Introduction: Canonization Processes in Context and Comparison

Sari Katajala-Peltomaa

Canonizations, which officially proclaimed a person's sanctity, were complex, embracing theological, judicial, social, and cultural aspects of medieval Christianity. "Holiness, in and of itself, was never enough," as Ronald Finucane has observed.[1] This volume scrutinizes canonizations as a multifaceted phenomenon by focusing on the set of sources most closely linked to them. Canonization hearings were formal inquiries into the life, merits, and miracles of a saintly candidate. While the dossiers created during the hearings are essentially about saints, sanctity, and miracles, at the same time they testify to judicial and administrative changes that took place within the church. They manifest the theological ponderings of the era while also revealing the devotional practices, daily life, and troubles of those not learned in canon law or theology. The inquiries themselves pertain most obviously to the regulations and aspirations of the Holy See, but they also reflect local nuances. It is because of this inherent complexity that canonization processes are excellent sources for studying various topics of and entanglements within the medieval era.

The volume at hand aims to offer tools for comprehending the multilayered nature of canonization processes, namely the judicial background and structural elements of individual hearings as well as the broader devotional aspects particular to time and place that are reflected in the depositions. At the same time, it aspires to illuminate the state-of-the-art and topical new themes within the field of canonization process studies. It thus approaches canonization processes in a three-fold way: as a phenomenon of the past, as a medieval source material with particular methodological challenges, and as a specific field of historical studies. This introduction begins with the phenomenon itself by offering a short overview of the development of canonization practice and judicial requirements before it turns to the structural elements that affect how the records can be tackled. A historiographical survey of research into

1 Ronald C. Finucane, *Contested Canonizations: The Last Medieval Saints, 1482–1523* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011), 256. The writing and open-access publication of this chapter has been funded by The Swedish Literature Society in Finland's "Lived Religion in Medieval Finland" project.

© SARI KATAJALA-PELTOMAA, 2025 | DOI:10.1163/9789004726833_002
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC 4.0 license.

canonization processes is followed by an explanation of the volume's structure. As methodological questions are critically important for the entire volume, they are addressed at relevant points throughout the text.

1 Development of Canonization Right

Canonization hearings emerged from tightening papal control during the central Middle Ages and the development of new papal policies that were connected to broader institutional, social, and cultural changes taking place within Christianity. The fight against heterodoxy was one of the goals of eleventh-century Gregorian reform, and these efforts increased during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. One step forward in this path was tightening control of lay religiosity in the form of annual confession of sins, an obligation enacted through the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. The new position of inquisitors tasked with rooting out "heretical depravity" served the same end. Canonization, the official proclamation of a person's sainthood, was part of the same set of tools. The right to acknowledge the sanctity of a person and to proclaim him or her as a saint was considered significant – and it traveled up the clerical hierarchy during the medieval era until it became a papal privilege in 1234.[2]

Canonization was one of the means by which papal power was centralized and consolidated, even if the development of the canonization process itself was largely sporadic and at first rather unsystematic. In the early Middle Ages, canonization was essentially a liturgical matter quite often synonymous with *translatio*, the ceremonial translation of relics, and did not require papal authority to be valid. Before the beginning of the twelfth century, a stable

2 The seminal works in the history of canonization right and procedure are Eric Waldram Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948); and Stephan Kuttner, "La réserve papale du droit de canonisation," *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger* 4.17 (1938): 172–228. More recently, see André Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Âge. D'après les procès de canonization et les documents hagiographiques* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1981); Thomas Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht. Das Kanonisationsverfahren im europäischen Spätmittelalter*, Forschungen zur kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht 28 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004); Donald S. Prudlo, *Certain Sainthood: Canonization and the Origins of Papal Infallibility in the Medieval Church* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015), Roberto Paciocco, *Canonizzazioni e culto dei santi nella "Christianitas" (1198–1302)* (Assisi: Edizioni Porziuncola, 2006); and Roberto Paciocco, "The Canonization of Saints in the Middle Ages: Procedure, Documentation, Meanings," in *A Companion to Medieval Miracle Collections*, eds. Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, Jenni Kuuliala and Iona McCleery (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 54–77.

procedure for the act of canonization cannot be reconstructed, and *vitae* and other hagiographic texts seemingly were sufficient for a decision on canonization to be made. However, the Holy See's role in matters of canonization grew over time, and the initially simple procedures were transformed into formal, legal processes. Already at the end of the twelfth century, the first *inquisitio*-type hearings were being conducted by papal delegates, and shortly thereafter decisions to grant sainthood were being based on witnesses' depositions recorded at a local hearing, *inquisitio in partibus*.[3] By the beginning of the thirteenth century, *vitae* and other hagiographic texts sent to the papal curia could only serve as a request for canonization; they alone were no longer sufficient to generate a decision.

Judicially, canonization inquests were of an *inquisitio* type, which meant there needed to be a general fame, *fama publica*, of an individual's saintly life and of miracles performed by the power of God through him or her. Responsibility to pursue the cases was laid on officials; witnesses did not have any say in the organization of an interrogation before they were summoned to testify. The so-called Romano-canonical process regulated the conduct of interrogations in canonization hearings and, as a judicial process, canonization developed in a reciprocal relationship with legal procedures connected to other judicial issues.[4]

One of the first papal interventions in canonization matters occurred during the papacy of Alexander III. In 1171 or 1172, he wrote a letter to King Kol of Sweden in which he condemned the veneration of a saint who had died drunk and thus was unworthy of veneration. The saint in question was King Eric IX of Sweden (r. 1156–60); Alexander argued that venerating him publicly was banned without papal approval of the cult. This ruling proclaiming papal authority over canonizations and forbidding the veneration of unofficial saints came to be known as *Audivimus*. The ruling became more influential after it was inserted in the *Liber Extra*, the fundamentally important decretal collection of Pope Gregory IX, in 1234.[5]

3 Kemp, *Canonization and Authority*; Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident*, 13–68; and Paciocco, "The Canonization of Saints in the Middle Ages," 54–77.

4 Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht*.

5 Prudlo, *Certain Sainthood*, 33–34. A detailed reconstruction of the way of *Audivimus* into the *Liber Extra* can be found in Thomas Wetzstein, "Audivimus (X 3.45.1) and the Double Failure of Raymundus de Peñafort," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law. Washington, D.C. 1–7 August 2004*, eds. Uta-Renate Blumenthal, Kenneth Pennington, and Atria A. Larson, Monumenta Iuris Canonici Series C: Subsidia 13 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2008), 251–87.

Only a few papal rulings addressed canonization directly. In addition to *Audivimus*, Pope Honorius III also declared that witnesses had to be questioned both diligently and one at a time. This ruling is known as *Venerabili* and was also included in the *Liber Extra*. The third ruling, *Testes legitimos*, was known also as *Interrogatorium* or *Forma examinandi testes*; it was used and proposed by the commissioners in a hearing.[6] This formulary, which contained the list of questions validating the quality of witnesses' knowledge – how did they know what they claimed to know, for example, when, where, and in whose presence did the events they described happen? – was used for the first time during the canonization hearing of Elizabeth of Hungary in 1232.

Canonization became a papal privilege in 1234; this meant that all new saints and cults – if they were to be added to the litany of saints and universally venerated by the church – had to be approved by the papal curia. This right to officially add a candidate to the litany of saints who were recognized in public liturgical worship did not, however, mean that the pope and papal curia had complete control over the practicalities of saint veneration. At the local level, saints were venerated and cults flourished without papal proclamation. In these cases, the approval of local clergy, bishop, or head of a religious order sufficed. The clergy was not always unanimous in its opinion of a new saintly candidate, however. Furthermore, lay participation should not be overlooked: without devotees there was no cult.[7]

Some saintly candidates were venerated within a small circle only, the cult not enticing enthusiasm among lay devotees. Much more troublesome for

6 On rulings concerning canonization, see Sari Katajala-Peltomaa and Christian Krötzl, "Approaching Twelfth- to Fifteenth-Century Miracles: Miracle Registers, Collections, and Canonization Processes as Source Material," in *Miracles in Medieval Canonization Processes: Structures, Functions, and Methodologies*, eds. Christian Krötzl and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), 1–39, esp. 17–20; for the rulings, see 18–19. On Romano-canonical procedures in canonizations, see Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht*; Ottfried Krafft, *Pasturkunde und Heiligsprechung. Die päpstlichen Kanonisationen vom Mittelalter bis zur Reformation. Ein Handbuch*, Archiv für Diplomatik 9 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005); Paciocco, *Canonizzazioni e culto*; and Roberto Paciocco, *Sublimia negotia. Le canonizzazioni dei santi nella curia papale e il nuovo Ordine dei frati Minori* (Padua: Centro Studi Antoniani, 1996).

7 See especially Pierre Delooz, "Towards a Sociological Study of Canonized Sainthood in the Catholic Church," in *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 189–216. See also Pierre Delooz, *Sociologie et canonisations*, Collection scientifique de la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Liège Bd. 30 (La Haye: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969). On the importance of "vox populi" in canonization procedures, see Gábor Klaniczay, "The Power of the Saints and the Authority of the Popes: The History of Sainthood and Late Medieval Canonization Processes," in *Church and Belief in the Middle Ages: Popes, Saints, and Crusaders*, eds. Kirsi Salonen and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016), 117–40.

clerical authorities was lay veneration of unsuitable candidates, as papal intervention in the letter to the Swedish king noted above testifies.

Judicial matters as they pertained to canonization continued to interest scholars. Canonists responded by providing new treatises on the subject, especially related to the need to acquire judicial proof of a miracle. Despite these new learned treatises, however, the practicalities and the resulting canonization records continued to follow older examples. Fifteenth-century hearings, for example, were not necessarily any more judicially accurate than their predecessors had been. Furthermore, a dearth of canonization hearings around the turn of the fifteenth century meant that the knowledge of how to conduct them was forgotten. The gap in canonizations also affected their outcome. Letizia Pellegrini argues, for example, that in the 1440s, at the opening of the canonization process of Bernardino of Siena, the procedures had been partially forgotten and the organizers were uncertain of how to handle the practicalities of the hearing.[8]

At the end of the fifteenth century, judicial discussions on miracles focused on whether *miracula in vita* were required for canonization, the degree to which witnesses had to corroborate each other, and the role of partial miracles or relapses in proving sanctity. An important step in the development of judicial theory as it related to canonization was taken by Johannes Franciscus de Pavinis (d. 1484), who proposed a new standard of defining miracles for canonization that was based on long tradition and the practice of analysing miracles performed by saints that had already been canonized.[9] This meant that both theoretical ponderings and already approved miracles recorded in canonization bulls were considered normative. Judicial treatises, for their part, had no immediate impact on either the practicalities or the outcomes of contemporary hearings.

After the interrogations *in partibus*, the procedures for canonization were continued at the curial level. The cardinals of the papal curia evaluated the evidence, and usually at this point a shortened version of the dossier was made, known as *relatio*. Sometimes the discussions conducted during this evaluation phase have been preserved, but unfortunately only in a minority of medieval cases. At the curia, canonizations were handled based on tradition, with only

8 According to Letizia Pellegrini, judicial scrutiny had advanced with new *tractati*, but "the collecting, recording and investigating miracles was no longer a well-known procedure." Letizia Pellegrini, "Testifying to Miracles: A Report on the Canonization Process of Bernardin of Siena," in *Miracles in Medieval Canonization Processes*, 105–27, esp. 107.

9 Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht*, 289–303, 307–8; for the evolution of the medieval canonization procedure, see 203–353.

small institutional changes being enacted during the late Middle Ages. Only after the Reformations of the sixteenth century did curial procedure become more standardized.

One of these changes related to the office of *promotor fidei*. It was customary already in late medieval curial discussions of canonization material to present doubt and to scrutinize the evidence from different angles, but the first specific mention of *promotor fidei* is given by de Pavinis only in 1488. A *Procurator fiscalis et fidei Christiane* [*promotor*] is also mentioned in Katherina of Vadstena's canonization process in 1474.[10] The need for careful scrutiny was acknowledged, and presenting doubt became institutionalized, yet the office through which this happened became standard only after the Reformations and was consolidated at the beginning of the seventeenth century. This official's duty was to raise suspicion at a curial level against the miracles presented in the dossiers.[11] After the Reformations, increased importance was also placed on expert medical testimony in evaluations of miraculous cures. Both of these changes allowed medical skepticism to play a stronger role in the certification of miracles.[12]

The Reformations also affected canonizations in other ways. First, they caused a disruption in the processes, as no new saints were canonized between 1523 and 1588. Then, in 1588, a major change in canonization rules and procedures was implemented: the founding of the Sacred Congregation of Rites sanctioned the final judicial acknowledgment of holiness to the Holy See. Beatification and canonization were also separated from each other at a procedural level. Accompanying the Sacred Congregation of Rites was an archive for canonization dossiers; before that, it was not unknown for an important document to go missing.

---

10 *Processus seu Negocium Canonizacionis Katerine de Vadstenis*, ed. Isak Collijn, Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet ser. 2, Latinska Skrifter, Band 2 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1942–1946), XVIII.

11 The position of *promotor fidei* was formally instituted in 1631. Fernando Vidal, "Miracles, Science, and Testimony in Post-Tridentine Saint-Making," *Science in Context* 20.3 (2007): 481–508.

12 Vidal, "Miracles, Science, and Testimony," 481–508. For the continuing significance of healing miracles after the Middle Ages, see Jacalyn Duffin, *Medical Miracles: Doctors, Saints, and Healing in the Modern World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Simon Ditchfield, "How Not to Be a Counter-Reformation Saint: The Attempted Canonization of Pope Gregory X, 1622–45," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 60 (1992): 379–422. Discussions about the number of miracles required for canonization emerged at the end of the sixteenth century. Krafft, *Papsturkunde und Heiligsprechung*, 1014–17.

Further institutionalization continued during the pontificate of Urban VIII; in 1625, all forms of public veneration of unauthorized saints – that is, cults without papal approval – were expressly forbidden. During these formative years, between 1588 and 1642, canonization procedures took a form that remained in place until 1983.[13] Nevertheless, canonizations continued to be topical and controversial; Maria Teresa Fattori's chapter in this volume explores changes to the canonization process implemented between the establishment of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and the papacy of Benedict XIV (1740–58), while Christian Krötzl addresses the medieval rulings.

If a hearing earned a positive outcome, the entire procedure concluded with a bull issued by the pope and a solemn canonization feast.[14] The outcome was never guaranteed, however, as the process could face unexpected hindrances or even insurmountable obstacles at any stage. Local devotion could diminish, for example, and provide an insufficient number of miracles or financial support for the cause. The curialists and/or the pope also may have been preoccupied with other affairs during turbulent eras. The Great Western Schism and the Protestant Reformation are obvious examples of such turbulence, but tension and competition within the curia itself sometimes was enough to prevent a canonization attempt from proceeding. Before the institutionalization of the canonization procedure and the establishment of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, the death of a pope or other major official in the curia could require a canonization process to restart from the beginning. Even in the best possible

13 Birgit Emich, "The Production of Truth in the Manufacture of Saints: Procedures, Credibility and Patronage in Early Modern Processes of Canonization," in *Making Truth in Early Modern Catholicism*, eds. Steven Vanden Broecke, Andreea Badea, Bruno Boute, and Marco Cavarzere (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2021), 165–89, here 166.

14 Thus far, these later curial stages of medieval canonization processes have not been fully analysed. For institutional elements following the hearing, however, see Finucane, *Contested Canonizations*; and Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident*, 633–47; for categorizations of miracles, see Didier Lett, "De la dissemblace à la resemblance. Construction sociale et métamorphoses des récits de miracles dans le procès de canonisation et l'*abbrevatio maior* de Nicolas de Tolentino (1325–1328)," in *Miracles, vies et réécriture dans l'Occident médiéval*, eds. Monique Goullet and Michel Heinzelmann, Beihefte der Francia 65 (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke, 2006), 121–47; Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, "Narrative Strategies in the Depositions: Gender, Family and Devotion," in *Miracles in Medieval Canonization Processes*, 227–56; and Jenni Kuuliala, "Proving Misfortune, Proving Sainthood: Reconstructing Physical Impairment in Fourteenth-Century Miracle Testimonies," in *Miracles in Medieval Canonization Processes*, 197–226. On the role of miracles in canonization bulls, see Étienne Doublier, "Il miracolo nella documentazione pontifica duecentesca," in *Miracolo! Emozione, Spettacolo e Potere nella Storia dei Secoli XIII–XVII*, eds. Laura Andreani and Agostino Paravicini Bagliani (Florence: SISMEL, 2019), 31–55.

scenario, medieval procedures for an official canonization were multisided, insecure, and slow.[15]

2 Structural Aspects and Methods of Recording

The theoretical or ideal canonization procedure described above was put into practice in different ways. The papal rulings were normative, but the practices and outcomes of hearings varied greatly. The final dossiers do not form a uniform set. All hearings, however, share some basic background elements, starting with the saintly candidate. Some candidates were already famous for their sanctity during their lifetime, while others' special status was recognized upon their death. A third group of candidates had to wait for a time, some even for years, before their relics were understood to possess divine power. For some candidates, *charisma* was manifested during their lifetime as *miracula in vita*, but all new saints were required to perform *post mortem* miracles by the power of God.

Often the dossiers were divided in two parts: the holy life of the candidate, including *miracula in vita*, was recorded in the first part, while *post mortem* miracles were the topic of the *pars secunda*.[16] Miracles were, however, a controversial matter in proving sanctity, since they could also be performed *per malos*.[17] Holy life became increasingly important for validating a person's sainthood, but thus far the depositions concerning miracles have gained much more scholarly interest. In this volume, Jenni Kuuliala analyses how the

15 For practical obstacles, see Finucane, *Contested Canonizations*, 1–11; for curial tensions, 19–21.

16 This kind of structure was followed, for example, in the canonization processes of Thomas Cantilupe (BAV MS 4015), Charles of Blois (BAV MS Vat. lat. 4025), and Louis of Toulouse (*Processus Canonizationis et Legendae variae Sancti Ludovici O.F.M. Episcopi Tolosani*, ed. Collegium S. Bonaventurae, Analecta Franciscana, Tomus VII (Florence: Collegium s. Bonaventurae, 1951)). This kind of categorization seems to have been particularly typical for *relatio*, abbreviated version of canonization process. See, for example, for Charles of Blois, ASV MS Collectorie 434; and for Nicholas of Tolentino, BAV MS Vat. lat. 4027; for Yves of Tréguier, "Relatio processus de vita et miraculis Sancti Yvonis," in *Monuments originaux de l'histoire de S. Yves*, eds. A. de La Borderie et al. (Saint-Brieuc: Imprimerie L. Prud'homme, 1887), 301–435.

17 André Vauchez argues that popes emphasized the saintly candidates' behavior at the expense of their miracles, especially those *in vita*, when evaluating sanctity. André Vauchez, "Il papato et il miracolo nella valutazione della santità nella prima metà del duecento," in *Miracolo!* 19–29. On the validation of miracles, see Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht*, 246, 280. On the curial approach to and analysis of miracles, see Finucane, *Contested Canonizations*, 15–24.

testimonies of a proposed saint's life were used to construct sanctity, while Marika Räsänen focuses on the transitional phase: how the saint's dead body manifested holiness.

A paradox of medieval canonizations was that there had to be an existing cult – including known miracles, devotees, and pilgrims to the shrine – before the pope would agree to open a judicial hearing for canonization. Often the opening of a process into the life, merits, and miracles of the candidate resulted from active lobbying by local agents, both secular and clerical. This required time, money, and effort, and thus many communities – dioceses, religious orders, or dynasties – were unable or unwilling to pursue a canonization.[18] Papal canonization right was universal, but canonizations were not distributed geographically in an equal manner: Italy and Southern France stand out as a hot spots of medieval canonization processes.[19] They also stand out in this volume, but this work strives for geographical balance, and processes from regions north of the Alps are scrutinized as well. Jonathan Greenwood's chapter, which focuses on early modern Jesuit saints, stretches the geographical scope of the volume to a global level.

When the pope decided to open a process, the standard procedure was for him to nominate three commissioners of high clerical rank (often cardinals, bishops, or abbots) to carry out the interrogations. The commissioners were in charge of the inquiry, and their performance had a significant impact on the nature of the final records. If the commissioners were learned in canon law and the judicial requirements were taken carefully into account, the records of such hearings are typically well structured, clear, and full of details concerning both the practicalities organizing the hearing and the actual interrogation. A case in point is the canonization hearing of Thomas Cantilupe (1307), analysed in this volume by Adelheid Russenberger and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa.

While some of the commissioners were efficient and dutiful, others were apparently not that keen to follow the regulations, and some did not even show up at the site of interrogation; they may have just sent an excuse for their absence or delegated the matter to local clergy, who in turn may not have been

18 Aviad M. Kleinberg, "Canonization without a Canon," in *Procès de canonisation au Moyen Âge. Aspects juridiques et religieux*, ed. Gábor Klaniczay (Rome: École française de Rome, 2004), 7–18.

19 For a map and table of medieval canonization processes, see Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident*, 320–21; this shows the prevalence of Italy and France and the lack of papally sanctioned processes in the Iberian Peninsula and parts of Eastern Europe during the Middle Ages.

fully aware of papal rulings concerning the interrogation.[20] Hearings could be rejected or ordered to be restarted due to judicial inaccuracy. Hearings *in partibus* were adjusted, but inquisitorial methods in canonization processes were elaborated only gradually and the rulings were internalized rather slowly.[21]

The implementation of these methods and rules cannot be seen as a straightforward process, either. Pope Gregory XI criticized the inquisitorial committee in the canonization process of Charles of Blois (1371) for failing to make clear in the records whether the witnesses were interrogated in detail – following a certain questionnaire – or only in a more general manner. Apparently, the commissioners in this case drew up or at least recorded their list of questions only after the interrogation was over.[22] In Birgitta of Sweden's canonization dossier (1374–80), a selection of miracles was added that was registered by local clergy in Vadstena, Sweden. These cases did not in all instances meet the requirements of canon law: witnesses apparently were not interrogated separately, a preset questionnaire did not guide the interrogation, and depositions were not recorded verbatim or one by one, but rather in the form of a synthesis.[23] In sum, regardless of papal rulings and the commissioners' shared

20 Ugolino, abbot of Saint Peter's in Perugia, was ordered to be the third commissioner in the hearing of Nicholas of Tolentino, but he declined the duty due to his other commitments and the unpleasant weather. *Il Processo per la canonizzazione di S. Nicola da Tolentino*, ed. Nicola Occhioni (Rome: Padri Agostiniani di Tolentino, École française de Rome, 1984), 12. In the case of Katherina of Vadstena, the commissioners were cardinals of the papal curia – Latinus de Ursinus, Stephanus Nardini, and Johannes de Michaelis – but the majority of the witnesses to the miracles were interrogated in Vadstena, Sweden, by local subdelegates. Isak Collijn, "Inledning," in *Processus seu Negocium*, VI–VII.

21 Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident*, 60–67; André Vauchez, "Les origines et le développement du procès de canonisation (XII^{e}–XIII^{e} siècles)," in *Vita Religiosa im Mittelater. Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70 Geburtstag*, eds. Franz J. Felten and Nikolas Jaspert (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1999), 845–56. André Vauchez, "Canonisation et politique au XIV^{e} siècle. Documents inédits des Archives du Vatican relatifs au procès de canonisation de Charles de Blois, duc de Bretagne (d. 1364)," in *Miscellanea in onore di Monsignor Martino Giusti, Prefetto dell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano II*, Collectanea Archivi Vaticani 6 (Vatican City: Archivio Vaticano, 1978), 381–404; and Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht*, 250–59.

22 Bathélémy Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, "La 'Sainteté' de Charles de Blois," *Revue des Questions Historiques* 54 (July 1926): 108–15; Vauchez, "Canonisation et politique," 381–404. The list of questions (*articuli*) was also missing from other hearings carried out in Brittany; see Laura Ackerman Smoller, *The Saint and the Chopped-Up Baby: The Cult of Vincent Ferrer in Medieval & Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014), 68–70, for a suggestion of this being a local custom.

23 Cordelia Heß, *Heilige machen im spätmittelalterlichen Ostseeraum. Die Kanonisationsprozesse von Birgitta von Schweden, Nikolaus von Linköping und Dorothea von Montau* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008), 99–204. On the practicalities of Birgitta's canonization, see Tore

background in canon law, the hearings did not follow exactly a preset schema in their organization.

Generally, local proctors or cult promoters handled the practicalities, organized hearing localities, and summoned witnesses. The promoters assumed financial responsibility for running the process, but they were also tasked with promoting the enterprise. This means that they were already active before the hearing: they collected initial evidence of sanctity, such as recorded miracles taking place at the tomb or another cult center, and gathered supporting letters from ecclesiastical and secular authorities. This documentation was then sent to the pope. It was then up to him to open a process and to issue a *commissio*.[24]

The third group of officials active in canonization hearings comprised the notaries who recorded the interrogations. Since canonization processes were judicial records, the outcome needed to be prepared in an official format, *in formam publicam*. This was the task of notaries who held their position by papal or empirical authority.[25] On occasion, notaries were charged with interrogating the witnesses and collecting miracles that had occurred elsewhere. They took notes at the interrogation and later transcribed the full depositions, which were later read to the witnesses for them to accept. They thus turned oral vernacular testimony into a Latin deposition, and furthermore also shaped the witnesses' narratives to fit the "language" of papal curia officials.[26]

Nyberg, "The Canonization Process of St. Birgitta of Sweden," in *Procès de canonisation au Moyen Âge*, 67–85.

24 On the practicalities, see Katajala-Peltomaa and Krötzl, "Approaching Twelfth- to Fifteenth-Century Miracles"; and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa and Jenni Kuuliala, "Practical Matters: Canonization Records in the Making," in *A Companion to Medieval Miracle Collections*, 78–101. On commissions, see Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht*, 535–42.

25 The office of public notary was not, however, established across all of medieval Europe. It was unknown, for example, in Sweden, where reliability and validity was secured by sigils instead. Local scribes handled the recording of cases in Swedish canonization processes. In his letter attached to the canonization records of Birgitta, Nils Hermansson, the bishop of Linköping, explains the general mistrust of notaries and the use of sigils: "Verum est quia notariorum usus rarus est in terra ista, nec eis creditur sed sigillis." *Acta et processus canonizacionis Beate Birgitte*, Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet ser. 2, Latinska Skrifter, Band 1, ed. Isak Collijn. (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri Ab., 1924–31), 179. See also *Acta et processus*, 351.

26 On the practice of notaries in the context of canonization processes, see Christian Krötzl, "Prokuratoren, Notare und Dolmetscher. Zu Gestaltung und Ablauf der Zeugeinvernahmen bei Spätmittelalterlichen Kanonisationsprozessen," *Hagiographica* V (1998): 119–40. On the standardization and molding of testimonies done by notaries, see Didier Lett, *Un procès de canonisation au Moyen Âge. Essai d'histoire sociale. Nicolas de Tolentino, 1325* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2008), 265; and Laura Ackerman Smoller, "Miracle, Memory, and Meaning in the Canonization of Vincent Ferrer, 1453–1454," *Speculum* 73 (1998): 429–54, here 430–31.

In addition to the aforementioned officials, other help could have been needed as well; on occasion, messengers and interpreters were used to carrying out an interrogation.

The witnesses, in turn, were local people who had either known the candidate during his or her lifetime and/or witnessed or experienced a miracle after the saint's death. Not everyone, however, was accepted as a witness or interrogated; after all, sanctity and miracles were a matter of crucial theological, judicial, and social importance. When a process was opened, there may have been a common summoning, *citatio generalis*, for witnesses to come forward and testify about their miraculous experiences. On these occasions, information about the hearing was proclaimed in the local church and the summoning could have been communicated, for example, by leaflets nailed to the church door.[27] This method of summoning could have led to a more liberal selection of witnesses.

As noted, the event needed to be renowned in general, and typically either the proctors or the commissioners carefully preselected both the cases to be evaluated and the witnesses to be interrogated. This selection of witnesses and cases has methodological significance for the study of canonization processes. Not all surprising and sudden recoveries, for example, were accepted as miracles, and not all miracles were accepted for further scrutiny in a canonization inquiry. Only the most reliable cases and trustworthy witnesses were chosen.[28] The selection of cases and witnesses, in turn, heavily influenced the kind of material found in the final dossier. Thus, before making far-reaching conclusions based on one case alone, one should comprehend the whole and understand whether the analysed case was typical for the collection or a rare exception.

Even if the inquisitorial committee controlled the selection and summoning of witnesses, this was not necessarily a straightforward enterprise. For example, in Delphine (Dauphine) de Puimichel's 1363 inquest, thirty-two witnesses were both listed beforehand and interrogated, nineteen were listed but

27 Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht*, 429.

28 On selection of witnesses, see Paolo Golinelli, "Social Aspects in Some Italian Canonization Trials: The Choice of Witnesses," in *Procès de canonisation au Moyen Âge*, 165–80; Lett, *Un procès de canonization*; and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, *Gender, Miracles and Daily Life: The Evidence of Fourteenth-Century Canonization Processes* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 23–56. On the selection of miracles to be investigated, see Laura Ackerman Smoller, "Choosing Miracles for Vincent Ferrer," in *Miracles in Medieval Canonization Processes*, 75–104; and Pellegrini, "Testifying to Miracles."

not interrogated, and thirty-six were not listed but interrogated.[29] In her chapter in this volume, Nicole Archambeau shows how the networks of witnesses affected the significance given to their testimony or even to their selection as a witness in this hearing. In addition to the commissioners, local authorities had a strong say in the process of selection. This is particularly clear in the canonization process of Nicholas of Tolentino, in which prevalence was given to the local political elite of Tolentino and the nearby cities of Marches of Ancona – loyal to the pope – primarily the wealthy Guelph faction. Members of the Guelph families summoned as witnesses gave long depositions about their miraculous experiences and about the *articuli* of the life of Nicholas. The opposing faction, the "Ghibellini" (supporters of the emperor), were neglected as witnesses and on occasion even demonized in the depositions.[30]

When a process for canonization was opened, the promoters or occasionally proctors formulated *articuli*, the list of detailed questions about the life and miracles of the candidate. A separate question, *articulus*, could provide details about the candidate's life or a separate miracle. Some of the *articuli* were short, focusing on single details, while in other processes an *articulus* could generate a summarized version of the whole miracle. In the first type of process, we may encounter free narration of the experience deemed miraculous by various witnesses. In the latter case, the summarized version presented in the article formed the core narrative and variation between witnesses is harder to analyse; in their depositions, the witnesses mainly added missing information or repeated the core information already in the *articulus*. The number of *articuli* varied greatly from one process to another.[31]

In addition to the articles formed by the local officials, witnesses were also expected to answer questions proposed by the commissioners to test the validity of their knowledge (*Interrogatorium*). This seems simple enough in principle but it, too, was put into practice in various ways. It is of crucial methodological significance to analyse how the basic principles and rulings were conducted in the individual process being examined, as the recording methods are of vital significance for the nature of the record.

---

29 *Enquête pour le procès de canonisation de Dauphine de Puimichel Comtesse d'Ariano, Apt et Avignon, 14 mai–30 octobre 1363. Édition critique*, ed. Jacques Cambell (Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1978), 597–99.

30 Didier Lett, "La parole des humbles comme ressource. L'utilisation de la procédure inquisitoire par les postulateurs de la cause dans la procès de canonisation de Nicolas de Tolentino (1325)," in *Agiografia e culture popolari. Hagiography and Popular Cultures*, ed. Paolo Golinelli (Bologna: CLUEB, 2012), 233–40.

31 For details see, Katajala-Peltomaa and Kuuliala, "Practical Matters."

It should be kept in mind, however, that regardless of their judicial nature, canonization processes also form part of the hagiographic genre.[32] Literary models shaped the way in which the details of saints' lives and the elements necessary for an event to be considered miraculous were understood. *Vitae* and the miracle genre gave shape to the inquisitorial committees' questionnaires, especially the *articuli*, and this in turn affected the responses given by the witnesses. The witnesses, too, knew the basic elements of a miracle narrative. These elements may have affected their comprehension and memories of the event long before they gave their testimony in an inquiry. In her chapter, Marika Räsänen shows how the hagiographic topos of *odor sanctitatis* was used in a judicial hearing to construct the sanctity of Domenic of Guzman and Thomas Aquinas.

The central issue among scholars focusing on canonization processes has been the "voice" of the witnesses: What kind of information can be deduced from the written depositions?[33] This question arises in different forms throughout this volume. Scholars hold different opinions about this basic issue; a shared common ground, however, is that the witness depositions do not replicate what "really happened." Rather, they are narratives of past events shaped through different "filters" – the inquisitorial committee's questionnaire, the act of interrogation, shared memories of the past event, and personal rhetorical choices – to various degrees. These issues as they pertain to lay depositions are tackled most directly in the chapters by Laura Ackerman Smoller, Jyrki Nissi, and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa.

32 Miracles in canonization processes have often been analysed jointly with other miracle collections. The scholarship in this field is too vast to be cited here; see, however, the collections *A Companion to Medieval Miracle Collections* and *Miracles in Medieval Canonization Processes*.

33 At the other end of the spectrum is Paolo Mariani's claim that in the canonization processes one can hear "viva voce di quasi muto." Paolo Mariani, "Racconto spontaneo o memoria construita? Testi a confronto in alcuni processi di canonizzazione del secolo decimoquarto," *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Moyen-Âge* 108 (1996): 259–319, here 260. In 1995 Michael Goodich also claimed that despite the notarial act, "the precision and variety of the accounts which remain nevertheless often allows us to detect the authentic voices of a wide spectrum of participants and witnesses to the miracle." Michael Goodich, *Violence and Miracle in the Fourteenth Century: Private Grief and Public Salvation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 9. In 2005 while comparing inquisition trials and canonization processes, he adopted a more cautious approach, admitting that the work – translation, selection, edition, rewriting, dissecting, rearranging, and summarizing – done by the inquisitors and notaries affected the outcome. Michael Goodich, "*Mirabilis Deus in sanctis suis*: Social History and Medieval Miracles," in *Signs, Wonders, Miracles: Representations of Divine Power in the Life of the Church*, eds. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory (Woodbridge: Boydell and Ecclesiastical History Society, 2005), 135–56.

Canonization records do not reflect the saint's entire cult, nor do they include all of the miraculous experiences or devotees. Miracles were responses to the particular social needs of the devotees and their communities, but they do not reflect them uncritically. Statistical analysis of different ailments cured by any given saint, for example, does not directly testify to the prevalence of these ailments among members of the surrounding community; rather, it reveals the prevalence of these ailments among the choices made by the inquisitorial committee. Certain types of recovery may also be interpreted as belonging to different miracle categories. This is particularly clear in cases of demonic possession, whereby similar symptoms could have been categorized completely differently in different hearings, depending on the commissioners' preferences. Some commissioners favored demonic presence as an explanation, while others required strict proof to invoke a supernatural affliction instead of a natural one, like an illness.[34] In a similar vein, illumination of a blind person was accepted quite often as the first or among the first miracles; such a cure held symbolic power, not only because the cured individual could see physically once again but also because the *miraculé* could see the truth – the sanctity of the candidate. Furthermore, the hearings typically gave prevalence to recoveries with biblical prototypes.[35] Theology affected the outcome even if learned theological ponderings are rarely directly reflected in the depositions.

A common feature shared by the different processes is their collaborative nature. The records were crafted by the inquisitorial committee, notaries, and witnesses. The questions proposed, whether formed by the commissioners or by local officials, as well as the notarial act – the way the original oral vernacular interrogation was turned into Latin and recorded in the language expected by curial officials – shaped the final dossier. The witnesses' perception of saints and miracles, their experiences and memories of them, and their willingness and capacity to articulate and narrate them in an acceptable manner at an official judicial hearing all contributed to the outcome.

---

34 See Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, *Demonic Possession and Lived Religion in Later Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, "Madness, Demonic Possession, and Methods of Categorization," in *Companion to Medieval Miracles* for diverse understanding of the phenomenon in different processes.

35 On miracles with biblical precedents, see Michael Goodich, *Miracles and Wonders: The Development of the Concept of Miracle 1150–1350* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 9–12. On miracle typologies and biblical prototypes in the canonization process of Saint Margaret of Hungary, see Ildikó Csepregi, "Miracle Types and Narratives: The Case of Saint Margaret of Hungary," in *Companion to Medieval Miracles*, 327–53.

3 State-of-the-Art of Canonization Process Studies

The study of canonization processes is a rapidly expanding field. As they were connected to or even formed a nexus of various spheres of culture and society, canonization processes have been used to research various themes and topics. Larger, general trends and paradigms of historical studies have been reflected within this field as well. Due to limited space, the following outline of the scholarship is but a selection. The relevant scholarship pertaining to individual processes is introduced more fully in the individual chapters.

Modern historical research was first interested in canonization processes as evidentiary documents of papal power, and the first studies were concerned primarily with the judicial and structural elements of canonization.[36] The seminal study, which launched current interest in the medieval canonization processes, appeared in the 1980s: André Vauchez's *La Sainteté en Occident*.[37] This substantial study laid the groundwork for various emerging themes and topics: the formation of canonization procedures and the different typologies of sainthood in various parts of Europe and among Christians of different social status, as well as signs of sanctity and various types of miracles. *La Sainteté en Occident* is still the standard reference work within this field; its undisputed value lies in its categorization both of official saints according to different variables and of miracles. The inventory of canonization processes presented in that volume still serves as a valuable manual.

Studies of procedures for canonization and technical and judicial approaches to it continued at the end of the 1990s. Authors such as Roberto Paciocco, Thomas Wetzstein, and Ottfried Krafft offered groundbreaking work in canonization procedures and the Romano-canonical process.[38] The practicalities of carrying out the hearing, the notarial act being one salient example,

36 Kemp, *Canonization and Authority*; and Kuttner, "La réserve papale du droit de canonisation." Also *S. Louis of Toulouse and the Process of Canonisation in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Margaret Toynbee (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929).

37 Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident*.

38 Paciocco, *Sublimia negotia*; Paciocco, *Canonizzazioni e culto*; and Paciocco, "The Canonization of Saints"; Wetzstein, *Heilige vor Gericht*; Thomas Wetzstein, "Iura novit curia. Zur Verfahrensnormierung der Kanonisationsprozesse des späten Mittelalters," in *Procès de canonisation au Moyen Âge*, 259–87; Thomas Wetzstein, "'Ad informationem apostolicae sedis.' Die Verehrung des Werner von Oberwesel und die Kultuntersuchung von 1426," in *Wege zum Heil. Pilger und Heilige Orte an Mosel und Rhein*, eds. Thomas Frank, Michael Matheus, and Sabine Reichert (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner 2009), 97–134; Krafft, *Papsturkunde und Heiligsprechung*; Christian Krötzl, "Kanonisationsprozess, Socialgeschichte und Kanonisches Recht im Spätmittelalter," in *Nordic Perspectives on Medieval Canon Law*, ed. Mia Korpiola (Helsinki: Gummerus, 1999), 19–39.

have generated interest as well.[39] The most recent monography-length examples within this field are Ronald Finucane's *Contested Canonizations* (2011) and Donald Prudlo's *Certain Sainthood* (2015). The technical-judicial aspects of canonization have remained somewhat underrepresented and, as Prudlo notes, legal-institutional-intellectual approaches have not truly interacted with the sociocultural facets of the processes.

Increasing scholarly interest in canonization processes was linked with "new social history" and its focus on daily life. The first works in this field coincided with, and even preceded, Vauchez's volume. The vagaries of daily life – the different types of illnesses and accidents for which the saint's help was pleaded – as well as the dynamics of family and community life were pronounced themes in canonization studies that followed Vauchez. Many of these studies utilized miracle collections and other hagiographic material in conjunction with canonization processes, thereby connecting the social history approach to an analysis of devotional practices – communal, family, and individual interaction with an intercessor – and cult formations. Statistical analyses and comparative perspective played an important role in these early studies.[40]

With regard to recent major monographs based on canonization processes, two trends concerning geographical coverage can be found. The first involves comparison of processes from different regions according to a specific theme.[41] The second, concurrent trend involves the deconstruction of

39 On practicalities like notarial acts and the interpretation of depositions, see especially Krötzl, "Prokuratoren, Notare und Dolmetscher"; and Christian Krötzl, "Vulgariter sibi exposito. Zu Übersetzung und Sprachbeherrschung im Spätmittelalter am Beispiel von Kanonisationsprozessen," *Das Mittelalter* 2 (1997): 111–18.

40 Ronald Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1977 [1995]); Ronald Finucane, *The Rescue of the Innocents: Endangered Children in Medieval Miracles* (New York: St Martin's Press, 2000); Goodich, *Violence and Miracle*; Christian Krötzl, *Pilger, Mirakel und Alltag: Formen des Verhaltens im skandinavischen Mittelalter (12.–15. Jahrhundert)* (Helsinki: SHS, 1994); and Christian Krötzl, "Parent-Child Relations in Medieval Scandinavia According to Scandinavian Miracle Collections," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 14 (1989): 21–37. Anders Fröjmark, *Mirakler och helgonkult. Linköpings biskopsdöme under senmedeltiden* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 1992); Janken Myrdal and Göran Bäärnhielm, *Kvinnor, barn & fester i medeltida mirakelberättelser* (Skara: Skaraborgs Länsmuseum, 1994). See also Stanko Andrić, *The Miracles of St. John Capistran* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2000); and Augustine Thompson, *Cities of God: The Religion of the Italian Communes 1125–1325* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005).

41 See Katajala-Peltomaa, *Demonic Possession and Lived Religion*; Jenni Kuuliala, *Childhood Disability and Social Integration: Constructions of Impairments in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Canonization Processes* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016); Jenni Kuuliala,

one specific cult and process. For instance, Robert Bartlett analyses the social, political, and cultural context of the Welsh border at the turn of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries by deconstructing depositions recounting the miraculous resurrection of William Cragh in the canonization process of Thomas Cantilupe.[42] Didier Lett likewise has analysed wider socio-political contexts and the reflection of social relations and hierarchies in Nicholas of Tolentino's canonization records,[43] while Nicole Archambeau examines the canonization process of Delphine de Puimichel in the context of war, plague, and other perils in fourteenth-century Provence.[44] Laura Ackerman Smoller deconstructs the cult of Vincent Ferrer and its four different hearings, each conducted in a different place.[45]

Quantitative approaches still play a role, as they did in the first social history works on canonization processes, but microhistorical approaches and qualitative close reading have become more dominant within canonization process studies. Increased interest in methodological elements has led to more nuanced analyses of the depositions, leading to more theoretical approaches. Scholars have focused, for example, on deconstructing the elements within the hagiographic genre and analysing the oral and literate elements in the depositions, or on scrutinizing the narrative aspects of various versions of the same case across different levels of the process (local hearing, canonization process, curial evaluation, papal bull, sermons on a feast day, etc.). Others have analysed the interconnection of ritual and narrative.[46] The theoretical

---

Saints, Infirmity, and Community in the Late Middle Ages (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2020).

42 Robert Bartlett, *The Hanged Man: A Story of Miracle, Memory, and Colonialism in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

43 Lett, *Un procès de canonisation*. Cecilia Gaposchkin has done a similar deconstruction of the cult of Saint Louis, although her focus is on the liturgical and homilectic sources of the post-canonization period. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).

44 Nicole Archambeau, *Souls Under Siege: Stories of War, Plague, and Confession in Fourteenth-Century Provence* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2021).

45 Smoller, *The Chopped-Up Baby*.

46 Gábor Klaniczay, "Speaking about Miracles: Oral Testimony and Written Record in Medieval Canonization Trials," in *The Development of Literate Mentalities in East Central Europe*, eds. Anna Adamska and Marco Mostert, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 9 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 365–95; and Gábor Klaniczay, "Ritual and Narrative in Late Medieval Miracle Accounts: The Construction of the Miracle," in *Religious Participation in Ancient and Medieval Societies: Rituals, Interaction and Identity*, eds. Sari Katajala-Peltomaa and Ville Vuolanto, Acta Institutum Romanum Finlandiae 41 (Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 2013), 207–23. See also Smoller, "Miracle, Memory, and Meaning." On changes in a miracle story across various levels of the process, see Lett, "De la dissemblace à la

framework of social and cultural models of disability has been used as well and discussed in the study of canonization processes;[47] this approach governs Adelheid Russenberger's chapter in this volume. Concepts borrowed from the social sciences have proven inspirational for the study of canonization processes, especially themes like gender[48] and childhood socialization.[49] Various aspects of lived religion, in particular demonic presence or disbelief among lay participants, as well as punishment miracles, likewise have become more prevalent recently.[50]

---

ressemblance," 121–47; Katajala-Peltomaa, "Narrative Strategies in the Depositions"; and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, "From Lived Reality to a Cultural Script: Punishment Miracles as an Experience," in *Histories of Experience in the World of Lived Religion*, eds. Sari Katajala-Peltomaa and Raisa Toivo (Cham: Palgrave, 2022), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92140-8_2.

47 See, for example, Kuuliala, *Childhood Disability and Social Integration*; Jenni Kuuliala, "Disability and Religious Practices in Late Medieval Prussia: Infirmity and the Miraculous in the Canonization Process of St Dorothea of Montau (1404–1406)," in *Lived Religion in the Baltic Sea Region during the Long Reformation*, eds. Sari Katajala-Peltomaa and Raisa Toivo (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 46–74; Jenni Kuuliala, "Physical Disability and Bodily Difference," in *A Companion to Medieval Miracle Collections*, 186–205; and Kuuliala, *Saints, Infirmity, and Community*. Similar themes have interested the scholars of the early modern era. See Albrecht Burkardt, *Les clients des saints. Maladie et quête du miracle á travers les procès de canonisation de la première moitié du XVIIe siècle en France*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 338 (Rome: École française de Rome, 2004); and Jenni Kuuliala, "The Saint as Medicator: Medicine and the Miraculous in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Italy," *Social History of Medicine* (2020): 34.3 (703–22), https://doi.org/10.1093/shm/hkaa053.

48 See Sharon Farmer, *Surviving Poverty in Medieval Paris: Gender, Ideology and the Daily Lives of the Poor* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002); Katajala-Peltomaa, *Gender, Miracles and Daily Life*; and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, "Fatherhood, Masculinity and Lived Religion in Late Medieval Sweden," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 38.2 (2013): 223–44.

49 On childhood socialization, see Kuuliala, *Childhood Disability and Social Integration*; Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, "Learning by Doing: Pilgrimages as a Means of Socialisation in the Late Middle Ages," in *Agents and Objects: Children in Pre-Modern Europe*, eds. Katariina Mustakallio and Jussi Hanska, Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 42 (Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 2015), 133–46; and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, "Diabolical Rage? Children, Violence, and Demonic Possession in the Late Middle Ages," *Journal of Family History* 41.3 (2016), doi 10.1177/0363199016644593.

50 Alain Boureau, "Saints et démons dans les procès de canonisation du début du XIVe siècle," in *Procès de canonisation*, 199–221; Alain Boureau, *Satan Hérétique. Histoire de la Démonologie. Naissance de la démonologie dans l'Occident médiévale (1280–1330)* (Paris: Odile Jacob, 2004); and Laura Ackerman Smoller, "A Case of Demonic Possession in Fifteenth-Century Brittany: Perrin Hervé and the Nascent Cult of Vincent Ferrer," in *Voices from the Bench. The Narratives of Lesser Folk in Medieval Trials*, ed. Michael Goodich (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 149–76. See also Laura Ackerman Smoller, "Dominicans and Demons: Possession, Temptation, and Reform in the Cult of Vincent Ferrer," *Speculum* 93.4 (2018): 1010–47; Katajala-Peltomaa, *Demonic Possession and Lived Religion*;

Systematic compilations of canonization processes are rather rare. The first was the collection edited by Gábor Klaniczay, *Medieval Canonization Processes – Procès de canonisation*, in 2004, which focused on the technicalities of carrying out hearings, the practical sides of certain processes, and characteristics of different processes. The other comprehensive collection, *Miracles in Canonization Processes*, was edited by Christian Krötzl and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa. Compared to the earlier collection, *Miracles in Canonization Processes* focused more strongly on methodological aspects: how and why these sources were written. The greatest difference between the volume at hand and the earlier ones is that here, the canonization processes are tackled as a whole, rather than focusing only on the depositions of miracles. Furthermore, the chapters in this volume search for methodological advances via new comparative options: Jonathan Greenwood analyses the dossiers alongside images, Didier Lett and Saku Pihko consider them against different kinds of judicial records, and Jyrki Nissi explores them together with *ars moriendi* guidebooks. The other chapters also show new ways to deconstruct the depositions. Nicole Archambeau, for example, demonstrates the benefit of digital network visualization tools for exploring networks and connections among those who testified for sanctity. Canonization processes thus offer significantly rich material for the study of various topics within religious, social, cultural, and legal history.

4 Structure of the Volume

This volume is loosely divided into two parts. The first focuses on the judicial and structural elements of various processes, while the second concentrates on devotional perspectives as revealed through the lay depositions. Each chapter strives to explain the structure of the selected process(es) and introduces previous scholarship that has used them. We hope that this volume will be useful both for those familiarizing themselves with this type of source and field of study and for those who are already familiar with canonization processes and are interested in the most recent trends in the field.

The volume opens with chapters addressing judicial developments and papal procedures. In his chapter "The Papacy on the Canonization of Saints: Between Appropriation, Regulation, and Disinterest," Christian Krötzl focuses on medieval developments with a special look at the Nordic canonization

and Didier Lett, "Des miracles incroyables. Doutes ou intérêt social et politique dans les procès de canonisation des xiii^{e}–xiv^{e} siècles," in *Miracles in Canonization Processes*.

process. Given the disruptions in the canonization practice during the Middle Ages, it is not possible to create a full analysis of chronological evolution within this volume. Continuity over the early modern divide is, nevertheless, an important contribution. The theme of judicial questions thus is continued in the second chapter, "God's Ordinary and Extraordinary Speech: The Determination of Miracles by the Roman Congregation of Rites in the Early Modern Era," by Maria Teresa Fattori, who concentrates on *On the Beatification of the Servant of God and the Canonization of Saints* by Prospero Lambertini (Benedict XIV). The possibility of reading medieval and early modern papal interventions side by side offers a more profound view of changes and continuities across time.

Canonization processes as judicial inquiries were not born in a vacuum, but rather were closely connected to other changes taking place in legal procedures more broadly. Comparison with other types of court records has long been a *desiderata* within the field of canonization process studies. Such efforts, however, have not been particularly numerous to date. In this volume, the challenge of comparative analysis is tackled by Didier Lett and Saku Pihko. In his chapter, "Transforming an Individual into a Saint and an Accused into a Criminal: Judicial Procedure in Canonization Processes and *libri maleficiorum* of Italian Communes at the End of the Middle Ages," Lett analyses the machineries of power at the level of the entire church and local community by deconstructing the significance of fame and preset questions in the production of collective memory. Pihko, in turn, reads side by side a case from a thirteenth-century inquisition and a canonization process in his chapter "The Construction of Information in the Records of Medieval Canonization and Heresy Inquests: A Methodological Comparison." He scrutinizes the ways in which information was selectively discarded and replicated during the interrogation processes.

A saint is essentially a saint for and by others, as Pierre Delooz already argued in 1983.[51] The construction of sanctity has been thoroughly analysed through *vitae*, but the less mediated and stylistically less refined construction in the testimonies of life in a canonization hearing has thus far attracted little attention. This topic is scrutinized in "Testimonies of the Life of the Saint in the Context of Canonization" by Jenni Kuuliala, who argues that a saint was created through interaction between the holy person and his/her community.

Devotional perspectives and their intermingling with daily life have long been a major trend among historians of canonization processes. In the second

51 Delooz, "Towards a Sociological Study of Canonized Sainthood," 208.

half of this volume, several themes emerge from this tradition. Some offer a new perspective of established themes, while others are new openings altogether. Nicole Archambeau opens this section with a chapter that uses digital network visualization tools to study networks and connections among those interrogated at the hearing of Delphine de Puimichel. In "Safe and Dangerous Names: Uncovering Connections and Boundaries in the Canonization Inquest for Countess Delphine de Puimichel, 1363," she demonstrates that when it comes to testifying to sanctity, sometimes silences speak, too.

Another continuing theme in the field of canonization processes has been recovery. According to André Vauchez's proposed statistics, approximately 90 percent of cases recorded in canonization processes could be labeled as therapeutic. Early studies of canonization records offered quantitative analyses of various ailments, but recently more nuanced analyses of concepts of disability and impairment have gained ground. In "Disability, Miracle, and Sainthood in Early Fourteenth-Century Canonization Dossiers," Adelheid Russenberger analyses disabling conditions from the perspective of both the inquisitorial committee and the patients and beneficiaries. She argues that despite the differing backgrounds of various participants in an interrogation, the unifying element was an underlying shared perception of how to behave toward saints and to petition for a miracle.

Resurrection was the ultimate proof of a saint's powers. This type of miracle had biblical precedents, and typically such cases appear in canonization dossiers. The cultural tensions between daily life and individual endeavors on the one hand, and general cultural trends of liturgy and theology on the other, are analysed by Jyrki Nissi in "'Are You Content to Die?' Death Acceptance and Death Denial in Depositions of Canonization Processes." Nissi corroborates recent arguments from death studies that medieval people were not fascinated with death and shows with practical examples from canonization processes that they rather embraced a will to live.

The next two chapters concentrate more clearly on the interconnection of daily life and devotion. In her chapter "Writing Microhistory from the Canonizations of Bernardino of Siena and Vincent Ferrer," Laura Ackerman Smoller adopts a microhistorical approach and shows how witnesses were able to retain agency while shaping their own narratives at the inquests. Even if an *articulus* of interrogation influenced their testimony, the interlocutors' interpretations could be resisted. Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, in turn, uses the concept of lived religion as the analytical frame for her chapter "Experiencing the Miraculous: Lived Religion in the Depositions." She analyses how the circulating narratives of past events affected the memories of participants, and eventually understanding of the miraculous.

Emotions and senses have become increasingly important research topics and methodologies across historical research in recent years. These themes are analysed by Marika Räsänen in her "Scent, Sight, Awe: Examining the Bodily Signs of Sainthood in the Canonization Processes of Dominican Saints." She scrutinizes how vision, touch, and smell were utilized while giving testimony in a judicial hearing of the miraculous signs in the body of the saintly candidate.

Early modern devotional culture and canonization endeavors at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the era of tightening papal control, are explored in Jonathan Greenwood's "Canonizations and Jesuit Saints: The Lives and Images amid the Causes for Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier." He examines the nature of the devotional books and images contributing to the canonizations of Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier, showing how visual culture before and after the canonization processes combined these two cults. His text adds a global perspective to the field of canonization studies.

Quotations from source material are translated by the authors unless otherwise indicated. An English version of the name is used for saints and other well-known persons, while for witnesses the version found in the sources is used.