

Coimbra and Porto: Episcopacy and National Identity in Diocesan Border Quarrels

MARIA CRISTINA CUNHA*

Although there have been significant advances in the history of Portuguese dioceses in recent years, there is still a lack of systematic studies on the relationships between them, including, naturally, processes of territorial demarcation¹, despite the fact that these advances are fundamental to understand the

* Faculty of Arts – University of Porto/ Researcher at CITCEM and collaborator at CEHR. We appreciate the help given by Doutor Luís Amaral in discussing with us some aspects of this work.

1 The inter-diocesan relationships have mostly been studied in the context of the quarrel between Braga, Santiago and Toledo, as part of the political developments of the early periods of nationality, on which there is a wealth of literature. However, few documents address the issue of the relationship between the Portuguese dioceses, among which we find José MARQUES: *Relações da Metrópole de Braga com a monarquia e a hierarquia hispânica*, in: *Monarquía y sociedad en el Reino de León: de Alfonso III a Alfonso VII*, 2 vols., ed. by José María FERNÁNDEZ CATÓN, León 2007 (Fuentes y Estudios de Historia Leonesa 117-118), p. 103-147, especially p. 134-145; Miguel de OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos: como passou para o Porto a Terra de Santa Maria*, in: *Lusitania Sacra*, 1ª série, 1 (1956) p. 29-50; and Hermínia Vasconcelos VILAR: *Uma fronteira entre Dioceses: as Dioceses de Évora e Guarda no Nordeste Alentejano*, in: *Revista de Guimarães* 106 (1996) p. 152-274. António Domingues de Sousa COSTA: *Mestre Silvestre e Mestre Vicente, juristas na contenda entre D. Afonso II e as suas irmãs*, Braga 1963 (Estudos e textos da Idade Média e Renascimento 1), p. 280-335 also referred to the disputes on territorial boundaries between the dioceses of Coimbra and Guarda, and between Guarda and Viseu. Porto and Coimbra disputed the territory of Santa Maria da Feira: see José MATTOSO/ Luís KRUS/ Amélia Aurora Aguiar ANDRADE: *O Castelo e a Feira. A Terra de Santa Maria nos séculos XI a XIII*, Lisboa 1989 (Imprensa universitária 74), p. 32-37 and Maria do Rosário Barbosa MORUJÃO: *A sé de Coimbra: a instituição e a chancelaria (1080-1318)*, Lisboa 2010, p. 56-60. Lamego is perhaps the only medieval Portuguese diocese with stable boundaries, even after the signing of the Alcanices Treaty in 1297, which included in the Portuguese territory the lands of Além-Coa, which, however, continued to be under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Ciudad Rodrigo until 1403. See Anísio Miguel de Sousa SARAIVA: *A sé de Lamego na primeira metade do séc. XIV (1296-1349)*, Leiria 2003 (História e arte 11), p. 30. For an overview on the development of the boundaries of Braga, see João Francisco MARQUES: *Poder eclesiástico e implantação regional. Os limites do arcebispado bracarense através dos tempos*, Porto 1999 (Colecção Trabalhos e Documentos do CENPA 11).

new organisation that was required after the restoration of dioceses. As the ensuing developments fully show, ecclesiastical geography in the 12th century aimed to correspond to the political interests of the Kingdom being formed and consolidated at the time. Indeed, “political and religious developments in the regions of León, Galicia and Portugal [...] [were the result of] an activity typical of a land stepping into a new organisation, but needing to define its mechanisms of stability in a very detailed manner”.² For this reason, based on the disputes that opposed the bishops of Porto and their southern counterparts on the diocesan boundaries, from the first half of the 12th century to mid-13th century, we will seek to understand how these issues can be integrated in the ecclesiastical developments that followed the political process leading to the formation of the national identity.

The study of the quarrels over territorial boundaries implies, first of all, a brief reference to the history of the diocese of Coimbra, restored 30 years earlier than the diocese of Porto.³ Indeed, soon after the conquest of Coimbra, in 1064, D. Paterno, bishop of Tortosa, was invited to occupy the episcopal chair of that city, which did not occur until 1080. Until his death seven years later, the new bishop carried out a series of activities that aimed at reorganising the ecclesiastical structures of the diocese.⁴ However, taking into account the specific geography of the Coimbra region at that time – a Mozarabic area that Afonso VI still struggled to control and reform – it seems that D. Paterno was not very concerned about the definition of the northern boundaries of his diocese, especially since this matter had apparently been solved in earlier times. By that time, the diocese of Coimbra stretched up to the Douro River⁵, and in fact the area south of the river was recognised by local notaries as belonging to it, as proven by the fact that D. Paterno was referred to, for example, as the *episcopo [...] in Colimbria* in documents dated 1081⁶ and 1084⁷ from the monastery of Pedroso. His successor, D. Crescónio, was also involved in episcopal activity in the region⁸: for example, the dedication of the monastery of Grijó

2 Maria João BRANCO: Nobles, Eclesiásticos y reyes en las cortes leonesa y portuguesa: escenas de la «vida cotidiana» (1109-1157), in: *Monarquía y sociedad* (see n. 1), vol. I, p. 755.

3 The bishopric of Porto was occupied in 1113, whilst the one of Coimbra had already been restored in 1080.

4 MORUJÃO: *A sé de Coimbra* (see n. 1), p. 41.

5 The churches belonging to that diocese listed in the *Divisio Teodomiri* were situated in *castrum novum*, as opposed to the others, located in *castrum antiquum de Portucale*, which now corresponds to the territory of Vila Nova de Gaia. See OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 29.

6 *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica*, vol. I: *Diplomata et Chartae*, ed. by Alexandre HERCULANO, Lisboa 1867, doc. n. 599.

7 *Ibid.*, doc. n. 627.

8 *Ibid.*, docs. n. 849, 851, 853, 855 and 876.

in 1093 was made before him.⁹ Moreover, as the bishop of Coimbra (between 1099 and 1109)¹⁰, D. Maurício Burdino received from Pope Paschal II in 1101 a bull which, among other things, expressly confirmed the possession of the territory from Coimbra to the Douro River: *interim a Colimbria usque ad Castrum antiquum, sicut Teodimiri regis temporibus ab episcopis diuisio facta est*¹¹.

Upon taking the chair in Coimbra in 1109¹², D. Gonçalo Pais was directly involved in another much vaster issue, which probably drew him away from the problems of the northern diocese: indeed, D. Gonçalo became a key ele-

-
- 9 (Re)founded in 1093 by Soeiro Fromarigues, the monastery of Grijó received on 22nd May 1128 the charter from D. Teresa, ensuring “des intelligences dans cette region” (Robert DURAND: *Le Cartulaire Baio-Ferrado du monastère de Grijó [XI^e-XIII^e siècles]*, Paris 1971 [Fontes documentais portuguesas 2], p. XXVII). The dedication by D. Crescónio of the “new” monastery is indicative of the changes that took place after the death of D. Paterno (in 1087) and of the governor of Coimbra (in 1093), namely with the fading of the last traces of the Visigoth church.
- 10 See OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 30. On the archbishop Maurício Burdino, see Carl ERDMANN: *Maurício Burdino (Gregório VIII)*, Coimbra 1940 (Publicações do Instituto Alemão da Universidade de Coimbra) and Maria Teresa Nobre VELOSO: *D. Maurício, monge de Cluny, bispo de Coimbra, peregrino na Terra Santa*, in: *Notas Diplomáticas. Estudos em Homenagem ao Prof. José Marques*, vol. IV, Porto 2006, p. 125-135.
- 11 Carl ERDMANN: *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, Berlin 1927 (repr. Göttingen 1970) (AGG, phil.-hist. Klasse, NF 20/3), n. 2. As Miguel de Oliveira refers, the description of this territory is quite clear, not least because *castrum antiquum* refers to Gaia, as opposed to *castrum novum*, identified as being Porto (OLIVEIRA: *Os territorios diocesanos* [see n. 1], p. 29).
- 12 By being appointed to lead the diocese of Coimbra, one of the duties of D. Gonçalo Pais was to adopt the reform, which aimed to finally implement the Roman rites within the diocese. As expected, this raised much controversy not only among the clergy, but also among the general population, felt at once when the monastery of Lorvão was donated by D. Henrique to the bishop of Coimbra. With this act, confirmed by Paschal II (bull *Sciatis omnes* de [1110-1112], 12th January; Livro Preto. Cartulário da Sé de Coimbra. Edição crítica. Texto integral, ed. by Manuel Augusto RODRIGUES and Avelino de Jesus da COSTA, Coimbra 1999, doc. 625; JL. 6485), through which the pope, addressing the priest and chapter of Coimbra, Martim Moniz and the Christians in town, threatens to excommunicate all those opposing the donation, ended the ‘last bastion of the local Visigoth tradition’ because the monastery fell under episcopal jurisdiction, even after 1116, when the bishop gave back to the monastery ‘some autonomy and part of his assets’ (MORUJÃO: *A sé de Coimbra* [see n. 1], p. 48sq.). This and other attitudes of the bishop enabled, upon his death in 1127, the city of Coimbra to no longer be ‘the Mozarabic hub at the time he assumed the chair. The political arrangements of the Portucalense Counts, seeking autonomy for their domains, implied an alliance with Rome and, therefore, the religious uniformity desired by the Holy See prevailed at the expense of local peculiarities which were sacrificed’ (ibid., p. 50).

ment in the conflict opposing the bishops of Braga and Toledo¹³ related to the jurisdiction over the dioceses that they regarded as their subordinates.

Until 1113 (the date of the consecration of the first bishop of Porto), the issue of the northern boundaries of the diocese of Coimbra stems from the disputes for metropolitan rights: the bishops of this diocese, which belonged to the Lusitanian province, attended the IV, V, VI and VII Councils of Toledo (in 633, 636, 638 and 646), as well as the XIV, XV and XVI Councils (in 684, 688 and 693, respectively), which immediately points us to the fact that the boundaries of the province extended to the Douro River.¹⁴ However, the *Divisio Teodomiri* of 561–572 included the diocese of Coimbra in the province of Galecia¹⁵, meaning that the southern boundaries of the diocese were further south of that river. In other words, in strictly ecclesiastic terms, the jurisdiction over the strip of land on the south bank of the Douro River goes beyond the mere boundaries of the diocese, since it meant much more than the boundaries of the metropolis. From a political standpoint, all circumstances had changed, especially when Alfonso VI of León and Castile brought under the same authority (of Henry of Burgundy) the Portucalense and Coimbra counties, to which he added Santarém, expediting the relationship between both territories, and diluting the ‘barrier embodied by the Douro River for centuries’¹⁶. In fact, when Paschal II handed to the archbishop of Braga, S. Geraldo, the pallium and its privileges in 1103, he included Coimbra (and the ‘satellite’ bishoprics of Viseu and Lamego) in the suffragan dioceses of that archbishop¹⁷, which was located in the old Lusitanian province and, for that reason, traditionally depended on Mérida. The metropolis of Braga was restored, including the control over the dioceses of Galicia and the Portucalense county, except Santiago de Compostela which had been exempted by Pope Urban II in 1095.

13 Toledo had been conquered in 1085 and, three years later, its bishops obtained not only the dignity of the patriarchate and primacy in *Hispania*, but also the jurisdiction over all peninsular dioceses that had not yet been restored from the Muslim grasp.

14 The maps showing the participation of the bishops of Lusitânia in the IV, V, VI and VII Councils of Toledo (in 633, 636, 638 and 646), as well as in the XIV, XV and XVI Councils (in 684, 688 and 693, respectively), Ana Maria Jorge tallies the boundaries of the Lusitânia province with the Douro River. Ana Maria C.M. JORGE: *L'épiscopat de Lusitanie pendant l'Antiquité tardive (IIIe-VIIe siècles)*, Lisboa 2002 (Trabalhos de Arqueologia 21), p. 144–149.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 123. We have not addressed the authenticity of the *Divisio*. The fact is that between 561 and 572 the peninsular Church was reorganized: as the Galicia province was too extensive, it was divided into two territories (one more to the North and another to the South). When the Swabian kingdom ended, the *Divisio* was no longer used, especially because it did not contain regulations on discipline or other ecclesiastic provisions. When the bishops of Lamego became interested in retaining a jurisdiction over a territory greater than their diocese in 1071, they recovered the document.

16 Luís Carlos AMARAL: *Formação e desenvolvimento do domínio da Diocese de Braga no período da Reconquista (século IX–1137)*, PhD thesis Porto 2007, p. 377.

17 ERDMANN: *Papsturkunden in Portugal* (see n. 11), n. 91.

Seeing that Coimbra had been suffragan to Mérida, in the 1120s, D. Bernardo (1086–1124) hoped it would also be suffragan to Toledo, which is why D. Gonçalo of Coimbra swore obedience to him¹⁸, raising considerable reactions from D. Maurício, who was, by then, the archbishop of Braga. In response, in 1114, Paschal II forced D. Gonçalo to pledge obedience to the bishop of Braga within 40 days.¹⁹

But it had not yet been decided to which metropolis Coimbra belonged: in the synod of Burgos in 1117, Cardinal-Legate Boso, by declaring that Coimbra was suffragan to the province of Mérida²⁰ – thus contradicting previous pontifical orders²¹, and adopting the Visigoth ecclesiastical division mentioned above –, confirmed that the diocese depended on Toledo and not Braga. This decision had important implications if we take into account subsequent developments of ecclesiastical politics in the North of the Peninsula: in 1120, Diego Gelmires of Compostela succeeded in obtaining metropolitan dignity, along with the rights of Mérida, and so Coimbra would henceforth be subject to the diocese of Galicia. A lengthy dispute then began between the archbishops of Braga and Compostela²², which was also influenced by political interests (this change was a major obstacle to the ecclesiastical unification of the Portucalense territory and to the nascent kingdom of Portugal). Whereas Braga was not in the least interested in losing the jurisdiction it claimed to have had at the time of the *Suevi – Divisio Teodomiri* (561–572) –, Compostela was committed to exercising effective control over Coimbra (a diocese already restored in its province), thereby increasing the area of influence of Diego Gelmires, in a manner less dependent on personal relationships, as in the relationship with the diocese of Porto since its chair had been occupied in 1113. Indeed, the first bishop of Porto had been chosen within the circle of the archbishop of Compostela. When D. Hugo received the chair of Porto, he sought immediately to recover the diocesan rights that had unduly escaped the episcopal jurisdiction (which meant building good relationships with monasteries within the diocese), but also expand the boundaries of the diocese to the North and South. Obviously, owing to the actual extent of the area under

18 See Liber Fidei Sanctae Bracaraensis Ecclesiae, ed. by Avelino de Jesus da COSTA, 3 vols., Braga 1965–1990, vol. 1, doc. 139.

19 Bull *Quanti Criminis*, de (1114), 3rd November (Liber Fidei [see n. 18], doc. 556).

20 ERDMANN: Papsturkunden in Portugal (see n. 11), n. 18.

21 See, for example, (1109–1113), when Paschal II orders archbishop Bernardo of Toledo, among other matters, to comply with the rights of the archbishop of Braga in the dioceses of Coimbra and Astorga (ERDMANN: Papsturkunden in Portugal [see n. 11], n. 12).

22 The rights of Braga over Coimbra were recognised in 1121, 1139, 1144, 1148 and 1153 (ERDMANN: Papsturkunden in Portugal [see n. 11], n. 21, 30, 41, 47 and 50). However, in 1155, Cardinal Hyacinthus confirmed the desires of Compostela, and the pontiffs restored the previous situation in 1157, 1163 and 1190 (ERDMANN: Papsturkunden in Portugal [see n. 11], n. 57, 63 and 121).

discussion, and also because of jurisdictional consequences, the bishop of Porto did not want to relinquish the diocese's holdings south of the Douro River.

It was imperative, therefore, to identify the 'terminos antiquos', that is, the boundaries of the diocese before the Muslim invasion, even though they all seemed clearly defined, including in papal documents. For this reason, only a policy previously drawn up by Diego Gelmires, to which D. Hugo was certainly associated, seems to explain the fact that as early as 1114, following the synod convened by the former and held in Compostela in November of that year, the attending bishops²³, after having signed a pact ('pacto de irmandade'), suggested that D. Gonçalo of Coimbra should solve the problems related to the boundaries between his diocese and that of Porto²⁴. This fact would have certainly pleased the archbishop of Toledo, as holder of the jurisdiction over the province of Mérida, not yet restored.

The bishops' suggestion was immediately implemented (albeit conditionally, because they said that if D. Gonçalo did not join the 'brotherhood' he should return the 'votos' to the archbishop of Braga, and the property he owned in that territory to the bishop of Porto²⁵): on 30th December, the two bishops established the terms of the agreement that has survived to this day in two versions (in the Livro Preto of the Cathedral of Coimbra, and the other in the Censual of the Cathedral Chapter of Porto²⁶), but with significant differences: whereas in the Coimbra codex, D. Gonçalo promised not to interfere in the region north of the Douro River (*trans Dorium*) and D. Hugo undertook not to claim anything south of that same river (*citra Dorium*), *nisi quantum dederit ei ex amititia*²⁷, the Censual of Porto mentions that the bishop of Coimbra would deliver to D. Hugo *que ad ecclesiam Portugalensem citra Dorium vel ultra Dorium pertinet*²⁸. Although Erdmann prefers the version in the Livro Preto, the

23 These bishops were those of Tui, Mondonhedo, Lugo and Orense, as well the bishop Hugo of Porto. In this synod, convened to confirm the canons of the Council of León of October 1114, a 'brotherhood pact' (*pacto de irmandade*) was made between the attending bishops, for which they also invited D. Gonçalo, bishop of Coimbra. Carl ERDMANN: *O papado e Portugal no primeiro século da história portuguesa*, Coimbra 1935, p. 27. OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 33.

24 ERDMANN: *O papado e Portugal* (see n. 23), Apêndice, doc. I, p. 80: *Ipsum quoque Portugalensem si vobiscum dilectionis vinculo astringeretis et concordiam super parte suae dioceseos, quam tenetis, cum eo faceretis, ut ambo in id ipsum ad omnia essetis [...]*.

25 Ibid.: *si ergo nostram confraternitatem et dileccionem non spreveritis, ecclesie Compostellane sua vota et hereditates in manu episcopi Portugalensis eius procul dubio vicarii absque contradicione restituetis*.

26 OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 34.

27 Livro Preto, fol. 240. ERDMANN: *O papado e Portugal* (see n. 23), Apêndice, doc. I, p. 80sq.

28 Cândido Augusto Dias dos SANTOS: *O Censual da Mitra do Porto: subsídios para o estudo da Diocese nas vésperas do Concílio de Trento*, Porto 1973 (*Documentos e memórias para a história do Porto* 39), p. 7.

originality of which he does not question²⁹, the fact is that, shortly after, in early 1115, Bernardo of Toledo, as the legate of the Holy See, wrote to the abbot of the monastery of Santo Tirso so that he and everyone living within the ‘terminos antiquos’ of the diocese of Porto (extending from the Vizela River, in the North, to the Antuã River, in the South of the Douro) recognised D. Hugo as their bishop.³⁰

It is in these circumstances that D. Hugo reports the situation of his diocese to Paschal II, in mid-1115, as having been ‘robbed of its property and land’ during the Muslim invasions.³¹ The pope’s answer, through the bull *Egregias quondam* (of 15/08/1115 – Benevento)³², further to exempting the diocese of Porto from any metropolis (which is particularly important considering the struggles of Braga to maintain the suffragan bishops as in Swabian times³³), establishes its territorial limits: overall, the borderline to the North coincided with rivers Ave and Vizela, and to the South with the Antuã River³⁴. For this reason, a few days later bishop D. Gonçalo of Coimbra was ordered by the same pope to hand to D. Hugo the land lying between the Douro and Antuã Rivers.³⁵

To the North, the problem of the boundaries of the diocese of Porto was not solved³⁶, and to the South, it was not settled either, as one might have

29 See the comment on the tradition of the document published in ERDMANN: *O papado e Portugal* (see n. 23), Apêndice, doc. II, p. 81.

30 ERDMANN: *O papado e Portugal* (see n. 23), Apêndice, doc. II, p. 81sq. OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 34 and SANTOS: *O Censual* (see n. 28), p. 23.

31 OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 34 and SANTOS: *O Censual* (see n. 28), p. 23.

32 *Censual do Cabido da Sé do Porto: códice membranáceo existente na Biblioteca do Porto*, ed. by João GRAVE, Porto 1924, fol. 1sq. José Augusto FERREIRA: *Fastos Episcopaes da Igreja primacial de Braga, Famalicão 1928-1935*, vol. I, p. 243.

33 As we have said, the Swabian ecclesiastical organization between 561 and 572 came to include the dioceses of Coimbra, Viseu, Lamego and Idanha. However, let us not forget that D. Maurício had received, in November and December 1114, three bulls that were beneficial to him, in particular the December one, ‘conferring on him the long awaited title of archbishop’ (ERDMANN: *O papado e Portugal* [see n. 23], p. 26; see FERREIRA: *Fastos* [see n. 32], vol. I, p. 240sq.). See also AMARAL: *Formação* (see n. 16), p. 430sqq.

34 *Censual do Cabido* (see n. 32), fol. 1. Moreover, in Rome, D. Hugo obtains the administration of the diocese of Lamego (1116, 12th April; ERDMANN: *Papsturkunden in Portugal* [see n. 11], n. 15), although it belongs to another ecclesiastical province (OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* [see n. 1], p. 35).

35 In other words, the Terra de Santa Maria. Bull *Sicut tuis* of (1115) 20th August (ERDMANN: *Papsturkunden in Portugal* [see n. 11], n. 14, p. 167; FERREIRA: *Fastos* [see n. 32], vol. I, p. 243).

36 The diocese of Braga also considered itself wronged by this pontifical determination, as the outline of the divide advocated by the archbishops was different from the one mentioned. D. Maurício (now archbishop of Braga) based his decision on the bull *Sicut iniusta* of 4th December 1114, which, in turn, confirmed the boundaries of the arch-

expected. In 1116, the bishop of Coimbra conveyed to the pope that the information given by D. Hugo was not true, probably invoking the *Divisio Teodomiri*, or ‘parochiale suevico’, of which the pope was unaware. He therefore asked Paschal II, in a bull sent to the archbishop of Toledo, to the archbishop of Braga, to the bishops of Tui and Salamanca³⁷, among others, to clarify a few points reported by Hugo³⁸. In 1117, however, Paschal II sent Cardinal Boso to the Iberian Peninsula to settle this and other matters related to the definition of the suffragan dioceses of Braga and Mérida.

Thus, in February 1117, presiding over the Council of Burgos³⁹, Cardinal-Legate Boso realised that the situation reported by D. Hugo three years earlier to the pope had been somewhat inaccurate. In effect, whereas there was no reason for the diocese of Lamego to still be linked to the diocese of Porto (a privilege given to D. Hugo by Paschal II’s bull *Apostolice sedis* in 1116⁴⁰), on the other hand, D. Hugo should abandon his claims over the land south of the Douro River to the Antuã River (the lands of Santa Maria). In other words, Cardinal Boso based his opinions on the Visigoth ecclesiastical division. An agreement was reached between the two bishops for the papal legacy⁴¹, and the bishop of Porto inherited some property legally acquired in return for the church of Olival in Gaia, given by D. Gonçalo of Coimbra to the bishop of Porto. The provisions of the December 1114 agreement signed after the Compostela synod were thus confirmed, as to the text kept in the Livro Preto (seeing that D. Hugo would keep what D. Gonçalo gave him *ex amititia*) and the text in the Censual (since the diocese of Porto would keep what belonged to it *ultra Dorium*). In any case, the boundary of the diocese of Porto was no longer the river, as the bishop of Coimbra agreed that the diocese of Porto

bishopric established in 569 (José MARQUES: *Relações entre as Dioceses do Porto e de Braga na Idade Média: alguns aspectos*, Porto 2002, p. 29).

- 37 That is, among all the recipients of the pontifical letter, the bishop of Tui was the only one to have been part of the ‘brotherhood’ underlying the agreement between the bishops of Porto and Coimbra. It also seems relevant that the archbishop of Compostela is not on the list of the recipients of this document.
- 38 (1116), 18th June. ERDMANN: *Papsturkunden in Portugal* (see n. 11), n. 16; OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 36.
- 39 Queen D. Urraca also participated in this council, in which Bernardo of Toledo reaffirmed that Coimbra should not be part of the suffragan dioceses of Braga, because it belonged to the province of Mérida (it should therefore temporarily depend on Toledo). On this matter, see AMARAL: *Formação* (see n. 16), p. 435.
- 40 1116, 12th April. ERDMANN: *Papsturkunden in Portugal* (see n. 11), n. 15.
- 41 1117, 24th Febr. ERDMANN: *Papsturkunden in Portugal* (see n. 11), n. 19; OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 37. According to the author, this was the document that always underpinned the boundary issues that kept on surfacing.

could have a narrow strip of land that included the church of Olival and the monastery of Crestuma, again donated by D. Teresa in 1118⁴².

As soon as he could, D. Hugo sought to confirm and, if possible, expand his domain south of the Douro. The opportunity came in 1120 when he travelled to Cluny at the service of Diego Gelmires⁴³: in that year, Calixtus II confirmed the 1115 papal bull⁴⁴, which, in practice, meant that the 1118 agreement signed with Cardinal Boso would cease to apply. D. Hugo would not hand over to Coimbra the territory mentioned in the 1118 agreement, also because the recent papal decision (from 1120) so permitted.

The collaboration between D. Hugo and Diego Gelmires led to an intercession before D. Teresa, who in that same year (1120) granted the *cautum* of Porto to D. Hugo, giving him full legal powers over the town.⁴⁵ D. Hugo continued to administer the region south of the Douro: that's why D. Teresa gave the monastery of Grijó in 1128 the 'carta de couto', before the bishop of Porto (and there is no reference in the diploma to D. Bernardo of Coimbra).⁴⁶

In August 1121, however, Cardinal-Legate Boso summoned a new council to be held in Sahagún. As we have seen, the boundaries of the diocese of Porto had still not been settled. Therefore, the papal legate confirming the decision made at the council of Burgos (in 1118) made the bishops of Porto and Coimbra sign a new agreement⁴⁷, whereby the bishop of Coimbra would administer the land between the Douro and Tejo rivers, and was to not bother D. Hugo from the Douro River up to the diocese of Tui⁴⁸.

42 On this donation, see the comment by Rui de AZEVEDO: *Documentos Medievais Portugueses: Documentos Régios*, vol. I,2, Lisboa 1962, p. 516. OLIVEIRA: *Os territórios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 38.

43 Hugo obtained several privileges for Gelmires, including the bull *Antiqua Sedis* addressed to Diego Gelmires wherein Calixtus II appoints him apostolic legate in the provinces of Braga and Mérida (Enrique FLOREZ: *España Sagrada* t. XX, Madrid 1765, p. 290-292; referred to in Miguel de OLIVEIRA: *O senhorio da cidade do Porto e as primeiras questões com os bispos*, in: *Lusitania Sacra*, 1ª serie, 4 (1959) p. 29-60).

44 Bull *Officii mei*, of 1120 (Censual do Cabido [see n. 32], p. 3-5). Note that the 1115 bull established the following boundaries (*terminos antiquos*) for the diocese of Porto (p. 4).

45 See Rui de AZEVEDO: *Documentos medievais Portugueses: Documentos Régios*, vol. I,1, Lisboa 1958, p. XXXVI, LII-LIV and LVII-LX.

46 DURAND: *Le Cartulaire Baio-Ferrado* (see n. 9), doc. n. 6. The donations of monasteries, but north of the Douro River, to the see of Porto, by both D. Teresa and by D. Afonso Henriques continued in subsequent years, at the same time that D. Hugo pursued a policy of arrangement with the main monastical institutions of the region. See Maria João de Oliveira e SILVA: *Scriptores et notatores: a produção documental da sé do Porto (1113-1247)*, Porto 2008, p. 25.

47 OLIVEIRA: *Os territorios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 41. SANTOS: *O Censual* (see n. 28), p. 27.

48 The agreement was signed on 5th April 1122. OLIVEIRA: *Os territorios diocesanos* (see n. 1), p. 41.

Political developments in the Portucalense county established that the successor of D. Hugo in the Porto bishopric was D. João Peculiar (who later became the archbishop of Braga). Within a short-lived episcopate (two years only: September/ October 1136 to late 1138), D. João Peculiar brought an end to Porto's exemption regarding the metropolis of Braga⁴⁹ but, on the other hand, exempted the monastery of S. Salvador de Grijó from the episcopal jurisdiction and the interdiction⁵⁰. This does not mean that this bishop had clearly determined that the diocese of Porto extended south of the Douro River, not least because the exemption document expressly refers to *cum terra de Sancta Maria colimbriane diocesis esset*. This was the assumption on which in 1132⁵¹, bishop Bernardo of Coimbra had granted a similar privilege to that monastery. Though it can be understood as an attempt to implement the Gregorian reform in the region, this attitude meant nevertheless the reaffirmation of the jurisdiction of the bishop of Coimbra in a land disputed by both him and the bishops of Porto.⁵² The fact that serious differences opened up between the bishop of Coimbra and the canons regular of Grijó would have explained why D. João Peculiar interfered in the matter, and the decision to exempt this monastery from any episcopal jurisdiction. The document subscribed by *Johannes, prefatus episcopus et postea bracarensis archiepiscopus factus* is a later copy (of [1139-1140], since it was confirmed by the archdeacon of Braga, Pedro Roxo, who at the time was the chancellor of Prince D. Afonso⁵³). It was also done in the presence of D. Afonso Henriques and some Porto canons, which may mean that, more than knowing the boundaries of the territory, the political powers were interested in considering that the diocese of Coimbra belonged to the province of Braga, clearly harmonising civil and ecclesiastical boundaries of the 'Portuguese' region.

When D. João Peculiar took charge of the diocese of Braga in 1138, he was replaced by D. Pedro Rabaldes, his relative (who, however, in 1140 was still referred to as *electus*⁵⁴), who pledged him obedience. Knowing that the still bishop of Coimbra (Bernardo) had been chosen by D. Afonso Henriques and D. Paio Mendes, and given what we have just said, the donation and its respective 'carta de couto' made by D. Afonso Henriques to the bishop of Porto⁵⁵, of S. João de Ver monastery⁵⁶, i. e., of an institution that lay precisely

49 ERDMANN: O papado e Portugal (see n. 23), p. 38-41.

50 DURAND: Le Cartulaire Baio-Ferrado (see n. 9), doc. n. 5.

51 DURAND: Le Cartulaire Baio-Ferrado (see n. 9), doc. n. 4.

52 DURAND: Le Cartulaire Baio-Ferrado (see n. 9), p. XXX note 78.

53 Chancellor of Afonso Henriques between 1128 and 1140: Rui de AZEVEDO: Documentos Medievais Portugueses: Documentos Régios, vol. I,1, Lisboa 1958, p. LXVIII-LXIX and Maria Cristina Almeida e CUNHA: A Chancelaria Arquiepiscopal de Braga (1071-1244), Noia 2005 (Trivium 15), p. 261.

54 SILVA: *Scriptores et notatores* (see n. 47), p. 26.

55 This monastery was located in the lands of Santa Maria da Feira, in the territory between the Douro and Antuã rivers.

within Coimbra territory, is perfectly understandable. In this sense, it would confirm that the problems of the boundaries between these two dioceses – that is, within the county – did not concern the young king, since they did not clash against his own political interests, unlike the matter of ecclesiastical provinces. In other words, more than knowing that a specific region belonged to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of this or that diocese, D. Afonso Henriques was interested in having his territory united under a single ecclesiastical authority. This was a purely ecclesiastical issue that mattered only to the bishops who wished to retain their jurisdiction over a specific area. Since the bishops supported D. Afonso Henriques in the development of the León issue, any solution to the problem of boundaries would serve the political powers. This is why in 1143, during a visit by the legate Guido, a new sentence was promulgated on the matter.⁵⁷ The bishops of Coimbra tried to confirm the Burgos agreement, and in 1198⁵⁸ and 1245⁵⁹ succeeded in obtaining two bulls ordering the return of territories they felt had been usurped by Porto. The diplomas, however, failed because in 1253 the bishop of Porto, D. Julião Fernandes, obtained the confirmation of Paschal II's bull dated 1115.⁶⁰

With regard to the conflicts between Coimbra and Porto, the real issue, in terms of the diocese boundaries, was a vast area of land that none of the dioceses wished to be deprived of and, therefore, continued to manage. First, the bishops of Coimbra were not interested in seeing their territory thinned down to the North and, secondly, the bishops of Porto wanted to retain jurisdiction over a region that, thanks to the survival of a church 'enclosed' in its Mozarabic nature until the disappearance of D. Paterno of Coimbra and the governor Sesnando, emerged now as a 'no-man's land'.⁶¹ In both cases, civil and ecclesiastical, beyond jurisdictional aspects, economic interests were also at stake.⁶²

56 SILVA: *Scriptores et notatores* (see n. 47), p. 26.

57 ERDMANN: O papado e Portugal (see n. 23), p. 43sq. According to OLIVEIRA: Os territórios diocesanos (see n. 1), p. 43, the sentence promulgated was about other problems, not about the boundaries of the diocese.

58 Bulário Português – Inocêncio III. Ed. by Avelino de Jesus da COSTA/ Maria Alegria Fernandes MARQUES, Coimbra 1989, doc. 7, p. 9sq.

59 SANTOS: O Censual (see n. 28), p. 27.

60 José Augusto FERREIRA: *Memórias archeologico-historicas da cidade do Porto (Fastos episcopais e políticos)* (século VI-século XX), Braga 1924, p. 243-249.

61 Despite the fact that this territory was joined to the county of Coimbra since at least the early 11th century. The process joining it to the Cathedral of Coimbra must have taken place alongside the civil process. On this matter, see José MATTOSO/ Luís KRUS/ Amélia Aurora Aguiar ANDRADE: *A Terra de Santa Maria no século XIII. Problemas e documentos*, Vila da Feira 1993, p. 32 and 36.

62 Note that the bishop of Porto collected 'the tributes paid by all churches that formed the archdeaconate of Santa Maria, that is, nearly all the parish seats of the region', except for three churches that depended on the Cathedral of Coimbra, from the lands between the rivers Douro and Antuã. MATTOSO/ KRUS/ ANDRADE: *A Terra de Santa Maria no século XIII* (see n. 61), p. 30.

Hence, in an early phase, when analysing both quarrels over the boundaries spearheaded by the bishops of Porto and Coimbra, they have to be brought under the ‘vaster complex of tensions in which Maurício Burdino became involved to defend his metropolitan rights against the intentions of Bernardo of Toledo and the ambitions of Diego Gelmires’⁶³. However, from the moment that political circumstances in the northwest of the peninsula changed, and the Portucalense county confirmed its willingness to become a kingdom, the disputes of the two dioceses – Porto and Coimbra – went beyond the ‘regional’ scope to have a broader meaning. On the one hand, there was the need to make the ‘national Church’ correspond geographically to the lands of the former metropolis of Braga and, on the other, the need to deal with the construction or reorganisation of the area of the archbishop of Santiago.⁶⁴ In this regard, D. Paio Mendes had inherited from his predecessor (D. Maurício) a metropolis that no longer corresponded to a Portuguese Church: the diocese of Coimbra had moved into the hands of Santiago. Consequently, the ‘terminos antiquos’ were continuously evoked, while the quarrel on the boundaries lasted, to support the ecclesiastical geography they wished to restore.

Since the papal privileges granted were an important framework of reference for the aspirations of autonomy, diplomatic arrangements parallel to the reorganisation of diocesan territories, carried out by D. Paio Mendes, but especially by D. João Peculiar, clearly supported the political activity of D. Afonso Henriques, in the same way that D. Hugo’s attitudes served the aspirations of Diego Gelmires, whilst the attitudes of D. Gonçalo, at a particular moment, served the aspirations of the archbishop of Toledo. The role of D. Afonso Henriques in this relationship between the two heads of the dioceses in his territory is not quite clear, but we are convinced that he was not indifferent to the developments, not least because he belonged to a ‘line of kings [...] whose power would be characterised by continuous interference in ecclesiastical matters’⁶⁵. On the other hand, it seems relevant to question to what extent his most direct collaborators (meaning, the archbishops of Braga) took full advantage of the history of the Swabian kingdom, integrating, from an ecclesiastical standpoint, the four dioceses south of the Douro River, and from a civil standpoint, a much vaster area than the one that the prince now controlled. This is why it was important to reorganise the diocesan territories, and in particular establish their boundaries, which, as we have seen, is found to have a much broader scope than the ecclesiastic.

63 MARQUES: *Relações* (see n. 36), p. 31.

64 See BRANCO: *Nobles, eclesiasticos y reyes* (see n. 2), p. 741sqq.

65 Maria João BRANCO: *Elites eclesiásticas e Perspectivas Doutrinárias: do reino à nação* (secs. XII e XIII), in: *Nação e Identidades – Portugal, os Portugueses e os Outros*, ed. by Hermenegildo FERNANDES et al., Lisboa 2009, p. 135–155, p. 136.

Summary

Taken as a whole, the border quarrels between the prelates of Porto and Coimbra in their first phase are to be integrated into the much broader context of those tensions the archbishop of Braga found himself involved in by defending his metropolitan rights against the pretensions of D. Bernardo of Toledo and D. Diego Gelmires of Santiago. However, since the moment in which the *Portucalense* county was about to become a kingdom of its own, the differences between those two bishoprics, Porto and Coimbra, passed the 'regional' ambit, due to the need of making coincide a 'national Church' with the territory of the former metropolis of Braga, and on the other hand, to that of making head against the construction or reorganization of ecclesiastical space by the archbishop of Santiago.

Papal privileges being an important reference framework for autonomy pretensions, the diplomatic activities parallel to the reorganization of diocesan territories and displayed by the archbishops of Braga (especially D. João Peculiar) resulted in an evident support of the political activity of D. Afonso Henriques, as well as the stances taken up by D. Hugo of Porto ministered to the pretensions of D. Diego Gelmires, and those of D. Gonçalo of Coimbra, in a particular moment, to those of the Toledan primate.

