

PROOF COVER SHEET

Author(s): Harriett Webster

Article Title: Mediating memory: recalling and recording the miracles of St Thomas Cantilupe

Article No: RMED1048977

Enclosures: 1) Query sheet
2) Article proofs

Dear Author,

1. Please check these proofs carefully. It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check these and approve or amend them. A second proof is not normally provided. Taylor & Francis cannot be held responsible for uncorrected errors, even if introduced during the production process. Once your corrections have been added to the article, it will be considered ready for publication.

Please limit changes at this stage to the correction of errors. You should not make trivial changes, improve prose style, add new material, or delete existing material at this stage. You may be charged if your corrections are excessive (we would not expect corrections to exceed 30 changes).

For detailed guidance on how to check your proofs, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/checkingproofs.asp>

Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can comment on the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat. If you wish to do this, please save the file to your hard disk first. For further information on marking corrections using Acrobat, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/acrobat.asp>

2. Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution. This check is to ensure that your name will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
1		Harriett	Webster	

Queries are marked in the margins of the proofs, and you can also click the hyperlinks below. Content changes made during copy-editing are shown as tracked changes. Inserted text is in **red font** and revisions have a red indicator **▲**. Changes can also be viewed using the list comments function. To correct the proofs, you should insert or delete text following the instructions below, but **do not add comments to the existing tracked changes**.

AUTHOR QUERIES

General points:

1. **Permissions:** You have warranted that you have secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner for the reproduction of any text, illustration, or other material in your article. Please see <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/permissions/usingThirdPartyMaterial.asp>.
2. **Third-party content:** If there is third-party content in your article, please check that the rightsholder details for re-use are shown correctly.
3. **Affiliation:** The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that address and email details are correct for all the co-authors. Affiliations given in the article should be the affiliation at the time the research was conducted. Please see <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/writing.asp>.
4. **Funding:** Was your research for this article funded by a funding agency? If so, please insert 'This work was supported by <insert the name of the funding agency in full>', followed by the grant number in square brackets '[grant number xxxx]'.
5. **Supplemental data and underlying research materials:** Do you wish to include the location of the underlying research materials (e.g. data, samples or models) for your article? If so, please insert this sentence before the reference section: 'The underlying research materials for this article can be accessed at <full link>/ description of location [author to complete]'. If your article includes supplemental data, the link will also be provided in this paragraph. See <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/multimedia.asp> for further explanation of supplemental data and underlying research materials.
6. The **CrossRef database** (www.crossref.org/) has been used to validate the references. Changes resulting from mismatches are tracked in **red font**.

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
	No Queries

How to make corrections to your proofs using Adobe Acrobat/Reader

Taylor & Francis offers you a choice of options to help you make corrections to your proofs. Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can edit the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat/Reader. This is the simplest and best way for you to ensure that your corrections will be incorporated. If you wish to do this, please follow these instructions:

1. Save the file to your hard disk.
2. Check which version of Adobe Acrobat/Reader you have on your computer. You can do this by clicking on the “Help” tab, and then “About”.

If Adobe Reader is not installed, you can get the latest version free from <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>.

3. If you have Adobe Acrobat/Reader 10 or a later version, click on the “Comment” link at the right-hand side to view the Comments pane.
4. You can then select any text and mark it up for deletion or replacement, or insert new text as needed. Please note that these will clearly be displayed in the Comments pane and secondary annotation is not needed to draw attention to your corrections. If you need to include new sections of text, it is also possible to add a comment to the proofs. To do this, use the Sticky Note tool in the task bar. Please also see our FAQs here: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/index.asp>.
5. Make sure that you save the file when you close the document before uploading it to CATS using the “Upload File” button on the online correction form. If you have more than one file, please zip them together and then upload the zip file.

If you prefer, you can make your corrections using the CATS online correction form.

Troubleshooting

Acrobat help: <http://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat.html>

Reader help: <http://helpx.adobe.com/reader.html>

Please note that full user guides for earlier versions of these programs are available from the Adobe Help pages by clicking on the link “Previous versions” under the “Help and tutorials” heading from the relevant link above. Commenting functionality is available from Adobe Reader 8.0 onwards and from Adobe Acrobat 7.0 onwards.

Firefox users: Firefox’s inbuilt PDF Viewer is set to the default; please see the following for instructions on how to use this and download the PDF to your hard drive: http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin

Mediating memory: recalling and recording the miracles of St Thomas Cantilupe

Harriett Webster*

School of Archaeology, History and Anthropology, University of Wales Trinity Saint David, Lampeter Campus, Ceredigion SA48 7ED, United Kingdom

(Received 4 February 2015; final version received 31 March 2015)

The manuscript containing the nine witness testimonies to the double hanging and miraculous resuscitation of William Cragh is an important site in which questions of memory and authority are negotiated. This article offers a detailed analysis of The Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, together with related manuscripts recording the canonisation of St Thomas Cantilupe, to explore how inquisitorial processes were conducted and recorded, **as well as** the ways in which the witness depositions were re-shaped through various interventions and mediations. This close analysis raises questions about competing models of authority in the thirteenth century, revealing the complex interplay between official written record and orally transmitted memory, **as well as** between the emphasis on specific evidence attributed to named individuals and the continuing power of popular consensus or public ‘fama’.

Keywords: saints; miracles; manuscripts; canonisation process; papacy; inquisitions; St Thomas Cantilupe

In 1320 Thomas Cantilupe, bishop of Hereford, was canonised by Pope John XXII, 13 years after his case had been opened in London by papal commissioners.¹ As part of the canonisation process, 38 miracles were examined in full,² the first of which is entitled ‘Primum miraculum de resuscitatione Willelmi Cragh bis suspensi’, that is, ‘The miracle of the resuscitation of the twice-hanged William Cragh’.³ Nine witnesses were examined in relation to this apparent

*Email: h.webster@uwtsd.ac.uk

¹ The following abbreviations have been used in this paper: BAV: The Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana; BnF: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France; HCA: Hereford, Hereford Cathedral Archives. The commissioners opened the case on 13 July 1307. R. Bartlett, *The Hanged Man: a Story of Miracle, Memory, and Colonialism in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 23.

² For a full breakdown of these miracles, see André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 492–3. The number of witnesses interviewed in the process is debated: see R.C. Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1977), 176–7; Michael Richter, *Sprache und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen zur mündlichen Kommunikation in England von der Mitte des elften bis zum Beginn des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1979), 205; and P.H. Daly, ‘The Process of Canonisation in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries’, in *St Thomas Cantilupe, Bishop of Hereford: Essays in his Honour*, ed. M. Jancey (Hereford: The Friends of Hereford Cathedral Publications Committee, 1982), 131.

³ BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 7v.

miracle, recounting how William Cragh was hanged in Swansea for rebelling against the lord of Gower and killing 13 men in an attack on Oystermouth Castle. Despite being hanged twice – the gallows broke on the first attempt – William Cragh recovered in the nearby house of a burgess of Swansea, and was later taken by the Lord and Lady de Briouze of Swansea Castle on a pilgrimage to Thomas Cantilupe’s tomb in Hereford to give thanks for the miracle. Each of the nine witness accounts are recorded in The Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, as part of the inquisition’s investigation into the life and miracles of Thomas Cantilupe.

The witness statements illustrate life in Swansea in the last decades of the thirteenth century, many aspects of which are explored elsewhere in this special issue. There are a number of famous micro-histories to which the resulting depiction of life in Swansea and the Gower in the late thirteenth century could be likened, such as that of Montréal contained in Ginzburg’s *The Cheese and the Worms* and La Roy Ladurie’s *Montaillou*.⁴ For Swansea itself, Robert Bartlett’s *The Hanged Man: a Story of Miracle, Memory, and Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, constitutes the most detailed study to date of the evidence for William Cragh’s case. Each of these studies is primarily based upon inquisitorial records, though in the first two cases the inquisitions investigated allegations of heresy rather than miracles. The ‘City Witness’ project has gone beyond these micro-histories in mapping details provided by the textual records onto cartographic and visual reconstructions of Swansea c.1300, allowing for further exploration of the boundaries and relationships within the medieval city.

Yet the streets of Swansea were not the only site upon which important issues in this case were played out. The manuscripts containing the witness depositions and record of Thomas Cantilupe’s canonisation process are an equally important space for negotiating tensions between different authorities, lay and ecclesiastical categorisations, and even divergences within the literate echelons of society. The various records produced for the papal investigation into Thomas Cantilupe’s miracles reflect these conflicts, coming as they do at an important historical moment when the official means of making a saint were undergoing extensive changes. Papal involvement in the form of inquisitorial commissioners became necessary following the reforms brought in by Innocent III at the Fourth Lateran Council.⁵

The existing system had largely been based on communal recognition of sanctity. Although there are earlier cases of papal lawyers being involved in the decision-making,⁶ it was normal for saints to be recognised unofficially by their communities as their reputations grew, and written collections of their miracles were often produced.⁷ Miracle collections of this kind continued to be written in the first decades of the thirteenth century, with collections for Gilbert of Sempringham, Wulfstan of Worcester and Hugh of Lincoln among the more important

⁴ The latest editions are: C. Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: the Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013); and E. Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou: the Promised Land of Error* (New York: Braziller Books, 2008).

⁵ Pope Alexander III in 1161, and even Gregory VII during his pontificate (1073–85), had tried to insist on a papal canonisation process: Michael E. Goodich, ‘The Use of Direct Quotation from Canonisation Hearing to Hagiographical *Vita et Miracula*’, in *Lives and Miracles of the Saints: Studies in Medieval Latin Hagiography* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 177–9; and Elisabeth van Houts, *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe 900–1200* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), 58–9.

⁶ See, for example, the case of St Milburga, in A.J.M. Edwards, ‘An Early Twelfth Century Account of the Translation of St Milburga of Much Wenlock’, *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society* 57 (1962): 134–51.

⁷ For more on this argument, see Benedicta Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval Mind* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), 215; S. Yarrow, *Saints and their Communities: Miracle Stories in Twelfth Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006); and E. Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948).

examples. A collection was also drawn together to mark the translation of Thomas Becket in 1220, but after this date few further collections were made.⁸ Indeed, in addition to the witness testimonies included in MS Vat. Lat. 4015, a more traditional collection was made at the tomb of Thomas Cantilupe in Hereford, and survives in Oxford, Exeter College, MS 158. It contains hundreds of miracle stories from those visiting the tomb to give thanks, including an account of William Cragh's recovery.⁹ By the end of the thirteenth century, as papal endorsement of saints was becoming more necessary and sought after, these collections began to decline, though pilgrimages to tombs and shrines continued as before.¹⁰ The collection of miracles made by the papal commissioners investigating Cantilupe's case makes for an illustrative example – in part, through their contrast with the Exeter College manuscript – of the increasingly forensic approach to miracles and saint-making. The depositions contained in MS Vat. Lat. 4015, therefore, reflect the shift in the recording of miracles which had occurred during the thirteenth century.¹¹

The testimonies of the Swansea witnesses have been used in the past to explore some of these issues. Bartlett recognises the filters placed upon the oral depositions, firstly via the commissioners' questioning, then by their subsequent translation into legalistic Latin prose. He suggests that this mediation flattens the individuality of the accounts, leading to difficulties in extrapolating the precise memories of the witnesses.¹² Jussi Hanska draws similar conclusions in his article, 'The Hanging of William Cragh: Anatomy of a Miracle', reminding us that the transformation from oral to written testimony obscures the authentic voices of the Swansea inhabitants.¹³ Michael E. Goodich comments more positively on the translation and transformation process, emphasising the value of the occasional passage of direct speech which reaches us.¹⁴ However, the current article will suggest that these scribal and editorial interventions are revealing rather than obstructive, as they illuminate the emerging purpose and function of the papal commission. Through a detailed examination of the manuscripts documenting the different stages of Thomas Cantilupe's canonisation inquiry, it demonstrates how the official written record struggles for authority over oral memory.

The Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. Lat. 4015

The depositions concerning William Cragh's case are contained BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, a large, quarto-sized volume, written on parchment with evidence that considerable care was taken with its construction and presentation. This attention to detail is apparent in many of the manuscript's features, and indicates the functional purpose of the text in the canonisation process.

⁸ Rachel Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate: Miracle Stories and Miracle Collecting in High Medieval England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 201–2.

⁹ Oxford, Exeter College, MS 158, ff. 49r–49v. This version of the miracle, recorded almost 20 years before the 1307 hearings, is rather different to the testimonies provided for the papal commissioners. For a discussion of these differences and the reasons behind them, see Jussi Hanska, 'The Hanging of William Cragh: Anatomy of a Miracle', *Journal of Medieval History* 27 (2001): 130–6.

¹⁰ Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate*, 203.

¹¹ Details of the changes enacted by Innocent can be found in Ward, *Miracles*, 184–5; and Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 22–32. The articles composed for Thomas Cantilupe's case became the basis for future papal inquiries; see R.C. Finucane, 'Toddler in the Ditch: a Case of Parental Neglect?' in *Voices from the Bench: the Narratives of Lesser Folk in Medieval Trials*, ed. M. Goodich (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 129.

¹² Bartlett, *Hanged Man*, 26, 128.

¹³ Hanska, 'Anatomy of a Miracle', 123.

¹⁴ Goodich, 'Use of Direct Quotation', 179.

Despite the multiple hands which are in evidence (there are at least eight involved in the course of the manuscript), care has been taken to ensure that the 41 quires are of roughly the same length, as the majority are the standard eight-folio composition. The depositions can be divided into two sections: those which were recorded in London in July 1307, followed by those that were given in Hereford in November of the same year.¹⁵ The text, and therefore the first division, opens with a large blue initial ‘I’ which extends down over 16 lines.¹⁶ This initial must have been part of the original conception of the manuscript, as the start of each subsequent line on folio 1r is indented in such a way as to allow for its inclusion. This elongated initial is then mirrored at the start of the second round of interviews on folio 123r. As with the additional uses of colour and flourishes in the manuscript, these perform the dual function of visually representing the content in a manner which reflects its spiritual importance and nature, and clearly establishing the start of each collection of testimonies. However, the division of the codex in such a way seems to be primarily for administrative purposes, as some miracles, William Cragh’s among them, had witnesses testifying in both London and Hereford.¹⁷ By apportioning the depositions into separate sections of the manuscript, the notaries were making it clearer to future users of the document where the interviews had taken place.

There is further use of colour in the alternating red and blue paraphs¹⁸ found throughout the codex, which assist with the use of the manuscript as a reference work. They were evidently added after the majority of this particular text had been prepared, as they are written over capital letters and at times even over the marginal sketches found in the codex.¹⁹ The paraphs correspond with the points at which commissioners ask the witness a new question, thereby serving as an easily navigable way of seeing at a glance where each individual statement begins within a deposition. The questions posed by the commissioners included standard legal inquiries into age, profession, and place of birth and residence, commonly found in both secular and canon law cases. However, the nature of miracles also required detailed, almost philosophical, questions as to the witnesses’ understanding of the meaning of ‘communis oppinio’ or ‘common opinion’, a key concept in establishing popular opinion and general acceptance that a miracle had occurred. These markers, therefore, represent in a very visual way the mediation of the commissioners and their notaries in the recording of these witness testimonies. Every marker found in the text denotes the inquisitorial team’s punctuation of the deposition, marking an interruption to the natural process of recollection, and a redirection to a particular line of enquiry. The accounts which are recorded as a result are not then the natural memories of the witnesses, but a deliberately shaped version designed to fulfil the directives of the canonisation process.

These directed questions represent an attempt to measure the miracle’s authenticity against a carefully designed set of criteria. The questions themselves are based upon a series of articles set out at the very beginning of the manuscript, before the witness testimonies begin.²⁰ The result of

¹⁵ Bartlett, *Hanged Man*, 23, 25.

¹⁶ BAV MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 1r.

¹⁷ Three witnesses, Mary de Briouze, her stepson, William de Briouze, junior, and their chaplain, William of Codineston, were examined in London; the remaining witnesses (William Cragh, Thomas Marshall, John of Baggeham, Henry Skinner, Adam of Loughor and John ap Hywel) were examined in Hereford.

¹⁸ For the development of the paraph from the capital letter ‘C’ as an abbreviation of *capitulum*, see M.B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: an Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 305.

¹⁹ E.g. a red paraph which partially covers the ‘D’ of ‘Domine’ on BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 234r.

²⁰ The articles are set out on ff. 4r–5r.

this questioning is that the testimony of each witness is divided into numbered statements beginning with formulae such as ‘sixthly he said ...’. At times this numbering serves as a form of shorthand, allowing the notaries to write ‘as said before in article ... above’,²¹ thereby reducing the repetition of extraneous detail which would otherwise make a long, complex volume even more so. This formulation further sculpts the recollected narrative, reflecting the future purpose and audience for which the text was compiled.²² The orally delivered testimonies of the witnesses are therefore reconstructed into a functional reference work preserved in writing for future consultation.

Assisting further with the navigation of the text are large, running headers placed along the top of each folio, recto and verso. The folio number, which is positioned in the top right-hand corner of each page, has been added at a different time to the writing of the main text, as it is in a lighter brown ink to that of the main hand. At the top of every page the number of the witness whose deposition is recorded below is also noted. Alongside this there is a large Roman numeral, either ‘I’ or ‘II’. The former indicates that the witness was interviewed in the cathedral chapter at St Paul’s, London, while the remainder of the interviews took place in St Katherine’s Chapel, Hereford.

These visually striking methods of structuring and easing a user’s navigation around the codex and its contents are not the only ways in which the testimonies were transformed in the process of committing them to writing. Despite the care and attention which clearly went into producing this elegant manuscript, the miracle accounts have been significantly edited and added to after their assembly into MS Vat. Lat. 4015. One example of such a change is a lengthy passage within the first witness statement of Ralph of Hengham, the king’s principal justice in King’s Bench, on folio 5r, which contains a central paragraph written in much lighter ink than the remainder of the text on the page. On closer inspection, it would appear that this whole paragraph was written over an erasure. As the paragraph contains the names of the first four witnesses to be interviewed – including Ralph of Hengham, Mary de Briouze, her stepson and chaplain – it is likely that some mistake was made and needed correcting.

There are also a large number of marginal annotations found throughout the text, which are in much lighter ink than the main text. Within the deposition of Lady Mary de Briouze, again, there are a number of marginal additions. For example, the word ‘primo’ has been added in the margin of folio 8r, while ‘aliā’ and ‘ymo’ have been added on folio 8v, all of which are qualifying terms used to sharpen the shape of the testimony. An example which is perhaps even more illustrative of the manner in which these marginal additions were intended to clarify the contents of the main text is the addition of ‘se credere’ alongside the record of one of Mary’s responses.²³ When asked if her maidservant had seen any breath of life in William Cragh when visiting him in the burgess’ house, Mary simply replied ‘no’. However, a later editor of the text decided to add the qualifying statement that she ‘believed’ not, to make it clearer that this was her opinion only. Such changes made to the content of the depositions were not amendments made in

²¹ For example, during the examination of William de Briouze, the notary records: ‘Item ad nonum et decimum interrogatorium, est per ipsum testem responsum, supra in primo et secundo tercio, quarto, quinto, sexto, et septimo capitulo dicti sui’ (‘Further, the ninth and tenth question were answered by the witness himself above in the first and second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh articles of what he said’): f. 14v.

²² A full examination of the language used in the canonisation process is given by Richter, *Sprache*, 217. Comments on the process of shortening testimonies are offered by Judith Everard, ‘Sworn Testimony and Memory of the Past in Brittany, c.1100–1250’, in *Medieval Memories: Men, Women and the Past, 700–1300*, ed. Elisabeth van Houts (Harlow: Longman, 2001), 74.

²³ BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 9r.

consultation with the witnesses themselves. Instead, the testimonies were probably recorded on wax tablets at the time of their delivery, before being written up more permanently into ‘six volumes’.²⁴ Although these codices no longer survive, they are mentioned in a letter contained in the archive of Hereford Cathedral.²⁵ The correspondence is dated to 1309 and written by Henry de Shorne then the archdeacon of Hereford. In it, he referred to the late delivery of six volumes copied from the original processes which were needed by the notaries working on producing the canonisation dossier – that is, MS Vat. Lat. 4015 and its companion manuscript MS Vat. Lat. 4016.

Further amendments made to the text of the testimonies are less dramatic, but equally visible, and all appear to be aimed at increasing the functionality of the manuscript’s content. Again, in the statement of Lady Mary de Briouze, the title of the miracle and her witness number have been underlined in lighter ink, which suggests that this was not done at the original time of writing. The emphasis provided by the underlining seems to be making it easier to identify the start of a new witness testimony. There is also a series of intriguing illustrations, in the form of ink line drawings found in the margins on a number of folios (although none fall within the sections of the manuscript concerning William Cragh).²⁶ These consist of a collection of heads which accompany the testimony of certain individuals, and appear to represent the person giving the deposition. For example, a picture of a female head is placed alongside the testimony of Margeria, the daughter of Richard of Pembroke,²⁷ and ‘Dominus Thomas, scholaris’ is written in the margin alongside a sketch of a young boy.²⁸ A large number of friars are also depicted, including Brother Henry de Sintone, warden of the Order of the Friars Minor,²⁹ Father Hugh of London,³⁰ Brother John de Clara³¹ and Brother Peter of Uxbridge,³² all belonging to the same order of friars. Interestingly, there are also two depictions of a bishop in the bottom margin of two successive folios³³ which appear to be of exactly the same head, and which, unlike the other cases, do not correspond with the witness being interviewed at these points. Complete with mitre, these heads may be representations of the manuscript’s main subject, Thomas Cantilupe.

It is not clear why some witnesses have been drawn or represented visually while others are not. The majority of the images fall within the same quire, which could point to them being the work of a single individual. The fact that a number of them are partially obscured with the red and blue paraphs points to them having been made closer to the time of the manuscript’s original composition, which could suggest they were therefore the work of one of the scribes working on the text. We can only hypothesise as to their purpose, but it may be that this was a further way of increasing the usability of the document, providing readers with visual cues to the witnesses included in particular sections. There may be more to the case of the friars, however. Henry de Sintone, Hugh of London and John de Clara were the only witnesses interviewed who did not fully support Thomas Cantilupe’s canonisation, claiming that his saintly nature

²⁴ It is highly likely that notes would have been made on wax tablets during the interviews and written up into the ‘six volumes’ soon afterwards. For more details of the process, see Monique-Cecile Garand, ‘Auteurs latins et autographes des XIe et XIIe siècles’, *Scrittura et Civiltà* 5 (1981): 77–108.

²⁵ HCA 1443.

²⁶ They fall on the following folios of BAV, MS Vat. Lat., 4015: 44v, 45r, 45v, 46v, 48r, 139r, 146v and 244v.

²⁷ f. 244v.

²⁸ f. 44v.

²⁹ f. 46v.

³⁰ f. 45v.

³¹ f. 46v.

³² f. 45r.

³³ ff. 139r and 146v.

and miracles had been exaggerated by the chapter at Hereford in the interests of self-promotion.³⁴ It could be that these heads were intended to mark out testimonies of particular interest to the commissioners, making them easier to identify among the hundreds of statements. There may also be an underlying political dimension to this, as the London friars would have sided with Archbishop Pecham in his lengthy disagreement with Thomas Cantilupe while he was bishop of Hereford.³⁵

There is also some internal evidence within MS Vat. Lat. 4015 which demonstrates something of how the manuscript was put together. This in turn hints at the process of recording and writing up the testimonies for the canonisation proceedings more generally. For example, folio 219r begins a new quire, with a change in hand from that found in the previous one. However, there are markings at the end of the first quire, which constitute the opening line of the following folio in note form. The use of such catchwords and phrases was of course very common in the Middle Ages, ensuring that quires written by different scribes were sewn together in the right order. This process of using multiple scribes simultaneously within a scriptorium allowed for a text to be created much more quickly, and also shows that the text was being written up from more than simply notes made on wax tablets at the time of the witnesses' interviews, or even from the six volumes of records produced over the course of the investigation.³⁶ The text found in MS Vat. Lat. 4015 must have been written up in full already for the scribes to have been able to use these catchwords across quires, and was certainly not being composed extempore as the testimonies were given. This observation also explains the lengthy repetition found at the top of folio 227r. Here, a new hand takes over as scribe of the new quire, and was evidently copying from an exemplar, as he proceeds to write a full two lines of the text already given on the previous folio before the error is realised.

This process of composition provides additional evidence for there being a single editor working through MS Vat. Lat. 4015 as a whole, tidying inconsistencies, and imposing a more rigorous structure on the piece. None of the scribes involved in the manuscript's creation under such a system would have had a full enough knowledge of the text as a whole to be able to make this kind of editorial decision. Despite more than 100 witnesses being interviewed between the de Briouzes and William of Codineston testifying in London to Cragh's resuscitation and the remainder in Hereford, the same small, neat hand amends the text in both sections in a lighter brown ink. This suggests that the refining process was undertaken after the manuscript had been put together as a whole, and had been passed on to a superior with an overview of the Cantilupe case.

The Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. Lat. 4016

The reworking and reconstruction of the witness testimonies in St Thomas Cantilupe's case did not end with MS Vat. Lat. 4015. The manuscript has a companion in The Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. Lat. 4016. It too contains the records of witnesses for the hearing of St Thomas Cantilupe's case, this time relating to the bishop's sanctity during his lifetime. The dimensions, hands and decoration of this second manuscript suggest that it was produced alongside the miracle collection of MS Vat. Lat. 4015, by the same group of scribes,

³⁴ Vauchez gives a full transcription of their testimonies, in appendix 2, *Sainthood*, 555–8. For a discussion of the testimonies, see Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 222, and Daly, 'Process of Canonisation', 128.

³⁵ The full details of the dispute can be found in R.C. Finucane, 'The Cantilupe–Pecham Controversy', in *St Thomas de Cantilupe*, ed. Jancy, 103–24; while Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 494–5, discusses this possibility for their lack of support.

³⁶ HCA 1443.

colourists and editor. It contains the testimonies of 45 individuals, mostly bishops and rectors who had some personal knowledge of Thomas. The same alternating red and blue paraps run throughout the manuscript, marking the beginning of new witness statements. In fact, the manuscript ends with the same notarial signs of those who composed it as those in MS Vat. Lat. 4015.³⁷ This is no surprise, however, as the testimonies for Thomas' good life were gathered at the same time and in the same locations as those concerning his miracles.

Although they have been preserved in a separate manuscript from the accounts of Thomas' miracles, the way in which the testimonies relating to his life have been recorded demonstrates that the papal commissioners employed the same methods of mediation. It is likely that the six volumes referred to in the Hereford Cathedral letter contained a mixture of depositions relating to Thomas' miracles and lifestyle.³⁸ Indeed, earlier hagiographical texts supporting the cults of various saints contained similar combinations of statements about the sanctity of an individual and the miracles which occurred by his or her intervention.³⁹ However, it was the increased involvement of the papacy and bureaucratisation of canonisation proceedings which led to an insistence on differentiating these two necessary attributes of a saint: miracles and a virtuous life.

In contrast to MS Vat. Lat. 4015, which contains the testimonies of people from many different stations in life, male and female (for Mary de Briouze is not the only female voice recorded in the volume), MS Vat. Lat. 4016 contains only depositions from men. In line with medieval ideas about the quality of witnesses, it may be that only they were considered reliable enough to bear witness to such an important question as an individual's saintly lifestyle.⁴⁰ The males interviewed were also all in clerical orders, which lends additional weight to their testimony. This would have been particularly important as one of the principal uncertainties surrounding Thomas Cantilupe's case was that he may have been excommunicate at the time of his death.⁴¹

The Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Ott. Lat. 2516

Yet even these two sister manuscripts, MSS Vat. Lat 4015 and 4016, are not the final witnesses to the miracles of Thomas Cantilupe. Three further iterations of the collection were made before the final outcome of Thomas' canonisation process was decided in 1320. The first of these is contained in BAV, MS Ott. Lat. 2516, which comprises brief and relatively untidy notes made on the case in 1313.⁴² These folios provide a record of an interim review into the case for canonisation, undertaken by six cardinals examining, over three days, the collection of miracles. The matter had been picked up again following a fresh prompt from the Hereford

³⁷ BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4016, ff. 110v and 111r.

³⁸ HCA 1443.

³⁹ For examples of this in action, see Janet Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 301–3; and van Houts, *Memory and Gender*, 41–8.

⁴⁰ The hierarchy of witnessing and the gender divide it endorsed were well established. For a detailed breakdown of the levels of witness, see van Houts, introduction to *Medieval Memories*, 1–16, 5; eadem, *Memory and Gender*, 23–4, 143; and Everard, 'Sworn Testimony', 81–5. For the role of women as witnesses to miracles, see Kathleen Quirck, 'Men, Women and Miracles in Normandy, 1050–1150', in *Medieval Memories*, ed. van Houts, 53–71.

⁴¹ For further details surrounding the reasons for his excommunication, see, in *St Thomas Cantilupe*, ed. Jancy. Nona D.S. Martin, 'The Life of Saint Thomas of Hereford', 15–20; David Carpenter, 'St Thomas Cantilupe: His Political Career', 57–72; and Finucane, 'Cantilupe–Pecham Controversy', 103–24;

⁴² BAV, MS Ott. Lat. 2516, ff. 44r–46v. For further discussion of the content of these notes, see Daly, 'Process of Canonisation', 126–7, 134–5.

authorities, keen to see progress made,⁴³ but unfortunately the surviving record of the meeting is incomplete and ends abruptly. It opens with a record of the cardinals and notaries present; it then goes on to detail the first day's discussion, which centred on the choice of the commissioners employed in the Cantilupe case, and the locations in which the interviews took place. Comments are also offered concerning the purpose of evaluating Thomas Cantilupe's miracles,⁴⁴ a discussion which was expanded upon the following day when the matter of Thomas's excommunication was considered. The remainder of the folios, however, contain only a list of the documentation to be reviewed.⁴⁵

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5373

The next extant compilation of Thomas' miracles is contained in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5373.⁴⁶ Made in 1319, this version of his miracles was compiled in preparation for the final review of Thomas' case in 1320.⁴⁷ There are two sections of the manuscript which contain details relating to Cantilupe's case: folios 66r–69v and 70r–119 v. Though the record in this instance is far more detailed than that found in BAV MS Ott. Lat. 2516, it contains an account of only 26 of the 38 miracles set out in the original MS Vat. Lat. 4015. Vauchez has made a very detailed comparison of the two miracle selections, and concluded that several were dropped as they were no longer considered miraculous or extraordinary enough. These included the cure of a mad woman, some disappearing warts, and a strange dream reported by Richard Swinfield, Thomas' successor as bishop of Hereford and the foremost promoter of the case for canonisation. Three further miracles are thought to have been omitted for being too common in hagiographical works: our case study of William Cragh, categorised as 'hanging not followed by death', is one of these 'common' examples, and was therefore omitted from further listings of Thomas Cantilupe's miracles. Finally, repetitive miracle types for which the commissioners had managed to find stronger examples were excluded.⁴⁸

Though BnF MS lat. 5373 is an abbreviated account containing only the more unusual and incontrovertible miracles, BAV MSS Vat. Lat. 4015 and 4016 have clearly been used as base texts in its compilation. The witness number and name are still included, along with a description of the miracle, which correspond with the detail provided in the earlier manuscripts. However, the compiler of BnF MS lat. 5373 has also introduced a level of analysis to the accounts. One instance of this is a consideration of what doubts might be raised about each miracle and how they might be explained, which is coupled with a judgement on whether it might be properly defined as a miracle. An attempt has also been made to classify a number of the miracles, as a gloss of sorts is provided in the margins alongside the miracles, detailing the book, chapter and verse of the Bible containing a comparable example. This occurs in the first miracle cited, the case of Joanna, a girl who died by drowning, and returned to life after 'those present' appealed to Thomas Cantilupe. In addressing the doubts which

⁴³ HCA 1439, 1443, 2673.

⁴⁴ BAV, MS Ott. Lat. 2516, f. 44r.

⁴⁵ f. 46r; ff. 44r–46r contain the extended list.

⁴⁶ The sections of the manuscript relating to St Thomas Cantilupe's case can be found in BnF, MS lat. 5373 A, ff. 70r–119v for the *recollection*, and ff. 66r–69v for the *summarius*. See Daly, 'Process of Canonisation', 126–7, for more on the contents of this manuscript. For a full transcription of the *summarius*, see Vauchez, appendix 1, *Sainthood*, 540–54.

⁴⁷ For a full account of the canonisation decision in 1320, see B. Schimmelpfennig, *Die Zeremonienbücher der römischen Kurie im Mittelalter* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1973), 164–6.

⁴⁸ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 495.

might be raised, the miracle is glossed with ‘III Regum XVII’ and ‘IV Regum’.⁴⁹ This concern with each miracle’s validity is an indication of the purpose of this latest collection of the miracles: it is the final presentation of the evidence from which the Curia would decide on the outcome of Thomas Cantilupe’s case. The compiler clearly felt the need to ensure that all of the necessary information, including biblical references, was to hand.⁵⁰

The bull of canonisation

The final collection of testimonies relating to Thomas Cantilupe’s case is contained in the papal bull of 1320, setting out the saint’s canonisation. It provides a brief account of Thomas’ best qualities, including a note, for example, to say that he did not drink too much wine too often.⁵¹ It then briefly outlines a carefully curated selection of his miracles, which had been narrowed down from the 26 to just 10. Although there is weight to Vauchez’s argument that these were ‘the most established’ of the miracles,⁵² their selection may also have been made on other grounds too. To begin with, 10 is a round figure, and the range of miracle-types within the selection is also well balanced: three resuscitations, three paralysis cures, three cures for blindness, and a spinal deformity which suddenly vanished.⁵³ Secondly, the presentation and layout of the bull posed a practical restriction, making it essential to summarise further the evidence supporting the canonisation. This may also be a reason for trimming the accounts of each miracle down to the bare topoi, eliminating references to names and biographical details which had been so carefully passed down the manuscript chain up until this point. The removal of these details makes the remaining miracles more universal, transforming them into timeless *exempla* which have more in common with earlier miracle collections.

Authority and memory

But how do the physical features of these manuscripts reflect changing attitudes towards witnesses and witnessing, not only of saints’ miracles, but also in more quotidian, often legal, situations? The manner in which the manuscripts are organised, with the underlining of names and witness numbers, demonstrates a keen focus on the importance of the individual in recalling and witnessing. Each deposition is presented as a distinct testimony, with its own title, the witness number and the witness name following quickly on from that. But here there emerges a tension between the individual and communal, for the depositions also contain a great deal of inter-referentiality and do not stand alone as discrete narrative episodes. One of the earliest and most apparent examples comes early in Mary de Briouze’s deposition, when a reference is made to ‘the aforesaid bishop’, meaning Thomas Cantilupe.⁵⁴ However, up until this point in her testimony, no reference has yet been made to the bishop; in fact, the phrase

⁴⁹ BnF MS lat. 5373, f. 66v.

⁵⁰ For a description of this final stage of the decision-making process, see F. van Ortoy, ed., ‘Procès-verbal du dernier consistoire secret préparatoire à la canonisation du Célestin V’, *Analecta Bollandiana* 16 (1897): 475–87.

⁵¹ HCA 1445.

⁵² Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 495.

⁵³ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 495; see also J. Bollandus and others, eds., rev. J. Carnandet, *Acta Sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur, ... Octobris*. New edn. 14 vols. (Paris: Victor Palmé, 1866–83), 1: 597–8, for a printed version of the text of the papal bull itself.

⁵⁴ BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 8v.

refers back to the previous witness statement in the collection.⁵⁵ The second group of depositions from Swansea inhabitants is even more dependent on one another. Towards the end of each statement, the notaries avoid unnecessary repetition by stating that ‘they asked the six final questions put to the said William [Cragh] (witness 148). He replied in effect just the same as him.’⁵⁶ The use of such a phrase would seem to direct the text’s reader to use the apparatus outlined above in order to navigate back to the testimony of the correct witness, by number, and within that, to use the numbered statements to find the appropriate response.

In the process of transferring the depositions into writing, they combine into something much bigger than the individual testimonies: a different kind of ‘witness’ altogether, a composite memory of a shared rather than private experience.⁵⁷ Ironically perhaps, despite the commissioners’ forensic approach, establishing the biographical details of each and every witness, the resulting collection in fact constitutes a communal recollection, more reminiscent of the previous ‘common-consent’ approach to saint-making. Even in light of the changes made to the process of canonisation following the Fourth Lateran Council, a necessary part of miracle-witnessing remained the communal confirmation that it had taken place.

This tension between the authority of the individual statement and validation offered by the communal confirmation reflects wider issues surrounding the recording of memory and the conflict between oral and written modes of doing so. At each stage in the documented process outlined above, the mediation of the remembered testimonies reflects the purpose for which that document was produced. For example, the clarity of the layout of BAV MSS Vat. Lat. 4015 and 4016 is designed to make them as easy as possible to consult as reference works for future users: it is possible to see at a glance which witness is testifying on any given page, as well as where each reply to an article begins. In the case of BnF MS lat. 5373, again, the beginning of each account of a miracle is easily identifiable, as is the name and number of each witness. In this manuscript, the marginal references to biblical miracles show attempts to classify and categorise Thomas Cantilupe’s miracles, in preparation for the next stage in the process. These references act as a gloss on the main text for readers, who would have been able to use these chapter and verse notations to identify quickly the type of miracle and any scriptural precedents which may have been needed to defend it. It is highly likely that this categorisation was used in selecting the final 10 miracles for the bull of canonisation, as they are carefully chosen to cover the full range.

The individuality of each witness testimony is also emphasised across the documentation, at least until the end of the process, the papal bull. The witnesses are readily identifiable in BAV MSS Vat. Lat. 4015 and 4016, and also BnF MS lat. 5373 as a result of the underlining of names and the numbers allocated to them by the notaries in the process. These features represent a growing concern with the specifics of the witnesses, as evidenced in the very detailed biographical information which is recorded in BAV MS Vat. Lat. 4015. These features

⁵⁵ The first testimony in the collection belongs to Ralph of Hengham (1235–1311), chief justice of King’s Bench, and is contained in MS Vat. Lat. 4015, ff. 5r–7r. For further details on Ralph’s life and career, see P. Brand, ‘Hengham, Ralph (b. in or before 1235, d. 1311)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eds. H.C.G. Matthew and B. Harrison, online edn., <http://www.oxforddnb.com/index/12/101012924> (Accessed 10 November 2014).

⁵⁶ BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 225r: ‘Item requisitus super sex ultimis interrogatoriis factis dicto Willelmo testi Cxlviii. Respondit idem in effectum sicut ipse.’ This occurrence comes in the testimony of John of Baggeham, but the same approach can be found in the testimonies of Henry Skinner (f. 226r), Adam of Loughor (f. 226v) and John ap Hywel (f. 227v).

⁵⁷ For discussion of the creation of these ‘legally created collectives’, see Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 528.

can be seen as an attempt to clarify the reliability and quality of each deposition for future users of the text, who had not been there in person during the interviews. The detail is not completely uniform across the whole collection of witnesses, but this example taken from the beginning of the deposition of Thomas Marshall, the local priest in Swansea, demonstrates the forensic approach being employed:

Master Thomas Marshall the priest was [sworn in as a] witness. He replied when questioned he was 32 years old and that he was not a relative or from the household of the said Lord Thomas, nor was he from that of the aforesaid Lord William de Briouze, and that he was staying in the town of Swansea in which he was born, under the temporal lordship of Lord William de Briouze.⁵⁸

One reason for this close attention to detail was to establish the quality of the witness. The commissioners and notaries were well aware that their record was the one upon which the decision-making process would be based: the Curia would never have the opportunity to meet the witnesses in person or call on them some years down the line. It was therefore important to ensure that every detail which might be of importance or interest be accurately documented. From the records of the William Cragh case, there is certainly a sense that the occupation and standing of the witnesses is important, and also that the witnesses themselves were aware of this. John of Baggeham cannot help but feel the need to clarify the actual status of one of his fellow witnesses. Tagged on to the end of his testimony is the statement that ‘John [ap Hywel] the witness sworn above did not have property from which he successfully lived, [but] lived by his labour.’⁵⁹ This concern with the quality of witnesses demonstrated by all parties also provides a clue to the reasoning behind the selection of individuals testifying to the sanctity of Thomas Cantilupe. Gender is a significant issue here: every witness in BAV MS Vat. Lat. 4016 is a clergyman, which suggests that only those witnesses of the highest calibre could be trusted to testify on such important and spiritually high matters. As the only female witness among the Swansea inhabitants, Mary de Briouze is also the only witness whose previous experience of giving evidence is commented upon. The notaries record that ‘because the said lady [Mary] was not trained in the law, nor in the practice of legal cases, and she had testified to much that she had heard said [i.e. by others] and was produced [as a witness] relating to this miracle alone, the said lords commissioners did not question her further from the lack of certainty of her knowledge.’⁶⁰ The inclusion of this observation sets her apart from the other Swansea inhabitants, and perhaps infers an awareness on the part of the inquisitorial team of her status as a less well regarded witness.⁶¹

Yet this need for clarity and forensic detail extends beyond the treatment and recording of the witnesses’ backgrounds to the nature of the questioning itself. One of the most important questions put to the witnesses was the ‘third question of the third article’, which relates to the nature of the miracle under examination. When it was put to Mary de Briouze ‘if she knew,

⁵⁸ BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 222r; ‘Dominus Thomas Marescalh presbiter testis supra iuratus respondit requisitus se esse etatis xxxii annorum et quod non fuerat de parentela vel familia dicti domini Thome nec sic predictum dominum W. de Brewes fuisse et quod morabatur in villa de Sweyneseye de qua fuerat oriundus sub temporali dominio domini Willelmi de Brewes.’

⁵⁹ f. 225r: ‘Johannes testis supra iuratus non habet possessiones de quarum proventibus vivat. Sed vivit de laboricio suo.’ Baggeham’s clarification of this matter could have been motivated by other concerns, such as his desire to guard his relative social status.

⁶⁰ f. 10r: ‘Et quia dicta domina non erat perita in iure, nec in exerciis causarum, et deposuerat in multis de auditu dici nec fuerat producta nisi super isto miraculo tamen dicti domini commissarii ex certa sciencia omiserunt eam interrogare.’

⁶¹ For further discussion of the issues surrounding male and female witnesses see above, n. 41.

believed or heard that following nature, and the natural way without divine miracle it was possible that the said William could survive or come back to life, after the said hanging and after the aforesaid indication of death', she replied 'that she did not believe or know, nor had she heard it said that it could have happened without being a divine miracle above nature'.⁶² In the phrasing of this question we can see echoes of the official classification and definition of what constituted a miracle. Although the concept of a miracle as being 'above nature' was an Augustinian one,⁶³ questioning a witness in this way was a result of the high-medieval scholastic method in which the commissioners in Thomas Cantilupe's case had been trained. St Augustine's reasoning was built upon by theologians such as Thomas Aquinas and his contemporaries in the thirteenth century. They composed highly structured arguments on the nature of miracles, stipulating that they must be performed by God directly, and that they could be divided into two classifications, either above or against nature, both of which were based upon biblical examples.⁶⁴ The work of theologians such as Aquinas was then taken up by canonists, influencing their own writing on and classification of the miraculous.⁶⁵

The links between the investigation of miracles in the early fourteenth century and the scholastic method extend beyond this comparison, however. Evidence supplied by BnF MS lat. 5373 demonstrates how these definitions and criteria were applied to the miracles attributed to Thomas Cantilupe. It has already been shown how biblical examples of miracles are glossed in the margins adjacent to the equivalent miracle type in Cantilupe's canon of miracles. The final comment of either 'sic' or 'non' added to each miracle also directly echoes the terminology used in the quodlibetals which provided the foundation for inquiry and proof in intellectual spheres.⁶⁶ The application of such terms and formalised approach to the canonisation process reflects the individuals responsible for collecting the evidence: namely, papal commissioners with a background in canon law, as opposed to local churchmen and the laity. The inquisitors assigned to hear Thomas Cantilupe's case were very much a part of this educated elite, sharing the views developed in the thirteenth-century university system. The principal commissioner, William Durand, was a distinguished canon lawyer as well as bishop of Mende, in the south of France;⁶⁷ his father before him had been trained in canon law at the

⁶² f. 8v; 'si scit credit vel audivit quod secundum naturam, et viam nature absque miraculo divino potuerit dictus Willelmus suspensus vivere, vel vixisse post dictum suspendium, et post predicta signa mortis que dixit apparuisse in eo... quod non credit, nec scit, nec audivit dici quod absque miraculo divino supra naturam existente potuerit vivere.' For the other witnesses' responses to this question, see f. 12r for William de Briouze, junior, and f. 14r for William of Codineston.

⁶³ For a detailed examination of Augustine's thoughts on this, see Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 86–7.

⁶⁴ For Aquinas' writing on these matters, see T.C. O'Brien, ed. and trans., *St Thomas Aquinas: Summa Theologica*, vol. 14 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd, 1975), 83–5: Ia, q.105, a.7. For a more detailed account of how these intellectual arguments influenced approaches to miracles, see M. Goodich, *Miracles and Wonders: the Development of the Concept of Miracle, 1150–1350* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Caroline Walker Bynum, 'Miracles and Marvels: the Limits of Alterity', in *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. F.J. Felten and N. Jaspert (Berlin: Duncker and Humblot, 1999), 799–817; Caroline Walker Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity* (New York: Zone Books, 2001); and Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate*, 203.

⁶⁵ An example of this can be found in Johannes Andreae, *Novellae in decretales*: the citation is printed in Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 497.

⁶⁶ Cf. Peter Abelard, *Sic et Non: a Critical Edition*, eds. Blanche B. Boyer and Richard McKeon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976).

⁶⁷ For more detail on his life and involvement in other cases, see Bartlett, *Hanged Man*, 126–7; T. de Morembert, 'Durand, Guillaume II', in *Dictionnaire de biographie française*, vol. 12, eds. M. Provost

University of Bologna.⁶⁸ Following the Cantilupe canonisation process, the former was summoned to France to participate in a rather different investigation: the trial of the Knights Templar.⁶⁹ Similarly, his co-commissioner, William de Testa, was also employed by the pope to collect taxes on his behalf.⁷⁰

The manner in which the witnesses are questioned by the papal commissioners reflects the other work which was undertaken by a wider inquisitorial force directed by the papacy. It is possible to draw parallels between the process by which the Swansea witnesses to William Cragh's 'miracle' were treated and the processes applied to those examined on charges of heresy. For example, one of the most influential inquisitors of the period, Bernard Gui, sets out in his handbook for fellow inquisitors the format which the examination must take. Tackling the Beguines and other heretical groups in France, Gui was active around the turn of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries,⁷¹ and was therefore a contemporary of the commissioners charged with investigating Thomas Cantilupe's case.

Bernard's manual for inquisitors employs a forensic approach to witnesses, proof and the transfer of authority from the oral to written word. For example, Bernard states that in the questioning process, every witness must give account of his or her name, occupation, diocese of habitation and birth, and must also swear an oath, before the examination begins.⁷² The same was required of the Swansea inhabitants and all the other witnesses called to testify to Thomas Cantilupe's miracles. Bernard also emphasises the importance of witnesses only speaking in relation to the questioners' prompting,⁷³ and again we see this practice in the Cantilupe case. In MS Vat. Lat. 4015 the very way in which the depositions are recorded on the manuscript page emphasises this trial-like approach, with the coloured paraphs marking the beginning of each new question and answer. Finally, in both Bernard Gui's manual and MS Vat. Lat. 4015, the examination of 'fama' – public report or rumour – is an important element.⁷⁴ One of the questions put to the Swansea witnesses asked if the miracle was believed to have occurred, and was publicly celebrated, whether it was 'the voice of the community and common opinion of the people and public rumour'.⁷⁵ It is not unreasonable, therefore, to assume that these similarities are more than coincidences, and that inquisitors applied this approach to more than heretical matters.

Whether investigating miracles or heresy, and despite the forensic approach dictated by canon law, the same initial body of material was required: oral testimony. The more traditional miracle collection made at Hereford⁷⁶ and the eyewitness testimonies to those miracles made during the course of the inquisitional investigation, are all based upon the recollections of groups of individuals confirming their belief that a miracle had taken place. The resulting dossier of

and R. D'Amat (Paris: Letouzey and Ané, 1933), 661–2; and P. Viollet, 'Guillaume Durant le Jeune, évêque de Mende', *Histoire Littéraire de la France* 35 (1921): 1–139.

⁶⁸ Bartlett, *Hanged Man*, 16.

⁶⁹ Bartlett, *Hanged Man*, 126.

⁷⁰ For more on the career of William de Testa, see W.E. Lunt, *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England to 1327* (Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1939), 557–8, 585–6, 621; and idem, 'William de Testa and the Parliament of Carlisle', *English Historical Review* 41 (1926): 332–57.

⁷¹ Janet Shirley, introduction to *The Inquisitor's Guide: a Medieval Manual on Heretics*, by Bernard Gui, trans. J. Shirley (Welwyn Garden City: Ravenhall Books, 2006), 1–15.

⁷² Gui, *Inquisitor's Guide*, 30, 158.

⁷³ Gui, *Inquisitor's Guide*, 153. This was a common view when it came to legal proceedings of any kind in the Middle Ages; for more details see Everard, 'Sworn Testimony', 73–5.

⁷⁴ Gui, *Inquisitor's Guide*, 29.

⁷⁵ BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 10r: 'vox communis et communis oppinio gencium et fama publica'.

⁷⁶ Oxford, Exeter College, MS 158.

evidence for Thomas Cantilupe is one of the most detailed we have from this period.⁷⁷ This confirmation was not based upon eyewitness testimony alone, however. Belief in a miracle having occurred could also be based upon public opinion, ‘publica fama’, as was the case for the first of the Swansea inhabitants to be examined.⁷⁸ Mary de Briouze, the lady of the castle, refers to ‘communis opinio’ a number of times, as it is the principal mode through which she knew anything of the events occurring around the hanging. For example, she asserts that it was the opinion of those present that William Cragh had actually died on the gallows,⁷⁹ and that his subsequent recovery was considered by locals of Swansea and the people of Hereford to have been a genuine miracle.⁸⁰ That Mary’s testimony had been based only on what she had heard is fully recognised, commented upon, and passed into written record by the notaries towards the end of her deposition: ‘she had testified to much that she heard said.’⁸¹ However, she was not alone among the witnesses in hearing more than she saw: William of Codineston could also only testify to what he had heard, leading to the commissioner questioning William on what he meant by ‘fama publica’ in order to clarify his testimony’s value. William duly replied, ‘That which was said by many in public and was publicly communicated by all.’⁸² This form of evidence was fully admissible in a medieval court,⁸³ and has been the subject of much scholarly debate in recent years. William’s definition is remarkably close to that of Hans-Joachim Neubauer, who suggests that it is ‘that about which it is said that everyone is saying it’.⁸⁴ This might at first seem like the spreading of hearsay, albeit by named individuals; however, Chris Wickham argues that information such as this provided in a legal setting was in fact ‘given weight by its collective nature. It was what everybody knew, so it was accepted as reliable.’⁸⁵

The manuscripts themselves reflect this tension between preserving the memories and opinions of an individual and a community. Although much care and attention has been taken to set out the individuality of each witness deposition, the end product still constitutes a communal recollection of the event. Alongside the more forensic examination of miracles and the witnesses attesting to them, there is still the need for multiple witnesses to attest to the same events having taken place. This would seem to support van Houts’ challenge to Michael Clanchy’s *From Memory to Written Record* in which he argues that the authority of the written word replaced the spoken word during the thirteenth century.⁸⁶ Despite the ever-increasing

⁷⁷ Goodich, ‘Use of Direct Quotations’, 178; he compares the Hereford bishop’s dossier to those of Yves of Treguier (d. 1303), John Buoni (d. 1249), Nicholas of Tolentino (d. 1305) and Celestine V (d. 1294).

⁷⁸ For detailed discussion of the meanings and definitions of *fama*, see Philip Hardie, *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 2; Thelma S. Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail, eds., *Fama: the Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2002), 10–11; and Hans-Joachim Neubauer, *The Rumour: a Cultural History*, trans. Christian Braun (London: Free Association Books, 1999), 37.

⁷⁹ BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 4015, f. 8v.

⁸⁰ f. 10r.

⁸¹ f. 10r: ‘Deposuerat in multis de auditu dici’.

⁸² f. 14v: ‘dixit quod illud quod in pluribus locis publice dicitur et publicatur communiter per omnes.’

⁸³ For further details of the medieval understanding of the value of *fama* in a legal context, see the discussion of the works of William Durand, Albert of Ghent and Tommaso di Piperata, in Francesco Miglione, *Fama e infamia: problemi della società medievale nel pensiero giuridico nei secoli XII e XIII* (Catania: Giannotta, 1985), 57–70. They differentiate between *publica fama* and rumour in a way in which our commissioners do not.

⁸⁴ Neubauer, *Rumour*, 3.

⁸⁵ Chris Wickham, ‘Fama and Law in Twelfth-Century Tuscany’, in *Fama*, eds. Fenster and Smail, 17.

⁸⁶ van Houts, *Memory and Gender*, 5–10. See also, M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record. England 1066–1307* (London: Edward Arnold, 1979).

practices of documentation of memory in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, there remains a question over the extent to which the authority of those memories ever transferred wholly to the written word. After all, in the Cantilupe process, the names of individual witnesses were preserved right up until the final version was written out and the canonisation confirmed in the papal bull.⁸⁷

The carefully presented and referenced chain of documents produced during the inquiry into Thomas Cantilupe's canonisation suggests that authority lay in the written text. Each document drew on the one before, by taking up its method of numbering each witness and miracle, for example. With the additional layer of authority added to each iteration, in the form of commentary on the miracles in BnF MS lat. 5373, and the formal sealing of the papal bull in 1320, the textual witness seems to supersede the oral testimonies. The accounts of the witnesses in MSS Vat. Lat. 4015 and 4016 were preserved carefully with their future reference use in mind, and we have evidence in the form of the later manuscripts to show that they were in fact used in exactly this way.

However, the importance of the initial oral deposition and the individual who gave it seems to be emphasised further by the manuscripts' very use as reference works. One document might supersede the next to some extent as the ratio of reportage to evaluation decreases, but each is still grounded in the oral testimonies, and the previous manuscripts are continually drawn upon for reference. The repetition at each stage of the biographical details of each witness upholds the traditional hierarchy of witnessing and the assessment of reliability, as well as the importance of multiple individuals speaking in agreement: a community of witnesses.⁸⁸ This kind of shared, communal authority is represented not only by the total number of interviews made,⁸⁹ but also by the interdependence of the testimonies, which in the case of the Swansea inhabitants simply do not stand alone as discrete units. Therefore, despite the insistence on the individuality of each witness – to suit the agenda of the commissioners – the canonisation dossier was still ultimately representative of a collective memory (albeit with some inevitable contradictions and disagreements), which is why it remains so useful as a sketch of life in medieval Swansea.

When, in 1320, the papacy canonised Thomas Cantilupe, he had already been referred to as a saint for at least three decades: communities were still very much at the heart of the process of saint-making even in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The sharing of miracle stories and experiences amongst local people spread the reputation of the potential saint which was a necessary first step to justify an appeal to the papacy to open the inquiry. Throughout the remainder of the process, the individual yet interdependent memories of the witnesses are preserved to the last. Perhaps it should come as no surprise that the bull of canonisation bears a great resemblance to the relative simplicity of an early *vita* or miracle collection. When the

⁸⁷ To the medieval mind, authority was transferred to the written word, and the text became the substitute for the event as witnessed. However, it was still necessarily based on trustworthy testimony; see Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 288–90, for a more detailed explanation.

⁸⁸ This interplay between orality and literacy in textual communities, such as the one in Cantilupe canonisation process, is explored in greater detail by Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 42–58, 88–150. See also Jack Goody, 'The Consequences of Literacy', in *Literacy in Traditional Societies*, eds. Jack Goody and Ian Watts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 27–68; Harvey J. Graff, ed., *Literacy and Social Development in the West: a Reader* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); and Michael Stubbs, *Language and Literacy: the Sociolinguistics of Reading and Writing* (London: Routledge, 1980).

⁸⁹ For more on the importance of an event being witnessed by many individuals, see Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 288–9; and van Houts, *Memory and Gender*, 29.

chain of evidence lying behind the papal bull is so well documented, the reliability of the oral testimony is to be inherently trusted. The authority, therefore, of the oral, individual deposition legitimises and reinforces the communal, written confirmation of the miracles having taken place. The remaining tensions in the canonisation process instead emerge from divergences among clerical and scholastic approaches to the matter of witnessing, and evaluation of the written and spoken word.

Harriett Webster is Lecturer in Medieval History at the University of Wales Trinity Saint David. She was the Research Assistant on the project *City Witness: Place and Perspective in Medieval Swansea*, based at the University of Southampton.