

THE PAPACY AND THE BISHOPS OF PORTO BETWEEN THE TWELFTH AND THE THIRTEENTH CENTURIES: SOME PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

FRANCESCO RENZI*

ANDREA MARIANI**

Abstract: *The aim of this paper is to offer a general overview on the sources related to the relationships between the bishopric of Porto and the Papacy between the twelfth and the thirteenth century. After the intense diplomatic work of bishop Hugo (1112/1114-1136), who established a connection with the Apostolic See, the clergy of the diocese of Porto became a trusted collaborator of the Roman Curia in the northwestern Iberian Peninsula. Through papal documents, we will try to understand how the relation with Rome evolved and affected the local dynamics between the bishops of Porto, the powers of the territory, both religious and civil, and the kings of Portugal.*

Keywords: *papal documents; Apostolic See; diocese of Porto; kings of Portugal; local church.*

Resumo: *O objetivo deste artigo é oferecer uma visão geral sobre as fontes relativas às relações entre o bispado do Porto e o papado entre os séculos XII e XIII. Após o intenso trabalho diplomático de D. Hugo (1112/1114-1136), que estabeleceu uma ligação com a Sé Apostólica, o clero da diocese do Porto tornou-se uma das referências da Cúria Romana no noroeste da Península Ibérica. Através dos documentos papais, tentaremos compreender como a relação com Roma evoluiu e afetou as dinâmicas locais entre os bispos do Porto, os poderes do território, tanto religiosos como civis, e os reis de Portugal.*

Palavras-chave: *documentos papais; Sé Apostólica; diocese do Porto; reis de Portugal; igreja local.*

I. This paper has two main objectives. First, it aims at offering a first survey of papal documents related to the diocese of Porto between the twelfth and the thirteenth century. Second, the article will show some of the potential research perspectives on the relations between the Papacy and the bishops of Porto in the decades following the definitive restoration of the Portuguese bishopric in 1112-1114. The diocese of Porto offers a particularly interesting case study for analysing relations between two

* FLUP-CITCEM (UID/04059/2025; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54499/UID/04059/2025>); UCP-CEHR. This article was initially submitted when I was an Integrated Researcher at CEHR (DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54499/DL57/2016/CP1485/CT0013>). The peer review process and the final version of this article were delivered when I was already an Integrated Researcher at CITCEM. Email: frenzi@letras.up.pt. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9470-3457>.

** FLUP-CITCEM (UID/04059/2025; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54499/UID/04059/2025>). Email: andrea.mariani@museobiassono.it. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5892-3885>.

entities that emerged in the twelfth century: the Apostolic See and the Kingdom of Portugal¹.

Historiography in the last decades challenged the traditional interpretation of the so-called *Gregorian Reform*, seen as a coherent and organized movement that took place approximately between 1050 and 1300 that shaped the entire medieval society through a clear separation between ecclesiastical and secular powers in Western Europe². Several international scholars such as G. Tellenbach, O. Capitani, J. Gilchrist, U.-R. Blumenthal, R. A. Fletcher, I. S. Robinson, J. E. H. Cowdrey, G. M. Cantarella, M. Miller, H. Fuhrmann, U. Longo, G. Fornasari, N. D'Acunto, B. Wiedemann, and P. Henriët, among others, have criticized this interpretative model, showing how an «executive programme» elaborated by Gregory VII (1073-1085) did not dictate the strategies of each pope between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries. Without neglecting the importance of Gregory VII, who is undoubtedly one of the most important figures in the History of Roman Church and medieval Europe, the above-mentioned scholars have considered the *Reform* of the Church as a more complex, plural, and not theologically ordered process that was still not complete and operative at the beginning of the thirteenth century³. Roman pontiffs continuously implemented new strategies according to the principle of *necessitas*, revoking and/or modifying their dispositions every time it was required by the political and ecclesiastical conjunctures⁴.

In this more pragmatic and sources oriented-vision, the Papacy «reacted» to the external stimulus coming from the different parts of *Christianitas*, especially from the so-called «peripheries» that played a fundamental role in the affirmation of the Roman Primacy on a larger scale⁵. Papal privileges were not simple gifts accorded by the Apostolic See as the all-powerful institution portrayed by traditional historiography since the publication of A. Fliche's works on *Gregorian Reform*. Rome needed legitimation exactly like the institutions that asked for its prestigious endorsement/recognition⁶. This dynamic is particularly evident in the Iberian Peninsula where bishops and abbots — especially those who were coming abroad from *Hispania* —

¹ On the definition of Papacy as an emerging reality of the twelfth century, see Cantarella 2014, p. 377.

² See for example Saranyana 2006, p. 20. Mazel 2013, pp. 9-38 and Mazel 2021, pp. 15-25. See also De Miramon 2019, pp. 283-315.

³ Morris 1989, pp. 3-4. For a general context of the Iberian Church and the Apostolic See in the thirteenth century, see the classic of Linehan 1971.

⁴ Tellenbach 1936, pp. 86 and 140-144; Capitani 1965, pp. 454-481; Capitani 1966, and Capitani 1990, pp. 4-9 and 142-174; Gilchrist 1970, pp. 1-10; Blumenthal 1978, pp. 82-98 and Blumenthal 1988, pp. 168-172; Fletcher 1984, p. 194; Robinson 1990, pp. 377-434; Cowdrey 1998, p. 272; Cantarella 2005, pp. 331-333 e Cantarella 2018, pp. 7-9; Miller 2009, pp. 1570-1580; Fuhrmann 2016; Longo 2016, pp. 113-118; Fornasari 2017, pp. 9-26; D'Acunto 2020, pp. 9-26; Wiedemann 2022, pp. 16 and following; Henriët 2023, pp. 149-179.

⁵ Johrendt and Müller, dir., 2008; Johrendt and Müller, dir., 2012; Schieffer 2013, pp. 13-28.

⁶ Fliche 1924-1937, I-III; Herbers 2013, pp. 75-92; Vones 2019. For a bibliography on this topic, see Renzi and Veneziani 2020, pp. 5-33 and Rust 2013, pp. 25-84.

found in the Apostolic See a source of legitimation to solve their internal conflicts and strengthen their position. At the same time, the Roman pontiffs and Curia were able to extend their authority more concretely in areas like the North-Western Iberian Peninsula. This does not mean that popes did not have any contact with the Iberian world before the eleventh century⁷ or that all Iberia was necessarily a «Roman Christianity without a pope» during Early/High medieval centuries⁸. However, the relations between Rome and *Hispania* became undoubtedly much closer from the pontificates of Alexander II (1061-1073) and Gregory VII onwards, and this might be an acceptable starting point to frame Roman-Iberian connections⁹.

Portugal offers an excellent example of these kinds of relations. Between the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as L. C. Amaral observed, Portugal was a territory «under construction», both politically and ecclesiastically. Politically, it was transforming from a county within León-Castile into an independent kingdom. Ecclesiastically, this process was marked by the definitive restoration of the episcopal sees of Braga, Coimbra, and Oporto, followed after 1147 by those of Lisbon, Lamego, Viseu, Évora, and Idanha-Guarda¹⁰. Restored in 1112-1114, the diocese of Porto is a «privileged observatory» to study the relations between Portugal and Rome. On one hand, the Papacy through its privileges tried to establish its authority and mark a position in a turbulent area characterised by the conflicts between the episcopal sees of Braga, Compostela, and Toledo, whose archbishops held the Primacy on *Hispania* thanks to the privilege of Urban II of 1088¹¹. On the other, the bishops of Porto established a dialectical relationship with the Apostolic See to strengthen their authority and widen the diocesan patrimony against their local competitors (both lay and ecclesiastical) as demonstrated by J. Marques, L. C. Amaral, M. C. Cunha, M. Oliveira e Silva, M. J. Branco, M. A. Marques, and the work we have been carrying out since 2017¹².

To achieve the goals of this paper, first we will introduce the main sources we used for our research (number, typology, and general content). Second, we will offer a possible interpretation of these relationships between Rome and the diocese of Porto, showing some potential research leads that we are planning to develop in future academic works. For this first approach on the relationships between Porto and Rome, we have selected a specific documentary *corpus*. We have taken into consideration

⁷ As demonstrated by Ayala Martínez 2021, pp. 260-263 and López Alsina 1999, pp. 120-121.

⁸ Deswarte 2010.

⁹ Fletcher 1978, pp. 183 and following; Fletcher 1984, pp. 193-194; Soto Rábanos 2004, pp. 268-274. See also Herbers 2017.

¹⁰ Amaral 2007, pp. 403-404. See also Sottomayor-Pizarro 2013, pp. 36-37; Marques 1996, V, pp. 331-338; J. Marques 2017, pp. 27-70; Branco 1993, IV, pp. 537-623.

¹¹ Feige 1991, pp. 66-74.

¹² Marques 2002, pp. 7-60; Amaral 2017, pp. 23-45; Cunha and Silva 2005, pp. 45-62; Cunha 2013, pp. 133-145; Branco 2017, pp. 277-304 and M. A. Marques 2017, pp. 343-360. On the patrimonial structures of the diocese of Porto, see the classic studies of Oliveira 1956, pp. 29-50 and Moreira 1971-1990. See also Mariani and Renzi 2017, pp. 91-107 and Mariani and Renzi 2018, pp. 161-187.

papal sources related with the diocese of Porto between 1114 and 1250ca. We mainly worked on the *Censual do Cabido da Sé do Porto*¹³; the *Livro Preto* of Coimbra and the *Liber Fidei* of Braga; C. Erdmann's *Papsturkunden in Portugal*; the editions of Calixtus II and Innocent III's bulls; Innocent III's documents addressed to Portugal edited by A. J. da Costa and M. A. Marques; and the *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*. We have also consulted the papal *Regesta* and information related to Porto collected in the work of M. A. Jácome de Vasconcelos and A. de Sousa Araújo (*Bulário Bracarense*); the documents of the monastery of Grijó (cartulary of Baio-Ferrado); the *Patrologia Latina*; the *Tumbo Viejo* of Lugo (Galicia, today Spain); and the works of P. Linehan (*Portugalia Pontificia*). Finally, we have worked with A. Domingues de Sousa Costa's book on Mestre Silvestre and Mestre Vicente, which contains several *Regesta* and transcriptions of documents preserved at the Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo (Lisbon) and at the Arquivos Distritais of Porto and Braga; the documents of King of Portugal Sancho I; and some further charters preserved at the Arquivos Distritais of Porto and Braga¹⁴.

We have gathered so far a significant number of documents concerning the relationships between the Apostolic See and the diocese of Porto between the pontificates of Paschal II (1099-1118) and Innocent IV (1243-1254). We have extended our chronology up to the thirteenth century to better observe the evolution of the contacts between the Papacy and the diocese of Porto. This choice is also related to the greater availability of documents from this period than from the twelfth century. We are aware that the list of papal documents and privileges we produced is not exhaustive and further research on both archival and edited sources must be carried out to have a more complete state of the art. However, we think that the sources we reunited so far are a good starting point, since it will be necessary a renewed and systematic historiographical study on the relations between Rome and Porto, after the very helpful essays of M. J. Branco and M. A. Marques, both published in 2017¹⁵.

After a first analysis, we individuated eight thematic macro-groups that we have used to subdivide and organise the documentation. The eight thematic macro-groups are:

¹³ In this work, we used the new edition published by M. J. Oliveira e Silva and J. Lencart in 2024. On the documentary production of the cathedral of Porto, see the fundamental studies of Oliveira e Silva 2008 and 2013.

¹⁴ See the final bibliography of the present work. In this article, we quoted only the documents we have used as examples.

¹⁵ Cf. M. A. Marques 2017, pp. 343-360 and in the same volume see also Branco 2017, pp. 277-304. For a general overview on these topics is still fundamental Erdmann 1935. On the restoration of the diocese of Porto at the beginning of the twelfth century, see Amaral 2017, pp. 23-45. For a general overview of the relations between the diocese of Porto and the Apostolic See up to the twelfth century, see the bibliographies of the following articles: Mariani and Renzi 2019, pp. 63-93; Renzi et al. 2023, pp. 87-117; Renzi and Mariani 2022a, pp. 89-103; Renzi and Mariani 2022b, pp. 121-149; and Renzi and Mariani 2020, pp. 91-121.

- The conflicts for the establishment of the diocesan frontiers of the diocese of Porto;
- More general documents on the relationship between Porto and other Iberian dioceses;
- The bishops of Porto as local papal legates or judges-delegate;
- The administration of the diocesan rights and patrimony;
- The relations with the Kings, particularly Afonso Henriques (1140-1185), Sancho I (1185-1211), and Sancho II (1223-1248);
- The relations between the bishops of Porto and the *religiones novae* that is the arrival and spread of the Dominican and Franciscan Orders in Portugal;
- The relations between the bishops and the cathedral chapter;
- The conflicts between the bishops of Porto and the inhabitants of the borough, the episcopal vassals, or other local lay powers.

Obviously, these macro-groups are not separate spheres and, in many cases, the same documents offer very helpful information on more than one subject, but we think that they show the complexity and the variety of problems that papal documents raise when it comes to study the medieval diocese of Porto. After the subdivision into thematic groups, we have tried to build a second classification following the chronologies of the documents as a tool to develop our analysis. This apparently simple operation revealed a series of very interesting points of coherence in documents that we have used to observe the evolution of the relationship between the Apostolic See and Porto in the period considered. In the next paragraphs, we will highlight four main phases of these Roman-Portuguese connections.

II. We can call the first one as the «territorialization» of the episcopal power led by bishop Hugo of Porto and his successors throughout the twelfth century. Bishop Hugo (1112/1114-1136) was a former clergyman of Compostela and one of the most trusted men of archbishop of Santiago Diego Gelmírez (1100-1140). In several occasions bishop Hugo operated as a negotiator for papal privileges in favour of Compostela¹⁶. Once bishop of Porto, Hugo benefited from his previous experience, his proximity with Diego Gelmírez, and his knowledge of the Roman Curia to negotiate multiple privileges for his diocese in Portugal. In 1115, 1116, and 1120, Hugo obtained several papal favourable decisions and privileges containing the exemption from the authority

¹⁶ Mariani and Renzi 2018, pp. 162-166; Mariani and Renzi 2019, pp. 87-91. On the definition of the concept of «territorialization», see the work of Mazel 2008, pp. 213-252. On the Iberian episcopal reorganization during Middle Ages, see also Henriët 2003, pp. 81-127 and Henriët 2008, pp. 287-308.

of the archiepiscopal See of Braga (metropolitan of *Gallaecia*); the administration of the vacant episcopal see of Lamego; and the confirmation of the control of a significant number of monasteries, some of which were in frontier areas with the bishoprics of Braga and Coimbra. Moreover, Hugo obtained from the Roman pontiffs a very convenient definition of the diocesan boundaries that allowed, in theory, the extension of Porto's authority south of the river Douro, a territory traditionally belonging to the bishops of Coimbra, according to the *Parrochiale Suevorum*¹⁷. It is also possible that Bishop Hugo sought to realign the territory of the diocese of Porto — specifically its southern border — with the *Territorium Portugallensis*, which, as early as the eleventh century, included several localities around Estarreja near the river Antuã. The diocese and the *Territorium Portugallensis* (a term with multiple meanings) did not coincide and Bishop Hugo perhaps tried to take advantage of this ambiguity to obtain a better privilege from popes Paschal II and Calixtus II who could not be aware of such linguistic nuances¹⁸.

In any case, thanks to the support of the Apostolic See, bishop Hugo could define a more precise area in which he aimed to exercise his episcopal authority, a significant difference from the high medieval idea of diocese conceived more as a «constellation» of specific points controlled by the bishops rather than a delimited territory as shown by J. Mattoso (Mattoso 1995, p. 177). Hugo's successors kept intensifying their expansion south of the river Douro while looking for the support of Rome. For example, between 1137 and 1143 the bishops of Porto João Peculiar (1136-1138, later archbishop of Braga, 1138-1175, and trusted man of King of Portugal Afonso Henriques) and Pedro Rabaldes (1138-1145) tried to take advantage of the conflicts between Coimbra and the monastery of Grijó to extend their influence in the *Terra de Santa Maria* south of the river Douro¹⁹. Building on the *Parrochiale Suevorum*, a list of the parishes allegedly belonging to the dioceses of the Suevic Kingdom in the sixth century which started circulating in Portugal and Galicia in several and different versions from Lugo in the second half of the eleventh century²⁰, the bishops of Coimbra considered the Douro as the frontier with Porto and San Salvador de Grijó as a monastery belonging to their diocese²¹.

¹⁷ *Censual*, docs. 1 and 2; *Bullaire du Pape Calixte II*, doc. 149; *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, doc. 15; *Livro Preto*, doc. 606; Mariani and Renzi 2019, p. 93; Mariani and Renzi 2018, pp. 168-170. On the source known as *Parrochiale Suevorum* (*Liber Fidei*, I, docs. 10 and 11), see the works David 1947, pp. 62-68; Díaz 1998, pp. 35-47; López Alsina 2013, pp. 105-132; Alarcão, 2015, pp. 35-48; Renzi and Mariani 2020, pp. 106-119 for the table with the comparison between the different versions of the *Parrochiale Suevorum* and a general bibliography. See also Mariani and Renzi 2023, p. 61 note n. 12; Branco 2017, pp. 279-284.

¹⁸ Erdmann 1935, p. 28; Oliveira 1959, pp. 29-34; Mariani 2024, p. 396; Renzi 2026.

¹⁹ Oliveira 1956, pp. 29-44; Renzi and Mariani 2022a, pp. 91-98.

²⁰ López Alsina 2013, pp. 111, 114-115, and 122-124.

²¹ Renzi and Mariani 2022a, p. 91 and relative notes for sources and bibliography.

The bishops of Porto established good relationships with the Regular Canons of Saint Augustine of San Salvador de Grijó. In Rome, former *portuense* prelate João Peculiar also negotiated the privilege of exemption for the monastery of Grijó accorded by Pope Lucius II in 1144²². Moreover, the *Liber Censuum* of the Roman Church records the fee paid by San Salvador de Grijó to the Apostolic See. Grijó was one of the few Portuguese monasteries exempted by the episcopal jurisdiction²³, together with Santa Cruz de Coimbra (another monastery populated by Regular Canons of Saint Augustine), which obtained its papal exemption in 1162²⁴. This was also a great opportunity for the Roman pontiffs, since they would have had at least two directly dependent monastic institutions located in the kingdom that Afonso Henriques was shaping in the second half of the twelfth century²⁵.

III. The second phase of the relationships between Porto and Rome was characterised by the response of the neighbouring dioceses to the policies implemented by the bishops of Porto. For example, the bishops of Coimbra harshly protested in 1116 (when Pope Paschal II completely modified his own decisions by revoking the right of Porto to administrate the diocese of Lamego); in 1117 (Council of Burgos); in 1121 (Council of Sahagún); in 1135 (when Pope Innocent II accorded to Coimbra the administration of both Lamego and Viseu²⁶); and still in 1198 during the pontificate of Innocent III (1198-1216)²⁷. Popes and papal legates, such as Boso of Sant'Anastasia (†post-1126), adopted a prudent approach. They established the Douro River as frontier, but they allowed the bishops of Porto to maintain their legitimate acquired possession in the

²² Baio-Ferrado, doc. 2; Renzi and Mariani 2022a, p. 98.

²³ *Liber Censuum*, I, pp. 16 and note 1 and 222, notes 1-6. However, Grijó remained under the *pouvoir d'ordre* (*potestas ordinis*) of the local bishop (Renzi and Mariani 2022a, pp. 90-91 and 98-99). On the concept of episcopal *pouvoir d'ordre* and the different degrees of monastic exemption, see Maccarrone 1980, pp. 49-132, Robinson 1990, pp. 231-233, Falkenstein 1997, pp. 129-132 and 176-177, and Cariboni 2003, pp. 68-69.

²⁴ Martins 2003, pp. 824-825. *Liber Censuum*, I, p. 222. In Renzi 2025a, p. 58, I have affirmed that Grijó was the only exempt monastery in northern Portugal as testified also by *Liber Censuum*. I generally confirm my statement, but I would like to give some further explanations. As noticed by C. Erdmann in his *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, in the *Liber Censuum* of the Roman Church there is also a reference to São Martinho de Crasto «*Ecclesia sancti Martini II marabutinos*» (*Liber Censuum*, I, p. 222) in the Archdiocese of Braga. This institution populated by regular canons was erroneously identified as São Martinho de Dumio by L. Duchesne (*Liber Censuum*, I, p. 222, note n. 1). However, the archbishops of Braga protested, and the papal judges-delegate decided in favor of them in 1202. Therefore, Crasto was put under the archiepiscopal jurisdiction of Braga at the beginning of the thirteenth century. See *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, pp. 113-114; Potthast 1894, *Regesta*, regs. 124 and 801, and *Liber Fidei*, I, doc. 496. Marques 2009, p. 478.

²⁵ Renzi and Mariani 2022a, p. 97.

²⁶ Coimbra received papal confirmations on the administration of Lamego and Viseu in 1101 and 1125 (*Livro Preto*, docs. 593 and 621). Later in 1147, the restorations of Lamego and Viseu occurred, both connected to the policies of King of Portugal Afonso Henriques and archbishop of Braga João Peculiar, solving *de facto* the problem of the administration of the two vacant dioceses between Porto and Coimbra. See J. Marques 2017, p. 31 and Morujão 2013, pp. 36 and following.

²⁷ *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, docs. 16 and 23. *Livro Preto*, docs. 594, 597, 598, 605, 614, and 629. *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 7. Branco 2017, p. 287, note n. 29. M. A. Marques 2017, pp. 355-356.

southern lands²⁸. Popes and legates admonished the bishops of Porto to give back the lands they took illegitimately in the bishopric of Coimbra, but at the same time, they did not suspend or depose the bishops of Porto²⁹.

The diocesan frontiers problems were less frequent, but not less interesting with Braga. Bishops of Porto received the support of Pope Calixtus II (1119-1124) against the usurpations of Braga and its archbishops, and territorial conflicts seemed to intensify since the end of the twelfth century³⁰. In 1193 in his first mission in Iberia, Pope Celestin III's (1191-1198) legate Gregory of Sant'Angelo (†1211) intervened in favour of the bishop of Porto Martinho Rodrigues (1190-1235) against Braga for the possession of some land and churches in Santo Tirso and Felgueiras³¹, two frontier areas between Porto and Braga until the nineteenth century³². The two Portuguese episcopal sees kept fighting for their diocesan frontiers and for the control over the church of Santa Cruz de Ribadouro in 1250 and 1251³³. The accusations were reciprocal. Braga claimed the clergy of Porto illegitimately occupied the church of Santa Cruz of Ribadouro, while the bishop and the cathedral chapter of Porto claimed the archbishop of Braga violated the frontiers and the dispositions established by Popes Paschal II and Calixtus II³⁴. On 20th February 1254, Innocent IV intervened again on this matter by ordering the *precentores* of the dioceses of Lisbon, Lamego, and Zamora to collect evidence of the accusations of the bishops of Porto against the See of Braga for the occupation of the church of Santa Cruz de Ribadouro and other territories belonging to the *portuense* diocese. The clash between Braga and Porto that took place over the church of Santa Cruz de Ribadouro around 1250 deserves a more detailed study, since we do not find much information in historiography so far³⁵.

Pope Innocent IV also intervened in this conflict due to some further alleged usurpations perpetrated by the archbishop of Braga João Egas (1245-1251) against the patrimony of Porto and its diocesan boundaries at the time of bishop Julião Fernandes (1247-1260)³⁶. What is surprising is one of the defensive arguments used by the clergy of Porto in this dispute reported in an Innocent IV's letter. The diocese of Porto was exempted from Braga, whose archbishops consequently had no rights of

²⁸ *Livro Preto*, doc. 597. *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, doc. 19. Mariani and Renzi 2018, p. 176.

²⁹ *Livro Preto*, doc. 599. Renzi and Mariani 2022b, p. 127.

³⁰ *Legislación conciliar*, p. 227.

³¹ *Censual*, docs. 6 and 7. Zerbi 1980, VIII.

³² Mariani and Renzi 2023, p. 74.

³³ *Bulário Bracarense*, regs. 110 and 112. *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 436.

³⁴ ADB. *Gaveta dos Arcebispos*, ns. 21bis. See ADB. *Gaveta dos Arcebispos*, n. 26 «quo licet felicis recordationis Pascalis pape predecessor noster bone memorie Hugoni portugalensis episcopi pro diffinitivam firmam restitui decisuit [...] Bracarensem archiepiscopum tunc illicite occupata se permodum pro recordationis Calistus papa predecessor noster».

³⁵ *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 436.

³⁶ *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, regs. 392, 393, and 394. ADP. *Mitra da Sé do Porto*, Pergaminhos, n. 8 «portugalense ecclesia ad romanam ecclesiam nullo pertinet mediante». *Nullo mediante* was one of the papal expressions that indicated an exempted institution, see Renzi and Mariani 2022a, p. 95.

jurisdiction over Porto. As we have seen, both Paschal II and Calixtus II accorded a privilege of exemption, converting Porto in a diocese directly depending on Rome³⁷. However, those privileges had not been renewed since 1120, and the bishopric of Porto was considered as a suffragan of the metropolitan see of Braga in twelfth century-papal documents, as observed by D. Mansilla Reoyo³⁸. Several bishops of Porto were connected to Braga during their ecclesiastical careers (such as Pedro Pitões, 1145-1152, Fernando Martins, 1176-1185, and Martinho Pires, 1185-1189³⁹) and swore obedience to the *bracarense* metropolitan see⁴⁰. Furthermore, Braga clearly considered Porto as a suffragan bishopric as demonstrated by the correspondence of Innocent IV⁴¹. It would be very interesting to study these charters to understand this significant change in the relations between Porto and Braga in mid-thirteenth century, as well as the role played by the Papacy, which took the side of the *bracarense* archbishops in several occasions during the thirteenth century, as demonstrated by Innocent IV's sentence against Porto of 28th November 1251⁴².

IV. Starting at the end of the third quarter of the twelfth century, the third phase can be identified with the appointment of the bishops of Porto, as well as other diocesan clergymen, as local judges-delegate by Popes Alexander III (1159-1181), Lucius III (1181-1185), Innocent III, Honorius III (1216-1227), Gregory IX (1227-1241), and Innocent IV⁴³. In our opinion, this shows the transformation of the relations between Rome and Porto. If during the episcopate of Hugo or João Peculiar, the connections with the Papacy were also the results of the personal networks and political/diplomatic individual skills of the local bishops, in the last decades of the twelfth century we can observe a closer relationship between the Roman pontiffs and the diocese of Porto. As we will see, these relations involved both the bishops and diocesan clergymen. It would be very interesting to do further research on these prelates to understand better why they were chosen as judges-delegate and, and if possible, which kind of cultural and ecclesiastical background they had. For example, P. Linehan showed

³⁷ See note 17 in the present work.

³⁸ Mansilla Reoyo 1955, p. 139.

³⁹ Renzi and Mariani 2022b, pp. 127, 128, 132, and 135.

⁴⁰ *Liber Fidei*, II, docs. 577, 583, 585, and 587.

⁴¹ ADB. *Gaveta dos Arcebispos*, ns. 21bis «Sua nobis venerabilis fratri nostris Bracharensis archiepiscopo petitione monstravit. Quod ipse fratrem nostrum portugalensis episcopum eius suffraganeum pro eo quod ad ecclesiam/sancte crucis de Ripadorii ad mensam ipsius archiepiscopi pertinentem portugalensis diocesis armata manu acredine redditus et res alias eiusdem ecclesie occupant».

⁴² *Bulário Bracarense*, regs. 19 and 21. *Censual*, docs. 1 and 2. *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 414. *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, docs. 47, 50, 57, and 121. Ferreira 1930, pp. 40-42.

⁴³ *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, docs. 73, 78, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 91, 98, and 99. *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, docs. 43, 60, 63, 64, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 102, 105, 120, 121, 186, 189, and 191. *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, regs. 116, 167, 197, 202, 226, 315, 376, 377, 379, 422, and 425. Branco 2017, p. 303. M. A. Marques 2017, pp. 356-357.

the importance of the juridical education of the canons of the Cathedral Chapter of Zamora in the relations with the Papacy in the thirteenth century⁴⁴.

The bishops of Porto became constantly involved in the local disputes (both in Portugal and Galicia) brought to the attention of the Roman Curia. Due to space constraints, we cannot list all the sources, but we will make some examples of the typology of tasks delivered by the bishops of Porto on behalf of the Papacy. Popes nominated the bishops of Porto as judges on patrimonial disputes, such as those between the diocese of Coimbra and the Templars in 1182-1184⁴⁵ or in the conflicts between the bishops of Lugo and Orense for the control of the Galician lands of Lemos and Brosmos⁴⁶. Bishops of Porto were also appointed to establish tithes collection rights (like in the case of the dispute between the see of Braga and the monastery of Castro de Avelãs in 1199)⁴⁷ and to solve diocesan frontier disputes, as happened in 1213 between the bishoprics of Coimbra and Idanha-Guarda or in 1243 between the diocese of Viseu and Idanha-Guarda⁴⁸. We have also found information about mediation by the bishops of Porto in the clashes between bishops and laymen (like the 1249 conflict between the bishop of Coimbra and the *miles* named Gomes Egee, an ally of the archbishop of Braga⁴⁹), and episcopal jurisdiction, as demonstrated by the dispute between the prior of Crasto, Ponte da Barca, and the archbishop of Braga in 1199⁵⁰.

In these situations, bishops of Porto operated with the support of their canons or a specific clergyman of their diocese (like the *magister scholarum* and the diocesan *precentor* in 1230)⁵¹; diocesan monasteries and collegiate churches such as Santo Tirso and Cedofeita (1213)⁵²; other bishops, such as those of Lamego⁵³, or other members of Portuguese regular clergy such as the prior of the monastery of São Jorge de Coimbra⁵⁴. In several cases, they collaborated with abbots and monks coming from Cistercian monasteries of Salzeda (twice in 1203)⁵⁵ and Maceira Dão in the diocese of Viseu (four times in 1203)⁵⁶. It is worth highlighting that Roman pontiffs could also appoint other members of the Portuguese diocesan clergy to solve local disputes without the presence of the bishops, as in the case of the *magister scholarum* of the

⁴⁴ Linehan 2009, pp. 131-136; Mariani and Renzi 2019, pp. 75-85, and Renzi and Mariani 2022b, pp. 134-135.

⁴⁵ *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, doc. 98.

⁴⁶ *Tumbo Viejo*, doc. 97.

⁴⁷ *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 60.

⁴⁸ *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 189. *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 315.

⁴⁹ *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 376.

⁵⁰ *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 64.

⁵¹ *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 226.

⁵² *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 186; M. A. Marques 2017, p. 358; Mariani and Renzi 2024, pp. 60, 62, and 65-66.

⁵³ *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 64.

⁵⁴ *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 105.

⁵⁵ *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 94. *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, regs. 43 and 226.

⁵⁶ *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, docs. 90, 91, 92, and 93.

diocese of Porto nominated by Innocent IV, together with the Cistercian abbot of Tarouca (located in the diocese of Lamego), to fix some patrimonial issues between the bishop of Coimbra and the monastery of Santa Cruz in 1249⁵⁷.

Moreover, Alexander III, Lucius III, and Innocent III appointed the bishops of Porto together with other Iberian prelates as legates in order to investigate and solve at least two of the most controversial ecclesiastical disputes in twelfth-century northwestern *Hispania*. We refer first to the conflicts between Braga and the Compostela for the definition of their respective ecclesiastical provinces, including the jurisdiction over the dioceses of Coimbra, Viseu, Lamego, Idanha, Lisbon, and Évora, the churches of Saint Victor and Saint Fructuous and the property of half the city of Braga⁵⁸. In this context, Porto had a very special position because it was one of the few, if not the sole, Portuguese episcopates that was not a cause of disagreement between the metropolitan Sees of the area in the second half of the twelfth century⁵⁹. Second, bishops of Porto had been appointed by popes to solve the dispute over the metropolitan belonging of the bishopric of Zamora within the Iberian Church⁶⁰. Although the other papal legates, the bishops of Tarazona and Salamanca, confirmed that Zamora was a suffragan of the archdiocese of Compostela in absence of the bishop of Porto in 1184, the problem was still open during the pontificate of Innocent III, who again appointed (1199) the bishop of Porto Martinho Rodrigues, together with the bishops of Plasencia and Osma, to find a solution for the case of Zamora⁶¹. *De facto*, the diocese of Zamora passed under the authority of the archiepiscopal See of Santiago de Compostela in the thirteenth century⁶².

V. The fourth and last phase shows the diversification of the papal interventions within the diocese of Porto. In our opinion, the documentation reflects the evolution of the episcopal structures as well the wider political, social, and religious context in which the bishops of Porto operated. We would like to highlight five main points.

The first is the papal certification of the internal patrimony of the diocese. In the early decades of twelfth century, the bishops of Porto asked for a more precise

⁵⁷ *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 377. On Cistercians in Portugal, see Cochéril 1959, pp. 61-92; Gomes 2006, p. 401; Marques 2019, pp. 83-108; Fontes, Andrade and Rodrigues 2020, pp. 13-14; Sousa et al. 2006, pp. 104-105 and following.

⁵⁸ *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, docs. 78, 82, 85, 87, 90, and 91; *Tumbo B*, docs. 282, 286, 298, and 320. In 1199, Innocent III was directly committed to finding a solution. The pope established that Tuy, Mondoñedo, Lugo, Orense, Astorga, Coimbra, and Viseu belonged to Braga, while Idanha, Lamego, Lisboa, and Évora (together with Salamanca, Ávila, Ciudad Rodrigo, Plasencia, and Coria) were part of the ecclesiastical province of Compostela. *La documentación pontificia*, doc. 215; Domínguez Sánchez 2017, p. 488. On the frontiers of the ecclesiastical provinces of Braga and Santiago all along the Middle Ages, see Romero Portilla 2006, p. 251; Branco 2011, pp. 31-63.

⁵⁹ Renzi and Mariani 2022b, pp. 140-141.

⁶⁰ *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, docs. 86 and 99. *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 63.

⁶¹ *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, doc. 99. *La documentación pontificia*, doc. 216. See also Renzi 2025b; M. A. Marques 2017, pp. 353-355.

⁶² Fletcher 1978, pp. 202-203; *La documentación pontificia*, doc. 199; Renzi 2025b, pp. 195-217.

definition of the diocesan boundaries. However, in the thirteenth century, their interests were more focused on the internal patrimonial and jurisdictional stability of their bishopric. Indeed, twenty-seven out of twenty-nine documents of this typology we have found so far are posterior to 1209⁶³. The bishops of Porto asked the popes and in 1226, 1227, 1234, 1245, 1249, and 1254, obtained papal privileges, confirmations, and/or favourable dispositions on patrimony south of the river Douro — Santa Maria do Olival (Vila Nova de Gaia)⁶⁴, São Salvador de Guetim (Espinho), São João de Ver (Santa Maria da Feira), Avanca (Estarreja), and Vila Chã (Oliveira de Azeméis)⁶⁵ —, as well as in the north and east of the diocese, as demonstrated by the cases of Guidões and São Tiago de Bougado (Trofa), Meinedo (Lousada), Fânzeres and São Pedro da Cova (Gondomar), Régua (Peso da Régua), and Paranhos (today part of the city of Porto)⁶⁶, and in the area of Guarda (church of Santa Maria de Lamegal, Pinhel)⁶⁷. The bishops of Porto also received dispensations for clergymen born out of illegitimate unions («defectum natalium»)⁶⁸, episcopal rights of interdiction and excommunication within the diocese⁶⁹, as well as papal indications on the rights of patronage over the ecclesiastical institutions of the diocese⁷⁰.

The second point is related to the relations between the bishops, the cathedral chapter, and its canons. The development of the diocesan patrimony and institutions led bishop of Porto Martinho Pires in 1186 to establish a *mesa* (*mesa capitular*) of the chapter and a *mesa* (*mesa episcopal*) of the bishops to redefine the fiscal structure of the episcopate⁷¹. The problems connected to the patrimony and its administration had as consequence several moments of tension between the bishops and the canons (1191, 1195, 1200, 1207, and in 1208-1209, when the canons appealed to the king against bishop Martinho Rodrigues) and in 1210, when Innocent III intervened through his legates (the Cistercian abbot of Moreruela and the archdeacon of Zamora) to investigate and eventually punish the canons who have usurped diocesan goods⁷². These complex dynamics continued throughout the first half of the thirteenth century. In 1254, Innocent IV backed the authority of the episcopate of Porto by establishing the obligation for the canons (as well as for other secular clergymen) to receive the

⁶³ *Censual*, docs. 10 (1227), 11 (1234), 17 (1209), 18 (1234), 19 (1245), 20 (1245), 22 (1254), 24 (1250), 25 (1253), 26 (1253), 27 (1253), 28 (1254), 30 (1253), 33 (1253), 34 (1254), 35 (1254), 37 (1234), 75 (1227), 146, (1227), 147 (1227), 208 (1227), 216 (1245), 251 (1227); Costa 1963, ns. 507 (1227), 321 (1234), 514 (1235); *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 456 (1254); *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, docs. 95 (1182-1183) and 142 (1195).

⁶⁴ The bishop of Coimbra donated this church to the bishop of Porto in 1117 (*Livro Preto*, doc. 597).

⁶⁵ *Censual*, docs. 208, 224, 251, and 272.

⁶⁶ *Censual*, docs. 73, 75, 146, 147, 157, and 147.

⁶⁷ *Censual*, doc. 216.

⁶⁸ *Censual*, doc. 19.

⁶⁹ *Censual*, docs. 9, 10, and 37.

⁷⁰ See as example *Censual*, docs. 33, 34, and 35.

⁷¹ A. E. Marques 2017, pp. 188-196; Renzi and Mariani 2022b, pp. 139-140.

⁷² *Bulário Português de Inocêncio III*, doc. 144; Branco 2017, p. 288; M. A. Marques 2017, p. 358; Coelho 2018.

holy orders to administrate episcopal goods and to comply with their tasks under the supervision of the bishop⁷³.

The third point is the papal intervention in the relations between the kings and the bishops of Porto. This aspect is particularly relevant in 1209-1210 and 1227-1238 during the reigns of Sancho I and Sancho II, the episcopates of Martinho Rodrigues and Pedro Salvadores (1235-1247), and the pontificates of Innocent III and Gregory IX. During the twelfth century, the bishops of Porto were among the closest clergymen to the royal power, in a context in which royal and episcopal authorities often looked to each other for mutual support⁷⁴.

As M. H. Coelho pointed out:

*The kings relied on the clergy to conquer the territory and diplomatically legitimise their independence; to support their political ideology [...] to preserve their written memory; to organise religiously and administratively local population; finally, to support them in everything that concerned the government of the kingdom [...]. The monarchs paid for all these services of the Church by facilitating and helping the ecclesiastical organisation of the territory, by founding various religious institutions, by donating goods, rights, and jurisdictions to the regular or secular clergy*⁷⁵.

However, this relation was often ambiguous (for example King of Portugal Afonso Henriques, 1109-1185, both supported and clashed with the episcopate of the kingdom of Portugal) and conflicts between kings and bishops occurred in several cases during the first half of the thirteenth century⁷⁶. There were multiple reasons behind these tensions between royal and episcopal power. For example, the royal attempts to exercise a stricter control on cities (a phenomenon that became increasingly evident in the fourteenth century)⁷⁷ and the positions assumed by the bishops during the «civil war» (1245-1248) between Sancho II and his brother, the count of Boulogne, future king of Portugal Afonso III (1248-1279)⁷⁸.

⁷³ See for example *Censual*, docs. 21 and 22.

⁷⁴ Renzi and Mariani 2022b, pp. 126-127, 129, 131, 133, 136, and 140.

⁷⁵ Coelho 2018: «Os reis apoiaram-se na clerezia para conquistar o território e diplomaticamente legitimar a sua ideologia política [...] para dar corpo à sua memória escrita; para enquadrar religiosa e administrativamente as populações; enfim, para os apoiar em tudo o que dizia respeito ao governo do reino [...] Os monarcas pagaram todos esses serviços da Igreja com a viabilização e auxílio ao ordenamento eclesiástico do território, com a fundação de instituições religiosas várias, com a doação de bens, direitos e jurisdições ao clero regular ou secular».

⁷⁶ Coelho 2018.

⁷⁷ See Linehan 2019, pp. 96-160.

⁷⁸ Mattoso 1984, pp. 7-23; Mattoso 1993, pp. 104-126; Branco 1999, pp. 285-388; Branco 2006, pp. 198-208 and 238-249; Fernandes 2006, pp. 236-242; Ventura 2009, pp. 73-94; Rocha 2013, pp. 111-115.

Both kings Sancho I and Sancho II attacked the authority of the bishops of Porto, who looked for support in Rome. Despite the initial good relations with bishop Martinho Pires, tensions between the king and the bishop of Porto arose in 1191 and reached their peak in the last phase of the reign of Sancho I. In 1209-1210, the *casus belli* with bishop of Porto Martinho Rodrigues was presumably the episcopal lack of support to the marriage of the king's heir, Afonso II (1211-1223), with his cousin Urraca of Castile (1211-1220)⁷⁹. The clash between bishop Martinho Rodrigues and Sancho I had a negative impact on the diocese; royal officials together with some *burgenses* attacked the city and the diocesan patrimony. In the opinion of A. de Sousa, this might be a sign of the growing power of the local *concelho* at the beginning of the thirteenth century⁸⁰. Moreover, the king supported the canons in their ongoing conflict with the bishop to weaken episcopal power⁸¹. In the case of Sancho II, the conflict with the bishop of Porto started as early as 1227, when papal legate John of Abbeville (1180-1237) first tried to find a solution, and ended only eleven years later in 1238⁸².

Generally, the popes supported the bishops of Porto, as demonstrated by the case of Martinho Rodrigues who took refuge in Rome after Sancho I's threats⁸³. In 1210, for example, Innocent III both directly and through the action of his judges-delegate (the bishops and the dean of Zamora, the Cistercian abbot of Moreruela, and the dean of the bishopric of León) censured Sancho I's behaviour⁸⁴. The pope also accorded the bishop of Porto the right to apply all the necessary condemnations against those who conspired against his rights, including the king of Portugal⁸⁵. However, papal interventions were prudent and even «ambiguous» to a certain extent, since they also sought to use these local conflicts to turn their political agenda and aspirations towards royal power into reality. Indeed, Innocent III tried to benefit from the crisis between Sancho I and the bishop of Porto (as well as that of Coimbra) to reinforce the strategy he implemented since 1198 in his correspondence about the payment of *census* promised by King Afonso Henriques⁸⁶. In his letter addressed to Sancho I in 1211, Innocent III, who aspired to be the *arbiter negotium regni* at a European scale (although with little success, as M. Maccarrone pointed out)⁸⁷, insisted on the idea that the foundation of the Portuguese kingship was the papal authority itself. In

⁷⁹ Oliveira 1959, pp. 40-60; Branco 2017, p. 289; Coelho 2018.

⁸⁰ Coelho 2018; Sousa 2000, p. 239.

⁸¹ Coelho 2018; Mattoso 1993, pp. 126-127 and 205-242 for the definition and development of the *concelhos* in medieval Portugal. See also Sousa 2000, pp. 160, 196-197, and 221-222.

⁸² Mattoso 1993, pp. 104-106; Linehan 2012, pp. 236-256.

⁸³ Coelho 2018.

⁸⁴ *Bulário Português de Inocência III*, docs. 143, 144, 145, 146, 172, 174, 181; *Die Register*, XIII, docs. 57 and 75.

⁸⁵ *Censual*, doc. 9.

⁸⁶ Renzi 2019, pp. 269-272; Branco 2006, pp. 238-249.

⁸⁷ Maccarrone 1995, pp. 168-169; Morris 1989, p. 426.

his account of the past relations between Portugal and Rome, Innocent III wrote to Sancho I that Alexander III «decorated Afonso [Henriques, *scil.*], your father, with the title of king and the royal *insignia*», an almost complete rewriting of history up to his pontificate in favour of the Apostolic See⁸⁸.

Moreover, Innocent III's decisions on the conflict between Sancho I and bishop of Porto Martinho Rodrigues were also a confirmation of the internal agreement joined by the king and the bishops and not just executive orders⁸⁹. Popes often played the role of mediators and context was always decisive. For example, after the preparation of his testament in 1210, Sancho I tried to resolve his conflicts with the bishoprics of Portugal, an aspect that might have bolstered papal efficaciousness⁹⁰. As in the case of the alleged deposition of the king of Portugal Sancho II in 1245, Rome played a more diplomatic role in trying to promote local solutions, but the Papacy was not the *deus ex machina* institution represented by historiography that dictated the political agenda in Portugal⁹¹. Furthermore, in 1238, the request for papal recognition of the agreements also came from King Sancho II and not only from the bishop and the cathedral chapter of Porto as one may expect («Et nos dictus rex et episcopus et capitulum Portugalenses santitati vestre duximus supplicandum quod hoc factum nostrum dignetur ut sic stabilitate taliter confirmare»)⁹².

The conflicts with the kings also imply new relations with the citizens and vassals of the diocese of Porto. Until 1406, Porto was a city of episcopal lordship (*senhorio*)⁹³, which is our fourth point. We have found several documents concerning the attacks of the *burgenses* on the diocese, often but not always connected to the crisis with royal power, and several papal and royal sentences and agreements to re-establish «peace» in the city of Porto, like in 1212 during the pontificate of Innocent III⁹⁴. This is quite interesting, because this aspect may also reflect the growth of the borough of Porto (which counted around 4000 inhabitants in the twelfth century)⁹⁵ and the increase of political and economic demands of the citizens. This situation was not exclusive to Porto. In 1254, Innocent IV asked the archbishop of Braga to stop the attacks of the laity against ecclesiastical patrimonies in several Portuguese dioceses⁹⁶, a very similar process to what happened in the twelfth century in the Galician cities

⁸⁸ PO 4253 (Laterano Maggio 26 1211) = *Bulário Português de Inocência III*, n. 157, p. 301 «Alphonsum progenitorem tuum nomine regio ac regalibus insigniis decoravit».

⁸⁹ *Documentos de D. Sancho I*, docs. 190, 206, 207, 208, and 209; *Bulário Português de Inocência III*, doc. 145; *Die Register*, XIII, doc. 76; Coelho 2018.

⁹⁰ Coelho 2018; Branco 1999, pp. 388-407; Branco 2006, pp. 199-208 and 264-266; Vilar 2005, pp. 45-46.

⁹¹ Peters 1970, pp. 135-169; Fernandes 2006, p. 335; Branco 2009, p. 129; Wiedemann 2022, p. 211; Veneziani 2025. We would like to thank Dr. Enrico Veneziani for giving us access to his ongoing research.

⁹² *Censual*, doc. 235; *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 289.

⁹³ Oliveira e Silva 2013, p. 9.

⁹⁴ *Bulário Português de Inocência III*, docs. 172 and 181.

⁹⁵ See Sousa 2000, p. 193.

⁹⁶ *Portugalia Pontificia*, I, reg. 450.

of Santiago de Compostela and Lugo and in many other European urban centres from the end of the eleventh century⁹⁷.

Finally, our fifth point is that the conflict between citizens and bishops was not limited to patrimony or economic and/or political aspects. Since the 1230s, as testified by the papal documentation of Gregory IX and Innocent IV addressed to Porto, divergences also concerned religion and devotion in connection with the spread of Franciscans and Dominicans in Portugal⁹⁸. As happened in other European cases, initially the bishops of Porto were very much hostile to this new form of religious experience and predication, while the citizens of Porto strongly supported the Mendicant friars that had in the cities one of their most relevant targets for their predication and source of recruitment⁹⁹. For example, the popes between 1233 and 1245 supported the initiative of Franciscans in Porto by openly asking the bishops to stop opposing their activities within the diocese and the foundation of their church in the lands donated by the local citizens¹⁰⁰.

VI. In conclusion, we would like to underline how these sources open several research perspectives on the relations between the diocese of Porto, the kingdom of Portugal, and Rome. These sources allow studying several problematic aspects such as patrimonial development, administration, vassalage with local powers, political networks between Porto, Rome, and the rest of Iberia that now might be observed through renewed perspectives thanks to the enormous progress of international historiography on these subjects in the last decades. Moreover, it will be very helpful to compare Porto with other realities, since this diocese shared features and dynamics comparable to other Iberian and international case studies¹⁰¹.

The sources we have presented can help us in debating and discussing the greater historiographical model such as the spread of the so-called *Gregorian Reform* and its concrete application in Portugal at the beginning of the twelfth century. The Papacy in many cases looked for the support of the powers of a territory, both secular and ecclesiastic, because in medieval papal thought, they were not alternatives and the popes accepted solutions building on context (the principle of *necessitas*) and pragmatism¹⁰². Consider the agreement of 1238 between Sancho II and bishop Pedro Salvadores confirmed by Gregory IX. The king and the bishop of Porto settled an agreement on

⁹⁷ See López Alsina 2015, pp. 71-79 (for the case of Santiago de Compostela) and 93, and Renzi 2015, pp. 43-57 and 57-66 for the bibliography on Lugo.

⁹⁸ PO (Lateran March 22nd 1241) = *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I, doc. CCCXXXV; *Portugalia Pontifica*, I, regs. 262, 281, 290, 293, 294, 296, 305, and 389.

⁹⁹ Mattoso 1993, p. 125; Rosas 2009, pp. 143-144; Fontes, Andrade and Rodrigues 2020, pp. 15-16.

¹⁰⁰ *Portugalia Pontifica*, I, regs. 262, 281, 290, and 293.

¹⁰¹ See also Cantarella 2000, pp. 41-47 for the case of the conflicts between the clergy and the *burgenses* of Nogent (northern France).

¹⁰² Cantarella 2018, p. 303.

episcopal participation to royal military expeditions¹⁰³. How could it still be possible in thirteenth-century Portugal, if the separation between secular and ecclesiastical power had been already achieved thanks to the Gregorian «Program»? Were service and support to the royal *militia* (even just economically or formally/symbolically) compatible with the Roman dispositions? Why did the pope accept that it was a king's prerogative to determine the military engagement of a bishop if they were formally criticising this aspect at least since the eighth century and the Carolingian era¹⁰⁴? Did Rome fail in spreading its *Reform*? Or, alternatively, should scholars focus on understanding which elements of Roman ecclesiology were successfully implemented in Iberia, as suggested by P. Linehan's works¹⁰⁵?

These are a few examples of the research opportunities offered by the sources we have presented.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

Arquivo Distrital de Braga

ADB. *Gaveta dos Arcebispos*, n. 21bis.

ADB. *Gaveta dos Arcebispos*, n. 26.

Arquivo Distrital do Porto

ADP. *Mitra da Sé do Porto, Pergaminhos*, n. 8 (paleographic transcription).

Sources and Repertories

AZEVEDO, Rui de, Avelino de Jesus da COSTA, and Marcelino Rodrigues Pereira, 1979. *Documentos de D. Sancho I (1174-1211)*. Coimbra: Centro de História da Sociedade e da Cultura, vol. I.

COSTA, António Domingues de Sousa, 1963. *Mestre Silvestre e Mestre Vicente, juristas da contenda entre D. Afonso II e suas irmãs*. Braga: Tipografia Editorial Franciscana.

COSTA, Avelino de Jesus da, and Maria Alegria F. MARQUES, ed., 1989. *Bulário Português: Inocência III (1198-1216)*. Coimbra: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica – Centro de História da Sociedade e da Cultura da Universidade de Coimbra.

COSTA, Avelino de Jesus da, et al., ed., 2017. *Liber Fidei sanctae bracarensis ecclesiae*. Braga: Arquidiocese de Braga, vols. I-II.

DURAND, Robert, ed., 1971. *Le Cartulaire Baio-Ferrado du Monastère de Grijó (X^e-XIII^e Siècles)*. Paris: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian – Centro Cultural Português.

¹⁰³ *Censual*, doc. 235 «ita deffinitum est inter me et p. episcopum et capitulum Portugalenses quod idem episcopus ibit mecum in <ex>peditionem cum ego invero cum exercitu generali ad deffensionem regni tantum cum prelati secularibus quibus ratione prelatie suppetunt facultates religiosi remanentibus si contigerit quod exercitus generalis sarracenorum intraverit ad obsidendas et capiendas regni villas». For Innocent IV's confirmation of the 1238 agreement between Sancho II and the bishop of Porto Pedro Salvadores, see also *Censual*, doc. 236.

¹⁰⁴ Prinz 1979, pp. 301-329. See also the works Martín Martín 2004, p. 58 and Pérez 2018, pp. 67-68; both scholars have pointed out how proprietary churches, aristocratic patronage, and control over monastic institutions did not automatically end in the twelfth century with the so-called «Gregorian Reform».

¹⁰⁵ Linehan 2019, pp. 5-44, 144, 155, and 166-167.

- ERDMANN, Carl, 1927. *Papstkunden in Portugal*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- FABRE, Paul, and Louis DUCHESNE, ed., 1889. *Le liber Censuum de l'Église Romaine*. Paris: Ernest Thorin, vol. I.
- GONZÁLEZ BALASCH, María Teresa, ed., 1987. *El «Tumbo B» de la Catedral de Santiago: edición y estudio*. Granada: Universidad de Granada. ISBN 8433806645.
- HAGENEDER, Othmar, Werner MALECZEK, and Alfred A. STRNAD, ed., 1980. *Die Register Innocenz' III. Jahrgang (1199-1200). Texte und Indices*. Wien; Rom: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften – Historisches Institut beim österreichischen Kulturforum in Rom, vol. II. ISBN 9783700102915.
- JAFFÉ, Philipp, and Samuel LÖWENFELD, 1885. *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*. Leipzig: Veit et Comp., vol. I.
- LINEHAN, Peter, ed., 2013. *Portugalia pontificia: materials for the history of Portugal and the papacy: 1198-1417*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, vol. I. ISBN 9789723114690.
- LÓPEZ SANGIL, José Luis, and Manuel VIDÁN TORREIRA, 2011. Tumbo Viejo de Lugo: (transcripción completa). *Estudios Mindonienses*. Mondoñedo: Centro de Estudios de la Diócesis de Mondoñedo-Ferrol, (27), 11-373. ISSN 0213-4357.
- MANSILLA REOYO, Demetrio, 1955. *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio III: (965-1216)*. Roma: Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos.
- MARTÍNEZ DíEZ, Gonzalo, 2009. *Legislación conciliar del Reino Astur (718-910) y del Reino de León (910-1230)*. León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación «San Isidoro». ISBN 9788492708017.
- POTTHAST, August, 1874. *Regesta pontificum romanorum inde a 1198 ad 1304*. Berlin: De Decker, vol. I.
- ROBERT, Ulysse, 1891. *Bullaire du Pape Calixte II*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- RODRIGUES, Manuel Augusto, and Avelino de Jesus da COSTA, ed., 1999. *Livro Preto: Cartulário da Sé de Coimbra*. Coimbra: Arquivo da Universidade de Coimbra. ISBN 9725940911.
- SBARAGLIA, Giovanni Giacinto, ed., 1759. *Bullarium Franciscanum*. Roma: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, vol. I.
- SILVA, Maria João Oliveira e, and Joana LENCART ed., 2024. *Censual do Cabido. Cartulário Medieval da Sé do Porto. Edição Crítica*. Lisboa: UCP Editora. ISBN 9789725410059.
- SOMMERLECHNER, Andrea, et al., 2015. *Die Register Innocenz' III. Jahrgang (1210/1211). Texte und Indices*. Wien; Rom: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften – Historisches Institut beim österreichischen Kulturforum in Rom, vol. XIII. ISBN 9783700176718.
- VASCONCELOS, Maria da Assunção Jácome da, and António de Sousa ARAÚJO, ed., 1986. *Bulário bracarense. Sumários de Diplomas Pontifícios dos Séculos XI a XIX*. Braga: Arquivo Distrital de Braga – Universidade do Minho.

Studies

- ALARCÃO, Jorge de, 2015. Os limites das dioceses suevas de Bracara e de Portucale. *Portvgalia*. Porto: DCTP-FLUP, Nova Série. **36**, 35-48. ISSN 0871-4290.
- AMARAL, Luís Carlos, 2017. A restauração da diocese do Porto e a chegada do bispo D. Hugo. In: Luís Carlos AMARAL, dir. *Um poder entre poderes. Nos 900 anos da diocese do Porto e da construção do cabido Portucalense*. Porto: UCP-FT-CEHR, pp. 25-45. ISBN 9789728361723.
- AMARAL, Luís Carlos, 2007. *Formação e desenvolvimento do domínio da diocese de Braga no período da Reconquista (século IX-1137)*. Tese de doutoramento, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto.
- AYALA MARTÍNEZ, Carlos de, 2021. Papado y guerra contra el Islam en la península ibérica siglos VIII-XI. *Intus – legere: historia*. Valparaíso: Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez, **15**(2), 260-263. ISSN 0718-5456.
- BLUMENTHAL, Uta-Renate, 1988. *The Investiture Controversy Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. ISBN 9780812213867.

- BLUMENTHAL, Uta-Renate, 1978. Opposition to Pope Paschal II. Some Comments on the Lateran Council of 1112. *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum*. Leiden: Brill, **10**, 82-98. ISSN 0003-5157.
- BRANCO, Maria João, 2017. Prelazia e Poder Real. Entre a concórdia e o conflito: os casos de D. Hugo e D. Martinho Rodrigues do Porto. In: Luís Carlos AMARAL, dir. *Um poder entre poderes. Nos 900 anos da diocese do Porto e da construção do cabido Portucalense*. Porto: UCP-FT-CEHR, pp. 275-304. ISBN 9789728361723.
- BRANCO, Maria João, 2011. Constructing Legitimacy and Using Authority. The Production of Cartularies in Braga during the 12th Century. In: Klaus HERBERS, and Ingo FLEISCH, dir. *Erinnerung – Niederschrift – Nutzung. Das Papsttum und die Schriftlichkeit im mittelalterlichen Westeuropa*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 31-63. ISBN 9783110253702.
- BRANCO, Maria João, 2006. *D. Sancho I*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores. ISBN 9789727599783.
- BRANCO, Maria João, 1999. *Poder real e eclesiásticos: a evolução do conceito de soberania régia e a sua relação com a praxis política de Sancho I e Afonso II*. Tese de doutoramento, Universidade Aberta, vol. I.
- BRANCO, Maria João, 1993. Portugal no Reino de León: etapas de uma relação (866-1179). In: *El reino de León en la alta edad media: la monarquía (1109-1230)*. León: Archivo Historico y Diocesano, vol. IV, pp. 537-623. ISBN 9788400068691.
- BRANCO, Maria João, 2009. Os homens do rei e a Manifestis Probatum: percurso de uma bula pelos caminhos de luta pela legitimidade do rei e do reino nos séculos XII-XIII. In: *Poder espiritual/ poder temporal. As relações igreja-estado no tempo da monarquia (1179-1909)*. Lisboa: Academia Portuguesa da História, pp. 125-171. ISBN 9789726241805.
- CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, 2018. *Gregorio VII*. Roma: Salerno Editrice. ISBN 9788869733062.
- CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, 2014. I normanni e la Chiesa di Roma. Aspetti e momenti. In: *Chiese Locali e Chiese regionali nell'Alto Medioevo*. Spoleto: CISAM, pp. 377-406. ISBN 9788868090463.
- CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, 2005. *Il sole e la luna. La rivoluzione di Gregorio VII 1073-1085*. Roma; Bari: Laterza. ISBN 9788842076049.
- CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, 2000. *Una sera dell'anno Mille: scene di Medioevo*. Milano: Garzanti. ISBN 978-8811692775.
- CAPITANI, Ovidio, 1990. *Tradizione ed interpretazione. Dialettiche ecclesiologiche del secolo XI*. Roma: Jouvence. ISBN 9788878010994.
- CAPITANI, Ovidio, 1966. *Immunità vescovili ed ecclesiologia in età «pregregoriana» e «gregoriana», l'avvio alla «restaurazione»*. Spoleto: CISAM. ISBN 9788879881524.
- CAPITANI, Ovidio, 1965. Esiste un'età gregoriana? Considerazioni sulle tendenze di una storiografia medievistica. *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*. Firenze: L. Olschki, (1), 454-481. ISSN 0035-6573.
- CARIBONI, Guido, 2003. Esenzione cistercense e formazione del Privilegium commune. In: Nicolangelo D'ACUNTO, dir. *Papato e monachesimo esente nei secoli centrali del medioevo*. Firenze: University Press, pp. 65-107. ISBN 8884530830.
- COCHÉRIL, Maur, 1959. Abadias cistercienses portuguesas. Inventário e cronologia das abadias do século XII. *Lusitania Sacra*. Lisboa: UCP-CEHR, (4), 61-92. ISSN 2182-8822.
- COELHO, Maria Helena da Cruz, 2018. A Chancelaria de Sancho I (1185-1211). In: Hélène SIRANTOINE, dir. *La lettre diplomatique. Écriture épistolaire et actes de la pratique dans l'Occident latin médiéval* [online]. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez [consult. 2025-03-18]. ISBN 978-84-9096-211-4. Available from: <https://books.openedition.org/cvz/6741>.
- COWDREY, Herbert Edward John, 1998. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. ISBN 0198206461.

- CUNHA, Maria Cristina Almeida e, 2013. Coimbra and Porto: Episcopacy and National Identity in Diocesan Border Quarrels. In: Klaus HERBERS, Fernando LÓPEZ ALSINA, and Frank ENGEL, dir. *Das begrenzte Papsttum. Spielräume päpstlichen Handelns. Lagaten – delegierte Richter – Grenzen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 133-145. ISBN 9783110304633.
- CUNHA, Maria Cristina Almeida e, and Maria João de Oliveira e Silva, 2005. Il clero della diocesi di Oporto nell'Europa del medioevo. In: *A Igreja e o Clero Português no Contexto Europeu*. Lisboa: UCP, pp. 45-62. ISBN 9789728361211.
- D'ACUNTO, Nicolangelo, 2020. *La Lotta per le Investiture. Una rivoluzione medievale (998-1122)*. Roma: Carocci Editore. ISBN 9788829000708.
- DAVID, Pierre, 1947. *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal du VI^e au XII^e siècle*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- DESWARTE, Thomas, 2010. *Une Chréienté romaine sans pape: l'Espagne et Rome (586-1085)*. Paris: Garnier. ISBN 9782812401060.
- DÍAZ, Pablo C., 1998. El Parrochiale Sueuum: organización eclesiástica, poder político y poblamiento en la Gallaecia tardoantigua. In: Julio MANGAS MANJARRÉS, Jaime ALVAR, and José María BLÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, dir. *Homenaje a José M. Blázquez*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, vol. VI, pp. 35-47. ISBN 8478821120.
- DOMÍNGUEZ SÁNCHEZ, Santiago, 2017. El arzobispado de Compostela, los obispados del noroeste de la península ibérica y el IV Concilio de Letrán de 1215. *Hispania Sacra*. Madrid: CSIC, **69**(140), 487-503. ISSN 0018-215X.
- ERDMANN, Carl, 1935. *O Papado e Portugal no Primeiro Século da História Portuguesa*. Coimbra: Instituto Alemão da Universidade de Coimbra.
- FALKENSTEIN, Ludwig, 1997. *La papauté et les abbayes françaises aux XI^e et XII^e siècles: Exemption et protection apostolique*. Paris: Honoré Champion. ISBN 978-2852037489.
- FEIGE, Peter, 1991. La primacía de Toledo y la libertad de las demás metropolis de España. El ejemplo de Braga. In: *La introducción del Císter en España y Portugal*. Burgos: La Olmeda, pp. 61-132. ISBN 8440487916.
- FERNANDES, Hermenegildo, 2006. *D. Sancho II*. Lisboa: Temas e Debates. ISBN 9789727599844.
- FERREIRA, José Augusto, 1930. *Fastos Episcopais da Igreja Primacial de Braga*. Braga: Arquidiocese de Braga, vol. II.
- FLETCHER, Richard A., 1984. *Saint James's Catapult: The Life and Times of Diego Gelmírez of Santiago de Compostela*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. ISBN 9780198225812.
- FLETCHER, Richard A., 1978. *The Episcopate in the Kingdom of León in the Twelfth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0198218699.
- FLICHE, Augustin, 1924-1937. *La réforme grégorienne*. Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, vols. I-III.
- FONTES, João Luís Inglês, Filomena ANDRADE, and Ana Maria S. A. RODRIGUES, 2020. Mosteiros e conventos no Portugal Medieval: vida espiritual e lógicas de implantação. *Symma*. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, (15), 8-34. ISSN 2014-7023.
- FORNASARI, Giuseppe, 2017. Gregorio VII e la riforma gregoriana. Un ripensamento. In: Fabrizio AMERINI, and Riccardo SACCENTI, dir. «Vicarius Petri», «Vicarius Christi». *La titolatura del Papa nell'XI secolo*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, pp. 9-26. ISBN 788846750297.
- FUHRMANN, Horst, 2016. *Papst Gregor VII. und das Zeitalter der Reform*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. MGH, Schriften 72. ISBN 9783447101622.
- GILCHRIST, John, 1970. Was there a Gregorian Reform Movement in the Eleventh Century? *CCHA Study Sessions*. Toronto: Canadian Catholic Historical Association, **37**, 1-10.

- GOMES, Saul António, 2006. A Congregação Cisterciense de Santa Maria de Alcobaça nos séculos XVI e XVII: elementos para o seu conhecimento. *Lusitania Sacra*. Lisboa: UCP-CEHR, (18), 375-431. ISSN 2182-8822.
- HENRIET, Patrick, 2023. Le pangrégorianisme et ses excès. À propos d'une nouvelle histoire du Moyen Âge. *Le Moyen Âge*. Louvain-la-Neuve: De Boeck Supérieur, **129**, 149-179. ISSN 1782-1436.
- HENRIET, Patrick, 2008. Territoires, espaces symboliques et «frontières naturelles». Remarques sur la carte diocésaine hispanique. In: Florian MAZEL, dir. *L'espace du diocèse. Genèse d'un territoire dans l'Occident médiéval*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, pp. 287-308. ISBN 9782753530980.
- HENRIET, Patrick, 2003. L'espace et le temps hispaniques vus et construits par les clercs (IX^e-XIII^e siècle). In: Patrick HENRIET, dir. *À la recherche de légitimités chrétiennes: représentations de l'espace et du temps dans l'Espagne médiévale (IX^e-XIII^e siècles)*. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, pp. 81-127. ISBN 9782847880403.
- HERBERS, Klaus, 2017. *Papado, peregrinos y culto jacobeo en España y Europa durante la edad media*. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada. ISBN 9788433861054.
- HERBERS, Klaus, 2013. El papado en el tiempo de Gelmírez. Constancia y variación. In: Fernando LÓPEZ ALSINA, et al., dir. *O século de Xelmírez*. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega pp. 75-92. ISBN 9788492923533.
- JOHRENDT, Jochen, and Harald Müller, dir., 2012. *Rom und die regionen*. Berlin: De Gruyter. ISBN 9783110285147.
- JOHRENDT, Jochen, and Harald MÜLLER, dir., 2008. *Römisches Zentrum und kirchliche Peripherie. Das universale Papsttum als Bezugspunkt der Kirchen*. Berlin: De Gruyter. ISBN 9783110202236.
- LINEHAN, Peter, 2019. *At the Edge of Reformation. Iberia before the Black Death*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780192570956.
- LINEHAN, Peter, 2012. A Papal Legation and its Aftermath. Cardinal John of Abbeville in Spain and Portugal, 1228-1229. In: Peter LINEHAN, dir. *Historical Memory and Clerical Activity in Medieval Spain and Portugal*. London: Routledge, pp. 236-256. ISBN 9781351219105.
- LINEHAN, Peter, 2009. Un quirógrafo impugnado. Zamora y la cultura jurídica zamorana a comienzos del siglo XIII. *Anuario de Estudios Medievales*. Madrid, CSIC, **39**(1), 127-176. ISSN 0066-5061.
- LINEHAN, Peter, 1971. *The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LONGO, Umberto, 2016. La riforma della Chiesa tra Pier Damiani e Bernardo di Chiaravalle. Un concetto da declinare al plurale. In: Marialuisa BOTTAZZI, et al., dir. *La società monastica nei secoli VI-XII. Sentieri di ricerca*. Trieste; Roma: CERM – École Française de Rome, pp. 113-132. ISBN 9788895368252.
- LÓPEZ ALSINA, Fernando, 2015 (1st Ed. 1988). *La ciudad de Compostela en la Alta Edad Media*. Santiago de Compostela: Consorcio de Santiago-USC. ISBN 9788415876694.
- LÓPEZ ALSINA, Fernando, 2013. El Parrochiale Suevum y su presencia en las cartas pontificias del siglo XII. In: Klaus HERBERS, Fernando LÓPEZ ALSINA, and Frank ENGEL, dir. *Das begrenzte Papsttum. Spielräume päpstlichen Handelns. Legaten – delegierte Richter – Grenzen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 105-132. ISBN 9783110308020.
- LÓPEZ ALSINA, Fernando, 1999. Urbano II y el traslado de la sede episcopal de Iria a Compostela. In: *El Papado, la iglesia leonesa y la basílica de Santiago a finales del siglo XI: el traslado de la Sede Episcopal de Iria a Compostela en 1095*. Santiago de Compostela: Consorcio de Santiago, pp. 120-121. ISBN 8493066710.
- MACCARRONE, Michele, 1995. Papato e regno di Sicilia nel primo anno di pontificato di Innocenzo III. In: Roberto LAMBERTINI, dir. *Nuovi studi su Innocenzo III*. Roma: ISIME, pp. 137-170. ISBN 2560338121832.

- MACCARRONE, Michele, 1980. Primato romano e monasteri dal principio del secolo XII ad Innocenzo III». In: *Istituzioni monastiche e istituzioni canonicali in Occidente (1123-1215)*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, pp. 49-132.
- MANSILLA, Demetrio, 1955. Restauración de las sufragáneas de Braga a través de la reconquista. *Revista Portuguesa de História*. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de História Económica e Social, **6**(1), 117-148. ISSN 0870-4147.
- MARIANI, Andrea, 2024. *Elementos defensivos medievais no território da diocese do Porto (séculos IX-XII)*. Porto: CITCEM; Afrontamento. ISBN 9789898970886.
- MARIANI, Andrea, and Francesco RENZI, 2024. Medieval Monastic Networks in northern Portugal. Research Methodology and perspectives on the Diocese of Porto in the eleventh century. *Journal of Medieval Monastic Studies*. Turnhout: Brepols, **13**, 51-79. ISSN 2034-3515.
- MARIANI, Andrea, and Francesco RENZI, 2023. Inde ad montem Marantis. A Serra do Marão no contexto das fontes medievais portuguesas (sécs. VI-XII). In: Carlos Balsa, dir. *Povoamento e vias de comunicação ao longo da História*. Vila Real: Biblioteca Municipal de Vila Real, vol. II, pp. 57-75. ISBN 9789898653727.
- MARIANI, Andrea, and Francesco RENZI, 2019. Redescubrir un obispo ibérico del siglo XII: Hugo de Oporto y el contexto político-eclesiástico del Condado de Portugal (1112-1136). In: Andrea Vanina NEYRA, and Victoria CASAMIQUELA GERHOLD, dir. *Sociedad, cultura y religión en la plena Edad Media: siglos IX al XIII*. Buenos Aires: IMHICIHU, pp. 63-93. ISBN 9789874934055.
- MARIANI, Andrea, and Francesco RENZI, 2018. 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). *Lusitania Sacra*. Lisboa: UCP-CEHR, (37), 161-187. ISSN 2182-8822.
- MARIANI, Andrea, and Francesco RENZI, 2017. Lettere e privilegi papali durante il pontificato di Ugo di Oporto (1112-1136): Nuovi studi ed ipotesi di ricerca. *CEM – Cultura, Espaço & Memória*. Porto: FLUP, (8), 91-107. ISSN 2182-1097.
- MARQUES, André Evangelista, 2017. A autoridade episcopal e a construção da rede paroquial na diocese do Porto (sécs. X-XIV). In: Luís Carlos AMARAL, dir. *Um poder entre poderes. Nos 900 anos da diocese do Porto e da construção do cabido Portucalense*. Porto: UCP-FT-CEHR, pp. 163-196. ISBN 9789728361723.
- MARQUES, José, 2017. A Igreja no tempo de D. Afonso Henriques. Alguns aspetos. In: Mário Jorge BARROCA, dir. *No tempo de D. Afonso Henriques. Reflexões sobre o primeiro século português*. Porto: CITCEM, pp. 27-70. ISBN 9789898351753.
- MARQUES, José, 2009. O Liber Fidei da Catedral de Braga e o Norte de Portugal. *Bracara Augusta*. Braga: Câmara Municipal, **LVII**, 473-500. ISSN 0006-8640.
- MARQUES, José, 2002. As dioceses portuguesas até 1150. *Biblos*. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, **78**, 7-60. ISSN 0870-4112.
- MARQUES, José, 1996. As doações dos condes portucalenses e de D. Afonso Henriques à Igreja. In: 2.º congresso histórico de Guimarães. Guimarães: Câmara Municipal, pp. 327-347. ISBN 9879728050062. Vol. V: *Sociedade e administração, cultura e igreja em Portugal no séc. XII*.
- MARQUES, Maria Alegria, 2019. O Cister ibérico e as suas peculiaridades. O Reino de Portugal. Três rostos para uma obra. In: Herbert GONZÁLEZ ZYMLA, and Diego PRIETO LÓPEZ, dir. *Monasterio de Piedra, un legado de 800 años. Historia, arte, naturaleza y jardín*. Zaragoza: Diputación Provincial de Zaragoza e Institución «Fernando el Católico», pp. 83-110. ISBN 9788499115818.
- MARQUES, Maria Alegria, 2017. Entre restauração e afirmação: a Diocese do Porto nas relações entre Portugal e a Santa Sé (1114-1216). In: Luís Carlos AMARAL, dir. *Um poder entre poderes. Nos*

- 900 anos da diocese do Porto e da construção do cabido Portucalense. Porto: UCP-FT-CEHR, pp. 343-360. ISBN 9789728361723.
- MARTÍN MARTÍN, José Luís, 2004. El clero rural en la Corona de Castilla. In: María Desamparados MARTÍNEZ SAN PEDRO, and María Dolores SEGURA DEL PINO, dir. *La iglesia en el mundo medieval y moderno*. Almería: Instituto de Estudios Almerienses, pp. 55-82. ISBN 8481083011.
- MARTINS, Armando Alberto, 2003. *O mosteiro de santa Cruz de Coimbra na Idade Média*. Lisboa: Centro de História. ISBN 9729876681.
- MATTOSO, José, 1995. *Identificação de um País. Ensaio sobre as origens de Portugal. 1096-1325*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, vol. II. ISBN 9789723310382.
- MATTOSO, José, 1993. *História de Portugal*. Lisboa: Editorial Estampa. ISBN 9789724206363. Vol. II: *A Monarquia Feudal (1096-1480)*.
- MATTOSO, José, 1984. A crise de 1245. *Revista de história das ideias*. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra, 6, 7-24. ISSN 0870-0958.
- MAZEL, Florian, 2021. Introduction. Une «révolution totale»? Penser la réforme grégorienne par-delà les frontières historiographiques. In: Tristan MARTINE, and Jérémy WINANDY, dir. *La Réforme grégorienne, une «révolution totale»? Paris: Garnier, pp. 15-25. ISBN 9782406111030.*
- MAZEL, Florian, 2013. Pour une redéfinition de la «réforme grégorienne». *Éléments d'introduction. Cahiers de Fanjeaux*. Toulouse: Privat, 48, 9-38. ISSN 1767-431X.
- MAZEL, Florian, 2008. Cujus dominus, ejus episcopatus? Pouvoir seigneurial et territoire diocésain (X^e-XIII^e siècle). In: Florian MAZEL, dir. *L'espace du diocèse. Genèse d'un territoire dans l'Occident médiéval*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, pp. 213-252. ISBN 9782753530980.
- MILLER, Maureen C., 2009. The crisis in the Investiture Crisis Narrative. *History Compass*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 7(6), 1570-1580. ISSN 1478-0542.
- MIRAMON, Charles de, 2019. L'invention de la Réforme grégorienne: Grégoire VII au XIX^e siècle. Entre pouvoir spirituel et bureaucratisation de l'Église. *Revue de l'histoire des religions*. Paris: Armand Colin, (2), 283-315. ISSN 0035-1423.
- MOREIRA, Domingos Azevedo, 1971-1990. Freguesias da diocese do Porto: elementos onomásticos altomedievais. *Boletim Cultural da Câmara Municipal do Porto*. Porto: Câmara Municipal do Porto, 34, 1-2 (1971), pp. 19-153; 34, 3-4 (1971), pp. 336-417; 35, 1-2 (1972), pp. 141-237; II série, 2 (1984), pp. 7-86; 3/4 (1985/1986), pp. 61-157; 5/6 (1987/1988), pp. 7-53; 7/8 (1989/1990), pp. 7-117.
- MORRIS, Colin, 1989. *The papal monarchy: The Western church from 1050 to 1250*. New York: Clarendon Press. ISBN 9780198269250.
- MORUJÃO, Maria do Rosário Barbosa, 2013. A organização da diocese de Lamego: da reconquista à restauração da dignidade episcopal. In: Anísio Miguel DE SOUSA SARAIVA, dir. *Espaço, Poder e Memória. A catedral de Lamego (sécs. XII a XX)*. Lisboa: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, pp. 15-45. ISBN 9789728361570.
- OLIVEIRA, Miguel de, 1959. O senhorio da cidade do Porto e as primeiras questões com os Bispos. *Lusitania Sacra*. Lisboa: UCP-CEHR, (4), 29-60. ISSN 2182-8822.
- OLIVEIRA, Miguel de, 1956. Os Territórios Diocesanos. Como passou para o Porto a Terra de Santa Maria. *Lusitania Sacra*. Lisboa: UCP-CEHR, (1), 29-50. ISSN 2182-8822.
- PÉREZ, Mariel, 2018. Encuadramiento del clero local y reorganización eclesiástica en la diócesis de León (siglos XI-XIII). *Studia historica. Historia medieval*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 36(1), 57-84. ISSN 0213-2060.
- PETERS, Edward, 1970. *The Shadow King. Rex Inutilis in Medieval Law and Literature, 751-1327*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press. ISBN 9780300012170.

- PRINZ, Friedrich, 1979. King, clergy, and war at the time of the Carolingians. In: Margot H. KING, and Wesley M. STEVENS, dir. *Saints, Scholars, and Heroes: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of C. W. Jones*. Collegeville: Hill Monastic Manuscript Library, vol. II, pp. 301-329. ISBN 9780835704809.
- RENZI, Francesco, 2026. Papal Legates in the Twelfth-Century Kingdom of León-Castile. The Councils of Burgos and Sahagún (1117-1121). In: Klaus HERBERS, dir. *Delegierte Gerichtsbarkeit. Entwicklung – Verbreitung – Wirksamkeit*. Forthcoming.
- RENZI, Francesco, 2025a. Un arzobispado medieval en marcha. Viajes, legaciones y relaciones entre Braga y Roma (siglos XI-XII). In: Jorge DÍAZ IBÁÑEZ, María José CAÑIZARES, and Mário FARELO, dirs. *El Papado y los Reinos Hispánicos en la Edad Media*. Murcia: Sociedad Española de Estudios Medievales, pp. 45-72. ISBN 9788409795123.
- RENZI, Francesco, 2025b. Los Papas y Santiago de Compostela en el siglo XII. Una historia conflictiva. In: Klaus HERBERS, dir. *XIII Congreso de Estudios Jacobeos Metrópolis. Santiago y Roma. 900 años de historia*. Santiago de Compostela: Turismo de Galicia, pp. 195-217.
- RENZI, Francesco, 2019. Un regno sotto la protezione di San Pietro. Le relazioni tra Papato e Portogallo da una prospettiva romana (1143-1212). In: Isabel Cristina F. FERNANDES, and Maria João Violante BRANCO, dir. *Da conquista de Lisboa à conquista de Alcácer (1147-1217): definição e dinâmicas de um território de fronteira*. Lisboa: Colibri, pp. 237-274. ISBN 9789896898717.
- RENZI, Francesco, 2015. The competition for the control of the urban space in medieval Galicia. The case of the diocese of Lugo (XIIth-XIIIth Centuries). *Memoria Europae*. San Juan: Universidad Nacional de San Juan, 1(1), 42-66. ISSN 1853-5259.
- RENZI, Francesco, and Andrea MARIANI, 2022a. Monasteri, vescovi e papato nel XII secolo. Il caso dell'esonazione papale di San Salvador di Grijó (1139-1195). *Hispania Sacra*. Madrid: CSIC, 74(149), 89-103. ISSN 1988-4265.
- RENZI, Francesco, and Andrea MARIANI, 2022b. Los obispos de Oporto entre 1138 y 1189: política patrimonial y relaciones con los poderes regio y papal. *En la España Medieval*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense, (45), 121-149. ISSN 1988-2971.
- RENZI, Francesco, and Andrea MARIANI, 2020. Sobre as origens da diocese do Porto na Alta Idade Média. Uma reflexão sobre o Parochiale Suevorum e a diocese de Magneto/Meinedo (sécs. VI-VII). *Portvgalia*. Porto: FLUP, 41, 91-121. ISSN 0871-4290.
- RENZI, Francesco, and Enrico VENEZIANI, 2020. Alcune note sulla Riforma della Chiesa Romana nel Pienomedioevo (secoli XI-XII). *Via Spiritus*. Porto: FLUP, (27), 5-33. ISSN 0873-1233.
- RENZI, Francesco, et al., 2023. A «Frenchman» in Portugal: Bishop D. Hugo of Porto and the transformations of the north-western Iberian Peninsula in the early 12th century. *CEM – Cultura, Espaço & Memória*. Porto: CITCEM, (15), 87-117. ISSN 2182-1097.
- ROBINSON, Ian Stuart, 1990. *The Papacy, 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 9781139167772.
- ROCHA, Ana Rita, 2013. A Corte de D. Sancho II (1223-1248). *Revista Portuguesa de História*. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de História Económica e Social, 44, 111-115. ISSN 0870-4147.
- ROMERO PORTILLA, Paz, 2006. Un Observatorio privilegiado de las relaciones entre Castilla y Portugal: Tuy en la Edad Media. In: *Estudos em homenagem ao professor doutor José Marques*. Porto: FLUP, vol. IV, pp. 247-259. ISBN 9728932073.
- ROSAS, Lúcia, 2009. O Convento de São Francisco do Porto na Idade Média: arquitetura, liturgia e devoção. In: Natália Marinho FERREIRA-ALVES, dir. *Os Franciscanos no Mundo Português. Artistas e Obras*. Porto: CEPESE, pp. 143-150. ISBN 9789899592285.
- RUST, Leandro Duarte, 2013. *A Reforma Papal (1050-1150): trajetórias e críticas de uma história*. Cuiabá: EdUFMT. ISBN 9788532701503.

- SARANYANA, Josep Ignasi, 2006. *Ecclesia semper reformanda*. In: Josep Ignasi SARANYANA, dir. *La reforma gregoriana y su proyección en la cristiandad occidental, siglos XI-XII*. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra, Institución Príncipe de Viana, pp. 17-36. ISBN 8423528421.
- SCHIEFFER, Rudolf, 2013. Die Reichweite päpstlicher Entscheidungen nach der papstgeschichtlichen Wende. In: Klaus HERBERS, Fernando LÓPEZ ALSINA, and Frank ENGEL, dir. *Das begrenzte Papsttum. Spielräume päpstlichen Handelns. Legaten – delegierte Richter – Grenzen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 13-28. ISBN 9783110308020.
- SILVA, Maria João Oliveira e, 2013. *A escrita na catedral: a chancelaria episcopal do Porto na Idade Média*. Lisboa: Centro de Estudos de História Religiosa – Universidade Católica Portuguesa. ISBN 978-972-8361-54-9.
- SILVA, Maria João Oliveira e, 2008. *Scriptores et Notatores. A Produção Documental da Sé do Porto (1113-1247)*. Porto: Fio da Palavra. ISBN 9789898171023.
- SOTO RÁBANOS, José María, 2004. La práctica de la pastoral en la Península Ibérica (siglos XI-XII). In: *La pastorale della Chiesa in Occidente dall'età Ottoniana al concilio lateranense IV*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, pp. 251-297. ISBN 9788834311196.
- SOTTOMAYOR-PIZARRO, José Augusto de, 2013. O nascimento do reino de Portugal: uma perspectiva nobiliárquica (1096-1157/1300). *Revista Portuguesa de História*. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de História Económica e Social, **44**, 29-58. ISSN 0870-4147.
- SOUSA, Armindo de, 2000. Tempos Medievais. In: Luís Oliveira RAMOS, dir. *História do Porto*. Porto: Porto Editora, pp. 119-253. ISBN 9789720062765.
- SOUSA, Armindo de, 1994. Tempos Medievais. In: Luís A. Oliveira Ramos, dir. *História do Porto*. Porto: Porto Editora, pp. 119-253. ISBN 9720062762.
- SOUSA, Bernardo Vasconcelos, et al., 2006. *Ordens religiosas em Portugal: das origens a Trento: guia histórico*. Lisboa: UCP-CEHR. ISBN 9789722414333.
- TELLENBACH, Gerd, 1936. *Libertas: Kirche und Weltordnung im Zeitalter des Investiturestreites*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- VENEZIANI, Enrico, 2025. L'afastamento di Sancho II di Portogallo: un esempio di papato reattivo e di Realpolitik. *Studi Medievali*. Spoleto: CISAM, **LXVI**(2), 733-754. ISSN 0391-8467.
- VENTURA, Leontina, 2009. *D. Afonso III*. Lisboa: Temas e Debates. ISBN 9789727599837.
- VILAR, Hermínia Vasconcelos, 2005. *D. Afonso II*. Lisboa: Temas e Debates. ISBN 9789727599653.
- VONES, Ludwig, 2019. Restauration ou bouleversement? La reconstitution des espaces diocésains dans la péninsule Ibérique au Haut Moyen Âge. *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* [online]. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, **49**(2) [consult. 2025-03-18]. ISSN 0076-230X. Available from: <https://journals.openedition.org/mcv/11225>.
- WIEDEMANN, Benedict, 2022. *Papal Overlordship and European Princes 1000-1270*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0192855039.
- ZERBI, Pietro, 1980. *Papato, impero e «respublica christiana» dal 1187 al 1198*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero. ISBN 9788834303269.

Appendix

Table. The papal edited documents related to the diocese of Porto between twelfth and thirteenth century: A Fist survey¹⁰⁶

Edition	Documents
<i>Livro Preto</i>	593; 594; 597; 598; 599; 600; 605; 606; 608; 612; 614; 616; 628; 629; 631; 632.
<i>Censual do Cabido da Sé do Porto</i>	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32; 33; 34; 35; 37; 73; 75; 146; 147; 208; 216; 234; 235; 251; 272; 293; 294; 295; 320.
<i>Jaffé-Löwenfeld (Regesta)</i>	Vol. I: 4778; 4779; 4818; 4993; 4996; 5149; 9491.
<i>Papsturkunden in Portugal</i>	14; 15; 16; 19; 22; 23; 24; 26; 28; 44; 45; 56; 73; 78; 82; 85; 86; 87; 91; 94; 95; 98; 99; 121; 142.
<i>Bullaire du Pape Calixte II</i>	149.
<i>Liber Fidei</i>	317; 417.
<i>Bulário Português de Inocêncio III</i>	7; 60; 63; 64; 90; 91; 92; 93; 94; 102; 105; 120; 121; 122; 126; 128; 143; 144; 145; 146; 172; 174; 181; 186; 189; 191.
<i>Potthast (Regesta)</i>	178; 797; 802; 4001; 4003; 4004; 7656; 10657; 10999.
<i>Portugalia Pontificia (Regesta)</i>	Vol. I: 38; 39; 40; 41; 43; 48; 50; 78; 105; 116; 167; 182; 183; 189; 190; 197; 202; 226; 236; 262; 281; 282; 284; 289; 290; 293; 294; 296; 305; 315; 327; 329; 376; 377; 378; 379; 383; 388; 392; 393; 394; 414; 422; 425; 436; 447; 450; 451; 454; 456.
<i>Costa Mestre Silvestre e Mestre Vicente</i>	321; 505; 506; 507; 508; 510; 514.
<i>Bullarium Franciscanum</i>	Vol. I: CCCXXXV.
<i>Register Innocenz' III</i>	Vol. II: n. 131 (140); Vol. II: n. 143 (152); Vol. II: n. 142 (151); Vol. XIII: n. 57; Vol. XIII: n. 75; Vol. XIII: n. 76.
<i>Bulário Bracaraense (Regesta)</i>	19; 21; 29; 32; 33; 34; 39; 52; 54; 92; 107; 110; 112; 131; 134; 189.
<i>Tumbo Viejo (Lugo)</i>	97.

¹⁰⁶ In this table, we indicated the published sources we consulted for this article, not the totality of the sources on Porto-Rome relations in the period considered. It is a general table with all the references, even though we are aware that some documents are published in more than one edition. For this reason, we do not commit ourselves to giving a precise number of sources, since the research is still ongoing. We are planning a further work to publish a complete and more detailed table with the documents (and their respective summaries) related to the relationships between the diocese of Porto and the Apostolic See between the twelfth and the thirteenth century.