ‘Factors in the Emergence of Catalan Nationalism During the Thirteenth Century’, \textit{Historian}, 27 (1965), 320.

\textsuperscript{232} His daughters married Jimena married Roger III of Foix; Matilda married the viscount of Castelvell; and Almodis married the viscount of Bas. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{233} S. Orvietani Busch, \textit{The Catalan and Tuscan Coast, 1100 to 1235} (Leiden: 2001), 8-9; P.E. Schramm et al., \textit{Els primers comtes-reis Ramon Berenguer IV, Alfons el Cast, Pere el Catòlic} (Barcelona: 1960), 66.

meo super te vel super terram tuam…’).\textsuperscript{235} Shortly after, Richard paid homage to his father for Aquitaine.\textsuperscript{236} Raymond of Toulouse was present at the occasion and paid homage to Richard.\textsuperscript{237} As duke, Richard took it upon himself to press the Angevin claims to Toulouse as part of a forty-year struggle that would draw him close to Catalonia-Aragón on several occasions.\textsuperscript{238} It is thought that through the influence of Henry II, a truce was agreed between Provence and Toulouse in 1174.\textsuperscript{239} However it was not until 18 April 1176, that Raymond V of Toulouse and Alfonso II finally reached an agreement over the county of Provence. On an island in the Rhone, located between Tarascon and Beaucaire (‘insula de Guernica inter Tarasconem et Bellicadrum’), the count of Toulouse agreed to drop his claims (‘comes Tolose solvit, deffinit atque remittit per se et per omnes successores suos’) to Provence (‘Provincie’), Arles (‘Amiliavensi’) and the vicomtés of Gévaudan (‘Gavaldanensi’), and Carladès (‘Carlatensi’). In return, Alfonso was to grant (‘donat’) Raymond 3100 marks of pure silver (‘tres mille et centum marchas argenti meri’) and thus obtain ‘castrum Albaronii’ and its appurtenances, with two major islands in the Rhone (Rhodani): ‘Lupariis’ and ‘Lussa’.\textsuperscript{240}

The peace between Alfonso II and Raymond V lasted only briefly, as hostilities were reignited by the death of Ermessinde (Ermessende, Ermessenda) of Melgueil, married to Raymond V’s son, who had inherited the county of Melgueil. Raymond V of Toulouse seized the moment and claimed Melgueil on behalf of his son. As usual, the

\textsuperscript{236} Torigny, Chronica, 255.
\textsuperscript{237} Macé, Catalogues raimondins, no. 136; cf. Howden, ii, 45.
\textsuperscript{238} Benjamin, ‘A Forty Years War: Toulouse and the Plantagenets, 1156–96’, 278.
\textsuperscript{239} Schramm et al., Primers comtes-reis, 67.
\textsuperscript{240} A.I. Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II Rey de Aragón, Conde de Barcelona y Marqués de Provenza. Documentos (1162-1196) (Zaragoza: 1995), no. 215.
succession was not straightforward because in December 1172, Bertrand, Ermessinde’s elder brother, had granted Melgueil with its appurtenances to Alfonso II (‘dono, laudo et inter vivos transfero et in perpetuum concede tibi domino Ildefonso…’), save those parts of the lordship that owed fealty to Guilhelm of Montpellier. 241

During Alfonso’s reign, Barcelona’s power in the Languedoc was extended. Alfonso II of Catalonia and Aragón acquired the county of Roussillon in 1172, when count Gerard, having no heirs, bequeathed it to the count-king in his testament. 242 Throughout Alfonso’s reign, Montpellier remained an important ally of the count-king. However, it was not until 1204 that it became a royal possession with the marriage of King Pedro II (Pere I) to Maria of Montpellier. Of all of King Pedro’s holdings in the Spanish March, Montpellier was the only one that Catalonia-Aragón remained after the devastating defeat at Muret in 1214.

The Moncada Family

The ties between Catalonia-Aragón and Béarn tightened under the tutorship of Guillem Ramón II de Moncada. The Moncada family had long since been one of the leading families in Catalonia, reaching new heights during the seneschally of Guillem Ramón II, ‘the Great’. The family, like other important families of Barcelona, amongst them the Cardona and Pallars, had already formed marriage alliances with

242 Orvietani Busch, Mediterranean Ports, 68.
the Languedoc. However, following the union of Catalonia and Aragón, the
Moncada looked to strengthen ties with Aragón’s old ally, Béarn.

Circa 1164-66, the Catalan Guillem (Guillermo) de Moncada (Montcada, Moncade),
eldest son of the seneschal, married Marie de Béarn, Gaston V’s sister. The exact
date of the marriage is unknown: in the earliest charter attesting their marriage, dating
form c. 1163-4, the abbot of Sant Cugat granted Guillem Ramón II dapifer and his
son, Guillem de Moncada (and his descendants), the market of Moncada in return for
protection. In this charter Marie de Béarn appears as wife of Guillem de Moncada
(‘Maria de Bearno, uxor Guillelmi de Monte Catano’). The intention, unlike the
date of the marriage, is unquestionable. The alliance was intended to strengthen the
ties between Béarn and Barcelona-Aragón by reinforcing the latter’s influence across
the Pyrenees. Around this same time (c. 1165), Gaston V of Béarn married Sancha of
Navarre, daughter of García Ramírez of Navarre through his alliance with Urraca,
daughter of Alfonso VII of León-Castile.

During Guillem Ramón II’s regency, the dapifer had the upper hand in matters
concerning Navarre and Castile, while ‘promoting a policy that took into account
interests in the vicomté of Béarn on the part of both the counts of Barcelona and the
seneschal’s family’. The vicomte, Gaston V, may have played some role in the

243 Cf. Shneidman et al., ‘Factors in the Emergence of Catalan Nationalism During the Thirteenth
Century’, 321.
244 On the controversy surrounding the date of this marriage see Shideler, The Montcadas, 109;
245 J. Rius, Cartulario de Sant Cugat del Vallès (Barcelona: 1945), no. 1049. Shideler has found other
two charters dated between 1164-6 in which, Marie is named as Guillem’s wife. He further shows how
by 1166, the couple had one son. cf. Shideler, The Montcadas, 109.
246 García Ramírez married the infanta Urraca on 24 July 1144. CAI, I, 91-94; J. Fernández Valverde,
ed., Roderici Ximenii de Rada. Historia de rebus Hispanie sive Historia gothica (Turnhout: 1987), B.
government of Aragón, but if so, this in no way approached the degree of influence exercised by Maria’s husband, Guillem de Moncada, over the court of Alfonso II. Perhaps as the result of Gaston’s marriage to Sancha, he played a part in relations between Aragón and Navarre. On 9 January 1164, at Saragossa, the vicomte witnessed a charter granting the abbot of the monastery of La Oliva the town of Carcastillo (on the border between Navarre and Aragón) with all its appurtenances, confirming gifts made by his father.  

Far more prominent was the participation of Guillem de Moncada, Marie de Béarn husband, in Catalan-Aragonese politics across the Pyrenees. Between August and September 1167, Alfonso II travelled across the Pyrenees to settle his disputes with the count of Razès. The count-king was accompanied and counselled, amongst other nobles, by the seneschal of Barcelona and by Guillem de Moncada.  

Marie’s Homage to Alfonso II  

Relations between Béarn and Catalonia-Aragón took a new turn when, in 1170, Gaston V de Béarn died without heirs, and his sister Marie (1170-1173) became the vicomtess. On 30 April 1170, she paid homage to Alfonso II of Catalonia-Aragón (1162-1196) for all her lands in Béarn and Gascony (‘ego domina Maria… facio hominum et fidelitatem vobis domino… Idelfonso…de tota illa terra Biarnensi et Gaschonie, quam ego habeo’), which she had inherited from her father Peter of  

248 Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 17.  
249 Ibid., no. 44.
Gavarret and from her brother Gaston.\textsuperscript{250} Marie also vowed not to marry without Alfonso’s council, will and command (‘consilio et voluntate atque mandato’), ensuring that the king would maintain a tight grip on Béarnaise affairs.\textsuperscript{251} Through this agreement, Alfonso became the protector of Marie and her lands against all men and women (‘ac defensione contra cunctos homines et feminas’), while recognizing all the lands she had inherited in Aragón (‘in regno ... Aragonis’). Alfonso also received from the vicomtess the castle of Gavarret of Mancieto pro tenensa and equally one of three castles specified as lying in Cadelon, Escures (Escurés, Pyrénées-Atlantiques), or Malbeng (possibly Maubourguet).\textsuperscript{252} At Jaca, in August that same year, Alfonso II granted Canfranc and other towns exemption from paying lezda, a tax for the movement of goods or merchandise. The vicomtess held the town and was there to witness the grant, being named accordingly as ‘lady’ of Canfranc (‘domina Maria, vicecomitisa Bearnensis in predicto Campo Francho’).\textsuperscript{253}

Béarn had long since been an important ally of Aragón. Ramón Berenguer IV had, in 1154, been appointed as regent for the young Gaston V. Amongst modern commentators, only Joaquín Miret y Sans has suggested that Marie’s homage to Alfonso was in response to an ‘English threat’ rather than determined by pre-existing friendships between Aragón and Béarn, and as will be shown, there is no evidence to suggest that Henry II was actively seeking influence in Béarn. Miret y Sans surely

\textsuperscript{250} According to Tucoo-Chala, other lands in Gascony included Gavardan and Brulhois. P. Tucoo-Chala, la vicomté de Béarn et le problème de sa souveraineté. Des origines a 1620 (Monein: 2009), 47.

\textsuperscript{251} As Shideler has shown, this clause applied to future marriages, in case her husband, Guillem de Moncada, who was aged between forty-five or fifty years old, died. Shideler, The Montcadas, 110.

\textsuperscript{252} LFM, no. 19; Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 85.

\textsuperscript{253} Other towns to receive this exemption were Ip, Samanet, Gisella, los Colletz las Benollas, el Pichet. Ip is located a few miles from Canfranc in the Pyrenees. However, other places I have been unable to identify. Ibid., no. 93. Also cf. Zurita, Anales, II, xxvii. Cf. A. Ubieto Artega, ‘Los “tenentes” en Aragón y Navarra en los siglos XI y XII (Valencia: 1973), 250. On Canfranc cf. M. Diago Hernando, ‘Los hombres de negocios bearneses en la Corona de Aragón durante la segunda mitad del siglo XIV: el ejemplo de Juan Mercer’, Aragón en la Edad Media, 17 (2003) 132.
exaggerates the extent to which Béarnaise submission to Catalonia-Aragón was a novelty for the vicomté.\textsuperscript{254} The vicomté of Béarn had long since been a close ally of the Aragonese crown. However, after Marie’s homage to Alfonso, it became a part of the Catalo-Aragonese ‘empire’ that Ramón Berenguer IV had sought to build across the Pyrenees.

\textbf{Marie de Béarn Paying Homage to Alfonso II}

\textit{Image has been removed}

\textit{Liber Feudorum Maior, f. 83bis r, in ACA, Cancillería Real, Registros, no. 1, in http://www.pares.es

In the image Marie is shown performing homage to Alfonso II, a tradition inherited from Aragón’s Pyrenean neighbours, and which increasingly throughout the twelfth century involved kissing the hand of a lord (‘homenaje de manos y boca’), following Muslim tradition.\textsuperscript{255}

A year after Marie became 	extit{vicomtess} of Béarn, in March 1171, her husband, Guillem de Moncada, also paid homage to Alfonso for all the lordship of Béarn (‘senoratico de Biarno’). Guillem vouched to help Marie (‘valitor et adiutor de Bearnensi vicecomitatu’) rule Béarn, deepening Catalan influence in the Gascon lordship.\textsuperscript{256} To further cement Béarnaise-Catalan relations, Alfonso II granted Guillem and his descendants all the inheritance (‘totas illas hereditates’) that Talesa and Gaston had held in Aragón.\textsuperscript{257}

According to Pierre de Marca, Marie’s homage was not readily accepted by the Béarnaise, who in 1173 after Guillem’s death, assembled their governing assembly, the Cour Majeur, at Pau to object to Catalan influence. To appease them, young
Gaston V was named vicomte.\textsuperscript{258} After this episode, Béarn seems to have been at peace.

Not long after Marie’s homage, her husband, Guillem, died. His father, Guillem Ramón II (‘the Great’), in his testament (20 April 1173) acknowledging Guillem’s death, granted his inheritance to his grandchildren. Gaston, the eldest son of Guillem and Marie, received Béarn, whilst the lordship of Moncada went to a younger son, Guillem Ramón [I]. Guillem Ramón II’s younger son received the lordship of Tortosa and the title of seneschal.\textsuperscript{259} Later that year, in October, Marie asked Alfonso II to allow the monastery of Bolvastre (of the order of Fontevraud, itself closely allied to Plantagenet family concerns) to buy the debts (‘redimat et extrahat de pignora omnem honorem’) from the properties that Guillem had held in Aragón.\textsuperscript{260} Moret y Sans suggests that, after the death of Marie’s husband, these debts had mounted up as a result of the young Gaston’s upbringing.\textsuperscript{261} Following this request, Marie seems to have been sidelined, as her name disappears from the sources. The lordship of Moncada and the vicomté of Béarn were thus separated until 1214, when Gaston VII of Béarn inherited title to both lordships.

Following the death of Guillem, Béarn was entrusted to the Aragonese Pelegrí (Pelegrín) de Castellazol, who became young Gaston VI’s tutor at least until 1187,

\textsuperscript{258} Marca, \textit{Histoire de Béarn}, 485-6; Miret y Sans, ‘La casa de Montcada en el vizcondado de Bearn’, III, 195.
\textsuperscript{260} Sánchez Casabón, \textit{Alfonso II}, no. 155.
\textsuperscript{261} Miret y Sans, ‘La casa de Montcada’, 194.
when he swore allegiance to Alfonso II.\textsuperscript{262} About this period we have little information. However, it seems that Béarn was not a major concern to Alfonso II.

**Catalonia-Aragón, Castile, and England**

It is unclear how Henry II reacted to Alfonso II’s increasing hold over southern Gascony. However, there seems to have been a reaction from the Angevin. Perhaps he was looking for a powerful Iberian ally in case he ever needed to counter the Catalo-Aragonese influence in the French Midi. At Sahagún, in July 1170, only three months after Marie’s homage, Alfonso II and Alfonso VIII of Castile forged an alliance (Image of Alfonso VIII and Alfonso II).\textsuperscript{263} In this perpetual peace and agreement (‘facimus et firmamus ureram amicitiam et perpetuam concordiam et pacem’) they promised to help each other against all other Christians (‘iuuemos nos ad inuicem super et contra Christianos’) save the king of England ‘whom we regard as our father’ (‘preter regem Anglie, quem pro patre habemus’).\textsuperscript{264} A series of castle were placed as surety, amongst them several castles disputed between Castile and Navarre, including Nájera, Clavijo and Ocón, in the Rioja, and Agreda, in the shifting border between Navarre, Castile and Aragón. Logroño (in La Rioja) was seized by Navarre in 1162-3, but Nájera, an important stopping off point for pilgrims on the way to Compostela, resisted the invasion, remaining a key Castilian stronghold against Navarre.\textsuperscript{265} By assigning the castle to the Castilian noble Nuño Pérez de Lara

\textsuperscript{262} Marca, *Histoire de Béarn*, 488-90; Miret y Sans, ‘La casa de Montcada’, 195.

\textsuperscript{263} Alfonso VIII was the son of Sancho III (1157-8) of Castile, son of Alfonso VII of Léon-Castile, who divided his kingdom between his two sons, giving Fernando II (1157-88) Léon and Castile to Sancho.

\textsuperscript{264} LFM, no. 32; J. González, *Alfonso VIII*, no. 147.

who was then obliged to pay homage for it to Alfonso II, the Castilian king was backing his claim to the disputed area and guaranteeing the support of the king of Aragón.\textsuperscript{266}

Image of Alfonso VIII and Alfonso II
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\textit{Liber Feudorum Maior} in ACA, Cancillería, Registros, no. 1, 19 in \url{http://www.pares.es}

The Anglo-Castilian Marriage Alliance

After the signing of this treaty in July, but before 17 September 1170, Henry II’s daughter, Eleanor (Leonor), married Alfonso VIII of Castile.\textsuperscript{267} The most precise date is given by Jerónimo Zurita’s chronicle. The Aragonese states that the marriage took place at Tarrazona in September 1170, following Alfonso VIII’s meeting with Alfonso II of Aragón at Sahagún. The two kings then left for Saragossa where they remained from July until August awaiting the arrival of Eleanor from Guyenne.\textsuperscript{268}

There, states Zurita, the kings of Castile and Aragón forged a treaty of mutual help against all men, save the English king. The treaty itself is recorded in the \textit{Liber Feudorum Maior}.\textsuperscript{269} The chronicle then lists the members of the Castilian court who awaited the arrival of Eleanor of England. At the wedding celebrations at Tarazona, the Castilian king boasted of the prestige of Henry II, whom he said was ‘the most esteemed king in all Christendom and who was lord of great estates in France’.\textsuperscript{270}

\textsuperscript{266} Cf. González, \textit{Alfonso VIII}, I, 792-6.
\textsuperscript{267} The document states that Alfonso VIII with his wife, Eleanor (‘Alfonso Dei gratia… rex et dominus, una cum uxor mea Alienor, regina…’), confirms certain tributes (\textit{collacios}) to the church of Osma. González, \textit{Alfonso VIII}, no. 148.
\textsuperscript{268} Zurita might be referring to neighbouring Gascony rather than Guyenne.
\textsuperscript{269} The treaty was, in fact, signed at Sahagún.
\textsuperscript{270} Zurita, \textit{Anales}, ii, xxviii.
In September, at Tarazona, on the border between Castile and Aragón, close to the border with Navarre, Alfonso VIII assigned Eleanor a dower (‘arram sive donacionem propter nupcias’).\(^{271}\) The document recording this settlement, survives only in the archives at Barcelona, having come there by means that are by no means clear but perhaps corroborating Zurita’s claims that Alfonso II of Aragón was present at the event. According to its terms, Eleanor, daughter of the triumphant king of England (‘filie invictisimi et semper triumfatoris regis Anglie’) was to receive Burgos, Castrojeriz, Amaya, Avia, Saldaña, Monzón, Tariego, Carrión, Dueñas, Bacezón de Pisuerga, Medina del Campo, Astudillo, Aguilar de Campoo, the valley of Villaescusa, the rents of the port of Santander, Cabezo, Viesgo, Bricia, Tudela, Calahorra, Arnedo, Viguera, Medrano, the castle and city of Nájera, Logroño, Grañón, Belorado, Pancorbo, Piedralada, Poza, Monasterio de Rodilla, Atienza, Osma, Peñafiel, Curiel, Hita, Zorita, Oreja, and Peña Negra. Alfonso VIII also conferred, towards his bride’s expenses (‘ad proprias et familiares expensas Camere sue’), the cities of Nájera and Burgos, and the rents and appurtenances of the town of Castrojeriz, 5000 maravedis, the rents of Toledo and half the profits (‘corum’) obtained from the Muslims (‘Sarracenos’) after the day of the marriage, and thereafter (‘a die contenti matrimonii et deinceps’). Witnessing the grant was Alfonso II, ally of both the Henry II and Alfonso VIII. Accompanying Eleanor were the archbishop of

\(^{271}\) *Carta de arras*: A type of endowment charter usually presented to a woman by her future husband. The earliest surviving charters date from the ninth century. They usually endow women with land, and sometimes with houses, villages, livestock, clothing, tithes and other items. The source of the endowment is ‘frequently the man’s inheritance, occasionally the *arras* he received from his own mother. The *arras* often stipulate that they should descend to children of the marriage. If there were no children, the property might be assigned to an abbey with usufruct reserved for the widowed husband or wife […] According to customs compiled in the thirteenth century, the Castilian noble endowed his bride with a third of his wealth or expected inheritance […] In addition to the *arras* proper, the Castilian noble could give his bride a fully owned and alienable cash present of as much as a thousand maravedis (mrs.).’ H. Dillard, Daughters of the Reconquest: Women in Castilian Town Society, 1100-1300 (Cambridge: 1984), 48-9.
Bordeaux, Peter bishop of Périgord, Peter of Castillon (‘Castellionis’), Raymond vicomte of Tartas, and Peter de Mota (‘qui cum uxore mea venerant’). Together with Cerebruno, archbishop of Toledo, they were present at the marriage itself (‘aderant quando desponsai uxorem meam’). 272

Amongst the estates assigned to Eleanor was the castle of Nájera, which a few months earlier had been given to Alfonso II as surety in the treaty with Aragón, as has already been pointed out. By granting it to both Alfonso II and Eleanor, the Castilian king was making a wider political statement, to which we will return when we analyse Henry II’s arbitration between Castile and Navarre in 1176. Also amongst the castles in the Rioja given to Eleanor were Grañón, Pancorbo and Monasterio, castles also disputed between Aragón and Castile. By assigning the disputed lands to his English bride, Alfonso VIII was potentially placing them under the protection of the English monarch. Therefore, it is not surprising that when Alfonso and Sancho VI of Navarre submitted to Henry II’s arbitration, in 1176, the English king confirmed the possession of these lands to the Castilian king.

As part of the marriage agreement, Spanish sources report that Alfonso assigned Eleanor the rents of several cities and towns, which were supposedly placed under the control of Eleanor’s men. Much more significantly, Gascony itself was allegedly assigned as part of Eleanor’s marriage portion, to be assigned to Alfonso VIII as her husband. 273 No contemporary charter survives to attest that Eleanor received Gascony as her marriage portion. According to Alfonso X, eighty years later, all the documents linking Gascony to Castile were to be destroyed in 1254, as a result of

272 ACA, Cancillería Real, Pergaminos, Alfonso I, no. 92; for the modern Spanish names of places cf. G. Martínez Diez, Alfonso VIII, Rey de Castilla y Toledo 1158-1214 (Burgos: 1995), 238.
273 Zurita, Anales, II, xxviii; ibid.
Alfonso X’s new alliance and peace with Henry III. Whatever the reality of the Castilian claims, they supplied Alfonso VIII with an excuse to assert his claims over Gascony following the death of Eleanor of Aquitaine in 1204, taking advantages of the problems that King John faced at this time. That Henry II was prepared to assign Gascony to Eleanor seems highly unlikely. Castilian accounts of this assignment seem to fit into the same pattern as the Castilian reports of the marriage alliance reported by Robert of Torigny between Richard, Henry II’s son, and one of the daughters of Ramón Berenguer IV in 1160, in which the Castilian sources alone report that Henry II assigned Gascony to Richard, as discussed above.

English chroniclers also report the Anglo-Castilian marriage, although their accounts lack detail. The fullest account is that supplied by Robert of Torigny, which states that the marriage took place in 1170, but fails to provide a more precise date and makes no reference to Gascony being assigned to Eleanor upon her marriage to Alfonso. According to Torigny, the Castilian king was not yet fifteen years old (‘nondum enim adimpleverat quindecim annos’), providing further evidence that the marriage took place between July and September. According to Matthew Paris, otherwise following Roger of Howden, the marriage took place in 1168, but no documentary evidence support this. Roger of Howden (alias Benedict of Peterborough) makes no reference to the marriage between Eleanor and the Castilian king until February 1177, when Henry II was required to arbitrate between the kings

---

275 Torigny, *Chronica*, 200-1.
276 Alfonso was born on 11 November 1155. Ibid., 247.
277 *CM*, ii, 246.
of Castile and Navarre. It is possible that the treaty of July 1170 was prompted by
the marriage of Alfonso VIII and Eleanor, but this remains speculation.

Despite the Castilian alliance, Henry II’s contacts with the Iberian kingdoms are
especially hard to document for the early 1170s. The silence might be the
consequence of the turmoil following the murder on 29 December 1170, of Thomas
Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. The following year, Henry II spent a significant
amount of time dealing with the aftermath of Becket’s assassination and with his
impending expedition to Ireland. Two years later (1173), he was faced with further
unrest, as his sons rebelled against him. It was not until 30 September 1174, that the
king and his sons, Henry, Richard and Geoffrey, signed a peace (pax), by which
Richard received the county of Poitou: a settlement which inevitably planted in
Richard a desire to assert his control over Gascony, drawing Richard back into the
orbit of the peninsular kingdoms. There is nonetheless evidence, hard to assemble
but compelling, that as early as January/February 1173, Henry II was in direct contact
with various of the principal powers in southern France, including the count of
Toulouse and the King of Aragón, both of whom may have attended a meeting with
Henry at Montferrand in the Auvergne. In other words, and as in general in our
dealings with Plantagenet rule in the far south, a silence on the part of the principal
chronicle sources cannot be read as evidence for an absence of diplomatic or political
activity.

278 W. Stubbs, ed., Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis (London: 1867), I, 139. The
arbitration is discussed in Henry II’s Arbitration Between Navarre and Castille.
279 Foedera, 1, 1, 30.
280 N. Vincent, ‘Patronage, Politics and Piety in the Charters of Eleanor of Aquitaine’, in Plantagènêts
Henry II’s Arbitration Between Navarre and Castile

Nonetheless, no certain evidence of the resumption of contacts between the Angevin court and the Iberian kingdoms can be found before 25 August 1176. It was at this time that Henry II’s son in law, Alfonso VIII of Castile, and Sancho VI of Navarre (1150-1194) submitted their longstanding territorial disputes to the arbitration of Henry II. The Castilian king sought Henry’s support in a territorial dispute with Navarre. However, Henry was not in a neutral position to deliver the arbitration. He was father-in-law to Alfonso VIII, himself an ally of another Navarrese enemy, Alfonso II of Catalonia-Aragón.

Navarre and Castile had quarrelled over the bordering territories of Álava, Viscaya and the Guipúzcoa, Navarre’s rich costal area, which, since 1134, had been taken by Garcia V (1134-1150) and had remained in Navarrese hands during the infancy of Alfonso VIII (Map Iberian Peninsula in 1150). Alfonso VIII promised his father-in-law, Henry II, that he would abide by his judgement, while Sancho VI, maternal uncle of the Castilian king, pledged to do the same. In addition, both Iberian kings agreed to a seven-year truce. As a guarantee of good will and to ensure they would comply with Henry’s arbitration, the cities of Arga and Calahorra were pledged by Sancho VI and Alfonso VIII respectively. If they failed to abide by Henry’s arbitration, the Iberian kings would lose the pledged lands.

---

283 ‘Insuper vero ambo reges praedicti, unusquisque, per fidem suam, firmaverunt, et statuerunt treugas bonas et salvas de hominibus, et castellis, et terris, et de omnibus alis rebus usque ad septem annos; et ut firmiter teneantur, Sanctius rex Navarre ponit Ergam in fidelitate, et rex Aldeonsus ponit Calaguram’: Howden, ii,124 and Foedera, I.i.33.
1177 (9 March), Henry received the Iberian ambassadors and delivered sentence. Howden tells a curious anecdote about the arbitration and the Latin spoken by the foreign envoys. Initially, Henry II and his barons were unable to understand the envoys’ Latin. Therefore the king asked the ambassadors to set down their claims in writing, and after three days, the court reconvened and Henry delivered sentence (‘Anglie minime intellexerant [sic.] sermonem illorum; praecepit eis rex ut scriberent hinc inde petitiones et calumnias et allegationes suas et postea ei offerrent scriptum illud’). 284

The Iberian Peninsula in 1150
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The Historical Atlas by William R. Shepherd, 1926, in http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/historical/history_europe.html#S

Alfonso VIII sought the restitution of Logroño (in La Rioja), Navarrete, Álava and Durango, amongst other places, which he claimed had been wrongly taken from him during his infancy. 285 Against this, Sancho VII claimed Montes de Oca, the valley of San Vicente and the mountainous region of Alba as far as Agreda, as well as other territories that the Castilian emperor, Alfonso VII, had taken from García V (1134-50), Sancho’s father, including the castles of Nájera, Garañón, Monasterio and Viguera. The Navarrese also demanded Beldorado, which Alfonso VIII had given to García but had later seized from Sancho. 286 Sancho assured Henry II that his grievances should proceed (‘procedere’) as he was violently attacked, after the truce

284 Howden, ii, 121; Stubbs, ed., Gesta, 146. Howden was critical of those who were unable to speak Latin cf. Howden, ii, p. 157.
285 Howden, ii, 125-6; Foedera, i.i.33.
286 Howden, ii, 127-8; Foedera, i.i.34.
that had been in place since October 1167 of which he dispatched a copy. Yet, regardless of this truce, Castile and Aragón had formed an alliance, in July 1170, against all kingdoms (Christian and otherwise), except England, in which several of the disputed castles were placed under control of Alfonso II, as has been discussed above.

The disputed lands were mostly situated in the border region between Navarre and Castile. They had been conquered from the Muslims in the eleventh century, after which Castilians and Navarrese had occupied them. At least up to the twelfth century, this territory lacked fortifications. Thus, no clear boundary could be established between Navarre and Castile. During the twelfth century, it was the cause of on-going disputes between the two kingdoms. Tensions mounted as the Castilian monarchy increasingly asserted its hegemony over neighbouring Navarre, which was also threatened, on its southern borders by Aragón. La Rioja was the rich agricultural region that bordered Aragón, Navarre and Castile. It was thus an important crossroads, lying on the French route to the shrine of St James at Compostela, as was the mountainous region of Álava – also under dispute. Also claimed by both kingdoms were the Duranguesado and its bordering coastal area, the Guipúzcoa, which bordered with Gascony and Álava. Control of the Guipúzcoa, would allow Castile direct access to Gascony and the towns leading to Bordeaux, and would strip Navarre of its prosperous maritime industry, leaving the kingdom landlocked. The

---

287 ‘Haec autem petit hac ratione, quia habuit et possedit pro suo, et sine ordine judiciario ejectus est, et idcirco querela sua debet procedere, quia ultima est violentia, et prius debet purgari…’: Howden, ii,128; Foedera, I,34; Gonzalez, Alfonso VIII, no. 90. The treaty was signed in Fitero, roughly located in the shifting border between Castile, Aragón and Navarre.

possession of these lands impacted directly on Henry’s lands in Aquitaine. Navarre had longstanding claims in the *ultrapuertos*, the regions of southern Gascony lying north of the Pyrenees, thus directly affecting Angevin rule south of Bayonne. Up to this point, Henry II had chosen to ally himself with Catalonia-Aragón and Castile, but not with Navarre. Henry’s inclination seems to have been to limit Navarre’s influence in Gascony, while taking advantage of Alfonso II’s influence in Béarn and the Languedoc. By siding with Castile, whose influence in the peninsula was on the rise, Henry II might have hoped also to reduce the Navarrese threat to his Gascon holdings.

As arbitrator in the territorial dispute, Henry promptly delivered sentence. The lands that had been taken from Alfonso VIII, during his infancy, were to be returned to him. In return, the Castilian king was to hand back to Sancho the castle of Legín (Leguín),289 the castles of Portol and those in possession of a man named Godín. Alfonso VIII was asked to pay the Navarrese 3,000 *maravedís* yearly for 10 years. In addition, both parties were to restore any other land violently seized from one another. Finally, Henry demanded that both kings make a peace agreement (‘pacem inter vos’) in order to extend the Christian faith (‘ad fidem Christianorum propagandam’), which was essential for the confusion of the enemies of Christ (‘ad inimicorum Christi confusionem necessarium’), this is to say against the Muslims. The kings agreed to Henry’s terms.290
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289 Legín, in the mountains close to Pamplona, was taken in 1175, by the Castilian-Aragonese alliance. Zurita, *Anales*, II, xxxiii; J. Moret, *Anales del Reino de Navarra*, Vol. IV (Tolosa: 1890), XIX, iv, par. 9. It is not known which were the castles in possession of Don Godin or who this person was.

290 Howden, ii,130; *Foedera*, 1.34-35; Stubbs, ed., *Gesta*, i, 153.
The territorial disputes between Navarre and Castile were not solved by Henry II’s arbitration, as the two kingdoms embarked on a long war that would ultimately favour Castile. Furthermore, Fernando Corral has underlined that Henry II had no intention of enforcing his arbitration and that at the time both Castile and Navarre had no real interest in the arbitration which was used merely a process to voice their ‘political’ concerns. The arbitration however, did buy time for Castile to acquire the disputed lands. What Corral fails to recognize is that it was not in Henry’s interest to interfere or enforce his verdict, particularly because he would have been keen that Castile gain control over the disputed costal lands of the Guipúzcoa. If Castilian efforts were successful, the loss of the costal lands would directly diminish Navarre’s threat to Gascony. Stripped of its costal lands, Navarre would be forced to rely on its neighbours for armament, merchandise and other vital resources, increasing its reliance on the other Iberian kingdoms and on Henry’s own lands across the Pyrenees. Because of his prior alliances with Castile and Catalonia-Aragón Henry’s arbitration was never impartial.

Further tightening of the relations between Catalonia-Aragón and Castile contributed to Navarre losing the disputed area. Only two years later, at Cazola, on 20 March 1179, Alfonso VIII and Alfonso II of Aragón made a treaty (‘concordia, et pactus et perpetua amicicia’) against Sancho VI of Navarre, in which the Castilian and the Aragonese agreed to attack Navarre the following year. They also made plans for the division of the conquered territories of Levante, an area located on the eastern coast of the Iberian Peninsula, formerly under Muslim control. This alliance violated the peace treaty Alfonso and Sancho VI had previously agreed in the presence of Henry

292 González, Alfonso VIII, ii, nos. 319-320; Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, nos. 280-1.
II. A month later, on 15 April (1179), Navarre was forced into a treaty with Castile, by which Alfonso recognized Álava as part of Navarre. However, Alfonso VIII kept the castle of Morillas in Álava and all land up to the Ebro river. This new peace agreement lasted until September 1190, when Sancho VI and Alfonso II of Aragón formed an alliance. It was not until 1198-9 that Alfonso VIII was able to take the coastal area of Guipúzcoa, Álava, and the port town of San Sebastián, leaving Navarre landlocked.

Not only would this seriously disrupt Navarre’s maritime trade, it could also gravely imperil Navarre’s salt supply. Salt, was necessary for everyday life, from the preservation and flavouring of foodstuffs to the keeping of livestock. Without salt, cattle cannot live. In consequence, seigneurial taxes on salt became an important source of revenue. In Castile, these slowly became a royal monopoly, and the king assigned the rents of the salt mines to monasteries, nobles or churches. Amongst the territories now lost to Navarre, some were important centres of salt distribution. San Sebastián and Fuenterrabía imported salt from other centres. Castro Urdiales, on the other hand, produced and imported the indispensable mineral. It is possible to infer that the land-locking of Navarre would seriously disturb its salt supplies. Unfortunately, the sparse documentation on the subject makes it difficult to assess the full impact that the appropriation of the salt producing and importing centres of the Basque coast had on Navarre’s economy. Conveniently, neighbouring Gascony had important salt mines in Bayonne, Agen (controlled to some extent by the archbishop

of Bordeaux) and on the Dordogne. By landlocking Navarre, both England and Castile stood to gain important revenue from controlling Navarre’s salt supplies.

**Count Richard of Poitou and Alfonso II of Aragón**

Following the arbitration between Navarre and Castile, in March 1177, Henry II asked the envoys of the kings of Navarre and Castile to confer with their masters and the king of León, Fernando II (1157-88), to inform the Spanish king that Henry himself intended to go on pilgrimage to Compostela. Early in January 1177, perhaps at his father’s wish, Richard besieged Dax, which was held by the vicomte of Bigorre, Centule III (1163-1185), and his son-in-law, the vicomte of Dax, Pierre. Richard also seized Bayonne from the local vicomte (known as the vicomte of Bayonne). His motives here are supplied to us by a later Navarrese source, which states that the vicomte of Bayonne, Arnald Bertrand, had failed to recognize Richard’s suzerainty. In a swift campaign, Richard succeeded in subjecting them to Plantagenet rule. Finally, to fulfil his father’s request, Richard asked the Navarrese and the Basques to ensure that the roads were safe for pilgrims going to Compostela. The pious promise however, served as an excuse to ‘extend the Plantagenet dominion over Gascony’ tightening their control to the south.

Nicholas Vincent has shown how after 1170, it was Richard, rather than his father,

---
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Henry II, who exercised control over southern Gascony, so that controlling the routes was crucial to him.  

Centule, vicomte of Bigorre and Marsan, was a kinsman of Alfonso II of Catalonia-Aragón and his vassal from at least October 1175, when the count-king granted Centule and his wife Matelle the lordship of Bordères (Bordères- sur-l’Échez, near Tarbes) and the Val d’Aran in north-western Catalonia—a valley irrigated by a tributary of the Garonne and which borders both Aragón and Gascony. The donations were made on condition that Centule and his heirs recognized Alfonso II as their lord. Therefore, the attack on Dax had direct implications for the Catalo-Aragonese crown.

From July 1177 to July 1178 the chroniclers fall silent on Richard’s activities in Aquitaine and turn to Henry II’s activities there, where he was pursuing a dispute over Berry. Once Henry returned to England, Roger of Howden resumes his reports on the activities of Richard. Following his father’s departure, Richard returned to Dax, were he found to his delight that the townspeople had captured and imprisoned the vicomte of Bigorre. The vicomte’s friend (‘amicus suus’), Alfonso II of Catalonia-Aragón, intervened in the affair and through his intervention (‘solicitus suus’) Richard

304 Matelle de Baux was the widow of Pierre de Gabarret, vicomte de Béarn (1134-55).  
freed the vicomte, on condition that he surrender to him Clermont and the castle of Montbron (dép. Charente), not far from Angoulême.\textsuperscript{307}

When did Alfonso II negotiate Centule’s release? From documentary evidence we know that Alfonso II remained in Catalonia throughout the second-half of 1178, travelling to Perpignan, far from Dax, in October and returning to Barcelona in November.\textsuperscript{308} The following year (1179), Alfonso remained in Catalonia-Aragón, where he attended to issues local to the Iberian Peninsula. In March, he signed an agreement with Alfonso VIII of Castile against the king of Navarre, which has been discussed above.\textsuperscript{309} For the rest of the year, the count-king remained in his Spanish lands. Finally, in November Alfonso II travelled to Carcassonne and the following month to Perpignan.\textsuperscript{310} Either late in 1178 or early in 1179, the bishop of Lérida was sent to the court of Louis VII of France to represent Alfonso II in several affairs, after which he travelled to the papal court in Rome.\textsuperscript{311} Amongst the issues discussed with the French king was the curious case of a man who was impersonating the dead Alfonso I and who had since convinced several people in the realm that the king was not dead. The man was thought to have fled to France and Alfonso II asked for Louis’ cooperation to apprehend him.\textsuperscript{312} It is possible that it was the bishop of Lérida, on his way to see Louis VII, who negotiated the release of Centule III of Bigorre, rather than Alfonso himself. There were certainly other issues to discuss in relations between England, France and Aragón. Could the on-going dispute over the

\textsuperscript{307} Howden, ii, 170; Stubbs, ed., \textit{Gesta}, 212-3.
\textsuperscript{308} Cf. Sánchez Casabón, \textit{Alfonso II}, nos. 256-273; T.N. Bisson, \textit{Fiscal Accounts of Catalonia Under the Early Count-Kings (1151-1213)} (Berkeley: 1984), no. 33
\textsuperscript{309} Sánchez Casabón, \textit{Alfonso II}, no. 280.
\textsuperscript{310} Ibid., nos. 288, 291.
\textsuperscript{312} Sánchez Casabón, \textit{Alfonso II}, no. 275; cf. Zurita. \textit{Anales}, II, xxii.
Languedoc between the count-king and Raymond V of Toulouse have been amongst the issues discussed? Certainly Toulouse was on Alfonso’s mind and it is possible that the negotiations to free Centule III had the ultimate purpose of forming an alliance with Henry II and Richard against Raymond of Toulouse.\textsuperscript{313}

John Gillingham recognized that Alfonso might have been more than an amicus of the vicomte of Bigorre. However he seems to have been unaware that the vicomte was a vassal of the count-king, who at the time was also Henry II’s ally against Toulouse.\textsuperscript{314} Furthermore, Gillingham suggests that Richard’s campaign in Dax was ‘intended to counter the northward expansion of Aragón’.\textsuperscript{315} This was a feat that had to be performed whilst preserving Henry’s prior alliance with the count-king. Richard was not prepared to confront Alfonso directly, as he was his father’s ally and a crucial partner against Toulouse, which seems to have been one of Richard’s priorities at this time. By not attacking Bigorre directly, Richard could maintain the Plantagenet alliance with Alfonso II, reaffirmed in 1183, whilst still asserting his power in the region.

Our next reference to Henry II’s relations with the Iberian Peninsula comes in 1179 when Robert of Torigny reports Richard’s departure for England. In his absence, a group of Basques, Navarrese and Flemish mercenaries ravaged and torched Bordeaux and its surroundings.\textsuperscript{316} The constant incursions by the count of Poitou, the Aragonese king and the counts of Toulouse had caused such horrific scenes, that

\textsuperscript{313} Between 1178-1185 Alfonso travelled extensively to Occitania and Provence, attempting to secure his barons fealty. Bisson, \textit{Fiscal Accounts}, 86-7.
\textsuperscript{315} Ibid., 60.
\textsuperscript{316} ‘…Bascli et Navarenses et Brebenzones venerunt ad urbem Burdegalensem, et ipsam urben vastaverunt in suburbiis, flammis et rapina.’: Torigny, \textit{Chronica}, 282.
Third Lateran Council (1279) threaten to excommunicate anyone who participated in mercenary activities or who was in any way associated with them. This time there are no reports of Richard receiving support from his Aragonese or Castilian allies. Thereafter, from the summer of 1179 until mid 1181, the chroniclers fall silent on Richard’s activities, again coinciding with Henry’s presence on the Continent, where he renewed his alliance with the French king, Philip Augustus.

Meanwhile, in Catalonia-Aragón, Alfonso II was preoccupied with avenging the murder of his brother, Ramón Berenguer comte of Provence, who had been killed in April 1181 by a supporter of Raymond V of Toulouse. It is uncertain whether Alfonso himself made war against Toulouse. Nonetheless, the troubadour Bertran de Born was commissioned by Raymond V to help entice the local nobility against a possible Catalo-Aragonese attack. The murder added to the tense situation between the count of Toulouse and Alfonso II over possession of Carcassonne (Image of Roger Trencavel and Carcassonne). In November 1179, Roger Trencavel had granted the homage of Carcassonne, Bèziers, Razès and the Minervois to the count-king. Alfonso then restored these possessions to Roger, who henceforth was to hold them ‘by the hand of the king’ in service and fealty (‘per manum domini regis per fevum et ad servicium et fidelitatem eius et suorum omni tempore’). Roger also promised to make peace or war against the count of Toulouse as and when Alfonso should
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command him (‘… et faciat paces et guerras semper comiti Tolose ... per mandamentum’).\textsuperscript{322}

\textsuperscript{322} Sánchez Casabón, \textit{Alfonso II}, no. 288.
Roger Trencavel and Carcassonne
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The troubadour Bertran de Born is best remembered for his commemoration in Dante’s *Divina Comedia*, in which he is portrayed holding his severed head in his hands in the eighth circle of hell, for his part in inciting the dissensions between King Henry II and his sons. His verses supply information on relations between Richard and Alfonso, as for a time (1181-2) the count of Toulouse, was Betran’s patron. Bertran’s verses are often heavily allusive and present a semi-fictionalized account of affairs. They cannot be read as a standard political narrative, but belong instead to that grey limbo for which Stephen Jaeger has coined the term ‘mimetic fallacy’. Nevertheless, the popularity of such poems insured their survival and their study, as Martin Aurell has shown, is often useful in determining the adhesion or not to comital power. His work may nonetheless help shed light into the relations between Richard, duke of Aquitaine, and Alfonso II.

In January 1183, Richard and his elder brother, Henry the Young King, quarrelled once again. In the end, only the death of Henry the Young King was to bring any clear resolution to the question of the Plantagenet succession. From 1182, young Henry was increasingly determined to exercise real power within his future dominions and demanded that his brothers pay him homage. Although he was Henry II’s heir, he held no territories over which he could exercise executive authority. By contrast, Richard ruled in Aquitaine and Geoffrey in Brittany. They both refused to pay homage to young Henry. It was not hard for his brother to find allies against Richard,

323 Paden et al., eds., *Bertran de Born*, 104.
who, in imposing his authority in Aquitaine, had angered many local nobles, who had already risen against him in 1182. Meanwhile, from October until December 1182, Alfonso II shuttled between Carcassonne and Provence where he was aiding his vassals, the comtes of Carcassonne and Nîmes, against Raymond V of Toulouse who laid claim to these counties.  

Amongst the rebels was the troubadour Bertran de Born, fighting for control over the Limousin lordship of Hautefort (Autefort) against his brother Constantine. In an attempt to further his claims, Bertran joined Henry the Young King’s revolt against Constantine’s overlord, Richard duke of Aquitaine. The troubadour claimed that Richard had ousted him from the castle in support of Constantine. Bertran therefore composed a *sirventes* against Richard. However, after the death of the Young King on 11 June, his hopes for revenge faded as two of his chief potential supporters, Raymond V of Toulouse and Hugh of Burgundy, returned to their own homelands. To suppress rebellion in Aquitaine, Henry II crossed the Channel. On 30 June 1183, the castle of Hautefort was taken by an army led by Henry II, his son, Richard, and his ally, Alfonso II, who afterwards returned to Barcelona (‘dehinc Rex Arragonensis rediit Barcinonem’), while Richard devastated (‘devastavit’) the lands of the comté of Périgord.
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327 The lordship was held from the vicomte of Limoges.
It is possible that Alfonso II himself fought in these campaigns alongside Henry II and Richard. The Catalo-Aragonese king had been in Provence since February 1183. In March, he granted the counties of Razes, Carlades, and Gabardan to his brother, Sancho. Sancho thereby became a vassal of Alfonso and vouched to wage war on whomever the count-king should command. The grant to Sancho came at a time of severe hostilities between Toulouse and Catalonia-Aragón, so that Sancho may have been assigned to confront Raymond while Alfonso II attended to business in other parts of his kingdom. By granting Provence to Sancho, Alfonso was able to face the problems that had arisen with the lord of Montpellier, who had allied with Raymond of Toulouse, making the king’s return to Provence impossible in 1184.

Throughout the struggles between the duke of Aquitaine and the southern rebels, Béarn and Bigorre remained faithful to Alfonso II. After the lost of Hautefort, Bertran lamented that the Gascon lords of Bigorre and Béarn, who he said had pledged their support had failed to provide him with aid. Bertran may have used poetic licence here, as there is no confirmation either in documents or in chronicles that the vicomte of Béarn or the comte of Bigorre-Marsan had ever offered him assistance against Richard. Indeed, it is virtually inconceivable that Béarn, then under the control of Alfonso II and his regent Peregí de Castellazol, could have offered such help.

331 ‘Ego vero Sancius, propter supradictam donacionem, facio tibi domino meo regi Ildefonso, hominum et fidelitatem et tactis Sacrosanctis Evangeliiis et Sanctorum reliquis et guerram et pacem secundum tuam voluntatem, contra cunctos homines me facturum, et omnes supradictas condiciones me bona fide et sine omni fraude perpetuo, servaturum promitto’: Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 367.
333 ‘... and Lord Centol and Lord Gaston, and Lord Raymond of Avignon... and many other barons- all of them gave me assurances, and they never helped me at all’: Gès no me desconort in Paden et al., eds., Bertran de Born, 236.
Bertran is not a reliable source. However, his verses sometimes provide us with partial clues as to duke Richard’s activities. In 1182, Bertran joined the rebellious barons against Richard, calling upon those he perceived as his enemies to fight against the duke’s rule. Possibly unaware of the true position adopted by the lords of Béarn and Bigorre/Marsan, he called upon ‘the mighty vicomte of Gascony’ to lead resistance to Richard.\(^{334}\) It was unlikely that Béarn or Bigorre-Marsan would rise against Richard, as both were vassals of Alfonso II, albeit lying beyond the orbit of Richard’s direct control. But again Bertran implies a detachment between Plantagenet and Gascon loyalties, telling us that, in 1183, Henry II gave money to Gaston of Béarn to negotiate the release of knights captured by the comte of Toulouse. According to Bertran, Gaston kept the money instead of ransoming the knights.\(^{335}\) This is a statement clearly intended to imply a degree of disloyalty because Gaston was around twelve years old at the time and his regent was in theory entirely faithful to the Catalo-Aragonese alliance and hence to Henry as Alfonso’s ally. From April to September 1183, meanwhile, there is a gap in documents detailing the movements of Alfonso II, possibly due to his involvement Henry’s and Richard’s campaign against Hautefort and the Limousin.\(^{336}\)

Further north, Geoffrey, Richard’s younger brother, himself now began to stir up trouble. He had married the heiress of Brittany in 1181 and was eager to claim Nantes from his father. Henry II stalled and refused to abandon Nantes, but Geoffrey challenged him. In 1183, he joined the Young King’s revolt, which ended with the

\(^{334}\) Stanza 3 of *Pois ventedorns e comborns ab segur*, in ibid., 180-1.
\(^{335}\) ‘…Gaston of Béarn and Pau sent to tell me the news that he got money from the King [Henry II] to ransom his captured men, and he preferred to make off with the loot rather than get them all back’: *Qan vei pels vergiers despleiar*, in ibid., 276-7.
Young King’s death. Even then, there was no proper resolution to family squabbling. In September 1183, Richard refused to surrender Aquitaine to his younger brother, John, in exchange for being named as Henry II’s heir, Geoffrey, now joined John in attacking Poitou. Henry II summoned his sons to England in the autumn of 1184. However, Richard continued to disregard his father’s wishes. It was not until mid 1185, that Richard surrendered Aquitaine, returning it not to John but to his mother, Eleanor. That same year, Henry II finally surrendered to Geoffrey’s requests and granted him Nantes. Yet it was not until the following year, 1186 that Henry II finally acknowledged Richard as his heir. In the meantime, between 1185 and 1186, Geoffrey forged an alliance with Philip Augustus and paid him homage for Brittany. On 19 August 1186, after being recognized seneschal of Gascony by Philip Augustus, while at the French court in Paris, Geoffrey was killed accidentally in a tournament, or as a result of injuries suffered in one and was buried in the chorus of Notre Dame.\(^{337}\)

The Treaty of 1185 Between Alfonso II and Richard

Richard Benjamin, less than secure in his knowledge of the struggles between Catalonia-Aragón and Toulouse, suggested that Alfonso II was perhaps fighting Raymond of Toulouse in 1183, and thus that an alliance with Richard would have benefited him in their joint hostilities against Toulouse.\(^{338}\) For Catalonia-Aragón, the fight against Toulouse had in fact become a priority. Entirely overlooked by English chroniclers and historians, the alliance between Richard and Alfonso was remembered


\(^{338}\) Benjamin, ‘Forty Years War’, 277-8.
only in Aragonese and Navarrese tradition. Thus the sixteenth-century chronicler, Jerónimo Zurita, drew attention to the treaty between Richard and Alfonso II, negotiated at Najac (dép. Aveyron), as an important alliance against the counts of Toulouse. A century later, the Jesuit José de Moret in his Anales del Reino de Navarra, once again recalled this alliance.

From January 1184 until the following year (January 1185), Alfonso II had remained in Catalonia-Aragón. It was not until February 1185, that he returned to Provence. That same month he signed a treaty with the count of Toulouse, in theory confirming the peace last renewed in 1176. But Alfonso had other plans and may have been buying time. On Palm Sunday (14 April) 1185, at Najac, Alfonso II and Richard, count of Poitou, signed a true friendship and concord ('veram amicitiam et concordiam') against Raymond of Toulouse ('R. comitem Sacti Egiidii'). They agreed not to make any truce or peace ('tregas, pacem concordiam sive aliquam composicionem') with Raymond without the other’s consent ('sine alterius consilio, assensu et voluntate'). Richard freely renounced and ceded all his rights ('dono, concedo et confirmo, deffinio atque evacuo per me et per successores meos libere et absolute et sine retentione et exactione') to Alfonso over all lands, towns and castles held by Roger (Trenceval) vicomte of Béziers. Furthermore, he vowed personally to assist Alfonso obtain the castles of Ariza, Trasmoz and Cojuelos presently held by the kings of Castile and Navarre ('Conventio preterea ego Richardus vobis regi
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Aragonum, quod reddam aut faciam reddi vobis castrum de Feriza quod tenet rex de Castelle; et castrum de Trasmuz et castrum de Caxelus, que tenet rex Navarre’).  

The castle of Ariza (‘Feriza’) had been delivered as security (‘fidelitate’) in the peace treaty (‘veram amicitiam et perpetuam concordiam et pacem’) agreed between Alfonso VIII of Castile and Alfonso II of Aragón at Saragossa in July 1170. At the time of the treaty, Ariza was claimed by both Navarre and Castile together with the aforementioned estates of Logroño, Navarrete and Grañón. Alfonso VIII had taken control of the castle itself c.1184. It is unlikely that Richard helped in this, because, at Berdejo in the Castilian-Aragonese border, on 5 October 1186, Ariza was handed over by Alfonso VIII to the Aragonese as part of the conditions of a peace treaty and alliance against the king of Navarre, Sancho VII. The kings had agreed to wage war against Pedro Ruíz de Azarga, who held Santa María de Albarracín and who, supported by the Navarrese king, refused to pay homage to Alfonso VIII. The dispute originated as long ago as 1173, when a joint Castilian and Aragonese force had conquered Albarracín, lying in the Aragonese zone of influence yet claimed by Alfonso VIII of Castile. This treaty of 1186 was intended to resolve this problem, so that Alfonso II of Aragón ceded his claims over Ariza to the Castilian king.

The castle of Trasmoz (‘Trasmuz’), in the modern province of Saragossa, lay in the border region between Castile and Aragón, making it a key fortress for the defence of Aragón. Yet since 1171, the castle had been held by Alfonso VIII of Castile. Of the other principal fortress mentioned in negotiations, the only reference to Cajuelos or Cojuelos occurs in Moret’s *Anales del reino de Navarra*, dating from the

345 LFM, no. 32; Gonzalez, *Alfonso VIII*, no. 147.
seventeenth century, which state that the castle was taken in 1173 by Sancho VI of Navarre during his war against Aragón for possession of territories on the river Ebro. According to Moret, the treaty between Richard and Alfonso, in which Richard promised to restore the castles of Trasmoz and Cojuelos, prefigured the marriage alliance subsequently agreed between Richard and Berengaria of Navarre. However, there is no contemporary evidence that such a marriage alliance, between Navarre and the Plantagenets, was contemplated at so early a date. Such an alliance may be implied by Bertran de Born’s poem ‘S’ieu fos aissi segner ni poderos’ (c. 1183-8) in which he glorifies the victories of the count of Poitou and describes how he ‘throws her [Alice, Philip Augustus’ sister] back, for Richard doesn’t care to have her’ as ‘the king of Navarre has given him as a husband to his daughter [Berengaria].’ According to Kate Norgate, this sirventes could have only been composed between December 1183 and March 1186. This, however, remains pure speculation.

Richard had been betrothed as early as 1177 to Alice, the sister of Philip Augustus, with Louis VII promising to endow Alice with Bourges. Alice was kept at the English court for twenty-five years, but even so the marriage was never solemnized. In 1183, Henry II suggested that Alice might marry one of his sons, but without any direct reference to Richard. In 1184, Henry II is said to have opened negotiations for a marriage between Richard and a German princess, these
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plans being terminated after the girl’s sudden death.⁴⁵⁵ The continuing spinsterhood of Alice of France combined with dark rumours that she had been deflowered by Henry II, contributed, after 1187, to the outbreak of open hostilities between England and France, in which Richard was ultimately to side with Alice’s brother, Philip Augustus, against his own father.⁴⁵⁶

**Dating the Alliance**

The treaty between Richard and Alfonso opens with a dating clause: ‘Anno m.c.lxxxv. mense Aprilis, Dominica Ramis Palmarum’ (14 April). In April 1185, Henry II was elsewhere, celebrating Easter (21 April) at Rouen⁴⁵⁷ and remaining in France until the following year (27 April 1186).⁴⁵⁸ As Richard Benjamin has acknowledged, there must be a question mark both over the date of the treaty and as to whether Richard was acting with his father’s full approval in negotiating with Aragón. Shortly after his Easter court in 1185, Henry II had hurried to Aquitaine to confront Richard. Eleanor of Aquitaine was brought out of captivity in England, and in May 1185, Richard was persuaded to return Aquitaine to her, as part of a gesture intended both to give an impression of Plantagenet family unity and to forestall any attempt by the Capetians to claim Henry or Richard’s direct fealty for Eleanor’s lands.⁴⁵⁹ All of this seems to confirm 1185 as the most likely date for Richard’s treaty with Alfonso. Richard Benjamin, by contrast, has argued that, because it involved
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deals with the king of Navarre, the treaty should be dated to April 1186. Since the treaty itself survives as a single sheet original, so that simple scribal error (‘lxxv’ rather than ‘lxxvi’) is most unlikely, this in turn requires that the treaty’s dating clause be read according to the Pisan style of dating, in which the new year begins on 25 March, the feast of the Annunciation.\(^ {360}\) In this context, it is worth noting that the Aragonese court usually followed French or Florentine rather than Pisan dating styles, which once again would bring us back to 1185 rather than 1186.\(^ {361}\) In the latest re-edition of his book on *Richard I*, John Gillingham continues to follow Benjamin’s theory as to the treaty’s date.\(^ {362}\) Benjamin’s assumption rests primarily on Howden’s *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, which state that in April 1186, before departing for England, Henry II entrusted Richard with a large sum of money (‘infinitam pecumiam’) in order to subjugate (‘subjugaret’) Raymond of Toulouse.\(^ {363}\) According to the same source, that year (1186) Richard defeated Raymond of Toulouse in a campaign otherwise lacking any more detailed description.\(^ {364}\) As Gillingham notes, Howden, like all other contemporary chroniclers, fails even to notice Richard’s treaty with Alfonso II.\(^ {365}\)

Without any further information from Anglo-Norman sources, we are forced to resort to the vast documentation surviving from Aragón. Richard Benjamin failed to examine these Catalo-Aragonese sources in any detail. He did identify the witnesses cited as Richard’s in the treaty, most of them from the region of Bordeaux and the
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\(^ {361}\) A. Casaus y Torres, *Nuevas observaciones para la historia general de Aragón, Navarra y Cataluña* (Barcelona: 1829), xxxviii.


\(^ {363}\) Stubbs, ed., *Gesta*, i, 345.

\(^ {364}\) ‘Interim comes de Sancto Aegidio, non valens resistere in bello comiti Ricardo, fugit de loco ad locum, et nuncios suos misit frequenter ad Philippum regem Francie dominum suum, petens ab eo succursum, se dab eo impetrare non potuit noluit enim quicquam molestiae inferred regi Anglie nec filii suis’: ibid., i, 347.

Agenais. They are of little help in dating the treaty, since their own details remain for the most part obscure.\textsuperscript{366}

If we now seek to revisit Benjamin’s suggested the date, the first point to note is Catalan preference for Florentine or French dating styles, with 25 March as the start of the new year. This was a common practice in Catalonia and in the lands that Aragonese rulers controlled in the Languedoc. Indeed, the Council of Tarragona, in 1180, had ruled that the archbishop’s documents should be dated according to this style instead of by a previous system of dating according to the years of the reign of the king of France.\textsuperscript{367} In fact, from 1180 there was a ‘brutal and definitive’ rupture with the old dating system by which all Catalan documents, royal or ecclesiastical, were only dated according to the year of the Incarnation.\textsuperscript{368}

Alfonso II’s itinerary likewise fails to support Benjamin’s attempt to re-date the treaty with Richard to 1186. In January 1185, accompanied by Berenguer de Vilademuls archbishop of Tarragona (1177-94), Alfonso left Lèrida (Lleida)\textsuperscript{369} to sign his peace treaty with Raymond of Toulouse in February. The archbishop, who was very close to Alfonso II, naturally witnessed the treaty.\textsuperscript{370} Later that month, but without Berenguer de Vilademuls, the King continued on his way through southern France. He was in Avignon in February, confirming rights granted by his grandfather to the bishop of Avignon over the village of Noves (‘Albergo de Novas’).\textsuperscript{371} He then

\textsuperscript{366} Cf. Benjamin, ‘Forty Years War’, 284-5.
\textsuperscript{369} Cf. Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 398.
\textsuperscript{370} The document is only dated February 1185. Ibid., no. 400. On the bishop of Tarragona, cf. C. Carl, A Bishopric Between Three Kingdoms: Calahorra, 1045-1190 (Leiden: 2011), 261.
\textsuperscript{371} 17 February 1185; Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 399.
travelled to Aix-en-Provence where in the first week of Lent (‘prima ebdomada quadragesime’, 13-19 March) he granted the cathedral of Aix a number of privileges. He was subsequently in Albaron (near Arles), and afterwards travelled, perhaps through Béziers, to arrive at Najac in April. He then returned to Catalonia, arriving at Castellón de Ampurias (Castelló d’Empúries) later that month. There he granted Pedro Jiménez de Ossia (‘P. Examenis de Osia’), who had been with the king at Najac, and his successors, the valley of Querol in fief to be settled (‘populato’) according to the fuero of Barcelona (‘forum Barchinonem’). Witnessing the act were Hugo (Ugo) de Mataplana and Iñigo de Abiego (‘Enego de Aveu’), both of whom had been with the king at Najac.

By contrast, in 1186 it is highly improbable that Alfonso could have met Richard at Najac. The king was at Perpignan, between 25-31 March, and returned to Lérida in April. In May, he was at Narbonne, and in July he was back in Aragón, at Uncastillo. In Perpignan he was accompanied by Berenguer, archbishop of Tarragona, and by Oto de Isla (‘Otnois de Insula, maiorhomo curie domini regis’), who had also been present at Najac the previous year. Oto’s presence was a regular occurrence in royal documents because of his office as mayordomo, chief of the royal household, so that he appears on frequent occasions from April 1185 to October 1192. Much more significant is the presence of the archbishop of Tarragona who

372 Documents 402-403 were dated following the Annunciation Florence style system (‘ab incarnationis’), cf. Ibid., nos. 401-403.
373 Also dated following the Florence style (1184). Ibid., no. 405. In March 1184 Alfonso was at Barbastro cf. Ibid., nos. 383, 385.
374 Ibid., nos. 406-7.
375 Ibid., no. 408.
376 Ibid.
377 Ibid., nos. 422-3.
378 Ibid., nos. 424-5.
379 Ibid., no. 422.
380 Cf. Ibid., nos. 406, 574
accompanied Alfonso to Narbonne in May (1186). If the treaty between Richard and Alfonso was misdated, as Richard Benjamin suggested, we would expect to find the archbishop present at Najac. But this is not the case. Furthermore, none of the other witnesses present at Najac appear in 1186 either at Perpignan or at Narbonne.

In addition, we are told by Howden’s Gesta that Henry II crossed from Dover to Wissant (near Boulogne) two days after Easter Sunday (17 April) 1185. He then summoned Eleanor to join him in France. It was not until May that Richard surrendered his claim to Poitou. The treaty was signed before Henry’s arrival, allowing Richard to then travel to meet his father. Further confirmation may again come from an unlikely source, a troubadour. Martín de Riquer has shown that a poem of Guilhelm de Berguedán, who joined Richard’s entourage, may help confirm the date of the alliance signed at Najac.

Having confirmed that the date for the treaty between Richard and Alfonso II was April 1185 as stated in the document, we must assume that Richard waited until 1186 to conduct his expedition against the comte of Toulouse conducted at the prompting of his father. Regardless of his alliance with Richard, Alfonso did not personally help him attack Raymond of Toulouse, most probably because he faced problems with his Iberian neighbours.

Also in April 1185, very likely before signing the treaty with Richard, Alfonso signed another alliance with Roger of Bèziers, who agreed to wage war against the count of
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381 Ibid., no. 424.
382 Stubbs, ed., Gesta, 337-7.
383 M. Riquer, “En torno a "Arondeta de ton chantar m’azir””, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona, 22 (1949), 223-6.
384 Cf. Schramm et al., Primers comtes-reis, 70.
Toulouse. The king must have met with Roger prior to going to Najac to meet Richard who would there renounce all rights over Béziers. Through these alliances the count-king expected to increase the pressure on Raymond of Toulouse and his own hold on Provence. Roger agreed always (‘semper’) to submit his differences with Raymond of Toulouse to the judgement and will of Alfonso. Only months later, in September (1185), the vicomte of Béziers bequeathed his lands to Alfonso’s younger son, Alfonso (b. 1180). In his charter acknowledging these arrangements, the king granted to his son the comté of Provence and Gabardan (‘Gabaldano’). Alfonso hereby strengthened his hold over the Languedoc. The designation of his infant son as comte of Provence was a measure aimed at centralizing the government of those lands by rescinding the role previously played by Sancho, Alfonso II’s brother, who had previously administered Provence. It has also been suggested that Alfonso was concerned with Sancho’s ‘incompetence’ in defending Provence. This idea is again sustained by Bertran de Born who, if we allow for poetic licence, portrayed Sancho as a glutton and a drunk.

Possibly as a result of his new alliance with Alfonso II, Richard received homage for certain lands held by Gaston VI of Béarn. For the first time, the vicomte of Béarn recognized a degree of dependence upon the Plantagenet count-dukes of Aquitaine. On 3 February 1187, at Huesca, Gaston VI, by now aged about 17, recognized Alfonso of Aragón as his feudal lord, paying homage to him for all his lands except for those he held from Richard count of Poitou (‘…facio corporaliter hominaticum

385 Insuper iuravi ego Rogerius vobis Ildefonso, regi domino meo, et hoc idem feci iuravi a supradictis viris quod semper stabo iudicio aut mandato vestro super controversiis que sunt vel erunt inter me et comitem Raimundum Tolose. Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 407.
386 Ibid., no. 412.
387 Cf. Schramm et al., Primers comtes-reis, 70.
388 Kastner, ‘Sirventes’, 231.
389 Paden et al., eds., Bertran de Born, 270-1.
per me et per successores vobis domino meo Ildefonso, Dei gracia regi Aragonis… et
vestros successores omnem meam terram preter illam quam teneo per dominum
Rich(ardum) comitem Pictavensem’). We have no reason to think that Béarn was
previously regarded as lying within Richard’s orbit. We have already seen how in
1170, Marie had relinquished the government of the vicomté to Alfonso. It was the
king who, after Guillelm de Moncada’s death, appointed Pelegrí de Castellazol to rule
as regent on behalf of Marie’s infant son.

According to the chronicler Jerónimo Zurita Gaston paid homage to Alfonso II for
Béarn and Gascony, in much the same way that Marie had sworn such homage in
1170 (‘le hizo reconocimiento por aquel señorío como la vizcondesa doña María su
madre; y le prestó homenaje como vasallo por sí y sus sucesores de toda la tierra de
Bearne y Gascuña’). Unfortunately, he is unable to inform us which lands in Gascony
Gaston VI held in from Richard, merely referring to ‘some places’ (‘algunos lugares’)
held from the count of Poitiers. The chronicler does not state, as John Gillingham
seems to assume, that Gaston paid homage for Béarn to Richard. Pierre de Marca
explained that it was only Brulhois and the Gavardan that Gaston acknowledged were
held from Richard. Marie in 1170 had paid homage to Alfonso not only for Béarn,
traditionally allied to Aragón, but also for the other lands she held in Gascony (‘tota
illa terra Biarnensi et Gaschonie’), for the lands she held from her father Peter de
Gabarret (‘et quam pater meus Petrus de Gavarreto, vicecomes, mihi dimisit’), and for
the lands she had inherited from her brother Gaston (‘et Gaston, frater meus ad diem

390 LFM, no. 20; Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 436.
391 Pelegrín (Pelegrí) was an influential man in the court of Alfonso II. Miret y Sans, ‘La casa de
392 Zurita, Anales, II, xlii.
393 Gillingham, Richard I, 124.
394 Marca, Histoire de Béarn, 490-3.
obitus suis mihi laudvit atque concessit’). Pierre de Gabarret was the vicomte of Gavardan and after his death Marie had inherited his lands.

Gaston vicomte of Béarn continued to serve his overlord, Alfonso of Catalonia-Aragón, and in September 1192, received from the king a promise of the marriage of Petronille de Comminges, heiress to the comté of Bigorre and daughter of Bernard IV of Comminges, as soon as she should reach the age of consent. Thereafter, Gaston proceeded to pay homage for Bigorre, which he held from the king of Aragón.

Regardless of Richard’s attacks against Centule of Bigorre in 1179, and despite having taken the castles of Clermont and Montbron from him, Aragón continued to act as Béarn’s suzerain. Moreover, as will be shown, Catalonia-Aragón continued to exercise lordship over the comtés and vicomtés of Foix, Comminges, Béarn and Bigorre until the disastrous defeat at Muret on 12 September 1213. Indeed, in the midst of the Albigensian Crusade, at Pamiers on 1 December 1212, the king of Aragón, accused Simon de Montfort of committing injustices in the domains of the comtés of Foix, Comminges and Béarn.

395 Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 85.
397 ‘Idelfonsus, Dei gratia rex Aragonum…, comendo et dono tibi Gaston, nobili vicecomiti Bearnensi, tosum comitatum meum et terram de Bigorra simul cum dilecta consanguinea mea, filia dilecti nostril Bernardi, nobilis comitis de Comenge…’: LFM, no. 21; Sánchez Casabón, Alfonso II, no. 572. Gaston VI died in 1214. She was later married to Guy de Montfort, Simon de Montfort’s second son on 6 or 7 November 1216 at Tarbes. Cf. W.A. Sibly et al., eds., The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: The Albigensian Crusade and its Aftermath (Woodbridge: 2003), xxiv, 54-5.
398 Cf. Stubbs, ed., Gesta, 1, 212-3.
As count of Poitou, Richard held Gascony, and sought to defend its borders, as when he imprisoned the vicomte of Dax.\textsuperscript{400} However, he never attempted to exert control over Béarn, held from Aragón since 1170. Since the beginning of the twelfth century, Béarn had been chipping off lands from its neighbours. In 1034, after a war between the vicomtes of Dax and Béarn, the latter had annexed Mixe and Ostabaret.\textsuperscript{401} However, Richard had no intention of claiming the vicomté. Rather, he focused on a much bigger prize: Toulouse, claimed by Richard as son of Eleanor of Aquitaine.

Jacques Boussard has shown that although the vicomte of Béarn had been a regular attendant at the court of William IX of Aquitaine (1071-1126), thereafter the vicomte ceased to appear in charters issued by the dukes of Aquitaine.\textsuperscript{402} The vicomtes of Béarn had since shifted their alliance towards Aragón. Our first indication of a return to an interest in their ancient allegiance to the dukes of Aquitaine comes in the treaty of 1187. Jacques Boussard, Pierre Tucoo-Chala and Jacques Clémens, have shown that Gaston VI held Bruilhois and Le Gabardan from Richard comte of Poitou, whereas Béarn’s suzerainty remained with the king of Aragón.\textsuperscript{403} John Gillingham, on the contrary, has suggested that Richard ‘recovered the homage of Béarn’ in 1187. However, this is contradicted by what we have seen.\textsuperscript{404} However, as Jean Ellis has remarked to the lack of surviving documents, there is a clear difficulty in affirming Béarn’s allegiance to Aquitaine, a situation that persisted well into the rule of Gaston

\textsuperscript{401} Ibid., 152. These lands were later held by the vicomte of Tartas from the King of Navarre (22 Noviembre 1247). Cf. J.A. Brutails, \textit{Documents des Archives de la Chambre des Comptes de Navarre} (1196-1384) (Paris: 1890), no. 12.
\textsuperscript{404} Gillingham, \textit{Richard I}, 124.
VII de Béarn (1229-1290), when it was finally resolved in favour the duke of Aquitaine. There is no firm evidence to suggest that Richard attempted to take control over Béarn, perhaps because his efforts were directed against Toulouse, a much greater prize. Henry II and Richard looked to Alfonso II as a critical ally against Raymond of Toulouse, so Aragonese control over Béarn and Bigorre went unchallenged.

As we have seen, the allegiances of the lords of southern France shifted throughout the twelfth century, as did the boundaries of their lordships. The territorial boundaries of the vicomtés well not firmly established in the thirteenth century, much less in the twelfth century for which there is even less reliable evidence. Towards the end of the twelfth century, in his *De instructione Principis*, Gerald of Wales attempted to define the boundaries of Henry II’s empire. According to Gerald, Henry held all of Gascony up to the Spanish mountains (‘…et Gasconiam totam usque ad Pyrenaeos Hispaniae montes…’). The Pyrenees constitute the border between the Iberian Peninsula and modern-day France, so that Gerald’s use of them is far from precise. The boundaries of Gascony coincided with those of the vicomtés of Labourd, Daz, Orthe, Tartas, Tursan, Marsan, Albret and Gabardan. However, these lordships remained fluctuating and Protean entities (see Map of Gascony during Henry II’s Reign).

Throughout this period, family ties seem to have determined alliances and often account for the shifting of comital boundaries. Just as unstable was the allegiance of the vicomte of Béarn, a matter that seems only to have been settled

---

405 Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn’, 76-7.
much later, in the thirteenth century, when Gaston VII finally declared himself to be a vassal of King Henry III of England as duke of Gascony.¶

\footnote{Cf. Débax, ed., \textit{Vicomtes et vicomtés}, 119-23.}
Maps of Gascony during Henry II's Reign
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Before travelling into Burgundy to meet Philip Augustus at the start of their long-projected crusade, Richard I made an extended detour south from Normandy into Gascony. On 2 February 1190, he held court at La Réole. The matters discussed there are a matter of speculation, as the chroniclers preserve no details. But the following day, Richard confirmed all the privileges that his predecessors, the dukes of Aquitaine and his father, Henry II, had granted to abbey of La Grande-Sauve, about 30 km from Bordeaux, on the pilgrim route to Compostela. Witnessing on this solemn occasion were Gaston de Béarn and other Gascon lords, including Bernard d’Armagnac, Bernard de Vésone and Peter de Castillon. It was the first time these men had been required to deal with Richard as king of England and duke of Normandy and a host of business must have been transacted. Whereas Plantagenet interest in La Grande-Sauve dated from Henry II (who had showered favours on the abbey in order to strengthen Eleanor’s claim over Toulouse), Aragón and Béarn had more ancient connections to the abbey, dating back to the end of the eleventh century. A month after his Gascon excursion, on 16 March, Richard I met Philip II and agreed to delay their planned crusade. By this time, marriage negotiations for his alliance with Berengaria of Navarre were clearly already in the air.

412 C. Higouet et al., Grand Cartulaire de la Sauve Majeure (Bordeaux: 1996), no. 1106.
Given Richard’s friendly relations with Alfonso II of Aragon, why did the king marry a Navarrese rather than an Aragonese princess? All of the Aragonese infantas were unsuitable for marriage, either, because they were already married or because they were still under the age of consent. The eldest, Constanza (b. circa 1179) was not yet twelve. Richard, on his way to crusade, had no time to wait, not only to contract a marriage but to father an heir. Sancha, was even younger (b. circa 1186).

Navarre and Aragón were on the verge of an alliance against Castile, signed at Borja on 7 September 1190. In May, the following year, Alfonso II of Aragón, Alfonso IX of León, and Sancho I of Portugal entered into a second common alliance against Castile. They thus neutralised the threat to Gascony and Richard’s southern lands posed by Castile and Alfonso VIII’s claims to Gascony as Eleanor’s dower. As John Gillingham has pointed out, Richard’s marriage to Berengaria of Navarre was part of a diplomatic strategy intended to protect his continental holdings from the increasing power of both France and Castile. Richard’s strategy worked, keeping Castile at bay until after 1204, when Alfonso VIII did eventually invade Gascony, claiming it on behalf of his wife, Eleanor.

Having first been introduced to his new bride in Sicily, Richard married Berengaria (the daughter of Sancho VI of Navarre by Sancha of Castile) on 12 May 1191, whilst
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416 She was betrothed in 1198 to the King of Hungary, and subsequently, in 1211, to Frederick II (crowned emperor 1220).
419 Cf. Gillingham, ‘Richard and Berengaria’, 161. While some historians have portrayed Richard’s decision to marry Berengaria as a strategic manoeuvre, others such as Ann Trinidad have chosen to focus on Berengaria and Richards emotional and sexual life. Cf. A. Trinidad, Berengaria. In Search of Richard the Lionheart’s Queen (Dublin: 1999), 21-22.
in Cyprus on his way to the crusade. The marriage took place despite Richard’s previous betrothal to Alice, daughter of Louis VII of France and Constance of Castile, sparking indignation from Richard’s supposed chief ally on crusade, the French king Philip Augustus.\textsuperscript{420} The marriage negotiations between Richard and Navarre were clearly well prepared. They may even have started while Richard was count of Poitou, before July 1189.\textsuperscript{421} Geoffrey de Vinsauf supplies a strong suggestion of this, claiming that the marriage had been arranged ‘a long time previous, while (Richard was) yet count of Poitou’.\textsuperscript{422}

**Berengaria of Navarre**

I think I’ll make just half a sirvientes about the two kings –for soon we shall see that there will be more knights of the valiant king of Castile, Sir Alfonso, who is coming, I hear, and will want mercenaries; Richard will spend gold and silver by hogsheads and bushels, thinking it happiness to spend and give, and he doesn’t want Alfonso’s treaty. He wants war more than a hawk wants quail.

Bertran de Born\textsuperscript{423}

Berengaria’s dower, assigned after her marriage to Richard, consisted of the Gascon lands south of the Garonne, the lordship of Château-du-Loir, the Norman or Angevin

\textsuperscript{420} Constance was the daughter of Alfonso VII of Castile by Berenguela of Barcelona and Provence. She was the second wife of Louis VII of France, after his divorce from Eleanor of Aquitaine.

\textsuperscript{421} Note the (doggerel) translation: ‘Upon the morrow of that day/ Was wedded the fair fiancée:/ And there at Limassol was crowned/ The fairest bride that could be found/ At any time and any place,/ A virtuous queen with lovely face’: Ambroise, *The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart* (New York: 1976), lines 1735-1745, 95.


\textsuperscript{423} ‘Meiz sirvientes veuilh far dels reis amdos’, in Paden et al., eds., *Bertran de Born* (Berkeley: 1986), 398.
castles of Falaise, Domfront and Loches, and a series of lordships in Poitou. In exchange, Berengaria’s father bestowed on her, and in effect upon Richard as her husband, a marriage portion consisting of the lordships of Saint-Jean-Pied-de-Port and Rocabruna, both of them major landmarks in the western Pyrenees dividing Navarre from Gascony.\textsuperscript{424} The betrothal as a whole was intended to ensure Navarrese protection of Gascony, and a degree of security for the ultrapuertos (the Navarrese Pyrenean lordships lying north of the Pyrenees) during Richard’s absence on crusade.\textsuperscript{425} However, the dower assigned to Berengaria in 1191, and in particular the lordship of Gascony south of the Garonne, involved a degree of horse-trading amongst the women of the Plantagenet family. Domfront, Falaise and the northern French lordships assigned to Berengaria were already assigned as parts of the dower of Eleanor of Aquitaine, Richard’s widowed mother. In due course, they were to be assigned, after Richard’s death, as dower for King John’s wife, Isabella of Angoulême, plunging Berengaria’s claim into yet further complexity and ensuring more than a decade of litigation before the papal and other courts. Meanwhile, the lands south of the Garonne were already claimed by Alfonso VIII as the marriage portion of his wife, Richard and John’s sister. Alfonso’s claims here may have been based more upon wishful thinking than upon reality. In particular, there is no other evidence to suggest that Henry II, on the marriage of any of his other daughters, assigned a marriage portion in the form of land rather than of money and other moveable wealth. For the King to assign a marriage portion in land was to risk such land falling into the hands of his future son-in-law and hence of its being permanently alienated from the royal estate. No king of England, from William I to Henry III, is

known to have made such a gift, even though a succession of disgruntled son-in-laws, from Alfonso of Castile in the 1190s to Alexander III of Scotland in the 1240s, were to claim that such gifts had been given. In the particular case of Eleanor of Castile’s claim to Gascony, it is hard to imagine why, if he knew Gascony to have been assigned as Eleanor’s dower, Richard would have undertaken an action so provocative, both of Castilian and ecclesiastical discontent, as his assignment of Gascony as Berengaria’s dower. Such provocation appears all the less likely, given that Richard was in the midst of a crusade and that his alliance with Navarre, as the historians agree, was intended not to provoke but to protect against potential hostility from Castile.426

At the time of Richard’s marriage to Berengaria, it is true, the Iberian kingdoms seem to have been on the brink of warfare. The marriage alliance between Richard and Berengaria favoured Navarre, which was itself building a series of alliances against Castile. Sancho of Navarre in due course allied against Castile with Aragón (late 1190), León and Portugal (May 1191). On 27 May 1191, at Palencia, in what was clearly construed as a gesture of defiance towards his neighbours, Alfonso VIII of Castile undertook to protect the Church and its properties in Aragón, Portugal, León and Navarre.427 Pope Celestine III (1191-8), perhaps fearing such disputes, had asked the archbishop of Toledo and his suffragans, to entice the Christian kings to wage war, not against each other, but against the Muslims.428 In the aftermath, on Easter day 1192 (5 April), a truce was agreed between the kings of Aragón and Castile, averting war.429

428 Ibid., i, 830-1.
429 Cf. Ibid., i, 833-4.
On 9 October 1192, Richard embarked from the Holy Land at the start of his disastrous return journey to England. Due to the mounting tensions with Philip Augustus, Richard travelled incognito. Forced to take the land route from the Adriatic, he was identified and captured outside Vienna on 10 December 1192. In March the following year, he was handed over to the Emperor Henry VI, remaining in imperial custody until 1194, when his ransom was finally paid. Only then was Richard able to return to England. During his absence, trouble erupted in Gascony. A group of nobles from Aquitaine and Toulouse attempted to depose the seneschal, Richard’s chief representative, in Aquitaine. In order to protect his English allies, Sancho VII, Berengaria’s brother, and a Navarrese contingent marched through the Pyrenees and into Aquitaine in 1192.430

In the Iberian Peninsula the demise first of Sancho VI of Navarre, in June 1194, and then of Alfonso II, in April the following year, led to a shifting of the political balance. The never-ending conflicts between the comital families of the French Midi now re-attracted the attention of the Iberian kings. Early in April 1194, Gaston VI de Béarn had invaded Orthez, in theory held by Arnald Raymond comte of Tartas.431 In March 1196, at Olite, Arnald Raymond pledged homage to Sancho VII of Navarre (1194-1234). The comte promised to make peace or wage war with whoever Sancho ordered, including the king of England and Gaston VI de Béarn. He also promised to repudiate whatever land or honour he held from Gaston whenever Sancho should demand it. Present was Gaston VI himself, who as the document states, was at Sancho’s court at Olite in an attempt to solve a controversy between himself and

430 Herreros Lopetegui, Tierras navarras, 66.
431 Marca, Histoire de Béarn (Paris: 1640), 503.
Raimond-Guillaume II, vicomte of Soule.\textsuperscript{432} Navarre was once again fishing in the deep and turbulent waters of Gascon politics. In these circumstances, and despite the fact that Sancho seems to have sent hostages to assist with Richard’s release from captivity in Germany, it is clear that Richard could no longer rely on the Navarrese king to maintain the security of Plantagenet Gascony.\textsuperscript{433}

The death of Raymond V of Toulouse on 20 March 1194 and of Alfonso II of Aragón at Perpignan on 25 April 1196, marked the end of an era of confrontation between Richard and the houses of Trencavel-Aragón. In October 1196, Joan, Richard’s sister married Raymond VI of Toulouse and the forty years’ war between the duke of Aquitaine and the comte of Toulouse was drawn to a close.\textsuperscript{434} Even despite Joan’s death only five years later, King John maintained amicable relations with Raymond VI and was henceforth uncle and protector to Joan’s young son, the future Raymond VII.\textsuperscript{435} This was also the end of an era for the crown of Aragón, whose throne now passed to Pedro II (Pere I of Barcelona, ‘the Catholic’).

**Navarre and the Growing Power of Castile and Aragón**

On 7 September 1190, Sancho VI and Alfonso II of Aragón had formed an alliance (‘conventio’) against Alfonso VIII of Castile\textsuperscript{436} If either king absented himself from his kingdom and his lands were attacked by Castile, the other would provide knights

---

\textsuperscript{432} J.M. Jimeno Jurío et al., *Archivo General de Navarra* (1194-1234) (Donostia: 1998), no. 10.


\textsuperscript{434} On this peace cf. Vincent, *Plantagenets and the Agenais*, 438.


\textsuperscript{436} ‘Conveniunt itaque inter se et promittit aler alteri, bona et legali et absque aliquo enganno, quod se aduuent contra Alfonsum, regem Castelle, et successores eius in regno ipsi et filii eorum et generationes omni tempore … Conveniunt itaque inter se et promittit aler alteri, bona et legali et absque aliquo enganno, quod se aduuent contra Alfonsum, regem Castelle, et successores eius in regno ipsi et filii eorum et generationes omni tempore’: Sánchez Casabón, *Alfonso II*, no. 520.
and men (‘milites et alii homines’) to fight against Alfonso VIII. A year later, on May 1191, the king of Portugal, Sancho I (1185-1211), the king of León, Alfonso IX (1188-1230), and the king of Aragón entered into an alliance (‘conventio’) against the king of Castile in order to prevent him from invading their kingdoms. Both alliances were short-lived, and did not stop Alfonso VIII’s expansionist campaigns. Three years later (20 April 1194), by arrangements brokered by cardinal Gregory of S. Angelo, the king of Castile signed an agreement with his cousin, Alfonso IX of León. An alliance with Aragón was soon to follow. Despite this, Navarre remained an implacable enemy of Castile.

An Uncomfortable Alliance: Navarre and Morocco

The Chronicles

Between 1195-7, taking advantage of Castilian defeat at the hands of the Muslims, Sancho VII (‘el Fuerte’) of Navarre pillaged Alfonso VIII’s lands. This campaign opened with Alfonso’s devastating defeat at Alarcos, on 18 July 1195, at the hands of Abu Yusuf al-Mansour. The Castilian army was slaughtered on the battlefield, while reinforcements from Navarre and León were still on their way. To aggravate Alfonso VIII’s troubles, Alfonso IX of León and Sancho VII of Navarre both now turned against him. León and Castile were subsequently brought to a peace agreement with the marriage of Berenguela, Alfonso VIII’s daughter, to Alfonso IX. The peace was

437 Ibid.
438 Ibid., no. 533.
439 ‘Hec est forma mandati quam nos Gregorius, Dei gratia Sancti Angeli diachoni cardinalis, apostolice sedis legatus, mandamus’: González, Alfonso VIII, no. 622.
short-lived, however, not least because the betrothal was dissolved. Berenguela was related to Alfonso within the second degree of consanguinity.\textsuperscript{441} In the following months, Sancho VII of Navarre allied with the Muslim emir of Morocco Yusuf al-Mansour. Roger of Howden supplies an account of this alliance, which reads much like a modern-day soap opera and that is most plausibly dated to the period c.1199. Howden tells a story of a love-struck Muslim princess, al-Mansour’s daughter, falling in love with Sancho after hearing of his fame for righteousness (‘audita per commune famam probitate Sanc(h)i’). Yusuf was subsequently convinced by his daughter of the need for an alliance, sending envoys to Sancho, promising him his daughter in marriage together with ‘Saracen Spain’ (‘Hispania saracenica’), from the borders of Portugal to Montsiá (in Catalonia). Sancho travelled to Morocco, only to find that al-Mansour had died (January 1199) and that he himself was now drawn into the succession dispute, as a supporter of Yusuf’s son, Muhammad al-Nasir (1199-1213. After three years of fighting, according to Howden, Sancho and Muhammed al-Nasir finally defeated (‘subjugavit’) all other claimants to the throne. In the meantime, Alfonso of Castile and Pedro II of Aragón had taken advantage of Sancho’s absence and invaded his kingdom.\textsuperscript{442}

The archbishop of Toledo, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada’s \textit{De Rebus Hispanie}, supplies a much less romanticized account of these events than that provided by Howden. According to the archbishop, the Castilian defeat at Alarcos followed the desertion of León and Navarre which had allied themselves with the ‘Arabs’ (‘Arabibus’). The Leonese treaty allowed Muslim armies to devastate the lands of Alfonso of Castile, who finally made a truce (‘fecit treguam’) with them. Further dangers were averted,

\textsuperscript{441} Cf. \textit{Chronica latina}, ii, 15, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{442} Howden, iii, 90-2.
according to the archbishop, by the most prudent attention of the perceptive and clever Eleanor, Alfonso VIII’s wife.\footnote{Alienor Regina uxor nobilis Aldefonsi, cum esset prudentissima, sagaci prouidencia et solerte rerum pericula atendebat: J. Fernández Valverde, ed., Roderici Ximenii de Rada. Historia de rebus Hispanie sive Historia gothica (Turnhout: 1987), VII, xxx-xxi, pp. 252-3.} Afterwards, trying to vindicate the injuries caused by Sancho of Navarre, Alfonso and his faithful friend, Pedro II of Aragón, entered Navarre, taking Vitoria, Álava, San Sebastián, Guipúzcoa, and other cities. Sancho, who had fled to live with the Arabs (‘ad Arabes transmigravit’), was informed of the invasion by Muslim envoys.\footnote{Ibid., VII, xxxii, pp, 253-4.} According to yet another chronicle, the Chronica latina, in the aftermath of the battle of Alarcos, Sancho VII of Navarre befriended the Moroccan Almohad ruler, Abu Yusuf, who had defeated Alfonso VIII, receiving Almohad money to fight a war against Castile. In the meantime, Alfonso VIII of Castile, taking advantage of Sancho’s absence, entered Vitoria and invaded the lands of the King of Navarre.\footnote{Chronica latina, ii, 16, p. 50. On the events leading to the battle of Alarcos, see A. Huici Miranda, Historia política del Imperio Almohade (Tetuan: 1956), 350-76; Ibid., Las grandes batallas de la Reconquista durante las invasiones africanas (almoravidas, almohades y benemerines) (Granada: 2000), 137-212.} As for Arab sources, the fourteenth-century work of Roudh el-Kartas makes no mention of the Navarrese king playing any part in the succession of the caliph, Yusuf al-Mansour, merely praising the Muslim king for his conquests.\footnote{R. El-Kartas, Histoire des souverains du Maghreb (Espagne et Maroc) et annales de la ville de Fès (Paris: 1860), 325-6.} Even so, we do know that Sancho was allied with Yusuf al-Mansour. According to the Arab chronicle of Ibn Idari al-Marrakusi, al-Bayan al-The lengths to which Sancho went to secure his alliance with Yusuf al-Mansour remain unknown. Compelling as Howden’s story is, his account seems unreliable both chronologically and in its claims that al-Mansour granted Sancho the whole of ‘Saracen Spain’.\footnote{N. Barbour, ‘The Relations of King Sancho VII of Navarre with the Almohads’, Revue de l’Occident musulman et de la Méditerranée, 4 (1967), 16-7.}
Mugrib fi Ijtasar ajbar Muluk al-Andalus wa al-Magrib, the caliph left Africa (‘Ifriqiya’) on 1 June 1195 and waged wars against the Christian kings of Spain until 10 April 1198 when he returned across the Straits of Gibraltar en route for Marrakesh. The meetings between Sancho and al-Mansour are likely to have taken place in al-Andalus rather than in Morroco.

The Aftermath of Alarcos and the Muslim Alliance

After the Castilian defeat at Alarcos, Alfonso VIII’s kingdom was plunged into a series of defeats at the hand of al-Mansour and the neighbouring kingdoms of León and Navarre. By the autumn of 1195, the Almohad caliph had retreated to Seville where he seems to have received Leonese and Navarrese embassies. León and Castile had broken the alliance signed on 20 April 1194 at Tordehumos in which they made peace and settled their disputed frontier. Instead, Alfonso IX of León now demanded that castles held by Castile be handed over to him. Alfonso VIII refused, and war broke out. The Leonese now hurried to seal an alliance with Yusuf, securing funds and soldiers to plunder Alfonso VIII’s lands from the west. Alfonso IX penetrated as far as Carrión, about 80 km west of Burgos. Simultaneously, the Almohad caliph attacked from the south, reaching Toledo, where he was finally stopped, although not before laying waste to the surrounding territories. Aid finally arrived from Aragón, when Pedro II reversed his father’s previous hostility towards Castile.

449 Cf. González, Alfonso VIII, no. 622
450 Alfonso II of Aragón died on 25 April 1196. On 7 September 1190, Alfonso II and Sancho VII of Navarre signed an alliance against Castile: M. Alvira Cabrer, ed., Pedro el Católico, Rey de Aragón y
On 29 March 1196, Celestine III, lamenting the setbacks suffered by the crusaders in the Holy Land and in Spain, urged Sancho ‘repudiate the society of pagans’ (‘abiurato consortio paganorum’) and make peace with the Christian kings (‘cum Christianis regibus vere ac perpetue pacis concordiam celebres’) in order to fight against the Muslims. In addition, the Pope encouraged Sancho to seek an alliance with the kings of Castile and Aragón. At the same time, Celestine wrote to Alfonso VIII of Castile and Alfonso II of Aragón, who died days later on 25 April, urging them to reach agreement amongst themselves (‘pace inter filios ecclesie’) in order to contest the advance of the Almohads. The pope also warned them that Sancho VII of Navarre, whom he here refers to merely as ‘dux Nauarre’, had made an alliance with the enemies of the Catholic faith (‘amicitia cum inimicis catholice fidei’). He further ordered the kings of Spain, and in particular those of Castile and Aragon (‘…regibus Hispaniarum et specialiter Castelanensi et Aragonensi’) to agree a peace treaty (‘pacis federe’) so that they might fight against the Saracens. The Pope also wrote to the archbishop of Tarragona and the bishops of Tarazona and Calahorra, informing them of Sancho’s alliance with al-Mansour and asked them to promote peace between the king of Navarre and the kings of Castile and Aragón. Celestine III instructed the Archbishop of Tarragona and the bishop of Pamplona to work towards a peace agreement between the Spanish kings, while informing them of Sancho’s alliance with the ‘enemies of the faith’ who had purchased his neutrality.

---


452 ‘Verum ad audientiam apostolatus nostri pervenit quod karissimus in christo filius noster Illustris Rex Navarre cum inimicis catholice fidei, imo ipsius domini nostri Jhesu Christi, amicitiam contraxerit, ab eis certam pecunie quantitatem annis singulis percepturus si auxilium et consilium in huius
Meanwhile, taking advantage of Alfonso VIII’s military setback, Sancho VII plundered the lands near Logroño. The Navarrese allied with Alfonso IX of León, who had again taken up arms against Castile. Himself making use of Almohad help, the king of León now attacked Castile, so that Celestine III was obliged to threaten him with excommunication if he advanced any further. On 20 May 1196, the Pope rebuked Sancho of Navarre, exhorting him to make peace with Castile and Aragón and to break his alliance with the Moroccan king. By the end of 1196, Sancho VII had signed a peace with Alfonso of Castile, and was promptly congratulated by Pope Celestine. However, despite papal exhortation, Sancho’s Moroccan alliance was only temporarily disrupted, being rekindled after the Treaty of Calatayud (1198) between Castile and Aragón.

Alfonso VIII, now allied with Pedro II of Aragón, seized the long-disputed lands on the Navarrese border and coastline. On 20 May 1198, Alfonso and Pedro signed a peace treaty (‘pax, concordia, amicitia atque conuentio’) at Calatayud, targeted against Sancho VII and the kingdom of Navarre. This alliance against Navarre and the ‘Saracen’ kingdoms effectively partitioned the disputed Navarrese territories...

---

necessitatis articulo ceteris denegaverit Regibus christianis’: Fita, ‘Bulas siglo XII’, no. 2; Kehr, Papsturkunden (Navarra und Aragon), no. 222, 228.
455 O’Callaghan, Reconquest, 62.
456 20 February 1197: Kehr, Papsturkunden (Navarra und Aragon), no. 230.
457 González, Alfonso VIII, no 667.
between Castile and Aragón. At last, Alfonso VIII seemed on the brink of recovering Álava and the regions of Guipúzcoa and the Duranguesado.458

In the meantime, Sancho remained excommunicate with his kingdom under interdict. It was in these circumstances, in May 1198, that he was ordered by the new Pope, Innocent III, to hand over Berengaria’s marriage portion, the castles of St-Jean-Pied-du-Port and Roquebrune, to Richard I of England.459 On 31 May, the pope informed Richard that he had already requested Sancho to transfer possession of these lands.460 On 13 June, Innocent III allowed García, bishop of Pamplona to celebrate private masses for the duration of the interdict: an order that itself implies that the interdict itself was otherwise properly observed in Navarre.461

On 16 April 1198, almost immediately after his election as Pope, Innocent III had called for an end to the ‘incestuous’ marriage alliance between Alfonso IX and Berenguela, demanding an immediate separation of the couple, in the event delayed until 1204. Likewise, the Pope condemned Sancho’s invasion of Castilian lands, requiring his legate in Spain to inform him whether the interdict issued by Celestine III (possibly a few days before his death on 8 January 1198) had been enforced in Navarre. Should the legate find any further proof of Sancho colluding with the Muslims, his excommunication and sentence of interdict were to be published throughout Spain.462

458 Until 1199, in Sancho VII’s charters the date was followed by the phrase ‘Regnante me Sancio, Dei gratia rege in Nauarra et in Alaua’. Cf. Jimeno Jurío et al.,Archivo General de Navarra (1194-1234), nos. 3-6, 12, 14, 20-4.
460 Foedera, I.i,69-70.
461 Fita, ‘Bulas siglo XII’, no. 6.
462 ‘Super eo autem quod de rege Navarrae dictum est, inquiras diligentius veritatem; et si sic inveneris, ut superius est expressum, latam in eum et terram ejus sententiam per totam Hispanicam publicari facias nec eam nisi sufficienti satisfactione recepta relaxes. Quod si fors in eum vel regnum ejus dicta non
In the following year, 1199, Alfonso VIII took control of Treviño and San Sebastián (see map). The forces of Alfonso VIII and Pedro II had already attacked Navarre, and on 11 February 1199 Innocent III acknowledged their invasion. In a letter addressed to Sancho VII, he allowed that, since the king felt compelled to save his kingdom, Sancho had agreed to a secret treaty by which Pedro II of Aragón would marry Sancho’s sister, Blanca. However, the Pope continued, this marriage could not proceed because Pedro and Blanca were related within the third degree of consanguinity. As Damian Smith has remarked, the pope made no mention of any interdict, so that it seems his earlier sentence had been lifted, perhaps following Sancho’s entering into negotiations with the King of Aragon. Even so, the Pope failed to protect the Navarrese king from the Aragonese and Castilian attacks that followed, most likely, because Sancho had rekindled his alliance with the Almohads. Alfonso VII’s army continued to advance into Navarre and it is here again that we must return to Howden’s narrative of events. It was probably at around this time that Sancho sent an embassy to al-Nasir, al-Mansour’s son, to concert an alliance. As Fidel Fita has shown, Sancho did not himself travel to Africa. In the midst of an invasion, he instead almost certainly sent envoys. In 1200, Castile gained control over Pasajes, Rentería, Oiartzun and Fuenterrabía, pushing Navarre’s
frontier southwards from the Atlantic Ocean to the Bidasoa River. Sancho’s situation was now desperate. His kingdom had been deprived of its coastline, while Castile now bordered directly with Gascony, potentially threatening both Navarre and King John of England.

According to Roger of Howden, Sancho VII of Navarre signed a three-year peace treaty with the Castilian and Aragonese kingdoms in 1200, after his return from Africa. Howden was generally well informed of Sancho’s dealings with Morocco against the Castilian and Aragonese forces that had invaded Navarre. Yet, in reality, it was not until 1209 that Navarre signed a peace agreement with Castile and Aragón. This was to become the basis of the joint Iberian expedition of Las Navas in 1212, mounted against Muslim rule in the Peninsula, that itself became a major milestone in the reconquista. Howden must have been concerned with Alfonso’s claims to Gascony and the effects Castilian expansionism could have for the English holdings in southern France. Certainly, the chronicler was interested in events in Navarre, not only because it bordered with the French domains of the king of England, but also because it was one of the Christian Iberian kingdoms that had been exhorted by Celestine to make war against the Muslims. Yet, however desirable a peace between Navarre, Aragón and Castile might have been to the papacy, the confederation between Sancho and the Moroccan king, al-Nasir, was still very much
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470 Huici Miranda, Las grandes batallas, 219-381; O’Callaghan, Reconquest, 64.
in operation at the time of Sancho’s treaty with King John, in 1202, as this treaty itself makes plain.\footnote{Through the alliance with Navarre, King John became the ally of Morocco. Matthew Paris’ report of the failed embassy (1213) sent to Morocco therefore has a broader context, cf. CM, ii, 559-64, and below.}

**King John and Hispania**

During the last days of Richard’s reign, in January 1199, Philip Augustus had proposed the marriage of his son, Louis [VIII] to Blanche (Blanca) of Castile, daughter of Alfonso VIII and Richard’s sister, Eleanor. Philip also offered to assist Richard’s nephew, Otto, gain the imperial crown. In return, Philip and Richard would ensure Blanche possession of the disputed frontier castle of Gisors as her marriage portion (‘in maritagium’).\footnote{Howden, iv, 81.}

It is uncertain whether these negotiations continued after Richard’s demise.

At the time John ascended the English throne, the Capetians were forging new alliances with the Iberian monarchies. On 1 July 1199, Blanca (Blanche), the sister of Sancho VII of Navarre, married Theobald III of Champagne. She was the daughter of Sancho VI of Navarre and Sancha of Castile. Theobald III was son of Henry ‘the Liberal’ of Champagne by Marie, herself daughter of Eleanor of Aquitaine and her first husband, Louis VII of France. Their son, Theobald I of Navarre (IV of Champagne) would, in 1234, follow his uncle Sancho VII of Navarre onto the throne of Navarre, Sancho having died without legitimate children to succeed him.

From the start of his reign, and no doubt aware of the need to counter the new rapprochement between France and Spain, John was in contact with the Iberian kings.
Amongst the issues discussed were Berengaria of Navarre’s unpaid dower and also the wider question of England’s relations with Castile and Portugal. On 30 June 1199, the newly crowned king sent P(eter) de Verneuil, Ralph de Mauléon, seneschal of Poitou, and Geoffrey de la Celle to Alfonso VIII of Castile, possibly to discuss the forthcoming marriage between his daughter, Blanche, and Louis of France. Likewise, he sent brother J[ohn] de Lisieux (‘Lexoven’) to Sancho I of Portugal. It is possible, as Diceto and Howden both suggest, that John had plans to marry the daughter of the king of Portugal. If so, these plans were short-lived, since he very soon broke off his Portuguese negotiations in order to marry Isabella of Angoulême. His intended Portuguese bride may have been the infanta Teresa, formerly married to Alfonso IX of León, an alliance annulled in 1198 because of their kinship within the second degree of consanguinity. Overall, John was clearly attempting to muster whatever resources he could to oppose his principal enemy, Philip Augustus of France.

In the meantime, negotiations with Alfonso VIII of Castile seem to have ground to a standstill. On 30 January 1200, John again sent Peter of Verneuil, Ralph de Mauléon, and Geoffrey de la Celle to the king and queen of Castile. Both, Geoffrey de la Celle and Ralph of Mauléon were expected to use this mission for the pacification of Gascony and to expedite the king’s business in those parts (‘ad pacificandum

---

473 Foedera, i.i.76.
474 Ibid.
476 On the marriage between Teresa (Tarasia) and Alfonso IX, cf. Howden, iii, 90.
Wasconiam et ad expedienda negocia nostra’).\textsuperscript{478} A meeting took place in Bordeaux and D[iego Garcia], Alfonso of Castile’s chancellor.\textsuperscript{479} Perhaps John was not only concerned about the implications of the marriage of his niece, Eleanor to the French Louis, but that Gascon lords were seeking help from the Castilian court. John at this time still had no child to succeed him. Should he die childless, like his elder brother Richard, there was now a risk that Eleanor of Castile, his sister (see genealogy), and Eleanor’s progeny including Blanche, now the wife of Louis of France, would lay claim to his inheritance. In these circumstances, there was an open threat that the Plantagenet Empire would be swallowed whole by the Plantagenets’ principal rival, Philip Augustus of France.

In May 1200, what was conceived as being a perpetual peace was finally concluded between John and Philip Augustus.\textsuperscript{480} Louis, Philip’s son, would marry Blanche, daughter of Alfonso VIII. In order to buy peace, John was to give Blanche as her ‘maritagium’ all his lands in Berry and the Auvergne (‘de Berri et de Auvernia’) together with several castles and honours both in Normandy and in Gascony.\textsuperscript{481} Later that same year Eleanor of Aquitaine (1122-1204) travelled to the court of Alfonso VIII to fetch his daughter, Blanche (Blanca), and take her back to Normandy for her marriage to Louis. On returning from Spain, Eleanor of Aquitaine retired to the abbey of Fontevraud whilst Blanche journeyed on to Normandy accompanied by Elias de Malemort, archbishop of Bordeaux, who finally delivered her to King John. The archbishop betrothed Blanche to Louis on 23 May 1200, at Portmort (‘Purmor’) in

\textsuperscript{478} 29 January 1200: Hardy, \textit{Rotuli Chartarum}, 58.
\textsuperscript{479} Ibid., 59.
\textsuperscript{480} Cf. \textit{Foedera}, i.i.79-80
\textsuperscript{481} Stubbs, ed., \textit{Diceto}, ii, 168
Normandy (‘apud Normannia’), on the right bank of the river Seine, bordering the lands of the French king.

This marriage sealed the peace agreement (‘forma pacis’) between the kings of France and England, finalized by the treaty of Le Goulet (22 May 1200) by which John paid homage to Philip Augustus for the Evrenchin and other Norman territories that had been seized by France, during the late war with England. The disputed lands were then conferred by King John upon Louis as part of Blanche’s marriage portion. The treaty stated that if John should die without legitimate heirs (and at this time he had none), then the lands held by Hugh de Gournay, the counts of Aumale, and the count of Perche were also to devolve to France. This last clause was nullified by the birth of John’s first son, the future Henry III, in 1207, but only after the upheavals of 1203-1204, which in effect, already rendered the Treaty of Le Goulet a dead letter.

Meanwhile, the Treaty of Le Goulet and the Castilian-Capetian marriage that to John seemed to put a stop to Philip Augustus’ territorial expansion into Normandy, from Philip’s point of view bought him not only further Norman territories but potentially, in the longer term, a claim via his son, Louis, and Louis’s bride, Blanche of Castile, to the throne of England. In this way, the distant politics of Spain played no small part in the affairs of the kings of England and France, both on a domestic and a geopolitical level.

The Franco-Castilian marriage alliance also posed a threat to Navarre, now at greater risk of being partitioned between the kings of Castile and Aragón, should Alfonso of Castile call upon France to support such an attack. A Navarrese confederation with John seemed one means of securing Navarre’s vulnerable French frontier. King John
was all the more ready to entertain such an alliance since the new rapprochement between Alfonso of Castile and Philip Augustus also imperilled English Gascony, claimed by Castile (albeit with dubious legality) as the marriage portion of Alfonso’s wife, Eleanor, daughter of Henry II.

The Perpetual Treaty between King John and Sancho VII of Navarre

On 4 February 1202, Sancho VII ‘el Fuerte’, of Navarre, signed a treaty of peace, ‘true friendship’ and perpetual alliance (‘pacem et veram amicitiam et perpetuam confederationem’) with King John of England and his heirs against all men, except the king of Morocco (‘dabimus etiam eidem regi Anglie et hereditibus suis et succedentibus auxilium et consilium contra omnes homines, solo rege Moroccorum excepto’). Sancho vowed not to enter into any peace agreement with England’s enemies, unless it had previously been agreed between him and John. In particular, there was to be no truce between Navarre and the kings of Castile, Alfonso VIII (1188-1214), or Aragón, Pedro II (Pere I, 1196-1213), unless John had been previously satisfied in his disputes with them (‘Preterea sciendum quod nos cum regibus Castelle et Arragoniea pacem vel treugam non faciemus, nisi prius satisfactum fuerit predicto regi Anglie de querelis quae sunt inter ipsos’). The treaty was signed at La Couronne outside Angoulême, and brokered by King John’s father-in-law, count Adomar, who had his own reasons to wish to shore up Plantagenet authority in Gascony, not least the fact that the marriage between his daughter, Isabella, and John of England had plunged not only King John but Adomar into open warfare with the Lusignan lords of La Marche.

---
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Negotiations between John and Alfonso VIII were clearly failing. In the meantime, King John faced a deteriorating situation in his French lands north of the Loire. In July 1202, having received homage from Arthur of Brittany for Brittany, Anjou, Maine, the Touraine, and Poitou, King Philip Augustus of France issued assurances to Alfonso VIII that any disputes he might have could be resolved before the French court. Whether such disputes related to the marriage of Blanche and Louis of France, or to Castile’s claims in Gascony, remains unknown. However, Castile continued to be a threat to John who, on 5 April 1203, asked Peter de Verneuil and the seneschal of Gascony to renew and secure (‘renovanda et firmanda’) a peace with Alfonso VIII: an episode that seems to have gone unnoticed by historians. Alfonso may have been pressing John to sign a treaty with Philip Augustus as a corollary to the marriage of his daughter, Blanche, to Philip’s son Louis. Unable to agree a peace with Castile, which now threatened Gascony, and powerless to stop Philip Augustus’ plans for a conquest of Normandy, John was forced increasingly to depend upon the Navarrese alliance first negotiated by his brother. The timing was inconvenient, because Sancho’s alliance with the Almohads meant that he was viewed with suspicion by the papacy. Furthermore, Sancho VII, at risk of losing his own kingdom to the other Iberian kings, was able to offer the Plantagenet only limited and distant support.

484 ‘Si autem karissimus frater et amicus nostre rex Castelle in terris aliquid juris clamaverit, per judicium curie nostre diffinitur, si ipsos de assensu utriusque non poterimus pacificare’: J. de Laborde, Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste roi de France (Paris: 1906-2005), ii, no. 723.
485 Julio González suggested that the disputes in question concerned the rights that Blanche might have had in the lands of her marriage portion, following the marriage with the French heir: González, Alfonso VIII, 1, 867.
**King’s John Witnesses**

Elias (Helias) de Malemort, archbishop of Bordeaux (1188-1206), the first English witness was an important figure in the early years of John’s reign.\(^{487}\) In 1200, in conjunction with the bishop of Poitiers (Maurice de Blason) and bishop Henry of Saintes (1189-1213), who also witnessed John’s treaty, Elias divorced John from his first wife on grounds of consanguinity in the third degree. In August of that same year, he had married King John to his new bride, Isabella of Angoulême.\(^{488}\) The bishop of Bordeaux and Philip of Poitiers, bishop of Durham (1197-1208), both witnesses to the alliance with Navarre, had also appeared as witnesses in 1201, when John promised to award Queen Berengaria, Richard I’s widow, her dower at Chinon. Berengaria was also awarded an annual payment of 1000 marks of silver.\(^{489}\) However, neither the money nor the lands promised to her were forthcoming. It is very probable that the archbishop of Bordeaux and the bishop of Durham were well aware of John’s failure to pay Berengaria’s dower and the consequences that this could have for Anglo-Navarrese relations. The issue of Berengaria’s dower was important to count Adomar of Angoulême, John’s father-in-law, who hosted and naturally witnessed the treaty with Sancho VII. Adomar was eager to ensure a suitable arrangement for his daughter, Isabella, even if it was at Berengaria’s expense.\(^{490}\)

\(^{487}\) In general, see F. Boutoulle, ‘Hélie de Malemort, archevêque de Bordeaux. Un prélât politique au service de Jean sans Terre (1199-1207)’, *Revue historique de Bordeaux*, 3 (2004), 7-23; Vincent, ‘Jean sans Terre et la Gascogne’, 561.


\(^{489}\) Howden, iv, 172-3; *Foedera*, I.i.84.

\(^{490}\) Vincent, ‘Isabella of Angoulême’, 186.
The seneschal of Poitou and Gascony (1201-2), Robert of Thurnham (from Thurnham north of Maidstone in Kent), was also a witness to John’s treaty. After the death of Richard I, in 1199, Robert had played a crucial role in ensuring that the dead king’s treasure at Chinon passed to John rather than to Arthur of Brittany, together with the castles of Chinon and Saumur. Afterwards, he held the office of seneschal of Poitou from 1199-1201. On 1 August 1202, John captured Arthur outside Mirebeau, imprisoning him in Falaise, where he disappeared, almost certainly to his death. Arthur’s death was the spur that prompted Philip Augustus to invade Normandy. In June 1204, Rouen surrendered and John lost control of Normandy. Robert of Thurnham, meanwhile, continued to act as a close advisor to King John. In 1210, when John asked the religious orders for money to help fund his war against Philip Augustus, Thurnham was, according to Matthew Paris, amongst the group of nobles who counselled the king.

Peter des Roches, treasurer of St Hilaire in Poitou (1200-1205), was another witnesses to the treaty with Navarre. Peter had been a member of Richard’s court since at least April 1197. Until John’s accession to the throne, he was active in the Angevin lands in Touraine, Anjou, Maine and Normandy, but not, apparently, in England. After the English defeat at the hands of French army in 1203, Peter followed King John to England where he was to remain until his death in 1238. He held office as treasurer of the church of St Hilaire from 1200 to 1205 (in effect as alter ego for the count of
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491 Howden, vi, 86; CM, ii, 453.
494 CM, ii, 531.
496 Ibid., 42-3.
Poitou, with a subsidiary role in the administration of the city and revenues of Poitiers. Soon after following John to England, early in February 1205, Peter was elected bishop of Winchester. In 1202, he had been sent to negotiate a truce with Philip Augustus. Clearly, he was present at the Anglo-Navarrese settlement as a major diplomatic figure, already author of several instructions concerning Gascony and Poitou.

Another witness was the Poitevin lord, Aimery vicomte of Thouars, who sought John’s favour. Aimery had supported Arthur of Brittany after Richard I’s death. In October 1199, at Le Mans, he had been obliged to surrender the castle of Chinon and the seneschalship of Anjou to King John, who placed them under the custody of Roger, constable of Chester. Afterwards, the vicomte escaped to Angers with Arthur of Brittany and Arthur’s mother, having been warned that John intended to imprison all three of them. Constance of Brittany, Arthur’s mother, had married Guy of Thouars, Aimery’s brother, after a divorce from her former husband, Ranulf, earl of Chester. In the following year, 1200, Aimery visited Eleanor of Aquitaine, at Fontevraud, where he assured her that he was faithful to John, regardless of his previous actions and alliances with the duke of Brittany. He also promised Eleanor that he would oppose those of his friends who had unjustly taken lands or castles from King John. That same year, Aimery paid homage to John, and signed a peace treaty with him, witnessed by the archbishop of Bordeaux and other French nobles.

497 Ibid., 17.
498 Ibid., 50.; cf. CM, ii, 489.
499 Foedera i.i.87.
500 Vincent, Peter des Roches, 66.
501 Howden vi, 96-7.
502 ‘Terrae, et castra sua amodo ad preceptum et voluntatem vestram erant, quicquid antea fecisset’: Foedera, i.i.81-2.
503 Ibid., 79.
Yet, that tensions between Aimery and the king persisted is proved, on 2 November 1202, when at Chinon, Aimery signed another truce with John, intended to last until the feast of St Hilary, the following year (13 Jan 1203).<sup>504</sup> Aimery must still have been considered a loyal supporter of John in February 1202, at the time he witnessed the treaty between John and Sancho.

The Navarrese Witnesses

We know far less about the Navarrese than about the English witnesses to the treaty. The first witness García Ferrández, bishop of Pamplona (1194-1205), is perhaps the best known. From the start of Sancho VII’s reign, the bishop of Pamplona regularly witnessed royal charters, apparently travelling with the king’s court until 1205.<sup>505</sup> He supported Sancho’s against the alliance formed at Calatayud in 1198, between Aragón and Castile. García handed the king 70,000 sueldos to fight Navarre’s Iberian neighbours, for which he was reimbursed in July 1198 with what was in effect a mortgage over the royal palace of Pamplona, including its chapel, and a general confirmation of the privileges granted by Sancho’s predecessors to the church of Pamplona.<sup>506</sup> A further recognition of the royal debt to the bishop was issued in December that year. In 1199, Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) confirmed Sancho’s gifts to García.<sup>507</sup> It is not surprising that having given Sancho money to fight the Castilian-Aragonese alliance and having been so close to the king’s court, bishop García appears as a witness to the treaty with England in 1202.
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<sup>504</sup> Ibid., 87.
<sup>505</sup> He first appears in a charter dated May 1195 in Tudela: Jimeno Jurio et al., Archivo General de Navarra (1194-1234), nos. 4-7. In June 1196, he witnessed a charter in Estella (approximately 100 km from Tudela), and by September he was back in Tudela: Ibid., nos. 14, 15. He continued to witness charters from 1197 to 1205: Ibid., nos. 20-9; 46-7.
<sup>506</sup> F. Idoate, Catálogo de cartularios reales de Navarra, años 1007-1384 (Pamplona: 1974), no. 124.
Amongst the other witnesses were Gometio de Agoncello (Gomez Garceyz de Agonceillo/Aguncillo, or Gomiz Garceiz de Agunçiello) and García Pérez de Moriata (Morieta). Both appear to have resided in the Navarrería of Pamplona. The Navarrería, the oldest part of the city, was an area controlled by the bishops of Pamplona. According to the privileges granted by Sancho VI in 1189, all the lands of the Navarrería were episcopal property and therefore under episcopal jurisdiction. The interests of Gometio and García seem to have lain in the Navarrería, so much so that they appear again in a prohibition, from Sancho VII, against the building of fortifications against the bordering burg (‘burgo’) of San Cernín. Gometio was a regular witness to Sancho’s charters from the start of his reign in 1194 until 1214, and held from the king the towns of Inzurra, Mendavia, Los Arcos, Portilla and Dicastillo. He witnessed a variety of royal documents, including confirmation of fueros, and family settlements with the infante Fernando of Aragón (1205).

Another witness in 1202, Rodrigo de Beltran/Berztan, was perhaps the man most acquainted with the diplomatic relations between Navarre and France, as he had held the lordship of St-Jean-Pied-du-Port (San Juan de Pie de Puerto), at least until 1199 when, as we have seen, Pope Innocent III demanded that it be handed to Richard I as Berengaria’s marriage portion, at which point Richard may possibly have assigned it

508 Cf. R. Cierbide et al., Documentos medievales del Archivo Municipal de Pamplona (1129-1356) (Donostia: 1998), nos. 8-10.
510 Cierbide et al., Documentos de Pamplona, no. 9-10.
511 Except for Portilla, the rest of the places are located between Pamplona and Logroño (on the route to Compostela). The small settlement of Inzurra was linked to St-Jean-Pied-du-Port (San Juan de Pie de Puerto): Jimeno Jurío et al., Archivo General de Navarra (1194-1234), nos. 3-6, 34, 39, 68-73, 14-5, 56-9, 61-2, 112.
512 Ibid., no. 40, 68-73.
to another lord. It is possible that of all the Navarese witnesses to the treaty between King John and Sancho VII, Rodrigo de Beltran was the one who stood to profit most, not least by securing his own lordship north of the Pyrenees (in the so-called ‘Ultrapuertos’). From 1210, he became the King’s man for the lordship of Peralta, located about 20 km from Calahorra.

Berengaria’s Unpaid Dower

Faithful and clean of wrong and shame,  
And Berengaria was her name.  
Her father, ruler of Navarre,  
Had given her into the care  
Of Richard’s mother, who did guide  
Her safely to King Richard’s side.  
Later she was called queen; most deer  
The king did love her and revere;  
Since he was count of Poitiers,  
His wish had wished for her always.

The problem with Berengaria’s dower, also comprehended within Anglo-Navarrese negotiations in 1202, was that although awarded in theory by Richard I in the early 1190s, no such dower was assigned in practice following Richard’s death. Similar problems affected Berengaria’s marriage portion as well as her dower. Susana Herreros Lopetegui suggests that, due to the untimely death of Richard (6 April 1199) and to the troubled conditions that followed, there is no evidence that England ever gained control of the Pyrenean castles that had been promised to Berengaria and Richard at the time of their marriage, including St-Jean-Pied-du-Port, where Sancho VII appears to have continued to nominate the constables. We have no proof that
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513 May 1194. Ibid., no. 3.  
514 Ibid., no. 68, 79.  
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Richard ever controlled the castle or town of St-Jean. By contrast, from February 1203 until at least until November 1208, the office of constable there was exercised by the Navarrese nominee, Pedro Garceiz de Arroniz, later the holder of other towns from king Sancho.\textsuperscript{517}

Berengaria’s dower was the object of at least three complications. Firstly, it consisted of lands that for the most part were already held as dower by the reigning queen-dowager, Richard’s mother, Eleanor of Aquitaine. Secondly, only a year after Richard’s death, and rather than promise future use of these lands to Berengaria, King John had in effect reassigned them, in futurity, as dower for his own bride, Isabella of Angoulême. Thirdly, Berengaria’s own close relations to her sister and the court of the count of Champagne, her brother-in-law, tended to throw her increasingly into the company of those who, after 1200, supported the Capetian rather than the Plantagenet cause in France. The consequence here was an even greater reluctance on the part of King John to allocate lands or territories in France to a woman viewed as the friend of John’s own enemies.\textsuperscript{518}

Never having visited England, Berengaria settled in France, within the orbit of the court of Champagne.\textsuperscript{519} In January 1204, following the Capetian invasion of Normandy, Berengaria promised Philip Augustus that she would abandon any claim she might have to Loches, the great fortress of the southern Touraine, in theory still part of her dower. In return, the French king promised her that he would maintain her

\textsuperscript{517} See also Pero Garceiz/Garçeiz/Garceyz/Garcez de Arroniz/Harroniz/Aroniç. He was later ‘tenente’ of Dicastillo, San Adrián and Tafalla. Jimeno Jurío et al., Archivo General de Navarra (1194-1234), nos. 34-6, 62. He witnessed the homage made by Biviano of Agremont to Sancho VII on 17 December 1203: Ibid., no. 36.

\textsuperscript{518} Vincent, ‘Isabella of Angoulême’, 186.

\textsuperscript{519} H.-F. Delaborde et al., Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste roi de France, Vol. II (Paris: 1943), no. 679; Layettes, i, no. 497.
By September 1204, she had also abandoned all claims to her Norman dower lands of Falaise, Domfront, Bonneville-sur-Touque, now overrun by the Capetian invasion. In exchange, she was promised the city of Le Mans, for which she rendered liege homage and which she continued to rule for the remainder of her life. As a result of Philip Augustus’ liberality, contrasted with King John’s mistrust, Berengaria was thus transformed into an ally of the Capetians, and therefore an enemy of the Plantagenets. This was all the more embarrassing, given that Sancho of Navarre was at this time one of the few allies that King John could claim to possess on the French side of the English Channel. Meanwhile, disputes between Berengaria and John continued to rage, no longer over the lands of her dower (now exchanged with Philip Augustus for Le Mans) but over the annual pension that she had been promised, apparently in lieu of the dower lands originally assigned to her by Richard in England and Gascony, still under Plantagenet rule and therefore excluded from the settlement made between Berengaria and Philip Augustus over the dower lands in Normandy and Anjou.

By 1207, Berengaria’s complaints concerning this pension had been heard by Pope Innocent III, who demanded an explanation from John as to why he had not yet honoured the debt. The pope’s demand went unheeded. Two years later, in 1209, Innocent III repeated his demand that John assign Berengaria her rightful dower. John, who faced troubles of his own in England and who by this stage was at open odds with the Church, once again, ignored the pope’s demands. It was not until 1215, that Berengaria’s complaints were finally addressed, with a promise that she be paid

520 *Layettes*, i, no. 745.
521 Ibid., ii, nos. 837, 840.
522 *Foedera*, I.i.97.
523 Ibid., 102-3.
2000 marks for all arrears and a further £1000 pounds sterling per annum hereafter.\textsuperscript{524} Meanwhile, John’s failure to pay Berengaria her dower, and the reassignment of it to his second wife, Isabella, might have prompted Sancho VII, Berengaria’s brother, to invade Gascony or at least permit its invasion. Instead, the alliance of 1202, had anticipated this scenario, allowing the English king to withhold Gascony and the other dower lands, originally promised to Berengaria by Richard. Sancho’s thinking here is not difficult to probe. Navarre itself was in just as perilous a position as Plantagenet Gascony. In these circumstances, it was wiser for Sancho to maintain his alliance with England and hence with English forces north of the Pyrenees, in the hope that support for John against Alfonso of Castile might, in the longer term, lead both to support for Sancho against Alfonso, and to a resolution of the continuing problems over Berengaria’s dower. The fact that that Berengaria’s marriage portion, including St-Jean-Pied-du-Port, was tactically excluded from the treaty of 1202 is itself an indication of a willingness, on both sides, to tread warily in the hope of maintaining an alliance valuable to both parties. King John could not himself lay claim to St-Jean-Pied-du-Port, since it had been promised to Berengaria and Richard, who had produced no direct heirs. He could nonetheless have exploited it as a bargaining counter or continued to demand its detachment from Sancho’s patrimony. That he did not do so is suggestive of the fact that both Sancho and John, friendless in all other respects, like the two least popular men at a party, preferred to league together rather than to jeopardize their alliance by squabbles over mutual interests.\textsuperscript{525}

\textsuperscript{524} Half of which was to be paid on the feast of All Saints (1 November) and the rest on the feast of the Ascension of the Virgin Mary (15 August). \textit{Foedera}, I.i.137. Cf. Vincent, ‘Isabella of Angoulême’, p. 186; Vincent, ‘A Forgotten War’, 116. 

\textsuperscript{525} Ibid.
Alfonso VIII of Castile and his Claim to Gascony

In 1205, after the French invasion of Normandy, Alfonso VIII, taking advantage of King John’s vulnerability, embarked on an expedition to obtain control of Gascony. According to the *Chronica latina regum Castellae* (c, 1236), which offers the most detailed account of events, Alfonso made a swift advance. His forces reached as far as the Garonne, occupying Blaye and Bourg-sur-Gironde north of Bordeaux, and the entire region of Entre-Deux-Mers. Save for the cities of Bayonne and Bordeaux, the whole of Gascony surrendered to Castilian rule. A year later, in May 1206, Alfonso abandoned his Gascon enterprise, to focus on his concerns in Spain.526 The Chronica’s account is the most detailed, but by no means the only Spanish narrative of these events.

According to Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada, archbishop of Toledo (d. 10 July 1247), who supplies no other details, Alfonso took all of Gascony, except for Bordeaux, La Réole, and Bayonne.527 Lucas, bishop of Tuy, in his *Chronicon mundi*, written at the request of Queen Berenguela, daughter of Alfonso VIII and Eleanor of England, in 1236, informs us that Alfonso moved his army against the Gascons and took San Sebastián, *Burgum de Ponte*, Sauveterre, the city of Dax, and other towns, before returning to

---


Castile with ‘great glory’. Lucas de Tuy’s version seems to be, at least partially, corroborated by a charter issued on 26 October 1204 at San Sebastián, on the Basque coast. Alfonso VIII, styling himself king of Castile and Toledo and lord of Gascony (‘Dei gratia rex Castelle et Toleti, dominus Vasconie’) granted the cathedral of Dax the fifteen villains (villanos) he had in Angonne (?Angoumé) and in Sa. The charter was witnessed by the vicomtes of Tartas (Arnald Raymond), Orthe (Loup Garcia II), and Béarn (Gaston VI), the comte of Armagnac (Gerald), and the bishops of Bayonne, (Bernard) and Bazas (Gaillard).

It is remarkable that all three Spanish chroniclers devote only a few lines to what must at the time have been a major enterprise: the Castilian conquest of Gascony. Such brevity is further reflected in the Estodia delos godos, a vernacular version of Jimenez de Rada’s chronicle, written in the last twelve years of Alfonso X’s reign. Here we find only the briefest of notes, that Alfonso ‘won Gascony by way of his wife, Eleanor, who inherited from her mother’. The chronology of the expedition is relatively easy to establish. Alfonso VIII must have travelled to Gascony between October 1205 and March 1206, when there is a gap in the documentation for his rule in Spain. On 23 October, the king was at San Sebastián from where he travelled towards Bordeaux. On 6 January 1206 he was at Bazas (Uastum), approximately 60 km from Bordeaux. By late March 1206, Alfonso was back in the Peninsula, signing a treaty peace treaty (‘forma de paz’) with Alfonso IX of León, now married
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528 *Adelfonsus autem rex Castelle labori cdere nescius, mouit exercitum suum contra Vascones et cepit Sanctum Sebastianum, Ortes, et Burgum de Ponte, Salamterminam, ciuitatem Aquensem et alia plura opida, et reuersus est in Castellam cum gloria magna.’: Tudensis, *Chronicon mundi*, lxxiv, p. 324.

529 González, Alfonso VIII, no. 767.


to Berenguela, Alfonso VIII’s daughter.\textsuperscript{532} Alfonso and his army must meanwhile have laid siege both to Bordeaux and to Bayonne, which as Nicholas Vincent has noted, may have been the only cities in Gascony faithful to John. Whether or not Sancho of Navarre send aid for their defence remains unknown. What is clear is that Navarrese neutrality in this Castilian invasion was one of the few benefits extracted from the Anglo-Navarrese alliance.\textsuperscript{533} From August 1204, Bayonne had been formally placed under the protection of King Sancho VII of Navarre who promised to safeguard its men and their goods. In return they promised to secure Navarre from both land and sea against any enemy of the king of Navarre, saving their fealty to King John.\textsuperscript{534}

It is possible that Alfonso’s invasion had been preceded by other attacks from the south. As early as 29 April 1205, King John had thanked the people of Bordeaux, Bazas, and Saint-Emilion for their good services (‘bono servicio’) in saving (‘salvaverunt’) these lands for the King.\textsuperscript{535} As this implies, and as the witness lists to Alfonso’s charters issued in Gascony themselves proclaim, loyalty to the Plantagenets was not a common trait amongst the Gascon nobility. To judge from the witness lists, Alfonso was able to count upon the support of the vast majority of the southern Gascon lords, including at least two of the Gascon bishops, not least Bernard bishop of Bayonne. Amongst these disgruntled Gascon lords was Gaston VI of Béarn, who had his own reasons to resent the rule of King John. On 13 May 1202, John had

\textsuperscript{532} Innocent III annulled the marriage on grounds of consanguinity, but this did not put an end to the conflict between the two crowns as problems over the succession of León followed: González, Alfonso VIII. no. 782

\textsuperscript{533} Vincent, ‘A Forgotten War’, 116.

\textsuperscript{534} ‘Preterea homines de Baiona debent custodire caminum et defendere ad totum posse suum, et debent se catare de toto damno regis Nauarre et regni sui per mare et per terram, et quod non adiuent inimicos regis Nauarre contra ipsum, nec ualeant eis auxilio neque consilio, salva tamen in omnibus fidelitate regis Anglie’: Jimeno Jurío et al., Archivo General de Navarra (1194-1234), no. 44.

\textsuperscript{535} Hardy, Rot.Lit.Pat., 53.
granted Gerald of Armagnac and his brother Bernard of Armagnac the town of Else (possibly Éauze, dépt. Gers) previously held by Gaston de Béarn, with whom the king promised to make no peace until proper trial had been held in his court. 536

Why then did Alfonso withdraw so swiftly after the successes of October 1205? There are a number of potential explanations here. One would be indifference. The Spanish chroniclers imply that Gascony was a worthless province, and that Alfonso, having seen it, wisely withdrew. This is almost certainly a device intended to save face. In reality, the conquest of territory north of the Pyrenees, and control over the rich southern trading ports of Bayonne and Bordeaux remained an ambition of the Spanish kingdoms long into the fourteenth, indeed into the eighteenth century.

Another explanation would be family sentiment. Alfonso’s retreat was signalled, in May 1206, by a safeconduct granted to Eleanor, Alfonso’s wife, travelling for discussions with her brother, King John. 537 Eleanor was granted similar safe-conduct in September. 538 Perhaps Eleanor worked to soften Alfonso’s temper and to negotiate a Castilian withdrawal. This too, however, seems improbable. It was Eleanor’s claims to dower that had first prompted the invasion, and, as we shall see, the Castilian claim to these lands was not officially abandoned for another fifty years, through to the 1250s. In these circumstances, we are thrown back upon two other possibilities. The first, favoured by French historians, is that the resistance of Bayonne and Bordeaux was so fierce as to force the Castilian retreat. Certainly, the kings of England had done their best since the 1170s to purchase the support of the

536 ‘Rex etc. omnibus etc. Sciatis nos dedisse in feodum Gerald’ de Amignac et Bearn’ de Armignac fratri suo Castellum Novum et medietatem Else que Gasto de Beauc [sic.] tenet, et que pacem non faciems sine eis cum ipso Gasto nec predictem feodum eis permitemus auferri nisi prius dato super hoc iudicio in curia nostra. Et ipsi iuraverunt que sine fraude per posse sue nocebunt predicto Gaston’ et iuvabunt nostros. T(este) Com’ Maresc’ Willelmo apud Arches xviii die Maii’: Ibid., 11.
537 Foedera, I.i.94.
two greatest cities of Gascony. Perhaps, in 1205, this approach paid off. Secondly, we must at least consider the possibility that King John’s alliance with Sancho of Navarre, itself the product of Anglo-Navarrese negotiations stretching back to the 1180s, bore fruit in 1205, with open Navarrese support for Bordeaux and Bayonne in their resistance to Castile. If we knew rather more than we do know of Sancho’s movements in 1205-6, it is at least possible that we would discover the king of Navarre taking active steps to attack Castilian interests in the Peninsula at the same time that Alfonso was engaged against Plantagenet interests in Gascony. To this extent, the Anglo-Navarrese treaty of 1202 may have enjoyed even more success than its critics have previously been prepared to accept.

**Plantagenet Gascony, Between Navarre and Castile**

Two other key factors can be detected in the Castilian invasion of 1205, both of which will loom large in this thesis. The first is the forging of an alliance between the Spanish kingdoms and the nobles of Gascony, in particular, with the counts of Béarn. The second is the growing complexity of the tripartite relations that now existed between England, France and Spain, in particular as a result of the marriage of Blanche of Castile with Louis of France. This too was to have a long posterity. Let us consider each of these factors in turn.

The key to Castilian success in Gascony in 1205-6 seems to lie in the presence of the vicomte of Béarn and the comte of Tartas as witnesses to Alfonso’s charters. In 1196, Arnald Raymond of Tartas, vicomte of Dax, had paid homage to Sancho of Navarre, promising to wage war against all potential enemies including the kings of England,
an alliance that reflected Navarre’s influence in the ultrapuertos. With Navarre after 1202 openly in alliance with England, and with Pedro of Aragon spending most of his time in his peninsular holdings, the Gascon nobles may have turned now from alliances with either Navarre or Aragon towards a new understanding with the king of Castile.

On 22 May 1206, as king of Castile and lord of Gascony, Alfonso confirmed all customs, donations, liberties granted to the monastery of Sauve-Majeure by the kings of England and the dukes of Aquitaine who had ruled the land before him (‘tam a regibus Angliae quam a ducibus Aquitaniae que ante nos dominium illius terrae habuerunt’). Once again Gaston and Arnald Raymond were present as witnesses. As this charter proves, the Chronica latina was hardly candid in its claims that Alfonso VIII, having found no faithful supporters in the poor lands of Gascony, decided to free the Gascons from their obligation to render homage to him. Far from abandoning his claims to Gascony, as the Chronica claims, Nicholas Vincent has unearthed evidence that, as late as 1214, Alfonso continued to style himself as ‘lord of Gascony’ in charters issued to the religious north of the Pyrenees.

As for the Capetian connection, at first glance, the Castilian invasion of Gascony does not seem to fit with Alfonso VIII continued struggle against the Almohads and his desire to assert Castilian dominance over neighbouring León and Navarre. It is only

540 According to Damian J. Smith, King Pedro II of Aragón spent less than 5 per cent of his reign in the Midi: D.J. Smith, Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon (c. 1167-1276) (Leiden: 2010), 31, n. 94.
541 González, Alfonso VIII, no. 1030.
542 ‘Paupertas siquidem terre, inconstancia hominum, in quibus rara fides inueniebatur, terram Vasconie ipsi regi reddiderant odiosam […] Vascones ipsos, tam nobiles quam populos ciutatum, absoluit a iuramento et omagio, quo ei tenebantur astricti’: Chronica latina, ii, 17, p. 52.
by considering the prospects that had opened up as a result of the marriage between Louis, the French heir, and Alfonso’s daughter, Blanche, that Alfonso’s sudden interest in Gascony begins to make sense. Alfred Richard, writing in 1903, was perhaps the first modern historian to suggest that Alfonso’s invasion was not itself a long-planned affair, but that it was Philip Augustus who, in 1205, incited Alfonso VIII to invade Gascony.⁵⁴⁴ In these circumstances, the Castilian claim to Gascony emerges not as some long-nursed act of revenge, traced back to the grant of a marriage portion to Eleanor of Castile in the 1170s, but as a far more immediate response to the new alliance between Castile and France, forged by the marriage of Blanche and Louis in 1200, and in particular as an act of opportunism provoked by the success of Philip Augustus’ invasion of Normandy and Anjou as recently as 1204. As has long been reorganized, there is no real proof that Alfonso and Eleanor had ever been promised Gascony as Eleanor’s marriage portion. Even the Castilian Chronica latina admits a lack of such proof, stating merely that Alfonso ‘believed’ (‘credebat’) that Henry II had granted Gascony to Eleanor.⁵⁴⁵ Lucas de Tuy and Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada are entirely silent about such Castilian belief or right, merely stating that Alfonso marched into Gascony and later returned to Castile.⁵⁴⁶ Without documentary evidence, the question of Eleanor’s marriage portion remains impossible to resolve. That she was indeed promised lands, some of which were later reassigned to Berengaria of Navarre, is perhaps hinted at in the Metz sirvientes veuilh far dels reis amdos, a sirvientes by Bertran de Born, in which the troubadour calls for war, describing Richard’s grant of Gascony to Berengaria as an incitement to war.

with Castile. Whatever the truth here, it is clear that through to 1200, Alfonso made little attempt to meddle with the troublesome Gascon lords, focussing his attentions upon the Peninsula. It was only the marriage alliance between Blanche and Louis, negotiated in 1200, itself involving reciprocal interests both for the Plantagenets and the Capetians, that for the first time properly involved Alfonso in northern politics. Even here, he was drawn into the affairs of John and Philip Augustus, at least to begin with, as a neutral party, able to supply a daughter, herself of Plantagenet descent, suitable to be offered as a Capetian bride and hence as a token of a new Anglo-French peace.

The fact that Gascony is barely mentioned in the Spanish chronicles before 1205, suggests that it was not seen as a key issue at the Castilian court and that it became a casus belli only when the Capetian alliance via Blanche refocused Alfonso’s thoughts north of the Pyrenees. Even before the actual invasion, Alfonso may have begun to exert pressure over Gascony, as suggested by the way in which the Anglo-Navarrese treaty of 1202 was targeted against both Castile and Aragon, and as suggested by the subsequent, apparently abortive attempts by King John to open negotiations with Castile. Instead, John continued to rely upon his alliance with Sancho VII of Navarre, himself a pariah in the eyes both of the Church and the other Spanish kingdoms as a result of his dealings with the Almohad ruler of Morocco. However, Navarre was a less than ideal ally for John, since Sancho of Navarre was now father both of Blanche countess of Champagne, and of Berengaria ruler of Le Mans, themselves firmly placed within the Capetian camp as enemies rather than allies of King John.

Other factors, in addition to the marriage alliance with Philip Augustus, may have contributed to Alfonso’s decision to invade Gascony. It was suggested by the seventeenth-century historian, Pierre de Marca, that Alfonso craved the assistance of Gaston de Béarn in securing the coastal lands that the Castilian had recently (1200) taken from Navarre (San Sebastián and the Guipúzcoa). In exchange for the homages paid him by the vicomtes of Béarn, Tartas, and the comte of Armagnac, Alfonso offered them military help against King John, himself already defeated in Normandy. The participation of Gaston VI of Béarn in Alfonso’s campaign was a notable event, pregnant with future significance. Nevertheless, it cannot rival the marriage between Blanche and Louis as a potential spur to the Castilian invasion of Gascony.

In the end, the Anglo-Navarrese alliance may only have added to John’s, already tarnished image both with the Church and with the Christian faithful. Like his later alliance with Raymond of Toulouse, it appeared to show him in cahoots not just with the disreputable but with the positively heretic or apostate. Matthew Paris was much later to describe John as an ‘oppressor’ (‘opressor’) who lost (‘amiserat’) many of his lands in France and who could have lost England as well. The chronicler used John’s alliance with Morocco to further damage the late king’s image. According to Paris, the court clerk Master Robert of London was sent to the caliph of Morocco. There, far from working his master, King John, he admitted that the English people were looking for a strong man to govern them, who would behave like a lion or an elephant (‘leo vel elephas’), as an alternative to King John and his reputation as

---

548 Marca, Histoire de Béarn, 506.
softsword’. 549 In reality, John’s negotiations with the Almohads were based upon a reasonable assessment of realpolitik, co-ordinated after 1210 in tandem with John’s negotiations with Toulouse and Aragon for a joint campaign against both Castilian and Capetian enemies. 550 Meanwhile, the alliance between John and Sancho of Navarre had offered both kings a tenuous lifeline to keep Castile, their mutual enemy, at bay. Even so, in the immediate term, the Anglo-Navarrese alliance did little either to prevent Philip Augustus’ forces from taking Normandy, or from deterring Alfonso VIII’s march into Gascony.


Chapter Six: Alfonso X and Henry III

In August 1253, Henry III arrived at La Rèole to oppose what he feared might be an imminent Castilian invasion of Gascony. Here, he was obliged to muster the resources necessary to fight against Alfonso X. Yet, only ten months later, in May 1254, without any Castilian incursion into Gascony, a treaty between the two kings was agreed. By this treaty, Alfonso X renounced any claim to Gascony while Henry III agreed to a joint crusade to North Africa and to the marriage of his son, Edward, to Eleanor, Alfonso X’s half-sister.

If there is one moment in Anglo-Iberian relations in the thirteenth century that has captured the interest both of English and of Spanish historians it is surely this treaty of 1254. Amongst the most widely consulted studies are those of Anthony Goodman on which many others have based their research. More recently, Francisco Hernández has re-evaluated the role of Gaston VII de Béarn in precipitating the crisis over Gascony between the two kings. José Manuel Rodríguez García has re-examined the implications of the Anglo-Castilian alliance for the future of crusading plans, both in northern Africa and in Sicily. Being the ‘Wise’ king’s first major diplomatic achievement, the negotiations of 1254 feature in all biographies of Alfonso X. However, there is one crucial element that has been lacking from previous studies: proper appreciation of the wealth of the English archival evidence. Along the way,

and thanks to these English records, we shall learn some surprising details of the role played in negotiations by the bishop of Morocco, Lope Fernández, previously a shadowy and insubstantial figure. More crucially, the following study should highlight the role of Gaston VII in reviving the Castilian claims to Gascony, and hence in eventually bringing Henry III and Alfonso X to the negotiating table.\textsuperscript{554}

Throughout its history, Béarn made several attempts to claim independence. By the mid thirteenth century, it had become a major thorn in the flesh for King Henry III, who in an attempt to settle the troubled affairs of Gascony sent Simon de Montfort to serve as his seneschal, effectively as viceroy in the south. The Earl of Leicester’s efforts backfired and Henry III was forced to bow to the demands of his Gascon vassals. Amongst the rebels was Gaston VII de Béarn, who commanded great power in the region. He was also the vassal of King Jaime I of Aragón from whom he held Castellvell, Moncada and a number of estates in Majorca. From 1252, he also became a vassal of king Alfonso X of Castile. The latter association prompted Henry III into diplomatic action, as the result of fears that a Castilian army might invade Gascony. In 1254, a treaty between Alfonso X and Henry III resolved the matter. However, Gaston VII continued to appear as a vassal of the Castilian king, who himself continued to support Gaston’s interests. In an attempt to further tighten their relationship, on 4 April 1270 a marriage agreement between the \textit{infante} Sancho [IV] and Guillelme, Gaston’s youngest daughter was drafted. However, after Sancho’s illicit marriage to Maria de Molina (1281), Béarn shifted its alliances from Castile back to Aragón, thus strengthening its ties with England and France.

\textsuperscript{554} The most comprehensive study of Gaston VII’s relation to Henry III was conducted by Jean Ellis in his PhD thesis which publication is now long overdue. Cf. J. Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn. A Study in Anglo-Gascon Relations (1229-1290)’ (D. Phil, University of Oxford, 1952).
Anglo-Castilian Relations Before the Accession of Alfonso X: Stasis?

Before Alfonso X ever decided to resurrect Castile’s long-dormant claim to Gascony, Matthew Paris had called attention to the relentless progress of the Castilian reconquista. In his chronicle for 1236, this well-informed English monk recorded the capture of Córdoba (29 June) and the defeat of Aben Hud’s impressive army (‘innumerabilis exercitus’) at the hands of Fernando III of Castile. Later, he reported the conquest of the rich city (‘civitatis opulentissima’) of Seville (23 November 1248). According to Paris, Henry III had been pleased to hear the news of the ‘most victorious’ Fernando in Spain (‘victoriosissimus .... in Hispania’). The superlative adjective here served as an epitaph with which Matthew marked Fernando’s death in 1252, a passing that, according to Matthew, was mourned throughout Christendom (‘omnibus Christianis deplorandus’).

During Fernando III’s long reign (1217-52) there were only minimal diplomatic contacts between the courts of León-Castile and England. The few surviving records deal with exceptional commercial transactions and circumstances. Amongst these, we read of the recovery of ships and goods unlawfully seized from English or Castilian merchants between 1234 and 1241. In 1237, a licence was extended to the men of the Basque port of San Sebastián to trade with the Cinque Ports. In 1243, while Henry III was at Bordeaux, he requested that Fernando III and Queen Berengaria

---

555 CM, iii, 334; 529.
556 CM, iii, 639-40; v, 232. Paris also mentions the capture of Valencia, although, contrary to his report, it was Jaime I of Aragón (1242), not Fernando III, who seized the city. In March 1244, in the castle of Almizra (Valencia), Jaime I and the infante Alfonso (X) of Castile defined the boundaries of both kingdoms and therefore, the future course of the Spanish ‘reconquista’. Cf. A. Ferrando et al., eds., Llibre dels fets de Jaume I (Barcelona: 1995), ch. 349.
557 CM, v, 231-2. Here Paris confuses Fernando III with his son and successor, Alfonso X.
558 King of Castile 1217-1252, King of León 1230-1252.
559 In 1234, an English ship was detained at La Coruña: CPR 1232-47, 68. In 1241, a ship taken in Spanish waters was recovered in Gascony. Ibid., 247.
560 Ibid., 192.
(Fernando’s mother) allow him to bring six destriers from Spain for his own use, such war-horses being a highly coveted commodity controlled by the Spanish crown.\footnote{Ibid., 362.} In 1248, Henry III is also to be found purchasing wax from merchants of Burgos.\footnote{CPR 1247-58, 7; CLR 1245-51, 179.} Of course, our evidence here may be warped by the way in which the record evidence has survived. It is possible that, behind the scenes, there were far more significant exchanges between the English and Castilian courts, unrecorded in the surviving chancery rolls. It has been pointed out elsewhere, in the context of Anglo-Navarrese relations at this time, that much of the truce and treaty-making that went on between England and Spain is recorded only fitfully, as a result of chance survivals amongst the English, French or Spanish royal archives.\footnote{Vincent, ‘A Forgotten War’, 133-4.} Even so, there is little reason to suppose that Henry III’s dealings with Fernando of Castile were on anything like the same scale, or matched anything like the importance that attached to English relations with Navarre, the direct and militarily ambitious neighbour of Henry III’s southernmost lands in Gascony.

The first recorded diplomatic contacts between Castile and England came very late in Fernando III’s reign, delayed until October 1241, when Fernando III sent his brother, Alfonso Duque de Molina (d. 1272), to meet with Henry III.\footnote{CPR 1232-47, 260.} What was discussed remains unknown. These talks with Alfonso de Molina nonetheless resumed the following year.\footnote{Ibid., 350.} On 8 January 1243, while Henry III was in Bordeaux, John, archdeacon of Burgos, was granted a safe-conduct to enter the territories of the king of England, although, once again, the purpose of this visit remains uncertain.\footnote{Ibid., 355.} In all probability, the intention here was to ensure Castilian support, or at worst Castilian
neutrality, should the tensions between Henry III and Theobald of Navarre boil over into open warfare.

Not until the late 1240s did relations between León-Castile and England finally gather momentum. And, as is often the case with diplomatic relations, the backdrop to these encounters is not as straightforward as one might wish. In Castile, from the start of his reign, Fernando III had embarked on a relentless crusade against the Muslim kingdoms of the south. By the late 1240s he was contemplating an invasion of Seville. His son, the infante Alfonso (X), who from the age of nineteen had been an active political figure, now took an even more prominent role in Castilian diplomacy, resulting in occasional clashes with his father, Fernando. In the meantime, the English king, Henry III, was at last free of the war with Navarre that in 1243-4 had disrupted English rule in southern Gascony.567

**England and the Iberian Peninsula: Aragón and Béarn**

Henry III was also in contact with the court of Jaime (Jaume) I of Aragón (k. 1213-76), whose agenda from the 1230s through to the 1250s encompassed the formation of ‘an empire extending from the Maritime Alps to the southern border of Valencia’ (cf. the map of Aragón).568 Jaime’s father, Pedro II of Aragón (king 1196-1213), one of the main participants in the Albigensian Crusade, had been killed by Simon de Montfort the elder (1160-1218) at the battle of Muret, in 12 September 1213.569 The

569 For Pedro’s own dreams of a new Aragonese empire, carved out in co-operation with count Raymond VI of Toulouse, see M. Alvira Cabrer et al., ‘Le Temps de la “Grande Couronne d’Aragon”’
result was the collapse of all Catalo-Aragonese interests in southern France, save for the continued Aragonese claim to Montpellier. Jaime himself, who had been only five years old at the time of Muret, was taken prisoner by de Montfort and led away to Carcassonne. The Aragonese subjects Guillen (Guillaume) de Montcada, señor de Moncada and Castelvell and [II] vicomte de Béarn (1223-9), and Nuño, comte of Roussillon and Cerdagne (1212-41/2), continued to fight for possession of Narbonne and for the young king’s release. In the end, Jaime’s release was secured only after intervention by Pope Innocent III (1198-1216). At the Cortes of Lérida, the following August (1214), Jaime was recognized as king.

Curiously, and unlike his father, who had been crowned by the Pope, Jaime was never crowned, perhaps because he was never able to negotiate better and more favourable terms for such a coronation than those accepted by his father in 1204. His first request to the papacy for coronation came in 1229, addressed to Pope Gregory IX. Similar such requests were still ongoing nearly fifty years later, as late as 9 May 1274, when Jaime sent an embassy to Gregory X. On this last occasion, we know that the Aragonese had a splendid crown made out of gold and precious stones which, according to the king himself, was worth more than 100,000 sous tournois. The Pope was willing to crown Jaime, but expected to receive the same tribute he had obtained from Jaime’s father, Pedro II, of 250 mazmudins of gold. Jaime I was not willing...
to pay the arrears, calculated as totalling 40,000 mazmudins. The king refused the
crown rather than acknowledge his obligation to pay the tribute to the papacy
promised by his father.\textsuperscript{574}

During the early years of his reign, Jaime was plagued by internal conflicts caused by
his nobles, amongst them Guillen de Moncada, vicomte of Béarn, who from his
accession in 1224 was one of the most powerful men in the realm. By 1227, Guillen
de Moncada and Jaime I had settled their grievances and Guillen was for the first time
able to visit his vicomté.\textsuperscript{575} Early that year, on 22 February 1227 in Bordeaux, he
promised the then seneschal of Gascony, Henry de Trubleville, that he would render
homage to the King of England (‘faciemus homagium’) for the lands he held in
Gascony, as had his predecessors, when Henry III was next in Gascony (‘venieritis in
terram Vasconiae’).\textsuperscript{576} Like his predecessors, however, he made no explicit mention
of Béarn, apparently assuming that Béarn lay beyond the fee for which he owed
homage to England. Even his limited promise of 1227 went unfulfilled, because two
years later, Guillen died in the conquest of Majorca. In this campaign of 1229, the
lord of Moncada and Béarn had been joined by several Catalan nobles. According to
the chronicler, Jerónimo Zurita, with a considerable royal fleet of over 155 ships, with
contingents from Genoa, Provence and a ship from Narbonne, Guillen prepared to
confront the Muslims of Majorca. Guillen was killed in the ensuing campaign even
though Jaime’s army conquered the island.\textsuperscript{577} When Jaime divided the island, Gaston

\textsuperscript{574} Ferrando et al., eds., \textit{Fets}, ch. 536-8.
\textsuperscript{575} J. Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn. A Study in Anglo-Gascon Relations (1229-1290)’, Unpublished D. Phil.
\textsuperscript{577} Zurita, \textit{Anales}, B. III, ch. iv. Jaime I dedicates a lengthy section to the conquest of Majorca
detailing the role of Guillen, cf. Ferrando et al., eds., \textit{Fets}, ch. 47-126.
de Béarn, son of Guillen de Moncada was granted land there in reward for his father’s services.  

Unlike his father who had operated for the most part in Catalonia, Gaston VII de Béarn, who inherited a vast swathe of land in Gascony and Catalonia-Aragón, spent the greater part of his lifetime in his Béarnaise lands. After a childhood in Catalonia, he travelled to Béarn in 1230, perhaps remaining there until 1233. After that he returned to Catalonia, where Garsende, his mother, was confronted with her former husband’s debts. In 1239, however, he was once again on the move, being one of the nobles who travelled with Theobald I of Navarre on his failed crusade to the Holy Land. When he returned he married Mathe of Bigorre. Mathe, through his father Boson de Mathas, fifth husband of Petronilla of Bigorre (see Genealogy of Mathe de Bigorre). Petronilla of Bigorre, was the granddaughter of Centule III of Bigorre. Upon her marriage to Gaston VI of Béarn (1173-1214), the vicomte received Bigorre from Alfonso II (1192). Gaston VI died in 1214, without heirs and she remarried four times afterwards. In the meantime, Aragón following the king’s death in the Albigensian made no further claims to Bigorre. Petronilla married as her third husband, Guy de Montfort (brother of Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester), with whom she had two children, Alice (Alix), who inherited the claim to Bigorre, and Petronilla. The countess of Bigorre later married Boson de Mathas, as her fifth husband, with whom she had Mathe, who married Gaston VII of Béarn. Gaston

---

578 Marca, Histoire de Béarn, 579. The city of Mallorca was divided in eight parts, four of which went directly to Jaime I with the other four assigned to Nuño Sánchez (Sanç), count of Rousillon, to Berenguer de Palou, bishop of Barcelona, to Hugh IV of Empúries, and to Gaston VII vicomte of Béarn. After the death of Nuño Sánchez, in 1241 and again following Gaston’s death, in 1290, the king took control of their lands in Mallorca. Cf. R. Soto i Company, ed., Còdex Català del llibre del repartiment de Mallorca (Barcelona: 1984), 20, 38, 301.

579 Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn’, 83.

580 Most of the following are debts acknowledged by Garsende between 1233-4. ACA, Cancillería Real, Pergaminos, Jaime I, Serie General, nos. 484, 514-5, 524-6, 528-35, 537-41, 544, 546, 549-50, 553, 555, 557, 559, 563-9, 571, 573, 575, 579, 581, 583, 585, 589, 595-6, 598, 630, 632.
claimed that because Guy’s marriage to Petronilla of Bigorre was not lawful, Mathe was the lawful heir to Bigorre. In the meantime, Esquivat de Chabanais, son of Alice and Guy, sought the help of his great-uncle, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, who controlled the county since 1248, sided with Esquivat. Before her death, Alice of Bigorre entrusted the earl with the county in return for 7,000 shillings Morlaas per annum. Gaston VII who was hostile towards the earls’s policies in Gascony bitterly objected Gaston’s control of Bigorre.

Genealogy of Mathe de Bigorre

It was not until the early 1240s that Gaston, having established himself in Béarn, began to feature on Henry III’s diplomatic radar. This period also saw the collapse of traditional Catalo-Aragonese relation with Béarn, as Gaston’s political interests became ever more closely entangled with the English, French and Castilian courts.

582 For an analysis of the relations between Simon de Montfort and Gaston VII between 244-54 cf. Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn’, 107-98.
583 Ibid., 83-4.
Béarn itself was transformed from a fluid collection of territorial rights into a stable political entity that for the first time began to press for a ‘permanent’ agenda of interests with the French and English crowns.\textsuperscript{584} In the meantime in Aragón, Jaime I was preoccupied with his campaign to conquer the Balearic islands. Following the conquest of Majorca, Montpellier and Marseille assisted the king with funds and a fleet, allowing the king to take Minorca.\textsuperscript{585} Having conquered, he turned his attention towards Valencia, then under Muslim control.\textsuperscript{586} This war against the Muslims continued until 28 September 1238, when Zayan, the king of Valencia, officially capitulated.\textsuperscript{587} Once again Montpellier and Narbonne had played key roles in Jaime’s campaign of conquest.\textsuperscript{588}

As Aragón and Béarn continued to drift apart, Henry III set out to regain his lost French lands. In 1241 Henry III, provoked by a new alliance between the Capetians and Hugh de Lusignan, count of La Marche and husband of the king’s mother, Isabella of Angoulême, joined Raymond VII of Toulouse in a campaign against Louis IX. Jaime, still immersed in the conquest of Valencia, was in no position to divert Aragonese forces to assist his ally, Raymond of Toulouse.\textsuperscript{589} Instead, the Aragonese took control of Játiva, in southern Valencia (1245). Meanwhile and despite an attack by Raymond VII on Narbonne, Jaime’s interests in the Midi remained secure.\textsuperscript{590}

Unlike Jaime I’s adventures in the far south, Henry III’s campaign in France came close to disaster. In July 1242, Henry had moved his army to Taillebourg, where he

\textsuperscript{584} Ibid., 80
\textsuperscript{585} R.I. Burns, ed., The Worlds of Alfonso the Learned and James the Conqueror. Intellect and Force in the Middle Ages (Princeton: 1985), 132-4.
\textsuperscript{586} Ferrando et al., eds., Fets, ch. 128-130.
\textsuperscript{587} Huici Miranda et al., eds., Documentos de Jaime I de Aragón II 1237-1250 (Zaragoza: 1976).
\textsuperscript{588} Burns, ed., Worlds, 137.
\textsuperscript{589} Smith et al., eds., Deeds, 242 n. See also the confederation (‘confederationis’) between Jaime I and Raymond of Toulouse (18 April 1241) in Layettes, iii, no. 2905.
\textsuperscript{590} Burns, ed., Worlds, 136-7.
suffered a humiliating standoff against Louis IX’s army and was forced to retreat to Bordeaux. Henry’s rashness lost him Poitou.\(^591\) After his defeat, on 26 September 1242, Henry III asked Richard of Cornwall, his brother, who was himself about to marry Sanchia (Sancha), the daughter of the count of Provence by Beatrice of Savoy, to act as a royal envoy to Aragón.\(^592\) A month later, on 31 October, the English king sent Berenger de Maylyn to Jaime’s court.\(^593\) Presumably, Henry III was looking for Aragonese support, as with Castile, perhaps in imminent expectation of an attack by Navarre against southern Gascony. Shortly afterwards, the English king sent another embassy to negotiate with Jaime of Aragón, Sancho II of Portugal and Fernando III of Castile.\(^594\) Henry III may also have feared that if Sanchia travelled through France, she would be detained and prevented from marrying Richard of Cornwall. This would explain why, on 23 January 1243, he requested Raymond of Provence not to allow her to travel via France.\(^595\)

In August 1245, Raymond V of Provence died and his youngest daughter, Beatrice, became the bride of Charles of Anjou, Louis IX’s brother. Jaime I had failed to secure a dispensation for a marriage to her that might have secured the port of Marseille for the Aragonese crown. Charles and Beatrice’s marriage took place in January 1246.\(^596\) Once again, Henry III sent envoys to Jaime I: Peter de Berbecy (Berbezill) in February, Adam Burnel in May, and Peter Chaceporc, keeper of the

---


\(^{592}\) The marriage took place in England (1243). *CPR 1232-47*, 327.
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\(^{594}\) CLR 1240-1245, 156.

\(^{595}\) *Foedera*, I.i.250.

\(^{596}\) Burns, ed., *Worlds*, 137.
wardrobe and Guy de Rocheford the following month. Aragón in turn, sent envoys to England. These embassies continued the following year.

Raymond of Toulouse died in 1249, and Alphonse, count of Poitiers, brother of Louis IX, took control of the county. As H.J. Chaytor points out, Jaime I was unable to assert any control over Toulouse, being forced to abandon what had been long-term interests of his family and especially of his father, King Pedro. However, Aragón continued to defend its rights in the French Midi until 1258, when the treaty of Corbeil, signed by Louis IX and Jaime I, effectively abandoned all Catalan feudal rights in Occitania save for Montpellier, Carladès, Omeladès and the Val d’Aran.

As the Capetians tightened their hold over southern France, and as Castile secured its interests in the west of the Iberian Peninsula, Aragón’s attention turned towards the Mediterranean and Sicily.

Navarre, Between War and Peace

For Henry III, peace with Navarre was desirable not only because Navarre bordered directly with Gascony, but also because it acted as a buffer between the Plantagenet lands and the aggressive kingdom of Castile. The kings of Navarre, Theobald I (1234-53) and Theobald II (1253-70), were also counts of Champagne and thus vassals of the French king, Louis IX (1226-70). This in turn increased the Capetian threat to Plantagenet rule in Gascony. Maintaining good relations with both Navarre and France thus became one of Henry III’s concerns. The perpetual alliance

597 CLR 1245-51, 26 53, 57, 59; CPR, 1232-1247, 481, 497.
598 CLR 1245-51, 55, 59.
599 Ibid., 121.
(‘perpetuam confederationem’) made between King John and Sancho VII of Navarre had expired in 1234, when Sancho died, and his nephew, the count of Champagne was crowned king.602 From this point forward, a series of truces maintained a delicate peace between England and Navarre.603 Yet Gascon nobles, such as the viscomte of Soule, continued to ally with Navarre, endangering the status quo. The viscomte became Theobald’s vassal in 1234, saving his allegiance to Henry III but in effect admitting a dual homage both to England to Navarre.604

Gascony now lay at the confluence of the interests not only of England and France, but of the Iberian kingdoms.605 The proximity of Navarre to Gascony, and the political interests of the House of Champagne, were of major concern to Henry III. Throughout the 1240s, Theobald I caused trouble for the English king. Yearly truces were drafted, but the lack of a long-lasting peace meant that Henry III’s lands in Gascony lay under constant threat of attack. In 1243, the delicate peace was finally broken when Navarre staged a full-scale invasion of southern Gascony.606 In vain, Henry III attempted to settle his disputes with Theobald.607 In the meantime, rumours of Theobald’s invasion spread throughout the Plantagenet lands.608 In 1244, hostilities ground to a standstill and peace negotiations were opened between the two kings. Henry III was unable to prevent Theobald from extending his interests towards Bayonne. At the same time, Louis IX’s influence was itself extended by the

602 Foedera, I.i.86; Vincent, ‘A Forgotten War’, 119.
603 Vincent, ‘A Forgotten War’, 120
604 F. Idoate, Catálogo de cartularios reales de Navarra, años 1007-1384 (Pamplona: 1974), no. 325. In 13 July 1244, the viscomte of Soule reaffirmed his alliance to Theobald and promised to help him against Béarn and the lord of Gramont, saving his allegiance to England. Ibid., no. 404. In the ensuing war, he viscomte of Béarn fought against the king of Navarre: CLR 1240-45, 297.
605 Cf. Powicke, King Henry, 214.
606 Cf. CLR 1240-45, 247.
607 Foedera, I.i.252.
608 Ibid., 255.
affirmation of French control over Poitou (first invaded in 1224), where Alfonse of Poitiers, the French king’s brother, was now installed as comte.  

In 1248, English Gascony once again erupted into chaos. Theobald I of Navarre allied himself with the southern Gascon nobility, amongst whom was the powerful Gaston VII, vicomte of Béarn. The vicomte’s powers did not derive from his title per se but rather from the argument that he held his lands as an allod, owing no homage to the dukes of Aquitaine, his equals rather than his overlords, a claim that was finally adjudicated in the court of France in 1278. In a desperate move, Henry III sought the help of his brother-in-law, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, to stabilize the rebellious province. In 1249, Simon de Montfort (1208-65), was given power to sign a peace with Theobald I of Navarre. On 2 January 1252, Henry III ratified the peace agreed with Theobald.

**Castile and Its Crusading Plans**

Fernando III was an active conqueror, who since the beginning of his reign and especially since the unification of León and Castile in 1230, headed the war against the Muslims of the Iberian Peninsula. Through his conquests, he drove the Muslims out of most of Andalusia, save for Granada. He is perhaps best remembered for his final campaign, which ended in the capitulation of Seville on 23 November 1248. Having confined the Iberian Muslim kingdoms to Granada, he became the ideal
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609 Alphonse became count of Toulouse in 1247, strengthening the Capetian hold over southern France: Vincent, ‘A Forgotten War’, 130; Maddicott, Simon de Montfort, 108.
610 Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn’, 79-81, 310.
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model of a Spanish Christian king, at least in the literature produced in the court of his heir, Alfonso X.\textsuperscript{614}

The thirteenth-century chronicler, Matthew Paris, and the later Estoria de España, composed under the patronage of Alfonso X, both state that, after the conquest of Seville in 1248, Fernando III yearned to extend the reconquista into northern Africa.\textsuperscript{615} Historians have generally regarded Alfonso’s plans for an African crusade merely as a continuation of those of his father and have tended to identify the need to repopulate Seville as the main impediment to the enterprise.\textsuperscript{616} José Manuel Rodríguez García, however, has argued that Fernando had no real intention of embarking on an African crusade.\textsuperscript{617} As there is no independent documentary proof that Fernando III planned an invasion of Morocco, we must turn to the chronicles.

It is likely that the Estoria de España’s intention was to legitimize Alfonso X’s own plans for a crusade to ‘La tierra de allend el mar’—Africa.\textsuperscript{618} In order for Alfonso to prove himself a greater conqueror than his father, he was forced to look beyond the Iberian Peninsula, to North Africa, a land untouched by Western Christendom but one long associated with the classical Roman Empire, not least via the great figure of St Augustine of Hippo. Already in the Estoria, there are glimpses of Alfonso’s attempts

---


\textsuperscript{615} CM, v, 232. ‘Et nunca lo a Castiella podieron fazer tornar desque desa vez passo faça la frontera: tanto auie sabor de la conqüere; nin tenie en veluntad de tornar y fasta que toda la ouiese conquerida. Allen mar tenie oio para pasar, et conquerir lo dalla desa parte que la morysma ley tenie ca los daca por en su poder los tenie, que asy era’: R. Menéndez Pidal, ed., Primera crónica general o sea Estoria de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y que se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289 (Madrid: 1906), mxxxii, 770.


\textsuperscript{617} Rodríguez García, ‘Crusading Plans’, 102, n. 29.

\textsuperscript{618} Both authors have hinted at this possibility: González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 107; Rodríguez García, ‘Crusading Plans’, 102.
to justify his African project. According to the *Estoria*, on his deathbed Fernando III declared to his son, the future king Alfonso X:

‘If you safeguard the land I am leaving you, you will be as good a king as I have been. But if you conquer more land, you will be a better king than I was. If on the contrary, you are unable to do either, you will be a worse king than me.’ 619

The portrayal of Fernando as a model conqueror and crusader king necessarily raised the expectations for his son, Alfonso X, who to outdo his father had to achieve even greater victories. 620 In the *Setenario*, a work that predates his most famous legal work, *Las Siete Partidas*, Alfonso X explains why his father, Fernando III, after the success in Seville, disregarded his vassals’ advice to refer to his kingdom as an empire (‘enperio’), as his ancestors had done. This was because ‘the land beyond the sea (‘la tierra daquent mar’) had yet to be conquered, therefore, Fernando understood that it was not the time to use the imperial title.’ 621 Again, by legitimizing the crusade into Morocco as an idea credited to Fernando III, Alfonso was in effect obtaining his father’s endorsement for the project.

The existing documentary evidence points to the *infante* as the driving force behind the African enterprise. On 24 April 1246, while Fernando III was in Jaén, it was Alfonso, who had obtained a papal indulgence allowing all who joined with him in a

619 ‘Sennor te dexo de toda la tierra de la mar aca, que los moros del rey Rodrigo de Espanna Ganado ouieron; et en tu sennorio finca toda: la vna conquerida, la otra tributada. Sy la en este estado en que te la yo dexo la sopieres guardar, eres tan buen rey commo yo; et sy ganares por ti mas, eres meior que yo; et si deso menguas, non eres tan bueno commo yo’: Menéndez Pidal, ed., Primera crónica general, mcxxxii, 771-3.


621 ‘… non era en tiempo de lo fíazer… primariaente, porque la tierra daquent mar non era conquerida toda e los moros fincauan en ella; et la otra porque los omnes non eran adereço a ssus ffechos asi commo deuían’: Alfonso X, *Setenario*, ed. K.H. Vanderford (Barcelona: 1984), 22-3.
planned expedition against the African Muslims to commute their vow from the Holy Land to the borders ('fronteria') of Castile. Whether the infante was looking to the possibility of invading Morocco is unclear. His father was at this time preparing for the conquest of Seville, and the kingdom of Granada had recently become a vassal state of Castile, even assisting in Fernando’s attack upon Seville. It is possible that Alfonso was already planning an incursion into North Africa. There the Almohads, whose empire had once stretched from Algeria to Morocco and into al-Andalus in Spain, clung desperately to their Moroccan territories and to their capital, Marrakesh, while the Marinids, one-time Almohad clients, strengthened their hold over the Maghreb. Undoubtedly, Alfonso and bishop Lope were aware of this situation and sought to take advantage of it. It was the start of a new enterprise beyond the borders of the peninsula. But whatever his plans for Africa, Alfonso set them aside to deal with more pressing issues.

From the early 1240s, as the infante approached his legal majority, he became an active figure in peninsular politics. In 1243, Fernando III entrusted Alfonso with the conquest of Murcia. Alfonso negotiated the ensuing surrender by which an envoy of king Ibn Hud signed the Pact of Alcaraz, rendering the Muslim kingdom a tributary and ‘protectorate’ of Castile. The cities of Mula, Cartagena and Lorca, which supported the king of Granada, refused to join in this peace. Mula fell to Alfonso’s army the following year, and Lorca hastened to reach an agreement.

---

perhaps with Moroccan aid, resisted Castilian attacks, but was taken by the *infante* in 1245.625

In 1244, Alfonso became actively involved in the negotiations for his marriage to Violante, daughter of Jaime I of Aragón.626 Independently from his son, Fernando III also corresponded with Jaime on the matter.627 Alfonso had a political agenda of his own and knew how to muster the necessary resources to fulfil his plans. In 1246, when the Pope made Afonso (III), count of Boulogne, king of Portugal, Alfonso continued to support the deposed King, Sancho II. Sancho subsequently took refuge in Castile, were he was given shelter by the *infante*, despite his father’s disapproval. Alfonso requested his soon-to-be father-in-law, Jaime I, to provide him with 300 horses for an expedition into Portugal.628 Combining the help he received from Aragón with the resources of his own Leonese holdings, the *infante* was able to muster a considerable army. This penetrated Portugal as far as Leiría, before being forced back by March 1247.629

At the time, the English monarchy was also conducting diplomatic negotiations with Portugal, which was riven by the bitter disputes between Sancho II and the papacy. On 15 April 1238, by order of Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241), the Archbishop of Braga, Silvestre Godinho, had excommunicated Sancho II, threatening to place Portugal under interdict if its king continued to labour against the Church.630 The disputes mounted, as Sancho II and his supporters failed to comply with papal

---

626 ACA, Cancillería Real, Cartas Reales, Jaime I, caja 1, nos. 101, 101 bis, 125.
627 Ibid., no. 120.
628 Ibid., no. 99.
demands. On 24 July 1245, in the midst of the Council of Lyons and with one eye very firmly on his plans to depose the Emperor Frederick II, Pope Innocent IV issued the bull ‘Grandi non immerito’, hereby deposing Sancho as a ‘rex inutilis’, conferring the kingdom upon Sancho’s brother, Afonso, count of Boulogne, who was to ascend the throne as Afonso III.\textsuperscript{631} After Sancho’s deposition, Afonso swore, at a ceremony staged in the French capital, Paris, to protect the Church and to rectify the damages caused by Afonso II and Sancho II.\textsuperscript{632} To further safeguard ecclesiastical rights, the Pope issued a bull granting the Archbishop of Braga, João Egas, the right to excommunicate those nobles who, in the past, had oppressed the Portuguese Church.\textsuperscript{633}

Inevitably, war now broke out in Portugal between the supporters of Sancho II and Afonso III. The then infante, Alfonso [X] of Castile pledged his support to Sancho against the commands of Alfonso’s father, Fernando III, who did not wish to divert forces from the siege of Seville.\textsuperscript{634} Meanwhile, and even before the final deposition of Sancho II, it is clear that Henry III of England was aware of Afonso of Boulogne’s plans against his brother, then king of Portugal. In June 1243, Henry III had granted a licence to Afonso to pass through Gascony on his way to the shrine of St James in Compostela, so long as his trip was made only as a pilgrim, the clear implication here

\textsuperscript{631} Ibid., no. 102. Sancho retained his title until his death in Toledo on 4 January 1248. It was only then that Afonso was finally crowned king of Portugal. For the parallels with Frederick II, see E. Peters, ‘Sancho II of Portugal and Thirteenth-Century Deposition Theory’, in The Shadow King: Rex Inutilis in Medieval Law and Literature, 751-1327 (New Haven: 1970), 135-69 esp. 166-7, noting that Frederick deliberately invoked the example of King Sancho in his letters complaining of the Council’s decisions to Fernando III of Castile-Léon. See also Linehan, Spanish Church, 161-2.
\textsuperscript{632} Jácome de Vasconcelos et al., Bulário Bracarense, no. 158
\textsuperscript{633} 13 September 1245, Ibid., no. 107
\textsuperscript{634} Cf. González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 32.
being that the English government was aware of Afonso’s wider political ambitions.635

Embassies to the English Court (1246-1252)

Early in 1246, while Fernando III was laying siege to Jaén, he sent a man named Andrew ‘Warnerius’ to Henry III.636 Later that year, in August, a seven-man embassy sent by Alfonso, led by a knight named Giles, returned to Castile from the English court.637 Henry III promptly replied to these Spanish embassies by sending Peter de Berbezil (Barbezieux), archdeacon of Bayonne, to the Castilian court.638 Unfortunately, no documentary evidence remains to determine the precise purpose of these embassies. It is possible that Fernando III was seeking a marriage alliance between Henry’s son, Edward, and his daughter, Eleanor (1241-1290), while also contemplating a marital alliance with Navarre.639

Fernando III and his son, Alfonso, continued to send diplomatic envoys to King Henry III. On April 1247, the English king ordered that £20 be paid for the expenses of the Castilian king’s embassy.640 Again, the infante Alfonso sent his own envoys, Martin and William Bec, to Henry III.641 Lope, was part of one of these embassies, present at Henry III’s court in April 1247, almost certainly promoting the African crusade. The precise details of this, Lope’s first interview with the English king, are unknown. But, one thing is certain: the bishop did not return empty-handed. Henry

---

635 CPR 1232-47, 383.
636 CLR 1245-51, 36; González, Diplomas Fernando III, nos. 731-738.
637 CLR 1245-51, 73.
638 Ibid., 75, 76.
640 CLR 1245-51, 116-7.
641 3 May 1247: Ibid., 120 123.
III gave Lope several gifts, including a horse to carry his chapel furnishings worth 40 s.,\(^{642}\) and a full set of vestments save crozier or shoes, worth £21 19 s. 8 d.\(^{643}\) When one month later the embassy left Dover, it was accompanied, once again, by Peter de Berbezil sent to meet with the *infante*.\(^ {644}\)

Over the next few months, Fernando III’s campaign in Seville, in which the *infante* Alfonso was soon embroiled, impacted on the king’s foreign diplomacy and there was a brief pause in Castilian embassies to England, after August 1247.\(^ {645}\) However, in May 1249, as soon as Seville was captured, and while Fernando III focused on the *repartimiento* of the conquered lands, Alfonso, once again, sent his own embassy to Henry III’s court in England.\(^ {646}\) There, as news of Louis IX’s crusade began to reach England, Henry III began to take crusading vows of his own. Meanwhile, a series of Castilian envoys was sent to the English king, possibly in an attempt to enlist him in a North African expedition. According to Matthew Paris, a Castilian embassy was sent to Henry III in 1251, proposing a joint expedition against Morocco.\(^ {647}\) Surviving documentary evidence confirms that it was Lope Fernández who led the *infante*’s embassy.\(^ {648}\) From March to July 1251, the bishop and his household were again in Henry III’s lands.\(^ {649}\) Matthew Paris recalled this visit, but is unable to inform us whether or not Henry III promised help. Moreover, Paris confuses the name of the Castilian king, writing Alfonso when he clearly intended Fernando.\(^ {650}\) This could

---

\(^{642}\) Ibid., 119.

\(^{643}\) Chasuble, cope, a tunic and dalmatic, orphreys, a mitre, an alb and an amice. Ibid., 152.

\(^{644}\) Ibid., 125.

\(^{645}\) From July 1247, Fernando III was already close to Seville and by October he had laid siege to the city: González, *Diplomas Fernando III*, nos. 747 and 748.

\(^{646}\) CLR 1245-51, 232.


\(^{648}\) CLR 1245-51, 339, 363, 364.

\(^{649}\) Ibid., 364.

\(^{650}\) Paris confuses the name of the Castilian king, writing Alfonso in place of Fernando: CM, v, 232.
have been an innocent mistake. It has traditionally been considered evidence that
Fernando was proposing a crusade to Henry III. In reality, whatever overture there
was originated not with Fernando but Alfonso.651

Lope Fernández and the Bishopric of Morocco

Bishop Lope has engaged the attention of historians because of his role in bringing
about the treaty of 1254 between England and Castile. Manuel González Jiménez,
Anthony Goodman and Joseph O’Callaghan have all noted that the bishop of
Morocco was present in the signing of the Anglo-Castilian treaty. However, his role
in Castilian diplomacy remains shadowy, as does his influence in the planning of the
North African crusade.652 To examine Lope’s career it is necessary that we
reconsider the standard account of diplomatic exchanges between England and Castile
in the time of Fernando III.

It has been suggested by local enthusiasts that Lope Fernández de Aín was born
c.1190 in the town of Gallur in Aragón. There is, in fact, no evidence to back such
conjectures.653 In 1221, he took vows as a Franciscan in Zaragoza, where he
remained an unknown period of time, after which he was sent to Rome.654 Of Lope’s
life, before 1247, very little is known. About his family, we know only what is
recorded in a papal dispensation, issued at Lope’s request by Pope Innocent IV in

652 González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 109-10; Goodman, ‘England and Iberia’, 77; O’Callaghan, The
Learned King, 168; Idem, Reconquest, 119-20.
653 It is uncertain whether he used the toponym ‘de Aín’ (a town in Aragón) as part of his own name, or
if it is a later accretion to the sources. However, it would not have been unusual for it to have formed
part of his name, as the use of such toponyms was common amongst noble families in twelfth and
thirteenth-century Aragón and Navarre, not necessarily to denote a place of birth, but more often to
state family ties to a particular place: A. Aslaniants, ‘La nobleza aragonesa en el siglo XIII: nombres de
persona y vínculos de sangre’ (paper presented at the II Conferencia de hispanistas de Rusia, Moscow,
19-23 April 1999), http://hispanismo.cervantes.es/documentos/Aslaniants.pdf
654 A. López, Memoria histórica de los Obispos de Marruecos desde el siglo XII (Madrid: 1920), 12.
February 1247, permitting the bishop to remain in episcopal office, despite the illegitimate marriage of his parents.\textsuperscript{655}

The Franciscan order had an interest in northern Africa since the time of St. Francis, who is said to have intended to visit Morocco in 1213-14, a voyage poised between myth and reality, and which may be more of a legend than a historical fact. Francis perhaps reached the shrine of St. James at Compostela, before falling ill and abandoning his planned African adventure.\textsuperscript{656} Five years later, he is said to have sent a group of friars to North Africa.\textsuperscript{657} After passing through Coimbra, the brothers made their way to Morocco where they preached the Christian faith before being martyred at the command of the local Moslem ruler. Their martyrdom was later celebrated in Portugal, where Queen Urraca fostered the cult of their relics.\textsuperscript{658} Whether or not this story is historically true is less important to us here than its usefulness in illustrating the interest Franciscans had in the conversion of northern Africa and thus in explaining Lope’s appointment to the bishopric of Morocco.

As a Franciscan, Lope was expected to preach the crusade, and this is the context in which we thereafter find him.\textsuperscript{659} However, Peter Linehan has also pointed out that Lope, together with Lorenzo de Portugal, bishop of Ceuta, also acted as a ‘roving

\textsuperscript{655} Sbaralea, Bullarium Franciscanum, i, no. 182. On 9 March 1247, brother Bernard, a colleague of Lope, was also dispensed, regardless of the marital status of his parents: Ibid., no. 174.

\textsuperscript{656} J.R. Webster, Els Menorets. The Franciscans in the Realms of Aragon From St. Francis to the Black Death (Toronto: 1993), 19-20.

\textsuperscript{657} Ibid., 22.


peninsular council’ to the papacy. As far as the surviving sources go, Lope suddenly emerges into the political and religious scene on 18 October 1246, when Pope Innocent IV exhorted the archbishops of Tarragona and Narbonne, the bishops of Majorca, Bayonne, Marseille, Porto and others to aid bishop Lope in spreading the Christian faith to the Muslims of Morocco. The pope also requested all the kings of the Iberian Peninsula - Jaume I of Aragón, Theobald I of Navarre, Fernando III of León-Castile, and Afonso III of Portugal - to provide for Lope and his brethren with the necessary assistance (‘consilium, auxilium, vel favorem’) and safe-conducts (‘securus conductus’) to aid their missionary efforts. Lope was about to acquire royal patronage.

Bishop Fernández was the second bishop appointed to the see of Morocco. Before him, at least two Dominicans, prior Domingo and friar Martin had resided there. The pope had granted Dominican and Franciscan missionaries in northern Africa the right to preach, baptize, and excommunicate Christians, and the right to welcome converts. In order to safeguard their lives, the missionaries were granted the right to grow beards and wear irregular clothing. While the Franciscans in the Maghreb were attached to the provincial obedience of Aragón, the Dominicans were attached to

---

660 In Lope’s case, at least between 1255-7. Linehan, The Spanish Church and the Papacy, 202.
661 L. Wadding, Annales minorum seu Trium Ordinum a S. Francisco institutorum (Florence: 1931), iii, 154, p. 176; López, Obispos de Marruecos, 13.
662 Wadding, Annales minorum, iii, 154, p. 176, and see the letter to the king of Aragón, in Quintana Prieto, Inocencio IV, no. 322. In addition, Innocent sent similar requests to the Franciscan order and to the military orders of St. James and Calatrava: Wadding, Annales minorum, iii, 154-5, 177.
that of Castile. On 20 February 1226, Honorius III asked Archbishop Rodrigo of Toledo to send Franciscans to convert the Muslims. He asked for the most learned in the law of God to be consecrated bishop, but made no provisions for assigning him a cathedral or see. The problem of establishing dioceses in places where the Christian population was so ‘disperse’ remained challenging, if not impossible.

The first bishop of whom there is record was appointed to the ‘infertile’ (‘sterilis’) see of Morocco, on 12 June 1237, by Gregory IX. He is generally identified with a man referred to as Bishop Agnello (1237-1246) in the papal registers. From a papal letter of 1233 to the young king of Morocco, Abd al-Wahid al-Rashid (1232-42), we know that Gregory’s principal missionary was then regarded as bishop of Fez. In addition to the appointment of the bishop, a peninsular king, Theobald I of Navarre, was entrusted with the protection of the Christians residing in north Africa. Perhaps the pope hoped that the Moroccan ruler, son of the Christian captive Habeb, would lend a helping hand to the bishop of Fez. After all, al-Rashid, like his father,

---

668 This same problem was faced in the territories held by the Mongols. See his work for the challenges faced by missionaries sent to Asia, particularly to the Mongols, India, and Ethiopia. Cf. Richard, Missions d’Orient, 141-2.
669 Mas Latrie, Traité, II, x. He is not to be confused with his contemporary, Brother Agnellus of Pisa, who was provincial minister of the Franciscans in England (1224), and who established the community in Oxford, where he died in May 1236, cf. F.A.C. Mantello et al., eds., The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (Toronto: 2010), nos. 1-2.
Idris al-Mamun, maintained a bodyguard that included Christian mercenaries. In 1228, Fernando III of Castile famously hired out to the Almohad ruler, Abu'l-Ula Idris al-Mamun, several mercenaries (possibly around 500) to help him seize Marrakesh from his opponents. Indeed, according to the fourteenth-century Tunisian historian, Ibn Kaldun, Christian mercenaries played a key role in the Muslim armies of the Maghreb. Ibn Kaldun commends their fighting ability and tells us how they ‘clung to the ground, better than the Arab light cavalry’. Not all Christians in the Maghreb were paid soldiers. From the twelfth century onwards a significant number of Catalan and Majorcan settlers, most of them merchants or pirates had established themselves in Tunis, Algeria (Oran, Tremecen, Constantine, and the port of Bejaia), and as far south as Marrakesh. In addition, there were a number of Christians, who had been deported by the Muslim kings of al-Andalus. It was perhaps with these Christians in mind that on 25 October 1246, Pope Innocent IV notified the king of Tunis of Lope’s election to the see of Morocco and asked him to extend his protection to his fellow Franciscans. The following day, he addressed

673 Dufourcq, Espagne Catalane et Maghrib, 20.
674 Catalan interest in North Africa dates from the eleventh century: M. García Arenal et al., Los españoles y el norte de África. Siglos XV-XVIII (Madrid: 1992), 22; Dufourcq, Espagne Catalane et Maghrib, 22-3. It was not uncommon either, for the king to commission a noble to arm a ship and sail as a privateer to the North African coast. Such was the case in 1229, following the conquest of Majorca, when Jaime I ordered count Nuño (son of Sancho of Provence) to go as a privateer to the Barbary coast, cf. Ferrando et al., eds., Fets, ch. 92. After the treaty of 1257 between Jaime I of Aragón and the king of Tunis, the Spanish king demanded that Benet de Rocaberti, archbishop of Tarragona, stop his corsary activity against the king of Tunis. ACA, Cancillería Real, Pergaminos, Jaime I, Serie general, no. 1498.
675 Dufourcq, ‘Maroc et Castille’, 44.
676 Quintana Prieto, Inocencio IV, no. 325. He may have also sent a similar letter to the king of Ceuta, which was at this time a vassal of the king of Tunis. Cf. G. Abate, ‘Lettere secretae d’Innocenzo IV e altri documenti in una raccolta inedita del sec. XIII’, Miscellanea Francescana, 55 (1955), no. 156.
this brethren asking them to extend their welcome and aid to the newly-elected bishop.677

As a bishop ‘in partibus infidelium’, on 31 October 1246, Lope obtained papal letters of introduction to the Almohad king of Morocco, Abu l-Hasan Ali al-Said (1242-48). Innocent IV requested the king’s favour for the bishop and the Christians living under his rule and reminded him of the Christians who served him as mercenaries in his army. Naturally, the pope used the opportunity to exhort al-Said to embrace the Christian faith and thus to place himself under papal protection.678 The pope also took the opportunity to notify the Christians of Morocco of the election of their new bishop, who he asked them to embrace.679 Later that year, on 19 December 1246, Innocent notified the Christians of Africa that Lope, bishop of Morocco, was to be considered the head of the Church of Africa, the only church there authorized to profess the Christian faith.680 Lope had yet to set foot in Africa. However, two years later, in 1248 al-Said died and the Berber tribe of the Banu Marin seized Fez from the Almohads. To the west of the old city, these Marinids established their capital, constructing mosques and madrasas. In time, Fez became an important religious centre for the study of Islam. This revived religious fervour also led to the expulsion of the Christian mercenaries. The turmoil in the region, and the Marinid hostility to Christianity, made it ever more difficult for Lope to establish himself in Morocco.681

From Alfonso X’s reign onwards, we know that the bishop was instead exiled to

678 Ibid., no. 332; Wadding, Annales minorum, iii, 151-2, p. 172-4; Registered in É. Berger, Les registres d’Innocent IV, publiés ou analysés d’après les manuscrits originaux du Vatican et de la Bibliothèque nationale (Paris: 1881), no. 2242.
679 Quintana Prieto, Inocencio IV, no. 333.
680 Sbaralea, Bullarium Franciscanum, i, nos. 170, 178; Wadding, Annales minorum, iii, 150, p. 171-2; 155, p. 178.
Seville, where Sancho, Archbishop of Toledo and brother of the king, granted him protection in the church of San Telmo. The bishop and archdeacon of Morocco relied on the Church of Seville for most of their income, as for the funding of Alfonso’s diplomatic endeavours, since the Moroccan church had no income of its own. From the time of his accession to the throne in June 1252, throughout 1253, Alfonso X remained preoccupied with the reorganization of Seville. Bishop Lope benefited from this, receiving more lands in Seville (1253) while still acting as Alfonso’s emissary to King Henry III of England. In the meantime, the recurrent setbacks to the conversion of the Muslims, both in the Maghreb and in the Balearics, had led Dominicans and Franciscans to conclude that a ‘studium arabicum’ was a necessity, soon supported by the papacy. By 1250, partly under the auspices of Jaime I of Aragón, this ‘stadium’ was already reaping rewards. But while the Dominicans made progress in Tunis, the Franciscans were not as lucky, a fact that is reflected in Lope’s subsequent career.

Alfonso X

On 30 May 1252, Fernando III ‘el Santo’ died in Seville. The next day (1 June), following Fernando’s obsequies, Alfonso X was crowned king of León-Castile. He was the son of Fernando III by Beatrice of Swabia, daughter of Philip of Swabia, himself briefly recognized as Holy Roman Emperor by Pope Innocent III. Having

---

683 Linehan, The Spanish Church and the Papacy, 204.
684 D. Ortíz de Zúñiga, Anales eclesiásticos y seculares de la muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla, metrópoli de la Andalucía, que contienen sus más principales memorias desde el año de 1246, en que emprendió a conquistarla del poder de los Moros el gloriosísimo Rey S. Fernando III de Castilla y León, hasta el de 1671 en que la Católica Iglesia le concedió el culto y título de Bienaventurado (Madrid: 1795), ii, 1253, 5.
686 Ibid., 109
reduced the Muslim states of the Peninsula, Alfonso X knew that he had to look beyond Iberia, laying the ground for a crusade into North Africa. In the end, it was Alfonso’s claims to the imperial throne, as the great-grandson of Frederick Barbarossa, and his enduring efforts to conquer North Africa that would become the two defining foreign policy initiatives of his reign, in turn impacting upon Castile’s relations with Henry III of England.

According to Anthony Goodman, in 1253, Alfonso X ‘reversed his father’s friendly policy towards the English Crown by reviving the claim to Gascony’. However, this assertion may not be entirely accurate. On his accession to the throne, Alfonso X focused on the completion of the repartimiento of Seville, after which he sought to lobby support for his African Crusade, a project central to his ‘foreign’ political agenda in the early years of his reign.

Example of a bilingual treaty (Latin-Arabic).


ACA, Colecciones, Cartas árabes, no. 155, in http://pares.es

A translation of the Arabic text can be found in: M.A. Alarcón y Santón et al., eds., Los documentos árabes diplomáticos del Archivo de la Corona de Aragón (Madrid-Granada: 1940), no. 155.

**Fecho de Allende**

The new king, Alfonso X, inherited a vast kingdom thanks to the conquering efforts of his father, who had reduced the Muslim presence to the southernmost part of the peninsula (see map: Castile In the Reign of Alfonso X). During the reign of Fernando III, the Muslim kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula had been whittled away to the vassal kingdoms of Granada and Murcia. The king’s new pretensions for Spanish monarchy and his determination to stamp his authority upon his own nobility, stressed in his novel approach to the reorganization of Seville, pressured some disgruntled nobles into alliance with the Muslim kings of Morocco. While the conquest of Seville, may have inspired Fernando III to continue fighting against the Moroccan king, the territorial organization of these newly conquered lands stalled his military plans. This reorganization continued into the early years of Alfonso’s reign (from June 1252 until 1253. This, however, did not put an end to Alfonso’s intention to extend his dominion into North Africa. Thus, Bishop Lope was amongst the first to benefit from the new king’s patronage. In 1253, Lope, who may have been in England at the time, received an additional grant of lands in Seville.

---


690 Dufourcq, ‘Croisade d’Afrique’, 27.

At the top of Alfonso’s agenda stood the crusade to North Africa. In October 1252, only five months into his reign, Alfonso X sent envoys to Henry III, amongst them Lope Fernández, almost certainly to pressure the English king into joining his African project. At the time of Alfonso’s accession to the throne, only the vassal kingdoms of Granada and Murcia remained in Muslim hands, making it possible for the new king to contemplate a crusade across the Straits of Gibraltar. This military expedition became one of Alfonso’s early obsessions and Lope Fernández became a central figure in its planning. As part of his agenda, the Castilian king sought official papal sanction for his crusade. On 4 October 1252, Pope Innocent IV (1243-54) ratified all treaties (‘federa’) made by Alfonso with the Muslims of Africa (‘Sarracenis de Affrica’), presumably referring to the Almohad rulers whose control of Morocco continued to crumble. The treaties themselves do not survive, so that their terms remain entirely mysterious. Further backing came in January 1253, when the pope ordered the Dominicans and Franciscans of León, Castile and Navarre to preach a crusade against the Muslims of Africa. Furthermore, Innocent granted the king a third of the tithe of the Castilian Church for three years to help finance his expedition: a generous allocation of funds. Alfonso’s attempts to ensure the future of the African crusade went even further. He asked Innocent IV to guarantee that clerics who participated would not be taxed on their benefices, a request with which the Pope agreed. When, in October 1253, Lope Fernández’s collaborator, the avid promoter of the African crusade, García Pérez, archdeacon of Morocco, was sent to Henry III,
the English king was in Gascony appeasing the rebellious nobility and preparing for what he apparently feared would be a Castilian invasion of the duchy. 698

**Henry III and the Gascon Nobility**

In the eleventh century, after decades of dispute with the counts of Toulouse, the counts of Poitiers had established themselves in Gascony. As a result, Gascony itself became part of the duchy of Aquitaine encompassing the county of Poitou and the city of Bordeaux. Further to the south-east, the counts of Toulouse took control of Narbonne and Carcassonne. 699 From the reign of Henry II of England, the Capetian kings began to bring pressure to bear on the new Plantagenet ‘empire’ in western France, a policy that culminated, in John’s reign, in the Plantagenet loss of Normandy. 700 Henry III regarded the recovery of his hereditary lands in France as his greatest and overriding royal duty. 701 Gascony, meanwhile, had remained united to English rule, perhaps precisely because it had been so tangential to Plantagenet concerns in the decades leading to 1204. From the 1220s, it became increasingly important for Henry III and his plans to extend and reform the administration of his southern lands.

Gascony had a long history of independence as the local nobility and the communes of cities like Bayonne (1215), Bordeaux (1235) 702 and Dax (1243) strove to protect their local customs and privileges and to obtain charters from England acknowledging their right to self-rule. As a result, the sovereignty of England’s kings was never

---
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firmly established. From the reign of King John onwards, the principal concern of the Plantagenets became the imposition of day-to-day control over a region only loosely tied to traditions of public ducal authority. Gascony was a potentially rich source of revenue to the English crown, with significant ducal monopolies over its trade in salt and wine, and with a role to play, in the longer term, as a springboard from which to relaunch Plantagenet rule over Poitou, the provinces of the Loire and ultimately over Normandy itself. The problem lay in extracting either income or obedience from the local population without risking the expenditure of even greater sums in warfare than could be extracted from ducal tolls and perquisites.\footnote{Maddicott, \textit{Simon de Montfort}, 106-9; J.P. Trabut-Cussac, \textit{L’administration anglaise en Gascogne sous Henry III et Edouard I de 1254 a 1307} (Paris-Geneva: 1972), xi-xvi; N. Vincent, ‘Jean sans Terre et les origines de la Gascogne anglaise: droits et pouvoirs dans les arcanes des sources’, \textit{Annales du Midi}, cxxiii (2011), 533-66.}

The duchy had a complicated administration headed by a seneschal based at Bordeaux, where a council of Gascon nobles aided him. Other local councils also played a role in the administration of Gascony. There were three main ducal administrative centres, Bazas, Dax and Saint-Sever, apart from Bordeaux. There arbitrations and inquisitions took place. In addition, there were local courts in several \textit{vicomtés} and a series of local customs that were dealt on a local basis. This meant that the king had to govern through ‘persuasion’ and was often forced to conciliate opposing factions.\footnote{Powicke, \textit{Henry III}, i, 209-211.} The constant rebellions of the Gascon nobility led Henry III to appoint Simon de Montfort to the government of the province in 1248.

Despite de Monfort’s intervention, troubles persisted. Many nobles regarded his interference as brutal suppression of their customary rights. Their dislike for him was fuelled too by their bitter memories of the career of his father, the elder Simon de
Montfort, ‘hero’ of the Albigensian Crusade. Alienated by Montfort, the Gascon nobles began to look to other potential poles of influence. In December 1251, Gaston de Béarn warned the English king that other Gascon nobles were about to send embassies to the kings of Navarre and Castile and to Alphonse of Poitiers, count of Poitou and Toulouse, the brother of King Louis IX of France. Being closer to Gascony, Gaston warned, any of these rulers could better defend customary rights from the injustices (‘iniuriiis et dampnis’) committed by Simon de Montfort, Henry III’s brother-in-law. Gaston, who in the past had already challenged Henry III’s rule, was a powerful leader in Gascony. It was perhaps Gaston’s alliance with Alfonso, only months later, that prompted Henry III into immediate diplomatic action. The records suggest that it was Gascon nobles, most likely including Gaston VII de Béarn himself who recruited Alfonso’s help. It is likely that it was from this point forwards that Alfonso X chose to resurrect Alfonso VIII’s long-dormant claim to have been offered Gascony in the 1170s as the marriage portion of his wife, Eleanor of Castile, the daughter of Henry II of England and Eleanor of Aquitaine.

Simon de Montfort continued to exercise control over Gascony but his rule only exacerbated the problems with the local nobility and, in due course, led to his trial (May 1252), after the communes of Bazas and Bayonne had simultaneously demanded his removal. Gaston de Béarn was also amongst those nobles who actively opposed Simon’s rule. In 1253, a group of rebels led by Gaston and supported by the French crown opposed Henry III. Matthew Paris reports that Gascon rebels seized La Réole and Saint Émilion. The dispute took a new turn when Gaston de Béarn and Guy, the vicomte of Limoges, paid homage to the king of
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Castile, fulfilling Gaston’s previous warning to Henry III. Both nobles were angered by Simon de Montfort’s policies in Gascony and were on the lookout for a powerful ally capable of capturing the attention of the duke of Aquitaine. Already in a *privilegio rodado* dated as early as 29 August 1252, Gaston VII, vicomte of Bearn, had appeared at the Castilian court as Alfonso’s vassal (‘vassallo del rey’). According to Anthony Goodman, it was Henry III’s arrival at La Rèole in August 1253 that compelled Gaston to look for help to the Castilian court. In reality, as Matthew Paris confirms, Gaston had been a client of Castile for at least a year before Henry’s arrival at La Rèole. This earlier date (1252) suggests that, even while Gaston was warning Henry III of a possible alliance with Castile or Navarre, he was already in negotiation with Alfonso X. It also stresses the role that Gaston VII played in bringing the Castilian king to the negotiating table and in gaining enough momentum to drive Henry III into immediate action. Other Gascon nobles followed Gaston’s example, and in the following year, on 20 August 1253, Guy of Limoges joined Gaston in a list of Castilian subjects (Image 1). Other French nobles like Ponce, Seigneur of Mirebeau, also sought split allegiances, both to Alfonso X and to Henry III.

Pressure was mounting on Henry III, and the fear of a Castilian or Navarrese attack, which had been latent since at least 1252, was now becoming greater, at least in Henry’s mind. Henry’s fears were finally confirmed when reports arrived from the
men of Bayonne arrived stating that they refused to go to travel any long as far as the
town of Auch for fear they would be attacked by their Iberian neighbours. In a land
troubled by factions and on the brink of rebellion, Henry III was right to worry about
a possible Castilian invasion.

Throughout his reign, Henry III sought to shield and reclaim his French inheritance
and for this reason he reacted without hesitation when rumours spread that Alfonso X
was planning an invasion of Gascony. The English king could not afford to cede
territory or to allow yet further dissent to spread among his nobles who had already
rebelled against his rule. Henry, who as a crusader had been granted a crusader’s
indulgence, obtained from the pope a bull (3 July 1253) excommunicating the Gascon
rebels, amongst them Gaston de Béarn. However, excommunication did not put an
end to the uprisings. Now, local nobility and the southern communes demanded that
Henry take direct control of Gascony. Henry III hoped that, once he had removed
Montfort, the powerful Gaston de Béarn would come to terms with him. In this he
was mistaken, as he was soon to find out.

Castile and Gascony

It is assumed that, in 1253, Alfonso X revived the claim that Gascony had been given
to Alfonso VIII as the marriage portion of Eleanor, daughter of Henry II of England,
as something that henceforth was expected to pertain in perpetuity to the Castilian
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crown. Whether this account of the disposition of Gascony in the 1170s is true or false, Henry III seems to have taken the claim very seriously. The Castilian claim to Gascony has been debated by scholars for decades. The marriage between Alfonso VIII and Eleanor took place in Toledo before 17 September 1170. If we are to believe the Chronica Latina, Alfonso VIII set ‘his’ Gascon subject free in 1206 as part of a military campaign intended to make good his rights. Beyond these assertions of the Chronica, Nicholas Vincent has shown that the Castilian claim to Gascony continued to be pushed by Alfonso VIII as late as 1214, when Alfonso can be found still styling himself ‘Lord of Gascony’ (‘dominus Vasconie’). During the reign of Fernando III, Castile did not pursue its claims to Gascony, perhaps because the king was completely absorbed by his campaign to conquer the Muslim Iberian territories.

Rumours of a possible invasion of Gascony may have been spread by other means, for example via troubadours. The Genoese poet, Bonifacio Calvo, who attended the court of the ‘Wise King’ from the beginning of his reign, wrote a song in which he tells how Alfonso X intended to invade Gascony and Navarre. In his sirventes, the troubadour reassures his audience that:

‘Our king … wishes soon to travel into Gascony with such a force of men that neither wall nor fortification may withstand it … [because] now he begins without delay to

---
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demand his rights so courageously that … the Gascons and Navarrois will do his bidding and he will deliver them to punishment through seizing and killing. 720

Calvo’s hope that Alfonso X would invade Gascony never materialized. Indeed, no documentary proof exists that he was preparing an army to march into Gascony. His negotiations with England suggest, instead, that he merely threatened Henry III with future military action. Even so, his diplomatic strategy, coupled perhaps, with literary scare tactics, drove his English counterpart to the negotiating table. In February 1254, the English king sent two of his most experienced diplomats, Peter d’Aigueblanche, bishop of Hereford, and John Mansel, to reach an agreement with the Castilian king who had been pressing Henry III for a treaty.

**Fears of a Castilian Invasion Extend to Navarre and Aragón**

The English king was not the only monarch worried by the political and military agenda of the new king of Castile. Jaime I of Aragón signed a friendship agreement (‘prometemos a vos ... que daquí anant seremos amigos de vos et e todos vuestros amigos’) with Margaret, queen of Navarre, the mother of Theobald [II], at Tudela in Navarre on 1 August 1253, intended to supply mutual support against all persons save the king of France, the Holy Roman Emperor, and Margaret’s subjects from Champagne (‘exceptados el rey de França, el emperador de Alamayna et aquellas personas de França a qui nos somos tenudos por senyoria’). Jaime I promised to aid and defend with all Aragonese power the kingdom of Navarre (‘que nos vos ajudemos con todo nuestro poder a defender vos et el regno et la senyoria de Navarra, contra todos los hommes del mundo’), within thirty days of having notice of any threat to

Margaret. If, because of such help extended to Navarre, war should break out between Aragón and Castile, the Aragonese king promised not to make a truce with Alfonso X until Navarre had agreed to it, with Margaret extending similar promises on behalf of Navarre (‘[si] por cualquier razón aviamos Guerra con el rey de Castieylla o con cualquier otro rey prometemos a vos que no faremos con eyllos treuga ni paz ni amiztat ni avinienza ninguna, menos de vuestra voluntat’). The treaty even went so far as to propose a marriage alliance between Constanza of Aragón, daughter of Jaime I, and Theobald [II] of Navarre (‘prometemos encara a vos, devant dita reyna, que nos daremos nuestra fylla dona Constança por myller a leyal matrimonio al devant ditto vuestro fillo, dont Tubaldo, rey de Navarra o a cualquier otro vuestro fillo, qui sera rey de Navarra’). Margaret of Navarre promised the Aragonese that her son, Theobald (or any other who was crowned king of Navarre in the event of Theobald’s death), would not marry any of the sisters of Alfonso X, nor his daughters, nor would any of her daughters marry the brothers or sons of the Castilian king.  

It is possible that Alfonso X was also employing scare-tactics to coax these neighbouring kings into agreement. In another sirventes, Bonifácio Calvo suggests that the Castilian king lacked:

‘The heart to fight with the king of Navarre or the king of Aragon … But I hear many say that he does not wish to attack them except with threats … If he wishes to have merit concerning what he has undertaken, let him wage war without threatening, for nothing comes of it otherwise.’

---
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Gaston de Béarn, himself a subject of Jaime I of Aragón for his lands in Majorca, played an instrumental role in intimidating the Navarrese, as his vicomté could increase pressure on Margaret and Theobald’s already land-locked kingdom.\textsuperscript{723} Margaret must have feared a Castilian invasion, because within days, on 20 August, she secured arrangements that envisaged her seeking asylum in Bayonne. The council of the city agreed to receive both her and her son, Theobald of Navarre, if they were to pass or stay in the city. However, if the king of England were to revoke this privilege, they were to have forty days to leave the city in safety.\textsuperscript{724} By 26 October 1253, Margaret had received a safe-conduct from Henry III, allowing her to pass through Gascony.\textsuperscript{725} Navarre and Aragón were preparing for a possible war with neighbouring Castile.

Alfonso X had recently ascended the Castilian throne. His father, Fernando III, had reduced the Muslim presence in Castile to Granada and Murcia, and naturally Aragón and Navarre feared that Alfonso would now turn against them, extending the Castilian pursuit of empire from the Muslim to the Christian parts of Spain. However, Castilian military ambitions were now focused not on the Iberian Peninsula, but in the Muslim kingdoms of North Africa. Alfonso X was planning a crusade to Africa and a military expedition against his Iberian neighbours would have been both untimely and unwise. Moreover, Alfonso’s attention was absorbed in reorganizing the vast territory of Seville, which had been recently conquered by his father. During the opening year of his reign, Alfonso resided in Seville, where he was busy in the organization and

\textsuperscript{723} Cf. C.d. Ayala Martínez, Directrices fundamentales de la política peninsular de Alfonso X (relaciones castellano-aragonesas de 1252 a 1263) (Madrid: 1986), 195.
\textsuperscript{724} Idoate, Catálogo, no. 449; M.R. García Arancón, Archivo General de Navarra (1253-1270). Tomo II. Comptos y Cartularios Reales (Donostia: 1996), no. 2.
\textsuperscript{725} CPR 1247-1258, 247.
distribution of lands and privileges. By May 1253, this repartimiento was complete and Alfonso could turn to other schemes. It is not difficult to see how the fears of a Castilian invasion could have spread from Navarre to neighbouring Gascony. These fears would have been further exacerbated by Alfonso X’s befriending of Gascon de Béarn. Such fears persisted even after Castile and England signed their treaty. As late as August 1254, Jaime I of Aragon still feared that a war between Castile and Aragón would take place, asking the several consejos of the realm for authorization to mint 15,000 silver marks (‘marcharum argenti’) to fund such a war.

Negotiations and Negotiators

On 15 May 1253, Henry III appointed William Bitton, bishop of Bath (1248–1264), and the royal secretary John Mansel, chancellor of London and provost of Beverley, to arrange a marriage between his son, Edward, and Eleanor, Alfonso X’s sister. John Mansel would replace John Clarel in these negotiations, suggesting that there had been embassies to the Castilian court regarding the proposed marriage previous to the recorded credences of May. A week later, Henry III issued his envoys with instructions for the marriage alliance between Edward and Eleanor. He demanded, as bare minimum, a full resignation of the rights Alfonso X claimed in Gascony, together with oaths of mutual support against all men:

---
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‘Plenam quietantiam iuris quod idem Rex exigit in terram nostram Wasconiae, ab ipso et hereditibus suis capientes, si meliores conditiones consequat non pateritis, dum modo talis mutua confederatio inter nos et heredes nostros contrabatur, ita quod adinvicem simus imprisii et confederati, iusta vires notras, contra omnes homines. Ad hec autem omnia et singula plenam vobis damus et concedimus potestatem.’

Here for the first time we find Alfonso’s claims to Gascony appearing in the documentary evidence. As we have suggested above, it seems that the Castilian king decided to press Alfonso VIII’s old claim to Gascony as part of a strategy to persuade Henry III to participate in a joint crusade. By this reckoning, it is unlikely that Alfonso had claimed a Gascon inheritance during his earlier embassies to Henry III in the 1240s, when his father, Fernando III, was still alive. Rather, it seems that the claim was first revived as a result of Gaston de Béarn’s interventions in 1251-2.

Henry III could not leave the future of Gascony to chance. The same day, and clearly in an attempt to insure against the Castilian threat by an alliance with Alfonso’s rivals in Aragón, he issued further guidelines for his proctors. On 24 May 1253, John Mansel and William Bitton, bishop of Bath and Wells (1248-1264), were charged with the arrangement of a marriage alliance between Beatrice (1242-75), Henry’s newly born daughter, and Jaime I of Aragón’s eldest son, Pedro (1239-1285). This marriage, in the event, was never contracted. Instead, in 1262, Pedro married Constance, the heiress to Manfred, king of Sicily.

---
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732 Constance was betrothed to the infante Pedro in 1258, a great cause of concern for Pope Innocent IV with regards to Hohenstaufen control of Sicily. Jaime I had the naval power to support Manfred. The pope was forced to look for a champion against Staufen rule of Sicily and offer the throne to Richard of Cornwall, however he declined it. Cf. S. Runciman, The Sicilian Vespers. A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century (Cambridge: 1958), 54-7.
Before setting out from Bordeaux into Gascony to settle his affairs with the disgruntled nobility, in August 1253, Henry empowered the bishop of Bath and John Mansel to arrange a marriage between Eleanor and Edward. He authorised them to supply her with lands as a marriage portion up to the value of 1000 marks per year, if Edward should die before being crowned king, and £1000 per year, if he was crowned by the time of her widowhood. If Mansel was unable to attend the negotiations, John Clarel was empowered to take his place.\textsuperscript{733}

Acting on behalf of Alfonso X was Garcia Perez (‘Garsias Petri’), envoy of the bishop of Morocco, as presumably Alfonso X continued to pressure Henry into signing a treaty that would commit the English king to more than a simple marriage alliance.\textsuperscript{734} Meanwhile, the Aragonese king sent his envoy, Bertram de Aoneys, to meet Henry in Gascony.\textsuperscript{735} Perhaps, at this point, the English monarch was concerned that Aragón would shift its allegiance and support the king of Castile, with whom negotiations seemed to be stalling.\textsuperscript{736} On 4 December 1253, Henry III promised the Gascon, Amaneo de la Breta, to defend his lands should Alfonso X invade them (‘infestaverit’).\textsuperscript{737}

Perhaps the negotiations between the two kings were at risk of breaking down, or Henry III feared that Alfonso would take advantage of his setback in Gascony. It could also be that Alfonso X rejected Henry III’s initial terms for a marriage alliance. On 29 December 1253, fearing that the ‘king of Castile and his Saracen army’ would march towards Gascony the following Easter, Henry III requested help from England
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\textsuperscript{736} Henry III grants a safe-conduct to merchants going to Gascony ‘so long as the king and the king of Aragon are friends and no contention of war arises between them’. Ibid., 255.  
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and Ireland. The king communicated to his Irish prelates, through his brother Richard of Cornwall and Queen Eleanor, that if the Castilian king was able to take control of Gascony, he might aspire eventually to invade England and Ireland as well:

‘Cum Rex Castelae, cum multitudine exercitus Christianorum et Saracenorum, terram nostram Vasconiae, in quindena Paschae proximo futura, ingressurus sit hostiliter, ad terram illam destruendam et occupandam, ac per introitum ejusdem terrae, si eam optineret, quod absit, terras nostras Angliae et Hiberniae invadere aspiret […]’

Richard of Cornwall, Henry III’s brother, and Queen Eleanor wrote to the king that they had received his letter and that they would summon to Westminster, on 13 January 1254 (the feast of St Hilary), all archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, earls and barons of England to request their help against the imminent Castilian invasion. In letters of 5 February 1254, they continued to press for the necessary funds to defend Gascony against an imminent Castilian invasion. Three days later, on 8 February, Henry III notified his subjects that he had sent Peter of Aigueblanche, bishop of Hereford and John Mansel, as envoys to Alfonso X in order that a treaty could be reached between them. The king was ready to agree to the basic points of the treaty. In England, the king’s requests for resources were met with suspicion. On 11 February, Henry nonetheless sent further letters to the regents and the sheriffs, requesting that they raise the necessary resources from magnates and royal tenants, who were ordered to pay £20 for distraint of knighthood, in order to provide Henry with an army sufficiently substantial to oppose Alfonso X. All of this is most interesting. Whether or not Henry’s claims as to Castilian intentions were
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exaggerated (and the suggestion that Alfonso dreamed of an invasion of England and Ireland anticipates the plans of Philip II’s Armada by an improbable three hundred years), the scramble for consent to taxation was to involve Richard of Cornwall in significant constitutional innovations, not least through the summoning of representatives of the county communities to debate the affair: in effect, the earliest example of a ‘parliament’ being summoned in England in the absence of England’s king. Amongst much scepticism, Richard and Eleanor attempted to raise the funds Henry III demanded.\textsuperscript{742}

The surviving Castilian documentary evidence does not indicate that Alfonso X was raising an army to attack Gascony or England. Björn Weiler has suggested, that perhaps Henry’s cry for help was a way of obtaining resources to fight the Gascon rebels, as his treasure was theoretically earmarked for a crusade and therefore inaccessible for the king’s immediate needs in southern France.\textsuperscript{743} Meanwhile, sceptics at the English court were alarmed by the signs that Henry III was trying to exact further subsidies. Before the parliament was over, Simon de Montfort, who had recently returned from Gascony, informed those in attendance that, for as long as he had been there, the king of Castile had made no attempts to claim the duchy. Hearing this, several of the magnates in attendance withdrew in sadness and indignation.\textsuperscript{744} Again this suggests that Alfonso X was not preparing an invasion of Gascony, but
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\textsuperscript{744} ‘Non tamen venire omitterent ad succursum domini sui regis corporaliter, si de hostile adventu regis Hispaniae, hoc comminantis plenius certificarentur. Mirabanturque, ut divebant, quod idem rex Castellae nunquam tempore, quo comes Legrecestriae Simon Wasconiae praefuit et rebelles multos edomuit, Wasconiae vendicavit ... Et sic cum summa indignatione tristes admodum proceres recesserunt’: \textit{CM}, v, 440.
rather had employed other strategies to pressure Henry III into a treaty, possibly promoting his crusade to North Africa. 745

In dealing with the Iberian monarchy, Henry III was forced into making suitable agreements with the Gascon nobility. On 14 February 1254, he set aside an appanage for Edward, which included Gascony, Oléron and Ireland (except Dublin and Limerick), together with Bristol and Chester. However, Edward was to receive no practical or independent authority within these lands, as they were defined as inalienable parts of the English crown demesne (‘imperpetuum remaneant dominio coronae Angliae’), a proviso that in the longer term was to have momentous consequences for relations between Henry III and his son, and hence for the wider development of political resistance to the King. 746 The grant was witnessed by the bishop of Hereford and John Mansel, who would soon meet with the Castilian representatives in order to reach an agreement. The timing of this grant suggests that Henry was endowing his son in order to make him a better candidate for betrothal to Eleanor. In all of this, Henry was unconsciously being drawn into a settlement with momentous, but in 1254 entirely unpredictable, long-term consequences. Looming on the horizon here was not only the relationship between Henry and Edward, but also that between Henry and his younger son, Edmund. It was in order to supply Edmund with a suitable match for Edward’s new estate that Henry was to be drawn, inexorably, into the negotiations over Sicily. Within only four years, the consequences of both his Gascon and Sicilian undertakings were to come close to costing the King of England his throne.

As this suggests, Henry III’s foreign agenda was not limited to the Iberian Peninsula and France. It was at precisely this time that the king first entered into those negotiations that in the longer term were to result in a papal grant of the throne of Sicily on behalf of his younger son Edmund (1245-96). The Regno was offered to Henry by Pope Innocent IV’s envoys, notably the papal legate Alberto da Parma then operating in Gascony, saving the liberties and immunities of the Church (‘salvis libertatibus et immunitatibus ecclesiarum praedictorum regni’) and was granted on condition that King Henry would send an army to the kingdom to free it from Staufen control. Above all, Henry accepted liability to discharge the debts (calculated in due course at the entirely absurd sum of 135,000 marks) that the popes had contracted in their defence of Sicily since the death, in 1250, of the emperor Frederick II. Once again, these arrangements were presided over by none other than the bishop of Hereford, Peter Aigueblanche, and John Mansel. Henry’s widely unpopular acceptance of Sicily would lead, in the longer term, to insuperable problems with the already over-taxe
d English Church and nobility. In a matter of only a few months since his arrival in Gascony, Henry had committed himself to crusade in the Holy Land, to a campaign of conquest in Sicily, and in due course to yet another campaign, as a crusader vowed to fight in North Africa.

García (‘Garci’) Martinez
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García Martínez is a rather obscure figure. Due to the lack of surviving documentary evidence for the early years of the reign of Alfonso X it is very difficult to explore Garcia’s role in government. The thinness of archival resources, in general, renders the study of Alfonso’s household a difficult task: almost impossibly so when compared to the extraordinarily rich archives for the household of Henry III. It is not surprising that García goes unmentioned by the Crónica de Alfonso X, which was written in the reign of Alfonso XI (1312-1350) and lacks precision, particularly during the early years of Alfonso X’s reign. The Crónica does not even mention Alfonso’s claim to Gascony, perhaps as a result of the shifting diplomatic agenda of the Castilian crown: by the reign of Alfonso XI, dreams of Castilian rule north of the Pyrenees were long vanished. Even so, the fact that García Martínez de goes unmentioned in other literary and archival sources suggests that his position was relatively humble. Antonio Ballesteros Beretta has speculated that García was the tutor of Eleanor of Castile, and that he may have been married to a niece of the bishop of Segovia. It is also likely that he was later a notary in Alfonso’s chancery.

During the reign of Alfonso X, there were three notaries (‘notarios’) assigned to the kingdom, one for each of the three provinces: León, Castile and Andalucía. García Martínez of Toledo was notary (‘notarius’) of Castile between April 1257 and September 1258. What office he held in 1254, however is unknown. During May
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749 Because there was no fixed seat of government and the Castilian court was itinerant, the sparse surviving documentary evidence for the early years of Alfonso’s reign is scattered across several archives, unlike in England. Cf. E.S. Procter, ‘Materials for the Reign of Alfonso X of Castile, 1252-84’, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 14 (1931), 40-2.
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752 A. Ballesteros Beretta, Alfonso X el Sabio (Barcelona: 1984), 102.
754 González Jiménez, ed., Diplomatario, nos. 192, 193, 199, 202, 203, 207, 211, 212, 213, 214; J. Torres Fontes, ed., Documentos de Alfonso X el Sabio (Murcia: 2008), no. 68. He last appears as notary in a ‘privilegio rodado’ dated 16 September 1258, in Segovia: González Jiménez, ed., Diplomatario, no. 214. According to Evelyn Procter he was notary from 1256 to 1259, but Procter fails
1254, he was notary of neither Castile nor León, as these offices were held by Maestre Ferrando and Martín Ferrandez respectively.\textsuperscript{755} Even so, there is reason to suppose that his status, as Castilian ambassador to England in 1254, was roughly equivalent to that of Peter de Vinea, notary of the emperor Frederick II and principal negotiator of the marriage between Frederick II and Henry III’s sister, contracted in 1236.

After the Anglo-Castilian treaty of 1254, García Martínez continued as envoy to Henry III. In the aftermath of the treaty, García’s son, John, received a promise of an ecclesiastical benefice (‘in beneficio ecclesiastico’) worth 200 marks a year.\textsuperscript{756} In July 1254, García himself was promised 100 marks per annum, until Henry III could provide him with the same value in either lands or escheats.\textsuperscript{757} A month later, the king awarded him, together with bishop Fernández of Morocco, 80 marks a year at the Exchequer of Easter to maintain him in royal service.\textsuperscript{758}

In 1255, García was expected to arrive at Dover with Sancho, bishop elect of Toledo and chancellor\textsuperscript{759} of Alfonso X.\textsuperscript{760} They could have arrived to England via Dover in September,\textsuperscript{761} and they were subsequently housed in the New Temple in London.\textsuperscript{762}

In anticipation of their visit, the Mayor and sheriff of London were ordered to escort them to their lodgings and to make public proclamation of their presence throughout

---
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\textsuperscript{759} B. Palacios Martín, Colección diplomática medieval de la Orden de Alcántara (1157?-1494). De los orígenes a 1254. (Madrid: 2000), no. 264.
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the city.\textsuperscript{763} In November, Martínez was awarded 200 marks for services rendered since October 1253.\textsuperscript{764} García remained in England until at least January 1256.\textsuperscript{765} During this time, Henry III issued a number of exemptions, grants and pardons at García’s request.\textsuperscript{766} Before he returned home to Castile, Martínez was granted a further £8, 5 s. and 4 d. in presents (‘exennis’) by the king.\textsuperscript{767} García was licenced to take receipt of various prisoners previously held in the castle of Corfe (John de Maurevell, Gerald del Mayne, Peter Burler and William Amaneu) in order to fulfil the peace signed with Alfonso X.\textsuperscript{768} Together with Alfonso X’s brother, Sancho bishop-elect of Toledo, he was sent to England to pressure Henry III into the joint crusade to North Africa and the fulfilment of the other clauses of the treaty. Nonetheless, his relations with the prisoners at Corfe, apparently themselves Gascons previously disgraced for their disloyalty to Henry III in Gascony, suggests a continuing engagement between Alfonso X and the disaffected nobility of Plantagenet Gascony.

García Martínez was a cleric in the service of the crown, as was Don Suero, bishop of Zamora, who was notary of the king, in León, roughly at the same time as García.\textsuperscript{769} Since the time of Fernando III, it had become customary for the king to interfere in episcopal elections, allowing his favourites to take the most important sees in Castile. According to Evelyn Procter, ‘the chancery was the surest avenue to ecclesiastical preferment’.\textsuperscript{770} Not surprisingly, the men appointed to such offices also accompanied the king as his chancellors. As Peter Linehan has pointed out, these officials were rarely promoted to their offices in order to solve the problems of the Church. Rather,
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it was loyalty to the King that earned them their fees.\textsuperscript{771} If he was indeed a crown clerk, it is possible that he can be identified with a namesake appointed dean and subsequently as bishop-elect of the see of Cartagena (‘deán y electo de Cartagena’) and as ‘partidor real’, offices he might have held since at least June 1266.\textsuperscript{772} As ‘partidor real’, García, and others, were in charge of the distributions of the lands conquered by Fernando III, most notably in Seville.

**John Mansel**

Unlike their Castilian counterparts, bishop Lope Fernández and García Martínez, who have received little attention from historians, the English ambassadors have enjoyed rather more consideration. John Mansel was one of Henry III’s most faithful English diplomats and perhaps the one with most experience of Gascon and Iberian affairs. By 1241, he was serving as a member of the king’s inner council by 1241, and in the following year was appointed keeper of the seal and *de facto* resident English ambassador Gascony.\textsuperscript{773} On 15 September 1242, while on duty in Gascony, he reimbursed 20 marks to the abbot of Garde-Dieu (Mirabel, Dép. Tarn-et-Garonne) who had been sent as Henry III’s messenger to the kings of Castile, Aragón, and Portugal.\textsuperscript{774} The following month, he was further ordered to pay 10 marks to an envoy of Jaime I of Aragón.\textsuperscript{775} He spent the winter of 1243 in Gascony with Henry III, as the kings sought to appease the rebel countess of Béarn and her son, Gaston. John was said to have participated in the siege of the monastery of Vérines in

\textsuperscript{772} Torres Fontes, ed., *Documentos*, no. 120.
\textsuperscript{774} CLR 1240-5, 156.
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Bordeaux, which had been taken by the rebel countess. He fought bravely (‘in armis strenuus et animo imperterritus’) and successfully. However, he injured his leg in the fight. After he recovered from his injury, Henry III made him a special counsellor. A friend of Matthew Paris, the chronicler made every attempt to highlight Mansel’s contributions. Soon after, in 1245, his nephew and namesake, known as Master John Mansel, also entered royal service, a name which has misguided some historians. Meanwhile, Mansel’s prestige grew when he was reappointed keeper of the Great Seal, from November 1246 to August 1247 and again from August 1248 to September 1249. He continued to climb the royal administrative ladder, and by 1244 had been promoted chancellor of St. Paul’s church in London. Three years later, in 1247, the archbishop of York installed him to the provostship of Beverley at the king’s presentation.

It was possible around this time that he was sent, together with the abbot of Westminster, another trusted counsellor, to arrange a marriage between Henry III’s son, Edward, and the daughter of the duke of Brabant. In 1252, in the wake of the Gascon revolt that had attracted the attention of Alfonso X, as the king’s faithful counsellor, John Mansel reversed Simon de Montfort’s policy towards the Gascon lords.

---
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may have played an important role in their refusal to make peace with Henry III.
Another important factor may have been trade, in particular that in wine, which had recently found new markets in Castile.\textsuperscript{784} As a trusted advisor to Henry III, and possessing in-depth knowledge of Gascon-Iberian politics, John Mansel played a key role in bringing about the treaty between Henry III and Alfonso X in 1254.

**Peter of Aigueblanche, bishop of Hereford**

Peter of Aigueblanche’s role in the treaty is perhaps not as evident as that of John Mansel. Like Mansel, he was a trusted advisor to Henry III. However, whereas Mansel was English, Aigueblanche was a Savoyard, promoted in England as a consequence of Henry III’s marriage to Eleanor of Provence in January 1236. This brought a whole series of ‘aliens’ to England, including the Savoyards Boniface, Peter and William of Savoy who were the queen’s maternal uncles. As a result of the presence of these principals in England, knights and clerks from Burgundy and Flanders followed, many of whom received lands. Amongst the most prominent foreigners to settle were Boniface (archbishop of Canterbury 1244-29),\textsuperscript{785} William (1237-39) and Peter (1241-68) of Savoy,\textsuperscript{786} Peter of Aigueblanche bishop of Hereford (1240-68)\textsuperscript{787}, Peter de Geneva (1244-49) and Geoffrey de Genneville (1252-1314).\textsuperscript{788}

\textsuperscript{784} Ibid., 485
\textsuperscript{787} Died 1268.
Peter of Aigueblanche (‘Aquablanca’), who was in England by 1240, had been, according to Matthew Paris, a clerk under William of Savoy, bishop-elect of Valence. By 24 August 1240, almost immediately after his arrival to England, Peter had been elected to the bishopric of Hereford. By 23 December he was consecrated bishop, to the dismay of Matthew Paris, who stoutly opposed Henry’s policy of granting offices to foreigners. As an alien close to the king, in 1263, Aigueblanche was taken prisoner by the Montfortian rebels who stormed the cathedral of Hereford.

The bishop of Hereford’s first appearance in the diplomatic affairs of Henry III came in 1242, when he and Peter of Savoy, earl of Richmond, travelled to Poitou to encourage the supporters of the English king in his campaign against Louis IX of France. Afterwards, Peter of Savoy returned to England, while Peter of Aigueblanche travelled to Provence to petition, on behalf of Richard of Cornwall, for the marriage of Sanchia, the count of Provence’s daughter and the sister of the queens both of England and of France. Unlike John Mansel, Peter of Aigueblanche did not have extensive experience of Gascon-Iberian politics, although he was issued with credences in 1242, for a meeting with Theobald of Navarre. For Henry III, having a Savoyard in his service proved fruitful, not least because both the German emperor and the Pope, Innocent IV, were at this time equally concerned to purchase the
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waveriing loyalty of the counts of Savoy. With its control of the Alpine passes between north and south, Savoy commanded unprecedented significance and prestige during this time of papal-imperial hostilities. In 1245-6, at the time of Pope Innocent’s Council of Lyons, Peter of Aigueblanche travelled from Burgundy to Savoy where he negotiated a treaty between the ruling count and king Henry III. Count Amadeus agreed to do homage for the castle of Avigliana (in the Susa Valley, close to the border between modern-day France and Italy) and the town of St-Maurice-sur-Isère. Aigueblanche remained in Henry III’s diplomatic service thereafter and, in 1250, was sent with Peter Chaceporc to the court of Louis IX to extend the truce in Gascony and to make sure that the long abandoned marriage between Henry III and Joanna of Ponthieu had been properly annulled in canon law. In the meantime, as Julia Barrow has shown, Peter was transforming himself into a significant lord in Savoy, primarily through grants of land made by Amadeus IV of Savoy. He now drew a considerable income from Savoy, where he may have spent most of the year 1251.

He came late to Gascon affairs and to the conflict between Alfonso X and Henry III, to which he was drawn in October 1253 when Henry travelled to Gascony to confront the invasion scare. According to the Patent Rolls, the embassy to Alfonso, which Peter was said to have undertaken ‘of his own free will’, had put the bishop ‘to great expense …(he) having received nothing from the king, save his own stipend of £300’ for which he was duly acquitted.

796 The House of Savoy had members on both sides of the Imperial-Papal controversy. In due course, they were able to benefit from this, rather than suffer the consequences. Cf. E.L. Cox, The Eagles of Savoy. The House of Savoy in Thirteenth-Century Europe (Princeton: 1974), 189-245.
797 Barrow, ed., EEA Hereford 1234-75, pp.xlv-xlvi.
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The Treaty

On 31 March 1254, the royal envoys (‘solempnes nuncii’) of Alfonso X (Lope Fernández de Ain, bishop of Morocco, García Martínez) and the representatives of Henry III (Peter bishop of Hereford, and John Mansel) finally reached terms. Alfonso X and Henry III hereby entered into a treaty of perpetual friendship (‘inivimus foedus perpetuae amicitiae’) against all men save the Holy See (‘contra omnes homines de mundo imperpetuum … salva fide eccesiae Romanae’). This was duly ratified and sealed by Alfonso X and Henry III, each at their own respective courts, without any meeting in person between the two principals.

Alfonso X and his heirs abandoned any future right to the parts of Gascony which, so it was claimed, had been granted to the crown of Castile through the marriage of Eleanor, Henry II’s daughter, with Alfonso VIII. The Spanish king promised either to hand over to Henry III or himself to destroy (‘delere’) any charters from Henry II, Eleanor of Aquitaine or others that granted him rights in those lands, a clause that does nothing to allay the suspicion that no such letters existed:

‘Dimittimus etiam et quitamus … domino Henrico illustri regi Anglie et suis heredibus, sicut melius et sanius intelligi potest, quicquid juris vel quasi habet ver habere debet dominus rex Castelle et Legionis et heredes sui in tota Vasconia vel in parte in terris, possessionibus, hominibus, juribus vel quasi, dominiis vel quasi, actionibus et rebus aliis, ratione donationis quam fecit vel fecisse dicitur dominus Henricus quondam rex Anglie et Aleonore uxor sua Aleonore filie sue et bone memorie domino Alfonso regi Castelle … Et omnes cartas quas idem dominus rex Castelle et Legionis habet super hoc a predictis vel aliquo eorum promittimus bona fide pro predicto domino nostro rege Castelle et Legionis et heredibus suis dicto regi

802 DD, no. 270; Foedera, I.i.297-301.
803 Ratification by Alfonso X (22 April) DD, 271; Foedera, I.i.300; Ratification by Henry III, Ibid., 298.
Anglie et heredibus suis restituere vel delere et, si invente fuerint ex hac hora, ulterius concedimus quod sint vacue et casse'. 804

Henry III’s son, Edward [I], and his heirs were to be knighted by Alfonso X on the feast of St Mary (15 August) at Burgos.

‘Promittimus etiam et concedimus, pro predicto domino nostro Rege, quod dominus Edwardus, promogenitus et haeres suus, veniat apud Burdegal’ [sic.] suscepturus cingulum militiae a prefato Rege Castelle’.805

To ensure that this came to pass, the Spanish king promised to issue the appropriate letters of safe conduct. The Lord Edward was also to marry, in less than a year’s time (‘infra annum’), any of Alfonso X’s sisters, as and whom Alfonso might select (‘cui voluerit’).806 In the event, the choice was to fall upon Eleanor, the king’s half-sister (daughter of Fernando III by Joan of Ponthieu).

Although the treaty is mainly remembered for the marriage alliance between Edward and Eleanor, its final clauses may have been those that Alfonso was keenest to secure. Subject to the Pope’s agreement, the two kings undertook to lead a joint crusade into Morocco or Africa (‘cum exercitu crucesignatorum suorum ad partes Affricanas in societate nostra accesserit’).807 Any lands conquered were to be divided equally between the two kings (‘quicquid lucrati fuerint in dictis partibus, inter eos equaliter dividatur’).808 Henry III promised Alfonso X, that because he was himself a crusader (‘quia idem Rex est cruce signatus’), and therefore reserved for warfare against the infidel, he would send the Lord Edward to assist (‘in auxilium’) Alfonso X should

804 Archivo General de Simancas, PTR, LEG, 52, no. 1 [in http://pares.es]; DD, no. 270, 271; Foedera, I.i.298, 300.
805 Foedera, I.i.298.
806 Ibid.
807 DD, no. 274; Foedera, I.i.298, 301.
808 Foedera, I.i.298.
hostilities break out between Castile and Navarre. If the Lord Edward himself was unable to assist Alfonso, then he was to send the seneschal of Gascony to the Castilian’s king’s aid. Castile, in turn, would help to recover for England any Gascon castles held unlawfully by the kings of Navarrese (‘quas reges Navarre per violenciam occupaverunt et sibi et suis progenitoribus abstulerunt’).

Finally, Henry III assured the Spanish king that Gaston, vicomte of Béarn, and other Gascon nobles, who were Gaston’s vassals at the time the vicomte was knighted and became a vassal of Alfonso (‘a tempore quo idem Gasto recepit militiam a prefato rege Castelle et Legionis et fuit eius vassallus’), would have their possessions restored (‘restituat’). Similarly, any Gascon noble in occupation of lands that belonged rightfully to the Lord Edward was required to make appropriate restitution. On 22 April 1254, Alfonso X informed Gaston de Béarn of the new agreement made with the English king and asked him to return, without delay, any possessions of the English crown (‘sine difficultatis obstaculo postposita restituatis’). Gaston, nonetheless, was to remain a Castilian vassal until July 1276, when the issue of the Castilian succession became a matter of dispute between France and Castile.

The Aftermath of the Peace Treaty

A Royal Marriage

Although at the time of the treaty, Alfonso’s principal ambition may have been to secure English participation in a joint crusade against North Africa, it was the Anglo-
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Castilian marriage, and Edward’s knighting, that were to prove the treaty’s principal legacies. On 18 July 1254, Henry III promised the ‘Wise King’ that Edward would marry Eleanor, Alfonso X’s sister, within five weeks of Michaelmas (29 September).\textsuperscript{814} Five days later, Edward consented (‘consentimus’) \textit{per verba de presenti} to the marriage with Eleanor.\textsuperscript{815} A month later, in August 1254, Henry III formally approved the alliance, empowering John Mansel to finalize arrangements.\textsuperscript{816} Meanwhile, even before his formal betrothal, on 15 July 1254 at Saint-Macaire in Gascony, Edward, with Henry III’s consent, assigned Eleanor a dower (‘in dotem’). She was to receive the castle and town of Tickhill in Yorkshire, Stamford and Grantham in Lincolnshire (both of them traditional dower lands of earlier English queens), the castle and town of the Peek in Derbyshire and land to the equivalent of £1000 a year with an increment of 500 marks worth of land (‘augebimus quingentis marcatis terre per annum’) should she be queen at the time of her widowhood. As might be expected, Peter of Aigueblanche witnessed the charter together with Guy and Geoffrey de Lusignan.\textsuperscript{817} If the assigned dower lands should fail to satisfy Eleanor, Henry III promised a further £1000 of land specifying that if either he or Edward were to die before the completion of these arrangements, their heirs were bound to make good the grant.\textsuperscript{818} Alfonso X seems to have been concerned by the grants that King Henry had made to the Lord Edward, because the English monarch, then at Bordeaux, wrote to Castile assuring Alfonso that as soon as the great seal arrived from England his grants and quitclaims would be properly sealed.\textsuperscript{819} As a result of the royal marriage, Alfonso became Edward’s ‘supreme counsellor’ (‘primus
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et supremus consiliarius’) in respect to all matters relating to Gascony and its nobles.820

By late May, Edward and his mother, Eleanor of Provence, had set sail from Portsmouth for Bordeaux. There, or thereabouts, Edward remained until the end of September when he left for Spain. He arrived at Burgos in mid October, having passed through Bayonne.821 On 1 November, All Saints’ Day and the occasion of Edward’s wedding to Eleanor, Alfonso X knighted him (‘cingulo accinximus militari’).822 It was an important occasion for the Castilian king, who proudly dated, several of the charters issued in the year 1254-5 (particularly his more solemn privilegios rodados), to the year ‘we knighted Edward, son of Henry of England’.823

‘anno que don Odoart, fijo primero e heredero del rey don Henric de Anglaterra, recibió caualleria en Burgos’.

‘anno videlicet eo quod inclitus Odoardus, illustris regis Anglie filius primogenitus et heres, per manum nostram extitit apud Burgis militari cingulo insignitus’. 824

The significance and prestige of Edward’s knighting reverberated in a number of later chronicles.825 The Cronica of Jofré de Loaisa (Loaysa), written in the reign of Sancho IV as a continuation of Jiménez de Rada’s Rerum in Hispania gestarum Chronicon, which ended in 1247, underscores this historic moment:
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822 Foedera, I.1.310.
823 Cf. Procter, Alfonso X of Castile, 72.
825 The ‘Chronicle of Alfonso X’, written in the reign of Alfonso XI (1312-1350) commented on the knighting of Edward. Mistakenly, J. O’Callaghan notes that Alfonso would later knight the future Edward II. This is impossible, as the younger Edward was born on 25 April 1284, a few days after Alfonso’s death (4 April 1284) and was knighted in England, on 22 May 1306. Chronicle of Alfonso X, (2002), Ch. 18, 68; O’Callaghan, The Learned King, 65.
Alfonso X appointed Loaisa’s father and namesake has often been confused with master Geoffre (Joffre) de Everly, ambassador to King Edward I on 1 April 1279. However, this is not to say that he was not acquainted, at least to some degree, with Anglo-Castilian diplomacy. In similar vein, the later fourteenth-century *Crónica de los reyes de España desde don Pelayo hasta don Fernando IV* lists the noble men whom Alfonso X knighted (‘omes e de alta sangre onra de caualleria, onrrando así a la su casa, e fízolos caualleros’). The first and second places on this list are occupied by the king’s two eldest sons, Sancho and Fernando (de la Cerda). Immediately thereafter, in third place we find Edward, son of Henry III of England (‘El terçero fue el rrey Adoarte de Inglaterra, que fue armado del dicho rrey en la çibdat de Burgos’). Edward is here listed ahead of Dinis, king of Portugal (k. 1279-1325).

In the Castilian tradition, conferring knighthood upon another person was in itself a sign of power, meaning that the person receiving the honour became a subordinate to the person conferring it. For this reason, a king could only receive knighthood at his own hand by a ritual in which he would take the sword from the altar where it had

828 Died in 24/5 July 1275, he was Alfonso’s eldest son but ranked after the infante Sancho who after a bitter dispute with the king succeeded to the throne.
been placed upon his predecessor’s death. Edward’s knighting was thus a highly politicized statement. Alfonso had ceded his rights over Gascony to Henry III, who had in turn granted them to Edward. But through the knighting ceremony, Edward accepted a moral subjection to the Castilian king. No wonder that Alfonso’s charters, and later Spanish chroniclers, made so much of the event.

The formal marriage ceremony between Edward and Eleanor of Castile took place on 1 November 1254, at the monastery of Santa Maria la Real de Las Huelgas, in Burgos, founded by Alfonso VIII in 1187: an institution as significant in Castilian history as Fontevraud had been in the history of the Plantagenet kings, both as favoured royal Eigenkloster and as burial place of successive members of the ruling dynasty. On the same day, Alfonso solemnly ceded to Edward all rights he had allegedly inherited in Gascony through the marriage of Eleanor and Alfonso VIII:

\[
\text{Damus, dimittimus, cedimus seu quitamus pro nobis et heredibus nostris eidem}
\]
\[
\text{Eduardo et heredibus et successoribus suis libere et absolute, omni exceptione remota,}
\]
\[
\text{quicquid iuris habemus vel quasi habemus vel habere debemus in tota Vasconia.}
\]

Shortly after the marriage, in mid-November, Edward and Eleanor departed from the Castilian court, travelling to Bayonne via Vitoria.
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His knighting of Edward, and the royal marriage of his sister Eleanor, greatly enhanced Alfonso’s prestige and standing, both in Castile and more importantly, amongst the other ruling houses of Europe. However, the remaining points of the treaty including the North African crusade proved harder, if not impossible, to implement.

The African Crusade

The joint crusade to North Africa was destined never to take place. Almost immediately after the signing of the Anglo-Castilian treaty, bishop Lope was sent to Henry III to secure his goodwill. In August 1254, Lope was at the English court where he was granted an annual pension of 80 marks by Henry III, payable at the Exchequer of Easter to keep him in Henry’s service. A further pension of 20 marks was assigned to the archdeacon of Morocco, until the King could provide for both men more amply. Whether either ever collected the money is unknown.834 On 18 September 1254, Henry III asked Pope Innocent IV to commute his crusaders vow to the Holy Land, in order that he could join Alfonso X in a crusade to Africa.835 The English king must have been aware that Innocent IV was unlikely to grant this request, as he had already commuted his vow from the Holy Land to Sicily in May 1254.836 In November, the pope urged Henry to hasten to Sicily, as his presence there could no longer be delayed (‘expectare non posset’).837 This came only a few weeks before the Pope’s own death. His successor, Pope Alexander IV (1254-1261), would

834 CPR 1247-58, 319.
835 Foedera, i.i.308.
836 Ibid., 304.
837 Ibid., 312.
not be so patient with Henry. In March 1255, he formally rejected Henry III’s request to commute his crusader vows from Jerusalem to Africa.\textsuperscript{838}

Henry’s prior commitments and prevarication did not deter Alfonso X in his efforts to promote the African crusade. In October 1255, an embassy headed by García Pérez, archdeacon of Morocco, arrived at Marseille to negotiate arrangements, presumably for a fleet, before travelling north to Germany, presumably to treat with Alfonso’s German kin.\textsuperscript{839} Marseille, by this time under the control of Charles of Anjou, the brother of the French King Louis IX, was an important commercial ally of both Aragón and Castile, and a centre of trade in oriental products that its ships brought back from the Levant. Amongst these were sugar, dyes, spices, mastic and myrrh. From Spain, the Marseillaise bought saffron and leather from Cordova, which were re-distributed throughout French fairs and through the Mediterranean as far east as Acre. Marseille also traded with North Africa, from which it bought hides and wax. Backing Alfonso’s crusade would commercially benefit the city.\textsuperscript{840} In September 1256, a formal agreement was reached by which Marseille was given quittance from toll throughout Castile in exchange for naval assistance for Alfonso’s crusade.\textsuperscript{841}

While in Marseille, the archdeacon must have received news of the latest developments in the Holy Roman Empire, where the imperial throne was now vacant. This would explain his decision to travel on to Germany. It was also gravely to complicate the matter of the African crusade. In Germany, Garcia was to represent

\textsuperscript{838} Ibid., 316.
\textsuperscript{839} C.C. Bayley, The Formation of the German College of Electors in the Mid-Thirteenth Century (Toronto: 1949), 73-4.
Alfonso X in all affairs concerning his bid for the imperial crown. In the meantime, at Christmas 1256, during the Parliament held at Westminster, the English court received news of the vacant imperial throne. Pressure now mounted on Richard of Cornwall, Henry III’s younger brother, to claim the title not only for his own glory but in order to shore up Henry’s failing bid for the throne of Sicily.

Even so, Alfonso X and his Moroccan envoys remained determined to organize a crusade into North Africa and continued to press the English king for his support. On 18 September 1254, at Castilian insistence, Henry III had repeated his request to Innocent to commute his crusader’s vow from the Holy Land to Africa, where he expected to join Alfonso. As we have seen, the outcome here was merely a papal insistence that Henry make good his promises to conquer Sicily. Pope Alexander IV (1254-1261) was even more insistent. At the same time that the Pope was pressing Henry to conquer Sicily, Alfonso X was urging him to make peace with Louis IX, in order to concentrate on the African campaign. Lope Fernández continued to promote the African crusade and was granted papal permission to send a representative to Africa so that he himself could continue his work of recruitment and propaganda in Castile. On 13 May 1255, Alexander IV granted Lope Fernández and other appropriate men (‘viros idoneos’) permission to preach the crusade to Africa, both in Spain (‘Hispania’) and in Gascony, with authority to grant indulgences
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to those who participated.\textsuperscript{848} Once again, in October, probably at Alfonso X’s insistence, Henry III sent William de Frennay and Lope Fernández to the Pope to request the commutation of his crusader vow from Jerusalem to Africa. In reply, the envoys were told that the English king had to tend first to his Sicilian commitments.\textsuperscript{849}

Lope Fernández’s efforts to promote the African crusade bore at least some fruit, if only in focusing papal attention upon the bishop. On 18 March 1255, Pope Alexander IV appointed Lope as legate for the whole of Africa,\textsuperscript{850} and later that year, granted him the power to absolve those who had plundered Alfonso X’s lands (‘injectores de terra’), so long as they joined the Castilian crusade to Africa.\textsuperscript{851} Lope continued to play an active role in Castilian politics, aiding Alfonso in the establishment of bishoprics in Cartagena, Silves and Badajoz,\textsuperscript{852} and later attending a council in Compostela.\textsuperscript{853} Meanwhile, Alexander IV granted Lope ample faculties to commute crusader vows from the Holy Land to Morocco.\textsuperscript{854} His work in the newly conquered lands of Castile and the intended crusade into northern Africa ensured that Lope
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\textsuperscript{848} See here the modern Latin calendar of a more extensive papal privilege: ‘Lupo, episcopo Marrochitano, scribit regem Castellae ac Legionis intendere cum bellatorum multitudine contra Sarracenos de Africa inimicos crucis Christi transfretare, eique concedit facultatem praedicandi in Hispaniam et Vasconia verbum crucis et largiendi eam in subsidium ipsius regis contra dictos Sarracenos recipere volentibus illum suorum peccatorum veniam, quae suum sanctae Terrae sanctae in generali concilio indulta sit’, in C.G.M.B. La Roncière et al., \textit{Les registres d’Alexandre IV} (Paris: 1902), no. 483; Rodriguez de Lama, \textit{Documentación Alejandro IV}, no. 62; Sbaralea, \textit{Bullarium Franciscanum}, ii, no. 57.

\textsuperscript{849} \textit{Foedera}, i.331.

\textsuperscript{850} La Roncière et al., \textit{Les registres d’Alexandre IV}, no. 274.

\textsuperscript{851} Ibid., no. 862

\textsuperscript{852} On 18 October 1255, Pope Alexander IV granted both king and bishop permission for this. Ibid., no. 873; Rodríguez de Lama, \textit{Documentación Alejandro IV}, no. 119.

\textsuperscript{853} La Roncière et al., \textit{Les registres d’Alexandre IV}, no. 902.

\textsuperscript{854} Rodríguez de Lama, \textit{Documentación Alejandro IV}, no. 117; Sbaralea, \textit{Bullarium Franciscanum}, ii, 116.
received papal exemption from any summons to the papal court for five years. Nonetheless, the bishop was never to set foot in his bishopric.

On 3 May 1255, Pope Alexander IV reiterated his predecessor’s commutation of the English king’s crusader vows from the Holy Land to Sicily, urging Henry to proceed with a Sicilian campaign. Money raised in England for the crusade to the Holy Land could now be used for a Sicilian expedition. Peter of Aigueblanche, who was aware of Henry III’s commitment to the North African campaign, served as Henry’s envoy to the pope. After meeting with Alexander in Naples he embarked on a fundraising campaign to raise funds for the Sicilian expedition. Armed with ‘void schedules (blank sealed pieces of parchment)’ he obtained funds from Italian merchants. This, however, was done in the most controversial fashion. Rather than pledge his own, or the King’s future income, Aigueblanche raised large sums of money in exchange for charters promising repayment by the English monasteries. Within a matter of only a few weeks, monastic communities such as Durham or St Albans, without themselves having any say in the matter, found themselves committed to the repayment of loans totalling several thousand pounds. None of this money passed into monastic hands. Instead, it seems to have passed more or less directly to the Pope, taken in part payment of the absurdly optimistic sum of 135,000 marks to which Aigueblanche had committed Henry III for the redemption of the sums already spent, before 1254, in the papal campaign against the heirs of Frederick

855 27 November 1255: Rodríguez de Lama, Documentación Alejandro IV, 129; 43.
856 Foedera, I.ii:319-20, 322.
857 Ibid., 322.
II. Not surprisingly, the English chroniclers reacted against these arrangements with horror and indignation.\textsuperscript{859}

Alfonso X was unaware that the English king would indefinitely postpone his plans for a joint crusade to Africa. Just as the pope was pressing for an English expedition to Sicily, so the Castilian simultaneously urged Henry III to make peace with Louis IX, in order he could concentrate on the African campaign.\textsuperscript{860} In July 1255, the French and English monarchs extended their truce for a further five years.\textsuperscript{861} Alfonso was eager to start for Africa. Henry III, meanwhile was becoming embroiled in financial arrangements that made it far more imperative to secure the Sicilian throne for Edmund. Only if Sicily were conquered could the vast sums borrowed in Italy and pledged from England be justified. In these circumstances, the African project discussed in 1254 came to appear ever more of an irrelevance. Alfonso X, however, continued to trust in Henry’s good will, so that the papal licence for Lope Fernández’s preaching of the African crusade was solicited not only for Castile but for those parts of Gascony in which Henry III and Edward had interests.\textsuperscript{862}

As Henry III informed his adviser, Peter of Savoy, Alfonso was eager to recruit English help for his African crusade and knew that a peace between France and England would aid his cause.\textsuperscript{863} Late in 1255, John Mansel was sent instructions with regard to a projected meeting with Alfonso. On the issues pending in Gascony, Henry III assured the Castilian that he had restored whatever lands and possessions in Gascony to those Gascon nobles who were entitled to receive them. The marriage

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{859} For these arrangements in general, see W.E. Lunt, \textit{Financial Relations of the Papacy with England to 1327} (Cambridge, Mass.: 1939), 263-90.
\item \textsuperscript{860} Close Rolls 1254-6, 195-6.
\item \textsuperscript{861} \textit{Foedera}. 1.i.324.
\item \textsuperscript{862} La Roncière et al., \textit{Les registres d’Alexandre IV}, no. 483.
\item \textsuperscript{863} Close Rolls 1254-6, 195 (10 May 1255), and cf. Powicke, \textit{Henry III}, i, 241-2.
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arrangements between Manuel, Alfonso X’s half-brother, and one of Henry’s daughters had stalled. Here Henry blamed the Spanish failure to confirm what lands the Castilian king was to confer upon Manuel. As for the joint crusade, Henry III claimed merely that he had sent William de Frennay and Lope, bishop of Morocco, to the Pope to ask to commute Henry’s vow from Jerusalem to Africa, a claim that seems to take us back to 1254, before the death of Innocent IV. The envoys had been told that the English king had to tend first to his Sicilian affairs. On a brighter note, the king informed Mansel, the truce with France had been successfully extended.\textsuperscript{864} Henry’s priority was, no doubt, the Sicilian campaign. Both John Mansel and Peter of Aigueblanche would have been aware of this, having been present when the king, without proper council from his barons, had declared his insistence on mounting a Sicilian campaign.\textsuperscript{865}

Alfonso X continued to press Henry III to fulfil his promise to join him in an African crusade. To his end, he recruited a younger and, perhaps, more energetic diplomatic envoy, his brother Sancho, bishop elect of Toledo, who, in 1256, was sent to Henry’s court together with the notary García Martínez. Amongst other issues, the envoys pressed the question of Africa.\textsuperscript{866} In response, Henry III sent William of Kilkenny, bishop of Ely, and John de Gatesden to Castile.\textsuperscript{867} They were empowered to deal with all issues pending between Henry III and Alfonso X.\textsuperscript{868} With regards to the African expedition, Henry III promised that he would continue to petition the pope so that he might commute (‘immutet’) his crusader vow to Africa (‘ad partes Affricanas’) as had already been agreed with Alfonso (‘prout in littera nostra conventionis’), presumably

\textsuperscript{864} \textit{Foedera}, I.i.331.
\textsuperscript{865} Cf. Weiler, ‘Henry III and the Sicilian Business: A Reinterpretation’, 139.
\textsuperscript{866} \textit{Foedera}, I.i.340.
\textsuperscript{867} \textit{CPR} 1247-58, 460, 486-7.
\textsuperscript{868} Ibid., 487; \textit{Foedera}, I.i.343.
referring here to the treaty of 1254. From this point onwards, however, there is a hiatus in the correspondence between the two kings, suggesting that both became immersed in other projects.

Just like Henry III when he had taken the cross in March 1250, Alfonso was keen to form strategic alliances with other kingdoms. The Spanish king, like Henry III, now turned to what might superficially be supposed a remote part of Christendom, towards Norway and its mighty fleet. In 1257-8, Alfonso X arranged a marriage alliance between his brother Felipe, former archbishop-elect of Seville, who had abandoned his ecclesiastical career, and Christina (Kristín), daughter of Haakon IV of Norway (1217-63). Haakon himself had taken the cross in 1247. It therefore looks as if Alfonso was now seeking Norwegian naval assistance for his own African crusade, a suggestion which also appears in Haakon’s Saga. The Castilian was not the only western monarch to turn to Norway for help. Later that same year, Louis IX of France invited Haakon to join his crusade to the Holy Land. Christina arrived in Castile, after being a brief but lavish reception in Aragón from king Jaime I. She was given a free choice amongst Alfonso’s brothers, nominating Felipe, who according to his brother, the king, was ‘the best man single-handed with bears and wild boars, and
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871 Henry III was repeatedly in contact with Felipe in 1254-5. Cf. CPR 1247-58, 385; CLR 1251-60, 212, 227-8; Close Rolls 1254-6, 82.
872 According to Haakon’s Saga, Castilian envoys arrived at the king’s court in late 1256 and there spent the winter. They then travelled through England via Yarmouth, and into France, where the king’s envoys discussed matters with the king of France and travelled through land, via Narbonne and Catalonia into Castile. G.W. Dasent, ed., ‘The Saga of Hacon’, in Icelandic Sagas and Other Historical Documents Relating to the Settlements and Descents of the Northmen on the British Isles, vol. iv, (London: 1894), 298-303 and 311-312.
873 The Haakon Saga suggests that Alfonso X was recruiting the Norwegian king’s help against the Muslims, possibly on Haakon’s crusader status. ‘The king of Spain was then fitting out his host against heathendom, he was very eager that king Haco should go with him and so redeem the cross which he had taken…’ Dasent, ‘Saga of Hacon’, 317; cf. Rodriguez Garcia, ‘Crusading Plans’, 106.
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ever merry and mirthful and courteous, and the best of fellows’. Following the marriage, in 1258, Alfonso X pledged assistance to Haakon IV against other kingdoms save France, Aragón or England, and the Norwegian promised to do the same saving his alliances with Denmark, Sweden and England. The Norwegian marriage must also be set within the context of Alfonso X’s bid for the imperial throne. Not only did it advertise Alfonso’s internationalism, but it held out the prospect, should Alfonso succeed as emperor or King of Germany, of guaranteeing Norway’s grain supply, assuming that Lübeck might now make good what would otherwise be a shortfall in the supplies traditionally sought in England. As a candidate for the imperial throne, Alfonso X was in a better position than Richard of Cornwall to persuade the council of Lübeck into a favourable agreement with Norway. A material relic of this new Castilian-Norwegian alliance is preserved in the Royal Library at Copenhagen: the so-called ‘Christina Psalter’, generally supposed to have been gifted to Christina at the time of her marriage to Felipe, either by Louis IX or by Henry III of England. This most
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875 Dasent, ‘Saga of Hacon’, 313-14. Cf. C. Larrington, ‘Queens and Bodies: The Norwegian Translated “lais” and Håkon IV’s Kinswomen’, Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 108 (2009), 524-5. For the Castilian version of the marriage, cf. M. González Jiménez, ed., Crónica de Alfonso X (Murcia: 1998), ii, pp. 8-9. The author of the ‘Anales de Sevilla’ considers that Alfonso X invited Christiana because he was anxious to have an heir to the throne, but suggests that he later changed his mind and married her to the infante Felipe. However, as we have shown this is a travesty of what really happened: Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales de Sevilla, ii, 1252, 36. The marriage was short lived as she died in 1262. In 1265, the infante was granted a papal dispensation to marry the noble Castilian woman, Leonor Rodriguez: S. Domínguez Sánchez, Documentos de Clemente IV (1265-1268) (León: 1996), no. 23. 876 Dasent, ‘Saga of Hacon’, 314-15.

877 ‘They [the messengers of king Haakon upon their return to Norway] had much to tell [Haakon] how great a friend the king was of king Haco, and with whomsoever king Haco had strife, then his strenght should be at his disposal so long as it were not against the king of France, or the king of Aragon his cousin, or the king of England. King Haco promised too to grant in return his strength to the king of Spain, if it were not against the Swede-king or the Dane-king, or the king of England.’ Dasent, ‘Saga of Hacon’, 317. Cf. J.P. Guzmán y Gallo, ‘La princesa Cristina de Noruega y el infante don Felipe, hermano de don Alfonso el Sabio’, BRAH, lxxiv (1919), 51.

lavish of luxury books is itself testimony to the truly international reach of diplomacy at this time, with the rival dynasties of northern and southern Europe brought together via a series of complicated interlocking kinships and alliances, themselves the product of much earlier diplomacy, not least the marriages of the daughters of Henry II of England.  

Even after the failure of his treaty with Henry III to bring about any practical English intervention in North Africa, and even despite the double imperial election that saw Richard of Cornwall, Henry III’s brother crowned as King of Germany, Alfonso X persisted with his crusading plans. On 14 December 1257, resuming a correspondence that goes unrecorded for the past two years, the English king explained that trouble in Wales had prevented him from fulfilling his promises to Alfonso. He congratulated Alfonso on his successful suppression of revolt amongst the Muslims of Murcia, and defended Richard’s election as King of Germany, arguing that his election had been made before Alfonso’s and that it had not been intended in any hostile sense. In reply, on 25 June 1258, Alfonso X wrote to Henry III with reference to the African crusade, the imperial crown contested by Richard of Cornwall, and a proposal for a marriage between one of Henry’s daughter and a brother of Alfonso. Meanwhile, the Castilian continued to press for a papal commutation that might allow Henry III to embark on their joint expedition to Africa.  

There can be few better illustrations than this of what, for all his European
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881 ‘De negocio Africano sciat vestra scinceritas quod satis libenter fuissemus vobiscum ad partes illas Africianas prefecti, si hoc de domini Pape licencia processisset’: Foedera, 1.i.372; Close Rolls 1256-9, 314-15.
diplomacy, remained Alfonso’s essential isolation both from the mainstream of European politics and, increasingly, from reality. By the time that his letters reached England in the summer of 1258, Henry III’s barons were in open revolt. The King was in effect placed under baronial commission, and even his most deeply-cherished project, the conquest of Sicily, had to all intents and purposes been forbidden by baronial decree. The idea that in these circumstances Henry III might still participate in a military expedition across the Straits of Gibraltar was, to say the least, absurd.

On 8 April 1260, Pope Alexander IV commissioned Martin, bishop of Segovia, to preach the crusade through all of Spain (‘per totam Ispaniam’) in order to assist Alfonso X’s African project. The king, who continued to press his North African agenda sent his trusted friend, the Dominican friar, Roberto bishop of Silves, to Henry III. Once again, this failed to secure Henry’s participation. In the meantime, Alfonso undertook the construction of a ‘permanent’ fleet that might lead an assault upon the Moroccan ports. The king went as far as to launch preliminary attacks, in particular a chaotic and essentially pragmatic raid on the port of Salé, in September 1260, launched from the Castilian port of Santa María, which by now had become an important base for Alfonso’s Moroccan operation: a Spanish equivalent to Louis IX’s great expeditionary base at Aigues-Mortes. There is even a possibility that the Cortes of Seville granted the king a subsidy for the African crusade. In an attempt to take advantage of the turmoil brought about by the Marinid advance on Rabat, earlier in July, Castile launched its attack on Salé. The assault failed, and the
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883 Foedera, I.i.372; Close Rolls 1256-9, 314-15. See also Procter, Cortes, 156.
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invading Castilian forces were forced to flee only five days after landing in North Africa, having plundered the port. The Marinid hold on Morocco continued to tighten. Nine years later, in 1269, the Marinids seized, the last Almohad bastion, their capital at Marrakesh. As Marinid power and territory grew, so did their interest in the Iberian Peninsula to which they occasionally sent troops in aid of the Nasrids of Granada. Although this was the end of Alfonso’s dreams of conquest in North Africa, the Iberian fantasy of a North African ‘reconquest’, a Christian counterblast to the Muslim invasions of the eighth century, persisted. It was still a factor in Spanish history as late as the seventeenth century, when both Portugal and Castile harboured African aspirations. It could still be considered a factor as late as the reign of Generalissimo Franco, whose rebellion of 1936, it may be remembered, was launched, if not from Africa then from Spain’s southern maritime outpost of the Canary Islands. When, in 1291, Sancho IV of Castile, Alfonso’s son, signed his peace treaty of Monteagudo with and Jaime II of Aragon, acknowledging the legitimacy of the Aragonese claim to Sicily, one element of this treaty remained the division of any future conquests in the Magreb. According to the terms negotiated here, Castile would stake its claim to Morocco, while Catalonia-Aragón would take Berbería (modern day Tunis and Algiers).

**Gaston de Béarn and the Treaty of 1254**
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889 M.T. Ferrer Mallol, Entre la paz y la guerra: la corona catalano-aragonesa y Castilla en la Baja Edad Media (Barcelona: 2005), 23.
Although the relations between the vicomte of Béarn and Henry III have been meticulously studied by Jean Ellis, what follows is intended to summarize the immediate consequences of the 1254 Anglo-Castilian as they impacted upon Gaston de Béarn and his Gaston followers. Shortly after the agreement was signed, and at the instance of Alfonso X, Henry III pardoned several of the dissident Gascon nobles who had naturally supported Gaston in his previous engagements with Spain. Early in August 1254, John Mansel requested a reciprocal agreement from Gaston to release of all the men of La Réole whom he held in captivity, in compliance with the treaty signed with Castile. Pardons were issued to a number of the Gascon dissidents: Gaston de Béarn, Gaillard de Solio and his brother, Raymond, vicomte of Fronzac, Bernard de Bouvill, Pierre, vicomte of Castillon, Ernald de Bouvill of Duraz and their adherents. On 18 August, on Henry III’s behalf, the bishop of Hereford issued a pardon to Peter de Roset and Bernard de Laen for all their misdeeds (‘transgressiones’) against the king. The pardon was confirmed a week later by John Mansel, who was himself still with Henry III in Bordeaux. Mansel’s letters exhorted the commonality of Bayonne to make restitution of houses, lands and ships disputed since the late hostilities. The bishop of Hereford also requested, on behalf of Alfonso X, that William, prior of Le Mas (Le Mas-d’Agenais, Lot-et-Garrone), and Bonnetto and Paytermo de Pins, who were held captive by Simon de Montfort, be released from captivity. Lope Fernández and García Martínez, notified the prior of Le Mas of the treaty made between Castile and England, and requested that the appropriate restitutions be made to the people at La Réole who had sustained losses
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caused by the king of Castile. These orders, which might be assumed to imply a Castilian military presence in Gascony, capable of doing damage at La Rèole, within only a few miles of Bordeaux, in reality are more likely to relate to the military activities of Gaston and his Gascon adherents. Alfonso X requested Peter of Aigueblanche to restore the properties of Elias, Peter and Hugh Biger.

Henry III ordered all the prisoners taken in Gascony to be released, in particular William Gauzan taken in Cusac. Not all Gascons had made peace with their lord. Such was the case with Gaston de Béarn and his men who, by September 1254, had still not made amends with Henry III. The king, therefore, ordered the men and community of Bayonne to seize (‘arrestari’) their goods and chattels. By November 1254, the Lord Edward was demanding, as part of this continuing attempt at pacification, that the citizens of Bayonne make a solemn oath to preserve the peace. In mid-December, Henry III commanded Edward to adhere to the treaty, but not to act before first consulting him.

As agreed in 1254, Alfonso X not only relinquished all rights in Gascony to Edward, but on 3 December empowered Gaston de Béarn in his name to absolve (‘plenam ac liberam potestaequitandii et absolvendi’) all Gascons who had pledged homage to him, including Gaston himself. Despite this, Gaston continued to make appearances as Alfonso’s vassal until mid 1276, when a row between France and
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Castile erupted as a result of the death of Fernando de la Cerda, itself a threat to the Spanish succession to the throne.\(^903\)

As late as September 1256, the full restitution of Gaston de Béarn’s possessions had yet to be finalized. Once again, Henry III empowered Peter of Aigueblanche and William, bishop of Ely, to ensure Gaston possession of his lands.\(^904\) A year later, in July 1257, Henry III wrote to Alfonso X to inform him that the lands of the vicomtes of Fronzac, Castillon and Benauges could not be restored. The reasons were to be explained by Henry’s envoys, but presumably included the continuing disobedience of these men.\(^905\) A similar credence was dispatched by Henry III to Jaime I of Aragón.\(^906\)

**Castile and its Neighbours**

In the aftermath of Alfonso and Henry III’s treaty, both Aragón and Navarre took defensive measures against this new Anglo-Castilian alliance. On 9 April 1254, at Monteagudo, on the frontier between Aragón and Navarre, Jaime I of Catalonia-Aragón and Theobald II of Navarre renewed a friendship agreement (‘conviniença’) that they had signed the year before at Tudela in Navarre. They agreed to help each other against all men, except the count of Provence. They also promised not to sign any peace treaty with Castile, unless both kings had been previously satisfied. Moreover, Theobald II promised Jaime I not to contract a marriage for himself with any of the sisters or daughters of Alfonso X (‘prometemos vos que nos non pongamos
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\(^903\) He last appears on a *privilegio rodado* dated 14 July 1276. González Jiménez, ed., *Diplomatario*, no. 429; cf. below ‘The Marriage between Sancho and Guillelme de Béarn’.
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tregoas nin fagamos adobo nenguno con el rey de Castieylla, nin casemos con ermana ni con filla suya, sense vuestro plazer et vuestro atorgamiento’), no doubt because such a marriage alliance would have further cemented Castilian claims to sovereignty over Navarre. 907

Once again, there were tensions on the Castilian-Aragonese frontier, but internal turmoil diverted the attention of both realms. In Valencia, the mudéjar Al-Azraq rebelled against the Aragonese king. 908 In 1245, following the capitulation of Valencia in 1238, Al-Azraq had signed an agreement with Jaime I allowing him to maintain control of several castles and to retain a number of rents from the mudéjar lands. 909 It has been argued that Jaime I permitted, rather than complete the expulsion of the Muslims from Valencia, due to his ongoing tensions with the Papacy and his failed attempts to forge a marriage alliance with Beatrice of Provence. 910 In 1254, the agreement with Al-Azraq backfired, with a Muslim rebellion in Valencia with which Jaime I was now forced to deal.

Meanwhile, in Castile, a number of nobles, including Alfonso X’s brother, Enrique, plotted a rebellion against their king because of his continued efforts to alter previously accepted feudal tenures. 911 The powerful noble, Diego López de Haro, Lord of Biscay, led an uprising against Alfonso X, taking advantage of the ongoing disputes between the kings of Aragón and Castile. In August 1254, Diego López de Haro, Ramiro Rodríguez and Ramiro Diez, who had fallen out with Alfonso X, signed
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907 ‘E prometemos vos que nos non pongamos tregoas nin fagamos adobo nenguno conel rey de Castieylla, nin casemos con ermana ni con filla suya, senes vuestro plazer et vuestro atorgamiento’: Huici Miranda et al., eds., Documentos 1251-1257, no. 645.
908 *Mudejar*: a Muslim living under Christian rule.
910 Ibid., *Al-andalus*, 571.
an agreement with Jaime I (‘prometemos e convinimos’) in Estella, before taking refuge in Navarre. The nobles and the king promised to assist one other against Alfonso X.  

Jaime I prepared for war with Castile, fearing that the current truce, due to expire at Michaelmas, would not be further extended. By the end of August, the Aragonese king had asked the council of Zaragoza to allow him to coin 15,000 silver marks in order to prepare for the coming war.  

Alfonso X was forced to deal with his own Castilian dissidents. Aware of Aragonese intentions, he wrote to Henry III informing him that Jaime I and other enemies (‘inimicos et adversarios’) planned to attack Castile, asking that Henry prevent his Gascon subjects from siding with the Aragonese. By October 1255, the dissidents had already started uprisings in parts of Andalucía and Biscay. Jaime I contributed to these by granting the noble, Ramiro Rodríguez, assistance in raising a considerable fighting force of more than 500 knights. Thanks to interventions by Alfonso X, nonetheless, the rebellion was short lived.

The tensions between Jaime I and Alfonso X continued into 1256, as the Aragonese continued to fear a Castilian invasion, promising the lord of Calatayud, Híjar, Daroca, Teruel and Ademuz help against possible attacks from Alfonso X (‘Encara vos
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913 ‘Recognoscimus et confitemur quod propter guerram quam habemus et speramus habere in isto festo proximo sancti Michaelis et deinde cum treuge inter nos et illustrem regem Castelle posite non se extendat ultra dictum festum sancti Michaelis, quam quidem guerram dictus rex Castelle nobis movet in magnam et gravem oppresionem persone nostro’: Huici Miranda et al., eds., Documentos 1251-1257, no. 659. See also no. 666 where Jaime I asks the cities of Zaragoza for 3,000 silver marks (in the coin of Jaca, ‘moneda jaquesa’).

914 DD, no. 280.

915 Huici Miranda et al., eds., Documentos 1251-1257, no.687.

916 González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 82-85.
prometemos que si el rey de Castiella vos guerriasse ni vos fiziesse mal en sen dolo vuestro que nos daquella Guerra vos siamos e que vos terremos onrado e desta onra no vos baxemos”).\(^{917}\) Finally, on 8 August 1257, a peace was arranged between Aragón and Castile (‘fazer emendar et endereçar todo los tuertos et todos los dannos et totas las peyndras, que fueron fechas del nuestro sennorio’).\(^{918}\) Hostilities finally ceased and compensation (‘emiendas’) was agreed.\(^{919}\) Later that same year, in November, Aragón and Navarre signed a two-year truce (‘tregua’).\(^{920}\) At last, the eastern frontier of Castile was at peace and Alfonso X was free to embark on his foreign projects. Nonetheless, throughout the 1260s and 1270s, Alfonso continued to confront problems with the Castilian nobility, product of his assertion of royal rights and his attempt to mould an effective royal government.\(^{921}\)

**Conclusion**

Sir Maurice Powicke suggested, that Alfonso X’s ‘revival’ of the Gascon claim could be attributed to a ‘new political broom rather than to serious policy’, with Alfonso using such claims ‘as a way of approach to an alliance’ with Henry III.\(^{922}\) By contrast, both Anthony Goodman and José Manuel Rodríguez García have suggested that Alfonso’s claim to Gascony was an attempt to force Henry into joining Castile’s plans for an African crusade (a plan already devised by Alfonso’ father, Fernando III). They both consider that the choice of the bishop of Morocco, Lope Fernández de Aín, from October 1252 onwards, to act as chief negotiator with Henry III, himself already
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917 Huici Miranda et al., eds., *Documentos 1251-1257*, no. 702.
918 Ibid., no. 742
919 Ibid., no. 743
920 Ibid., no. 833
pledged to crusade to the Holy Land, was an overt attempt to force the English monarch into a joint crusade to North Africa.\textsuperscript{923}

Why was Gascony so important to Alfonso X? Anthony Goodman has suggested, that Alfonso was taking advantage of ‘Henry’s dismal record of military failure in France’, following Henry III’s failed attempt in 1242 to recover Poitou, taken from him since 1224.\textsuperscript{924} There were other reasons why Alfonso might have coveted a toehold north of the Pyrenees. Gascony profited from the customs collected at Bordeaux, and played host to the fleet and shipbuilding industry of Bayonne, of great potential assistance in Alfonso’s plans to attack Morocco.\textsuperscript{925} Gascony could also provide León-Castile with a tactical and political advantage over Navarre, ruled by the young Theobald II (V Count of Champagne).\textsuperscript{926} As Goodman puts it, ‘control of Gascony would make the Bay of Biscay more secure for Castilian trade and give Alfonso political leverage in his dealings with Navarre and the French Crown’.\textsuperscript{927}

Joseph O’Callaghan considers that Henry’s failure to keep his word frustrated Alfonso who ‘realistically had little expectation of gaining control of Gascony’ and who was ‘further disappointed by Henry III’s failure to assist him in his projected invasion of North Africa, his quest for the imperial crown, and his attempt to dominate Navarre’.\textsuperscript{928} For Alfonso X, it was important to ensure that Navarre, under the rule of the house of Champagne, did not receive aid from its king’s French overlord to regain the costal lands of San Sebastián and Fuenterrabía seized by Castile.

\textsuperscript{924} Goodman, ‘Alfonso X’, 42.
\textsuperscript{925} Ibid., 42. On Bordeaux and Bayonne, cf. Trabut-Cussac, L’administration anglaise, pp. xiv-xvi. For a geographical description of Morocco in regards to Europe, in particular Spain, see the ‘Fragmentum Itinerarii fratis Mauritii et domini Andraei Nicolai a. 1273’, in Güzmán y Gallo, ‘La princesa Cristina’, 51-3.
\textsuperscript{926} Cf. González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 69 and 75.
\textsuperscript{927} Goodman, ‘Alfonso X’, 42.
\textsuperscript{928} O’Callaghan, The Learned King, 152.
from Navarre in the twelfth century. During the reign of Sancho VII (1194-1234), Navarre had been encircled by Castile and Aragón. Under the terms of the treaty of Calatayud (1198), signed by Alfonso VIII of León-Castile and Pedro II of Aragón, Navarre was reduced to an area of only approximately 12,000 km². Above all, it lost its access to the sea. Because of this and due to Navarre’s interests in land across the Pyrenees (the so-called ‘ultrapuertos’), Theobald II was drawn closer to France than to his peninsular neighbours.  

The tensions between Castile and Navarre continued during the early years of the reign of Alfonso X. In a dramatic and generous attempt to make peace with his neighbours, on 1 January 1256 (a surely significant choice of date) the Castilian king restored the coastal lands of Fuenterrabía and San Sebastián, with their rents, to the young Theobald II of Navarre, to hold for the remainder of his life. Does this too not speak of a king (Alfonso X) keen to demonstrate his magnanimity, in an attempt both buy friends and to speed the departure of what he had conceived of his great campaign of conquest on the southern shores of the Mediterranean? Where once Tarik and Muslims had crossed from south to north to bring about the collapse of the Christian Visigothic kingdom of Spain, now, five centuries later, Alfonso and his crusaders would sweep southwards to crush Islam at its roots. This was a noble ambition, pursued with single-minded vigour. That it was entirely impractical should not blind us to the fact that, in Alfonso’s mind, it was not only conceivable but of the very highest political priority. In an age that dreamed increasingly of the apocalypse, of eschatology and the coming end of days, what more appropriate figure to emerge as the true world emperor than Alfonso of Castile, great

930 ‘Do en amor a mi amado pariente el amigo don Tibalt, por essa mesma graçia rrey de Nauarra, de Chanpanna et de Brian, comde Palazin, las dos villas de Sant Sebastian et de Fuenterabia, con todas sus rentas de mar et de tierra; et estoy le do yo que tenga de mi en amor en toda su uida’: G. Martinez Díez et al., Colección de documentos medievales de las villas guipuzcoanas (1200-1369) (Donostia-San Sebastián 1991), no. 19.
grandson of Frederick Barbarossa, *de facto* emperor of Spain, claimant to the imperial titles of Frederick II, and now himself on the verge of a great new imperial conquest of Africa, last ruled by Christians during the time of Augustine and the emperors of classical Rome.

In the meantime, Alfonso’s revival of the Castilian claim to Gascony served one purpose: to force Henry III into an alliance that would allow Alfonso to crusade into North Africa. Alfonso’s threat to enter Gascony played on Henry’s fear of losing his French inheritance, an issue that the king held very dear to heart. The Anglo-Castilian alliance of 1254 not only allowed Alfonso to dream his dreams of conquest, but resulted in a marriage between his sister, Eleanor of Castile, and Edward of England, in the final analysis the most lasting and significant of all the consequences of Alfonso’s imperial dreams.

Henry III was no stranger to Iberian politics, and the intertwined nature of Spanish high politics. He was aware of the complications and advantages that a treaty with Castile could provide, at least in the short term. Combined with baronial resistance in England, his other projects, like the Sicilian business and his hopes of recovering his ancestral lands in France, rendered it quite impossible for him to honour his agreement with Alfonso. The Castilian faced troubles of his own with the Castilian nobility. These were further complicated by Alfonso’s bid for the German imperial throne. This in turn forced Alfonso X to delay his African expedition. For a period in the mid 1250s, however, it must have appeared to observers elsewhere in Europe as if Alfonso X, rather than the late Frederick II, was about to emerge as the true world-emperor. With his African empire, Alfonso would have qualified as *Stupor Mundi*, to an extent that even Frederick II could barely have imagined.
Chapter Seven: Alfonso X of Castile and his Imperial Dream

For much of Alfonso X’s reign, he insisted he was the rightful holder of the imperial crown. In 1257, following a double election, Richard of Cornwall, Henry III’s brother, was crowned at Aachen. However, Alfonso, considering himself wronged, disputed the title. Unlike Richard, Alfonso made no attempt to travel to Germany to receive the crown, but continued to claim ownership of the title. From 1257 until the death of Richard, in 1272, he disputed the double election. The dispute lingered on, much to the convenience of the papal court, until finally, in 1275, Pope Gregory X crowned Rudolph of Habsburg, crushing Alfonso’s imperial dreams. While the dispute never led to open hostilities between England and Castile, the event has captured the attention of Spanish, German and English historians. Björn Weiler’s detailed accounts of Henry III’s relations with the Staufen Empire, of Richard of Cornwall’s candidacy for the imperial throne, and of Henry III’s aspirations to the Sicilian throne have greatly contributed to our understanding of this period.931 At the same time, Alfonso’s conception of empire and his aspirations have been well documented by Bruno Meyer, Gianluca Pagani and Julio Valdeón.932 Rather than simply repeat these discoveries, the section present chapter is intended to draw attention to Alfonso’s failure to claim the imperial crown and to offer an explanation as to why this major dispute had so little overall effect on Anglo-Castilian relations.

Sicily and the Empire

Late in 1250, the Emperor Frederick II died an excommunicate in Apulia. The Pope’s efforts to expunge Hohenstaufen influence were now focused against Frederick’s son, Conrad, who had already been crowned King of the Romans, and who inherited Sicily upon the deposed emperor’s death. Despite the various hurdles raised against him by the pope, who had recognized William of Holland as anti-king, Conrad gained the support necessary to cross the Alps. Meanwhile, his opponent quarrelled with three successive archbishops of Mainz, failing to obtain the necessary support to back his papally-sponsored cause. From Perugia, Conrad travelled to Apulia in 1252. Despite Conrad’s success in Sicily, Innocent IV continued to oppose the union under own crown of Germany and Sicily. The papacy entered negotiations with Conrad’s half-brother Henry, the prize: the Sicilian crown. Nothing came of these negotiations before the death of the young Henry, late in 1253. Accusations nonetheless flew from both sides. Meanwhile, the pope was unable to launch a crusade against Conrad, who enjoyed a position of military and political strength. In a turn of luck for the papacy, Conrad suddenly fell ill in April 1254 and died the following month.\textsuperscript{933} Conradin, his infant son (b. 1252), succeeded him on the throne, in theory more than in practice. In practice, Manfred, Frederick II’s son, generally considered illegitimate by the Church, retained control of Sicily. Pope Innocent IV was determined to oust Manfred from Sicily.

In 1254, when Alfonso X and Henry III signed a peace agreement by which, amongst other things, the English king would join the Castilian in a crusade to Africa, the

opportunity to separate Sicily from the German crown presented itself to the papacy.

Two months after the Anglo-Castilian treaty was signed, in May 1254, Henry III accepted the Sicilian throne on behalf of his youngest son Edmund, after Richard of Cornwall’s rejection of the crown months earlier. Innocent IV agreed to commute the king’s crusader vow from the Holy Land to Sicily, with Henry in effect now pledged to lead crusades, in due course, to Jerusalem, to Sicily and to North Africa.\footnote{Foedera, I.i.304; CM, v, 457-8.}

Pledged to these three simultaneous crusades, Henry decided to focus on the Sicilian expedition, to his barons’ dismay and to Alfonso’s disappointment.

The acceptance of the Sicilian crown on behalf of Edmund caused Henry III a series of financial and political inconveniences so that he soon found himself confronted by an already over-burdened and incensed nobility and with the impossibility of raising the large sums of money needed to fund his projected expedition to the south.\footnote{Annales Dunstaplia’, 200; G.A. Loud, ‘The Kingdom of Sicily and the Kingdom of England, 1066–1266’, History, 88 (2003), 541-3; Runciman, Sicilian Vespers, 60-2; Weiler, ‘Henry III and the Sicilian Business: a reinterpretation’, 132.}

From the moment Henry III accepted the Sicilian crown, the papacy demanded that he intervene rapidly and effectively in Sicilian affairs. Days after Edmund was granted Sicily, Innocent IV urged the king to avoid unnecessary expenses, granting him 50,000 livres tournois, men to aid with the expedition and the commutation of the king’s crusader’s vow from the Holy Land to Sicily.\footnote{Foedera, I.i.302-4.}

Alexander IV confirmed the commutation in May 1255 and urged Henry to free Sicily from Manfred and his Muslims allies.\footnote{Manfred was king of Sicily from 1258-66. Foedera, I.i.319-20.} To alleviate the monetary burden of the expedition, the pope allowed the English king to employ money raised from papal taxes supposedly for the
Holy Land. However, the expedition’s burden on economic and human resources was more than the king could support. By commuting the vow of the Norwegian king, Haakon IV, the new pope hoped to offer a helping hand to Henry III. It was to Haakon of Norway that, two years later (1257-8), Alfonso X turned in order to form a marriage alliance between Haakon’s daughter, Christina, and his own brother, Felipe, formerly bishop-elect of Seville.

Sicily was not the only issue on Henry III’s agenda. As we have seen, Alfonso X continuously reminded the English king of his commitment to a joint African crusade. England needed a long-lasting peace with France that would allow Henry to tend to other affairs without the fear of a war with the French. At this early stage in his diplomacy, Henry III employed, amongst other trusted men, his brother-in-law, Simon de Montfort, and his uncle, Peter of Savoy. By June 1255, Henry’s envoys had secured a tree-year extension of the Anglo-French truce. Thereafter, Henry continued to send John Mansel and his two envoys to the French court in the hope of reaching a long-lasting peace. Their in-depth awareness of Henry’s diplomatic agenda meant that it was these same men who were sent to the papal court, in an attempt to renegotiate the conditions on which Edmund held Sicily. Their main concern was to guarantee the pope’s patience, while a durable peace was negotiated between Henry III and Louis IX of France. But the embassy never reached the papal
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938 Foedera, I.i.322.
939 12 May 1255: Foedera, I.i.320.
940 An agreement that, while recruiting the Norwegian fleet against the Muslims of Morocco, was also intended to strengthen Alfonso’s imperial claims; B.E. Gelsinger, ‘Thirteenth-Century Norwegian-Castilian Alliance’, Medievalia et Humanistica, 10 (1981), 55-63.
942 June 1257: Foedera, I.i.359.
In Henry’s mind, meanwhile, peace with France remained a much more pressing concern than his projected expedition to North Africa with Alfonso X.

**Double Imperial Election (1257) and The Immediate Aftermath**

From 1257, the relations between Alfonso and Henry III took a new turn due to the vacancy in the imperial throne. The electors looked for a foreign ruler rather than a German noble, perhaps because of the impact that Emperor Frederick II (1194-1250) and his descendants had had in their land, while the pope rallied to eradicate Staufen rule from Italy in general and Sicily in particular. This same year, Richard of Cornwall, Henry III’s brother, was elected King of the Romans. The earl’s election was in line with Henry’s goal of enhancing his family’s standing within Western Europe as one route to the recovery of the lands lost by Henry and Richard’s father, King John.

Frederick II’s successor, his son Conrad IV, had already been elected King of the Romans in 1237, and had enforced his father’s rule in Germany while Frederick was absent, in the Holy Land, Sicily or Italy. Frederick’s government of the empire had repeatedly clashed with papal ambitions, and the pope, now hoped to separate the Sicilian and imperial thrones. Thus, from the mid 1230s, papal and imperial factions continued to drift apart. As the situation deteriorated, mediation became increasingly difficult. On 17 July 1245, Innocent IV took the decisive step of deposing Frederick, releasing Frederick’s subjects from their fealty and ordering the election of a new
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943 CPR 1247-58, 567; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 140.  
king of the Romans. The immediate consequence was the election of Henry Raspe, landgrave of Thuringia (1204-47), as anti-king. Despite Raspe’s swift progress against Conrad’s forces, he died in February 1247 and Innocent IV was forced to find a new papal champion. According to Matthew Paris, the principal candidates for this role were Otto count of Guelders, Henry duke of Brabant, Haakon IV of Norway, and Richard of Cornwall. Ultimately, it was William, count of Holland, who accepted the honour and was acclaimed as king of the Romans on 8 November 1247. In August of the following year, he was crowned at Aachen, the city he had recently seized. However, it was not until Frederick II died on 13 December 1250, that William of Holland took real control in Germany lands as a result of Conrad’s move to Italy. After May 1254, and the death of Conrad IV, William of Holland was left to face the quarrelsome German cities, which had previously supported Conrad. But William was himself killed in January 1256. The papacy was, once again, faced with the troublesome issue of electing a King of the Romans, while Manfred held on to Sicily.

Always working toward the promotion of his own family, Henry III may have encouraged his brother, Richard of Cornwall, to take the vacant crown in an attempt to secure Sicily for his younger son, Edmund. Taking advantage of William’s death, Henry III perhaps approached pope Alexander IV to propose the candidacy of his brother, the earl of Cornwall. As the pope hesitated, a series of English diplomatic missions attempted to convince the German nobles, whose support was undoubtedly costly, further stirring up the anger of Henry’s barons against royal extravagance.
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945 CM, v, 201. Bayley considers that Paris mistakenly recorded the episode and that it was the imperial crown and not the Sicilian throne that was offered to Richard: Bayley, College of Electors, 61. 946 Ibid., 3-54. 947 Ibid., 64-6. Cf. Weiler, ‘Image and Reality in Richard of Cornwall’s German Career’, 1112-5.
Henry III and his brother, Richard earl of Cornwall, were the cousins of Otto IV of Brunswick (d.1218), son of their aunt Matilda. Earl Richard was a well-respected man, of vast resources, who had previously been offered the Sicilian crown, but had refused after considering the cost of such an expedition. He was also a trusted adviser to the English king. After negotiations on behalf of Richard, no unanimous agreement was reached by August 1256, thus paving the way for more than one candidature to be considered.\footnote{Huffman, Anglo-German Relations, 284.} However, according to Matthew Paris by Christmas of that same year, Richard had been offered the German crown.\footnote{CM, v, 601; Huffman, Anglo-German Relations, 287.} Early in 1257, John Mansel, who had conducted the negotiations with Castile in 1254, and Richard, earl of Gloucester, were sent to Germany to prepare for Richard’s coronation.\footnote{CM, v, 604.}

Meanwhile, Alfonso X, son of Elizabeth Hohenstaufen (1202-1235), now began to employ his claim to Swabia as a way of strengthening his claim to the imperial crown. Elizabeth was the daughter of Philip, brother of Henry VI, both sons of Frederick I Barbarossa. Control over the duchy of Swabia was strategic to the empire as Swabia guarded the passes that ensured the emperors control over Lombardy.\footnote{Bayley, College of Electors, 6.} Alfonso’s interest in the duchy predated the controversial election of 1257. On 3 May 1246, Alfonso had informed Innocent IV of his to claim the duchy of Swabia, which was, explained the king, his maternal inheritance. The pope answered that if the \textit{infante} were able to obtain the duchy, the papacy would recognize him as duke.\footnote{A. Quintana Prieto, \textit{La documentación pontificia de Inocencio IV (1243-1254)} (Rome: 1987), no. 273.} Only days earlier, on 21 April, pope Innocent IV had announced to the German nobility Henry...
Raspe’s willingness to accept the throne. Undoubtedly, Alfonso was looking to take advantage of a decisive break in the already fractured relations between emperor and pope. At first the situation seemed to favour Alfonso, while Raspe, supported in Germany against the Hohenstaufen, took control of Frankfurt, freeing Swabia from Conrad’s control. However, when Conrad married the daughter of the duke of Bavaria, his position was transformed, strategically and economically. Thus, when in early 1247, Henry Raspe besieged Ulm, Conrad was better prepared to repel the attack. Raspe, papal king, died in his attempt to defeat Conrad, only weeks after the start of the siege, on 16 February. Swabia reverted to Staufen control. In Castile, Alfonso devoted all his energies to aiding his father, Fernando III, in the conquest of Seville, and was thus in no position to pursue his claim to the duchy in practice rather than theory. After Frederick II’s death in 1250, Swabia remained locked in factional dispute, with support for the Hohenstaufen continuing to diminish. In November 1250, when the upper Rhine cities of Hagenau, Schlettstadt, Colmar, Kayserberg, Breisach, Muhlhausen, Neuenberg, Rheinfelden, Schaffhausen, Bern and Zurich threatened to form a union faithful to the Hohenstaufen, Swabia remained under the control of men sympathetic to the papacy. Upon Conrad’s death, William of Holland set out to ensure that such leagues were subordinated to the Pope’s authority. It was probably with this in mind that Pope Alexander IV revived Alfonso’s claim to the duchy. On 4 February 1255, the pope addressed the Swabians, asking them to respect Alfonso’s hereditary claim to the duchy. Alfonso X, however, remained preoccupied elsewhere, not least with his African crusade to which, in 1254, he recruited English help.

953 Bayley, College of Electors, 18.
954 Ibid., 20.
955 Ibid., 30-4.
956 Ibid., 47-9.
957 C.G.M.B.d. La Roncière et al., Les registres d’Alexandre IV (Paris: 1902), no. 139.
Alfonso’s claim to Swabia was thus merely a convenient excuse for his first launching into the imperial race. The initial proposal that Alfonso be granted the imperial throne came not from Alfonso himself, but from the Republic of Pisa. A Pisan embassy, travelling to Soria, was hosted by Alfonso’s own father-in-law, Jaime I of Aragón, recognizing Alfonso’s claim to Swabia and nominating him as imperial candidate. Alfonso accepted the offer.958 From here on, one of Alfonso’s priorities became the fecho del imperio.

Firstly, Alfonso tightened his ties with the Pisan commune. According to Arnold Busson, Alfonso’s new Italian interests produced a treaty with Pisa offering the Italian maritime republic Castilian assistance against mutual Guelf enemies: Genoa, Lucca and Florence. According to Busson, Castile promised to send 500 armed knights.959 Pisa was not alone in attracting Alfonso’s attention. On 1 June 1255, Alfonso confirmed a commercial privilege conferred by Fernando III, by which he rewarded Genoese participation in the conquest of Seville and granted its merchants important privileges within the city and the right to use the ports of León-Castile, Granada, Murcia and Jerez.960

In October 1255, an embassy headed by García Pérez, the archdeacon of Morocco, who had helped negotiate Castile’s treaty with Henry III in 1254, arrived at Marseille

for negotiations between Alfonso and Charles of Anjou, younger brother of Louis IX of France. There notice arrived of the imperial vacancy, Alfonso’s ambassador speedily setting off for Germany.\footnote{Bayley, \textit{College of Electors}, 73-4.} Charles of Anjou stood to gain more if Alfonso X were elected Emperor, rather than Richard of Cornwall. It is also clear that Marseillaise support was intertwined with Alfonso’s planned crusade to North Africa, as confirmed by the king’s choice of envoy, the archdeacon of Morocco. In Alfonso’s mind, the ideas of empire and of crusade to Africa went hand in hand.

It has been suggested that, initially, Alexander IV favoured Alfonso’s imperial candidacy as a means of lending yet further support to the Castilian’s African crusade.\footnote{Cf. Bayley, ‘Diplomatic Preliminaries’, 477.} The imperial throne, was at least in Alfonso’s mind, united to his planned crusade to northern Africa and to his goal of making Castile the preeminent Iberian kingdom.\footnote{Cf. Socarras, \textit{Alfonso X}, 152-3.} Thus, when Richard of Cornwall’s made his bid for the imperial throne, Alfonso, who probably felt wronged by Richard’s candidacy, complained to his ally, Henry III.

In January 1257, outside the city walls of Frankfurt, the archbishop of Cologne and his representative of the archbishop of Mainz, acting together with Louis II count palatine of the Rhine, elected Richard of Cornwall king of the Romans. The margrave of Brandenburg, the archbishop of Trier and the duke of Saxony had refused to participate in the election.\footnote{CM, vi, 341-2} Meanwhile, Frankfurt itself had been taken by the supporters of Alfonso X. The English king was aware of Alfonso’s involvement in the German election. In a letter urging the discretion of Peter of
Aigueblanche, bishop of Hereford, who was in charge of the Lord Edward’s and Henry III’s endeavours in Gascony and Castile, Henry III urged that an arrangement be reached with Gaston de Béarn and other Gascon lords, presumably to bring support both to Henry III and to Richard of Cornwall against Castile. At the same time, Henry III acknowledged Alfonso’s interest in the German throne, and throughout 1257, renewed his diplomatic contacts with Castile.

It was not until 1 April that the archbishop of Trier and the other electors who had refused to participate in Richard’s election named Alfonso X as king of the Germans. García Pérez was there to accept the honour. Once again, there seems to have been a close connection, at least in Alfonso’s mind, between the crusade to North Africa and the imperial crown. In 1254, García had also been instrumental in securing Henry III’s alliance with Alfonso X and had been present at the English court after the treaty had been signed, possibly pressing Henry to crusade with Alfonso.

Alfonso, considering himself wronged by the double election of Richard of Cornwall, now complained to his ally, Henry III. The response came on 14 December 1257. The king of England congratulated Alfonso on his advances against the Muslims, but defended Richard’s election as king of Germany. Henry argued that his brother’s election had been made before Alfonso’s and was not intended to cause the Castilian
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965 ‘Et quia pro certo intelligimus quod dilectus frater noster Ricardus comes Comubie in regem Alemannie eligatur, cum quo partes Alemannie adire proponimus, Deo dante, et icirco de negociis nostris ordinate ac disponere per consibum et auxibum amicoram et fidebum nostrorum nos convenit, scrisimus Gastonide Bearn’ ut ad nos in Anglia personaliter accedat, per cujus adventum negocio nostro WASConie tam ipsum quam suos tangentia melius expediri poterunt, ut speramus’: Close Rolls 1256-9, 118-20.


967 Furthermore, in August 1254 he was awarded 20 marks per annum to maintain him in Henry III’s service: CPR 1247-57, 243, 319.

harm. He was prepared, nonetheless, to support Alfonso if he discovered Alfonso’s allegations were true, a point to which we shall return.\textsuperscript{969} Alfonso was eager to gain support for his imperial candidature, but, given his concern for the success of his African campaign, breaking the alliance with the English king was not on his agenda.

Richard of Cornwall’s election enhanced Henry III’s reputation and perhaps, as Björn Weiler has suggested, was intended to distract attention from the looming Sicilian affair. If so, the attempt proved a failure. Richard’s stay in Germany was soon cut short by the troubles facing his brother in England after discontent amongst the nobles erupted into open rebellion in 1258. In October 1260, Richard returned to an England in which Henry III’s control of politics remained poised precariously in the balance.\textsuperscript{970}

The Imperial Crown and the Castilian King

While Richard of Cornwall had been quick to secure the German crown and thereafter to press for an imperial coronation, Alfonso X made no attempt to travel to Germany. It is well known that the earl of Cornwall had ample financial resources that allowed him to smooth his progress down the Rhine.\textsuperscript{971} Several Spanish historians have speculated as to why Alfonso, given his own relative lack of resources, coveted the imperial throne. In his study of Alfonsine politics, Carlos de Ayala Martínez asserts that the Castilian king ‘never thought to make himself the effective holder of the Holy

\textsuperscript{970} Weiler, ‘Image and Reality in Richard of Cornwall’s German Career’, 1116.
\textsuperscript{971} Cf. Idem, Empire, 172.
Roman Empire’, but rather aimed at ‘regal primacy’ in the Peninsula. More recently, Gianluca Pagani has traced the various interpretations of Alfonso’s claim, ranging from the absurd to the politically coherent. An exploration of Alfonso’s ideas on kingship and empire may still hold the key. What was the meaning of coronation to Alfonso and how did this impact on his claim to the Holy Roman Empire? Alfonso’s unwillingness to travel to Aachen for the coronation may also need further consideration. Alternatively, an answer may be sought not in Alfonso’s political career, but within the Castilian coronation ritual, or rather the lack of it. Unlike the theoretical coronation ritual depicted in the Ordo of 1250 (see image below), in practice the Castilian monarchy had no real system of symbolic sacralisation. Castilian kings, unlike their French and English counterparts, were not crowned, and their office was not a sacred one. Instead, the sword and secular power reigned supreme. Teófilo Ruíz has noted that, from the birth of Castile as a kingdom through to the reign of the present Juan Carlos I, few Castilian kings have been anointed or crowned, and the few exceptions have largely been attempts to ‘legitimize usurpation of power’.

Unction and coronation were not central to the ritual of Castilian kingship, nor were kings considered sacred, as in Anglo-French tradition. It was knighting, rather than coronation, which better-represented and signified Castilian royal power. Whereas in
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975 Cf. Linehan, ‘King’s Touch’, 200-2.
the *Ordo* of 1250 (see image below)\(^{977}\) a bishop is depicted knighting the future king, the Castilian ritual was not based on sacral ritual. Nor were homage and knighting straightforward ceremonies, particularly not in mid thirteenth-century Castile.

**Image has been removed**

`Accipe gladium per manus episcoporum licet dignas, vice tamen et auctoritate sanctorum apostolorum consecratas tibi regaliter imponitum nostreque benedictionis officio in defensionem sancte Dei ecclesie divinitus ordinatum.`


Far more important to the ritual of kingship was the knighting ceremony. Edward [I], Henry III’s son, had been himself knighted by Alfonso X at Burgos, in 1254, before his marriage to Eleanor of Castile. Knighting, as understood by Alfonso X, was a prerequisite for coronation, so that knighting Edward further enhanced Alfonso’s prestige.\(^{978}\) The royal ritual of kingly knighthood remained a central concern. Unlike the image broadcast in the *Ordo*, it was not a bishop who knighted the king. Neither Fernando III nor Alfonso had received episcopal knighting. The ritual itself was flexible and was not representative of that practiced in all other Iberian monarchies. In the case of Navarre, which more closely resembled the practices of the English and French court, from 1259 Pope Alexander IV granted the bishop of Pamplona the


\(^{978}\) "The ancients attached so much importance to the order of knighthood, that they held that neither emperors nor kings should be consecrated or crowned, until after they had been created knights": R.I. Burns et al., eds., *Las Siete Partidas* (Philadelphia: 2001), Par. II, tit. XXI, xi.
authority to crown future kings and queens. In Aragón, where there was a similar tradition to Castile, there were also exceptions. The most notable involved Pedro II of Aragón, crowned by Innocent III on 10 November 1204 in St Peter’s Basilica in Rome, in the process becoming a papal vassal. It should be noted that the papal coronation of Pedro II (as opposed to his making as king) only served to enhance his prestige. Pedro II’s claim to the throne rested solely on inheritance, as Alfonso X would later underline, rather than on coronation: a king in either Aragón or Castile was a king through inheritance, not through crowning. Anointing and crowning remained distinct from king-making in Iberian kingship, at least in Castile and Aragón. Perhaps the most representative case is that of Jaime I of Aragón, who refused to be crowned by Pope Gregory X, thereby denying his future obligations as a papal vassal.

Peter Linehan has underlined the fact that, unlike the Anglo-French tradition in which the rituals of unction and coronation were associated with the sacrality of the ruler, no such place was accorded unction or crowning in Castilian tradition. Alfonso X does not once mention coronation in his *Siete Partidas*, and unction is only mentioned on a single occasion, linked to the sacraments and specifically to the sacrament of baptism. Unction, Alfonso states, is given to Christian kings, since those ‘who hold his [Jesus’]
place in this world for the dispensation of justice and law are required to bear every burden [like Jesus when he carried the cross] and therefore are anointed on the back part of the right shoulder. Although Alfonso states that unction was given to kings, it does not appear in this context as an essential aspect of king-making ritual, nor is it likely that Alfonso himself had received it.

As opposed to other parts of Europe, where coronation became increasingly elaborate, in Spain, from the twelfth-century onwards, knighthood came to play an even more significant role in king-making. This is not to claim that Castilian kings were unaware of other European traditions. Visigothic kings and the later rulers of Asturias and León had been crowned and anointed. After the Muslim invasion (711), the Christian kingdoms of Asturias and León, like later Castile, continued with the Visigothic practice of an elected ruler who was then crowned, with the sword and the standard merely auxiliary to the ritual. Early Castilian and Leonese kings favoured coronation rituals. Alfonso VI who ascended the throne of León in 1065, became king of Castile in 1072 with coronation still very much an expected prerequisite of king-making. In practice, Alfonso was crowned king of Castile, but only after swearing, with his hand on the Bible, that he bore no responsibility for the murder of his brother, a deed that had first necessitated Alfonso’s king-making. In 1077, he claimed the title ‘emperor of Spain’, and in 1085 conquered Toledo, further strengthening his rule and thus his claim to an imperial title. His rule, was founded on inheritance, rather than consecration, but also as Teófilo Ruiz has pointed,
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984 Burns et al., eds., Siete Partidas, Part. I, Tit. IV, xiii.
985 Palacios Martín, Coronación, 86.
987 Ibid., 112-3.
988 Sancho II of Castile was king from 1065 until his murder in 1072: Ibid., 116.
989 Ruiz, Heaven to Earth, 140.
‘on conquest and on the approval of the magnates and knights’, with the conquest of Toledo serving to ‘confirm’ his authority. 990

Alfonso VI was succeeded by his daughter, Urraca, who, after marrying count Raymond of Burgundy, gave birth to a son, the future Alfonso VII. Like his grandfather, Alfonso VII was also crowned and anointed (in 1135, at León) being acclaimed as ‘emperor of Spain’ after the ceremony. 991 Thereafter, the title of ‘emperor of Spain’ carried less practical significance, undermined by the independence and confidence of the five rival kingdoms that now divided the peninsula.

A shortage of documentation has made it impossible to determine the precise reasons behind the martial ceremonies surrounding the accession of Castilian kings, and has forced historians to look to later chronicles and materials for answers, in the process further confusing the historical record. 992

Fernando III, who in 1217 received the throne of Castile from his mother, Berenguela, eldest daughter of Alfonso VIII of Castile (1158-1214), was not crowned. Nor could be knighted by his mother, given that she was a woman. 993 Berenguela had recently ascended the throne, after the untimely death of her young brother, Enrique I (1214-1217), for whom she had acted as regent. After Enrique’s death she had hurried to León to take control over her son, Fernando. Outside Valladolid, in 1217, perhaps accompanied by the Cortes, she abdicated in favour of her son. We know little about

990 Ibid., 141.
991 He was later re-crowned at Toledo, but not anointed. Ruiz, ‘Unsacred Monarchy’, 118; Ruiz, Heaven to Earth, 143.
992 Ruiz, Heaven to Earth, 145.
Fernando’s entrance to Valladolid or the ceremony that accompanied his accession, save for later chronicles, which serve political purposes of their own.\textsuperscript{994} However, the dating clause to a privilege issued by Fernando III tells the story of his knighting. At the nunnery of Las Huelgas in Burgos, on 12 December 1219, in the third year of his reign, Fernando III claimed to have taken the sword with his own hands (\textit{manu propria}), presumably from the altar, and then to have knighted himself (\textit{in nouum militem me accinxi}). Three days later, he married Beatriz of Hohenstaufen, daughter of the king of the Romans.\textsuperscript{995} His knighting is highly significant, because he was already a king by the time he was knighted. Thus knighting did not in itself make him a king. The knighting and subsequent marriage of Fernando III, set the model for future royal marriages, amongst them those of Edward of England to Eleanor of Castile in 1254, and of Fernando de la Cerda to Blanche of France in 1270.\textsuperscript{996}

It is very likely that Alfonso X, like his father, knighted himself. The lack of firm proof has led to debate on the matter, itself further demystifying the eighteenth-century idea of Castilian sacred monarchy.\textsuperscript{997} Manuel González Jimenez and Teófilo

\textsuperscript{994} Ibid., and see M. Shadis, Berenguela of Castile (1180-1246) and Political Women in the High Middle Ages (New York: 2009), 98-101.


\textsuperscript{996} Hernández Sánchez, ‘Two Weddings’, 410.

Ruiz have argued in favour of Alfonso’s knighting himself. But this was not a tradition followed by all Castilian kings. The most obvious exceptions were Alfonso’s sons, Fernando de la Cerda, and Sancho. Fernando de la Cerda was knighted by his father, Alfonso X, before marrying, Blanche, daughter of the French king, Louis IX. Jaime I of Aragon, in his autobiographical memoir, recalls how Alfonso X knighted Fernando de la Cerda on 30 November 1269. Afterwards, the newly knighted heir to the crown performed the customary knighting of nobles and his other brothers. However, Jaime recalls advising Sancho to refuse knighthood from his brother and to accept it only from his father, Alfonso X. Sancho followed his grandfather’s advice. The knighting of Fernando followed the marriage agreement by which any sons born to the marriage between Fernando and Blanche of France, would, should the infante die, be recognized as rightful heirs to the Castilian throne. Benjamin Wild has pointed out that a particularly suitable gift was presented to Fernando upon his marriage to Blanche: a sword-belt commissioned originally by Henry III of England which, Wild suggests, had been given as a gift to Theobald of Navarre in December 1254, at the Temple in Paris, at a meeting also attended by Louis IX. The gift must have been given to Theobald at a time when relations between Castile and Navarre, then allied to Aragon, were fragile. By the time of Fernando de la Cerda’s marriage, relations between the three kingdoms were once again cordial. On the occasion of Fernando’s wedding, in 1269, Theobald may have gifted the sword-belt to the infante as a symbol of the rapprochement between

998 M. González Jiménez, Alfonso X el Sabio (Barcelona: 2004), 44-6.
999 Ferrando et al., eds., Fets, ch. 495.
France, Navarre, Castile, and by extension England. In a sense, the gift, like the knighting of Fernando de la Cerda, symbolised the future of the Castilian crown and its proximity to other European royal dynasties.

When the *infante* Fernando de la Cerda died, on 25 July 1275, he was buried together with his exquisite sword-belt. With him (and it) were buried the pretensions of the de la Cerda children and their French connections. Supported by his father, Alfonso X, Sancho [IV], Fernando’s younger brother, was now proclaimed heir to the throne. With France backing the de la Cerda heirs against those Castilian nobles now supporting Sancho, civil unrest erupted. Worse still, and now approaching the end of his life, Alfonso X once again changed his mind and withdrew his support from Sancho, further complicating an already tortuous family squabble. To counter French support for the de la Cerda children, Sancho, backed by most of the Castilian nobility and Church, was knighted by the archbishop of Toledo to mark his own accession to the throne. Had it not been for his grandfather’s advice, to reject knighting at the hands of his late brother, the matter of Sancho’s succession would have been further complicated. As it was, and amidst civil war, Sancho IV, Alfonso’s younger son, was crowned by the archbishop of Toledo in an attempt to legitimise a succession already tainted by the uncanonical marriage of Sancho’s aunt, María de Molina, and by his late father’s disapproval.
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1002 Cf. Ibid., 395.
Knighting ceremonies were solemn occasions, but as Björn Weiler has underlined, rituals that allowed for a degree of flexibility. The royal Castilian ceremony, was certainly adaptable to the circumstances surrounding royal accession. Perhaps nothing better symbolizes this than the mechanical statue of St James (‘Santiago del espaldarazo’) used to knight successive Castilian kings, from at least 1332, when it was used to knight Alfonso XI on his accession to the throne.

Meanwhile, Alfonso X had undoubtedly acquired great prestige from his knighting of Edward in 1254, emphasized in royal charters and thereafter remembered by the chroniclers including Jofré de Loaysa and the anonymous writer of the Chronicle of Alfonso X. Above all the ceremony conferred upon Alfonso X the ‘great honour’ of having knighted Edward, which made it possible for him to press the demands of his Gascon vassal, Gaston de Béarn, and have these listened to by Henry III. Edward’s knightings was literally a double-edged ceremony from which both parities reaped political and symbolic advantages. This was by no means always the case with Castilian royal inauguration rituals.

Symbolically, although Fernando III’s inauguration (and possibly that of his son) was different from that depicted in the 1250 Ordo, the Castilian kings undoubtedly conceived of themselves as protectors of the faith. Later in his life, Alfonso X would reflect on the tradition by which various kings bestowed knighthood upon
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1005 Linehan, ‘King’s Touch’, 76; Ruiz, ‘Unsacred Monarchy’, 109. This was not the only mechanical statue in Medieval Spain, where it was common, from the High Middle Ages, to have mechanical representations of the crucified Christ. Another famous contemporary mechanical statue is the Virgen de los Reyes. Cf. F. Cornejo Vega, ‘La escultura animada en el arte español. Evolución y funciones’, Laboratorio de Arte, 9 (1996), 239-44. 
1007 Burns et al., eds., Siete Partidas, Par. II, Tit. I, i.
themselves. According to Alfonso, because knighthood was necessary before a king could be consecrated or crowned, in some places ‘although no one, no matter how high his rank, had the power to make himself a knight’ kings might choose to knight themselves ‘rather through custom than through justice.’ There is no evidence that Alfonso X was either consecrated or crowned. Most likely he knighted himself.

Richard of Cornwall had been crowned king of the Germans at Aachen on 17 May 1257 by the archbishop of Cologne. Of the two contenders to the imperial title, Richard was the only one to travel to Germany. There he enjoyed the support of an important contingent of electors, albeit that his election had to be ‘bought’ with costly gifts supported by the diplomatic efforts of John Mansel and the earl of Gloucester, Gilbert de Clare. By contrast, Alfonso made no attempt to travel to Aachen for coronation.

Later Castilian sources offer little information on Alfonso’s nomination to the imperial throne. The fourteenth-century Chronicle of Alfonso X only once mentions his imperial candidacy, under the year 1268, when it states that, as the German Empire was vacant and the ‘electors of the empire could not agree on a new emperor from the land of Germany’, they called upon the Castilian king as a result of his ‘renowned greatness’. According to O’Callaghan, the Chronicle here refers to the events not of 1257 or 1268 but of 1272, following the death of Richard of

1008 Ibid., Par. II, Tit. XXI, xi.
1010 On the events leading to his coronation, see O’Callaghan, The Learned King, 200-201. On Alfonso’s reaction to his election and the events that followed, see González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 115-120.
1012 Chronicle of Alfonso X (2002), ch. 18, 69.
However, this is to assume that Alfonso X and other Castilian chroniclers considered Richard to have been truly an ‘Emperor’, a title that the ‘Wise King’ contested throughout the interregnum, from 1257 onwards.

Alfonso X on Empire and Kingship

Imperium is a great dignity, noble and honored above all other temporal offices which men can hold in this world. For the lord on whom God confers such an honor is both king and emperor, and to him belongs, according to law, the power granted by the people in former times to govern and maintain the empire with justice. For this reason he is styled emperor, which means commander, because all persons of the empire obey his commands, and he is not bound to obey any one except the Pope, and that only in spiritual matters.

Meanwhile, in the German Empire very little had been solved by Richard’s coronation. Factions in Pisa, Marseilles and Genoa recognized Alfonso X as emperor. Manuel González Jiménez has suggested that the Castilian claim was based on the legalist idea that a ‘king was an emperor in his own realm’ (‘Rex est imperator in regno suo’) and that, as such, Alfonso considered himself emperor in his own right. By contrast, Cayetano Socarras asserts that the ‘Wise King’ attempted to revive the concept of a Spanish emperor by adding, for the first time, to his titles that of ‘Holy Roman Emperor’. Here we need to turn to Alfonso’s own legal

1013 O’Callaghan, The Learned King, 222.
1014 Burns et al., eds., Siete Partidas, Par. II, Tit. I, i.
1015 Weiler, Empire, 201.
1017 Cf. Socarras, Alfonso X, 63.
compilations for further motives for his pursuit, against all financial or practical common sense, of the imperial title.

It has already been pointed out that in his Setenario, Alfonso X explained his father’s refusal to use the imperial title after his conquest of Seville, which was not to be used until the land beyond the sea (‘tierra daquent mar’), North Africa, had been conquered.\textsuperscript{1018} It was clear that, in Alfonso’s mind, the crusade to Morocco and his imperial claims went hand in hand. As a result, Alfonso continued to work towards both goals. His idea of ‘Empire’, it would seem, lay not in Germany, but in Spain. Furthermore, it rested on military deeds rather than upon any classical or post-Roman concept of dynastic imperial succession.

Alfonso’s political thought, albeit divorced from the practicalities of his government, has been transmitted to us via his chief political legal compendium, Las Siete Partidas. This legal treatise provides us with a glimpse into Alfonso’s own mind, however much his precepts may have diverged from his day-to-day practice.\textsuperscript{1019} Here again we find clues as to why Alfonso made no attempt to secure the imperial crown through coronation. In the Siete Partidas Alfonso describes empire as a ‘great dignity’. However, as he points out, kings hold more power than any emperor, because ‘they are sovereign by inheritance’, unlike emperors who ‘obtain theirs by election’.\textsuperscript{1020} Election rather than coronation was central to Alfonso X’s imperial pretensions. He considered himself the rightful emperor on the basis of his election

\textsuperscript{1018} Alfonso X, Setenario, K.H. Vanderford ed. (Barcelona: 1984), 22-3.
\textsuperscript{1019} The most notorious instance occurred after the death of his firstborn son, Fernando de la Cerda, when Alfonso initially supported his second-born son, Sancho [IV], over the ‘rightful’ heirs, Fernando’s children. Because of subsequent rivalry with Sancho, Alfonso X later changed his mind and backed the de la Cerda children, for all of which see Chapter Eight: Sancho’s Marriage to Guillelme (Wilhemina) de Béarn, 306-57.
\textsuperscript{1020} Burns et al., eds., Siete Partidas, Par. II, Tit. I, viii.
and it was on those grounds that he seems to have requested Henry III’s help. It was in answer to this request (itself now lost) that, in 1258 Henry III promised to look into the matter of the election. From Henry’s response to Alfonso it is clear that Alfonso disputed the validity of Richard’s election, claiming himself to have secured more electoral votes than his rival. In Alfonso’s mind, coronation was only an incidental feature of any claim to an imperial title itself held through election. Hence the Partidas do not emphasize the coronation ritual, only the knighting and the unction of kings.

In Alfonso’s mind, the imperial title was not limited to the German Empire either north or south of the Alps. In León-Castile, it carried moral weight linked to the Iberian Visigoth past, to a large extent divorced from present Castilian political realities. This idea of a Leonese empire was still alive in the thirteenth century, regardless of what Menéndez Pidal has described as the emergence of ‘the Five Kingdoms’. There is no doubt that in Alfonso’s mind his imperial claim would help re-establish the old Leonese claim to an Iberian empire. Jaime I of Aragon objected precisely to such pretensions on Alfonso’s part. On 23 September 1259, Jaime declared his refusal to countenance any submission to Alfonso should he claim the title of Spanish emperor (‘Imperator Hispano’).

Late in 1259, Alfonso X at last openly declared his intentions to claim the imperial title, summoning the Cortes.
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to discuss the imperial dispute (‘fecho del imperio’). The Cortes met at Toledo in late 1259. Archbishops, bishops, the king’s brothers, his uncle, Alfonso de Molina, and many other ricos hombres were all present. It is possible that the king also discussed his intention to use the imperial claim to revive the old title ‘Emperor of Spain’, against which his father-in-law, Jaime I, had already objected. Alfonso planned to use his imperial dignity to claim Castilian hegemony over the other Iberian kingdoms. At the same time as pursuing the imperial crown, Alfonso continued to lobby for support for the North African crusade, to which Jaime I was willing to lend assistance, save against his ally, the king of Tunis. In the meantime, Alfonso’s pursuit of the imperial title continued to add to his expenditure, in the process proving ever less popular.

Alfonso’s imperial enterprise might be judged as absurd as Henry III’s Sicilian campaign. Certainly, there were many Castilian nobles unwilling to support it. It is unlikely that Alfonso rallied such support at the Cortes of 1259. Amongst those opposing Alfonso’s plans was the king of Granada, Mohammed I, who apparently declared to Alfonso that, if he could not obtain the imperial title (‘que si el Imperio non nos diessen’), he should avoid any travelling outside Spain to obtain it (‘que non fuésemos’). Rather, he should remain in Castile (‘uiniésemos a esta tierra’) helping Alfonso to obtain a better empire (‘él nos ayudarie e nos mostrarie commo ouiéssemos muy mayor e meior imperio que aquél’). When Alfonso travelled to Jaén

1024 Unfortunately, the cuadernos for the Cortes have been lost. We know about them only through other documents of the time. Cf. A. Ballesteros Beretta, Alfonso X el Sabio (Barcelona: 1984), 225; González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 133; P. Linehan, Spain, 1157-1300: A Partible Inheritance (Oxford: 2008), 129-32.
1025 Rodríguez, Memorial histórico, no. 71.
1027 April 1260. Rodríguez, Memorial histórico, no. 73.
1028 O’Callaghan, Cortes of Castile-León, 98-9.
to meet the king of Granada, he was informed by Mohammed that Granada would help him conquer Ceuta in North Africa. Mohammed also promised to help him gain Muslim allies in Morocco (‘nos ganaríe muchos moros de allent mar por amigos’) who would help Alfonso conquer the coveted Moroccan lands (‘que seríen en nuestra ayuda e farien lo que nos quisiéssemos para conquerrar la tierra’). But the King failed to make good his promise, by mid 1264 heading an uprising against Alfonso X.

**Enrique of Castile and Henry III**

Amidst the imperial election dispute, and in the face both of Alfonso’s insistence that Henry III participate in an expedition to North Africa and restore Gascon lands to Castile’s allies, a man with the potential to destabilise the Anglo-Castilian relationship made his way to Henry III’s court. The presence of Enrique (Henry) of Castile, Alfonso’s estranged brother, in England from 1256, threatened to disrupt relations between the two kings. In the event, it did no such thing.

The tensions between Enrique and Alfonso could be traced at least as far back as the conquest of Seville in 1248. After capturing the city, the brothers had met with their father, Fernando III, to discuss how the newly acquired land was to be distributed. Alfonso suggested dividing it into fiefs, thus making the beneficiaries vassals of León-Castile. But Enrique, who favoured a more traditional system, disagreed with
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his brother. Their differences proved to be irreconcilable and with Alfonso’s accession to the throne, the brothers drifted even further apart.

The rift between Enrique and Alfonso deepened as the result of Alfonso’s reform of land tenure, which affected not only his brother but several major Castilian nobles. Land tenure remained a headache for Alfonso throughout his reign. Convinced that lordship of the newly conquered lands of Seville should remain in the hands of the king, he had distrained Enrique’s lands. In 1253, after the conquest of Jeréz and Lebrija, he required the master of the Order of Calatrava to deliver up whatever privileges had been issued by Fernando III to Enrique, which Alfonso then tore into pieces. Enrique no longer held Morón and Cote. Adding insult to injury, the king now crushed the infante’s claims to land in the newly conquered provinces of Jeréz and Lebrija.

Other members of the nobility, particularly those who had been close to Fernando III, shared Enrique’s grievances. From his accession, Alfonso had favoured certain nobles, possibly in an attempt to limit the power held by families, such as the Haros, previously buttressed by vast lands and important offices. After a failed uprising, the offended nobles took refuge in Navarre where they sought an alliance against Alfonso. Taking advantage of this tense situation between Castile and its Iberian neighbours, in September 1255, Enrique signed an agreement (‘convenimos e prometemos a buena fe e sense mal engaynno’) with Jaime I of Aragón against Alfonso X of Castile and all others, save the king of Portugal, the king of Navarre and

1032 Ibid., 82.
the count of Provence. That same day, Jaime I entered into a separate agreement ('convenimos e prometemos') with Diego López de Haro, likewise directed against Castile and Alfonso X.

Inevitably, Enrique could not remain in Spain. His first refuge lay in France, from where he passed to England, remaining there from 1256-9. By the summer of 1256, Enrique and his household had crossed the Channel to seek Henry III’s hospitality. On 23 August, Henry ordered the sheriff of Oxford to pay 30 marks to William Bonquer, his knight, who in turn would pay Enrique’s expenses. The well-informed Matthew Paris recalled this Spanish visit. He tells us that at about this time [August 1256] a high baron from Spain ('Hispania'), the brother of the king, had been hounded into exile ('profugus et fugatus') having incurred royal anger. Enrique dreamed of financial aid ('pecuniae') and help ('auxilio') from the king of England. Always critical of the foreigners at Henry’s court, Matthew condemned Henry’s reception of the infante. Henry, as was his wont with all foreigners ('consuevit omnibus alienis'), received Enrique and placed him in the care of a knight, William Bonquer, who was himself well acquainted with the Spaniards ('Hispanos') and their customs ('mores et consuetudines'). The king made further arrangements for his guest. On 4 September 1256, for example, he authorized a further 200 marks towards Enrique’s maintenance.

1033 A. Huici Miranda et al., eds., Documentos de Jaime I de Aragón III 1251-1257 (Zaragoza: 1978), no. 682.
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Enrique was the King’s guest, but behind such hospitality, as always, there lay a political agenda. Enrique was lobbied for his support for the Sicilian expedition, which the pope was adamantly that Henry should pursue. In England, few English barons were willing to support the King so that the King was forced to solicit foreign mercenaries to fulfil his ambitions. Enrique was an experienced warrior, or in the words of his own brother, Alfonso X, he was the ‘best knight of all [the king’s] brothers, but he said he had no need to speak of him, for he had risen against him and his father, and made war on their realm.’ He had participated in the conquest of Seville, and again in the conquest of Jeréz and Lebrija. He also had diplomatic experience from his dealings with the Christian and Moslem kings of the peninsula.

At the time of Enrique’s arrival in England, Henry III must have known that the infante was estranged from his brother, king Alfonso. García Martinez, who was also in England at this time, would have supplied news of the problems between the two brothers. Likewise, when in October García travelled back to Castile, he surely informed Alfonso X that Enrique had sought refuge at Henry’s court. In the meantime, the pope allowed Henry III an extension for the expedition to Sicily, whilst continuing to insist upon the urgency of the matter. Unfortunately for Henry, matters were complicated even further by the outbreak of a Welsh revolt (1256-7).

From August 1256 until the infante’s departure in 1259, Henry III paid Enrique’s expenses. Two months after the infante’s arrival in England, Enrique, sponsored
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1041 At some time between September and November, Pope Alexander IV urged Henry III to launch a Sicilian campaign: Foedera, I.i.348.
1042 Cf. PRO, E403/11, 13, 3115.
by the English king, embarked on a journey to the continent. During Enrique’s absence, his household’s expenses were to be covered, starting on 24 October (the Wednesday before the feast of St Simon and Jude), at a rate of twenty shillings a day, or more than £60 a year, suggesting an establishment of some size, even despite the absence of its master and his closest supporters. Meanwhile, Enrique received 40 marks for his trip to France (‘Francia’). Early in November, Henry III urged the sheriff of Kent and his bailiffs at the port of Dover, to provide swift transport for Enrique. Rather than leading a diplomatic mission, Enrique may have travelled to the continent to recruit mercenaries for Henry’s Sicilian campaign. It was perhaps with such an expedition in mind that Henry III paid a further 100 marks of the *infante*’s expenses.

It is uncertain how long did Enrique remained in France. By mid-January, he seems to have returned to England. On 27 January 1257, the king ordered the custodian of Havering to catch 10 deer on his behalf. All aspects of Enrique’s daily needs were taken care of, including his clothes. On 20 April, Henry III paid £30 for cloth used to make robes for Enrique, his fellows, and some of the king’s own knights. The king also paid for fire-wood to warm his quarters. Payments for Enrique’s expenses continued to mount. Following the festivities of Easter (8 April 1257), the king paid 20 m and £7 towards his expenses; and from 9 April to 3 June he was given
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1043 Only days before, Henry III paid 100 marks towards Enrique’s expenses. CLR 1251-60, 330; PRO E401/11.  
1044 CLR 1251-60, 336; PRO E403/11.  
1045 CLR 1251-60, 339; PRO E403/11.  
1046 CLR 1251-60, 348; PRO E403/11.  
1047 Close Rolls 1256-9, 29.  
1048 CLR 1251-60, 366.  
1049 London, 17 January 1257, in CLR 1251-60, 352; 23 November 1257, in CLR 1251-60, 410.
a further £38. For his expenses from 28 May to 25 June Enrique received another £29.\textsuperscript{1050}

In the meantime an embassy, headed by the bishop of Jaen, arrived from Castile.\textsuperscript{1051} Its chief purpose was to secure the restoration of certain rights to Alfonso’s Gascon allies.\textsuperscript{1052} It is also possible that the bishop discussed the matter of the empire with Henry. There is no record that he complained to Henry over the hospitality extended to Enrique. Curiously though, we know that the bishop’s embassy was accompanied by two performers (‘istriones’) from the Castilian court, who performed for Henry III and who in return received robes of camlet trimmed with squirrel fur.\textsuperscript{1053} Henry was a generous host.

On 6 June 1257, Henry III revealed to the pope, that he had been planning to send Enrique of Castile to Apulia, as his captain with ‘a great sum of money’. Only the Welsh revolt had prevented him from doing so. Because of the Welsh uprising, he informed the Pope, it was now impossible to send a captain that summer, leaving the matter to the pope’s discretion.\textsuperscript{1054} Time was running out for Henry III’s Sicilian plans, but he perhaps hoped that Alexander IV would extend the deadline. In the meantime, the English barons remained highly critical of Henry’s Sicilian adventure. It was probably against Enrique’s presence at the English court that Matthew Paris

\textsuperscript{1050} PRO, E403/13.
\textsuperscript{1051} CPR 1247-58, 558-9.
\textsuperscript{1052} Foedera, I.i.363.
\textsuperscript{1053} CLR 1251-60, 388.
\textsuperscript{1054} CPR 1247-58, 567.
lashed out when he condemned the Spanish who surrounded Henry as ‘ugly-faced Spaniards’ (‘Hispanorum’) with wretched morals and debased religious practices.  

Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the problems Henry faced with his barons, there is little record of Enrique’s activities at court in 1258. Henry’s hospitality undoubtedly suffered as a result of the baronial rebellion, as did his Sicilian plans, which he was in due course forced to abandon. In the meantime, diplomatic channels remained open between Henry III and Alfonso X. On 25 June 1258, perhaps pressured by the recent imperial controversy, Henry assured Alfonso that he would always honour their friendship (‘convenciones insuper et pacta inter nos inita nostre semper intencionis extitit et existit pro posse nostro servare’). The king was here responding to Alfonso’s demands, firstly in regard to Gascony, secondly in regard to a projected marriage between Alfonso’s brother, Emmanuel (Manuel), and Henry’s daughter, Beatrice. To this the king would happily agree. With regards to the African expedition, Henry would proceed, if the pope gave him license. Finally, there was the matter of the imperial election. Alfonso had complained about Richard’s coronation to Henry. The English king promised to look into the matter of the election and to find out whether there had been any disfavour to the Castilian, in which case Henry would support Alfonso against Richard, his brother.  

Alfonso was clearly too concerned with other matters to worry overly about Enrique.

As the imperial controversy dragged on and Henry III faced problems of his own in England, Enrique may have begun to look further afield for future opportunities. Not until the summer of 1259 does Enrique reappear in the records of Henry III’s court.
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1055 ‘Novit insuper dominus rex Hispanorum mores et religionem, quoniam sunt hominum peripsima, vultu deformes, cultu despicabiles, moribus detestabiles’: CM, v, 450.
1056 Close Rolls 1256-9, 314-5.
As Henry’s hopes of conquering Sicily were extinguished, Enrique found a more rewarding role for himself in North Africa. It is only at this point that we find a reference to the king of Castile, proving that Alfonso had indeed been concerned over Enrique’s whereabouts and future plans. On 27 July 1259 Henry III made Enrique promise that he would not attempt to wage war against Alfonso X. The infante was travelling from England to Bayonne whence he would make his way to Africa (‘ad partes Africanas’).\(^{1057}\) Henry wanted to avoid any frictions between the quarrelling brothers. In a final display of generosity, he allowed Enrique to engage ships at Bordeaux and Bayonne for his expedition into Africa at English expense.\(^{1058}\)

Enrique thereafter made his way to Tunis. An ally of the crown of Catalonia-Aragón, Tunis was in desperate need of military help. Its Hafsid rulers, who on behalf of the Almohad kings had once ruled territories extending across modern Tunis and Algeria, had since the late 1240s divided themselves from the Almohads, forming their own kingdom, as Almohad authority dwindled across the Maghreb. In wartime, the Hafsids, like the Almohads, often depended on hired Christian militias. In 1257, their Aragonese allies had provided them such help, with the Aragonese noble, Guillem de Moncada, placed at the head of a mercenary army. The Hafsids were at war with Berber tribes from the region of Miliana (on the coast of modern-day Algeria). Although Enrique now fought alongside Catalan nobles, he could hardly hope for Jaime I’s official support, as Jaime was Alfonso X’s declared ally, banning his nobles from helping Enrique until he had made peace with his brother.\(^{1059}\) Days later, on 29 April 1260, Jaime further reassured Alfonso that he would support him against the Muslims of Africa, save his ally, the king of Tunis (‘nos sacavamos del fecho de la

1057 Foedera, I.i.388.
1058 Ibid.
1059 22 April 1260: Rodriguez, Memorial histórico, no. 74.
Meanwhile, Jaime I continued to support the Christian enclaves in Tunis and, on 5 May 1261, endowed his chapel of Alfondac (‘alfundici’) in Tunis with two lodgings (‘duas botigias’) for the use of a chaplain. Alfonso X was certainly aware of his brother’s whereabouts, but it seems that so long as Enrique was not waging war against him, he remained immune from further royal reprisals. Enrique now fought alongside his brother, the infante Federico, against the enemies of the Hafsid kings.

Still on the look-out for better opportunities and pay, in 1266, Enrique made his way to Italy where he fought against Manfred under Charles of Anjou. He was handsomely rewarded by Charles who made him senator in Rome. He also gained the favour of Pope Clement IV who, on 15 May 1267, wrote to Jaime I of Aragón to propose a marriage between Enrique and one of his daughters. Nothing seems to have come of this.

As Enrique’s aspirations grew, he fell out with Charles of Anjou over an outstanding loan that the French refused to pay after the conquest of Sardinia, whose throne was coveted by both Enrique and Charles. In late 1267, he was linked with a Ghibelline attack on the bishop of Silves, dean of Salamanca and the subsequent loss of documents that Alfonso X had sent to the pope, with regards to his bid for the
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1060 Ibid., no. 75.
1065 Ibid., no. 1231.
imperial title. After a decade, it seems that the *infante* and his brother had still to be reconciled. Finally, after several years as senator in Rome, Enrique returned to Castile. Alfonso X had been dead for several years, and Enrique became tutor to the young Fernando IV, son of Sancho IV. As such, he appears as a frequent presence in Fernando’s royal charters.

**Sicily: an Abandoned Dream**

From 1254 onwards, Henry III faced political pressure from the Welsh, and from the English baronage as well as from France and Rome. In addition, he was burdened with a large debt following his return from Gascony. In these circumstances, he could not honour his commitments to mount either a Sicilian or an African campaign. The fact was that he lacked the money even to fund the Welsh campaign of 1257. Much less could he afford an expedition to either Sicily or Morocco. The 1257 expedition to suppress Llewellyn’s revolt was only made possible by further loans.

Within England, the enraged nobility had for a long-time disapproved of the king’s favouritism towards certain *aliens*. They now increased their pressure on the king. After his marriage with Eleanor of Provence (1236), Henry III had employed Savoyards mainly as knights and clerks, sometimes granting them land. Following the king’s failed campaign against Louis IX in Poitou in 1247, in which the king had

---

acted in concert with his maternal family, his half-brothers from the house of Lusignan, the Lusignans themselves were invited to England and given lands. The problem was that, by now, there was simply not enough land to go around. Where the Savoyards had been endowed with English honours and integrated fairly easily into English noble society, the Lusignans found themselves locked into a far fiercer competition for patronage. Several such ‘aliens’ secured English marriages, further angering the English baronage.\textsuperscript{1070} The pressure mounted. Finally, in the Westminster parliament of April 1258, a group of nobles, including Hugh Bigod, Peter of Savoy, John fitz Geoffre, Peter de Montfort, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, and led by the earls of Gloucester and Norfolk, Richard de Clare and Roger Bigod, united in a common front, displeased with the king’s frequent breaches of Magna Carta, his failure to consult them in matters such as the Sicilian affair, the setbacks in the Welsh campaign, and the privileges granted to foreigners. As a result, the king was forced to accept their demands. These measures, known as the Provisions of Oxford, forced King to expel the Lusignans and to place royal castles in the hand of the English-born nobility. The following year, in October, at Westminster, further provisions were put in place.\textsuperscript{1071}

The problems that Henry III faced within England, combined with the mounting pressure to make a lasting peace with France, made it impossible for him to attend either to the Sicilian business or to the African crusade. After a prolonged diplomatic effort, peace with France was finally reached in October 1259 when Henry III and


Louis IX of France signed the Treaty of Paris. Through the treaty Henry renounced his ancestral rights to Normandy, Anjou, Touraine, Maine, and Poitou. In return he received in fief Bordeaux, Bayonne and Gascony, all of which had remained loyal to his family since 1204, and the regions of the Dordogne and the Limousin, now detached from their French conquerors and restored to Plantagenet rule. This peace potentially set Henry III free to honour his commitment to the Sicilian Business. However, there was still widespread opposition to the Sicilian campaign amongst the English barons.

Meanwhile, Castilian embassies continued to arrive in England. Early in 1260, Pascasius, bishop of Jaen, and García Pérez, treasurer of Seville, crossed the Channel. It is possible that they came to press Alfonso’s claims to the imperial throne, or for the fulfilment of the clauses of the treaty of 1254 relating to Africa. Nothing seems to have come of their mission, and there is no documentary record of their dealings beyond the payments for their upkeep. In May 1260, Peter of Castile, a messenger from Alfonso X received 20 marks for his expenses. Again we are given no further details. On 1 April 1262, Alfonso X sent another embassy. The Benedictine Fernando Rodríguez, abbot of Covarrubias, and the knight Pedro od Castile, who had twice before visited Henry’s court (1256 and 1260), were sent again to the English king. Presumably they came to resolve pending Anglo-Castilian issues: the joint crusade, the ongoing disputes in Gascony, and the imperial succession. In
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1072 P. Chaplais, ‘The Making of the Treaty of Paris (1259) and the Royal Style’, EHR, 67 (1952); Layettes, iii, no. 4554.
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1075 On May 1280, Alfonso X backed an attempt to secure the Pope’s favour and thus the see of Toledo for Rodríguez. Cf. P. Linehan, ‘An Archbishop In Angustiis (May 1280)’ (paper presented at the Encontro internacional carreiras eclesiásticas no ocidente cristão, séculos xii-xiv, Lisboa, 2007), 245-55.
exchange for Henry’s support against Richard of Cornwall, Alfonso offered help against Welsh and English rebels. In the same month, the Castilian king sent his notary, Rodrigo, to the papal court to ask Pope Urban IV (1261-4) to crown him Emperor. The pope was unable to comply given that Richard of Cornwall laid claim to the same title. Alfonso was now determined to press his claims through any diplomatic means possible.

In response to the latest embassy, on 16 August 1262, King Henry III sent a letter to Alfonso X of Castile, addressing him for the first time as king of the Romans (‘magnifico principe et consanguineo suo karissimo… Romanorum Regi semper augusto’), an extraordinary concession that suggests at least partial abandonment by Henry of his brother, Richard of Cornwall, possibly in an attempt to avoid a conflict with Alfonso. Henry here explained that trouble in Wales had prevented him from honouring his prior commitment to join Alfonso’s African crusade, assuring him that, once domestic issues had been resolved, he would keep his earlier promises. As regards the imperial election, Henry undertook to support the papal policy of reviewing the controversy. The king explained that his brother, Richard, had been crowned (‘coronatus’) King of the Romans and therefore that it was right to accord Richard the title, just as these letters themselves accorded the same title to Alfonso. The imperial election was a matter to be further examined by the Roman Church, over which Henry had no control.
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1076 DD, no. 357. Pedro de Castello was not new to the English court, having been sent to England in 1256: CLR 1251-60, 281.
1078 Super hoc autem quod dicti nuncii de subsidio vobis praestando contra regem Alemanniae petierunt, vos credimus non latere quod ipse germanus noster et homo ligius existat dudum in regem Alemannie coronatus, et etiam, quod oporteat nos ipsum, quem ecclesia Romana regem reputat et appellat, pro rege tenere; propter quod, imperii pendente negotio sub examine Romanae ecclesiae, non possemus, salvo fidei et fidelitatis vinculo quibus eidem ecclesiae astringimur, super hoc aliquid attemptare; verumtamen, si praefatus germanus noster vobis injuriatus fuerit in aliquo, et hoc ad
Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso X as ‘reges Romanorum’ is suggested by a letter to his brother dated only a few days later, on 30 September 1262, in which Richard is formally addressed as ‘Rex Romanorum illustris, semper augustus’.  

Why did Henry III give Alfonso X the benefit of the doubt? It was not in the English king’s best interest to alienate the Castilian king. Henry already faced political and financial pressures in England, and could not risk his Castilian ally supporting the always fickle Gascon nobility. Meanwhile, the papacy scrutinized the double election, as both sides continued to lay claim to the title ‘Emperor’.

On 10 September 1262, Urban reminded John Mansel that Henry III had already received fair warning over the Sicilian business from his predecessors, popes Innocent and Alexander, and had received repeated licences for delay. Therefore, if the king could not attend to his Sicilian enterprise, another man would be appointed to take his place. The pope was determined to find a better candidate, one who could immediately and effectively deliver Sicily to the papacy. As a native French speaker, he naturally favoured a candidate from France, where Louis IX turned down the offer, but had no objections to his brother, Charles of Anjou, accepting.

On 28 July 1263, Urban IV confronted Henry III and announced that as he had failed to free Sicily, the papacy would award the kingdom elsewhere. Meanwhile, the papal wars against Manfred continued, with Urban IV looking beyond England for...
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monitionem et inductionem nostram emendare noluerit, nos super hoc quod foedera, inter vos et nos contracta, desiderant, faciemus’: Foedera, I.1.420.
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assistance. In June 1264, the Pope asked the archbishop of Tarragona and the bishops of Mallorca, Barcelona, Tarazona, Urgel, Pamplona, Tortosa, Lérida, Calahorra, Vich, Gerona, Valencia, Osense and Zaragoza to provide financial aid against Manfred’s ‘tyrannical madness’ (‘rabie tirampnica’). He also made a broad appeal to the archbishops, bishops, abbots and other ecclesiastical authorities, including the Templars, the orders of Santiago, Calatrava and Roncesvalles in Castile, León, Portugal, Navarre and Aragón, as well as Gascony, Bordeaux, Auch and Narbonne, to give money for the relief of the Roman Church. It is uncertain to what extent these churches were able to contribute to the papal cause. In England, Henry III was unable to muster any troops, money or support for the campaign. Finally, in June 1265, just before the battle of Evesham, the king renounced his claims to the Sicilian throne, claiming to act here in the name of Edmund his son.

The Two Candidatures for the Imperial Throne: An Unresolved Issue

Urban IV (1261-1264)

In mid 1263, as the pope prepared to launch another crusade and encouraged suitable preachers from England, Castile and Portugal to promote the recovery of the Holy Land, Urban IV treated the two contenders to the imperial title to a lengthy rehearsal of the problems raised by their rival claims. The pope refused to award the title ‘emperor’ to either of the contenders. In practice, he was more concerned with ousting the Staufen from Sicily and Italy. He explained that, while Richard of
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Cornwall claimed that he had been first to be elected King of the Romans, several
other electors had chosen Alfonso X. Therefore, without decisive evidence, he had no
grounds on which to crown either of them. Due to the uncertainty, he would continue
to address both Richard and Alfonso as ‘Romanorum rex electus’. 1087 Alfonso may
simply have pressed the matter of his election, rather than complaining directly or
officially against Richard’s coronation. By February 1263, he had appointed the
bishop of León, the bishop of Silva, the archdeacon of Compostela and a royal notary
as delegates (‘gestores’) to the papal curia to defend his imperial claims. 1088 In the
meantime, without decisive papal action, the interregnum persisted.

In August 1263, Pope Urban IV at last summoned Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso
X to his court to settle the dispute. Both candidates were expected to come in person
or to send proxies by the following 2 May. Addressing the earl of Cornwall, a couple
of days later, the Pope, who showed no apparent preference for either of the
candidates, reminded Richard that he would consider the arguments of both parties.
Richard named Laurence of St. Martin, bishop of Rochester (1251-1274), and
William, archdeacon of Rochester, as proctors to the papal court. Laurence had
experience of the papal-imperial struggle stretching back to 1245 and the Council of
Lyons. 1089 Urban’s letters of August 1263 summarized the contenders’ claims.
Richard claimed to have been elected by the archbishop of Mainz and the Count
Palatine of the Rhineland, outside the walls of Frankfurt, as was customary. The
election had been followed by Richard’s coronation in 1257, at Aachen by the
Archbishop of Cologne. By contrast, as the pope explained to Richard, Alfonso
claimed to have been peacefully (‘pacifici’) elected at Frankfurt by the archbishop of

1087 Ibid., no. 89.
1088 Ibid., no. 58.
1089 As will shortly be proved in an article by Nicholas Vincent.
Trier, the duke of Saxony, the margrave of Brandenburg and proctors of the king of Bohemia (‘dictum regem Castellae, suo et illorum nomine, publice et solemniter, in eodem oppido de Frankenford, Dei nomine invocato, Romanorum regem et imperatorem elect(ur)’).\textsuperscript{1090} Clearly, what was important to Alfonso was the validity of Alfonso’s election without which, as Richard and his proctors maintained, any claim by Alfonso to consecration and coronation were invalid.\textsuperscript{1091} As in his \textit{Si\textsuperscript{e}te Partidas} it was the election to the imperial throne that Alfonso regarded as the key to his claim, rather than coronation itself.

By May 1264, when his claims came for judgement in Rome, Richard himself had been forced to attend to other business in England, where he aided his brother, Henry III, in the face of the popular rebellion that ended with the royalist defeat and Richard and Henry’s captivity at Lewes. The rebellion of 1263-4 had been provoked, amongst other things, by the economic burden placed on England by Henry’s acceptance of Sicily, the changes made by Henry to the tenure of land, castles and the administration of justice, and the King’s increased preference for ‘aliens’.'\textsuperscript{1092} For the next year Richard was held prisoner by Simon de Montfort’s regime. He was only freed after Montfort was defeated in the battle of Evesham in August 1265.

Urban IV himself died in October 1264, with the dispute between Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso X still unresolved. As Peter Linehan has pointed out, it had been Urban IV’s policy to grant important benefits to the Castilian Church, in order to

\textsuperscript{1090} \textit{Foedera} I.i.430-1; ibid, no. 92, 94-9.
\textsuperscript{1091} \textit{Foedera} I.i.432.
‘discourage the king from forcing the imperial issue’. As we shall see, it was not only the Church that received special privileges. Other political concessions were granted to Alfonso X. In May 1263, the pope notified the bishop and chapter of Palencia that he had granted the masters and scholars (‘magistri et scolares’) of the university (‘studium generale’) of Palencia the same privileges, indulgences, liberties and immunities granted to the masters and scholars of Paris. That same year, on 21 August, in a flattering letter to the Castilian king, the Pope granted the church of the Holy Cross of Cádiz, constructed by Alfonso X as his final resting place, the status of a cathedral. Interestingly, the promotion of the church of Cadiz came six days before the pope requested both imperial contenders, Alfonso and Richard of Cornwall, to send their proctors to the papal curia to defend their claims to the imperial throne. In August 1264, a series of papal privileges was issued at the instance of Alfonso, granting royal clerks, scribes, notaries and messengers prebends in several Castilian bishoprics. Once again the grants came days before the pope extended for a further year, from the feast of St Andrew (30 November), the deadline by which Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso X were expected to present their arguments in favour of their claims to the imperial throne. The pope seemed to be benefiting from the interregnum, perhaps in the hope of finding a better candidate for the imperial throne.

Not only did Urban IV grant ecclesiastical privileges to the Castilian Church; he made important concessions touching the Castilian royal family. In mid June 1263, he

1094 Rodríguez de Lama, Urbano IV, no. 69.
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1097 Ibid., nos. 308, 310, 311, 312, 318.
1098 Ibid., no. 317 (26 August 1264).
finally legitimized the marriage, contracted in 1253 following Afonso III of Portugal’s divorce from Matilda, countess of Boulogne (d. 1260), between Afonso and Beatriz, the illegitimate daughter of Alfonso X by his mistress, Mayor Guillén de Guzmán. The marriage had already produced four children, amongst them the future Dinis, king of Portugal, but had been contracted when Beatriz (b. 1243) was under the age of consent. In addition, the bride was related to Afonso III within the fourth degree of consanguinity. Although the petition to legitimize the marriage was made by the kings of France and Navarre and the bishops of Coimbra and Lisbon, rather than by the king of Castile, the marriage of his daughter was clearly amongst Alfonso’s more personal concerns. Castile had long pressured the papacy into accepting the marriage, a process in which the archbishop of Compostela (1238-66), Juan Arias, and the bishop of Mondoñedo, had placed Portugal under interdict. In these circumstances, there seems little doubt that it was Alfonso X who was ultimately responsible for the papal initiative of June 1263.

Throughout his pontificate, Urban IV strove to drive the Staufen from Italy and Sicily. As we have seen, Henry III, who had accepted the Sicilian throne on behalf of his son Edmund, had been unable to amass the economic resources to mount a military campaign to free Sicily from Manfred. Urban was forced to look to other candidates for the throne, finally, in June 1264, offering the crown to Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX of France. The intention was to avoid the union of the Imperial and Sicilian crowns under one ruler. The agreement with Charles was not finalized before Urban’s death, but was a task continued by his successor, the former Guy Fulquois.
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archbishop of Narbonne, himself a Frenchman with strong links to the Capetian court. In 1266, Charles of Anjou mounted a successful military campaign to take control of Sicily. Urban was most concerned with freeing Italy and Sicily from the remnant of Staufen rule and the continuation of the interregnum offered a respite from similar problems in Germany, much to the dismay of Alfonso X and Richard of Cornwall. Furthermore, the stalemate allowed the pope to act, more or less without contradiction, in his distribution of the former domains of the Staufen amongst those, like Charles of Anjou, who favoured papal interests.

**Clement IV (1265-1268)**

On 23 March 1265, the French-born Pope Clement IV (1265-8) granted a twenty-day indulgence to all of the faithful reciting prayers for Alfonso’s crusade against the Muslims of Africa. In these letters he continued to refer to the king as ‘rex Castelle et Legionis illustris, in regem Romanorum electus’. For the time being, Alfonso X was forced to focus his attention upon Castile, where he faced a Mudejar uprising, which Jaime I of Aragón and his son, Pedro, finally helped him suppress. All Spanish preachers of the Crusade to the Holy Land were asked to refocus their preaching on the crusade against the African invaders (‘contra Sarracenos qui nuper in multitudine graui de Africa uenientes’), themselves now assisted by the king of Granada, Alfonso’s one-time ally. To aid Alfonso in his fight against the Muslims of Granada and Africa, the pope authorized the king to take a tenth of all benefices of the
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Castilian Church instead of the hundredth part formerly assigned.\textsuperscript{1104} Genoa, Castile’s commercial partner, and Pisa, the Italian city that had favoured Alfonso’s imperial election, were also summoned to aid the king in his fight against the Muslims of Africa, possibly to distract Italian attention from the pending imperial controversy.\textsuperscript{1105} Clement IV was seriously concerned about the situation in Castile and unsure about the course of action, as he confessed to one of his cardinals.\textsuperscript{1106} Soon after, in the spring of 1265, the pope pleaded with Raymond, archbishop of Seville, to convince the king to abandon (‘discedere’) his imperial pretensions, so that a more suitable candidate might be found. Alfonso’s mission, in the Pope’s eyes, was thus to fight the Muslims in Spain.\textsuperscript{1107} The pope was also concerned with the way in which the kings of Castile and Aragón had seized the tercias (the third part of the ecclesiastical tithe) to assist their wars against Islam. Here, there was little the pope could do, as the two kings remained unmoved by spiritual threats.\textsuperscript{1108} On 24 June 1265, the Pope asked the Archbishop of Seville to pay a tenth of the ecclesiastical benefits of the Castilian Church to Alfonso, so long as the king promised in writing (‘litteras super hoc patentes exhibeat’), that he would stop illegally seizing ecclesiastical rents. Clement’s tough political line extended also to Aragón, where he warned Jaime I that, as long as abuses against the Church continued, Jaime would be granted no ecclesiastical subsidies.\textsuperscript{1109} In an attempt to limit royal influence over the Castilian Church, in September 1265, Clement refused to accept the king’s nominee

\textsuperscript{1104} ‘Cumque centesimam ecclesiasticorum prouentuum regnorum et terrarum suarum in eiusdem negotii subsidium concessissemus eodem; quia multiplicatis hostibus, aggrauatum negotium pinguiori subsidio intellleximus indigere, dictam centesimam in decimam de gratum nostrorum consilio, duximus commutandam’: Domínguez Sánchez, \textit{Clemente IV}, no. 25.

\textsuperscript{1105} Ibid., no. 31. Privilegios granted to commune of Genoa (1255, 1260-1, 1281) in González Jiménez, ed., \textit{Diplomatario}, nos. 152, 250-1, 476.

\textsuperscript{1106} P. Linehan, \textit{The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century} (Cambridge: 1971), 207.


\textsuperscript{1108} Linehan, \textit{Spanish Church and the Papacy}, 207-12.

\textsuperscript{1109} Domínguez Sánchez, \textit{Clemente IV}, no. 41.
for the vacant see of Toledo, reserving the election to papal provision.\textsuperscript{1110} The following year, Clement chose Sancho, son of Jaime I of Aragón, rejecting Alfonso’s candidate, Pascual, bishop of Jaen.\textsuperscript{1111} Although aware that his decision ran contrary to Alfonso’s express desire, the Pope, after seeking the advise of Giovanni Gaetani Orsini, cardinal-deacon of S. Nicolao in Carcere Tulliano, proceeded with his decision to provide Sancho (21 August 1266).\textsuperscript{1112}

The Pope was unable to impose anything like root and branch ‘reform’ on the Castilian church. Under Clement IV, as had happened in Urban IV’s time, little income from the Spanish Church reached the papal curia.\textsuperscript{1113} The Pope’s lack of initiative here mirrored his apparent unwillingness to tackle the rival claims to the empire. Perhaps from a fear that Alfonso X would abandon his attempts to contain the Muslim revolt in Spain, the pope continued, until his death in 1268, to address both imperial candidates as ‘king elect of the Romans’. In practice, all he did to resolve their dispute was to exhort them to make peace: an exhortation that no-one can have expected to lead to practical results.\textsuperscript{1114} On the one hand, Clement had no desire to alienate Richard of Cornwall, a crucial player both in the restoration of peace to England and in the stabilisation of the politics of western Germany. On the other, Alfonso was needed for the containment of the Muslin threat to Spain, so much so that the Pope was prepared to allow funds raised for the Holy Land to remain in Spain for the support of the Christian crusade.\textsuperscript{1115}

\textsuperscript{1110} Ibid., no. 45; Jordan, \textit{Clément IV}, no. 954.
\textsuperscript{1112} Dominguez Sánchez, \textit{Clemente IV}, nos. 76, 81.
\textsuperscript{1113} Linehan, \textit{Spanish Church and the Papacy}, 211-2.
\textsuperscript{1114} Jordan, \textit{Clément IV}, nos. 415, 588, 594, 596, 704, 839.
\textsuperscript{1115} Linehan, \textit{Spanish Church and the Papacy}, 208.
In the meantime, Alfonso’s expenses continued to soar. To boost his prestige and in an attempt to outweigh Richard’s claims to empire, Alfonso had forged alliances with the Italian cities and the Latin Empire of Constantinople. But these were themselves expensive ventures. Meanwhile, the real victor in Italy proved to be neither Richard no Alfonso. In 1266, papal letters to Alphonse of Brienne, count of Eu and Grand Butler of France, announced the great victory won by Charles of Anjou against Manfred in the town of Saint-Germain, near Catania. The new king Charles of Sicily, the pope explained, enjoyed the full support of Alfonso X (fideliter astitisse et nominis gloriam christiani procurasse viriliter et promouisse feliciter), probably in hopes of rallying further support against the Staufen.1116 Alphonse of Brienne was the nephew of Fernando III of Castile. His father was John of Brienne, King of Jerusalem (1208-25) and Emperor-regent of the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1229-37). His mother was Fernando’s sister, Berenguela (Blanche of Castile’s niece). Alphonse was also the brother of Marie of Brienne, married to the impoverished Baldwin II, the last of the Latin Emperors of Constantinople (ousted by Michael Palaeologus in 1261).1117 From as early as 1235, the fragility of the Latin Empire of Constantinople had been apparent to all who cared to take notice. Desperate for help, Pope Gregory IX had urged Theobald of Navarre to do everything possible to entice the Courtenay family and other nobles to help Baldwin II defend his Latin Empire.1118 By 1248, Baldwin II had hostage his son, Philip of Courtenay, to Venetian merchants in exchange for much needed funds that would, he hoped, saved his empire from being re-seized by the Greeks. Philip had only been freed in May 1261 through the intercession of Pope Urban IV, Louis IX of France, and to a lesser degree, Alfonso X. According to

1116 Domínguez Sánchez, Clemente IV, no. 58, and see Jordan, Clément IV, no. 1028.
1117 Baldwin II remained titular emperor until his death in 1273.
Robert Wolff, Marie de Brienne was probably at the court of Alfonso X between 1258 and before May 1261 seeking the king’s help to free Philip. The Castilian king is thought to have contributed towards Philip’s ransom, although the third of the ransom claimed by the *Chronicle of Alfonso X* may be an exaggeration.\(^{1119}\) The fact that there must have been an arrangement between Marie de Brienne and the Castilian king is further attested by a *Privilegio rodado* dated 5 February 1258, now in the municipal archive of Cordoba, in which Alphonse of Brienne and his brothers Louis and John appear as vassals (*vassallos del rey*) of Alfonso X.\(^{1120}\) Alfonso’s help for the eastern emperor was surely prompted by his desire to boost his prestige, in order to convince the pope that he himself deserved an imperial title in the west.\(^ {1121}\) In reality, far from enhancing his political position in Europe, it merely added to the financial burdens already placed upon Castile, much to the dismay of Alfonso’s nobles who already bore the brunt of Alfonso’s imperial endeavours.\(^ {1122}\) Castile continued to play a part in the papal strategy to win back the Latin Empire. When in the summer of 1261, Baldwin was forced to abandon Constantinople to Michael VIII Palaeologus (1223-82), the papacy sought to raise funds from a reluctant Spanish Church (1262-3). The bishops of the peninsula replied that they were too poor to contribute.\(^ {1123}\)

On 31 March 1266, still hoping to boost his international standing, Alfonso attempted to forge a marriage alliance between Philip of Courtenay and one of his daughters,

\(^ {1120}\) Archivo Municipal de Córdoba, no. 5, for which see [http://archivo.ayuncordoba.es/EAD/pergaminos/index.html#T5](http://archivo.ayuncordoba.es/EAD/pergaminos/index.html#T5), viewed 23 August 2011.
\(^{1123}\) Linehan, ‘Gravamina’, for a full account, and see also Rodriguez de Lama, *Urbano IV*, nos. 114, 116.
despite the close degree of consanguinity by which Philip was bound to the Castilian ruling dynasty. The pope refused dispensation for the marriage,\footnote{1124} arguing that marriage in the second degree was displeasing to God and in this instance unjustified by either usefulness or necessity (‘magna… utilitas aut necessitas iusta’).\footnote{1125} Instead, Clement favoured an alliance between Philip and the family of his countryman, Charles of Anjou. On 27 May 1267, Baldwin II signed the Treaty of Viterbo by which Charles of Anjou agreed to recoup the Latin Empire, meanwhile marrying his infant daughter to Philip of Courtenay (the marriage took place in 1273). Charles and his daughter hereby gained a theoretical interest in the succession to the throne of the Latin empire, guarantied to them even should Philip die without heirs.\footnote{1126}

By this time, it was clearly Charles of Anjou who was making the chief running in Italy, with Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile both confined to the political margins. Installed as King of Sicily, Charles was nonetheless encouraged by the French Pope, Clement IV, to look to Constantinople and the east if he was to secure a truly imperial succession. With the disastrous example of Frederick II in mind, the Pope had no intention of installing as Charles as western emperor. To have done so would have been merely to replace a German with an Angevin threat to the political stability of central Italy. The papacy’s policy remained one of stasis, to deny any of the imperial claimants a clear-cut succession, and thereby to guarantee the independence of the papal states, sandwiched between the imperial lands of the Regno and Tuscany. In June 1267, Clement IV assured the Tuscans that regardless of the

\footnote{1124} According to the chronicler, Jofre de Loaisa, Philip had been knighted by Alfonso X, date unrecorded. Presumably the knighting occurred after Philip was released by the Venetian merchants and before Alfonso sought papal dispensation for Philip’s marriage to Berenguela. Cf. J.de Loaisa, Crónica (Valencia: 1971), 17.
\footnote{1125} Domínguez Sánchez, Clément IV, no. 59, and cf. Jordan, Clément IV, no. 1036 (incomplete).
vacancy in the imperial throne, the Holy See would maintain peace in their lands, entrusting this task to the new papal champion, Charles of Anjou. Both imperial candidates were ignored. By 1268, following the Angevin victory at Tagliacozzo, Clement IV secured the arrest and subsequently the judicial execution of the sixteen year-old Conradin. The papacy was well on its way to fulfilling its ambition of driving the Staufen entirely out of Italy. Only the death of Clement IV in 1268, and the three-year conclave of Viterbo that followed, prevented the complete fulfilment of these plans.

The New Emperor

The 1270s were also difficult times in both England and Castile. Alfonso was once again faced with the threat of a major noble revolt, led in 1272 by a group of nobles headed by Nuño González, once a close friend and collaborator, now transformed into a bitter rival. Nuño’s proximity to the king had not brought him the wealth he coveted, as a result of Alfonso’s insistence upon strengthening royal control over legal and territorial affairs. The political changes involving land tenure and judicial process, which started with Fernando III and did not end until the fifteenth century, were not unique to Castile and had already led to similar discontent elsewhere in Europe. In Castile, such problems were compounded by Alfonso’s imperial ambitions and his attempts to lead a crusade to North Africa. These in turn

1127 Jordan, Clément IV, nos. 590-1.
1128 Ibid., 601-2, 690.
were attempted against a background of soaring monetary inflation. Alfonso was forced to attend to the conflict brewing within Castile, which erupted at the Cortes of 1272.

In April 1272 Richard of Cornwall died, followed in November by his brother, the English King Henry III. Although this left Pope Gregory X in theory with only one imperial candidate, Alfonso X, Alfonso himself was preoccupied with Castilian affairs. In practise, Gregory was clearly determined that Alfonso should not be crowned emperor. Instead, the imperial title was awarded to Rudolph of Habsburg, a more distant and hence an even more convenient claimant, and one who, unlike Alfonso, was in a position to take military action within the imperial lands of Germany without necessarily wielding authority south of the Alps. Alfonso refused to accept this volte face, instead demanding a personal meeting with the pope.

In May 1275, Pope Gregory agreed to meet with Alfonso and his brother, Manuel, at Beaucaire. En route for this encounter, Alfonso stopped off at the court of his father-in-law, King Jaime of Aragon. Once again, events in Castile now intervened, forcing Alfonso to postpone his papal interview in the face of rumours that the Marinids from North Africa had allied themselves with the Nasrids of Granada. Instead of the imperial crown, the pope granted, Alfonso the sexennial tenth previously intended to aid the liberation of the Holy Land. This in effect was the last that was to be heard of Alfonso’s imperial dream.

---

1133 M.de los D. Cabanes Pecourt, Documentos de Jaime I relacionados con Aragón (Zaragoza: 2009), ch. xlvi; Ferrando et al., eds., Fets, 546-7.
1134 Domínguez Sánchez, Gregorio X, no. 214; Linehan, The Spanish Church and the Papacy, 213.
Throughout his diplomatic battle to obtain recognition as Holy Roman Emperor, Alfonso had set aside his claim to Swabia, his maternal inheritance. Only in 1275, when it became apparent that his aspirations to the Empire had been shattered, did he revive his claims to the duchy. Pope Gregory X asked the new emperor Rudolph to seek reconciliation with the Castilian king over these Swabian claims. Meanwhile, Alfonso X’s failure to secure the empire merely compounded Castile’s financial and political problems.

What are we to make of all this? In the event, the imperial double election generated a great deal of rhetoric and hot air, but very few practical results. It led to no permanent solution to the problems of southern Italy, where the imperial lands continued to be disputed, if no longer between Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso, then between Charles of Anjou and his rivals, first the Hohenstaufen princes, subsequently the kings of Aragon. Although for a period threatening to destabilize relations between the ruling dynasties of England and Castile, it led to no permanent breach in relations between Alfonso and the English kings, Henry III or Edward I. Edward I found himself drawn into Sicilian politics, not least on his return from Crusade in 1273, but this was perhaps an inevitable outcome of his kinship to Charles of Anjou rather than a consequence of his uncle, Richard of Cornwall’s, claims to the German throne. Even the most notorious political scandal of this period, the murder of Richard of Cornwall’s son, Henry of Almain, at Viterbo on 13 March 1271, was an outcome not of Castilian-Plantagenet rivalry but of the bitter hatred stored up against Richard and his family during the Montfort rebellion of the 1260s in the heart of Guy de Montfort, Simon de Montfort’s son, the perpetrator of the Viterbo murder.

1135 Domínguez Sánchez, Gregorio X, no. 188.
At the same time, the double-election was not without its longer term consequences, some of them in due course to impact upon Anglo-Spanish relations. Most notably it allowed the installation of the Angevin dynasty in Sicily and the Regno. This was an event of momentous significance, not just for Italian but for wider European politics. In the process, it not only compounded the general sense that papal politics in Italy were hopelessly corrupt, but discouraged any wider engagement with papal ventures, up to and including the crusades for the recovery of Jerusalem. At the same time, it once and for all shattered the claims of Castile or England to a permanent political presence either in Italy or Germany. The world empire of which Frederick II had dreamed was exposed as an empty boast, certainly as something in which neither the Castilian or the English royal families would be prepared to invest future effort or resources. From this, perhaps, can be traced something of that concern with domestic rather than ‘foreign’ affairs that was to see Edward I attempt the conquest of Wales and Scotland, and the heirs of Alfonso X abandon their ambitions in either Africa or Italy. Germany, meanwhile, was presented with a ruler, Rudolph of Hapsburg, whose imperial orbit was more severely circumscribed than that of any German emperor since Conrad III in the 1150s. Whatever else had been achieved, the political map of Europe had been fundamentally altered by the new lines drawn between 1257 and 1275. That these alterations were the result of deliberate papal inactivity was by no means the least significant of their longer term consequences.

Chapter Eight: Sancho’s Marriage to Guillelme

(Wilhemina) de Béarn

I know another Guilhelma [Guillelm de Béarn] even nobler, whom I will recall to you the daughter of Lord Guasto [Gaston VII of Béarn]. With her lovely ways she has attained such good customs for our entire country that Gascony and the region shine brightly thanks to her, for her gracious person was born and raised there.\footnote{A. Marcos Pous, ‘Los dos matrimonios de Sancho IV de Castilla’, Cuadernos de Trabajos de la Escuela Española de Historia y Arqueología en Roma, 8 (1956) 7-180.}

In 1956, a seminal article by Alejandro Marcos Pous in which he analysed the two marriages of Sancho IV of Castile was published.\footnote{A. Marcos Pous, ‘Los dos matrimonios de Sancho IV de Castilla’, Cuadernos de Trabajos de la Escuela Española de Historia y Arqueología en Roma, 8 (1956) 7-180.} This has since come to be regarded as the definitive work on Sancho’s marriage to Guillelme (Guillerma, Guilhelm, Guillermina) de Béarn (de Moncada), daughter of Gaston VII, vicomte de Béarn, vicomte of Marsan, señor of Moncada and Castellvell. In reality, however, and contrary to Pous’ conclusions, there is no proof that the betrothal of Sancho and Guillelme was ever transformed into a full-blown marriage. The sixteenth-century annalist, Jerónimo Zurita, was right when, in his Anales de la Corona de Aragón, he described the planned marriage between Sancho and Guillelme as a failed (‘fallido’) arrangement that ‘did not take place’ (‘no hubo efecto’), a judgement in which he was joined by Pierre de Marca whose history of Béarn (first published in 1640) remains a source of fundamental significance and reliability, furnished with medieval evidences

\footnote{Altra Guilhalma say/ pus auta, que us dirai/ la filha d’En Guasto./ C’ab sa bela faiso/ a tans bos aibs conques/ de tot nostre paes./ Guascuenhe’e l’encontrada/ n’es fort illuminada/ car lo sieus cors grazitz/ y fo natz e [noiritz’]: Amanieu de Secás, ‘Enssenhmen dede la donzela’ (written between 1278-95), in Johnston, ed., Medieval Conduct Literature: an Anthology of Vernacular Guides to Behaviour for Youths, with English Translations (Toronto: 2009), 57.
many of which have since been lost. According to Zurita, the betrothal failed because Sancho found his bride ‘ugly and fierce’ (‘fea y brava’). In reality, it not because of her looks that the arrangement was abandoned but rather because it faced a series of impediments, both canonical and political.

Let us begin by rehearsing Zurita’s account of these events, opening with the rubric (here translated from the Spanish): ‘Failed marriage project of the infante Sancho of Castile’:

In that same year [1270] in the month of October, the king of Castile arranged a marriage between the infante don Sancho, his son, with doña Guillelma de Moncada, daughter of don Gaston vicomte of Béarn and lord of Moncada and Castellvell, who was the nephew of doña Constanza de Béarn, sister of the vicomte, who married Diego López de Haro, lord of Vizcaya, and who was the mother of the count don Lope. And the king of Castile promised that after a year from the time when doña Guillelma should arrive in Castile, he would place in the castle of Monzón 20,000 gold maravedis to be used in several heredamientos as the king and the vicomte should see fit. But this marriage did not take place and later doña Guillelma married the infante Pedro, son of the king Pedro of Aragón.1141

1141 ‘[Proyecto fallido para casar al infante Sancho de Castilla.] En este mismo año [1270] por el mes de octubre el rey de Castilla concertó matrimonio del infante don Sancho su hijo con doña Guillelma de Moncada hija de don Gastón vizconde de Bearne y señor de Moncada y Castellvell, que era sobrina de doña Constanza de Bearne, hermana del vizconde, que casó con don Diego López de Haro señor de Vizcaya, que fue madre del conde don Lope. Y el rey de Castilla se obligaba que dentro de un año después que doña Guillelma fuese a Castilla, mandaría poner en el castillo de Monzón veinte mil maravedis de oro para que se empleasen en heredamientos a voluntad del rey y del vizconde. Más este matrimonio no hubo efecto, y después doña Guillelma casó con el infante don Pedro hijo del rey don Pedro de Aragón’: Zurita, Anales, III, lxxvii.
There were two chief impediments facing Sancho and Guillelme’s marriage in 1270. Firstly, Sancho had yet to reach the age of consent (14 years of age). Secondly the couple were related within the fourth degree of consanguinity (See genealogy Sancho and Guillelme) and thus required a papal dispensation. In addition, the marriage faced serious political opposition, which ultimately rendered it unviable. Although it faced canonical impediment, Sancho and Guillelme’s marriage was not a matter settled by canon law, but rather by a series of political circumstances that involved the Castilian, French, Aragonese, and English courts, recorded in diplomatic exchanges of which Marcos Pous was entirely unaware.

Forging A Marital Alliance

Constance de Béarn

Gaston de Béarn, Guillelme’s father, was the most powerful lord in Gascony where he held the vicomtés of Béarn, Marsan, Comminges, Brulhois, Eauze, Gabardan and Manciet (dépt. Gers), and where he claimed Bigorre on behalf of his wife, Mathe. In Aragón he held the lordship of Moncada and Castellvell, lands in Vich, the pass of Somport, the castle of Sobreporta in Gerona, and lands in Majorca, as well as a number of tenancies in Zaragoza (held through his wife Mathe).\(^1\)\(^\text{1142}\) As a result of this extraordinary collection of lands, he was simultaneous a vassal of the kings of England and dukes of Gascony (Henry III and later Edward I), of the kings of France (Louis IX and Philipp III), and of the kings of Aragón (Jaime –Jaume- I and Pedro III -Pere II). The marriage between the infante Sancho and Guillelme was not the only

---

high profile marriage Gaston had planned for his daughters. Following the death of the infante Alfonso, son of Jaime I of Aragón, before 26 March 1260, Gaston’s eldest daughter Constance, was returned to her father together with her dower, at the express command of her late husband. Unfortunately there is no record of the lands assigned to her in her marriage to Alfonso, but it is possible that they included Béarn as would be the case in later arrangements. Meanwhile, Spanish historians have tended to portray Gaston’s links to Spain (and especially to the Castilian court) as a direct consequence of Gaston’s ‘rebelliousness’ and the ‘limited authority’ exercised by the English kings in Gascony.

In 1256, at the time of his marriage to Constance, the infante Alfonso (of Aragón), a supporter of both Fernando III and Alfonso X of Castile, was with Gaston of Béarn. Gaston had himself (on 5 August that year) entered Bigorre, a county he claimed in right of his wife Mathe. The descent of the lordship of Bigorre was itself of tortuous complexity. Esquivat de Chabanais, who in 1256 controlled the county, had placed himself and his lands under the lordship of Simon de Montfort, seeking a means by which Bigorre could be passed as a hereditary possession to his children.

Naturally, Gaston opposed Esquivat’s grant and entered the county with the assistance

1143 ‘…Ad hoc uolumus et mandamus quod si nos mori contigerit quod domina Constancia uxor nostrae habeat dotes suas et omnia jura sua integer, et pater noster reducat eam honorifice in terram suam sicut eam decet et quare nichil habemus in bonis de quo ipsam possimus in plus dotare vel heredare. Rogamus eam et patrem et matrem eius et dominam Comitissam suam eius quod circa hec nos habeant excusatos cum inopia nos excuset…’: The marriage may have taken place four years prior (August 1256) around the time he drafted the testament, after which Alfonso travelled to Gascony to support Gaston de Béarn in his claims to Bigorre. F. Sagarra i de Siscar, ‘Noticias y documentos inéditos referentes al Infante Don Alfonso, primogénito de Don Jaime I y de Doña Leonor de Castilla’, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona, 9 (1920), 296-7.

1144 C. Ayala Martínez, Directrices fundamentales de la política peninsular de Alfonso X (relaciones castellano-aragonesas de 1252 a 1263) (Madrid: 1986), 193.

1145 J.R. Maddicott, Simon de Montfort (Cambridge: 2001), 173-4. Before her death in 1251, Petronilla of Bigorre had given the county to her grandson, Esquivat de Chabanais, who was related to Simon de Montfort. Simon had first held the county in 1248, when Petronilla leased it to him, to protect it from Gaston. The following year Simon took possession of it, prompting Gaston to move against him as noticed by Maddicott, Simon, 111, 134.
of his son-in-law, prompting the bishop of Tarbes to appeal to Simon de Montfort for help. As a result, the marriage alliance between Constance and Alfonso, the heir to the king of Aragón, should not be seen as a response to ‘England’s economic pressure over Gascony’ as has been suggested by Carlos de Ayala Martínez. Because Gaston was a vassal of the king of France, a vassal of the king of Aragón, and a close ally of Castile, his actions cannot be seen simply as a response to the policies of Henry III and the English administration. Rather, the marriage alliance between Constance and Alfonso promised an alliance that would support Gaston’s claims to Bigorre, a county he had long sought to control. On 10 September 1256, when Roger de Foix pronounced arbitration in the disputes between Esquivat and Gaston over the comté of Bigorre, Alfonso, the heir of Jaime I, witnessed the process (made ‘in presencia et testimonio domini Alfonsi, promogeniti filii et heredis domini regis Aragonum’).

From 1259, following Simon de Montfort’s failed lease of Bigorre to Henry III, the county returned to Esquivat de Chabanais. Gaston now sought to adopt a new role, as defender of Esquivat’s rights against de Montfort. Following the news of Gaston’s new stance, in May 1260, de Montfort gave Lourdes to the Lord Edward for protection, who ordered the fortification of the city. As a result of the Parliament of April-May 1258, in which Henry III had agreed to a reform of his realm in response to baronial complaints, chiefly against the sums raised for Henry’s planned Sicilian campaign, the English administration of Gascony had itself undergone a

1147 Ayala Martínez, Directrices, 195.
1148 Alfonso of Aragón was the son of Jaime I and Leonor (Eleanor of Castile), he was the grandson of Eleanor of England and Alfonso VIII of Castile. Cf. Linehan, Partible Inheritance, 85.
1149 Layettes, III, no. 4284.
1150 Maddicott, Simon de Montfort, 200.
diplomatic revolution. On 10 June 1258 the Provisions of Oxford, drafted with the aid of Simon de Montfort, came into effect. Henry III was, in effect, deprived of personal rule, with a council of 15 barons appointed to rule by commission alongside the King. From here until 1261, Henry’s control over his own administration remained highly precarious. As an enemy of Simon de Montfort, Gaston de Béarn became a natural ally to the king. On 14 May 1264, Henry III’s forces were decisively trounced at the Battle of Lewes, spelling potential disaster for Gaston as the King’s ally. Even after the destruction of de Montfort and his army at the battle of Evesham (4 August 1265), Henry III regained only a tenuous hold over his Kingdom. Through to his death in 1272, indeed, Henry’s realm continued subject to weak central authority and the threat of renewed baronial rebellion. All of this had an impact upon the administration of Henry’s distant lands south of Bordeaux.

In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that Gaston of Béarn continued to look southwards, to Spain, rather than northwards to England, for effective diplomatic alliances. Having sought an Aragonese alliance through to 1260, he now turned to Castile, already an effective partner. The death of the Aragonese infante, Alfonso, left Aragón with no suitable heir to replace Alfonso as a marriage partner for the daughters of the lord of Béarn. Furthermore, from 1258 the relations between France and Aragón had tightened as a result of the Treaty of Corbeil, of 11 May 1258. Here Jaime I had renounced (‘renuncians’) all his claims in the French Midi save for Foix and Montpellier, which he retained, thereby putting an end to disputes with the French King, Louis IX, over the French inheritance in southern France, for the most part an inheritance that had come to Louis, in the 1230s, as a result of his marriage to the

heiress to the county of Provence.\footnote{Layettes, no. 4411. On 29 August 1265, Jaime I recognized the homage paid to him by Roger Bernard, comte of Foix. A. Huici Miranda et al., eds., Documentos de Jaime I de Aragón (Zaragoza: 1976-1988), v, no. 1466.} To further cement Franco-Aragonese peace, a marriage was agreed between Isabella, daughter of Jaime I of Aragón, and the future Philip (III), heir to Louis IX.\footnote{Ibid., no. 4412.} Despite the fact that the couple were related within the third and fourth degrees of consanguinity, on 1 December 1258, pope Alexander IV granted a dispensation for their marriage.\footnote{Ibid., no. 4457.} It is worth noting the wider circumstances here: the promotion of Louis IX’s younger brothers, Alphonse and Charles, as rulers of Poitou-Toulouse and Provence, and the final negotiation, in 1259, of what was intended as a permanent Anglo-French peace treaty governing the future disposition of Gascony and the disputed counties of Limoges, Périgord and Cahors. In these circumstances, and rather than become caught in an ever tightening political vice controlled by France and Aragón, it was only natural for Gaston of Béarn to look to Castile for a new marriage alliance.

According to Pierre de Marca, in 1265, and coinciding with the emergence of England and its kings from the past seven years of political turmoil, the possibility was raised of a marriage between Constance, Gaston’s eldest daughter, and Henry of Almain, the eldest son of Richard of Cornwall, Henry III’s younger brother.\footnote{Cf. R. Studd, ‘The Marriage of Henry of Almain and Constance of Béarn’, in Thirteenth Century England III (Woodbridge: 1989), 161-79.} The prevailing atmosphere of crisis between Henry III and his barons, put paid to these arrangements, so that even as Henry of Almain was being proposed as a potential husband, Constance was the object of rival advances from the infante Manuel (Emanuel), brother of Alfonso X. From discussions held in Seville, there also emerged proposals for a second such Castilian marriage alliance, between Gaston’s
younger daughter Guillelme and Alfonso Manuel, son of *infante* Manuel. Had both marriages taken place, Gaston’s younger daughter would in effect have married the son of her sister’s husband, introducing a series of blood relations sufficient to baffle even the most expert of canon lawyers for generations still to come. On 12 March 1266, Alfonso X duly announced that his brother, Don Manuel, had agreed to a double marriage alliance with Gaston of Béarn.\footnote{According to the document reproduced by P. de Marca, 12 March 1266 was a Tuesday, but it fell on a Friday.} The marriage between Don Manuel and Constance was proclaimed for the feast of the Ascension of the Virgin (15 August), to be followed by Guillelme’s marriage to Alfonso Manuel a year later.\footnote{Marca, *Histoire de Béarn*, 617.} However, the requisite papal dispensation for one part of this alliance was never issued.\footnote{Ibid., 613-5.} Constance’s marriage to Don Manuel did not require dispensation since they were related only within the fifth degree of consanguinity. Guillelme’s marriage to Alfonso Manuel was a different matter, since they were related within the fourth degree (See Genealogy Guillelme and Alfonso Manuel).

These negotiations with Béarn themselves coincided with a troubled time for Castile, which from 1264 until 1266 was assailed by a North African invasion that led in turn to a revolt in Murcia. James I of Aragón had a decisive role in the affair, restoring order to Murcia in January 1266.\footnote{Cf. D.J. Smith et al., eds., *The Book of Deeds of James I of Aragon. A Translation of the Medieval Catalan Llibre dels Fets* (Aldershot: 2010), 4-5; ch. 6, 283-328.} Why the projected marriage between Constance and Don Manuel was abandoned remains uncertain: perhaps because Gaston was unpersuaded of the security of the alliance between Castile and Aragón and preferred instead, in light of the improving political circumstances in England, to rekindle thoughts of an alliance between Constance and Henry de Almain. Gaston de Béarn,
however, did not completely abandon his plans for alliance with Castile. In January 1268, Pope Clement IV wrote to Gaston to inform him of a reconciliation between Alfonso X and his formerly estranged brother, Enrique, who had for some time been exiled in England and who was now claiming to act as Alfonso’s representative and senator in Rome, in the ongoing imperial election disputes. The pope licenced Gaston to renew negotiations for a marriage alliance with the Castilian infante. There is no proof that such negotiations took place. Nonetheless, and despite their complexities, the diplomatic implications here are well worth pondering. Faced with a situation in which the King of Castile and the brother of the King of England stood as chief rivals for the title Holy Roman Emperor, the Pope continued to meddle in Béarnaise affairs, playing off the brother of Alfonso X against the son of Richard of Cornwall as potential husbands for Constance of Béarn. In reality, perhaps, the Pope intended that Constance should marry neither of her potential suitors. What mattered was that the waters continue to be muddied between Alfonso and Richard, to ensure that neither emerged with clear title to the imperial throne.

Following the collapse of negotiations for Constance’s marriage to don Manuel, Gaston nonetheless gave serious thought to renewing negotiations with Henry of Almain. Perhaps Constance’s betrothal to Don Manuel had itself been intended merely as a means of placing further pressure on Henry III for such a marriage between Constance and Henry of Almain to proceed. Soon after the Castilian marriage scheme collapsed, negotiations were once again under way between Henry and Constance. For Henry III, these offered a means of securing the Gascon frontier

---

with the Iberian kingdoms as well as of enlisting an important ally against the
descendants of Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, himself slain at Evesham but
leaving a widow and sons who now moved to assert their own dynastic claims to the
lordship of Bigorre. For Gaston, a marriage between Constance and Henry of Almain
raised hopes of stamping Béarnaise authority over the long-coveted county of
Bigorre. Gaston was prepared to endow Constance with a rich marriage portion,
granting her the vicomte of Béarn, while Mathe, her mother, promised her Marsan.
All of this held out distinct advantages not just to Béarn, but to Henry of Almain, to
Richard of Cornwall and to King Henry III. To further cement the alliance,
following Henry and Constance’s betrothal in August 1270, Gaston pledged to join
Henry III’s son and heir, the Lord Edward, on crusade to Acre. Yet on 12 March
1271, the entire arrangement was brought to nothing. Guy and Simon de Montfort,
the sons of Simon the elder, caught up with Henry of Almain in the cathedral of
Viterbo. There they fell upon him in revenge for the death of their father at Evesham.
This notorious ‘murder in the cathedral’ was undertaken in revenge for Evesham
rather than in rivalry over the county of Bigorre. Once again, however, Gaston found
himself with an unmarried daughter on his hands. For at least the third time, attempts
to marry off the heiresses to Béarn collapsed in confusion and chaos

1162 Cf. Trabut-Cussac, L’administration anglaise, 36-7.
An Alliance with Castile

Manuel González Jiménez has argued that Gaston attempts to enter in alliance with Alfonso X of Castile were determined solely by his desire to bring pressure to bear upon ‘the English king who was in permanent conflict with the Gascon barons, especially the vicomte of Béarn’. According to González Jiménez, it is ‘unimaginable’ that such arrangements might have had anything to do with ‘political manoeuvres against Jaime I of Aragón, with whom Alfonso maintained close diplomatic and affective relations’. According to González Jiménez, from the Castilian perspective, the alliance was also a way of pressuring Henry III, in this instance to ‘reduce’ his support for Richard of Cornwall in the ongoing imperial election dispute.\footnote{González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 206.} Not only was Alfonso X in no real position to offer Gaston effective military assistance against the Plantagenets, especially after 1254, following the marriage between Eleanor of Castile and the Lord Edward; but Gaston’s relations with Henry had remained relatively unblemished throughout the 1250s and 60s.\footnote{Cf. F.M. Powicke, The Thirteenth Century (Oxford: 1998), 284.} All of this is plausible. However, there are signs that is by no means a probable reconstruction of events. In particular, if Gaston intended the marriage alliance with Castile to impact upon the imperial election dispute, it is difficult to see how the subsequent attempt to negotiate an alliance between Constance and Henry of Almain could have been construed in Castile as anything other than a hostile move by Béarn. Yet relations between Alfonso X and Gaston seem to have remained entirely friendly. Certainly, the projected marriage between Henry and Constance seems to have done nothing to interrupt the ongoing negotiations between Béarn and Castile over the projected marriage between Sancho of Castile and Guillelme of Béarn.
In November 1269, Fernando (de la Cerda), heir to Alfonso X of Castile, married Louis IX’s daughter Blanche at Burgos. Alfonso X was now free to pursue marriage alliances for his other children. This nonetheless coincided with a period of unrest, as the disgruntled Castilian nobility, angered amongst other things by rising inflation and, what they claimed, as royal disregard for their customary rights, plotted against Alfonso. Another contributing factor may have been Alfonso’s renunciation of the feudal rights he claimed over the Algarve to Portugal at the request of his grandson, the future King Dinis’ (k. 1279-1325), son of Afonso III (1245-1279). This was confirmed in a settlement dated 16 February 1267, issued at Badajoz, in favour of Afonso III and Dinis, followed by a reconfiguration of the border between Castile and Portugal. On 7 (1267), Alfonso X formally dissolved the homage he had performed to Afonso III for the Algarve following his marriage to Beatriz, Alfonso’s illegitimate daughter. According to Richard Kinkade, the nobles of Castile disapproved of the king’s actions, considering them as an assault upon Castilian ‘integrity’. The rebels, led initially by the Lara family, were soon joined by other leading magnates including Lope Díaz de Haro, lord of Viscaya, nephew of Gaston de Béarn, and by Esteban Fernández de Castro, governor of Galicia. While Alfonso X remained in southern Castile, noble discontent mounted in

---

1165 The marriage was concluded by proxy in July 1269, in the presence of Alfonso X, Sancho archbishop of Toledo, Alfonso bishop of León, and Master William de Châtellerault, canon of Reims, Blanche’s representative. Cf. G. Daumet, Mémoire sur les relations de la France et la Castille de 1255 à 1320 (Paris: 1913), no. 4, 155-6.
1167 Dinis was the son of Afonso III by Beatriz, illegitimate daughter of Alfonso X.
1169 Ibid., no. 326.
the north. Following Fernando de la Cerda’s marriage, in November 1269, the disgruntled nobility met with Alfonso in the Cortes, held at Burgos.

Shortly thereafter, on 6 February 1270 at Logroño, Alfonso X and Gaston agreed (‘promissiones et pacta’) to a marriage between Guillelme, Gaston’s youngest daughter, and one of Alfonso’s sons, either the infante Sancho or the infante Pedro. On 4 April, Alfonso X announced the marriage of Sancho and Guillelme. The king notified all present and future that they bride and groom had accepted one another as husband and wife, making the marriage a sponsalia per verba de presenti, according to canon law. The marriage was witnessed by Fernando, heir to the Castilian throne, by Constance, Gaston’s sister (then abbess at the Cistercian abbey of Cañas, in the Rioja), her influential sons, Diego López de Haro and Lope Díaz de Haro, lord of Viscaya, the nobles Amicus Petri de Coires, Jofré de Loaisa (Loaysa), Garcia Arnaldi de Novaliis, Bernat de Centelles, and Guillem Ramón de Doaceto. At first sight, the marriage seems to have been accepted as a valid one. However, as will be shown, it was in reality set about with impediments that more than outweighed its validity.

1172 ‘Ego Infans Sanctius accipio vos dominam Guillelmanm uxorem meam et promitto quod semper habebo et tenebo vos pro mea uxore legitima. Et ego Guillelma accipio vos domnum Infantem Sanctium in meum maritum et promitto quod semper habebo et tenebo vos pro meo marito legitimo’: Ibid.
1173 Monasterio de Santa María de San Salvador de Cañas, in the Rioja was founded by the Haro family, not surprisingly, the abbesses were usually from the founding family; cf. R. Alonso Álvarez, El monasterio cisterciense de Santa María de Cañas (La Rioja): Arquitectura gótica, patrocinio aristocrático y protección real (Logroño: 2004). Cf. M.I. Zabalza Aldave, Archivo General de Navarra (1274-1321), II. Documentación Real (Donostia: 1997), no. 68.
1174 Marcos Pous, fails to reproduce the entire list of witnesses, leaving out, most notably, Jofré de Loaisa, later author of a the ‘Crónica de los reyes de Castilla’ (Fernando III, Alfonso X, Sancho IV, and Fernando IV). D’Achery, Spicilegium, 673.
According to the agreement proclaimed at Logroño, Gaston de Béarn would grant his Catalan lands to Guillelme as a marriage portion: namely the *baronias* of Moncada and Castellvell with all their appurtenances. He also granted her all his possessions in Majorca and Aragón, and all other places that he held in Spain beyond the mountains (‘in tota Hispania citra portus’), including presumably, although unmentioned, the Pyrenean town of Somport, a crucial point of exchange on the French-Aragonese frontier. These lands, Guillelme’s marriage portion, were to remain under the custody of Bernat de Centelles (‘Bernardum de Scintillis’), who was Gaston’s procurator in Catalonia-Aragón.\(^{1175}\) Guillelme would have all the lands that her father had held in Catalonia-Aragón, but Gaston made it clear that neither she nor Alfonso X could seek to hold any of Gaston’s lands in Gascony:

‘non possint petere portionem nec aliquam aliam rem in dictis bonis que nos damus iure hereditario et legitime tibi Guillele dictie filie nostre, et tu [Alfonso X] non possis petere aliquid ratione portionis nec alia ratione in iis que habemus, habuimus vel habebimus in tota Vasconia ultra portus, et de hoc facies nobis publicum instrumentum’.\(^{1176}\)

This would have been a key clause, if Gaston’s overlord, the duke of Gascony (Henry III of England), were to agree to the marriage alliance, intended to ensure that there would be no revival of the Castilian claims to Gascony first advanced in the 1170s and only renounced as recently as 1253.

From the time of his father, Gaston’s lands in Spain had been burdened with severe debts, forcing his mother, Gersende, to abandon Catalonia and settle in Béarn, a move

\(^{1175}\) Cf. ACA, Cancillería Real, Pergaminos, Jaime I, Serie general, nos. 1702, and 1766.

\(^{1176}\) D’Achery, *Spicilegium*, 382.
that determined Gaston’s political and diplomatic initiatives thereafter.\textsuperscript{1177} As part of
the new marriage treaty, the revenues from Guillelme’s marriage portion were
intended to discharge Gaston’s debts in Catalonia, Majorca and Aragón. If she failed
to discharge these obligations, then the rents from Majorca and Castellvell would be
sequestrated until payment was complete. The document was witnessed by
Constance, Gaston’s sister (who had entered religion after the death, in 1254, of her
husband, Diego López de Haro), her sons, Lope Díaz, señor de Biscaya, and Diego
López de Haro, and Gaston’s proctors in Catalonia-Aragón, Guillem Ramón de
Doaceto\textsuperscript{1178} and Bernat de Centelles. The notary of Barcelona, Bernat de Cumbis, it
was noted, had confirmed Jaime I’s approval.\textsuperscript{1179} In short, this was a settlement
intended to please all parties: Castilian, Béarnaise, Aragonese and English.
On 17 May 1270, Alfonso X confirmed his own letters patent, issued in 1254 on the
occasion of the Lord Edward’s marriage to Eleanor of Castile as part of the peace
agreement with Henry III, by which he released (‘quitamus et absoluimus’) Gaston
VII and any other Gascon lords from any oaths of fidelity made to him or his
ancestors, the kings of Castile, for lands held in Gascony (‘ab omni iuramento
fidelitatie et homini, si quod ipse, vel antecessores sui nobis, aut predecessoribus
nostris ratione terrae Vasconiae fecit, aut fecerunt’).\textsuperscript{1180} It has been suggested by
Manuel González Jiménez that it was perhaps King Louis IX of France who
demanded that Alfonso X confirm Gaston de Béarn’s absolution from such
obligations, in light of the wedding between Blanche (Blanca) of France and the
\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{1177} Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn’, 82-4.
\textsuperscript{1178} He was named as Gaston’s proctor in Catalonia and Majorca on 2 May 1268. ACA, Cancillería
Real, Pergaminos, Jaime I, Serie general, no. 1942.
\textsuperscript{1179} D’Achery, Spicilegium, 382-3. A late seventeenth-century or early eighteenth-century copy, most
probably taken from Pierre de Marca, can be found in RAH, Salazar y Castro, Signatura: D-9, folio 43,
no. 20060, in http://bibliotecadigital.rah.es/dgbrah/i18n/catalogo_imagenes/grupo.cmd?texto_busqueda=&path=1037
725&interno=S&presentacion=pagina&posicion=1
\textsuperscript{1180} Marca, Histoire de Béarn, 601. On 3 December 1254, Alfonso X had released Gaston from any
oaths and obligations, cf. C.P. Cuttino et al., Gascon Register A, no. 126.
\end{flushright}
In reality, it is better situated within the context of the marriage between Sancho and Guillelme, as a means of ensuring the support of both Louis IX and Henry III for a settlement that otherwise threatened to intrude Castilian influence north of the Pyrenees.

**Canon Law and Marriage**

Marcos Pous has challenged the assertion, itself accepted by both Jaffé and Heinrich Finke, that the arrangements between Guillelme and Sancho amounted merely to a betrothal (sponsalia per verba de futuro) rather than a binding marriage (per verba de presente), the reservation here being due to the fact that the parties themselves were under age or absent and therefore unable to offer personal assent. Since then, no other historian has challenged Marcos Pous, for the most part, I suspect, because the Spanish archives, themselves the principal resource at the disposal of Spanish historians, lack any further documentation of the issues.

The marriage, as has been noted, was drafted as a sponsalia per verba de presente, because it followed the formula set by medieval canon law (‘ego te in meam accipio, et ego te accipio’). By contrast, a future promise would have been drafted in the Latin formula ‘ego te recipiam, et ego te in meum’.

---

However, there are other factors to suggest that the marriage was merely a future promise. Firstly, Sancho had yet to achieve the age of consent. On 4 April 1270, he was only 11 years old (born on 12 May 1258). According to medieval canon law, the marriage could only be regarded as a *sponsalia de futuro* because of his age (we do not know Guillelme’s date of birth). Sancho was almost twelve, but had yet to reach the age of consent, defined as 14 in the case of boys and 12 for girls. Urban III (1185-7) had ruled that in cases in which the betrothed were under this age, and the marriage was not consummated, such an alliance could be dissolved. Later, Boniface VIII made clear that marriages known as *sponsalia de presenti* were regarded as future promises *de futuro* if the parties were either pubescent or beneath the age of puberty (‘impuberem et puberem’). The betrothal of Sancho then, even though phrased as a *sponsalia per verba de presenti*, has to be considered as a *sponsalia de futuro* because of the infante’s age, a fact entirely overlooked by Marcos Pous.

In addition, although consent was crucial to make a marriage valid, if there was ‘diriment impediment’ (in essence, an objection to the form of words as spoken), the marriage was considered invalid regardless. It has been suggested that in cases in which the age of the couple, or one of them, was an impediment to consummation, vows might well be exchanged in the present tense, to avoid repudiation by one or

---

1187 Ibid., lib. IV, tit. ii, cap. x, p. 676.
other of the parties. Consummation also played an important role in rendering a marriage ‘indissoluble’, but Gaston did not send Guillelme to the Castilian court after the agreement was signed, so that it is most unlikely that the marriage could have been consummated. Sancho, it should be recalled, was only eleven and therefore in no position to insist on consummation. Finally, delayed consummation often served as a strategy in medieval marriages, granting the groom’s family ‘leverage’ over the negotiations of the dowry. Much this sort of leverage had governed, for example, the marriage of a younger daughter of Henry III of England and the still pre-pubescent Alexander King of Scots. According to the twelfth-century lawyer Azo, any marriage agreement or betrothal, once agreed by the parents of the betrothed, either in person or by proxy, had to be ratified by the betrothed. Sancho, himself, never ratified the marriage to Guillelme, and, the marriage was never consummated. In a similar case, when Henry III (of England) had married Joan of Ponthieu, by proxy, he had known that they were related within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and had sought the necessary papal dispensation. However, once the marriage arrangements were no longer considered desirable, he dropped the negotiation of dispensation and instead asked the pope for an annulment. Henry’s marriage alliance, like Sancho’s, was not consummated. Before the papal annulment was itself issued, Joan had married Fernando III of Léon-Castile. This marriage raised no adverse reaction from the papal curia, in part because the invalidity of the previous arrangements between Henry and Joan was widely acknowledged. It was not until the projected wedding between Henry’s son, Edward, and Joan’s daughter, Eleanor, that Henry III reopened his request for an annulment. After a long and tortuous diplomatic process, Henry obtained what he sought: a confirmation that his

1192 Ibid., 180-1.
The marriage to Joan was invalid and a ratification of his marriage to Eleanor of Provence. The fact that Henry III went to so much trouble to obtain a confirmation of the invalidity of a marriage, which at the time must have seemed so clearly invalid, has been considered, at length, in a paper by David D’Avray. 1194

The Unconsummated Marriage

Béarnaise Problems

Following Sancho and Guillelme’s marriage agreement, both Alfonso X and Gaston de Béarn were faced with other, more pressing, commitments. Gaston had pledged to accompany the Lord Edward on Crusade and to lend him 70,000 livres tournois (approximately £17,500).¹¹⁹⁵ The expedition was planned to depart on the feast of the Annunciation (15 August) 1270. On that day, King Louis IX set out for the Holy land, but Gaston was unable to join him as he had made plans to depart with Edward, who had been detained by problems on the Welsh Marches and by a dispute with Gilbert de Clare, earl of Gloucester. The dispute with the earl was resolved in June when he agreed to accompany Edward on crusade. In the end, Gilbert was prevented from fulfilling this promise because of a Welsh attack on his lordship. However, Edward was now free to leave for the Holy Land.¹¹⁹⁶ Gaston and his wife, Mathe, continued to prepare for the crusade, endowing religious houses in Béarn and Marsan (including gifts to the convents of Beyries close to Mont-de-Marsan, Saint-Jean-de-Sorde and its town, Sainte Suzanne). Constance’s marriage to Henry of Almain was still expected to take place so that Gaston and Mathe remained anxious to ensure that, should they die on crusade, Constance would enjoy peaceful succession to their vicomté. It seems likely that Gaston VII was preparing for the crusade during the summer of 1270. Meanwhile, Mathe named Constance her heir for the vicomtés of Marsan, Maubourguet, Castelnau and Ladeuise,¹¹⁹⁷ and as successor to her claim to the county of Bigorre. She named Guillelme her heir to the lands she held in Aragón.

¹¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 70-1.
¹¹⁹⁷ Possibly Castelnau-Magnoac and Ledeuix.
stating that should Constance die without a child, her younger sister, Guillelme, or her children would succeed her in Marsan and Bigorre.\footnote{Marca, Histoire de Béarn, 630.; On Gaston’s crusade cf. Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn’, 277-9.}

The Lord Edward finally set said from Dover on 20 August 1270. Gaston did not accompany him. Originally, Edward had planned to break his itinerary in Gascony, where he made plans to meet Alfonso X. However, the delayed expedition forced the \textit{vicomte} to abandon his initial plans to embark for Acre. In September, when Edward finally arrived in France, Louis’ contingent had long since departed. He was informed that Louis had gone to Tunis, and followed him.\footnote{On Edward’s crusade cf. Prestwich, Edward I, 72-80.}

Whilst Edward was still on crusade, on 16 November 1272 Henry III died. Returning to Gascony a year later, the new King Edward discovered that Gaston, following problems with the newly appointed seneschal of Gascony, Luke de Tany, had refused to render homage for his lands held of the King of England.\footnote{On Luke de Tany cf. M. Prestwich, ‘Tany, Sir Luke de (d. 1282)’, rev. ODNB, 2004; online edn, Oct 2005 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37698, accessed 11 March 2013].} On 6 October 1273, the court of Saint-Sever dispatched orders for Gaston to make good this lapse. The \textit{vicomte} initially agreed, but then withdrew to Orthez breaking his oath. Philip III of France attempted to bring the dispute to a conclusion, but failed. It was not until 6 February 1275, that Philip finally sent Gaston to Edward, and the \textit{vicomte} submitted to his English overlord. Gascon was imprisoned for his insubordination. He was not freed until April 1277, at the French king’s insistence. And it was not until the following February (1278), at the \textit{parliament} held in Paris, that Edward officially
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pardoned him. A year later, on 28 April 1279, as duke of Aquitaine, Edward finally restored Gaston’s lands and castles.  

**Castilian Problems**

From the early 1270s and until 1275, Alfonso X’s political energy was mostly consumed in his efforts to claim the imperial title. As a result, plans for the marriage of Sancho (still a boy of only twelve or thirteen) were sidelined. But trouble was brewing in Castile, where, since the time of Fernando de la Cerda’s marriage, the nobility had been engaged in prolonged rebellion against the king. It is possible that the planned marriage of the *infante* Sancho had been an attempt to recruit allies against *don* Nuño González de Lara. This might explain the presence as witnesses to the arrangements of Lope Díaz and Diego López de Haro who were, at the time, allied to the rebels. The nephews of Gaston de Béarn, had joined the dissatisfied nobility, led by Nuño González and the *infante* Felipe, Alfonso’s brother. If their inclusion as witnesses to the marriage contract was an attempt to relieve Alfonso of some of the pressure from the uprising it failed to achieve this result.

In February 1271, the *infante* Felipe, Nuño González de Lara and other members of the most important noble families united against Alfonso X. At the time, the king was still endeavouring to lobby support for his claim to the Imperial crown through a marriage alliance. In August, Alfonso agreed to a marriage between his daughter Beatriz (Beatrix), and the Marquis of Montferrat, a Guelf and an avid supporter of

1202 *Foedera*, I.ii.569.  
1204 Ibid.
Alfonso’s imperial pretensions.\textsuperscript{1205} Shortly afterwards, on 1 September, Gregory X was elected as Pope, ending a three-year interregnum in the papal office. Alfonso could at last hope for papal support. Instead, in the outcome, he was to experience the final crushing of his hopes to succeed Frederick II as emperor.

In León-Castile, the uprising continued. In 1272, the Cortes assembled at Burgos, following Richard of Cornwall’s death, to discuss Alfonso X’s imperial aspirations. However, these discussions were forcibly ended when the rebels broke off negotiations with the king. Alfonso’s brother, Felipe, leader of the insurrection, and other rebels preferred to go into exile in Granada where they supported the accession of Muhammad I as ruler over this part of southern Andalucía.\textsuperscript{1206}

In 1273, the exiled nobles demanded that the king grant them soldadas\textsuperscript{1207} and the devolution of whatever territory he had, allegedly, taken from them. Diego López de Haro demanded the return of the towns of Orduña and Valmaseda taken, in December 1255, from his father, Diego López, after he had rebelled against the king and joined the infante Enrique.\textsuperscript{1208} Clearly, his inclusion as witness to the marriage agreement between Sancho and Guillelme had done little to dissuade him from joining the rebel cause.

\textsuperscript{1205} Kinkade, ‘Cantiga 235’, 292.
\textsuperscript{1207} ‘Soldada’ was the Iberian equivalent of money fiefs. The king would pay a certain amount of money in return for military service. Sometimes the money would be collected from the rents of royal lands.
The situation in Castile deteriorated further when, in January 1273, the rebels paid homage by proxy to the king of Navarre, Enrique I.\(^{1209}\) To avert any further conflicts, a marriage alliance was swiftly negotiated between Enrique and Alfonso. The Navarrese heir, Theobald, would marry Violante, Alfonso’s daughter.\(^{1210}\) However, this marriage never took place, as the young boy was killed in a fall from the walls of the castle of Estella. Jeanne, Enrique’s surviving daughter, thus became heir to the throne.

In Castile, meanwhile, the rebellion was drawing to a close. Through the mediation of Queen Violante, negotiations between the rebels and Alfonso X took place at last. Lope Díaz de Haro, who had requested the lands between Álava and Victoria was granted Álava after the king asked the infante Fernando de la Cerda to yield it. In addition, Alfonso agreed to return Orduña and Valmaseda taken from Lope’s father. Finally, the king acceded to most of the rebels’ requests drawing the episode to at least a temporary close.\(^{1211}\)

Following the death of Enrique I of Navarre on 22 July, Alfonso X sought to assert control over the neighbouring kingdom. The king renounced, but transferred his claim to Navarre to his heir, Fernando de la Cerda. On 3 September 1274, Fernando laid an unsuccessful siege to Viana, and two months later, he successfully took Mendavia.

In the midst of the turmoil, in June 1273, Eleanor, Edward I’s wife, visited Alfonso in Seville. Upon her return to Edward, Alfonso X dispatched a safe-conduct with her in

---

\(^{1209}\) Enrique (Henry) I of Navarre was king from 5 December 1270 until his death on 22 July 1274.

\(^{1210}\) González Jiménez, Alfonso X, 258.

\(^{1211}\) Ibid., 260-1.
which he explained to Edward that she was empowered to discuss a series of issues. Undoubtedly, she must have told Edward about the nobles’ uprising and its resolution. The information would have been of interest to Edward, who was planning marriage alliances with the other Iberian kingdoms. He was already seeking a marriage alliance between one of his sons, either Henry (died October 1274) or Alfonso (born 24 November 1273), and Jeanne (queen from 1274-1305), the heiress to Navarre and Champagne. At the same time, he intended to marry one of his daughters to the future king of Aragón. Edward’s plans for an alliance with Navarre did not materialize as Philip III of France swiftly arranged an alliance. In 1275, Pope Gregory X issued a dispensation for a marriage between Philip (IV), son of Philip III, and Jeanne of Navarre, shattering all hopes for an Anglo-Navarrese alliance.

For Edward I, it was of paramount importance to maintain peace between Gascony and the neighbouring Iberian kingdoms. Given the recent unrest in Castile, he knew that an alliance with Navarre and Aragón would benefit him. Therefore, the king proceeded with his plans for a marriage alliance with Aragón. Because Gaston VII of Béarn was a vassal of both Aragón and the duke of Aquitaine, his marriage plans for Guillelme could impact on the policies of Edward I and Jaime I of Aragón. Edward must have been concerned that, if Castile took hold of Gaston’s Aragonese lands, it could potentially unsettle the delicate balance in the region with further impact on Gascony.

---

1212 ‘Excellentiam vestram rogamus quatinus dominae Alienorae, consorti vestrae, sorori nostrae karissimae, in his quae vobis ex parte nostra, referenda verbo tenus duxerit, fidem pleniam adhibere, et eadem operibus adimplere velitis’: Foedera, I.ii.503.
1214 Powicke suggests a proposal involving Alfonso (III) of Aragón, who was Pedro III (Pere II)’s son, born in 1265. Pedro had been married to Constanza of Swabia (Hohenstaufen), from which he claimed Sicily: Powicke, King Henry III, ii, 614.
On 9 October 1273, Edward I and the infante Pedro (III),\(^{1215}\) drafted the terms for a betrothal (or marriage per verba de futuro) between the Aragonese’s eldest son, Alfonso, and Edward’s eldest daughter, Eleanor.\(^{1216}\) Esquivat de Chabanais, Gaston’s rival for the county of Bigorre, witnessed the arrangement. Gaston was at the time not in favour with Edward who was probably considering the possibility of acknowledging Esquivat’s claims to Bigorre over those of Gaston. Pedro of Aragón was married to Constanza (Constance), daughter of Manfred of Sicily, giving the infante a claim to the south Italian Regno, then under the control of Charles of Anjou. This linking of the families of Aragon and Frederick II, pregnant with significance for the future of Angevin rule in Sicily, not surprisingly attracted French attention. The marriage plans Meanwhile of Eleanor of England to Pedro’s son appears to have been conceived of as a way of limiting French influence over Edward’s Gascon lands.\(^{1217}\) The negotiations continued until 1282, when a marriage was finally agreed.\(^{1218}\) In the meantime, Alfonso X, who had not yet abandoned his imperial aspirations assembled the Cortes at Burgos in March 1274, to restate his imperial claims. This followed the election as King of the Romans on 23 September 1273 of Rudolph of Habsburg, to whom Gregory X had promised the imperial crown. In a final attempt to bend Gregory’s resolve, Alfonso sent an embassy to the pope.\(^{1219}\) In June 1274, Gregory X asked that Alfonso abandon his imperial dreams and focus rather on a Crusade to the Holy Land.\(^{1220}\) This, however, did not deter the king, who insisted on personally meeting with Gregory. Suspecting that Alfonso would not easily abandon his claims,

\(^{1215}\) Pedro was the eldest son of Jaime (Jaume) I of Aragón (1213-76).
\(^{1217}\) Prestwich, Edward I, 315.
\(^{1219}\) Valdeón Baruque, ‘Alfonso y el Imperio’, 254.
\(^{1220}\) Domínguez Sánchez, Gregorio X, no. 109.
the pope agreed to meet him at Beaucaire. 1221 There, Alfonso tried unsuccessfully to convince the pope of the justice of his cause. The Pope himself merely confirmed his support for Rudolph of Habsburg.

During Alfonso’s absence, on 3 May, a new contingent of Muslim Marinid forces landed at Tarifa, in southernmost Granada. By August, Abu Yusuf, the Marinid emir of Morocco, had joined the invading forces. Alfonso suffered a further blow when on his way to fight the invasion, Alfonso’s heir, Fernando de la Cerda, died (24-25 June 1274). The news of his son’s death reached Alfonso around August, when he was at Montpellier where he had fallen ill and was being tended by Jaime I’s surgeon. The king was forced to remain there from July until, possibly as late as December 1275. In the meantime, in Castile matters worsened. On 7 September, at Ecija, the Castilian army headed by Nuño González de Lara, suffered a severe blow when Nuño was captured by the Muslims. There were further losses on the Castilian frontier when, on 20 October, Sancho, archbishop of Toledo and Alfonso’s brother-in-law, was beheaded by the invading Moorish army. 1222 News of the invasion had by this time reached the pope, who, on 14 October, granted Alfonso a tenth of the revenues of the Castilian Church to fight the Muslims. 1223 Meanwhile, Yusuf’s forces continued to make their way through southern Castile arriving at Seville where they failed to breach the city’s defences but ravaged the surrounding area. It was at this moment that the infante Sancho, then seventeen, made his debut on the military stage by commanding a naval blockade that cut Muslim supplies. 1224

1221 3 May 1275 ibid., no. 168.
1223 Domínguez Sánchez, Gregorio X, no. 214.
A Marriage Alliance Rekindled

Naturally, after the death of Fernando de la Cerda and the continued deterioration of Alfonso’s health, the succession to the Castilian throne became a delicate matter. On 4 January 1276, at Toledo, Alfonso X met with the infante Sancho and his supporter, Lope Díaz de Haro, señor of Biscay. At the time, following Sancho’s triumph over the invading Muslim forces, the king favoured the succession of his son, Sancho, over the claims of Fernando’s own son, Alfonso (de la Cerda), supported by Nuño González’s son, Juan Núñez de Lara. But the issue soon came to divide the entire kingdom, leading to interventions by Philip III of France, who naturally supported his young nephew, Alfonso de la Cerda.

At Angoulême, in September 1276, Juan Núñez paid homage to Philip III and pledged to provide him with 300 knights for 40 days to defend the rights of Alfonso de la Cerda’s heir. Nuño González de Lara, Juan’s brother, also paid homage to Philip, pledging 106 knights for the same purpose. The dispute for the succession of the Castilian throne was fast drawing the king of France into military intervention south of the Pyrenees. Jerry Craddock has convincingly argued that by naming Sancho as his successor, Alfonso X was acting against the legal framework he had constructed in the Siete Partidas. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, he was ignoring the agreement made on Fernando’s marriage to Blanche in which the couple’s children would be regarded as heirs to the kingdom. Perhaps in a move to keep relations

---

1225 Ibid., chs. Ixiv-v.
1226 Daumet, Relations France et Castille, no. 7, 157-8.
1227 Ibid., no. 8, 160-2.
between Castile and France amicable, Alfonso avoided referring to Sancho as heir, but rather described him as his eldest son and his *ordomo* in royal *privilegios rodados*. By contrast, in his own charters, Sancho chose to style himself heir to the throne.\textsuperscript{1229}

The news of Alfonso’s decision to support Sancho over Alfonso de la Cerda came as a blow to the expectations of Philip III, Blanche’s brother, and to Yolanda, Alfonso X’s queen, who took refuge in the court of her Aragonese brother, King Pedro III. In time, Yolanda would change her mind and return to Castile. However, for the moment, her exile further divided the Castilian nobility.

Turmoil spread throughout the region, into Navarre. There France had vested interests which it moved to protect, in particular Jeanne of France’s rights after the death of her father. In 1276, in a move to bolster these interests, Philip III gathered an army to invade Navarre. Commanding it were Gaston de Béarn, recently liberated from Edward I’s captivity, and the count of Foix. The town of Salvatierra, in central Navarre, became Philip’s headquarter, and Gaston spent a large part of the year stationed there. The campaign’s purpose was to assert Jeanne’s rights in Navarre, which were in theory controlled by Philip III. The French and Castilian kings soon reached agreement. Gaston de Béarn was present at the treaty of Victoria in November 1276, in which Alfonso agreed to a truce with Navarre until Jeanne could herself convene the *Cortes*, at Christmas 1277, when the rights of Fernando’s heirs would be further discussed. However, the treaty was never enforced.\textsuperscript{1230}

\textsuperscript{1230} Ellis, ‘Gaston de Bearn’, 376; Ballesteros Beretta, *Alfonso X*, 796.
In Castile, Alfonso X continued to confront the north African invasion until February 1278, when a truce was agreed. Meanwhile, the new pope, Nicholas III, intervened in the disputes between Philip and Alfonso, on 15 July 1278 exhorting them to reach an agreement. On 1 April 1279, Alfonso X sent the English clerk, Geoffrey de Everley (‘Everle’), as his envoy to the court of Edward I. The Englishman, described as Alfonso’s notary (‘notario’) was supplied twice with letters of credence from Castile, reporting that he was empowered to discuss several issues, that he was well acquainted with Castilian politics, and that he already had experience of the negotiations between Rome, France, Aragón, and with the Muslims (Appendix F). In addition, he would talk to Edward about a series of marriages (Appendix G). Only a few days before, on 16 March 1279, Joan of Ponthieu, wife of Fernando III of Castile, had died. Around this time, Alfonso wrote to Edward (in a letter composed in Castilian) announcing he had learned that Edward had met with Philip III at Amiens (18-25 May 1279) and that amongst other things they had discussed the succession of Eleanor of Castile, Edward I’s queen, to the comtés of Ponthieu and Montreuil. He informed the English king that he was glad that these lands would pass to Edward and his wife (Appendix I). Without any further dispute, Ponthieu passed by inheritance to Eleanor. On 6 June 1279, Edward and Eleanor received the homage of the mayor and town of Abbeville and the men of Ponthieu.
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1231 Cf. S. Martínez, Alfonso X, the Learned: a Biography (Leiden: 2010), 402.
1232 Daumet, Relations France et Castille, no. 11, 164-7.
1233 1 April 1279. PRO, SC1/16/6; Foedera, I.ii.567.
1234 An additional credence issued 12 May: PRO, SC1/16/7; Foedera, I.ii.570.
1235 Part of it is missing. The endorsement describes it as an answer to a previous letter (respuesta): PRO, SC1/16/12.
1236 Foedera, I.ii.574.
Geoffrey de Everley has been identified by Noel Delholm-Young as a figure learned in the *ars dictaminis*, who wrote and dedicated a work to Alfonso X. He was sent by Alfonso to Rome and have also served Edward in Alfonso’s court for several years. He had experience of the Roman curia and had already served as envoy to Alfonso X, at least from 1276 when he was issued a safe-conduct returning to Castile. Curiously, master Geoffrey was sent to England bearing safeconducts written in the Castilian vernacular, rather than in Latin. These letters have never been properly investigated and are generally ignored by diplomatic historians. Pierre Chaplais went so far as to suggest, almost certainly incorrectly, that it was Alfonso X’s ignorance of Latin that prompted him to write to England in the Spanish vernacular. In reality, as with Alfonso’s laws, his histories, and his religious compositions, the vernacular seems to have been used here quite deliberately, rather as it had been in Anglo-Saxon England, as a sign of Castilian particularism, intended to proclaim that the Castilian language now ranked equal to Latin or French as a learned language, used in diplomacy, law and sciences. David Rojinsky, has remarked that although Alfonso X privileged the use of the Castilian vernacular or as he often referred to it ‘nuestro latín’ (our Latin), it was part of an inherited process of ‘castellanización’ associated with the reconquest and repopulation of such areas and the associated works, be it official documents or legislation, that were to be written in the language most widely understood, Castilian.
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1238 “…que muchas vezes provamos, que maestre Joffre notario, es omne qui servio et sirve bien et leal miente de grand tiempo, aca a vos, et a nos…”: PRO, SC 1/16/7, in *Foedera*, I.ii.570. See Appendix for full transcription and translation.
1239 CPR 1272-1281, 146.
1241 Amongst the works attributed to Alfonso X there are also works on astronomy and Castilian history. D. Rojinsky, ‘The Rule of Law and the Written Word in Alfonsine Castile: Demystifying a Consecrated Vernacular’, *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 80 (2003), 288-90.
On 2 May -independently from his father, it would seem, since he was in Toledo while his father was in Seville - the infante Sancho informed Edward that Geoffrey would discuss with him the disputes against France, the claims of the heirs of Fernando de la Cerda, and Sancho’s proposed marriage to the daughter of the ‘king of Germany’, Rudolph of Habsburgs (‘… es la nostra voluntad, en razon del casamiento entre mi et la fija del Rey de Alemanna…’) – Appendix H.1242

Unfortunately, no other source mentions the negotiation of a marriage between Sancho and one or other of Rudolph’s daughters. Sancho, it would seem, was unaware that in 1278, Edward I was negotiating a marriage between his own daughter, Joan, and Hartmann, Rudolph’s son.1243 The infante was probably taking advantage of his new position, as heir to the Castilian crown, to negotiate a more favourable marriage alliance, that would help him counterbalance Philip’s support for the succession of the infantes de la Cerda while seeking to reassert the Castilian claim to the imperial throne. Ten days later, on 12 May, Alfonso X wrote again to Edward, reiterating that Geoffrey was familiar with the affairs of France, Aragón, the frontier,

Perhaps the most famous work of Alfonso X, the Marian poems collected in the Cantigas de Santa María is to be separated from his other works, as it is the only one not to be written in Castilian, but rather in Galician-Portugues, a language favoured for lyrical works such as this one. Thus, it is important to underline the existence of other vernacular languages in Léon-Castile which co-existed with Castilian, used primarily for legal works and which have been more widely spoken. Marian miracles for the Cantigas were collected from a number of other languages, most notably Latin and French and later written in the vernacular. Cf. S. Parkinson et al., ‘Collection, composition, and compilation in the Cantigas de Santa Maria’, Portuguese Studies, (2006), 159-72. Amy Remensnyder does not take notice of the language used in the Cantigas, assuming it is Castilian, however provides a good introductory work and acknowledges the extensive use of Castilian vernacular in Alfonso’s works. Cf. A. Remensnyder, ‘The Virgin and the King: Alfonso X’s Cantigas de Santa Maria’, in The Middle Ages in Texts and Texture: Reflections on Medieval Sources (Toronto: 2011), 288. For a comprehensive analysis of the Cantigas see: J.F. O’Callaghan, Alfonso X and the Cantigas de Santa Maria: A Poetic Biography, (Leiden: 1998); D. Jackson, ‘The Influence of the Theophilus Legend: An overlooked Miniature in Alfonso X’s Cantigas de Santa Maria and its Wider Context’, in Under the Influence: The Concept of Influence and the Study of Illuminated Manuscripts (Turnhout: 2007), 75-87.

1242 King of the Romans from 1273 to 1291. PRO, SC1/16/8, in Foedera, I.ii.569.
1243 Foedera dates the charters to 1276, but Pierre Chaplais dates them 1278. Foedera I.ii.536; Chaplais, English Medieval Diplomatic Practice, no. 246.
Castile and Rome, and that furthermore he was empowered to talk to Edward about certain marriages (‘algunos casamientos’).  

These perhaps included Sancho’s planned marriage with Gaston’s daughter, and possibly the infante’s new plans to marry a German princess. However, it would seem, Geoffrey’s primary mission was to ask Edward to act as arbitrator in Franco-Castilian disputes. The Castilian envoy must have succeeded in his mission since by 26 November 1278, Edward was declaring his willingness to mediate between Alfonso X and Philip III.

But ever-changing Castilian politics dissuaded Alfonso from supporting Sancho as heir to the throne, so the king reversed his decision, backing Alfonso de la Cerda instead. Not surprising, his change of heart was met with violent insurrection led by Sancho and other Castilian nobles, in particular the influential de Haro family. By 13 July (1279), Edward in England had received news of this friction between Sancho and Alfonso X. In all of this, a wider consideration is worth bearing in mind.

Spanish politics, with an over-might aristocracy rising in rebellion against a King felt to have sat for too long on his throne, bear at least some resemblance to the politics of England under Henry III, during the 1250s and 60s. Even the English ‘reform’ crisis of 1258, it has been suggested, had been provoked in no small part by the perceived alliance between the heir to the throne, the Lord Edward, and one particular faction at court, Edward’s Lusignan uncles. Edward was not only married to a Castilian princess but had grown up in circumstances that would have rendered the politics of Castile depressingly familiar. Just as Edward had learned many lessons in kingship
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1244 PRO, SC 1/16/7, in Foedera, I.ii.570.
1245 Foedera, I.i.576
1246 ‘Insuper, sciatis quod dominus rex Castellae, sicut intelleximus, se traxit versus partes Sibiliae, et dimisit in castella dominum Sanciam filium suum, dominum et potentem de omnibus terris suis’: Foedera, I.ii.575.
from Simon de Montfort and the baronial rebels of the 1260s, so those same experiences now helped in his management of Anglo-Spanish diplomacy.\textsuperscript{1248}

In the meantime, the revived plans for a marriage between Sancho and Guillelme had met with disapproval from the French king. Most likely, Gaston requested Edward’s assistance in procuring the marriage. But Edward could not ignore Philip III’s support for the \textit{infantes} de la Cerda, nor could he turn a blind eye to his brother-in-law, Alfonso X’s recent change of heart with regards to the Castilian succession. On 5 September 1279, Edward I sent William de Valence with instructions not to proceed with the Béarnaise marriage negotiations as he had learned that a kinsmen of Gaston had damaged the relations between Alfonso X and the \textit{infante} Sancho.\textsuperscript{1249} The unnamed kinsmen was most likely Diego López de Haro, Constance’s son and Gaston’s nephew, who actively supported Sancho.

Castile was once again thrown into turmoil, as Ibn Yusuf returned from Morocco to wage war against the king of Granada, now Alfonso’s vassal. The king, already a frail old man, summoned the \textit{infante} Sancho, his other sons, Pedro, Juan and Jaime, and his brother, Don Manuel, to oppose the invasion.\textsuperscript{1250} In desperation, he also appealed to King Edward for help. On 18 May 1280, Edward I issued orders to the or and jurats of Bayonne, to allow Alfonso X to purchase galleys and ships to be used against the Muslim invaders (‘galeas et navis contra Sarracenos’). He also

\textsuperscript{1249} ‘Verum, quia postmodum intelleximus quod aliqui, de consanguinitate eiusdem Gastonis, aliqua fecerunt, pro quibus de amicitia aut benevolentia regis, et domini Sench’ predictorum, ad presens non existent, et quorum occasione matrimonium illud ipsis nequaquam complacere’: \textit{Foedera}, I.ii.575.
\textsuperscript{1250} González Jiménez, ed., \textit{Crónica de Alfonso X}, lxxiii, 206.
encouraged carpenters and shipbuilders to assist Alfonso in the building of ships.  

In the meantime, Sancho gathered an army to repel the invaders.

Negotiations between Castile and France continued and Edward, who had agreed to act as mediator, devised a form for a peace treaty, first put into circulation c. May 1280. On 1 June 1280, Alfonso formally asked Edward to mediate between him and Philip and agreed to a truce. The English king assured him that he would be ready to proceed by Christmas. Alfonso proposed a truce between Castile and France to last to Easter or the feast of St Martin (11 November) 1282.

But once again, Alfonso had a change of heart. A fortnight after Edward’s agreement to arbitrate, Philip informed Edward that Alfonso had instead chosen Charles of Salerno, heir to the throne of Sicily and Philip III’s cousin, as mediator. In addition, he asked the English king to allow Alfonso to enter Bayonne in order to proceed with negotiations. Finally, he requested that Edward himself be present at the peace. Edward agreed to send representatives. Days later, on the Feast of the Assumption (15 August 1280), Alfonso ratified the truce with France negotiated by Charles.

The reasons behind Alfonso’s change of heart remain obscure, although is clear that the Castilian king had secretly sent envoys to the prince of Salerno while conducting negotiations with Edward I. Salvador Martínez suggests that this was because, as an Angevin, Charles had the support of the pope. Alfonso’s diplomatic blunder

1251 Foedera, I.ii.580.  
1253 Foedera, I.ii.581.  
1254 Treaty Rolls, no. 161.  
1255 Foedera, I.ii.584; Treaty Rolls, nos. 155-6.  
1256 Foedera, I.ii.586; Treaty Rolls, no. 160.  
1257 Daumet, Relations France et Castille, no. 14, 171-2.  
1258 Martínez, Alfonso X, 430.  
1259 Ibid., 429.
ensured that his relations with the English king were never again so close. Perhaps, out of fear that Edward would favour Sancho and his Aragonese ally, King Pedro III, Alfonso turned to Charles of Salerno. Philip may have also attempted to influence events by preferring a mediator closer to own uncle, Charles of Anjou. In all of this, we enter that game of three- or four-dimensional chess that renders the writing of diplomatic history so complicated, and that in this particular instance reveals a series of close but often mysterious connections between the ruling houses of Castile, Aragon, England, France and Sicily. In due course, these connections were to be of no small significance in the crisis provoked by the Sicilian Vespers of 1283. No one who has read Stephen Runciman’s wonderful account of the Sicilian crisis can be in any doubt as to the tortuous complexity of international relations at this time.

Meanwhile, negotiations for a permanent Castilian-French peace proceeded apace. By 30 December 1280, the Castilian king was at Bayonne. Without Sancho’s knowledge, Alfonso X proposed to Philip III to grant the lands of Jaen, the former Muslim kingdom conquered in 1246 by Fernando III, to Alfonso de la Cerda. Philip refused this suggestion, reasserting the infante’s right to the united kingdom of León-Castile. Discovering his father’s plans, Sancho also rebuked Alfonso for attempting to divide the kingdom.1260 At this stage, Alfonso X once again wavered in his nomination of a successor to the Castilian throne, withdrawing his support from Sancho and instead backing the infantes de la Cerda.

Alfonso’s relations with Aragón were themselves detraining, as Sancho and Pedro III formed an alliance early in 1281. The Aragonese King renounced his claims to Navarre and promised to help Sancho assert control over Castile on condition that,

---

upon his accession to the throne, Sancho return the castle of Albarracín.1261 By this time, the *infantes* de la Cerda were themselves held captive by Pedro following the return of Violante to Castile in 1279.

Edward I was also directly affected by the turbulence in the Iberian Peninsula. For some time he had been negotiating a marriage between his daughter and Pedro’s son. The unsettled political climate meant that this marriage had to be postponed. Through his wife Constanza, Pedro III of Aragón had claims to Sicily, which he actively sought to exploit. To do this, he first had to ensure his position in Catalonia-Aragón. By 1280, he was in a position to stake his claim to Sicily, having imprisoned the *infantes* and thereby guaranteed himself against the threat of any direct attack from Castile.1262 Edward I, on the brink of concluding a marital alliance with Aragón, found himself caught in a triangular international rivalry, with the kings of Castile, Aragón and France all possessing vested interests in the future of the Sicilian kingdom. Edward’s support for any one of these rival parties threatened to turn the other two against him. As mediators, either Charles of Anjou or Charles of Salerno were bound to support their kinsman Philip III. Edward’s proposals for an Aragonese marriage meanwhile threatened to drag England into the disputes over Sicily and hence into a direct confrontation with France.

In 1281, Sancho was once again forced into war with the Muslim kingdom of Granada.1263 This episode further marred relations between Alfonso and his son. The increasingly frail king had been afflicted for some time with what modern specialists have sought to identify as a cancerous tumour. With Alfonso incapable of ruling in

---

1261 Idem, *Sancho IV, infante*, nos. 74-8, 188.  
person, Sancho had taken on a large part of the duty of kingship. Yet, Alfonso remained merely lukewarm in his support for Sancho. While the king attempted to negotiate his treaty with Philip III, Sancho supported the imprisonment of the *infantes de la Cerda* by Pedro III of Aragón.\(^{1264}\) In this, he had the support of a significant number of nobles, including the de Haros. Nonetheless, the Lara family favoured Alfonso de la Cerda. In short, Castilian politics were in total disarray.

To add to the commotion, on 13 October 1281, at Estella (Navarre), possibly in an effort to safeguard his Navarrese lands, Lope Díaz de Haro, lord of Biscay, declared himself a vassal of Philip III, promising 300 armed knights with their horses (‘*trezientos cavailleros guisados de cavaillos e armas*’) for forty days to serve in Gascony, Navarre, Catalonia or Aragón or in all of Spain (‘*e que faga yo este servicio en Gascoyna, en Navarra e en Cathaloyna e en Aragon e en toda Espanya*’). In these new arrangements, Lope Díaz deliberately omitted any reference to Castile, even though his actions were bound to imply a change of his position in respect to both Alfonso and Sancho.\(^{1265}\) His negotiations with France followed those with Eustace of Beaumarchais, governor of Navarre on behalf of Jeanne of Navarre and her husband Philip III of France, by which, on 6 April 1276, Lope Díaz, along with other *ricoshombres*, had vowed to protect the kingdom of Navarre from any projected Castilian invasion.\(^{1266}\) Meanwhile, Pope Martin IV, eager to launch a Crusade to the Holy Land, exhorted Philip III to extend to ten years his truce with Castile.\(^{1267}\) It was

\(^{1264}\) Ibid., 164-5.


\(^{1266}\) Ibid., no. 10.

against this backdrop, that Gaston de Béarn continued to seek a marriage alliance between his daughter, Guillaume, and Sancho of Castile.

**Marriage in the Fourth Degree of Consanguinity**

The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 had reduced the prohibition on consanguineous marriages from the seventh to the fourth degree. As David D’Avray has argued, the measure was intended to limit what had previously been a chaotic situation in which vast numbers of noble marriages could, if necessary, be challenged on the grounds of consanguinity and annulled under canon law. Henceforth, although the Pope reserved the power to annul in exceptional circumstances, ‘easy annulment’ became virtually impossible to obtain.\(^{1268}\) Sancho and Guillelme were related within the fourth degree of kinship, and thus required papal dispensation for their marriage to be considered canonical (see genealogy).\(^{1269}\) A dispensation for a marriage in the fourth degree of consanguinity was not a rare event, as can be attested by the multiple dispensations issued by Martin IV (1281-5), several of these granted after the couples concerned had contracted *de facto* marriages.\(^{1270}\) Edward I had become involved in one such case, in December 1283 recommending that papal dispensation be granted to support the marriage of (?a Welshman) ‘Resus Mareducus’, and Auda of Hastings.\(^{1271}\)

There is evidence to suggest that Gaston himself approached Edward for help in securing a dispensation for the marriage of Sancho and Guillelme. A draft surviving

\(^{1271}\) ‘...rege Angliae per litteras apostolicae sedis gratiam super eodem jam implorante, quod impedimento hujusmodi non obstante, libere ad invicem matrimonium contrahere valeant’: Ibid., no. 404.
from Edward’s chancery offers a form of letters from the King, informing Gaston that the vacancy following the death of Pope Nicholas III (d. 22 February 1281) had prevented the King from interceding on the vicomte’s behalf. Edward nonetheless proposed to send Donatus de Pinibus to Gaston with a model letter (forma), devised by master Guillelme Raymond, to be addressed to the Pope. If Gaston preferred, he was free to devise his own form of words. Edward I nonetheless asks to be informed of Gaston’s preference. Finally, he notifies the vicomte that his plans to meet with Alfonso X at Christmas had been postponed but that he expected to meet him instead a fortnight after Easter (late April 1281). All of this fits neatly into the context of 1281. On 27 August 1280, for example, Edward had agreed to meet Alfonso at Bayonne, a fortnight after Easter 1281. On 22 February 1281, he reaffirmed his intention that they meet on the frontiers of Gascony after the Easter Parliament, around the feast of the Assumption (15 August). Relations with Castile nonetheless cooled following Alfonso’s nomination of Charles of Salerno as mediator with Philip III. On 3 July 1281, shortly after Edward had commissioned Anthony Bek and John de Vescy to continue the negotiations for the marriage of his daughter, Eleanor, to the son of Pedro III of Aragón, he informed Alfonso X that he expected to travel to Gascony in September, to be present at the negotiations between Alfonso and Philip, sending meanwhile as his representatives Anthony Bek (1245-1311), then in charge of the marriage negotiations with Pedro II of

1272 In 1252, Raymond and Donatus de Pinibus appear as brothers of William, prior of Le Mas (in Agen). They had been taken prisoners by Simon de Montfort and Henry III ordered their release (CPR 1247-58, 158). On 11 November 1273, the brothers were listed amongst those nobles present at the court at Saint-Sever, which summoned Gaston de Béarn (Foedera, I.i.i.506).
1273 PRO, SC1/12/46.
1274 Foedera, I.i.i.586.
1275 Ibid., 589.
1276 12 July, as in Ibid., 593.
1277 Ibid., 594.
Aragón, and Luke de Tany (d. 1282), former seneschal of Gascony (1274-8). In the end, no meeting between Edward I and Alfonso X took place. However, to judge from a safe conduct issued by Alfonso from Seville on 23 June 1282, plans continued for Eleanor, Edward’s queen and Alfonso’s sister, to travel to Castile. It is possible that Edward had no real intention of assisting Gaston of Béarn towards a Castilian marriage alliance, but was merely buying time either in order to conclude a marriage alliance between his own daughter, Eleanor, and Alfonso of Aragón, or pending the outcome of negotiations between France and Castile.

Without papal dispensation, the marriage between Sancho and Guillelme remained an empty proposition. From the papal registers we have no evidence that any of the popes, John XXI, Nicholas III, or Martin IV granted such dispensation. Nor is there any surviving petition from Gaston requesting its issue.

Martin IV, who supported Charles of Anjou in southern Italy, was keen to enlist Castilian assistance for his ally. On 9 August 1283, he ordered, in support of Alfonso X, that all regions supporting Sancho’s insurrection against his father were to be placed under interdict. He also asked Edward I, and the kings of France and Portugal, Philip III and Dinis, to help maintain the peace in Castile. Given political circumstances, and with Alfonso rather than Sancho as the chief object of papal support, it would have been unwise for Edward to intercede on behalf of Sancho’s proposed Béarnaise marriage, itself a potential lever with which Sancho could apply further pressure against his father, Alfonso X. In Castile itself, by

---

1278 Ibid.
1279 PRO, SC1/16/10.
1280 Olivier-Martin, Les registres de Martin IV (1281-1285), no. 479.
contrast, Sancho enjoyed widespread support from the nobility and the Castilian church. Amongst his leading advocates were Diego López de Haro, Gaston’s nephew, Don Manuel, Alfonso X’s brother, and a significant number of Spanish bishops who seem to have ignored the papal order placing Sancho’s lands under interdict. The interdict nonetheless remained in place even after Sancho’s accession as King. Alfonso X died on 4 April 1284 and Sancho was raised to the throne of León-Castile. However, it was not until 7 November 1286 that the interdict against him was lifted by Pope Honorius IV. That it had not, in the meantime, been effectively enforced is evidenced from the register of Pope Nicholas IV, who ordered the archbishop of Compostela, the bishop of Salamanca and the bishop of Burgos to pardon those clerics who had not obeyed the sentence passed against Sancho’s supporters by Pope Martin IV. It had fallen to the bishop of Burgos and to the bishop of Astorga to make sure that other dioceses enforced the papal sentence. Henrich Finke long ago pointed out that a lack of documentation from this period renders it impossible to know to what extent papal orders were carried out. Even so, according to a chronicle attributed to Gonzalo de la Hinojosa, bishop of Burgos (d. 1327), the archbishops and bishops of Spain did little to conciliate Alfonso X, merely seeking a more rigid segregation of the King from Sancho as his son and successor.

1284 Finke mistakenly writes the archbishop of Burgos. However, it was not until the sixteenth century (1574) that Burgos was elevated to the status of an archbishopric. Finke et al., ‘Dispensa para Sancho IV’, 301.
1285 G. Hinojosa, Continuación de la Crónica de España del arzobispo Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, Vol. 106 (Madrid: 1893), ch. ccxlii, 24-5.
Guillelme’s Dowry

Perhaps expecting opposition to any Béarnaise marriage alliance from Gaston’s overlords, Philip III and Edward I, as well as from the Pope, in the summer of 1281, Sancho of Castile was betrothed to Alfonso X’s cousin, María de Molina. The couple were related with the third degree of consanguinity (Appendix J on the dating of this marriage), so that, like the earlier Béarnaise negotiations, there was no guarantee that this new betrothal would obtain ecclesiastical sanction. As a result, negotiations for a marriage between Sancho and Guillelme, far from ending as a result Sancho’s Molina marriage, continued as an ongoing ambition for Gaston de Béarn.

Constance de Béarn informed Edward I that his father, Henry III, had required the knights and nobles of Béarn to pay her homage (‘…milites et burgenses de Bearnio faciat ei de sacramento homagii obligari…’), which she had already received and concerning which she had letters patent. Thus, she continued, she felt her father’s negotiations went against her rights. Furthermore, she suggested it was against Edward’s own interests that Sancho, such a powerful man, should be intruded to an English fee (‘si ita potens homo vestrum feodum ingrediatur’). She offered to travel to England to discuss matters further.1286 If Sancho held Béarn, Edward’s hold on the region would be threatened. It would, in addition, strain relations with Aragón, with whom Edward planned a marriage alliance. In addition, it endangered Edward’s relations with Philip III, a supporter of the rights of Alfonso de la Cerda. On 10 July 1282, Edward informed Philip III that Gaston de Béarn, to entice Sancho to marry

1286 PRO, SC1/19/103 (marked as no. 104 in the front due to foliation mistake, no. 103 on the back); reproduced in J.J. Champollion-Figeac et al., Lettres de rois, reines et autres personages des cours de France et d’Angleterre depuis Louis VII jusqu’a Henri IV Vol. 1 (Paris: 1839), no. 127.
Guillelme, proposed (‘proponit’) to assign to Guillelme a part of the fiefs he held from the French king, which had already been assigned to Constance. Philip III, naturally, disproved of this arrangement. Dutifully, Edward informed Philip he would not allow (‘non permitteremus’) the marriage.\textsuperscript{1287}

The request to include Gaston’s Béarnaise lands, or indeed any of his Gascon holdings, went against the original marriage agreement, in which, as has been noticed, Gaston stated that no Gascon lands could be part as Guillelme’s dowry. It would seem that Sancho was again exploiting his power and influence, as the most likely candidate to ascend the Castilian throne, to exert pressure upon Gaston and increase Guillelme’s dowry.

Sancho must have been well aware of the possibility that his marriage with Guillelme would prove impossible to implement, but perhaps wanted to buy himself more time as well as Gaston’s support. Fearing he was losing support in Castile, he in the end married Maria Alfonso de Meneses (de Molina).\textsuperscript{1288}

\textbf{Sancho’s Rebellion and Gaston de Béarn}

In Castile, support for Sancho remained strong, with Sancho able to call upon the assistance of Lope Díaz de Haro, señor of Bizcay, and other members of the nobility like Fernando Pérez Ponce, Ramiro Díaz, Pedro Perez de Asturias, Fernando Rodríguez Cabrera and most of the archbishops, bishops and abbots, save for the

\textsuperscript{1287} PRO, SC1/13/16 (draft); reproduced in ibid., no. 239.
\textsuperscript{1288} Cf. Valle Curies, \textit{María de Molina}, 41-8.
archbishops of Toledo and Seville, who remained faithful to Alfonso X. Notably, the Lara family did not support Sancho, but rather Fernando’s heirs.

On 21 April 1282, at Valladolid, Alfonso X was deposed by his nobles. Previously, he had asked his son-in-law, Edward I, for help. Edward responded on 22 December (1282) by asking Gaston de Béarn to aid Alfonso. After the failed negotiations for Guillelme’s marriage to Sancho, Gaston had no other option but to send the requested aid, but he was in no hurry, as he was in Pamplona attempting to settle his longstanding claim to Bigorre. His ongoing dispute with Esquivat de Chabenais had a Navarrese dimension, since it involved Jeanne of Navarre, now past the age of majority and therefore in a position to declare her own wishes for the disputed county. The case involved Edward I, as duke of Aquitaine, concerned to safeguard his interests in the region. To represent him, Edward sent the seneschal of Gascony, Jean de Grilly. In August 1283, Esquivat died in Navarre. Philip III, whose son Philip was to marry Jeanne of Navarre, also had a vested interest in Bigorre. But before any other claimant to the county could act, Gaston and Constance of Béarn entered Tarbes where on 1 September 1283 the court there recognized Constance as countess. In the aftermath, Gaston assured Edward I that they would pay homage to him for Bigorre. Negotiations continued into November, when Constance travelled to England to discuss matters with Edward.

---

1289 Ibid., 41-4.
1290 Martínez, Alfonso X, 447-8.
1291 Ballesteros Beretta, Alfonso X, 959-60, 970. By May, a significant number of Leonese bishops and abbots signed an allegiance with the infante Sancho and attached their seals to the document. Cf. Linehan, Partible Inheritance, 186-93.
1292 Ellis, “Gaston de Bearn”, 415-19.
On 2 December 1282, Edward I explained to Alfonso that trouble in Wales meant that, at present, he was unable to help him personally. However, he continued, he had issued instructions to Gaston de Béarn to send 100 knights from Gascony to Alfonso’s aid. On 18 January 1283, from Pamplona, Gaston informed Edward he had received from Anthony Bek 2270 livres tournois to pay for the 41 knights, 59 squires and 20 mounted sergeants sent to aid Alfonso X from 14 November 1282 until 14 January 1283. Each knight received eight sous and each squire six sous. Further claims for losses were made on 25 January 1283. The aid seems nonetheless to have been more of a diplomatic gesture than actual help for Alfonso X, who was losing his war against Sancho.

The Marriage Between Eleanor of England and Alfonso of Aragón: A Similar Case to Sancho and Guillelme’s Marriage?

Following the disputes over Sicily between Charles of Anjou on one side, supported by his nephew, the French king, and Pedro III of Aragón on the other, supported by Pope Martin IV, Edward I stepped back from the proposed marriage alliance between his daughter, Eleanor, and Alfonso of Aragón, son of Pedro III. The marriage had been completed by proxy -through Anthony Bek and John de Vescy. however, there were still grounds on which to argue impediment. Eleanor and Alfonso were related in the fourth degree of consanguinity and Martin IV had not issued a dispensation. Nor did he intend to issue one.

1293 Foedera, I.ii.620.  
1294 Foedera, I.ii.625; 638.  
1295 The losses include two horses (equus): Foedera, I.ii.638.  
1296 On 24 January 1282, Edward had issued a credence to Anthony Bek and John de Vescy to arrange the marriage, cf. PRO, SC 1/12/33. On 13 August 1282, the marriage agreement was drafted at Osca. Foedera, I.ii.613; 615.
In Aragon, on 15 August 1282, Pedro announced that Eleanor and Alfonso had married (‘Alfonsus… contraxit matrimonium per verba de presenti cum illustri domina Alienora…’). But like the marriage between Sancho and Guillelme’s, this was a union that would have required, but never received, papal dispensation. Edward continued to stall. On 12 January 1283, he excused his failure to send Eleanor to Aragón to consummate the alliance, claiming his preoccupation with the Welsh revolt. The marriage was then decisively blocked, perhaps to Edward’s relief. On 7 July 1283, Pope Martin asked Edward to withdraw from the planned alliance between his daughter and Alfonso, son of the excommunicated King Pedro. The pope added that not only were Eleanor and Alfonso related within the fourth degree, but that it would be detrimental to Edward’s prestige and to that of the Church for the marriage to proceed.

**Guillelme’s Marriage to Pedro of Aragón**

Gaston of Béarn was once again forced to find a suitable husband for his younger daughter. Not until 28 August 1291 was she finally married, to the *infante* Pedro, son of Pedro III of Aragón. And not until 22 June 1295 did Pope Boniface VIII at last...

---

1297 *Foedera*, I.ii.615.
1299 Pedro was excommunicated for having invaded Sicily on 18 November 1282. Olivier-Martin, *Les registres de Martin IV (1281-1285)*, no. 276.
1300 ... quod i(n) tui dicte quibus domus honoris derogac(i)o(n)em no(n) modicam i(n) laudis regie detrimentu(m) in tue glorie nubilum talis copula p(er)veniret, nunq(u)i(d) tue circumspecte p(ro)uidencie magnitudo discussit q(u)embr(... q(u)embr) multa divine mages(t)is offensa graui fideliu(m) scandal(m) aniamar(um) p(red)ictu(m) conceptu(m) canon(um) manifesto ta(m) infausta conjuncio...’: ACA, Real Cancellaría, Pergaminos (Bulas), legajo xvi, no. 4 (Miquel, 198). Although this document is not included in Chaplais correspondence, he has analysed the correspondence regarding the plans for the marriage, cf. Chaplais, *English Medieval Diplomatic Practice*, ii, 473-81.
grant dispensation for such a marriage. As a sign that her previous alliance with
Sancho had never been regarded as valid, there is no evidence that Guillelme was
required to seek any sort of annulment of her Castilian marriage, apparently regarded
by the papacy as a mere sponsalia raising no impediment to her marriage to the
infante of Aragón.

Meanwhile, on 13 January 1283, Pope Martin IV declared Sancho and María’s
marriage invalid on the grounds of spiritual ties (via shared God-parenthood) and
consanguinity within the third degree of kinship. María was the godmother of
Sancho’s illegitimate daughter, making the marriage invalid according to canon
law. A week later, on 21 January, the pope also ruled against Violante’s marriage
to Diego López (V) de Haro. Neither couple obeyed the Pope’s rulings. Both
marriages were consummated and several children were born from them. Sancho
never obtained a dispensation, although he ordered a fake one that was later
denounced by Pope Nicholas IV. His son by María, Fernando (IV), was nonetheless
later recognized as his legitimate heir.

In the longer term, Sancho’s marriage to Guillelme continued to haunt him. On 21
March 1297, Pope Nicholas IV denounced Sancho’s fake dispensation for his
marriage with Maria de Molina, referring to the fact that Guillelme of Béarn was
either betrothed or married to the king.

\[^{1301}\] G.A.L. Digard et al., Les registres de Boniface VIII: recueil des bulles de ce pape publiées ou
\[^{1302}\] Olivier-Martin, ed., Les registres de Martin IV (1281-1285), no. 303.
\[^{1303}\] Friedberg, ed., Corpus iuris canonici, lib. IV, tit. iii, p. 1067-8.
\[^{1304}\] Olivier-Martin, ed., Les registres de Martin IV (1281-1285), no. 304.
\[^{1305}\] On the forged dispensation cf. H. Finke et al., ‘Dispensa para Sancho IV’; Domínguez Sánchez,
‘Falsificaciones medievales una “Bula” de Nicolás IV falsificada por el Rey Sancho IV de Castilla’,
‘Predicto predecessore vivente, proponebatur quod dicti S(ancio) et M(aria) non potuerant invicem matrimonium legitime contraxisse, non solum propter impedimentum consanguinitatis in tertia linea, verum etiam propter spiritualem cognationem quia ipsa, M(aria) filium ipsius Santii ex alia muliere genitum de sacro fonte levaverat, et quia idem S(ancio) cum nobili muliere Guillelma, nata Guasconis de Bierna, sponsalia vel matrimonium ante contraxerat, unde et ipsa Guillelma repetebat eundem et separationem ejus a dicta Maria postulabat instanter’.\textsuperscript{1306}

At the time, Guillelme had been married Pedro of Aragón for at least six years, in an alliance that had obtained papal dispensation in 1295. In the end, it was not Guillelme’s looks that had deterred Sancho from marriage to the house of Béarn, but rather the political situation surrounding his succession to the throne. The dispute between Aragón and France thus merely sealed the faith of an ill-starred alliance.

As this long protracted story illustrates, marriage in the thirteenth century was a complicated affair. It was all the more so when the parties were related (as was almost inevitably the case amongst the ruling houses of France, England and Spain), when the bride was an heiress, or when wider political considerations intervened to lend extra weight to one or other sum within a immensely complex three- or four-dimensional equation. If we strip away the naivety of one school of commentators, and the romanticism of another, we are left with a situation in which the loyalties of the Pyrenees counties continued to be pulled in a wide variety of directions, towards Castile, Navarre or Aragon, towards England, or towards France.

\textsuperscript{1306} Langlois, \textit{Registres Nicolas IV}, no. 2335
Conclusion

The history of Anglo-Iberian relations from the reign of Henry II of England to that of Alfonso X of Castile is one of opportunistic alliances. It is not the story of continuity, but rather of change, not of uniformity but of diversity. Anglo-Iberian relations were the result of particular circumstances and interests rarely leading to long-term policies or commitments. The distinctions that divided the various Iberian kingdoms, themselves forming an ‘artificial’ entity, as Peter Linehan has warned us, brought about many such contacts. These kingdoms united by strong bonds of kinship were also divided through their different traditions, cultures and languages, not least in respect to religion. They could unite to confront a common enemy, as they did in 1212 when the kings of Castile, Catalonia-Aragón and Navarre defeated the Muslim armies of al-Nasir. However, with few exceptions, the Christian kingdoms tried constantly to outweigh each other, often shifting their alliances in the process.

Cultural historians, such as Rose Walker, have quite rightly drawn attention to the cultural exchange involved in the marriages of Eleanor of England and Alfonso VIII, and Eleanor of Castile with Edward I of England. However, the more mundane task of analysing Iberia's political relations with England have been sidelined because of the lack of any central Iberian archive, Spain's shifting frontiers, and the changing interests and alliances of its kings.

1307 Linehan, Partible Inheritance, x.
*Hispania*, the Roman name for the Peninsula, was in use for centuries after the collapse of the Roman Empire, and thus may have misled historian into false conceptions of unity. It was a term used by the people who inhabited the Peninsula in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Even here, however, it was not reserved for the Christian kingdoms. English chroniclers and clerks, and other European monarchs, likewise used the term *Hispania* to describe not only the land but the people who inhabited this region. The term's appropriation by modern scholars has led to misconceived ideas of unity.\[^1^\] Here, I make no claim to discuss the wider implications of this phenomenon. Nonetheless, it is clear that in economic and mercantile, as in royal or diplomatic relations, it would be misleading to assume too great a degree of unity, just as it would be wrong to overlook the great diversity that continued to characterise the Peninsula as a whole.

From the start, it is evident that a history of Anglo-Iberian relations is unlikely to be either glamorous or straightforward. Rather, what is revealed here is a tangled web of political interests linking Iberia into southern France and Gascony. Within this tangle, particular interests predominate. The web as a whole is nonetheless worthy of exploration, since it adds greatly to our understanding of diplomatic and cultural commerce.

Anglo-Iberian relations between the mid-twelfth and the second half of the thirteenth century, were largely dominated by the Plantagenet hold over Gascony. The vicomté of Béarn, in particular, became a significant player in the multidimensional chess game that resulted. Béarn, and to lesser degree Bigorre, were relatively independent

---

from the duke of Aquitaine. Because of their affinities with their Pyrenean neighbours, they were drawn closer to Aragón. Béarn, in particular, became an active ally of Aragón in the *reconquista*. Gaston IV of Béarn was a key figure in the conquest of Saragossa in 1117, receiving a considerable collection of lands in the region. Aragonese influence was also strong in neighbouring Bigorre, especially after Centule of Bigorre became an Aragonese vassal in 1122. These ties would, to some extent, impact on Henry II’s rule over Aquitaine. Not surprisingly, it was to Catalonia-Aragón that the duke, and later his son, Richard [I], turned when in the second half of the twelfth century they confronted their common enemy, the count of Toulouse. It was very largely thanks to his claims to Gascony that Henry II became involved in diplomatic exchanges with the count-kings of Catalonia-Aragón. Even so, when Berenguer Ramón entrusted Henry II with his young son, Alfonso [II], this was done not just because Henry was duke of Aquitaine but because he was a king in his own right, in England not in France. The intention here was to entrust Alfonso to a powerful fellow sovereign. Not only would Henry serve as protector of the future king’s lands in southern France, but his tuition would add prestige to Alfonso's upbringing. In the case of the marriage between Alfonso VIII and Eleanor of England, prestige was likewise significant. Eleanor was sought because she was the daughter of a widely respected king of England. Her father's lands in Gascony, a region in which Castile had shown no previous interest, were only a secondary consideration here. As yet, there was not even a common frontier between Castile and Gascony. Only in the aftermath of the marriage, and as a result of the subsequent Castilian appropriation of what had previously been Navarrese coastline, was Alfonso VIII prompted to claim Gascony as part of Eleanor’s dowry, a claim that is poorly
supported by the evidence and that may well have been more speculative than Castilian historians have been prepared to accept.

Once Richard I was crowned king of England, and having settled matters with Toulouse, he looked towards Navarre to form a marital alliance that would protect his Gascon holdings. Changing circumstances, and Philip Augustus’ growing control over France, altered the Iberian panorama once again. After the death of Richard I, relations were determined by John’s desperate efforts to counter Philip Augustus, leading to a short-lived alliance with Sancho VII of Navarre, an alliance that failed to protect John from defeat at the battle of Bouvines in 1214, but which provided his critics with further charges against him. Civil unrest ensued, and there was a period of relative quiet in Anglo-Iberian relations. Even here, however, the unrest of John’s reign prompted the Castilian king, Alfonso VIII, to take advantage of the turmoil and claim Gascony on behalf of his wife, Eleanor. It remains unclear why Alfonso VIII, having allegedly entered Gascony, should have abandoned his expedition. It is possible that he came to consider it a waste of resources, preferring instead to focus upon strengthening his hold over his peninsular lands rather than those north of the Pyrenees, in which he may found little local support. Unfortunately, given the state of our documentary and narrative resources, either Gascon or Castilian, it is impossible to pinpoint the precise causes for his withdrawal. Even so, Alfonso's retreat, and the relative obscurity of the sources, do not necessarily prove that relations between Castile and Gascony were completely severed. To some extent they survived as late as 1252, when Gaston de Béarn’s alliance with Alfonso X of León-Castile prompted the king to revive his ancestral Castilian claims to Gascony in the midst of what for
Henry III of England were ongoing disputes with both the Gascon and the English nobility.

From the 1230s onwards, and partly as a result of the Albigensian Crusade, and Pedro II’s death at Muret in 1213, the balance of powers in Southern France shifted. With no room for manoeuvre, either in Occitania or in the peninsula, Catalonia-Aragón refocused its expansionism towards the Mediterranean, forging alliances with Tunis, and by the end of the thirteenth century claiming Sicily following the Sicilian Vespers. From 1234, Navarre grew ever closer to France, as the counts of Champagne came to rule as kings of Navarre. From 1284, indeed, Navarre was effectively placed under the control of the kings of France through the marriage of Jeanne of Navarre and Philip [IV] of France. As for England, Henry III’s lingering hopes to regain his ancestral lands drove his efforts to protect Gascony and hence to establish relations with the kings of Spain whose interests stretched across the Pyrenees.

Béarn now drifted from Catalo-Aragonese politics and attempted to form closer bonds with Castile, whose power was rapidly growing and which was perceived, by the mid-thirteenth century, as a threat to Henry III’s hold over Gascony. The danger was averted in 1254, following the marriage of Edward [I] of England and Eleanor of Castile and the impracticable compromise of a joint crusade into North Africa. The shifting interests of the vicomte of Béarn were further evidenced through his plans to marry his younger daughter to the infante, Sancho of Castile. However, the marriage, which has the potential to alter the balance of power in Béarn, became impossible to
enforce, as both of the comte’s overlords Philip III of France and Edward I of England opposed the alliance.

In addition, Alfonso X of Castile’s novel ways of representing Castilian power impacted on his political relations with Henry III and later Edward I. Amongst his tactics was the unprecedented use of the vernacular, not only in his private commissions and legal works, but in his diplomacy outside the peninsula. This in turn reached the English court, where master Geoffrey de Everley is to be found carrying letters to Edward I in the Castilian vernacular.

From the start of his reign, and in an attempt to enhance Castilian standing both within the Peninsula and more widely across Christendom, Alfonso X seems to have attempted to revive the age-old title 'Emperor of Spain'. That this was the case is indicated in Jaime’s correspondence, emphatically refusing to recognize any such title. Not satisfied with enhancing his kingdom’s standing in Iberia, Alfonso also sought the German imperial throne. This merely added to his existing financial difficulties. Coupled with Muslim rebellions, it led to a period of baronial and social unrest, paving the way to family disputes and civil war. Alfonso continued to press for recognition as Holy Roman Emperor, his rival here being none other than, Richard of Cornwall, Henry III’s brother. Despite pleas to the English king, Alfonso was unable to deter Richard of Cornwall from his claim. Pressing his own claims both diplomatically and through his reform of Castilian law in the Siete Partidas, Alfonso failed to gain either foreign or local sympathy for his cause. Paradoxically, it was his legal reforms that have sparked most interest among modern historians. In the process, Alfonso merely drove Castile into further financial crisis, complicated by the
civil war brought about by the disputed succession to the throne following the death of Alfonso’s heir, Fernando de la Cerda.

In addition to the ever-changing alliances of Iberian monarchies, diplomatic exchanges between the English and Iberian courts were complicated by rival ideologies and efforts at self-representation. One such conflict emerged from the Castilian, and to some extent Catalo-Aragonese, notion of kingship. Such differences were manifested with particular force at the knighting of the Lord Edward in 1254 at Burgos. The intention here was to boost Alfonso X’s prestige across Europe, or at the very least across the Iberian Peninsula (particularly in the eyes of Catalonia-Aragón), by demonstrating that the knighthood of kings could be every bit as significant as their anointing, a feature deemed essential to English and French kings, but in Castile avoided by a ruling dynasty that preferred to base its claims to authority not on sacrality or the Church, but upon conquest and the sword.

Anglo-Iberian relations did not stand at the centre-stage either of English or of Hispanic politics. They were nonetheless significant, sparked by ad hoc needs, often in relation to Gascony. Rather than acting as a barrier, the Pyrenees served almost to invite Iberian intervention in Gascony. Further work remains to be undertaken on the networks of power that linked Iberia and Gascony: work that will be challenging and difficult, given the scarcity of documentary remains. This thesis, however, has attempted to lay down a foundation for such work. My intention here has been to present something of use to Hispanists and English specialists alike.
Appendix A

English, Iberian and French Monarchs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings of England</th>
<th>Count/Kings of Barcelona</th>
<th>Kings of Aragón</th>
<th>Kings of Navarre</th>
<th>Kings of Portugal</th>
<th>Kings of Castile</th>
<th>Kings of Leon</th>
<th>Kings of France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1006-1080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066-1087</td>
<td>William I (the Conqueror)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076-1082</td>
<td>Ramón Berenguer II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087-1100</td>
<td>William II (Rufus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1135</td>
<td>Henry I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135-1156</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154-1189</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180-1199</td>
<td>Richard I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199-1216</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216-1272</td>
<td>Henry III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272-1307</td>
<td>Edward II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307-1327</td>
<td>Edward II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

1. **Privilegio rodado** of Alfonso X in favour of the hospital at Burgos built next to the nunnery of Las Huelgas, confirming a grant from Alfonso VIII of Castile of the cultivated lands in Ubierna, Sotopalacios, Arroyal and Villavascones.

30 December 1254

A = BL Additional Charter 24804. Various post-medieval endorsements, including Cajon, 18. leg. 10, N° 4 (s.xviii). Approximately 580 X 584 + 65mm. Sealed sur double queue, top of the plica unevenly cut as if from the end of length of parchment. Yellow and green silk cords through 2 holes, matching the yellow, green and brown coloured circles of the rueda or monogram. Lead bulla of Alfonso X, as described by W. de Gray Birch, *Catalogue of Seals in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 6 vols (London 1887-1900), vi, 619-20 no.23027.

According to González, Alfonso VIII, no. 917, a duplicate original apparently survives in the archives of the monastery of Las Huelgas, leg. 6, no. 220. The present charter was acquired by the British Museum in 1876 together with other charters (BL Additional Charters 24802-19) relating to the Hospital Del Rey at Burgos. It is chiefly of interest in revealing the mixture of Latin and the Castilian vernacular increasingly employed in the chancery of Alfonso X. Note also the attestation by the vicomtes of Béarn and Limoges, here described as vassals of Alfonso, and the dating clause that refers to the knighting of the Lord Edward at Burgos.

*(Chismon)* Conosçuada cosa sea a todos los omnes que esta carta vieren. Cuemo yo don ALFONSO por la gracia de dios Rey de Castiella, de Toledo, de Leon, de Gallizia, de Seuillia, de Cordoua, de Murcia et de Jahn. Ui privilegio del rey don Alfonso mio uisauue ffeito enesta guisa: Non inmerito ad helemosina(m) comoueatur qui per eam obtinere sperant veniam delictorum. Eapropter ego ALDEFONSUS Dei gratia rex Cast(e)lle et Tol(e)ti parentum meorum remissionem et propriam neconon et karissimi filii mei bone memorie don(mi)ni Ferrandi, cuius anima sempiterna perfriu reque mereatur, desiderans prom(ou)eri una cum uxore mea Alienore regina, et cum filio meo do(mi)no Henrrico, libenti animo et voluntate spontanea ffecto cartam donationis, concessionis, confirmationis et stabilitatis D(e)o et hospitali meo apud Burg(os) prope monasterium Sancte Marie Regalis in via que ducit ad Sanctum Iacobum ad sustentationem pauperum hedificato perpetuo valituram. Dono itaque et concedo predicto hospitali hereditates meas agriculture
quas habeo in villa Felmiro, in Buirna, in Sotopalatos, in Arroyal, in Villauascones, cum omnibus pratis, pasquis, molendinis et omnibus pertinenciis suis ad agriculturam pertinentibus et cum omn iure quod ibi habebam et habere debebam ad apotecam meam pertinente, ut illas iure hereditario habeat et irreuocabiliter sine contradicione aliqua possideat in eternum. Si quis vero hanc cartam infringere vel in aliquo diminuere presumserit, iram Dei omnipotentis plenarie incurrat et regie parti mille aureos incauto persoluat et damnum predicto hospitali super hoc illatum restituat duplicatum. Ffacta carta apud Burg(os), Reg(is) exp(editione), vi. die Aprilis, era Mª. CCª. Lª.iiª., iiiº, videlicet anno quo ego predictus A(lfonsus) rex Amiramomeninum regem de Marrochos apud Nauas de Tolosa campestri proelio deuici non meis meritis sed Dei misericordia et meorum auxilio vasallorum. Et ego A(lfonsus) rex regnans in Cast(i)lla et in Toledo hanc cartam quam fieri iussi manu propria roboro et confirmo. Et yo sobredicho rey don ALFONSO regnant en uno con la reyna donna YOLAND mi mugier et con mis ffijas la inflante donna Berenguella et la inflante donna Beatriz, en Castiella, en Toledo, en Leon, en Gallizia, en Seuilla, en Cordoua, en Murcia, en Jah(e)n, en Baeça, en Badilloz et en el Algarue otorgo este priuilegio et confirmolo. Et mando que uala assi como uallio en tiempo del rey don ALFONSO mio visauuelo ffecha la carta en Burgos por mandido del rey, xxx. dias andidos del mes de Deziembre, en era de mill(e) et dozientos et nonaenta et dos annos. En el anno que don Odoart ffijo primero et heredero del rey Henrric de Anglatierra recibio cauall(e)ria en Burgos del rey don ALFONSO el sobredicho. Don Alfonssso de Molina la conf(irma). Don Ffederalic la confª. Don Henrric la confª. Don Manuel la confª. Don Fferrando la confª. Don Ffelipp electo de Seuillia la confª. Don Sancho electo de Toledo la confª. Don Johann arçobispo de Sanctyago la confª. Don Aboabdille Abennazar rey de Granada uassallo del rey la confª. Don Mahomat
Abenmahomat Abenhut rey de Murcia uassallo del rey la conf. Don Abenmahfot rey de Niebla uassallo del rey la conf.

[list of bishops and ricosombres in four columns, two columns to each side of the rueda]

First column

Don Apparitio obispo de Burgos con(firma).
La Eglesia de Palencia vaga
Don Bernordo obispo de Segouia conf'.
Don P(edr)o obispo de Siguença la conf'.
Don Gil obispo de Osma la conf'.
Don Mathe obispo de Cuenca la conf'.
Don Benito obispo de Auila conf'.
Don Aznar obispo de Calahorra conf'.
Don Lopp electo de Cordoua la con'.
Don Adam obispo de Plazencia la conf'.
Don Paschual obispo de Jah(e)n conf'.
Don ffrey P(edr)o obispo de Cartagenna con'.
Don Pedrinnanes maestre de la Orden de Calatraua la conf'.

Second column

Don Ann'o Gonçaluez la conf'.
Don Alfonso Lopez la conf'.
Don R(odrig)o Gonçaluez la conf'.
Don Symon Royz la conf'.
Don Alfonspo Tellez la conf'.
Don Fferrand Royz de Cast(r)o la conf'.
Don P(edr)o Nunnez la conf'.
Don Nunno Guill'm la conf'.
Don P(edr)o Guzman la conf'.
Don R(odrig)o Gonçalvez el ninno la conf'.
Don Fferand Gautia la conf'.
Don Alfonspo Gautia la conf'.
Don Diago Gomez la conf'.
Don Gomez Royz la conf'.
On top of the rueda

Don Gaston bizcom de de Beart uassallo del rey la conf'.
Don G(u)i (over an erasure) bizcom de de Limoges uassallo del Rey la conf.

Rueda

Third column

Don Martin Fferrandez electo de Leon.
Don P(edr)o obispo de Quiedo la conf'.
Don P(edr)o obispo de Çamora la conf'.
Don P(edr)o obispo de Salamanca conf'.
Don P(edr)o obispo de Astorga la conf.
Don Leonart obispo de Cipdad conf'.
Don Migmael obispo de Lugo conf'.
Don Joh(an)n obispo de Orens la conf'.
Don Gil obispo de Tui conf'.
Don Joh(an)n ob(is)po de Mendonedo con'.
Don P(edr)o ob(is)po de Coria la conf'.
Don ffrey Robert obispo de Silue con'.
Don Pelay Perez maestre de la Orden de Sanctyago la conf'.

Fourth column

Don Rodrig Alfonsso la conf'.
Don Martin Alfonsso la conf'.
Don Rodrigo Gomez la conf'.
Don R(odrig)o Ffrolaz la conf'.
Don Joh(an)n Perez la conf'.
Don Fferrand Yuannes la conf'
Don Martin Gil la conf'.
Don Andreo Perteguero de Sanctyago la conf'.
Don Gonçaluo Ramirez la conf'.
Don R(odrig)o Rodriguez la conf'.
Don Aluardiaz la conf'.
Don Pelay Perez la conf'.

In three columns at the bottom
First column

Diago Lopez de Salzedo m(ér)ino mayor de Castiella la conf'.
Garci Suarez m(ér)ino mayor del regno de Murcia la conf'.
Maestre Fferrando notario del rey en Castiella la conf'.

Second column

Roy Lopez de Mendoça almirage de la mar la mar (sic) la conf'.
Sancho Martinez de Xodar adelantato de la frontera la conf'.
Garci Perez de Toledo notario del rey en Andaluzia conf'.

Third column

Gonçalvo Morant m(ér)ino mayor de Leon la conf'.
Roy Suarez m(ér)ino mayor de Gallizia la conf'.
Suero Perez notario del rey en Leon la conf'.
## Appendix C

### Ecclesiastical Division of Hispania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archbishopric</th>
<th>Suffragan bishoprics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarragona</td>
<td>Terraconensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huesca</td>
<td>Oscensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarazona</td>
<td>Tirasonensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calahorra</td>
<td>Calaguritano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgell</td>
<td>Urgellensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortosa</td>
<td>Dortosensi (Dertosensi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamplona</td>
<td>Pampilonensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Toletano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osma</td>
<td>Oxomiensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td>Burgensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palencia</td>
<td>Palentino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segorbe</td>
<td>Segobricensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segovia</td>
<td>Secobiensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compostella</td>
<td>Emeritensi vel Compostellano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ávila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braga</td>
<td>Bracharensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1311}\) Annexed to Aragón and incorporated in the province of Tarragona in 1238.
### Appendix D

**Vicomtes de Béarn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centule V (I comte de Bigorre)</td>
<td>1058-1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston IV</td>
<td>1088-1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centule VI</td>
<td>1131-1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre (III de Gabarret)</td>
<td>1134-1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston V</td>
<td>1153-1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>1170-1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston VI</td>
<td>1173-1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillen Ramón de Moncada (Guillaume-Raymond)</td>
<td>1214-1224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillen II (Guillaume II) de Moncada</td>
<td>1224-1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston VII</td>
<td>1229-1290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: P. Tucoo-Chala, *La vicomté de Béarn et le problème de sa souveraineté. Des origines a 1620* (Monein: 2009), 25. The dates given above, taken from Tucco-Chala, are in many cases approximate or based upon best guesses.
Appendix E

Vicomtes of Béarn (Genealogy)
Appendix F

2. Letters of credence from Alfonso X of Castile to Edward I of England, notifying him of the credentials of Master Geoffrey (of Beverley), Alfonso's notary, to act as spokesman in his affairs concerning France, Rome, the Moors, and Aragon.

Toledo, 1 April 1279

A = PRO SC1/16/6.

Printed (from A) Foedera I.ii.567.

Al mucho amado et onrado don Edoard por la gracia de dios rey de Ingla terra, sennor de yrlanda et Duc de aquitannia, Don Alffonso por essa mesma gracia rey de Castiella, de Toledo, de Leon, de Galliçiâ, de Seuilla, de Cordoua, de Murcia, de Jahen et del Algarbe salutos. Commo a cununnado que mucho amamos et que tenemos en logar de hermano et para quien quissiemos mucha onra et buena uentura tanta commo para nos mismo. Façemos uos saber que por la lealtad que nos fallamos en maestre Jofre nostro notario et por que sabemos por cierto que el ha muy grand sabor de seruir bien et leal mentre auos et anos et otrossi por que el sabe mucho de nostra façienda tam bien del fecho del rey de Francia commo dela corte de Roma et del fecho delos moros et del rey de Aragon et delos naturales de nostra tieira, touiemos por bien del embiar alla auos por cosas que uos el dira por palabra. Onde nos rogamos que uos quel creades daquellas cosas que uos el diviere de nostra parte. et que punnedes quanto uos pudieredes en todo aquello que uos entendieredes que sera onra et pro de uos et de nos, et gradecer uos leemos mucho. Dada en Toledo primero dia de Ab[ri], era de mill et ccc. et xvii. annos. Yo Iohann Andres la escriui por mandado del rey.

Translation:

To the much loved and honoured Don Edward by the grace of God king of England, lord of Ireland and Duke of Aquitaine, Don Alfonso by the same grace king of Castile, of Toledo, of León, of Galicia, of Seville, of Cordoba, of Murcia, of Jaen, and of the Algarve, greetings. As to a brother-in-law who we much love and whom we repute in place of a brother and for whom we wish as much honour and good fortune
as for ourselves, we inform you that because of the loyalty that we find in Master Geoffrey, our notary, and because we know for sure that he will want to serve you and us well and loyalty, and otherwise because he knows much about our estates and about the deeds of the king of France, likewise of the court of Rome, and of the deeds of the Moors, and of the king of Aragón and of the men of our land, we find it appropriate to send him to you to discuss the things that he will speak to you about. We beg you to believe those things that he shall tell you on our behalf, and that you trust that these things are said for your honour and ours, we send you our thanks. Given at Toledo on the first day of April, era 1317 [1279]. I, Juan Andrés, wrote this by order of the king.
Appendix G

3. Letters of credence in similar terms on behalf of Master Geoffrey (of Beverley),
Villarreal, 12 May 1279

A = PRO, SC1/16/7. Endorsed with a contemporary address: Al rey de Ingla terra .... por el rey.

Printed (from A) Foedera, I.i.570.

Al mucho amado et onrado don Edoard por la gracia de dios rey de Inglaterra, sennor de Yrlanda et duc de Aquitannia, don Alffonso por esa misma gracia Rey de Castiella, de Toledo, de Leon, de Galliçia, de Seuilla, de Cordoua, de Murcia, de Jahan, et del Algarbe salutos. Commo a cunnado que mucho amamos et que tenemos en logar de hermano et para quien querremos mucha onra et buena uentura tanta commo para nos mismo et ffaçemos uos saber que por que nos sabemos por cierto commo cosa que muchas ueçes prouamos que maestre Joffre nostro notario es omme que siuio et sirue bien et leal mientras de grand tiempo aca auos et anos et por que el sabe muchas cosas de nostra façiendra assi commo en fecho del rey de Francia et de los nostros mandaderos de Burdel et del Rey de Aragon et de la Frontera et otrossi de nostros vassallos et de la corte de Roma et en razón de algunos casamientos touiemos por bien del embar alla auos por todas estas cosas et por outras que uos el dira por palabra. Ende uos rogamos que uos quel creades daquellas cosas que uos el dixiere de nostra parte et que punnedes quanto uos pudieredes en todo aquello que uos el dixiere en <man>era que sea onra et pro de uos et de nos. Et gradecer uos loemas mucho. Dada en Villa real xii dias de mayo Era de mill ccc. et xvii. annos. Yo Iohann Andres la escreui por mandado del rey.

Translation:

To the much beloved and honoured Don Edward by the grace of God king of England, lord of Ireland and duke of Aquitaine, Don Alfonso by the same grace king of Castile, of Toledo, of León, of Galicia, of Seville, of Cordoba, of Murcia, of Jaén,
and of the Algarve, sends greetings. As to a brother-in-law whom we much love and who we repute in place of a brother and for whom we wish as much honour and good fortune as for ourselves, we notify you that because we know [it] to be true and we have often proved that master Geoffrey, our notary, is a man who served and serves you and us well and loyally and for a long time and because he knows much about our estate and about the deeds of the king of France and about our envoys to Bordeaux (Burdel) and of the king of Aragón, and about the frontier and also of our vassals and of the court of Rome and by reason of certain marriages [and] because of all these things and others that he will tell you, we have sent him to you. Therefore, we beg you that you believe the things he will tell you on our behalf and that you shall contribute as much as you can in all that he shall tell you in a way that redounds to your honour and so as to benefit you and us. Given at Villarreal on the twelfth day of May, Era 1317 [1279]. I, Juan Andrés, wrote this by order of the king.
Appendix H

4. Letters of credence in similar terms from Sancho [IV], son of Alfonso X.

Toledo, 1 May 1279

A = PRO SC1/16/8.

Printed (from A) Foedera, I.ii.569. Note the mixture of first person singular and plural.

Al muy noble et mucho onrrado don <E>doard por la gracia de dios rey de Inglatieria sennor de Irlanda et Duc de Aquitania, <Two words too damaged to be read> Don Sancho fijo mayor et heredero del muy noble Don <Alfon>so por essa mesma gracia rey de Castiella, de Toledo, de Leon, de Galicià, de Seuilla, de Cordoua, de Murcia, de Jahan et del Albarbe salutos. Assi commo a rey que ammos muy de <c>oraçon et por quien faria quanto sopieszte et pudiesse en todo lo que fuesse uestra onrra et uostro plaçer et para quien quiria tanta vida et tanta salud commo para nos mismo rey. Por maestre jufre notario del Rey nostro padre et nostro clerigo es omme en que mucho fiamos et que sabe todo el fecho del rey de Françia et del rey nostro padre et de mi commo passo fata agora, et que es aquello que tenemos en coraçon de fazer y daqui adelant[e] et otrossi que es la nostra uoluntad en raçon del casamiento entre mi et la fija del rey de Alimanna por ende tomemos por bien de embiar alla auos sobre estas cosas. Ende uos ruego que uos le querades et que punnedes de fazer y aquello que sea onrra et pro de uos et del Rey nostro pader et de mi et agradeçer uos lo e mucho.

Dada en Toledo dos dias de Mayo, Era de mill treçientas et diez et fiete annos. Yo Alfonso Royz la fiz escreuir per mandado del infante.

Translation:

To the most noble and much honoured Don Edward, by the grace of God king of England, lord of Ireland and duke of Aquitaine, Don Sancho, eldest son and heir of the most noble Don Alfonso by the same grace, king of Castile, of Toledo, of León, of Galicia, of Seville, of Cordoba, of Murcia, of Jaén and of the Algarve, greetings. As
to a king that I love from the heart and for whom I would do as much as I knew and I
could in all that was for your honour and pleasure and for whom I wish as much life
and as much health as for ourselves, trust to master Geoffrey, notary of the king, our
father, and our clerk, who is a man in whom we much trust and who knows all about
the deeds of the king of France, and of the king, our father, and about what has
happened until now, and about what it is that we have in our heart to do from now
onwards and also what is our will concerning the marriage between me and the
daughter of the king of Germany, whom we have sent him to you discuss these things.
Therefore I beg you to believe him and that you contribute in that which adds to your
honour and benefit and that of the king, our father, and myself. We much thank you.
Given at Toledo, on the second day of May, era 1317 [1279]. I, Alfonso Ruíz, wrote
this by order of the infante.
Appendix I

5. Letters from Alfonso X to Edward I, concerning Ponthieu and Montreuil.

[?May 1279]

A = PRO, SC1/16/12. Torn and illegible in parts, with final sentence or sentences entirely torn away.

Previously unpublished. Note that the document mentions Edward's presence at Amiens for discussions with the king of France, presumably referring here to the Treaty of Amiens, May 1279, according to which Eleanor of Castile was permitted to succeed her mother, Joan, as ruler over Ponthieu. Cf. Foedera I. ii, 179-80, and H. Johnstone, 'The County of Ponthieu, 1279-1307', English Historical Review, 29 (1914).

Al mucho onrado et amado don Edoard por la gracia de dios Rei de Inglaterra, sennor de Hibernia et duc de aquitannie, don Alfonso por essa mesma gracia rey de Castilla, de Toledo, de Leon, de Galliçia, de Seuilla, de Cordoua, de Murcia, de Jahen et del Albarbe, salut(os). Commo a cunnado que mucho amamos et en que mucho fiamos et que tenemos en logar de hermano et para quien querriemos onra et buena ventura tanta commo para nos mismo, viemos vostra carta en que nos embiastes deçir de commo vos et la reyna uestra mugier nostra hermana que uos viestes com al rey de Francia en Amiens et que faklastes com el sobre muchos pelytos et mayor mientre sobre los condados de Pontiç et de Mostenol, los quales devie heredar la reyna <nostra> hermana de parte de su madre la reyna donna Johana et que depues dela <......> fgiestas aquel debido qual deuistes fazer et que el que vos dio estos conda<dos> <.......> uos deçimos que nos plaçe de toda cosa que sea uestro pro et uestra onra ........................................

Translation:

To the honoured and beloved Don Edward by the grace of God, king of England, lord of Ireland and duke of Aquitaine, Don Alfonso by the same grace king of Castile, of Toledo, of León, of Galicia, of Seville, of Cordoba, of Murcia, of Jaen, and of the Algarbe, sends greetings. As to brother-in-law who we much love and in whom we place our trust and who we repute as a brother and for whom we wish honor and good
fortune as much as for ourselves, we have seen your letter in which you tell us how you and the queen, your wife, our sister, saw the king of Fance at Amiens and that you spoke about various disputes and above all the counties of Ponthieu and Montreuil which the queen [our] sister should inherit from her mother, the queen Doña Johanna, and that after […] the feast that he gave you the counties […] we tell you that it pleases us above all things for you and for your honour […]
Appendix J

Dating Sancho’s Marriage to Maria de Molina

In blatant defiance of canon law, but most likely in an attempt to garner support from the Castilian nobility, Sancho of Castile sought and obtained betrothal to Maria de Molina, to whom he was related within the third degree of consanguinity. Their marriage took place at Toledo, at some time between the summer of 1281 and June 1282. The precise date remains unknown. The fourteenth-century *Chronicon Domini Joannis Emmanuelis* dates the marriage to July 1281 (‘Era MCCXX. Fit lata sententia contra regem Alfonsum in Valleoleti, in mense Aprilis. Proxima praecedenti era contraxit rex d(omi)n(u)s Sancius, adhuc infans, cum regina d(omi)na Maria, Toleti in mense Julii’). The supposed author of this account, Don Juan Manuel (1282-1348), was the son of Don Manuel, son of Fernando III and Beatrice Hohenstaufen, brother of Alfonso X. In general, he supported Sancho’s succession to the throne. The sometimes sparse *Crónica*, written by Jofré de Loaisa’s (died after 1307), confirms 1281 as the correct year, but states merely that Sancho and María married in Toledo in 1281 (‘era millesima ccc³ xix⁴a’). The *Crónica de Alfonso X*, written in the reign of Alfonso XI (reigned 1312-1350), dates the marriage to the thirtieth year of the reign of Alfonso X (1 June 1281 to 31 May 1282) (‘en los treynta annos del regnado deste rey don Alfonso, que fue en la era de mill et trezientos et veynte annos et andaua el anno de la naçençia de Ihesu Christo en mill e dozientos e ochenta e dos annos’: ‘Sancho, having attended the Cortes (held in April at Valladolid)’, travelled to Toledo where he married María de Molina’. This could be read as proof of a marriage either in 1281 or as late as the summer of 1282. At

---


1313 Smith et al., eds., *Deeds*, ch. 371, p. 278, n. 139.

1314 J. Loaisa, *Crónica* (Valencia: 1971), 23.Jofré was abbot of Santander from 1272 and archdeacon of Toledo from 1280. The *Crónica* is rather sparse, but as Procter has pointed out, it is sometimes the only chronicle, which keeps track of key moments in Castilian history: Procter, *Cortes*, 120-1. Jofré was present in 1270 for the infante’s marriage to Guillaume.

much the same time, Sancho’s sister Violante (born c. 1266) married Diego López (V) de Haro, son of Constance de Béarn and Diego López (III) de Haro.\footnote{González Jiménez, ed., \textit{Crónica de Alfonso X}, ch. lxxvi, p. 224.}

The ambiguity over dates here has led to widespread confusion in the secondary literature. According to Mercedes Gaibrois de Ballesteros, Sancho’s marriage took place in the summer of 1281.\footnote{Gaibrois Riaño de Ballesteros, \textit{María de Molina}, 18.} Alejandro Marcos Pous, José-Manuel Nieto Soria and Rafael del Valle Curies, by contrast, assign it to June 1282.\footnote{Marcos Pous, ‘Los dos matrimonios de Sancho IV de Castilla’, 39; Nieto Soria, \textit{Sancho IV}, 47; Valle Curies, \textit{María de Molina}, 42.}
Glossary

alcaide Castellan
alcalde Judge in a local court
alcalde del rey Judge in the king's court
almojarife mayor King's treasurer in charge of collecting the royal rents.
bayles In the Crown of Aragón, a judge in certain towns
bovaje Tax paid in Catalonia-Aragón for the number ox-teams
burazagi See sobrejuntero
cofradía Guild
corte An equivalent to the English curia regis

Cortes A council (similar to a Parliament), that included members of the royal family and nobles and prelates from the kingdom. It also included procuradores, who represented communal interests. Such councils dealt with legal and financial matters
exarico A muslim who rented a pece of land, paying a lease proportional to the crops he picked.
fonsadera (l. Fonsado) 11th to the 15th century, Tax paid in substitution for military service (fonsado) = the Spanish equivalent of the English 'scutage'.
fonsado (l. Fossatum) 13th to the 15th century, military service
fuero 9th-15th cent law or codex granted to a municipio, also 13th cent right or justice, also 14th cent the privileges or exemptions granted to a province, city or person
herbaje Tax paid to the king of Aragón at the beginning of a reign. Generally proportional to the number of livestock held.
herbazgo Tax paid when livestock were pastured on seigniorial land
hermandad First appearing in the early thirteenth century as confederations between towns (sometimes between
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hijodalgo or hidalgo</td>
<td>Member of the lesser nobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infante</td>
<td>Title of the legitimate sons of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infanzón</td>
<td>Member of the lower nobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lezda (lezta)</td>
<td>A tax paid for the movement of goods or merchandise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayordomo</td>
<td>Chief of the royal household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merindad</td>
<td>An administrative, military or jurisdiction area under the control of the merino. They gain importance from the thirteenth century onwards, but had existed since the twelfth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>montazgo</td>
<td>Tax paid for the transit of cattle through the mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mozárabe</td>
<td>A Christian living under Muslim rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mudéjar</td>
<td>A Muslim living under Christian rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paria</td>
<td>A Muslim state paying tribute to a Christian kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pecho/pecha</td>
<td>Tax paid to the king or lord for goods or haciendas; a tribute or tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realengo</td>
<td>Royal demesne land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ricohombre</td>
<td>Member of the high nobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tercia</td>
<td>A third of the ecclesiastical tithe. In Castile it was assigned to the crown to help finance warfare against the Muslim states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sobrejuntero or buruzagi</td>
<td>Leader of a junta (similar to the Cortes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soldada</td>
<td>Money fiefs. The King would pay a certain amount of money in return for military service. Sometimes such money would be collected from the rents of royal lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taifa</td>
<td>The Muslim kingdoms of al-Andalus, after the fall of the Caliphate of Cordoba in 1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenencias</td>
<td>Tenancies. Temporary assignments of lordships. From the thirteenth century onwards they were replaced with merinidades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yugada</td>
<td>The extent of land that could be ploughed in one day using a pair of oxen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zalmedina</td>
<td>In a city, a judge ruling in civil and criminal cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin names of Places</td>
<td>Spanish Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
<td>Aguilar de Campoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaia</td>
<td>Amaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnedo</td>
<td>Arnedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnoia</td>
<td>Arnoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artudela</td>
<td>Astudillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arunda, Runda</td>
<td>Ronda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asidona, Siduna</td>
<td>Sidonia (Medina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astoricensi</td>
<td>Astorga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ateua</td>
<td>Teba (Córdoba)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurela</td>
<td>Oreja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auriensi</td>
<td>Orense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avia</td>
<td>Avia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azenza</td>
<td>Atienza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barchinona, Barcinona, Barcinone, Barxinona</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belforado</td>
<td>Beldorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besgo</td>
<td>Viesgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brizia de Sancto Juliano</td>
<td>Brícia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgia</td>
<td>Borja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgis</td>
<td>Burgos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabedo</td>
<td>Cabedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calagurritano, Calaforra, Calafforra</td>
<td>Calahorra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calatayub</td>
<td>Calatayud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çamorensis</td>
<td>Zamora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardonense</td>
<td>Cardona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrion</td>
<td>Carrió̱n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthaginensem (Carthaginensis)</td>
<td>Cartagena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castro de Cuculudum</td>
<td>castillo de Cogolludo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrotaraf</td>
<td>Castle of Castrotorafe, in Zamora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrum Soris</td>
<td>Castrojeriz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caveron</td>
<td>Bacezón de Pisuerga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesaraugusta</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complutum</td>
<td>Alcalá de Henares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conimbricae, Colimбриensis</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corel</td>
<td>Curiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darosense</td>
<td>Daroca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertusensis</td>
<td>Tortosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donas</td>
<td>Dueñas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egitaniensis</td>
<td>Idanha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elepla, Labla</td>
<td>Niebla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerita, Marida</td>
<td>Mérida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquo</td>
<td>Esco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flabiobriga</td>
<td>Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallur</td>
<td>Gallur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerundensi</td>
<td>Gerona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graion</td>
<td>Grañón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispalis</td>
<td>Seville (Sevilla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iaccensis</td>
<td>of Jaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilerda, Larida</td>
<td>Lleida-Lérida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illipula</td>
<td>Repla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illerden</td>
<td>Lérida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italica, Taliqa, Talqa</td>
<td>Talca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leierense / Ligerense</td>
<td>Leire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logronio, Logroño</td>
<td>Logroño</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorita</td>
<td>Zorita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manerium de Miranda</td>
<td>Miranda de Ebro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua (Carpentanorum)</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mataplania</td>
<td>Matallana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melgorii</td>
<td>of Melgorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methymna Campi, Methymna Duelli</td>
<td>Medina del Campo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metira, Metria</td>
<td>Medrano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindoniensis</td>
<td>Mondoñedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monasterio</td>
<td>Monasterio de Rodilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsson</td>
<td>Monzón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motis Ferrandi</td>
<td>Montferrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagera</td>
<td>Nájera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najarensi/Nagarense</td>
<td>Nájera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obulcon, Bulkuna</td>
<td>Porcuna (Jaén)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaura</td>
<td>Lora (Seville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olisipona, Ulisibuna, Lisbuna</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olit</td>
<td>Olite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oniense</td>
<td>Oña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscense</td>
<td>Huesca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxomam</td>
<td>Osma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacencem, Badalot, Badaioz, Badaioz, Badalozun Badajoz Badajoz Badaozum</td>
<td>Palencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palentinae</td>
<td>Pamplona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pampelunae</td>
<td>Pancorbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancorb</td>
<td>Pancorbo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedraltam  
Péña Fidelem  
Pena Nigra  
Penna  
Petraleada  
Pincia, Pintia  
Pitella  
Populeti  
Portucale  
Portucalese  
Poza  

Salamantina  
Saldania  
Sancta Marie de Celorio  
Sancta Marie de Sancto Stephanus  
Sanctarensium  
Sancta Marie de Berrazim  
Sancta Marie de Rocamador  
Sancti Cucufatis, Cucuphatis  
Sancti Emmerii  
Sancti Emilianii  
Sancti Johannis de Penna, Pinna  
Sancti Petri de Covelliana  
Sancto Dominico de Calciata  
Sanctum Johannem de Pede Portus  

Seguntino  
Silvensem  
Siterium  
Spina  
Stelle  
Supraruia  

Tagus  
Talauera  
Tarraconen, Terrachonen  
Tita  
Turol/Torol  
Tutellanis  

Urdacum  
Urgellen  

Valdoletum, Vallisoletum, Valentino  
Vegera  
Vegera  
Vicensi  

Peralta  
Peñafiel  
Peña Negra  
Peña  
Piedralada  
Valladolid  
Petilla  
Poblet  
Porto or Oporto  
Portugal  
Poza  

Salamanca  
Saldaña  
Santa María de Celorio  
Santa María de Castro of Santarem  
Santa María de Albarracín  
Santa María de Rocamador  
San Cugat del Vallés  
Santander  
San Millán  
San Juan de la Peña  
San Pedro de Covelliana  
Santo Domingo de la Calzada  
St-Jean-Pied-du-Port (San Juan de I Puerto)  
Sigüenza  
Silves  
Fitero  
La Espina  
Estella  
Sobrarbe  

Tajo (Tejo) River  
Talavera  
Tarragona  
Hita  
Teruel  
Tudela  

Urdax  
Urgel  

Valencia  
Viguera  
Viguera  
Vich (Vic)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villa Ascusa</th>
<th>Valle de Villaescusa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vimaranis, Wimaranensis</td>
<td>Guimarães</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yranç</td>
<td>Irache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrasç, Yransio</td>
<td>Iranzu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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