


Cum enim sit ecclesie Romane vassallus: some observations on a letter of Pope Honorius III about James I of Aragon*

ENRICO VENEZIANI



Universidade do Porto, Centro de Investigação Transdisciplinar Cultura, Espaço e Memória;
Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Centro de Estudos de História Religiosa, Portugal
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8087-9358>
eveneziani@letras.up.pt

Abstract: The aim of this work is to analyse the relationship between the Apostolic See and the Crown of Aragon during the papacy of Honorius III. While the idea of a feudal link between Aragon and the papacy has already been questioned by Johannes Fried, a letter sent from Honorius's chancery in 1222 seems to show how the pope might have reframed this relation at some point during his papacy, explicitly highlighting the idea of King James I as a *vassallus* of the Roman Church. Tackling this document from an ecclesiological perspective and reading it in light of the context in which it was produced, this article considers the reasons for the change of interpretation by Honorius and the consequences for Aragon and for the papacy.

Keywords: Honorius III, Aragon, Vassalage, James I, Papacy.

***Cum enim sit ecclesie Romane vassallus:* algumas observações sobre uma carta do Papa Honório III sobre Jaime I de Aragão**

Resumo: O objetivo deste trabalho é analisar as relações entre a Sede Apostólica e a Corona de Aragão durante o pontificado de Honório III. Apesar da ideia de uma ligação feudal entre o Papado Romano e Aragão ter já sido questionada por Johannes Fried, uma carta enviada pela Chancelaria de Honório III em 1222 parece mostrar como o papa reformulou esta relação numa determinada altura do seu pontificado, sublinhado explicitamente a ideia do rei Jaime I de Aragão ser um *vassallus* da Igreja Romana. Abordando este documento do ponto de vista eclesiológico e lendo-o à luz do contexto em que foi produzido, o presente artigo interroga-se sobre esta mudança na interpretação de Honório III e quais foram as suas consequências na evolução das relações entre Roma e Aragão no século XIII.

Palavras-chaves: Honório III, Aragão, Vassalagem, Jaime I, Papado.

* This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 894678 – RAP.

«Nos karissimo in Christo filio nostro Iacobo illustri regi Aragonum [...] cum enim sit ecclesie Romane vassallus, non solum contra inimicos nominis christiani sibi auxilium tenemur impendere, verum etiam contra christianos, si, quod absit, urgeret necessitas, teneremur eidem favorem et subsidium exhibere»¹.

This is how Pope Honorius III addressed all the faithful in *Hispania* on 15 June 1222, asking them to help King James I of Aragon by sending men and goods in case of a war against the Moors in exchange for the remission of all their sins². For the first time, the pontiff called James a *vassallus* of the Roman Church, thus justifying the intervention in his favour. Apparently, this was a significant change in the relationship between the papacy and Aragon, which had so far been shaped around the concession of Apostolic protection. However, this shift has usually been overlooked; very recently, the adoption of this word has been deemed as «probably not written with the intention of changing James’s status vis-à-vis the pope; more probably the use of the word was accidental, perhaps because the drafters did not see a clear difference between protection and vassalage»³.

The aim of this essay is to reframe the use of this particular title, comparing it not only with further letters from Honorius and his predecessors but also paying due consideration to the context in which the pope was writing and highlighting the ambiguity and vagueness of a language that could describe very different situations – but which was always understood by the addressees. This work shows how various relationships that did not follow predetermined models cannot be read through a simplistic *reductio ad unum* but should be evaluated considering the pope sending the letters and the context.

Before going on any further, a clarification needs to be made concerning the meanings and uses of the words “Kingdom of Aragon” and “Crown of Aragon”. Today, the historiography tends to use the former to indicate the kingdom of Aragon alone (which is more or less the modern region of Aragon), while the latter includes all the domains belonging to the kings of Aragon and counts of Barcelona. This distinction is important in our understanding of the Crown of Aragon as a “monarquía compuesta”, a composite monarchy *aeque principaliter*, a conglomerate of political domains, each with its own legislation and political institutions, all sharing

1 MANSILLA, Demetrio, ed. – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio III (1216-1227)*. Rome: Instituto Español de Historia Eclesiástica, 1965, p. 298.

2 The word *Hispania*, when used here, cannot be simply translated as “Spain”, but should be understood as the Latin word “Hispania” or replaced by the modern “Iberian Peninsula”. On the concept of *Hispania*, see SABATÉ, Flocel; FONSECA, Luís Adão da – The Spain that never was: the Iberian Peninsula from its peripheries. In SABATÉ, Flocel; FONSECA, Luís Adão da, ed. – *Catalonia and Portugal. The Iberian Peninsula from the periphery*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2015, p. 9-41.

3 WIEDEMANN, Benedict – *Papal overlordship and European princes 1000-1270*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022, p. 191.

the same king because he was also the sovereign (or the lord) of each territory⁴. Both concepts and their meanings have been at the core of a longstanding dispute, recently summarised by Cristian Palomo Reina⁵. Scholars such as Jesús Lalinde Abadía, Juan Manuel del Estal, Flocel Sabaté, and Jaume Sobrequés i Callicó have considered the evolutions of these expressions starting from the Middle Ages, showing how they initially indicated either the “entidad principesca” or the territories directly depending on the king, the *realengo*⁶. It was only between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries that the “Crown of Aragon” began to be used to refer to all the territories and regions under the authority of the kings of Aragon. Throughout this article, I shall adopt the modern distinction when referring to the Kingdom and Crown of Aragon (the latter term referring only to Aragon, Catalonia, and the territories in Languedoc inherited by James I from both his father Peter II and mother Maria of Montpellier, the actual extension of this political reality in 1222).

Relations between the papacy and the Kingdom/Crown of Aragon between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries have been the focus of numerous works. The classic interpretation was proposed by Paul Fridolin Kehr in a series of articles published between 1926 and 1928⁷. Through the analysis of papal letters, Kehr understood the Kingdom of Aragon as a fief of the Apostolic See – one of his works is indeed entitled *Wie und wann wurde das Reich Aragon ein Lehen der römischen Kirche/ ¿Como y cuándo se hizo Aragón feudatario de la Santa Sede?*. This view (which is sometimes still present) was questioned by Johannes Fried in 1980 in his work *Der apostolische Schutz für Laienfürsten*, where the scholar highlighted how these relationships did not entail any subordination of Aragon to Rome; on the contrary, they concerned the Apostolic *protectio* and the payment of a *census*⁸.

4 PALOMO REINA, Christian – Denominaciones históricas de la Corona de Aragón. Balance crítico e historiográfico. *eHumanista/IVITRA*. 16 (2019) 160-163.

5 PALOMO REINA – Denominaciones históricas, p. 160-180.

6 PALOMO REINA – Denominaciones históricas, p. 176-177. See also LALINDE ABADÍA, Jesús – Depuración histórica del concepto de Corona de Aragón. In SARASA, Esteban; SERRANO, Eliseo, ed. – *La Corona de Aragón y el Mediterráneo: siglos XV-XVI*. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico 1997, p. 433-458; ESTAL, Juan Manuel del – Antigüedad del concepto y denominación ‘Corona de Aragón’. *Medievalia*. 10 (1992) 133-168; SABATÉ, Flocel – *El territori de la Catalunya medieval: percepció de l’espai i divisió territorial al llarg de l’edat mitjana*. Barcelona: Rafael Dalmau, 1997; SABATÉ, Flocel – *Maison et Couronne d’Aragon*. In JARDIN, Jean-Pierre; ROCHWERT-ZUILLI, Patricia; THIEULIN-PARDO, Héléne, ed. – *Histoires, femmes, pouvoirs. Péninsule Ibérique (IXe-XVe siècle). Mélanges offerts au Professeur Georges Martin*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2018, p. 763-777; SOBREQUÉS, Jaume – Corona d’Aragó, Reyat Corona d’Aragó, Corona Reial d’Aragó i casa d’Aragó, en el llenguatge polític del segle XV. In CLARET, Jaume ed. – *Miscel·lània Ernest Lluch i Martín*. Vilassar de Mar: Fundació Ernest Lluch, 2006, Volume I, p. 533-550.

7 KEHR, Paul Fridolin – *Das papsttum und der katalanische prinzipat bis zur vereinigung mit Aragon*. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1926; KEHR, Paul Fridolin – *Wie und wann wurde das Reich Aragon ein Lehen der römischen kirche? Eine diplomatische untersuchung*. Berlin: Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1928; KEHR, Paul Fridolin – *Das papsttum und die Königreiche Navarra und Aragon bis zur mitte des XII. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1928.

8 FRIED, Johannes – *Der päpstliche schutz für laienfürsten: die politische geschichte des päpstlichen schutzprivilegs für laien (11.-13. Jh.)*. Winter: Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980.

A great contribution to the study of the relationships between the popes and *Hispania* has been provided by Damian Smith in both his works on the twelfth-century pontificates and in his monograph, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon*⁹. Smith has made a systematic study of these relations not only in light of the whole Iberian context but also with particular consideration of the Roman horizon. In 2021, Benedict Wiedemann, in his work about papal overlordship between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, stressed the role played by petitioners in resorting to Rome, considering in detail the case of Aragon and making a comparison with further cases such as the Normans in Southern Italy, the Kingdom of England, the County of Melgueil, and the Bishop of Maguelonne¹⁰.

The 1222 letter from Honorius III has already been analysed both by Fried and Wiedemann. Fried argued how the adoption of the title *vassallus* was the reaction of the Curia to the self-investiture of James I as a knight in 1221, when the king's minority ended, and to the assumption of the direct administration of the kingdom, all without involving Rome. The attempt to raise the stakes failed after the king's threat to not pay the *census*¹¹. Wiedemann, on the other hand, harking back to the cases of the English kingdom and to Rognvaldr as king of the Isles of Man of the Outer Hebrides, has framed this letter in light of the increasing use of feudal language by the Apostolic See. Wiedemann has argued that the title in Honorius's letter would have been suggested either by some courtiers who were also involved in both the English and Rognvaldr's cases or by someone writing the letter, influenced by the mentioned cases and who would have had some difficulties in distinguishing between protection and vassalage¹². There is no mention of this document in Viola Skiba's recent (2016) monograph, *Papst Honorius III*¹³.

Both Fried and Wiedemann's analyses, although making significant steps forward in the historiography of relations between the papacy and Aragon, consider only some aspects of the problem. They are anchored to either a rigid feudal model and whether this had been applied or not to the Aragonese case or to an excessive

9 SMITH, Damian J. – The abbot-crusader: Nicholas Breakspear in Catalonia. In BOLTON, Brenda; DUGGAN, Anne J., ed. – *Adrian IV, the english pope (1154–1159). Studies and texts*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003, p. 29-39; SMITH, Damian J. – The Iberian legations of Cardinal Hyacinth Bobone. In DORAN, John; SMITH, Damian J., ed. – *Pope Celestine III, 1191-1198: diplomat and pastor*. London/New York: Routledge, 2008, p. 81-111; SMITH, Damian J. – Alexander III and Spain. In CLARKE, Peter D.; DUGGAN, Anne J. – *Pope Alexander III (1159-81): The art of survival*. London/New York: Routledge, 2012, p. 203-241; SMITH, Damian J. – The men who would be kings: Innocent II and Spain. In DORAN, John and SMITH, Damian J., ed. – *Pope Innocent II (1130-43): the world vs the city*. London: Routledge, 2016, p. 181-204; SMITH, Damian J. – A golden rose and the deaf asp that stoppeth her ears: Eugenius III and Spain. In FONNESBERG-SCHMIDT, Iben, ed. – *Pope Eugenius III (1145-1153): the first Cistercian pope*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018, p. 219-242; FONNESBERG-SCHMIDT, Iben – *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon. The limits of papal authority*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

10 WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*.

11 FRIED – *Der päpstliche Schutz*, p. 240-242.

12 WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 108-118 and 186-191.

13 SKIBA, Viola – *Papst Honorius III. (1216-1227)*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2016.

emphasis on the role of petitioners, perhaps a reaction to a view of an almost “omnipotent” papacy à la Walter Ullmann, who did not leave any space for them to move¹⁴. Petitioners and their requests, although they played a significant part in the production of documents by the papal chancery in the thirteenth century, cannot be considered solely responsible for the text of papal letters.

These are all consequences of a stagnant vision of the papacy, one of the legacies of the model of the so-called “Gregorian Reform”, as if the papacy was an institution already fully developed in accordance with a pre-established and linear model and acknowledged by all the political actors, which addressed Rome in order to gain legitimacy¹⁵. Actually, the creation of the so-called “papal monarchy” was far from complete in the thirteenth century¹⁶. The Apostolic See was always looking for new possibilities to state its authority and be acknowledged, but in this, it greatly depended upon the context and the reigning pontiff – this is how the idea of a reactive papacy should be interpreted, not only as a simple passive subject.

Building on Fried and Wiedemann’s analyses, to understand better the change in language adopted by Honorius III in 1222, it is important to look at some of the most significant steps in the relations between the Roman Church and Aragon through the extant papal letters. This is only a short *excursus*, but it shows how these relations, as highlighted by Fried, concerned the Apostolic *protectio* and the payment of a *census*, without entailing any kind of subordination.

On 1 July 1089, Urban II wrote to Sancho Ramírez, king of Aragon, replying to the latter’s letter sent between 1088 and 1089, rejoicing because he had shown himself truly devout to the Roman Church and had made everybody under his authority tributaries of this church, a reference to Sancho’s pilgrimage almost twenty years before – which probably resulted in the Roman rite replacing the Mozarabic rite in the kingdom¹⁷. Indeed, Sancho Ramírez had promised to pay

14 ULLMANN, Walter – *The growth of papal government in the Middle Ages. A study in the ideological relation of clerical to lay power*. London: Methuen, 1955. See also OAKLEY, Francis – Celestial hierarchies revisited. Walter Ullmann’s vision of medieval politics. *Past and Present*. 60 (1973) 3-48.

15 The classic work is FLICHE, Augustin – *La réforme grégorienne*. Vol. 2. Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1925. The model of a “Gregorian Reform” has been questioned by several scholars. See CAPITANI, Ovidio – Esiste un’età gregoriana? Considerazioni sulle tendenze di una storiografia medievistica. *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*. 1 (1965) 454-481; GILCHRIST, John – Was there a Gregorian reform movement in the eleventh-century?. *The Canadian Catholic Historical Association: Study Sessions*. 37 (1970) 1-10; VIOLANTE, Cinzio – La riforma ecclesiastica del secolo XI come progressiva sintesi di contrastanti idee e strutture. In VIOLANTE, Cinzio – *Sant’Anselmo vescovo di Lucca (1073-1086) nel quadro delle trasformazioni sociali e della riforma ecclesiastica*. Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1992, p. 1-15. For an overview see RENZI, Francesco; VENEZIANI, Enrico – Alcune note sulla riforma della chiesa romana nel pienomedioevo (secoli XI-XII). *Via Spiritus*. 21 (2021) 5-33.

16 MORRIS, Colin – *The papal monarchy: The Western church from 1050 to 1250*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1989.

17 «Te erga Romanam ecclesiam adeo devotum agnovimus, ut caput ipsum tuum et omnes, qui sub tua ditione continentur, eidem ecclesie tributarios feceris» KEHR – *Wie und wann*, p. 320. SMITH, Damian J. – Sancho Ramirez and the roman rite. In SWANSON, Robert – *Unity and diversity in the church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 95-105.

an annual *census* of 500 *mancusos* and that his *militēs* would also offer a tribute¹⁸. On the same day, the pontiff granted a privilege to the monastery of Montearagón (together with concessions to St Pons de Thomières and San Juan de la Peña), where he brought to mind how Sancho Ramírez, the most devout *famulus* of Peter, had given himself, his *domus*, and his kingdom to the Roman Church, promising to pay a *census* together with his *militēs*. For this reason, the pontiff took the king, his sons, and his kingdom under the protection of the Apostolic See, exhorting Sancho's successors to receive the kingdom from the hands (*de manu*) of the pope, thus showing themselves to be faithful and obedient to Peter and his vicar, to pay the *census*, and to acknowledge themselves as *reges, ministros ac famulos* of St Peter¹⁹. If we consider that Urban found himself in the middle of a fight against Clement III and Emperor Henry IV, all these references to being faithful to the pope become clear²⁰. The protection of the Apostolic See was nothing new – it is sufficient to recall the numerous privileges granted to monasteries²¹. *Protectio* and *census* appeared again in the letter Urban addressed to the new king Peter I on 16 March 1095, granted to the king because he was following his father Sancho Ramírez in the *fides ac devotio* to the Roman Church²². Peter is again addressed by Urban as *rex Beati Petri devotissimus*;

-
- 18 «Pro remedio anime mee Deo cupiens placere, decrevi in animo Deo tributum et beato Petro apostolorum principi pro meo meorumque filiorum capite persolvere, videlicet quingentos mancosos laccensis monete. Hunc censum pollicitus sum et polliceor me per singulos vita superstitute redditurum annos. Haec constituo et confirmo et a meo successore meo observanda perpetuo. Omnes etiam pene milites, qui intererant, eadem condicione se duros promiserunt unusquisque per singulos annos predictae monete unum mancosum» KEHR – *Wie und wann*, p. 319.
- 19 «Ipse [Sancho Ramírez] [...] ea [the Roman Church] semetipsum omnemque domum et regnum suum devotione dedit, ut se cum filiis suis in perpetuum quingentorum mancosorum omneque caput in regno suo militantium unius mancosi laccensis annuatim obnoxio fore decreverit. [...] Preterea catholicis omnibus notum fieri volumus, quia regem beato Petro devotissimum Sancium eiusque filios et omne eius regnum in tutelam sedis apostolice speciali dilectione suscepimus» FRIED – *Der päpstliche schutz*, p. 327-328.
- 20 On Urban's papacy, see BECKER, Alfons – *Papst Urban II. (1088-1099)*. 3 vols. Stuttgart-Hannover: MGH, 1964-2012; MUSARRA, Antonio – *Urbano II e l'Italia delle città. Riforma, crociata e spazi politici alla fine dell'XI secolo*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2023. On Clement III see ZIESE, Jürgen – *Wibert von Ravenna, der Gegenpapst Clemens III. (1084-1100)*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1982; LONGO, Umberto; YAWN, Lila, ed. – Framing Clement III, (Anti)Pope, 1080-1100. *Reti Medievali Rivista*. 13:1 (2012). Acedido em: <http://www.serena.unina.it/index.php/rm/article/view/4804>. Consultado a 2/3/2023. Wiedemann's idea that receiving the kingdom from the hands of the pontiff was language taken from the model used in investitures of bishops by kings is interesting, but we should also take into consideration the variety of meanings these words entailed and the difficulties for the same men of the eleventh/twelfth century to understand them (something also acknowledged by Wiedemann), as attested by the negotiations leading to Worms – which had to move from focusing on the meaning of the gesture of the investiture to its objects in order to reach the compromise – and all the propaganda works created during the so-called "Investiture Contest". The concept of investiture (especially the *regalia*) remained problematic at least until the time of Frederick I Barbarossa. Therefore, we cannot trace the papal language in Urban's letter to a single clear model. WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlords*, p. 32-34.
- 21 MACCARRONE, Michele – *Primato romano e monasteri dal principio del sec. XII ad Innocenzo III*. In MACCARRONE, Michele – *Romana ecclesia cathedra Petri*. 2 vols. Rome: Herder editrice, 1991, Volume. II, p. 821-927. On the papal *protectio* in the kingdom of Aragon see SMITH – *Innocent III*, p. 231-232.
- 22 «Te enim tamquam regem beati Petri devotissimum et omne tuum regnum in tutelam sedis apostolice dilectione suscepimus. [...] Tuam vero personam in beati Petri et nostre manus tutelam ita omnino suscepimus. [...] Sane ad iudicium huius precepte a Romana ecclesia libertatis quingentos laccensis monete mancosos aureos per annos singulos [...] persolvatis» MANSILLA,

the pontiff also granted the king the privilege of not being excommunicated either by any prelate or papal legate without an explicit order from the pope (perhaps a concession following a letter from Peter to the same Urban sent again in 1095)²³.

During the pontificates of Urban's successors, there was some kind of cooling in the papal-Aragonese relations, perhaps a result of both Alfonso I's long reign – the king was not as sympathetic to the papacy as his father or his brothers – and of the events following his death and his peculiar testament²⁴. Only with Ramón Berenguer IV, Count of Barcelona and husband of Petronilla, daughter of Ramiro II the Monk (brother of Alfonso I and his successor, though never acknowledged by Rome) did direct contact with the Aragonese resume – although not with a king, Ramón Berenguer never called himself *rex*, and Ramiro II kept this title even after returning to the monastery²⁵. In a series of four letters, Adrian IV renewed to the count the impossibility of being excommunicated but with a papal mandate (4 December 1156-58)²⁶. This time, however, the pope limited this concession in comparison to Urban's letter because the decision to excommunicate the count could also be taken by a papal legate «qui sit a latere Romani pontificis destinatus», thus attesting to the development of the office of legates²⁷. On 26 March 1157-59, Adrian confirmed the *libertas* (that is, the privilege) enjoyed by Ramón Berenguer's successors in Aragon, in Barcelona, and in their remaining lands – a possible reference to the concept of “Crown of Aragon”? However, as mentioned above, Ramón Berenguer never called himself king, therefore the question is tricky...²⁸ A reference appeared to the topic of the lands conquered by the *comes*, which are depicted as having been made in defence and for the increase of the Church of God in Western regions, thus harking back to what Ramón Berenguer had written to Adrian in 1156²⁹. On 23 June 1158, addressing the archbishops of Tarragona and Narbonne, the pope reminded them how the count, *tanquam devotissimus ac specialis filius*, was under papal protection, together with his kingdom³⁰. On the following day, 24 June 1158, Adrian gave the

Demetrio, ed. – *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio III (965-1216)*. Roma: Instituto Español de Historia Eclesiástica, 1955, p. 53-54.

23 UBIETO ARTETA, Antonio, ed. – *Colección diplomática de Pedro I de Aragón y Navarra*. Zaragoza: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1951, p. 235-238.

24 WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 80-81 and 87-90. On Alfonso I see LEMA PUEYO, José Ángel – *Alfonso I el Batallador, rey de Aragón y Pamplona (1104–1134)*. Gijón: Trea, 2008.

25 On Ramiro II see LAPÉÑA PAÚL, Ana Isabel – *Ramiro II de Aragón, el rey monje: 1134-1137*. Gijón: Trea, 2009.

26 KEHR, Paul Fridolin, ed. – *Papsturkunden in Spanien. Vorarbeiten zur Hispania Pontificia, Katalanien*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1926, p. 365-366.

27 KEHR, Paul Fridolin, ed. – *Papsturkunden in Spanien*, p. 366. On legates see RENNIE, Kriston R. – *The foundations of medieval papal legation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. For the Iberian Peninsula see SÁBEKOW, Gerhard – *Die päpstlichen legationen nach Spanien und Portugal bis zum ausgang des XII jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Ebering, 1931.

28 KEHR – *Papsturkunden*, p. 366-367.

29 KEHR – *Das Papsttum*, p. 941-942.

30 MIGNE, Jacques-Paul – *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Latina*. Vol. 188. Paris, 1844, p. 1570-1571.

“Roman version” of the events following the succession to Alfonso I, claiming that the kingdom had been left by the heirless king to the Templars, the Hospitallers, and the Holy Sepulchre, who entrusted it to Ramón Berenguer (avoiding any mention of Ramiro II)³¹. If the count thus gained an important legitimisation (especially after the death of Alfonso VII of León-Castile, the most powerful king in the Peninsula, and the problems arising from the subsequent division of his kingdom), the same pope gained an important acknowledgement, especially at a moment when relations with Frederick I Barbarossa were beginning to cool down³².

It was only Alexander III who officially recognised the royal title to Ramón Berenguer’s son, Alfonso II, the first king of Aragon and Count of Barcelona, after the *Unió* resulted from the wedding between Ramón and Petronilla – thus acknowledging only a *de facto* situation³³. On 7 December 1162, the pope called him *rex catholicus et princeps christianissimus*, and on 25 July 1163, Alexander took the king and his kingdom under the Apostolic protection, claiming that his lands pertained *ad ius beati Petri specialiter*³⁴. Again, this claim did not entail any actual right of Rome over the kingdom – the whole letter concerned the concession of the *protectio* (the payment of the *census* disappeared). While this letter was important for Alfonso, who was only six years old, being acknowledged as a legitimate pontiff during the ongoing papal schism of Victor IV (with whom Ramón Berenguer may have initially sided), it was also a significant achievement for Alexander (who was in the middle of his French exile, which lasted until 1165)³⁵. Moreover, on 28 September 1171-72, the pope, recalling the king’s *devotio* towards the Roman Church and his efforts to expand the Christian faith, renewed the possibility for him to attend the divine office even in places stricken with the interdict³⁶. Although Alfonso II was the first count-king, Rome did not seem to acknowledge this situation – the papal letters only mentioned the *regnum* (what we would call the Crown of Aragon today) without distinguishing among its territories (if not for an ambiguous reference to

31 «Totam terram, quam Adefonsus quondam Aragonensium rex sine herede decedens Sepulchro Domini, Hospitali et Templo pro anime sue salute reliquit, et fratres Sepulchri cum consensu patriarche, Hospitalarii et Templarii eandem terram tibi [Ramón Berenguer IV, Barchinonensi comiti] postea concessisse noscuntur» KEHR – *Papsturkunden*, p. 364-365.

32 On Adrian IV, see BOLTON and DUGGAN ed. – *Adrian IV*.

33 A similar acknowledgment of the title of king had been granted by Alexander III to Afonso Henriques of Portugal in the famous document *Manifestis Probatum*, see WIEDEMANN, Benedict – The kingdom of Portugal, homage, and papal “fiefdom” in the second half of the twelfth century. *Journal of Medieval History*. 41:4 (2015) 432-445; RENZI, Francesco – Un regno sotto la protezione di San Pietro. I rapporti tra il Portogallo e la Sede Apostolica da una prospettiva romana (1143-1212). In FERNANDO, Isabel Cristina; BRANCO, Maria João – *Da conquista de Lisboa à conquista de Alcácer (1147-1217)*. Lisboa: Edições Colibri, 2019, p. 237-274; VENEZIANI, Enrico – *Carissimo in Christo filio Alfonso illustri Portugalensium regi: re-framing the relationship between the Papacy and Portugal in the twelfth century*, forthcoming.

34 KEHR – *Papsturkunden*, p. 381; «Karissimo in Christo filio I. illustri Aragonensium regi [...]. Quod [the kingdom] ad ius beati Petri specialiter pertinere dinoscitur, [...] personam tuam et totum regnum cum antiquis et rationabilibus dignitatibus suis ad tuam ditionem pertinens sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus» *Ibid.*, p. 393.

35 KEHR – *Papsturkunden*, p. 371-372; SMITH – *Innocent III*, p. 12, note 2.

36 KEHR – *Papsturkunden*, p. 448-449.

the «antiquas et rationales dignitates suas ad tuam ditionem pertinentes» in the letter of 1163)³⁷.

The renewal of Apostolic protection is at the core of two letters Celestine III sent to the new king, Peter II, and to his mother, Queen Sancha, on 7 August 1196. In the epistle sent to the former, the pope, after claiming in the *arenga* that the Apostolic See loves those who acknowledge the Prince of the Apostles as *patronus ac defensor*, encouraged both by Alfonso II's *devotio* and by Peter following in his father's footsteps, took the king, the queen mother Sancha, and the kingdom under the protection of both the pope and Peter³⁸. The latter document, addressed to Sancha only, is almost identical to the first, save for the specific mention that in this case, the *protectio* especially concerned the goods and lands his dead husband left her (the original disputed dowry entailed by the 1174 wedding)³⁹. This particular care can be understood if one considers that Alfonso II died in April 1196, and the administration of the kingdom was left to Sancha due to Peter's minority⁴⁰. Moreover, the whole context in the Iberian Peninsula was "magmatic" due to the defeat suffered by Alfonso VIII at Alarcos in July 1195 at the hands of the Almohads⁴¹.

Peter II's relations with the Apostolic See became even more frequent with the new pontiff Innocent III (or this is the impression derived from the increasing available documentation). The most significant event was the coronation of Peter in Rome on 10 November 1204 – the king went to the *Urbs* to ask for the support of both the Pisans and Genoese in his future campaign to conquer Majorca and to negotiate the wedding of Frederik II, King of Sicily, with one of Peter's daughters⁴². The *ordo coronationis*, included in both the pope's *Registrum* and in his anonymous biography, the *Gesta Innocentii tertii*, is still extant⁴³. The text has been convincingly analysed by Damian Smith, who also considered the reasons and gains derived for both the king and the pope from this coronation⁴⁴. For the purpose of this article, it is important to recall how the text of the oath sworn by Peter and included in

37 KEHR – *Papsturkunden*, p. 393.

38 «Personam tuam et personam nichilominus karissime in Christo filie nostre Sancie illustris regine matris tue cum regno et omnibus, que impresentiarum concedente Domino possidetis, sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus» KEHR – *Papsturkunden*, p. 578.

39 «Personam tuam cum omnibus bonis, que impresentiarum rationabiliter possides aut in futurum iustis modis prestante Domino poteris adipisci, sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus, specialiter autem ea, que inclite memorie [A.] rex quondam Aragonum, vir tuus serenitatis tue pia largitione donavit» KEHR – *Papsturkunden*, p. 579.

40 SMITH – *Innocent III*, p. 21-23.

41 On Alfonso VIII, see GÓMEZ, Miguel, LINCOLN, Kyle C., and SMITH, Damian J., ed. – *King Alfonso VIII of Castile: government, family, and war*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2019.

42 SMITH – *Innocent III*, p. 26-30 and 40-42.

43 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio*, p. 339-341; *Gesta Innocentii tertii*. In *Patrologia Latina*, 214, p. 159-161.

44 SMITH – *Innocent III*, p. 43-60.

the *ordo* only mentioned Peter's loyalty to the pope and to the Roman Church, the protection of the Catholic faith, and the fight against heresy⁴⁵. Moreover, when the kingdom was offered to Innocent and to the Roman church, it became censual: in exchange for the payment of a *census*, the king, his successors, and the kingdom would benefit from the protection of Peter and of the Apostolic See⁴⁶. There is a reference to the Crown of Aragon for the first time in a papal document when Peter II is addressed as king of Aragon, count of Barcelona, and *dominus* of Montpellier. Perhaps this entailed some kind of Aragonese influence in the creation of the *ordo*, as these were the usual titles listed in documents produced by the royal chancery.

There is a thinly veiled element: according to the version produced in Rome, Peter had been made king by the pontiff – giving free rein to the pope in any possible future decision, as a concession could always be withdrawn. The same strategy was adopted by Innocent regarding Sancho I of Portugal when renewing the *Manifestis Probatum*, as pointed out by Francesco Renzi⁴⁷. This claim (together with the identification of Aragon as being a censual kingdom of Rome) is made explicit in two further letters, both *Cum quanta gloria*, the first issued on 16 June 1205 and the latter dated 17 June 1206, when the pope granted future Aragonese kings to be crowned by the archbishop of Tarragona in Zaragoza⁴⁸.

However, everything changed in 1213 after the death of Peter II in the battle of Muret against Simon de Montfort⁴⁹. The period encompassing the death of Peter and the beginning of James I's reign was at the core of the classic analysis of Ferran Soldevila⁵⁰. More recently, Damian Smith has analysed this period in various works⁵¹. The situation of the Crown of Aragon rapidly deteriorated after Peter's

45 «Ego Petrus, rex Aragonum, profiteor et polliceor quod semper ero fidelis et obediens domno meo pape Innocentio eiusque catholicis successoribus et ecclesie Romane, regnumque meum in ipsius obedientia fideliter conservabo, defendens fidem catholicam et persequens hereticam pravitatem» MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio*, p. 340.

46 «Ego Petrus, Dei gratia rex Aragonum, comes Barchinonie, et domnus Montis Pessulani, cupiens principalii post Deum beati Petri et apostolice sedis protectione muniri, tibi, reverentissime pater et domne summe pontifex Innocenti, et per te sacrosancte Romane apostolice sedi, offero regnum meum, illudque tibi et successoribus tuis in perpetuum divini amoris intuitu et pro remedio anime mee et progenitorum meorum constituo censuale» MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio*, p. 341.

47 RENZI – Un regno, p. 268-273.

48 «Cum quanta gloria et honore, tripudio et applausu regium Rome de manu nostra in monasterio beati Pancratii susceperis diadema, postquam per venerabilem fratrem nostrum, Petrum Portuensem episcopum, in regem fecimus te iniungi» MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio*, p. 346; 369. Luis García de Valdeavellano saw the possibility of being crowned by the archbishop of Tarragona as a strong claim of autonomy for Aragon in reference to the remaining kings of the Iberian Peninsula, VALDEAVELLANO, Luis García de – *Historia de España, de los orígenes a la Baja Edad Media*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1980. Volume II, p. 591-596.

49 ALVIRA CABRER, Martin – *12 de septiembre de 1213: el jueves de Muret*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 2002.

50 SOLDEVILA, Ferran – *Els Primers Temps de Jaume I*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1968.

51 SMITH – *Innocent III*, p. 143-145. SMITH, Damian J. – Simon of Montfort and the orphan king. In AURELL, Martin; LIPPIATT, Gregory; MACÉ, Laurent, ed. – *Simon de Montfort (c. 1170-1218). Le croisé, son lignage et son temps*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2020, p. 87-102.

death, and the kingdom fell into chaos⁵². As argued by Thomas Bisson, the financial situation was particularly bad⁵³. Moreover, the underage James I had been handed over to Simon in 1211 (to quote Smith, Peter II offered «a son he did not want and a town [Montpellier] he could not control») as part of the marriage agreement with Amicie, Simon's daughter⁵⁴. Even his succession was not certain, threatened by the presence of other candidates, such as Raymond-Berengar V of Provence, son of Peter II's brother Alfonso II, count of Provence; Ferdinand, Peter's youngest brother and abbot of Montearagón; and Sanç, Count of Roussillon and James's great-uncle⁵⁵. Ferdinand and Sanç's claims to the throne were also recorded *ex post facto* by James in his *Llibre dels fets*⁵⁶. Their ambitions also endangered the same *Unió* between Aragon and Catalonia: these territories could have been divided between them⁵⁷. Smith has argued how the desire for vengeance is the key to understanding the attempts of the barons (especially Catalan) to rescue James from Simon, now depicted as a hostage⁵⁸. After their unsuccessful petitions, Bishop Hispan of Segorbe-Albarracín went on an embassy to Rome to ask for the intervention of Pope Innocent III⁵⁹. The mission succeeded, and James was freed thanks to pressures by Innocent and his legate Peter of Benevento, cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Aquiro, who was tasked by the pope to organise the administration of the Crown during James's minority⁶⁰. Initially, Sanç and Ferdinand were chosen as *procuratores* of the king's lands (one for Catalonia and one for Aragon)⁶¹. Then Peter of Benevento appointed Sanç as sole *procurator*, although he lacked the support to administer the whole kingdom, where

52 «Et sic rege mortuo multiplicata sunt mala in terris, et ceperunt esse inaudite confederationes et conspirationes villarum» CINGOLANI, Stefano Maria, ed. – *Les Gesta Comitum Barchinonensium (versió primitiva), la Brevis historia i alters textos de Ripoll*. Valencia: Universitat de València, p. 156.

53 BISSON, Thomas N. – The finances of the young James I (1213-1228). In BISSON, Thomas N. – *Medieval France and her Pyrenean neighbours. Studies in the early institutional history*. London and Roncheverte: The Hambledon Press, 1989, p. 351-391.

54 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 89. Smith has also pointed out how James was of some use to Simon and therefore the latter did not have any intention to harm him, *ibid.*

55 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 90-91.

56 «E tots vengren al dia de la cort, levat Don Fferrando e-l comte Don Sanxo, car havien esperança que cascú fos rey» BRUGUERA, Jordi, ed. – *Llibre dels fets del re en Jaume*. 2 vols. Barcelona: Barcino, 1991, Volume II, p. 15; SMITH, Damian J.; BUFFERY, Helena, transl. – *The Book of Deeds of James I of Aragon*. Aldershot: Routledge 2003, p. 26.

57 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 90.

58 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 92-93.

59 This interpretation followed Soldevila's view, since the nobles' attempts and the mission of Bishop Hispan are found in different sources, SOLDEVILA – *Els primers temps*, p. 55-57. See also WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 155, note 6.

60 *Ibid.* p. 145-153; SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 93-95; BRUGUERA – *Llibre dels fets*. Volume II, p. 14; SMITH; BUFFERY – *The Book of Deeds*, p. 25. On this episode see also, WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 154-156, who sees Bishop Hispan's embassy to Rome as an alternative to the requests made by the nobles, not as a consequence of their failure. On Cardinal Peter's legation see SMITH, Damian J. – Inocencio III, Pedro Beneventano y la historia de España. *Vergentis*. 2 (2016) 85-97; MONTAUBIN, Pascal – Une tentative pontificale de reprise en main du Midi: la légation du cardinal Pietro Beneventano en 1214-1215. In FOURNIÉ, Michelle; LE BLÉVEC, Daniel; THÉRY, Julien, ed. – *Innocent III et le Midi*. Toulouse: Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 2015, p. 391-418.

61 CINGOLANI – *Les Gesta Comitum Barchinonensium*, p. 156.

entire areas remained in turmoil, and maintained a hostile attitude towards Simon de Montfort – although not forcefully⁶². On 23 January 1216, when appointing the regency council after petitions from the lands of the Crown with the assent of Sanç (the pope's letter is addressed to all the nobles in Aragon and Catalonia, indicating a distinction between them), Innocent resorted to *utilitas*, a papal prerogative allowing the popes to act notwithstanding law and giving their decisions a sacramental meaning, as shown by Ovidio Capitani⁶³. The papal *protectio* disappeared – it was no longer the justification for the pope's intervention. The mention of *utilitas* was also included in a document issued on 16 September 1216 by five members of the regency council, who took James under their protection and promised to advise him in the administration of the kingdom⁶⁴. As pointed out by Smith, the clause stating that the procuration of Sanç must be respected as long as he governs well is evidence of the weak position of the *procurator*⁶⁵. Smith has indeed shown how, by 1217, there were three (possibly four) groups with different objectives in the Crown of Aragon⁶⁶.

This was the context in which the new pope, Honorius III, found himself acting. He might have initially shared his predecessor's view in resorting to various reasons for his first interventions, all aimed at strengthening James's position and organising the crusade proclaimed at the Fourth Lateran Council – the latter being a constant in this papacy, as argued below⁶⁷. On 13 April 1217, when writing to the king of France, Philip II, ordering him not to threaten Montpellier, which pertained to James I, he justified his decision by claiming that these lands had been left in inheritance to the young king by his mother Maria – a justification which, according to Wiedemann, began to appear more frequently in the documentation after Honorius's election⁶⁸. The Apostolic *protectio* is mentioned again on 29 April 1217 in a letter to the archbishop of Narbonne and the bishops of Maguelonne and Elne, in which the pope informed the prelates that he had written to the people of

62 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 95.

63 «Hinc est, quod nos hanc utilitatem attendentes circa dilectum filium Iacobum natum clare memorie Petri regis Aragonie, ut ipsius et terre sue negocia per dilectum filium nobilem virum comitem Sancium, cui procuratio terre commissa esse dinoscitur, utilius disponantur, et ne ipsius responsum sibi vel aliis esse valeat captiosum a nonnullis, qui regni bonum diligunt requisiti, hos sibi consiliarios providimus deputandos» MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio*, p. 567. On the concept of *utilitas*, see CAPITANI, Ovidio – *Ecclesia romana e riforma: utilitas in Gregorio VII*. In *Chiesa, diritto e ordinamento della "Societas Christiana" nei secoli XI e XII*. Atti della nona Settimana internazionale di studio. Mendola, 28 agosto-2 settembre 1983. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1986, p. 26-69. On the enlargement of the regency council see WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 157-158 and SMITH – *Innocent III*, p. 168-169; SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 95-97.

64 BOFARULL Y MASCARÓ, Prospero de, ed. – *Colección de documentos inéditos del Archivo General de la Corona de Aragón*. 41 vols. Barcelona: Monfort 1947-1910, Volume VI, p. 80-81.

65 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 98.

66 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 99.

67 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 100.

68 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 45-46. WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 188.

Montpellier exhorting them to remain faithful to James I and obey his *procurator*, Sanç⁶⁹.

However, Honorius's interventions did not achieve the desired result, as the pope wrote to his legate, Bertrand, cardinal-priest of SS Giovanni e Paolo, on October 1217, complaining that James and his barons were acting against the *negotium pacis et fidei* concerning Toulouse (which was rebelling against Simon de Montfort) and jeopardising the papal efforts for the crusade⁷⁰. Both charges appeared again on 28 December 1217, when Honorius wrote to James, reminding him that he owed his lands and his own freedom to the intervention of the Apostolic See («te de illorum manibus, quos inimicos reputas eruendo ac reddendo tibi terram tuam pariter et te terre»), thus giving a powerful reading of Peter of Benevento's legation – that his kingdom pertained to the Roman Church («quod regnum tuum ad Romanam ecclesiam noscitur pertinere») – and exhorted him not to come to the aid of Toulouse, threatening him that he would allow his enemies to occupy his kingdom («regnum tuum per extraneas gentes comprimere»)⁷¹. On the following day, a second letter was sent to Sanç ordering him to do the same things and threatening that, if the letter was not obeyed, the «Romana ecclesia, que tantam Dei et suam iniuriam dissimulare non posset, forsitan contra ipsum regnum aggravabit taliter manum suam, quod pena ipsius erit aliis in exemplum»⁷². It is worth highlighting the strong claim that James owed his kingdom to the Apostolic See, entailing the threat that Rome could always take it back.

As argued by Smith, 1218 would indeed see a change in the policy of the Crown, with Pedro-Fernández and Bishop Berengar of Barcelona (James's new chancellor) – both belonging to the group in favour of making peace with Simon de Montfort – taking the administration of the Crown upon themselves, and Sanç officially resigning from the procuratorship in September 1218⁷³.

The papal protection reappears with a central role in the letter addressed to James on 8 May 1219. The pope, resorting to vivid analogies, took under his *protectio* Aragon, Catalonia, and Montpellier (the Crown of Aragon, further evidence that Rome might have been aware of the peculiar nature of this kingdom), reminding the young king how he had been entrusted to the care of the Roman Church

69 «Cum igitur regi predicto [James I], qui sub Apostolice Sedis protectione consistit» ROUQUETTE, Julien; VILLEMAGNE, Augustin, ed. – *Bullaire de l'église de Maguelone*. Vol. 2. Montpellier: Louis Valat, 1911, p. 20.

70 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 75.

71 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 86-87. On this see SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 100; WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 162. For the correct reading of «per extraneas gentes» see SOLDEVILA – *Els primers temps*, p. 145.

72 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 87-88.

73 SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 100-101.

together with his lands by his mother, Queen Maria⁷⁴. Two days later, on 10 May, a second privilege of protection was granted, addressed to James and concerning Montpellier⁷⁵. Honorius addressed his legate Bertrand with the same words on 26 July 1219, this time resorting to the title of *specialis ecclesie Romane filius* when referring to James⁷⁶. On the same day, in a second letter sent to Luis, son of Philip II of France, the pope ordered the prince not to invade the lands of James of Aragon «cum charissimus in Christo filius noster Iacobus Aragonum rex illustris sub apostolice sedis et nostra protectione consistat», in accordance with the wishes of Queen Maria⁷⁷. Both epistles were sent when Luis decided to join the crusade against the Albigensians⁷⁸. As pointed out by Wiedemann, all these epistles were issued after James's petitions and probably never delivered to their addressees because there was no longer a need for them.⁷⁹

The letter sent on 15 June 1222, which opened this article, may seem to be a change in the quality of the relations between Rome and the Crown of Aragon at first glance, which Honorius may have wanted to bring to the level of vassalage. Indeed, all elements, such as the *protectio*, the reference to a censual kingdom, the loyalty to Rome, and the titles connected with Aragonese kings in the documents considered above disappeared. The pope resorted to vassalage to justify his diligence in helping James (or asking for help, as in this case) in case of necessity against both the enemies of the Christian faith and the same Christians.

There are, however, some elements that ought to be considered to understand better all the nuances of the papal language. Firstly, the adoption of the language of vassalage did not necessarily entail a feudal model and subordination among the subjects involved, as pointed out by Sandro Carocci. The papacy was rarely able to create this kind of relationship, and the few cases concerned realities and institutions in the territory of *Patrimonium Beati Petri*⁸⁰. Vassalatic words and elements were more frequently used to describe a very close relationship with some political actors, especially those enjoying the Apostolic *protectio*, and this seems to be the case with

74 «Nobis, fili karissime, supplicasti, ut te sub alarum nostrarum umbra dignemur protegere ac protectionis apostolice clippeo communire; [...] regis itaque supplicationibus inclinati, personam tuam, regnum Aragonie, terram Cathalonie, villam et terram Montis Pessulani cum omnibus aliis bonis tuis [...] sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus» MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 171.

75 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 172.

76 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 177-178 («Personam regis eiusdem, regnum Aragonie, terram Cataloniae, villam et terram Montis Passulani [...] sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscepimus»).

77 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 178-179.

78 SMITH, Damian J. – Jaime I y el Papado. In FERRER I MALLOL, María Teresa, ed. – *Jaume I: commemoració de viii centenari del naixement de Jaume I*. 2 vols. Barcelona: Instituto de Estudios Catalanes / Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 2011, Volume I, p. 529.

79 WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 163-165.

80 CAROCCI, Sandro – *Vassalli del papa. Potere pontificio, aristocrazie e città nello Stato della Chiesa (XII-XV sec.)*. Roma: Viella, 2010, p. 54; 94.

Aragon⁸¹. Moreover, there was a certain degree of ambiguity in the language, always leaving some kind of indefiniteness perfectly understood by the addressee, who most of the time shared the same education as the sender because they belonged to the same social *milieu*. As argued by Carocci, the pontiffs benefitted from this vagueness⁸².

Wiedemann has convincingly argued that Cardinals Rainier of Viterbo and Stephen of Fossanova (and possibly two more courtiers) might have been involved in the production of the letter, proposing themselves as new contacts at the papal Curia for the king of Aragon in order for Aragonese petitions to have better chances of success⁸³. Moreover, according to Wiedemann, the concepts of censual and vassal kingdoms may have either become or been misunderstood and read as almost synonyms (as he infers from Rognvaldr's letter, but this ambiguity might also be desired). Similar confusion and the use of *vassallus* in Honorius's epistle would have been the result of some kind of mistake made by the writer of the letter in the papal chancery or of the possible involvement of Rainier and Stephen in the whole affair – and they were involved in John and Rognvaldr's cases of vassalage⁸⁴. This hypothesis is, however, a little bit more problematic. Firstly, even if such a misunderstanding may have been possible in the production of epistles *to the Curia*, this seems less plausible when the document was produced *by the Curia*. There was always extreme care in the chancery, and documents were reviewed over and over – much more in case of an epistle concerning a king, which was undoubtedly read in front of the pope and approved by him before being sent⁸⁵. The same Honorius III, when he was Cardinal Cencius, had been in charge of the chancery of Celestine III and *camerarius* at the same time and was therefore entrusted with the administration of papal finances (the *Liber Censuum* was produced under his supervision)⁸⁶. He could not have missed the meaning of such a strong word. Moreover, Wiedemann does not consider the different situations depicted by the word *vassallus* and the ambiguity of words, as if this concept unequivocally identified a clear model. As pointed out by Annarita de Prosperis, a certain degree of fluidity had been found in

81 CAROCCI – *Vassalli del papa*, p. 48-53.

82 CAROCCI – *Vassalli del papa*, p. 85.

83 WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 109-117.

84 WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 108-109; 116-117; 191.

85 SMITH – Jaime I, p. 523. On the *modus operandi* of the papal chancery in the thirteenth century, see SMITH, Thomas W. – *Curia and Crusade: Pope Honorius III and the recovery of the Holy Land, 1216-1227*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2017, p. 10-24.

86 CAROCCI, Sandro; VENDITTELLI, Marco – Onorio III, papa. In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. 79 (2013). Acedido em: https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/papa-onorio-iii_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/. Consultado a 3/3/2023. On the *Liber Censuum* see DUMAS, Enrico – *Il Liber Censuum. Strutture e logiche compositive del manoscritto Vaticano Latino 8486*. In GRASSO, Christian, ed. – *Nuovi studi su Onorio III*. Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo, 2017, p. 37-48.

Honorius's language, even towards other addressees such as the Mendicant orders⁸⁷. Although petitioners and proctors certainly played an important part in drafting a letter, they were not ultimately responsible and did not have the final word. Also, making a comparison between Aragon and other contexts and situations might be risky. In the kingdom of England, facing a civil war and an invasion from the French, King John declared himself a *vassallus* and granted his kingdom to the Roman church as a *fief* during the papacy of Innocent III (a word which does not appear in any of the letters concerning Aragon). Therefore, Honorius did not make the first move but inherited the whole situation from his predecessor, who only adopted the language of the royal chancery on his behalf. Moreover, the same King John took the Cross, again an element that did not appear in the relationship with Aragon⁸⁸. A comparison with Rognvaldr might be more appropriate. However, once again, the first to write to Rome was the king of the Isle of Man and of the Outer Hebrides, while in the case of Aragon, the Curia seems to adopt the new word first – nor was Honorius's letter concerning Aragon issued directly to the king⁸⁹.

Even though the word *vassallus* did not necessarily entail that Aragon had become a fief of the Apostolic See and relations kept involving the papal *protectio*, the use of a new and strong word by the papal chancery is undeniable, which placed the king of Aragon on a different level in respect of the other kings of the Iberian Peninsula, highlighting a special link with Rome. The change in tone would surely have been noticed by the Crown of Aragon. A quick survey through the documentation produced by Peter II's chancery has revealed the frequent use of the word *vassallus/vasallus*, entailing an actual vassalatic relationship between two subjects⁹⁰. Most of the time, this concept occurred in concessions of lands to key figures in royal politics in exchange for their becoming vassals to the king, together with reference to various gestures pertaining to this institution⁹¹. Even more significant is that although references to vassalatic relationships are present in James's documents issued before 1222 (when Honorius's epistle was sent), the word *vassallus* only appears for the first time on 16 June 1224, in a *convenientia* with Gonzalo Ibáñez, master of the Order of Calatrava, concerning the payment of some

87 DE PROSPERIS, Annarita – Innovazioni nel lessico delle lettere pontificie relative agli Ordini Mendicanti durante il pontificato di Onorio III. In GRASSO – *Nuovi studi*, p. 49-72.

88 On King John's decision see WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 95-115.

89 WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 106-108.

90 ALVIRA CABRER, Martín – *Pedro el Católico, Rey de Aragón y Conde de Barcelona (1196-1213). Documentos, testimonios y memoria histórica*. 6 vols. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico, 2010.

91 See for example documents nos 153, 216, 292 («et ex inde devenio per me et / per meos [...] vester homo et vester fidelis vassallus»), 597, 633 («facio vobis domine Rex, iunctis propriis manibus, hominum et fidelitatem propter hec, et vester devenis inde vassallus»), 725, 832 in *ibid.*

debts⁹². The pope's choice would thus have stood out even more. Why this sudden change and the adoption of this kind of language in a papal letter?

Historiography has dwelled on the benefits this kind of closer relationship entailed for James I – whatever this relationship meant. The king had just come of age and been invested as a knight the previous year; his rule was still unstable – and the previous sentence included in the *arenga* of Honorius's letter concerning potential Christians opposing him might refer to a difficult internal situation (it is worth noticing the mention of *necessitas*, which allowed the popes to act notwithstanding law)⁹³. Indeed, this was a moment (1221) when James's advisors had arranged the renewal of the Castilian alliance through James's marriage to Eleanor, daughter of Alfonso VIII and aunt to Fernando III of Castille, as they sought to bolster his position with the nobles as pressure built to renew the war against the Almohads, as analysed below⁹⁴. This new status could also be useful when facing the king of France and the Crusader army in Languedoc, both making claims on an area of strategic interest also for Aragon (what Alvira Cabrer has called the "Gran Corona de Aragón")⁹⁵. We cannot completely exclude that the suggestion to use this language may have come from the Crown of Aragon to emphasise the

92 HUICI MIRANDA, Ambrosio; CABANES PECOURT, María de los Desamparados – *Documentos de Jaime I de Aragón*. 7 vols. Valencia: Anubar, 1976-2017, Volume I, p. 126. For this survey I have also considered the documents concerning the kingdom of Aragon only, CABANES PECOURT, María de los Desamparados – *Documentos de Jaime I relacionados con Aragón*. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico, 2009.

93 FRIED – *Der päpstliche Schutz*, p. 241. «Cum enim sit ecclesie Romane vassallus, non solum contra inimicos nominis christiani sibi auxilium tenemur impendere, verum etiam contra christianos, si, quod absit, urgeret necessitas, teneremur eidem favore et subsidium exhibere» MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 298. James recalled his investiture as knight in his *Llibre dels fets*. SMITH; BUFFERY – *The Book*, p. 34. On *necessitas*, see CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria – Sondaggio sulla 'dispensatio' (sec. XI e XII). In *Chiesa, diritto e ordinamento della "Societas Christiana" nei secoli XI e XII: atti della 9. Settimana Internazionale di Studio Mendola, 28 agosto – 2 settembre 1983*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1986, p. 460–485; PENNINGTON, Kenneth – *Pope and bishops: The papal monarchy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984, p. 87, 93, 97; ROUMY, Franck – L'origine et la diffusion de l'adage canonique. *Necessitas non habet legem* (VIII). In MÜLLER, Wolfgang P. and SOMMAR, Mary E., ed. – *Medieval church law and the origins of the Western legal tradition. A tribute to Kenneth Pennington*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006, p. 301-319.

94 CLARAMUNT, Salvador – La política matrimonial de la casa condal de Barcelona y real de Aragón desde 1213 hasta Fernando el Católico. *Acta historica et archaeologica mediaevalia*. 23 (2002) 201; VARELA-RODRÍGUEZ, Elisa – Les relaciones amoroses d'Elo Álvarez, Aurembiaix d'Urgell, Blanca de Antillón, Teresa Gil de Vidaure, Berengiera Alfonso, Sibila de Saga... Amistançades, concubines o amants de Jaume I?. In FERRER I MALLOL, María Teresa, ed. – *Jaume I: commemoració de viii centenari del naixement de Jaume I*. 2 vols. Barcelona: Institut de Estudios Catalanes / Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 2011, Volume I, p. 585; URCELL HERNÁNDEZ, Ricard – Els fills de Jaume I i la política successòria. In FERRER I MALLOL, María Teresa, ed. – *Jaume I: commemoració de viii centenari del naixement de Jaume I*. 2 vols. Barcelona: Institut de Estudios Catalanes / Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 2011, Volume I, p. 600.

95 ALVIRA CABRER – *12 de septiembre*, p. 164-170. On Aragonese kings' claim to Languedoc, see AURELL I CARDONA, Jaume – Autour d'un débat historiographique: l'expansion catalane dans le pays de langue d'oc au Moyen Âge. *Congrés d'histoire de la Corona d'Aragó 1987*, p. 9-41. Concerning the actual brief existence of the Gran Corona de Aragón see ALVIRA CABRER, Martín; MACÉ, Laurent; SMITH, Damian J. – Le temps de la Grande Couronne d'Aragon du roi Pierre le Catholique. À propos de deux documents relatifs à l'abbaye de Poblet (février et septembre 1213). *Annales du Midi: revue archéologique, historique et philologique de la France méridionale*. 265 (2009) 5-22.

close relationship with Rome, although given the previously mentioned specific meaning of *vassallus* attested in documents passed by the royal chancery, the lack of use of this word in James's documents until 1224, and the behaviour adopted by the king in even more dangerous situations (such as in 1226-27, as discussed below), this hypothesis is problematic⁹⁶.

There is also the other side of the coin, which has been overlooked because of the vision of the papacy as already shaped and acknowledged by all actors: the Roman point of view. Honorius III might benefit from the change in language and the emphasis on a closer link with Aragon. As pointed out by Carocci and Marco Vendittelli, in 1222, the clash between the pontiff and the Roman Commune started again⁹⁷. The latter intervened in a fight internal to Viterbo at the beginning of the year. Honorius had tried to mediate but had been strongly opposed by the Romans, who rebelled and forced him to take refuge in Southern Lazio. Only the intervention of the imperial army in favour of Viterbo resulted in the withdrawal of the Romans, who were also forced to welcome the pope back when he returned to Rome on 21 June – after the letter concerning Aragon had been sent, issued from Alatri. However, the imperial intervention also resulted in the expulsion of papal representatives from some of the cities of the Mark of Ancona and of the Duchy of Spoleto in favour of imperial men appointed by Gunzelin of Wolfenbüttel and Bertold of Urslingen, a close collaborator of Frederick II, who kept referring to himself as Duke of Spoleto – and the emperor had already made some claims to Honorius concerning this area in the spring of 1222 at Veroli. Not even the excommunications passed by Cardinal Rainer Capocci, the rector of the Duchy, had any effect – only the direct involvement of Frederick at the end of the year put an end to the crisis. However, the situation remained quite tense both in the *Patrimonium* and in Rome. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the pope and Frederick had discussed the organisation of a new crusade in Veroli after the failure of the last in 1221⁹⁸. This was one of the cornerstones of Honorius's pontificate, as pointed out by Christian Grasso, and implied a certain stability in *Christianitas*: in all those years, the attempts of the pontiff towards the organisation of the crusade were quite frequent⁹⁹.

These difficulties may have pushed Honorius to adopt stronger language when addressing Aragon, thus highlighting both the proximity of this kingdom to the papacy (and not only to Aragon: Frederick, the guarantor of the pope,

96 Wiedemann has also deemed the idea of the inclusion of this concept in a petition from Aragon unlikely, WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 109.

97 CAROCCI; VENDITTELLI – Onorio III.

98 CAROCCI; VENDITTELLI – Onorio III.

99 GRASSO, Christian – Onorio III e la Crociata. In GRASSO – *Nuovi studi*, p. 105-120; GRASSO, Christian – *Governare con la parola: Papato e crociata durante il pontificato di Onorio III (1216-1227)*. Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo, 2021.

had married James I's aunt, Constance) and trying to move the relations to an ambiguous and different field, which exalted the role of Rome. The claim of a very close relationship might also be useful and give more force to the pope's request to the faithful in *Hispania* to help James I against the Moors. The papacy was therefore depicting and claiming for itself a major role right in a moment of difficulty. It was nothing new – the same claim had been made during the mentioned coronation of Peter II in 1204, which took place after Innocent had been forced to leave Rome (1203-4) due to the opposition of some Roman families and could return only after ten months¹⁰⁰.

Finally, it is worth noting how this strategy was a *unicum* and was not pursued further either by Honorius or his successors. The reference to vassalage had already disappeared in a letter issued on 27 June 1222, after the pontiff had returned to Rome – which may not be the best example because the epistle was addressed to the papal legate, the cardinal-bishop Conrad of Porto and concerned only the county of Millau, which was a part of the Crown that was inherited by James through his father but which, already in 1219, Honorius had ordered to be restored to the king (the county was still in the hands of Bishop William of Mende, after having been taken from Count Raymond VI of Toulouse due to his heresy)¹⁰¹. Therefore, this land was directly interested in the ongoing crusade – and was also quite problematic even in the years to come, considering that in 1223, the county was claimed by Raymond VII, the son of the count of Toulouse¹⁰². The mention of the mother's decision to entrust the young king to the Apostolic See indeed disappeared in the letter issued on 15 June 1222, as pointed out by Fried¹⁰³. The renovation of the *ordo coronationis* of Peter II issued by Honorius on 3 February 1223 might be more significant¹⁰⁴. Furthermore, on 26 May 1227, Gregory IX harked back to the mention of the Apostolic *protectio* enjoyed by James I to justify the royal privilege of not being excommunicated by anyone but the pope or his legates, thus maintaining the limits added by Adrian IV's concession to Ramón Berenguer after Innocent

100 SMITH – *Innocent III*, p. 54-55.

101 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 50. The county had been pledged to Raymond VI by Peter II to repay a loan, SMITH – Simon of Montfort, p. 100.

102 SMITH, Damian J. – *Crusade, heresy and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon (c. 1167-1276)*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2010, p. 48-49.

103 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 303; FRIED – *Der päpstliche Schutz*, p. 241. James's threat to not pay the *census* might be one of the reasons for not following through with this path, as argued by Fried (who however, does not include any evidence for this hypothesis), but this was a problem which lasted for the whole of James's reign and had already appeared in a letter sent by Honorius III to the archbishop of Tarragona on 5 October 1218, see MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 148-149.

104 MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia de Honorio*, p. 313-314. James sent an emissary, Jaun Boxados, asking the pope to crown him king but Gregory IX, in a letter issued on 27 April 1229, delayed the coronation because «varios turbines nunc instantes, sicut convenit, attendentes», DOMÍNGUEZ SÁNCHEZ, Santiago, ed. – *Documentos de Gregorio IX (1227-1241) referentes a España*. León: Universidad de León, 2004, p. 124-125.

III's confirmation to Peter II of the original privilege of Urban II on 4 July 1213¹⁰⁵. The protection disappeared in two further letters sent on the same day, rebuking Ferdinand, abbot of Montearagón and James's uncle, for his unfaithfulness and also rebuking some of the cities supporting his claims to the throne¹⁰⁶. As argued by Smith, Gregory's significant decision – the pope had only been elected on 19 March 1227, so this would have been one of his first acts as pontiff – was intended to prevent Bishop Sancho de Ahonés of Zaragoza from excommunicating James¹⁰⁷. Pedro de Ahonés, Sancho's brother, had been one of the members of the regency council appointed by Innocent III in 1216, but his relationship with James later deteriorated due to a clash over the king's favourites and the war against the Muslims¹⁰⁸. Pedro's death in June 1226 marked the beginning of a real revolt of some Aragonese nobles, ecclesiastics, and townsmen lasting until 1227, and Bishop Sancho was one of the leaders of the opposition against the young king¹⁰⁹. Although the civil war had already ended when Gregory issued his privilege, it is possible the pope had not yet received news of this or wished to prevent the conflict from sparking again.

Indeed, James would later be excommunicated by the pope during his reign in 1236 and 1246. The king was first sanctioned by Gregory IX due to the imprisonment of Bernardo, bishop of Zaragoza, preventing him from reaching Tarragona and being consecrated archbishop of the same church¹¹⁰. A second excommunication was issued by Innocent IV because James had cut out the tongue of Bishop Berenguer of Girona, who had been accused by the king of having revealed secrets, thus jeopardising his reputation, as we know from the letter Innocent sent to James on 27 June 1246¹¹¹. Innocent IV considered the king's action as an excess dictated by James's rage rather than by any jurisdictional dispute. Yet Sabaté has

105 «Te [James I], sub speciali protectione Sedis Apostolice constitutum» DOMÍNGUEZ SÁNCHEZ – *Documentos*, p. 58. Innocent III's privilege is found in MANSILLA – *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio*, p. 550-551. On Gregory IX and *Hispania* see SMITH, Damian J. – Gregory IX and Spain. In SMITH, Damian J., ed. – *Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241): power and authority*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2023, p. 215-234. I would like to thank Prof. Smith for allowing me to read his chapter prior to its publication.

106 DOMÍNGUEZ SÁNCHEZ – *Documentos*, p. 60; SCHMIDT, Tilmann; SABANÉS I FERNÁNDEZ, Roser, ed. – *Butllari de Catalunya: documents, pontificis, originals conservats als arxius de Catalunya (1198-1417)*. 3 vols. Barcelona: Fundació Noguera, 2016, p. 166-167; PALACIOS MARTÍN, Bonifacio – *La coronación de los reyes de Aragón 1204-1410. Aportación al estudio de las estructuras medievales*. Valencia: Universidad de Zaragoza, 1975, p. 302-303, where the letters are wrongly ascribed to Innocent III.

107 SMITH, Damian J. – James I, chapter 4, p. 25-28, forthcoming. I would like to thank Prof. Smith for allowing me to read his chapter prior to its publication.

108 GONZÁLEZ ANTON, Luis – La revuelta de la nobleza aragonesa contra Jaime I en 1224–1227. In *Homenaje Jose Maria Lacarra en su jubilación del profesorado. Estudios Medievales*. 2 vols. Zaragoza: Anubar, 1977, Volume II, p. 154-160.

109 SMITH – Gregory IX, p. 218-219; GONZÁLEZ ANTON – La revuelta, p. 143-163.

110 SMITH – Jaime I, p. 532-533; SMITH – Gregory IX, p. 231.

111 QUINTANA PRIETO, Augusto, ed. – *La documentación pontificia de Inocencio IV (1243-1254)*. Rome: Instituto Español de Historia Eclesiástica, 1987, Volume I, p. 305-307; SMITH – Jaime I, p. 533. Smith has argued how these two attacks against ecclesiastics represented preludes to a fourth phase in the relations between James and the papacy, characterised by the king's open actions against the Church.

argued how the violence against the prelate was a consequence of the increasing jurisdictional tension between James and the barons in Catalonia (which would also interest the bishopric of Girona in the following years, leading to what nineteenth-century historiography called the “grandes luchas de los obispos de Gerona con los reyes”) but also of the organisation of the inquisition in the Catalan church and the fight against heresy – piercing the tongue, cutting it out, and burning it would become standard sanctions against heretics¹¹². According to Innocent’s view, the king’s anger and violence against the bishop were one of the reasons leading to excommunication – they were not regarded «comme un exercice de la capacité universelle supérieure du roi»¹¹³.

A further element worth noting in Gregory’s 1227 letter is the mention that James was a minor, one of the three reasons given to justify the papal concession¹¹⁴. This formula was used even though James was already 19 years old at that time¹¹⁵. Could this have been a new strategy adopted by Rome to claim a strong position right at the beginning of Gregory’s papacy, once again taking advantage of James’s difficulties? Besides the previously mentioned rebellion between 1224 and 1227, the king had already faced Roderic de Liçana’s revolt before his marriage to Eleanor, then the war with Guillem de Montcada, and a failure in the war against the Muslims, the 1225 Peñíscola campaign¹¹⁶. Was this a “ballon d’essai” to test the relations with Aragon? There is also a second hypothesis. As pointed out by Smith, James called for the pope’s help at a very dangerous moment, in the winter of 1226-27, when the king had to face the claim to the throne of his uncle Ferdinand, abbot of Montearagón, supported by some Aragonese cities such as Zaragoza, Huesca, and Jaca. Although Gregory’s replies were issued when the war was already concluded with the treaty of Alcalá on 1 May, Smith has argued how the pope’s rebuke of Ferdinand and the cities that supported him played an important role in stabilising the Crown in the following years (Ferdinand swore loyalty to James only in March 1228)¹¹⁷. Did Gregory’s language therefore reflect what the king and his envoys themselves wanted to hear? The mention of the Apostolic protection granted to James’s kingdom and the minority of the king may have been dictated by the context and the clash for the throne with Ferdinand, thus justifying Gregory’s intervention in favour of James,

112 SABATÉ, Flocel – L’abus de pouvoir dans la Couronne d’Aragon (XIII^e–XIV^e siècles): pathologie, corruption, stratégie ou modèle?. In GILLI, Patrick, ed. – *La pathologie du pouvoir: vices, crimes et délits des gouvernants. Antiquité, Moyen Âge, époque moderne*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2015, p. 304-307.

113 SABATÉ – L’abus de pouvoir, p. 307.

114 «Si iustum est ut regie celsitudini deferamus, si pium ut minori faveamus etati» DOMÍNGUEZ SÁNCHEZ – *Documentos*, p. 58.

115 SMITH – Gregory IX, p. 218.

116 SOLDEVILA – *Els primers temps*, p. 171-181; 203-219; SMITH – Gregory IX, p. 218; see GONZÁLEZ ANTON – *La revuelta de la nobleza*, p. 146-147; 150-153.

117 SMITH – Gregory IX, p. 218-219.

which would have been in line with his predecessors' decisions. Could they have also mirrored the wording included in the king's request for help? However, even this path was not followed through, and the letter sent on 31 August 1227 did not mention the minor age of the king¹¹⁸.

This article has shown the importance of context in the analysis of the letters issued by the papal chancery. Although more work can be done on the relationship between the papacy and the kingdom/Crown of Aragon, it is possible to draw some preliminary conclusions. First, it is no longer possible to resort to prearranged models, which have only proven simplifications of much more complex contacts. The relations between Aragon and the Apostolic See mostly revolved around the concession of the Apostolic protection and the payment of a *census*. However, this did not entail any kind of subordination, and the view of Aragon as a fief of the Roman church can no longer be upheld. Historiography has already made significant steps in questioning the view that referred everything to Rome and suggesting a model of a reactive papacy, but it is important not to fall for the opposite mistake, considering the Apostolic See as being "at the mercy" of the petitioners. The so-called "papal monarchy" was far from being complete even in the thirteenth century, and the papacy was always looking for new opportunities to be acknowledged. Some of the ecclesiological constructions and the boldest claims were made during moments of extreme difficulties for the Roman church. The case of Honorius's letter considered here went in this direction, and the adoption of the language of vassalage – which could, however, be applied to different situations – might be an answer to a situation of crisis. When the conditions changed, this language was abandoned because it no longer met the necessity of Rome. As observed by Wiedemann, papal letters were not consistent because of the numerous actors involved in their productions¹¹⁹. But we should also take into consideration that both the popes and their ideas changed over time. The context also played an important part (if not the most) in determining the kind of language and the images and claims adopted. This is why the hypothesis that the suggestion to adopt this kind of language may have come from Aragon cannot be excluded, even though it is quite problematic. It was a real game of mirrors; the perception of the different actors was not only created by what was claimed by themselves but also by what the others perceived or was attributed from the outside. It was a two-way communication, a system of communicating vessels.

118 DOMÍNGUEZ SÁNCHEZ – *Documentos*, p. 67.

119 WIEDEMANN – *Papal overlordship*, p. 174.