

Vol. 4 • n.º 2 • Winter 2006

e-journal
of PORTUGUESE
HISTORY

Table of Contents

Volume 4, number 2, Winter 2006

[ARTICLES]

The Lusitanian Episcopate in the 4th Century:

Priscillian of Ávila and the Tensions Between Bishops

Ana Maria C. M. Jorge

Bishops and Politics:

The Portuguese Episcopacy during the Dynastic Crisis of 1580

José Pedro Paiva

Relations between Portugal and Brazil (1930-1945).

The Relationship between the two National Experiences of the Estado Novo

Paula Marques Santos

Echoes of the ‘politics of the spirit’ at the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute:

Salazar’s representatives at the 4th National History Congress

Lucia Maria Paschoal Guimarães

[INSTITUTIONS & RESEARCH]

The Coimbra See and its Chancery in Medieval Times

Maria do Rosário Barbosa Morujão

The Urgent Empire: Portugal between 1475 and 1525

António dos Santos Pereira

Ph.D. Dissertations in Medieval History

The editors

[BOOK REVIEW]

MARCUS, George E.; MASCARENHAS, Fernando. *Ocasão:*

The Marquis and the Anthropologist, A Collaboration.

Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2005

ISBN: 0-7591-0777-7

Cristina S. Ogden

The Lusitanian Episcopate in the 4th Century: Priscillian of Ávila and the Tensions Between Bishops¹

Ana Maria C. M. Jorge

Center for the Study of Religious History (CEHR)

Portuguese Catholic University (UCP)

ana.jorge@cehr.ucp.pt

Abstract

This paper looks at Priscillian of Ávila and the tensions that existed in the 4th century between bishops at the heart of the Lusitanian episcopate, which covered part of the southwest of the Iberian Peninsula. It does not attempt to offer an exhaustive analysis of the various aspects of Priscillianism; instead it takes a close look at those which it is possible to single out from what we know of his actual work. Priscillian helps us to achieve a better understanding of the Christianization process and the orthodox/heterodox debate in late antiquity. He also provides insight into the complexity of a period which precludes any arbitrary simplification and which, despite a search for unity, proves to be a time of opposition and confrontation. Against a background of the progressive “Constantinization” of the church, bishops become key figures who centralize the main forces of the day. At the same time, we become aware of the coercive measures that lay authorities introduced as Christianity spread. The confrontation between rival Christian communities – Priscillianist and Nicean Catholicism – reveals an important facet of the position adopted by Christians in their relations with civil authorities, as well as the close ties between Christianity, the top of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the Empire. It also gives a clear picture of the work of the bishop of a city in antiquity, in which the emphasis was on the militant view of the kerygma.

Keywords

Priscillian; episcopate, orthodoxy/heterodoxy; late antiquity; religious history

Resumo

O presente artigo versa sobre Prisciliano de Ávila e as tensões no seio do episcopado da Lusitânia, região situada a sudoeste da Península Ibérica, no século IV. Este trabalho não pretende ser uma análise exaustiva do priscilianismo mas antes um ponto de partida para o conhecimento da acção concreta do bispo de Ávila no processo de cristianização peninsular. A sua acção é, aliás, importante para compreendermos o processo de cristianização e o debate ortodoxialheterodoxia na Antiguidade tardia, bem como a complexidade de um período que contraria toda a simplificação arbitrária e se revela como um tempo de oposições e confrontos, apesar da procura persistente de unidade por parte do episcopado. Num contexto de “constantinização” progressiva da Igreja, no século IV, o bispo torna-se uma figura central cuja acção revela de forma ímpar as medidas de coacção exercidas pelo poder secular durante a difusão do cristianismo. O confronto entre comunidades cristãs rivais – priscilianista e católico niceana – revelam não só uma faceta do discurso cristão na sua relação com o poder civil mas também os laços estreitos que uniam o cristianismo e a alta hierarquia do Império na Cidade antiga, assim como o carácter militante no anúncio do Kerygma.

Palavras-chave

Prisciliano; Episcopado; Ortodoxia/heterodoxia; Antiguidade tardia; História religiosa.

Priscillian – a road to asceticism?

In the second half of the 4th century, Roman Lusitania witnessed the development of an ascetic movement centered on the person of the Bishop of Ávila – Priscillian. Contemporary literature says little about him, but of the information that does exist, it is Sulpicius Severus who gives us the most complete report.

Let us begin with a portrait: "...Priscillianus (...) familia nobilis, praediues opibus, acer, inquires, facundus, multa lectione eruditus, disserendi ac disputandi promptissimus, felix profecto, si non prauo studio corrupisset optimum ingenium..." (Sulpicius Severus 1866: 99).

This note by the Gallic chronicler tells us that Priscillian was of noble birth – something that did not prevent him from practicing a rigorous form of asceticism. Like other contemporary sources, Sulpicius tells us absolutely nothing about where Priscillian came from. We can only suppose that Priscillianism originated in southern Lusitania, along the border with Baetica (see Cabrera 1983). Perhaps this is why one of the first reactions to the movement came from Higinus, the Bishop of Córdoba, in Baetica? The question remains open. However, other, essentially later, authors said that he was born in Galicia and that at an unknown time he must have left that province to go to Lusitania. These suppositions are probably linked to the fact that Priscillianism also developed quite extensively in Galicia.

Sulpicius Severus's chronicle leads us to believe that Priscillian's effectiveness was due to his exceptional and ascetic personality. This is what gave him such religious authority and secured the support and partnership of some of his colleagues in the episcopate. The chronicler also says that Priscillian drew "multos nobilium pluresque populares" to him. The gradation in this Latin expression covers a real diversity of social groups, and his entourage included women as well as men (Sulpicius Severus 1866: 99).

This is the doctrine that the lay *doctor* preached to his followers: the dominical fast all year round, retreats during Advent and Lent "far from the noise of this world", disdain for worldly goods, and obligatory familiarity with the Holy Scripture. He also demanded that the church hierarchy practice chastity, as laid down by the Council of Elvira.

According to Sulpicius, Priscillian was appointed Bishop of Ávila by Instantius and Salvian – two bishops whose seats are still unknown to us: "...Instantius et Saluianus damnati iudicio sacerdotum Priscillianum etiam laicum, sed principem malorum omnium, una secum Caesaraugustana synodo notatum, ad confirmandas uires suas episcopum in Abilensi oppido constituunt, rati nimirum, si hominem acrem et callidum sacerdotali auctoritate armassent, tutiores fore sese." (Sulpicius Severus 1866: 100).

Were they the Bishops of Lusitania? (see the note by Hydatius 1974: 108; Torres 1954: 81; and Babut 1909: 91). We can certainly suppose this to be the case, given the rules established by

the Council of Nicaea (325), which said that new bishops should be consecrated by the existing ones in the candidate's ecclesiastical province (Alberigo 1973: 7). We have very little data that would tell us whether Ávila was vacant due to the death of the previous incumbent. Who was he? And what were the ties that linked Priscillian to Ávila? All these are questions that are still without answers. In any case, Prosper of Aquitaine (1961: 460) places Priscillian's ordination in the year 379 (also see Escribano Paño 1988: 392).

As to his education and training before his promotion to the episcopate, in *Liber Apologeticus* Priscillian (1960^c: 1413) himself admits that he had engaged in forbidden studies. Other contemporary accounts confirm this. Sulpicius Severus (1866: 99) says: "...sed idem uanissimus et plus iusto inflator profanarum rerum scientia: quin et magicas artes ab adolescentia eum exercuisse creditum est."

He also adds that Priscillian followed masters who included a certain Agape and someone named Helpidius, both disciples of Mark of Memphis, who lived in a town that was known as a center of magic arts (see Sulpicius Severus 1866: 99). Isidorus of Seville (1964: 135) takes up this information in his *De uiris illustribus*, on the subject of a pamphlet by the Bishop Ithacius, otherwise known as Clarus: "Itacius Hispaniarum episcopus, cognomento et eloquio Clarus, scripsit quemdam librum sub apologetici specie, in quo detestanda Priscilliani dogmata et maleficiorum eius artes libidinumque eius probra demonstrat: ostendens, Marcum quemdam Menpheticum, magiae scientissimum, discipulum fuisse Manis et Priscilliani magistrum."

The pamphlet adds that Priscillian learned magic with Mark of Memphis, who was a direct disciple of Mani. It is probable that Priscillian studied a form of teaching in Egypt, with which the Iberian Peninsula maintained relations, but this could also merely be a supposition on the author's part. We will limit ourselves to the probability that Priscillian received some form of secular cultural education in his youth. He must also have read the Apocrypha, which were circulating at the time.

The sources say nothing else about Priscillian's story or way of life. The few works that are said to have been written by him add nothing concrete. History's silences no doubt partially explain the assumptions made by historiographers – the fact is that until this century ecclesiastical historiography always saw Priscillian as a heretic. It is understandable that over the centuries the issue of orthodoxy and heterodoxy has been the focal point of all the views on the subject. This is made clear by Menéndez Pelayo (1956: 131-247. See also Silva 1999: 87-106), who considers Priscillian to be a heretic and the instigator of a Gnostic sect with Manichean roots.

Can one say that Priscillianism was based on Manichaeism or Gnosticism? This is a difficult question. The research that highlights these issues is generally based on Priscillianist writings – this is the case of the treatises that were compiled as part of the Würzburg corpus, most of which post-dated Priscillian's death (see Schepss 1889: 1-106; Madoz 1957: 72). We must bear the following in mind: while the theses contained in these texts are rooted in the ideas that Priscillian personally developed, they were written in other spatial/temporal contexts – such as Galicia – and concern practices that were observed by other Priscillianists (on the development of Priscillianism in Galicia and the sources that discuss the movement from the 5th century onwards, see Escribano Paño 1988: 46-52). Perhaps one ought to distinguish between an initial phase of Priscillianism, which was restricted to his lifetime, and a second one following his death – i.e. the period in which his ideas

developed in the neighboring ecclesiastical province. But this would go beyond the scope of our study. Let us simply note that it is during this stage of the story of Priscillianism in Galicia that we also begin to see the outline of the links between this province in the north of the Iberian Peninsula and Aquitaine (see J. Fontaine, above all in *Panorama spiritual* 1981). Nor should we forget that after Priscillian's death the accusations of Manichaeism and Gnosticism even spread beyond the Iberian Peninsula itself. As reported in Augustine and Prosper of Aquitaine, both of whom say more or less the same thing: "Nec illud mouet, quod Priscillianistae Manichaeorum similli ad ieiunandum die dominico solent testimonium de apostolorum actibus adhibere, cum esset Paulus apostolus in Troade." (Augustine 1895: 57); "Ea tempestate Priscillianus (...) Manicheorum et gnosticorum dogmate haresim nominis sui condit." (Prosper of Aquitaine 1961: 460).

We know of the Bishop of Ávila's predilection for the ascetic life, including penitential reclusion; we catch glimpses of his practices, all of which aimed at attaining a state of perfection or election (*electi Deo*), but if we are to interpret them correctly we must also gain an in-depth understanding of where they really came from. It is becoming clearer and clearer that Priscillian represented an adaptation of the monastic type of life – one that developed an ascetic kind of spirituality that could be seen as part of the maintenance and structuring of society in late antiquity. He played the role of a catalyst among Lusitanian Christians and crystallized a variety of ascetic, monastic and intellectual aspirations that were either fairly, or even entirely, incompatible with Christianity as it was lived by the great majority of the bishops of the day. What Priscillian wanted was to reform the church. He thought that the separation of men and women was not inevitable and that the fundamental thing was to seek out the traditional practices of Christian asceticism (Mayeur 1995: 415 et seq.).

It is a fact that the main result of Priscillian's activities was a new concept of Christian life in Lusitania, which was later reinforced by other Priscillianist bishops. The infiltration of these ideas into rural areas allows us to deduce that there was a reunion with a Christianity that was "less closely controlled" by the entrenched bishops.

One of the accusations leveled at Priscillian was that he led the Christians of the towns to go to isolated *villae* in the country. It was even supposed that Priscillian was the owner of these *villae*, or that they were located on land that belonged to his friends. But how many Priscillianist *villae* actually existed? Where were they? The truth is that there is no documentary evidence for them. We do not know of a single *villa* in which excavations have shown traces that might allow us to conclude that Priscillianist practices took place there. However, a few years ago, Huffstot (1995: 443) interpreted paleo-Christian remains discovered in Torre de Palma in this way. In her opinion, scientific analysis of the remains found in this *villa* indicates that livestock breeding was abandoned there – something that might reveal the adoption of a vegetarian-type diet practiced by the members of an ascetic group. The fact that the *villa* had work done to it and was extended over the course of the 4th century could imply the presence of a growing number of followers of Priscillianism.

We should note that the confrontation between town and country also became a part of the process by which Priscillian and his entourage made Christianity an established part of culture. The fact is that it seems that thanks to Priscillianist practices, Christianity spread out into the rural areas, which were still within the towns' sphere of influence.

However, it is worth taking a closer look at the move towards asceticism that Priscillian advocated, so as to separate it from both its old and its Christian roots (on Christian asceticism in the 4th century, see Fontaine 1968: 665). If we are to do away with all the uncertainty that arises from generalizations, we must situate our study within the broader picture of western monachism and social history – indeed, the research into Priscillianism that has been carried out in the last few years makes this indispensable. While the works on Priscillian have become more numerous over the last century, it is only since 1965 and the efforts of W. Schatz (especially: *Studien zur Geschichte* 1957) and A. Barbero Aguilera (above all: *El priscilianismo: herejía* 1963) that Priscillianism has begun to be analyzed other than against a strictly theological/ecclesiastical background (see also Molé 1975).

Interpreting Priscillian's doctrine continues to pose a great many problems, as do both his criticisms of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and his consecration of bishops and priests to serve small rural communities.

If we are to believe Hydatius's account, the Bishop of Ávila was executed in Treves in 387. However, the date of the execution is hotly disputed. Some say it took place in 385, others in 386: E.-B. Babut (1909: 241-244) opts for 385; after studying the problems posed by Ambrose's journey from Milan to Treves, J. R. Palanque (1933: 518) places the execution at the end of the summer of 386; A. D'Alès (1936: 167-169) concurs with the latter date.

Hydatius reports that after Priscillian was executed, Galicia was invaded by Priscillianist ideas which the author, in his belligerent style, calls "heresy": "Priscillianus, propter supra dictam haeresem, ab episcopatu depulsus, et cum ipso Latronianus laicus aliquantique sectores sui apud Treuerim sub tyranno Maximo caeduntur. Exim, in Gallaeciam Priscillianistarum [haeresis inuasit]." (Hydatius 1974: 109).

Apart from the dissemination of the Priscillianist doctrine, Sulpicius Severus's account (1866: 104-105) tells us more specifically that, following the events at Treves, it was the cult of Priscillian himself that spread in Hispania: "...ceterum Prisciliano occiso, non solum non repressa est haeresis, quae illo auctore proruperat, sed confirmata latius propagata est. Namque sectores eius, qui eum prius ut sanctum honorauerant, postea ut martyrem colere coeperunt. peremptorum corpora ad Hispanias relata magnisque obsequiis celebrata eorum funera: quin et iurare per Priscillianum summa religio putabatur."

This news may reflect the need on the part of the church in the north of the Iberian Peninsula to "invent" local martyrs in order to spiritually "nourish" the life of its communities, and simultaneously to secure relics with which to consecrate places of worship (see Chadwick 1978: 206). According to the same tradition, Priscillian's remains were placed in Astorga in around 396. The Metropolitan of Galicia, Symphosius, is thought to have become Priscillian's main spiritual heir, and Astorga is said to have drawn pilgrims to pray on the tombs of the Priscillianist "martyrs". However, during his lifetime, Priscillian did not create an organized ascetic movement with communities that lived under the same order (on the historical context and Priscillian monks, see Simões 2002).

Around 530, two letters on Priscillianism by Montanus of Toledo also state that in the churches of Palence, not far from Astorga, it was customary to commemorate Priscillian's name

among those of the martyred saints. The Bishop of Toledo criticized Christians who sought to remember the heretic (Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 46-52).

Religious and secular stakes in the Priscillianist affair

The Priscillianist issue first arose in 378 or 379, when Higinus, Bishop of Córdoba, wrote to Idacius, Bishop of Mérida and Metropolitan of Lusitania to suggest that the latter should take a stance in relation to a movement initiated by a group of laymen (see Sulpicius Severus 1866: 100-105). He said that these laymen, who belonged to his ecclesiastical province, were teaching Gnostic and Manichean-type doctrines and were living in accordance with a severe form of asceticism. We know that Idacius of Mérida took this request seriously, because he led the fight against Priscillian personally.

While we are on this subject, this affair provides evidence of the upper hand the metropolitan bishop enjoyed over the other bishops in his ecclesiastical province – even if it is still premature in the 4th century to speak of a real central authority who coordinated relations between all the other bishops.

Another thing worth noting is the importance of the Faro Diocese, which was emphasized during the Priscillianist crisis. Its bishop, Ithacius, became deeply involved in the matter and even demanded that the civil authorities forbid free access to churches by Priscillianists.

In a desire to prevent the “sect” from growing, Idacius of Mérida and Ithacius of Faro denounced the Priscillianist movement to Gratian in 381. The Emperor immediately published an edict ordering them to expel the “heretics” from their churches: “...Ydacius atque Ithacius acrius instare, arbitantes posse inter initia malum comprimi: sed parum sanis consiliis saeculares iudices adeunt, ut eorum decritis atque executionibus haeretici urbibus pellerentur. Igitur post multa et foeda certamina Ydacio supplicante elicitor a Gratiano tum imperatore rescriptum, quo uniuersi haeretici excedere non ecclesiis tantum aut urbibus, sed extra omnes terras propelli iubebantur. Quo comperto Gnostici diffusi rebus suis, non ausi iudicio certare, sponte cessare, qui episcopi uidebantur: ceteros metus dispersit.” (Sulpicius Severus 1866: 100-101. See also Babut 1909: 149-151).

It is this offensive against Priscillian and the bishops who supported him, which began in 378, that probably led Priscillian’s entourage to consecrate him bishop in an attempt to strengthen their positions. In this way, the Priscillianist conflict shows that a victory over the Hispanian Episcopate faction could only be obtained by incorporating Priscillian into the episcopal hierarchy itself. On this subject, Sotomayor y Muro (García-Villoslada 1979: 236) points out that the “Episcopalian” tendency is one of the characteristics of the Priscillianist movement – a movement based on the conviction that the reform of the church should be led from the “hierarchical top” of the church itself (see Jorge 2001: 63-67).

Questions about the canonical nature of Priscillian’s episcopal appointment have broadened the debate. They show that in the background there were real battles between bishops for control over the episcopal seats, even though at the same time ecumenical councils – like that of Constantinople (381) – were ordering the bishops of a given diocese not to meddle in the affairs of other dioceses, or, for example, to ordain bishops there (see Alberigo 1973, above all canon 2: 22).

In the second half of the 4th century, the established church hierarchy was worried at the sight of some of its faithful straying away and organizing themselves beyond the pale of episcopal authority. These bishops reacted to a religious experience that was escaping their administrative control (Escribano Paño 1988: 391).

As to the issue of episcopal ordinations, after Priscillian's death, Hydatius of Chaves (1974: 104) tells us that at the beginning of the 5th century there was a very unusual situation in the neighboring province of Galicia: increasing numbers of bishops without specific seats, and conflict between an established hierarchy and an itinerant one – in other words, a confrontation between two different visions of the episcopate (see Díaz y Díaz 1983: 93).

The doctrinal conflicts only masked the reality. From this perspective, ascetic practices were described as being secret nocturnal meetings and liturgical chants as being the opportunity for endless orgies (see Chadwick 1978: 52 et seq.). However, as we can see from the councils that took place during this period, the challenge that was addressed by this religious dialogue was to get the bishops to become more "theocentric" by rediscovering in Christ the mediator of salvation. We cannot forget that the Christian identity, along with that of Christ himself, was defined in the symbol of Nicaea: "the Son consubstantial in the Father", while safeguarding the faith in the face of heresy (see Alberigo 1973: 1-19).

We can see that this questioning by certain Lusitanian bishops spread to other religious authorities, such as Ambrose of Milan and the Bishop of Rome, Damasus. Both of them were caught up in this debate. In 382, Priscillian did not hesitate to call on Ambrose and Damasus – the two bishops whose personal authority was greatest at that time (as Sulpicius Severus recognizes 1866: 101. On this subject, see also Gryson 1968: 155). The Bishop of Milan always refused to support Priscillian's cause and thought that the man himself was not entirely pure. He went further when he addressed himself to Treves, to the Emperor Maximus, to protest against this "party" (see Ambrose of Milan 1968: 214-215. See also Escribano Paño 1988: 314-315 and 395-399). Later, in 390, he even welcomed a number of Gallic bishops, who had probably come to discuss the tragic aftermath of the Priscillianist quarrel in Gaul, to a synod in Milan (this issue is looked at in more depth by Gryson 1968: 162).

We cannot say how Damasus reacted to Priscillian, Instantius and Salvian. According to Jerome's *De uiris illustribus* (1883: 650), he did not receive the Bishop of Ávila and his colleagues. It seems that he said nothing. Why not? Did he think they were innocent? Or did he just not want to get involved? We don't know. Damasus certainly knew what was happening to Priscillian's entourage, because in his *Tractatus* II (probably written near the end of 381 or at the beginning of 382), Priscillian told the Bishop of Rome about the accusations of "pseudo episcopus et manichae" that were being made against him (see Priscillian 1960^b: 1439-1440). He also reminded Damasus that the assembly of bishops at Zaragoza (a reference to the council of 380) had not condemned either him or his friends. The message that Priscillian (1960^b: 1435) sent to Damasus is not without interest: "Denique in couentu episcopali qui Caesaraugustae fuit nemo e nostris reus factus tenetur, nemo accusatus, nemo couictus, nemo damnatus est, nullum nomini nostro uel proposito uel uitae crimen objectum est, nemo ut euocaretur non dicam necessitatem sed nec sollicitudinem habuit."

This "petitio ad Damasum" calls on the apostolic seat's primacy and *auctoritas* in the dual sense of the term: theological and legal. It gives a particularly good picture of the course that Priscillian decided to adopt – to go above the heads of the local ecclesiastical hierarchy by addressing himself directly to Peter's successor (see Escribano Paño 1988: 395). It even seems that Priscillian went to Italy with Instantius and Salvian, after a visit to Bordeaux and other places in Aquitaine, where he was enthusiastically received by the region's landowners (see, above all, Fontaine 1981: 185-209).

This journey to Italy enabled them to obtain a dispensation from the imperial edict (see above) thanks to the influence of a clerk of the imperial court. At the same time, Priscillian and his colleagues denounced their accusers to the imperial authorities. These contacts at court recall how Consentius (1981: 51-70) underlined the aristocratic status of the members of Priscillian's entourage, and talked about how they may have belonged to the Theodosian circle (in this respect, see also Escribano Paño 1988: 391).

As to Rome's intervention in the Priscillianist affair, we only know about the reactions to the phase in which Priscillianism was developing in Galicia, but these exceed the scope of our research. We will limit ourselves to saying that there is a letter from Pope Innocent I (1845: 501-502) addressed to Bishop Exuperius of Toulouse, which is dated 20 February 405 and discusses various disciplinary issues concerning clerics and the faithful; and a second one from Leo I (1881: 688), which is addressed to Bishop Toribius of Astorga and is dated 21 July 447. Both pronounce themselves opposed to the Priscillianists' interpretation of the Apocrypha.

Some time in 382 or 383, following the accusations which Priscillian made against Ithacius of Faro, the dissension took on new political dimensions (see Escribano Paño 1988: 396 et seq.). Gregorius, the Prefect of the Gauls, decided to hear the case himself and summoned Priscillian (see Sulpicius Severus 1866: 102, and Babut 1909: 168-176). In the wake of these events, the Emperor summoned a council in Bordeaux in 384 to consider the Lusitanian episcopate's accusations against Priscillian (see Sulpicius Severus 1866: 102-103, and Étienne 1962: 269).

The chronicler Hydatius (1974: 109) mentions that, after the assembly in Bordeaux, Martin of Tours and other bishops declared Priscillian to be a heretic. If we look at Martin's role in this affair, it seems probable that he and other bishops from Gaul took part in the Council of Bordeaux in 384. However, we know nothing about the Council's composition or the specific part that Martin of Tours played in it.

Following the Council of Bordeaux, Priscillian, Instantius and Salvian decided to appeal to the Emperor and even considered going to him to explain their position (see Sulpicius Severus 1866: 101).

After all this, the "Priscillianist issue" was transferred to the secular court at Treves. Ithacius of Faro and Idacius of Mérida both went there for the trial. Sulpicius Severus (1866: 103) also adds that Martin of Tours protested to the Emperor against the ruling, which said that the accused who went to Treves should be imprisoned. In a way, the Bishop of Tours reacted against the *Iudice publica*. To him, the episcopal sentence at Bordeaux was enough.

Accused in Treves of the crimes of *maleficium* and obscene religious practices, Priscillian and four of his disciples were condemned to death and executed, while a number of others were exiled:

"...Priscillianum gemino iudicio auditum conuictumque maleficii nec diffitentem obscenis se studuisse doctrinis, nocturnos etiam turpium feminarum egisse conuentus nudamque orare solitum, nocentem pronuntiavit redegitque in custodiam, donec ad principem referret. Gesta ad palatium delata censuit imperator, Priscillianum sociosque eius capite damnari oportere. (...) eo insistente Priscillianus capitis damnatus est, unaque cum eo Felicissimus et Armenius, qui nuper a catholicis, cum essent clerici, Priscillianum secuti descuerant. Latronianus quoque et Euchrotia gladio perempti. Instantius, quem superius ab episcopis damnatum diximus, in Sylinancim insulam, quae ultra Britannias sita est, deportatus." (Sulpicius Severus 1866: 103-104).

We should note the speed with which the conflict was resolved once the civil hierarchy became involved. Priscillian's execution is seen as the first example of secular justice intervening in an ecclesiastical matter (see Gaudemet 1958: 233-234). It clearly illustrates both the tension and the ideological union between the church and imperial authority at the end of the Low Empire; or in other words, the way in which "the sword of justice" placed itself at the church's service. But this topic could be the object of a study in its own right.

As soon as Priscillian and his four disciples had been executed orders were given to repress the heresy everywhere. However, in the north of the Iberian Peninsula their death sentence actually injected even more vitality into the group (see Mattoso 1993: 288).

The Hispanian Councils – guarantors of orthodoxy

In around 380, the Council of Zaragoza ordered the repression of the Priscillianist "movement", and around the year 400 the Council of Toledo did the same thing. The signatures are missing from the text of the former Council – they were omitted from the only surviving copies, which were preserved at an unknown time (see Rodríguez 1981: 12). Nevertheless, thanks to the prologue we know the names of the participants. True, their episcopal seats are not mentioned, but we know who came from Lusitania: Ithacius of Faro and Idacius of Mérida, Metropolitan of Lusitania (see Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 16). Both of them must have played an important role in the Council, given their involvement in the Priscillianist affair.

The presence of bishops from Aquitaine (Delphinus, Bishop of Bordeaux, and Phœbadus of Agen) shows that the problem was also of interest there. It also reveals that Priscillian's message had spread not only to northern Hispania, but also to southern Gaul. Zaragoza, which was chosen as the site of a Hispano-Gallic episcopal assembly, benefited from its geographic location, which made it a good place to hold this meeting (see Fatás 1981: 155). Was Baetica not always conscious of the Priscillianist challenge?

These bishops' participation in the Council demonstrates a real search for episcopal *communio* and an effort to take common steps to ensure orthodoxy (see Ramos-Lisson 1981: 207-224). We are thus able to get a better idea of the fact that to these bishops, the diocese was not an isolated territory and that taking part in councils was a source of inspiration for their pastoral work. This is the perspective from which we should look at canon 5 of the Council of Zaragoza (Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 17): "Item lectum est: Ut hii qui per disciplinam aut sententiam episcopi ab ecclesia fuerint separati ab aliis episcopis non sunt recipiendi; quod si scientes episcopi

fecerint, non habeant communionem. Ab universis episcopis dictum est: Qui hoc commiserit episcoporum non habeat communionem."

How should we look upon this hardening of the position? In reality, neither the geographic proximity, nor the organization of the ecclesiastical hierarchy explains this quite heterogeneous gathering of bishops in Zaragoza. The only common purpose can have been to confound the Priscillianists and to put an end to the troubles they were causing among the Christian communities in Galicia and Aquitaine. It is certainly not by chance that Priscillian's name does not appear once in the canons, any more than those of his disciples. Nor is any sect mentioned or even alluded to. As O. Griffe says (1981: 162), it is sure that the sometimes sibylline and always moderate terms of the canons proclaimed by the bishops meeting in Zaragoza gave no hint whatsoever of the dramatic events that were to take place in Treves.

There can be no doubt, however, that the Council of Zaragoza possessed an anti-Priscillianist nature that is manifest in many of the canons. The fact is that the latter are dominated from the start by a clear anti-ascetic/Priscillianist tendency. In our opinion, canon 1 refers to the ascetic Priscillianist practice, which included a significant feminine participation: "Ut mulieris omnes ecclesiae catholicae et fideles a virorum alienorum lectione et coetibus separentur, vel ad ipsas legentes aliae studio vel docenti vel discenti convenient, quoniam hoc Apostolus iubet. Ab universis episcopis dictum est: Anathema futuros qui hanc concilii sententiam non observarint." (Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 16). Probably, in order to fight the teaching of laymen in the Priscillianist movement, canon 7 says that a *doctor's* investiture should be canonical: "Ne quis doctoris sibi nomen inponat praeter has personas quibus concessum est, secundum quod scriptum est. Ab universis episcopis dictum est: Placet." (Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 17-18).

To tell the truth, the norm in the 4th century was for a *doctor* to be a bishop and not a cleric, let alone a layman, as had been Priscillian's case before he was ordained bishop (on this subject see González Blanco 1981: 352). What was at stake was in fact ecclesiastical control. This is why the Council was sure to condemn all teaching that took place in parallel to that provided by the episcopal hierarchy – that is to say outside the established framework of the ecclesiastical institutions that ministered teaching and the catechesis. These reactions also address the "private *magisterium*" which the Bishop of Ávila said in his treatises that he ought to exercise – in other words that he should be entitled to interpret the spirit of the Scriptures outside the official framework of the church. We may recall *Canones in Pauli*, which are a true compilation of texts from the Holy Scripture (see Priscillian 1960^a: 1391-1413).

Canons 2 and 4 forbid liturgical meetings in the *villae* and call on the faithful not to drift away from their episcopal churches – as we can tell from a number of extracts: "Ne quis ieiunet die dominica causa temporis aut persuasionis aut superstitionis, aut quadragesimarum die ab ecclesiis non desint, nec habitent latibula cubiculorum ac montium qui in his suspicionibus perseverant, sed exemplum et praeceptum custodiant et ad alienas villas agendorum conventum causa non convenient. " (canon 2: Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 16); Viginti et uno die quo a XVI^{mo} kalendas ianuarias usque in diem Epifaniae qui est VIII idus kalendas ianuarias continuis diebus nulli licet de ecclesia absentare, nec latere in domibus, nec sedere in villam, nec

montes petere, nec nudis pedibus incedere, sed concurrere ad ecclesiam. Quod qui non observaverit de susceptis, anathema sit in perpetuum." (canon 4: Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 17).

It is clear that the dominical fast, which was anathematized by the participants in the Council of Zaragoza, was really a Priscillianist practice. Augustine (1895: 57) confirms this and criticizes the Priscillianists, whom he said were like the Manicheans in their habit of fasting on Sundays. The condemnations issued in Zaragoza were probably also targeted at the Priscillianist practices in the *villae*. However, here we can see a broader concern on the part of the episcopate – that of the development of Christian life in Hispania.

Finally, while it is absolutely certain that the bishops gathered in Zaragoza condemned the attitude of Christians who stayed away from their local churches and among other things organized assemblies in the *villae*, we have to ask ourselves: did the Council issue any individual condemnations? From the text of the Council it would seem not.

Sulpicius Severus (1866: 100), on the other hand, clearly refers to the Council of Zaragoza as an *iudicium sacerdotale* in order to accentuate the fight that the episcopate was waging against the "heretics" (see Escribano Paño 1981: 123-133).

The Council of Toledo, which was held in 400, after Priscillian's execution in Treves, took place from this same perspective and it is certainly not possible to confuse the situations and problems that existed before the executions in Treves with the ones that came afterwards. The Council was chaired by Patruinus, Bishop of Mérida and Metropolitan of Lusitania. It was he himself who, from the opening of the first session, referred to the Priscillianist issue in the following way: "Quoniam singuli coepimus in ecclesiis nostri facere diversa, et inde tanta scandala sunt, quae usque scisma perveniunt, si placet communi consilio decernimus quid ab omnibus episcopis in ordinandis clericis sit sequendum. Mici autem placet et constituta primitus concilii Nicaeni perpetuo esse servanda nec ab his esse recedendum." (Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 19).

An important part of the Council was dedicated to Priscillianism, the leading representative of which in the 5th century appears to have been Bishop Symphosius of Astorga, supported by his son Dictinius (see Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 28 et seq.). This means that the later council had more to do with the development of Priscillianism in Galicia (see Babut 1909: 187 and 286).

The Council of Toledo in 400 sufficed in its own right to reveal the problems from which the Hispanian churches were suffering at around the turn of the century. We should recall that in general terms the Council sought to ensure orthodoxy in Hispania by admitting the credo and discipline established by the Council of Nicaea. This is the case of the "regulae fidei catholicae contra omnes haereses et quam maxime contra Priscillianos", which were written by a number of Hispanic bishops who attended the Council (Vives, Marín Martínez and Martínez Díez 1963: 25-28). What was really at stake was the hierarchical model of the church that had been emphasized at Nicaea, which was opposed to any other concept of Christian life, and particularly to any organization of the church by the community (see Escribano Paño 1995: 271).

The decisions taken in Toledo did not succeed in putting an end to the Priscillianist movement, which continued to spread among the people of the north-west (see Tranoy 1981: 428;

Cardelle de Hartmann 1998: 265-286; Escribano Paño 1997: 279-321; and Villella Masana 1997: 177-185). One would like to see the Council of Braga in 561, during which the Priscillianist issue surfaced once more, as proof of this, but it adds nothing new where Lusitania is concerned.

Note

1. Extract from a shortened, reworked version of a doctoral dissertation: Jorge, Ana Maria C. M. (2002). *L'épiscopat de Lusitanie pendant l'Antiquité tardive (IIIe-VIe siècles)*, Lisbon: Instituto Português de Arqueologia.

Bibliography

- Alberigo, J. [et al.] eds. (1973). *Conciliorum œcumenicorum, decreta*. Bologna: Istituto per la scienze religiosa.
- Ambrose of Milan (1968). Epistula 30 (24). In *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, ed. O. Faller. Vol. 82 (1). Wien: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 214-215.
- Augustine of Hippo (1895). Epistula 36. In *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, ed. A. Goldbacher. Vol. 34 (1). Wien: Tempsky & Freytag, 31-62.
- Babut, E.-Ch. (1909). *Priscillien et le priscillianisme*. Paris: Champion.
- Barbero Aguilera, A. (1963). El priscilianismo: herejía o movimiento social?. *Cuadernos de Historia de España*, 37 (38): 5-41.
- Cabrera, J. (1983). *Estudio sobre el priscilianismo en Galicia antigua*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Cardelle de Hartmann, C. (1998). El priscilianismo tras Prisciliano, un movimiento galaico?. *Habis*, 29: 265-286.
- Chadwick, H. (1978). *Prisciliano de Ávila*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Consentius (1981). Commonitorium domino meo sancto patri Augustino. In *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, ed. J. DIVJAK. Vol. 8. Wien: Tempsky & Freytag, 51-70.
- D'Alés, A. (1936). *Priscillien et l'Espagne Chrétienne à la fin du IV^e siècle*. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Díaz y Díaz, M. C. (1983). L'expansion du christianisme et les tensions épiscopales dans la Péninsule ibérique. *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 6: 84-94.
- Escribano Paño, M. V. (1995). Cristianización y liderazgo en la Lusitania tardía. In *IV Reunió de Arqueologia (Paleo)Cristiana Hispànica*. Barcelona: Ed. Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 267-275.
- (1991). Breviario de historiografía sobre el priscilianismo. In *Historiografía de la arqueología y de la historia antigua en España (siglos XVIII-XX)*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 229-235.

- ___ (1988). *Iglesia y Estado en el certamen priscilianista causa ecclesia y iudicium publicum*. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza.
- ___ (1981). Sobre la pretendida condena nominal dictada por el concilio de Caesaraugusta del año 380. In *I Concilio Caesaraugustano (MDC aniversario)*. Zaragoza: CSIC, 123-133.
- Étienne, R. (1962). *Bordeaux antique*. Bordeaux: Fédération historique du sud-ouest.
- Fatás, G. (1981). Caesaraugusta christiana. In *I Concilio Caesaraugustano (MDC aniversario)*. Zaragoza: CSIC, 135-160.
- Fontaine, J. (1981). Panorama espiritual del occidente peninsular en los siglos IV y V: por una nueva problemática del priscilianismo. In *Primera Reunión Gallega de Estudios Clásicos. Santiago-Pontevedra, 2-4 julio 1979*. Santiago de Compostela: [s.n.], 185-209.
- ___ ed. (1967, 1968 and 1969). *Vie de saint Martin*. 3 vols. Paris: Les éditions du cerf.
- García-Villoslada, R. dir. (1979). *Historia de la Iglesia en España: La Iglesia en la España Romana y Visigoda (siglos I-VIII)*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Editorial Católica.
- Gaudemet, J. (1958). *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain (IV^e-V^e siècles)*. Paris: Sirey.
- González Blanco, A. (1981). El canon 7 del concilio de Zaragoza (380) y sus implicaciones sociales. In *I Concilio Caesaraugustano (MDC aniversario)*. Zaragoza: CSIC, 237-253.
- Griffe, M. O. (1981). Étude sur le canon II du premier concile de Saragosse. In *I Concilio Caesaraugustano (MDC aniversario)*. Zaragoza: CSIC, 161-175.
- Gryson, R. (1968). *Le prêtre selon saint Ambroise*. Louvain: Édition orientaliste.
- Huffstot, M. da L. and Huffstot, J. S. (1995). Prisciliano, um caso arqueológico? In *IV Reunió de Arqueologia (Paleo)Cristiana Hispànica*. Barcelona: Ed. Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 443-447.
- Hydatius of Chaves (1974). Chronicon. In *Hydace: "Chronique" (Introduction. Texte Critique)*, ed. A. Tranoy. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Innocent I (1845). Epistula 6. In *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, ed. J. -P. Migne. Vol. 20. Paris: Garnier Frères, 495-502.
- Isidore of Seville (1964). De Viris Illustribus. In *El "De viris illustribus" de Isidoro de Sevilla (Estudio y edición crítica)*, ed. C. Codoñer Merino. Salamanca: CSIC.
- Jerome (1883). De uiris illustribus. In *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne. Vol. 23. Paris: Garnier Frères, 631-760.
- Jorge, A. M. C. M. (2001). Priscillianismo. In *Dicionário da história religiosa de Portugal*, dir. C. A. M. Azevedo. Vol. 4. Lisbon: Círculo de leitores, 63-67.
- Leo I (1881). Epistula 15 (Ad Turibium Asturiensem episcopum de priscillianistarum erroribus). In *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, J.-P. Migne. Vol. 54. Paris: Garnier Frères, 693-695.
- Madoz, J. (1957). Arrianismo y priscilianismo en Galicia. *Bracara Augusta*, 8: 68-87.
- Mattoso, J. dir. (1993). *História de Portugal*. Vol. 1. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores.
- Mayeur, J. M. dir. (1995). *Histoire du christianisme: Naissance d'une chrétienté (250-430)*. Vol. 2. Desclée.
- Menéndez Pelayo, M. (1956). *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles: España romana y visigoda*. Vol. 1. Madrid-Santander: CSIC.

- Molé, C. (1975). Uno storico del V secolo: Il vescovo Idazio. *Siculorum Gymnasium*, 28: 58-139.
- Palanque, J. R. (1933). *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire romain*. Paris: Ed. Polígrafa.
- Priscillian of Ávila (1960)a. Canones in Pauli Apostoli epistulas a Peregrino episcopo emendati. In *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina. Supplementum*, ed. A. Hamman. Vol. 2. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1391-1413.
- ___ (1960)b. Liber ad Damasum. In *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina. Supplementum*, ed. A. Hamman. Vol. 2. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1434-1441.
- ___ (1960)c. Liber apologeticus. In *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina. Supplementum*, ed. A. Hamman. Vol. 2. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1413-1434.
- ___ (1960)d. Liber de fide de apocriphis. In *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina. Supplementum*, ed. A. Hamman. Vol. 2. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1442-1451.
- Prosper of Aquitaine (1961). Chronica. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores Antiquissimi*, ed. T. Mommsen. Vol. 9. Hannover-Leipzig: Hahnian, 341-485.
- Ramos-Lisson, D. (1981). Estudio sobre el canon V del I concilio Caesaraugusta (380). In *I Concilio Caesaraugustano (MDC aniversario)*. Zaragoza: CSIC, 207-224.
- Rodríguez, F. (1981). Concilio I de Zaragoza: Texto crítico. In *I Concilio Caesaraugustano (MDC aniversario)*. Zaragoza: CSIC, 9-25.
- Romero Fernández-Pacheco, J. R. (1988). Prisciliano y el priscilianismo: Radiografía de un debate historiográfico. *Hispania Sacra*, 40: 27-44.
- Schatz, W. (1957). *Studien zur Geschichte und Vorstellungswelt des frühen abendländischen Mönchtums*. Freiburg: [s.n.].
- Schepss, G. ed. (1889). *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Vol. 18. Wien: Tempsky & Freytag [Tractatus de Würzburg, 1-106].
- Silva, P. O. (1999). Ortodoxia e heterodoxia. In *Historia do pensamento filosófico português*, dir. P. Calafate. Vol. 1. Lisbon: Editorial Caminho, 43-116.
- Simões, M. B. (2002). *Prisciliano e as tensões religiosas do século IV*. Lisbon: Universidade Lusíada Editora.
- Sulpicius Severus (1866). Chronica. In *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, ed. C. Halmi. Vol. 1. Wien: Tempsky & Freytag, 1-105.
- Torres, C. (1954). Prisciliano, doctor itinerante, brillante superficialidad. *Cuadernos de Estudios Gallegos*, 9: 75-89.
- Tranoy, A. (1981). *La Galice romaine: Recherches sur le nord-ouest de la Péninsule ibérique dans l'Antiquité*. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard.
- Villella Masana, J. (1997). Priscilianismo galaico y política antipriscilianista durante el siglo V. *Antiquité Tardive*, 5: 177-185.
- Vives, J.; Marín Martínez, T. and Martínez Díez, G. eds. (1963). *Concilios visigóticos e hispano romanos*. Madrid: CSIC.

Jorge

*The Lusitanian Episcopate in the 4th Century
Priscillian of Ávila and the Tensions between Bishops*

Copyright 2006, ISSN 1645-6432-Vol.4, number 2, Winter 2006

Bishops and Politics: The Portuguese Episcopacy During the Dynastic Crisis of 1580*

José Pedro Paiva

University of Coimbra
Centro de História da Sociedade e da Cultura
lejpaiva@ci.uc.pt

Abstract

Using Pierre Bourdieu's concept of "field", this essay assumes that there was no single "Church position" during Portugal's dynastic crisis of 1578-81: Portugal's Church was an institution encompassing a large number of different agencies, each containing a huge number of very different agents (from a social, cultural, economic and even religious perspective) struggling for power and influence and disputing control over material, spiritual and symbolic goods. Therefore, my purpose is to explain the various and changing ways that the different prelates of Portugal's thirteen mainland dioceses responded to the acute political problem of the royal succession between 1578 and 1581, and how the crown candidates tried to obtain their support.

Keywords

Church History, Bishops, Portuguese dynastic crisis of 1580, Political history, Religious 'field'

Resumo

Partindo do conceito de "campo" tal como formulado por Pierre Bourdieu, este estudo assume que não existiu uma posição unitária da Igreja no agitado processo político que marcou a vida portuguesa nos anos da crise dinástica (1578-1581). A Igreja portuguesa era uma instituição constituída por várias instâncias e organismos, englobando diferentes agentes, tanto do ponto de vista social, como económico, cultural e até religioso, os quais lutavam por poder e influência e disputavam a posse de bens materiais, espirituais e simbólicos.

Em face desta perspectiva, a intenção central da análise aqui apresentada é explicar como é que cada um dos bispos que ocuparam as 13 dioceses do reino de Portugal se posicionaram e actuaram no contexto da vida política portuguesa, entre 1578 e 1581, e como é que os candidatos à sucessão da Coroa portuguesa em 1580 tentaram obter o seu apoio

Palavras-chave

História da Igreja; Bispos; União Ibérica; História político-religiosa; Campo religioso

* I wish to thank my friend and American colleague William Monter for his assistance in improving the English of my original draft.

Introduction

Although recent Portuguese historiography on the early modern period has rarely emphasized the importance of the political activities undertaken by bishops, it is commonly acknowledged that they were deeply engaged in politics throughout the sixteenth century. Some prelates even played leading roles in the political decision-making process, through their presence at the king's court (which was gradually becoming the center of Portugal's political arena), through the seats they occupied in such central councils and tribunals of the monarchy as the Royal Council, Council of State, *Mesa da Consciência e Ordens*,¹ and *Desembargo do Paço*,² and through their writings or sermons.

The high cultural level and academic training that some of them possessed, the religious prestige and symbolical importance of their episcopal functions, the effectiveness of their episcopal bureaucratic apparatus and the territorialisation of their power, the deep interpenetration between politics and theology (some authors even use the expression 'political theology' to describe it) – all these things made them a very important elite. Consequently, monarchs were perfectly aware of the importance of the Church, and particularly the bishops who occupied the leading positions in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, in reinforcing royal authority within their realm. The concept of confessionalization, proposed by Heinz Schilling (Schilling 2001), and the notion of social disciplining applied by Wolfgang Reinhard and Paolo Prodi (Reinhard 1994 and Prodi 1994) are generally very useful for understanding the key role played by the Church in early modern politics and state-building processes.

In the light of these considerations, it seems useful to analyze episcopal behavior during the Portuguese political crisis of 1580. Yet this topic has seldom received extensive attention from historians studying the Portuguese dynastic crisis which followed the death of King Sebastião on 4 August 1578. Excluding Queiroz Velloso, who briefly mentioned it in a book published exactly sixty years ago (Velloso 1946: 172-173), and more recently Fernando Bouza Alvarez (Bouza Alvarez 1987), most historians dealing with this question have restricted their remarks to brief considerations about the role of the Church in general, ignoring the individual position of each specific bishop. Conversely, a few studies have been concerned only with the particular attitudes of individual bishops; for example, Bartolomeu dos Mártires, the famous archbishop of Braga, or Jerónimo Osório, bishop of Algarve (Rolo 1964, Serrão 1964 and Pinho 1993).

The classical and dominant thesis argues that the Portuguese Church was split in 1580. What is usually called the upper clergy (bishops and prelates governing major religious orders - with the exception of the Jesuits) tended from the beginning to support Philip II, the king of Castile, based on the notion that for both economic and religious purposes, he offered the best solution for the kingdom. However, the majority of the clergy, socially recruited from amongst non-nobles, strongly opposed the solution of a foreign king wearing the crown of Portugal and tended to adhere to D. António, the Prior of Crato, an illegitimate son of the *infant* D. Luís (see, for example, Godinho 1978: 383-384; Marques 1986: 42-43 and Polónia 2005: 224-225).

João Marques made some effort to justify and explain the attitudes of the upper clergy. According to him, the support they gave to Philip II arose from several causes: their family ties to the nobility (a social group that largely preferred Philip II); their fear of social and religious transformations; their general conservatism; pressure on them from agents of the king of Spain;

¹ Council created in 1532 to advise the king on religious matters.

² Appellate tribunal with jurisdiction over criminal and civil justice.

and especially due to the advantages they hoped to gain by supporting the most powerful candidate to the crown, simultaneously perceived as the 'Catholic king' and the greatest defender of the Catholic religion, threatened at that time by both Protestant heretics and the Turks (Marques 1986: 43).

More recently, Fernando Bouza has argued that if it is beyond any doubt that the lower clergy in general opposed the idea of a foreign king, and issued propaganda all over the country, especially from the pulpits, against the Habsburg monarch, with widespread acceptance of a popular state (a topic very well studied by João Marques in 1986), it is no longer sustainable that bishops were strongly engaged as a group in defense of Philip II's candidacy. Bouza demonstrated that during the dynastic crisis, although the Portuguese bishops never strongly opposed Philip II's candidacy (excluding the unique case of the bishop of Guarda, who always supported the Prior of Crato), they were not open and enthusiastic supporters of it. They only changed their positions after a difficult set of negotiations, undertaken by Cristóvão de Moura and Pedro Girón, Duke of Ossuna, assured them that the Castilian monarch would preserve all the privileges that the Portuguese Church had enjoyed before 1580. Bouza thus implies that an historical process occurred, during which the episcopal position underwent a transformation (Bouza Alvarez 1987, II, 558-569 and 579-590; Bouza Alvarez 2005: 118-120).

All the above-mentioned studies, even if some of them tried to distinguish positions assumed by particular bishops, take for granted that it is possible to define a general position sustained by the Portuguese church hierarchy during this complex political process, corresponding to the attitudes expressed by the majority of its bishops. A good example of this methodological approach is an essay by Jacinto Monteiro entitled *The attitude of the Church and the loss of Portugal's independence in 1580* (*A atitude da Igreja e a perda da independência de Portugal em 1580*) (Monteiro 1965).

I suggest, however, that it is impossible to understand this process correctly by assuming that there was any single "Church position", and that it resulted from some common point of view shared by all bishops, acting as a group representing its corporate interests. Firstly, it is worth remembering that the Portuguese Church had no institution or agency where its general position could be debated and afterwards presented as a collectively-agreed, institutional policy. The political assemblies of Portugal's three different social estates (including the clergy) known as the *Cortes* did not function in that way. Secondly, they lacked consensual positions on almost every major issue; the concept of "field" (Bourdieu 1971; Bethencourt 1984) applies here, because the Portuguese Church was an institution encompassing a large number of different agencies, each containing a huge number of very different agents (from a social, cultural, economic and even religious viewpoint) which fought for power and influence, disputing control over innumerable material, spiritual and symbolic goods. One implication of this approach is that, within what is usually called "the Church" (in the singular), there co-existed very different strategies and interests among the various institutions, agents and groups that comprised it.

Periods of deep rupture, during which tensions emerge more obviously, provide good moments for testing this assumption. The Portuguese political crisis of 1580 is one such privileged conjuncture. Accordingly, this essay will try to detect and explain the ways in which the different individuals who were prelates of Portuguese dioceses in the years from 1578-1581 faced the acute political problem of the royal succession, and how the crown candidates, particularly the one who ultimately won the prize - Philip II, tried to obtain their support.

1. The problem

On 4 August 1578, the young and unmarried king of Portugal, D. Sebastião, died on the battlefield of Alcácer-Quibir in North Africa. With him perished a large number of Portuguese, including some distinguished members of the nobility and clergy, in particular the bishops of Coimbra (Manuel de Meneses) and Oporto (Aires da Silva). The monarch's journey to Africa was disastrous from every perspective, and it aggravated the already very difficult economic and budgetary situation of his kingdom. Worse still, it opened up the prospect of a dynastic crisis.

D. Sebastião had neither sons nor brothers; therefore, the crown was assumed by his only great-uncle who was still alive: D. Henrique, the son of D. Manuel I and brother of the former king D. João III, was already 66 years old and a cleric, cardinal, and papal legate; for much of his life, he had also been Portugal's Inquisitor-General (*Inquisidor geral*). The danger of the extinction of the ruling dynasty after his imminent death was obvious to everyone.

From the beginning of his reign, all the efforts of D. Henrique as king were directed towards three main targets: the punishment of those Portuguese who had encouraged D. Sebastião's highly dangerous intention of fighting in Africa; ransoming the vast number (c. 10.000) of Portuguese still captive in Africa; and preparing for his succession (Polónia 2005: 194-213). Although he was a very old and devout churchman, a cardinal and the former archbishop of Braga, Évora and Lisbon (Portugal's three most prestigious cathedrals), his first step towards resolving the dynastic crisis was an attempt to get married. This intention was already evident in a letter he wrote to Philip II on 24 September 1578 (Brandão 1943: 21-22). But this plan was foiled by Castilian diplomacy in Rome, preventing the Pope from sending the necessary brief of dispensation (Velloso 1946: 98-129).

After September 1578, the succession debate and the consequent political dispute intensified at the center of Portuguese politics. Among six leading candidates for the throne after the cardinal-king's death, the great majority boasted blood ties to D. Manuel I, king of Portugal in its golden age between 1495 and 1521. These claimants were D. Catarina, duchess of Bragança, Portugal's most distinguished noble house, who was the daughter of D. Duarte, one of the youngest sons of D. Manuel I; D. António, the Prior of Crato, a bastard of D. Luís, another son of D. Manuel I; Philip II, king of Spain, son of Charles V and Isabel, the elder daughter of D. Manuel I; Emanuele Filiberto, duke of Savoy, son of a younger daughter of D. Manuel I; Ranuccio Farnese, duke of Parma, a nephew of the already-mentioned son of D. Manuel I, D. Duarte; and finally, the widowed queen of France, Catherine de' Medici, who claimed very remote links to a thirteenth-century Portuguese king, Afonso III.

The strongest claimants were D. Catarina of Bragança, the Prior of Crato, and Philip II. From a juridical point of view, as has been very well demonstrated (Cunha 1993), the situation was indeed complex. This is not the place to discuss further the advantages and handicaps of each one, but there is no doubt that all three could invoke legitimate succession rights after the death of D. Henrique.

The difficulties went far beyond juridical and genealogical disputes; the general framework was extremely complex. Apart from a general sense of decadence that can be easily perceived in the literature of the period, Vitorino Magalhães Godinho emphasized the difficulties of Portuguese international trade and the ensuing economic and financial consequences which had provoked a crisis since the middle of the century (Godinho 1978: 25-26, 381-382). The external support sought by D. Catarina and D. António from Spain's great rivals, France and England, provoked distrust among large sectors of the population, particularly from some ecclesiastics who feared that Protestant heresies could be disseminated in Portugal through such future allies. On the other

hand, a majority of people strongly opposed the introduction of a foreign king such as Philip II. Their opposition was not a matter of nationalism, such as the concept came to be developed during the nineteenth century, but there was evidently an atavistic reaction to the idea of a non-native king. There was also the specter of armed conflict among groups supporting the three strongest parties, a conflict that some sectors defended as the only way to prevent the kingdom from falling under the control of a foreigner.

Moreover, all the candidates used the best means at their disposal to defend their cause: political propaganda; support from the best jurists and theologians; the search for external alliances (including the papacy); the preparation of military campaigns; and the activity of foreign agents attempting to acquire influence and supporters and to obtain information about decisions affecting the succession. One consequence was the emergence of political factions supporting each of the candidates. As a final solution was postponed, it became more difficult to reach a consensus among all the parties involved in the dispute. As Francisco Bethencourt has argued, the indecision of D. Henrique, who, after the marriage solution had failed, initially seemed to prefer D. Catarina, but Henrique changed his mind after October 1579 and sought a negotiated agreement with Philip II, causing him to lose control of the political and social conflict (Bethencourt 1993: 549).

Such waffling made it clear how difficult the task facing D. Henrique was and why, from the beginning, he sought some legally-based solution to avoid a war between Christians that would destroy his realm. However, because the situation was so complex, he took no final decision before he died on 31 January 1580.

2. In search of a peaceful solution

In his search for a juridically sustainable agreement that could prevent a war, one of the most important steps taken by D. Henrique was to summon the *Cortes*. Previously, on 11 February 1579, he had addressed a letter to all the candidates, demanding from them a demonstration of their claim to the crown. The solemn opening of the assembly took place soon afterwards, on 1 April 1579.

According to Queiroz Velloso, this meeting had three main purposes: to obtain support for sending a special ambassador to the Pope, demanding his approval for the marriage of D. Henrique (a wish still being blocked in Rome); to create a council of five governors, chosen by D. Henrique from a group of 15 nobleman elected by the *Cortes*, who would govern the kingdom if the monarch died before a consensus was reached concerning the succession; and to elect a tribunal of 11 judges to decide, on a strictly juridical basis, who was the most legitimate candidate to become king. Finally, all three estates represented in the *Cortes* should swear to recognize and respect the decision taken by the governors in case D. Henrique died before any final solution was reached (Velloso 1946: 205-209).

On 1 June, representatives of all three estates swore to respect any future decisions taken by the governors and judges and also to fight, with weapons if necessary, in the event of any of the candidates trying to obtain the crown through illicit means.

At this key moment in the political process surrounding the succession, let us try to perceive what position the bishops adopted during the *Cortes*.

The first thing to be noted is that half of the bishops were not in Lisbon attending the *Cortes*, preferring instead to remain in their dioceses. In April 1579, only eleven of the thirteen Portuguese continental bishoprics even had a prelate: Bartolomeu dos Mártires (Braga); António Pinheiro (Miranda, transferred to Leiria in November 1579); Simão de Sá Pereira (Lamego,

transferred to Oporto in November 1579); Miguel de Castro (Viseu); João de Portugal (Guarda); Gaspar do Casal (Leiria, transferred to Coimbra in November 1579); Jorge de Almeida (Lisbon); André de Noronha (Portalegre); Teotónio de Bragança (Évora); António Mendes de Carvalho (Elvas); and Jerónimo Osório (Algarve). The Oporto and Coimbra bishoprics remained vacant. According to José de Castro, five of these eleven prelates (Mártires, Pinheiro, Portugal, Noronha and Osório) did not attend the assembly (Castro 1942: 140).

A Latin memoir, addressed to the Pope from the people of Lisbon in November 1579,³ suggested that the missing bishops were avoiding the *Cortes* because they opposed the position of the Jesuits, who were apparently inclined towards D. Catarina of Bragança (as was also, in this phase, the king, D. Henrique). But it is also plausible to argue that at least some of them did not attend because they were uncertain about whom to support and preferred not to become deeply involved in the dispute. This could be the case with Bartolomeu dos Mártires, who adopted a distant and very legalistic position throughout the crisis, and also with Osório.

The other three seemed to have preferred a different solution. Pinheiro and Noronha favored Philip II. In June 1579, Philip II already knew about the inclination of the bishop of Miranda and wrote him a letter to be delivered by his ambassadors in Portugal, Cristóvão de Moura and the Duke of Ossuna, recommending that his two agents tell the bishop that he would never regret helping the Castilian side (Velloso 1946: 172). This opinion was subsequently confirmed when Moura wrote to Madrid in December 1579: "About António Pinheiro, we can have confidence (...) he was at my house today and told me that he will punish a friar who preached against Castile last Sunday at Santarém" (Velloso 1946: 348-349).

The bishop of Portalegre was a cousin of Manuel de Noronha, fifth Marquis of Vila Real, who was already engaged on Philip II's side in February 1579. Naturally, the bishop followed his prominent kinsman (Velloso 1946: 149).

João de Portugal, the bishop of Guarda, was one of the leading supporters of D. António, the Prior of Crato. Moura confirmed it in a letter dated 14 April 1579 (Velloso 1946: 52). Although Moura often tried to convince him of the advantages of supporting Philip II, he never changed his position (Velloso 1946: 173). João de Portugal's position must be placed within the context of a dispute with D. Henrique dating from 1573. The case has been well reconstructed by Carlos Margaça Veiga: as papal legate, D. Henrique had denounced his bad behavior as bishop and caused a trial to be held against him at Rome. In order to ensure his best possible defense, João de Portugal went to Rome. En route to the Vatican, he passed through Madrid, hoping to obtain Philip II's help. But, warned by D. Henrique, the king of Spain refused him (Veiga 1995). So, João de Portugal had personal reasons for opposing Philip II, and of course, chose the candidate whom D. Henrique hated most - his nephew, the Prior of Crato. In December 1578, the king had even determined to banish D. António from Lisbon after learning about the steps the Prior was taking to legitimize his origins and prove he was not a bastard.

By April 1579, D. Henrique presumably desired to arrange matters so that he could promote the candidacy of Catarina of Bragança (although large sectors of the third estate opposed her) and used the *Cortes* to gauge the mood of his realm. He expected to have support from a majority of the bishops. And there is no doubt that some of them were his creatures, men who owed their mitres to him. This is confirmed by a letter from the papal legate, Alessandro Frumentini, dated 19 May 1579, informing the cardinal of Como that most of the prelates tended

³ Archivio Segreto Vaticano [hereafter ASV], Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fol. 230.

to support D. Catarina.⁴ He offered no names, but different sources make it plausible to presume that he meant Teotónio de Bragança, Simão de Sá Pereira, Gaspar do Casal, Jorge de Almeida and António Mendes de Carvalho.

The bishop of Evora, Teotónio de Bragança, was an uncle of D. Catarina and also maintained close relations with the Jesuits (Marques 1995: 263-268). Philip II was aware of the Congregation's initial support for D. Catarina, and tried to prevent it at Rome. This he did with some success: on 10 January 1579, the Jesuit general Everardo Mercuriano wrote to Portugal from Rome, prohibiting any direct involvement by Society members in Portugal's political disputes.

Simão de Sá Pereira, a former member of the general council of the Holy Office, had very close links with D. Henrique, as his promotion to the Oporto diocese in November 1579 illustrates. Moreover, numerous references attest to his presence at key moments of the Lisbon *Cortes*, for example at the ceremony where the city of Lisbon swore to obey the decisions of the *Cortes*,⁵ which presume his importance as a faithful royal agent.

Jorge de Almeida was also a man high in the confidence of D. Henrique. The cardinal-king had chosen Almeida to replace him as Inquisitor-general; he had appointed him to the five-man governing commission created from the Lisbon *Cortes*; Almeida was also a member of the special tribunal, created by papal authority and chaired by D. Henrique to assess the legitimacy of the birth of the Prior of Crato, which declared D. António a bastard on 22 August 1579. Gaspar do Casal was another member of this court,⁶ whose decision denied the Prior of Crato any legal chance of contending for the Portuguese crown. In June 1579, Moura tried to buy Almeida's support, suggesting he could become a cardinal by supporting Philip II. But Almeida coolly told Moura that Portugal's future king should be decided by the tribunal created in the *Cortes* (Velloso 1946: 247)

Finally, António Mendes de Carvalho also had close ties with the Jesuits. One of his biographers claims he was made bishop by a very influential Jesuit, Martim Gonçalves da Câmara, during the reign of king D. Sebastião.⁷

So, the only bishop at the Lisbon *Cortes* supporting Philip II was Miguel de Castro; so did the former bishop of Viseu and head court chaplain (*capelão mor*), Jorge de Ataíde, though at this time Ataíde kept his decision relatively secret (Velloso 1946: 145, 206). Miguel de Castro was a noble from one of the richest and most prestigious families in Évora. His elder brother was Fernando de Castro, an early supporter of Philip II, who rewarded him after becoming king of Portugal by naming him Count of Basto. In fact, this entire clan supported Philip II as early as 7 February 1579, as Moura informed the king of Spain in a letter (Velloso 1946: 147-149).

The preceding details make it impossible to argue that the majority of Portuguese bishops held a clearly defined public position by April/June 1579, and even more difficult to claim that they already supported Philip II. Even among those bishops closest to D. Henrique, who was himself little disposed to António, Prior of Crato, ambiguous positions seem to have been held. On 12 August 1579, two months after the Lisbon *Cortes*, the Prior of Crato sent a letter to Pope Gregory XIII, begging him not to give D. Henrique the decision about the legitimization of his birth. Documentary evidence indicates that D. António then believed in the impartiality of several

⁴ ASV - Segretaria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fl. 32.

⁵ ASV - Segretaria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 4, fl. 59.

⁶ ASV - Segretaria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fols. 179-180.

⁷ BACELAR, Manuel da Cunha de Andrade e Sousa - *Éptome historica e panegirica da vida, acçoens e morte do Excellentissimo e reverendissimo Senhor Dom Antonio Mendes de Carvalho, primeiro bispo de Elvas*. Lisbon: Pedro Ferreira, 1753, p. 57-59.

prelates, including D. Gaspar do Casal, Simão de Sá Pereira, and of course João de Portugal, together with the former bishop of Angra (Azores), Manuel de Almada, and Bartolomeu dos Mártires, who had once briefly been his master.⁸

Much evidence from this period suggests the continuous evolution and transformation of Portugal's political process. By the beginning of September 1579, some signals had begun to appear, suggesting a shift in position by D. Henrique (Veiga 1999: vol. 1, 344-346). He recognized the impossibility of getting married, the antipathy of large sectors of the third estate towards D. Catarina of Bragança, and, of course, he became increasingly persuaded of Philip II's interest in becoming king of Portugal and realized how difficult it would be to stop his power-play. By this time, he was aware that large sectors of the nobility and even people within the restricted membership of the royal councils were already compromised with Philip II. At the same time, he wanted to prevent the Prior of Crato, who enjoyed great support from the popular estate, from becoming the next king of Portugal. Under these circumstances, he began to think the best solution would be to strike a deal with Philip II, if only to avoid a war that could destroy the kingdom. All this became evident in the letters that Moura wrote to Madrid. On 18 September, Moura reported that he had been told in a private meeting with the Cardinal King that D. Henrique would soon take a final resolution favoring Philip II. Six days later, Moura sent Madrid a letter from the cardinal with proposals for an agreement, though D. Henrique insisted that any final decision had to be confirmed by the *Cortes*. In November, D. Henrique wrote to his niece D. Catarina, confirming that he was negotiating with Philip II. Finally, at a meeting between D. Henrique and Cristóvão de Moura on 10 November, the main points of an agreement were reached. The deal had been negotiated mainly by Philip II's ambassador and Miguel de Moura, a member of D. Henrique's privy council, who supported Philip II (Velloso 1946: 315-339).

With these basic ideas in mind, a very old and sick D. Henrique summoned another *Cortes* with the hopeful expectation that all three estates would accept his proposals (Bouza 2005: 78-79). One thing seems certain: confronted with so many conflicting interests, he did not want to make an official decision by himself.

This *Cortes* opened at the small town of Almeirim on 11 January 1580. Once again, only five bishops definitely attended: Teotónio de Bragança (Évora); Jorge de Almeida (Lisbon); António Pinheiro (Leiria); Jerónimo de Meneses (Miranda) and Jerónimo Osório (Algarve). We have no information about three others: André de Noronha (Portalegre); Gaspar do Casal (the new bishop of Coimbra); and António Mendes de Carvalho (Elvas). Bartolomeu dos Mártires acted as he had done at the time of the Lisbon *Cortes* and once again avoided the center of the political arena. It is evident that he did not want to get involved. His silence meant that he would accept any solution that was legally announced, but would not show any preference.

It is plausible that two of the missing bishops could justify their absence by the fact that they had only been very recently nominated, and so should remain in their dioceses. Such was the case with António Teles de Meneses (Lamego) and Simão de Sá Pereira (Oporto), both confirmed as bishops in late November 1579 and both very close to D. Henrique. We have no evidence of either man's presence at Almeirim.

As for two others, Miguel de Castro and João de Portugal, both enthusiastic supporters of D. António, Prior of Crato (who was at Santarém, a town very close to Almeirim), it is more difficult to understand why they did not appear to defend their candidate. However, the position of the bishop of Guarda looks reasonable. His candidate had been declared a bastard by D.

⁸ ASV - Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fols. 462-463.

Henrique in November 1579; hostile towards the Cardinal King, he must have concluded that his presence among his episcopal colleagues would not be welcome. Prudently, he remained nearby, keeping well-informed and helping those who defended D. António's cause at Almeirim, while assisting D. António's numerous supporters in Santarém, the town where the third estate assembled during the *Cortes*.

As to the five prelates in attendance at Almeirim, we are better informed.

Jerónimo de Meneses had decided in favor of Philip II even before becoming a bishop, although his brother João Telo de Meneses, one of the five governors, supported D. Catarina – an unusual family strategy. But the name of the bishop of Miranda appears on a list of people receiving money from Cristóvão de Moura in 1579 (Velloso 1946: 171).

Teotónio de Bragança seemed still attached to his niece, D. Catarina. The papal nuncio informed the Cardinal of Como on 21 January 1580 that D. Henrique was doing everything possible to be replaced by Philip II and therefore he had forbidden D. Teotónio from speaking at the clerical meetings during the Almeirim *Cortes*, because of his family links with the house of Bragança.⁹ A few days later, when D. Catarina of Bragança decided to visit the dying Cardinal King at Almeirim, Teotónio de Bragança was the only bishop to give her and her entourage a public welcome (Velloso 1946: 393).

Like his beloved patron D. Henrique, Jorge de Almeida was making every effort to find some solution that would prevent a war. But rumors circulated at Almeirim that he had sold his support to Castile.¹⁰ Nevertheless, Almeida's future position, especially after becoming a governor, reveals that he was very hesitant.

The two most important actors among the bishops at Almeirim were undoubtedly Jerónimo Osório and António Pinheiro.

Upon receiving the letter from D. Henrique summoning him to the new *Cortes* at Almeirim, Osório replied in November 1579. Among other things, he begged D. Henrique to do everything possible to avoid a disastrous war among Christians and advised the king not to listen to anyone who argued that war was the best way.¹¹ His letter was used by Castilian propaganda to claim that the prestigious bishop of Algarve supported Philip II (Velloso 1946: 365).

After reaching Almeirim on 4 January 1580, Osório wrote another letter to D. Henrique, containing a very clear, pragmatic and well-argued position. With a large number of candidates who all considered themselves legitimate, the best solution for the kingdom's dangerous situation was to form a union with Castile. Seeing no way to defend the realm if Philip II decided to attack, he argued that it was preferable to accept him peacefully than after the shame and oppression of a military defeat. Finally, he argued that the best method involved negotiating the union of the two crowns with Philip II "under some honest conditions" and concluded his letter with the pithy phrase, "subjugated never, united yes".¹²

According to Sebastião Tavares de Pinho, this letter from Osório finally persuaded the Cardinal King to accept Philip II. Pinho used another open letter of the bishop of Algarve, written some months later (July 1580) and known as *Defensio sui nominis*, to argue that (in Osório's words), "when the bishops were meeting with the clerical estate at Almeirim, the cardinal confessed to him that he [Osório] will appreciate and defend the formula he will soon receive for resolving

⁹ ASV - Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fl. 280.

¹⁰ *Idem*.

¹¹ The letter was first published by Baião 1951: 201-202. Pinho (1993: 311-313) uses another version, which he claims is closer to Osório's usual style from a formal point of view.

¹² The entire letter was published by Velloso 1946: 366-367.

the dynastic crisis,” implying that this formula was a preliminary agreement with Philip II to be presented at the *Cortes* (Pinho 1993: 318-319). Though the position sustained by the bishop of Algarve was undoubtedly very pragmatic and impressed some of his episcopal colleagues, Pinho neglected the data used by Queiroz Velloso, demonstrating that D. Henrique had been moving in this direction since September 1579.

António Pinheiro also seems to have played a very important role during this period. He had the advantage of being a very experienced politician; since the reign of João III, he had been a respected courtier who had often preached at the most important monarchical ceremonies. Perhaps because of his previous experience, D. Henrique assigned him the role of broker between the king and the popular estate in these crucial January days. We must also remember that D. Henrique was then very ill and near death; under such circumstances, he entrusted António Pinheiro with delivering some of his most important decisions to the *Cortes*.

In view of some hesitation on the part of D. Henrique during the last days of December that worried the Spanish ambassadors Moura and Ossuna, the cardinal probably intended to obtain some general consensus at the *Cortes* that would allow him to make an acceptable compromise declaring Philip II as his successor. According to Bouza, this was the strategy used by Philip II throughout 1579: to negotiate some solution that defended his interests, relying on the skill of his representatives in Portugal, and avoiding the necessity of using military force (Bouza 2005: 78).

And Pinheiro played a key role in defending Philip II's interests during the *Cortes*. Three times the cardinal sent him to talk to the popular estate. Particularly on his second visit, on 18 January 1580, he read a memorial, purporting to express D. Henrique's ideas, which asserted that Philip II's claims were more consistent than those of D. Catarina and, accordingly, that D. Henrique expected that it was possible for the realm to reach an agreement with the King of Castile (Velloso 1946: 375-380). This statement was badly received by the third estate, provoking excited and hostile reactions. Four days later, the popular assembly decided that they preferred to die rather than deliver the crown to a foreign king.

We must pay attention to two letters in order to understand António Pinheiro's feelings and actions. Firstly, in a letter from Philip II to Moura, sent from Madrid on 26 January, the king recognized his key role and asked Moura to aid him : “Bishop Piñero behaves in ways that show well his favorable inclination for our affairs; therefore it is fitting that you show him my satisfaction with his conduct and assure him that he will receive suitable rewards in gratitude for what I owe him” (original in Velloso 1946: 382). A second letter, from the papal nuncio to Rome, dated 29 January, reported that António Pinheiro had told the popular estate that D. Henrique was about to reach an agreement with Philip II; however, the nuncio commented that this was untrue and had not been explicitly ordered by the cardinal.¹³ Together, these letters suggest that rumors circulated that António Pinheiro had privileged information from the Cardinal King but had twisted it a little in order to favor, as much as possible, the interests of Philip II.

The third estate's vigorous rejection of any suggestion of a foreign king, combined with the division among the estate of nobility, where Philip II received only one more vote than either D. Catarina or the Prior of Crato, effectively prevented D. Henrique from taking any final decision before he died on 31 January 1580. His inability to proclaim any satisfactory solution contributed to the creation of the historiographical myth that his hesitation delivered Portugal to the Spanish.

¹³ ASV - Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fl. 293.

3. From negotiation to war

Immediately after D. Henrique's death, power was transferred to the five governors elected at the Lisbon *Cortes*. They were divided about the best solution to be taken, although they tended to agree about choosing a king with the best dynastic claim from a juridical point of view. Basically, the archbishop of Lisbon hesitated about supporting anyone. João Telo de Meneses opposed Philip II, while the other three (João de Mascarenhas, Francisco de Sá de Meneses and Diogo Lopes de Sousa) supported the King of Spain (Veloso 1953: 4). Initially, given the obvious social and political divisions in the realm - including among themselves - they merely tried to prevent Philip II from launching a military invasion of Portugal. Accordingly, they sent a special embassy to the Spanish court, formed by the Bishop of Coimbra, Gaspar do Casal, and Manuel de Melo (Veiga 1999: 360-361). Simultaneously, in a letter dated 19 February 1580, they asked Pope Gregory XIII to urge Philip II not to use military force to conquer the Portuguese throne.¹⁴

The coming months were very confused and full of political activity, with different centers of power emerging.

The governors, still split among themselves, preserved a general atmosphere of indecision while trying to create conditions for respecting a juridical solution that would be confirmed through the *Cortes*. On 30 April 1580, they convoked them, although they were never formally summoned. During this period, they apparently trusted the role bishops could play in preserving peace in their dioceses and respecting the decisions taken by the governors. They even sent a circular letter to all prelates, ordering them to encourage their flocks to be ready to defend Portugal against anyone who tried to conquer its crown against their decisions, also asking them to be alert and not to allow their clergy, especially during sermons, to take public positions in favor of any of the candidates (Rolo 1964: 23).

Philip II tried to profit from the circumstance that Portugal's three estates were still assembled at Almeirim (the *Cortes* were not closed immediately after D. Henrique died, and were only suspended on 15 March) by offering them a solution based on the agreement he had negotiated with the late king, including the various privileges among the different estates and also offering a certain amount of autonomy to the kingdom. His position was made explicit in a document of 25 chapters, presented by Ossuna at Almeirim on 20 March 1580, entitled *Memorial de las gracias y mercedes que el Rey nuestro señor concederá a estos reynos quando fuere jurado rey y señor dellos* (...) (Bouza 2005: 69, 80-82).

At the same time, Philip II made it very clear that he considered himself the legitimate king of Portugal. This was clearly demonstrated in the first days of April, when he received the representatives sent by the governors not as ambassadors, but as vassals - a significant difference, as some of the governors noticed (Veloso 1953: 41). But together with his one hand wearing a velvet glove of peaceful and "generous" strategy, Philip II showed an iron fist in the other by preparing troops for an invasion. On 20 May, for example, the governors convoked a Council of State to discuss a letter from the Spanish ambassador, in which Philip II declared that if he was not declared monarch of Portugal by 8 June, he would invade the kingdom (Veloso 1953: 112). In Portugal, Cristóvão de Moura kept trying to convince some notable Portuguese figures to declare for Philip II and rewarded others by offering them privileges and even bribes. D. Jorge de Ataíde, the former bishop of Viseu, for example, was offered an amount of one thousand *cruzados* yearly, according to a letter dated 25 January 1580 that he kept among his papers.¹⁵

¹⁴ ASV - Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 4, fols. 90-91.

¹⁵ Biblioteca Nacional (Lisbon) – Pombalina 641, fl. 559.

Meanwhile, D. António, Prior of Crato, had mustered considerable support, especially among ordinary people. He simultaneously sought international help and tried to reopen the legal process of legitimizing his birth. If he could only be declared legitimate, he would undoubtedly overtake all rival candidates and be declared heir to the Portuguese crown. On 19 June 1580, stimulated by the bishop of Guarda, João de Portugal, a group of his supporters at Santarém publicly acclaimed him as the new king of Portugal. Four days later, he and his forces entered Lisbon, where he was also received as king and began acting as Portugal's new monarch (Veloso 1953: 151-153 and Serrão 1956).

At this moment, the governors and the various supporters of Philip II around them (including the bishop of Leiria, António Pinheiro, and the former bishop of Viseu, Jorge de Ataíde) escaped to Setúbal, fifty kilometers south of Lisbon. A few days later, on 17 July, the three governors who had clearly supported Philip II from the beginning, and now, pursued by the forces of D. António, had fled from Setúbal, decided to declare Philip II King of Portugal.¹⁶

In this whirlwind of political confusion, only D. Catarina de Bragança, aware of her military weakness but confident of her dynastic rights, still insisted on a juridical solution. On 20 June, her husband insisted that the governors proclaim her as queen, because, by using force, both Philip II and D. António had broken the agreement reached during the Lisbon *Cortes* (Veloso 1953: 158).

Throughout these six dramatic months, what was the attitude of the bishops? Once more, we can find no homogeneous scenario. In February and March, some of them remained at Almeirim, still one of the main centers of power, where Moura and Osuna kept trying to convince not only the bishops but also other members of the nobility of the advantages of declaring Philip II king, despite risking accusations of treason. As the nuncio informed Rome, a riot had occurred shortly before 22 March, when they were assembled with the bishops.¹⁷

At this point, it became particularly evident that Philip II was seeking support from the Portuguese episcopacy. This was one point in his strategy for conquering the Portuguese crown by preventing preachers in particular, and the lower clergy in general, from using Portugal's pulpits against him.

According to Bouza (Bouza 2005: 112-113), his negotiations with the bishops were difficult because, especially after a 1578 agreement between the clergy and the king D. Sebastião, the privileges of the Church, and particularly its jurisdictional privileges, were enormous, far beyond those existing in Spain.¹⁸ Philip's official *Memorial de las gracias y mercedes* referred to Church privileges in chapters 9, 10, 15 and 18.¹⁹ Basically, it said that all bishops, heads of religious orders, holders of church benefices subject to royal appointment, and the Inquisitor General were positions that had to be given to Portuguese natives; that the king would not impose new taxes on the Church and clergy, like the "*terças, subsidios e escusados*" levied in Castile; that whenever the king was away from Portugal, he had to be accompanied by one clergyman and another Portuguese who would form a council (*Conselho de Portugal*) to be consulted about all Portuguese matters; finally, that, like previous kings of Portugal, the king would maintain a royal

¹⁶ This document, known as the *Proclamação de Castro Marim*, was published by Veloso 1953: 175-179.

¹⁷ ASV - Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fl. 373-375.

¹⁸ The agreement of 18 March 1578 between D. Sebastião and the clergy was printed by CASTRO, Gabriel Pereira de - *Monomachia sobre as concórdias que fizeram os reis com os prelados de Portugal nas duvidas da jurisdição eclesiástica e temporal*. Lisbon: José Francisco Mendes, 1738, pp. 228-256.

¹⁹ I have used the copy in ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fols. 367-368. See also (Bouza Alvarez 1987: vol. 2, 956-957).

chapel in Lisbon. Following Bouza's interpretation, supported also by Federico Palomo, it was only after these concessions that the Portuguese bishops accepted the union of the crowns of Portugal and Spain (Bouza 1987: vol. 2, 580-581; Palomo 2004: 69-70).

I am, however, less sure about the decisive importance of these negotiations in persuading the bishops. According to a letter from Almeirim dated 28 March, only António Pinheiro, bishop of Leiria, Jerónimo de Meneses, bishop of Miranda, Teotónio de Bragança, archbishop of Évora, and Jorge de Ataíde, the former bishop of Viseu were present at Almeirim when these arrangements were discussed, and they confirmed their support of Philip II by acknowledging the "sacred zeal" he had always shown when confronting the problem of Portugal's dynastic succession.²⁰ As shown above, three of them (Pinheiro, Meneses, and Ataíde) had already decided to support Philip II a long time before, at least since March/April 1579, and were not particularly worried about these negotiations. Moreover, other bishops who were probably not at Almeirim in March 1580, for example Miguel de Castro (Viseu), Jerónimo Osório (Algarve) and André de Noronha (Elvas), did not wait for these concessions to the clergy before declaring their support for the king of Spain. As we have seen, Osório's letter of 4 January 1580 invoked reasons other than the privileges conceded to the Church for giving his support to Philip II. On 11 June, Osório wrote to Philip II, boasting that he had done his best to defend him at Almeirim and was still continuously doing so in his diocese. He again acknowledged his prudent support for the king of Castile, recognizing that Philip II could easily conquer Portugal by force, but praising him for preferring to act more as a father than as an "imperial lord".²¹

So, I accept that negotiation remained an important strategic element in Philip II's policy, but it was not decisive for convincing most bishops, except Teotónio de Bragança and perhaps Gaspar do Casal. According to our available information, the Archbishop of Evora changed his position between late January and March 1580; until then he had remained loyal to his relative, D. Catarina, but by the end of March he was on Philip II's side. Yet he had apparently decided to support the king of Castile even before Moura and Ossuna produced the so-called *Mercês de Almeirim*. He started a letter dated 3 March 1580 complimenting Philip II on the birth of a new daughter, by declaring that he was 'always ready to serve' Philip II.²²

We have little information about the attitude of Gaspar do Casal before March 1580, although he was generally in sympathy with D. Henrique. So it seems plausible that he was inclined to support Philip II by January 1580, if still slightly hesitant. In any event, there is no doubt that by April he was supporting the king of Castile.²³

Other bishops maintained an ambiguous or non-explicit position between February and July. One was the archbishop of Lisbon and also one of the governors, Jorge de Almeida. Apparently his conduct resembled that of D. Henrique, the former king. Some of his actions reveal support for Philip II. The best example is his opposition to reopening the procedure legitimizing D. António. As one of the judges at the first inquest into legitimizing D. António, carried out while D. Henrique was alive, he was pressed by the papal nuncio between March and June 1580 to reopen it. But Almeida blocked all attempts to do so, and no new legitimization procedure was ever begun by a new tribunal (Castro 1942: 104-106). Throughout these months, Almeida often met with Cristóvão de Moura. At one of them, in early May, he promised Moura that, as

²⁰ Archivo General de Simancas [hereafter AGS], Estado, legajo 419, letter 136.

²¹ AGS - Estado, legajo 419, letter 152.

²² AGS - Estado, legajo 419, letter 170.

²³ AGS - Estado, legajo 418, letter 57 (Reasons given by the bishop of Coimbra in support of Philip II's claim to the Portuguese crown).

Inquisitor General, he would punish a friar who had preached a sermon claiming that any Portuguese who died fighting against Philip II's troops would enter Paradise (Veloso 1953: 76). In any event, like the Cardinal King, he was afraid of a war; in June, exactly one day before D. António was acclaimed at Santarém, Almeida was still begging Moura to give him more time to summon the *Cortes* and have a final and consensual solution approved there (Veloso 1953:142-143).

Another prelate who never revealed an explicit position was the Archbishop of Braga, Bartolomeu dos Mártires. It appears that he too was primarily concerned with shaping some juridical solution that would prevent a war between partisans of D. António and Philip II, and therefore remained officially neutral. That is how I prefer to interpret his absence from all the *Cortes*, his public silence about the succession issue after August 1578, and also the position he took in a pastoral letter promulgated on 11 May 1580, after receiving the order sent by the governors to all Portuguese prelates. His pastoral letter makes it very clear that his main intention was to maintain peace (he even ordered all good Christians to make prayers and processions for its promotion), together with a neutral position and respect for all decisions made by duly constituted public officials, i.e. the five governors.²⁴ The heated controversies of forty years earlier, debating whether this famous archbishop's attitudes reveal him as a patriot trying to prevent the realm from being handed to Philip II (Rolo 1964), or blaming him as someone whose silence and hesitation made him indirectly responsible for Philip II's triumph (Serrão 1964), make no sense at all.

Finally, we must recognize that the two bishops who were most active politically throughout the succession crisis (excluding Jorge de Almeida, who was a governor) were António Pinheiro and João de Portugal. The first consistently promoted Philip II's candidacy; the second masterminded D. António's strategy.

Pinheiro defended Castilian interests in the Council of State, for example in late March, when he opposed the decision that the governors were about to take concerning the necessity of summoning a new *Cortes* to declare who should be king. He seems to have always been well informed about the measures Philip II was planning. For example, on May 2, Moura told him that Philip II had obtained declarations from Spanish theologians, clarifying his right to make war in order to defend his legitimate rights (Veloso 1953: 60). And Pinheiro frequently displayed agreement with policies followed by Castile. Fernando Bouza found two very important letters from him that confirm this interpretation. In the first, the bishop of Leiria argued that the Portuguese were so individualistic that it was better to persuade them to support Philip II by offering individual rewards rather than general privileges. In the second, dated March 1580, when the necessity of using military force became increasingly evident, Pinheiro said that those (he called them "evil men") who refused the rewards and privileges offered by Philip II must be convinced by the "hammer of fear" (Bouza 2005: 75, 78). His explicit and public engagement explain why, after D. António entered Lisbon in July, he had to flee, together with Jorge de Ataíde the former bishop of Viseu. And, as the papal nuncio informed Rome, both men's lives and honor were at risk on that occasion.²⁵

On the opposite side emerged the equally prominent role of João de Portugal. His position was very well known to the alert Cristóvão de Moura; in a letter to Philip II in April, Moura reported that the bishop, his brother Manuel de Portugal, the governor João Telo de Meneses, the Jesuit Martim Gonçalves da Câmara and Febo Moniz were the king of Spain's worst

²⁴ It was published by Rolo 1964: 23-24.

²⁵ ASV - Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fl. 465v.

enemies (Veloso 1953: 74). By the end of May, Moura knew about the meetings held at Santarém, at which the bishop and his friends had hatched their conspiracies (Veloso 1953: 148).

Finally, it was João de Portugal, who on Sunday 18 June, after mass, proclaimed in a very enthusiastic speech to a large audience that D. António was the only Portuguese capable of preventing Portugal, with God's mercy, from falling into Spanish hands. So, he concluded, our only hope was to proclaim the Prior of Crato as defender of the realm, and assist him in a spirit of resistance and sacrifice (Serrão 1956: 16-17). After D. António's uprising, during the few weeks when he managed to act like a king in Lisbon, the papal nuncio considered the bishop of Guarda one of the most powerful people in the "new state".²⁶

He paid heavily for it. Philip II showed him no pity. In April 1585, a court presided over by Pedro de Castilho, the former bishop of Angra (Azores) and loyal to Philip II, deprived him of his bishopric, his priestly rank, and every ecclesiastical benefice he possessed. He was also denaturalized and sentenced to prison for life in a monastery in Spain, where he died (Castro 1942: 359-362).

4. The final assault

After D. António's uprising on 18 June at Santarém, followed by his entry into Lisbon, where Manuel de Almada, another former bishop of Angra, also supported him (Serrão 1956: 45), Philip II had no other choice than to invade Portugal with his army. On 18 June (the same day as the uprising at Santarém), the border towns of Campo Maior and Elvas surrendered to Philip II without fighting. At Elvas, an agreement was made with the approval of the local bishop, António Mendes de Carvalho (Veloso 1953: 159-160). On 28 June, commanded by the renowned Duke of Alba, Philip II's infantry crossed the Portuguese border and headed in the direction of Lisbon. En route, on 25 August, at a place called Alcântara, Philip II's troops routed the outnumbered and under-prepared forces of D. António, who managed to escape towards northern Portugal during the battle. This result explains why Philip II, after this lengthy process, considered that he had simultaneously inherited, purchased, and conquered the kingdom of Portugal (Serrão 2001: 80).

Only after the battle of Alcântara was the question of the Portuguese succession definitively decided. However, from a legal viewpoint, the proclamation of Castro Marim, made on 17 July by three of the five governors, officially transformed the monarch of Castile into the King of Portugal. The king's formal acclamation occurred several months later, at a session of the *Cortes* held at the town of Tomar in April 1581.

After the battle of Alcântara, all the bishops (except of course João de Portugal), including those who until then had remained hesitant or neutral, like D. Jorge de Almeida, Bartolomeu dos Mártires or Simão de Sá Pereira, rapidly showed their support for the new king. And all of them attended the *Cortes* of Tomar in April 1581, except Jerónimo Osório, the bishop of Algarve, who had died on 20 August 1580. At the *Cortes*, António Pinheiro, of course, gave the opening speech (Bouza Alvarez 1987: vol. 1 218-220, and Serrão 1956: 215-216).

We have abundant proof of the open and rapid support given by the bishops to Philip II. Chronologically, the first is a letter from the Bishop of Portalegre, André de Noronha, dated 29 August, in which he vividly congratulates the new king on the "reduction of Lisbon to His

²⁶ ASV - Segreteria di Stato, Portogallo, vol. 7, fols. 469-470.

Majesty's service".²⁷ One month before this, he had opposed the acclamation of D. António at Portalegre.²⁸ But from a rhetorical point of view, the most interesting letter was the one written by the Bishop of Miranda, Jerónimo de Meneses, in December 1580. No one else expressed such flattery towards the new king.²⁹ At Viseu, as expected, Bishop Miguel de Castro also played an important role in proclaiming Philip II as the new king in the first days of September, despite some local resistance.³⁰

Even those bishops who had not openly declared themselves before August now supported Philip II.

On 9 September, Jorge de Almeida, Archbishop of Lisbon, finally ended his indecision and wrote to Gabriel Zaías, a secretary of Philip II, expressing his desire to visit the new king personally and kiss his hand.³¹ His visit was postponed at Philip's orders, despite the continuous insistence of the archbishop to do so.³²

Another archbishop, Bartolomeu dos Mártires, who had refused to proclaim D. António in August, despite pressure from some inhabitants of Braga which had forced him to abandon his seat briefly, decided to proclaim Philip II as king, at the town where he was archbishop and lord, on the first of September. Two days earlier, he had written to Garcia Sarmiento de Sotomayor, a Castilian general, saying that because he opposed D. António some people from Braga had tried to kill him and that his intention had always been to preserve justice (Serrão 1964: 268-269). And, on 11 November, answering a letter from Philip II, he reassured the new ruler that he would persecute and punish any cleric who had been loyal to D. António during the crisis.³³

At Oporto, Simão de Sá Pereira - who always kept in close touch with his neighbor Bartolomeu dos Mártires, including when both had been forced to flee from their towns under pressure from D. António's forces - showed his subordination to the new king's orders in letters written in December.³⁴

During the coming years, recognizing the help he had received and purporting to show his gratitude, Philip II promoted some of the bishops who had supported him during these two dramatic years. As one would expect, António Pinheiro received important and lucrative offices in the new Portuguese administration (Veiga 1999: vol. 1 392), as did D. Jorge de Ataíde who remained as head court chaplain and in December 1580 was made President of the Mesa da Consciência.³⁵ Miguel de Castro, the Bishop of Viseu, was made archbishop of Lisbon and later became one of the kingdom's governors. André de Noronha, Bishop of Portalegre, was promoted to the Spanish bishopric of Plasencia, while Jerónimo de Meneses was transferred from the impoverished diocese of Miranda to wealthier Oporto. Other prelates from the Portuguese overseas empire who supported Philip II were also promoted. As I have demonstrated elsewhere, it was during his government that we find the highest number of bishops already serving the previous king being promoted (Paiva 2006).

²⁷ AGS - Estado, legajo 418, letter 152.

²⁸ AGS - Estado, legajo 421, letter from Jerónimo de Mendonça, dated 25 June 1580.

²⁹ AGS - Estado, legajo 418, legajo 424, letter 127 and 128.

³⁰ AGS - Estado, legajo 421, letter dated 11 September 1580.

³¹ AGS - Estado, legajo 419, letter 111.

³² AGS - Estado, legajo 419, letter 120.

³³ AGS - Estado, legajo 419, letter 150.

³⁴ AGS - Estado, legajo 426, letter dated 13 December 1580.

³⁵ Biblioteca Nacional (Lisbon) – Pombalina 641, fols. 543 and 545.

Such developments led Federico Palomo to conclude that during the first years of Philip II's government as king of Portugal, and relying on the agreements preserving the privileges of the Portuguese Church (presented at Almeirim and confirmed at the *Cortes* held in Tomar), Portugal's episcopate offered no opposition to the new king and indeed acted as very important allies who contributed to the consolidation and legitimization of the new monarch's rule (Palomo 2004: 78-80). But this period is part of another story.

Conclusions

For purposes of clarity and objectivity, I offer my conclusions in the form of six summary statements.

1 – It is no longer possible to assert that there was some uniform position taken by “the Portuguese Church” during Portugal's dynastic crisis of 1578-1581. Even assuming that its bishops represented the Portuguese Church, this study makes it clear that the Portuguese episcopate had no single consensual position. Thirteen different mainland bishops played different roles at different times. The ‘field’ of Portuguese clergy, including its bishops, remained deeply divided over this vital issue.

2 – Episcopal attitudes evolved continuously throughout this crisis. The general tendency reveals that, over time, an increasing number of prelates supported Philip II, although a majority of them preferred Catarina de Bragança until May/June 1579. In any event, the time at which each chose to declare or act as a supporter of Philip II differed from bishop to bishop.

3 – In general, bishops kept a very low strategic profile about intervening at the center of this political dispute. Although a few of them (António Pinheiro, bishop of Miranda and Leiria; Jorge de Ataíde, former bishop of Viseu, João de Bragança, bishop of Guarda; and Jorge de Almeida, archbishop of Lisbon) played particularly active and decisive roles, most preferred to remain prudent in their support of the various candidates.

4 – We still have no overview of the real impact and importance of Portugal's episcopate at a diocesan level; but their collective proceedings at the *Cortes* or individual dealings with agents of Portugal's political center make it clear that every important candidate for the throne sought their support, implying that the candidates were aware and convinced of their importance.

5 – Insofar as we can find any governing logic behind the positions assumed by the Portuguese episcopacy, it seems that a majority acted in defense of their personal, family and clientage interests, revealing an acute sense of opportunism. However, within this individualistic framework, four main reasons emerge to help explain their attitudes and motivations: a) preserving Catholicism in Portugal; b) preserving the privileges of the Portuguese Church and clergy; c) awareness that it was impossible to resist the power of Philip II; and d), the necessity of avoiding war if possible.

6 – If Philip II became king of Portugal, a majority of Portuguese bishops ultimately contributed to his success. And the new ruler crushed the only one who had vehemently opposed him.

References

- Baião, António (1951). 'Cartas inéditas de D. Jerónimo Osório acerca da transferência da catedral Algarvia no século XVI', in *Anais da Academia Portuguesa de História*, III (2ª série): 570-577.
- Bethencourt, Francisco (1984). 'Campo religioso e Inquisição em Portugal no século XVI', in *Estudos Contemporâneos*, 6 : 43-60.
- Bethencourt, Francisco (1993). D. Henrique, in MATTOSO, José (dir.) - *História de Portugal*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores, vol. 3, 546-551.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1971). 'Génese et structure du champ religieux', in *Revue Française de Sociologie*, XII : 295-334.
- Bouza Alvarez, Fernando Jesus (1987). *Portugal en la Monarquia Hispanica (1580-1640): Felipe II, las Cortes de Tomar y la genesis del Portugal catolico*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid. 2 vol.
- Bouza, Fernando (2005). *D. Filipe I*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores.
- Brandão, Mário (1943). *Alguns documentos relativos a 1580*. Coimbra: Biblioteca da Universidade.
- Castro, José de (1942). *O Prior do Crato*. Lisbon: União Gráfica.
- Cunha, Mafalda Soares da (1993). A questão jurídica na crise dinástica in MATTOSO, José (dir.) - *História de Portugal*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores, vol. 3, 552-559.
- Godinho, Vitorino Magalhães (1978). *Ensaio. II Sobre História de Portugal*. Lisboa: Editora Sá da Costa (first published 1968).
- Marques, João Francisco (1995). 'Os jesuítas, confessores da corte portuguesa na época barroca (1550-1700)', in *Revista da Faculdade de Letras - História*, XII 2ª série: 231-270.
- Marques, João Francisco (1986). *A parenética portuguesa e a dominação filipina*. Porto: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica.
- Monteiro, Jacinto (1965). 'A atitude da Igreja e a perda da independência de Portugal em 1580', in *Insulana*, XXI: 1-44.
- Paiva, José Pedro (2006). *Os bispos de Portugal e do império (1495-1777)*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade.
- Palomo, Federico (2004). 'Para el sosiego y quietud del reino. En torno a Felipe II y el poder eclesiástico en el Portugal de finales del siglo XVI', in *Hispania. Revista Española de Historia*, LXIV/1, nº 216: 63-94.
- Pinho, Sebastião Tavares de (1993). 'D. Jerónimo Osório e a crise sucessória de 1580: em torno da Defensio sui nominis, da Carta Notable e de outros documentos afins', *Actas do Congresso Internacional Humanismo Português na Época dos Descobrimentos*. Coimbra: [s.n.], 305-331.
- Polónia, Amélia (2005). *D. Henrique o cardeal-rei*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores.
- Prodi, Paolo (a cura di) (1994). *Disciplina dell'anima, disciplina del corpo e disciplina della società tra medioevo ed età moderna*. Bologna: Società Editrice il Mulino.
- Reinhard, Wolfgang (1994). Disciplinamento social, confessionalizzazione, modernizzazione. Un discorso storiografico. in PRODI, Paolo (ed.) - *Disciplina dell'anima, disciplina del corpo e disciplina della società tra medioevo ed età moderna*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 101-123.
- Rolo, Fr Raul de Almeida (1964). *O patriotismo de D. Frei Bartolomeu*. Braga: [s. n.].
- Schilling, Heinz (2001). Confessionalisation and the rise of religious and cultural frontiers in Early Modern Europe. in Andor, Eszter and Tóth, István György - *Frontiers of faith*. Budapest: Central European University and European Science Foundation, 21-36.

- Serrão, Joaquim Veríssimo (1964). 'D. Bartolomeu dos Mártires e a sucessão de 1580', *Aufsätze zur Portugiesischen Kulturgeschichte*, 4: 261-272.
- Serrão, Joaquim Veríssimo (2001). *História de Portugal*. [s. l.]: Editorial Verbo, vol. III (first published in 1978).
- Serrão, Joaquim Veríssimo (1956). *O reinado de D. António Prior do Crato*. Coimbra: [s.n.] Phd thesis.
- Veiga, Carlos Margaça (1999). *Poder e poderes na crise sucessória portuguesa (1578-1581)*. Lisbon: [s.n.] Phd Thesis. 2 vols.
- Veiga, Carlos Margaça (1995). Reforma tridentina e conflitualidade: o litígio entre o bispo da Guarda, D. João de Portugal, e o cardeal D. Henrique. in *Amar, Sentir e viver a História - Estudos de homenagem a Joaquim Veríssimo Serrão*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri, 305-319.
- Velloso, Queiroz (1946). *O reinado do Cardeal D. Henrique*. Lisbon: Empresa Nacional de Publicidade.
- Veloso, José Maria de Queirós (1953). *O interregno dos governadores e o breve reinado de D. António*. Lisbon: Academia Portuguesa da História.

Relations Between Portugal and Brazil (1930-1945)

The Relationship Between the Two National Experiences of the Estado Novo

Paula Marques Santos

Professor at Lusíada University of Porto

CEPESE

p.m.s@iol.pt

Abstract

The years from 1930 to 1945 marked both a regional and world period of great political and economic instability. Because of the passive and permissive stance of most national governments, society experienced a deep crisis, from which no immediate positive change could be expected without a much-needed reformulation of the social, economic and political structure of each public and state entity. In their attempts to solve these problems, Portuguese-Brazilian relations were influenced by the internal reorganization processes of the *Estado Novo* and also by the changes taking place in the world system itself. These two influences led to a strengthening of the transatlantic link in some areas, but also to a decline in other areas.

Keywords

Estado Novo, Portugal, Brazil, World War II, diplomatic and political relations

Resumo

Os anos que decorrem entre 1930 e 1945 caracterizam-se por uma conjuntura regional e mundial de forte desconforto político e económico. Perante a permissividade e passividade da maioria dos Governos nacionais, vive-se uma era de profunda crise, onde não se gorava qualquer expectativa de retoma imediata, que não fosse precedida obrigatoriamente pela reformulação de todo o edifício social, económico e político de cada uma das entidades estatais. Perante tal situação, as relações Portugal – Brasil são conformadas, por um lado, pelos processos de reorganização e reestruturação interna estado-novista, e, por outro, pela mutação do próprio sistema internacional. Estes dois parâmetros conduzem ao reforço do elo transatlântico em determinadas áreas, mas também à decadência e menoridade de outros sectores.

Palavras-chave

Estado Novo, Portugal, Brasil, II Guerra Mundial, relações político-diplomáticas.

Introduction

The widespread instability that characterized international relations after the New York stock market crash (which, in turn, had deepened the crisis situation existing since World War I) had an enormous effect on the political, economic and social options that each state adopted in response to this crisis, after noting the inability of the former regimes to extricate their national social and economic structures from this downward spiral. In fact, “*before the new postwar world could be constructed, this had already begun to disintegrate*”¹, once more proving the inadequacy of existing models.

The bilateral relationship between Portugal and Brazil was characterized by an ambiguous period of increasing incomprehension during the republican period at the beginning of the 20th century (even though there were some important events that kept alive the ties between the two countries, such as the Portuguese president’s official visit to Brazil and the renewal of bilateral diplomatic relations). After this, fresh and more vigorous attempts were made to bring the two countries closer together, as they embarked upon similar political and ideological processes, through the centralized and dictatorial governments of Oliveira Salazar and Getúlio Vargas, whose central goal, in each case, was to establish a new *project of national regeneration* and to form a new conception of the country in light of the existing international order and its main actors.

In fact, during these fifteen years, relations between Portugal and Brazil will be seen here as forming an unbreakable bond, which no one wanted to deny as a part of each nation’s regenerating process, for it symbolized a guarantee of national originality and individuality and, at the same time, constituted one of the main factors for Portugal and Brazil’s reaffirmation as sovereign nations that were unique in the international scene.

“*Only a cosmic cataclysm can interrupt or change the natural course – natural and unavoidable rather than traditional – of Portuguese-Brazilian friendship. It is not based only on past knowledge, but also on aspirations, impositions and future advisability.*”²

The above statement implies that beyond cementing the historical links that had brought Portugal and Brazil together in the past, *lusio-brasilidade* (lusio-brazilianness) was also seen as a political, cultural and social movement in both countries and a factor affecting the relations that the two countries maintained *inter pares*. Closer Portuguese-Brazilian relations were not only seen as desirable by the authoritarian leaders of the respective *Estados Novos*, but were also regarded as a necessary and advisable part of their internal reconstruction processes and a guarantee of their affirmation as individualized and unified actors in the world’s *status quo*.

Thus, in this period both governments sought to deepen these bilateral ties, even though this meant limiting their connections to other actors who were not prepared to accept the central role played by this particular link in every area, due to geographical and/or political and economic considerations. Nonetheless, Brazil granted fundamental importance to the principle of pan-Americanism in its external relations (continental solidarity and tacit “submission” to US interests and orientations), whereas Portugal became gradually and exaggeratedly closed in on itself and its colonial empire, allowing this to take precedence over the importance attached by Salazar to the other

¹ NOGUEIRA, Franco – *Salazar. Os Tempos Áureos (1928-1936)*. Vol. II. Coimbra: Atlântida Editora, 1977, p. 127.

² BARROS, João de – *Brasil*. Lisbon: Edições Europa, 1938, p. 11.

three relational elements of its foreign policy – the UK, Spain and the Catholic Church. Even so, Portuguese-Brazilian relations between 1930 and 1945 became a crucial issue for both countries, in terms of their processes of national regeneration and cohesion and for their actions and reaffirmation as countries at the external level.

The national experiences of the *Estado Novo* and their influences on bilateral relations

When we read about Portuguese-Brazilian relations during the 20th century (mostly until the 1970s), they are seen as reflecting a completely unproductive period at both a political and economic level: “*The ‘failed political meetings’ of this century, characterized by long periods of dictatorship on either side, thwarted all attempts to improve relations between the two countries. [...] It was assumed that Portuguese-Brazilian convergence was so natural that it was immune to the avatars of politics. It wasn’t. Most importantly, the cultural community was maintained. The community of affection was also obviously maintained. But political and economic relations did not assume a compatible dimension.*”³

Generally speaking, it is accepted that Portuguese-Brazilian relations passed through a “*rhetorical period*” (Amado Cervo), as final results in several areas were not as successful as had been expected (during the period of the negotiation and signing of protocols). However, this conceptual generalization cannot be applied to this period, because the rapprochement between both countries, explicitly observable in many areas, increased after the efforts promoted by both dictatorial regimes, and especially by the Portuguese leader. Oliveira Salazar saw the reinforcement of the transatlantic bilateral bond as crucial, in order to protect existing cultural and historic links, as well as other influences in Brazilian territory. His aim was also to ensure that Portuguese-speaking countries could enjoy greater bargaining power *inter pares* in the world system, because Brazil represented an international partner with a geopolitical and geostrategic position that was clearly privileged in terms of transatlantic and world contacts.

All of this meant that “*Portugal, at the western corner of the European continent was continued in Brazil, at the eastern end of America*”⁴ and, for this reason, political leaders understood the crucial importance of maintaining this relationship, due to “the importance of Portugal’s unique position in Europe: *it is a European country, with a lot of Africa and with a great geo-historical and cultural link to Brazil.*”⁵. In this way, both countries could benefit from their reciprocal extensions, and derive several important advantages from these. Portuguese and Brazilian Atlanticism and the particular conjuncture to be found at that time, between the financial crash of 1929 and World War II, amounted to a unique moment in the history of international relations that both countries had to take advantage of for the welfare of their nation and its citizens, as well as for their chances to deepen common principles and values.

Although there was no positive or significant short-term economic development capable of elevating this bilateral exchange to a level of major prominence, Portuguese-Brazilian cooperation

³ MAGALHÃES, José Calvet de – *Relance Histórico das Relações Diplomáticas Luso-Brasileiras*. Lisbon: Quetzal Editores, 1997, p. 8.

⁴ Interview with the Brazilian Ambassador, Dr. Dário de Castro Alves, in Lisbon (in 1983). *Apud* GASTÃO, Marques – *Relações Culturais luso-brasileiras: entrevistas e comentários*. Lisbon: Centro do Livro Brasileiro, 1983, pp. 118-119.

⁵ MAGALHÃES, José Augusto de – *Por uma unidade económica e geográfica em duas nações distintas*. *Boletim Semanal do Rotary Club de São Paulo*. N.º 596, de 28/05/1943. A.H.-D. do M.N.E.; 2P A48 M208, p. 2.

resulted in extremely important events for both parties, allowing not only for the preservation of a cultural community and continued affective exchange between the two nations, but also ensuring a permanent linguistic unity and obtaining dividends that highlighted the cooperation between the two *Estado Novo* regimes at a pragmatic and political level through their reciprocal, ideological, official and operational supports.

That is why, while the 1950s have been referred to as the “decade of the synthesis in the specificity”⁶ of Portuguese-Brazilian relations, the 1930s and 1940s are to be seen as the *period of the reconstruction and preservation* of these bilateral bonds and the time when the idea of the shared “Portugueseness” of both societies and States was developed. In fact, the cooperation between both states during the two national experiences of the *Estado Novo* regimes prevented the space of *lusobrasilidade* from being condemned to total oblivion, and avoided the fragmentation of the transatlantic Portuguese-Brazilian community. This resulted in several positive displays of bilateral cooperation, as well as highlighted potential paths for future collaboration.

The first real display of this reciprocal influence is found in the inherent similarity between the political regimes during this period, which they developed through relatively revolutionary processes and with greater or lesser military support during the process of breaking away from previous republican institutions and legal norms. The *Estado Novo* phenomenon in both cases is, in fact, the final result of an ongoing disbelief in republican regimes and of a social discontent that began searching for new models in order to raise the morale of the nation. Portugal and Brazil found this in the project of one man, despite this model’s centralized and authoritarian structure.

The *national project* is then defined by a charismatic leader, according to its central goal of *regenerating and redeeming the motherland*, seen as an indivisible whole (the supreme national collective interest was always placed above individual interests). For that reason, the regime’s leader becomes the central figure in the whole project and its pragmatic application, focusing all national energies on the achievement of that goal. The success of Salazar’s model was so clear in terms of rebalancing national finances and reorganizing the country that it inspired the homonymous model adopted by Getúlio Vargas, as a possible answer to the economic stagnation and social fragmentation that was undermining Brazilian society. New regimes were constructed, based on principles such as *nationalism*, *authoritarianism* and the *complete control and centralization* of public affairs, supported by the *cult of the leader* and *mechanisms of repression and control*, and the establishment of a system of *interventionism* and *public guidance* of the economy and finance, as well as the launching of a struggle against any international ideology. These were seen as the central requirements for the real application of a national project of regeneration.

One of the main gaps between these two national experiences (the limited leadership skills of Vargas and the greater political ability of Salazar) is shown by the different life spans of the two regimes. Despite the increasingly fierce opposition to the Portuguese prime minister (not only from citizens and national opposition groups, but also from the international community), essentially after World War II, Salazar remained intransigent and inflexible with regard to the principles that governed his project, choosing the path of standing “*proudly alone*” instead of trying to reformulate his regime’s political and economic directives. This means that the strength of each regime was directly related to its leader’s strength and his ability to force his directives and guidelines upon all internal forces, submitting them to these rules if necessary, although attempts were made to soften

⁶ MENEZES, Pedro Ribeiro de – “As relações entre Portugal e o Brasil – uma perspectiva pessoal”. *Negócios Estrangeiros*. Lisbon. 2 (September 2001), p. 105.

the impact of this dictatorial centralization of power in one person, through clever games played with the rest of the political representatives and other forces (political, economic and military).

Thus, it is in the formative but nonetheless divergent components of those two experiences and the different paths that they followed towards the implementation and constitutionalization of their regimes that we find the keys for understanding the fate of each one. Whereas Salazar's regime chose a path of *autarchy* and *total national independence, political and economic nationalism*, and *total control* and *public interventionism* in matters relating to the nation's economic, financial and social life, the Brazilian experience instead led to a state of permanent external dependence, with continuous pressure being exerted by certain social and economic classes and other external partners on the development of the authoritarian project, so that it proved impossible in Brazil to completely the model designed and adopted by the professor of finance⁷.

The second component that corroborates the idea of the importance of the bilateral relationship derives from the *reciprocal awareness of the importance of the Portuguese-Brazilian community and space in the world* and the permanent efforts of both governments (but mainly from the Portuguese side) to do everything possible to achieve this unity. Among all the external relationships deemed to be central to the foreign policy of both countries, the transatlantic Portuguese-Brazilian relationship was not forgotten or overlooked.

With the approach of the Second World War, both leaders were forced to attach even greater importance to Portuguese-Brazilian contacts. While in the 1930s these transatlantic ties had been important for both regimes, providing valuable political and ideological support at a time when there were few authoritarian regimes and when democratic models had become generalized, the 1940s afforded a new geopolitical and geostrategic centrality to the Atlantic Ocean, so that the Portuguese and Brazilian territories were once again placed at the center of the world's political decisions. In this new period, the importance of maintaining these relations was clearly understood by the Brazilian government, which, although remaining faithful to the principles of American solidarity, certainly believed in preserving its own identity both worldwide and within the regional system, so that cooperation with Portugal brought it every possible advantage.

Between 1940 and 1945, there were many favorable results for the Portuguese-Brazilian community in the world, due both to international developments and essentially to the action of both governments, which really began to cooperate more effectively in a variety of areas and to solve several strategic problems. And this process was reinforced as the regimes consolidated their position and leadership at both the internal and external levels. Thus the governments' performance helps us to understand several relational areas and makes it possible to explain their deep impact on the life of the two national communities as well as the bilateral relationship between them, most particularly at the economic, political, diplomatic and cultural level.

Economic relations

Despite the many bilateral negotiations undertaken between Portugal and Brazil concerning economic issues, there was no major increase in the value of reciprocal trade, and there were even some periods when this declined because of the world depression and the fact that the two national markets were unable to become competitive partners at a financial and logistical level. Most of the

⁷ As regards the nation's *recourse to foreign finance*, Salazar always defended the principle of total autonomy and self-sufficiency, seeking to develop the nation only through the use of available national means, whereas Vargas accepted the participation of foreign capital in his definition of the national regeneration project, so as to be able to finance and accelerate the nation's growth and development.

measures outlined in the first agreement, the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation (1933)⁸, produced no results whatsoever, and all the attempts made to make economic bilateral cooperation more effective proved fruitless. Both parties agreed on the need to develop trade, but it proved impossible to translate theory into action, despite continuous public efforts to identify the main problems and to find efficient alternatives for their resolution.

With measures ranging from the Portuguese Special Mission of 1938⁹ to the Additional Protocol¹⁰, signed in 1941, and the subsequent meeting of the Bilateral Commission, serious efforts were made by the two governments to encourage trade and promote a relationship that was more in keeping with the political statements of unity between the two nations. However, these political events were unable to stimulate the economic forces necessary for the development of reciprocal contacts (there was a widespread reluctance to make contact with the other side of the ocean), which remained in a passive state, for various reasons:

- the scenario of *crisis and depression* that marked the world economy and international economic relations in general¹¹;
- the *political and military convulsions* that took place in both countries after 1929, helping to worsen the negative effects felt because of the world's economic and financial crisis, and to spread mistrust and suspicion among economic agents;
- the *characteristics of both authoritarian regimes of the Estado Novo type* – protectionism/nationalism, low production capacity, a lack of infrastructure and directives in

⁸ The Treaty of Commerce was signed on 26 August 1933. The plenipotentiary representatives were the Portuguese Ambassador in Rio de Janeiro – Martinho Nobre de Mello – and the Brazilian Foreign Minister – Afrânio de Mello Franco Cf. Treaty of Commerce between Portugal and Brazil, signed on 26 August 1933, in R. J.. A.H.-D. do M.N.E.; 3P A12 M312, § 2.º e 3.º do Preâmbulo.

⁹ This Special Mission took place at a time when Nazi *realpolitik* was beginning to achieve some of its goals in view of the passivity of the international community, which was more intent on preserving the *status quo* by maintaining an idealistic policy and using diplomacy to fight the pragmatic results achieved by Hitler's totalitarianism. Such measures proved to be ineffective in combating Nazi aggression. In fact, by March of that year, Germany had completed the *Anschluss* and, at the same time as the Portuguese Special Mission was in Brazil, the European situation grew worse with the crisis in Czechoslovakia. Moreover, the European situation was also marked by continuing civil war in Spain, in which Portugal had direct interests (the Portuguese government sought to influence the course of events to its advantage). In the American context, with the hegemony of the United States and its attempt to spread the principles of pan-Americanism, there were rapid changes taking place in the American continent with the Brazilian government providing greater facilities and displaying increasing permissiveness (the Foreign Minister at this time was Oswaldo Aranha).

¹⁰ ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL to the Treaty of Commerce between Portugal and Brazil, signed on 21 July 1941, in Lisbon. In *Diário do Governo* No. 175 of 30 July, 1941, pp. 685-986. Library of the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

¹¹ The *domino effect* that affected the entire world, essentially after the North American stock market crash in October 1929, can be understood to have resulted from the position of hegemony that the USA had acquired after World War I. With Europe completely destroyed, the USA was to become, through its liberalist policies, the main financier of the reconstruction of the *old continent* and thus dominated international trade. Most of the world's states were heavily dependent on North American economic policy, either because of their minority position, in some cases, or because of their decline/weakness in other cases. With the 1929 crisis, the measures adopted by the USA (such as the repatriation of American capital, the drastic reduction of imports, etc.) became even more stringent because of the spread of the depression to other countries, where both unemployment and the number of bankruptcies rose, causing the financial, foreign exchange, political and economic crises to worsen.

terms of economy and finance imposed by centralized State supervision and interventionism;

- the prior existence for both governments of *privileged economic and financial relationships with other stronger external partners*, which did not make it possible to concede regimes of privilege to this bilateral exchange;
- the *insufficiency of the Portuguese metropolitan market* (and the preference given to imperial trade with the colonial territories), as well as the *development of the Brazilian economy* in several new sectors, neglecting the products previously imported from Portugal;
- the incompatibility between the basic principles of the Portuguese-Brazilian relationship and the new competitive requirements of the world market.

All the economic formulas devised by the two governments, although important as means of keeping the channels of negotiation open during this fifteen-year period, never succeeded in freeing Portugal and Brazil from the nationalist and protectionist position underlying the intrinsic characteristics of the regimes, limiting any possibilities for bilateral economic expansion. In the postwar period, Portuguese-Brazilian economic relations could not remain at the same level, with the two countries merely preserving their traditional trade shares: to be successful in the new world economic order, they would have to evolve in the same direction as the great world economies, through the adoption of modern production mechanisms, assisted by efficient policies of communication and distribution, and the gradual elimination of all trade barriers.

Unfortunately, the economic and political guidelines changed in Brazil after 1945 (following the political “disagreement” between the Portuguese and Brazilian regimes) leading to a lack of coordination in the bilateral dialog. Despite economic agreements signed in 1949, Portugal’s maintenance of its extremely simple, individualistic and nationalistic view of trade and foreign relations did not allow the country to adapt to the more complex world economy, based on greater interdependence and worldwide competition¹². Only with the political changes introduced in 1974 did the Portuguese economy definitively enter into this climate of interdependence, at both a regional and a world level, with support being given to investment and national and foreign private initiatives¹³.

The main political and diplomatic results

The second great area covered by Portuguese-Brazilian relations was the political and diplomatic sphere. This entailed not only the bilateral treatment given by the two countries’ political and diplomatic representatives to all those issues related to the direct and prompt defense of the interests of their citizens in foreign territory, but also the two governments’ efforts to establish important new channels through which the bilateral relationship could be strengthened. Three main issues are considered to have been crucial in this period, with much more visible and positive results being achieved in these areas than in the economic area, and affording a new central

¹² Despite the continuation of many protectionist and nationalist economic policies, by the last period of the Portuguese dictatorship there was already some concern shown about not remaining totally isolated at an economic level, as for example through the country’s membership in EFTA or through the introduction of measures designed to boost private investment, at both an internal and an external levels.

¹³ As an example, one can mention the great importance that Portuguese private investment achieved in Brazil, ranking 6th in 2004 amongst foreign investors in that territory. This shows that Portuguese investors were fully aware of all the advantages that could accrue from the Portuguese-Brazilian relationship.

importance to this bilateral relationship. These three issues were: the *treatment given to Portuguese immigrants in Brazil* and several questions related to nationality (and dual nationality); the *negotiation and implementation of bilateral agreements* in an attempt to obtain greater and more efficient benefits; and the *effective cooperation between Portugal and Brazil during World War II*.

The main goal of bilateral political and diplomatic cooperation was to reinforce the mutual *feeling of belonging to the same community of shared values*, which ran parallel to the regeneration and internal homogenization of both nations *against all other influences and internal and/or external pressures that were felt especially in the Brazilian landscape* (e.g. the nativist pressures from inside or the Italian, Japanese or North American influences from the outside). Faced with all these threats, Portuguese-Brazilian collaboration sought to center its attention on all those mechanisms that made *lusu-brasilidade* a privileged and advantaged condition for Brazilian and Portuguese nationals in both countries, while also contributing to each country's consolidation of its own national unity and their joint emergence in the world system as actors of great geopolitical and geostrategic importance. In this way, we can understand the concessions that the Brazilian government made to Portuguese citizens, affording them a regime of exclusivity in its legislation regarding the entry, permanence and access to work of immigrants:

- the preference shown for Portuguese immigration and the progressive reduction of the limits to their entry and stay in Brazilian territory¹⁴;
- the concession of privileges to Portuguese citizens regarding general access to work and some specific professions (e.g. so-called liberal professions or those connected with ports and navigation);
- the exceptions granted to the formation of social and cultural associations by the Portuguese community in Brazil – allowing them to maintain these associations without being forced to have Brazilian citizens controlling and directing them, and;
- the special treatment afforded by Brazilian public authorities to Portuguese diplomatic representatives and consuls.

Despite the initial restraints, the situation started to be attenuated for Portuguese citizens, allowing them almost completely equivalent rights to those enjoyed by Brazilian-born citizens in several areas of social life (with the obvious exception of political rights and duties), which shows the importance that was attached to Portuguese-Brazilian relations between 1930 and 1945, promoted by the reciprocal policies in both states, with government representatives in each country agreeing that it was Portuguese citizens who best served Brazil's interests, namely its internal reconstruction and its growth and development as a united and modern nation.

Along the same lines, in addition to the various measures that immediately favored the citizens of each country in their everyday life, we can also observe the formalization of Portuguese-Brazilian cooperation in countless areas, such as the postal service¹⁵ and telegraphic communications¹⁶, as well as at the level of air transport. Pragmatically, these agreements specifically

¹⁴ Regarding the most important Brazilian legislation of this period concerning immigration, see PAULO, Heloísa – *Aqui também é Portugal. A Colónia portuguesa do Brasil e o Salazarismo*. Coimbra: Quarteto Editora, 2000, pp. 604-605.

¹⁵ Postal Agreement of 30 April 1942. In *Diário do Governo*, I série, No. 100, de 02/05/1942, p. 362 – Diplomatic Library of the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Lisbon.

¹⁶ Telegraphic Agreement of 9 June 1943. In *Diário do Governo*, I série, No. 119, de 09/06/1943, pp. 359-360 – Diplomatic Library of the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Lisbon.

covered all Portuguese overseas territories in many of their provisions and directly so, in all clauses, in the case of the Air Transport Agreement 17. Further, the *centralization of telegraphic communications services* between the two capital cities allowed for both the development of infrastructures and the control of all bilateral traffic. And finally, the *use of the national resources* of both countries was guaranteed to effectively support these communications and services, such as ships and national enterprises.

Agreements were signed about strategically important transatlantic matters, such as the above-mentioned, becoming crucially important in the 1940s at the bilateral and international levels, and for different reasons:

- the *immediate advantages for national citizens* who had emigrated to each of these countries – with the simple reduction in postal and telegraphic charges;
- the *structural advantages* for each country – the cooperation made in these areas allowed for the development and modernization of economic and national infrastructures;
- the *cultural and social advantages* – with the development of the means of transport and communications, there was, at first, a greater exchange and dissemination in terms of cultural and intellectual production, leading to greater empathy between the two communities about the policy options of the authoritarian regimes;
- the *international advantages* – the greater projection and prestige enjoyed at the technological, political and diplomatic levels made it easier to face the “competition” of other international actors, and;
- the *political advantages* – the agreements provided evidence of a good Portuguese-Brazilian relationship, with the tacit recognition of internal political options and joint stances being adopted in relation to the world conflict.

Cooperation in terms of culture and propaganda

At the same time as cooperation was taking place in the political and diplomatic spheres, further evidence was provided of the fact that this was an auspicious period in terms of Portuguese-Brazilian dialog by the cooperation also taking place in the field of culture and propaganda, promoting a true communion of social, political and ideological positions, as well as the sharing of spiritual and cultural experiences between the two communities. Such cooperation sought to reinvigorate the sense of belonging to one and the same community and culture, which could be found on both sides of the Atlantic (the *mare nostrum* of *luso-brasilidade*), through the permanent exchange of intellectuals, artists, qualified experts and technicians, etc.¹⁸.

Different in their continental identity, but convergent in their *Atlanticism*, Portugal and Brazil thus found themselves united by a complex group of factors, consisting in particular during this period of the language component and the similarity of their governmental processes. They were also joined together by the efforts made in each country to promote the presence of reciprocal

¹⁷ Air Transport Agreement between the United States of Brazil and Portugal – Secretariado de Aeronáutica Civil. In Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa; S.C. 13497/7 V.

¹⁸ During these years, besides the several visits and the special missions being sent between the two countries, there was also a continuous exchange of specialists in different areas, who worked as consultants and participated in universities, enterprises, etc. This exchange can be also noted in the annual reports of official organizations, such as the Foreign Ministries of both countries.

representatives, as well as the contributions made by both countries towards ensuring united dealings with other foreign representations.

In the first of these two contexts, mention should be made of the exchanges occurring in all formal dialectical, institutional and/or specific events that promoted the *defense of the culture and language* common to both territories – exhibitions, congresses, conferences, exchanges of teachers and specialists, the formation of organizations for the promotion of Portuguese-Brazilian culture, etc. These events promoted the cultural and spiritual links between the two communities, and simultaneously publicized the spiritual development of both nations around the world.

The *defense of linguistic unity*¹⁹ (although receptive to the differences in vocabulary and spelling between the two national communities) acquired a new importance during this period, because of the threats being expressed by some factions who called for a separation at this level between the two countries. The defense of linguistic autonomy derived during this period not only from Brazilian nationalist supporters in the 1930s, but also from the most evident pragmatic causes, such as the large numbers of immigrants in Brazil and the direct consequences that this had in terms of work and the employment capacity of those people. Fortunately, such ways of thinking did not become ingrained, which meant that Portuguese was maintained as the official language. Nonetheless, the warning had been given that the maintenance of the language and its uniformity required a continuous effort and bilateral agreement, through permanent collaboration between the two National Academies (The Lisbon Academy of Sciences and the Brazilian Academy of Letters).

The second area of cultural cooperation between the two regimes – the area of propaganda²⁰ – arose from the specific needs and features of the two authoritarian and dictatorial governments, namely the *requirement for an extremely well-organized propaganda system*, both internally and internationally, which would be favorable to the regime and sing the praises of the spiritual output of the *Estado Novo*, making this another matter for bilateral agreement. Examples of the most significant events during the period in this bilateral cooperation over propaganda include the cooperation between the two organizations created by each regime with this same goal in mind – the *SPN* and *DIP* – resulting not only in a deep understanding between the two chairmen, but also in the signing of the bilateral *Cultural Agreement* of 1941; the *Centenary Commemorations* in Portugal in 1940²¹, in which Brazilian diplomats and citizens were always to be seen in prominent positions, alongside the Portuguese authorities at every event; and also the sending of the Portuguese *Special Mission* to Brazil in 1941, in recognition of the Brazilian participation at the Centenary Commemorations (this mission included prominent Portuguese intellectuals and specialists from several areas).

These three events were the most significant examples of cooperation in terms of Portuguese-Brazilian propaganda and summarize all the efforts toward rapprochement and solidarity between two governments that were determined to join forces to fight against any foreign infiltration that

¹⁹ Cf. Portuguese-Brazilian Orthographic Agreement of 29/12/1943. A.H.-D. do M.N.E.; 3P A12 M312. This question of linguistic unity did in fact give rise to many problems between Portugal and Brazil that were to lead to the signing and formalized introduction of various laws and documents. Of all those documents, the Convention of 1943 was the most important and complete, because it established the fundamental parameters of understanding, as well as the bodies that were to uphold its provisions between both nations – the Lisbon Academy of Sciences and the Brazilian Academy of Letters.

²⁰ HENRIQUES, Raquel P. – *António Ferro. Estudo e antologia*. Lisbon: Edições Alfa, 1990, p. 49.

²¹ Cf. MEMÓRIAS E COMUNICAÇÕES APRESENTADAS AO CONGRESSO LUSO-BRASILEIRO DE HISTÓRIA (VII Congresso). Comissão Executiva dos Centenários. Vols. 9, 10 and 11. Lisbon: Editora Bertrand. 1940.

might be adverse to their political regimes, to work together in promoting their own regimes and the basic principles thereof among the international community, and also to publicize the positive results of their governments' actions in order to gain the support of their respective communities for the right-wing dictatorships they had implemented.

Effective cooperation during World War II

Finally, the last issue of great importance in bilateral cooperation between Portugal and Brazil is related to the *effective cooperation between the two governments during World War II*. Such cooperation was designed not only to gain mutual respect for the political decisions taken by each country in relation to their strategic and political position in the world conflict and to obtain external support for those decisions, but also to guarantee the defense of both the nation's interests and the individual interests of Brazilian citizens by the official Portuguese delegations in several countries and continents, directly or indirectly involved in world hostilities (e.g. Germany, France, Italy and Japan)²², while also seeking to reinforce the bond existing between the two countries with regard to this matter.

In fact, the period between 1939 and 1945, in which the armed conflict took place, was a time of great cooperation between Portugal and Brazil in terms of defending their respective national interests within the international community. Both countries started from similar positions with regard to the world conflict (they both proclaimed total neutrality in 1939), although they each evolved from these original positions, taking different roads (Brazil decided upon an effective policy of *belligerence* while the Portuguese government chose to engage in *cooperative neutrality*, such options being imposed by the continental and regional contexts to which the two countries belonged). Nonetheless, Portuguese-Brazilian cooperation in this matter displayed a theoretical and pragmatic confirmation of a close relationship at both the political and diplomatic levels, expressed through the defense by official Portuguese representations of Brazilian interests in several countries and territories and through the respect shown internally and externally for the political choices taken by each government.

To fully understand this political and diplomatic process, we must, however, draw a distinction between two moments. The first relates to the period *from 1939 to 1942*, in which both countries officially and unambiguously proclaimed their complete *neutrality* in the world conflict. In this first period, the most important goal was to support the bilateral Portuguese-Brazilian relationship as a guarantee for preserving their common status in the world system and as a way of looking for more favorable benefits for both nations.

During the second period, *between 1942 and 1945*, Brazil broke off its official and diplomatic relations with Germany, Italy and Japan and became actively involved in the conflict. The *defense of Brazilian interests by Portugal* occupied an important position in the political and diplomatic relations between the two countries, giving a central world role to Portugal's official diplomatic and consular representatives in several foreign territories and countries, not only for the resolution of concrete and/or individual cases involving Brazilian citizens or the public interests of the Brazilian state, but also for the obvious and consequent defense and reaffirmation of *lusobrasilidade* worldwide.

²² With regard to the specific measures taken in each of these countries by Portuguese diplomatic representatives, see SANTOS, Paula Marques dos – *As Relações Luso-Brasileiras (1930-1945)*. Doctoral thesis, defended at the Faculty of Letters of the University of Porto. June 2005, pp. 439-473.

The evolution of the war between 1941 and 1942 did not allow either country to maintain a position of pure neutrality, because they inevitably became central pieces in the conflict between the Allies and the totalitarian countries, gaining a privileged and central position with regard to its final outcome. The spread of the war to the Pacific Ocean, Africa and the Atlantic Ocean created a new context in which both political regimes had to react and interact, once more choosing alternative positions in their attempt to most efficiently preserve and protect their national interests.

Thus, the Brazilian and Portuguese positions evolved toward greater external commitment and therefore determined that the political future of both nations would also become more closely bound up with the evolution of international affairs. In the Brazilian case, its extreme external and economic dependence on the USA was to lead it to a *de facto* state of belligerence (war was officially declared on 31 August 1942, after an attack on its national merchant navy)²³; in the Portuguese case, however, while its formal and official neutrality was maintained, the country's stance evolved at a pragmatic level to a position that was favorable to the Allies' cause, resulting in the concession of several advantages within its national territory.

In the first phase (1939-1942), certain isolated minor issues allowed for effective cooperation between the two governments, such as, for example, those cases that by endangering the neutrality of one of the two countries meant that the government of the other country was called upon for its support²⁴ in order to ensure its preservation and international respect. Despite this, however, most Portuguese-Brazilian bilateral cooperation directly related to the world conflict took place after Brazil had been forced to sever official relations with the Axis countries and needed to ensure the defense of its interests, as well as those of its citizens who were living in those territories (either in those territories that were occupied by Axis forces, such as France, or those which for geographical reasons were within an area of German influence, being forced to submit to Nazi rule, as was the case with Romania).

Thus, when Brazil's declaration of war became certain and imminent, and after Portugal had shown itself to be available to cooperate with Brazil at a world level, the Brazilian Foreign Relations Ministry (MRE), on the orders of President Vargas, officially asked the "Portuguese government to send urgent instructions to its diplomatic representatives in Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania and Hungary that it will represent Brazil's interests in those countries"²⁵. These were the first territories in which Portugal took over the defense of Brazilian interests because Salazar's response was rapid, unquestionable and unequivocal about the acceptance of such a role and function, immediately informing the heads of the diplomatic missions and consulates in all those countries that "*following the favorable answer given by the Portuguese government to the Brazilian government's request (...) you will be responsible for the protection of Brazil's interests in that country when the rupture becomes official.*"

²³ The declaration of war by the Brazilian Government was also supported by most of the country's population, who publicly showed their support for the Allies' cause against Nazi and fascist ideals. Cf. PELO BRASIL, pela América, pela democracia! *Jornal do Brasil*, de 05/07/1942. *Apud* O ESTADO NOVO. 1937-1945. In *Períodos – República online 1889-1961*. At site <http://www.republicaonline.org.br>.

²⁴ As an example, one can mention the case of the capture of Siqueira Campos's ship by British forces in Gibraltar. This ship had set sail from Lisbon to Rio de Janeiro, carrying war material bought from German suppliers, and ordered before the beginning of the conflict. Another situation involved the incarceration by Great Britain of German sailors that worked on a Brazilian merchant ship. Cf. Ofício No. 710 of 16/12/1940 from the Portuguese Ambassador in London to the Portuguese Foreign Office. A.H.-D. do M.N.E.; Cota 2P A48 M208.

²⁵ Verbal Note of 28/01/1942 from the Brazilian Embassy in Lisbon to the Portuguese Foreign Ministry. A.H.-D. do M.N.E.; Cota 2P A49 M107.

You will accept that incumbency when the official Brazilian representative asks you to do so, and after that you will inform the government of that country"²⁶.

Besides defending the interests of the state and citizens of Brazil, Portugal also guaranteed that throughout the conflict it would maintain communications between the Brazilian government and its several diplomats, until such time as they could be repatriated. In fact, it was through Lisbon that all communications between the MRE and its foreign representatives were exchanged, so that all important decisions could be transmitted and the Brazilian authorities could know exactly what treatment was being given by the authorities of each country to their own diplomatic representatives (in this way, Brazil could apply similar measures to the diplomatic representatives of those countries in its own territory, according to the principle of reciprocity).

On the other hand, while Portugal became the main diplomatic link for Brazil at an external and extra-American level, Spain also assumed an important political and diplomatic role in this situation, because it was its diplomatic representation in Brazil that was put in charge of safeguarding the interests of Japan, Germany and Italy²⁷ (and their citizens) throughout the Brazilian national territory. This meant that, from this moment on, it was Iberian neutrality that guaranteed the defense of interests between the different belligerent countries through Portugal and Spain, providing yet another benefit to be gained through the maintenance and safeguarding of the neutral status by Salazar and Franco.

Because of all these issues, Portuguese-Brazilian transatlantic cooperation and solidarity was made evident, ensuring the defense of the territorial and political integrity of both countries, at the same time as it opened up a space for a new geopolitical world importance to be attached to *lusitanidade* (Portugueseness). The geographical and political positions of Portugal and Brazil, especially in the Atlantic Ocean, had become crucial for both belligerent factions and for deciding the final outcome of the conflict. The joint efforts undertaken as part of international Portuguese-Brazilian cooperation resulted in a wider world recognition of both dictatorial governments, strengthening their international position and their ability to defend their interests.

Conclusion

In brief, it can be stated that the years from 1930 to 1945 have some constituent components *sui generis*, representing a unique moment in the bilateral relationship between Portugal and Brazil after their political separation. Portugal was not yet the European platform for Brazil and, conversely, Brazil was not yet the Portugal's American platform, to a large extent because of the weak economic interactivity between the two countries, but also because of the external political dependence (both military and economic) to which Brazil was subject. However, these fifteen years can be called the *years during which "lusitanidade" was preserved*. This had unique consequences in the international system, in a general sense, and in a narrow sense, in the western Judeo-Christian civilization, to which this movement belonged.

Subsequent decades were not very different from this period as far as final results were concerned, even though there were other more specific outcomes. This clearly demonstrated that the same problems and relational difficulties persisted after the fall of the *Estado Novo* in Brazil. It also explains why it is not possible to attribute the situation of stagnation to be found in the bilateral

²⁶ Confidential Telegram No. C-3 of 29/01/1942 from the Portuguese Foreign Ministry to its Delegations in Berlin, Rome, Tokyo, Bucharest and Budapest. A.H.-D. do M.N.E.; Cota 2P A49 M103.

²⁷ Cf. Official Letter No. 90 of 28/03/1942 and No. 100 of 02/04/1942 from the Brazilian Ambassador in Lisbon to the Portuguese Foreign Ministry. A.H.-D. do M.N.E.; Cota 2P A49 M104.

relationships in some areas to the existence of *Estado Novo* regimes in both states. The supplanting of these regimes and the obstacles that were raised resulted from the intrinsic and extrinsic conditions of both countries, which were frequently unavoidable and, more often than not, beyond the control of national political leaders.

Only in very recent years have both sides of the Atlantic once again begun to understand what Salazar so clearly realized in the 1930s – *the strategic need to maintain close links between the two countries and national communities*. This means that, although Portugal and Brazil have found themselves increasingly engaged in homogenization processes at both a regional and a continental level, and increasingly affected by the universal elements created by globalization and simultaneously submitted to the more binding phenomena of national identities, they have nonetheless managed to preserve the unique legacy deriving from their shared specific identity in the world, the fact of their common language and culture as a result of their *lusitanidade*. The confirmation of all the potential and advantages resulting from this cooperation had already been clearly shown by the shared processes developed briefly over nearly fifteen years during the simultaneous existence of the *Estado Novo* regime in both countries.

Sources and Bibliography

- Diplomatic documentation concerning the period 1925-1950 – Historic-Diplomatic Archive of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, in Lisbon;
- Documentation about the *Estado Novo* in Brazil, available at www.cpdoc.fgv.br, <http://www.republicaonline.org.br>, www.crl.edu/info/brazil/pindex.htm;
- Legislation of that period in Portugal and Brazil, concerning migration and access to work, among other issues;
- The Additional Protocol to the Treaty of Commerce signed between Portugal and Brazil on 21 July 1941, in Lisbon. In *Diário do Governo* No. 175 of 30 July 1941, pp. 685-986. Library of the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- The Treaty of Commerce signed between Portugal and Brazil on 26 August 1933, in Rio de Janeiro. In *Diário do Governo* No. 209 of 14 September 1933, pp. 1632-1633. Library of the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- The Luso-Brazilian Orthographic Convention of 29 December 1943. Historic-Diplomatic Archive of the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in Lisbon; 3P A12 M312.
- Atlântico. Revista Luso-Brasileira. 1st Edition, Nos. 1 to 6. Lisbon: Edição do Secretariado da Propaganda Nacional, 1942 – 1945.
- Carone, Edgard – *A República Nova. 1930-1937*. 3ª Edição. S.P.: Difel, 1982;
- Carone, Edgard – *A Terceira República. 1937-1945*. 2ª Edição. S.P.: Difel, 1976;
- Cervo, Amado Luiz – “As Relações entre Portugal e o Brasil – o peso da História”. *Lusíada*. Revista de Relações Internacionais da Univ. Lusíada do Porto. Porto: 3 (2002), pp. 47-59;
- Ferro, António – *Dez anos de política do espírito*. Lisbon: Edições SPN, 1943;
- Gonçalves, Williams da Silva, *O Realismo da Fraternidade: Brasil-Portugal*, Lisbon, Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 2003
- Memórias e comunicações apresentadas ao congresso luso-brasileiro de história (VII Congresso). Comissão Executiva dos Centenários. Vols. 9, 10 and 11. Lisbon: Editora Bertrand. 1940;

- Magalhães, José Calvet de – *Breve História das Relações Diplomáticas entre o Brasil e Portugal*. S. P.: Editora Paz e Terra, 1999;
- _____ – *Economia de Guerra e Comércio Externo*. Relatório de 1943. A.H.-D. do M.N.E.;
- _____ – *Relance Histórico Das Relações Diplomáticas Luso-Brasileiras*. Lisbon: Quetzal Editores, 1997;
- Miranda, Jorge – *Manual de Direito Constitucional. Preliminares – O Estado e os Sistemas Constitucionais*. Tomo I. 5ª Edição. Coimbra: Coimbra Editora, 1993, pp. 221-236 – *Os sistemas constitucionais do Brasil e dos países africanos de língua portuguesa*;
- Moura, Gerson – “Neutralidade Dependente: o caso do Brasil, 1939-42”. *Estudos Históricos*. Rio de Janeiro. 12 (1993), pp. 177-189;
- Paulo, Heloísa – *Aqui também é Portugal. A Colónia Portuguesa do Brasil e o Salazarismo*. Coimbra: Quarteto Editora, 2000;
- _____ – *Estado Novo e Propaganda em Portugal e no Brasil. O SPN/SNI e o DIP*. Coimbra: Livraria Minerva, 1994;
- Rosas, Fernando; BRITO, J. M. Brandão (dir.) – *Dicionário de História do Estado Novo*. 2 Volumes. Venda Nova: Bertrand, 1996;
- Saraiva, José Hermano – “O Estado Novo”. In SARAIVA, José Hermano (dir.) – *História de Portugal*. Volume 6. Lisbon: Publicações Alfa, 1985, pp. 135-165.
- Santos, Paula Marques dos – *As Relações Luso-Brasileiras (1930-1945)*. Ph.D. thesis, defended at the Faculty of Letters of the University of Porto. June 2005;
- Telo, António José – “Política Externa”. In ROSAS, Fernando; BRITO, J. M. Brandão (dir.) – *Dicionário de História do Estado Novo*. 2.º Volume. Venda Nova: Bertrand, 1996, pp. 769-776;
- _____ – “Segunda Guerra Mundial”. In ROSAS, Fernando; BRITO, J. M. Brandão (dir.) – *Dicionário de História do Estado Novo*. 2.º Volume. Venda Nova: Bertrand, 1996, pp. 898-900.

Echoes of the ‘politics of the spirit’ at the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute: Salazar’s representatives at the 4th National History Congress¹

Lucia Maria Paschoal Guimarães²

luciamp@uol.com.br

UERJ – Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro

Abstract

This article discusses the participation of the Portuguese delegates at the Fourth National History Congress promoted by the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute, in 1949, to celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the city of Salvador. It seeks to demonstrate how the official delegation, appointed by António de Oliveira Salazar and led by Júlio Dantas, tried to convert the congress into a continuation of Portugal’s Centenary Commemorations (1940), when the idea was put forward to bring together intellectuals from both countries, with the aim of developing a Portuguese-Brazilian historiographical project based on a unified interpretation.

Keywords

Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute – 4th National History Congress – intellectuals and Salazarism – Portugal’s Centenary Commemorations – Portuguese-Brazilian historiography

Resumo

O artigo discute a participação dos delegados portugueses no IV Congresso de História Nacional, promovido pelo Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro, em 1949, para celebrar o quarto centenário de fundação da cidade de Salvador. Pretende-se demonstrar que a representação oficial designada por António de Oliveira Salazar, e liderada por Júlio Dantas, procurou converter a jornada científica num prolongamento das Comemorações Centenárias de Portugal (1940), quando se lançou a ideia de reunir intelectuais dos dois países, com a finalidade de desenvolver um projeto historiográfico luso-brasileiro orientado pela unidade de interpretação.

¹ A preliminary summarized version of this work was presented at the Real Gabinete Português de Leitura, to the 2nd Conference of the Research Centre into Portuguese-Brazilian Relations (Pólo de Pesquisa sobre Relações Luso-Brasileiras – PPRLB), held in Rio de Janeiro, from 26 to 28 April, 2004. The research was supported by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq - Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico).

² Ph.D. in History from the University of São Paulo. Full Professor and Member of the *Prociência* Research Program at UERJ. Scholarship Holder from CNPq and Principal Researcher of CEO/PRONEX/CNPq-FAPERJ.

Palavras-Chave

Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro – IV Congresso de História Nacional - intelectuais e salazarismo – Comemorações Centenárias de Portugal – historiografia luso-brasileira

In order to celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the city of Salvador and the setting up of the General Government in Portuguese America, the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute (Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro – IHGB) organized the 4th National History Congress, held in April 1949, henceforth referred to simply as the 4th Congress. The event's organizers sought to encourage the participation of foreign historians, particularly Portuguese specialists, since the academic conference was intended to examine the beginnings of nationhood, which, in the final analysis, meant paying special attention to the history of the colonial period.³

The idea of bringing together scholars from both sides of the Atlantic to discuss themes of common interest had long been entertained by the Historical Institute. In 1908, under the management of the Baron of Rio Branco, a conference was planned, similar to the one that was to take place in 1949, to coincide with the announced visit to Brazil of the king Dom Carlos. It is also known that Rio Branco had already prepared the academic program for the conference when the news of the king's assassination reached Rio de Janeiro, rendering the planned project unviable.⁴

The Institute based in Rio de Janeiro had maintained constant exchanges with its counterparts in Lisbon since its foundation in 1838. Over the years, various Portuguese scholars had joined its ranks either as honorary members or as correspondents. Some of these members were frequently in touch with their Brazilian colleagues, as, for example, the historian João Lúcio de Azevedo, who used to exchange correspondence with Capistrano de Abreu and Max Fleiüss, the permanent secretary of IHGB.

Such contacts intensified even further with the resurgence of the Portuguese Academy of History, in May 1936.⁵ The effective membership of that organization, fixed at forty professors, had

³ IHGB's Organizing Committee consisted of the following members: Augusto Tavares de Lira, Alfredo Valadão, Pedro Calmon, Wanderley Pinho, Virgílio Corrêa Filho, Afonso d'Escagnole Taunay, Rodolfo Garcia, Braz do Amaral, Cláudio Ganns, Carlos da Silveira Carneiro, Henrique Carneiro Leão Teixeira Filho, Artur Cesar Ferreira Reis, Francisco Radler de Aquino, Afonso Costa and José Pedro Leite Cordeiro. IHGB, *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*. Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional, 1950, v. 1, pp. 5-6.

⁴ Lucia Maria Paschoal Guimarães, *Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro: da Escola Palatina ao Silogeu (1889-1938)*. Full Professor's Thesis. Rio de Janeiro: UERJ, 1999, p. 27. (mimeo).

⁵ The Portuguese Academy of History (Academia Portuguesa de História) was recreated on 19 May, 1936, by Decree-Law No. 26611. Its plenary sessions, however, only began again in April 1938. Its origin dates back to the Royal Academy of Portuguese History (Academia Real de História Portuguesa), established in Lisbon, through a decree issued by Dom João V, on 8 December, 1720, with the motto *Restituet omnia*. Located in the palace of the

ten seats allocated to Brazilian academics.⁶ By 1937, all these vacancies were occupied, with all the nominations having been given to members of the Historical Institute, namely: the Count of Afonso Celso, Max Fleiüss, Afonso d'Escragnole Taunay, Arthur Guimarães de Araújo Jorge, Francisco José de Oliveira Vianna, Gustavo Barroso, Júlio Afrânio Peixoto, Manuel Cícero Peregrino da Silva, Pedro Calmon and Rodolfo Garcia.⁷

But, at that time, other factors would certainly have contributed to closer ties between the IHGB and the Academy, especially when it is known that Brazil and Portugal were experiencing similar political and ideological contexts. The authoritarian governments set up in the two countries by Getúlio Vargas and Oliveira Salazar, respectively, presented themselves as legitimate agents of modernization. It was not by chance that the two regimes had given themselves the title of a New State. Furthermore, they both developed public policies designed to enhance the importance of nationality, based on certain conceptions of history that sought to legitimate the present through past glories.

In Brazil, the privileged place for such historiographical production was the veteran Historical Institute, the guardian of the national memory. Although it was not a body that formed part of the government apparatus, it enjoyed the patronage of Vargas,⁸ who besides affording it great prestige and visiting it periodically, set great store by the recommendations and advice proffered by the Brazilian *temple of citizenship*.⁹ The Institute was led between 1913 and 1938 by the Count of Afonso Celso, the author of *Porque me ufano do meu país*,¹⁰ and what was developed there was a nationalist-style historiography, geared towards the formation of civic feelings and based on the cult of the nation's traditions and its most notable figures, converting history into a vast repertoire of different experiences to be apprehended by the present in order to avoid the repetition of past errors.¹¹

A similar role to the one played by the Institute in Brazil was enjoyed in Lisbon by the Portuguese Academy of History, re-founded, as has already been said, in 1936, (...) *under the auspices of the Head of State*. The Academy's stated aim was to bring together scholars engaged in research in order to promote the (...) *critical reconstruction of the past, its prime objectives being to*

Dukes of Bragança, its membership consisted of 50 academics, who were given the task of writing the ecclesiastical, military and civil history of the realm. See Isabel Ferreira da Mora, *A Academia Portuguesa de História. Os intelectuais, o poder cultural e o poder monárquico no século XVIII*. Coimbra: Edições Minerva, 2003 (Coleção Minerva-História No. 22).

⁶ Brazilian intellectuals were also allowed to join the ranks of supernumerary academics.

⁷ *Boletim da Academia Portuguesa de História*, Lisbon: APH, 1st and 2nd years, 1937-1938.

⁸ See, for example, Getúlio Vargas, *Diário*, presented by Celina Vargas do Amaral Peixoto; published by Leda Soares. São Paulo: Siciliano; Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 1999, v.1, p. 143.

⁹ Lucia Maria Paschoal Guimarães, *Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro: da Escola Palatina ao Silogeu*, op. cit. p. 256.

¹⁰ According to Nanci Leonzo, Afonso Celso's book provided the inspiration for the work *O que todo português deve saber de Portugal*, published in 1938 by Albino Forjaz de Sampaio from the Lisbon Academy of Sciences.

¹¹ Cf. Reinhart Koselleck, "Historia magistra viate". In: _____, *Le futur passé: contribution à la sémantique des temps historiques*. Paris: Éd. de l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1990, p. 37.

*stimulate and coordinate the revisionist efforts needed to reintroduce historical truth and to enrich the documentation of Portugal's inalienable rights.*¹²

The Academy represented one of the nationalist spaces established by Salazar's government in the 1930s with the aim of promoting a re-interpretation of the past, in accordance with the values of the regime. In this sense, it played a prominent part in the organization of the festivities of the so-called *double centenary*, which were held between 2 June and 2 December 1940 to mark the eight hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the Portuguese kingdom and the three hundredth anniversary of Portugal's Restoration from Spanish rule.

It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss here the political and ideological motivations that led the Salazarist State to promote such celebrations, aimed at the development of the so-called *politics of the spirit*, idealized by António Ferro, and put into practice by the National Propaganda Office (Secretariado de Propaganda Nacional – SPN).¹³ Nor is it possible to consider here the succession of festive events that took place in 1940, designed to exalt the greatness of the Portuguese nation. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that the cultural policy developed by Ferro sought to lift the spirits of the Portuguese people, underlining not only their value as an ethnic group, but also the importance of their culture, their productive force, their civilizing capacity and their independent unity within the concert of nations. The successful achievement of this policy was based on three pillars: the use of culture as a symbol of nationality and a means of propaganda, in order to dignify the work of Salazar's government; the attempt to reconcile ancient Portuguese traditions and values with the modernity symbolized by the advent of the New State; and the establishment of a popular national culture based on the roots and ideals forged by the Salazarist regime¹⁴. It is also worth adding that the efforts made to present Portugal as a culturally rich and prosperous nation were not limited to internal propaganda. Symptomatically, as is clearly noted by the historian Fernando Catroga, the intention of the general plan for the Centenary Commemorations was to glorify the present (...) *in the light of an uningenuous diachronic interpretation of Portugal's destiny*, by means of a (...) *direct exaltation of what it was most important to remember: the Discoveries, (...) the foundation and re-foundation of the Nation should be symbolized as formative and preparatory moments in the construction of the Empire.*¹⁵

In the "Chronicle" that he published in the *Anais das Bibliotecas e Arquivos*, in 1939, Júlio Dantas, the president of the National Commission for the Centenary Commemorations, emphasized the importance of such events, which he considered should be the central core of the commemorative program:

¹² *Boletim da Academia Portuguesa de História*, Lisbon: Academia Portuguesa de História, 1st and 2nd years, 1937-1938, p. 53.

¹³ Luís Reis Torgal, *História e ideologia*. Coimbra: Livraria Minerva, 1989, p. 194. (Coleção Minerva - História nº 3). See also Yves Leonard, *Salazarismo e Fascismo*. Translation by Catarina Horta Salgueiro. Lisbon: Editorial Inquérito, 1998, pp. 95-96.

¹⁴ See Fernando Rosas, *O Estado Novo nos anos trinta: 1928-1938*. Lisbon: Editorial Estampa, 1986. _____, "Salazar e o Salazarismo: Um caso de longevidade". In: *Salazar e o Salazarismo*. Lisbon: Publicações D. Quixote, 1989.

¹⁵ Fernando Catroga, "Ritualizações da história". In: TORGAL, MENDES & CATROGA, *História da História em Portugal – Da historiografia à memória histórica*. Lisbon: Temas e Debates, 1998, pp. 268-269.

*As is already publicly known, through the dissemination of the general program, the second period, or the imperial period of the national festivities of 1940, is centered around three main pieces: the Portuguese World Exhibition, which will be held in Belém, in the square in front of the Jerónimos Monastery; the parade of the Portuguese World, a stunning procession of eight centuries of history; and the Congress of the Portuguese World, at which the origins, activities, institutions, development and expansion of Portugal and its Empire will be studied. Grouped around this triptych – doctrine, documentation and apotheosis – are all the other realizations of the Golden Age (our emphasis)*¹⁶.

Brazil was invited to participate in the *Centenary Commemorations* in its capacity as a *sister nation*. It should be remembered that, since the celebratory festivities organized in honor of Prince Henry the Navigator in 1894, the Portuguese leaders had made every effort to incorporate the ex-colony in the celebrations of its great events. From a symbolic point of view, Brazil's continued presence in those commemorations served as an antidote to the criticism levied against Portuguese colonization, and as *a kind of posthumous proof of our civilizing virtues*, to use the words of Fernando Catroga¹⁷.

In their turn, the Brazilian authorities tended to respond positively to the wishes of the old metropolis. Brazil saw itself *as the favorite child of the Portuguese overseas diaspora*, as Luís Reis Torgal¹⁸ suggests. In this regard, the statement proffered by Afrânio Peixoto, on his visit to the Lisbon Colonial Archives in 1937, is highly representative: (...) *My country, a fully grown child, cannot have any awareness of itself without finding the documentation here about its adolescence and age of minority. This will teach it to love even more this glorious Portugal which made it great, from its very first days, and trusted in Brazil, making possible its magnificent future*¹⁹.

Another indication of this stance can be understood from the care with which Brazil's inclusion in the solemn commemorations of the *Golden Age* was handled, both under the scope of the Historical Institute, through the reading of the correspondence exchanged between Max Fleiüss and Júlio Dantas²⁰, and in the upper echelons of the government of Getúlio Vargas. It is sufficient to say that even in his *Diário*, Vargas left a record of the preparations being made to take part in the *Historical Exhibition of the Portuguese World*.²¹

¹⁶ Júlio Dantas, "Crônica". *Anais das Bibliotecas e Arquivos*, Lisbon, vol. XIV, 1939, p. 7.

¹⁷ Fernando Catroga, op. cit., p. 241.

¹⁸ Luís Reis Torgal, *História e ideologia*, op. cit., p. 189.

¹⁹ Afrânio Peixoto, apud Alberto Iria, *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*. Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional, 1950, v. 2, p. 15.

²⁰ See, amongst other documents, the correspondence exchanged between Júlio Dantas and Max Fleiüss. Coleção Max Fleiüss, Arquivo IHGB, Lata 587. Pasta 48.

²¹ The Brazilian presence was to be noted above all in the symposiums that formed an integral part of what has conventionally come to be known as the *Congress of the Portuguese World* and at the *Historical Exhibition of the Portuguese World*. At this latter event, Brazil was the only foreign country to be represented, also occupying its own pavilion. In Getúlio Vargas' *Diário*, for example, in the notes relating to 31 January 1940, it is stated that the dictator received the director of the National History Museum, Dr. Gustavo Barroso, one of the delegates to the event, in order to give him official orders and special instructions. Cf. Getúlio Vargas, *Diário*. Presented by Celina Vargas do Amaral Peixoto; published by Leda Soares. São Paulo: Siciliano; Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 1999, p. 241.

The end of Vargas' dictatorship, in 1945, did not alter the climate of cordiality that had characterized the policy of cultural relations between the governments of Rio de Janeiro and Lisbon. The same can be said about the exchanges taking place between the Historical Institute and the Portuguese Academy of History.²² So much so that one of the first measures taken by the leadership of the Institute, on issuing invitations to the 4th Congress, was to address the following invitation to the Prime Minister of Portugal, Dr. António de Oliveira Salazar:

*(...) the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute has decided to commemorate in an appropriate form the 400th anniversary of the foundation of the general government of Brazil and the city of Bahia,. (...) It is with this lofty thought in mind that the Institute has decided to give well-deserved emphasis at these commemorations to the Portuguese intelligentsia, extending to the scholars of the sister nation the invitation made to its own distinguished scholars to take part therein, and moreover reserving one of the places in the committee presiding over the 4th National History Congress for the special representative of the Portuguese Government (...)*²³

Attached to the document, signed by the president of the Historical Institute, the ex-chancellor and ambassador José Carlos de Macedo Soares²⁴, were the list of themes for study and the *Rules* for the academic conference. The event was structured around eight areas of specific study, which respectively contemplated the following fields of knowledge: general history; historical geography and cartography; ethnography; economic and social history; military and diplomatic history; religion, science, art and humanities; political and legal institutions, and bio-bibliography. For each of these areas, there would be a *rapporteur*, entrusted with the task of preparing the list of subjects for discussion, as well as summarizing the results achieved during the ordinary meetings.

The time frame fixed by the organizers gave special privilege to the period from 1500 to 1763. The first date naturally referred to the arrival of the fleet led by Pedro Álvares Cabral to the south of Bahia, whilst the second corresponded to the transfer of the seat of the general government from Salvador to Rio de Janeiro. Broadly speaking, the detailed list of themes proposed for study corresponded to a major review of the historical knowledge available about the colonial period, with special emphasis being given to the so-called *baiano cycle*.

The *Rules* of the 4th Congress were based on the guidelines used at similar events organized by the Institute in 1914, 1931 and 1938²⁵. Participation was open to historians, geographers, sociologists, men of letters and essayists. Within the limits of the themes offered in the program, those who so wished could write papers and submit them to the IHGB by 31 December 1948. They were, however, requested to present previously unpublished texts, which would then be

²² *Boletim da Academia Portuguesa de História*, Lisbon: APH, 13th year, 1949, p. 111.

²³ IHGB, *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*. Rio de Janeiro: IHGB/Imprensa Nacional, 1950, v. 1, pp. 7-8.

²⁴ The president of the IHGB, the ambassador José Carlos de Macedo Soares, was Minister of Foreign Relations in the first government formed by Getúlio Vargas.

²⁵ See Lucia Maria Paschoal Guimarães, *Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro: da Escola Palatina ao Silogeu*. Passim.

submitted to the prior assessment of a scientific committee, given the task of emitting an opinion as to the merit and convenience of their publication in the *Proceedings*.

At the end of the academic activities, those participating in the congress would be able to enjoy a cultural program, with visits to the National Library, the Casa Rui Barbosa, the National Archives, the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics, the National History Museum and the National Historical and Artistic Heritage Services. The program ended with a trip to the city of Petrópolis, where participants would visit the recently inaugurated Imperial Museum.²⁶

Roughly a hundred and fifty scholars replied to the invitation issued by the Historical Institute, eighty-nine of whom enrolled for the presentation of papers, including twenty foreigners. In this latter group, except for Professors Charles Boxer (University of London – King's College), Robert C. Smith (University of Pennsylvania) and Ronald Hilton (University of Stanford), all the rest were Portuguese scholars.

Table 1
IHGB, 4th National History Congress: Portuguese Participants
/ Institution Represented

PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTION REPRESENTED
--------------	-------------------------

²⁶ The Imperial Museum was created by Getúlio Vargas and inaugurated on 16 March 1943, in the rooms of the former summer residence of the emperor Dom Pedro II, in the city of Petrópolis.

1. Alberto Iria	Lisbon Colonial Archives.
2. Alfredo Mendes de Gouveia	Lisbon Colonial Archives
3. Américo Pires de Lima	University of Porto
4. Berta Leite	No information available
5. Damião Peres	Portuguese Academy of History
6. Eduardo Dias	Portuguese Academy of History
7. Fernando da Silva Correia	Lisbon Higher Institute of Hygiene
8. Hernani Cidade	University of Lisbon
9. Jaime Cortesão	No institutional link/ Exile in Brazil
10. Júlio Dantas	Lisbon Academy of Sciences
11. Luís de Pina Manique	No information available
12. Luís Silveira	Évora Public Library
13. Luísa da Fonseca	Lisbon Colonial Archives
14. Manuel Lopes de Almeida	University of Coimbra
15. Maria Isabel de Albuquerque	Lisbon Colonial Archives
16. Padre Serafim Leite	Portuguese Academy of History
17. Torquato Soares de Sousa	University of Coimbra

Source: Table compiled from information contained in *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*. Rio de Janeiro: IHGB/ Imprensa Nacional, 1950-52, 13v.

Except for the historian Jaime Cortesão, who had been living in exile in Brazil since the end of 1940²⁷ and was a dissident of the Salazarist regime, all the other names on the list, whose institutional links are stated in the *Proceedings of the 4th Congress*, belonged to public bodies. This is a clear sign that the invitation addressed to the Portuguese Prime Minister had been warmly received. In fact, it constituted considerably more than this. Considering the number of Portuguese delegates and the high costs of transatlantic travel at that time, it can be seen that the opportunity offered by the Institute had been taken advantage of by Salazar to give some continuity to the policy of forging even closer links between Portugal and Brazil, a policy that had been stepped up at the time of the *Centenary Commemorations*.

Table 1 clearly shows that the largest contingent of official representatives was formed by specialists from the Lisbon Colonial Archives, a body that had been founded in 1931 and was later to be renamed the Overseas Archives. It also strongly suggests that the appointments had been screened by António Ferro, the director of the National Office for Information regarding Popular Culture and Tourism (Secretariado Nacional da Informação da Cultura Popular e do Turismo –

²⁷ With regard to this subject, see Nanci Leonzo, “Jaime Cortesão: Um condestável em terras brasileiras”. *Revista da Cátedra Jaime Cortesão*, Instituto de Estudos Avançados, USP, São Paulo, 1 (1): 35-43, July 1997. See also Lucia Maria P. Guimarães, “Jaime Cortesão”. *Convergência Lusíada*. Rio de Janeiro: 22: 317-322, 2006.

SNI).²⁸ Alongside the recognized archivists and librarians, of the standing of Alberto Iria, Luís Silveira, Luísa da Fonseca and Maria Izabel de Albuquerque, there were such important personalities as the medical doctor Américo Pires de Lima, a Professor from the University of Porto and a recognized intellectual of the New State, who was an apologist for the teaching of a patriotic form of history in Portuguese high schools.²⁹ The same can be said about Luís de Pina Manique, one of the authors of the collective work *Portugal. Breviário da pátria para portugueses ausentes*, published at the initiative of António Ferro in 1946, and also about Manuel Lopes de Almeida, a Professor from the University of Coimbra and a historian who was closely linked to the regime.³⁰

In contrast, other participants at the conference - Hernani Cidade, Damião Perez and Padre Serafim Leite - were familiar figures in Brazilian scholarly circles. The last two had been nominated by the Portuguese Academy of History.³¹ This is not to mention Júlio Dantas, who was, at that time, the president of the Lisbon Academy of Sciences. The appointment of such an important and eminent figure to represent Marshal Oscar Carmona, the head of the Portuguese State, at the event organized by the Historical Institute, deserves a separate comment of its own.

The celebrated politician, diplomat and intellectual Júlio Dantas represented one of the main Portuguese literary references. Highly regarded in Brazil, which he had already visited on various occasions, he had been honored with the title of honorary citizen of Rio de Janeiro in 1923, amongst other tributes. As has already been said, besides these credentials, the author of *A Ceia dos Cardeais* and *A Severa* played a leading role in the *Centenary Commemorations*, where he was president of the National Commission responsible for the organization of those celebrations.³² It should further be added that, when officially opening the business of the *Congress of the Portuguese World*, Júlio Dantas had announced the intention of developing a Portuguese-Brazilian historiographical project, (...) *in which, through the close cooperation between Portuguese and Brazilian researchers and historiographers, an attempt will be made to clarify and unify the interpretation of the facts that are important for the first three centuries of the glorious history of Brazil, our common heritage* (our emphasis)³³. We shall return to this question later on.

Opened on 21 April 1949, by the President of the Republic Eurico Gaspar Dutra, in the main hall of the Silogeu Brasileiro,³⁴ the inaugural session of the 4th Congress attracted leading personalities from the upper echelons of government, from the ecclesiastical authorities and

²⁸ Luís Reis Torgal, *História e ideologia*, op. cit., p. 194. See also Yves Leonard, op. cit., pp. 69-70

²⁹ _____, "Ensino da história". In: TORGAL, MENDES & CATROGA, *História da História em Portugal – Da historiografia à memória histórica*. Lisbon: Temas e Debates. 1998, pp. 134-135.

³⁰ Cf. Fernando Catroga, op. cit., p. 357.

³¹ Damião Perez and Serafim Leite were appointed to act as representatives of the Portuguese Academy of History at the IHGB's event at the Academy's Ordinary General Meeting, on 6 April 1949. *Boletim da Academia Portuguesa de História*, Lisbon: APH, 13th year, 1949, p. 111.

³² The National Commission for the Centenary Commemorations was composed of Júlio Dantas (president), António Ferro (general secretary) and Augusto de Castro (general curator of the *Historical Exhibition of the Portuguese World*).

³³ Júlio Dantas, "Discurso". *Anais das Bibliotecas e Arquivos*. Lisbon, v. XV, 1940, p. 17.

³⁴ Silogeu Brasileiro was the name given to the building where the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute was located. The name was chosen in 1906, at the suggestion of Ramiz Galvão, to indicate its use by societies dedicated to the letters and the arts.

members of the diplomatic corps. It should also be mentioned in passing that the leaders of the IHGB were not particularly clever in choosing the day of the ceremony. This conference of studies on Portuguese America, attended by official delegates from the *mother country*, began precisely on the national holiday dedicated to the anniversary of the hanging of Tiradentes, an emblematic figure in the *Conjuração Mineira* (the Minas Conspiracy), the greatest representative of colonial resistance to the oppression from the metropolis.

Certainly, the hosts must have realized the inconvenience of this, for they remained silent about the date and its symbolic content. They even dispensed with the reading of the *Efemérides Brasileiras* (Important Brazilian Dates), by the Baron of Rio Branco, a traditional practice that is still used today as an introduction to the formal sessions at the Casa da Memória Nacional. The president of the Historical Institute limited himself to making a brief statement, highlighting the importance of the academic initiative, which provided a continuation of the first three national history congresses promoted by the organisation (1914, 1931 and 1938). After paying the customary tribute to the patron of the Casa, the Emperor Dom Pedro II, he made a brief welcome to the conference participants and guests, addressing himself in particular to Júlio Dantas, the ambassador extraordinary from Portugal.³⁵

The reply of the plenipotentiary from Lisbon, however, expanded upon the customary demonstrations of appreciation in keeping with protocol. When solemnly presenting the insignia of the Military Order of St. James of the Sword to the IHGB, His Excellency gave a lengthy speech, preceded by the following reflections:

*(...) A History Congress is substantially an act of revision. A revision of the facts, so often clarified in the light of new documents or new interpretations, a revision, above all, of the judgments made about facts, frequently distorted by political passion and by the inevitable imperfections of human nature (...) "L'histoire est une science; mais elle est aussi une justice," said the Marquis of Vogué. (...) A History Congress has, at the same time, the opulence of a university cloister and the majesty of a supreme court. It is not limited to creating science; it judges men and peoples; it reviews unfair judgments and rectifies erroneous ones. This was what we did at the Congress of the Portuguese World held in Lisbon in 1940, which I had the honor to preside over (...) Because I know in advance that this meeting will be setting out to perform a similar work of clarification and justice in relation to the men, ideas and events that constitute the historical heritage of our two nations (...)*³⁶

In Júlio Dantas' particular brand of oratory, the event organized by the Historical Institute represented a continuation of the *Centenary Commemorations*. Furthermore, he waved the flag of the impartiality of science and converted the academic meeting into a kind of privileged forum, suited by nature to judge and recognize the proclaimed merits of the work performed by the Portuguese in the New World:

³⁵ IHGB, *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*, op. cit., v.1, p. 8.

³⁶ Júlio Dantas, *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*. Idem, pp. 48-49.

*(...) I venture to claim that due justice has yet to be rendered, especially in Portugal, to the outstanding work of organization represented by Tomé de Sousa's fleet. In the holds of its three ships (...) there not only came colonists and men of the sea (...) there also came material to begin the building of Brazil's first city; there came the whole structure of the future Brazilian State, its first political constitution was none other than the Rules signed by Dom João III in Almeirim, on 17 December 1548... (...) In so far as the historical circumstances made this possible, Portugal fulfilled its duty as a colonizing power (...).*³⁷

However, through these references to the remote past, Dantas did not intend solely to stress the positive legacy left by the mother-country in the formation of the Brazilian nationality. Underlying such an aim was a relatively concealed political concern with the present moment that was of the utmost importance: the safeguarding of the overseas Empire. In fact, at the end of the 1940s, there was a speeding up of the process of decolonization, driven by the changes that had taken place in the world order after the Second World War. The design of the new world scenario was characterized, on the one hand, by the decline in the authority of the former colonial powers and, on the other hand, by the emergence of two antagonistic blocs, led respectively by the United States and the Soviet Union. In an international context that was increasingly opposed to the colonial practices of the Salazarist State in its dominions in Asia and Africa, Brazil again served as an exemplary case testifying to *Portugal's missionary and civilizing vocation*.³⁸

In the wake of the *Centenary Commemorations*, the ambassador extraordinary brought to the fore the history of the Discoveries. He exalted their magnitude and grandeur in order to contrast their history with the small size of 16th-century Portugal. In the face of such arguments, that epic in itself made up for the period of almost half a century that had elapsed between the discovery of Brazil by Cabral and the arrival of Tomé de Sousa, entrusted with the mission of setting up the General Government in the territories of the South Atlantic:

*(...) Could the General Government have been created earlier? Could the mother-city of Brazil have been built earlier? It is possible (...) But perhaps it is not entirely fair to attribute the delay in the settlement of Brazil to the forgetfulness or carelessness of the Portuguese, as some historians have done, such as Frei Vicente or even contemporary teachers (...). We did not sit back with our arms folded; we opened them up wide in a scintillating fashion in order to embrace the World. (...) We did a great deal; we could not have done everything.*³⁹

Dantas' apologetic defense, running counter to the chronicle of Frei Vicente de Salvador, even undermined the authority of the pen of Francisco Adolfo de Varnhagen, the greatest icon of nineteenth-century Brazilian historiography. It is sufficient to remember that, for Varnhagen, the Portuguese realm had neglected Brazil in favor of India, where (...) *the efforts made and the capital*

³⁷ Idem, p. 48.

³⁸ Luís Reis Torgal, *História e ideologia*, op. cit., p. 188. See also Yves Leonard, op. cit., p. 77.

³⁹ Idem, p. 49.

invested (...) produced greater and more immediate interest.⁴⁰ At the same time, he aimed a blow at his fellow countryman Jaime Cortesão, who was in the audience at the Silogeu and enjoyed great prestige, not only within the Brazilian intellectual world, but also at the Ministry of Foreign Relations, where he worked as a teacher at the Rio Branco Institute.⁴¹

(...) If anything causes me amazement and admiration, it is the fact that a small nation, with such a tiny population (a million and a half people, or in other words three hundred thousand able and fit-bodied men), could, in such a short space of time, have sailed so far, fought so hard, suffered so much and taken so far the splendor of Latin civilization and the gentleness of the Christian faith...⁴²

Lisbon's special envoy sought refuge in traditional interpretations, which, as it happens, had been given great importance and had been widely disseminated by the Salazarists during the festivities in 1940, attributing the epic period of the Discoveries to mental and religious motivations. It therefore invalidated the discussion begun by Cortesão, in his recent works, about the importance of economic and geographical factors in the overseas expansion undertaken by the Portuguese.⁴³ Indeed, it is opportune here to make a brief parenthetical comment to explain that the dissident historian did not respond to the provocation delivered by his compatriot. He limited himself to participating assiduously, but discreetly, in the various sessions of the conference, although the research that he presented – "The significance of Pedro Teixeira's expedition in the light of new documents" – had received enthusiastic praise from the scientific committee of the Historical Institute.⁴⁴

Basically, Júlio Dantas had stolen the show at the opening ceremony of the 4th Congress. He had transformed the Historical Institute's conference hall into a stage and had begun to direct the performance. To this end, he used the same strategy that he had formulated to direct the

⁴⁰ The first edition of the *História Geral do Brasil* (General History of Brazil) dated from Madrid, 1854. In the present work, we used the 5th complete edition. Cf. Francisco Adolfo de Varnhagen, *História geral do Brasil, antes da sua independência e separação de Portugal*. 5th complete edition – 6th of volume I, revised and with notes by Rodolfo Garcia. São Paulo: Melhoramentos. 1956, p. 106.

⁴¹ Jaime Cortesão arrived in Brazil at the end of 1940 and took up residence in Rio de Janeiro, where he remained until 1957, when he returned to his motherland. He was in charge of the map library at the Ministry of Foreign Relations. In 1945, he joined the recently created Rio Branco Institute. He taught a number of courses and undertook important research at the Itamaraty Historical Archives, such as the one that gave rise to the nine volumes of the work *Alexandre de Gusmão e o Tratado de Madrid*. He also worked as a researcher at the National Library. In 1954, he was the curator of the Exhibition of the 400th Anniversary of São Paulo. Cf., Lucia Maria P. Guimarães, "Jaime Cortesão", op. cit., 321-322.

⁴² Júlio Dantas, *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*, op. cit. p. 49.

⁴³ Vitorino Magalhães Godinho. *Ensaio III – Sobre teoria da história e historiografia*. 1st edition. Lisbon: Livraria Sá da Costa Editora, 1977, pp. 311-312.

⁴⁴ The paper put an end to an old dispute between Portuguese-Brazilian and Spanish-American historiography about the political scope of Pedro Teixeira's expedition. In the opinion of Jaime Cortesão, this represented the first attempt to establish the limits of Portuguese sovereignty in the Amazon. Cf. Jaime Cortesão, "O significado da expedição de Pedro Teixeira à luz de novos documentos". IHGB, *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*, op. cit., v. 3, pp. 169-204.

organization of the *Centenary Commemorations*, basing himself on the triptych of *doctrine-documentation-apotheosis*⁴⁵. The *doctrine* part had already been made explicit by reading between the lines of the welcoming speech given by the plenipotentiary ambassador: in the history of the former colony, it was the metropolis that was called upon to perform the main role. He still had to develop the other two fundamental elements of that triad, or, in other words, *documentation* and *apotheosis*.

As far as *documentation* was concerned, the cast directed by Dantas set about their task with great mastery and coherence in the course of the ordinary sessions, sometimes bringing to light previously unpublished sources from the Colonial Historical Archives, and on other occasions presenting papers founded on copious empirical material. It is true that most of the authors chose to present papers on themes in which it would be hard to find anything that could be criticized at the level of historiography, in order not to allow room for possible controversies. In particular, they preferred to produce bio-bibliographical essays, or descriptions of travelers, as well as reports about epidemics, religious institutions and charitable organizations.

Certain participants in the congress did, however, renounce this posture of apparent scientific neutrality. There were some who went beyond the cultural origins in Portugal, even disregarding the time span and the themes proposed by the IHGB. Such a fact makes it possible to suspect that the Institute's scientific committee, always jealously guarding its specific duties, showed a certain complaisance in regard to some of the guests invited from overseas. Take, for example, the text entitled *José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva*, written by Berta Leite. The author sought to discover what were the motivations that might have led an individual of Bonifácio's *moral and intellectual worth (...) to cease to be Portuguese*, becoming involved in the process for the political emancipation of the former colony. She concluded that (...) *only one truth might rehabilitate him in our Portuguese eyes: that perhaps José Bonifácio had seen in the independence of Brazil the only possibility for the continuity of the Race*.⁴⁶ Berta Leite's controversial reflections, however, passed almost completely unnoticed in the face of the great wealth of sources that she added to her paper as an appendix: previously unpublished testimonies to the performance of Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva in the Portuguese realm, including his involvement in the battalion known as the *Restorers of the Nation*, during the French invasions.

As far as the specific work on *documentation* is concerned, some isolated papers should be highlighted, beginning with the one presented by Alberto Iria, a genuine lesson in heuristics and archivology, which disclosed the collections of sources originating from the captainship of Bahia and the establishment of the General Government, deposited at the Colonial Historical Archives.⁴⁷ In fact, the patrimony of that institution was discussed by another two highly regarded specialists, Maria Izabel de Albuquerque and Alfredo Mendes de Gouveia, the latter being the author of an extensive compilation covering eighty-six agreements of Brotherhoods, Confraternities and Charitable Institutions, situated between Maranhão and Rio Grande do Sul, documents that belonged to the notary's office of the former Overseas Council. In turn, besides being visited by various scholars, the collection of documents at the Torre do Tombo (the National Archives) served

⁴⁵ Júlio Dantas, "Crônica". *Anais das Bibliotecas e Arquivos*, op. cit., p. 7.

⁴⁶ Berta Leite, "José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva". *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*, op. cit., p. 268.

⁴⁷ Alberto Iria, "A Bahia no Arquivo Histórico Colonial de Lisboa". *Idem*, v.2, pp. 15-110.

as a basis for the contents drawn up by Luísa da Fonseca, with notes regarding the presence of Brazilian holders of bachelor's degrees in Portugal.

As far as the actual historiographical production itself was concerned, although this was marked by a heavy dose of empiricism, the originality of certain themes should be noted, which until then had been underexplored by Brazilian historiography, partly due to the difficulty of gaining access to the Portuguese collections of documents. A good example of this is to be found in the contribution made by Dr. Fernando Silva Correia, *Some theses about the origins of welfare in America and Brazil*. A recognized scholar of the *Misericórdias* (Charitable Institutions), Silva Correia noted the importance of those institutions in everyday life in the first centuries of colonization. Also, following a similar line of research, were the three texts written by Dr. Américo Pires de Lima. The paper that he presented on the epidemics that ravaged the city of Salvador in the 17th century prompted a suggestion that the Ministry of Education should introduce into the curriculum of medical courses a discipline dedicated to the study of the history of medicine in Brazil.⁴⁸

Similarly distinguishing themselves through their erudition and methodological rigor in the treatment of the sources were the works written by Padre Serafim Leite and Damião Perez, two names from Portuguese historiography that were frequently quoted in Brazil. The priest stuck to his already well-known studies on the Society of Jesus, dedicating bibliographical essays to the works of Fernão Cardim and Manoel da Nóbrega, respectively. Damião Perez commented on the presuppositions developed by Pandiá Calógeras in the book *As minas do Brasil e a sua legislação*, based on the rules, laws and acts enacted by the kings of Portugal and gathered together in the Lisbon archives. The critical discussion in this paper revealed great objectivity, but its conclusion left something to be desired, since Perez could not resist the temptation and slipped into *doctrine*, heaping praise upon the performance of the *mother country*: (...) *In relation to mining, as in so many other sectors of the political, economic and cultural life of this nascent nationality, Portugal modeled it to its own image with the proud tenderness of a creator...*⁴⁹

The strategy used by the Lisbon delegation achieved the expected results. The dissemination of such a voluminous and diversified body of documents left the Brazilian scholars fascinated. This succeeded to such an extent that the plenary session of the 4th Congress approved two motions, indicating that the IHGB should persevere with the President of the Republic for the establishment of an official body encharged with the task of extracting copies of documents regarding the history of Brazil from the Portuguese archives.⁵⁰ As it happened, this exhaustive and systematic survey was only to be completed in the 1990s, with the development of the so-called Rescue Project, under the

⁴⁸ Dr. Américo Pires de Lima presented the following papers: "Nota sobre algumas epidemias na Bahia (séc. XVII)"; "Atribuições da misericórdia na Bahia (séc. XVIII)" and "Notas sobre a Roda dos Enjeitados na Bahia (séc. XVIII)". In regard to the motion, see *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*, op. cit. v.1, pp. 85-86.

⁴⁹ Damião Perez, "Antecedentes históricos da legislação concernente ao ouro no Brasil". Idem, op. cit. v. 5, p. 587

⁵⁰ To a certain extent, the motion marked a return to the work of uncovering the sources that had been undertaken by the IHGB in the 19th century in the various European archives. Amongst other members of the Institute, some of the participants in these research missions had been: Varnhagen, Gonçalves Dias, João Francisco Lisboa and Joaquim Caetano dos Santos. See Lucia Maria Paschoal Guimarães, "Debaixo da imediata proteção de Sua Majestade Imperial: o Instituto Histórico de Geográfico Brasileiro (1838-1889)". *Revista do IHGB*. Rio de Janeiro, 156 (388): 459-613.

scope of the commemorations being organized to mark the 500th anniversary of the discovery of Brazil.

Whatever the case, the performance directed by Júlio Dantas was not yet complete. The *apotheosis* was still to come. The grand finale came in the farewell address of the Portuguese delegation at the closing ceremony. On this formal occasion, Dantas gave the word to the historian Eduardo Dias, who was entrusted with the task of presenting the Historical Institute with a bronze plaque to commemorate the event. The choice of speaker was apparently motivated by academic reasons, since Dias had begun to appear in Lisbon as a promising specialist in the history of Brazil, having been awarded the Larragoiti Prize by the Lisbon Academy of Sciences in 1947 for his book *Memórias de Forasteiros: Brasil, séculos XVI a XIX*.⁵¹

Meanwhile, Eduardo Dias returned to the question of the importance of the Portuguese origins in the formation of the Brazilian nationality. He stressed it in the very foundation of the Historical Institute, referring to two emblematic figures from the *Casa da Memória Nacional*: the first was Marshal Cunha Matos – Portuguese by birth and one of the founders of the IHGB; the second was the patron of the *Casa*, the Emperor Dom Pedro II, (...) *the son of a Portuguese man, who, exactly like the intrepid field marshal Raimundo Matos, served Brazil with self-sacrifice and sincerity (...) In this way, in the foundations of the Institute, as well as in the formation of the nationality itself, we have the indelible and efficient presence of Portuguese people*⁵².

The omission of the name of the father of Dom Pedro II is highly significant. It should not be forgotten that the Brazilian monarch Dom Pedro I, who was Dom Pedro IV of Portugal, always gave rise to contradictory opinions in Portuguese historiography, leaving room for some conjectures. Did the silence that had built up around the figure who had proclaimed Brazil's independence still reflect some remaining traces of metropolitan resentment over having lost the jewel of its colonies? Or, what seems most likely, the liberal excesses of the Duke of Bragança in the Old World were not favorably regarded by the historians connected to Salazar's regime, such as, for example, João Ameal, who *explicitly defended Dom Miguel and the Vilafrancada, in his action against Jacobins, liberals and masons*.⁵³

But it was not sufficient just to revive the past, stressing the Portuguese-Brazilian origin of the *Casa da Memória Nacional*. It was essential to reaffirm this in the present time in order to consolidate it in the future. In other words, this meant putting into practice the project announced by Júlio Dantas in the *Centenary Commemorations*, more specifically at the *Congress of the Portuguese World*, of bringing together specialists from both countries in order to produce a single and coherent historiography, narrating the feats of the three hundred years of Portugal's *civilizing mission* in the New World. Even if, it might also be said, in order to achieve such an aim, it were to prove necessary to expunge the name of Dom Pedro from the Portuguese-Brazilian memory. Or (who knows?) to rehabilitate José Bonifácio in the eyes of his fellow countrymen, just as Berta Leite

⁵¹ The Larragoiti Prize was set up at the Lisbon Academy of Sciences at the initiative of the entrepreneur Antônio Sanchez Larragoiti Júnior, one of the owners of the Grupo Sul América de Seguros (an Insurance Group). It was intended, every two years, to reward the best work by a Portuguese writer on a theme of Portuguese-Brazilian interest, and it was awarded on a competitive basis.

⁵² Eduardo Dias, *Anais do IV Congresso de História Nacional*, op. cit., v 1, p. 94.

⁵³ See Fernando Catroga, op. cit., p. 280.

wished. There is no doubt that Eduardo Dias attempted to clearly define the role that the Historical Institute would play in such a project:

(...) To fervently examine the Portuguese archives in search of still unknown elements; to piously honor the tomb of the admiral of the discovering fleet; to disseminate precious manuscripts; to review the chronicles and old documents in the national archives in order to clarify the historical truth – all this represents the marvelous task of the Historical Institute, all this is basically serving Portugal! (...) Serving Portugal undoubtedly means taking care not to attribute its glories to outsiders, and preventing the measures and initiatives, the efforts and sacrifices of the former metropolis from being distorted or undervalued through a lack of knowledge or surreptitious intentions.⁵⁴

Whether or not consideration was in fact given at the Historical Institute to pressing ahead with the mission entrusted to it by Eduardo Dias is a theme for future research. Everything suggests that the person who best performed those tasks was Gilberto Freyre. The Institute always insisted on the importance of the Portuguese origin in the formation of Brazilian national identity. However, the projected Portuguese-Brazilian cooperation did not in any way interfere with the commitment to write a common history based on the *unity of interpretation*, aspired to by Júlio Dantas. Nor even did it interfere with the aim of developing a historiographical project directed by the court of intellectuals gravitating around Salazar.

⁵⁴ Eduardo Dias, op. cit, p. 97.

APPENDIX

Table 2
List of the official delegates from Portugal and their respective papers

Author	Section	Title of Paper presented
Alberto Iria	1st 1st	• Bahia in the Arquivo Histórico Colonial de Lisboa (A Bahia no Arquivo Histórico Colonial de Lisboa) • The foundation of the General Government (A fundação do Governo Geral e o Arquivo Histórico Colonial de Lisboa)
Alfredo Mendes de Gouveia	6th	• The official papers of the Brazilian brotherhoods, confraternities and voluntary hospitals to be found in the Arquivo Histórico Colonial de Lisboa (Relação dos compromissos de irmandades, confrarias e misericórdias do Brasil, existentes no Arquivo Histórico Colonial de Lisboa)
Américo Pires de Lima	4th 4th 4th	• A note on some Bahian epidemics in the 17th century (Nota sobre algumas epidemias na Bahia (séc. XVII) • The illnesses in the voluntary hospital of Bahia in the 18th century (Atribuições da misericórdia na Bahia (séc. XVIII) • Notes on the 'Assembly of the Abandoned' of Bahia in the 18th century (Notas sobre a Roda dos Enjeitados na Bahia -- séc. XVIII)
Berta Leite	1st 1st 1st ^a 6th 6th 8th 8th 9th 9th	• Our History: inedited correspondence of Francisco Xavier de Mendonça Furtado (História Nossa: correspondência inédita de Francisco Xavier de Mendonça Furtado) • Brazil in the Index of Papal Bulls (O Brasil no Índice do Bulário Romano) • Salvador Correia de Sá e Benevides • D. Pedro Fernandes Sardinha • The ecclesiastic history of Brazil (História eclesiástica do Brasil) • José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva • Bartolomeu de Gusmão in the documentation to be found in Lisbon (Bartolomeu de Gusmão na documentação de Lisboa) • São João de Brito • Chancellery of Dom João III (Chancelaria de D. João III)
Damião Peres	4th	• Historical antecedents to the legislation concerning Brazilian gold (Antecedentes históricos da legislação concernente ao ouro no

		Brasil)
Eduardo Dias	1st 8th	• The Land of the True Cross (A Terra de Vera Cruz) • The inspections of Captain and Sergeant Major Diogo de Campos Moreno and the fortunes of brazil-wood in Ilhéus (Inspeções do capitão e sargento-mór Diogo de Campos Moreno e aventuras do pau brasil em Ilhéus)
Fernando da Silva Correia	4th	• Some hypotheses concerning the origin of the Assistency in American and Brazil (Algumas teses sobre as origens da assistência na América e no Brasil)
Hernani Cidade	8th	• Some notes concerning Antonio Teles da Silva (Algumas notas acerca de Antonio Teles da Silva)
Luís de Pina Manique	2nd	• The Luso-Brazilian convention of 1867 concerning Portuguese cartography (O Convênio luso-brasileiro de 1867 sobre cartografia portuguesa)
Luís Silveira	4th	• An episode in luso-brazilian commerce: the foundation of the Companhia da Ilha de Corisco (Um episódio do comércio luso-brasileiro: a fundação da Companhia da Ilha de Corisco)
Luísa da Fonseca	8th	• Biographical information on Brazilian university graduates (Bacharéis brasileiros – elementos biográficos)
Manuel Lopes de Almeida	1st 5th	• An account of the Pernambucan uprising of 1710 (Relação do levante pernambucano de 1710) • A document regarding the expedition of Duclerc to Rio de Janeiro (Um documento sobre a expedição de Duclerc no Rio de Janeiro)
Maria Izabel de Albuquerque	1st 6th	• Four documents from the Arquivo Colonial de Lisboa (Quatro documentos do Arquivo Colonial de Lisboa) • The Convento do Desterro in Bahia (O Convento do Desterro da Bahia)
Serafim Leite	8th 8th	• Bibliography of D. Fernão Cardim on the 4th centenary of his birth (Bibliografia de D. Fernão Cardim (no 4^o centenário do seu nascimento 1549/1949) • Bibliography of Padre Manuel da Nóbrega on the 4th centenary of the Jesuit arrival in Brazil, inaugurating public education and missionization of the Indians (Bibliografia do Padre Manuel da Nóbrega (no 4^o centenário da chegada dos jesuítas no Brasil, inaugurando o ensino público e a catequese dos índios)
Torquato Soares de Sousa	4th	• The land-seizing bandeirantes (Presores bandeirantes)

Source: Table drawn up from the contributions published in *Anais do IV Congresso de História*

Nacional, Rio de Janeiro: IHGB/ Imprensa Nacional, 1950-1951, 13v.

Copyright 2006, ISSN 1645-6432-Vol.4, number 2, Winter 2006

The Coimbra See and its Chancery in Medieval Times

Maria do Rosário Barbosa Morujão

University of Coimbra
rmorujao@gmail.com

Abstract

This article seeks to resume the main conclusions of the author's Ph.D. thesis on the Coimbra See as an institution and a chancery from 1080 to 1318. The institutional approach, examining the evolution of the history of the diocese and its bishops, the organisation of the chapter and the government of the diocese, establishes a context for the study of the cathedral chancery, seeking to discover not only the charters produced at that writing office and their composition, writing and practices of validation, but also the human side of the scribes who worked there.

Keywords

Portugal, Medieval History, Diplomatic history, Palaeography, Sigillography, Cathedral, Bishop, Chapter, Chancery

Resumo

Este artigo resume as principais conclusões da tese de doutoramento da autora, na qual é analisada a Sé de Coimbra enquanto instituição e chancelaria, desde 1080 a 1318. A Sé é estudada do ponto de vista institucional, abordando-se a evolução da história da diocese e dos seus bispos, a organização do cabido e o governo da diocese. Esta análise contextualiza o estudo da chancelaria da catedral, que procura conhecer não apenas os actos escritos nela produzidos e as práticas de redacção, escrita e validação seguidas nesse centro de produção documental, mas também o quadro humano dos escribas que nele trabalhavam.

Palavras-chave

Portugal; História Medieval; Diplomática; Paleografia; Sigilografia; Catedral; Bispo; Cabido; Chancelaria

The purpose of this article is to present the main conclusions of my Ph.D. thesis entitled *The Coimbra See: the institution and the chancery (1080-1318)*, which was defended at Coimbra University in July 2005. This work should be understood as part of a fresh approach to diplomatic history, no longer being limited to the determination of true from false (*veri ac falsi discrimen*) that originally defined its purpose, but interested instead in more complex and wide-ranging approaches, among them the production of written acts. These new paths laid out for the study of diplomatic history have also been followed in Portugal, where a growing number of works have appeared since the early 1990s regarding

the various writing offices, from the royal chancery to the public notary's office. As far as ecclesiastic chanceries are concerned, a Ph.D. thesis was presented in 1998 on the chancery of Braga Cathedral until the mid-13th century¹, and in 2000 another dissertation seeking the same academic degree provided further knowledge about the writing office of the Santa Cruz de Coimbra monastery, from its origins until the 14th century². The time has now come for this study of the Coimbra See's chancery to be made the subject of a Ph.D., from the diocese's restoration in c. 1080 to 1318, the year in which the last of the bishops included in this analysis died.

However, as the above title is intended to show, this dissertation is not limited to the study of the Coimbra See's chancery. In the first part, I have tried to make up for the absence of any precise and up-to-date monograph on the Coimbra diocese by conducting an institutional approach to the subject that allows me to contextualise the diplomatic analysis. In it, I briefly describe the evolution of the history of the diocese: the bishops that presided over it; the organisation of its chapter; and some of the main aspects of the episcopal government revealed by the documentation.

Located in the centre of Portugal, on the banks of the Mondego river and a little over 40km (25 miles) from the coast, Coimbra was known as Aeminium in Roman times. It received its new name in the High Middle Ages from Conimbriga, an urban centre located some 17km (10 miles) to the south and the seat of a diocese that already existed in the 6th century but that had probably been founded much earlier. In c. 580, the bishopric was transferred to Aeminium, since its geographical situation allowed for a better defence against the threat of invasion, and the city then took its name from the episcopal seat. This name was changed to Coimbra in the 9th century, by which time the city had been under Muslim rule since c. 715, interrupted by a brief period of Christian control for a little over 100 years, from 878 to 987, with its definitive reconquest taking place only in 1064.

The period that followed the city's recapture by the Christians, lasting until the mid-12th century, was marked by the extensive reorganisation of its political, administrative and ecclesiastical structures. The rule of the city and of the extensive territory under its dominion was given to the Mozarab Count Sesnando, a man well trusted by the King of Leon, Fernando Magno. Since Mozarabism played a key role in this region, the first bishop chosen was a Mozarab, Paterno, a former prelate of Tortosa, who was unable to travel to his new diocese directly upon receiving the invitation addressed to him after the Reconquest by the monarch and Count Sesnando, but who was already residing there in 1080 and remained in office until his death, in c. 1087. It was Paterno who took the first steps towards integrating Coimbra into the Christian peninsular world of that time, even though full integration was not to be achieved until Mozarabism was left behind and the Gregorian reform triumphed at the bishopric. In fact, the secular local traditions were in conflict with the papal policy of asserting the Roman church's hegemony over Western Christendom by standardising liturgical practices. The pontifical policy was seconded by that of the Hispanic emperor Afonso VI, who had family ties with St. Hugh of Cluny, favoured the Gregorian

¹ Cunha, *A chancelaria arquiépiscopal de Braga*, 2004.

² Gomes, *In limine conscriptionis. Documentos, chancelaria e cultura no mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra: séculos XII a XIV*, 2000.

reform and supported its leading actor in the Iberian Peninsula, Bernardo, the archbishop of Toledo (1086-1124†). After the death of Sesnando and the assimilation of the territory of Coimbra into the County of Portugal (after Afonso VI had handed the responsibility for its government to his son-in-law Henry of Burgundy), the monarch's main concern was to combine forces with the Catholic hierarchy in order to eradicate Mozarabism. To achieve this aim, political agents of French origin and prelates were chosen who had adopted the Gregorian reform and the Roman liturgy. Two of them, Maurício Burdino (bishop from 1099 to 1108) and Bernardo (who headed the diocese from 1128 to 1146), were among the group of Frankish clergymen that surrounded Bernardo of Toledo. The other two heads of the diocese during this period were of local origin, but they nonetheless adhered to the Roman cause: Crescónio (1092-1098†), generally identified as a monk from Arouca who became the abbot of a Benedictine monastery in Tui; and Gonçalo Pais (1109-1127†), son of an important noble family, who introduced the Roman rites into the liturgy and imposed the necessary chapter reforms to transform Coimbra into a cathedral governed according to the dictates of the Holy See.

This first period of the diocese's history was followed by a second one that lasted until the first few decades of the 13th century and was marked by continuous confrontations and rivalries between the cathedral and the Augustinian monastery of Santa Cruz. The monastery had been founded in c. 1130 on the outskirts of the city, and was supported by Prince Afonso Henriques, who had in the meantime taken charge of the County of Portugal. Almost immediately a tense relationship developed between the monastery and the see, since the monastery had been founded by clergymen who had abandoned the cathedral chapter to join the new institution and consequently the Crucians tried to evade the episcopal authority. During this period, five bishops succeeded each other at the Conimbriga See: João Anaia (1148-1155), Miguel Salomão (1162-1176), Bermudo (1178-1182†), Martinho Gonçalves (1183-1191†) and Pedro Soares (1192-1232), recruited either from among the members of the see's chapter or from among the canons of the Crucian monastery. The latter bishop in particular was a tireless defender of the interests of his cathedral, fighting for the recognition and strengthening of episcopal authority over all other powers, strongly influenced by the ideas of the Fourth Lateran Council that he had attended in 1215.

During a third period, there followed a series of strained relationships between royal authority (duly established in the meantime, since Portugal had been recognised as an independent kingdom in 1179) and ecclesiastic authority, resulting in a number of interventions being made in the selection of the prelates by both the monarchy and the papacy, since both parties sought to control the episcopacy and used the cathedral sees to promote and reward trustworthy clergymen. I now briefly present the prelates of this period and describe the way in which they were appointed to their office. The first bishop, Tibúrcio (1234-1246) was appointed directly by the Pope when the chapter's support was split between two candidates; his successor, Domingos, whose brief episcopacy ran for two short months in 1247, was chosen by the canonical college, as was Egas Fafes (1247-1267), who was very close to the court of Dom Afonso III and was later appointed by the Pope to the archbishopric of Compostela. With the throne having been left empty in curia, the Holy Pontiff chose the new bishop, Mateus (1268-1279), who until then had been

head of another Portuguese diocese, Viseu, and was at that time in the papal curia following a number of differences with the king. Mateus remained absent from his diocese throughout and was never even accepted by the chapter; he eventually returned to his previous office, and the Pope chose as his successor Aymeric d'Ébrard (1279-1295†), a Frenchman from Quercy. The prelate that followed, Pedro Martins (1296-1301†), was a former chancellor of Dom Dinis and thus the first clergyman close to the king to ascend to the throne of the Coimbra See. Although responsibility for his compromise election had been delegated by the chapter to three ecclesiastics, it is unlikely that the monarch would not have influenced it in some way, since we know from complaints lodged with the Pope by the clergy that he usually pressurised cathedral chapters into electing the candidates that he supported. Certainly, the same must have happened when the king's chancellor Estêvão Eanes Brochardo (1303-1318†) was chosen for the see, following after Fernando (1302-1303†), a prelate of Castilian origin appointed by the Pope after an inconclusive runoff election between two influential candidates who were both very close to the Portuguese crown.

These were the bishops who governed the diocese in the period that I am analysing, helped by a chapter that, over the course of these centuries, evolved in a very similar fashion to the canonical formations of most Hispanic cathedrals of the time.

Upon its establishment shortly after the restoration of the diocese, the Coimbra chapter was organised according to the precepts approved at the mid-11th century peninsular councils of Coiança and Compostela, recommending a communitarian lifestyle for the bishop and the members of the canonical college. The chapter was then composed by some ten members, with a prior being chosen from among them to take care of the various aspects of the canons' community life. It is known that by this time there was already a school at Coimbra cathedral, in anticipation of the recommendations of the III Lateran Council, convened in 1179.

However, in the first few decades of the 12th century, a separation was introduced between prelate and chapter. In c. 1116-1117, when bishop Gonçalo conducted a chapter reform seeking, as previously indicated, to bring the canonical organisation closer to the Gregorian dictates, membership of the chapter was set to 30, and a patrimonial division was established between the chapter and the prelate, following the usual principle of attributing two-thirds of the estate to the episcopal *mensa* and the remainder to the chapter. It is also known that the chapter was already autonomous enough to manage its own property well before the mid-12th century.

Simultaneously, there was a progressive secularisation of the canons' life. The prebend system was established around the 1170s, with the number of prebendaries peaking at 40 under bishop Martinho Gonçalves in 1187 or 1188. In the meantime, the reforms that the archbishop of Braga João Peculiar (1138-1175†) introduced into his cathedral between 1145 and 1165, not only led to the definitive division of property between that prelate and the Braga canonical chapter, but also, despite anticipating the continuation of community life, sped up the process of the chapter's secularisation. The Braga restructuring served as the model for all other Portuguese chapters, including that of Coimbra, which was reformed along the same lines under Pedro Soares (1192-1232).

The secularisation of the life of the chapter was definitively determined, in Coimbra as in several other Iberian cathedrals, by the statutory reform undertaken by papal envoy

Jean d'Abbeville, in 1229. The statutes with which he endowed the chapter remained in force generally until the 15th century; these statutes maintained the pre-existing 40 prebends, defined the number of dignitaries and their respective roles, and established a system of fines and the compulsory distribution of the liturgical service amongst the several members of the canonical college. From then on, the Coimbra chapter included eight dignitaries, listed here in decreasing importance:

- Dean – the oldest of the dignitaries, present since the chapter's foundation, designated in olden times by the title prior. The word "dean" only began to be used from 1184 onwards. The dean presided over the chapter, represented it and was responsible for its discipline, whilst also managing the chapter's assets. Entitled to three prebends if a canon, otherwise only to two.
- *Precentor* – documented in Coimbra since 1129. This figure was referred to explicitly in the statutes bestowed by Jean d'Abbeville as being responsible for the choir, chapter discipline and liturgical ceremonies. Received two prebends if a canon, forfeiting one if not.
- *Magister scholarum* – as already stated, there is evidence of a school being linked to the see ever since the chapter's foundation; however, the *magister scholarum* was not named as a dignitary before 1183, and the 1229 statutes assigned him the task of teaching grammar. Was entitled to two prebends, under the same terms as the *precentor*.
- Treasurer – also documented since 1183, although the office may have existed since 1162, the year in which there was mention of a sacristan, this being another possible title for this dignitary. He was in charge of sacred vessels and vestments, holy apparel and holy oils, as well the lighting of the church, incense and the tolling of the cathedral bell. Like the *precentor* and the *magister scholarum*, he also received two prebends.
- Archdeacons – the bishop's co-workers in the administration of the diocese. These were first documented in Coimbra in 1091, initially having a number that it has proved hard to establish, due to the scarcity of documents, but numbering four from the early years of the 12th century onwards. Each archdeacon was in charge of one of the four archdeaconries into which the bishopric was divided, and received one prebend.

Of the remaining prebends, one was set aside for the cathedral's *scriptorium* and another for its *fabrica*, leaving 25 prebends for the canons. Adding these to the eight dignitaries, a total of 33 chapter members is obtained, making this quite a large canonical body. However, the make-up of the chapter was to be altered with the introduction of new beneficiaries: portionaries, choir clergy and bachelors. Portionaries had been noted at least since 1232, and numbered six in total, all of them priests. They received half of the portion allotted to canons, had no voice within the chapter and could not participate in the elections for a new prelate. The choir clergy, also referred to for the first time in 1232, numbered twelve and seemed to have had as their main duties helping in the cathedral choir service and participating in intercessory prayer services for the dead. Little is known about the

bachelors, their number, or the reason for this designation, which was probably due to their academic degree; they are mentioned in documents as early as the mid-13th century.

To conclude the first part of my survey, I also tried to analyse the concrete actions of the prelates, by collecting data about the make-up of the episcopal bureaucracy and the ecclesiastical administration of diocesan territory (namely concerning the appointment of new parish priests, the consecration of churches, the fulfilment of diocesan synods and visits, and the granting of sacred orders), as well as about the performance of the episcopal court. The court was first organised in the early 13th century; initially being just a court used for trying cases under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, it gradually became a court responsible for the full government of the diocese, which, together with the bishop and the chapter also granted documents written by the cathedral's chancery.

It is the study of the chancery, i.e. the organ or service "charged with the composition, writing and validation of acts (...) ordered by the authority above it"³ – in this case, Coimbra cathedral – that, as previously stated, constitutes the subject of the second part of my thesis.

In order to study this subject, I analysed 506 documents, selected in accordance with strict and precise criteria, which allowed for the inclusion in the corpus exclusively of acts granted by the bishops, the chapter or the episcopal court and which were known not to have been executed either by a public notary or at writing offices other than that of the cathedral. This set of documents is made up mostly of originals (72%), which were written preferentially in Latin (85%). As far as the typology of such documents is concerned, which was established according to their content, charters granted on court matters (36.17%) and economic matters (31.03%) predominated throughout the corpus, though the latter declined in number as time went by, not only in favour of the former, but also in favour of documents dealing with the ecclesiastical administration of the bishopric, which make up 18.38% of the total. Besides these, 12.85% deal with subjects of a varied nature, and the remaining 1.58% are either statutory rules or deal with the organisation of the chapter.

As for the granters of such documents, 48.52% of the charters studied were ordered by the prelates, either on their own or together with the chapter or other personages or institutions. Although almost non-existent at the end of the 11th century, episcopal documents were in the majority during the 12th and 13th centuries, their numbers falling significantly in the 18 years of the 14th century that I also studied. This fall was mainly due to an increase in the written production from the court, which did not previously exist as a charter-granting court, but developed gradually thereafter to reach an overall percentage of 23.08% in the corpus. Finally, I mention the documentation of the chapter, i.e. all of the papers that survived from the 11th century and represent 28.40% of the total.

I have tried to compare the annual average documentary production of the see's chancery with that of other medieval cathedrals⁴. Although the figures available relate to

³ Cárceles Orti, *Vocabulaire international de la Diplomatie*, 1994.

⁴ These are the Portuguese cathedrals of Braga, Lamego and Viseu; the English cathedrals of Canterbury, London, Worcester, Norwich, Hereford, Coventry and Lichfield, Lincoln, Winchester, Bath and Wells, York, and Exeter; the cathedral of Tournai, in modern-day Belgium; Arras, Toul, Metz and Strasbourg in France; Münster and Halberstadt in Germany; Burgos in Spain; and the Hungarian cathedrals (data in Cunha, *A chancelaria arquiépiscopal de Braga*, 2004: 130 and 145; Gomes, *In limine conscriptionis*.

diverse chronologies and were obtained by differing methods depending on the institution supplying them, I believe that the comparative exercise is indeed profitable. Firstly, it enables us to note the great inequality between the production of each chancery; secondly, it demonstrates that the yearly average of 2.18 documents issued by the Coimbra See is well above 43% of the remaining averages (two documents a year at the most), while none of the chanceries with higher documentary outputs than Coimbra ever exceeded 4.44 charters per year (with one single exception). If I had not restricted the selection criteria of the corpus documents, and had also included charters addressed to the cathedral and drawn up by individual canons at another writing centre, the production of the Coimbra See would reach an even higher annual average — around 4.03 documents, which is higher than the score of 62.5% registered by other cathedrals. As fallible as they may be, these figures allow us to conclude that the see's chancery shows an average production that is well within the average — or maybe amongst the highest — of the time, both abroad and in Portugal.

The analysis of the evolution in the number of documents produced also enabled me to note that the chancery's written activity developed in accordance with the different moments in the history of the cathedral. Let us now look at this aspect through a couple of significant examples.

The late 11th century when, as I have said, the diocese's ecclesiastical structures were restored and reorganised, bequeathed us with a scanty number of documents, most of which were probably subject to forgery in the early decades of the 12th century, to favour the interests either of those prelates who defended Romanist ideals or those members of the chapter that were still controlled by Mozarabic elements and therefore reacted in this way to the reforms undertaken by the bishops. In the early 12th century, the sharp rise in the production of charters should be directly associated with the zeal of the French bishop Maurício Burdino (1099-1108), one of the mainstays behind the successful implantation of the Gregorian reform in the diocese. In the second half of that same century, the cutback in the number of charters follows the see's loss of influence during the briefly noted conflicts with the monastery of Santa Cruz. This situation was reversed under bishop Pedro Soares (1192-1232), and the chancery's written output recovered strongly, following the strengthening of the episcopal authority under this prelate and his organisation of the episcopal court as a granter of charters. There was then a visible and constant growth in the activity of the chancery during the 13th century, although this was regulated by fluctuations that can be explained through concrete events in the history of the diocese. For instance, the non-existence of any documents dated between February and April 1247, a period during which Domingos headed the bishopric, can only be explained in the context of the civil war that was raging at that time and forced the chapter to abandon Coimbra and seek refuge from the wrath of Dom Sancho II in nearby Montemor-o-Velho, since the see's bishop

Documentos, chancelaria e cultura no mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra, 2000: I, 858-860; Guerra, *Os diplomas privados em Portugal dos séculos IX a XII. Gestos e atitudes de rotina dos seus autores materiais*, 2003: 31; Haidacher, *Die Diplomatie der Bischofsurkunde vor 1250*, 1995: 159-177, 432; Parisse, *Les chartes des évêques de Metz au XIIe siècle. Étude diplomatique et paléographique*, 1976: 273; Pycke, *Le chapitre cathédral Notre-Dame de Tournai de la fin du XIe à la fin du XIIIe siècle. Son organisation, sa vie, ses membres*, 1986: 14).

Tibúrcio actively supported Prince Afonso's claim to the throne. Another interruption in the chancery's production of documents took place during the episcopacy of Mateus (1268-1279), the absentee bishop whom the chapter refused to recognise as a prelate and who didn't leave us with a single charter. In contrast, long and remarkable episcopacies such as those of Egas Fafes (1247-1267), Aymeric d'Ébrard (1279-1295†) and Estêvão Eanes (1303-1318†) were highpoints in the production of charters. However, the highest annual average production was recorded under Fernando (1302-1303†), the leader of a diocesan administration that was far too short for him to have left an enduring impression on the history of the see.

Just as Benoît-Michel Tock confirmed in his study of Arras⁵, this analysis led me to conclude that the chancery of the Coimbra See served the designs of episcopal politics, and that writing was a solid, supportive base for the prelates, who made growing use of it. The most significant — and also the least common — case is that of Estêvão Eanes Brochardo (1303-1318†). Absent from the diocese for long periods of time, Brochardo used writing as a way to rule, and thus opened an avenue of communication by letter with the officials of the chapter and the episcopal vicars, who supplied his intelligence and executed his orders.

The chancery had on its roster a body of officials, exact knowledge of whom is made difficult by the absence of any subscriptions left by the material authors of the documents in almost three quarters of the charters making up the corpus. Since, however, it is made up of a large majority of originals, I have been able to identify 71 scribes through a comparison of the handwriting.

I use the word "scribes" and not chancellors or *dictatores*. In fact, the word "chancellor" was not used in this chancery, and there are no signs of any division of labour between the composition and the actual writing of the charters. The existing data refers only to those people who, when subscribing their name to the documents, identified their action through the verbal forms *notavit*, *notuit*, *scripsit* or *conscripsit*.

This data allow us to clearly perceive two different periods in the structuring of the chancery's human staff. Until 1230, there seems to have been an incipient organisation, which essentially made use of the infrequent work performed by members of the chapter or of the episcopal household, or by other clergymen who were not connected to the service. From that decade onwards, on the contrary, there was a group of scribes who generally had lengthier careers and, as a rule, wrote a large number of documents. This group used designations that revealed their connection to the see's writing: between 1232 and 1285, they called themselves the bishop's, the chapter's or the see's *tabelliones* or *notarii*, and frequently used specific notarial signs to authenticate the charters they drew up, similar to the royal public notaries that Dom Afonso II appointed from 1210 onwards. The last of these scribes, João Eanes, used his sign and the title of *tabellio* until 1285; from then on, no official in the chancery (not even João Eanes himself, who continued writing until 1299) employed such a validation process, and all identified scribes used the title of *scriptores jurati* of the bishop's court.

It is certainly no coincidence that the *episcopal notarii*, in Coimbra just as in Braga and Viseu, first appeared around this same time, during the reign of Dom Sancho II, when

⁵ Tock, *Une chancellerie épiscopale au XIIIe siècle. Le cas d'Arras*, 1991.

the royal public notary's office created in the previous reign had all but disappeared. It is highly probable that the ecclesiastical authorities would have taken advantage of this disappearance to assume for themselves the right to set up their own public notaries⁶. However, such a right was to be claimed exclusively for the king's notaries after Dom Afonso III's rise to the throne and his consolidation of the public notary's office. This is made clear in a letter sent by the monarch to the officials of the Coimbra municipality in April 1277. Echoing a complaint made by the see's chapter and vicar that the municipal authorities prevented their notaries from recording any ecclesiastical matters in writing, the king's answer allowed them to maintain two scribes in their service, as long as they did not call themselves public notaries or seek to authenticate their documents by any sort of notarial sign.

The denomination *scriptores jurati* that had now come into force already existed but had seldom been used. From 1280 onwards, it was, as I said, applied to practically every scribe known by name who worked mainly for the episcopal court, although they could also do so for the bishop or the chapter. Furthermore, these *scriptores* almost systematically only subscribed their name to those charters drawn up for episcopal audiences, just as the *notarii* of the previous decades had done. The subscription of documents was less usual in episcopal and capitular acts, and, as a rule, was omitted from the time of the episcopacy of Pedro Soares (1192-1232). I believe this "notarial" subscription of documents was an unnecessary way of validating the charters granted by the bishop and the chapter, especially from the moment when the use of the seal became widespread, at the turn of the 12th to the 13th century, i.e. at precisely the same time as the anonymity of the material authors was imposed. The prelate's or the chapter's seals were enough in themselves to guarantee their authenticity, so the name of the actual scribe was not important. With the court, it was a different situation: the scribes intervened more fully, as demonstrated by the highly notifiatory style used in the charters issued by this court, thereby conferring upon the scribes the central role in the graphic rendering of the cases tried by the episcopal vicars; the subscription of such documents was therefore necessary to lend authenticity to the text.

Occasionally recruited clergymen, *notarii episcopi* and *scriptores jurati* were therefore, along with a large number of anonymous scribes whose names are unknown to us, responsible for executing the charters that issued from the see's chancery throughout the centuries studied. They did not do this without models, as is indicated by the repetition of structures and forms in many charters; the existence of any particular formula used for their composition is, however, unknown. My thorough clause-by-clause analysis of the diplomatic content of the charters retained in the corpus points to the existence of a larger vocabulary and greater formulaic variety until the end of the 12th century, followed by a tendency to simplify and standardise vocabulary, as indeed happened generally in every chancery at that time.

The texts were created in this way and then written on parchments that have survived the centuries in generally good condition. Although their sizes vary, their formats, almost always regular, are mostly *cartae non transversae*, meaning that they were written in lines parallel to the parchment's longer side. This format predominated especially during the

⁶ Nogueira, *Tabelionato e instrumento público em Portugal. Gênese e implantação (1212-1279)*. 1996: I, 188.

12th century, being gradually replaced in the following century by the *cartae transversae*. This evolution coincided with that generally seen in most Portuguese private charters, but runs contrary to the one found in the French and German territories⁷.

The script used on the parchments followed the graphic precepts of each era studied. In the late 11th and early 12th century, Visigothic script predominated, already influenced by the Caroline script that was to follow this from 1130 until the end of the 12th century, showing a growing influence of the Gothic style of handwriting that was to prevail afterwards. The scripts of this period are very close to their contemporary book hands; document hands followed with the 13th century, and, from 1250-1260 onwards, the cursive Gothic script that would be used in all subsequent charters became commonplace.

In the transition from the 12th to the 13th century, under bishop Pedro Soares, changes took place in the process used for the validation of documents: subscriptions, until then the favourite mode of authentication, were replaced in an almost systematic manner by pendent seals. Although bishop Miguel Salomão would have been the first to use a seal in the Coimbra See, in 1162, this form of validation only truly became widespread after Pedro Soares' episcopacy, during which the first chapter seal emerged. Thereafter, the chapter started authenticating the documents it granted with the seals of its presiding judges and vicars; only in 1283 did the court earn a seal of its own. In all, there exist seals on 77% of the charters in the corpus, and in over half of these cases, the seal was in fact the only form of validation used — numbers that clearly demonstrate the importance that seals acquired in this chancery, and justify the special attention that I have given to their study in my thesis.

All the Coimbra bishops chose the usual format of the double ogive for their seals. Most of them carried, as was usual at the time, an image of the prelate exhibiting the garments and insignia pertaining to his eminence, carrying the crozier in his left hand and raising his right hand in the gesture of blessing. Another type of figuration emerged in the second half of the 13th century, following a model then frequently used across the Pyrenees, presenting devotional scenes divided into several sections, similar to Gothic retables, and placing the image of the praying bishop in the lower part of the seal. This type of devotionally-themed seal was introduced not only into Coimbra, but, apparently, into the country as well, by Aymeric d'Ébrard (1279-1295†), who was also the first to use the counter-seal. Although his example was followed by several contemporary bishops in other Portuguese dioceses, only another foreign prelate, Fernando (1302-1303†), used these new sigillographic forms in Coimbra, as the two local bishops that followed him both preferred to use the traditional figuration, without a counter-seal. It is also important to mention bishop Pedro Soares' innovative early 13th-century seal; at a time when episcopal seals were still rather recent in Portugal, this seal dispensed with the representation of the prelate in a hieratic position in preference for a devotional scene: the Annunciation to the Virgin.

As for the chapter, it used a series of different seals throughout the first half of the 13th century, all of them shaped like a double ogive and featuring the same figurative motif: Our Lady, the cathedral's patron, almost always sitting, with the Baby Jesus in her lap. Around 1250, and until the end of the period studied, a new seal, very similar to the model previously described, prevailed, representing the Virgin and Child. The same theme

⁷ Guerra, *Os diplomas privados em Portugal dos séculos IX a XII. Gestos e atitudes de rotina dos seus autores materiais*, 2003: 110-111; Guyotjeannin, Pycke, Tock, *Diplomatique médiévale* 1993: 65.

was used in the early 14th century for a new chapter seal, rather more richly adorned in keeping with the Gothic style, but this was used to authenticate only a mere handful of documents before the previous seal, which had symbolised the see's chapter for so long, was reinstated.

The documents granted by the episcopal court were sealed with the matrices of the episcopal judges and vicars who presided over it until 1283. That date marks the first known instance of the personal seal created for the court by bishop Aymeric d'Ébrard, following the usual practices of the French episcopal courts.

After validation, the document was ready to be published and run its course. Thus ended the work of the chancery that had produced it, since the recording of those charters that had been executed was not a common practice at the Coimbra See. Thus ends my thesis too, whose main conclusions I have tried to summarise in this article. This is a thesis that seeks to contribute to our knowledge of the dioceses, the secular clergy and episcopal diplomatic history, uniting, in one study, two areas of research to which medievalists have been paying closer attention and which can indeed complement each other, as this approach seeks to prove. If it is not possible to understand the workings and the evolution of an episcopal chancery without understanding the history of the institution it served, the study of a cathedral is also enriched and finds new possibilities for analysis when associated with a diplomatic analysis of the *acta* it produced.

References

- Cárcel Ortí, María Milagros, ed. (1994). *Vocabulaire international de la Diplomatie*. València: Conselleria de Cultura. Universitat de València.
- Coelho, Maria Helena da Cruz [et al.] (2001). *Estudos de Diplomática Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Ed. Colibri. Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra.
- Costa, Avelino de Jesus da (1997-2000). *O bispo D. Pedro e a organização da arquidiocese de Braga*. 2 volumes. Braga.
- Costa, Maria Antonieta Moreira da (2000). *O cabido de Braga na segunda metade da centúria de Duzentos (1245-1278)*. Braga: Universidade do Minho.
- Cunha, Maria Cristina Almeida (2004). *A chancelaria arquiépiscopal de Braga (1071-1244)*. Noia: Editorial Toxosoutos.
- Farelo, Mário Sérgio da Silva (2003). *O Cabido da Sé de Lisboa e os seus cónegos (1277-1377)*. 2 volumes. Lisbon: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Gomes, Saul António (2000). In *limine conscriptionis*. *Documentos, chancelaria e cultura no mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra: séculos XII a XIV*. 2 volumes. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra.
- Guerra, António Joaquim Ribeiro (2003). *Os diplomas privados em Portugal dos séculos IX a XII. Gestos e atitudes de rotina dos seus autores materiais*. Lisbon: Centro de História da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Guyotjeannin, Olivier; Pycke, Jacques; Tock, Benoît-Michel (1993). *Diplomatique médiévale*. Turnhout : Brepols.
- Haidacher, Christoph; Köfler, Werner, eds. (1995). *Die Diplomatie der Bischofsurkunde vor 1250. La Diplomatie épiscopale avant 1250*. Innsbruck.

- Lima, Maria Justiniana Pinheiro Maciel (2003). *O cabido de Braga no tempo de D. Dinis (1278-1325)*. Cascais: Patrimonia.
- Marques, José (1988). *A arquidiocese de Braga no século XV*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional Casa da Moeda.
- Marques, José, ed. (1996). *Diplomatique Royale du Moyen Âge. XIIIe-XIVe siècles. Actes du Colloque*. Porto: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto.
- Morujão, Maria do Rosário Barbosa (2005). *A Sé de Coimbra: a instituição e a chancelaria (1080-1318)*. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra.
- Nogueira, Bernardo de Sá (1996). *Tabelionato e instrumento público em Portugal. Génese e implantação (1212-1279)*. 3 volumes. Lisbon: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Parisse, Michel (1976). *Les chartes des évêques de Metz au XIIe siècle. Étude diplomatique et paléographique*. *Archiv für Diplomatik*, 22: 272-316.
- Pycke, Jacques (1986). *Le chapitre cathédral Notre-Dame de Tournai de la fin du XIe à la fin du XIIIe siècle. Son organisation, sa vie, ses membres*. Louvain-la-Neuve/Brussels.
- Santos, Maria José Azevedo (1994). *Da visigótica à carolina. A escrita em Portugal de 882 a 1172 (aspectos técnicos e culturais)*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Tecnológica.
- Saraiva, Anísio Miguel de Sousa (2003). *A Sé de Lamego na primeira metade do século XIV (1296-1349)*. Leiria: Ed. Magno.
- Ribeiro, João Carlos Taveira (1998). *A instituição capitular bracarense no século XIV (1325-1374)*. Braga: Universidade do Minho.
- Távora, Luís Gonzaga de Lancastre e (1983). *O estudo da sigilografia medieval portuguesa*. Lisbon: Instituto de Cultura e Língua Portuguesa.
- Tock, Benoît-Michel (1991). *Une chancellerie épiscopale au XIIe siècle. Le cas d'Arras*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales.
- Vilar, Hermínia Vasconcelos (1999). *As dimensões de um poder. A diocese de Évora na Idade Média*. Lisbon: Ed. Estampa.

The Urgent Empire Portugal Between 1475 and 1525

António dos Santos Pereira

University of Beira Interior
apereira54@sapo.pt

Abstract

After a survey of the natural resources in the different areas of the Portuguese territory, the effects of the overseas expansion on these sectors were studied. An excessive demand was noted, given the scale of the available resources, together with the general incapacity to rapidly replace them. The serious involvement of all social classes in the realm's principal political projects was demonstrated, as well as the existence of leaderships and the financial and technical resources necessary for ensuring Portuguese primacy in European expansion. Urgency justified the over-exploitation of resources and the heavy tax burden, but it also compromised the country's future, with its small metropolitan space proving incapable of sustaining a lengthy revitalization effort, hence the title of this paper.

Keywords

Portuguese economic history, Portuguese crafts and industry, Portuguese production, Portuguese natural resources

Resumo

Depois de proceder ao levantamento de todos os recursos nos diferentes espaços portugueses, conferem-se os reflexos da expansão planetária nos mesmos. Nota-se uma procura excessiva para a dimensão dos recursos disponíveis e a incapacidade da sua rápida substituição. Demonstra-se um sério empenho de todas as camadas sociais nos principais projectos do reino e a existência de lideranças, meios financeiros e técnicos para a primazia na expansão europeia. A urgência justificava a sobreexploração e fiscalidade agravada, mas comprometia o futuro do país, com um espaço metropolitano pequeno, incapaz de esforço longo de revitalização, daí o título.

Palavras-chaves

Indústria, espaço, recurso, produto, procura

I recently published a two-volume study, *Portugal. O Império Urgente*, which was the result of my Ph.D. thesis (Pereira, 2003). My work considered the manufacturing sector of the Portuguese economy in the period 1475-1525, a subject that had previously not been given an appropriate treatment. This much-needed fresh approach had become justified after both an analysis of the different manufacturing activities and a survey of formidable piles of documents had

been undertaken by Sousa Viterbo, an effort in which he was accompanied by Anselmo Braamcamp Freire, and I continued to pay attention to the records and inventories of the assets of diverse institutions and personalities, as well as to other documentation, with the aim of covering the whole country. Such a study seemed attractive since, at the time, there were transformations taking place that were decisive for the evolution of humankind and of Portugal in particular. Some of the changes included the increasing development of urban life, constituting a revolution that took place in the late 15th and early 16th century, as a result of which, sooner or later, the economies of all western countries would develop from an urban to a national phase and from autarky to specialization. The further consequence of this was the appearance of certain capitalist, commercial and industrial concentrations that contributed towards a more rapid development in consumption and led to an improvement in the quality of life of ever wider social strata.

During this period, there was undoubtedly progress made in agricultural productivity, with the development of speculative crops, and in some manufacturing industries, namely textiles, mining and quarrying, and metallurgy. It has also already been demonstrated that, at the time, changes were brought about, albeit more slowly, in people's ways of thinking, through the appearance of new social, economic and religious values that were significantly different from the preceding ones. In particular, I considered it important to consider the new aspects that had been introduced into the area of manufacturing and which were characterized by large-scale investments of fixed capital and an intensive use of labor. Such investments were caused by the pressure of increased demand, resulting from the greater population growth, the resurgence of large metropolises, the prosperity of some social strata and the establishment of the mercantilist state, both within and beyond national borders. Although this is more difficult to account for, an assessment should also be made of the production of small family businesses, i.e. simple workshops, especially when these were operating within larger markets through the agency of merchant-financiers from a royal factory or trading station, or as a result of their proximity to important fairs or markets. In this way, the group of activities I investigated was formed from the so-called primary industries, which processed raw materials said to be strategic, in order to respond to the basic needs and protection of the population: food, clothing, housing and metallurgy. Special attention was paid to those industries arising either from national forms of economic specialization or from state projects: in the former case, salt extraction, food preservation, cloth-fuling, tanneries and sawmills; and, in the latter case, metallurgy, smelting, shipbuilding and biscuit-making. The insistence on this last group of industries makes it possible to contradict J. Vicens Vives, who claims that the transition to the modern type of monarchy began in Western Europe with the great naval expeditions undertaken by the Emperor Charles V against the Turks in 1535 (Vicens Vives, 1984: 213). In fact, the arguments advanced make it possible to bring that date forward by a few decades, if not to the reign of the "perfect Prince" (Dom João II), at least to the reign of Dom Manuel I. The need to arm more men, to accumulate weapons, supplies and money in a certain place, and the prevalence of specific technical and financial requirements imposed by the administration upon the more cumbersome and static mediaeval inheritance had already been widely noted in the case of these two Portuguese kings. In their governmental practices, it is possible to note the crown's intervention in all sectors of the economy, in agriculture, industry, trade and finance, in society in general, in welfare, culture and the tutelage of administrative and religious institutions. More generally, the early modern era came into being simultaneous to the loss of importance of the Mediterranean world and the discovery of the splendor of the Atlantic world, to which Portugal acted as a gateway.

This rough outline of the geography of 16th-century Portuguese production causes us to move up another step to the interpretative level. In fact, more than simply describing and justifying the past, it is the historian's role to clarify and explain the present. In mapping the distribution of the country's manufacturing capacity, the regions that are shown are those that had a tradition of manufacturing and an industrial culture, capable of forming a local productive system that was "coherent, integrated and diversified", together with regions where there was a single industry, without the capacity to change direction and "highly dependent on the market of one product and the evolution of a certain technology" (Reis, 1992: 91). Thus, particular regional situations can be observed, showing the poles of development and the industries that acted as driving forces, the regions' particular ways of life, namely their means of production, and urban and rural characteristics; and consideration can also be made of costs, energy and transport. Besides the description thus provided of the means and resources available, agents and paths of development can also be identified.

The historiographical tradition that is open to the contributions of the social sciences dictates that the production process should be studied with the instruments provided by Anthropology and Economics: with the aid of the former, the specific forms of the culture of production and its symbolic expression are revealed; with the latter, the overall movements are revealed, with attention being paid to savings, investment, consumption and production in combination with social reproduction. Ambitiously, I have positioned myself on the path followed by Braudel, at the crossroads where Geography intersects with History, with the aim of studying the movements of Man and his implantations, his social relations and his production. My attempt to demonstrate Portuguese productive capacity during the period in question is therefore justified, for in the meantime two other maritime cities similar to Lisbon had become industrialized: Venice and London.

The investigation of events occurring at the start or end of the process was not set up as an immediate objective, although there was no shortage of such events. In fact, in this area, in order to gain an overall view, it seemed preferable to accompany the progress of economic complexes in Portuguese territory. However, at the beginning of the period proposed for this study, the king's *dirigisme* of all economic movements in the realm and the empire, with its inevitable social, political, administrative and productive implications, presupposed an early option for mercantilism. The subjection of the transactions of foreign agents operating within the realm to the control of the Crown, the mobilization of resources for royal projects, the attention consequently paid to the accounting of these resources and the investments made in the fleets, were all measures that derived from such an option. Seen from another perspective, attention is drawn to the successive years of the cereal crisis, 1472-1478 (Marques, 1978: 222 and 275-277). If, even so, my intention were to highlight any one particular event, I would point to the bankruptcy of the policy of Portuguese peninsular supremacy over Castile followed by Dom Afonso V and clearly manifested in the Battle of Toro on 2 March, 1476. The end of this process was marked by the marriage between Dom João III and Princess Catarina of Spain in 1525 or by the agreement signed over the Moluccas, The Treaty of Saragossa, signed in 1529, occurring in the same decade as the one in which Portugal reached its apogee and its ships set sail for the most remote corners of the earth.

The whole period analyzed was marked by the arrival of great volumes of gold in the realm, roughly 700 kilograms per year between 1480 and 1520, according to Pierre Vilar and V. M. Godinho, and a rise in prices in the second quarter of the same period (Vilar, 1974: 92 and 109). As far as the size of the geographical space considered is concerned, due to the knowledge of

other studies covering the whole of the Portuguese territory for later periods, it was decided to choose the same space for the period from the late 15th to the early 16th century, confirming the existence of a national economic space with longstanding industrial traditions. It is therefore accepted that, in the period under analysis, there was already a national economy that had superimposed itself on the regional and local economies and acted as a catalyst for them through its central driving force: Lisbon.

It seems to have generally been proved that the last quarter of the 15th century in Portugal began with some very cold, wet years and that the decade beginning in 1483 was marked by particularly harsh weather throughout Europe. During these years, the inland regions of the country were covered by extensive snowfalls, reaching well into the south of Portugal, as happened, for example, in Évora in 1490. However, from the end of the 15th century until the mid-16th century, Portugal enjoyed a favorable period of weather. Under the influence of a hot phase, 1495-1555, Europe only experienced one extremely harsh winter during this period, that of 1505-1506, which was to leave its negative marks on the Iberian peninsula with the plague that affected several important cities: Évora, Lisbon, Porto and Seville. Less cruel, but still very wet, were the winters of 1502-1503 and 1519-1520. The Guadiana valley was hit by a drought in 1513, as were other areas of the country in 1515 and 1516. Mafra, Óbidos, Santarém and certainly a large part of the country were affected by drought and famine in 1521-1522. However, the link between bad years in climatic terms and the spread of epidemics cannot always be established. It is not known whether the climatic conditions lay at the origin of the epidemics of 1519 and 1525, in Lisbon, and 1523, in Palmela. Unlike 1497, the years 1498, 1514 and 1515 were favorable ones, whilst the rest can be considered normal.

There is a shortage of information regarding the demographic size of Portugal at the beginning of the early modern era. Testimonies from the time point to an apparent lack of people: difficulties in occupying the islands; the settlement of some of the islands by foreigners; and the development of slave markets. However, the first decades of the 16th century were a time of expansion and allowed for the peopling of different Portuguese areas. Besides the data provided by the first attempts to enumerate the population, carried out between 1527 and 1532, other more limited data has since been discovered about both previous and later dates. From the information thus gathered, it can be concluded that, at the end of the period, there were roughly 1,200,000 inhabitants living in the country. Surveying Portugal as a whole, it has proved possible to document a positive demographic evolution for the country, most notably in the Minho and even for some regions of Trás-os-Montes. The Beira province achieved a remarkable rate of growth in the first three decades of the 16th century, covering the length and breadth of its area. This growth rate was slower in the rural areas of the Estremadura province, by virtue of the attractive pull that the capital city exerted over this district. The Alentejo also grew over this period, albeit with a lower rate of growth than the different regions in the north of the country. Amongst the most densely populated European cities, Lisbon stood out as the place of residence of investing elites, nobles and plebeians.

Throughout the late 15th century and the first few decades of the 16th century, the Portuguese crown acted as the principal agent of the imperial economy through its main factories in Mina and Bruges/Antwerp and the trading houses set up in Lisbon: the Casa de Ceuta, Casa da Guiné, Casa da Mina and Casa da Índia. The Recebedoria da Especiaria da Casa da Índia (the spice tax collector's office of the House of India) and the Tesouraria das Rendas do Reino (the Treasury of the Rents of the Realm), acting as intermediaries between income and expenditure, settled the state's accounts. Throughout the period, the accountants of the Royal Household acted

as important centers for financial operations, receiving deposits of the rents from many different institutions and paying pensions, settlement relief and salaries and making purchases. Their respective financial assets and other sources of remuneration, such as sugar and pepper, substantially increased at the turn of the 15th to the 16th century, making it possible to effect payments, as was convenient, all over the realm, through customs houses, exchequers, ports, stores, Lisbon trading houses and tax collection offices. The greatest amounts of money were not allocated to the industrial sphere, but instead to the structures involved in representation and consumption. Nonetheless, one should not overlook the lucrative commercial investments made by those who were responsible for these institutions. The creation of genuine industrial estates and chains of production in the suburbs of the main urban centers depended greatly upon such investment. The dockyards of Porto, Aveiro, Foz do Mondego, Pederneira, Peniche and Lisbon, where monarchical intervention was coupled with the investment of private citizens, built up local systems of production based on both national and international financial investments. In the same way, the armories of Santarém, Lisbon and Évora, the Casa da Pólvora (gunpowder store) and the Fornos da Porta da Cruz (biscuit-making ovens) in Lisbon, and the windmills and ovens of Vale do Zebro mobilized and dealt with large sums of money.

The great merchants-financiers, particularly those originating from Italian cities, controlled the circulation of the principal Portuguese products. They were represented by their family relatives at the Portuguese entrepôts: Lisbon, Funchal, Évora etc. By advancing money on the settlement relief or pensions of nobles and senior officials, they were able to intervene in the industrial sphere. The trade in salt, wine, cereals and sugar depended greatly upon them. Participation in the fleets coming from India gave them access to other more profitable goods, namely spices, after some of them had already made a fortune out of the slave trade. Capable of requesting the minting of gold and silver, they could also make payments in bills of exchange that were to be discounted in Lisbon or abroad. There is no evidence of their involvement in the formation of farming businesses or in the installation of equipment, except occasionally through their involvement in the manufacturing and containerization of the products that they traded in. Here, with relative ease, it was the ecclesiastical institutions that intervened, as well as the members of the nobility, at the highest levels, following the example set by the king. The visits of the leaders of the Military Orders to all the commanderies of the realm and the inventories made of ecclesiastical property during the period in question required investment in the whole of the housing stock, storage and manufacturing facilities, using quality materials. The demand for income, avoiding usury, encouraged the holders of capital to invest in the purchase of property and in subletting. The common practice was for the money-lender to purchase property that he would then leave in the hands of the seller, with the latter thereby becoming a tenant under lease and providing a return on the invested capital at a rate of between 5% and 7% per year. The financing of the transport of products, generally in the form of a limited partnership, led to the involvement of other social strata, besides merchants.

Also in the urban centers, and particularly in the largest cities, Lisbon, Porto and Coimbra, the town councils revealed a solid capacity in the allocation of their revenue: rents from their own property; taxes on commercial activity, and police fines. The increase in their revenue seems to have been particularly evident in the first few years of the 16th century. The building of town halls of great nobility in the main towns and cities of the realm, Lisbon, Porto, Tavira etc., testifies to this fruitful investment of resources. There was also tremendous municipal investment to be noted early on in this period in the building of roads, the supply of water (through a system

of pipes and public fountains), the placement of clocks on church towers, and the provision of sanitation facilities.

Of another kind, but also much larger, due to the greater income available, were the investments made in the religious spaces of the urban world, by bishops and particularly by the chapters of cathedrals. However, the absence of some heads of the church in Rome meant that a great deal of money was drained off and sent abroad. All around the country, various religious institutions claimed a monopoly of the revenue from worship. Thus, just like the court and the palaces of certain figures from the high nobility, ecclesiastical establishments were transformed into centers of relative consumption, obtaining goods in return for the granting of privileges, perhaps because they frequently housed figures from the high nobility. On a smaller scale, in rural areas, financial investment almost all fell to the brotherhoods and the chapels set up in churches. The churches accumulated assets through mortgages, but also through alms and money left to them in wills. Unpaid debts continued to cause problems. In fact, in certain cases, difficulties were to be noted in the payments made in cash. It seems that hoarding at the above-mentioned institutions, as well as amongst the urban elites, almost always contributed to deflation. The recovery of human resources through the release of prisoners and the purchase of slaves, besides the ethical and religious dimensions thereof, caused the same economic effect. The building of many large ecclesiastical buildings, all over the realm and overseas, with the involvement of the respective patrons, who were always responsible for the chancels, also drained off large sums of money from the common people, who were responsible for the main bodies of the churches. Thus, the clearly documented increase in demand took place with a serious concern for the financial resources that were spent on this.

The whole period can be considered one of monetary stability. The *real* became the unit of account after the reform of 1435-36, being made of silver until 1511 and later of copper. The least valuable coin in the monetary system was the *ceitil*, which, after 1485, corresponded to one sixth of the value of the *real*. The Portuguese currency included a gold coin of international prestige, the *cruzado*, and another one of great intrinsic value, the *português*. The former was worth 390 *reais* and the latter 3900 *reais* during the period in question. It was more difficult to find equivalents in the use of silver coins. However, after 1485, two important coins began to circulate made of this metal: the *vintém* (worth 20 rs.) and the *meio vintém* (10 rs.). Another coin, which gained some space for itself, was the *tostão*, originally minted in both gold and silver, with a value of roughly one quarter of a *cruzado* or five *vinténs*. The concern with the movement abroad of good coins and the entry into the country of bad coins led the kings to introduce successive reforms into the monetary system.

At the end of the 15th century, the costs of minting gold and silver coins were high in Portugal: 4 *reais* per *cruzado*. In view of the protests, in 1498 Dom Manuel I fixed the prices and established a suitable set of rules for the Lisbon mint, issuing new coining dies, appointing new officers, assayers and examiners, and making it compulsory for the longest-serving officers to retire. The crown's eminent overseeing of the officers of the Mint guaranteed them privileges against the interference of local authorities and ensured the quality of the services provided there even to the private individuals who requested the minting of silver and gold coins. The shortage of silver in the last decade of the 15th century, which called for the attribution of tax exemptions and the mortgaging of some of the main products of the realm, namely cork and leather, to foreign exporters through the granting of monopolies, seems to have been overcome during the reign of Dom Manuel I. Each year, roughly 30 000 marks in weight of silver were minted at the Lisbon Mint. In 1515, the gold of private citizens amounted to more than 414 marks, from which 26

831 *cruzados* were minted. At the end of the first decade of the 16th century, Lisbon continued to follow the Florentine rules on the assaying, purification and fineness of gold coins. In the second half of the 15th century, the Porto Mint continued to be in operation and, in the first years of the 16th century, a substantial quantity of copper coins (*ceitis*) were minted there, although these were rarely accepted in payments. However, the processing of this metal into coins, carried out in the three main cities of the realm, Lisbon, Évora and Porto, was never conducted on a large scale. It was more common for small payments to be effected in silver. Even the treasurers of the Casa da Mina and the Casa da Índia resorted to the Lisbon Mint to exchange gold for silver. The *tostão* was used in the payment of medium-sized amounts in the rural world. The agents of certain high-ranking nobles agreed upon the replacement of *cruzados* with *vinténs*. Silver cups were also used as payment for business deals throughout the realm. In Safim, the local population preferred to receive payments in silver. In Cape Verde, goatskins were used as a form of remuneration. In the same way, salaries in Santa Cruz were also complemented with animal hides. Further south, in São Tomé, payments were made with slaves. In Sofala, bracelets made of brass replaced the coins made of noble metal. Primary liquidity made it possible for the great merchants to make advances to the crown and to the houses of the high-ranking nobility, guaranteed by the settlement relief paid in market products at the exchequers and factories of the realm and the islands. Madeiran sugar was particularly sought after. Contracts made in pepper were also commonplace.

Besides the coinable metals, all the materials linked with shipbuilding and the military industry, as well as the components of the staple diet, bread and meat, were considered as raw materials or already semi-products or strategic products, with restrictions being imposed upon their export from the realm. The *Ordenações Manuelinas* (the royal law or Ordinances of Dom Manuel I) reinforced, in this regard, the *Ordenações Afonsinas* (the Ordinances of Dom Afonso V), although they presented new arguments. Such legislation afforded the commercial monopoly over these products to the king, who persecuted all individual initiatives. The centralization of the management of mercantile transactions also took place in neighboring Spain, creating serious difficulties for the supply of certain raw materials that were needed in the Portuguese realm, namely saltpeter and iron.

Obviously, the production chain of most goods was based on agriculture. The equipment was increased with the plowing of what had previously been wasteland and the digging of ditches in marshy areas. The empire's roads, population centers and strategic bases were generally located in those areas where the availability of energy resources intersected with agricultural land. In the suburbs, the forces of specialization in the rural environment were faced with the multiple responses required by the cities, so that entrepôts were formed there for the transfer of people, goods and technology. These areas, offering a privileged kind of intervention to the newly emerging personalities, benefited from large-scale investment, with resources there being committed to industry and leisure. As the cities began to spread, some already installed production facilities withstood these changes, while others were moved to the country, especially to places where there was an abundance of water and wood. The pollution that was caused close to residential areas made landlords alert to the spread of epidemics, particularly at critical periods. Short-term leases, the whims of the owners of facilities and equipment, as well as acts of violence, dictated the need for change.

Long processes of accumulation and technical consolidation in production equipment and professional workers were noted, despite periods of stagnation or dramatic situations of disaggregation. The former accumulation processes were almost always based on the existence of one product, such as salt, linen, wool and metal, and the availability of energy resources; the latter

periods resulted from the effects of natural crises, and the failure of demand to adapt to the situation, the collapse of chains of production and the break-up of the industrial infrastructure. The quality and size of the market called for specialization and guaranteed survival, even at critical moments. The greater concentration of industry in some regions was due to a variety of reasons: a technical culture that had been built up over centuries, centered upon taking advantage of energy resources, through mills, particularly tidal mills in Aveiro, in the lower Mondego valley, the Tagus and Sado valleys and the Algarve's Sotavento or eastern region; the availability of raw materials, such as the wood of pine trees in the Setúbal peninsula, iron in Tomar and Torre de Moncorvo, linen and wool in the mountainous regions, along the valley of the River Mondego and the tributaries of the River Douro; interactions and catalyzing complementarities, for example, salt, cereals, biscuits, olive-oil, wine, meat and animal skins and hides; as well as the ease with which goods could be stored and distributed and the proximity of large population centers with dynamic elites.

The volume of tax revenue confirms the densities of local manufacturing structures. The many tax-receiving bodies in Lisbon attained annual quantities that were incomparable throughout the realm, a situation which can be explained by the manufacturing capacity and consumption levels to be found there, but also by the rapid turnover of businesses and the high price of toll rates. However, the revenue of the exchequer of the city of Guarda greatly exceeded that of identical districts: Porto, Guimarães, Ponte de Lima, Coimbra, Estremoz, Setúbal and Torre de Moncorvo, in the same way that the wealth of the productive capacity in the Beira-Serra region was equally confirmed in demographic terms. However, in Porto, many of the rents belonged to the city's chief landlord, the respective bishop, and were exempt from the payment of royal taxes. In effect, in the northern capital of Portugal, the high revenue resulting from the pension of the notaries public was without comparison in the rest of the country. In the Algarve, the taxes levied on the fishing of tuna reached high values. The undertaking of royal building works was rarely reflected in fiscal gains.

The increase in revenue seems to have become fairly generalized from the middle of the second decade of the 16th century onwards. However, in some cases, this increase began earlier, immediately after the serious epidemic of 1505-1507. In other cases, such as Setúbal, it had started from the very beginning of the 16th century, since the epidemic had not been felt there and the action of the Master of the Order of Santiago had provided incentives for this, despite the later period of stagnation. The increase was to be explained by the demographic growth that was recorded, the stricter tax system applied after the revision of the charters and the updating of leases, the increased productivity and also the rising prices and the devaluation of the currency.

In Lisbon, inflation running at roughly 15%, namely in the price of meat, was reflected in the increase in tax revenue from 1509 onwards. Three years later, the sharp rise of 25% in the price of both mutton and beef explains the further rise in revenues. The administrative control of prices throughout the realm at the same date resulted in an upward movement. The downside of all this was the negative effect that high prices had on the less fortunate. Such effects were widely felt in urban spaces, especially in Lisbon, Funchal and the towns of the Algarve, where the cost of daily bread was twice that charged in the rural world, namely in agricultural areas. Curiously, in Sofala, certain foodstuffs exported from the realm, such as cheese, increased fivefold in price, whilst the price of liquids, olive oil and beverages, increased more than tenfold. Magistrates benefited from the first great pay rise. Certainly, the increase in the value of contracts of the works of master builders also preceded that of basic provisions. However, once the effects of the epidemic of 1505-1507 had been overcome, the prices of manufactured products did not accompany the prices of

the former. It is therefore reasonable to bring the date of the beginning of the price rises in Lisbon, as proposed by Magalhães Godinho and others, further forward. According to Damião de Góis, inflation resulted from the speculative activity of the tax farmers, particularly the New Christians, as far as cereals were concerned, and of the great cattle breeders, in the case of meat. As remedies, this famous humanist pointed to foreign examples: the payment of tax contributions in money and a better distribution of cattle-breeding throughout the country, with the number of cattle breeders being increased by limiting the number of animals that each one could keep. The complication of receiving such revenue, particularly noticeable in the large urban centers, led to the appearance of the first specialists in taxation matters.

The drawing up of the records of property from the end of the reign of Dom João II and the reform of the charters restored many of the forgotten tax contributions and updated others in the sense of leading towards their normalization. The frequent visits of the representatives of the landlords had the same effect. The residents on the estates of certain monasteries and of streets under lease in towns were subject to exceedingly heavy impositions, with personal services being maintained on working days on manorial estates, in the transport of crops and in the conservation of equipment. In the case of some products, such as olive oil, the system whereby the farmer who leased the land paid the owner for the privilege was commonplace. The share of taxation amounted to generally one-third of production and rent. In the case of long-term leases, the taxes levied on agricultural production varied between one-quarter and one-tenth. The former value was the one most often levied on old farming land, which was therefore of better productive quality, reserved as the property of the great lords of the manor, whilst the latter value was levied on more recent land or land that was still being cleared or inhabited. The Military Orders charged such taxes on a widespread basis. Besides this contribution, the farmer was subject to the payment of other taxes further down the production process, which generally doubled his tax burden.

Manufacturing activity was subject to the so-called *conhecença*, a form of ecclesiastical revenue that was levied as a personal tithe, paid by the different craftsmen and the productive structure, namely olive-presses and mills, depending on their manufacturing capacity. To the clergy, it seemed opportune to receive such money at the time of confession, in Holy Week, despite the general mutterings that could be heard. The manufacture of cloth, in the weaving and fulling phases, was also subject to taxation, almost always paid in the form of product in some areas of the country. Besides these taxes on production, the taxpayer was subject to a broad set of royal duties, charged on the sale of goods and collected by the officers of the crown, or else allotted as a concession: claims, loans, transit charges, tolls, lodgings, services, conveyance taxes, as well as halves, thirds, fourths and fifths of rents, etc. Not even the ecclesiastical tithes were exempt since the war in Africa justified the incidence of the so-called *terças* (one third payment) on these. Municipal income was also subject to *terças* for the financing of public works and the payment of wages. The commanders of the orders were supposed to pay one-quarter of their respective income. In fact, the king felt the need to constrain everyone for the sake of equipping the realm at the request of the municipal representatives at the *Cortes* held in 1498. Not even death escaped the tax demands of the lords of the manor. Measures of cereal and wine, heads of cattle or the most valuable pieces of jewelry, belonging to the deceased, were used to satisfy the demands of the implacable landlords. The purchase of tombs in churches made death even more expensive.

An incentive for sugar production was provided by the alteration that occurred in Madeira in 1507, when the quarter tax, paid at home by the farmers, was transformed into a fifth, paid at the Customs' House, possibly in order to avoid evasion and leading to savings on transport costs on the part of the king's tenant farmers. In the realm as a whole, the merchants of some towns and

villages with a great productive capacity benefited from the exemption of having to pay toll charges in many places: amongst such towns, almost always the ones that are cited, were those of Covilhã and Guimarães. Perishable products were also allowed to circulate without the payment of taxes. The same thing happened with the basic provisions and excellent raw materials destined for typical manufactures in certain towns and villages, such as, for example, silk used for manufacturing purposes in Bragança and iron in Teixoso. The customs duties on goods meant the payment of a tithe generally paid in cash by Portuguese importers and in kind by the foreigners. Tax evasion seems to have made use of a false re-exporting of cloth to the islands. In effect, at the ports in northern Portugal, merchants requested exemptions under this very pretext.

In short, it can be said that, in the transition from the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Era in Portugal, it was possible to find the necessary ingredients for global expansion: men, skills, motivation and strategic raw materials. The activation of the resources of the realm and the islands continued to be pursued, with a paradoxical exhaustion of these same resources in all spaces. Until the end of the period, no serious ruptures were to be noticed whether in demographic terms, in the renewal of the labor force, or in terms of raw materials. Productive capacity was consolidated by guaranteeing the supply of basic provisions and manufactured articles. The land continued to be cleared, together with the drainage of the marshland areas throughout the Tagus Valley, as far as Santarém, in Estremadura, between Óbidos and Alenquer, and particularly in the Lower Mondego valley, at the mouth of the River Vouga and close to the main urban centers of the Algarve. Traditional crops were expanded, together with the growing of cereals, vines, olives and flax. North of the River Mondego, it was possible to note great equilibrium in the production of wheat and rye and a sharp increase in the growing of corn. Portuguese olive-oil and wine were exported to the north of Europe. Flax was brought down from Torre de Moncorvo, Lamego, Guarda and Covilhã, along the valleys of the Rivers Douro, Mondego, Zêzere and Tagus, to the main centers of cloth manufacture and rope-making, most frequently to Porto, Santarém and Coimbra. The basic food supplies to the garrisons in North Africa and to the crews of the fleets called for great storage capacity in the stores of Lisbon and made heavy demands on the production capacity of the realm and the islands in relation to cereal crops and biscuit-making. Associated with this was a total and almost exclusive use of available energy, overwhelming in the case of flour grinding and olive and wine pressing. This could endanger the production of other industries, especially weaving, when there was an urgent need for cloth-fulling, and mechanical sawmilling. The conflicts arising between crop and animal farmers indicated important changes in rural areas. The size of some transhumant flocks and herds continued to be quite impressive along the lanes opened in the woodland areas running from Bragança to Beja. The high rates of meat consumption in the main urban areas, principally in Lisbon, attracted countless heads of cattle, which was favorable as far as the tanneries and their derived industries were concerned. The arrival in the capital of the hides and tallow of the cattle, initially used in the colonization of the Atlantic islands, turned the city into the main centre for the redistribution of these raw materials. In this period, there is no doubt that the most easily exploited woodlands, the pine forests of the coastal region, were on their way to being completely used up, being particularly heavily exploited in the Setúbal peninsula and in Pederneira for shipbuilding purposes. The rehousing of the Castilian Jews and the manufacture of coal for metallurgical and heating purposes speeded up the felling of other tree species in the areas around the main population centers all over the country. Awareness of this fact imposed the need for a serious reforestation policy. However, in the inland regions, the chestnut tree continued to thrive. The capacity of resistance of the olive tree also favored its plantation in detriment to other trees that provided wood and fruit, such as walnut and cherry trees. Mining and quarrying

increased dramatically. Quarries mushroomed around the country, with stone being extracted for building purposes and for the making of lime, on the outskirts of the main urban centers, particularly Lisbon and the Algarve towns. Smithies were heading for exhaustion, with all the surface seams being completely used up. The installation of productive facilities, mills and kilns, the activities connected with shipbuilding and their consequent attraction of greater populations led to the abandonment of some salt-pans whose production had paradoxically produced a remarkable effect of aggregation. This process was noted particularly in the valleys of the Rivers Zebro and Trancão, and in the lower Mondego and Vouga valleys, as well as in Alfeizerão and Pederneira. Hydraulic energy reserves were being used to the point of their complete exhaustion. Flows of fresh or saltwater powered the mills, providing landlords with substantial rents. Landlords were almost always of noble blood, or else were ecclesiastical institutions. Already in progress was the building of flour grinding facilities designed to make use of the opportune water supply during the winter season and the winds of summer. Manufacturing industry consumed all the wool and linen produced inland and the timber from the coastal woodlands, with unaccustomed repercussions on the large-scale shipbuilding industry and freight. Undoubtedly, the population growth rates were higher in those places where the manufacturing activities that were typical of rural industry enjoyed the most favorable conditions, amongst these spinning and weaving. The development of rural industry may have benefited from the over-regulation of techniques, wages and profits, which crystallized production in the main urban centers, Lisbon, Porto and Coimbra, from the end of the 15th century onwards. Consequently, there was a sharp increase in investment in agriculture on the part of craftsmen. However, the first signs of the exhaustion of strategic raw materials began to appear, particularly wood and metals, as well as the lengthy and difficult processes of renewal and extraction, which were evident in the more accessible areas being integrated into a singular economy of scale. The construction of large buildings, churches and ecclesiastical buildings, royal and aristocratic residences, overspending on transport and freight packaging, and the military effort, which was enormous in North Africa, compromised the country's resources and its future.

Bibliography

- Almeida, António A. Marques de (1993). *Capitais e Capitalistas no Comércio da Especiaria. O Eixo Lisboa-Antuérpia (1501-1549). Aproximação a um estudo de Geofinança*. Lisbon: Cosmos.
- Dias, João José Alves (coord.) (1999). *Nova História de Portugal* (dir. Joel Serrão e A. H. Oliveira Marques). vol. V. *Portugal do Renascimento à Crise Dinástica*. Lisbon: Editorial Presença, 1999.
- Godinho, Vitorino Magalhães (1981-1983). *Os descobrimentos e a economia mundial*. 2ªed., 4 vols.. Lisbon: Presença.
- (1990). *Mito e Mercadoria, Utopia e Prática de Navegar*. Lisbon: Difusão Editorial, Lda.
- Magalhães, Joaquim Romero (coord.) (1997). *História de Portugal* (dir. José Mattoso), vol. 3 (1997): *No Alvorecer da Modernidade (1480-1620)*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores e Editorial Estampa.
- Marques, António H. de Oliveira (1978). *Introdução à História da Agricultura em Portugal*. Lisbon: Edições Cosmos.
- Pereira, António dos Santos (2003). *Portugal. O Império Urgente*, 2 vols.. Lisbon: INCM.

- Pereira, João Cordeiro (1983). *Para a História das Alfândegas em Portugal no Início do Século XVI (Vila do Conde - organização e movimento)*. Lisbon: UNL.
- Reis, José (1992). *Os Espaços da Indústria. A Regulação Económica e o Desenvolvimento Local em Portugal*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.
- Vicens Vives, J. (1984). «A estrutura administrativa estadual nos séculos XVI e XVII», in António Manuel Hespanha, *Poder e Instituições na Europa do Antigo Regime: Colectânea de Textos*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Vilar, Pierre (1974). *Oro e Moneda en la Historia (1450-1920)*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.

Copyright 2006, ISSN 1645-6432-Vol.4, number 2, Winter 2006

Ph.D. Dissertations in Medieval History

Ph.D. Dissertations in Medieval History are well represented in Portuguese universities. The development of Masters programs from the 1980s onwards and the increasing number of Ph.D. dissertations have largely contributed to the development of new research interests and new topics of historical inquiry, especially those concerning the 14th and 15th centuries. It is difficult to have a clear picture of this research by sub-fields, and the list presented below is certainly incomplete, not only due to the fact that there is not in Portugal a centralized list of dissertations covering the 1975-2003 period, but also because most departments of history in Portugal do not yet have formal "Ph.D. programs".

By listing these dissertations it is our purpose to better acquaint the reader with works that in many cases have not been published. The list is organized in alphabetical order by the author's name, indicating both the year and university of origin. When applicable, the reference to publication is also included.

As with the "Masters Courses and Dissertations in Medieval History at Portuguese Universities" listed in the first issue of the *e-JPH* (Summer 2003), these dissertations cover a wide variety of themes, and deal with several sub-disciplinary approaches, focusing on areas such as social, economic, urban and rural, military, religious, political, and cultural history. This collection of PhD dissertations on the whole represents a well-balanced, accumulated body of knowledge that has indisputably contributed to the development and enhancement of the field of medieval Portuguese history.

The editors of *e-JPH* gratefully acknowledge the information provided by the Observatório da Ciência e do Ensino Superior, Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Ensino Superior de Portugal, and the former Secretary of this journal, Maria Cecília Cameira, who drew up the present list.

List of Dissertations in Medieval Portuguese History

Almeida, Carlos Alberto Ferreira, *Arquitectura Românica de Entre Douro e Minho*, Universidade do Porto, 1978 (texto policopiado).

Andrade, Amélia Aurora Aguiar de, *Vilas, poder régio e fronteira: o exemplo do Entre Lima e Minho, Medieval*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1994 (texto policopiado).

Antunes, José, *A cultura erudita portuguesa nos séculos XIII e XIV (Juristas e Teólogos)*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1995 (texto policopiado).

Araújo, Julieta Maria Aires de Almeida, *Portugal e Castela (1431-1475): ritmos de uma paz vigilante*, Universidade de Lisboa, 2003 (texto policopiado).

Barata, Filipe Manuel Miranda Themudo, *Navegação, comércio e relações públicas: os Portugueses no Mediterrâneo Ocidental (1385-1466)*, Universidade de Évora, 1994 (Publ.: *Navegação, comércio e relações públicas: os Portugueses no Mediterrâneo Ocidental (1385-1466)*, Lisboa,

- Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian – Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Tecnológica, 1998).
- Barbosa, Pedro Ferreira Gomes, *Povoamento e estrutura agrícola na Estremadura Central: século XII a 1325*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1988 (Publ.: *Povoamento e estrutura agrícola na Estremadura Central: século XII a 1325*, Lisboa, Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica, 1992).
- Barroca, Mário Jorge Lopes Neto, *Epigrafia medieval portuguesa (862-1422)*, Universidade do Porto, 1995 (Publ.: *Epigrafia medieval portuguesa (862-1422)*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian – Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, 2000).
- Beirante, Maria Ângela Godinho Vieira da Rocha, *Évora na Idade Média*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1988 (Publ.: *Évora na Idade Média*, [Lisboa] Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian - Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Tecnológica, 1995).
- Branco, Maria João Violante, *Poder real e eclesiásticos. A evolução do conceito da soberania régia e a sua relação com a praxis política de Sancho I e Afonso II*, Universidade Aberta, 1999 (texto policopiado).
- Cardoso, Isabel Maria Marino de Vaz de Freitas Botelho, *Uma fronteira entre mercados: a Norte do Douro na Idade Média*, Universidade Portucalense Infante D. Henrique, 2001 (texto policopiado).
- Catarino, Helena Maria Gomes, *O Algarve oriental durante a ocupação Islâmica – povoamento rural e recintos fortificados*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1997 (texto policopiado).
- Coelho, Maria Helena da Cruz, *O Baixo Mondego nos finais da Idade Média (Estudo de História Rural)*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1983 (Publ.: *O Baixo Mondego nos finais da Idade Média*, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional - Casa da Moeda, 1989).
- Conde, Manuel Sílvio Alves, *O Médio Tejo nos finais da Idade Média: a terra e as gentes*, Universidade dos Açores, 1997 (Publ.: *Uma paisagem humanizada: O Médio Tejo nos finais da Idade Média*, Cascais; Patrimonia 2000).
- Costa, Adelaide Maria Pacheco Lopes Pereira Millán, *Projecção espacial de domínios das relações de poder ao burgo portuense*, Universidade Aberta, 2000 (texto policopiado).
- Costa, Paula Maria de Carvalho Pinto, *A Ordem Militar do Hospital em Portugal: dos finais da Idade Média à Modernidade*, Universidade do Porto, 1998 (Publ.: *A Ordem Militar do Hospital em Portugal: dos finais da Idade Média à Modernidade*, «Militarium Ordinum Analecta», 3/4, Porto, Fundação Eng. António de Almeida, 2000).
- Crispim, Maria de Lurdes, *Christine de Pizani: o Livro das Três Virtudes ou o Espelho de Cristina. Edição crítica da tradução quatrocentista de Le Livre des trois vertus e estudo linguístico de algumas construções nominais da versão manuscrita*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1995 (texto policopiado).
- Cunha, Maria Cristina Almeida e, *A Chancelaria Arquiepiscopal de Braga (1071-1244)*, Universidade do Porto, 1998 (Publ.: *A Chancelaria Arquiepiscopal de Braga (1071-1244)*, Noia, Ed. Toxosoutos, 2005).
- Duarte, Luís Miguel, *Justiça e Criminalidade no Portugal Medieval (1459 – 1481)*, Universidade do Porto, 1993 (Publ.: *Justiça e Criminalidade no Portugal Medieval (1459 – 1481)*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian – Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, 1999).
- Emiliano, António Henrique de Albuquerque, *Latim e Romance em documentação notarial da segunda metade do século XI. Análise scripto-linguística de textos provenientes do Territorium Bracaraense (Liber Fidei, 1050-1110)*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1995 (texto policopiado).

- Fernandes, Fátima Regina, *O Reinado de D. Fernando I no âmbito das relações régio-nobiliárquicas*, Universidade do Porto, 1996 (texto policopiado).
- Fernandes, Hermenegildo Nuno, *Entre mouros e cristãos. A sociedade de fronteira no sudoeste peninsular (sécs. XII-XIII)*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2000 (texto policopiado).
- Fernandes, Manuela Rosa Coelho Mendonça de Matos, *D. João II: um percurso humano e político nas origens da modernidade em Portugal*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1989 (Publ.: *D. João II: um percurso humano e político nas origens da modernidade em Portugal*, Lisboa, Estampa, 1991).
- Ferreira, Maria da Conceição Falcão, *Guimarães: 'Duas Vilas, um só Povo'. Estudo de História Urbana (1250-1389)*, Universidade do Minho, 1997.
- Ferreira, Maria Isabel Rodrigues, *A normativa das Ordens Militares portuguesas (séculos XII – XVI). Poderes, sociedade, espiritualidade*, Universidade do Porto, 2005 (texto policopiado).
- Fonseca, Celso Silva *A centralização monárquica portuguesa (1439-1495)*, Universidade do Porto, 1995.
- Fonseca, Luís Alberto Adão da, *O Condestável D. Pedro de Portugal: a Ordem Militar de Avis e a Península Ibérica do seu Tempo (1429-1466)*, Universidade de Navarra, 1975 (Publ.: *O Condestável D. Pedro de Portugal*, Porto, Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica - Centro de História da Universidade do Porto, 1982).
- Freitas, Judite Antonieta Gonçalves de, “*Temos por bem e mandamos*”. *A burocracia régia e os seus Oficiais em meados de quatrocentos (1439-1460)*, Universidade do Porto, 1999 (Publ.: “*Temos por bem e mandamos*”. *A burocracia régia e os seus Oficiais em meados de quatrocentos (1439-1460)*, Cascais, Patrimonia 2001).
- Gomes, Rita Maria Fernandes da Costa, *A Corte dos Reis Portugueses no final da Idade Média*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1994 (Publ.: *A Corte dos Reis Portugueses no final da Idade Média*, Lisboa, Difel, 1995).
- Gomes, Rosa Maria Mendonça Gonçalves Varela, *Silves (Xelb) – Uma Cidade do Gharb Al-Andalus – Arqueologia e História (Séculos VIII-XIII)*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1999 (Publ.: *Silves (Xelb) - Uma Cidade do Gharb Al-Andalus: território e cultura*, Lisboa, Instituto Português de Arqueologia, 2002).
- Gonçalves, Iria Vicente, *O temporal do Mosteiro de Alcobaça nos séculos XIV e XV*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1984 (Publ.: *O património do Mosteiro de Alcobaça nos séculos XIV e XV*, Lisboa, Universidade Nova, 1989).
- Guerra, António Joaquim Ribeiro, *Os diplomas privados em Portugal dos séculos IX a XII: gestos e atitudes de rotina dos seus autores materiais*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1996 (Publ.: *Os diplomas privados em Portugal dos séculos IX a XII: gestos e atitudes de rotina dos seus autores materiais*, Lisboa, Universidade de Lisboa – Centro de História da Universidade de Lisboa, 2003).
- Homem, Armando Luís Gomes de Carvalho, *O Desembargo Régio (1320-1433)*, Universidade do Porto, 1985 (Publ.: *O Desembargo Régio 1320-1433*, Porto, Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica - Centro de História da Universidade do Porto, 1990).
- Jorge, Ana Maria C. M., *L'épiscopat de Lusitanie pendant l'Antiquité tardive (3e-7e Siècles)*, Universidade de Lovaina, 1998 (Publ.: *L'épiscopat de Lusitanie Pendant l'Antiquité tardive (3e-7e Siècles)*, Lisboa, Instituto Português de Arqueologia, 2002).
- Krus, Luís Filipe Llach, *A concepção nobiliárquica do espaço ibérico. Geografia dos livros de linhagens medievais portuguesas (1280-1380)*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1989 (Publ.: *A concepção nobiliárquica do espaço ibérico. Geografia dos livros de linhagens medievais*

- portugueses (1280-1380)*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian - Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Tecnológica, 1994).
- Kuznetsova, Tatiana Petrovna, *Os mosaicos com motivos báquicos da Península Ibérica: contribuição para o estudo diacrónico dos seus significados*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1998 (texto policopiado).
- Lavajo, Joaquim Chorão, *Cristianismo e Islamismo na Península Ibérica – Raimund Marti Um Precursor do Diálogo Religioso*, Universidade de Évora, 1988 (texto policopiado).
- Marques, José, *A Arquidiocese de Braga no século XV*, Universidade do Porto, 1982 (Publ.: *A Arquidiocese de Braga no século XV*, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1988).
- Marques, Maria Alegria Fernandes, *O Papado e Portugal no tempo de D. Afonso III (1245-1279)*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1990 (texto policopiado).
- Marreiros, Maria Rosa Ferreira, *Propriedade fundiária e rendas da Coroa no reinado de D. Dinis: Guimarães*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1990 (texto policopiado).
- Martins, Adolfo António da Silveira, *A arqueologia naval portuguesa (séculos XIII-XVI). Uma aproximação ao seu estudo Ibérico*, Universidade de Sevilha, 1998 (Publ.: *A arqueologia naval portuguesa (séculos XIII-XVI). Uma aproximação ao seu estudo Ibérico*, Lisboa, Universidade Autónoma, 2001).
- Martins, Alcina Manuela de Oliveira, *O Mosteiro de S. Salvador de Vairão na Idade Média: o percurso de uma comunidade feminina*, Universidade Portucalense Infante D. Henrique, 1999 (Publ.: *O Mosteiro de S. Salvador de Vairão na Idade Média: o percurso de uma comunidade feminina*, Porto, Universidade Portucalense, 2001).
- Martins, Armando Alberto, *O Mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra: Séculos XII-XV. História e Instituição*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1996 (Publ.: *O Mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra na Idade Média*, Lisboa, Centro de História da Universidade de Lisboa, 2003).
- Martins, Rui Luís Vide Cunha, *A fronteira antes da sua metáfora. Cinco teses sobre a fronteira Hispano-Portuguesa no século XV*, Universidade de Coimbra, 2000 (texto policopiado).
- Mata, Joel Silva Ferreira, *A comunidade feminina da Ordem de Santiago: a Comenda de Santos em finais do século XV e no século XVI – um estudo religioso, económico e social*, Universidade do Porto, 1999 (texto policopiado).
- Miranda, Maria Adelaide da Conceição, *A Iluminura Românica em Santa Cruz de Coimbra e Santa Maria de Alcobaça – Subsídios para o estudo da Iluminura em Portugal*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1996 (Publ.: *A Iluminura Românica em Santa Cruz de Coimbra e Santa Maria de Alcobaça - Subsídios para o estudo da Iluminura em Portugal*, Lisboa, Biblioteca Nacional, 1999).
- Monteiro, João Manuel Filipe Gouveia, *A Guerra em Portugal nos Finais da Idade Média*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1997 (Publ.: *A Guerra em Portugal nos Finais da Idade Média*, Lisboa, Editorial Notícias, 1998).
- Nogueira, Bernardo Sá, *Tabelionato e instrumento público em Portugal: génese e Implantação (1212-1279)*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1997 (texto policopiado).
- Norton, Manuel Artur de Fraga, *A Heráldica em Portugal – Raízes, simbologias e expressões histórico-culturais*, Universidade do Minho, 2002 (texto policopiado).
- Oliveira, António Resende, *Depois do espectáculo trovadoresco. A estrutura dos Cancioneiros Peninsulares e as recolhas dos séculos XIII e XIV*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1992 (Publ.: *Depois do espectáculo trovadoresco. A estrutura dos Cancioneiros Peninsulares e as recolhas dos séculos XIII e XIV*, Lisboa, Colibri, 1994).

- Pereira, António dos Santos, *Espaços, homens e recursos: contributo para a História da Produção em Portugal (1475-1525)*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1994 (Publ.: *Portugal o Império urgente (1475-1525)*, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 2003).
- Pimenta, Maria Cristina Gomes, *As Ordens de Avis e Santiago na Baixa Idade Média: o governo de D. Jorge*, Universidade do Porto, 1999 (Publ.: *As Ordens de Avis e Santiago na Baixa Idade Média: o governo de D. Jorge*, «*Militarium Ordinum Analecta*» 5, Porto, Fundação Eng. António de Almeida, 2001).
- Pizarro, José Augusto Pereira de Sotto Mayor, *Linhagens Medievais Portuguesas - genealogias e estratégias (1279-1325)*, Universidade do Porto, 1997 (Publ.: *Linhagens Medievais Portuguesas - genealogias e estratégias (1279-1325)*, Porto, Universidade Moderna Centro de Estudos de Genealogia, Heráldica e História da Família, 1999).
- Rodrigues, Ana Maria S. de A., *Torres Vedras. A vila e o termo nos finais da Idade Média*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1992 (Publ.: *Torres Vedras. A vila e o termo nos finais da Idade Média*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian – Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Tecnológica, 1995).
- Rodrigues, Miguel António Jasmins Pereira, *A organização dos poderes e estrutura social - A Ilha da Madeira (1460-1521)*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1995 (Publ.: *A organização dos poderes e estrutura social - A Ilha da Madeira (1460-1521)*, Cascais, Patrimonia, 1996).
- Santos, Maria José Azevedo, *Da Visigótica à Carolina – a escrita em Portugal de 882 a 1172 (aspectos técnicos e culturais)*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1988 (Publ.: *Da Visigótica à Carolina - a escrita em Portugal de 882 a 1172 (aspectos técnicos e culturais)*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian - Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Tecnológica, 1994).
- Silva, Carlos Manuel da Conceição Guardado da, *Lisboa Medieval: a organização e a estrutura do espaço urbano*, Universidade de Lisboa, 2004 (texto policopiado).
- Silva, Isabel Luísa Morgado de Sousa e, *A Ordem de Cristo (1417-1521)*, Universidade do Porto, 1998 (Publ.: *A Ordem de Cristo (1417-1521)*, «*Militarium Ordinum Analecta*» 6, Fundação Eng. António de Almeida, 2002).
- Silva, José Custódio Vieira da, *Paços Medievais Portugueses - Caracterização e Evolução da Habitação Nobre (Séculos XII a XVI)*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1993 (Publ.: *Paços Medievais Portugueses*, Lisboa, IPPAR, 1995).
- Silva, Manuela Santos, *Óbidos e a sua região na Baixa Idade Média*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1996 (texto policopiado).
- Silva, Maria Teresa B. Lino da, *Crónica do Conde D. Pedro de Meneses de Gomes Eanes de Zurara. Edição e estudo*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1994 (Publ.: *Crónica do Conde D. Pedro de Meneses de Gomes Eanes de Zurara*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian – Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Tecnológica, 1997).
- Silva, Saúl António Gomes, “*In Limine Conscriptionis*”. *Documentos, Chancelaria e Cultura no Mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra (séculos XII a XIV)*, Universidade de Coimbra, 2000 (texto policopiado).
- Sousa, Armindo de, *As Cortes Medievais Portuguesas (1385-1490)*, Universidade do Porto, 1987 (Publ.: *As Cortes Medievais Portuguesas (1385-1490)*, Porto, Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica - Centro de História da Universidade do Porto, 1990).
- Sousa, Bernardo Vasconcelos e, *Os Pimentéis. Percursos de uma linhagem da nobreza medieval portuguesa (séculos XIII-XIV)*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1995 (Publ. *Os Pimentéis*.

- Percursos de uma linhagem da nobreza medieval portuguesa (séculos XIII-XIV)*, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 2000).
- Sousa, João Luís de Lima Silva de, *A Casa Senhorial do Infante D. Henrique*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1988 (Publ.: *A Casa Senhorial do Infante D. Henrique*, Lisboa, Livros Horizonte, 1991).
- Tavares, Maria José Pimenta Ferro, *Os Judeus em Portugal no século XV*, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1980 (Publ.: *Os Judeus em Portugal no século XV*, Lisboa, Universidade Nova de Lisboa / Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, 1982).
- Varandas, José Manuel Henriques, *Bonus Rex ou Rex Inutilis: As periferias e o centro – redes de poder no reinado de D. Sancho II (1223-1248)*, Universidade de Lisboa, 2003 (texto policopiado).
- Vaz, João Luís Inês, *A Civitas de Viseu – espaço e sociedade*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1993 (texto policopiado).
- Veloso, Maria Teresa Nobre, *D. Afonso II – relações de Portugal com a Santa Sé durante o seu reinado*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1988 (Publ.: *D. Afonso II - Relações de Portugal com a Santa Sé durante o seu reinado*, Coimbra, Arquivo da Universidade, 2000).
- Ventura, Leontina Domingos, *A Nobreza da Corte de D. Afonso III*, Universidade de Coimbra, 1992 (texto policopiado).
- Ventura, Maria Margarida Ribeiro Garcês da Silva, *Poder régio e liberdades eclesiásticas (1383-1450)*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1993 (Publ.: *Igreja e poder no século XV. Dinastia de Avis e liberdades eclesiásticas (1383-1450)*, Lisboa, Edições Colibri, 1997).
- Viana, Mário Paulo Martins, *Espaço e povoamento numa vila portuguesa (Santarém, 1147-1350)*, Universidade dos Açores, 2003 (texto policopiado).
- Vicente, António Maria Balcão, *Povoamento e estrutura administrativa no espaço transmontano: século XII a 1325*, Universidade de Lisboa, 2002 (texto policopiado).
- Viegas, Valentino, *Uma Revolução pela Independência Nacional nos finais do século XIV*, Universidade de Lisboa, 1996 (texto policopiado).
- Vilar, Hermínia Maria de Vasconcelos Alves, *As Dimensões do poder: a Diocese de Évora na Idade Média (1165-1423)*, Universidade de Évora, 1998 (Publ.: *As Dimensões do poder: a Diocese de Évora na Idade Média*, Lisboa, Editorial Estampa, 1999).

George E. Marcus and Fernando Mascarenhas:
Ocasão: The Marquis and the Anthropologist, A Collaboration.
(Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2005). ISBN: 0-7591-0777-7

Cristina S. Ogden
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada
csimao@ualberta.ca

How have the roles of cultural elites such as the Portuguese nobility changed during the course of the twentieth century? How does the contemporary Portuguese nobility view itself and how might it wish to present itself within Portuguese society today? George E. Marcus and Fernando Mascarenhas's book *Ocasão: The Marquis and the Anthropologist, A Collaboration*, begins to explore these and other complex questions concerning contemporary nobility in Portugal. *Ocasão* traces a remarkable correspondence between George E. Marcus, a distinguished American anthropologist and professor and Fernando Mascarenhas, Marquis of Fronteira and Alorna and president of the Fundação das Casas de Fronteira e Alorna. The book is part of an ethnographic study of contemporary Portuguese nobility that emerged from a seminar organized by the Institute of Social Sciences (ICS), University of Lisbon, and held at the Palácio Fronteira in October of 1997. The close to two hundred letters and email messages cover a period between March 1998 and July 1999. These are supplemented with writings that reveal some of the results of fieldwork, such as interviews and meetings conducted in Portugal in the summer of 1999. There are some subsequent communications as well as English translations of Mascarenhas's *Sermon to My Successor*, and the Fundação das Casas de Fronteira e Alorna's Charter Preamble.

What results from the correspondence is a number of discussion threads that reveal as much about a scholar's methodology as they reveal about the intended subject. It quickly becomes apparent that Marcus intends to involve the marquis as an engaged partner rather than assuming the role of a distant unbiased observer merely recording and interpreting the marquis's activities (or his writings, in this case). At times we are offered brief glimpses into Marcus's own life with references to his family, his administrative duties and his role as an anthropologist. This form of reflexivity may be a useful methodological model not only for anthropologists but also for scholars in other disciplines, since it allows for some flexibility in the development of the study (in terms of topics pursued, et cetera).

The letters reveal the personal history of the marquis through his anecdotes and memories. They discuss how the marquis understood his position as a child and as an adult, his decision to create his foundation, his interpretations of his family's history and his personal memories of

childhood, familial activities, habits and customs. The letters also reveal the marquis's grappling as to whether he should become personally involved in a broader effort to raise the public profile of nobility in the country. These personal memories and thoughts are layered against other letters that discuss historical and contemporary issues confronting the Portuguese nobility (as interpreted by the marquis). These issues include the notion of *casa* (house) versus *linhagem* (lineage), the bestowing and recognition of titles, the public profile of the nobility and their attitudes toward current and recent past politics. What results is an intricately woven discussion revealing how a Portuguese nobleman views the nobility's past and present within Portuguese society.

The correspondence is augmented by periodic textual interjections by the writers, written long after the letters were sent. These interjections alternately fill in some of the information that was not noted in the original messages and consist of updates concerning certain subjects mentioned in the original letters. This subtext is itself interesting in terms of what is (and is not) discussed by the writers. As a result, we encounter another layer of dialogue that adds to the weaving of this sustained exchange.

The book's framework, which consists of a series of letters, offers some unique challenges for the reader. For example, the limiting of the majority of email exchanges to those that occurred directly between Marcus and Mascarenhas results in little discussion concerning Portuguese noblewomen. The supplemental writings (and a couple of emails) begin to address some issues regarding noblewomen, such as women's changing roles within the family, as well as some examples of noblewomen as titleholders, but these are brief interludes. By publishing the emails chronologically and with little editing, there is some movement between discussion topics, with the result that some subjects remain unresolved, only to be discussed briefly several letters later, or not at all. In other cases, certain topics are discussed and then reexamined at different stages of the exchange. The minimal editing also results in the inclusion of all topics, whether they are broader contextual issues or more mundane details, such as the discussions concerning the use of rental cars during Marcus's impending research trip. It is appealing, however, to follow the development of a relationship through a sustained written dialogue with its many nuances and its mixture of topics.

The layering of the book's various themes might appeal to those whose interests lie outside of cultural anthropology, such as those interested in contemporary definitions of social class structures, or those interested in issues concerning the intertwining of history, memory and biography. *Ocasião: The Marquis and the Anthropologist, A Collaboration* offers us a glimpse of contemporary Portuguese nobility, as well as a biography of a Portuguese nobleman, while demonstrating the possibilities and complexities of collaboration as a research methodology. As the book shows us, the art of research may very well be awaiting us in our email inboxes.