

The “Territorialization” of the episcopal Power in medieval Portugal. A study on the bullae of Popes Paschalis II and Calixtus II and the conflicts between the dioceses of Oporto, Braga and Coimbra (12th century)

A N D R E A M A R I A N I * | F R A N C E S C O R E N Z I **

FCT-CITCEM-Universidade do Porto
* andrea.mariani@museobiassono.it
** francesco.renzi@gmail.com

Abstract: The first decades of the 12th century are a turning point in the History of Portugal. The successful military campaigns against the Muslims allowed the reorganization of the northern dioceses. This episcopal restoration policy led to a clash between Oporto, Braga and Coimbra for the diocesan frontiers. During the pontificate of Hugh of Oporto (1112-1136), the Popes directly intervened to solve this territorial conflict. The aim of this paper is to study the papal *bullae* granted by Paschalis II and Calixtus II in 1115 and in 1120 to Hugh Bishop of Oporto. Our goal is to demonstrate how this type of document is not a reliable representation of the territory. The value of these papal *bullae*, in fact, is not *factual*, but *political* and it is very important to introduce the study of both the territorialization of episcopal power in Medieval Portugal and the tight relation between local bishops and Roman Pontiffs.

Keywords: Hugh, Oporto, Portugal, Rome, *bullae*.

A “Territorialização” do poder episcopal no Portugal Medieval. Um estudo das bullae dos Papas Pascoal II e Calisto II e os conflitos entre as dioceses de Porto, Braga e Coimbra (século XII).

Resumo: As primeiras décadas do século XII são um ponto crucial na história de Portugal. O sucesso das campanhas militares contra os muçulmanos permitiu a reorganização das dioceses do Norte. Esta política de restauração episcopal teve como consequência um conflito entre Porto, Braga e Coimbra e durante o pontificado do bispo do Porto, Hugo (1112-1136), os papas em muitas ocasiões intervieram para resolver esta disputa territorial. O objetivo de este artigo é o estudo das *bullae* papais de Pascoal II e Calixto II de 1115 e 1120 em favor de Hugo do Porto. O escopo é demonstrar como este tipo de documento não é uma representação fiável do território. O valor destas *bullae*, efetivamente, não é *factual*, mas *político* e é muito importante para introduzir o estudo sobre a territorialização do poder episcopal no Portugal medieval e a relação muito próxima entre os bispos locais e os pontífices romanos.

Palavras-chave: Hugo, Porto, Portugal, Roma, *bullae*.

* Bolseiro FCT no CITCEM-Universidade do Porto-SFRH/BD/109896/2015.

** Bolseiro FCT no CITCEM-Universidade do Porto-SFRH/BPD/110178/2015.

1. Introduction

The pontificate of bishop of Oporto Hugh (+1136) is a very interesting case for studying the structures of Medieval Portugal. When Hugh became Bishop of the restored See of Oporto, the political situation in the Northwest Iberian Peninsula was critical. From 1107 to 1112, the most important men of the Kingdom of León-Castile died: Raymond of Burgundy Count of Galicia, 1107; the *Infante* Sancho Alfonso, 1108; the King of León-Castile Alfonso VI, 1109; Henry of Burgundy Count of Portugal, 1112. Two women had to manage the troubles of the Kingdom: Queen Urraca (+1126) – Alfonso VI's daughter and widow of Count Raymond – and “Countess-Queen” of Portugal Teresa (+1130), Urraca's stepsister and widow of Count Henry. Urraca had to fight against her second husband the Kingdom of Aragon Alfonso I “The Battler” (+1134), while Teresa had to deal with the growing opposition of the nobility of the County of Portugal. The “Portuguese” noblemen in fact supported Teresa's son, the young Afonso Henriques (future first King of Portugal) against his mother and the Galician aristocrats captained by Count Fernando Pérez de Traba¹.

At the same time, the ecclesiastical *panorama* from the second half of the 11th century was completely changing, because of the restoration of the Portuguese bishoprics, such as Braga (1070-1071), Coimbra (1080) and Oporto (1112-1114), as the result of the successful military campaigns against the Muslims in the 11th century and the progressive reorganization of the Iberian episcopate after the council of Coyanza of 1055². Another factor of instability in the area were the pretensions of the See of Santiago de Compostela to reach the archiepiscopal dignity under the pontificate of Diego Gelmírez (+1140). These claims were the origin of continuous clashes with other bishoprics and in particular the See of Braga, which

-
- 1 José Mattoso – *História de Portugal. A monarquia feudal (1096-1480)*, II, Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, 1992, p. 36 and following. On the Traba family see María del Carmen Pallares Méndez-Ermelindo Portela Silva – *Aristocracia y sistema de parentesco en la Galicia de la Edad media: el grupo de los Traba*. *Hispania. Revista española de historia*. 185 (1993) 823-840.
 - 2 See Luís Carlos Amaral – *A restauração da diocese do Porto e a chegada do bispo d. Hugo*. In *Um poder entre poderes. Nos 900 anos da diocese do Porto e da construção do cabido Portucaleense*. Ed. Luís Carlos Amaral. Porto: Universidade Católica Portuguesa. Faculdade de Teologia. Centro de Estudos de História Religiosa, 2017, p. 25-45. See also Luís Carlos Amaral – *Organização eclesiástica entre Douro e Minho: o caso da diocese de Braga (sécs. IX-XII)*. In *Dal Cantábrego al Duero. Trece estudios sobre organización social del espacio en los siglos VIII al XIII*. Ed. José Ángel García de Cortázar y Ruiz de Aguirre. Santander: Ed. Universidad de Cantabria, 1999, p. 313-350. José Marques – *Relações entre as Dioceses do Porto e de Braga, na Idade Média: alguns aspectos*. In *Tempos e Lugares de Memória, Actas do 1.º Congresso sobre a Diocese do Porto (5-8 Dez. 1998)*, II. Porto/Arouca: Centro de Estudos D. Domingos de Pinho Brandão, Universidade Católica, Centro Regional do Porto, Faculdade de Letras – Departamento de Ciências e Técnicas do Património, 2002, p. 21-56. Maria Cristina Cunha – *Os limites da diocese do Porto com as suas vizinhas de Braga e Coimbra: problemas e soluções*. In *Um poder entre poderes...*, p. 147-159. See also José Ignacio de la Torre Rodríguez – *Hugo de Oporto*. In *Estudos em homenagem ao professor doutor José Marques*. Porto: Universidade do Porto, 2006, II, p. 431-447.

had recovered its ancient archiepiscopal dignity in 1100 during the pontificate of Bishop Saint Gerald of Moissac (†1108)³.

It is very important to introduce this political framework in order to understand the figure of Hugh of Oporto and the specific features of his pontificate⁴. First, Hugh most likely came from France, like other bishops in the Iberian Peninsula between the end of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century⁵. This first point is very significant, because it is necessary to study Hugh's life and strategies in a wider ecclesiastical and political context characterized by the introduction of Roman Rite in the Iberian Peninsula (especially after the Council of Burgos in 1080⁶); the relationships between Rome, Cluny and the Iberian Kings; the circulation of clergymen in western Europe since the 11th century⁷. Second, Hugh was a former archdeacon of Compostela and so a trustful man of Diego Gelmírez. This is a crucial point, because even if Hugh was bishop in the County of Portugal he was supported by the Galician See of Compostela⁸. This connection was so important that Hugh can be listed as one of the authors of the *Historia Compostelana*. Hugh wrote, in fact, one of the most interesting and controversial pages of the history of the See of Compostela and its competition with Braga: the thief of the relics made by Diego Gelmírez in Braga in 1102. An episode remembered in the *Historia Compostelana* as the «pio latrocinio» (the "pious theft"), in which Hugh took Gelmírez's side by justifying the action led by the Bishop of Santiago⁹. Third, the international space in which Hugh operated. Hugh travelled several times to get in touch with the Pope

3 Ermelindo Portela Silva – *Diego Gelmírez (c.1065-1140). El báculo y la ballesta*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2016, p. 17-38.

4 For a general overview on the clergy of Oporto in the Middle Ages see the work of Maria Cristina Almeida e Cunha and Maria João de Oliveira e Silva – *Il clero della diocesi di Oporto nell'Europa del medioevo*. In *A igreja e o clero português no contexto europeu*. Lisboa: Universidade Católica Portuguesa. Faculdade de Teologia. Centro de Estudos de História Religiosa, 2005, p. 45-62, in particular 49-52.

5 On the origin of Hugh of Oporto see *Historia Compostelana*. Ed. Emma Falque Rey. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 1994, p. 11-12 and 195. In the opinion of R. A. Fletcher, Hugh was, possibly, a native of Compostela. See Richard Alexander Fletcher – *The Episcopate in the Kingdom of León in the twelfth century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978, p. 90.

6 Teófilo Ruiz – Burgos and the council of 1080. In *Santiago, Saint-Denis, and Saint Peter: The Reception of the Roman Liturgy in León-Castile in 1080*. Ed. Bernard F. Reilly. New York: Fordham University Press, 1985, p. 121.

7 See Patrick Henriët – Political Struggle and the legitimation of the Toledan Primacy: The Pars Laterani Concilii. In *Building legitimacy: Political discourses and forms of legitimacy in medieval societies*. Ed. Isabel Alfonso Antón, Hugh Kennedy, Julio Escalona Monge. Brill: Leiden-Boston, 2004, p. 291-318. Luís Carlos Amaral – A restauração da diocese do Porto..., p. 30-33.

8 See Ermelindo Portela Silva – Diego Gelmírez y Hugo de Oporto. Poderes y fronteras. In *Um poder entre poderes...*, p. 361-381.

9 *Historia Compostelana*. Trad. (castilian) Emma Falque Rey. Madrid: Akal Ediciones, 1994, p. 48-51. Anne-Lise Barbanès – Écrire l'histoire d'un évêque et de son Église au XI^e siècle: le cas de Diego Gelmírez (1100-1140) et de l'Historia Compostelana. *Rives méditerranéennes*: <http://journals.openedition.org/rives/85> [consulted on-line 12.2.2018]. Javier García Turza – Formulation, development and the expansion of the translation of St James. In *Translating the Relics of St James: From Jerusalem to Compostela*. Ed. Antonio M. Pazos. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge, 2017, p. 105.

and the Cardinals to get privileges both for his See and for Compostela; privileges often used to solve local conflicts¹⁰.

The figure of Hugh shows all the complexity of the Iberian ecclesiastical framework characterized by continuous political and patrimonial bargaining between the local bishops¹¹. Together with the problem of the acceptance of the Toledan Primacy by the Iberian bishops¹², one of the most important conflicts during the pontificate of Hugh of Oporto was, in fact, the precise definition of the boundaries within the Iberian dioceses and their respective ecclesiastical provinces. This specific kind of conflict should be interpreted under two different perspectives.

First, the evolution of the Iberian Kingdoms and its relation with the local ecclesiastical geography. If on the one hand, the development of the “Reconquista” continuously changed the Kingdoms’ frontiers, on the other, bishops when they claimed their jurisdiction over lands, goods or a bishopric they often referred to a late Antiquity-high Middle Ages ecclesiastical geography, that supposedly had been entirely, or at least partially, before the Muslim invasion of 711¹³. One of the best examples is the use of the very controversial document known as *Divisio Theodemiri* or *Parochiale Suevorum* (a document with different versions referring to the ecclesiastical organization during the suebic kingdom of the 6th century probably produced, or in any case deeply manipulated/interpolated, during the 11th-12th centuries, but whose content is considered plausible by scholars such as P. David¹⁴) that shows how the ecclesiastical organization was often completely incompatible with the 12th century political frontiers¹⁵. This process is particularly evident after the birth of the Kingdom of Portugal. Braga, in the Kingdom of Portugal, had authority on all the Galician Bishops (apart from Compostela¹⁶) in the Kingdom of

10 Maria Cristina Cunha – Os limites da diocese do Porto com as sua vizinhas de Braga e Coimbra: problemas e soluções..., p. 159. Maria Alegria Marques – Entre restauração e afirmação: a diocese do Porto nas relações entre Portugal e a Santa Sé (1114-1216). In *Um poder entre poderes...*, p. 343-360, in particular p. 346-352.

11 Richard Alexander Fletcher – *The Episcopate...*, p. 227-228.

12 Peter Feige – La primacía de Toledo y la libertad de las demás metrópolis de España: el ejemplo de Braga. In *La introducción del Cister en España y Portugal*. Ed. Aa. Vv. Burgos: La Olmeda, 1991, p. 61-132.

13 Patrick Henriot – L’espace et le temps hispaniques vus et construits par les clercs (IXe-XIIIe siècle). In *À la recherche de légitimités chrétiennes: représentations de l’espace et du temps dans l’Espagne médiévale (IXe-XIIIe siècle)*, ed. by Patrick Henriot. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2003, p. 124. See also Peter Linehan – *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, p. 56-59.

14 Pierre David – *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal: du VIe au XIIe siècle*. Lisboa: Livraria Portugália, 1947, p. 66-69 and Fernando López Alsina – El Parrochiale Suevum y su presencia en las cartas pontificias del siglo XII. In *Das begrenzte Papsttum Spielräume päpstlichen Handelns. Legaten – delegierte Richter – Grenzen*. Ed. Klaus Herbers, Fernando López Alsina and Frank Engel. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013, p. 108.

15 Pierre David – *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal: du VIe au XIIe siècle...*, p. 19-82; Armando de Almeida Fernandes – *Paróquias Suevas e Dioceses Visigóticas*. Arouca: Associação para a Defesa da Cultura Arouquense, 1997, p. 41-105. José Mattoso – *Identificação dum País: ensaio sobre as origens de Portugal 1096-1325, 2. Composição*. Lisboa: Editorial Estampa (5th ed.), 1995, p. 180.

16 JL 4193 (Brioude December 5th 1095) = PL CLI, Urbani II papae ep. CLXVI, cols. 440-441.

León-Castile (Kingdom of León between 1157 and 1230), while Compostela had authority on Lisbon (conquered in 1147 by Afonso Henriques), Coimbra, Lamego and Viseu in the Kingdom of Portugal, a right inherited from the ancient Diocese of Mérida¹⁷.

Second, the crucial relation with Papacy. These conflicts – for the Primacy or for the diocesan frontiers – were not merely local. The Iberian Bishops further involved the Popes and the Roman Cardinals in their disputes as a “third authority” to judge and resolve those conflicts. From the 11th century onwards, the Popes were increasingly interested in being in touch with the Iberian Bishops and Abbots and sending legates south of Pyrenees. Asking the Pope to solve their issues was an implicit recognition of the Roman Primacy by local clergymen and the opportunity for the Popes to intervene in areas in which they had practically no, or very little, power. This is particularly evident after the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073-1085), when the Popes had more efficient and accurate instruments and methods of intervention, thanks to the development of the Canon Law¹⁸. For these reasons, we choose papal privileges as a starting point of our research because this particular typology of source offers the opportunity to analyze the dynamics we have introduced above. Scholars often used these documents to understand the size of a diocese, but this is a misleading methodological perspective. The representation of the territory contained in the papal *bullae* is not a reliable report of a diocese's possessions, but the *mirror* of the interests and problems of the Bishops who asked for privileges from Rome and the consequences of the relations between a Bishop, his local antagonists or supporters, and the Apostolic See¹⁹. Starting from these last considerations, we will show the discrepancy between this papal representation of the territory and the image issued by local sources in order to give a better approximation of the frontiers of the Diocese of Oporto under Bishop Hugh (1112-1136), his political goals and the main features of the territorial organization in the County of Portugal at the beginning of the 12th century.

17 Richard Alexander Fletcher – *The Episcopate in the Kingdom of León in the twelfth century...*, p. 102-114. Maria Cristina Cunha – Coimbra and Porto: Episcopacy and National Identity in Diocesan Border Quarrels. In *Das begrenzte Papsttum Spielräume päpstlichen Handelns*, p. 136-141; 146.

18 Thomas Deswarte – *Une Chrétienté romaine sans pape: l'Espagne et Rome (586-1085)*. Paris: Garnier-Flammarion 2010, p. 356 and following. Glauco Maria Cantarella – *Il sole e la luna. La rivoluzione di Gregorio VII 1073-1085*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2005, p. 65-74; 117-140 and Glauco Maria Cantarella – *Gregorio VII*. Roma: Salerno Editrice, 2018, p. 47; 96; 110-114; 191-192; 208; 270-271.

19 Guido Cariboni – *Esenzione cisterciense e formazione del Privilegium commune. Osservazione a partire dai cenobi dell'Italia settentrionale*. In *Papato e monachesimo "esente" nei secoli centrali del Medioevo*. Ed. Nicolangelo D'Acunzio. Florence: Firenze University Press, 2003, p. 86.

2. The papal *bullae* of Paschalis II and Calixtus II

2.1. Pope Paschalis II's *bullae Egregias quondam* (1115)

The two papal privileges we will analyze are the *Egregias quondam* by Pope Paschalis II (Benevento, August 15th 1115) and the *Officii Mei* by Pope Calixtus II (Valence, March 2nd 1120)²⁰. The first *bullae* accorded by Paschalis II is very important at least for two reasons. First, because Paschalis II granted the Bishop of Oporto the exemption from the authority of the Archbishop of Braga. In this way, Hugh was dependent from Rome and the bishopric was not anymore a part of the ecclesiastical province of Braga:

“Ea te libertate donantes ut nullius metropolitanj nisi romanj pontifices aut legatj qui ab eius latere missus fuerit subiectionl tenearis obnoxius. Set remotis molestijs commissae ecclesiae quietus immineas”²¹.

This decision could be very important because Hugh could consolidate his position in northern Portugal and at the same time, Diego Gelmírez indirectly obtained the result to weaken his rival Archbishop of Braga. Hugh and Diego reinforced their alliance during the year 1114. In the month of November, the Bishop of Compostela convoked a synod in Santiago attended by the Galician Bishops of Lugo, Tuy, Mondoñedo, Orense and the Portuguese Bishop of Oporto. During the synod, the Bishops signed a pact of “brotherhood” and they invited the Bishop of Coimbra Gonçalo in joining their agreement. The Galician Bishops and Bishop Hugh also asked Gonçalo to solve as soon as possible his frontier problems with Oporto²². They justified this demand with the fact that the Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain Bernard of Sédirac (+1124) would have approved this strategy. Bernard of Toledo was also deeply interested in weakening Braga's position, because he was involved in a conflict with the Archbishop of Braga Maurice “Bourdin” (1109-1118) for the control of the bishopric of León in the years previous the *bullae*

20 On Paschalis II and Calixtus II see Glauco Maria Cantarella (1997) – *Pasquale II e il suo tempo*. Napoli: Liguori, 1997, p. 9-31 and Mary Stroll (2004) – *Calixtus II (1119-1124). A Pope born to rule*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2004, p. 15-33.

21 *Censal do Cabido da Sé do Porto: código membranáceo existente na Biblioteca do Porto*. Porto: Imprensa Portuguesa, 1924, p. 1. See for the privileges JL 4778 (Benevento August 15th 1115) = PL CLXIII, Paschalis II papae ep. CDXXXIII, cols. 385-387. JL 4993 (Valence March 2nd 1120) = PL CLXIII, Calixti II papae ep. LXXXIII, coll. 1171.

22 Carl Erdmann – *O Papado e Portugal no Primeiro Século da História Portuguesa*. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra, 1935, doc. 1. *Livro Preto: Cartulario da Sé de Coimbra*. Ed. Manuel Augusto Rodrigues and Avelino de Jesus da Costa. Coimbra: Arquivo da Universidade de Coimbra, 1999, doc. 631. On December 30th 1114 Gonçalo and Hugh join an agreement. They established the river Douro as the border between their bishoprics. In the version contained in the *Censal* Hugh reserved for himself the control of all the churches pertaining to Oporto even south of Douro. See *Censal*, p. 7; *Livro Preto...*, doc. 628. See also Maria Cristina Cunha – Os limites da diocese do Porto com as suas vizinhas de Braga e Coimbra: problemas e soluções..., p. 154.

*Egregias quondam*²³. Second, the privilege of Paschalis II provides us a description of the borders of the diocese of Oporto:

“Et quod de antiquis parrochiae terminis dum portugalensis prostrata iaceret ecclesia ab alijs ecclesijs occupatum est. Auxiliante Deo eidem reintegretur ecclesiae. Quorum videlicet terminorum distinctio horum dicitur finium continuatione distendj. A fauce auiae fluminis ubi cadit in mare oceanum. Per ipsum fluminem sursum usque in auicellam fluuium. Et per auicellam ad archus palumbaris. Inde ad antam de temone. Inde ad montem marantis. Inde ad canpeanam fluuium. Et per ipsum fluuium sicut defluit in bandugium. Et per bandugium sicut decurrit in corregam et per corregam in dorium flumem. Inde trans dorium ad piscarium fratrum per montem magnum ad antoanum flumem. Et per ipsum fluuium sicut descendit ad mare oceanum”²⁴.

Following the document, the borders of the Diocese are in the north from the river Ave up to its tributary, the river Vizela. From the river Vizela to the locality of Pombeiro de Ribavizela, and then onward to the elevations of Anta de Timone (Vila Meã, near Pombeiro) and Marão. From these elevations along the river Campeã to the confluence with the river Banduge; from the river Banduge to the river Corgo; then on to the confluence with the river Douro. The last part of the borders is beyond the river Douro from the *Mons Magnum*, all along the River Antuã up to the Atlantic Ocean near Aveiro, more than fifty kilometers south of Oporto.

There are two further points to introduce. First, it could seem strange not to have the See at the centre of the diocese. Oporto is, in fact, located at the estuary of the Douro River in the extreme west of the diocesan territory. This specific feature might be due to the fact that the borders of the papal *bull*a in favor of Hugh are not referring to *Divisio Theodemiri* and in the opinion of important scholars the primitive see of *Portugale* was located in *Magneto* (today Meinedo, municipality of Lousada, thirty-nine kilometres east from Oporto) which is in a more central position towards the borders of the diocese²⁵. Second, this papal privilege gave Oporto an advantage on the archdiocese of Braga. By the privilege of 1115, the Archbishops of Braga lost territories compared to those accorded by the same Pope Paschalis II with the *bull*a *Sicut Iniusta* (December 4th 1114)²⁶. In 1114 Paschalis II had confirmed

23 Carl Erdmann – *Maurício Burdino (Gregório VIII)*. Coimbra: Publicações do Instituto Alemão da Universidade de Coimbra, 1940, p. 12-20. Pierre David – *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal: du VIe au XIIe siècle...*, p. 455-473. Juan Francisco Rivera Recio – *El arzobispo de Toledo don Bernardo de Cluny (1086-1124)*. Roma: Iglesia Nacional de España, 1962, p. 76-81.

24 *Censual...*, p. 2.

25 Ilídio Alves de Araújo – A antiga Diocese de Meinedo. In *Tempos e Lugares de Memória*. II, p. 95-119. See also Pierre David – *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal: du VIe au XIIe siècle...*, p. 68-69.

26 *Liber Fidei: sanctae bracarensis ecclesiae*. 2 vols. Ed. Avelino de Jesus da Costa, new edition by José Marques; with Maria Teresa Nobre Veloso and Joaquim Tomás de Silva Pereira. Braga: Arquidiocese de Braga, 2017, doc. 554. Both J. Marques and C. Cunha affirm that the borders of the archdiocese of Braga were established in 569 in the Council of Lugo. In the document of Paschalis II there is not any direct reference to that year or to a specific Council. The Pope affirmed that he was confirming the decisions taken in a council during the Kingdom of Miro. Miro was King from 570 to 583, so his reign is

Braga's frontiers established by the Suebian King Miro (†583). This papal privilege reveals, in our opinion, Hugh's attempt to change the local patrimonial balances based on the ecclesiastical geography of the 6-7th centuries, which still constituted the reference and the source of legitimation for other Portuguese archbishoprics like Braga or – as we will see below – Coimbra²⁷. Although Braga lost part of the diocese due to Hugh's request to Paschalis II, the local Archbishops kept considering those lands as belonging to them and they administrated those territories on their own²⁸. Therefore, this is a primary example of how it is important to critically read all of the official papal documents for comparison with the local reality.

2.2 The *bullā Officij mei* and the monastic «incongruences»

The borders description in the *bullā* from Calixtus II of 1120 is almost the same of 1115:

“Propterea quod de antiquis parrochiaie terminis dum portugalensis prostrata iaceret ecclesia ab alijs ecclesijs occupatum est precipimus ut auctore Deo eidem reintegretur ecclesiae quorum videlicet terminorum distinctio horum finium continuatione distendit. A fauce Ave flumine ubi cadit in mare oceanum, per ipsum fluvium sursum usque in avicellam fluvium, et per avicellam ad archum palubarrii. Inde ad antam de temone, inde per montem eguas, ad monte farinae, inde ad montem maraonis, et per maraonem ad campanam fluvium. Et per ipsum fluvium sicut decurrit in correca. Et per correca in dorium flumen. Item transdorium flumen a fauce arde per monte de meda. Ad montem nabal ubi nascitur fluvius antusiana qui antea dicitur, per ipsum fluvium sicut descendit ad mare oceanum”²⁹.

Nevertheless, the *bullā Officij Mei* offers other very interesting elements of analysis. In our opinion the most significant passage is the very precise list of monasteries and churches inserted in the privilege:

not compatible with the year 569 used by the two scholars. See Maria Cristina Cunha – Os limites da diocese do Porto..., p. 154 and José Marques – Relações entre as Dioceses do Porto e de Braga, na Idade Média: alguns aspectos..., p. 29. On King Miro and the Councils during his reign see Jorge de Alarcão – Os limites das dioceses suevas de Bracara e de Portucale. *Portvgalia*. Nova Série, 36 (2015) 36-41. In the opinion of P. David Miro died in 582, while P. C. Díaz Martínez recently affirmed that the suebian King died in 583. See Pierre David – *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal: du Vie au XIIIe siècle...*, p. 68 and footnote n. 3 and Pablo Díaz Martínez – *El reino suevo (411-585)*. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 2011, p. 293.

27 Maria Cristina Cunha – Coimbra and Porto..., p. 137-140. The period included between the 3th and the 6th century a.C. had been very important for Braga's historical memory and political/ecclesiastical legitimation during the Middle Ages, because *Bracara Augusta* was the capital of the roman province of Galicia, maintaining its importance even during the suebic Kingdom. See Guy Halsall – *Barbarian Migrations and the Roman West 376-568*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 300 and Franquelim Neiva Soares – Os concílios suevos de Braga. In *Suevos-Schwaben. Das Konigreich der Sueben auf der iberischen Halbinsel (411-485)*. Ed. Erwin Koller, Hugo Laitenberger. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1998, p. 74-75.

28 José Marques – Relações entre as Dioceses do Porto e de Braga, na Idade Média: alguns aspectos..., p. 30-31.

29 *Censual...*, p. 3-4. See also Ulysse Robert – *Le bullaire du Calixte II*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1891, doc. 149.

"[...] Ecclesia sancti Iacobj de Custodijs cum omnibus ad ema pertinentibus. Quintanam ejusdem villae cum pertinentijs suis Monasterium de Ruiuo tinto ecclesiam Ulvar [...] infra quos fines hic perhibentur monesteria continerj Monasterium santi tirsi de ripa, Monasterium de Burguaes, Monasterium de Roderitis, Monasterium de Vilarinho Monasterium de Palunbario, De antinj, De Arnoio, De vila cova, De Telonis, De frauxino, De Mancelis, De Santio, De Riali, De Varzio De villa nova episcopi, Monasterium de palaciolo, Monasterium santi Iohannis, Monasterium Anxedi, De suilanis, De inter ambos rruuios De Baucis, De Citoffeita, De Aquis santis, De Macanarijs, De Lecia, De uairano, Sanctae Marinae de Portu dori, De Petrosso. Haec igitur et alia omnia monasteria vel ecclesiae quae infra predictos fines continentur apostolica auctoritate precipimus ut supradictae portugalensis ecclesiae obedientiam debitam iustitiamque persoluant"³⁰.

1. Table of the monasteries listed in the papal privilege of 1120.

Monastery	Municipality (Current)	First documentary record
Macieira de Maia	Vila do Conde	1120 ³¹
Vairão	Vila do Conde	974 ³²
Santo Tirso	Santo Tirso	978 ³³
Burgães	Santo Tirso	1120 ³⁴
Roriz	Santo Tirso	1096 ³⁵
Vilarinho	Santo Tirso	1104 ³⁶
Pombeiro	Felgueiras	1072 (or 1102?) ³⁷
Antime	Fafe	1120 ³⁸
Arnoia	Celorico de Basto	1120 ³⁹
Vila Cova	Felgueiras	1120 ⁴⁰

30 *Censual...*, p. 4.

31 *Censual...*, p. 4. It must be added to table 1 the monasteries of Leça, Bouças, Aguas Santas, Rio Tinto and Cedofeita. Please, see Map 3.

32 *Portugaliae monumenta historica: a saeculo octavo post Christum usque ad quintumdecimum. Diplomata et Chartae*. Ed. Alexandre Herculano. Olisipone: Academiae Scientiarum Olisiponensis, 1868-1873, doc. 112.

33 *Monumenta Portugaliae Vaticana IV*. Ed. António Domingues de Sousa Costa. Braga: Editorial Franciscana, 1970, doc. 1621.

34 *Censual...*, p. 4.

35 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 833.

36 Geraldo José Amadeu Coelho Dias *et al.* – *Vilarinho tem história. O Mosteiro e a freguesia de S. Miguel de Vilarinho! (Concelho de Santo Tirso)*. Vilarinho: Associação de Pais da EB1 de Lage, 2010, doc. 2, p. 108-109.

37 For the document of 1102, see *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 3: *Documentos particulares: A. D. 1101-1115*. Ed. Rui Pinto de Azevedo. Lisbon: Academia Portuguesa da História, 1940, doc. 54. The date of Pombeiro's foundation is still debated by scholars. On this theme, see also Marcelo Mendes Pinto – *Mosteiro de Santa Maria de Pombeiro. Arqueologia*. Felgueiras: Camara Municipal de Felgueiras, 2011, p. 34-35 and José Mattoso – *Ricos-Homens, Infanções e Cavaleiros*. Lisboa: Guimarães Editores, 1985, p. 46-47. Mattoso thinks that the monastery had been founded around the half of the 11th century, and the first documentary evidence would be in 1072.

38 *Censual...*, p. 4.

39 *Censual...*, p. 4.

40 *Censual...*, p. 4.

Telões	Amarante	1120 ⁴¹
Freixo	Amarante	1091 ⁴²
Sanche	Amarante	1120 ⁴³
Mancelos	Amarante	1120 ⁴⁴
Real	Amarante	1120 ⁴⁵
Várzea	Amarante	1120 ⁴⁶
Soalhães	Marco de Canaveses	875 ⁴⁷
Ancede	Baião	1120 ⁴⁸
Vila boa do Bispo	Marco de Canaveses	1120 ⁴⁹
Paço de Sousa	Penafiel	994 ⁵⁰
Pendorada	Marco de Canaveses	1059 ⁵¹
Entre os Rios	Penafiel (?)	1120 ⁵²
Pedroso	Vila Nova de Gaia	1078 ⁵³
Santa Marinha	Vila Nova de Gaia	947 ⁵⁴

It is fascinating to notice how at least thirteen monasteries (almost half of the total) are mentioned for the very first time in the privilege. The list of the monasteries is the most problematic point in the analysis of Calixtus II's *bull*a. The first problem is that the monasteries listed in the privilege of 1120 are not all the monasteries located in the territory of the diocese of Oporto as delimited by Pope Calixtus II. Starting from the research of M. de Oliveira⁵⁵ in the papal document there are more than twenty monasteries “missing”, all documented in sources before 1120:

41 *Censual...*, p. 4.

42 *Cartulário de D. Maior Martins: século XIII*. Ed. Filomeno Amaro Soares da Silva. Arouca: Associação da Defesa do Património Arouquense, 2001, doc. 10.

43 *Censual...*, p. 4.

44 *Censual...*, p. 4.

45 *Censual...*, p. 4.

46 *Censual...*, p. 4.

47 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 8.

48 *Censual...*, p. 4.

49 *Censual...*, p. 4.

50 *Portugalíæ Monumenta Historica. A Sæcvo Octavo Post Christum Vsque Ad Qvintvdecimvm Ivssv Academiæ Scientiarvm Olisiponensis Edita – Diplomata et Chartæ – Chartularia: Livro dos Testamentos do Mosteiro de São Salvador de Paço de Sousa*. Ed. Filipa Lopes e Maria João Oliveira e Silva, Lisboa: Academia das Ciências de Lisboa, 2015, doc. 132.

51 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 416.

52 *Censual...*, p. 4.

53 *Diplomata et Chartæ...*, doc. 552.

54 *Diplomata et Chartæ...*, doc. 12.

55 Miguel de Oliveira – *As paróquias rurais portuguesas: sua origem e formação*. Lisbon: União Gráfica, 1950. See also Domingos Moreira – Freguesias da Diocese do Porto. Elementos onomásticos alti-medievais, *Boletim Cultural da Câmara Municipal do Porto*. 5/6 (1987-1988) 7-53.

2. Table of the missing monastery chronologically ordered.

Monastery	Municipality (Current)	First Documentary record
São João de Ver	Santa Maria da Feira	773 ⁵⁶
Cete	Paredes	882 ⁵⁷
Riba Paiva	Castelo de Paiva	989 (?) ⁵⁸
Azevedo	Ovar (?)	897 ⁵⁹
Santa Marinha	Vila Nova de Gaia	897 ⁶⁰
Lavra	Matosinhos	897 ⁶¹
Sanguedo	Santa Maria da Feira	897 ⁶²
Crestuma	Vila Nova de Gaia	922 ⁶³
Grijó	Vila Nova de Gaia	922 ⁶⁴
Arouca	Arouca	925 ⁶⁵
Aldoar	Oporto	944 ⁶⁶
Vermoim	Maia	1014 ⁶⁷
Anta	Espinho	1018-1026 ⁶⁸
Moreira	Maia	1027 (915) ⁶⁹
Fânzeres	Gondomar	1032 ⁷⁰
Sá	Santa Maria da Feira	1050 ⁷¹
Gião	Santa Maria da Feira	1050 ⁷²
Canedo	Santa Maria da Feira	1055 ⁷³

56 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 454. In the opinion of J. Mattoso there are two further "missing" monasteries: Vila Boa de Quires and Refojos de Riba de Ave (Table 2). See José Mattoso – *O monaquismo ibérico e Cluny*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, 2002, p. 40; 53.

57 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 9.

58 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 157. Oliveira thought was a false document, see Miguel de Oliveira – *As paróquias rurais portuguesas: sua origem e formação...*, p. 197.

59 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 12.

60 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 12.

61 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 12.

62 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 12.

63 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 81.

64 *Le cartulaire Baio-Ferrado du Monastère de Grijó: (XI-XIII siècles)*. Ed. R. Durand, Paris: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. Centro Cultural Português, 1971, doc. 130.

65 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc.746. See also: *O Mosteiro de Arouca: do século X ao século XIII*. Ed. by Maria Helena da Cruz Coelho, Arouca: Camaral Municipal, 1988 (2nd edit.), p. 23.

66 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 54.

67 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 197 (1014).

68 José Mattoso – *O monaquismo...*, p. 54.

69 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, docs. 21 and 262.

70 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 353 (1032).

71 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 378.

72 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 378.

73 José Mattoso – *O monaquismo...*, p. 17.

Cernadelo	Lousada	1059 ⁷⁴
Bustelo	Penafiel	1063 ⁷⁵
<i>Petri</i>	Penafiel (?)	1066 ⁷⁶
Cesar	Oliveira de Azeméis	1068 ⁷⁷
Vilar (San Salvador)	Vila Nova de Gaia	1072 ⁷⁸
Silva Escura	Maia	1077 ⁷⁹
Vila Cova	Vila Nova de Gaia	1081 ⁸⁰
Vilela de São Estevão	Paredes	1085 ⁸¹
Airães	Felgueiras	1090 ⁸²
Vilar (São Isidoro)	Baião	1115 ⁸³

It might be added to this list the monastery of Santo Tirso de Meinedo which is not mentioned in the *bull*a of 1120. This monastery was granted by Afonso Henriques to the Bishop of Oporto Hugh in 1131⁸⁴. In the document Afonso Henriques affirmed that he accorded all his own properties in the land of Sousa, that is the monastery of Santo Tirso de Meinedo⁸⁵, but there is no further information to understand since when the monastery existed and/or if Bishop Hugh already owned a part of it. This point is very important to understand the relations of Hugh with the local monastic communities. A very good example of the complexity of these relations is the case of the abbey of Rio Tinto. This monastery appeared in the privilege of 1120 and it was already mentioned under the authority of Oporto in a document of 1097, when the See was not restored as much⁸⁶. Nevertheless, in 1119 Hugh had received from the patrons of the monastery, Diogo Soares and

74 *Vimaranis monumenta historica: a saeculo nono post Christum usque ad vicesimum: iussu Vimaranensis Senatus edita*. 2 vols. Vimarane: ex typis Antonii Ludovici da Silva Dantas, 1908-1929, doc. 45.

75 Antonio Caetano do Amaral – *Memorias de litteratura portugueza*. Vol. 7. Lisbon: Academia Real das sciencias de Lisboa, 1806, Memoria IV, 181.

76 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 451.

77 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 471.

78 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 504.

79 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 542.

80 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 599.

81 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 642.

82 *Cartulário de D. Maior Martins...*, doc. 10.

83 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 3: *Documentos particulares...*, doc. 504.

84 Santo Tirso di Meinedo (*Censual*, p. 165-166): «Ego infans Adeffonsuss Portugalsium princeps gloriosus. Ffacio testamentum per huius scripturae ffirmitatem de hereditate mea propria quam habeo in terra de Sausa per successionem parentum meorum et auorum. id est monasterium de sancto Tirso de Meinedo vobis domno Hugonj episcopo Portugalsi et ecclesiae portugalsis sedis».

85 *Censual*, p. 165-166.

86 *Diplomata et Chartae*, doc. 857 (18th of August 1097): “ipsius monasterii sancti christofori quod est fondatum secus castrum amae discurente flumine durio in territorio et diocese portugalsense”.

Maior Nunes, only the third part of Rio Tinto⁸⁷. Did Hugh already have the rest of the property? Or did he ask the papal confirmation of a monastery which he only partially owned?

These questions should be asked also in the case of Meinedo, because the archaeological investigation demonstrated that under the current chapel of Santo Tirso (church of Santa Maria de Meinedo) there is evidence of a suebian-visigothic building including, its north-side apse dated of the 6th-7th century⁸⁸. This element deserves deeper studies because the monastery accorded by Afonso Henriques to Hugh was probably more ancient than 1131. The fragmentary documentation before 1120 makes even more difficult to understand when and how Bishop Hugh obtained his rights on some monasteries of the diocese. Another very interesting case is that of Leça. This monastery (accorded to the Hospitallers by "Countess-Queen" Teresa before 1128) was dependent on the abbey of Vacariça (diocese of Coimbra) at least until 1091⁸⁹. In 1122, Hugh gave a fiscal exemption to the monks of Leça⁹⁰: when did Hugh start to control the monastery? Did he receive or inherit those rights from the monastery of Vacariça before 1120 or did Hugh have rights on Leça only after Calixtus II's *bull*⁹¹? We would like to offer an interpretation of this data. If one looks at the list of the monasteries and overlaps it with the diocesan frontiers of Oporto, one could observe how the majority of the monasteries quoted in the privilege are located at the northern and eastern frontiers of the diocese (see map, image n. 3)⁹². Probably in the first years of his pontificate between 1115 and 1120, Hugh realized that these were risky territories at the frontier with the See of Braga and he probably looked for an official papal certification of his possessions. This could explain why important monasteries like Moreira – undoubtedly situated in the territory of the diocese of Oporto – were not inserted in the list of 1120. This monastery were not in a disputed area with other Portuguese Bishops and perhaps Hugh considered it as safe differently from other abbeys located at the boundaries with Braga.

87 *Censual*, p. 156: "Ego Didacus suariz et uxor mea Maior nuniz uobis domno Hugonj Portugalensi episcopo in domino Deo eternam salutem Amen. Denique conueit nobis pura mente et proprio consilio ut faceremus uobis supra memorato textum scripturae firmitatis et Cartulam testationis. sicut et ffacimus uobis ecclesiae uestrae de illo monasterio prenominato santo Cristofforo de Riulo Tincto Testamus uobis inde iija integram cum omnibus pertinentijs suis et adiunctionibus pro Remedio animae nostrae et parentum et auuorum nostrorum ut habeatis et possideatis uos et ecclesia uestra et posteritas successorum uestrorum. usque in perpetuum".

88 Miguel Areosa Rodrigues – Igreja de Santa Maria de Meinedo (Lousada): Intervenção arqueológica (1991-1993). *Oppidum*. 7/6 (2012-2013) 89-104.

89 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 160.

90 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 4: *Documentos particulares: A. D. 1116-1123*. Tomo 1. Ed. Rui Pinto de Azevedo, concluded by Avelino de Jesus da Costa. Lisbon: Academia Portuguesa da História, 1980, doc. 272.

91 Paula Pinto Costa – *A Ordem Militar do Hospital em Portugal: Dos Finais da Idade Média à Modernidade*. Porto: Fundação Eng. António de Almeida, 2000, p. 145-146.

92 Luís Carlos Amaral – *Formação e desenvolvimento do domínio da diocese de Braga no período da Reconquista (século IX-1137)*. Porto: Universidade do Porto (PhD Dissertation), 2007, p. 19, Map 1A and 1B.

Among the monasteries listed in 1120, indeed, there are also Pombeiro and Vilarinho. In Calixtus II's privilege these two monasteries appeared under Hugh's authority, but we have several doubts about the concreteness of Hugh's jurisdiction over them. For example, the monastery of Pombeiro – that J. Mattoso did not consider part of the Diocese of Oporto⁹³ – on August 1st 1112 is clearly considered as a part of the *territorio bracharensi* along the river Vizela. It is true that this document is previous to the restoration of the See of Oporto, but in the text Pombeiro is clearly indicated as a monastery in the territory of Braga and the restoration of the Bishopric of Oporto does not automatically imply Hugh's authority on Pombeiro⁹⁴. In a document dated 1155, for example, King Afonso Henriques donated some lands to Gonçalo de Sousa belonging to the *couto* of Pombeiro⁹⁵. From the description contained in the document it is possible to observe how a part of the *couto* of the monastery clearly was in the territory of the archdiocese of Braga⁹⁶. We have found in a document dated 1216 another element which suggests that Pombeiro was under Braga's authority. In that year the Archbishop of Braga Estêvão Soares da Silva (1212-1228) had a conflict with the Hospitallers knights for the possession of some lands along the river Vizela in the nearby of Pombeiro. Lands that the Archbishop considered as part of his archbishopric⁹⁷. The definitive proof of Pombeiro being under Braga's jurisdiction is in a papal *bull*a from Honorius III. In this document the Pope appointed the bishops of Ourense and Lamego and the abbot of Pombeiro to solve a conflict between the bishop of Coimbra and Évora. In this papal document, Pombeiro is clearly indicated as a monastery of the archdiocese of Braga and there are no references to the diocese of Oporto⁹⁸.

A very similar case is that of São Miguel de Vilarinho. In a document of 1104 this monastery already appeared in Oporto's territory, eight/ten years before the restoration of the diocese⁹⁹. Nevertheless, it is very difficult to establish if Bishop Hugh of Oporto and his successors have ever had an authority over Vilarinho during the 12th century. In his doctoral dissertation on the monastery of Santo

93 José Mattoso – Os cartórios nos mosteiros Beneditinos na Diocese do Porto. *Anuario de estudios medievales*. 1 (1964) 142-143.

94 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 1: *Documentos régios: documentos dos Condes Portucalenses e de D. Afonso Henriques A. D. 1095-1185*. Tomo 1. Ed. Rui Pinto de Azevedo. Lisbon: Academia Portuguesa da História, 1958, doc. 35.

95 For the meaning of the word *couto* see next paragraph.

96 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 1: *Documentos régios...*, doc. 253. Sub monte qui dicitur sancte Crucis territorio bracharensi discurrentibus aquis ad flumen Avizela.

97 *Liber fidei...*, II, doc. 898.

98 PO 7755 (s. d.) = Quinta compilatio Epistolarum Decretalium Honorii III. Ed. Innocent de Ciron, Paris, 1645, Lib. II, Tit. XI, c. 2, p. 126. In 1247 Pombeiro was still indicated as belonging to the archdiocese of Braga, see Domingos Moreira – Freguesias da Diocese do Porto..., p. 52.

99 Concedimus ad aulam Micahelis Archangelis qui era fundata in villa noncupatam Arcucello [...] subtus mons Frugoso (Frugoso) et ribolum Avizella territorio Portugalense. Donazione al monastero; Menendus Presbiter Notuit. Geraldo José Amadeu Coelho Dias et al. – *Vilarinho tem história...*, doc. 2 (1104).

Tirso, F. Carvalho Correia demonstrated how the monastery of São Miguel in the 14th century was still under the authority of the archbishops of Braga¹⁰⁰. In the Arquivo da Torre do Tombo of Lisbon, we have found an unpublished document of 1231 in which the Prior Mendo Peres and the monastic Chapter of Vilarinho asked the Archbishop of Braga the permission to donate some properties to a woman named Maria Peres:

"In D(e) i n(omi)ne. Ego Mene(n)d(us) Pet(ri) p(ri)ori d(e) Villarino cu(m) univ(er)so/ capitulo ei(us)dem et de voluntate patrono(rum) et p(er) (con)cessione(m) Bracaren(s)em eccl(es)ie/ facio k(ar)tam donationis et p(er)petue firmitudinis t(ibi) Marie pet(ri). d'uno casali q(uo)d monast(er)iu(m) de Villarino habet in villa q(ui) vocat(a) Regildi./et e(st) situ(m) in loco q(ui) d(icitu)r Baucu"¹⁰¹.

In this document the monastic community openly referred to the authority of Braga rather than the jurisdiction of Oporto in the first half of the 13th century. Vilarinho would be under Braga's authority until 1882, when the monastery was definitely assigned to the diocese and Oporto¹⁰². Finally, another possible element of proof is constituted by the *Liber ecclesiarum totius regni Portugalie de quibus dominus rex est patronus* (1220-1229), in which Vilarinho – together with the monasteries of Roriz, Mancelos and Pombeiro, all mentioned in the papal privilege of 1120 – is considered as being under Braga's authority¹⁰³.

2.3 Conflicts on northern and southern borders of the diocese

Studying the northern border of the diocese of Oporto, we have found further problematic aspects. In 1964, J. Mattoso published his research on the Benedictine monasteries of the diocese of Oporto. He did not consider, the monastery of São João de Arnoia in the municipality of Celorico de Basto as belonging to the diocese, even if it is listed in papal privilege of 1120¹⁰⁴. The analysis of the frontiers contained in Calixtus II's privilege gives another perspective. In the document there is a reference to the *monte farinae*, nowadays Mount Farinha in the municipality of Mondim do Basto. Arnoia is approximately twenty kilometres southwest from mount Farinha, so the monastery was fully in the territory of Oporto as described in the privilege

100 Francisco Carvalho Correia – *O Mosteiro de Santo Tirso na idade média: a silhueta de uma entidade projectada no chao de uma história milenar*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (PhD dissertation), 2007, p. 363-364.

101 PT/TT/MSMV/A/M01 doc. n. 34.

102 Bernardo de Serpa Marques – O espaço da diocese do Porto: limites e áreas regionais. In *Tempos e Lugares de Memória*, p. 173-185.

103 See *La construction administrative d'un royaume: registres de bénéfices ecclésiastiques portugais (XIII-XIVe siècles)*. Ed. Stéphane Boissellier. Lisboa: CEHR-UCP, 2012, p. 76; 79.

104 José Mattoso – Os cartórios nos mosteiros Beneditinos na Diocese do Porto..., 142-143.

of 1120. Probably Hugh was interested in Arnoia, because near the monastery (four kilometers) there also was a castle built between the 10th and the 11th centuries¹⁰⁵. For Bishop Hugh it might have been important to control a fortified point in a mountain zone and in a territory disputed with the Archbishops of Braga¹⁰⁶. Finally, by observing the frontiers established by the papal *bull*a of 1120, we consider very suspect the presence in the list of the monastery of Antime. It is because this abbey is completely out of the boundaries established by the same papal privilege. If, on the one side, Pope Calixtus II was just certifying Hugh's requests and he did not necessarily know all the details of the local situation, on the other this could be considered another attempt by the Bishop of Oporto to extend his authority against the See of Braga.

The situation of the southern border was even more complicated, because of the conflicts between Bishop Hugh and the Bishops of Coimbra Gonçalo and Bernardo. During his pontificate, Hugh unsuccessfully tried to extend his jurisdiction south of Douro as in the case of his failed attempts to control the vacant See of Lamego¹⁰⁷. On April 12th 1116, Paschalis II accorded to Hugh the administration of the aforementioned See¹⁰⁸, but two months after (June 18th 1116) he revoked his decision because of the protests of the Bishop of Coimbra¹⁰⁹. On February 24th 1117, after the Council of Burgos (18th February 1117¹¹⁰), the cardinal-legate Boso of Saint Anastasia ordered Bishop Hugh and Bishop Gonçalo to solve their conflict and reach a friendly agreement. Cardinal Boso also obliged Hugh to return the diocese of Lamego to Coimbra and, even worse, Boso established the border between the two dioceses in the Douro River according to the See of Oporto only some specific properties legitimately acquired south of the border¹¹¹. In this way, Hugh lost what he had apparently obtained with the aforementioned *bull*a of 1115 *Egregias Quondam* of Paschalis II. The only «positive» result for Hugh was the donation granted by Gonçalo of Coimbra at Burgos on 24th February 1117

105 Maria Leonor Botelho; Nuno Resende – Castelo de Arnoia: Celorico de Basto. In *Rota do Românico*. Ed. Lúcia Rosas. Lousada: Centro de Estudos do Românico e do Território, 2014. Vol. 1, p. 147-172.

106 For a general overview on the defensive structures see Mário Jorge Barroca – Prope Littore maris: o sistema defensivo da orla litoral da diocese do Porto (séc. IX a XII). In *Um poder entre poderes...*, p. 197-243. Mário Jorge Barroca – Do castelo da reconquista ao castelo românico (Séc. IX ao XII). *Portvgalia*. XI-XII (1990-91) 89-136. Mário Jorge Barroca – Da reconquista a D. Dinis. In *Nova História militar de Portugal*. Vol. 1. Ed. Manuel Themudo Barata and Nuno Severiano Teixeira. Coord. José Mattoso. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, 2003, p. 21-162

107 Maria Cristina Cunha – Os limites da Diocese do Porto..., p. 159.

108 The *bull*a *Apostolicae Sedis* (Alba, April 12th 1116), see *Livro Preto...*, doc. 606.

109 The *bull*a *Fratrum nostrorum* (Palliano, June 18th 1116) revoked the *Apostolicae Sedis*. *Livro Preto...*, docs. 605, 614 and 629.

110 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 624. Carl Erdmann – *Papsturkunden in Portugal* (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.Phil. –Hist. Kl. Neue Folge 20). Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1927, doc. 8.

111 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 597. *Papsturkunden in Portugal...*, doc. 19.

(a donation «pro asequenda pace») of the church of Santa Maria do Olival (municipality of Vila de Nova de Gaia)¹¹² which is also listed in the *bull*a of 1120¹¹³.

For these reasons the papal *bull*a of 1120 was a temporary victory for Hugh. The privilege established again the frontier between Oporto and Coimbra at the river Antuã north from Aveiro; this implies an extension to the south of the diocese of Oporto in an area under the influence of Coimbra since the 6th century¹¹⁴. For example, on April 13th 1113 Countess of Portugal Teresa Alfonso attributed the hermit of Crestuma to the authority of Coimbra¹¹⁵. This hermit was located along the Douro River (municipality of Vila Nova de Gaia), this means that in 1113 the frontier between Oporto and Coimbra was still the same as mentioned in the *Parochiale Suevorum*¹¹⁶. This detail is even more significant because on April 1113 Hugh was in charge as Bishop and he swore fidelity to the Archbishop of Braga Maurice "Bourdin" on the 23rd of March of the same year¹¹⁷. In this context it is plausible that Gonçalo of Coimbra immediately wanted to defend the traditional border of his diocese before an eventual Hugh's intervention. In a document of the monastery of Pedroso (located south of Duero) dated 29th December 1118, we have found a reference to the authority of the bishop of Coimbra: *regnante principe nostra regina Tarasia portugalense et antiste nostro Gundisalvus colimbriensis*. This is a very important detail because this document is posterior the *bull*a of 1115 when Hugh of Oporto tried for the first time to extend his authority south of Duero and in the *bull*a of 1120 Pedroso is in the list of the monasteries belonging to Oporto¹¹⁸. Bishop Gonçalo's strategy seems to be the same of Maurice "Bourdin" of Braga, who on December 4th 1114 asked and obtained by Pope Paschalis II the *bull*a called *Sicut Iniusta* as we have previously noticed¹¹⁹. The restoration of the See of Oporto worried all of the other Portuguese bishops.

The privilege of 1120 altered the situation especially in the southern border also because the new frontier offered the opportunity to Hugh and eventually to his successors to claim their authority even on all the monasteries south from the Douro, in the lands confirmed by Calixtus II. One of the most evident examples of

112 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 597.

113 *Censual...*, p. 4.

114 *Liber Fidei...*, I, docs. 10-11.

115 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 405.

116 *Liber Fidei...*, I, docs. 10-11. See also See Pierre David – *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal: du VI^e au XIII^e siècle...*, p. 78-79. On these conflicts, see the excellent work of Maria Cristina Cunha and of the same author – *Coimbra and Porto...*, p. 138-140.

117 *Liber Fidei...*, II, doc. 589.

118 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 4: *Documentos particulares...*, doc. 79. On the problem of the southern frontier between Oporto and Coimbra, see the papal intervention of August 20th 1115, also Carl Erdmann – *Papsturkunden in Portugal...*, doc. 14.

119 *Liber Fidei...*, I, doc. 554

this instability is represented by the case of Grijó. This ancient monastery founded by the Abbot *Gotierre* and his brother *Ausindus* in the 10th century¹²⁰ should have been under Hugh's authority¹²¹, but sources give us a different situation. In a document dated April 1132, Bernard Bishop of Coimbra (1128-1147) together with John Prior of Grijó accorded to the priest Peter and the Patron of Grijó, Nuno Soares, the exemption from the payment of the tributes due to Bishops of Coimbra («de eadem ecclesia [Grijó] ut sempre sit libera et non ex debito aliquid tributi nobis nostrisque successoribus in perpetuum reddenda»)¹²². This document shows the attempt by Bishop Bernard of Coimbra to manifest a sort of authority on Grijó, but R. Durand, the editor of the cartulary of Baio-Ferrado in which the document of 1132 is preserved, suspected this document of falsity because of the absence of subscriptors¹²³. Nonetheless, we have other sources showing proximity and conflicts between Coimbra and Grijó. In 1137 Bishop of Oporto John Peculiar – Hugh's first successor – tried to cut any link between Grijó and Coimbra by giving Prior Tructesindus an exemption from any episcopal authority. In the document, in fact, John Peculiar referred to a controversy between Coimbra and Grijó for the possession of the land of Santa Maria:

“cum terra de Sancta Maria colimbriane diocesis esset, ab episcopo illius sedis, Bernardo, talem libertatem consequuti sum, ut totam fere terram Sancte Maria sue ditioni subderent, unde postea maxima discordia inter prefatum episcopum et ipsos canonicos orta est”¹²⁴.

Bishop John did not introduce himself as the diocesan ordinary of Grijó – he affirmed to give this exemption in the name of Jesus Christ and by the authority of Saint Peter (“in nomine Domini nostri Jhesu Christi et ex auctoritate beati Petri apostolorum principis”¹²⁵) –, but this help in favor of Grijó against Coimbra could be considered as an implicit affirmation of Oporto's authority, because if Bishop John could accord the privilege, he also might claim the right to revoke it. In the privilege of 1137 there are no references to the papal *bull*a of 1120, but it is possible that the strategy led by John Peculiar was an example of the attempt by the Bishops

120 *Le cartulaire Baio-Ferrado...*, doc. 130.

121 On May 22nd 1128 Queen Teresa gave the monastery of Grijó the *carta de couto*. The privilege was confirmed by Hugh of Oporto – see p. 15 “Hugo Portugalensis (ee) episcopus, conf.» –.” and, as observed by Maria Cristina Cunha, there is no reference to the Bishop of Coimbra, see *Le cartulaire Baio-Ferrado*, doc. 6 and Maria Cristina Cunha – Coimbra and Porto..., p. 141. See also José Marques – As doações dos condes portucalenses e d. Afonso Henriques a Igreja. In *Sociedade, Administração, Cultura e Igreja no séc. XII*. Vol. 5. Guimarães: Câmara Municipal de Guimarães, 1996, in particular p. 343.

122 *Le cartulaire Baio-Ferrado...*, doc. 4, See also José Augusto de Sottomayor Pizarro – *Os patronos do mosteiro de Grijó. Evolução e estrutura da família nobre (séc. XI-XIV)*. Ponte de Lima: Edições Carvalhos de Basto, Lda, 1995, p. 119-1124.

123 *Le cartulaire Baio-Ferrado...*, p. 10.

124 *Le cartulaire Baio-Ferrado...*, doc. 5.

125 *Le cartulaire Baio-Ferrado...*, doc. 5.

of Oporto to manipulate the political and patrimonial dynamics south of the Douro River in their favor. The Bishops of Coimbra Gonçalo and Bernard always tried to deny access to this area to the bishops of Oporto. It is not a coincidence that in 1121, 1125 and 1135 the Bishops of Coimbra asked and obtained the papal confirmation of the disposition against Oporto taken at the Council of Burgos of 1117¹²⁶.

This situation could have been very uncomfortable for Prior *Tructesindus*, who asked Pope Innocent II to confirm this exemption. On April 27th 1139 Innocent II accorded this privilege to *Tructesindus* and put Grijó under the protection of Saint Peter and the Holy See by the payment of an annual *census* of two maravedis («ecclesiam Sancti Salvatoris de Ecclesiola sub censu annuo duorum morabitorum in beati Petri protectione ac nostra suscipimus»). In this way the community of Grijó had a papal confirmation which defended them from new possible claims from Coimbra or a revision of the exemption by the successors of John Peculiar¹²⁷. Grijó is recorded, in fact, in the *Liber Censuum* written by *Cencius Camerarius* (future Pope Honorius III) among the *censualia* of the Apostolic See. Grijó is the monastery located in the diocese of Oporto called in the *Liber Censuum* «Ecclesiola» («In Episcopatu Portugalensi. Canonica que vocatur Ecclesiola II marabutinos»), the latin name of Grijó which was not identified by the editors of the source¹²⁸.

These examples illustrate how the papal privileges of Paschalis II and Calixtus II are not reliable representations of the territory of the diocese of Oporto; they were, on the one hand, another step forward for the Apostolic See to improve its right of intervention in the local conflicts of north-western Iberian Peninsula, and on the other the reflection of Hugh's interests and patrimonial goals. Not all of the monasteries were in the list as we noticed, and at the same time some monasteries were not under Hugh's authority and he was just trying to acquire legitimation from popes for its internal policies against his neighbours, Braga and Coimbra. So, how was really organized the territory of the diocese of Oporto?

126 *Livro Preto...*, doc. 593 (February 1st 1125, *Bulla aequitatis et justitiae* by Honorius II); doc. 594 (May 26th 1135, *Bulla Officii nostri* by Innocent II); doc. 598 (August 25th 1121, Cardinal Boso's intervention at Sahagún). See also Miguel de Oliveira – O senhorio da cidade do Porto e as primeiras questões com os Bispos. *Lusitania Sacra*. 4 (1959) 40-41.

127 *Le cartulaire Baio-Ferrado...*, doc. 1; for its confirmation see docs. 2 (1144) and 3 (1148). See also Maria Alegria Marques – Entre restauração e afirmação..., p. 343-360, in particular p. 353.

128 *Le liber Censuum de l'Église Romaine*. Vol. 2. Ed. Paul Fabre e Louis Duchesne. Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1889, p. 222 and footnote n. 3 for the missing identification of Grijó. For the origin of the name "Grijó", see Grijó, em *Grande Enciclopédia Portuguesa e Brasileira*. XII. Lisboa: Editorial Enciclopédia, 1940, p. 782. On this theme see also B. Wiedemann – The Papal Camera and the Monastic Census. Evidence from Portugal, c.1150-1190. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*. 126 (2015) 181-196.

3. Main features of the organization of the diocese of Oporto

3.1 Countess-Queen Teresa's foral (1120): Hugh and the borough of Oporto

After the death of Count of Portugal Henry of Burgundy in 1112, the main political figure was his wife Countess-Queen Teresa¹²⁹, even because their son Afonso Henriques was only three at that time. In 1120, the *Regina* Teresa accorded to Hugh the *Couto* over the borough of Oporto¹³⁰. The terms *Couto* and borough deserve further explanations. The word *Couto* between the 9th and the 13th century defined both the jurisdiction, the collection of some specific taxes, service benefits and the exemption from the royal or comital officers like “meirinhos”, “mordomos” or judges¹³¹. This means that in the area delimited by Teresa's privilege, Hugh was the landlord of the only borough of the diocese and he could administrate justice. Moreover, when Teresa granted the full control over the borough, she did not mean the whole area of Oporto, but she delimited precise borders including the fortified area in the nearby of the Cathedral, as well as the north and east territories such as Paranhos and *Castrum Luneta* in Noeda, Campanhã, near the modern railway station¹³². It is very interesting to notice the fact that under the jurisdiction of Hugh there was a castle existing from at least 1072¹³³. Furthermore, the civil power granted by Teresa allowed Hugh to give a “foral” (a privilege which regulated administration, exemptions and duties of a community) to the inhabitants, present and future, of the borough («quod hominibus in portugalensi burgo abitantibus vel qui ad abitandum venerit»¹³⁴). In this way, Hugh had the right to accord specific privileges to the *burgenses* who might recognize his authority in change, even if M. H. Da Cruz Coelho considered the clause concerning the exclusive obedience of the *burgenses* to Bishop Hugh as an addition of the 13th century to the original document¹³⁵.

The definition of the frontiers is very important because it is possible to observe that all along the west frontier of the *Couto* the area under Hugh's

129 On the “royal” title of Teresa see Luís Carlos Amaral and Mário Jorge Barroca – *A Condessa-Rainha: D. Teresa*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, 2012, p. 133-154; 175; 187-195; 198-207; 209-214; 274-286.

130 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 1: *Documentos régios...*, doc. 53.

131 Geraldo José Amadeu Coelho Dias – Na variedade dos foros, a singularidade dos coutos beneditinos: generosidade régia e poder monástico. *Revista de Guimarães*. 106 (1996) 275-297.

132 Mário Jorge Barroca – *Prope Littore maris...*, p. 240.

133 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 500.

134 Miguel de Oliveira – O senhorio da cidade do Porto e as primeiras questões com os Bispos..., doc. III. On the *Foral* or *Fuero* see José Perona – Notas para la recepción textual de un fuero medieval. Segunda aproximación a las escrituras de las tradiciones forales. *Cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale*. 22 (1998) 271-284.

135 Maria Helena da Cruz Coelho – O foral do Porto, concedido pelo bispo D. Hugo, no contexto da política foraleira do período condal. In *Um poder entre poderes...*, p. 333-335.

jurisdiction bordered with the properties of the monastery of Cedofeita. This monastery and its goods were outside of the *Couto* of 1120, but when Hugh asked Calixtus II for a privilege in the same year he also included it in the monasteries list, as we have demonstrated above. This might be another proof of how Hugh of Oporto might use the papal privilege to extend his power on lands and ecclesiastical rents he could not practically control or collect. The relation between the monastery of Cedofeita and the See of Oporto was still deeply ambiguous during the first half of the 13th century. For example, in 1227 Pope Honorius III intervened to solve a conflict between the Abbot of Cedofeita and the Oporto Cathedral Chapter for the payment of a specific fee called *signa nobilium*¹³⁶. Honorius ordered the Abbot to pay, and this decision was particularly relevant because the *signa nobilium* ("the Signs of the Nobles") might be interpreted as a specific right or a fee paid by the local inhabitants, vassals and/or any person under the rule of a landlord. If so, the Canons' request to pay this fee was an implicit affirmation of the lordship of the See of Oporto on the monastery of Cedofeita¹³⁷.

This episode could also reveal a fracture in the community of Cedofeita in the first quarter of the 13th century. In the aforementioned case of the payment of the *signa nobilium*, it is evident that the majority or the most important part of the monks were against this decision, if the Cathedral Canons asked the Pope to find a solution, but not everyone seemed to have the same interests. For example, Nuno Soares, the priest (*prelatus*) of the Church of São Martinho de Cedofeita (that is the monastery of Cedofeita church) also was a member of the Cathedral Chapter of Oporto. In April 1227, Nuno granted the Canons the patronage on the Church of Santa Maria de Campanhã¹³⁸. The Bishops and the Chapter of Oporto were connected with this church apparently since 1120, when Teresa testified in an

136 *Censual...*, p. 14 «Eapropter dilecti in domino filij vestris iustis precibus inclinati diffinitivam sententiam pro nobis contra Abbatem de Citofecta super quibusdam redditibus qui signa Nobilium vulgariter appellantur a Venerabili fratre nostro Portugalensi episcopo non ex delegatione nostra pro latam sicut est iusta nec legitima prouocatione suspensa auctoritate apostolica confirmamus et presentis scripti patrocinio communitus». The document should be released at the beginning of 1227, because Pope Honorius III died on 18th March of that year.

137 Also the famous portuguese diplomatist João Pedro Ribeiro interpreted this expression as a right, see *Dissertacoes chronologicas e criticas sobre a historia e jurisprudencia ecclesiastica e civil de Portugal, publicadas por ordem da academia R. das Sciencias de Lisboa*. Vol. 5. Lisboa: Academia Real das Sciencias, 1836, Dissertação XIX, p. 9. See also José Ignacio de la Torre Rodríguez – Hugo de Oporto..., p. 447.

138 *Censual...*, p. 81 «Notum sit omnibus tam presentibus quam ffuturis quod Ego Nuno suarij. Prelatus ecclesiae santi Martinij de Citofecta et Canonicus ecclesiae sedis Portugalensis ssanus mente et corpore existens ex mea spontanea volumptate Ffacio cartam donationis et perpetuae firmitudinis dictae ecclesiae beatae Mariae sedis Portugalensis. et uobis domno Martino eiusdem episcopo». There are also two original copies of this document: Arquivo distrital do Porto (ADP), Cartório CAB, Livros dos Originaes, 1670 (12), fl.19 and Arquivo distrital do Porto (ADP), Cartório CAB, Pergaminhos Avulsos, 1658, fl.4.

agreement between Bishop Hugh and the *heredes*¹³⁹ of the church of Campanhã¹⁴⁰. We have serious doubts on the reliability of this document conserved only in a copy preserved in the *Censual do Cabido da Sé do Porto*, a cartulary produced in the 14th century. There is, in fact, a reference to Maurice “Bourdin” as the Archbishop of Braga¹⁴¹, but this is a mistake, because in 1120 Maurice was no longer in Braga: he was in Rome or Sutri as the Antipope Gregory VIII¹⁴². Furthermore, it is unconvincing that both Teresa and Hugh were not informed of Maurice’s destiny. On March 25th 1118 Pope Gelasius II sends a letter to all the Bishop of *Hispania*, to inform them of what happened in Rome¹⁴³. Gelasius II was forced to leave the city by the intervention of King of Germany and Emperor Henry V who elected in his place Maurice “Bourdin” as the new pope after the death of Paschalis II (January 1118)¹⁴⁴. Gelasius II excommunicated both Henry and Maurice and he ordered the Iberian Bishops to elect a new Archbishop of Braga. The choice fell on Paio Mendes (1118-1137), who already appeared as Archbishop during the year 1118¹⁴⁵. In this specific context the donation of Nuno Soares is even more significant because the Bishop of Oporto surely obtained some kind of authority on the church of Campanhã only in the first decades of the 13th century¹⁴⁶.

3.2 Territorial organization of the countryside

If it is possible to notice a complex structure for the borough of Oporto in the countryside, the three keywords to understand the organization of the rural space of the diocese are *villa*, river and *mons*. The *villa* in the medieval Portuguese context is a housing nucleus probably derived from the structure of the Roman *villa rustica*. In the case of the diocese of Oporto, we did not find defensive elements related with these specific villages. The Portuguese *villa* is very different from the norther-Italian *villas* studied by F. Menant, who identified the term as a housing nucleus rising

139 The term *heredes* indicates a heterogenous social group composed by people with different social backgrounds who have rights on a good inherited by their families which they fully or partially owned. See Esther Pascua Echegaray – Vasallos y Aliados con conflictos: las relaciones entre Santa María de Montederramo y la sociedad local gallega del siglo XIII. In *Transacciones sin mercado: instituciones, propiedad y redes sociales en la Galicia monástica, 1200-1300*. Ed. Reyna Pastor de Togneri. Madrid: CSIC, 1999, p. 44.

140 *Censual...*, p. 79-80 «Haec est conventio quae est ffaucta per ffirmatatem huius scripturae quae est ffaucta per Religiosam domnam Reginam Tarassiam inter episcopum Hugonem et haeredes de ecclesia Sanctae Mariae de Campanaa».

141 *Censual...*, p. 80 «Ffacta Cartula uenditionis siue libertatis. IIJ. Semptembris Era M.aCL.aVIIJ.a Ego Mauricius Bracharensis Archiepiscopus confirmo».

142 Mary Stroll – *Calixtus II...*, p. 52-57; 329-332.

143 JL 4886 (Gaeta March 25th 1118) = Gelasii II papae ep. VI, PL CLXIII, coll. 491.

144 Glauco Maria Cantarella – Pasquale II, papa. In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/papa-pasquale-ii_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/ [consulted on-line 24.3.2018].

145 *Liber Fidei...*, II, doc. 582 (6th December 1118). Luís Carlos Amaral – *Formação e desenvolvimento...*, p. 447-451.

146 For the relations between Campanhã and Oporto in the 13th century see L. C. Amaral – A. Marques, Poder episcopal e património senhorial no século XIII: o caso de Santa Maria de Campanhã. In *A Igreja e o clero...*, p. 65-74.

around a *castrum* with some defensive elements¹⁴⁷. Documents indicate the location of the *villas* through their relations with the local high grounds (*mons*) and rivers. In particular, the rivers are used as a mean to better define the geographical position of a *villa*. The main meaning of the word *mons* is obviously 'a high ground,' but it might also refer to a *castrum* or a defensive enclosure. In northern Portugal, many medieval castles were restored Iron Age fortifications belonging to the so-called "cultura castreja". Therefore, the typical space organization scheme we found in sources is the name of the *villa*; the *mons* under the *villa* stands; the indication of the river to detail the *villa*'s position and finally we found the indication of the macro-area (*territorium*), ecclesiastical or civil¹⁴⁸. See the following examples:

"Villar de Porcos subtus mons Faro discurrente ribulo Kabadon territorio Portugalense prope litore maris"¹⁴⁹;

"Baselica sita est [...] in villa Palacioli subtus mons Ordinis discurrente rivolo Sausa territorio Portugalense"¹⁵⁰;

"In villa que vocitant Poiares et ecclesie Sancte Marie Penna Longa cum suis terminis subtus castello Beuiuer territorio ecclesie Portugalensis discurrente flumen Dorii"¹⁵¹.

The word *territorium* is very ambiguous. It could indicate a political, ecclesiastical or military territory. The only way to establish the meaning of this term is the analysis of the historical context and the information given by sources. For example, in a document dated 870 of the monastery of São Miguel (municipality of Guimarães) we have found the expression *territorio bracarensis urbium portugalensis*. In our opinion, in this case, *territorium* has an ecclesiastical meaning and it indicates the diocese of Braga, while *urbium* has a political meaning and it might refer to the county of *Portucale* created after the occupation of Oporto by Vimara Peres in 868¹⁵². Another good example in defining what *territorium* means is the case of the locality of Lamas de Arouca (municipality of Arouca, mentioned for the first time

147 François Menant – Dai Longobardi agli esordi del comune. In *Storia economica e sociale di Bergamo. I primi millenni. Dalla Preistoria al Medioevo*. Vol. 2, tomo I. Ed. Maria Fortunati and Raffaella Poggiani Keller. Bergamo: Fondazione per la Storia Economica e Sociale di Bergamo, 1997, p. 747.

148 Carlos Alberto Ferreira de Almeida – *Castelologia medieval de Entre-Douro-e-Minho: desde as origens a 1220*. Trabalho complementar para prestação de provas de Doutoramento em História de Arte. Porto: FLUP, 1978 and Mário Jorge Barroca – Fortificações e Povoamento no Norte de Portugal (Séc. IX a XI). *Portvgalia*. Nova Série, XXV (2004) 181-203. For a general overview on medieval *villas* in north-west Iberian Peninsula see María Pallares Méndez and Ermelindo Portela Silva – La investigación histórica sobre la Edad Media de Galicia. *Semata*. 5 (1993) 73-106.

149 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 3: *Documentos particulares...*, doc. 420 (January 29th 1113).

150 *Livro dos testamentos de Paço de Sousa*, doc. 115 (April 23rd 1115).

151 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 1: *Documentos régios...*, doc. 108 (January 31st 1130-December 31st 1130).

152 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 5. «baselica sita et fundata est in villa negrelus territorio bracarensis urbium portugalensis secum sancte marie subtus mons cauallus prope riuulum haue». For a general overview on Vimara Peres and his family, see José Mattoso – *As famílias condais portugalenses dos séculos X e XI*. Porto: Instituto de Alta Cultura/ Centro de Estudos Humanísticos, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, 1970, p. 11 and ss.

in 1088¹⁵³) during the 12th century. Several times (1119, 1121, 1127, 1154)¹⁵⁴, Lamas is indicated as belonging to *the territorio Arauca* which was a military district (*terra*, see the explication below). At the same time, Lamas is also referred to as part of the *territorio colimbriensis* in 1143¹⁵⁵, and as *territorio lamecensis* after the restoration of the episcopal See of Lamego in 1147 (1152, 1159, 1193); in both cases *territorium* has to be interpreted as the diocesan territory¹⁵⁶. In some cases, sources are clearer and after the word *territorium* we have its explanation as in the case of an unpublished document of the monastery of Pendorada, which in 1134 is indicated in «Territorio Diocesi Portugalensis Ecclesie»¹⁵⁷. The *villa* was not the only territorial division. In sources, there is also the term “locus”, which might indicate a specific part of the *villa*.

“In villa Moraria in loco predito Quintaella subtus mons Faro discurrente rio Leca territorio Purtukal prope litore maris”¹⁵⁸.

Another important feature of the Portuguese rural space is the *casal*, from the Latin *casalis* (rural estate). *Casal* does not only indicate housing unit with its lands (*fundus*), but a familiar unit of population and exploration/exploitation of a territory¹⁵⁹. For example, Hugh of Oporto on September 11th 1116 exchange a part of his rights over the monastery of Paço de Sousa with three *casais* situated in the locality of *Ceidones* (municipality of Penafiel) and one *casal* located in Piães (municipality of Cinfães)¹⁶⁰. Another example is the following:

“In illo casal de Figaria [...] subtus mons Ordinis discurrente rivulo Bolpeliars territorio Portugalensis”¹⁶¹.

There is a further element to highlight: the *terras*. During the rule of King Fernando I of León-Castile (+1065), it is possible to observe a transformation of the territorial administrative division from a system based on the roman *civitas* to another one based on smaller units the so-called *terras*¹⁶². The *terras* were military districts entrusted to the aristocrats (the *tenentes*), who administrated these

153 *Diplomata et Chartae...*, doc. 712.

154 *Cartulário de D. Maior Martins...*, doc. 49 (1119). *O Mosteiro de Arauca...*, doc. 25 (1121). *Cartulário de D. Maior Martins...*, docs. 46 and 47 (the second document is a copy of the first, 1121). *O Mosteiro de Arauca...*, docs. 45; 53 (1127); 115 (1154).

155 *O Mosteiro de Arauca...*, doc. 81.

156 *O Mosteiro de Arauca* *Cartulário de D. Maior Martins, Cartulário de D. Maior Martins, Espaço, poder e memória: A Catedral de Lamego, sécs. XII a XX*

157 PT/TT/MSJBP/004/0008 doc. 9.

158 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 3: *Documentos particulares...*, doc. 469 (March 31st 1114).

159 André Evangelista Marques – *O casal: uma unidade de organização social do espaço no Entre-Douro-e-Lima (906-1200)*. Noia: Toxosoutos, 2008, p. 21-24.

160 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 4: *Documentos particulares, ...*, doc. 20 (September 11th 1116).

161 *Livro dos Testamentos do Mosteiro de São Salvador de Paço de Sousa...*, doc. 110 (July 6th 1113).

162 Mário Jorge Barroca – *Do castelo da reconquista ao castelo românico...*, p. 91-92 and 115-126.

territories on the behalf of the Leonese-Castilian monarchs. The *tenentes* resided in the main castle of a specific *terra* known as "cabeça-de terra" (head of the land)¹⁶³. For example, when Queen-Countess Teresa accorded the *Couto* to the monastery of São Pedro de Cete (municipality of Paredes), two *tenentes* – Egas Gondesindiz of Baião and Soeiro Mendes of *Aquilar* – confirmed the privilege together with Bishop Hugh¹⁶⁴. Other examples are:

"In terra de Bem Viver territorio Portugalis"¹⁶⁵;

"Illa ecclesia Sancti Bartolomei [...] habet iacenciam in terra de Baiam rivo Ovuil territorio Portugalensi sub monte Genestazo"¹⁶⁶.

It is very easy to observe the complexity of the territorial organization in the County of Portugal at the beginning of the 12th century. These structures are completely absent in the papal documents which should be considered for their political value and their implications once they were used to modify the local balances between Bishops or Kings of the Iberian Peninsula.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we have tried to give a better approximation of the territory of the diocese of Oporto after its restoration under Bishop Hugh, and the main features of the local territorial organization in the 12th century. First, we have analyzed the papal *bullae* of Paschalis II and Calixtus II, showing how these documents are not representative of the real authority and patrimony of Hugh of Oporto. Their value is not factual; it is *political* for both Bishop Hugh and the Roman Popes. These *bullae* show two very important processes: the territorialization of the Episcopal power and the tight relation between the Apostolic See and the See of Oporto immediately after its restoration. On the one side, Hugh was interested in defining a territory, a space in which he could exercise his rights. On the other, both Paschalis II and Calixtus II reinforced the idea of the Papacy as the apex and the coordinator of all the churches of Christianity, an idea which included also the right to create and define the territory of a diocese. This relation was bilateral and both Bishop Hugh and the Popes benefitted from this connection. Papal privileges were political instruments used by Bishop Hugh to improve his jurisdiction in his own diocese and to manage the relations with his neighbors. This is a very important point, especially because Hugh needed to consolidate his position and find new allies in a very difficult area

163 Leontina Ventura – *A Nobreza de Corte de Afonso III*. Vol. 2. Coimbra: FLUC (PhD Dissertation), 1992, p. 997-1038.

164 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 1: *Documentos régios...*, doc. 58 (1121-1128).

165 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 4: *Documentos particulares...*, doc. 347 (April 24th 1123).

166 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 1: *Documentos régios...*, doc. 101 (July 28th 1129).

to administrate during a period of deep and quick transformations. Local alliances and political bargaining were tightly connected to the contemporary contingencies. Bishops could reach an agreement against or in favor of one of them – like in the case of Toledo and Braga fighting for the diocese of León –, but these agreements were often momentary and they did not end local conflicts for land rights or diocesan borders. Moreover, even if he had direct contacts with Countess-Queen Teresa and he subscribed documents under Alfonso Henriques, Hugh does not appear connected to the local nobility in the sources we have studied¹⁶⁷. Noblemen seem more interested in their monasteries than in the diocese of Oporto and its Bishop, who probably in a first phase had to look for an external support offered by the Roman Church to have the certification of his rights in order to proceed with his political strategies¹⁶⁸. The Iberian Bishops, in fact, on many occasions during the 12th century appealed to Rome to solve their conflicts, especially after the restoration of the local dioceses. The Apostolic See was very interested in obtaining recognition of its authority, its primacy and its right to intervene in the local Episcopal conflicts. The Roman popes could also have the political goal to “convert” a Bishop like Hugh, for example, in a sort of permanent Roman legate in Portugal. Hugh could become a trustful ally in a very far and complex territory like the Iberian Peninsula where the papacy had not enough economical means to send a legate every year. According a privilege was not a disinterested act of charity. The popes used them to reinforce and to disseminate more and more the idea of the *primatus romanus* and to establish a connection with whoever received these *bullae*. The local Iberian Bishops, very receptive to the Roman authority, could offer a reliable political and strategic network for the Apostolic See. The popes needed legitimation as well as bishops or kings; the papacy of the beginning of the 12th century was very far from the powerful, centralized structure of the following centuries¹⁶⁹. In other words, they needed one another and this is maybe an interesting perspective to study the relations between Rome and Portugal. For these reasons and as a final reflection, we think that papal privileges should be read for their political meanings and implications to understand how the local bishops and the Roman popes built their authority and jurisdiction in medieval Iberia, more than using them as reliable representation of a territory or as a mere reference for geographical data.

167 *Documentos medievais portugueses*. Vol. 1: *Documentos régios...*, docs. 93, 98, 108, 121 and 124.

168 José Augusto de Sottomayor Pizarro – *Aristocracia e mosteiros na rota do românico. A senhoriação dos vales do Sousa, Tâmega e Douro (séc. XI a XIII)*. Lousada: Centro de estudos do românico e do território, 2014, p. 25-27.

169 Glauco Maria Cantarella – *Il sole e la luna...*, p. 46-70; 100; 237; 331-335. Carl Erdmann – *O Papado e Portugal...*, p. 4-5; 43; 60-63; 71. Richard Alexander Fletcher – *The Episcopate...*, p. 188.

3. Map of the monasteries of the diocese of Oporto and the churches of Olival and Custoias.

