

The Fragility of Historical Memory: In Pursuit of the Career and Canonization of San Diego de Alcalá

L. J. Andrew Villalon*

First, let me say what this paper is—and what it is not. It is not a detailed account of the life or the canonization of San Diego de Alcalá, a fifteenth century Franciscan friar after whom the sixth largest city in the United States is named. Three printed articles and an in-the-works monograph tackle that larger subject.¹ Instead, this paper traces a “quest” for sources, some of which have survived, a disturbing number of which have not. The story is told, as it must be, in the first person. While I shall supply quite enough information to show who the friar was and how he reached that exclusive circle of men and women regarded as saints by the Roman Catholic Church, my principal focus will be on the search process and how the ever-present “fragility of historical memory” has shaped it. Finally, I should mention that the story is a work in progress for the search goes on.

During my career, I have experienced three really bad academic moments: the meeting with my first doctoral committee when it became clear I had no idea where my dissertation was going; the day I learned someone else had just published a book on my dissertation topic; and my receipt of a letter informing me that a certain archive in central Spain had burned down in 1939. The third experience is relevant to today’s paper.

In winter, 1991, I received a travel grant from the University of Cincinnati to finance research in Spanish archives. I was particularly interested in one facility I had never before used (or even heard of)—the Archivo Central, located in the old university city of Alcalá de Henares northeast of Madrid. An obscure 1914 journal article indicated that this archive held critical documents for my research on the Franciscan saint named Diego de Alcalá.² It is always a good idea (sometimes an absolute necessity) to contact an archive in advance; this is particularly true of American scholars working in Europe. In 1991, I tried to do just that, but to no avail. Finding no mention of the Archivo Central in a book which lists Spanish archives and libraries,³ I had adopted a “shot-gun approach” to making contact: Addressing my first letter simply to the Archivo Central in Alcalá, in hopes that this would prove

sufficient for the Spanish post office, I then wrote to the Ministry of Education and several other libraries and archives where I have worked in the past, asking that they forward my message.

Despite the absence of an answer, I applied for the grant fully expecting to hear something before taking it up. Over the years, I have worked in a number of Spanish archives without encountering any insurmountable problems. Up until the 1980s, I always went through the process of getting an official-looking, “good citizen letter” from my university. In the last several decades, however, I have found this an increasingly unnecessary precaution: Spain has moved to a national system in which a scholar obtains from the initial archive where he or she works an “investigator’s card” (*tarjeta de investigador*). Once secured, the *tarjeta* provides an entry to most other archives as well, certainly to any run by the state. Although my original card with the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid dated back to my student days in the 1960s (and therefore pre-dated the national system), I had had no trouble getting it updated in 1984. Hence, I was not particularly worried when I heard back regarding my inquiries. If worse came to worse, I planned to simply fly into Madrid, pick up a rental car, drive downtown to visit the Archivo and the Biblioteca Nacional, reactivate my *tarjetas* from both (for some reason, archives and libraries have different cards), then drive out to Alcalá to see what was what. After all, it shouldn’t be too hard to find an archive!⁴

The letter arrived at the beginning of September, two days before my wife and I were scheduled to leave. Written by a subdirectora of the Archivo General de la Administración in Alcalá, its first sentence struck like a thunderbolt.

I wish to inform you that the documents to which you refer used to be preserved in the Archivo Central, the direct predecessor to the present archive that unfortunately was totally destroyed by fire in the year 1939.

With a sinking feeling, I read on. The subdirectora informed me that during the nineteenth century, the entire Spanish file of canonization documents, once housed in the Archivo General de Simancas,⁵ had been transferred to a newly-established archive in Alcalá. It was that archive that had gone up in smoke. I was informed that the present archive held nothing relevant nor did the municipal archive she had contacted on my behalf. Her letter closed with the exquisite courtesy typical of Spanish correspondence:

“lamenting my inability to convey anymore information, I attentively salute you” etc.

My first (somewhat naive) reaction was, how on earth can an archive burn down? Only then did I remember my modern Spanish history: 1939 was a rough year for Spain. The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), after being stalled along virtually the same lines for three years, had once again become a war of motion, as the Republic crumbled in the face of a final successful assault by the Nationalist army of Generalissimo Francisco Franco.⁶ One of the last battles was fought in Alcalá, as that army closed on Madrid. Obviously, I was aware in a general sense of the enormous destruction wrought across Spain by the Civil War; on the other hand, it had never before had such a direct impact on my research. Up until then, if medieval and early modern documentation had survived the vicissitudes of history long enough to end up in an archive, it had always been available for me to consult.⁷ Although the subdirectora assured me in later correspondence that the archive had been destroyed not by military action, but by an unrelated fire some months after the war ended, other historians I have spoken with believe it to have been a casualty of the conflict. Either way, it is gone and with it, any easy access to the history of San Diego.

II

During the night of November 12, 1463, an aged lay brother named Diego died within the walls of a Franciscan friary recently-established in Alcalá.⁸ The deceased had spent the closing decade of a long, but unremarkable career serving as the friary’s gatekeeper, tending the sick and feeding the poor.⁹ Despite a lack of worldly distinction, on July 2, 1588, one hundred and twenty-five years after his death, Pope Sixtus V (1585-1590) enrolled Diego in the catalogue of saints.¹⁰ The gentle friar became the first Spanish Franciscan¹¹ to achieve that honor as well as the first saint made by the Counter-Reformation papacy.¹²

Diego’s story falls neatly into two chapters. Chapter one begins with his birth in the small village of San Nicolás del Puerto not far from Seville. According to accounts drafted late in the sixteenth century, he was born somewhere around the year 1400, though the evidence for anything in his early life, including his date of birth, is exceedingly thin. If, in fact, hagiographers have determined the birth date more or less correctly, then the friar’s life of some sixty years would be relatively lengthy by the standards of his day. At the same time, it proved relatively uneventful and is therefore

largely undocumented.

First and foremost, we have nothing from the saint himself. The sparse testimony of those who knew him makes clear why this is the case: While marveling over his wisdom in matters of the spirit, his kindness and charity, his asceticism, and his strict adherence to the Franciscan rule, eyewitnesses agree that this was particularly marvelous in a man who was “lego sin letras”—to wit, “an illiterate lay brother.”¹³ No single fact about Diego is better documented than his illiteracy.

Nor was his relatively undistinguished career the sort that might inspire treatment by more literate contemporaries. The traditional story has Diego answering a religious calling at a young age, first, by retreating to an isolated hermitage, later, by the decision (not uncommon among Christian hermits) to enter a religious order. Unfortunately, this initial part of the story, that fits almost too perfectly with hagiographic traditions,¹⁴ seems based only on dubious evidence.¹⁵ The first solid information we have concerning Diego postdates his entry into the Franciscan order and places him at the monastery of Cerraja, several leagues from Seville. Whatever his true background, the future saint’s piety and devotion proved sufficient to win him entry into the order, although his illiteracy seems to have impeded any advance beyond a lay affiliation.

Only two episodes involving the friar transcend an otherwise unremarkable career. During the 1440s, Diego spent several years in the Canary Islands, which had recently come under Spanish control,¹⁶ where he served as guardian of the order’s small monastery on Fuerteventura. Although later accounts extol his evangelizing efforts there, other evidence indicates that conversion of the island’s population had been largely achieved before his arrival.¹⁷ His attempt to move to the neighboring and as yet unsubdued island of Grand Canary, where further missionary work might win him a martyr’s crown, met with a singular lack of success.

In 1450, shortly after his return to Castile, Diego and a companion joined pilgrims from all over Europe who were flocking to the Holy City to celebrate a Jubilee Year.¹⁸ The crowd included many Franciscans scheduled to attend a conclave of their order and to witness the canonization of a recently deceased brother, Bernardino of Siena.¹⁹ When in the hot summer months, disease began to rage throughout the overcrowded city, Diego took over the care, not only of his ill companion, but many other victims in the Franciscan convent of Araceli.

Upon returning to Spain, his life resumed its ordinary course. He soon moved to the new Franciscan establishment at Alcalá, where he spent his closing years. The friar's existence proved too mundane to earn him a place in the chronicles of his time, in which respect, he stands in stark contrast to the Spanish saint most recently preceding him—the militant Aragonese Dominican, Vicente Ferrer (1350-1419), canonized in 1455.²⁰ San Vicente, many of whose writings are preserved, was famous in his own day for his preaching, his participation in papal politics, and his role in the forced conversion of much of Spain's Jewish population following the pogroms of the 1390s.²¹

During the four years immediately following Diego's death (1463-1467), there was a flurry of activity as members of the monastery encouraged by its founder, the warrior-archbishop of Toledo, Alonso Carrillo (1412-1482), gathered information about the gentle friar with an eye to seeking his canonization. This first chapter closed abruptly in 1467, when preliminary attempts to acquire sainthood for Diego ended, having apparently fallen victim to Castilian politics. There followed a hiatus of nearly a century, during which the remains sat undisturbed in a small chapel built in his honor by one of those whom Diego is said to have benefited, King Enrique IV "el Impotente" of Castile (1454-1474).²² Throughout these years, the friar seems to have been recognized as a local saint or *beatus*, venerated in the region around Alcalá, but virtually unknown beyond.²³

The second, more dramatic chapter began nearly a century later when, on May 9, 1562, the people of Alcalá removed their *beatus* from his resting place and carried him in solemn procession to the sickroom of their prince, Don Carlos, son of Philip II.²⁴ In mid-April, while residing in their city, the prince had sustained a head injury rendered serious by the onset of infection, which left him at death's door.²⁵ Now, in a dramatic scene, the friar's desiccated corpse was laid down beside the royal patient, who, according to several witnesses, rallied sufficiently to reach across, touch it, then draw his hand across his own severely infected face. That night, Carlos's condition, which had seemed hopeless, began to improve. Upon first hearing of this visit to the sickroom, the English ambassador, Thomas Challoner, astutely predicted that "if God sende the prince to escape, that fryer is not unlike to be canonized for his laboure."²⁶ When the prince, despite all expectations, did survive his injury, most Spaniards credited Alcalá's *beatus* with having miraculously interceded in his behalf. A movement, led by the royal family, soon began to press for sainthood. Even after the tragic death of Don Carlos in 1568, Philip II continued to cajole and pressure four

successive popes until, in 1588, Sixtus V made San Diego de Alcalá the first saint of the Counter-Reformation period.

III

I arrived at San Diego along the same pathway as Philip II—our shared concern for his near-mythic son, Don Carlos, often referred to as “the Unhappy Prince of Spain.”²⁷ In real life, Don Carlos (1545-1568), a member of the Hapsburg Dynasty and heir apparent to the throne, was Philip’s eldest child by his first wife, María of Portugal, who died in giving birth. From an early age, Carlos was plagued by poor health and, by the 1560s, began to show signs of a mental instability that would render his conduct increasingly violent, occasioning comment by foreign ambassadors and eventually forcing his father to take drastic action.²⁸ In January, 1568, Philip and several trusted officials burst into the young man’s chambers and placed him under house arrest. Six months later, at age twenty-two, Carlos died under what many regarded as “mysterious circumstances.”²⁹

Before the end of the sixteenth century, with help from Protestant propagandists, rumors surrounding the dead prince began to crystallize into a formidable myth, one that converted an unstable Hapsburg princeling into the Don Carlos of legend, whose tragic love for his stepmother and opposition to Spain’s bloody policies in the Netherlands led to his death at the hands of his own father.³⁰ The mythic Don Carlos has become enshrined in an extensive literature,³¹ the best-known examples of which are the 1787 historical drama by German playwright, Friedrich Schiller,³² and the 1867 opera that Italian composer, Giuseppe Verdi, based on Schiller’s play.³³

Although familiar with the myth in a general way since graduate school, I began to study it seriously only in the mid-1980s, when I delivered several papers on Don Carlos, one of which dealt with the prince’s head injury. While turning that paper into an article, I became increasingly interested in Diego’s role and the light it cast on medical treatment and the art of healing during the period. I was particularly impressed when my doctor-cum-medical adviser (himself Jewish and therefore no advocate of Christian miracles) told me in all seriousness that the visit to the sickroom, through its positive psychological impact, may well have had more to do with saving the patient’s life than anything he suffered at the hands of his ten physicians.³⁴

Several contemporary sources mention the “visit,” among them, two of the most detailed medical accounts of the century, written by the prince’s

surgeon, Dionisio Daza Chacon, and personal physician, Diego Olivares.³⁵ Both alluded to the highly dramatic visitation. In addition, Philip II's principal chronicler, Luis Cabrera de Córdoba, focused almost exclusively on Diego's miraculous intercession and ensuing canonization, virtually ignoring the work of the doctors.³⁶

Although these printed references whetted the appetite, they did not begin to supply enough information. Eventually, however, a well-known medical historian's passing reference to an obscure, but singularly important source convinced me that an in-depth study of the saint might be feasible.³⁷ During the First World War, a Spanish Franciscan named Lucio María Nuñez produced a lengthy article entitled "Documentos sobre la curación del príncipe D. Carlos y la canonización de San Diego de Alcalá" which he "serialized" in several issues of the *Archivo Ibero-americano*.³⁸ The piece was composed primarily of excerpts from sixteenth century documents that Fra Lucio had unearthed in Spanish archives, including the now defunct Archivo Central. It included eyewitness accounts of the removal of Diego from his coffin, the procession to the palace, the visit to the sickroom, the later visit by the prince to Diego's chapel, and the celebrations in Alcalá that followed canonization. Nuñez also reproduced a small, but significant sampling of testimony favoring canonization, gathered by a papal-appointed commission of three Spanish bishops.

Even before having enough source material for an article, I began to entertain dreams of the monograph that would trace the history of this obscure friar whose canonization seemed to epitomize the politics of saint-making in a crucial period of church history. Brother Lucio had pointed the way toward the source that would almost certainly have to be found—the bishops' report. At the time he was writing in 1914, it was housed in the Archivo Central, designated Legajo 20/471 and entitled "Information concerning the life, sanctity, and miracles of the sainted brother Diego." His description left no doubt that his selections represented only a fraction of the original. While not specifying its precise length, he stated that "[it] forms a great volume of assorted documents, each of which is numbered and is either an original or notarized copy." Of the eighty-three witnesses interviewed, Nuñez reproduced portions of the testimony of only about half a dozen. Clearly, the original could provide much more information—if only it could be found! And with both the name of the archive and the catalogue number of the document, I assumed I could find it. (As my mother used to say, "never assume!")

I did wonder why no other historian had latched onto the subject. In the last several decades, the study of saints has been a hot topic; and the history of this saint fascinated everyone whom I told of it. The reaction of friend and mentor, Jack Hexter, was typical: "That is one great story!" At the time, I could only imagine that fortune had smiled on me and I had better stake my claim before someone else beat me to it. I began by sending off those letters, hoping they would find their way to the Archivo Central before I did. I wrote my grant proposal, received my grant, and then got the subdirectora's fateful reply.

IV

For one wild moment in 1991, I contemplated turning back the money! My wife, who had a grant and project of her own, quickly put an end to that madness. She reminded me that I had other on-going research in Spain that I could turn to if necessary; so we finished packing. In the end, the nightmare scenario of everything having been destroyed by fire proved highly exaggerated. Spain's principal library, the Biblioteca Nacional, yielded a number of important printed works, including two late sixteenth century lives of the saint (both in Latin) written as part of the canonization process: the first produced around 1567 by the royal historian, Ambrosio de Morales; the second, commissioned by Pope Sixtus in 1588 and entrusted to an Italian writer, Pietro Galesini.³⁹ The Biblioteca also contained a 400-page Spanish account, published in 1663 by a guardian of the monastery where Diego had spent his closing years.⁴⁰

More importantly, toward the end of the trip, a new source of primary documents made its appearance. Despite having only three days left before our return flight to the States, my wife and I decided to visit the Archivo General de Simancas, a four hour drive north of Madrid. She had learned that much of the documentation required for her project was housed there; I simply guessed that Spain's premier repository of early modern material might have something, despite its having transferred the official file in the 1870s.

The picturesque village of Simancas lies out on the Castilian high plain, a few kilometers south of Valladolid. It is site of a splendid fifteenth century castle, home to one of Spain's oldest archives. Although (sadly) the archive contains no duplicate copy of the Diego file, it does house Spain's diplomatic papers from the sixteenth century, including a vast correspondence between Rome and Madrid.⁴¹ Despite its significance to historians,

this collection of state papers is not well-catalogued. There exists only a sketchy, early twentieth century index to provide rudimentary guidance. Nevertheless, the index made it possible to determine which of hundreds of boxes (*legajos*) contained diplomatic correspondence with Rome from the years between 1562 and 1588, years when Philip was lobbying for his saint. It also contained eleven specific references to Diego. While most items in the collection were assigned numbers during the nineteenth century, they were never bound together and have therefore gotten out of order. Just to find those eleven specific references required plowing through entire *legajos*.

It was during the first three days at Simancas that I made a critical discovery, one, which would shape my research for years to come. Instead of simply looking for the eleven items that had been indexed, I skimmed through hundreds of pages of sixteenth century script in those same *legajos*, to see if those who did the indexing had missed anything. I soon found that they had included only documents where the canonization was mentioned on the outer cover (*cubierto*). This amounted to approximately half the items my skimming had turned up. I decided that a similar search through other *legajos* from the correct years might yield a number of other documents that mentioned canonization within the text, but not on the outer cover. This reasoning set the stage for five trips to Simancas in the next seven years during which I ploughed through seventy-four *legajos*, finding several dozen uncatalogued references to Diego, a useful cache though fewer than I had hoped given the number encountered on that initial visit. Although I have no illusions that I found everything, it was far too laborious a process to repeat in one lifetime.

Following the 1991 research trip, I had enough to write a first paper where San Diego rather than Don Carlos became the central focus.⁴² On the other hand, the disappearance of the Archivo Central and with it, the official record of the saint's canonization, threatened to cripple any plans for a monograph. I had come to understand why the topic had escaped earlier historians: in the absence of those records, prospects for a book were considerably diminished.

During the next several years, much time and effort went into searching for another copy of the canonization file—a search that naturally led to Rome. After all, the Spanish bishops had compiled their report at the instructions of the Holy See, and had forwarded it there in two installments (1565 and 1567). The Spanish ambassador testified to its arrival, informing Madrid that it was being translated into Latin and that multiple copies

were being prepared for use by the committee of cardinals examining the case.⁴³ In 1588, the church-appointed author, Galesini, had the report in hand when he composed his official life of the saint. All things considered, it seemed a good bet that this and perhaps other documentation would be preserved in the Vatican.

Late in spring, 1994, finding a fare we could not refuse, my wife and I decided to take our September holiday in Rome. Although it was not primarily a research trip, I did hope to get in a visit to the Archivio Segreto Vaticano to see if by chance I might discover that sought-after second copy of the file. Were I to do so, I could then arrange for a microfilm copy or plan a longer stint in the archive or both. Although I wrote immediately, the last minute nature of our vacation combined with the long summer break taken by archives again prevented me from receiving any response. Unlike Spain, however, I was now venturing into *terra* completely *incognita*, with the added (and, as events would demonstrate, decisive) disadvantage of not knowing the language.

What is more, I had made another of my dangerous assumptions: that by the second week of September, the Vatican archives would indeed be open for business. Decades ago, I began dealing with Spanish archives that, until relatively recently, have shut down late in July and reopened only in the first week of September. For the most part, that insalubrious tradition, so damaging to American scholars who must do their research in the summer, has been corrected—in *Spain*. There, vacations have shortened and some places, like Simancas, are open almost year around. I therefore assumed that at the very worst, a world-class facility like the Vatican would adhere to a schedule no more leisurely than that which characterized Spanish archives when I began my research in the late 1960s. By the first or at latest the second week of September, its doors would have reopened to scholars. Unfortunately, once again my mother's advice came into play: never assume. Upon arrival in Rome, I quickly learned that the Vatican archives observe a summer holiday several weeks longer on either end than that which characterized Spain several decades ago, rendering it even less "user friendly" to American scholars. As it turned out, it was not scheduled to reopen until the day before our return flight to the states, a flight that had been booked to get us back just in time for our first day of classes.

Needless to say, our last day in the Eternal City began early. My wife and I⁴⁴ stood among the first in line to apply for entry to the archives. Just getting in proved a stroke of luck. Neither of us speaks Italian and the receptionist charged with distributing credentials could not function in

English, Spanish, or French. Naturally, I had a copy of my letter, but there had never been any response and while we both had university identification, we had not bothered to get the official-looking request on letterhead. Fortunately, a young German scholar, fluent in both English and Italian, saved the day. He explained the circumstances, got us our credentials, and then hustled us in to see the prefect of the archives. (One of the first things we discovered was my letter that had arrived some weeks earlier sitting on his desk awaiting an answer.)

Once again, our new friend helped me explain the purpose of the search and, as a result, the provost handed me the index to a section of the archives containing documentation from the Congregation of Rites, the division of papal government created in the late 1580s to handle saint-making. This index contained only a single entry for Diego (Didacus in Latin), cross-referencing him to someone I had never heard of—a Father Marcelo Mastrilli, member of the Society of Jesus, martyred in Japan during the 1630s. The file, Riti 1193, proved utterly useless. Not that the language presented any problem; since most documents had originated at Jesuit headquarters in the Philippines, they were in Spanish. Unfortunately, all of them dealt with Father Marcelo's martyrdom and supported his canonization. I could not find even a passing reference to Diego, much less a complete document dealing with him.

Without an index or catalogue supplying the easy trail to follow, one day's research was not going to suffice. Archives can be worked without catalogue references (as I had done with the diplomatic papers at Simancas), but it requires a knowledge of the archive, adequate language skills, and that all important element of time. In Rome, I had none of these. Nor did I receive much help from the provost. With an important visitor from Eastern Europe arriving that afternoon, he had more to worry about than solving the mysterious cross reference. The best he could offer was a vague assurance that if the index said there was something there, it was probably so. In the face of our language difficulties and his preoccupation with the approaching visit, I was not about to convince him that the compilers of his index had made a mistake. Only by sitting down and going through the documents was there any chance of that happening. In the end, having learned all we could about Riti 1193 (to wit, that it did not contain anything useful on Diego), my wife and I sauntered out of the archive and spent our last afternoon wandering around the city.

Rome in 1994 proved as disappointing as Alcalá had three years

earlier. I have not, however, given up hope. Scholars who regularly conduct research at the Vatican assure me there are numerous avenues to explore that might generate important new information. On the other hand, I doubt I would have much success pursuing these avenues without considerably improving my Italian.

Soon after returning from Rome, a new development offset my disappointment. At the same time I was writing to the Vatican, I had sent a similar inquiry to another Spanish library that might contain relevant documentation—the Real Biblioteca at San Lorenzo del Escorial. Located northwest of Madrid, the Escorial⁴⁵ is the magnificent palace-monastery that Philip II built to serve as both retreat and final resting place. It is also the site of the king's personal library. Given Philip's intense interest in the canonization, it stood to reason that he might have preserved copies of some or all of the documents. In his letter, the archivist confirmed my suspicions, indicating that the Escorial possessed not only a leg bone of San Diego, but of far greater significance, a lengthy document that bore a very promising description: "Notarized copy of the original writings that contain information concerning the life and miracles of San Diego de Alcalá, compiled under instructions from the Prince Don Carlos in 1562." The description suggested that here might be a copy of the canonization inquiry (*proceso*) conducted by the three bishops—or at least a substantial part of it. The sole sticking point was the date—1562. This was the year of the prince's injury, preceding by several years the actual investigation.

At the time, I suspected the date might have been incorrectly recorded. Alternatively, it might have been taken from the opening page of a collective document, akin to a file, begun at the moment when Carlos, having miraculously recovered from his injury, began to gather material supporting sainthood for his benefactor. If correct, then within that collective document would be found individual items of a later date, very possibly including the bishop's report. For a long time, my letters to the Escorial, inquiring about the precise nature of the document, went unanswered, though eventually, the archivist did supply a quote I had requested for the price of a microfilm copy.

Early in summer, 1996, while planning a vacation in Greece, my wife and I arranged to make a one-week stopover for research in Spain. Since we had still heard nothing substantive from the Escorial, we decided to drive there on our way north to Simancas, both to see the document and to help expedite the process of obtaining a microfilm copy. We would adjust our stay

depending upon what turned up. Early September found us at the monastery. Upon consulting the library catalogue,⁴⁶ I quickly discovered that I had been told about only one of two relevant documents. The one not mentioned in the letter from the archive turned out to be more or less what I was looking for: materials gathered during the 1560s in support of sainthood, including some, but not all of the testimony taken by the three bishops.⁴⁷

The second item, the description of which had been sent to me, proved very different and even more valuable than what I had imagined it to be. As noted earlier, there are two chapters to the saint's story: a fifteenth century life and a sixteenth century canonization. Even without the full *proceso*, I had uncovered a good deal about the later period.⁴⁸ By contrast, from the fifteenth century, I had nothing: nothing by the saint, nothing about him.

Given the complete absence of sources, I had originally assumed (as have a number of others) that the earliest accounts of Diego's life appearing in canonization *vitae* had either been cobbled together from oral tradition or, alternatively, cut from whole cloth. The document in the Escorial now proved me wrong. Almost certainly the only surviving fifteenth century source, it not only provides almost all of the sparse information we have concerning the saint's life, but also catalogues the miracles said to have been performed through his intercession and tells of an abortive fifteenth century attempt to seek his canonization. Officially designated only by a reference number (&.II.14.), what I have dubbed "The Miracle Book," is a handsome, leather-bound volume drafted in 1562 at the express command of Prince Carlos who had just recovered from his injury. It is written in an archaic Gothic script that closely resembles a popular typeface of the mid-1560s.⁴⁹ The catalogue description fails to make clear that over half of the text (fifty-five of 109 folios) was devoted to testimony taken from more than 150 individuals in the four years immediately following the saint's death (1463-1467).⁵⁰ While most of the depositions are fairly brief and recount only miracles said to have been performed through Diego's intercession, a few contain vital, eyewitness testimony to his life and to the events surrounding his death. They supply almost all of that we possess concerning the saint's life.

Although it is now clear that hagiographers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries made use of "The Miracle Book," it seems to have escaped the notice of more recent historians—or at least, I have found no modern secondary source that mentions it. The few scholars in our century who write about San Diego have been content to work from the canonization

vitae.⁵¹ The newest, a bilingual account published in 1998, categorically (and mistakenly) asserts that “there are no documents from the fifteenth century on [Diego’s] life, such as a baptismal certificate or eyewitness testimonies.”⁵²

For the existence and survival of this crucial source, we are indebted to four individuals: two clerics and two members of the royal family. In the mid-1460s, Juan de Peñalver, the friary’s guardian, joined with its founder, Archbishop Carrillo, in conducting the first inquiry into Diego’s life and miracles. It was this inquiry that generated the depositions. Nearly a century later, in December, 1562, Don Carlos ordered these documents copied into the manuscript now housed in the Escorial. Following the prince’s death, his father, Philip II, retained the volume as part of his own collection.⁵³ The long-overlooked fifteenth century material in the Escorial made possible a second article on the saint, published in the *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*.⁵⁴

The final piece of archival research undertaken to date took me back to Italy—this time north to Venice. Among the most widely used documents of the early modern period are the diplomatic dispatches of Venetian ambassadors, housed in the Archivio di Stato. The first documents I ever saw concerning Don Carlos appeared in a translated collection of these ambassador reports.⁵⁵ Consequently, in March, 1998, one of a number of trips my wife and I planned for our twenty-fifth anniversary took us to the city which had once dominated Mediterranean trade. During a week in the city on the lagoon, we learned why many of our colleagues have chosen to work there: not only is Venice magical, but the Archivio di Stato is extremely user-friendly. Despite a continuing deficiency in Italian only slightly alleviated by studying a beginning level textbook, everyone bent over backwards to be helpful. A director who spoke some English took me to the reading room, explained the drill, and introduced me to the non-English speakers who worked there. I was also shown how to compile a microfilm order and introduced to the people who would fill it. And I was handed the excellent indexes of this much used collection.

While I could never have skimmed the documents as I had at Simancas, their superb filing and cataloguing made such an expedient unnecessary. As a result, I found a number of documents that would ultimately be of use.⁵⁶ My *modus operandi* in Venice was simple: Although I could get only a rough idea concerning the contents of these Italian documents, I knew the key dates—when Don Carlos had been injured, when the Spanish crown had first sought canonization, when the papacy had opened the

proceedings, when the canonization had actually occurred, and when there had been a major celebration of the event in Alcalá. Given the organization of the dispatches into bound volumes, all in chronological order, it was easy enough to find passages dealing with “Didaco” or “canonizacione” or which came from “Alcalá”. While unable to translate on site, I could both transcribe and microfilm the relevant dispatches, leaving me to deal with them at my leisure upon return to the United States. For the first time, I had evidence of the skepticism with which Catholics outside of Spain greeted the elevation of their newest saint. Unfortunately, one of the most important letters dating to mid-May, 1562, and talking about the visit to the sickroom is almost unreadable due to the ravages of time. Apparently, at some point, the letter lay in contact with something slightly smaller which seems to have caused the ink to bleed through and for some of the paper to disintegrate.

V

Several aspects of my research on San Diego have heightened my awareness of “the fragility of historical memory,” beginning with the failure of the fifteenth century to record more about the man. Admittedly, during his lifetime, he was too obscure to be bothered with, but in the four years after his death, when initial efforts were made to seek sainthood, the interrogators failed to take adequate advantage of the opportunity. Devoting the vast majority of their attention to gathering miracle stories, they gleaned only enough biographical material to supply the broad outlines of a career. Virtually all of this came from just three friars who had known Diego before his arrival in Alcalá. Once the denizens of the monastery were debriefed, there appears to have been no further attempt to collect any more such information. There is no record of messengers being sent to other parts of Spain to search out new facts about the would-be saint, as in fact, messengers were sent out to gather material about miracles. Such efforts would not occur until a century later, by which time it was too late.

Most notably, the fragility manifests itself in the failure to preserve sources that at one time did exist, but that have since disappeared. From the twentieth century destruction of a Spanish archive containing the official case file to the seeming failure of the Vatican to preserve at least one copy of its canonization proceedings, to the partial disintegration of that 1562 letter from the Venetian ambassador to his government: all illustrate “the fragility of historical memory,” that so inexorably shapes our knowledge of the past. While flexibility and imagination in concocting research strategies may enable historians to finesse some of the source problems, they cannot

fully compensate for the outright disappearance of sources. It is what might be called the humpty-dumpty principle of scholarship: "All the king's horses and all the king's men, cannot put those sources together again."

NOTES

* This article has grown out of a paper first presented in February, 2002, to the University College Faculty Forum at the University of Cincinnati. A revised version was delivered in April, 2002, during the Ohio Academy of History meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio. It has undergone some further revision for publication in these *Proceedings*. Over the years, my research in Spain has been generously financed by the University of Cincinnati Research Council with grants in 1991 and 1997.

1. L. J. Andrew Villalon, "Putting Don Carlos Together Again: the Treatment of a Head Injury in Mid-Sixteenth Century Spain," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Summer 1995), 347-365; "San Diego de Alcalá and the Politics of Saint-making in Counter-Reformation Europe," *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 83, No. 4 (October, 1997), 691-715; "The Miracle Book of San Diego de Alcalá, or, the Fifteenth Century Failure to Canonize the First Counter-Reformation Saint," *Mediterranean Studies, The Journal of the Mediterranean Studies Association*, No. 10 (April 2001), 9-35.

2. The article is spread through several issues of the journal. See: Fr. Lucio María Núñez, "Documentos sobre la curación del príncipe D. Carlos y la canonización de San Diego de Alcalá," *Archivo Ibero-americano*, (1914), 1: 424-46; (1915), 4: 374-87; 5: 107-26, 421-30.

3. *Directorio de Bibliotecas Españolas* (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 1988).

4. One must remember that these events predate my introduction to the web or email. It is hard to imagine a similar senario occurring today.

5. Useful guides to Simancas, oldest of all state archives in the region of Spain known as Castile, can be found in: Angel de la Plaza Bores, *Guía del Investigador: Archivo General de Simancas*, tercera edición (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 1986); José Luis Rodríguez de Diego and Francisco Javier Alvarez Pinedo, *Los Archivos Españoles: Simancas* (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 1993).

6. Classic treatments of this conflict in English include: Hugh Thomas, *The Spanish Civil War* (New York: Harper and Row, 1961); Gabriel Jackson, *The Spanish Republic and the Civil War 1931-1939* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965); Herbert L. Matthews, *Half of Spain Died: A Reappraisal of the Spanish Civil War* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973); Arthur H. Landis, *The Abraham Lincoln Brigade* (New York: The Citadel Press, 1967).

7. A good example is the Osuna Collection that fortunately for all students of medieval Castilian history made it safely into the Archivo Historico Nacional in 1927, despite its near despersion in the decades following the death of the last Duke of Osuna. See: Carmen Crespo Nogueira, *Archivo Histórico Nacional Guía* (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 1989), 65-69.

8. Alcalá de Henares was best-known in the early modern period for its university established by the Archbishop of Toledo, Jiménez de Cisneros. For a comprehensive history of the city, see: Esteban Azaña, *Historia de la Ciudad de Alcalá de Henares (Antigua Compluto)*, 2 vols. (Alcalá de Henares: Garcia, 1882).

9. The monastery was established around 1454, according to its founding deed granted by Archbishop Alonso Carrillo on June 4 of that year. This document is reproduced in its entirety in the leading seventeenth century account of the saint's life, Fra Antonio Rojo's *Historia de San Diego de Alcalá. Fundación y Frutos de Santidad que ha Produzido su Convento de Santa María de Iesus* (Madrid: En la imprenta Real, 1663), 28-34. See also: John H. R. Moorman, *Medieval Franciscan Houses* (New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, St. Bonaventure University, 1983), 9. Since Diego died in 1463, he could have spent at most the last nine years of his life in the monastery; nevertheless, some testimony from the *inquisición* into his life and miracles suggests that he arrived in Alcalá several years earlier. On the other hand, this may be simply one more example of the chronological imprecision characterizing all surviving fifteenth century information concerning the saint's life.

10. In Spain, the saint is also called Diego de San Nicolas del Puerto, a name derived from the village of his birth near Seville. In most non-Spanish documents, he is referred to by the Latinized form of his name, Didacus, or some variant thereof (Italian, "Didaco"). See, for example, Venetian archival documents which mention Diego's visit to the sickroom and ceremonies surrounding his canonization in: *Archivio di Stato* (Venice) [ASV], filza 4, letter from Ambassador Paolo Tiépolo (May 26, 1562); filza 22, letters from Giovanni Gritti (spring, 1589).

11. Salimbene de Adam, a major thirteenth century Italian chronicler who treats extensively the early decades of the Franciscan Order to which he belonged, refers to the scholar and preacher, Anthony of Padua (1195-1231), as having come from "Spain." In reality, however, St. Anthony was Portuguese, having been born in the region around Lisbon. *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, trans. Joseph L. Baird (Binghamton, New York: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1986), 46. Donald Attwater, *The Avenel Dictionary of Saints* (New York: Avenel Books, 1981), 50-51.

12. The last canonization before Diego's had been that of Antoninus of Florence, sixty-five years earlier (1523). Ludwig von Pastor, the great nineteenth century historian of the papacy, is partially in error when he states that "in 1586 [Sixtus V] celebrated the canonization of the Dominican, Louis Bertrand, and in 1588, that of Franciscan lay brother, Diego de Alcalá." Although correct in respect to Diego, St. Louis Bertrand did not die until 1581, and was not canonized until 1671. Since most historians would consider the year 1523 to predate the Counter-Reformation, it seems safe to refer to Diego as "the first Counter-Reformation saint," in the sense of having been the first person canonized during that turbulent period in Church history. In the other sense, i. e. of a saint who took part in the Counter-Reformation, the first was Charles Borromeo, the great reforming cardinal and papal power broker who died in 1592 and was canonized less than twenty years later (1610). In 1622, during an orgy of saint-making, four of the other giants of the Counter-Reformation joined Borromeo—Ignatius Loyola, Francis Xavier, Philip Neri, and Teresa of Avila. Ludwig von Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, ed. Ralph Francis Kerr (St. Louis: Herder, 1932), 21: 138. Attwater, pp. 83-84, 141-42, 284-85, 177-79, 220, 318-19.

13. See testimony of three people who knew Diego personally—Juan de Peñalver, Felipe de Sevilla, and the Bachiller de Cuenca in *RBE*, ms. &.ll.14, fols. 10v, 19v, 20v. This document is referred to in the text of this article as *The Miracle Book*.

14. The motif of the hermit-turned-monk repeats throughout the history of Christian monasticism. Among the many examples are Pachomius, Jerome, Benedict, and, of course, the founder of Diego's own order, Francis of Assisi.

15. Based on the traditional story which has Diego seeking after a religious life at an early age, Donald Weinstein and Rudolph Bell would categorize him as a "child saint," one of several categories they establish in their ground-breaking work, *Saints & Society, The Two Worlds of Western Christendom 1000-1700* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982). Unfortunately, there is no mention of this episode from his early life in the one fifteenth century source which we possess; instead, the story crops up only in the late sixteenth century, during the inquiry into Diego's life that accompanied the successful push for canonization. The fact that none of the fifteenth century depositions taken from people who actually knew the saint mentions this anchoritic episode renders it suspect.

16. For a history of the Canary Islands, see: José de Viera y Clavijo, *Noticias de la Historia General de las Islas Canarias*, 3 vols. (Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Goya-Ediciones, 1950-52).

17. The observant house on Fuerteventura was founded in 1416, nearly three decades before Diego's arrival. Presumably, its members had been evangelizing the native population ever since that time. See Moorman, 193.

18. Later historians would dub 1450 the Jubilee of Six Saints, since six of those in attendance, including four Franciscans, ultimately achieved sainthood. Antonio Hernández Parrales, *Breve Compendio de la Vida de fray Diego de san nicolás del Puerto vulgarmente conocido por San Diego de Alcalá* (Seville: Imprenta Provincial, 1964), 30.

19. H. Marto, "Les Fetes de la Canonisation de Saint Bernardin de Sienne á Rome en 1450," *Etudes franciscaines*, Vol. 30, (Paris, 1913), 156-68.

20. Vicente Ferrer owed his canonization to the first Borgia pope, Callixtus III (1455-1458). While still a young priest, Alonso de Borja had encountered the old preacher who had confidently predicted that he would rise to the papacy. William Rolfe (Frederick Baron Corvo), *Chronicles of the House of Borgia* (New York: Dover Publications, n. d.), 13-14. Michael Mallett, *The Borgias* (Chicago: Academy Chicago Publishers, 1987), 69. Henry Gheon's widely-cited biography, *St. Vincent Ferrer* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954) is an uncritical devotional work, of far greater interest for what it tells us about its author (a Catholic "born again" in the crucible of the First World War) than for any serious study of its subject. Of far greater interest is Laura A. Smoller's recent article, "Miracle, Memory, and Meaning in the Canonization of Vicent Ferrer, 1453-1454," *Speculum* 73, (April, 1998), 429-454.

21. Cecil Roth, *A History of the Marranos* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 17, 22; *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York: 1937), 25, 29. Henry Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York, 1965), 18, 47, 225.

22. Henry (Spanish: Enrique) IV's twenty year reign (1454-1474) is one of the best-documented of the Castilian Middle Ages. A number of chronicles survive including: Alonso de Palencia, *Crónica de Enrique IV*, ed. A. Paz y Melia, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles [BAE], vols. 256-57, 267 (Madrid, Ediciones Atlas, 1973-1975). Diego Enríquez del Castillo, *Crónica del Rey Don Enrique el Cuarto*, in *Crónicas de los Reyes de Castilla [CRC]*, vol. 3, in BAE 70 (Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1953), 99-222. Mosen Diego de Valera, *Memorial de Diversas Hazañas* in CRC 3, BAE 70 (Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1953), 3-95. Juan Torres Fontes, *Estudio sobre la "Crónica de Enrique IV" del Dr. Galíndez de Carvajal [Carvajal]*

(Murcia: Suc. de Nogues, 1946). A brief contemporary description of the king can be found in Hernando del Pulgar, *Claros Varones de Castilla* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1954), 9-20. The best modern biography is William D. Phillips, *Enrique IV and the Crisis of Fifteenth-Century Castile, 1425-1480* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1978). Gregorio Marañón, *Ensayo Biológico sobre Enrique IV de Castilla y su Tiempo* (Madrid: 1964) for a widely-known albeit highly speculative medical diagnosis of this controversial monarch. Several sources attribute the construction of Diego's chapel to Henry, including Rojo, 144 and Azaña, 429.

23. Surviving sources give no indication that Diego's cult extended beyond Alcalá, in particular to the region of his birth around Seville.

24. The most important treatment of Don Carlos is still the mid-nineteenth century work by Louis Prosper Gachard, *Don Carlos et Philippe II*, 2 vols. (Bruxelles: E. Devroye, imprimeur du roi, 1863). A twentieth century historian who has written extensively about the Don Carlos story is C. D. O'Malley, whose work on the topic grew out of his interest in Andreas Vesalius, the great anatomist whose career intersected that of the prince in 1562. See: O'Malley, *Andreas Vesalius of Brussels 1514-1564* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964); *Don Carlos of Spain: A Medical Portrait* (Los Angeles: University of California, 1969). For a more recent account in Spanish of Vesalius and his interaction with the prince, see: José Barón Fernández, *Andrés Vesalio: Su Vida y su Obra* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1970).

25. For a detailed account of the prince's accident and the medical treatment, which ensued, see my article: "Putting Don Carlos Together Again."

26. Gachard, *Don Carlos*, 2:640.

27. "Desdichoso" meaning "unfortunate" or "unhappy" was a sobriquet applied to Prince Carlos at least as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century when Spanish bishop and historian, Prudencio de Sandoval, wrote his history of Charles V. According to the introductory study, he published this work sometime between 1604 and 1607. See: Prudencio de Sandoval, *Historia de la Vida y Hechos del Emperador Carlos V*, 3 vols. in Biblioteca de Autores Españoles 80-82 (Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1956), 80:xix, 82:220.

28. Four Venetian ambassadors have left reports detailing the prince's odd behavior during the decade before his arrest—Federigo Badoaro (1557), Antonio Tiépolo (1563 and 1567), Giovanni Soranzo (1565), and Sigismundo Cavalli (1568). *Le Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Venuti al Senuto*, ed. Eugenio Alberi (Firenze: Aspesse dell Editore, 1861), Serie I: 5, 74-75. L. P. Gachard, *Carlos V y Felipe II a través de sus contemporáneos* (Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1944), 52-54, 109-111, 144-45. *The Pursuit of Power: Venetian Ambassadors' Reports on Turkey, France, and Spain in the Age of Philip II (1560-1600)*, ed. James C. Davis (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 87-95.

29. *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series [CSP/Foreign]*, (Elizabeth, 1566-68) (London: Longmans, 1871), 5: 513.

30. When rumors began to circulate almost immediately after the arrest, Spanish ambassadors at Vienna and London informed Madrid that the Protestant camp was having a field day, spreading the word that Carlos had been imprisoned for his Protestant sympathies—a totally unfounded claim which later became part of the myth. Despite these warnings, the king adopted the view that this was a personal matter and became stubbornly uncommunicative. Even his Austrian cousins, who had hoped to arrange a marriage with the Spanish prince,

complained that they were not being told enough. Although interest in the affair waned after the prince's death, it resurfaced violently in 1580 when William the Silent, in his famous *Apoloogy*, accused Philip II of infanticide. Gachard, *Don Carlos*, 2: 572-76. *Calendar of Letters and State Papers relating to English Affairs preserved principally in the Archives of Simancas [CSP/Spanish]*, (Elizabeth, 1568) (London, Longmans, 1892), 2: 6-8, 21. Numerous printed sources on Don Carlos appear in the 112-volume *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España [CDIHE]*, published in Madrid between 1842-1895. See *CDIHE*, 27 (Madrid, Imprenta de la Viuda de Calero, 1855), 10.

31. There are several works that trace the literary treatment of the Don Carlos myth over the centuries. See, for example: Frederick W. C. Lieder, *The Don Carlos Theme*, Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, vol. 12 (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1930). Lieder unearthed 105 such treatments and explored their interrelationship.

32. Friedrich Schiller, "Don Carlos", in *Historical Dramas* (Boston: Dana Estes & Co., n. d.): 117-336. See also Thomas Carlyle, *The Life of Friedrich Schiller in Complete Works of Thomas Carlyle* (New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1901).

33. Gunther, Ursula, *The Complete Edition of Don Carlos by Giuseppe Verdi* (English translation by Lionel Salter) (Milan: Ricordi, 1978). See also *The Victor Book of Opera* (Camden, N. J.: RCA Manufacturing, Inc., 1936): 105-106. Leo Melitz, *The Opera Goers Complete Guide*, trans. Richard Salinger (Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Co., 1911), 515-17.

34. My particular thanks go to Dr. Sander Goodman of the University of Cincinnati who generously gave of his time to walk me through the medical aspects of the case.

35. Two lengthy accounts of the prince's injury have survived, the primary one written by his surgeon, Dionisio Daza Chacon, the other by his personal physician, Santiago Diego Olivares. Chacon and Olivares are most easily consulted through the *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España*. Dionisio Daza Chacon, "Relación Verdadera de la herida de cabeza del Serenísimo Príncipe D. Carlos nuestro Señor, de gloriosa memoria, la cual se acabo en fin de julio del año de 1562" in *CDIHE* 18 (Madrid, Imprenta de la Viuda de Calero, 1851), 537-63; and Santiago Diego Olivares "Relación de la enfermedad del Príncipe D. Carlos en Alcalá por el Doctor Olivares medico de su camara" in *CDIHE* 15 (Madrid, Imprenta de la Viuda de Calero, 1849), 554-75. In addition, an anonymous account, "Relación del suceso de la enfermedad y cura del príncipe nuestro señor, hasta los xxvii de mayo 1562, en Alcalá," was unearthed in the mid-nineteenth century at the Archivo General de Simancas, and printed in Gachard, *Don Carlos*, 2: 627-31. Although far shorter than either Chacon or Olivares, it does add some information.

36. Luis Cabrera de Córdoba, *Felipe Segundo, Rey de España*, 2 vols. (Madrid: Imprenta de Aribau y Compania, 1876), 1:348-49.

37. I am indebted to C.D. O'Malley whose footnote first led me to this obscure, but crucial article. See O'Malley, *Andreas Vesalius*, 469.

38. Fr. Lucio María Núñez, "Documentos sobre la curación del príncipe D. Carlos y la canonización de San Diego de Alcalá," *Archivo Ibero-americano*, 1914, 1: 424-46; 1915, 4: 374-87; 5: 107-26, 421-30.

39. The first history of the saint, entitled *Vita B. Didaci Complutensis*, was written around 1567 by the Cordoban priest and royal chronicler, Ambrosio de Morales, to be sent to Rome. It is printed in the three volume collection of Morales' works: *Opúsculos Castellanos de Am-*

broisio de Morales, cuyos originales se conservan Inéditos en la Real Biblioteca de Monasterio del Escorial, ed Fr. Francisco Valerio Cifuentes (Madrid: En la Oficina de D. Benito Cano, 1793), 3:190-232. At the time of canonization two decades later, Sixtus V assigned Pietro Galesini to produce his *Sancti Didaci Complutensis canonizatio quam Sixtus V. Pont. opt. max.* (Rome: Ex Typographia Vaticana, 1588). At approximately this same time, several other accounts were written. See: Cardinal Marco Antonio Colonna, *Relatio de vita et miraculis B. F. Didaci de S. Nicolao* (Rome: Ex Typographia Vaticana, 1588); Francisco Peña, *De vita, et actis canonizationis Sancti Didaci* (Rome: Ex Typographia Vaticana, 1589).

40. Rojo, *Historia de San Diego*.

41. *Archivo General de Simancas*, Sección de Estado [AGS, *Estado*], legajos 890-954.

42. In October, 1994, I delivered this paper at the Sixteenth Century Studies Conference in Toronto. In March, 1995, the *Catholic Historical Review* accepted the revised version that appeared in September, 1997.

43. AGS, *Estado* 905 (March 17, 1567), (September 15, 1567).

44. Over the years, my wife, Dr. Ann Twinam, a professor of Latin American history at the University of Cincinnati, and I have often functioned as a team, helping one another with research. Rome proved no exception though on this occasion we were both hobbled by our lack of Italian.

45. San Lorenzo de el Escorial is the magnificent edifice, which Philip II constructed some forty kilometers north of Madrid during the 1560s to serve as a royal palace, a Jeronymite monastery, and ultimately, a tomb. Although there is an Anglicized version of the name (Escorial), this article will employ the Spanish spelling.

46. *Catálogo de los Manuscritos Castellanos de la Real Biblioteca de el Escorial* [RBE, *Catálogo*], 3 vols. (San Lorenzo de el Escorial, 1929).

47. See entry for the document designated “&.II.15” in RBE, *Catálogo* 1: 272-74.

48. This included the *vitae sanctorum*, prepared as part of the canonizing process, the detailed medical accounts of the prince’s injury mentioning Diego’s “visit” to the sickroom, the documents selected and published during the first World War by Fra Lucio, the diplomatic papers at Simancas, and now, the document in the Escorial that reproduced at least some of the material gathered during the inquiry of the 1560s.

49. RBE, *Catálogo*, 1: 271. The catalogue description characterizes the document as having been written in “Letra muy buena, imitando la gótica de imprenta, del siglo XVI.” Such a script was already archaic in handwritten manuscripts.

50. While explaining that the document contains “original writings” on the life and miracles of San Diego and that Don Carlos ordered them to be copied, the catalogue does not give any indication that a good many of these writings dated back to the fifteenth century, in particular to the four years following the saint’s death. When first reading the description, I assumed (as others have probably done before me) that it referred to writings being gathered from witnesses to the “healing” of Don Carlos in 1562 and that, therefore, this was a document generated by the sixteenth century inquiry undertaken in response to the order from Rome.

51. In 1914/15, Fra Lucio María Núñez failed to extract any part of this source for inclusion in his article. In his short book commemorating the quincentennial of Diego’s death,

Perrales also failed to mention its existence. In *Saints and Society*, Weinstein and Bell categorize San Diego as one of those saints whom they have been able to study only on the basis of information dating to about a century after his death, from which one may infer that their earliest sources were the *vitae sanctorum*, produced in the late sixteenth century as part of the canonization process.

52. Thomas E. Case, *La historia de San Diego de Alcalá. Su vida, su canonización y su legado. The Story of San Diego de Alcalá. His Life, His Canonization and His Legacy* (Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 1997), 123. The work is part of a series commemorating the 500th anniversary of the University of Alcalá.

53. Although the fate of the original documents copied by the scribe, Andrés Corchado, is unknown, they may have been among the materials lost when the Archivo Central de Alcalá was destroyed by fire in 1939.

54. The article is based on a paper originally presented in September, 1997, at the University College Faculty Forum and later delivered during the 33rd International Congress on Medieval Studies in May, 1998, at Kalamazoo, Michigan. Shortly after the meeting of the Ohio Academy it appeared in print. See: "The Miracle Book of San Diego de Alcalá," *Mediterranean Studies*, 9-35.

55. *Pursuit of Power*, 87-95.

56. ASV, filza 4, letter from Ambassador Paolo Tiépolo (May 26, 1562); filza 22, letters from Giovanni Gritti (spring, 1589).