

# The papal camera and the monastic census

Evidence from Portugal, c. 1150–1190\*

Benedict G. E. Wiedemann

The multiplication of direct grants of protection to ecclesiastical institutions from the tenth century onwards is a salient theme of papal history in terms of documentation. The large number of surviving grants and confirmations of protection, and – from the later eleventh century – various rights of exemption, constitute a significant proportion of the extant papal documents in the period before the Vatican registers are preserved. Simple protection – „protectio“ – granted an institution the „protection of us and of St Peter“ and gave a non-specific promise of such. Some houses also possessed various rights which exempted them from the jurisdiction of their diocesan bishop – freedom from excommunication and interdict promulgated by the ordinary for example.<sup>1</sup> Many, although not all, of these houses – both protected and exempt – had to pay an annual tax – a census – to the papacy „as evidence of this protection“. There is little correlation between houses which possessed rights of exemption from diocesan jurisdiction and houses which paid census; some houses had no exemption but still paid census, some fully exempt houses were not bound to pay at all. There were also a multiplicity of rights of exemption which houses might hold and – in general – no one case was exactly like another. From the second half of the twelfth century there are indications that houses which were exempt from diocesan jurisdiction could be identified by certain formulae in their privileges.<sup>2</sup>

---

\* My thanks to Dr. Peter Linehan and Professor David d'Avray for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper, to the anonymous reviewers of the ZKG for their many helpful suggestions and to Professor Stuart Jenks for his help when writing the abstract. All arguments, mistakes and mis-interpretations of this article are my own.

<sup>1</sup> Ludwig Falkenstein, *La papauté et les abbayes françaises aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles. Exemption et protection apostolique*, Paris 1997, (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. Sciences historiques et philologiques; 336), 218–223. The rights granted to the same house in papal privileges might vary depending on the specific circumstances which that house found itself in at the time. For the Cistercians in Iberia see Francesco Renzi, *The bone of contention. Cistercians, bishops and papal exemption. The case of the archdiocese of Santiago de Compostela (1150–1250)*, in: *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 5, (2013), 47–68, at 48–51. For England generally see David Knowles, *Essays in monastic history IV. The growth of exemption*, in: *The Downside Review*, 31, (1932), 201–231, 396–425.

<sup>2</sup> A letter of Alexander III to Albert de Summa (c. 1177) claims that houses which were exempt from the jurisdiction of their diocesan paid their census „ad indicium huius libertatis“. Houses without exemption, but under papal protection, were, however, said to pay their census „ad indicium huius

The question of how, and how frequently, monasteries and ecclesiastic institutions under papal protection paid their census obligations is extremely difficult to answer; there is nothing to compare with the *Dialogus de Scaccario* of the English royal exchequer. William Lunt, in his classic study of papal revenues held that:

„The amounts due were paid with much irregularity. Since default of payment, though it might result in interdict or excommunication, was not punished with loss of privilege, a large accumulation of arrears was the natural result. The placing of this levy in the hands of collectors gave only partial remedy“.<sup>3</sup>

His earlier 1909 work had expressed the same view in similar terms but with the addition: „originally this form of census had been rendered at the Holy See by the payers themselves“.<sup>4</sup> However, the actual evidence for payments is scanty. One of the few sources to shed light on the topic is the collection of seven census-receipts copied into the back of a cartulary at the monastery of Santa Cruz in Coimbra from the second half of the twelfth century.<sup>5</sup> Noted by Fletcher in the context of the Iberian

---

protectionis“. Obviously this does not help to identify houses with rights of exemption which did not pay a census. In reality what rights a religious house held varied from case to case and a detailed study of privileges and letters – both papal and local – would need to be undertaken for each individual house. Lotte Kéry aptly quotes the words of Alexander III: „Inspicienda sunt ergo privilegia ipsarum ecclesiarum et ipsorum tenor diligentius attendendus“, Lotte Kéry, *Klosterfreiheit und päpstliche Organisationsgewalt. Exemption als Herrschaftsinstrument des Papsttums?*, in: Jochen Johrendt/Harald Müller (eds.), *Rom und die Regionen. Studien zur Homogenisierung der lateinischen Kirche im Hochmittelalter*, Berlin/Boston 2012, (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Neue Folge; 19), 83–144, at 87, 142. Falkenstein, *Papauté et abbayes*, (see n. 1), 22f; Knowles, *Growth of exemption*, (see n. 1), 205–208, Paulus Rabikauskas, *Diplomatica Pontificia*, Rome 1998, 49–51.

<sup>3</sup> William E. Lunt, *Papal revenues in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols, New York 1934, (Records of Civilisation. Sources and Studies; 19), I, 62f.

<sup>4</sup> W. E. Lunt, *The financial system of the medieval papacy in light of recent literature*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 23, (1909), 251–295, at 276.

<sup>5</sup> *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, Carl Erdmann (ed.), Berlin 1927, (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Neue Folge; 20), no. 159, at 379–380. The cartulary is the *Livro Santo de S. Cruz*. The digitised version of this codex by the Torre do Tombo – the Portuguese National Archive – has occasionally been referred to below. The entire cartulary has been edited by Leontina Ventura and Ana Santiago Faria in *Livro Santo de Santa Cruz. Cartulário do Sec. XII, Coimbra 1990*, (História Medieval; 3), docs at 382f. There are also two records of payment and one receipt surviving from the French monastery of St Bertin, (1174, for the next five years; 1181, for two unspecified years; 25 October 1184, for the present year and the past three, the latter is the only definite copy of a receipt). Unfortunately these are not terribly useful to the argument which will be advanced here. The first two payments (1174 and 1181) do not state whether the payment was collected at St Bertin or sent to the papal court; the third payment (1184) was paid at the papal court in Verona. Furthermore when the monks of St Bertin recorded the payments they only recorded the year; when they copied papal privileges and mandates into their cartulary they recorded the date but not the year. This means, for the privileges of Alexander III (1159–81), it is difficult to tell whether a confirmation of privilege was only issued after payment or when no payment was due. The one actual receipt was given on the 25 October 1184. There was a confirmation of St Bertin's privilege issued on the 22 December 1184 (*Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, Philippus Jaffé/Gulielmus Wattenbach/S. Loewenfeld/F. Kaltenbrunner/P. Ewald [eds.], 2 vols, Leipzig 1885–8, II, [Henceforth: JL] no. 15145, PL, CCI, 1307) which may well be related. French records of payment and receipt: *Papsturkunden in Frankreich, III, Artois*, Johannes Ramackers (ed.), Göttingen 1940, (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Dritte Folge; 28), 244f; papal bulls to St Bertin: JL 12536 (1160–76), 13315–6 (prob.

Church and Robinson and Jordan in the context of papal finance,<sup>6</sup> these receipts give us an – almost unique – insight into the structures for payments during the period 1157–1186 and also enable us to make educated guesses about frequencies, amounts and the links between payments and re-grants of privileges.<sup>7</sup>

Santa Cruz in Coimbra was the premier monastic foundation of the kingdom of Portugal. A royal foundation, it would be the burial place for the first two kings of Portugal: Afonso I, its founder, and his son Sancho I. Afonso had successfully preserved and extended the independence of Portugal from Castile-León and came to an agreement with the „Imperator totius Hispaniae“ (in reality, king of Castile-León) Alfonso VII at Zamora in 1143.<sup>8</sup> After this he seems to have been regularly recognised

---

1179), 14394–8 (prob. 1181), 15232 (1184–5) and cf. the dating of the same bulls in *Collection des Cartulaires de France*, III, *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Bertin*, M. Guérard (ed.), Paris 1840, 352–355.

<sup>6</sup> R. A. Fletcher, *The Episcopate in the kingdom of León in the twelfth century*, Oxford 1978, (Oxford Historical Monographs), 213; I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073–1198. Continuity and innovation*, Cambridge 1990, (Cambridge Medieval Textbooks), 272f; Karl Jordan, *Zur päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, in: *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 25, (1933–4), 77. See also Ingo Fleisch, *Rom und die Iberische Halbinsel. Das Personal der päpstlichen Legationen und Gesandtschaften im 12. Jahrhundert*, in: Jochen Johrendt/Harald Müller (eds.), *Römisches Zentrum und kirchliche Peripherie. Das universale Papsttum als Bezugspunkt der Kirchen von den Reformpäpsten bis zu Innozenz III*, Berlin/New York 2008, (Neue Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Neue Folge; 2), 168f, 171 where the document is used in a comprehensive study of legates, collectors etc. in the Peninsula. Unsurprisingly Carl Erdmann refers to it in *Das Papsttum und Portugal im ersten Jahrhundert der portugiesischen Geschichte*, Berlin 1928, (Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse; 5), 43 too. The document is also mentioned in Lunt, *Papal revenues*, (see n. 3), I, 37f.

<sup>7</sup> There is one receipt for payment of the Portuguese royal census from the pontificate of Innocent III. *Bulário Português. Inocêncio III (1198–1216)*, Avelino de Jesus da Costa/Maria Alegria F. Marques (eds.), Coimbra 1989, (História; 7), 355. Peter Linehan, *Portugalia Pontificia. Materials for the history of Portugal and the papacy, 1198–1417*, 2 vols, Lisbon 2013, I, 138. This receipt, from 1213, is for the census for the preceding 28 years. This long hiatus in payment of the royal census was probably down to Afonso I having finally achieved papal recognition of his royal title (*Manifestis Probatum* – JL [see n. 5] 13420 [1179]). It seems that after 1179 the kings of Portugal acted with less deference towards the papacy than they did in the period from 1143–79. Cf. the story of Roger of Howden that, when cardinal-legate Jacintus attempted to degrade the bishop of Coimbra, Afonso threatened to cut off the legate's foot if he didn't leave the kingdom at once! While Howden's dating of this episode to 1187 cannot be accepted (Afonso died in 1185) it may still give an indication of the general terseness of papal-royal relations after 1179. If, however, Howden is referring to some specific incident involving Jacintus as legate then it must have occurred before 1179 (seeing as Jacintus' missions were 1154–5 and 1172–4). If it does refer to a real event involving Jacintus then there were clearly serious problems between pope and king before 1179. Stubbs suggested that the event occurred when Jacintus compelled Ferdinand II of León to separate from his wife, Urraca, daughter of Afonso of Portugal in 1175 (based on the supposition that Jacintus was actually involved in the annulment). Or perhaps the account refers to Jacintus' deposition of the archbishop of Braga (a close ally of Afonso of Portugal) during his earlier legation (1155) or to some other event of which we are ignorant or possess only partial knowledge (the specific events surrounding Jacintus' excommunication of William, bishop-elect of Zamora, for example. See JL [see n. 5] 14160). My thanks to Dr Linehan for pointing me towards Howden's account and its importance (and the difficulty of dating it). *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, William Stubbs, (ed.) 4 vols, London 1868–71, (Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages) II, lviii–ix, 333.

<sup>8</sup> Erdmann, *Papsttum und Portugal*, (see n. 6), 31.

as „Rex“ by the other Iberian kings, although the papacy would not consistently recognise his title until 1179. One of the ways by which Afonso extended his kingdom's independence was to place it under papal protection in 1143–4 and establish an annual census.<sup>9</sup> Another way he showed his royal power was in the establishment of his own royal monastery: Santa Cruz.

Four of the seven Santa Cruz receipts are first person records of payments – composed by either the payer (the prior of Santa Cruz), the recipient (the papal chamberlain), or a collector (sent by the papal court). The other three are third person records of payment. The four in the first person are clearly copies of receipts which were written when the payments were made. The three in the third person may be copies of actual receipts as well, or they might simply be written by a canon of Santa Cruz as an aide-memoire. The similarity in formulation of all seven suggests that these documents are all of the same type. All seven entries follow the formula of: date given by AD and Indiction followed by month; followed by details of from whom and to whom payment was given and amount of payment; followed by amount of additional payment as „benediction“. This similarity suggests that even the three notifications in the third person were originally actual receipts made by the payer or payee at the time. That all seven entries are copies of actual receipts is supported by the dating. All date by AD. Six also date by Indiction. Additionally three have the pontifical year. None date by Spanish Era or Afonso I's regnal year. This suggests that all the entries are composed by the papal officials. The four receipts in the first person – two when payment was made at the papal court and two when the payment was made to a collector in Portugal – are certainly copies of actual receipts. It is probable that the other three are too.

The census-receipts give an important insight into census payments. Fletcher noted that several of the payments, five out of seven, are actually more than the amount which was owed. Some of the amount is said to be „pro censu“ – for the census – and ten morabitini are „pro benedictione“ – for blessing.<sup>10</sup> This suggests that the amounts recorded as being owed annually by each foundation were in fact a minimum, when it came to actual payment a significant amount more might be offered. Although there are only seven payments (1157, 1162, 1163, 1168, 1173, 1183 and 1186), every year between 1157 and 1186 is accounted for. This is because, when it came to payment, the institution would pay its arrears and it appears to have been remarkably good at keeping track of when it had paid. From Erdmann's transcription it would appear that 1174 was not paid; the payment in 1183, ten years after the last payment in 1173, claims only to cover the present year (1183) and the eight preceding (1175–82 inclusive). However, the actual amount of money is twenty morabitini – the census for ten years – and Erdmann has made a rare mistake in his transcription. The original, digitised and available freely online, and the more recent printed edition

---

<sup>9</sup> The extension of papal „protectio“ to lay princes is examined in detail in Johannes Fried, *Der päpstliche Schutz für Laienfürsten. Die politische Geschichte des päpstlichen Schutzprivilegs für Laien (11.–13. Jahrhundert)*, Heidelberg 1980, (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse; Jg. 1980; 1), for Portugal specifically see 140–142; José Mattoso, *D. Afonso Henriques*, Lisbon 2007, 214.

<sup>10</sup> Fletcher, *Episcopate*, (see n. 6), 213.

of the cartulary clearly have four „i“s after the „v“: „nine preceding years“. <sup>11</sup> Every year was paid for. More, in fact, since the 1186 receipt covers „the preceding two years“ (1184–5) and „the next three“ (1186–8). <sup>12</sup>

There could be a significant gap between payments but the census could also be paid in consecutive years, as it was in 1162 and 1163. The time between payments was dependent on two main factors: when the house sent representatives to the papal court and when the papal court sent collectors – members of the papal household, subdeacons, chaplains or similar – to Portugal. However, it must be emphasised that these factors meant that payments could be close together or with a long period in between, which necessitated the payment of arrears. Most importantly, these receipts allow us to analyse the means of payment. In two cases, 1157 and 1163, a member of the house was sent to the papal court to pay (Segni and Bourges, respectively). In the other five cases payment was made to a papal representative who was within the kingdom. <sup>13</sup> These seem to have been the two ways in which payment was effected. <sup>14</sup> In the *Liber Censuum*, the chamberlain Cencio, later Honorius III, also outlines these two ways of collecting the census. He begins by admitting that many institutions cannot send payment to Rome every year and then expands on this by outlining how the court can send nuncios to collect payment. There were indeed a number of papal letters sent out authorising nuncios and diocesan officials to collect the census from monasteries. <sup>15</sup>

It might seem then that payment was probably very intermittent. It would cost a great deal to travel to Rome so monasteries would surely be quite keen to avoid that. It might seem then that they would only have to pay when a legate or nuncio travelled to them, but that, in turn, might be very infrequent and surely the institutions would

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://digitarq.dgarq.gov.pt/viewer?id=4614123> [No. 256] [Accessed: 14/11/2014]. „xx<sup>i</sup> morabitinos pro censu viiii preteritorum anno [sic] et pro anno presenti“. See also Livro Santo, Ventura/Santiago Faria (eds.), (see n. 5), 383.

<sup>12</sup> Papsturkunden in Portugal, (see n. 5), no. 159, at 380. „pro duobus annis preteritis et[...]pro tribus futuris annis“. It is possible that the 1186 receipt means 1185–6 by „the two preceding“ and 1187–9 by „the three following“ in which case 1184 was not paid. I have assumed that, even when the receipt does not explicitly mention the current year, the current year is one of the years included in the payment. Were this not the case then some years would have been paid twice and some not at all.

<sup>13</sup> Jordan states that three times the canons send the payment to the papal court („Dreimal haben die Kanoniker von Coimbra selbst das Geld an den päpstlichen Hof gesandt“), Päpstliche Finanzgeschichte, (see n. 6), 77. Perhaps he is counting the 1162 payment as being sent to the papal court by the House even though it was given to a papal subdeacon who was at Coimbra. Robinson only identifies two payments sent to the court 1157 and 1163 and describes the other five as „received by a member of the papal curia at Coimbra“. Erdmann also describes all the other five as being paid at Coimbra. Robinson, Papacy, (see n. 6), 273; Papsturkunden in Portugal, (see n. 5), 379.

<sup>14</sup> A third was when the papacy mandated local ecclesiastics to collect census payments. Thomas Wetzstein, Noverca omnium ecclesiarum. Der römische Universalepiskopat des Hochmittelalters im Spiegel der päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte, in: Johrendt/Müller (eds.), Rom und die Regionen, (see n. 2), 13–62, at 24–26.

<sup>15</sup> Le Liber Censuum de l'Église romaine, Paul Fabre/Louis Duchesne (eds.), 2 vols, Paris 1889–1910, I, fasc. 1, 4–5; Robinson, Papacy, (see n. 6), 270f. Lunt, Papal revenues, (see n. 3), II, 35; Ludwig Falkenstein, Leistungensuchen Alexanders III. aus dem ersten Jahrzehnt seines Pontifikats, in: ZKG 102, (1991), 45–75, 175–208, at 197–199.

balk at paying twenty years of arrears or some equally large amount when the nuncio finally came. However, the two occasions when members of the house of Santa Cruz travelled to the papal court are actually indicators of when the census might have been paid most often. The Segni and Bourges receipts tally up, in place of issue and time, with confirmations of papal protection, as Erdmann noticed.<sup>16</sup> (The 1157 receipt actually gives 1156 but, as Erdmann notes, this must be a mistake. The papal court was at Narni not Segni in August 1156<sup>17</sup> and the receipt also specifies „the third year of the Pontificate of Adrian IV“ which would be August 1157). These two re-confirmations were the only two issued to Santa Cruz during the 1157–1186 period. It is therefore much easier to formulate the following rule: an institution paid its census when a legate arrived to ask for it *or* when it wanted confirmation of its existing privilege – or a new privilege – and sent to the papal court for it. When one considers that many institutions were eager to get confirmations from newly elected popes,<sup>18</sup> this must actually have provided a significant amount of cash for the papacy fairly consistently, but only if the institutions paid their arrears rather than just the amount for the current year.

In 1163 John, canon of Santa Cruz, only paid for the current year in Bourges. This is not surprising because he only owed to pay for the current year anyway. 1162 had been paid on time to a papal nuncio in Portugal: Master Teodinus, who by 1163 had been appointed papal chamberlain – the chief financial officer. Therefore the fact that only one year was paid in 1163 does not tell us whether or not the institution would have been expected to pay arrears as well as the current year’s payment before gaining re-confirmation of its privilege. However, in Segni in 1157 the census for the preceding six years had been paid. Frustratingly we do not know if that was the correct amount because the 1157 receipt is the earliest of the collection. There are, though, two possibilities. Either six years was the amount and the papal chamberlain (Cardinal Boso in 1157) knew this, or the amount of arrears was unknown and six years seemed a plausible amount. If the amount was unknown then we have an indication that, every time an institution went to Rome to renew its privilege, it paid either the amount of arrears which it owed if it knew what that was, or a plausible amount, probably five or six years. If Boso knew that Santa Cruz owed six years in arrears then we must ask how the papal court knew the amount of arrears. Either the chamberlain kept a record of payments or the institution presented some kind of evidence for the last payment. While it is possible that the camera kept a record of payments, it seems very unlikely. Even records, like the *Liber Censuum*, of which institutions paid the census at all are error-prone;<sup>19</sup> it seems implausible that the chamber could keep an accurate record

<sup>16</sup> JL (see n. 5) 10301, 10925; *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica*, 7 vols, Scriptorum, Lisbon 1856, I, fasc. 1, 71–75; *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, (see n. 5), no. 159, at 379f.

<sup>17</sup> JL (see n. 5) 10198–10205.

<sup>18</sup> For Italian Cistercian houses in the second half of the twelfth century see Guido Cariboni, *Esenzione cistercense e formazione del Privilegium commune*. Osservazioni a partire dai cenobi dell’Italia settentrionale, in: Nicolangelo D’Acunto (ed.), *Papato e monachesimo „esente“ nei secoli centrali del Medioevo*, Florence 2003, 65–107, at 81f. Francesco Renzi agrees with Cariboni in his own study of Iberian Cistercian houses. Renzi, *Cistercians, bishops and papal exemption*, (see n. 1), 52f.

<sup>19</sup> Falkenstein, *Papauté et abbayes*, (see n. 1), 33–35; Robinson, *Papacy*, (see n. 6), 270.

of which of the hundreds of protected houses had paid their censuses and when.<sup>20</sup> Far more likely is that it was the representative of the institution who told the chamber how much was owed. But why would the chamberlain accept the word of the house given that it had an interest in limiting the amount which it owed? Probably it was the custom for the institution to present a copy (or the original) of the receipt for the most recent payment. They also probably had to do so when they paid the census to a legate or nuncio at the house. This provides an explanation for why the collection of copies of surviving receipts in our documentation starts in 1157 – if the previous receipt had been taken to Segni and shown to Boso as evidence of the most recent census payment then it would probably not have been kept for the journey back. Once the house had been given the 1157 receipt, they no longer needed the previous receipt and it was thrown away. Erdmann noted that copies of the first two receipts (1157 and 1162) seem to have been written in the same hand and then subsequent receipts have been added in different hands, possibly contemporaneous with each payment being made.<sup>21</sup> That appears plausible.<sup>22</sup> The record was probably begun in 1163, just before the canon set off for Bourges. The 1157 and 1162 receipts were copied into the book and the original 1162 receipt was taken to Bourges by the canon. It was presumably then presented to the chamberlains to prove that Santa Cruz only owed the current year's census payment. The fact that the house kept copies of the receipts at all suggests that they may have been unusually conscious about keeping records of past payments. Variation in how the records were kept may be down to the differing attitudes of the treasurers and priors of Santa Cruz. In general, however, it seems likely that only the most recent receipt needed to be kept.

While that is hypothesis only, it seems a plausible hypothesis. It is likely that, when religious foundations wished to get a confirmation of their privileges or their protection – or a new privilege with new rights – they were expected to pay their census arrears first. In order to do that they had to provide a record of the last payment which had been made. If they did not have a record perhaps they paid some set amount or set number of years. While this can only be definitely demonstrated for Santa Cruz, it is likely to be generally applicable. The brilliance of this system should be obvious. Because foundations would always (eventually) wish to renew their privilege the papacy didn't have to chase them up about payment (although legates and nuncios clearly did also collect census payments). If the papal court expected a receipt before re-confirmation of a privilege, then in many cases, the institution had to pay arrears and probably close to the full amount which it owed. Since it was the institutions themselves which desired confirmations of privileges the onus was on them to

---

<sup>20</sup> Although the 1184 receipt for St Bertin (see n. 5) ends: „as it is seen in the present letters, so was it diligently noted in our writings“ – „sicut praesentibus litteris cernitur, ita in scriptis nostris diligenter est annotatum“. However, the very fact that the receipt is explicitly said to be recorded by the papal chamberlain (Master Melior) suggests that this was not the normal practice and receipts were not recorded centrally unless specifically noted.

<sup>21</sup> Papsturkunden in Portugal, (see n. 5), no. 159, at 379.

<sup>22</sup> <http://digitarq.dgarq.gov.pt/viewer?id=4614123> [Accessed 14/11/2014]. Clearly the receipts are in a range of hands but, from the digitisation, it is hard to be sure if any are definitely in the same hand. In this I defer to Carl Erdmann's judgement, especially since it was based on examination of the original.

keep records of payments and thus the record keeping was delegated to the institutions themselves. The papacy was freed of almost all activity; it simply waited.

When religious houses acquired a confirmation of their privilege, or a new privilege, they also had to pay chancery fees to procure it. In the middle of the thirteenth century the payment to the scribes alone for a confirmation of privilege was supposedly limited to 12 denarii, and for a new privilege ten solidi.<sup>23</sup> The scribes were not the only ones who had to be paid, however, although Innocent III (1198–1216) had earlier tried to prevent his curial officials from extorting payments; chancery taxes were to be freely given and be fixed amounts received by the scribes and the bullators only.<sup>24</sup> This suggests that, in the period prior to Innocent's reforms, chancery fees were distributed quite widely. All of this meant that paying the census arrears was just one part of the large costs for a religious house when it wanted a confirmation of privilege or a new privilege. Whether, in the twelfth century, the census arrears were paid at the same time as the chancery fees – perhaps when the letter was sealed<sup>25</sup> – is impossible to know. However, it does seem clear that in the twelfth century there was considerable overlap between the chancery and the chamber;<sup>26</sup> it is quite plausible, therefore, that the process of getting a privilege or confirmation of privilege from the chancery could incorporate the paying of census arrears to the chamber. It may well also be the case that the chamberlain's approval was required before such confirmations or privileges were sealed.

Even in cases when the nuncio or legate came to collect the census the link between privilege granting and payment is in evidence. Erdmann linked a privilege from legate Jacintus (later Pope Celestine III), allowing the canons of Santa Cruz to excommunicate and then absolve their „parrochianos“, with the 1173 receipt of payment.<sup>27</sup> The link is plausible. It again seems likely that the institution wished for a confirmation of its privilege and offered Jacintus the census arrears. They probably had to show him the 1168 receipt in order to calculate that they owed five years in arrears. This fits in well with current ideas about routinisation and the responsive character of papal government. The papacy was, primarily, a rescript government which depended on petitions and requests in order to act. It did not intervene proactively but was appealed to. The very structure of protection, where the only specific duty which the papacy stipulated was to receive a census, seems suggestive of responsive government. If any institution wished to activate papal protection it had to specifically request it, which Santa Cruz seems to have done in 1163. As well as getting a

<sup>23</sup> Michael Tangl, *Die päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen von 1200–1500*, Innsbruck 1894, 60f; Andreas Meyer, *Eine Verordnung gegen die Korruption an der päpstlichen Kurie aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, in: Brigitte Flug/Michael Matheus/Andreas Rehberg (eds.), *Kurie und Region. Festschrift für Brigide Schwarz zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 2005, (*Geschichtliche Landeskunde*; 59), 169–173, at 171f.

<sup>24</sup> PL (see n. 5) CCXIV, lxxx; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, James M. Powell (ed. tr.), Washington DC 2004, 55f; Patrick Zutshi, *Innocent III and the Reform of the papal Chancery*, in: Andrea Sommerlechner (ed.), *Innocenzo III. Urbs et Orbis*, Rome 2003, (*Nuovi studi storici*; 55), I, 84–101, at 85f.

<sup>25</sup> Jane E. Sayers, *Papal Government and England during the Pontificate of Honorius III (1216–1227)*, Cambridge 1984, (*Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, third series*; 21), 47f.

<sup>26</sup> Tangl, *päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen*, (see n. 23), xiii.

<sup>27</sup> *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, (see n. 5), nos. 68, 159, at 239–241, 379f.

confirmation of papal protection in August 1163, Alexander III sent a letter to the bishop of Coimbra instructing him to respect the rights of the canons, doubtless at the request of Santa Cruz.<sup>28</sup> This is an example of papal protection in practice but it had to be activated by the monastery itself.

If payments were made as I suggest above, then the papacy's part in collecting the payment is split between actively sending nuncios out to the foundations and waiting for the foundations to come to Rome. The record keeping in both situations is mainly forced upon the foundations because if they ever need active papal support they will have to go to the papal court to request it and if they want a confirmation of their privilege they will have to go to the papal court to request it. At which point they will probably have to present a receipt and pay any arrears, as Santa Cruz had to in 1163 and 1157. The onus is therefore upon them to keep a record of the last payment. The papal camera, on the other hand, does not have to keep any record but will still be provided with records and, probably, with a significant amount of the total amount owed. The ideal – that houses will pay the census and arrears when they get their privileges confirmed – shows how collection of the census was routinised<sup>29</sup> and structured, with the actual record keeping being offloaded onto the houses themselves. Given that the receipts would be taken to the papal court or shown to the nuncio when he arrived at the church, it is less surprising that so few receipts, or copies or notes of receipts, have apparently survived. The houses only had to keep records of the most recent receipt and the older ones could be disposed of. Another, although to my mind less likely, possibility is that the link between re-issue and payment was so strong that, in most cases, a receipt was not needed. The petitioner brought the original or a copy of the last privilege (or the last privilege was looked up in the papal registers) and it was assumed that the house had last paid its debts when that privilege was issued. This seems to me to be unlikely because it would still require receipts when the census had been paid to a collector rather than at the papal court.

When the French abbey of St Bertin paid its census in 1184 it sent the payment to Lucius III's council at Verona.<sup>30</sup> The 1157 payment from Santa Cruz, however, was not sent at a time when there was a major council; Adrian IV was at Segni but not seemingly for any particular reason. Obviously therefore, religious houses sometimes took advantage of their attendance at major ecclesiastical gatherings to acquire a confirmation of privilege and pay their census arrears, but privileges were acquired from, and petitioners sent to, the papal court at all times, not just during councils. Nonetheless the papal court certainly saw an increase in petitions and income during church councils.<sup>31</sup> An advantage of acquiring privileges at a church council might

---

<sup>28</sup> Papsturkunden in Portugal, (see n. 5), no. 62, at 232. For the continuing dispute between Santa Cruz and the bishop of Coimbra and the subsequent decline of the latter's mental health see Linehan, *Portugalia Pontificia*, (see n. 7), I, 49–51.

<sup>29</sup> Compare with the system of judges-delegate and the *Audientia litterarum contradictarum*, the other obvious routinisations in papal bureaucracy.

<sup>30</sup> JL (see n. 5) 15104–15149 for council of Verona. Also see n. 5 for St Bertin census payments.

<sup>31</sup> See the accusation in the *Draco Normannicus* that Alexander III's 1163 council of Tours was intended to raise revenue. Robert Somerville, *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163). A Study of Ecclesiastical Politics and Institutions in the Twelfth Century*, Berkeley and Los Angeles/London 1977, 13.

have been that petitioners would be sure about where the curia would be. When the papacy was not in Rome and constantly moving there must have been an element of uncertainty about where exactly petitioners had to travel. Likewise when the papal court was exiled from Rome we can occasionally see a desire to find a permanent location for its sojourn.<sup>32</sup>

This all suggests that payment of the censuses at the court might have been more common, or at least brought in more cash, than has been previously thought. The account in the *Liber Censuum* devotes more space to explaining how nuncios might collect payment but collection by nuncios seems implicitly to be seen as an alternative to what should be done. The account begins: „whenever the census is not sent to the Apostolic See by those who owe it, using their own envoys (which often happens)[...]“; it is clear that that is the ideal.<sup>33</sup> Also papal letters requesting payment and authorising others (collectors or local bishops) to collect censuses can make it appear that this was the more common method of payment. If the papacy did not keep records of payment, and if the institutions kept only a record of the most recent receipt, then there would be little record of payments at the papal court. The best indication we have of the frequency of payment is whenever a re-issue of a privilege is given but even this will not tell us how many years of arrears might have been paid before it was granted.

Lunt and more recently Thomas Wetzstein both suggest that payment via dispatching a member of the foundation to the camera was unsatisfactory. Therefore, in their view, in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries the papacy began dispatching collectors from the papal court, as we can see from the Santa Cruz receipts: representatives are sent to the camera in 1157 and 1163 but are not sent from 1163 onwards. Now collectors are appointed.<sup>34</sup> This may not do justice to the clear link between payment of census arrears and re-grants of privileges. Clearly both dispatch of collectors and payments sent by the houses to Rome each played a role, but, because houses continued to get their privileges re-issued by new popes into later centuries, the practice of the institution paying the census at the papal court must have continued. The system of receipt use which I have suggested, if accepted, probably also continued in use.

While Santa Cruz only requested papal re-confirmation of privileges twice in the period, other houses might well have been more active. According to David Knowles' survey of exemption in England, the house at Malmesbury received its first papal privilege from Innocent II in 1142. This was confirmed by Eugenius III in 1151 and Anastasius IV in 1153. Adrian IV issued a similar, though not as complete, privilege in 1156. Alexander III returned to the previous wording in 1163. A dispute between

---

<sup>32</sup> In 1184 Lucius III was apparently in the process of ensuring that Ferrara would be a secure location for the curia away from Rome. Piero Zerbi, *Un inedito dell'Archivio Vaticano e il convegno di Verona* (a. 1184), in: *Aevum*, 28, (1954), 470–483, at 472–476.

<sup>33</sup> *Liber Censuum*, (see n. 15), I, fasc. 1, 4–5: „Ut si quandoque, quod sepe contingit, a quibus debentur census ipsi per proprios nuntios ad apostolicam sedem non fuerint destinati“. Translated by Robinson, *Papacy*, (see n. 6), 271f; Lunt, *Papal revenues*, (see n. 3), II, 35.

<sup>34</sup> Lunt, *Papal revenues*, (see n. 3), I, 38f; Robinson, *Papacy*, (see n. 6), 164, 273; Wetzstein, *Noverca omnium ecclesiarum*, (see n. 14), 27f. Wetzstein also points to a shift from local ecclesiastics being mandated to collect the census to collectors being dispatched from the papal court to the periphery.

Malmesbury and the bishop of Salisbury broke out in 1174 and the abbot carried his case to the pope. This seems to have occasioned the payment of census too. Alexander III's 1174 letter to the bishops of London and Worcester directs the two to investigate the dispute and ends „therefore we wish that you should faithfully send the content of those privileges to us under your seals, and you should ensure the census, which is owed from that monastery to St Peter, is given wholly to the abbot of St Germain of Paris“.<sup>35</sup> While this request for census payment has the appearance of a papal initiative, the immediate impetus was clearly Malmesbury's appeal to the papal court. Finally Celestine III issued a new privilege for Malmesbury in 1191.<sup>36</sup> This gives us gaps between privileges of: nine years; two years; three years; seven years; eleven years; and seventeen years. While there might well have been some payments lost between 1174 and 1191 it seems very likely that in every other case Malmesbury probably paid arrears when they obtained their new privilege or sent an appeal to the papal court. From this evidence one would conjecture that Malmesbury paid their census – one ounce of gold – and arrears for most of the years in this period. The long period without a renewal of privilege – 1163–1191, with the appeal to Alexander III in 1174 – corresponds with Santa Cruz's neglecting to gain any renewals between 1163 and 1187.<sup>37</sup> This might be connected with the 1159–78 papal schism but more likely is connected to Alexander III's long pontificate (1159–1181). The frequency of Malmesbury's re-confirmations suggests that they sought such a re-issue from each new pope,<sup>38</sup> but neither Malmesbury nor Santa Cruz needed to get another re-issue until after Alexander III's death in 1181.

This raises the possibility that a long pontificate was financially damaging for the papal camera! A long pontificate lessened the impetus to get frequent re-issues of privileges which, in turn, meant that houses sent their censuses to the court less frequently. Fortunately few medieval popes lasted as long as Alexander III.<sup>39</sup> If it was

---

<sup>35</sup> JL (see n. 5) 12401; *Registrum Malmesburiense*, J. S. Brewer (ed.), London 1879, (Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages), I, 372. „Praeterea volumus ut ipsorum privilegiorum continentiam nobis sub sigillis vestris fideliter conscriptam mittatis, et census, qui ab eodem monasterio beato Petro debetur, abbati Sancti Germani Parisiensis faciatis integre assignari“.

<sup>36</sup> Knowles, *Growth of exemption*, (see n. 1), 227–231.

<sup>37</sup> *Papsturkunden in Portugal*, (see n. 5), 76–81 for list of papal letters to Santa Cruz, no. 111, at 325–328 for Urban III's 1187 confirmation (Not registered in JL [see n. 5]). Urban's 1187 confirmation slips up in referring to Afonso as „dux“ rather than „rex“ because, since the previous re-confirmation for Santa Cruz in 1163, the kings of Portugal had subsequently been recognised as „reges“ by the papacy. See also Erdmann, *Das Papsttum und Portugal*, (see n. 6), 46, n. 4.

<sup>38</sup> As Cistercian houses did in the twelfth century according to Cariboni and Renzi: Cariboni, *Papato e monachesimo „esente“*, (see n. 18), 81f; Renzi, *Cistercians, bishops and papal exemption*, (see n. 1), 52f. However, in the first half of the twelfth century this does not seem to have been the case, at least in England. Dr Martin Brett pointed out that re-confirmations for English houses are generally contemporaneous with English missions to the Curia for other, unrelated business. In this period it seems that houses only bothered to get confirmations when they were already going to Rome. M. Brett, *The English Church under Henry I*, Oxford 1975, (Oxford Historical Monographs), 61.

<sup>39</sup> Adrian I in the late eighth century supposedly ruled two years longer than Alexander III. Other than him no pope was to rule for longer than Alexander until Pius VI (1775–1799). See J. M. D. Kelly/Michael Walsh, *The Oxford dictionary of popes*, Oxford 2005.

the activity of petitioners which led to payments, then a decline in petitions for privileges meant a decline in payments. When Alexander III began his pontificate he had faced a similar financial problem: much of the traditional papal revenue was out of his reach because of the schism. As Ludwig Falkenstein has noted, Alexander made use of active papal collection to gather „extra-ordinary subsidies“ from across Western Europe even in the earliest years of his reign.<sup>40</sup> The 1162 census payment from Santa Cruz – the first to be collected by papal nuncios – was collected by Teodinus, who was one of the collectors sent out by Alexander’s court to gather those extra-ordinary subsidies. He also appeared in Castile and León where he collected subsidies.<sup>41</sup> This clearly suggests that, when we see active papal collection of census in the sources, it is a short-term response to deficiencies in the papal finances, not a policy in reaction to long-term non-payment of the monastic census. The novelty of collection is seen in the *Draco Normannicus* when the author declares with outrage that, at the beginning of his pontificate, Alexander „sent his men everywhere in order that they should bring back the census.“<sup>42</sup> It may have been the case that the papal court continued actively to collect dues in the later years of Alexander’s pontificate but houses would still have continued to pay their arrears when they petitioned for a new privilege. Unfortunately, with Alexander’s long reign there was less need for houses to get re-confirmations. Any increase in active collection during Alexander’s reign (1159–81) does not mean that prior to 1159 there was a problem with the regularity of census payments; it just means that Alexander needed immediate cash resources because the usual sources of papal finance were beyond his control.<sup>43</sup> Active

<sup>40</sup> Falkenstein, *Leistungsersuchen Alexanders III.*, (see n. 15), at 197–199.

<sup>41</sup> Falkenstein, *Leistungsersuchen Alexanders III.*, (see n. 15), at 55–59; see citations thereat, especially: Toribio Minguella y Arnedo, *Historia de la diócesis de Sigüenza y des sus obispos*, Madrid 1910, I, no. 62, at 417; Antonio López Ferreiro, *Historia de la santa A.M. iglesia de Santiago de Compostela*, Santiago 1901, IV, appendix no. 33, at 84–86. Teodinus, and his companion Leo, probably also fulfilled a diplomatic function, bringing the kings and churches of Iberia over to Alexander. The Compostelan document (cited above) specifies that Alexander sent „Master Teodinus and Leo [...] to the Lord King Ferdinand, and to all the churches of Spain“. Ingo Fleisch sees the mission of Teodinus and Leo as being financial rather than legatine and certainly the collection of payments does seem to have been their primary duty. However, I suspect there was a diplomatic element to their mission, even if it was secondary, Fleisch, *Rom und die Iberische Halbinsel*, (see n. 6), 164f.

<sup>42</sup> The *Draco Normannicus* of Etienne de Rouen, in: *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I*, Richard Howlett (ed.), London 1885, (*Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages*), 740: „Ut census referant mittit ubique suos“; Lunt, *Papal revenues*, (see n. 3), I, 38.

<sup>43</sup> A papal collector (Peter) came to Santa Cruz in 1168 to collect the census. This is suggested by Falkenstein to be contemporaneous with formulaic letters of Alexander III, perhaps widely dispatched, for census payments. Cardinal Jacintus collected the census from Santa Cruz in 1173. In 1173 a „voluntary subsidy“ was collected from the English Church and recorded by Ralph of Diceto. It does appear that active collection of the census from Santa Cruz is linked with Alexander’s immediate need for money, rather than general dissatisfaction with the frequency of payment. For 1168 see Falkenstein, *Leistungsersuchen Alexanders III.*, (see n. 15), at 191f. Regarding Peter, see the detailed suggestions of Fleisch, *Rom und die Iberische Halbinsel*, (see n. 6), 167–171. For the English subsidy of 1173 see Radulfi de Diceto decani Landoniensi opera historica, William Stubbs (ed.), London 1876, (*Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages*), I, 378f; William E. Lunt, *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England to 1327*, Cambridge MA 1939, (*Studies in Anglo-Papal Relations during the Middle Ages*; 1), 175f.

papal collection was not intended to replace the system of paying census when a house petitioned for a privilege, but to augment it in a time of great need. While popes only reigned for around five years – and while there was no schism and hence no competition for papal revenue – there was no problem with houses paying their arrears when they petitioned for a confirmation of their privilege.

Regarding the protection census paid to the papacy in the twelfth century by the Portuguese monarchy, there is a point of importance.<sup>44</sup> Between 1179 and 1198 we can be certain that no census payments were made because, in a letter of 24 April 1198, Pope Innocent III states as much. He requests the back payments for two censuses: four ounces of gold constituted in 1143 and two marks, constituted in 1179, neither paid since 1179.<sup>45</sup> However, in 1190 Sancho I had received confirmation of the papal protection, the two mark census, and his royal title in a re-issue of *Manifestis Probatum* from Pope Clement III.<sup>46</sup> If payment of the census and arrears are linked with re-issues of privileges then why was no payment made in 1190? The answer is given in the same letter of Innocent III. Some years earlier Sancho had told Master Michael, a papal notary sent to the Iberian peninsula, that his father's gift of 1,000 aurei (paid in 1179–80) had covered the two mark census for the following ten years.<sup>47</sup> Michael's mission to Iberia can certainly be dated to the pontificate of Clement III (1187–91) probably to mid-1189.<sup>48</sup> Therefore Sancho's claim that he did not need to pay was surely a prerequisite to requesting the 1190 re-confirmation. The census was not paid in 1190 because the camera accepted Sancho's claim that it had already been paid. Thus a confirmation was issued even without the census payment because it seemed as though there were no outstanding arrears. When Innocent III came to the papal throne, however, he did not accept this. In the letter of 24 April 1198, he claimed that the gift of 1,000 aurei had been made „from devotion“ and not for the census after all.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>44</sup> For the „protectio“ – Schutz – extended to Portugal see Fried, Papstlicher Schutz, (see n. 9), 140–142.

<sup>45</sup> Die Register Innocenz' III. 1 Pontifikatsjahr, 1198/99. Texte, Othmar Hageneder/Anton Haidacher (eds.), Graz/Cologne 1964, (Publikationen der Abteilung fur historische Studien des osterreichischen Kulturinstituts in Rom, II. Abteilung: Quellen, I. Reihe; 1), no. 99, at 145–147; Bulario Portugues, (see n. 7), 5–6; PL (see n. 5) CCXIV, 87f, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad annum MCCCIV, Augustus Potthast (ed.), 2 vols, Graz <sup>2</sup>1957, I, [Henceforth: Potthast], no. 103.

<sup>46</sup> Papsturkunden in Portugal, (see n. 5), 342f; Not registered in JL (see n. 5).

<sup>47</sup> Register Innocenz' III. 1198/99, (see n. 45), no. 99, at 145–147; Bulario Portugues, (see n. 7), 6; PL (see n. 5) CCXIV, 87f; Potthast (see n. 45) 103.

<sup>48</sup> The edition of the letter in Migne has Celestine rather than Clement but this is corrected in both: Register Innocenz' III. 1198/99, (see n. 45), no. 99, at 145–147 and Bulario Portugues, (see n. 7), 5–6. For date of 1189 see Fleisch, Rom und die Iberische Halbinsel, (see n. 6), 181, n. 158.

<sup>49</sup> One is tempted to suggest that Innocent III's dismissal of Cencio (later Honorius III) as chamberlain was linked to these events. Perhaps Sancho's evasion of payment was one of many such fraudulent excuses from papal „censuales“. When Innocent discovered this financial mismanagement he may have been persuaded that a new chamberlain was necessary. „Brother Richard“, Innocent's new chamberlain, was appointed no later than 14 August 1198, Liber Censuum. I, fasc. 2, (see n. 15), 8; cited in Werner Maleczek, Papst und Kardinalskolleg von 1191 bis 1216. Die Kardinale unter Coelestin III. und Innocenz III., Vienna 1984, (Publikationen des historischen Instituts beim osterreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom. Abt. 1; 6), 349, n. 209. Cencio had been acting as chamberlain since

Of course it must be admitted that the monastery of Santa Cruz might not be representative. It was the royal foundation and necropolis, the equivalent of Westminster Abbey in England. Perhaps it should not be taken as automatically representative of all the foundations which paid census. For example, when sending someone to the papal court to ask for confirmations in 1157 and 1163, in both cases the representative carried letters from King Afonso I requesting the pope to grant the confirmations.<sup>50</sup> It is unlikely that most institutions were so closely linked with the king of their territory. The unique position of Santa Cruz might account for the keeping of copies of receipts even when they were not needed anymore. Santa Cruz served Afonso I as a scriptorium and royal chancery and so the canons might have been extra-sensitive to the keeping of records.<sup>51</sup> The position of the Italian houses which paid census may have been different too. When the papal court was situated in the Italian peninsula it must have been much easier for them to come to Rome and pay their census. We should also remember that the amounts Northern and central Italian houses owed tended to be less than those owed by Sicilian and other more peripheral houses.<sup>52</sup> It is also worth noting that census payments from monasteries were hardly the most considerable item in the papal finances.<sup>53</sup> The papal court had income in cash and kind from its lands in the patrimony and tribute from kingdoms too.

In the light of the foregoing, it may be suggested that census payments were a more regular source of papal income than has been hitherto understood: the clear

---

1189 (Maleczek, *Zwischen lokaler Verankerung und universalem Horizont. Das Kardinalskollegium unter Innocenz III.*, in: *Innocenz III. Urbs et Orbis*, [see n. 24], I, 102–174, at 140) and so it had been he who had accepted Sancho's 1190 false claim of pre-payment. But Innocent did not only replace Cencio, he seemingly replaced him with Cencio's own predecessor. A „brother R. of the Temple“ had been chamberlain to Pope Urban III in 1187, see *Epistolae Cantuarienses*, William Stubbs [ed.], London 1865, (*Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages*), 556; cited in Marie Luise Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae domus militiae templi Hierosolymitani magistri. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templerordens 1118/19–1314*, Göttingen 1974, (*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Dritte Folge*; 86), 337, n. 205. Cencio first appears as chamberlain in 1189, making him brother R.'s successor. If, as seems very likely, „brother R.“ and „brother Richard“ are identical, then Innocent replaced Cencio with Urban's old chamberlain. It seems probable that brother Richard's second appointment was as a caretaker, fulfilling the role until Innocent could make a more permanent appointment. This he did by 1200 when Octavian, Innocent's kinsman, appears in the position (Maleczek, *Papst und Kardinalskolleg*, 163). It is unlikely that Innocent's animosity towards Cencio was personal – Innocent advanced him to cardinal-priest – but possible that it was down to a perceived failure to call in debts and enforce payment to the papal court. It is rarely a good sign when an incoming leader replaces someone with that person's own predecessor; it suggests that their own tenure was not satisfactory.

<sup>50</sup> *Documentos Medievais Portugueses. Documentos Régios*, Rui Pinto de Azevedo (ed.), Lisbon 1958, I, t. 1, 317f, 359f; *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica, Scriptorum*, (see n. 16), I, fasc. 1, 71–75.

<sup>51</sup> Maria João Violante Branco, *Revisiting the political uses of vernacular language in Portugal during the thirteenth century. On models, motives and modes*, in: Hannah Skoda/Patrick Lantschner/R. L. J. Shaw (eds.), *Contact and exchange in later medieval Europe. Essays in honour of Malcolm Vale*, Woodbridge 2012, 103–126, at 119, n. 46.

<sup>52</sup> Robinson, *Papacy*, (see n. 6), 270f.

<sup>53</sup> Volkert Pfaff, *Die Einnahmen der römischen Kurie am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 40, (1953), 97–118, at 113f; Robinson, *Papacy*, (see n. 6), 282.

link between payment of the census and arrears and re-confirmation of privileges would seem to imply that it was the exempt and protected religious houses which actively arranged to pay the census, and they sent payment to the papal court more often than has previously been suspected. The reason why so little documentation, primarily receipts, has survived is surely that the houses disposed of unnecessary documentation and only required a record of the most recent receipt in order to show the last time they paid. The seeming increase in active papal collection in the second half of the twelfth century was not so much a considered decision to a long-term problem of payment as a short-term reaction to the sudden collapse of the Alexandrine finances caused by the papal schism. Alexander's long reign then meant that institutions had less need to get confirmations of privileges.

When crusading taxes were introduced in the thirteenth century active collection of dues to the papacy may have become more consistent. These crusading taxes were assessed and collected by a mixture of papal and local ecclesiastics. In 1274 one or two centrally appointed collectors were sent to each area – often an entire kingdom – and they were then ordered to appoint two sub-collectors in each city or diocese from the „suitable persons“ found in the locality.<sup>54</sup> The collectors and sub-collectors then had to assess the income of the clergy so that they knew how much should be paid. Such assessment by collectors gave rise to the *Rationes decimarum*: detailed accounts of how much was paid from each diocese. The crusading taxes, once collected, were dispatched to the papal court through Italian banking firms, as the census seems often to have been in the thirteenth century.<sup>55</sup> The amount raised from crusading taxes dwarfed the census-payments, however. Considering this system of collection and accounting it seems entirely possible that census-payments were more frequently gathered by papal collectors in the thirteenth century than previously. Nonetheless, it appears that houses continued to pay their census arrears at the papal court. More than a century ago Paul Fabre edited records of census collection in France from the pontificate of Nicholas IV (1288–92).<sup>56</sup> A papal representative collected arrears for 28 years from a Parisian church, but noted that he did not have to collect any more because „concerning the preceding time“ the church had paid its census to the papal chamberlain. The collector then copied out a receipt from 1263 which the chamberlain had given to the payer. Another monastery had „paid to the lord chamberlain in the curia, as shown through his letters patent“, presumably meaning that they had paid their census that very year.<sup>57</sup> There were several others who had re-

---

<sup>54</sup> See the general letters dispatched by Gregory X (Potthast [see n. 45] 20925). For the copy sent to England see The Register of Walter Giffard, Lord Archbishop of York, 1266–1279, William Brown (ed.), Durham/London/Edinburgh 1904, (Surtees Society; 109), 274–276. For details of the collectors sent to Spain – one to Castile-León, one to Aragon and Navarre and one to Portugal – see *Rationes Decimarum Hispaniae* (1279–80), J. Rius Serra (ed.), 2 vols, Barcelona 1946–7, (Textos y estudios de la corona de Aragón; 8), II, 312.

<sup>55</sup> *Rationes Decimarum Hispaniae*, (see n. 54), II, 312; Lunt, Papal revenues, (see n. 3), I, 41; Paul Fabre, La perception du cens apostolique dans l'Italie centrale en 1291, in: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 10, (1890), 369–383, at 369.

<sup>56</sup> Paul Fabre, La perception du cens apostolique en France en 1291–1293, in: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 17, (1897), 221–278.

<sup>57</sup> Fabre, Cens apostolique en France, (see n. 56), 226.

ceipts from the papal chamberlain for their last payment.<sup>58</sup> Clearly it was still normal in the thirteenth century to give out receipts for census-payments at the papal court, although whether the link between confirmations of privilege and paying census still existed is harder to answer. However, in the second half of the twelfth century the collection of income taxes from the universal church was still in the future. A papal schism and such a long pontificate as Alexander III's were exceptional. Thus active collection of census was equally exceptional and merely a short-term reaction to a current dearth of funds. Collection was not intended to replace the payment of census at the papal court but to remedy an urgent need for cash. It would follow that, in a period with no schism and with the normal much more rapid tempo of succession to the throne of Peter, census payments would keep time and be relatively regular.

### Abstract

Dieser Aufsatz untersucht den jährlichen Zins, den bestimmte papstunmittelbare Klöster im Mittelalter dem Heiligen Stuhl entrichten mussten. Bislang hat die Forschung allgemein angenommen, dass diese Zinszahlungen selten erfolgten, gewöhnlich nur dann, wenn ein päpstlicher Nuntius oder Legat im Haus war. Belege aus Portugal zeigen allerdings einen anderen Zusammenhang auf: Die Zinszahlung an die apostolische Kammer hing mit der Erneuerung der Privilegien des Klosters durch die päpstliche Kanzlei zusammen. Dies ermöglicht eine genaue Analyse der Häufigkeit der Zinszahlung an die apostolische Kammer sowie der Methoden der päpstlichen Finanzverwaltung.

---

<sup>58</sup> Fabre, *Cens apostolique en France*, (see n. 56), 234, 237, 247, 249, 252, 254, 262, 271. There are also receipts from nuncios, at 240 for example.