

# Leeds Studies in English

## Article:

Philip Shaw, 'The Dating of William of Malmesbury's Miracles of the Virgin', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 37 (2006), 391-405

## Permanent URL:

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=123827&silos\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123827&silos_library=GEN01)



*Leeds Studies in English*  
School of English  
University of Leeds  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

# The Dating of William of Malmesbury's *Miracles of the Virgin*<sup>1</sup>

Philip Shaw

William of Malmesbury's *Miracula Sanctae Mariae Virginis* (*Miracles of the Virgin*) is perhaps not as well known as his *Gesta Regum Anglorum* or his *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, but it has long been known to Marian scholars as an important text in the early development of the Marian miracle collections which were to become one of the most popular literary forms of the high and later Middle Ages.<sup>2</sup> Richard Southern has argued that such collections developed first in England, spreading from there to the rest of Europe.<sup>3</sup> Southern does not argue that England produced the earliest collections of Marian miracles – still less the earliest individual accounts of such miracles – but that the English collections of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries introduced an innovation which was instrumental in the emergence of the huge later collections. The earliest continental collections had been collections of miracles associated with a particular locality, composed for local communities.<sup>4</sup> The English collections moved beyond this local impact, bringing together miracles associated with various localities; these collections, although initially small in size, were the first universal collections – or at least the first potentially universal collections. Without this first step, very large collections such as Gautier de Coinci's *Miracles de Nostre Dame* and the *Cantigas de Santa María* of Alfonso X (el Sabio) would perhaps not have developed.

Southern points to the collection which Mussafia termed the HM-TS series (which Southern ascribes, not implausibly, to Anselm of Bury, nephew of St Anselm, writing in the first quarter of the twelfth century) as the starting point of the tradition.<sup>5</sup> He argues that Dominic of Evesham's *De Miraculis Sanctae Mariae* was produced shortly after HM-TS, and William of Malmesbury's *Miracula* within around twenty years of Dominic's collection.<sup>6</sup> Southern does not address the relationship between the collections of Dominic and William, because

Peter Carter was in the process of producing his doctoral thesis on William's collection at the time Southern was writing.<sup>7</sup> Carter, in an article based on this thesis, argued that William's text is a combination and re-writing of the two earlier collections, together with a smaller collection of versified miracles.<sup>8</sup> He provides a table setting out the miracles narrated by William, with indications of the probable sources for these accounts.<sup>9</sup> This is extremely useful, but perhaps gives a false impression that William's compositional process was to a large extent one of stitching together a number of smaller collections – Dominic's *De Miraculis*, HM-TS, and the series of (usually) six narratives in rhythmical Latin which Carter terms MB. This does appear to be Carter's view of the collection:

This means that only a small fraction of the collection is original, as far as we can now tell: 'The Jews of Toulouse', 'Guy Bishop of Lescar', 'Guimund and Drogo', 'Rustic Church Enlarged', and 'Mary Image confounds Saracens' all probably come from oral testimony while the stories about Pavian saints [ . . . ] and those about Constantinople [ . . . ] are compiled from William's own research. 'Prayers of a Friend' and 'Dying Freeliver' appear to have come from written miracle stories but these have not been traced.<sup>10</sup>

Leaving aside the issue of originality, it seems clear that this misrepresents William's compositional process. In his edition of the *Miracula*, Canal, like Carter, notes that William shares several miracles with Dominic of Evesham: but, unlike Carter, he does not assume that, in most cases where William recounts the same miracle as Dominic, he is using Dominic as a direct source. Canal's caution is justified: a closer look at the relationship between Dominic's and William's versions of shared episodes suggests a rather more complex picture.<sup>11</sup>

While a detailed account of the relationship between William's text and that of Dominic cannot be provided in an article of this size, a brief summary may be useful here. Dominic's text often follows an obvious source quite closely. For instance, Dominic's account of Theophilus is closely based on the *Paenitentia Theophili*.<sup>12</sup> William's version of this miracle is not strikingly similar in wording or content to either Dominic's account or the *Paenitentia*. Nevertheless, it echoes some words and phrases present in Dominic's account, but none which are not also present in the *Paenitentia*. In a few cases, William's narrative agrees with the *Paenitentia* against Dominic. The execution of the Jewish magician appears in the

*Paenitentia* and in William's version, but not in Dominic's. In introducing the magician into the story, William echoes the phrasing used by the *Paenitentia*, writing 'erat in eadem urbe hebraeus' ('there was in that same city a Jew'; the *Paenitentia* has 'erat denique in eadem civitate hebraeus'; 'there was, finally, in that same city a Jew').<sup>13</sup> Dominic retains the word *civitas* from the *Paenitentia*, but re-arranges the sentence and replaces *eadem* with *praelibata*: 'ea tempestate quidam nefandissimus hebraeus in praelibata civitate erat' ('at that time a certain most wicked Jew was in the aforesaid city'). The *Paenitentia* has Mary instruct Theophilus, 'confitere mihi, o homo' ('confess to me, O man').<sup>14</sup> William preserves the word *mihi* while removing 'o homo', while Dominic preserves 'o homo' while removing *mihi*. It appears, then, that William probably used the *Paenitentia* directly, although we cannot rule out the possibility that he also consulted Dominic's version. Similar evidence can be found in some of the other miracles shared between William's and Dominic's texts.<sup>15</sup> William probably did use Dominic's collection, but he did not follow it closely, and seems frequently to have availed himself other sources – often Dominic's sources, but, as we shall see, in at least one case of a source not used by Dominic.

This case is in William's version of the story of the Jewish boy who is thrown into an oven by his father. This story, which became extremely well-known in the later medieval miracle collections, had already achieved a wide circulation by William's day as a miracle relevant to debates over transubstantiation.<sup>16</sup> Both William and Dominic include in their collections versions of this miracle, but there are no obvious parallels of phrasing between them. Carter has shown that Dominic's account almost certainly derives from the version in HM-TS, which is itself based on Paschasius Radbertus's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*.<sup>17</sup> It has been supposed that William then based his account on Dominic's, but this seems unlikely. Their narratives differ substantially, with Dominic's representing a much fuller and more detailed account. In William's version, a Jewish boy in Pisa, in a spirit of play, joins other boys in going to church and receiving the Eucharist. He then plays until his mealtime, when he goes home, and his parents gently ask where he has been. In his childish innocence, he tells the truth, and his father, enraged, hurls him into the oven. His mother begins to cry out, and Christians rush in and rescue the child, who is entirely unharmed. They ask how he escaped the flames, and he replies that the beautiful woman whom he saw sitting on a throne, and whose son the people divided among themselves, kept him safe from the flames. At this point, they

realise that Mary kept the boy safe, and that she revealed the mystery of the Eucharist to him.<sup>18</sup>

Dominic's version is much fuller. The Jewish boy, seeing some Christian companions, goes along with them, and, on going into the church, simply does as others are doing. He looks around the church, seeing the cross, and an image of the Virgin. He goes up with the rest for the Eucharist, and it seems to him that the image of the Virgin is distributing the host along with the priest. Meanwhile, the boy's parents are frantic with worry about their missing child, seeking him everywhere. When, after the Mass, he returns home, they question him with threats about where he has been, and the terrified boy tells them. His father becomes enraged, and hurls him into an oven and blocks up the door. His mother begins to cry out, and the populace and the judges rush in. They are stupefied at this terrible deed, but, to their surprise, see that the boy alive and well, and playing amid the flames. When he is taken out, he explains that the woman whom he saw standing above the altar in church, and distributing the host, protected him from the flames. Everyone praises the mercy of Mary, and it is decided to punish the boy's father by casting him into the oven. The boy and his mother are then baptised, and almost all the Jews of the city are converted.<sup>19</sup>

The narrative as it appears in HM-TS is similar in its essentials to Dominic's, but shorter, and lacking the detail of the parents' anxiety.<sup>20</sup> These versions tie up all the loose ends which are left hanging in William's version, such as the fate of the father. They lack the emphasis on miraculous witness of transubstantiation present in William's narrative. The different geographical settings of the accounts are significant; William's setting of Pisa is anomalous, while HM-TS and Dominic's Bourges is seen in many versions of this miracle.<sup>21</sup> The difference in setting is intriguing, but it remains unclear why William should introduce Pisa.<sup>22</sup> The miraculous witness of transubstantiation in William's account is essentially irrelevant in the context of a collection of Marian miracles: the miracle which is of importance here is Mary's protection of the boy in the oven. HM-TS and Dominic's *De Miraculis* seem to reflect a realisation of this problem, removing the transubstantiation and replacing it with the boy's vision of Mary distributing the host. This seems an awkward attempt to turn this part of the narrative into another Marian miracle.

If William's account differs significantly from those of HM-TS and Dominic, it differs no less from that of Paschasius Radbertus's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, the probable source of HM-TS. William's presentation of the Jewish boy as a witness to transubstantiation is lacking in Paschasius's text.

Paschasius does include Jesus as a key figure in the Eucharist in the boy's vision, but says simply that he 'propria manu sacram communionem sacerdoti porrigebat' ('was providing the holy communion to the priest with his own hand').<sup>23</sup> HM-TS and Dominic re-assign Jesus's role here to Mary, choosing to focus solely on Mary who is, after all, their main subject. William takes the interesting step of having the boy say that he was protected in the oven by the lady he saw sitting on a throne in the church, 'cuius filius populo diuideatur' ('whose son was divided among the people').<sup>24</sup> This is an ambiguous presentation of the vision. It is unclear whether the boy is claiming to have seen Jesus divided among the people, or whether he is simply expressing his (perhaps somewhat surprising) knowledge of the doctrine of transubstantiation. That William intended the former is suggested by the version of this episode which he includes in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, in which the Jewish boy 'uidit puerum in ara membratim discerpi et uiritim populo diuidi' ('saw a child on the altar being torn limb from limb and distributed individually to the people').<sup>25</sup>

There remains, however, another possible source to consider. In his commentary on this miracle in his thesis, Carter quotes a short version of the story from a sermon for Christmas Day by Herbert Losinga, Bishop of Norwich.<sup>26</sup> Curiously, Carter does not consider the possibility that William made use of this version; yet a comparison of his two versions with Losinga's text reveals a number of shared words and phrases. Herbert states that the miracle took place 'die sancto paschæ' ('on the holy day of Easter'); William, in his *Miracula*, gives the date as 'die paschae' ('on the day of Easter').<sup>27</sup> Herbert claims that the boy 'et coevos suos ad altare accederet. et sacram communionem acciperet' ('and his peers approached the altar and received holy communion').<sup>28</sup> In his *Miracula*, William says that the boy 'ceterisque ad altare pro communione accedentibus, pariter accesserat' ('when the others were approaching the altar for communion, likewise approached it');<sup>29</sup> in his *Gesta Regum*, the boy goes to communion 'cum aequo Christiano' ('with a Christian boy of his own age'; in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 712, and in London, British Library Harley 447, *coequo* appears, rather than *aequeo*).<sup>30</sup> In Herbert's sermon, the boy's honesty in telling his mother what he has been doing is put down to 'puerili simplicitate' ('youthful guilelessness'), while in William's accounts it is ascribed to 'puerili innocentia' ('youthful innocence'; *Miracula*) or 'innocentia puerili' (*Gesta Regum*).<sup>31</sup> Herbert, like William and Dominic, uses the word *clibanus* for the oven into which the boy is thrown.<sup>32</sup> In William's *Miracula*, as in Herbert's sermon, the boy is asked, when he is pulled from the oven, 'quomodo euasisset' ('how he escaped [death by burning]').<sup>33</sup>

In the *Gesta Regum*, the wording is similar, but not exactly the same: 'interrogatusque quomodo uoraces ignium globos euaserit' ('when asked how he escaped the flames of the devouring fire').<sup>34</sup>

Some of these phrases are present in the HM-TS account: the date is 'die solemnitatis paschē' ('on the day of the solemnity of Easter'), the boy 'ad altare accessit' ('approached the altar'), and he is asked 'quomodo euasisset' ('how he escaped [death by burning]); but his *innocentia* or *simplicitas* do not figure in his decision to tell his father where he has been, and he is thrown into a *fornax* rather than a *clibanus*.<sup>35</sup> It is, of course, possible that William took the term *clibanus* from Dominic, and the other details from HM-TS; but this would not account for the boy's fatal *innocentia*, which is paralleled in Herbert's version. These correspondences provide fairly convincing evidence, then, that William had access to something very like Herbert Losinga's account.<sup>36</sup> Certainly, there are differences between his accounts and Herbert's – Herbert places the miracle in an indeterminate Greek city, and has the boy reveal his participation in communion first to his mother, who then tells his father – but these are no greater than the differences between William's own two versions: for instance, in the *Gesta Regum* the boy is rescued only after several hours, whereas in the *Miracula*, as in the majority of versions, he is rescued very quickly. William evidently knew of Herbert Losinga, as he appears in both the *Gesta Regum* and in the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*.<sup>37</sup> Herbert is also cited as a source elsewhere in William's *Miracula*, in the story of St Bon, in which it is said that Herbert had seen the saint's garment.<sup>38</sup> It seems quite plausible, then, that William should have had access to a copy of Herbert's sermon for Christmas Day, or to a closely-related text, and that he should have used it in composing his versions of the story of the Jewish boy's communion.

It is significant that William's account in his *Miracula* appears more closely related to Herbert's narrative than does that in the *Gesta Regum*. Many of the parallels discussed above appear in both of William's versions, but in many cases the parallel is more exact in the *Miracula*. The term *clibanus*, moreover, is replaced by *rogus* in the *Gesta Regum* – a term which does not appear in any of the other accounts discussed so far.<sup>39</sup> This is surprising, given that the *Gesta Regum* is generally supposed to have been composed prior to the *Miracula*. One might expect that William would have composed the version in the *Gesta Regum*, based on Herbert's, and then used the *Gesta Regum* version in composing the version in his *Miracula*. Yet this is unlikely to have been the case. While it is tempting to suppose that William simply used Herbert's sermon on both

occasions, but more freely on the first, this would not satisfactorily account for the fact that both of William's versions have the same set of echoes from Herbert's account (with the exception of the innovative use of *rogus* in the *Gesta Regum*). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that William may well have composed the version which appears in his *Miracula* before that which appears in the *Gesta Regum*, and that the latter is based on the former.

This order of composition would also account for William's emphasis on transubstantiation, which is lacking in Dominic's account, and in HM-TS, and in the version by Paschasius Radbertus. Herbert does not explicitly depict the Jewish boy as miraculously witnessing transubstantiation, but he does include, in the boy's explanation of his miraculous protection in the oven, the statement that he was saved by the protection of the boy 'cujus super aram christianorum sanctissimum accepi corpus' ('whose most holy body I received on the altar of the christians').<sup>40</sup> William's *Miracula*, like Herbert's account, makes no reference to transubstantiation at the point at which the boy receives communion, but rather includes a reference in the boy's explanatory speech. In the *Miracula*, of course, William presents Mary alone as saving the boy, but nevertheless describes her as the lady 'cuius filius populo diuideatur' ('whose son was divided among the people').<sup>41</sup> While these two phrases are quite different in wording, they appear at the same juncture in both accounts, and they both draw attention to the boy's understanding of transubstantiation, and his apprehension of this process in the communion he has recently attended. That William is essentially following Herbert here, modifying his source only in order to present Mary as the sole miracle worker (a very necessary alteration for a collection of Marian miracles), seems wholly plausible.

If William then later used the account in his *Miracula* in composing that which appears in his *Gesta Regum*, he might very naturally have taken the reference to transubstantiation in the boy's explanatory speech as indicating that the boy actually witnessed transubstantiation. In Herbert's account, the boy's understanding of transubstantiation can easily be attributed to the schooling of Jews by Christians, which Herbert specifically remarks on as causing Jewish children to learn something of christian doctrine: 'veritatis succus teneris iudæorum mentibus paulatim infundebatur' ('the elixir of truth was gradually poured into the young minds of the Jews').<sup>42</sup> In William's *Miracula*, this element of Herbert's account is omitted; if William used the narrative from his *Miracula*, then, in composing the version in his *Gesta Regum*, he would have had no indication in the source from which he was working that the boy would have been



in any position to understand transubstantiation due to his schooling. Since William is specifically discussing the controversy surrounding transubstantiation in this chapter of his *Gesta Regum*, it is perhaps only natural that he should take the boy's speech as an indication that he had come to understand transubstantiation through miraculous witness.

If this sequence of composition is correct, it makes a very considerable difference to our understanding of the development of William's *Miracula*, and, indeed, to our knowledge of the development of Marian miracle collections more generally. Southern suggests that Dominic of Evesham was writing his *De Miraculis* between around 1120-1125 and 1130.<sup>43</sup> If this is correct, and if Carter is correct in believing that William used the account of the siege of Chartres in Dominic's *De Miraculis* in composing his own version of that episode in his *Gesta Regum*, then Dominic's work must have been available to William very soon after its composition.<sup>44</sup> Interestingly, there is one possible indication that William's account of the siege of Chartres in the *Gesta Regum* is based on that in his *Miracula*, and not, as has previously been thought, *vice versa*. Both accounts are very similarly worded, and one must clearly have been taken from the other, but there is nothing in their wording which suggests the direction of influence. Both of William's accounts tell us that one of the French kings named Charles obtained Mary's tunic from Constantinople and gave it to Chartres – a fact which does not appear in accounts prior to William's.<sup>45</sup> In the *Gesta Regum*, William states that this king was Charles the Bald; in the *Miracula*, he merely says that 'unus ex Karolis' ('one of the Charleses') imported the tunic.<sup>46</sup> If William was copying his account from the *Gesta Regum* in composing that in his *Miracula*, this would be surprising. As Carter has shown, William takes considerable (though not always effective) pains to situate many of the miracles in his collection in their historical contexts.<sup>47</sup> If William did wish to present the miracle with less specificity, there is no reason why he could not have omitted entirely the name of the king who gave the tunic to Chartres. The simplest explanation of the fact that William identifies the particular Charles in question in the *Gesta Regum*, but not in the *Miracula*, is that the account in the *Gesta Regum* was written after the account in the *Miracula* and incorporates extra information about which William was uncertain when he wrote the *Miracula* version. This would be consistent with our knowledge of his revisions of the *Gesta Regum* in the light of new information becoming available to him.<sup>48</sup>

William's improving understanding of the historical contexts for the siege of Chartres also appears to be reflected in his use, a few chapters earlier in the

*Gesta Regum*, of some phrasing which occurs in the opening part of his *Miracula* account. In the *Miracula*, William presents Rollo as 'tota paene Gallia et maxime circa maritima grassatus' ('having descended on almost the whole of Gaul and most greatly around the sea-coasts').<sup>49</sup> To suggest that Rollo had descended on almost the whole of Gaul is to exaggerate the scale of the Norman incursions, if not their perceived impact. The account in the *Gesta Regum* is more accurate, noting that, as a prelude to the siege of Chartres, 'omnia inquietauerint Northmanni ab oceano Britannico, ut ante commemorauit, usque ad Tirrenum mare' ('the Northmen set everything in turmoil from the British ocean, as I have described already, to the Tyrrhenian Sea').<sup>50</sup> William's cross-reference here is to the section of chapter 121 in which he claims that Hasting and his followers 'tota enim ora maritima usque ad mare Tirrenum grassati' ('descended upon the whole sea-coast as far as the Tyrrhenian sea').<sup>51</sup> Carter supposed that William used this phrase as the source for the opening part of the *Miracula* account quoted above.<sup>52</sup> Given William's cross-reference within the *Gesta Regum*, it is certainly not impossible that he might have checked back to the earlier chapter, and borrowed a few words, in composing his version for the *Miracula*. It is, however, at least equally likely, and perhaps even more likely, that William was using his *Miracula* account in composing the account in the *Gesta Regum*, and that he was prompted to create the cross-reference precisely by his use of an account in which this phrasing is more closely connected with introducing the siege of Chartres.

It seems possible, then, that at least parts of William's *Miracula* were composed prior to the composition of the parallel episodes in the *Gesta Regum*. These episodes in the *Gesta Regum* were already present in the earliest complete text of the *Gesta Regum*, which was in circulation by 1126.<sup>53</sup> This has important implications for our understanding of the dating of William's *Miracula*, its process of composition, and its relationship with Dominic of Evesham's collection. The currently accepted dating of William's *Miracula* rests principally on the belief that William used Dominic's collection as a source, and on statements within the text which suggest that William was writing towards the end of his life.<sup>54</sup> The fact that the two manuscripts of the *Miracula* have the miracles in quite different orders has been interpreted by Carter as evidence that William originally set the miracles out in one order, which he later revised. Carter has found convincing evidence in the text of the Salisbury manuscript for this process of revision.<sup>55</sup> It does not seem implausible, then, that the *Miracula*, like the *Gesta Regum*, was revised over many years, and perhaps released at different points in time in different arrangements. One might therefore suppose that

William wrote his versions of the siege of Chartres and the Jewish boy for the *Miracula* very early in his career, and that these subsequently found their way into the first version of the *Gesta Regum*. It need not be the case that the *Miracula* as a whole was completed prior to the completion of the *Gesta Regum* (though this cannot be ruled out); the *Miracula* could have been an ongoing project of many years or even decades.

Doubts about the dating of William's *Miracula*, and the duration of the compositional process, clearly impact on our understanding of its relationship with Dominic's *De Miraculis*. Dominic's text can be dated only by our knowledge of Dominic's career, and by the assumption that Dominic's text was used by William in composing his *Miracula*. Our knowledge of Dominic's career is scanty. Jennings has shown that he was a monk at Evesham by 1104, that he became Prior there by 1125, and that his successor as Prior was in office by 1145.<sup>56</sup> If William was already writing his *Miracula* by 1126, then it is possible that the parallels between some of William's narratives and some of Dominic's narratives are in fact due to Dominic's knowledge of William's text, and not *vice versa*. It remains more likely that William drew on Dominic's text, as William tends, when he is following Dominic, to depart further from Dominic's sources than Dominic already had. It is important, however, to realise that William in all likelihood began his *Miracula* while Dominic was still Prior of Evesham. In his re-working of some of Dominic's narratives, and his occasional rejection of Dominic in favour of other sources, William can be seen to be engaging in a vital process of developing and refining Marian miracle collections very early in their development. William's work should not simply be seen as a process of second-generation compilation based on selecting and copying miracles from first-generation texts. William's text is, in fact, one of the first generation texts. William at least started his *Miracula* within Dominic's lifetime, and he makes a very definite attempt to answer Dominic's text, going back to Dominic's sources for further information, or even using entirely different sources for the same miracle.

Southern, in his seminal article discussed above, chose to see the HM-TS collection and Dominic's collection as the earliest examples of Marian miracle collections with more than a local agenda. For Southern, the origins of this genre, which was to become ever more popular and ever more compendious throughout the Middle Ages, were with these two English collections. Yet Dominic's collection, as Jennings has pointed out, was composed by the Prior of a monastic house dedicated to Mary; a man whose writings are, according to Jennings, 'all centred on Evesham'.<sup>57</sup> Moreover, Dominic concludes his collection with a

miracle located in Evesham.<sup>58</sup> While the miracles as a whole have a wide variety of locations, Dominic's collection is in many ways a response to a local interest, even if the collection has more than local interest. The HM-TS collection is, if Southern is correct in his attribution to the younger Anselm, also the product of a circle, if a well-travelled one. William's text is different, and not just because it is larger. William's text represents the true step away from the local collection, because it simply attempts to collect noteworthy miracles, without regard to a particular circle of individuals, or to a particular locality or monastic house. Indeed, William enjoys demonstrating his knowledge of a variety of cities across Europe.<sup>59</sup> If William fails to mention Dominic as his source, and suppresses the name of the younger Anselm, perhaps this is not, as Carter implies, a deliberate attempt to obscure his use of sources, but a product of the fact that William was by no means solely reliant on these individuals' collections.<sup>60</sup> William seems, moreover, to be writing a new sort of collection – a collection designed from the start to possess supra-local appeal.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Mary Swan and Siân Prosser for advice on the structure and content of this article. Penny Eley and Elaine Treharne both gave valuable advice on features of twelfth-century manuscripts. Any errors are, of course, my own.

<sup>2</sup> There are two modern editions of the text: Peter Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise on the Miracles of the Virgin', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1960); José-María Canal, 'El Libro *De Laudibus et Miraculis Sanctae Mariae* de Guillermo de Malmesbury, O. S. B. († c. 1143)', *Claretianum*, 8 (1968), 71-242.

<sup>3</sup> R. W. Southern, 'The English Origins of the "Miracles of the Virgin"', *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, 4 (1958), 176-216.

<sup>4</sup> Southern notes especially the collections of Fécamp, Soissons and Laon (p. 178).

<sup>5</sup> Southern, pp. 183-200.

<sup>6</sup> Southern, pp. 182-83 and 200-01.

<sup>7</sup> Southern, p. 201.

<sup>8</sup> Peter Carter, 'The Historical Content of William of Malmesbury's Miracles of the Virgin Mary', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. by R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 127-65 (pp. 137-38).

<sup>9</sup> Carter, 'Historical Content', pp. 133-36.

<sup>10</sup> Carter, 'Historical Content', p. 138.

<sup>11</sup> I have suggested elsewhere that William's account of the death of Julian the Apostate may depend as much on the Pseudo-Amphilochian *Vita Sancti Basilii* as on Dominic's text (Philip Shaw, 'A Dead Killer? Saint Mercurius, Killer of Julian the Apostate, in the Works of William of Malmesbury', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 35 (2004), 1-22, (p. 4)). This miracle will therefore not be discussed in this paper.

<sup>12</sup> The *Paenitentia* has been edited in G. G. Meersseman, 'Kritische Glossen op de Griekse Theophilus-Legende (7<sup>e</sup> Eeuw) end haar Latijnse Vertaling (9<sup>e</sup> Eeuw)', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België: Klasse der Letteren*, 25:4 (1963), 1-36 (pp. 17-34).

<sup>13</sup> Meersseman, p. 18 (chapter 5). Unless otherwise stated, all translations are the author's own.

<sup>14</sup> Meersseman, p. 25 (chapter 25).

<sup>15</sup> Stevenson has identified some of the evidence for William's direct use of the *Vita Sanctae Mariae Aegyptiacae* in his account of Mary of Egypt (Jane Stevenson, 'The Holy Sinner: The Life of Mary of Egypt', in *The Legend of Mary of Egypt in Medieval Insular*

## *The Dating of William of Malmesbury's Miracles of the Virgin*

*Hagiography*, ed. by Erich Poppe and Bianca Ross (Blackrock: Four Courts Press, 1996), pp. 19-50 (pp. 47-48)). William also clearly agrees with Dominic against the *Vita* in a few places.

<sup>16</sup> See Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise', II, 523-25.

<sup>17</sup> Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise', II, 526-28.

<sup>18</sup> See Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', pp. 201-02.

<sup>19</sup> José-María Canal, 'El Libro "De Miraculis Sanctae Mariae" de Domingo de Evesham (m.c. 1140)', *Studium Legionense*, 39 (1998), 247-83 (pp. 260-61).

<sup>20</sup> See *Miracula Sanctae Virginis Mariae*, ed. by Elise F. Dexter, University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, 12 (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1927), pp. 32-33. This is a convenient, if flawed, edition of a single manuscript of the HM-TS series. The manuscript in question, the first of several bound together as Chicago, University of Chicago Library, Manuscript 147, contains the HM-TS series in more or less its supposed original order, and without the addition of other collections, such as Dominic's *De Miraculis*, as is common in many manuscripts of HM-TS. On palaeographical and art-historical grounds the manuscript has been dated to the first half of the twelfth century (Dexter, pp. 7-9). The small, two-column format of the manuscript, and its distinctive formatting of verse, suggest to the present author that it may have been an insular production. Such formats are not, however, common in the earlier part of the twelfth century, so it is intriguing that Thomson remarks that two manuscripts which can be identified as products of the Malmesbury scriptorium in William's day are small format volumes laid out in two columns (R. M. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1987), p. 83). Unfortunately, at the time of writing, Special Collections at the University of Chicago Library are undergoing renovation work, and the manuscript is not available for consultation. Given that this may be one of the very earliest manuscripts of HM-TS extant, a new edition, perhaps as part of a wider effort to edit the earliest manuscripts of Marian miracle collections, could prove invaluable.

<sup>21</sup> Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise', II, 526-29.

<sup>22</sup> Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise', II, 530, suggests that William perhaps misread the word *pusio* ('boy') in his other version of the story in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*.

<sup>23</sup> Paschasius Radbertus, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, in *Patrologia Latina*, 120, cols 1261-1350 (col. 1299).

<sup>24</sup> Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 202.

<sup>25</sup> *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. by R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, trans. by R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford Medieval Texts, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998-99), I, 520 (book 3, chapter 286), trans. p. 521.

<sup>26</sup> Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise', II, 521-22.

<sup>27</sup> *The Life, Letters, and Sermons of Bishop Herbert de Losinga*, ed. by Edward Meyrick Goulburn and Henry Symonds, 2 vols (Oxford; London: Parker, 1878), II, 30. Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 201.

<sup>28</sup> *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, p. 30.

<sup>29</sup> Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 201.

<sup>30</sup> *Gesta Regum*, I, 520 (book 3, chapter 286), trans. p. 521.

<sup>31</sup> *Life, Letters and Sermons*, p. 30. Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 201. *Gesta Regum*, I, 520 (book 3, chapter 286).

<sup>32</sup> *Life, Letters and Sermons*, p. 30. Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 201. Canal, 'Domingo de Evesham', p. 260.

<sup>33</sup> Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', pp. 201-02. *Life, Letters and Sermons*, p. 30.

<sup>34</sup> *Gesta Regum*, I, 520 (book 3, chapter 286), trans. p. 521.

<sup>35</sup> *Miracula Sanctae Virginis*, pp. 32-33.

<sup>36</sup> Though Herbert's account, as it appears in *Life, Letters and Sermons*, pp. 30-32, only states that Mary was sitting above the altar, and not that she was sitting on a throne: this detail is shared by William and Paschasius alone of the authors discussed here.

<sup>37</sup> *Gesta Regum*, I, 536 (book 3, chapter 300), 586-88 (book 4, chapters 338-39), 754 (book 5, chapter 417). *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum Libri Quinque*, ed. by N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series, 52 (London: Longman, 1870), pp. 107-08, 117 and 151-52.

<sup>38</sup> Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 142.

<sup>39</sup> The term *rogus* is usually used in classical Latin to refer to a funeral pyre (see *A Latin Dictionary*, ed. by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879), *sub* rogus). A glance at the *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources* suggests that it was undergoing a semantic development in twelfth-century Anglo-Latin from use to refer to a 'pile of wood' or a 'beacon', to being used also to refer to ovens. The word-list records two late twelfth-century usages in which the term is used to mean 'limekiln': in the earlier of these two instances, it is paired with the explanatory term *calcis* to create a phrase meaning 'limekiln'. Such phrases represent the early stages of a shift by which *rogus* can come to mean 'oven' on its own (*Word-List*, ed. by R. E. Latham (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), *sub* rogus). The *Word-List* notes 1193 as the earliest date of the term used on its own to refer to a limekiln. William's use of *rogus* here, then, may well represent a particularly early instance of this usage of the term in the British Isles.

<sup>40</sup> *Life, Letters and Sermons*, p. 32.

<sup>41</sup> Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 202.

<sup>42</sup> *Life, Letters and Sermons*, p. 30.

<sup>43</sup> Southern, p. 183.

*The Dating of William of Malmesbury's Miracles of the Virgin*

- <sup>44</sup> Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise', II, 365.
- <sup>45</sup> Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise', II, 364.
- <sup>46</sup> *Gesta Regum*, I, 200 (book 2, chapter 127). Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 145.
- <sup>47</sup> Carter, 'Historical Content', pp. 140-62.
- <sup>48</sup> See, for instance, the discussion of William's addition of material concerning Glastonbury, sometime in the late 1120s or thereafter, in *Gesta Regum*, II, pp. xxvii-xxviii.
- <sup>49</sup> Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 145.
- <sup>50</sup> *Gesta Regum*, I, 200 (book 2, chapter 127), trans. p. 201.
- <sup>51</sup> *Gesta Regum*, I, 184 (book 2, chapter 121), trans. p. 185.
- <sup>52</sup> Carter, 'William of Malmesbury's Treatise', I, 365.
- <sup>53</sup> *Gesta Regum*, II, pp. xvii-xxii.
- <sup>54</sup> For instance, William remarks in closing his work 'inter uincula corporis aegri tutare animam' ('to protect the soul amidst the chains of a sick body'; Canal, 'Guillermo de Malmesbury', p. 235) — a phrase which Canal, in a note to this sentence, treats as evidence that William was unwell, and perhaps near the end of his life, when he finished this work.
- <sup>55</sup> Carter, 'Historical Content', pp. 130-31.
- <sup>56</sup> J. C. Jennings, 'The Writings of Prior Dominic of Evesham', *The English Historical Review*, 77:303 (1962), 298-304 (p. 298).
- <sup>57</sup> Jennings, p. 298.
- <sup>58</sup> Canal, 'Domingo de Evesham', p. 283.
- <sup>59</sup> Carter, 'Historical Content', pp. 161-62.
- <sup>60</sup> Carter, 'Historical Content', p. 137.