

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

A Descriptive Language of Dominion? Curial Inventories, Clothing, and Papal Monarchy c. 1300

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7km0668x>

Journal

Textile History, 48(2)

ISSN

0040-4969

Author

Miller, Maureen C

Publication Date

2017-07-03

DOI

10.1080/00404969.2017.1323994

Peer reviewed



A Descriptive Language of Dominion? Curial Inventories, Clothing, and Papal Monarchy c. 1300

Maureen C. Miller

To cite this article: Maureen C. Miller (2017) A Descriptive Language of Dominion? Curial Inventories, Clothing, and Papal Monarchy c. 1300, *Textile History*, 48:2, 176-191

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00404969.2017.1323994>



Published online: 16 Nov 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

A Descriptive Language of Dominion? Curial Inventories, Clothing, and Papal Monarchy

c. 1300

MAUREEN C. MILLER 

Using evidence from both papal and cardinal inventories, as well as from cardinal wills, this essay argues that the papal curia developed a distinctive language for describing liturgical vestments in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries that emphasised the peoples and places that made the materials and ornaments of these garments. Examples from inventories of local dioceses and religious houses are offered to illustrate the peculiarity of the curial descriptions, and comparisons are also made to royal and mercantile inventories. While the curial emphasis on the places and peoples producing the materials used in ecclesiastical vestments may simply have been the performance of connoisseurship within an elite institutional culture, the author suggests that it may also express the expansive papal claims to dominion articulated by Boniface VIII (1294–1303) and his immediate successors.

From the early Middle Ages, the pre-eminence claimed by the successors of Saint Peter was associated with special clothing. Our earliest papal sources reveal this connection. The letters of Pope Gregory I (590–604), for example, and the earliest redaction of the *Liber Pontificalis* mention the *pallium* as a symbol of papal office and favour. This white, woollen band was granted by popes to other bishops as a mark of special merit or status, and it was stripped from pontiffs to visualise their deposition.¹ The *Constitutum Constantini*, or ‘Donation of Constantine’, generally regarded as a late eighth-century forgery, laid claim to much more exalted garb: it asserted that the emperor had granted to Pope Sylvester I (314–335) and all his successors the right to wear imperial regalia. Only fragmentary evidence before the millennium reveals the actual use of imperial garments, but from the mid-eleventh century surviving vestments, visual depictions and textual references document distinctive elements of papal attire that represented the pope’s authority — most notably the red mantle and the tiara.² What popes wore mattered during the Middle Ages, and still today papal clothing occasions commentary.

To the frustration of textile specialists, however, the number of surviving garments known to have been worn by medieval popes, or donated either to them or by them to other individuals or institutions, is quite limited. The burial garments of Pope Clement II (1046–1047) provide an early, quite spectacular, view of an entire matched set of pontifical vestments, but then one must wait until the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries for further exemplars.³ These are mainly richly embroidered copes, such as the so-called cope of Saint Sylvester at S. Giovanni in Laterano. According to tradition, Pope Boniface VIII wore this

magnificent *opus anglicanum* vestment during the jubilee of 1300. The linen cope is beautifully embroidered with silk, gold, silver and pearls, presenting scenes from the life of the Blessed Virgin and the life of Christ interspersed with images of angels and saints. The style is English, as most certainly is the manufacture.⁴ The design of concentric tiers of scenes, each under a stylised gothic arch, is typical of several other surviving copes from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries conserved, for example, at Bologna and Pienza.⁵

The particular interest of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century popes and cardinals in fine embroidered vestments and orphreys, particularly *opus anglicanum*, has long been recognised.⁶ What has not been noted is the distinctive descriptive language deployed in the inventories and wills that are the richest and most numerous sources for what was worn at the papal court. These documents emphasise the regions, kingdoms or peoples producing the precious textiles worn and their descriptive conventions likely reflect papal claims to dominion. After introducing the general patterns of describing textiles in medieval inventories, I will set out the evidence for a distinctive curial language of description and then sketch its possible significance to our understanding of the visual culture of the late medieval papacy.

Inventories of cathedral and monastic treasuries survive from the late eighth century on and include liturgical textiles.⁷ The earliest tended only to indicate the type of garment (cope, chasuble, dalmatic, etc.), the number owned and sometimes the material. An 870 inventory from the Benedictine abbey of Sint-Truiden, for example, catalogued ‘thirty-three precious copes of silk, twelve precious chasubles of silk’.⁸ In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, most simply distinguished between the numbers of each kind of vestment with and without gold embroidery. So an inventory compiled in 1127 of the cathedral treasury of Bamberg listed ‘forty chasubles, of these fifteen decorated with gold ... fourteen dalmatics, of these nine with gold embroidery’.⁹ In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the usual descriptive language of ecclesiastical inventories identified three things: the type of vestment, the material (wool, silk, samite, etc.) and the colour. A mid-thirteenth-century inventory from the cathedral of Hildesheim opened with ‘a chasuble of black samite-silk with gold embroidery’, while one from Pisa’s cathedral in 1300 listed a total of thirty chasubles, the four better of which are described as ‘one of red samite, another of white diaper, another of green samite, and another of cloth of gold’.¹⁰ English inventories followed similar conventions — that of Sarum (Salisbury) in 1222 described ‘three tunics and three dalmatics, embroidered, of which two are of indigo [blue] silk, and one of red silk’ — but also gave the names of clerics whose copes were now part of the cathedral treasure. Among them were ‘two copes, nicely embroidered, which were Bishop Roger’s’ and ‘a cope of red samite, well embroidered with gold, which Bishop Herbert gave’.¹¹

Were these conventions followed in Rome? The *Liber Pontificalis*, first redacted in the 530s and then continued down to 891, described amazing quantities of liturgical textiles donated by various popes to Roman churches. In the period 791 to 891 alone, 5,232 cloths were donated, an average of 291 per pope. These, however, were not vestments, but *vela*, ‘veils’ hung from architraves and between columns to create spatial divisions within churches, and *vestes*, altar coverings.¹² Not until the twelfth-century *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae* do we have evidence of papal gifts of liturgical vestments: Pope Anastasius IV (1153–1154) donated to the basilica a white silk chasuble hemmed all around with precious gold embroidery. Later in the twelfth century Pope Urban III (1185–1187) donated several vestments to the Milanese Church, detailing the type of garment, colour and ornamentation. The language of these brief entries conforms to the general conventions described above.¹³

After these twelfth-century references, however, there is a long gap in our papal evidence until the very end of the thirteenth century when several detailed inventories offer elaborate descriptions of vestments associated with Boniface VIII. In these inventories, a language of description distinctive to curial circles is amply attested. By ‘curial’, I mean simply ‘of the papal court’. Included in this category for the purposes of this study are three inventories of the treasury of the Holy See (one from 1295,¹⁴ another from c. 1300,¹⁵ and an extraordinarily detailed inventory of 1311¹⁶); an inventory drawn up at Boniface’s death in 1303 at the Vatican basilica of San Pietro¹⁷; several inventories compiled during the pontificate of Clement V (1305–1314)¹⁸; inventories pertaining to cardinals’ movable goods¹⁹; and the thirteenth-century wills of cardinals collected and edited by Agostino Paravicini Bagliani.²⁰ The curia’s language of description regarding embroideries and fabrics emphasised the places or peoples that produced the materials of which their sacred vestments were made. Rather than representing themselves as wearing Roman attire, they underscored the foreignness of their finery.

The 1295 inventory of the treasury of the Holy See described copes, for example, as English (*pluviale anglicanum*), or having English embroidery (*cum frixio anglicano*); chasubles were decorated with English work (*de opere anglicano*).²¹ Other copes had ‘Cyprus work’ (*de opere ciprensi*). For example, ‘a cope of red samite embroidered in gold in Cyprus work with roundels in which there are griffins and two-headed eagles and two birds facing a certain flower’.²² Still others were characterised as having been made of Tartar cloths, referring to a range of Asian silks produced in the Mongol empire,²³ and a cope made of Tartar cloth was also described as decorated with German embroidery.²⁴ Many vestments were depicted as composite creations, bringing together cloth from one place and ornamentation from another — all carefully distinguished by notaries. In addition to *opere alamanici* or *theotonico*, the 1295 papal inventory referenced cloth of Salerno, Lucca and Reims;²⁵ cloth or gold embroidery work of the Veneto (*panno de Venetiis, frixio venetico*),²⁶ and Spanish cloth (*panno hispanico*).²⁷ Vestments *de diaspro de Antiochia* (‘diaper from Antioch’) and decorated in golden embroidered *opere Romanie* (‘Roman [Byzantine] work’) were described as well as a red dalmatic made *de panno imperiali de Romania ad aquilas magnas cum duobus capitibus* (‘of imperial cloth from Byzantium with large, two-headed eagles’).²⁸

As in these last examples, some descriptions assert that the items were ‘from’ (*de*) a certain place: *de Venetiis, de Antiochia, de Romania*. One might reasonably wonder how a notary redacting an inventory would know the true provenance of a textile. A number of possibilities may be considered. The notary may simply have been recording the assertion of where it was from, dictated to him by the textile’s owner or custodian. It is also possible, since labels were sometimes attached to stored treasures, that he was copying a description affixed to the textile. Or he could, without other cues, simply have been using his own knowledge of such wares to assert a place of origin. Indeed, in an entry in the 1295 inventory, we get evidence that those compiling it had different appraisals of materials. Concerning the ornament on an altar dossal, the notary recorded that ‘in the middle part are 20 stones which appear to be sapphires but master Richard said those were glass or crystal. [In the same part] ten stones seem to be garnets, but master Richard said they were crystals’.²⁹ Obviously, we cannot be absolutely certain that a liturgical garment described in an inventory as made of ‘diaper from Antioch’ was, indeed, sewn of cloth woven in that city and imported to western Europe. Imitations of prestige fabrics are amply attested. The twelfth-century geographer al-Idrisi, for example, noted that weavers in the Iberian city of

Almería manufactured imitations of Iraqi and Persian silks, and elsewhere on the peninsula entrepreneurial workshops not only copied Baghdadi designs but also supplied these cloths with inscriptions claiming that they were actually woven in Baghdad.³⁰ Mongol fabrics also came to be imitated in the West, as references to ‘Tartar cloth from Lucca’ (*drap tartaire de Lucques*) reveal.³¹

When the place name is in an adjectival form — as in *de panno hispanico*, *de panno tartarico*, *de opere ciprensi* or *cum frixio anglicano* — we must be even more cautious concerning the actual provenance of the textiles. As Christiane Elster has recently noted in the case of *opus anglicanum*, ‘an original indication of provenance might have become a *terminus technicus* indicating certain manufacturing techniques typical for these embroideries’.³² Evelin Wetter’s study of an orphrey fragment made in Spain — depicting stories from the *Cantigas de Santa María*, replete with inscriptions in old Spanish — demonstrated that the Iberian maker used design features typical of English manufactures and the technique of underside couching often taken as the defining feature of *opus anglicanum*.³³ Some of the *opus cyprense* vestments donated by Boniface VIII to the cathedral of Anagni may have been produced ‘in the circle of the royal workshops in Palermo’ rather than in Cyprus.³⁴

None of these epistemological problems, however, undercut the central argument of this essay. The distinctive language of description used in curial circles reflected choices about *representation*, about what those within the papal court emphasised about their liturgical garments, about what features of their attire they deemed worth recording. Whether or not their vestments were in fact made of fabrics and ornament from many regions and peoples, it is significant that popes and their closest associates at the apex of ecclesiastical power in western Christendom wanted others to think that the garments they wore combined materials from all over Europe and beyond.

The patterns of description in the 1295 inventory of the treasury of the Holy See, moreover, were not confined to this one document. The descriptive emphasis on the places and peoples supposedly creating papal liturgical attire also occurs in the other inventories surveyed. Very few vestments were recorded in the inventory redacted c. 1300 but all were of ‘English work’.³⁵ It also listed numerous other textiles. Pieces of Tartar cloth were described, as well as fabrics from Reims and Germany, linen from Pisa and red serge from Ireland (*petium sargie de Ybernia rubee*).³⁶ Articles ornamented in various *opere* (of Reims, the Veneto, *Alamania*, Pisa, Lombardy and Tours)³⁷ and several types of cloth from Lucca (white, red and green diaper, striped and brilliant violet coloured silk) were described.³⁸ The 1303 inventory of the treasury of S. Pietro in Vaticano, listing mainly vestments and organising them by colour, detailed embroidery work from Naples, Siena and Rome, as well as *opere Saracenicum* or ‘Saracen work’.³⁹

The 1311 inventory is the most extensive surviving for the medieval papacy and, indeed, the conditions that led to its compilation were unusual. The death of Pope Benedict XI in Perugia on 7 July 1304 was followed by a conclave to elect his successor that lasted more than eleven months. Ongoing tensions between the French crown and the papacy ultimately led to the election of a French prelate, Bertrand de Got, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who took the name Clement V. In Lusignan, when news of his election reached him, the new pope was crowned in Lyon and spent the early years of his pontificate moving between Bordeaux, Vienne and Poitiers before settling with the curia at Avignon.⁴⁰ With the papal treasure still at Perugia, Clement V sent his chaplain, another cleric, and a servant to Italy in order to appraise it, presumably to raise loans, but also to arrange its conveyance to the curia. On 27

A Descriptive Language of Dominion?

February 1311, these three papal emissaries — Pietro da Gubbio, Vitalis de Cabanaco and Guilielmo de Lua — began ‘weighing and describing’ the treasure at Perugia. They worked doggedly, every day but Sunday, until 4 June 1311.⁴¹ The inventory they produced begins with gold and silver vessels, objects and ornaments, including precious gems; continues with liturgical furnishings, vestments and linens; and goes on to household wares, bedding, tents, horse-fittings and even the capes used when the pope had his beard shaved.⁴² Vestments were precisely described with identifying details of ornamentation. A cope recorded on Wednesday 31 March 1311 was

beautiful, made of red samite of Cyprus work with a pattern of large roundels with two circles of gold and silk, and within these circles are vines and leaves in gold thread, and in the middle of some roundels are griffins, in others double parrots, and in others double-headed eagles. And between the roundels are other smaller roundels with four leaves, each having a lily at its head. And it has an orphrey with many roundels of pearls and in the middle of the roundels are crosses of red, green, and blue silk. And it has a hood of the same work with pearls and an eagle in the middle.⁴³

A total of 1,605 textile objects were inventoried, 786 (49 per cent) of which indicate materials made in a particular place or by particular people. The language of material origin was even more frequently used in describing vestments: 75 per cent of the copes, 83 per cent of the chasubles and 96 per cent of the dalmatics were described as made of fabrics from specific cities or regions (cloth of Lucca, linen of Reims) and decorated with ‘work’ of a place or people.⁴⁴ The embroidery work was inventoried as being English, Roman, Italian, of Cyprus, Aalst or Limoge. Most of the cloth was described as being from Lucca or Reims, but there were also fabrics described as being from the Mongol empire, the Byzantine east, Germany, France, Spain, Ireland, the Swiss cantons, the Veneto, Romagna, Genoa, Pisa, Caen and Tripoli.⁴⁵

Clement V himself made sure that the treasure of the Holy See would pass more smoothly to his successor. Before his death in 1314, he left instructions and a note that were read to the cardinals assembled for the conclave. The note instructed two curial auditors ‘to weigh, enumerate, describe, and consign’ the treasure to the pope’s chamberlain, Arnaldo cardinal bishop of Albano, in order that it be preserved for the Roman Church and the future pontiff.⁴⁶ The inventory compiled following these instructions is dated 27–29 May 1314 and its descriptions of textiles follow the curial pattern of emphasising the peoples and places creating the fabrics and embroideries. In addition to the usual English, Roman, Veneto and Cyprus work, there are vestments of Tartar silks and German altar cloths.⁴⁷ Although this language continued to be deployed under John XXII and Clement VI, emphasis falls off: later inventories were more summary in their descriptions and cash, gold, silver and jewels predominated rather than vestments or textiles.⁴⁸

Having arrived at the denouement of this language of description emphasising places or peoples, let us return to the long evidentiary gap in the papal record from the late twelfth century to 1295: can we date the emergence of these descriptive conventions more precisely by turning to other curial sources? An inventory of items donated in 1224 by Guala Bicchieri, cardinal priest of SS. Silvestro e Martino ai Monti, to the abbey of S. Andrea in his hometown of Vercelli, follows the standard conventions for describing vestments in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, giving the type of vestments, the material and the

colour. Among the vestments he gave, for example, were ‘seven chasubles, of which two are made of red samite, a third of bluish-gray samite, a fourth of green samite, a fifth of purple, a sixth of *bucharamo*, and a seventh purple with [ornamented] edges’.⁴⁹ After the list of vestments, however, pieces of cloth were also described and these followed the conventions of the papal inventories. Guala donated ‘an altar cloth of red Saracen fabric with gold’, another thirty-two large and small pieces *de opere teutonico, Apulie, Lombardie*, and cloth from Reims.⁵⁰ Only with the 1287 post-mortem inventory of the possessions of Cardinal Goffredo d’Alatri, however, does the penchant for naming the places and peoples producing textiles appear prominently in the description of sacred vestments. Cardinal Goffredo had a cope of Tartar cloth, a tunicle of fabric from the Veneto, a dalmatic of Genoese cloth, other vestments in Byzantine textiles and English orpheys.⁵¹ Several other inventories of cardinals’ belongings from the early fourteenth century reveal this descriptive language well established and pervasive. Cardinal Bentivegna Bentivegni had ‘a solemn cope of silk and gold with images of the apostles and diverse birds in English embroidery’, as well as other vestments in Tartar cloth with Veneto orpheys, while Cardinal Matteo d’Acquasparta had several *opus anglicanum* vestments, a dalmatic and tunicle of Spanish cloth, and sets of vestments in various colours with orpheys from Rome and Lucca.⁵² The executors distributing the goods of Cardinal Giovanni Boccamazza in 1310 described several vestments in Tartar cloth; those inventorying possessions of Cardinal Guglielmo Longhi in 1319 listed amices, maniples and stoles with orpheys from Rome and Constantinople; and a very precise notary recording the estate of Cardinal Luca Fieschi in 1337 described over eighty vestments, some of cloths from Lucca, Cyprus and Paris, decorated with work of Greece, Rome, England, Arras and Damascus.⁵³

Cardinal wills follow a similar pattern: they only begin to emphasise the places and peoples producing the materials used in sacred vestments at the very end of the thirteenth century and into the first half of the fourteenth. Only a handful of these testaments and codicils to them are extant from before 1270. Of these, three list bequests of vestments and their descriptions follow the usual general pattern of indicating the type of garment, the material and colour. For example, a 1244 document recording the delivery of goods bequeathed by Cardinal Raniero Capocci to the Dominican church of his hometown of Viterbo described four sets of vestments and ‘an episcopal alb with golden embroidery’. For three of the sets, only the type of garments and colours (red, white, green) are indicated, while for the fourth purple set the notary specified that the chasuble was of violet samite silk and that this vestment and the matching tunicle and dalmatic were embroidered with gold.⁵⁴ Places of origin or manufacture began to be noted in cardinal wills dated 1270 (*de panno yspanico*), 1286 (*de samito lucano*), 1295 (*anglicanum*), 1297 (*de opere anglicano*).⁵⁵ But this language is not really prominent until the will of Tommaso d’Ocre, cardinal priest of S. Cecilia, redacted in Naples on 23 May 1300, six days before his demise. He made bequests of multiple vestments to nine different churches and religious houses, with each noting the origins of the fabrics and ornaments. The vestments he donated to his titular church all had ‘Roman orpheys’ (*cum aurifrisiis romanis*), while others were decorated with *opere gallicano* and *anglicano*. The fabrics employed were listed as Tartar cloths and silks from Lucca.⁵⁶ A more extreme example is the 1 March 1321 will of Niccolò da Prato, cardinal bishop of Ostia, redacted at Avignon. He made thirty-one bequests of sacred vestments, each carefully described. Most of these vestments were reported to have been made of diapered and brocaded silk, but some were described as made of Byzantine samite.

A Descriptive Language of Dominion?

Several were ornamented with *opus anglicanum*, others in embroidery work of Montpellier, Florence and Rome, and still others with pearls, birds, vines and parrots. The range and variety of vestment materials in cardinal wills was more limited than the expansive profusion of origins named in papal inventories. Some cardinals (and/or their notaries) also continued to describe only the type of garment, material and colour, with no reference to the places or peoples producing components, so the adoption of this curial language of description was not universal within curial circles.⁵⁷

It is strikingly minimal or absent altogether, however, in the inventories drawn up in local dioceses. The case of Anagni is particularly interesting because this was Boniface VIII's hometown and he made several gifts to its cathedral over the course of his papacy. Four inventories drawn up in Anagni described these gifts.⁵⁸ The inventories do use the phrases *de panno tartarico* and *de opere theotonico*, but those are the sole ethnic or place descriptors. Only thirteen of the ninety textiles listed included this language, so 14 per cent as compared to 49 per cent or higher in the 1311 papal inventory.⁵⁹ It is also possible to compare descriptions of vestments in the 1295 inventory of the papal treasury compiled at the beginning of Boniface's pontificate and those described in the Anagni inventories. Multiple vestments made of a fabric with griffins, double-headed eagles and birds are recorded in both the papal and the Anagni inventories and, further, several vestments matching this description also survive in the cathedral treasury. In the papal inventory the fabric with this particular pattern is described as made *de opere ciprensi*, but in the Anagni inventories it is merely 'of red samite with needlework of beaten gold of griffins, parrots and eagles with two heads'.⁶⁰ The local Anagni scribe did not use the place identifier.

Other roughly contemporary cathedral treasury inventories entirely lack the curial references to regions, kingdoms and peoples. A 1286 inventory of the cathedral treasure at Lucca used no such descriptors. Beyond the usual identification by type of garment, material and colour, the notary Bartholomew was only moved to extra verbiage in order to evaluate the quality of fabrics or embroidered panels, noting the 'best quality diaper' (*optima diaspini*) used in an alb and the *optimo fregio* on one chasuble. Another inventory of 1297 from the same church was equally laconic about the textiles, but does specify that one of the coffers in the treasury was 'of Limoge work' (*una cassa operis Lemovicensi*). Later inventories for Lucca did not develop a more geographically informed descriptive language. The series of cathedral inventories from Pisa are similar. In a late thirteenth-century inventory, and another from 1300, there were more local characterisations of types of cloth — *sargia camulata* (patterned or 'damasked' serge), *baracano scaccato* (a rough woolen cloth with squares of different colors) — but only one possible indicator of place: the notary specified that three of the eight 'everyday chasubles' (*planetas feriales*) were 'black from Soria' [in Castile?] (*nigre de suriano*). A 1295 inventory of the cathedral church of St Paul in London gave detailed descriptions of vestments — such as the cope of its dean 'made of purple samite, embroidered with roses, stars, gladiolas, little moons, with fringe, [and] upon which were embroidered Saints Peter and Paul' — but none mentioned the regions, kingdoms or peoples of manufacture. Such language is also absent from thirteenth-century German ecclesiastical inventories.⁶¹ David Jacoby, indeed, has stated that 'the provenance of the vast majority of silks recorded in Western inventories and accounts from the 14th century is not stated'.⁶²

Although these comparisons are by no means exhaustive, it appears that, in the ecclesiastical world at least, the papal court of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries

was particularly inclined to highlight the places and peoples creating the fine textiles and embroideries used in their vestments. Was this a descriptive language papal monarchs shared with other royal courts? That is, was it common for all monarchs, clerical as well as lay, to use a language advertising the geographical reach of their rule, patronage or commercial connections? Unfortunately, the types of sources produced by the French and English royal courts are not directly comparable. These courts recorded accounts of royal expenditures and thus reveal the materials bought to produce clothing rather than finished garments. Thus, an entry in the 1285–1286 great wardrobe records for King Edward I (1274–1307) reported that the King’s tailor was paid for ‘cloth, furs, various carpets [or tapestries?], bench mats, embroidered seats, and other purchases in Paris and in Flanders’.⁶³ Some indications of places of origin, therefore, were sometimes recorded, but even the more detailed roll of liveries for Edward III (1327–1377) tended to give the usual descriptive triumvirate of type of garment, material and colour: ‘for the making [of] one tunic and a double hood of blue long cloth for the king for his tournament at Canterbury, and furring the same tunic, 4 ells blue long cloth, one lining of 249 bellies “pured” miniver’.⁶⁴ The 1316 account of Geoffroi de Fleury, treasurer to King Philip V of France (1316–1322), detailed all the finery purchased for the royal coronation and mentioned very few places of origin for the materials: there was cloth of gold from *Turquia*, some fabrics from Greece, Douai, Reims and Lucca, but most of the cloth was listed without indications of origin. Both the English and French courts wore a lot of sendal (lightweight silk) lined with ermine and, unsurprisingly, the dominant colour of the fine textiles purchased was scarlet. But the places of origin of materials named are rather few, and these royal accounts really do not cultivate the kind of descriptive language of foreign origins of textiles that is so striking in the curial wills and inventories.⁶⁵

Certainly, the merchants who bought and sold textiles distinguished their wares by type and place of manufacture. Indeed, the Florentine merchant Francesco di Balduccio Pegolotti organised his famous commercial handbook, *La pratica della mercatura* (compiled c. 1310–1340), by cities and regions.⁶⁶ In their letters and charters, merchants used more specific technical terms: so instead of ‘Tartar cloths’, they referred to the distinct types of cloths of gold called *nach* and *nassic* or the figured silk termed *camoca*.⁶⁷ But not all consumers appear to have been equally interested in cultivating these distinctions. Rather than using these technical terms, members of the papal curia at the very end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century seem to have been very interested in describing their liturgical attire with reference to kingdoms, regions and cities all across Europe and even beyond to non-Christian peoples such as Mongols and ‘Saracens’. Why emphasise the myriad places that produced fine cloth and beautiful embroideries?

To a certain degree we can understand this curial language of description as a performance of connoisseurship, although the use of the mercantile technical terms would have been an equal or better means of displaying elite knowledge. Popes, cardinals and their retinues constituted, as Julian Gardner observed, ‘a cosmopolitan, cultivated, widely experienced and well-travelled elite’.⁶⁸ Indeed, Gardner noted a profound change in the artistic taste in Rome in the last third of the thirteenth century, a chronology roughly approximating the emergence of the curial language of description discussed here. This new artistic taste was marked by innovative experimentation with northern styles and forms, as well as by significant wealth and a vibrant market in luxury goods not unrelated to the curia’s economy of gift exchange and preferment. *Opus anglicanum* definitely figured among the precious art objects — along with illuminated manuscripts, enamel work, ivories, sculpture and fine

seals — favoured by curial collectors and arbiters of taste.⁶⁹ The intensive and repeated references to the kingdoms, regions and peoples creating the fine fabrics and embroideries used in their liturgical attire was surely a way to highlight not only one's wealth and social capital, but also artistic taste and connoisseurship.

Yet, of course, these vestments were not simply inventoried; they were worn. The curia's descriptive language is some index, therefore, of the self-conscious visual image the papal court wished to project in the elaborate processions and liturgies that punctuated its day-to-day life. It is worth pausing for a moment to consider the possible visual impact of vestments made of Tartar cloth or diaper from Antioch and decorated with *opus anglicanum*, gold Cyprus work or Veneto orphreys. To many observers, the extravagant display of wealth by leading ecclesiastics would be objectionable. From the second half of the eleventh century, when the papacy began embracing the imperial raiment long ago claimed for it in the Donation of Constantine, the Roman Church's display of wealth and sartorial splendour provoked biting satire. The *Tractatus Garsiae*, or the 'Translation of Saints Gold and Silver', as early as 1095 lampooned the pope's wearing of 'royal purple and rare furs' (*purpura regia, in pellibus preciosis*) as well as the pomp and avarice of cardinals.⁷⁰ Serious theological critiques mounted over the twelfth century, most pointed being that of the widely influential Parisian scholastic Peter the Chanter who decried the 'multicoloured clothing' in purple, gold and silver worn by elite clerics. The Church had enough 'of gold, silver, golden cloths, ornaments, and every kind of silk vestment', he observed, concluding that 'it would be better that they be exposed for sale, than the poor to hunger, better that they be exposed to usury than the poor to frost'.⁷¹ In the opening decades of the thirteenth century Francis of Assisi's renunciation of wealth and dedication to 'Lady Poverty' deepened this critique of the Church. Yet by the end of the century two members of the order the Poverello inspired appear to have worn *opus anglicanum* copes and chasubles of Tartar cloth: cardinals Bentivegna Bentivegni and Matteo d'Acquasparta were both Franciscans, Bentivegna serving as *custos* of the Umbrian province of the order and Matteo leading it as Minister General from 1287 to 1289, but the inventories of their movables discussed above reveal the same taste in sacred vestments as other curial clerics.⁷²

We do not know how these individual Franciscan cardinals defended their wearing of opulent vestments, but the general defence of such liturgical garments had two aspects. On the one hand, reverence for the body of Christ normalised the use of gold and silver in liturgical vessels and, by extension, the wearing of precious vestments by those serving at the altar. Many lay people, moreover, appear to have wanted magnificent and beautiful liturgies because they donated most of the silk and gold-embroidered vestments that were described in the cathedral inventories discussed above.⁷³ Presumably these viewers of the curia's finery would accept it as fitting to the status of the pope and cardinals as leaders of Christ's universal Church on earth. On the other hand, the clergy from the early Middle Ages had developed a spirituality of sacred vestments built upon the idea that the Christian priesthood superseded that of the Old Testament, thus inheriting the garments made of 'gold and violet and purple and scarlet twice dyed, and fine twisted linen embroidered with diverse colours' (Exod. 28: 3–5) worn by the sons of Aaron. Ornate, precious garments proclaimed the truth of Christian revelation and the special status of the Christian clergy as God's chosen in the work of redeeming his people. This clerical spirituality of liturgical garb associated priestly virtues with each vestment and ritualised the putting on of these virtues as the clergy prepared for Mass. Vestments were blessed and those of particularly

saintly clerics were venerated.⁷⁴ For a clerical audience, therefore, the opulent finery of the papal court was a claim not only to status, but also to virtue and holiness.

It is impossible to know how many lay people might have recognised the diverse origins of the materials and embroideries that popes and cardinals described themselves as wearing, but certainly a larger percentage of the clergy may have. What might the decidedly ‘international’ image of the curia’s vestments have meant to them? The metaphorical logic underpinning the clerical spirituality of liturgical attire might simply have interpreted it as a fitting reflection of the universality of the Church. Just as Christians from Scandinavia to Sicily recognised the pope as Christ’s vicar, so the grace of the saviour’s redemption was offered by missionaries to all peoples, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries especially to Tartars and Muslims.⁷⁵

But why, then, does this curial language of description emerge in the late thirteenth century and ebb by the mid-fourteenth? Two circumstances in the Church of this period may explain the prominence of curial emphasis on the diverse origins of the materials worn by the pope and his court. The first is increased resistance to papal authority and an escalating critique that the bodies governing the Church in concert with the popes — councils, but particularly the college of cardinals and curia — were not representative. The papacy’s wars against Emperor Frederick II, especially their perceived misuse of crusading tithes for blatantly political ends, spread disillusionment and heightened concern about the composition and political ties of the papal court. Exactly in the period when the curial language of description is most in evidence, Italian dominance of the papacy was broken: whereas the overwhelming majority of the thirteenth-century popes were Italians, from the election of Bertrand de Got in 1305 they were French until the Great Schism began in 1378. The Italian–French division had been present in the college from the late twelfth century, with roughly 80 per cent of the cardinals from Italy, 18 per cent from France and the rest of Christendom accounting for the remaining 2 per cent. Pope Boniface VIII’s struggle with King Philip the Fair of France, moreover, dominated ecclesiastical politics at the turn of the century.⁷⁶ In this context of the increasingly politicised perception of the curia, the cultivation of a liturgical look that blended materials from many places may have constituted a visual as well as descriptive rhetoric of greater universality.

The second circumstance is related: even as papal claims to authority were being more vigorously and effectively challenged, the expansiveness of those claims reached a crescendo during the pontificate of Boniface VIII (1294–1303). While the fundamental axioms of papal hieratic authority were well established by the late twelfth century, these theories were given their greatest legal precision and visual expression by Boniface. He consolidated the body of law that had developed buttressing papal monarchy in his promulgation in 1298 of the *Liber Sextus* and, in the course of his dispute with Philip the Fair, he asserted probably the most extreme conception of papal power. His bull *Unam sanctam* of 1302 decreed that ‘it is necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the pope’.⁷⁷ In the jubilee of 1300 he conceded an innovatively expansive plenary indulgence on the basis of his fullness of power and this exalted conception of papal authority was represented in numerous media. Boniface, for example, added extra crowns to the papal tiara, creating the *triregno* that remained the most prominent symbol of papal sovereignty. He had multiple statues of himself erected, one with a highly significant iconographical innovation: whereas previously only Saint Peter held the keys to heaven, in the bust that today survives in the

A Descriptive Language of Dominion?

Vatican Grotte Boniface himself holds the keys.⁷⁸ Despite mounting challenges to papal authority, the papal court under Boniface asserted an expansive vision of its dominion.

Submission to papal authority, moreover, was sometimes rendered in sacred vestments. They were sent to Rome as *censum*, tribute: we know, for example, from the *Liber Censuum*, or the ‘Book of renders’ (1192) that the monastery of Saints Anastasius and Innocent in Gandersheim every year owed the Roman Church ‘two stoles of precious silk embroidered with gold in which at least 30 Bisantii [besants] of gold have been utilised’.⁷⁹ At least one English Cluniac priory in the thirteenth century was also supposed to pay its annual papal *censuum* of fifteen pounds sterling to an English embroiderer, Gregory of London, ‘who makes orphreys for the lord pope’.⁸⁰ These stipulations that some of the tribute due in recognition of papal authority be paid in vestments, or materials to make them, suggest that the curial language of description emphasising the many places and peoples contributing to ecclesiastical finery may express claims to dominion. The timing, contemporary with Boniface’s pontificate, is right: this pope’s conception and expression of papal authority was fulsome and the inventories of papal treasure related to Boniface’s papacy are the most prominent evidence of this curial language. The descriptive language of curial inventories — emphasising materials from all over Italy, Europe and even further afield — may be a display not just of connoisseurship and taste, or of the universality of the Church, but of expansive claims to authority. Wearing vestments described as made of *opus anglicanum*, *opus alamanicum*, *opus gallicanum*, and so on could be seen or understood as a visualisation of the extent of papal lordship, of the tribute the papal monarch could command. I suspect, in sum, that the cultivation of not just a ‘foreign’ look, but of a multiplicity of foreign styles, at the papal court was not just ‘fashion’, but the fashioning of immense ambition to minister and to rule far beyond Rome. Although in the wake of Boniface’s pontificate these ambitions were progressively limited in Europe, we should not dismiss them as fanciful: missionary efforts would in the centuries to come propel them to global proportions.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the Pasold Research Fund.

ORCID

Maureen C. Miller  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1494-4892>

REFERENCES

¹ M. C. Miller, *Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800–1200* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014), pp. 26–27. A more in-depth study of this important garment is S. A. Schoenig, *Bonds of Wool: The Pallium and Papal Power in the Middle Ages*, (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2016).

² Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 191–94; in greater detail and with additional bibliography in M. C. Miller, *Vestire la Chiesa. Gli abiti del clero nella Roma medievale*, trans. R. Cristiani, *La corte dei papi 26* (Rome: Viella, 2014), pp. 49–50, 64–67.

³ Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 179–81, 192–94; some photographs of these papal burial garments are also available in ‘Catholic Bamberg: The Vestments of Pope Clement II and Other Treasures from the Diocesan Museum’ (Online, 29 May 2009). Available from: <http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2009/05/catholic-bamberg-vestments-of-pope.html> - .Vy13WnBD_S9 [Accessed: 3 May 2016]. My thanks to one of the anonymous reviewers of this article who referenced this site.

⁴ A. G. I. Christie, *English Medieval Embroidery, a Brief Survey of English Embroidery Dating From the Beginning of the Tenth Century Until the End of the Fourteenth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 149–52 and pls CII–CV;

R. Buono, *Il Museo di S. Giovanni in Laterano* (Rome: Fratelli Palombi Editori, 1986), pp. 38–39, 41; M. Andaloro, ‘Il Tesoro della basilica di S. Giovanni in Laterano’, in C. Pietrangeli ed., *San Giovanni in Laterano* (Florence: Nardini, 1990), pp. 271–97, but especially p. 275 where she affirms a dating to the late thirteenth century; L. Martini, ‘Il piviale di Pienza e rapporti con la cultura artistica del Trecento’, in *Il piviale di Pio II*, ed. L. Martini (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2001), pp. 30–31 on the basis of the style of the architectural and ornamental framing elements dates the Lateran cope to the 1320s; J. Gardner, *The Roman Crucible: The Artistic Patronage of the Papacy 1198–1304*, *Römische Forschungen der Bibliotheca Hertziana* XXXIII (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2013), pp. 213–14.

⁵ The Bologna cope, datable to the very end of the thirteenth century, is mentioned in a 1390 inventory from the convent of San Domenico as ‘unum pluviale magnum cum figuris contextum de auro et fuit domini benedicti pape’. Almost certainly this was Pope Benedetto XI (1303–1304), a Dominican, and provincial of Lombardy for the order in 1286 and 1293; F. Bignozzi Montefusto, *Il piviale di San Domenico* (Bologna: Casa Editrice Prof. Riccardo Patron, 1970), pp. 35–36; on its iconography, see C. Bussolati, ‘Il Piviale di San Domenico; una proposta di lettura’, *Arte e Bologna: bollettino dei Musei civici d’arte antica*, III (1993), pp. 93–104. The Pienza cope, created between 1315 and 1330, may have been a gift to Pope John XII, although attempts to identify it in subsequent papal inventories are not entirely convincing. It was definitely donated, however, by Pope Pius II (1458–1464) to the cathedral of his native town, Pienza, in 1462; L. Martini, ‘Il piviale in *opus anglicanum* di Pio II’, in *Il piviale di Pio II*, pp. 15–25. On the corpus of *opus anglicanum* vestments, see N. Morgan, ‘L’Opus Anglicanum nel Tesoro pontificio’, in *Il Gotico europeo in Italia* (Naples: Electa, 1994), pp. 299–309; J. Gardner, ‘Opus Anglicanum, Goldsmithwork, Manuscript illumination and Ivories in the Rome of Boniface VIII’, in *Le culture di Bonifacio VIII. Atti del Convegno organizzato nell’ambito delle Celebrazioni per il VII Centenario della morte, Bologna, 13–15 dicembre 2004* (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, 2006), pp. 163–79; Gardner, *The Roman Crucible*, p. 209–17.

⁶ Christie, *English Medieval Embroidery*, pp. 2–4; D. King, *Opus Anglicanum: English Medieval Embroidery* (London: Arts Council, 1963), pp. 20, 31–32, 40–41; M. Schuette and S. Müller-Christensen, *The Art of Embroidery* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1964), p. xv; O. Brel-Bordaz, *Broderies d’ornements liturgiques: XIIIe–XIVe s.* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions latines, 1982), pp. 15–16; Morgan, ‘L’Opus Anglicanum’, p. 299; Gardner, ‘Opus Anglicanum’, pp. 163–65; Gardner, *The Roman Crucible*, pp. 209–12.

⁷ B. Bischoff ed., *Mittelalterliche Schatzverzeichnisse, I: Von der Zeit Karls des Großen bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte in München IV (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 1967), pp. 42 (parish church of Holzheim, 793?), 63–64 (Benedictine abbey of Milz, 799 [800]), 73–74 (church of Etpurc [Passau?], 788/799), 107 (parish church of Wieblingen, 790).

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 88: ‘Cappae 33 preciosae de pallio. Casulae 12 preciosae de pallio’.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 18: ‘Casule XL, ex hiis XV auro ornate ... Dalmaticae XIII, ex hiis IX cum aurifrigio’.

¹⁰ R. Barsotti, *Gli antichi inventari della cattedrale di Pisa* (Pisa: Istituto di Storia dell’Arte, Università di Pisa, 1959), p. 19: ‘Item planetas XXX quarum III sunt meliores videlicet: I de sciameto rubeo, aliam de draspo albo, aliam de sciameto viridi et aliam de panno ad aurum’.

¹¹ W. H. R. Jones, *Vetus registrum sarisberienae alias dictum Registrum S. Osmundi episcopi. The Register of S. Osmund*, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1883–1884), II, p. 133: ‘Tunicae iii. et dalmaticae iii. brodatae, quarum duae sunt de serico indico, et unum par de serico rubeo’; p. 130: ‘capae duae quae fuerunt episcopi Rogeri bene brodatae. ... Item capa una quam Herbertus episcopus dedit de samitto rubeo, bene parata aurifris’. See also W. S. Simpson, ‘Two inventories of the Cathedral Church of St Paul’, *Archaeologia*, I (1887), pp. 464 (1298), 476–90 (1245); G. Oliver, *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter and a History of the Cathedral with an Illustrative Appendix* (Exeter: William Roberts, 1861), pp. 297–301. I thank Hugh Thomas for these references.

¹² M. C. Miller, ‘The sources of textiles and vestments in early medieval Rome’, in *Rome and Religion in the Medieval World: Studies in Honor of Thomas F.X. Noble*, ed. V. L. Garver and O. M. Phelan (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 83–84. On the continuing importance of textiles ornamenting spaces, and their use not only in churches but also in palaces and plazas, see T. Ertl, ‘Stoffspektakel. Zur Funktion von Kleidern und Textilien am spätmittelalterlichen Papsthof’, *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, LXXXVII (2007), pp. 139–85, especially p. 157 and following.

¹³ R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti eds, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, 4 vols., *Fonti per la storia d’Italia* 81, 88, 90, 91 (Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1940–1953), III, p. 352: ‘... casulam unam albam et optimam pretioso aurifrigio circumdatam ad celebrationem missae’; O. Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Schriftquellen zur Kunstgeschichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts für Deutschland Lothringen und Italien* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1938), pp. 630–31, No. 2667: ‘duo pluvialia, unum rubeum et aliud fodoratum de glauco ... et camisium frixiatum in capella archiepiscopi et dalmaticam deauratam, utantur in principalibus festivitibus, ordine servato; et dalmaticam albam et tunicam albam in capella archiepiscopi; et tunicam rubeam ad usum canonicorum in laetaniis; et planetam rubeam in capella archiepiscopi ...’. For some of the reasons for the late written evidence in Rome and Italy for gifts of liturgical vestments, see Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 99–137.

¹⁴ E. Molinier, ‘Inventaire du trésor du Saint-Siège sous Boniface VIII (1295)’, *Bibliothèque de l’école des chartes*, XLIII (1882), pp. 277–310, 626–46; XLV (1884), pp. 31–57; XLVI (1885), pp. 16–44. The items inventoried are numbered, and to facilitate reference further citations will be to Molinier, ‘Inventaire’, and then the item number.

A Descriptive Language of Dominion?

¹⁵ L. Burkart, 'Das Verzeichnis als Schatz. Überlegungen zu einem *Inuentarium Thesauri Romane Ecclesie* der Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Cod. Ottob. lat. 2516, fol. 126r–132r)', *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, LXXXVI (2006), pp. 144–207.

¹⁶ *Regesti Clementis Papae V ex Vaticanis Archetypis Sanctissimi Domini nostri Leonis XIII Pontificis Maximi Ivssu et Mvnsificenta nunc primvm editi cura et studio monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti Appendices*, tomus I (Rome: Typographia Vaticana, 1892), pp. 357–513. I thank the Inter-Library Loan librarians of the Yale University Library for making this volume available to me. On this extraordinary document and its significance, see J. Gardner, 'The treasure of Pope Boniface VIII: the Perugian inventory of 1311', *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, XXXIV (2004), pp. 69–86. On the need for new editions of the three inventories of the papal treasury utilised here, see P.-Y. Le Pogam, 'Les inventaires du trésor pontifical entre la fin du XIIIe siècle et le début du XIVe siècle (1295, 1304, 1311). Pour une réédition et une confrontation', *Thesis Cahier d'histoire des collections et de Muséologie*, VII (2005), pp. 7–39.

¹⁷ E. Müntz and A. L. Frothingham, 'Il Tesoro della Basilica di S. Pietro in Vaticano dal XIII al XV secolo con una scelta d'inventari inediti', *Archivio della Società romana di storia patria*, VI (1883), pp. 1–137.

¹⁸ H. Hoberg, *Die Inventare des päpstlichen Schatzes in Avignon 1314–1376*, Studi e testi III (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1944).

¹⁹ V. Brancone, *Il Tesoro dei cardinali del Duecento: Inventari di libri e di beni mobili* (Florence: SISMEL – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2009) publishes new editions of the inventories published in the nineteenth century cited below and adds newly discovered material. I will cite her edition, but readers may also consult M. Prou, 'Inventaire des meubles du cardinal Geoffroi d'Alatri (1287)', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, V (1885), pp. 382–411; A. Teneroni, 'Inventario di sacri arredi appartenuti ai Cardinali Bentivegna e Matteo Bentivegna d'Acquasparta', *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th series, II (1888), pp. 260–66; G. Levi, 'Il cardinale Ottaviano degli Ubaldini secondo il suo carteggio ed altri documenti', *Archivio della Società romana di storia patria*, XIV (1891), pp. 231–303.

²⁰ A. Paravicini Bagliani, *I testamenti dei cardinali del Duecento*, Miscellanea della Società romana di storia patria 25 (Rome: Società romana di storia patria alla Biblioteca Vallicelliana, 1980).

²¹ Molinier, 'Inventaire', nos 881, 891, 902, 904, 916, 952, 967; other garments with English embroidery: 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 936, 949, 951, 952, 953, 954, 958, 961, 962, 964, 967, 971, 972, 973, 974, 976, 982, 984, 986, 988, 989, 991, 998, 1001, 1005, 1008, 1010, 1018, 1034, 1036. Fine embroidery work from England is known as early as the late eighth- or early ninth-century *casula* of Saints Harlindis and Relindis, now conserved at the church of Saint Catherine in Maaseik: M. Budney and D. Tweddle, 'The early medieval textiles at Maaseik, Belgium', *Antiquaries Journal*, LXV (1985), pp. 353–89. The term *opus anglicanum*, however, has tended since the late nineteenth century to be used more specifically to denote embroideries produced in England, chiefly in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, distinguished by the technique of 'underside couching': M. Flury-Lemberg, *Textile Conservation and Research: A Documentation of the Textile Department on the Occasion of the Twentieth Anniversary of the Abegg Foundation* (Bern: Schriften der Abegg-Stiftung, 1988), p. 118; G. R. Owen-Crocker, E. Coatsworth and M. Hayward, *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles in the British Isles c. 450–1450* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), s.v. *Opus anglicanum*, pp. 392–97; Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 131, 250. See discussion below, however, at notes 32–33.

²² Molinier, 'Inventaire', no. 890: 'unum pluviale de examito rubeo brodatur ad aurum de opere ciprensi cum rotis in quibus sunt grifones et aequile cum duobus capitibus, et due aves respicientes quemdam florem'; other vestments with 'Cyprus work': nos 882, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 906, 908, 910, 915, 919, 923, 943, 980, 987.

²³ *Ibid.*, nos 897, 898, 907, 920, 932, 933, 941, 946, 947, 949, 963, 978, 987, 994, 1000, 1001, 1014, 1019, 1098. On Tartar cloths, 'a generic name applied to a large and varied group of silks woven in Mongol-ruled territories of Central Asia and the Middle East', see D. Jacoby, 'Oriental silks go West: a declining trade in the later Middle Ages', in *Islamic Artefacts in the Mediterranean World: Trade, Gift Exchange and Artistic Transfer*, ed. C. Schmidt Arcangeli and G. Wolf (Venice: Marsilio, 2010), pp. 71–78.

²⁴ Molinier, 'Inventaire', no. 897: 'unum pluviale de panno tartarico rubeo ad aurum cum frixio de Alamania'; other examples of German embroidery: nos 886, 983, 1039.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, nos 958 (*de panno salernitano*), 1016 (*de panno lucano*), 1022 (*de tela Remensi*).

²⁶ *Ibid.*, nos 901, 921, 930, 934, 937, 959, 961, 973, 990, 992, 999, 1016, 1047, 1066, 1072.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, nos 929, 930, 931, 938, 939, 942, 960, 962.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, nos 887, 937, 944, 957, 959, 976, 996, 1031, 1035.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 810: 'In media autem parte sunt XX. lapides qui videntur zaffiri; sed magister Riccardus dixit eos esse vitreos vel cristallos. Item XX. lapides qui videntur granati, sed dicit magister Riccardus quod sunt cristallini'. A lack of certainty is also evident in some of the entries in the 1311 inventory where a tunicle is described as made 'de panno tartarico sive lucano' and lengths of cloth as 'quasi tartaricum' or 'factam ad modum panni tartarici': *Regesti Clementis Papae V*, pp. 422, 436, 438 — the insight is Jacoby's, 'Oriental silks go West', p. 77.

³⁰ D. Jacoby, 'Silk economics and cross-cultural artistic interaction: Byzantium, the Muslim world, and the Christian West', *Dumbarton Oak Papers*, LVIII (2004), pp. 217–18; Jacoby, 'Oriental silks go West', pp. 71–88, especially pp. 71 and 77–79.

³¹ S. Farmer, 'Medieval Paris and the Mediterranean: the evidence from the silk industry', *French Historical Studies*, XXXVII, no. III (2014), p. 402.

³² C. Elster, 'Liturgical textiles as papal donations in late medieval Italy', in *Dressing the Part: Textiles as Propaganda in the Middle Ages*, ed. K. Dimitrova and M. Goehring (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), pp. 65–79, 177–85, here in n. 15 p. 179.

³³ Ibid.; E. Wetter, 'Defining a model of worship: an embroidered orphrey with depictions based on the *Cantigas de Santa María*', in *Iconography of Liturgical Textiles in the Middle Ages*, Riggisberger Berichte XVIII, ed. E. Wetter (Riggisberg: Abegg-Stiftung, 2010), pp. 89–99, but especially pp. 97–98.

³⁴ Elster, 'Liturgical textiles,' p. 180 n. 27.

³⁵ Burkart, 'Das Verzeichnis als Schatz', nos 137 (*i frixium anglicanum*), 184 (*i pluviale pretiosum ad ymaginem de opere Anglicano*), 195 (*i planetam cum campo indico ad ymagines et arma de opere Anglicano*).

³⁶ Ibid., nos 192, 221 (*Tartarico*); 151, 154, 172, 179 (*Remensi*); 148, 285, 286, 325, 326, 327 (*de Alemania*); 245, 323.

³⁷ Ibid., nos 122, 139, 140, 182, 189, 204, 359.

³⁸ Ibid., nos 211, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217.

³⁹ Müntz and Frothingham, 'Il Tesoro della Basilica di S. Pietro', pp. 23, 32 (*de opere Neapolitano*), 23 (*de opere Senensi*), 19–22, 30 (*de opere Romano*), 15 (*de opere Saraceno*).

⁴⁰ I. Walter, 'Benedetto XI' and A. Paravicini Bagliani, 'Clement V', in *Enciclopedia dei papi*, 3 vols (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2000), II, pp. 493–500, 501–12.

⁴¹ *Regesti Clementis Papae V*, pp. 357–58, 369, 509; the inventory occupies pp. 369–513.

⁴² For this last detail, *ibid.*, p. 459: 'tres camisias sive scapularia de tela ad induendum, pro papa quando facit sibi radi barbam'.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 419: 'unum pulcrum pluviale de samito rubeo de opere cipri, laboratum ad magnos compassus rotundos cum duobus circulis de auro et serico, et inter ipsos circulos sunt vites et folia de auro filato, et in medio aliquorum compassuum sunt grifones, et in aliquibus aliis sunt papagalli duplices et in aliis aquile cum duplice capite. Et inter dictos compassus sunt alii minores compassus cum quatuor foliis, que folia habent liliium in capite. Et habe aurifrigium laboratum ad multos compassus de perlis et in medio compassuum sunt cruces de serico rubeo, viridi et indico. Et habet caputium de dico opere cum perlis et aquila in medio'.

⁴⁴ The 1295 inventory yields similar patterns. It recorded 1,617 textile objects, 777 of which referenced a place or people (48 per cent). The emphasis on such descriptors, as in the 1311 inventory, was stronger for vestments: all of the copes, 77 per cent of the chasubles and 84 per cent of the dalmatics were described as made of fabrics from specific cities or regions and decorated with 'work' of a place or people.

⁴⁵ Examples, *Regesti Clementis Papae V*, pp. 418, 422, 429, 433, 437, 456, 460–62, 464.

⁴⁶ Hoberg, *Die Inventare*, pp. 10–11.

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 22–31.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 45, 55–64, 90–96, 98, 122. In the 1314 inventory, 37 per cent of the chasubles and 27 per cent of the dalmatics are described referencing places and people; by the 1342–1343 inventory of Clement VI's treasure, only 13 per cent of the chasubles, 14 per cent of the dalmatics are listed with such descriptors.

⁴⁹ Brancone, *Il tesoro dei cardinali*, p. 47: 'Item septem planete, quarum due sunt de examito rubeo, tercia de examito glauco, quarta de examito viridi, quinta de purpura, sexta de bucharamo, septima de purpura cum listis'. *Bucharamus* was a light muslin originally made in Boukhara but also produced in Persia, the Maghreb and India.

⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 48–49: 'Item tuallia rubea saracena cum auro'. Another list of pieces of cloth, which Cardinal Ottaviano degli Ubaldi pawned to a group of Florentine merchants in 1262, also identified their places of manufacture (*Ispanie, de Romania, de Venetiis, Armenie, de Turchia, Tripolitano*), as did a list of cloths acquired 'in Curia Romana' by Archbishop Gonsalvo Gudiel and inventoried in 1280 for his return to Toledo: *ibid.*, pp. 75, 83–84, 160–61.

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 95–100, 103–05, these latter pages listing cloths from Reims, Lombardy, southern Italy, Rome, *Alemania* and Reggio.

⁵² Ibid., pp. 114–16 (quote from this final page): 'Item unum pluviale solenne de serico et auro cum ymaginibus apostolorum et diversarum avium de opere anglicano'; 142, 143–45.

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 131–32, 154–55, 193–99.

⁵⁴ Paravicini Bagliani, *I testamenti*, pp. 111, 123: 'Item unum camisum episcopale cum aurifrigio'.

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 127–28, 235, 274, 306.

⁵⁶ Ibid., pp. 323–25.

⁵⁷ Beyond mention of a 'dossale tartarescum' in Cardinal Francesco Orsini's 1304 will, and of a white cope in Tartar cloth in Cardinal Leonardo da Guarcino's testament of 1311, the general conventions of description reign; in Cardinal Guglielmo Longhi's 1316 will no indications of origins are given for textiles: *ibid.*, pp. 348, 387, 413–14. On 'Florentine work', see M. Salmi, 'Il paliotto di Manresa e l'"opus Florentinum"', *Bollettino d'Arte*, 2nd series, X (1931), pp. 385–406.

⁵⁸ The most recent study and edition is V. Fennicchia, 'L'inventario dei paramenti e degli oggetti di sacra suppellettile donati da Bonifacio VIII alla cattedrale di Anagni', *Storia e letteratura*, CXXXIX–CXL (1979), pp. 513–26. The same set of inventories has also been published in L. Mortari, *Il Tesoro della cattedrale di Anagni* (Rome: De Luca Editore, 1963), pp. 12–17; and in X. Barbier de Montault, 'Trésor cathédrale: Inventaire de Boniface VIII', *Annales Archéologiques*, XVIII (1858), pp. 18–32.

⁵⁹ Fennicchia, 'L'inventario', pp. 518–20, 523–24. The earliest inventory (1338) of the sacristy of the basilica of S. Francesco at Assisi reveals a very similar pattern: of 122 entries for liturgical vestments only 17 (14 per cent) used a place or people descriptor, and 16 of these were usages of *tartarico* as a type of fabric. L. Alessandri and F. Pennacchi, 'I più

A Descriptive Language of Dominion?

antichi inventari della sacristia del Sacro Convento di Assisi (1338–1473): Bibl. Com. di Assisi, Cod. 337', *Archivum franciscanum historicum*, VII (1914), pp. 82–89. Both Assisi and Anagni had significant contact with the curia, and vestments donated by Boniface VIII appear in both inventories.

⁶⁰ Compare Fennicchia, 'L'inventario', p. 521, no. 38: 'Item unum pluviale de samito Rubeo laborato ad ecum [sic, acum], de euro [sic, auro] battuto, ad Griffos, pappagallos et sequilas [sic, aquilas] cum duobus capitibus' to Molinier, 'Inventaire', no. 890: 'unum pluviale de examito rubeo brodatum ad aurum de opere ciprensi cum rotis in quibus sunt grifones et aquile cum duobus capitibus, et due aves respicientes quemdam florem'.

⁶¹ Simpson, 'Two inventories', p. 475: 'Capa, quae dicitur Alardi Decani, est de purpureo samito, breudata rosis, stellis, et gladeolis, et lunulis, cum tassellis, in quibus breudantur Sanctus Petrus et Sanctus Paulus'; *Mittelalterliche Schatzverzeichnisse*, pp. 27, 40–42, 52–55, 95–97.

⁶² Jacoby, 'Oriental silks go West', p. 81.

⁶³ B. F. Byerly and C. R. Byerly, eds, *Records of the Wardrobe and Household 1285–1286* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1977), p. 247 no. 2355: 'et in pannis et peluris, diversis tapetis, banqueris, sellis brudatis et aliis emptis Paris' et in Flandr' per Adinettum cissorem regis ...'.

⁶⁴ L. M. Sylvester, M. C. Chambers and G. R. Owen-Crocker, *Medieval Dress and Textiles in Britain: A Multilingual Sourcebook*, Medieval and Renaissance Clothing and Textiles 2 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014), pp. 16–17: 'Et ad faciendum .j. tunicam & capucio duplex de panno bleu longo pro Rege ad hastiludum suum Cantuariam & ad eandem tunicam fururand' — iiii. ulne pann' bleu long' — j. fur' de .ccxl ventr' miniver pur'. 'Pured' miniver means trimming the grey squirrel fur to leave only the pure white belly: Owen-Crocker, et al., *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles*, p. 367.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 117–25; *Records of the Wardrobe*, pp. 242, 246–47; J. Topham ed., *Liber quotidianus contrarotulatoris garderobae. Anno regni Regis Eduardi primi vicesimo octavo. A. D. MCCXCIX. & MCCC. Ex codice ms. in biblioteca sua asservato typis editit Soc. antiq. Londinensis* (London: J. Nichols, 1787), p. 354; S. M. Newton, *Fashion in the Age of the Black Prince: A Study of the Years 1340–1365* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1980), pp. 25–27, 133–39; L. Doué d'Arcey, *Comptes de l'argenterie des rois de France au XIVe siècle publié pour la Société de l'histoire de France d'après des manuscrits originaux* (Paris: J. Reouard et cie, 1951), pp. 5–73 (account of Geoffrie de Fleuri), 18–19, 54 (*Turquia*), 7, 29 (Douai), 54 (Greece, Lucca), 50–54 (Reims).

⁶⁶ F. B. Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, ed. A. Evans, Mediaeval Academy of America Publication 24 (Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1936), pp. xiv, 3–12; for examples of merchant inventories, B. Cecchetti, *La vita dei Veneziani nel 1300* (Venice: Tipografia Emiliana, 1886), pp. 113–29, which includes one of the contents of Marco Polo's warehouse. Of all the cloths listed, only four are described as *tartaresca* and three from *catai* (China).

⁶⁷ Jacoby, 'Oriental silks go West', p. 73.

⁶⁸ Gardner, *The Roman Crucible*, p. 13.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 13–15, 386–88.

⁷⁰ *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Libelli de Lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI. et XII. conscripti*, 3 vols (Hannover: Hahn, 1891–1897), II, p. 428, or R. M. Tomson ed. and trans., *Tractatus Garsiae or The Translation of the Relics of Gold and Silver* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), pp. 24–25.

⁷¹ Peter the Chanter, *Verbum adverbium, textus conflates*, ed. Monique Boutry, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 196 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 563–64: 'Si etiam obiciatur quod hodie in Ecclesia est superflua uarietas auri, argenti, palliorum aurifrigiorum, ornamentorum et omnimoda uestis holoserica, respondeo quod melius ista exponerentur ad uendendum quam pauperes ad imbrem, melius exponerentur ad usuram quam pauperes at pruinam'. For the broader debate over liturgical vestments of costly materials, see Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 207–37.

⁷² D. Waley, 'Bentivegna (Bentivegni)' and G. Barone, 'Matteo d'Acquasparta', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1960–), VIII, pp. 586–87; LXXII, pp. 204–08.

⁷³ For examples of lay donations of ecclesiastical vestments, see Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Schriftquellen*, pp. 634 no. 2692, 636 no. 2697, 637 no. 2703, 638 no. 2706; *Mittelalterliche Schatzverzeichnisse*, p. 110, where a purple cope decorated with birds was given by *regina Richenza*, either the wife of Lothar III (1125–1137) or that of Mieszko II of Poland (1025–1031).

⁷⁴ Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 29, 53–95, 144–53.

⁷⁵ See, for example, J. D. Ryan, ed., *The Spiritual Expansion of Medieval Latin Christendom: The Asian Missions* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013); J. France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom, 1000–1714* (London: Routledge, 2005); A. Jotischky, 'The Mendicants as Missionaries and Travellers in the Near East in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', in *Eastward Bound: Travels and Travellers, 1050–1500*, ed. R. Allen (Manchester: University Press, 2004), pp. 88–106.

⁷⁶ On the composition of the cardinalate and papacy, see J. F. Broderick, 'The Sacred College of Cardinals: size and geographical composition (1099–1986)', *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 25 (1987), pp. 16–21; on the ecclesiastical politics of the era, see B. Schimmelpfennig, *The Papacy*, trans. J. Sievert (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), pp. 193–200 or G. Barraclough, *The Medieval Papacy* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968), pp. 134–47; specifically on Boniface VIII, A. Paravicini Bagliani, *Bonifacio VIII* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi Editore, 2003), especially pp. 282–366.

⁷⁷ W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1965), pp. 413–14, 447–48; Schimmelpfennig, *The Papacy*, pp. 181–83, 196; E. Conte, 'La bolla *Unam sanctam* e i fondamenti del potere papale fra diritto e teologia', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome Moyen âge*, cxiii, no. 1 (2001), pp. 663–84.

⁷⁸ Paravicini Bagliani, *Bonifacio VIII*, pp. 223–34, 244–54; A. Paravicini Bagliani, *Le Chiavi e la Tiara: Immagini e simboli del papato medievale*, La corte dei papi 3 (Rome: Viella, 1998), pp. 20–21, 66–72.

⁷⁹ L. Duchesne, ed., *Le Liber Censuum de l'église romaine*, III (Paris: Fontemoing, 1889–1905), p. 160: 'Monasterium sanctorum Anastasii et Innocentii situm in Ganderseim tenetur ecclesie Romane singulis annis in duabus stolis precioso serico et aurifrisio contestis in quibus triginta bisantii auro frisiso contexti debent esse inserti'.

⁸⁰ Gardner, *The Roman Crucible*, p. 211: 'qui parat aurifrixia domini papa'.

MAUREEN C. MILLER is a professor of History at the University of California, Berkeley. She is the author of *Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800-1200* (Cornell University Press, 2014) and other works on the culture of the secular clergy during the early and central Middle Ages.