



A medieval “enigma”: About the ecclesiastical trajectory of the Archbishop of Braga and “Antipope” Gregory VIII, Maurice “Bourdin” (11th-12th centuries)

LUÍS CARLOS AMARAL* | FRANCESCO RENZI**



* Universidade do Porto, Centro de Investigação Transdisciplinar Cultura, Espaço e Memória; Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Centro de Estudos de História Religiosa, Portugal
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9661-6605>
lcamaral@letras.up.pt

** Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Centro de Estudos de História Religiosa, Portugal
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9470-3457>
frrenzi@ucp.pt

Abstract: The ecclesiastical and political trajectory of the archbishop of Braga and “antipope” Maurice “Bourdin” had been long and diversified. In the complex context of both the Roman Church’s affirmation among the powers of Medieval Europe and the reorganization of the Hispanic Church, Maurice’s experience represents a paradigmatic case. The study of his career allows us to reflect on the main problems related to the ecclesiastical institutions and the transformations of European society between the end of the 11th century and the first decades of the 12th century. In this article, we will analyse two specific aspects. First, we will study Maurice’s trajectory as bishop of Coimbra and archbishop of Braga from 1099 onwards and his relations with the Iberian ecclesiastical powers and the Roman Curia. Second, we will analyse the causes of his “unexpected” 1118-election as “antipope” Gregory VIII, supported by Emperor Henry V, in opposition to the Roman pontiffs Gelasius II and Calixtus II.

Keywords: Maurice “Bourdin”, Braga, Hispania, Papacy, Henry V.

Um “enigma” medieval: em torno do percurso eclesiástico do arcebispo de Braga e “antipapa” Gregório VIII, Maurício “Burdino” (séculos XI-XII)

Resumo: Longo e diversificado foi o percurso eclesiástico e político do arcebispo bracarense e “antipapa” Maurício “Burdino”. Dentro do complexo contexto da afirmação da Igreja romana face aos poderes da Europa Medieval, bem como da reorganização da Igreja hispânica, a experiência de Maurício representa um caso paradigmático. O estudo da sua ação permite-nos refletir acerca dos principais problemas da instituição eclesiástica e sobre as transformações da sociedade europeia, entre finais do século XI e as primeiras décadas do século XII. Neste artigo analisaremos dois aspetos específicos: primeiramente, a trajetória de Maurício à frente da arquidiocese de Braga, a partir de 1109 – privilegiando o seu relacionamento com os demais poderes eclesiásticos peninsulares e com a cúria pontifícia –, e, num segundo momento, as causas da sua “inesperada” eleição como “antipapa” Gregório VIII, pelo imperador Henrique V, em 1118, em oposição aos pontífices romanos Gelásio II e Calisto II.

Palavras-chave: Maurício “Burdino”, Braga, Hispânia, Papado, Henrique V.

Introduction

Research carried out in recent decades has shown, with great evidence, the deep changes in the Iberian Christian kingdoms, from the mid-11th century onwards. The first monarch of León and Castile, Fernando I (1037-1065), and his son and main successor, Alfonso VI (1065-1109) were central figures in this entire process. One of the most innovative manifestations of the two reigns materialised in a set of initiatives that aimed to reorganise the ecclesiastical structures of the great northern monarchy, promoting discipline within the institutions, and defending the strengthening of the bishops' jurisdiction. This scenario resulted in a growing royal interventionism in religious matters, which greatly favoured the development of a Church increasingly identified with the *Regnum*. With the two entities thus articulated, it is not surprising that, throughout this period, the episcopal power also gradually took on the role of a real extension of the monarch's authority. And in this context, it is also not surprising that the chronicle of Bishop Pelayo of Oviedo (1101-1130) rightly recognises that Alfonso VI “fuit Pater et defensor omnium Ecclesiarum Hispaniensium, ideo haec fecit, quia per omnia Catholicus fuit”¹.

If the “restoration” policy of the Leonese and Castilian Church was one of the most important realities that contributed to the reconfiguration of powers in the Christian North, it is no less true that, in the period under consideration, the foundations were definitely laid for a regular relationship with the Roman Curia, which was also engaged in an intricate and long-lasting reform process. As Carlos de Ayala Martínez pointed out, “el estímulo proveniente de Roma será uno de los principales argumentos que condicione la vida eclesiástica peninsular durante los más de cuarenta años que transcurren entre la muerte de Fernando I en 1065 y la de su hijo Alfonso VI en 1109”, adding right afterwards that “este estímulo aportará nueva savia al reformismo peninsular”². When we consider this dimension, the historical process referred to at the beginning is amplified and proves to be extraordinarily complex. But simultaneously, it provides a more accurate and enlightening framework, which allows for a better understanding and interpretation of the paths and individual and collective actions of several prelates and other ecclesiastical agents.

Conditioned by the reorganisation of the Hispanic Church and by the growing interference of kings and popes in their governments and domains, the bishops had

«This paper is financed by National Funds through the FCT - Foundation for Science and Technology, under the project UIDB/04059/2020».

- 1 PELAGII OVETENSIS EPISCOPI – Chronicon Regum Legionensium (Post ann. 1119). In FLÓREZ, Enrique, ed. – *España Sagrada*. Vol. 14: *Iglesias sufragáneas de Mérida*. Guadarrama: Editorial Revista Agustiniiana, 2004 (New edition by Rafael Lazzano), p. 546.
- 2 AYALA MARTÍNEZ, Carlos de – *Sacerdocio y Reino en la España Altomedieval. Iglesia y poder político en el Occidente peninsular, siglos VII-XII*. Madrid: Sílex Ediciones, 2008, p. 297.

no alternative but to give their interventions a more affirmative character and no less dynamism. This means that, from the moment they were appointed and began their duties, they knew that all their actions, especially the most relevant ones, should also be thought out and carried out in accordance with the monarch’s intents and, increasingly, those of Rome and even the interests of the neighbouring bishops. What appears to be a true “straitjacket” could, however, prove to be advantageous had the prelate been sharp enough to exploit to his advantage the omnipresent conflicts and rivalries that invariably shape relationships between powerful people. Furthermore, the characters and entities with which a prelate interacted were organised and acted equally by virtue of that relationship. We are thus faced with a system of “communicating vessels”, which, with regard to Hispanic religious structures and beyond, promoted an acceleration and diversification of contacts with institutions beyond the Pyrenees, generating a growing interdependence between all of them.

The ecclesiastical trajectory of the monk, Bishop of Coimbra, and Archbishop of Braga, Maurice, known as “Bourdin”, who later became “antipope” Gregory VIII, inscribes within this context. His trajectory seems to be exemplary in that it accurately illustrates the time and the changes under way, and even more so because, coming from Frankish territory, it was in the peripheral region of Galicia-Portugal that he embarked on a career that was in every way remarkable, despite his humiliating end. In this paper, therefore, we will focus on the factors and circumstances that, from the experience of governing the See of Braga, shaped and modelled Maurice’s progressive relationship with a pontifical Curia undergoing a profound reform, and which had unleashed, particularly since Paschal II (1099-1118), a true “epistolary offensive” directed towards the Iberian Peninsula.

1. “Hispanic” Maurice

The time between the death of Archbishop Gerald of Braga (1097/99-1108) and the coming to power of Prince Afonso Henriques in 1128 (-1185) proved decisive in the political reorganisation of the northwest of Hispania, accelerating the autonomy process that culminated in the formation of the Kingdom of Portugal. In this context, the diocese of Braga played a crucial role, contributing decisively to the convergence of the ecclesiastical and political interests and goals of the vast majority of the territory’s elites and, from a certain point of view, even to their overlap. This development had begun to take shape as early as the time of Bishop Pedro (1071-1091), albeit timidly, and it was not until the first decades of the 12th century that it reached its fullest expression. The structuring of a solid political power in the region, following the arrival of Count Henry of Burgundy (1095/96-1112) and the creation of the second Portucalense County, provided Braga and its prelates with a support they had never been able to count

on until then. Changes became inevitable, and, with remarkable speed, Braga's claims became intertwined with the demands of the regional aristocracy. The interests of the religious and civil authorities were so closely related that it is not surprising that the former capital of *Gallaecia*, given its past and the effective leadership of the ecclesiastical structures south of the river Minho, sought to preserve and affirm a set of rights that it considered legitimate, especially in the Portucalense territory.

This seems to be the main guiding principle of Maurice's episcopate in Braga (1109-1118)³. Fully involved in the complex and unpredictable political situation that followed the death of Alfonso VI of León and Castile, and which spared no region of Christian Hispania, the prelate was faced with the imperative need to translate the dignity and metropolitan prerogatives he enjoyed into practical governance acts. All this was done with the permanent care given to strengthening the pastoral authority, which was increasingly bound to Roman discipline, and to strengthening the diocese's lordship. All of this also took place against a backdrop of endless disputes with Toledo interests and the unbridled ambitions of Compostela, as well as several collateral confrontations with other dioceses. Finally, all of this took place simultaneously with the maturing of the "projects" and autonomic aspirations of certain sectors of the Portucalense aristocracy, who were quick to consider the development of a "regional Church", as much as possible coinciding with the area they dominated politically, economically, and militarily, to be convenient to their pretensions.

Archbishop Gerald died on 5 December 1108. At the time of his death, there were already clear signs on the horizon of the generalised crisis that would soon befall the kingdom of León and Castile. Old and ill, Alfonso VI must have experienced the disaster of Uclès (29th May 1108) with deep bitterness and concern, not only because the death of Infante Sancho had deprived the crown of its only male heir and reopened the problem of succession, but also because the Muslim offensive could now dangerously threaten Toledo. Despite everything, the serious problems facing the monarchy did not prevent the rapid appointment of a new prelate for the vacant Church of Braga. The choice fell on the Bishop of Coimbra, Maurice (1099-1108),

3 On the ecclesiastical career of Maurice "Bourdin" and, in particular, on his episcopate in Braga, see: ERDMANN, Carl – *O Papado e Portugal no primeiro século da história portuguesa*. Coimbra: Publicações do Instituto Alemão da Universidade de Coimbra, 1935, p. 20-34. ERDMANN, Carl – *Maurício Burdino (Gregório VIII)*. Coimbra: Publicações do Instituto Alemão da Universidade de Coimbra, 1940. DAVID, Pierre – L'énigme de Maurice Bourdin. In DAVID, Pierre, ed. – *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal du VI^e au XII^e siècle*. Lisbon-Paris: Livraria Portugália Editora, Société d'Édition «Les Belles Lettres», 1947, p. 441-501. AMARAL, Luís Carlos – *Formação e desenvolvimento do domínio da diocese de Braga no período da Reconquista (século IX-1137)*. Porto: PhD thesis in History presented to the Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, 2007, p. 417-447, 500-520. AMARAL, Luís Carlos; BARROCA, Mário Jorge – *A condessa-rainha Teresa*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores, 2012, particularly p. 195-210. RENZI, Francesco – *Mauricius Bracaraensis archiepiscopus, quae est civitas Hispanie. Le fonti narrative europee sull'arcivescovo di Braga e antipapa Gregorio VIII Maurizio «Burdino» (secoli XII-XIII)*. Porto: CITCEM, 2021.

who, like Gerald, was of Frankish origin and had belonged to the group of monks recruited by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo (1086-1124) on his journey through what is now southern France in 1096⁴. At the beginning of 1099, and after a period in the See of Toledo, he was elected to Coimbra, where, as far as we know today, he lived an episcopate without much controversy. He was the first Coimbra prelate to receive more direct attention from the Papacy, having received several bulls from Paschal II⁵. Between the autumn of 1104 and the spring of 1108, he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, returning with important relics obtained in Jerusalem, Constantinople, and Italy⁶. It is probable that the collection of such a remarkable set of relics was the result of a specific commission from Gerald, who was endeavouring in this way to overcome the serious damage caused by the “pious theft” of 1102⁷. In fact, everything makes us believe that Maurice’s relationships with his metropolitan were excellent, with the former even replacing Gerald in the administration of Braga at the time of the archbishop’s second trip to Rome in the first half of 1103⁸. The author of *Vita Sancti Geraldi*, emphasising the prophetic abilities of Gerald, tells us

-
- 4 On the journey of the Toledo archbishop, see: REILLY, Bernard F. – *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under King Alfonso VI, 1065-1109*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988, p. 264-265.
- 5 We know of three letters from Paschal II addressed to Maurice as Bishop of Coimbra: papal bull *Apostolice sedis*, given in Lateran, on 24 March 1101 (*Liber Fidei Sanctae Bracarensis Ecclesie*. COSTA, Avelino de Jesus da ed.; MARQUES, José reed. Vol. 1. Braga: Arquidiocese de Braga, 2016, doc. 5; ERDMANN, Carl – *Papsturkunden in Portugal*. Berlin: Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1927, doc. 2); bull *Noveris nos*, given in Lateran, on 1 April [1103] (*Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 7; ERDMANN – *Papsturkunden*, doc. 7); and papal bull *Presentium portatorem*, dated 1100-1108 (ERDMANN – *Papsturkunden*, doc. 9).
- 6 On Maurice’s journey to the Holy Land and the set of relics he is said to have brought back, see: DAVID – L’énigme, p. 473-479. VELOSO, Maria Teresa Nobre – D. Maurício, monge de Cluny, bispo de Coimbra, peregrino na Terra Santa. In *Estudos de Homenagem ao Professor Doutor José Marques*. Vol. 1. Porto: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, 2006, p. 125-135. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 29-31, 134-141, 275-277, 284-285, 292, 299, 357. RENZI, Francesco – Dal Portogallo alla Terra Santa. Gli itinerari di Maurizio “Burdino” (secoli XI-XII). In ROTILI, Marcello; EBANISTA, Carlo, ed. – *Il Mediterraneo fra tarda antichità e medioevo integrazione di culture, interscambi, pellegrinaggi*. Naples: Guida Editori, 2018, p. 207-218. RENZI, Francesco – Da Coimbra a Costantinopoli fino a Cluny. Il viaggio di Maurizio “Burdino” e la donazione della Croce all’abate Ponzio di Melgueil (1104-1112). In FERRERO, Marco, ed. – *Un abate, un monastero, un Crocifisso. Ponzio di Melgueil da Cluny a Campus Sion*. Vicenza: Scriptorium, 2019, p. 19-44 (this essay is a further development of the previous work by the same author). PRAT, Dominique Iogna – *Order & exclusion. Cluny and christendom face heresy, judaism, and Islam, 1000-1150*. Ithaca (N.Y.): Cornell University Press, 2002, p. 330-332. GADY, Maurice – De Saint-Pierre d’Uzerche à Saint-Pierre de Rome. Maurice Bourdin. *Bulletin de la Société scientifique historique et archéologique de la Corrèze*. 81 (1959) 32-34, 42-47. On the relationship between Maurice “Bourdin” and the relics and, in particular, the cult of Saint James “the Intercisus”, see the work of GOULLET, Monique; PELOUX, Fernand; JULLIEN, Christelle; JULLIEN, Florence; LAMPADARIDI, Anna – *Les actes des martyrs perses du Vème siècle dans le monde latin*, forthcoming. We thank our colleague and friend Fernand Peloux (CNRS), for giving us access to the work.
- 7 Manuel Luís Real expressed the same opinion in: REAL, Manuel Luís – O projecto da Catedral de Braga, nos finais do século XI, e as origens do românico português. In *Actas do IX Centenário da Dedicção da Sé de Braga. Congresso Internacional*. Vol. 1: *O Bispo D. Pedro e o ambiente político-religioso do século XI*. Braga: Universidade Católica Portuguesa-Faculdade de Teologia-Braga-Cabido Metropolitano e Primacial de Braga, 1990, p. 476.
- 8 See: DAVID – L’énigme, p. 453, and also, ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 11, and *Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 231, note (1), p. 372. The replacement of Gerald by Maurice is explicitly mentioned in a document of 3rd November 1103: «[...] et dum ille pergeret ad Romam reliquid domnum Mauricium vice sua in Braccara [...]» (*Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 322 and vol. 2, doc. 651; *Documentos Medievais Portugueses. Documentos Particulares*. AZEVEDO, Rui Pinto de, org. Vol. 3: *A.D. 1101-1115*. Lisbon: Academia Portuguesa da História, 1940, doc. 141). On Gerald’s second trip to Rome, see: ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 16-19.

that once, when Maurice needed to go to Braga for urgent reasons, the chanter from Braga asked the Holy Archbishop how he should receive the suffragan prelate, to which the latter replied: “(…) *Episcopum Colimbriensem honorifice et cum venerabili processione suscipere debetis, quia eum in Dominum et Metropolitanum in Ecclesia Bracarensi post decessum meum proculdubio habebitis*”⁹. Whether prophetic or not, Gerald’s words proved to be true, and so, at the very beginning of 1109, Maurice came to preside over the diocese of Braga. On 22 December 1108, he was still prelate of Coimbra, but by 19 January of the following year, Gonçalo Pais (1109-1128) had already taken over the See of Coimbra as bishop-elect¹⁰. The rapid transfer from Coimbra to Braga might be proof that Gerald’s successor must have enjoyed the full confidence of the Portucalense counts and also of the monarch and the Toledan primate, without asking the Pope and the Papal Curia about this matter. This circumstance is reported in the letter *Miramur de vobis*, which Paschal II addressed to the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Braga, exhorting them to obey the new metropolitan, without forgetting the irregular nature of his election, since it had taken place without the required approval of Rome¹¹. The text, however, also states that such a “mishap” did not represent sufficient reason to invalidate the election, so the Supreme Pontiff not only approved it but also granted Maurice the respective pallium and privilege. According to the extant sources, everything might have happened in the spring or summer of 1109, when the new prelate travelled to Rome in person¹².

Meanwhile, even before the trip to Rome, Maurice had already confirmed, at the end of February of the same year, a large donation from the Infanta Urraca of León to the Cluny Abbey¹³. Moreover, five months later, he witnessed the important

FEIGE, Peter – 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*. Burgos: Editorial La Olmeda, 1991, p. 76-77.

9 Vita Sancti Geraldi. In *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica a saeculo octavo post Christum usque a qintumdecimum. Scriptores*. Vol. 1. Lisbon: Academia das Ciências de Lisboa, 1856-1861, chap. 16, p. 56. Portuguese translation in: *Vida de S. Geraldo (Da autoria de D. Bernardo, Arceidiago de Braga, seu discipulo e valido)*. CARDOSO, José, trad. Braga: Livraria Cruz, 1959, chap. 16, p. 28-29.

10 See: AMARAL – *Formação*, p. 420-421.

11 This papal document, most likely written in 1109 (March?), was published in Portugal by: FERREIRA, José Augusto – *Fastos Episcopales da Igreja Primacial de Braga (Séc. III – Séc. XX)*. Vol. 1. Braga: Edição da Mitra Bracarense, 1928, p. 412-413, see also p. 411. See also: ERDMANN – *Papsturkunden*, doc. 160. DAVID – *Lénigme*, p. 454-455.

12 According to Carl Erdmann, specifying a previously presented hypothesis, “a ausência de Maurício de Braga deu-se entre 5 de Fevereiro e 22 de Julho de 1109” (ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 21, note 1). In fact, as the German historian also stated, document no. 694 of *Liber Fidei* (vol. 2, p. 947-949; also published in *Documentos Medievais Portugueses. Documentos Particulares*, vol. 3, doc. 326), of 20 April 1109, mentions that the prelate was absent: «(…) si ille archiepiscopus reversus fuerit (...)». On this subject, see also: FERREIRA – *Fastos Episcopales*, vol. 1, p. 230-231, 411-412. ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 11-12. REILLY – *The Kingdom*, p. 360. FEIGE – *La primacía*, p. 77.

13 «Mauricius bragalense episcopus, confirmavit» (22 February, 1109); *Documentos Medievales del Reino de Galicia: Doña Urraca (1095-1126)*. RECUERO ASTRAY, Manuel, coord. Santiago de Compostela: Xunta de Galicia, Consellería de Cultura, Comunicación Social e Turismo, 2002, doc. 18). On this donation, see: BISHKO, Charles Julian – The cluniac priories of Galicia and Portugal: their acquisition and administration. 1075-ca.1230. In BISHKO, Charles Julian, ed. – *Spanish and*

confirmation of privileges that the now titled “Urraka, Dei nutu totius Yspanie regina” (1109-1126) granted to the Leonese Church, although in this document the subscription of Maurice seems to have been added later to the original text¹⁴. From the beginning, the newly appointed Archbishop of Braga sought to be close to some of the characters who, after the “emperor’s” disappearance, came to occupy the central positions of the kingdom’s governance, especially since Count Henry’s frequent and prolonged absences left it very exposed to the pressures of Braga’s traditional ecclesiastical opponents. In reality, Maurice, like several other members of the kingdom’s elite, was trying to achieve an advantageous position for himself and his diocese in the conflicting scenario that was foreseen as a result of the succession issue. But, from a given point of view, his responsibilities seemed bigger, since the recent history of the northwest of the Peninsula had shown how favourable the existence of a strong authority based in the Portucalense County had been for the aspirations of the Church of Braga. A very particular attention to the evolution of the regional political and ecclesiastical scenario was, therefore, unavoidable for Maurice.

For a matter of space, it is not possible to examine in detail all the events that resulted from and fuelled the growing rivalries between Braga, Santiago, and Toledo. We believe it is sufficient to summarise the major ones, since they document and are very good examples of the long dispute that developed between the three bishoprics. Giving credit to the testimony of *Historia Compostellana*, and certainly with the objective of consolidating Braga’s position vis-à-vis the Toledan archbishop, Maurice sought an immediate rapprochement with the Bishop of Compostela, Diego Gelmírez (1100-1140), who saw in this move a precious opportunity to move forward with his plans. The attempt to put an end to the endless dispute that the two Churches maintained over the properties that Compostela owned in Braga was the pretext. Thus, on 16 September 1109, after returning from his trip to Rome, Maurice, who had been appointed canon of Santiago in the meantime, made a pact with Diego Gelmírez, and received “in prestimonium siue feudum medietatem possessionum et hereditatum, quas habet ecclesia sancti Iacobi in Portugalensi terra

Portuguese monastic history, 600-1300. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984, XI, p. 316-319. REILLY, Bernard F. – *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Queen Urraca, 1109-1126*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982, p. 54. REILLY – *The Kingdom*, p. 358, 360.

14 «Mauricius Bragarensis archiepiscopus conf.» (22 July 1109; *Colección Documental del Archivo de la Catedral de León (775-1230)*). FERNÁNDEZ CATÓN, José María, ed. Vol. 5: (1109-1187). León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación «San Isidoro», Caja de Ahorros y Monte de Piedad, Archivo Histórico Diocesano, 1990, doc. 1327; RUIZ ALBI, Irene, ed. – *La Reina Dona Urraca (1109-1126). Cancillería y Colección Diplomática*. León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación «San Isidoro», Caja España de Inversiones, Archivo Histórico Diocesano, 2003, doc. 1). On the palaeographical, diplomatic and historical problems raised by this charter, particularly the interpolated confirmations, see: REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 56-57; and José María Fernández Catón’s introductory note to the edition of the diploma (p. 4-5).

a flumine Limie usque in Dorium”¹⁵. At the same time, he undertook to return the loan when it was requested by the diocese of Compostela. It was, therefore, a concession which appeared to be free of charge and without time limit, but which could be revoked.

A less careful observation would lead one to conclude that the agreement was very advantageous for Braga. The reality, however, may be quite different. In fact, the effective control of the most significant part of the Compostela patrimony in the city and surroundings of Braga, in particular the churches of S. Vitor and S. Frutuoso, already belonged *de facto* (and *de jure*) to the See of Braga, at least since 1103¹⁶. Thus, what other objective could have driven Maurice to reopen an issue that seemed to have already been closed in Braga’s favour than to secure Santiago’s support, or at the very least, its non-hostility? From this point of view, the deal balance seems more favourable to Diego Gelmírez since the mere pact meant Braga’s acknowledgement that the problem was not yet definitively resolved. However, the greatest result achieved by Diego Gelmírez was that he was able to establish himself as an “*amici et confratris*”¹⁷ of Maurice, establishing an alliance with him that, before long, would bring him invaluable successes. Also in 1112, certainly after the death of Count Henry (24 April), he managed to get his devoted archdeacon Hugh elected to the diocese of Porto (1112/14-1136) and the treasurer of his church, Munio Alfonso, to that of Mondoñedo (1112-1136)¹⁸. On 23 March 1113, Maurice took charge of the consecration of the new prelates, who immediately pledged obedience to their metropolitan¹⁹.

15 *Historia Compostellana (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, LXX)*. Ed. Emma Falque Rey. Turnhout: Brepols, 1988, lib. I, chap. LXXXI, p. 128. On the agreement between the two prelates, which resulted in the granting of the loan by the prelate from Compostela, see: FERREIRA – *Fastos Episcopales*, vol. 1, p. 232. ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 21. GRASSOTTI, Hilda – *Las Instituciones Feudo-Vasalláticas en León y Castilla*. Vol. 2: *La Recompensa Vasallática*. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull’Alto Medioevo, 1969, p. 594, 605, 635-636 (it should be noted that this author dates the grant, wrongly, from 1112). PÉREZ RODRÍGUEZ, Francisco Javier – *El dominio del cabildo Catedral de Santiago de Compostela en la Edad Media (Siglos XII-XIV)*. Santiago de Compostela: Tórculo Edicións, 1994, p. 38-39.

16 In fact, by the papal bull *Et fratrum relatione* (ERDMANN – *Papsturkunden*, doc. 5), issued from Lateran on 1 April 1103, Paschal II ordered Diego Gelmírez to return to Braga the part of the parishes of S. Vitor and S. Frutuoso that he was governing. However, despite the papal decision and the agreement reached between Maurice and Diego Gelmírez, the issue surrounding the two temples remained and passed on to the episcopate of Paio Mendes (1118-1137). On this matter, see: AMARAL – *Formação*, in particular p. 406-409.

17 *Historia Compostellana*, lib. I, chap. LXXXI, p. 128.

18 “Et quoniam beato Iacobo ecclesie sue filios exaltari placuit, duo de canonicis, quos supra dictus episcopus (Diego Gelmírez) educaerat, ad pontificatus culmen conscenderunt. Alter quorum Hugo, scilicet sancti Iacobi archidiaconus, in Portugalsensi sede; alter uero, Munio scilicet Adefonsiades, eiusdem ecclesie thesaurarius, in Minduniensi sublimatus est” (*Historia Compostellana*, lib. I, chap. LXXXI, p.127). The full narrative of these events can be found in *Historia Compostellana*, lib. I, chap. LXXXI, LXXXII, p. 126-127, 129-131. On this matter, see: ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 25. DAVID – *L’énigme*, p. 459. REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 80, 91, 229-230, 235. AMARAL, Luís Carlos – *A restauração da diocese do Porto e a chegada do Bispo D. Hugo*. In AMARAL, Luís Carlos, coord. – *Um poder entre poderes. Nos 900 anos da restauração da Diocese do Porto e da construção do Cabido Portucalense*. Porto: Cabido Portucalense, Centro de Estudos de História Religiosa, 2017, particularly p. 41-45.

19 “In eadem die, id est in sabbato ante dominicam de Passione Domini, qua sancti Iacobi episcopus (Diego Gelmírez) Lerzium (Lérez) ingressus est, archiepiscopus (Maurice) missam celebrauit et dominum Hugonem archidiaconum ad

However, the understanding between Braga and Compostela could not last for long since Diego Gelmírez' ambitious plans involved the reduction or total usurpation of the metropolitan rights of the Church of Braga, and also because the relationships between Maurice and the Archbishop of Toledo had deteriorated significantly following recent events. The first of these had occurred soon after the election of Maurice's successor to the Coimbra see. The new bishop, Gonçalo Pais (1109-1128), soon pledged obedience to both Maurice and Bernard of Toledo, in his capacity as administrator of the Lusitania province, not yet restored, contrary to the stipulations of the privilege granted by Paschal II to Gerald in early 1103²⁰. Carl Erdmann even argued that it was Bernard himself who performed his consecration, perhaps in Viseu, on 29 July 1109²¹. In fact, throughout his episcopate, Gonçalo Pais showed almost absolute fidelity to the Church of Toledo and, in particular, to Bernard, which allows us to believe that his appointment had the clear support of the primate from the beginning.

The other major cause of conflict was related to the provincial obedience of the Leonese bishopric. It seems that Maurice was in the city of León in the spring of 1112, probably with the intention of enforcing his alleged metropolitan rights over the royal diocese, so he might have tried to take advantage of the opportunity presented to him by the death of the Leonese Bishop Pedro (I, 1087-1112), which occurred between June and September 1112²². We do not know whether he managed to intervene in the appointment of the new prelate, Diego (1112-1130), Pedro's nephew, whose first documentary reference as head of the Leonese Church dates from 1 October 1112²³. What we do know for sure is that the time when Maurice remained in León coincided with the occupation of the city by Aragonese forces

presbiterii gradum sublimavit. Sequenti die, scilicet dominica de Passione Domini (23 March 1113), in *Lerzensem ecclesiam sancti Iacobi canonici conueniunt, uidelicet supra dictus episcopus, canonicorum pater et canonicus, Bracharensis archiepiscopus, Auriensis episcopus atque Tudensis, Minduniensis electus atque Portugalensis. (...) Post hec archiepiscopus missam solemniter celebravit et supra dictis episcopis astantibus predictos electos his, que ad rem pertinebant, sufficienter indagatis consecrauit*". (*Historia Compostellana*, lib. I, chap. LXXXII, p. 129-130). The pledges of obedience of Bishops Hugh of Porto and Munio Alfonso of Mondoñedo are published, with the critical date of [1113, March, 23rd], in: *Liber Fidei*, vol. 2, docs. 589 and 590.

20 Gonçalo Pais' obedience to Maurice is published, with the critical date of [1109], in: *Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 139. We have news of the obedience pledged to the Archbishop of Toledo in the bull *Ad hoc*, critically dated [1109-1113] (ERDMANN – *Papsturkunden*, doc. 12), addressed to the primate, by which Paschal II, among other things, reproached Bernard for having unduly demanded obedience from the Bishop of Coimbra. He also ordered him to restore the rights of the Church of Braga. On this subject, see also: ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 22-23. DAVID – *L'énigme*, p. 462-463. FEIGE – *La primacia*, p.77.

21 ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 22-23.

22 On Maurice's controversial presence and actions in the city of León in the spring of 1112, see: FERREIRA – *Fastos Episcopales*, vol. 1, p. 236-238. ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 24. DAVID – *L'énigme*, p. 459-462. FLETCHER, Richard A. – *The episcopate in the Kingdom of León in the twelfth century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978, p. 69. REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 230-231, 235. MANSILLA REOYO, Demetrio – *Geografía eclesiástica de España. Estudio histórico-geográfico de las diócesis*. Vol. 2. Rome: Iglesia Nacional Española-Publicaciones del Instituto Español de Historia Eclesiástica, 1994, p. 56. On the date of death of the Leonese bishop Pedro I, see: REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 230, note 12, 231.

23 REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 231.

and with a phase of total rupture between Urraca and Alfonso I of Aragon (1104-1134). It is not surprising, therefore, that in the eyes of his opponents, Maurice's trip resembled a demonstration of support for the "Battler" and his supporters. Nothing could be more contrary to Bernard's interests. Apart from the extremely serious political nature of Maurice's initiative – let us not forget that the Toledo primate had been an opponent of the marriage of Urraca and Alfonso I the "Battler" almost from the start – from the ecclesiastical point of view, the presence of the Archbishop of Braga in León at that time could only be interpreted by Bernard, to paraphrase Pierre David, as a true invasion and usurpation of his authority²⁴. In reality, the diocese of León, despite having obtained the status of exemption in 1104, thanks to a privilege of Paschal II²⁵, had never ceased to be "coveted" by the primate, and in fact, in 1121, Calixtus II (1119-1124) determined that the sees of León and Oviedo became suffragans of Toledo²⁶. The positions of Braga and Toledo were therefore practically irreconcilable.

Bernard did not take long to react. As early as 1113, using his prerogatives as papal legate, he convened a council which, among other issues, was supposed to investigate the facts that had occurred in León during the recent Aragonese occupation. On 25 October 1113, in the city of Palencia, and under the presidency of the Toledan, the assembled bishops approved several measures that were unfavourable to the interests of Braga, to which the absence of Maurice must have contributed significantly²⁷. For failing to observe the legate's summons and, consequently, for having disrespected his authority, the Archbishop of Braga was suspended from his office. On 18 April 1114, Pope Paschal II himself confirmed the suspension imposed by Bernard, taking the opportunity to harshly censure Maurice for the "Legionensis ecclesie inuasio et contritio"²⁸. Again, the primate wrote to Diego Gelmírez asking him to disseminate the papal decision to the

24 DAVID – L'énigme, p.461.

25 FLETCHER – *The Episcopate*, p. 69. FLETCHER, Richard A. – Las iglesias del Reino de León y sus relaciones con Roma en la Alta Edad Media hasta el Concilio IV de Letrán de 1215. In *El Reino de León en la Alta Edad Media. VI*. León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación «San Isidoro»-Caja España de Inversiones, Caja de Ahorros y Monte de Piedad-Archivo Histórico Diocesano de León, 1994, p. 471. MANSILLA REYOY – *Geografía*, vol. 2, p. 265-269.

26 FLETCHER – *The Episcopate*, p. 69. FLETCHER – Las iglesias, p. 471.

27 On this council, namely its summons, holding and consequences, see: FERREIRA – *Fastos Episcopales*, vol. 1, p. 238-240. ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 25-26. ERDMANN – *Mauricio Burdino*, p. 12. DAVID – L'énigme, p. 461-463. REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 93-96, 231-232, 235-236. GARCÍA Y GARCÍA, Antonio – Concilios y sínodos en el ordenamiento jurídico del Reino de León. In *El Reino de León en la Alta Edad Media. Vol. 1: Cortes, Concilios y Fueros*. León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación «San Isidoro»-Caja de Ahorros y Monte de Piedad-Archivo Histórico Diocesano de León, 1988, p. 407-408. FEIGE – La primacia, p. 77. *Historia Compostellana* devoted several chapters to some of the topics addressed at the Palentine Council (*Historia Compostellana*, lib. I, chaps. XCII, XCVII, XCVIII, XCIX, p. 151-152, 161-164).

28 Paschal II's brief is part of a letter from Bernard addressed to Diego Gelmírez and copied in *Historia Compostellana*, lib. I, chap. XCIX, p. 163-164. See previous note.

suffragan bishops of Braga and Countess Theresa²⁹. Maurice could not fail to realise the seriousness of the situation and the concerted nature of the measures approved against him and his church. He then decided to travel personally to Rome in order to enforce his rights with the papal Curia³⁰. The negotiation skills that he certainly had, and that must have contributed significantly to his later Roman career, did not take long to achieve results. On 3 November 1114, Paschal II issued two documents from Anagni that, categorically, not only accepted Braga's reasons, but also safeguarded its interests³¹. In the rescript addressed to the Archbishop of Toledo, the pontiff condemned in very severe terms several abuses committed by the primate. Accordingly, he determined to withdraw Bernard's legate rights over the province of Braga³². In the second missive, addressed to Gonçalo Pais, Paschal II threatened to suspend the bishop of Coimbra if he did not comply with the metropolitan authority of the church of Braga³³. None of the documents made any reference to the suspension of Maurice decreed by the Toledan and, even less, to its papal confirmation, which testifies to the permanent revocable nature of pontifical decisions, almost entirely dependent on the information reaching the Curia and the negotiating "skill" of their bearers. Finally, and as a corollary of the initiative of the prelate from Braga, Paschal II confirmed, in a privilege granted from the Lateran, on 4 December 1114, the limits of the archbishopric of Braga, which meant the full revocation of the previous suspension³⁴.

29 "Precamur igitur amicitiam uestram, quatinus omnibus suffraganeis Bracharensis ecclesie episcopis has ostendatis litteras (the papal letter) et, ne predicto M. (Maurice) secundum iussionem domini Pape obedientiam exhibeant, ammoneatis. Has quoque alias Portugalensium infantisse (Theresa) uestri gratia pro nostro amore destinate" (*Historia Compostellana*, lib. I, chap. XCIX, p. 164). This letter from the Archbishop of Toledo contains a transcription of Paschal II's brief referred to in the previous note.

30 With regard to this journey by Maurice to the papal Curia, in particular on the objectives and privileges achieved, see: FERREIRA – *Fastos Episcopales*, vol. 1, p. 240-243. ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 26-28. ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p.13-17. DAVID – *L'énigme*, p. 463-465. REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 237-239 (regarding the dating of the papal documents presented by this author, see the following note). FEIGE – *La primacia*, p. 77.

31 Bull *Pro iniuriis* addressed to Archbishop and papal legate Bernard of Toledo (*Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 555); bull *Quanti criminis* addressed to Archbishop Gonçalo of Coimbra (*Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 556). On the critical dating of these papal legal texts see: ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 14-16. It should be noted that Bernard F. Reilly, by adopting the chronology previously proposed by Juan Francisco Rivera Recio, proposes 1115, and not 1114, as the year in which the cited documents were issued, resulting in a different sequence of events (REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 238, note 36).

32 "Nos autem in his vehementer regni turbationem et etatis tue gravedinem infirmitatisque pensamus, idcirco te ab iniuncta super archiepiscopum et provinciam Bracarensem cura legationis absolvimus, ut liberius ipse valeat in provincia sua iusticiam exercere" (*Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 555). See previous note.

33 "Adhuc tamen paternam penes te pacientiam exhibentes precipimus ut eidem archiepiscopo tanquam metropolitano tuo deinceps debeas obedire. Porro nisi infra dies quadraginta postquam has litteras acceperis debitam ei obedientiam presentaveris, ex tunc ab episcopali officio te suspendimus" (*Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 556). See note 29.

34 "Tuis igitur frater in Christo karissime Maurici precibus annuentes ad perpetuam sancte Bracarensis ecclesie pacem ac stabilitatem presentis decreti stabilitate sancimus ut universi parrochie fines sicut temporibus Mironis regis in episcoporum concilio distincti leguntur et sicut a tuis antecessoribus usque hodie possessi sunt ita ut integri omnino tibi tuisque successoribus in perpetuum conserventur (...)" (bull *Sicut iniusta*, *Liber Fidei*, vol. 1, doc. 554).

Meanwhile, the agreement between the prelates of Toledo and Santiago de Compostela was taking shape and proving to be active. Certainly, benefiting from Maurice's absence, Diego Gelmírez took the opportunity to summon, on the behalf of the primate, a regional synod on the pretext of publishing the canons approved at the recent Council of León, in mid-October 1114³⁵. Therefore, on 17 November of the same year, the bishops of Tuy, Mondoñedo, Lugo, Ourense and Porto met in Compostela, under the presidency of Gelmírez. After becoming aware of the decisions of the Leonese assembly, they decided to establish a "confraternitatem" among themselves with the objective of promoting charity and solidarity within the group³⁶. It is assumed that all owed obedience to Braga, but Diego Gelmírez. Therefore, the initiative of the bishop of Santiago, as it appears in the Compostela chronicle, can only be interpreted as one more step towards trying to place the suffragans of Braga under the control of the church of the Apostle. However, the ambitious strategy of the Galician prelate might not have had a great effect on his most immediate recipients, obviously excluding the case of Hugh of Porto, whose unshakable loyalty we witnessed from very early on, extending until the end of his episcopate. The non-existence of any other documentary news besides the account of *Historia Compostellana* and the letter that the bishops in question addressed to Gonçalo of Coimbra, informing him of the deliberations of the Compostela synod and inviting him to join the fraternity that they established and to resolve the problems he had with the dioceses of Santiago and Porto³⁷, attests to the initiative's lack of success. What we have just described clearly documents the intricate nature of the ecclesiastical landscape of the kingdom of León and Castile, especially in the westernmost regions, in early 1115. Nothing, however, that strayed too far from the complex political situation in which the monarchy itself was immersed, which proves the close complicity between both structures.

In any case, even before what would become the definitive rupture with the legitimate Papacy, which took place in 1118, Maurice already seems to have completely, or almost, abdicated from safeguarding the rights of his diocese. This is the only way to explain why the privileges obtained in Rome, at the end of 1114, did not have great repercussions in the Hispanic ecclesiastical situation. At best, we

35 On the Council of León of 18 October 1114, see: REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 100-101, 233. GARCÍA Y GARCÍA – Concilios, p. 408-409.

36 "Confraternitatem etiam inter nos fecimus, ut alius alium diligat et alius alii, si necesse fuerit, pro posse suo subueniat et mutuam caritatem inuicem habeamus, et quando aliquis nostrum obibit, eius anime unanimiter alii succurrant elemosinis, orationibus, sacrificiis, quatinus ad eternam beatitudinem peruenire possit" (*Historia Compostellana*, lib. I, chap. Cl, p. 170). Regarding the matters addressed in this episcopal meeting, especially with regard to the establishment of a fraternity, see: FERREIRA – *Fastos Episcopales*, vol. 1, p. 243-244. ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 27-28. ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 22. DAVID – *L'énigme*, p. 470-471. REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 236. GARCÍA Y GARCÍA – Concilios, p. 409-411.

37 The letter sent to Bishop Gonçalo of Coimbra, dated 17 November [1114] – that is, drawn up on the same day as the regional synod of Compostela was held –, is partially published in: ERDMANN – *O Papado*, doc. 1.

can conclude that they limited themselves to rebalancing a scenario that, due to the concerted initiatives of Toledo and Santiago, proved to be manifestly unfavourable to Braga. However, more significant is the fact that, between mid-1115 and early 1117, a series of decisions were made by Paschal II, and others, which greatly penalised Braga's interests. Thanks to the dynamism of Diego Gelmírez, who found in Bishop Hugh of Porto the ideal ambassador to defend and negotiate with the Roman Curia his projects and those of his Church, but also to the endeavours of Bernard of Toledo and Gonçalo of Coimbra, the metropolis of Braga saw several privileges, which it had achieved at great cost, being limited and/or withdrawn³⁸.

Representative of this state of affairs were the measures taken at the Council of Burgos, held in February 1117, under the presidency of Cardinal Legate Boso of Sant'Anastasia³⁹. The council was summoned to publicise the results of the enquiry requested by the pope and conducted by the primate of Toledo into the endless problem of the obedience of the church of Coimbra and was also attended by the bishops of Porto and Coimbra and by Queen Urraca herself. The Cardinal Legate heard Bernard defending the thesis that the diocese of Coimbra should not be part of the suffragans of Braga, since it belonged to the church of Mérida and was therefore temporarily dependent on the See of Toledo. But the synod also deliberated on border issues between Braga, Porto, and Coimbra. To the south of the Douro, the church of Coimbra was favoured and to the north, the church of Porto, so Braga ended up being the only see affected by the adjustments to the diocesan boundaries⁴⁰. Finally, Cardinal Boso published a very harsh judgement against Maurice which, given the chronology, we can interpret as a serious reproach of the conduct of the archbishop of Braga who, by that time, as we shall see, should have definitively joined the "party" of the German emperor.

Contrary to what might be expected, Maurice's reaction to such a generalised and hostile attack on the interests of his diocese, if it existed at all, was very limited, to the point of leaving no trace in the documentation. We have not found any evidence of Maurice taking a stand to obstruct the initiatives of his rivals, either within the Hispanic Church or with the Papacy, where he had already fully demonstrated his skills as a negotiator. In short, everything suggests that, after 1114 or 1115, Maurice gradually became detached from the affairs of his diocese. However, this fact may not mean, as Carl Erdmann argued, a definitive physical distance from the Portucalense County, a

38 On the pontifical measures, and beyond, taken during this period against the interests of Braga, see: FERREIRA – *Fastos Episcopales*, vol. 1, p. 243-245. ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 28-29. ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 23-26. DAVID – *L'énigme*, p.471-473. REILLY – *Queen Urraca*, p. 239-240.

39 With regard to the topics addressed in this conciliar assembly, see the bibliography cited in the previous note.

40 On the problems related to the alteration of the diocesan boundaries between Braga, Porto and Coimbra, which had already begun before the Council of Burgos, the bibliography cited in note 36 should be seen.

theme on which we will focus later on⁴¹. It is, therefore, not difficult to accept that his visit to and stay in Rome familiarised him with and seduced him by the multiple issues arising from the extensive conflict between the Papacy and the German emperors, polarised around the problem of the Investitures. His Roman involvement thus seems to have gone hand in hand with his gradual disinterest in Hispanic affairs. These intertwined processes may also indicate a gradual realisation of a certain impotence to face the powerful adversaries of Toledo and Santiago alone, without the effective support of the elites of Portugal.

2. “Roman” Maurice

Maurice, “antipope” Gregory VIII between 1118 and 1121. The dynamic of his papal election in Rome at the beginning of March 1118 is a true *enigma* to quote Pierre David’s famous expression, or almost a “treasure hunt”, in which historians have only a few clues, included in different, dispersed, and fragmentary sources, to reach a possible solution⁴². What were Maurice’s relations with Paschal II and the chancellor of the Roman Church, John of Gaeta, future Gelasius II (1118-1119)⁴³? And how did he reach the imperial court of Henry V (1106-1125)⁴⁴? Let us start at the end. In March 1118, in the city of Gaeta, after having fled Rome following the arrival of Henry V, Pope Gelasius II wrote a letter to the clergy (*clerum*) and the Roman “people”⁴⁵, the *populus*, that is, specific leaders and political actors of Rome linked to the system of city regions and opposed to the *nobiles* in the 12th century, as highlighted by Chris Wickham⁴⁶. In this letter, Pope Gelasius II wanted to dissuade the Romans from pledging allegiance and obedience to Maurice, known as “Bourdin” – a pejorative nickname whose origin

41 As we shall see, Carl Erdmann tried to prove, with elements that we consider relevant, that Maurice no longer returned to Braga after having settled his affairs in Rome in the second half of 1114 (ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 17-20; see also, ERDMANN – *O Papado*, p. 28). Making use of no less relevant data and arguments, Pierre David sought to demonstrate exactly the opposite, arguing that Maurice returned to his diocese in April or May 1115, remaining there until the summer of 1116, when he left definitively for Rome (DAVID – *L’énigme*, p. 465-469, 473). Although they did not delve as deeply into the subject as the two authors cited, both José Augusto Ferreira and Avelino de Jesus da Costa also advocated Maurice’s return to Braga after the Roman stay of 1114 (FERREIRA – *Fastos Episcopales*, vol. 1, p. 241, 243-244. COSTA, Avelino de Jesus da – *Burdino, Maurício (Gregório VIII)*. In SERRÃO, Joel, dir. – *Dicionário de História de Portugal*. Vol. 1. Porto: Livraria Figueirinhas, 1990, p. 394).

42 In this second part, we will not study the modalities of election already dealt with in RENZI, Francesco – *Uno sguardo “altro” sul papato di inizio XII secolo. Le elezioni di Papa Gelasio II, dell’antipapa Gregorio VIII e il loro spazio sonoro*. In RODRÍGUEZ, Gerardo; PALAZZO, Éric; SCHWINDT, Gisela, ed. – *Paisajes sonoros medievales*. Mar del Plata: UNMDP, 2019, p. 283-314 and CONDORELLI, Orazio – *L’elezione di Maurizio Burdino (Gregorio VIII), il concilio di Reims e la scomunica di Irnerio (1119)*. *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law*. 37 (2020) 1-64.

43 *Liber Pontificalis nella recensione di Pietro Guglielmo OSB e del card. Pandolfo glossato da Pietro Bohier OSB, vescovo di Orvieto*. PRÉROVSKÝ, Ulderico, ed. Vol. 2. Rome: Libr. Ateneo Salesiano, 1978, p. 727-728.

44 DAVID – *L’énigme*, p. 441-501.

45 JL 4882 (Gaeta, 1118, March, 10th) = Gelasii II papae ep. II, PL CLXIII, cols. 487-488.

46 WICKHAM, Chris – *Medieval Rome: Stability and Crisis of a City, 900-1150*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, p. 262-263 and following.

is uncertain⁴⁷ –, elevated to the throne of Saint Peter by Henry V and, therefore, invader of the Roman Church⁴⁸. Gelasius II added two fundamental details, the first clues. First, Maurice had been known in Rome for a long time since he had received the episcopal *pallium* (as archbishop of Braga, a/n). Second, Maurice, called “familiaris noster”, had been chosen as a legate to negotiate peace with Henry V on behalf of Paschal II (“super tractanda pacem legatum”) but ended up going over to the emperor’s side, this being the great betrayal of the prelate from Braga against the Catholic Faith⁴⁹. How did it get to this point?

Let us return to the beginning, more precisely to the year 1101. As bishop of Coimbra, Maurice travelled, probably for the first time, to Rome, where he received from Paschal II a privilege that confirmed the patrimony and borders of the diocese according to the *Divisio Theodomiri*, a document also known as *Parrochiale Suevorum*, whose content probably dates back to the second half of the 6th century⁵⁰. At the time of his election as Gregory VIII, there had been, therefore, almost seventeen years of contact between Maurice, Paschal II, and his “entourage”, which also included the former monk of Montecassino, John of Gaeta, already in the service of the Papacy since the time of Urban II (1088-1099), as stated by Pandulf of Alatri, author of the biography of Gelasius II included in the *Liber Pontificalis*⁵¹. This relationship did not end in 1101 and was cultivated by both sides. Most likely, Maurice was in Rome again during his journey to the Holy Land, which, as we said before, took place between 1104 and 1108, before becoming the archbishop of Braga⁵². As we have seen, relations continued from Braga in the years when connections between Rome and the northwest of the

47 ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 51-55. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 445-451. GADY – De Saint-Pierre, p. 4-12. VONES-LIEBENSTEIN, Ursula – Cluniazensische Spurensuche: Aufstieg und Sturz Gregors (VIII.) (1118-1121). In SOHN, Andreas, ed. – *Benedictiner als Päpste*. Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2018, p. 139. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 24-26 and related notes for the bibliography.

48 JL 4882 (Gaeta, 1118, March, 10th) = Gelasii II papae ep. II, PL CLXIII, cols. 487-488.

49 JL 4882 (Gaeta, 1118, March, 10th) = Gelasii II papae ep. II, PL CLXIII, cols. 487-488. STROLL, Mary – *Calixtus II (1119-1124). A Pope born to rule*. Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2004, p. 91 and by the same author – *Symbols As Power: The Papacy Following the Investiture Contest*. Leiden: Brill, 1991, p. XIX-XX.

50 ERDMANN – *Papsturkunden*, doc. 2. *Livro Preto: Cartulário da Sé de Coimbra*. Ed. Manuel Augusto Rodrigues e Avelino de Jesus da Costa. Coimbra: Arquivo da Universidade de Coimbra, 1999, docs. 592 and 621. On this matter, see: DAVID, Pierre – L’organisation ecclésiastique du Royaume suève au temps de Saint-Martin. *Bracara Augusta*. 8 (1957) 31-33. OLIVEIRA, Miguel – Os territórios diocesanos. *Lusitania Sacra*. 1 (1956) 30-31. LÓPEZ ALSINA, Fernando – El Parrochiale Suevum y su presencia en las cartas pontificias del siglo XII. In HERBERS, Klaus; LÓPEZ ALSINA, Fernando; ENGEL, Frank, ed. *Das begrenzte Papsttum Spielräume päpstlichen Handelns. Legaten – delegierte Richter – Grenzen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013, p. 105-132. ALARCÃO, Jorge de – As paróquias suélicas do território atualmente português. In VILLAR, Francisco; FERNÁNDEZ ÁLVAREZ, María Pilar, ed. – *Religión, lengua y cultura prerromanas de Hispania*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad Salamanca, 2001, p. 29-60 and by the same author – Os limites das dioceses suevas de Bracara e de Portucale. *Portvgalia*. 36 (2015) 35-48. FERNANDES, Armando de Almeida – *Paróquias suevas e dioceses visigóticas*. Arouca: Associação para a Defesa da Cultura Arouquense-Câmara Municipal de Tarouca, 1997. MARQUES, José – As dioceses portuguesas até 1150. *Biblos*. 77 (2002) 7-60. RENZI, Francesco; MARIANI, Andrea – Sobre as origens da diocese do Porto na Alta Idade Média. Uma reflexão sobre o Parrochiale Suevorum e a diocese de Magneto/Meinedo (sécs. VI-VII). *Portvgalia*. 41 (2020) 91-121.

51 *Liber Pontificalis*, II, p. 727-728. See RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 78-79 for a general bibliography.

52 See bibliography cited in note 6.

Iberian Peninsula intensified. This was a bilateral relationship in which both parties had potential benefits. On the one hand, local episcopates could receive prestigious legitimacy from the Apostolic See, which could be “used” in the territory and in local conflicts, and on the other hand, Rome sought to spread its Primacy on a European scale. Rome also needed legitimation and was not, in fact, the “all-powerful” institution imagined by historians of the 19th and 20th centuries⁵³.

Certainly, relationships were not always idyllic. Maurice, as mentioned above, was suspended from his episcopal office by Paschal II, following the complaints made to the pope by the Archbishop of Toledo, Bernard⁵⁴. According to the Toledan prelate, Maurice had illegitimately “invaded” and “occupied” the episcopal see of León (1112), disputed by the two archdioceses. This episode is a good example of the conflicts for Primacy in Hispania and that, will characterise, among other aspects, the relations between Braga and Toledo throughout the 12th and 13th centuries⁵⁵. As shown by Patrick Henriët, this confrontation will in many cases have as protagonist, “malgré lui”, Maurice “Bourdin”, whose memory of the experience as “antipope” will be used in Toledo to denigrate and delegitimise the primatial claims of Braga still in the 13th century⁵⁶. Maurice, however, knew how to play his cards and, in 1114, as mentioned above, after being summoned by Paschal II, he managed to recover his ecclesiastical office and obtain a new papal privilege over Braga’s patrimony⁵⁷. This time, the prelate from Braga used, most likely, as a documentary source to support his claims, some documents attributed to Miro King of the Suevi (570-583), produced in Braga, and preserved in the *Liber Fidei*⁵⁸, moulded into other false or interpolated documents proceedings from the Galician see of Lugo, as highlighted by Fernando López Alsina and in a recent work on the Serra do Marão⁵⁹.

53 CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria – *Gregorio VII*. Rome: Salerno Editrice, 2018 187-188, 223-224 and 303. JOHRENDT, Jochen; MÜLLER, Harald, ed. – *Römisches Zentrum und kirchliche peripherie: das universale papsttum als bezugspunkt der kirchen von den Reformpäpsten bis zu Innozenz III*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008. VENEZIANI, Enrico – Between Rome and Montecassino: re-thinking the investiture controversy in the first half of the twelfth century. *Questiones Medii Aevi Novae*. 23 (2018) 185-211.

54 RENZI, Francesco; VENEZIANI, Enrico – Alcune note sulla Riforma della Chiesa Romana nel pienomedioevo (secoli XI-XII). *Via Spiritus*. 27 (2020) 5-33.

55 ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 12-15. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 459-463. MANSILLA REOYO, Demetrio – Orígenes de la organización metropolitana en la iglesia española. *Hispania Sacra*. 12 (1959) 255-290. FEIGE – La primacía, p. 61-132.

56 HENRIËT, Patrick – Political Struggle and the legitimation of the Toledan Primacy: The Pars Laterani Concilii. In ALFONSO ANTÓN, Isabel; KENNEDY, Hugh; ESCALONA MONGE, Julio, coord. – *Building legitimacy: Political discourses and forms of legitimacy in medieval societies*. Leiden: Brill, p. 291-318. See also LINEHAN, Peter – *History and the historians of medieval Spain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, p. 352-354.

57 ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 18 and 19-31. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 463 and following.

58 *Liber Fidei*, vol. 2, docs. 15, 552 and 554.

59 DAVID – L’énigme, p. 455-458. LÓPEZ ALSINA – El Parrochiale Suevum, p. 122-124 and MARIANI, Andrea; RENZI, Francesco – *Inde ad montem Marantis. A Serra do Marão no contexto das fontes medievais portuguesas (sécs. VI-XII)*. In BALSÀ, Carlos, coord. – *Povoamento e vias de comunicação ao longo da História*. Vila Real: Biblioteca Municipal de Vila Real, 2023, p. 57-75.

According to Carl Erdmann, the year 1114 is the turning point in Maurice’s career⁶⁰. After this year, he would not have returned to Braga, remaining outside his diocese for two years, as attested by an excerpt of the *Liber Pontificalis*, more precisely in the *Vita Paschalis II*: “Mauritio Braccarensi archiepiscopo, qui ob superbiam levitatemque curialis effectus per biennium extra parrochiam propriam opulentissime cultu regio hac et illac molliter dissoluteque vagaverat”⁶¹. This biography, traditionally attributed to Pandulf of Alatri, was completed *ex post facto*, in the years of Gelasius II or Calixtus II (between 1119 and 1121 according to Ulderico Přerovský), and we must be careful to take this reference as exact time data⁶². Pierre David, in his study on the figure of the “antipope” Gregory VIII, had already underlined how, with high probability, Maurice had returned to Braga after obtaining the papal privilege, in December 1114⁶³. There is, for example, a letter from July 1115, addressed to the then archbishop of Braga, about the papal confirmation of the change of location of the see of Mondonedo (1113-1114), of which Maurice “Bourdin” was the metropolitan⁶⁴. Furthermore, the same missive from Paschal II also announced a papal legation in Hispania, a reference that would probably allude to the future mission of Cardinal Boso of Sant’Anastasia⁶⁵, an initiative communicated by the Roman pontiff to the abbot of Saint Rufo and bishop-elect of Barcelona, Oleguer, in 1116⁶⁶. Moreover, among the documents of Santiago de Compostela, more precisely in a donation made in April 1115 by Diego Gelmírez to the monastery of Pinario, there is a reference to Maurice, even if only as *confirmans* of the document⁶⁷. As mentioned above, in November 1115 Paschal II confirmed that the

60 See on this matter what we have already said in note 41.

61 *Liber Pontificalis*, II, p. 723-724. ERDMANN – *Maurício*, p. 18 and 29. COLOTTO – Gregorio VIII, p. 246.

62 For the debate on the identity of the author of *Vita Paschalis II*, see *Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 1, p. 113-129 and particularly p. 120-121 for dating the work. DUCHESNE, Louis – Le “Liber Pontificalis” aux mains de Guibertistes et de Pierléonistes. *École française de Rome. Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire*. 38 (1920) 181-193. VOGEL, Cyrille – Le «Liber Pontificalis» dans l’édition de L. Duchesne. In MARROU, Henri Irénée, coord. – *Monseigneur Duchesne et son temps*. Rome: École française de Rome, 1975, p. 121-127. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 78 for a general bibliography on the topic.

63 JL 4746 (Lateran, December, 1114, 4th) = Paschalis II papae ep., PL CLXIII, col. 361. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 465-473. COLOTTO – Gregorio VIII, p. 246.

64 JL 4775 (Benevento, July, 1115, 3rd) = Paschalis II papae ep., PL CLXIII, ep. CDXXX, col. 383. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 32-33. In turn, the papal privilege of 11 April 1115, with which Paschal II guaranteed Braga’s possessions in Galicia and Portugal, would be false. Cf. VASCONCELOS, Maria da Assunção Jácome de; ARAÚJO, António de Sousa – *Bulário Bracarense. Sumários de Diplomas Pontifícios dos Séculos XI a XIX*. Braga: Arquivo Distrital de Braga-Universidade do Minho, 1986, regs. 13 and 14 and ERDMANN – *Papsturkunden*, doc. 13.

65 JL 4775 (Benevento, July, 1115, 3rd) = Paschalis II papae ep., PL CLXIII, ep. CDXXX, col. 383 “Si quid igitur in hoc corrigendum est, legatus noster, cum ad vos venerit, per Dei Gratiam providebit”. ZAFARANA, Zelina – Bosone. In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. Vol. 13. Rome: Treccani, 1971. Accessed on: [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bosone_res-b6e7f78d-87e8-11dc-8e9d-0016357eee51_\(DizionarioBiografico\)/](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bosone_res-b6e7f78d-87e8-11dc-8e9d-0016357eee51_(DizionarioBiografico)/). Accessed on 14/11/2022. HÜLS, Rudolf – *Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms 1049-1130*. Tübingen: Niemeyer Max Verlag, 1977, p. 147-148. BLUMENTHAL, Uta-Renate – *Papal reform and canon law in the 11th and 12th centuries*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 1998, p. 83. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 33.

66 JL 4814 (Trastevere, May, 1116, 23rd) = Paschalis II papae ep., PL CLXIII, ep. CDLXIX, cols. 405-407. Sobre Olegário, ERDMANN, *Maurício Burdino*, 48. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 33.

67 DAVID – L’énigme, p. 465-473. LUCAS ÁLVAREZ, Manuel – *El Archivo del Monasterio de San Martiño de Fóra o Pinario de Santiago de Compostela*. Vol. 1. A Coruña: Castro, 1999, reg. 27 and by the same author – *El Monasterio de San Martiño*

diocese of Coimbra owed obedience to the metropolitan see of Braga. Could this letter from Paschal II addressed to the Bishop of Coimbra, Gonçalo Pais, be the result of a further diplomatic mission from “Bourdin”⁶⁸? Maurice could have travelled again to Rome in the autumn of 1115, a round trip that by land took about four or five months⁶⁹. In those same years, the Bishop of Porto Hugh travelled several times to Rome, as highlighted by Maria João Oliveira e Silva and Maria João Branco. Hugh was present in Rome in 1114, 1115, when he obtained an important papal privilege⁷⁰, and in 1116, without forgetting the trips abroad from Hispania to negotiate the archiepiscopal title of Compostela⁷¹. Therefore, it would not be impossible for Maurice “Bourdin” to have travelled to Rome two years in a row. The bishops of the Kingdom of León and Castile were in regular contact with the Apostolic See already at the beginning of the 12th century⁷². A tradition of contacts and trips to Rome that, in Braga, would remain stable thanks to the ecclesiastical and diplomatic activity of the Archbishop João Peculiar (1138-1175), throughout the 12th century⁷³. Finally, it is unlikely that Paschal II would hand over a relevant diplomatic mission, addressed to Emperor Henry V, to a negligent bishop who had abandoned his see, as evidenced by Pierre David⁷⁴. Furthermore, as already noted, the *Vita* of Paschal II was completed by Pandulf of Alatri after the death of the pontiff, and it is possible that the two-year time reference is not that accurate. The same source points out that Maurice “Bourdin” left his see attracted by the luxurious lifestyle of the imperial court. However, before March 1116, in the biennium 1114-1115, imperial documents do not record Henry V’s presence in Italy – as we shall see, his coronation by Maurice took place in March 1117 –, which makes it difficult for a mission

Pinaro de Santiago de Compostela en la Edad Media. A Coruña: Ediciós do Castro, 2003, doc. 23. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 32-33
RENZI – Dal Portogallo, p. 210 on the authenticity of the document.

- 68 JL 4786 (Anagni, November, 1115, 3rd) = Paschalis II papae ep. CDXLI, PL CLXIII, col. 390. Paschal II also confirmed this provision in a letter to the archbishop of Toledo, cf. JL 4787 (Anagni, November, 1115, 3rd) = Paschalis II papae ep. CDXLII, PL CLXIII, col. 391. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 469-470.
- 69 CHERUBINI, Giovanni – I pellegrini. In SENSINI, Sergio, coord. – *Viaggiare nel Medioevo*. Pisa: Centro di Studi sulla Civiltà del Tardo Medioevo, 2000, p. 544-560.
- 70 JL 4778 (Benevento, August, 1115, 15th) = ROBERT, Ulysse – *Bullaire du Pape Calixte II*. Vol. 1. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1891, doc. 149. MARIANI, Andrea; RENZI, Francesco – 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*. 37 (2018) 166-167.
- 71 REAL, Manuel Luís – A Sé Catedral do Porto no momento da restauração da diocese e a subsequente reforma românico-gótica, and BRANCO, Maria João – Prelazia e poder real. Entre a concórdia e o conflito: os casos de D. Hugo e D. Martinho Rodrigues do Porto, both in, *Um poder entre poderes*, respectively p. 57 and 281. SILVA, Maria João Oliveira e – *Scriptores et notatores. A produção documental da Sé do Porto (1113-1247)*. Porto: Fio da Palavra, 2008, p. 24.
- 72 VONES, Ludwig – Restoration ou bouleversement?. *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez*. 49:2 (2019). Accessed at: <http://journals.openedition.org/mcv/11225>. Accessed on 05/03/2023.
- 73 COSTA, Avelino de Jesus da – D. João Peculiar, co-fundador do mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra, bispo do Porto e arcebispo de Braga. In *Santa Cruz de Coimbra do século XI ao século XIX. Estudos no IX Centenário de S. Teotónio, 1082-1982*. Coimbra: [s/n], 1984, p. 59-83. MORENO, Humberto Baquero – A Igreja bracarense na Independência de Portugal. In 2^o CONGRESSO HISTÓRICO DE GUIMARÃES: SOCIEDADE, ADMINISTRAÇÃO, CULTURA E IGREJA EM PORTUGAL NO SÉC. XII, Guimarães, 1996 – *Actas*. Vol. 4. Guimarães: Câmara Municipal-Universidade do Minho, 1996, p. 7-16.
- 74 DAVID – L’énigme, p. 485-486.

before 1116 and that the period of absence of “Bourdin” from the Portucalense County may have started as early as 1114. We are, however, dealing with mere hypotheses⁷⁵.

Let us now consider the papal diplomatic mission to negotiate peace with Henry V. According to the emperor’s diplomas published by Alfred Gawlik and Mathias Thiel, we know that the emperor, in mid-March, was already in Treviso, near Venice, after having been in Augsburg in Bavaria, and he stayed in central-northern Italy for almost a year⁷⁶. It should not be forgotten that Henry V was travelling through formally imperial territory and in the ancient *Regnum Italiae* (the title of “King of Italy” was linked to the imperial crown⁷⁷), whose bishoprics were also part of the Empire and its church, the *Reichskirche* or *Reichskirchensystem*⁷⁸. It is worth remembering that, progressively, between the 11th and 13th centuries, imperial authority was limited by the power of the cities, the “Comuni”, which emerged victorious in the battle of Legnano against the imperial forces of Frederick I Hohenstaufen (1155-1190) in 1176⁷⁹. During his stay in northern Italy, Henry V, in the autumn-winter of 1116, also reached Forlimpopoli, located south of Ravenna, in Romagna. Ravenna was an operational centre of the Empire in Italy since the Ottonians, even if claimed by Rome since the time of the Carolingians in the 8th-9th century⁸⁰. Forlimpopoli was another strategic point, since it is located close to Rimini, where *Via Flaminia*, that connected Rome to Romagna, ended. It was always in Romagna that *Via Popilia-Annia* began. This road reached Aquileia, located between Venice and Trieste, in northeastern Italy, an area connected to Germany through *Via Claudia Augusta*⁸¹.

It is difficult to establish the exact moment of Maurice’s legation to Emperor Henry V. If it took place as early as March 1116, Maurice might have been in Rome in December 1115. This would be truly interesting because it would mean the simultaneous presence in Rome of the archbishop of Braga and Hugh of Porto, who, on 24 March 1116, appears as the *subscriber* of a document of Paschal II addressed to

75 *Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, p. 723-724. *Die Urkunden Heinrichs V. und der Königin Mathilde*. GAWLIK, Alfred; THIEL, Matthias. MGH. Accessed on: <<http://www.mgh.de/ddhv/>>. Accessed on 06/03/2023, docs. 120-152. ERDMANN, *Mauricio Burdino*, p. 31-32. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 465-473 and 484-487. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 33-34.

76 *Die Urkunden Heinrichs V.*, docs. 153-155.

77 CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria – Dalle chiese alla monarchia papale. In CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria; POLONIO, Valeria; RUSCONI, Roberto, coord. – *Chiesa, chiese, movimenti religiosi*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2001, p. 28-29. SERGI, Giuseppe – The kingdom of Italy. In REUTER, Timothy, ed. – *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: University Press, 1999, p. 346-371.

78 CANTARELLA – Dalle Chiese, p. 30-36.

79 BARBERO, Alessandro – *29 maggio 1176. Barbarossa sconfitto a Legnano*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2012.

80 *Die Urkunden Heinrichs V.*, doc. 197. CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria – La ruptura truncada: la muerte de Otón III. In SABATÉ, Flocel, ed. – *Ruptura i legitimació dinàstica a l’Edad Mitjana*. Lleida: Pagès ed., 2015, p. 88-90.

81 SAMI, Denis – The network of Interregional roads and harbours. In COSENTINO, Salvatore, ed. – *A companion to Byzantine Italy*. Leiden: Brill, 2021, p. 262. BENEDICTOW, Ole Jørgen – *The complete history of the Black Death*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2021, p. 11.

the bishopric of Besançon⁸². If the legation took place in October/November of the same year, Maurice could have travelled to Italy again from Braga. Maurice's mission could also have been an *in extremis* attempt to negotiate with the emperor in early 1117, since in March of the same year Maurice crowned Henry V in Saint Peter's Basilica and was, therefore, already part of the imperial entourage⁸³. In this context, the fact that in February 1117 Cardinal-Priest Boso of Sant'Anastasia, who had left Rome after March 1116, harshly condemned Maurice in Burgos, as mentioned above, is of some relevance. Boso travelled first to *Hispania* in the spring of 1116. In November of the same year, his presence is attested in northwestern Italy (Turin). Shortly afterwards, he was travelling again in the Iberian Peninsula, where he remained in the winter of 1117. This chronology and the condemnation of Burgos could mean that Boso had already left the Roman Curia informed about Maurice's "betrayal", or that he could have been updated on the events during his presence in Italy in the autumn of 1116, thus placing Maurice's legation in that year⁸⁴.

However, this mission raises several questions. Why was Maurice chosen? Was he supposed to enjoy the trust of Paschal II, but to the point of handing him such a task? Even if it was not really a question of achieving peace (on the Investitures?), what did Gelasius II mean in the letter of 1118? In short, there were many latent issues between Paschal II and Henry V, and even if it were only a simple truce between the parties, it was still a very difficult mission. We must not forget that in 1116 or early 1117, it must not have been easy to find someone in Rome willing to negotiate with Henry V. Almost all the protagonists of April 1111, when the king of Germany kidnapped the pope and some cardinals – the occasion on which the *privilegium* (sic), i.e. the Settefratte agreement on the Investitures, was signed – including the powerful Peter, Cardinal-Bishop of Porto (*Portuensis diocesis*), a suburbicarian diocese of Rome, were still alive. In this context, an external ecclesiastic could be a valid solution. In other words: could Maurice be sacrificed? Who accompanied Maurice? And was he one of the legates or the head of the legation? The silence of the literary sources seems almost total, even though it is certain that the prelate from Braga did not travel alone. Why, then, did Maurice accept what seemed to be a thorny mission? Is it legitimate to

82 JL 4811 (Lateran, March, 1116, 24th) = PL CLXIII, Paschalis II papae ep. CDLXVI, cols. 402-404. RENZI, Francesco; MARIANI, Andrea – Redescubrir un obispo ibérico del siglo XII: Hugo de Oporto y el contexto político-eclesiástico del Condado de Portugal (1112-1136). In CASAMIQUELA GERHOLD, Victoria; NEYRA, A. Vanina, ed. – *Sociedad, cultura y religión en la plena Edad Media*. Buenos Aires: IMHICIHU, 2019, p. 78.

83 STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 50-51 and 53. In this case, Maurice's embassy would have taken place after the excommunication of Henry V in Milan. The scholar considers that Maurice's legation took place in Lombardy between 1116 and 1117, building on the work of BALUZE, Étienne – *Vita Mauricii Burdini archiepiscopi Bracarenensis*. MANSI, Giandomenico, ed. Vol. 1. Lucca: Apud Vincentium Junctinum, 1761, cols. 137-148. However, imperial documentation from autumn 1116 shows Henry V more active in present-day Emilia-Romagna rather than in Lombardy, cf. *Die Urkunden Heinrichs V.*, docs. 194-199.

84 ERDMANN, *Maurício Burdino*, p. 33. DAVID – *L'énigme*, p. 484-488. David did not share Étienne Baluze's hypothesis that it was Maurice who suggested to Henry V that he go to Rome. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 52-53 and 329-332.

think that Paschal II might have promised something important to the archbishop of Braga? A clear support against Toledo and the pressures of Santiago de Compostela? A position in the Roman Curia⁸⁵? A source on “Bourdin” dating from the third quarter of the 12th century, little used in Iberian historiography, despite notable points of contact with the work of the Archbishop of Toledo, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (1209-1247), the *Annales* (or *Chronicon*) of the Archbishop of Salerno Romuald II Guarna (also known as Romualdo Salernitano, 1153-1181), offers us a further clue⁸⁶. According to the ecclesiastic of the Norman kingdom of southern Italy, Maurice moved to the imperial side because Paschal II, despite having received a large amount of money, did not fulfil his promise to replace the Archbishop of Toledo, Bernard, with Maurice, who would thus have become Primate of all *Hispania*⁸⁷. Putting Romuald’s complex relations with Rome aside⁸⁸, he was certainly very well informed, given that ten kilometres away from Salerno is the abbey of the Holy Trinity of Cava de’ Tirreni, where Maurice was imprisoned by Calixtus II after 1121, and where according to a German source, the *Annales Palidenses*, the “antipope” Gregory VIII was still imprisoned during the pontificate of Innocent II (1130-1143)⁸⁹. These sources must be read with caution, but they could at least help us to reflect on Maurice’s point of view and begin to see him as a capable and flexible ecclesiastic and not just the naive “puppet” of Henry V⁹⁰.

Certainly, the archbishop of Braga was aware that siding with Henry V entailed significant risks. Did Maurice realise that Paschal II was really throwing him “to the wolves”? Did the emperor offer him something more than the pope? Did Henry V force the archbishop of Braga to come over to his side? With few exceptions, historiography has rarely asked about Henry V’s potential reaction: what must the emperor have thought when he saw the archbishop of Braga in the legation instead of a group composed of cardinals or Roman ecclesiastics? Could all this be seen as an affront to

85 ANDENNA, Giancarlo – Pietro. In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. Vol. 83. Rome: Treccani, 2015. Accessed on: https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/. Accessed on 29/03/2023. CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria – *Pasquale II e il suo tempo*. Napoli: Liguori, 1997, p. 77-79, 93-94, 101-105, 111-113, 114-115 and 117-120. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 53-55. ERDMANN, *Maurício Burdino*, p. 41-51. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 480-483. COLOTTO – Gregorio VIII, p. 246. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 33-35.

86 ERDMANN, *Maurício Burdino*, p. 13 and note 1. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 460. RENZI, Francesco – *Imperator Burdinum hispanum romanae sedi violenter imposuit. A research proposal on the Archbishop of Braga and Antipope Gregory VIII, Maurice “Bourdin”*. *Imago Temporis. Medium Aevum*. 25 (2018) 233-234.

87 ROMOALDI II ARCHIEPISCOPI SALERNITANI – *Annales*. Ed. Wilhelm Arndt (MGH, SS, XIX). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Avlici Hahniani, 1866, p. 416-417.

88 ZABBIA, Marino – *Un cronista medievale e le sue fonti. La storia del papato nel Chronicon di Romualdo Salernitano*. In DELLE DONNE, Roberto; ZORZI, Andrea, ed. – *Le storie e la memoria*. Florence: Firenze University Press, 2002, p. 248-250. RENZI – *Imperator*, p. 233 and RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 127-128.

89 *Annales Palidenses*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz (MGH, SS, XVI). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Avlici Hahniani, 1859, p. 76.

90 ERDMANN, *Maurício Burdino*, p. 71. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 500-501. STROLL – *Symbols as power*, p. XIX. RENZI – *Imperator*, p. 226 and related notes. RUST, Leandro Duarte – *Historiografía, filosofía política moderna e antipapas medievais (1040-1140)*. *Revista Crítica Histórica*. 7 (2012) 301-302.

his authority⁹¹? William of Malmesbury wrote that the emperor was fascinated about Maurice, defined as a skilled and refined man, who knew how to win the favour of Henry V⁹². This is not the only portrait in which important qualities are recognised to the archbishop of Braga, as Pierre David and Patrick Henriët have already noted, and as demonstrated by the Morigny Chronicle. In the *Annales Romani*, Maurice is called Gregory, his name as a pope, rather than his baptismal name, a treatment usually reserved for “antipopes”⁹³. Henry V, therefore, treated Maurice well and integrated him into his travelling court, but this could also be seen as a provocation to Rome and a clear and unequivocal demonstration of his power to attract ecclesiastics linked directly or indirectly to the Apostolic See, thus isolating the pope⁹⁴.

Nothing new, then. It is enough to think of what happened to Gregory VII (1073-1085) between 1082 and 1084, when he was abandoned by a part of the Roman clergy who sided with Henry IV (1054-1106) and “antipope” Wibert/Clement III (1080-1100)⁹⁵. In any case, in March 1117, Maurice was in Rome with Henry V⁹⁶. The emperor arrived in the *Urbs* probably with his wife, Matilda of England (1109-1125), whose alleged coronation in 1117 is attributed to Paschal II instead of “Bourdin”, by John of Salisbury⁹⁷. In fact, Henry V wanted to be crowned again, this time at Saint Peter’s Basilica. He wanted a new legitimisation since his only coronation up to that point had been the one in 1111 after the Settefratte agreement. We know that Paschal II had taken refuge in Benevento, and according to the *Vita* of Paschal II, no one wanted to crown Henry, who was then crowned emperor by Maurice, who at the time was still only archbishop of Braga and not the “antipope” Gregory VIII⁹⁸. Two not exactly canonical coronations, but still no one questioned his imperial title, like his father Henry IV, crowned only by the pope or “antipope” Wibert/Clement III⁹⁹. According

91 ERDMANN, *Maurício Burdino*, p. 20-31. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 488-490. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 52-58. RUST – Historiografia, filosofia e antipapas medievais, p. 300-303.

92 WILLELMI MALMESBIRIENSIS MONACHI – *Gesta regum anglorum atque Historia novella*. Ed. Thomas Hardy. Vol. 2. London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1840, p. 667 “Ut eum quem oderat, regis Teutonici vocaret idolum; quod ille Mauritiū peritiam, tum in litteris tum in civilibus negotiis, magni pensaret”.

93 DAVID – L’énigme, p. 493. HENRIËT – Political struggle, p. 305-306. MIROT, Léon, ed. – *La Chronique de Morigny (1095-1152)*. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et fils, 1909, p. 25-26 “Bracarensem archiepiscopum, litteratum et curialem et eloquentem virum”. *Annales Romani*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz (MGH, SS, V). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Avlici Hahniani, 1844, p. 478-479.

94 STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 53-56. COLOTTO – Gregorio VIII, p. 246.

95 CANTARELLA – *Gregorio VII*, p. 286.

96 ERDMANN, *Maurício Burdino*, p. 30. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 484 and following.

97 GROSSE, Rolf – *La fille aînée de l’Église: Frankreichs Kirche und die Kurie im 12. Jahrhundert*. In *Römisches Zentrum*, p. 304. CHIBNALL, Marjorie – *The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1993, p. 32-33. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 89, according to this scholar there is no concrete evidence of a coronation of Matilda by Paschal II or Maurice “Bourdin”/Gregory VIII. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 248-249.

98 *Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, p. 723-724. ERDMANN, *Maurício Burdino*, p. 30-31 and 34. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 489-490. CANTARELLA – Dalle Chiese, p. 54-55 and by the same author – *Pasquale II*, p. 105-111 and 117.

99 ROBINSON, Ian Stuart – *Henry IV of Germany 1056-1106*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 272-274.

to historiography, Maurice was chosen because he was probably the highest-ranking ecclesiastic in the imperial entourage¹⁰⁰. This is a plausible conclusion. Building on the analysis of the documents of Henry V issued in Italy (1116-1118), it is possible to observe that among the imperial ecclesiastics who appeared most frequently in the documentation between March 1116 and March 1117, there were Burchard of Münster¹⁰¹ and Gebhardt of Trento¹⁰², both bishops, while Maurice had been an archbishop since 1109. For example, the patriarch of Grado is mentioned only in two documents drawn up on 16 March 1116, in Venice, at the Doge's Palace¹⁰³. Moving forward a little further, we know that, during his exile outside Rome, Gelasius II sent a letter to the bishops of Gaul in 1118, in which he said that Maurice, at the time of his "unworthy" elevation to the papal throne as Gregory VIII, had already been excommunicated in Benevento, by Paschal II¹⁰⁴. It was the council summoned by the pope in April 1117 during his absence from Rome¹⁰⁵. With this detail, as Pierre David had already shown, Carl Erdmann's thesis according to which it was Gelasius II who entrusted Maurice with the peace mission would fall. The German historian read literally the *pluralia maestatis* of the papal language of Gelasius II, who would hardly have turned to an excommunicate for a diplomatic mission, in 1118¹⁰⁶.

We are finally in 1118. After the death of Paschal II in January of that year, John of Gaeta was elected as Gelasius II. There was, however, an unavoidable problem: Gelasius could not be immediately consecrated because he had not yet been ordained a priest¹⁰⁷. In the time that elapsed between the election and the consecration (which took place in Gaeta or, according to Alberto Milioli's *Liber* and the *Cronica* of João de Deus, in Capua in southern Italy) a kind of "end of the world" took place¹⁰⁸. According to Landulf "Iunior" s *Historia Mediolanensis* and the *Chronicon* attributed to Ekkehard of Aura, Henry V was staying in northern Italy, when he quickly reached Rome at the beginning of March, not in a very good mood, to use a euphemism, because he had not been consulted in advance about the election of the new pontiff¹⁰⁹. The issue was

100 ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 30. DAVID, *L'énigme*, p. 489. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 231.

101 *Die Urkunden Heinrichs V.*, docs. 155, 157, 162, 163, 169, 174, 175, 179, 182, 183, 186, 187, 188, 189, 193, 194, 198 and 199.

102 *Die Urkunden Heinrichs V.*, docs. 154, 155, 163, 164, 185, 186, 192, 194, 198 and 199.

103 *Die Urkunden Heinrichs V.*, docs. 158 and 159.

104 JL 4884 (Gaeta, March, 1118, 10th) = PL CLXIII, Gelasii II papae ep., IV, coll. 489. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 222.

105 DAVID, *L'énigme*, p. 486. COLOTTO – Gregorio VIII, p. 246. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 33 and 112-113 and note 142.

106 ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 30-41. DAVID – *L'énigme*, p. 487-488.

107 BAGLIANI, Agostino Paravicini – *Morte e elezione del papa. Norme, riti e conflitti. Il Medioevo*. Rome: Viella, 2013, p. 29.

108 *Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, p. 727-744. LANDOLPHUS IUNIORS – *Historia Mediolanensis ab anno MXCV usque ad annum MCXXXVII*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann; Philipp Jaffé (MGH, SS, XX). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Avlici Hahniani, 1868, p. 40-42. ALBERTUS MILIOLI NOTARIUS REGINI – *Liber de temporibus et aetatibus et Cronica imperatorum*. HOLDER-EGGER, Oswald (MGH, SS, XXXI). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1903, p. 430. IOHANNES DE DEO – *Cronica*. Ed. Oswald Holderegger (MGH, SS, XXXI). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1903, p. 321.

109 *Historia Mediolanensis*, p. 40. EKKEHARDUS URAUGIENSIS – *Chronicon Universale*. Ed. Georg Waitz (MGH, SS, VI). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Avlici Hahniani, 1844, p. 253.

the interpretation of that word, *honor*, which appeared in the *Decretum Electione Papae* of 1059 and which Rome and the Empire interpreted differently¹¹⁰. Henry V wanted to receive the fidelity of the pope and the guarantee of the respect of the agreements that existed with Paschal II. Gelasius II fled Rome – for fear of a repetition of what had happened in 1111, says Falcone of Benevento –, where he returned for a short time before exile and death in Cluny¹¹¹. After a lecture on papal decretals delivered by Master Irnerius of Bologna, on 10 March 1118, in Saint Peter's Basilica in the Vatican, Maurice was elected as Pope Gregory VIII, a position in which he remained until 1121, when he was captured by Calixtus II and his supporters in Sutri, where “Bourdin” went after Henry V return to Germany in the second half of 1118 or later in 1120¹¹². In the surviving papal charters issued as Gregory VIII, the former archbishop of Braga considered himself to be the only legitimate successor of Paschal II and, consequently, of the true Papacy¹¹³. However, the name he had chosen to preside over the Throne of Saint Peter said much more. A provocation against Gelasius II and the Roman Curia? Or an agenda of his pontificate? If Gregory VII had opened the Investiture Controversy, first with the episcopate of the kingdom of Germany and afterwards with Henry IV, would Maurice/Gregory VIII close it together with Emperor Henry V? At some point, did Maurice represent a concrete and realistic solution to the problems between the Papacy and the Empire¹¹⁴?

Our answer is yes, at least between 1118 and 1119. Firstly, because Gelasius II was not particularly popular outside Rome. Orderic Vitalis (1075-1142), a chronicler and monk of the monastery of Saint-Évroult in Normandy, despite recognising the great political experience and culture of the former chancellor of the Roman Church, John of Gaeta, openly accused him of greed and of having oppressed the churches of Gaul, where Gelasius II remained after his second and final escape from Rome, with his continual requests for resources to support the expenses of the Roman Curia¹¹⁵. A negative view of Gelasius II is also included in the *Vita* of Theogerus of Metz (†1120),

110 DAVID – L'énigme, p. 481-482. BAGLIANI – *Morte e elezione*, p. 15-19.

111 FALCONE DI BENEVENTO – *Chronicon Beneventanum. Città e feudi nell'Italia dei Normanni*. Ed. Edoardo D'Angelo. Firenze: SISMEL, 1998, p. 35. FREUND, Stephen – Gelasio II, papa. In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*. Vol. 52. Rome: Treccani, 1999, p. 807-811.

112 COSTA, Avelino de Jesus da – Burdino, Maurício, p. 393-394; COLOTTO – Gregorio VIII, p. 246. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 282 and 329-333. LANDOLPHUS IUNIOR – *Historia Mediolanensis*, p. 40. On the figure of Master Irnerius, traditionally considered as the founder of the *Studium* of Bologna, see PADOVANI, Andrea – Roberto di Torigni, Lanfranco, Irnerio e la scienza giuridica anglo-normanna nell'età di Vacario. *Rivista Internazionale di Diritto Comune*. 18 (2007) 71-140 and DOLCINI, Carlo – Pepo, Irnerio, Graziano. Alle origini dello “*Studium*” di Bologna. In CAPITANI, Ovidio, ed. – *L'Università a Bologna. Personaggi, momenti et luoghi dalle origini al XVI secolo*. Bologna: Silvana Editoriale, 1987, p. 17-27.

113 *Monumenta Ordinis Servorum Sanctae Mariae*. Ed. Augustino Morini. Vol. 2. Bruxelles: Société belge de librairie, 1900, p. 199-200. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 35.

114 On the choice of the papal name Gregory VIII, cf. DAVID, L'énigme, p. 493. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 54. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 35. WIEDEMANN, Benedict – *Papal overlordship and European princes, 1000-1270*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022, p. 63.

115 *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*. Ed. Marjorie Chibnall. Vol. 6. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969, p. 184.

traditionally attributed to the monk Wolfger of Prüfening Abbey (Regensburg, Bavaria). This biography reveals strong hostility towards John of Gaeta on the part of the archbishop of Salzburg. The source adds that this posture was due to the service rendered by the new pope to Paschal II, a detail that would deserve a separate study, given that it could refer to the complex issue of the agreements of Sutri and of Settefratte of 1111 with Henry V, to the accusations of heresy against Paschal II, and his defence at the Lateran synods of 1112 and 1116¹¹⁶. Secondly, Maurice must have had many more supporters than traditional historiography has indicated and what Gelasius II himself had pointed out in his correspondence¹¹⁷. English contemporary sources such as Eadmer of Canterbury (+1128) tell us that the kingdom of England was divided between some bishops who supported Gregory VIII, and others Calixtus II, while a part of the episcopate remained neutral¹¹⁸. Indeed, in the Council of Reims in 1119, promoted by Calixtus II, transmitted by the work of Hesso *Scholasticus*, Maurice/Gregory VIII and Henry V were condemned together with their supporters, among whom were bishops from northern Italy (Empire) of Ravenna, Treviso/Feltre and Brixen (Bressanone). It should be noted that in 1080, the pope or "antipope" Clement III, Wibert, archbishop of Ravenna, had been elected in Brixen against Gregory VII¹¹⁹. Other imperial partisans (support in favour of Calixtus II was not as immediate as can be deduced from the narrative of the *Annalista Saxo*) came also from the German prelates of Augsburg, Worms, Eichstätt, Osnabrück and Trier (probably until 1118) and Huesca (Iberian Peninsula), which reveals a wider and more favourable support for Gregory VIII than what was thought until the historical research carried out in recent decades¹²⁰.

Furthermore, as evidenced by the German historiography of the 19th and 20th centuries, Maurice could also count on support in Rome¹²¹. Gregory VIII, for example, granted a privilege to the Roman church (cardinal title) of San Marcello *al Corso* (or, formerly, in *Via Lata*), which had already been the object of the attention of

116 *Vita Theogeri abbatis S. Georgii et episcopi Mettensis*. Ed. Philipp Jaffé. (MGH, SS, XII). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Avlicii Hahniani, 1856, p. 470. CANTARELLA – *Pasquale II*, p. 115-117.

117 See note 45 and RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 55-58.

118 *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*. Ed. Martin Rule. London: Longman & Co., 1884, p. 246-248. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 55.

119 CANTARELLA – *Gregorio VII*, p. 254-285.

120 HESSONIS SCHOLASTICI – *Relatio de concilio remensi*. Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. (MGH, SS, XII). Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1856, p. 428. HOLTZMANN, Walther – Eine Bannsenntenz des Konzils von Reims 1119. *Neues Archiv*. 50 (1935) 301-319. ERDMANN – *Mauricio*, p. 61-64 and note 2 from p. 61. DOLCINI, Carlo – Pepo, Irnerio, Graziano, p. 17-27. MAZZANTI, Giuseppe – Irnerio: contributo a una biografia. *Rivista Internazionale di Diritto Comune*. 11 (2000) 121-122. CONDORELLI – *L'elezione*, p. 1. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 49, 60-61 and 145-146. ANNALISTA SAXO – *Chronicon Regni*. Ed. Klaus Nass (MGH, SS, XXXVII). Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2006, p. 564. BOSHOFF, Egon – *Germania Pontificia*. Vol. 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992, p. 82. KRONAU, Gerold Meyer von – *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV. und Heinrich V. zu 1116 bis 1125*. Vol. 7. Leipzig: Dunck. & Humbl., 1909, p. 71.

121 GIESEBRECHT, Wilhelm von – *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*. Leipzig: Schwetschke V., 1877, p. 870-926. GREGOROVIVUS, Ferdinandus – *Storia della città di Roma*. Vol. 1. Rome: G. Antonelli, 1873, p. 440-455. KRONAU – *Jahrbücher*, p. 34, 50-96, 166-187 and 349-354. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 37.

Wibert/Clement III¹²². Maurice, therefore, seemed to be part of the imperial network that existed in Rome – or, at least, he was close to that part of the clergy of the *Urbs* not aligned with the decisions of the cardinals and the Curia –, as would also be demonstrated by the relations of Maurice “Bourdin” with some ecclesiastics from the circle of Wibert/Clement III and/or linked to Roman titular churches, such as San Marcello *al Corso*, as we have seen, San Crisogono and San Marco¹²³. The *Vita* of Gelasius II by Boso of Santa Pudenziana (written in the third quarter of the 12th century) admits that Maurice “Bourdin” received the support of some “schismatic” canons of Saint Peter’s – who in several cases supported the so-called “antipopes”, also for reasons of internal competition with Lateran – and, at least initially, managed to control Saint John Lateran, the cathedral of Rome¹²⁴. Maurice/Gregory VIII had the support of the Frangipane (a Roman family that controlled the area of the Colosseum, the *Circus Maximus*, and the church of Santa Maria Nova) and, most likely, of the Tuscolani, belonging to the highest Roman aristocracy, and the abbot of Farfa, allies of Henry V, according to *Vita Paschalis II*¹²⁵. Finally, the *Annales Romani* tell how Maurice/Gregory VIII was defeated also due to the corruption of Calixtus II’s ally, Peter Leone, father of the future pope or “antipope” Anacletus II (1130-1138), who managed to buy the loyalty of the supporters of Maurice in Saint Peter’s¹²⁶. The seizure of power by Calixtus II in Rome, which, as evidenced by Susan Twyman, continued to be the object of “revision” in papal historical memory in the 12th century to celebrate the figure of the pontiff, shows how the image that Guido of Vienne wanted to promote of himself in written and artistic communication resulted from much more complex dynamics

122 KEHR, Paul Fridolin – *Italia Pontificia*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Weidmann: 1906, regs. 15-18 and 19. KEHR, Paul Fridolin – *Römische Analekten. Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*. 14 (1911) 1-37; ARMELLINI, Mariano – *Le chiese di Roma dal secolo IV al XIX*. Roma: Ed. del Pasquino, 1891, p. 254-255 e 289, and PAUTRIER, Massimo – *I Santi delle Chiese medievali di Roma (IV-XIV secolo)*. Roma: Lulu.com, 2013, p. 177-178 and 195. RENZI, Imperator, p. 233 and by the same author – El mundo sensible de un obispo y antipapa del siglo XII: la humillación de Mauricio “Burdino” en las fuentes literarias medievales. In RODRÍGUEZ, Gerardo; NEYRA, A. Vanina, ed. – *El mundo sensible de los eclesiásticos, siglos IV al XIII*. Mar del Plata: UNDMP, 2022, p. 167-198. On p. 187 of this last publication, the church that received a privilege from Maurice/Gregory VIII was identified, by mistake, with Santa Maria in *Cannella*. On the recommendation of our colleague and friend, Professor Laura Fernández Fernández (Universidad Complutense de Madrid), to whom we are grateful, it would be interesting to return to the question of the animals present in the public humiliation of Maurice, and, in particular, the camel, a symbol not only of monstrosity, but also, and above all, humility, and submission.

123 ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 41 and 57-61. DAVID – *L’énigme*, p. 493-498. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 55-58 and related bibliography.

124 BOSO – *Vita Gelasii II*. In DUCHESNE, Louis, ed. – *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, introductions et commentaires par l’abbé Louis Duchesne*. Vol. 2. Paris: Ernest Thorin Éditeur, 1892, p. 376. *Historia Mediolanensis*, p. 41. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 56-57. CARPEGNA, Tommaso di – *Il clero di Roma nel medioevo. Istituzioni e politica cittadina (secoli VIII-XIII)*. Rome: Viella, 2002 and JOHRENDT, Jochen – *Il capitolo di San Pietro i papi e Roma nei secoli XI-XIII*. Città del Vaticano: Edizioni Capitolo Vaticano, 2012, p. 21-29.

125 WICKHAM – *Rome*, p. 230 and 293-294. *Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, p. 705.

126 *Annales Romani*, p. 479. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 290-305 and RENZI – *El mundo*, p. 166.

than his triumphal entry into Rome¹²⁷. In addition, while trying to expand his network, Maurice sent, as Gregory VIII, letters and privileges outside the *Urbs*, namely to his former see of Coimbra and to the abbey of Saint-Pierre of Uzerche, Corrèze, Nouvelle Aquitaine, France, located about 60 kilometres southeast of Limoges, even if this did not lead, according to Étienne Baluze and Pierre David, to a recognition of his authority¹²⁸.

This last fact is a very important detail, as it could prove that Maurice was actually from Limousin, as stated by Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada in the 13th century, in his *De Rebus Hispanie*, and also in a letter of Paschal II studied by Carl Erdmann¹²⁹. But, at the same time, also suggests that “Bourdin” might not have been a Cluniac monk, given that the Benedictine monastery of Uzerche was reformed by Saint Martial of Limoges, in the 11th century, but was not a priory or part of the Cluniac congregation, as demonstrated by D. Poeck¹³⁰. In 2008, Carlos M. Reglero de la Fuente already questioned the Cluniac origin of Maurice¹³¹. This aspect deserves a specific study in the future, because it could help to question the classical historiographical idea of Cluny as “model” of the so-called Gregorian Reform and as a firm ally of the Papacy in spreading the Reform. Deeply criticized in the last decades, these interpretations, applied to the Iberian context, led to the conclusion that 11th-12th centuries clerics arriving in Iberia from north of the Pyrenees were basically all Cluniacs, and consequently “reformers”. This kind of approach entails two main problems: first, it gives a unique explanation attributing to Cluny all the credits for the progressive transformation of the Iberian Church and second, it completely neglects the fact that Rome and Cluny experienced also very tense relations and ecclesiological-political conflicts between the end of the 11th and the first quarter of the 12th centuries. If this model (Frank cleric ► Cluniac monk ► Roman reformer) can be applied to figures such as Dalmace of Compostela (1094-1096) or Gerald of Braga, former monk of Moissac, it might not be automatically or mechanically extendable to Maurice “Bourdin” or other cases. We think this should stimulate modern scholarship to revise the medieval relations between Rome and the northwestern Hispania from new perspectives¹³². All the details that we have just

127 TWYMAN, Susan – Papal adventus at Rome in the twelfth century. *Historical Research*. 69:170 (1996) 241-242. RENZI – El mundo, p. 171-197 and 168-184 and notes for the bibliography on the iconography of Maurice “Bourdin”.

128 BALUZE – *Vita*, cols. 137-148. ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 5-9. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 497. GADY – De Saint-Pierre, p. 4-15 and 69-72. VELOSO – D. Maurício, p. 129 and note 7. VONES-LIEBENSTEIN – Cluniazensische, p. 145-146 and 148-161.

129 RODERICI XIMENII DE RADA – *Historia de rebus Hispanie sive Historia gotica*. Ed. Juan Valverde Fernández. Turnhout: Brepols, 1987, p. 226-227. ERDMANN – *Papsturkunden*, doc. 12.

130 POECK, Dieter – *Cluniacensis ecclesia: der cluniazensische Klosterverband: (10.-12. Jahrhundert)*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1998, p. 245-539. RENZI – *El mundo*, p. 164-166 and note 9 for the reference bibliography. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 28-29.

131 REGLERO DE LA FUENTE, Carlos M. – *Cluny en España: los prioratos de la provincia y sus redes sociales (1073-ca.1270)*. León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación “San Isidoro”, 2008, p. 347-345 and 355.

132 NEISKE, Franz – Réforme clunisienne et réforme de l’Église au temps de l’abbé Hugues de Cluny. In SARANYANA, Josep-Ignasi, ed. – *La reforma gregoriana y su proyección en la cristiandad occidental. Siglos XI-XII*. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra, 2006, p. 335-359. RUCQUOI, Adeline – Cluny, el Camino Francés y la Reforma Gregoriana. *Medievalismo*. 20 (2010) 97-122.

mentioned can help us to better frame first the figure of Maurice and his trajectory, seen in many cases as just an “accident” of history, and second to understand (even if the answers are not definitive) how he achieved such a relevant place, both in the Iberian Peninsula and Rome. In fact, Maurice was not a member of the Roman Church like Gelasius II, a representative of the *Reichskirche* like Leo IX (1049-1054), or an ecclesiastic that benefited from powerful family ties between Burgundy, the Empire and the Iberian Peninsula, such as Guido of Vienne/Calixtus II, who was never Cluniac as affirmed by a part of the historiography, including in Portugal¹³³.

Conclusion

It seems clear that the reconstruction of Maurice’s trajectory in the Iberian Peninsula, as well as the analysis of the dynamics of his “enigmatic” papal election in Rome as Gregory VIII, emerge as interesting case-studies to deepen the knowledge of medieval history. In fact, the trajectory of “Bourdin” allows us to better understand, on the one hand, the reconstruction process of the Hispanic church between the 11th and 12th centuries and, on the other hand, to observe, from a different perspective, the issues related to the Investiture Controversy and the construction of a European political-ecclesiastical space in the medieval centuries. But it also reveals how much a peripheral area of Western Europe, such as the Galician-Portuguese northwest, through an increasingly intense relationship with Rome, was connected to those greater historical processes. A final and controversial note: the set of problems addressed in this article – which still have margin for critical research, as in the case of the concept of “antipope” – in many cases it escaped or was treated superficially by the traditional historiography that, in its linear vision, excessively shaped by Augustin Fliche’s idea of “Gregorian Reform”, reserved as the only destiny for a “secondary” character like Maurice, the *damnatio memoriae*¹³⁴.

HENRIET, Patrick – Géraud de Braga (*1108): la problématique Vita d’un moine-évêque grégorien entre Moissac et Braga. *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*. 48 (2013) 81-111. HENRIET, Patrick – Political Struggle, p. 291-318. CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria – Cluny. In CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, ed. – *I castelli della Preghiera*. Roma: Carocci, 2020, p. 15-63. RENZI – *El mundo*, p. 164-166 and footnote n. 9.

133 ERDMANN – *Mauricio Burdino*, p. 71. DAVID – L’énigme, p. 441-501. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 60 and notes. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 329-332. SCHILLING, Beate – *Guido von Vienne-Papst Calixt II*. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1998, p. 589-603. RENZI, Francesco – O monaquismo Beneditino e o papado da reforma: influências recíprocas. In *Atas do V Seminário internacional ora et labora. Refojos de Basto: Leituras, textos e autores beneditinos*. Cabeceiras de Basto: Município de Cabeceiras de Basto, 2022, p. 131-146. On the idea that after Leo IX until 1124 all the popes were Cluniacs, see DIAS, Geraldo José Amadeu Coelho – *Quando os monges eram uma civilização...Benedictinos: espírito, alma e corpo*. Porto: CITCEM, 2011, p. 128-129.

134 RUST – Historiografía, p. 285-314. HERBERS, Klaus – El papado en el tiempo de Gelmírez. Constancia y variación. In LÓPEZ ALSINA, Fernando et. al., coord. – *O século de Xelmírez*. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega, 2013, p. 75-91. CARPEGNA, Tommaso di – Popes through the looking glass, or “Ceci n’est pas un pape”. *Reti Medievali*. 13:1 (2012) 121-136. RENZI – *Mauricius*, p. 61.

Appendix

In order to better illustrate the action of Maurice "Bourdin" as "antipope" Gregory VIII, we decided to publish the only documents of his pontificate known to date. Although they are already published, we decided to collect them in the present appendix.

Appendix I Maurice "Bourdin"/Gregory VIII's Letters and Privileges

I

1118, March, 19th, Rome, *Porticus* of Saint Peter's Basilica

Gregory VIII grants in the person of Romano, cardinal-priest of San Marco and provost of San Marcello, a privilege in favour of the church of San Marcello to which he confirms the control over the church of Santa Maria in *Cannella* (Rome)¹³⁵.

Editions:

- *Monumenta Ordinis Servorum Sanctae Mariae*. Ed. Augustino Morini. Vol. 2. Bruxelles: Société belge de librairie, 1900, p. 199-200.
- KEHR, Paul Fridolin – *Römische Analekten. Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*. 14 (1911) 34-35.

Regesta:

- KEHR, Paul Fridolin – *Italia Pontificia*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Weidmann: 1906, reg. 19.

Gregorius episcopus, seruus seruorum Dei, dilecto filio suo Romano, preposito ecclesiae sancti Marcelli, reliquisque fratribus eiusdem ecclesiae ibidem Deo seruiantibus in perpetuum salutem et apostolicam benedictione. Cum per ineffabilem diuinae pietatis clementiam regendarum aecclesiarum curam susceperimus, ex auctoritate Sedis Apostolicae, cui licet indigni praesidemus, universis per orbem ecclesiis, in quanto possumus, providere debemus, maxime tamen illis quae nostra specialiter esse noscuntur, et quae nullius alterius nisi nostra consolatione vel munimine fulciuntur; illis quoque precipue quibus fratres nostri cardinales attulati sunt, qui nostra vicissitudine funguntur, per quos etiam nostra iudicia et decreta principaliter disponuntur. Illarum bona nos conseruare et augmentare oportet, quatenus habitantes in eis nulla sint penuria prepediti, sed potius, necessariorum copia suffragante, et suum, ipsi officium exequi, et diuina mysteria in eisdem aecclesiis ualeant celebrari. Si enim nostrarum negligimus sollicitudinem, quomodo nos sperabunt extraneae aecclesiae provisorem? Aut quomodo videbimur de aliarum regimine solliciti, cum simus de nostrarum gubernatione incuriosi? Prouocati itaque dilectioni filii nostri Romani, cardinalis sancti

135 We publish here the Augustino MORINI edition.

Marci, prepositi vero aeccliesiae sancti Marcelli, concedimus supradictae aeccliesiam sancti Marcelli aeccliesiam sanctae Mariae in Cannella, quae iuris et proprietatis atque parrochiae sancti Marcelli esse comprobatur, et ante predecessorem nostrum Paschalem papam finitum esse iusta sententia denuntiatur. Ideoque nos supradictae ecclesiae sancti Marcelli et omnibus ibidem seruiantibus imperpetuum, apostolica auctoritate donamus et confirmamus supradictam aeccliesiam sanctae marie in Cannella cum omnibus quae ad eam pertinere videntur, in usum et sumptum fratrum in sancto Marcello Deo seruentium. Si quis vero... perfruatur. Data Rome in porticu sancti Petri, per manus Petri abbatis atque cancellarii sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae, xiiii kalendas aprelis, indictione XI, anno primo pontificatus domni Gregorii Papae viii. Ihesvs Christvs Dominvs noster. Verbo Domini caeli firmati svnt. Confirma hoc Deus quod operatus es in nobis. Bene valete.

II

1118, March, 22nd, Rome, *Porticus* of Saint Peter's Basilica

Gregory VIII writes to the Bishop of Coimbra, Gonçalo Pais, expressing his good will towards the See of Coimbra and assuring that he will approve the bishop's future petitions addressed to the Apostolic See¹³⁶.

Editions:

- ERDMANN, Carl – *Papsturkunden in Portugal*. Berlin: Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Gottingen, 1927, doc. 20;
- *Livro Preto: Cartulário da Sé de Coimbra*. Ed. Manuel Augusto Rodrigues; Avelino Jesus da Costa. Coimbra: Arquivo da Universidade de Coimbra, 1999, doc. 601.

G. episcopus seruus seruorum Dei. Karissimo filio et fratri Colimbriensi episcopo G. salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Quondam, fili karissime, non bene aduersus te uoluntatem nostram credidisti extitisse. Sed quia, prout Deus nouit, te diligimus et dileximus, postquam ad summi pontificatus honorem peruenimus, litteris nostris uisitare fraternitatem tuam decreuimus. Mandando itaque precipimus, ut ecclesiam, in qua positus es, quam non modicum semper dileximus, et disponendo augeas et augendo disponas, quatinus a Deo et a nobis bonam remunerationem accipias. Si qua uero tibi negocia fuerint, in quibus indigeas nostro auxilio, secure ad nos mittito, et que iuste pecieris, iuste Deo auxiliante inpetrabis. Data Rome in porticu sancti Petri undecimo kal. aprilis.

III

1118, April, 13th, Rome, Saint John Lateran

136 We publish here the Carl ERDMANN edition.

Gregory VIII grants a privilege to the abbot and monks of the Abbey of Saint-Pierre de Uzerche (Corrèze, Nouvelle Aquitaine, France)¹³⁷.

Editions:

– BALUZE, Étienne – *Vita Mauritii Burdini archiepiscopi Bracarenensis*. Ed. Giandomenico Mansi. Vol. 1. Lucca: Apud Vincentium Juntinum, 1761, cols. 144-145;

Regesta:

– JAFFÉ, Philipp; LÖWENFELD, Samuel – *Regesta pontificum romanorum: ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Veit et comp., 1885, reg. 5194.

Gregorius Servus Servorum Dei dilecto in Christo filio Aldeberto Abbati Sancti Petri Vsercensis monasterii omnibusque fratris ibidem Deo famulantibus et successoribus ejus in eodem monasterio substituendis in perpetuum salutem et apostolica benedictionem. Cum per Dei omnipotentis Misericordias in summi pontificatus arce constituti, universarum Ecclesiarum curam suscepisse videamur, illarum tamen maxime necessitatibus condescendere debemus quas religiose conversari ac in Dei servitio semper permanere cognoscimus. Ideoque, fili carissime, auctoritate sedis apostolicae, cui Deo dispensante praesidemus, confirmamus tibi et Ecclesiae tuae libertate, quam a principio habuisse dinoscitur, videlicet ut nullus Episcopus, nullus Archiepiscopus monasterium istud sine nostra iussione audeat excommunicare, et post obitum tuum vel cujuscumque abbatis habeant monachi ipsius monasterii licentiam et facultatem secundum regula Sancti Benedicti sibi eligendi Abbatem aut de illo monasterio, si ibi repertus fuerit, aut de alio quo voluerint. Insuper concedimus tibi monasterium Agidunense cum omnibus Ecclesiis sive terris ad idem pertinentibus, monasterium quoque Maimacense cum omnibus possessionibus suis, necnon Tusturiaci et Sancti Raphaelis et Exidolii cum omnibus possessionibus ad haec in integrum pertinentibus, alias quoque Ecclesias quas nunc habere videmini aut inantea Deo auxiliante iuste acquirere poteritis. Recepimus quoque te et monasterium sub tutela et defensione beati petri, cujus Ecclesiae omni anno debes persolvere bizantium auri. Ita ut nullus Archiepiscopus, Dux, Marchio, Comes, Vicecomes, nec aliqua parva magnaue persona de rebus ad Ecclesiam pertinentibus aliquid depraedare, subtrahere, aut quolibet ingenio defraudare audeat. Si quis vero, quod non credimus, contra hanc nostrae ordinationes paginam ausu temerario obviare tentaverit, sciat se anathematis vinculo colligandum. Datum Laterani per manum Petri Sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cancellarii secundo Idus Aprilis, Indictione undecima, anno dominicae incarnationis millesimo centesimo octavo decimo, pontificatus autem Domini Gregorii Papae VIII. anno primo.

137 We publish here the Étienne BALUZE edition.

Appendix II

Maurice “Bourdin”/Gregory VIII’s alleged letter to Emperor Henry V

I

1118 -1121

Letter from Gregory VIII (Maurice “Bourdin”), in which he asks Henry V for help¹³⁸.

Editions:

- BALUZE, Étienne – *Miscellanea*. Ed. Giandomenico Mansi. Vol. 3. Lucca: Apud Vincentium Junctinum, 1762, cols. 12-13.
- LIVERANI, Francesco – *Codice Diplomatico e Bollario di Gregorio VIII antipapa*. In *Opere del Monsignor Francesco Liverani*. Vol. 4. Macerata: Presso Alessandro Mancini, 1859, doc. CCXLVIII.
- GIESEBRECHT, Wilhelm von – *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Schwetschke V., 1877, p. 1270¹³⁹.
- SCHEFFER-BOICHORST, Paul – *Kleinere Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*. 7. Der Streit über die pragmatische Sanction Ludwigs des Heiligen. 8. Zur deutsch-italienischen Geschichte der Jahre 1120-1130. 9. Zur Kritik Flodoards von Reims und päpstlicher Epitaphien. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 8 (1887) 414-416.

Regesta:

- JAFFÉ, Philipp; LÖWENFELD, Samuel – *Regesta pontificum romanorum: ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Veit et comp., 1885, reg. 5195.

Note: According to Erdmann, the present document would be an apocryphal letter, whose content suggests its falsity more than its veracity¹⁴⁰.

G(regorius) episcopus servus servorum dei, dilectissimo filio H(enricus) Romanorum imperatori semper augustus salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Postreme littere, quae per nostrum peditem vestri magnificentia transmisit imperii, plurimum, serenissime fili, dulcedinis habuere, sed inter duas clasulae utilitatis omnino nichil, onuste quidem floribus spem maximam promittentes, sed maiorem fructum diuturne diffidentie prebentes. Una enim

¹³⁸ We publish here the Paul SCHAFFER-BOICHORST edition. On the handwritten translation of the letter, cf. ERDMANN – *Maurício*, p. 89.

¹³⁹ *Apud* ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 89.

¹⁴⁰ ERDMANN – *Maurício Burdino*, p. 89-93. Mary Stroll takes up, in turn, the historiographical tradition of Wilhelm von Giesebrecht and Gerhold Meyer von Kronau who considered this letter to be reliable, cf. STROLL – *Calixtus II*, p. 57.

nuncios afferebat transmittendos a curia que a. 14 kal. novemb. celebrari debuit, alteraque maiores omnes multis cum minoribus invitatos ad auxilium nostrum pollicebatur venturos. Porro venit ad nos Warnerus cum LXX pene militibus, qui fere per XV. dies nobiscum commoratus, sumpto precio Judae Scariothe sine licencia recedens, plus nobis intulit debilitatis, quam virium nostris abstulerit inimicis: nos presens pocius impedivit, quam presens vel absens nostris nocuerit adversariis. Fredericus autem postquam Chunradi patruī adventum presensit, a nobis recedens nichil apud nos dignum reliquit memoria. De ipso Chunrado incerti eramus quid facile conaretur, cum literis frequenter invitatus et nunciis nichil boni respondisset et suis pocius commodis, quam nostris iubiare videretur, de quo plurimi fidelium autumabant, quam nostra velit moderatio designare. Exitus rerum satis intencionem cordium demonstravit. Sed nodum querit in scirpo qui fidem sperat in illo, cuius nunquam habuit dilectionem. In hoc fallimur potissimus neque etiam vobis non est inutile, quod, ut credimus, vestra putat discretio nos de vestra parte aliquid habere praesidii, cum nobis plus omnibus hostibus nocuerunt, quos, iuisse exstimatis. Inde nobis pericula, tot angustiae, quot e quanta scribere nequimus; et dum putamus evadere auxiliorum penuria, consumendo tempora, in graviora dilabimur iuxta vulgi proverbium

Expectando, expectando
Transit tempus, nescis: quando.

Dicis, que sit tanta sevicia, unde mansuetudini vestre talis potuit impietas contingere, quod sic nostri volnitiis oblivisci nec in tantis porrigere manum periculis, ut mirentur omnes, qui noverunt et vos ipsi quoque crimentur inimicis, ut aliud vos tractare affirmetur atque aliud lingua proferre, unde terror fidelibus et hostibus audacie fomenta parentur? Testis nostre altissimus est conscientie, cuius intuitos omnium secretorum rimatur archana, quod pro veritate fidei et defensionem iustitie, clementissime fili, quo nichil est nobis sub sole carius, illa patimur, quae intoleranda videntur, ne locum victoriae hereticorum supersticio reperiat aut veritas mendacio succumbat, vel sanctorum patrum auctortias destruat, aut vestri dignitas imperii quod ad iuvamen regiminis ecclesie deus instituit, in nichilum redigatur. Non vostra turbetur gloria nec ulla (vos) consumat desperatio, quia si velociter veniretis vel subsidium mitteretis contrarium hostibus, divina opitulante gratia certissime potiremur (victoria), Dilectionem vestra fidei sinceritate non dubitamus, fili gloriose, quod erga plurimos pro iusticie veritate conservanda vos pugnare didicimus. Si quis fluvium velit decurrere, prius fontem oportet eum siccare. Fontes heereticorum secunda Babylonia designatur. Annitandum est igitur, Romam, omnium malorum originem, persecucionem ignibus exsiccare ut per orbem terrarum gurgitos in omni nationum genere desinant redundare. Qua subiecta levius, quam potetia, cetera sedabantur; qua furente continue reliqua discordiis vexabuntur.

Appendix III

Maurice “Bourdin”/Gregory VIII’s alleged privileges granted from captivity

I

[1122 or 1187], November, 15th

Pope Gregory VIII grants a privilege in favour of the Benedictine female monastery of Catesby (Northamptonshire, England)¹⁴¹.

Editions:

- DUGDALE, William; CALEY, John; ELLIS BANDINEL, Bulkeley – *Monasticon Anglicanum*. Vol. 4. London: T. G. March, 1849, p. 637-638.
- LIVERANI, Francesco – Codice Diplomatico e Bollario di Gregorio VIII antipapa. In *Opere del Monsignor Francesco Liverani*. Vol. 4. Macerata: Presso Alessandro Mancini, 1859, doc. CCLII.

Note: This is a very dubious document mentioned in the *Monasticon Anglicanum*¹⁴² and republished in the 19th century by Francesco Liverani. According to Liverani, both Étienne Baluze and Giandomenico Mansi missed this document¹⁴³. In the opinion of Liverani, this privilege should not be attributed to Pope Gregory VIII (Alberto di Morra, October-December 1187), but to “antipope” Gregory VIII (Maurice “Bourdin”, 1118-1121). Liverani based his assertion on the fact that the document speaks of “pontificatus nostri anno quinto”, which would make it difficult to attribute this privilege to Pope Alberto di Morra/Gregory VIII who governed the Church for only 57 days, between October and December 1187¹⁴⁴. According to Liverani, the fifth year of the pontificate would be a reference to Maurice “Bourdin” who, despite being imprisoned, continued to consider himself as the legitimate pope and to send privileges and letters to gain supporters. Indeed, the date of the privilege – 15 November “XVII kal. decembris” – if added to the five years of pontificate referred in the source, would correspond to the full date of 15 November 1122, which would coincide with the dates of the pontificate of Maurice “Bourdin”, whose fifth year of pontificate would have ended, hypothetically, in early March 1123. This interpretation by Liverani could also agree with a passage from the *Vita* of Calixtus II by Boso of Santa Pudenziana, “Postmodum vero Burdinum fecit in arce Fumonis retrudi et inde ad monasterium Cavense, ubi perseverans in sua rebelione vitam finivit, transferri”¹⁴⁵; with the information contained in *Annales Palidenses*,

141 We publish here the Francesco LIVERANI edition.

142 DUGDALE, William; CALEY, John; ELLIS BANDINEL, Bulkeley – *Monasticon Anglicanum*. Vol. 4. London: T. G. March, 1849, p. 635-636.

143 LIVERANI – Codice Diplomatico, p. 467.

144 CARPEGNA, Tommaso di – Gregorio VIII, papa. In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. Vol. 59. Rome: Treccani, 2002. Accessed at: https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/papa-gregorio-viii_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/. Accessed on 30/03/2023.

145 BOSO – Vita Calixti. In DUCHESNE, Louis, ed. – *Le Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, p. 377.

according to which Maurice "Bourdin" was still a prisoner in Cava in the time of Innocent II¹⁴⁶; and with the news of some support that the prelate from Braga had had in the Kingdom of England¹⁴⁷. However, doubts have already been expressed about this document¹⁴⁸. For example, the privilege mentions the Bishop of Lincoln, Hugh – "Hugo Linconiensis episcopus" –, a figure that can only be Hugh of Avalon, bishop between 1186 and 1200, dates that are compatible with the figure of Alberto di Morra/Gregory VIII, whereas in 1122 the bishop of Lincoln was Robert Bloet (1094-1123)¹⁴⁹. Furthermore, the female monastery of Catesby was founded only in 1175, which makes it impossible to have benefited from a privilege of Maurice "Bourdin"/Gregory VIII in 1122¹⁵⁰. Finally, the date of 15 November is compatible with the pontificate of Alberto di Morra/Gregory VIII, who died in December 1187¹⁵¹. The reference to the fifth year of the pontificate could, therefore, be a transcription mistake. Our conclusion is that, most likely, this privilege refers to Alberto di Morra/Gregory VIII and not to Maurice "Bourdin"¹⁵². However, given the particularity of the case, we decided to reproduce the text of the privilege as edited by Francesco Liverani.

Gregorius episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilectis in Christo filiabus prorsae et conventui monasterii de Cateschy, ordinis sancti Benedicti, lincolniensis diocesis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Sacrosanta romana ecclesia devotos et humiles filios, ex assutae pietatis officio propensius deligere consuevit; et ne pravorum hominum molestiis agitentur, eos tamquam pia mater suae protectionis munimine confovere. Ea propter, dilectae in Christo filiae, vestris justis postulationibus, fratp concurrentes assensu, personas vestras et locum in quo divino estis obsequio mancipatae, cum omnibus bonis quae in praesentiarum rationabiliter possideatis, sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus: specialiter autem de Cateschy, de Clsebi et de Cliten ecclesias cum pertinentiis eorumdem, quas venerabilis frater noster Hugo lincolniensis episcopus, et predecessores ipsius, capituli sui accedente consensu, pia vobis liberalitate concesserunt, in usus proprios retinendas: nec non de Clsby, et de Basford maneria, terras, possessiones, decimas, molendina, redditus, prata, et alia bona vestra, sicut ea omnia juste et pacifice possideatis, vobis, et pro vos, eidem monasterio, auctoritate apostolica confirmamus et praesentis scripti patrocinio communitus. Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam vestrae protectionis, et confirmationis infringere, ve ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attemperare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus se noverit incursum. Data Romae XVII kal. Decembris, pontificatus nostri anno quinto.

146 *Annales Palidenses*, p. 76.

147 See note 118.

148 RENZI – El mundo, p. 189.

149 CROUCH, David; CARLIN, Martha – *Lost letters of medieval life English society, 1200-1250*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013, p. 176. CROSBY, Everett U. – *The king's bishops. The politics of patronage in England and Normandy, 1066-1216*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, p. 282.

150 Accessed at: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/rchme/northants/vol3/pp37-43>. Accessed on 30/03/2023.

151 CARPEGNA – Gregorio VIII, papa.

152 DUGDALE, William – *Monasticon Anglicanum*. Vol. 2. London: James Bohn, 1846, p. 221.

II

[1127?], June, 7th

Pope Gregory VIII grants a privilege in favour of the Cistercian female monastery of Syningthwaite (Archdiocese of York, England)¹⁵³.

Editions:

- LIVERANI, Francesco – Codice Diplomatico e Bollario di Gregorio VIII antipapa. In *Opere del Monsignor Francesco Liverani*. Vol. 4. Macerata: Presso Alessandro Mancini, 1859, doc. CCLIII.

Note: As for the previous document, there are several doubts about the possible attribution of this privilege to Maurice “Bourdin”/Gregory VIII made by Liverani. In addition to the problems of the place of writing and dating, which Liverani himself discusses and criticises in his work, there is once again a problem with the content of the document. The privilege is addressed to the Cistercian female monastery of Syningthwaite (Archdiocese of York, England), which was founded only around 1150-1160¹⁵⁴. This chronological detail seems to make it impossible that the former Archbishop of Braga granted this privilege. It is also true that the date of the document, 7th June “VII idus junii”, would also not be compatible with the pontificate of Alberto di Morra/Gregory VIII, but this does not seem to us sufficient to attribute this (false? interpolated?) charter to “antipope” Gregory VIII.

Gregorius episcopus servus servorum Dei dilectis in Christo filiabus priorissae et conventui monasterii de Synningthwait cistercensi eboracensis dioceseos salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Cum a nobis petitur quod justum est et honestum, tam vigor equitatis quam ordo exigit rationis, ut id per sollicitudinem officii nostri ad debitum perducatur effectum. Ea propter, dilecte in Domino filie, vestris justis postulationibus grato concurrentes assensu personas vestras et monasterium de Synningthwait in quo divino estis obsequio mancipate cum omnibus bonis quae in praesentiarum rationabiliter possidet aut in futurum justis modis praestante Domino poterit adipisci sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus, specialiter autem terras, possessiones, redditus, et alia bona vestra, sicut ea omnia juste ac pacifice possideatis, vobis et per vos eidem monasterio auctoritate apostolica confirmamus et presentis scripti patrocinio communimus, districtius inhibentes ne quis de ortis et virgulis vestris seu de vestrorum animalium nutrimentis a vobis decimas exigere vel extorquere praesumat. Nulli ergo hominum omnino licet hanc paginam nostrae protectionis, confirmationis et inhibitionis infringere vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hec attemptare praesumpserit indignationem omnipotentis Dei et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus se noverit incursum. Datum Interamnae VII idus junii pontificatus nostri anno decimo.

153 We publish here the Francesco LIVERANI edition.

154 Accessed at: <https://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/ARY/Bilton/Bilton90>. Accessed on 30/03/2023.