

Article

The Remission Phase in the Canonization of Francis Borgia (1649–1655)

Henar Pizarro Llorente 

Department of Philosophy and Humanities, Comillas Pontifical University, 28015 Madrid, Spain; hpizarro@comillas.edu

Abstract

This article examines a decisive yet relatively understudied stage in the canonization process of Francis Borgia, third superior general of the Society of Jesus, by focusing on the remission phase carried out between 1649 and 1655. Although Borgia had been beatified in 1624, the path toward his canonization extended over several decades, shaped by a combination of institutional, political, and procedural factors that slowed its progress. The pontificate of Innocent X marked a turning point, creating favorable conditions for renewed momentum within the Roman Curia. Following authorization by the Congregation of Rites, the remission phase formally commenced in 1649, leading to a series of witness examinations conducted in key Iberian centers—Toledo, Madrid, and Valencia—beginning in 1650. By analyzing the selection of witnesses in each location and the substance of their testimonies, the article sheds light on the strategies employed to consolidate Borgia's reputation for sanctity and to address juridical expectations in Rome. Particular attention is given to the coordination between local ecclesiastical authorities and the central institutions of the Holy See. The study argues that the efficiency and coherence of this phase, culminating in the issuance of the remission briefs in 1655, played a crucial role in advancing the cause toward its successful conclusion in 1670.

Keywords: canonization process; Society of Jesus; early modern sainthood

1. Introduction

The canonization cause of Francis Borgia, third superior general of the Society of Jesus, extended from his beatification, decreed by Pope Urban VIII on 24 November 1624, until 21 June 1670¹. A variety of factors contributed to the protracted nature of the process, while progress unfolded in a slow yet persistent manner. The accession of Innocent X to the papal throne in 1644 made renewed advancement possible. In 1649, the Congregation of Rites authorized the opening of the remission phase, which led to the examination of witnesses in 1650 in Toledo, Madrid, and Valencia. In this regard, the selection of witnesses in each of these locations, together with the significance of their testimonies, provides deeper insight into the development of the process that ultimately led Borgia to the altars, so that the faithful might render him universal veneration as a saint. This phase unfolded efficiently and successfully, as the remission briefs were issued in 1655.

It should be clarified that this article adopts a juridical–procedural framework, focusing specifically on the remission phase (1649–1655) within the post-Tridentine canonical structure. The study offers an analysis of the witnesses selected to give testimony, the rationale underlying their selection for this task, and their integration into the various groups that supported the advancement of the cause. To this end, it draws upon previously



Academic Editor: Katharine Olson

Received: 11 February 2026

Revised: 24 February 2026

Accepted: 18 March 2026

Published: 21 March 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and

conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\) license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

unpublished documentation from the ARSI (Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu), specifically from the APG section (Archivio della Postulazione Generale [Santi]), pertaining to this phase of the process.

2. The Factors That Prolonged the Canonization Process

2.1. *The Tridentine Redefinition of Sanctity and the Roman Centralization of Canonization Procedures*

The collective perception of sainthood has undergone significant transformations across different historical periods. Critiques advanced by Christian humanism and Protestantism against the medieval understanding of sanctity and the practices of saintly veneration prompted the Council of Trent (1562–1563) to address this issue with the aim of redefining the concept. The establishment of bodies responsible for centralizing the recognition of sainthood developed in parallel with the affirmation of papal primacy established by the decretals of Gregory IX in 1234. Although effective pontifical control was consolidated gradually—supported by the action of the Roman Holy Office to prevent deviations and excesses—it remained essential to renew the model of sanctity, a matter addressed in the final session of the third Tridentine period. The appointed commission reaffirmed the intercessory role of the saints, the tradition of their veneration since the origins of Christianity, and the legitimacy of devotion to relics and images. Within this framework, the bishop, a key figure in the proposed reforms, was tasked with guiding the faithful toward a dual objective: encouraging the imitation of the saints' lives and exercising vigilance to prevent deviations in devotional practice that might compromise orthodoxy. See: (Jedin 1972, pp. 253–54, 274–80; Suire 2001; Kaziri 2014; García y García 1989; Vauchez 1981; Eire 1996, pp. 28–39; Gotor 2004, pp. 17–23, 26, 30–35).

From the late sixteenth century onward, the papacy progressively established institutional bodies to manage matters related to the recognition of sainthood. The formal institutionalization of the Congregation of Rites by Sixtus V in 1588 formed part of the broader structural reforms undertaken within the Holy See. Following the work carried out by the Tribunal of the Rota, this commission was entrusted with examining the dossiers of the candidates, which included information concerning their lives, the exercise of the theological and cardinal virtues, as well as reported supernatural experiences. The establishment of new bodies continued with the creation of the Congregation of Beatification in 1602 under Clement VIII.² In practice, the members of the Congregation of Rites and the Roman Holy Office collaborated closely in the supervision of canonization causes. Paul V (1607–1621) maintained this dynamic by establishing that every candidate had to be beatified by the pontiff prior to canonization, thereby prohibiting unauthorized personal cults. The concentration of authority over the recognition of sainthood in papal hands reached its culmination under Urban VIII (1623–1644), while the monitoring and sanctioning of transgressions remained the responsibility of the Holy Office (Papa 2001; Gotor 2002).

2.2. *Seventeenth-Century Canonical Legislation and Its Delaying Effects on Canonization Causes*

Between 1625 and 1631, a series of decrees established the canonical procedures governing beatification and canonization. These provisions curtailed popular initiatives and reduced episcopal competences, which were made subject to Roman approval. The depiction of individuals who had not been beatified or canonized with a halo of sanctity was prohibited, as was the placement of lamps or epitaphs at their tombs and the publication of accounts of miracles or revelations. All printed biographies of candidates for recognized sainthood were required to include a formal protestation clause. Although cases involving immemorial cults were exempted, it was stipulated that no new cause could be initiated unless these norms had been observed. In addition, a minimum period of fifty years from

the candidate's death was established before a cause for beatification could be opened. These measures were compiled and published in 1634 and subsequently in 1642. The reforms introduced made it necessary to restart all ongoing processes, resulting in significant delays in their resolution. Indeed, no canonizations were recorded in the following decades, affecting, among others, the cause of Francis Borgia (Armogathe 2005, pp. 149–54).

The canonizations carried out by the Church in the seventeenth century represented the exaltation of the leading figures of the Catholic Reformation, grounded in Tridentine principles. Within this framework, several categories have been identified that characterized the new saints: exemplary bishops (such as Saint Charles Borromeo), founders or reformers of religious orders (such as Ignatius of Loyola or Teresa of Jesus), prominent missionaries whose work proved especially significant (such as Francis Xavier), as well as religious figures from the sixteenth century and earlier periods. In this context, the relationship between the Spanish Monarchy and the Holy See during the development of canonization processes was decisive. The support of the Crown was essential to achieving this objective, even though the final decision rested entirely with the pope. As various studies have noted, the notion of the Spanish Monarchy as a 'Catholic Monarchy' took shape under Philip II, was consolidated under his successor, and reached its fullest definition during the reign of Philip IV. In the jurisdictional struggle between the Monarchy and the papacy, both Charles V and, above all, Philip II managed to subordinate the pontiffs to the interests of a Monarchy that presented itself as "Universal." However, in the early decades of the seventeenth century, the popes reversed this situation, subjecting the Monarchy to the influence of the Church. This concept of "Catholic Monarchy" entailed the establishment of a series of rites and devotions intended to promote its acceptance throughout society. Such religious practice was accompanied by an ideological discourse aimed at reducing the prominence of the Spanish Monarchy in the development of an autonomous and universalist political thought. To this end, the idea of an equal fusion with the Empire was promoted, so that both dynastic branches might share a primary objective: the defense of the Catholic Church. See: (Martínez Millán 2003, 2008, 2013, 2018; Martínez Millán and Visceglia 2008).

Thus, the concentration of authority over the recognition of sainthood in papal hands meant that aspirants had to be presented and defended amid the competition generated by the simultaneous candidacies of others, within a procedure governed by highly precise norms and timelines. The difficulty of securing solid support and the considerable financial costs involved compelled promoters to assess the risks carefully, including the potential negative consequences of failure. The models to be emulated were drawn from figures representative of the spirituality emanating from Rome (such as Philip Neri) and from reformers who advanced the new ideal of the bishop and the missionary, in keeping with the orientation promoted by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (such as Archbishop Thomas of Villanova). Candidates who did not conform to these categories, such as Francis Borgia, therefore faced greater obstacles in attaining universal veneration, which in his case were compounded by additional, specific constraints.

2.3. The Case of Francis Borgia: Political, Familial, and Hagiographical Constraints

Although petitions calling for the elevation of Francis Borgia to the altars began to circulate shortly after his death on 30 September 1572, the process proved protracted. The procedure leading to beatification began in 1607, encouraged by Pope Paul V and promoted by the Duke of Lerma. While the Society of Jesus firmly supported the cause, it was deemed unnecessary to publicize Borgia's figure, as he was believed to enjoy widespread renown. In this regard, it should not be forgotten that this was a lineage that had produced two popes, Pope Callixtus III and Pope Alexander VI, and that was related by kinship to

Ferdinand II of Aragon. See also: (Batllori 1999). Informative processes were initiated with the participation of numerous individuals who had known him personally. From 1611 onward, petitions for beatification began to reach Rome, addressed both to the ambassador and directly to the pontiff. The Duke of Lerma remained the principal advocate of the cause, although several of Borgia's great-grandsons also intervened in the diplomatic negotiations. Paul V and the Jesuit superior general Vitelleschi authorized the transfer of Borgia's remains to Madrid. On 22 April 1617, the body was entrusted to Cardinal Antonio de Zapata for its conveyance from Rome. Owing to the unfinished state of the Jesuit Professed House in Madrid, the remains were temporarily deposited in the Royal Convent of the Incarnation until their definitive placement there on 18 December of the same year. Beatification was decreed by Urban VIII on 24 November 1624. Aware of the event's significance as a reflection of familial prestige, the descendants of the fourth Duke of Gandía chose to postpone the celebrations until September 1625 in order to stage them with appropriate splendor. The solemn thanksgiving ceremony was attended by the monarchs and the principal figures of the court. His noble status was especially emphasized during the celebrations, presenting him as a man who, from his elevated position, had served as counselor to Emperor Charles V and had applied the political experience acquired during his courtly career to the governance of the Society of Jesus in the service of the Church (García Hernán 2010b, pp. 80–82; Rodríguez de G. Ceballos 2011, p. 294). See also: (García Hernán 2010a; Coloma 1903, pp. 11–20; Simón Díaz 1992, pp. 108–9; Felipo Orts 2012, pp. 67–68).

The canonization of Francis Borgia, initially regarded as imminent owing to the support of the Congregation of Rites, was delayed by the decrees promulgated by Urban VIII between 1625 and 1631, which established a new procedural framework and required the reopening of cases already underway. The expectations of the Borgia family for a swift resolution were thus frustrated, especially as the evolving relationship between the Spanish Monarchy and the papacy did not favor this outcome. While the fourth Duke of Gandía had served both emperor and pope, his descendants were compelled to navigate mounting tensions in maintaining this dual loyalty. Cardinal Gaspar de Borja, the blessed's great-grandson, assumed responsibility for promoting the cause after the beatification, while his brother Melchor, appointed General of the Neapolitan Galleys in 1627, provided financial support. However, during the consistory of 1632, Gaspar de Borja openly protested against Urban VIII's policies concerning Spanish interests in the Thirty Years' War, prioritizing his duties as royal ambassador over his cardinalatial status. This action gravely damaged his political standing and influence. Undoubtedly, a context marked by strained relations between Philip IV and the pontiff during the conflict hindered the progress of the canonization process.

In response, the Society of Jesus sought to advance the cause by reshaping Borgia's image in accordance with Roman expectations. To this end, in 1644, Juan Bautista Nieremberg composed a new biography that, from an ascetic-mystical perspective, emphasized humility and detachment from the world in contrast to noble vanity, while highlighting the blessed's virtues and miracles. This work replaced the earlier biography by Pedro de Ribadeneira, which had been written with the aim of reconciling diverse—and at times conflicting—interests surrounding Borgia's figure and of projecting an image that embodied an ideal of sanctity for the Spanish nobility, at the service of both king and God. Such an image, however, was deemed unlikely to secure the necessary papal favor of Urban VIII. At the same time, Borgia's iconography was transformed, depicting him with the Eucharistic monstrance in reference to his devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. Through these adaptations, efforts were made to align Borgia's image with the successful models

required for the attainment of officially recognized sainthood. See: (La Parra López 2011; Martín López 2010, pp. 224–26; Aldea Vaquero 1986; Visceglia 2003; Chaparro 2011).

3. The Development of the Remission Phase

3.1. *The Reactivation of the Cause Under Innocent X and the Mobilization of Dynastic and Royal Support*

The election of Innocent X as pontiff in 1644 made it possible to reactivate the canonization process of the Blessed Francis Borgia with the support of Philip IV. The family clan promoted the revival of the cause, whose success they regarded as a familial triumph. Thus, in the summer of 1645, a series of letters were sent by prominent members of the lineage, including Francisco de Borja y Aragón, Prince of Esquilache, who alluded in his letter to the pope to his recent widowhood following the death of his wife, Ana de Borja. The ninth Count of Lemos likewise emphasized his kinship with the Blessed and the distinction that canonization would bring to the House of Borgia, arguments echoed by the seventh Duke of the Infantado, who underscored the support provided by the family for Innocent X's elevation to the papal throne. He also expressed the expectation that the Society of Jesus would press this petition as a result of the Eighth General Congregation then being held in Madrid. These requests were accompanied by a letter from the king to the pontiff, dated 20 September 1647, which emphasized the growing devotion of the faithful and the miracles worked through Borgia's intercession. The monarch further reported that he had instructed the Count of Oñate and Villamediana, ambassador in Rome, to appear in person to present this petition on his behalf.³

3.2. *Canonical Verification and Obstacles in the Roman Phase of the Process*

In late February 1647, the Congregation of Rites proceeded to verify that the process conformed to the decrees of Urban VIII, thereby making it possible to initiate the remission phase. Tasked with rigorously ensuring that no irregularities were present, the long intervals between successive meetings of the Congregation led Cardinal Ciriaco Rocci to press the body repeatedly to bring its deliberations to a conclusion.⁴ Thus, in January 1648, the Congregation ordered a renewed review of all the documentation concerning the miracles attributed to the Blessed, as well as of his writings both prior to and subsequent to his entry into the Society of Jesus. These two issues were evidently of great importance, since it was necessary, on the one hand, to assess the extraordinary events said to have occurred through his intercession, and, on the other, to address the fact that one of his works had been deemed heretical by the Spanish Inquisition and included in the Index of Prohibited Books of 1559. Although his reputation had later been rehabilitated through the actions of the Inquisitor General Gaspar de Quiroga—who published the Catalogue of Prohibited Books in 1583 and the Expurgatory Index the following year, explicitly naming Borgia among the authors who had been removed from censure—this issue proved to be one of the factors that most significantly delayed the resolution of the process. Cardinal Rocci's final intervention before the Congregation took place in July 1649, when his efforts met with success and resulted in the issuance of the remission and compulsoria letters.⁵

3.3. *Opening of the Remission Phase and Institutional Coordination*

So, the Congregation of Rites authorized the opening of the remission phase in October 1649, which led to the examination of witnesses the following year in Toledo, Madrid, and Valencia. At the same time, the Society of Jesus republished the biography of Borgia authored by Francesco Sacchini in 1622, entitled *Historiae Societatis Iesu, pars tertia, sive Borgia*, issued in Rome in 1649, and focused on his tenure as Superior General, offering more balanced assessments of his spirituality than those presented by other biographers.

Likewise, having obtained the approval of the Congregation, both the Superior General of the Society of Jesus and the Vicar General sent letters to the rector of the Professed House in Madrid, Manuel Pardo, as well as to the city of Toledo, to the assistant of the rector of the Professed House in Valencia, Father Miguel de San Román, and to Martín Pérez, rector of the Jesuit College of San Pablo in Valencia, in order to keep them informed and prepared for further progress in the canonization cause. Following the death of Cardinal Gaspar de Borja in 1645, the principal impetus for the process within the family clan fell to Fernando de Borja y Aragón, son of the first Count of Mayalde, joined by the eighth Duke of Gandía, Francisco Diego Borja Centelles, who closely monitored developments through his contacts with Father Alonso Yáñez, rector of the Professed House in Toledo, and with the Superior General of the Society after the completion of the collection of testimonies.⁶

3.4. *The Toledo Proceedings: Ritual, Personnel, and Judicial Formalities*

The Toledan remission process began on Friday, 20 May 1650, with a meeting held in the archiepiscopal palace attended by Cardinal Baltasar Moscoso y Sandoval, primate archbishop of Toledo; Fray Pedro Orozco, Bishop of Temnus; Fray Miguel Abellán, Bishop of Syria; and the apostolic notary Julián de Pedraza, a Jesuit appointed by the Vicar General of the Society of Jesus in matters relating to the canonization cause of the Blessed Francis Borgia. In accordance with the instructions issued by the Congregation of Rites, Jacinto de Urtariz Ibáñez, fiscal promoter of the Archiepiscopal Court of Toledo, was to be summoned to ensure that proceedings were conducted in conformity with canon law, as was the ecclesiastical prosecutor Ignacio de Velasco, apostolic public notary and secretary to the nuncio, who was responsible for certifying the accuracy of the transcription of the testimonies. Likewise, the cathedral chapter supported the proceedings through two of its members: the dean canon Antonio Fernández Portocarrero and Pascual de Aragón, archdeacon of Talavera. The archbishop of Toledo appointed the bachelor Blasco Antonio de Valencia to exercise the office of nuncio, while the promoter of the faith deputed by the Congregation of Rites was Pedro Francisco de Rubeis, who was assisted by an interpreter, Martín de Ximena, a cleric of the diocese of Jaén residing in Toledo and secretary to Cardinal Moscoso y Sandoval.⁷

The appointed officials gathered between the two choir stalls of the cathedral to receive and open the letters and packet containing the instructions of the Congregation. The dean and chapter organized the reception of the procession at the Puerta del Perdón, which was preceded by musicians playing kettledrums and wind instruments—like trumpets—as a demonstration of celebration and joy. This was followed by the banner bearing, on one side, the image of the Blessed and, on the other, the arms of his house. A large group of knights and citizens accompanied it, along with a significant representation of members of religious orders. Pascual de Aragón, canon and archdeacon of Talavera, as well as professor of Canon Law at the University of Toledo, brought up the rear of the procession, carrying the documents pertaining to the remission letters that were to be put into effect.⁸ Upon reaching the designated place between the two choir stalls, the banner was placed on the high altar and the documents were laid upon a desk prepared for their opening, with Julián de Pedraza ensuring the strict observance of the prescribed procedures. It was decided that witnesses were to appear to give testimony in the chapel of Our Lady of the Conception located in the archiepiscopal palace. Accordingly, from 23 May onward, those summoned were required, after taking an oath, to testify by responding to the questions put to them.⁹

3.5. *Structure and Scope of the Interrogatories*

The interrogation naturally focused on the essential matters necessary for the continuation of the canonization process. Structured in twenty-four questions, translated from

Latin into Castilian from the original text contained in the documentation received—a task carried out by Martín de Ximena, a member of the Toledan prelate’s household—the questionnaire addressed in detail the issues that the Congregation of Rites was required to examine and verify.¹⁰ First, the witnesses were warned of the gravity of committing perjury and of the importance of truthful testimony, given that the matter concerned sanctity. They were required to begin by providing information regarding their name, age, place of origin, profession, family background, and wealth, as well as the frequency with which they confessed and received communion and the last occasion on which they had done so. They were also asked whether they had encountered any problems with justice—even if they had been acquitted after prosecution—or whether they had been excommunicated, subsequently absolved or still under censure. Finally, they were to declare whether they had been instructed on what to say in their testimony and, if so, by whom and in what manner.

They were asked whether they felt devotion toward the Blessed and whether they desired his canonization; whether they knew when the Blessed had died, where he had been buried, and whether they had visited his tomb. They were also required to testify as to their knowledge of the condition of the tomb, whether it had undergone any transfers, and, if so, where it was currently located, under what conditions, when the relocation had taken place, and who had ordered and financed it. In all cases, witnesses were further asked whether they knew of any memorial or inscription placed on the tomb and, if so, of its content. They were to specify whether the influx of the faithful was continuous throughout the year or limited to particular dates, and whether they knew the motives that led frequent visitors to attend, when such visits had begun, and to what extent this devotion stemmed from the Blessed’s reputation as a saint and powerful intercessor, whose favor was sought.

Particular emphasis was placed on the notion of public fame as attested by the witness: whether this reputation was confined to a single locality or extended to other places; whether it originated among persons with vested interests or close ties—such as relatives, friends, members of the Society of Jesus, or other sympathetic religious—or whether it was upheld by persons of standing rather than by ordinary or ignorant individuals, such as women or rural laborers; and whether this fame had been constant and enduring or short-lived and gradually dissipating. Witnesses were also asked whether they had discussed this reputation with relatives or friends, on what occasions, and whether they had heard that such fame already existed in the time of their elders. Finally, they were to state whether this reputation had grown and persisted not only in places where the Blessed had lived or in Madrid, where his tomb was located, but also elsewhere.

They were likewise questioned about the gathering of the faithful at the tomb: what kinds of people attended; whether attendance had increased or declined, especially since 1624, and for what reasons; whether visitors came to venerate him as a saint; whether ex votos had been placed at the tomb itself or before one of his images, of what kind and in what quantity, and whether these offerings had endured over time. Similarly, they were asked whether lamps, candles, or other forms of lighting had been installed, who had paid for them, and how long they had remained in place. They were also questioned as to whether Mass had been celebrated at the tomb or before an image of the Blessed, and specifically whether Masses were offered in his honor or commemoration under the title of Blessed or Saint, whether this occurred at particular times of the year or in specific churches, which authority had granted permission for such celebrations, whether attendance was general or limited to local inhabitants, and since when such practices had been observed.

The witnesses were expressly questioned about any miracles they knew to have occurred through the intercession of the Blessed, whether reported to them or directly witnessed and experienced, and were required to declare everything they knew regarding their circumstances (place, time, witnesses, and so forth). They were asked to consider

whether the events in question exceeded the powers of nature and could therefore be attributed to a miracle. In this regard, they were questioned about the distinction between grace and miracle, whether they believed that God's grace could be obtained through the mediation of a saint, and whether they perceived the difference between such grace and events attributable solely to natural causes. Witnesses were repeatedly and meticulously questioned on all aspects of their testimony concerning miracles and graces, as well as on the Blessed's reputation in relation to these matters and in connection with the aspects of public fame addressed previously. It was specified that interrogation or admonition might be employed to ensure that the witness provided all information known to them, whether directly or indirectly, as well as their opinion or conjecture regarding the Blessed's sanctity. The final question concerned the veneration of relics: whether it had increased since 1624, in which places—especially whether it had extended beyond the local contexts of Madrid and Rome, where he had lived and died—and whether such veneration was spontaneous or promoted by particular individuals or by members of the Society of Jesus.

On 25 May, the tribunal was formally constituted at ten o'clock in the morning, and the necessary checks were carried out regarding the interrogation and its translation into Castilian, in order to ensure that the proceedings conformed in every respect to the decrees established by Urban VIII. In order to advance the canonization process, the matters that had to be proven through the interrogations were clearly defined. The investigations to be conducted were organized into five sections, reflecting the substance of the questions to be put to the witnesses, which were articulated in different forms throughout the interrogation.

1. Whether it was true that there had always existed a common, public, and well-established reputation that the Blessed Francis Borgia conducted the course of his life in the continual practice of the theological and cardinal virtues in heroic degree, and that he performed miracles even during his earthly lifetime; whether such a reputation was not confined solely to the cities of Toledo, Madrid, and Valencia, but extended to other parts of the world; and whether all of this had been confirmed by the testimonies of serious and reputable men, without any of them being able to say anything to the contrary.
2. Whether it was true that, since the Blessed had been received into the heavenly dwelling, his reputation had led to popular gatherings of men and women, as well as persons of standing and distinction, at his tomb and in the veneration of his relics, in order to seek his intercession and to commend themselves to him in both spiritual and temporal matters; whether inquiry should be made specifically into the healing of various illnesses, and whether the Blessed enjoyed a reputation as a healer in any part of the world, transcending the local sphere; and whether all of this had been confirmed by testimonies without any contradiction to such a reputation.
3. Whether the veneration of his relics since he had been declared Blessed had increased in Rome and Madrid, as well as throughout the rest of the world, following the decrees issued by Urban VIII on this matter in 1624 and 1625; whether it could be verified that pilgrims of all social conditions came to his tomb, what reputation he enjoyed among those who visited it, and what spiritual or temporal benefits they obtained. More specific reference was also made to the tomb itself, to the paintings that adorned it, to the *ex votos*, to wax figures, candles or lit lamps, and to other objects and ornaments that might reflect the growing devotion to his relics. The witnesses were required to declare whether they themselves had obtained countless favors through his intercession, and to testify to the universal reputation associated with these matters.
4. Whether there was evidence that miracles had occurred through the intercession of Francis Borgia since Urban VIII had declared him Blessed, and whether instantaneous

healings or similar extraordinary events—belonging to the third category, and likewise to the second—had been verified as having taken place in various parts of the world, and what reputation he enjoyed in this regard. Emphasis was placed on the requirement that the questions posed should relate directly to the testimony provided by the witnesses, who were to report either on what they had personally experienced or on what they had learned through others.

5. Whether the Blessed's reputation for sanctity was widespread, public, and well established by virtue of the benefits obtained through his intercession;¹¹

3.6. *Extension of the Process to Madrid and Valencia*

In mid-June 1650, the extension of the process to the city of Madrid began. Gabriel de Arenas, lawyer of the Royal Councils and fiscal promoter of the archiepiscopal court, went to the Convent of San Gil of the Discalced Franciscans to initiate the summons of witnesses and the taking of depositions, a task in which Julián de Pedraza—who normally resided at the Imperial College in Madrid—was engaged until the end of July. While women were received in the chapel of the Blessed Pascual Bailón, men were summoned to the cloister of the Chapel of the Holy Christ.¹² It was precisely through his initiative, undertaken in defense of the rights of the Society of Jesus in the cause, that the initial list of witnesses was expanded to include individuals associated with the Monastery of the Incarnation, as well as several nuns of the Descalzas Reales, who gave testimony within their convent. Moreover, the proceedings conducted in Madrid made it possible to carry out a visit to the tomb of Francis Borgia in the Jesuit Professed House and to subject his burial site to a detailed examination.

The procedural framework established in Toledo and Madrid was replicated in Valencia during the months of September and October 1650. There, witnesses were received in the Chapel of the Nativity of the archiepiscopal palace to give testimony, under the supervision of the promoter Martín Guillermo Villorado, a presbyter and doctor of theology of the Valencian Church. He was assisted by two presbyters, Vicente Bassant and Vicente Pérez de Cullamilito, and the proceedings were attended by the bishops of Valencia and Segorbe—both royal councilors—Pedro de Urbina Montoya and Diego Serrano de Sotomayor, who acted as apostolic commissioners, as well as by the bishop of Maronea, Jacinto Minuarte. The Jesuit Martín Pérez, rector of the College of San Pablo of the Society of Jesus in Valencia, served as procurator for the cause. The notaries appointed were Jerónimo Ruiz de Ripodas, a beneficed cleric of the church of Segorbe, and Vicente Ayerne. Also present were Bruno Soriano, representing the city of Valencia, and the presbyter Vicente Sepúlveda. Likewise, as in the Toledan process and its extension to Madrid, the promoter of the faith appointed by the Congregation of Rites was Pedro Francisco de Rubeis.

The procedure for summoning witnesses was identical in all three venues, as they were divided and cited in different groups, which appeared successively in organized batches to give their testimony.¹³

4. Some Considerations Regarding the Witnesses

Although they appear grouped together in the documents reflecting this phase of the process, the majority of the witnesses gave their testimony in Madrid, since the holding of various offices within the administration of the Monarchy and the Royal Household, as well as affiliation with different Madrid convents, determined this circumstance. The witnesses who testified in Toledo and Madrid were as follows (Table 1).¹⁴

Table 1. The witnesses in Toledo and Madrid.

Witness No.	Name	Office	Age
1	Don Pedro de Losada y Quiroga	Canon of Toledo	n.r.
2	Don Alonso de Morales y Ballesteros	Canon of Toledo and Vicar of Madrid	57
3	Pedro López de Inarra e Isasi	Senior canon of the fabric of Toledo Cathedral	40
4	Don Miguel Ferrer	Penitentiary canon of Toledo	60
5	Don Matías de Cuéllar	Professor of Prima and university lecturer	48
6	Father Luis (Aloysius) Fernández	Member of the Society of Jesus	60
7	Don Francisco Miranda	Chaplain of the Reyes Nuevos	32
8	Don Diego Osorio	Vicar General and Canon of Toledo	50
9	Don Mateo Segade Bugueiro	Magistral canon of Toledo	45
10	Don Antonio de Isla	Doctoral canon of Toledo	38
11	Don Antonio de Verastegui	Royal chaplain and chaplain of the Reyes Nuevos	50
12	Don Miguel de Noronha	Count of Linares and Marquess of Villareal; Council of State; General of the Sicilian Gallies	72
13	Alonso de Palma	Bishop-elect of Ceuta	67
14	Don Francisco de Rebollo	Knight of the Order of Santiago	65
15	Don Juan Francisco Pacheco	Dean of Jaén Cathedral and sumiller de cortina to Philip IV	44
16	Fray Luis de San Bernardo	Provincial of the Discalced Franciscans	74
17	Don Francisco de Chiriboga	Lord of the House of Chiriboga	72
18	Fray Francisco de Santa Ana	Royal preacher and Discalced Franciscan	54
19	Fray Juan Ponce de León	Friar of the Order of Minims of St Francis of Paola	60
20	Fray Alonso de Herrera	Friar of the Order of Minims of St Francis of Paola	59
21	Don Gaspar de Rocafull	Count of Albaterra, Councillor of Aragon	50
22	Don Juan Pérez Delgado	Bishop-elect of Ciudad Rodrigo	46
23	Fray Alonso de Sanvitores	Benedictine monk and master	72
24	Fray Diego Niceno	Provincial of the Order of St Basil	56
25	Don Pedro de Rojas	Count of Mora; Queen's steward; Knight of Calatrava; Council of Italy	59
26	Fray Andrés Pacheco	Abbot of San Bernardo and qualifier of the Holy Office	44
27	Don Francisco Ramírez de Haro	Knight of the Order of Santiago	52
28	Don Gil González	Royal chronicler and priest	64
29	Don Antonio Calderón	Canon of Toledo; chief chaplain of the Convent of the Incarnation; tutor to the Infanta	56
30	Fray Francisco de Ricos	Royal preacher; friar of the Order of the Holy Trinity	40
31	Father Vicente Guevara	Bishop-elect in the Philippines	74
32	Cardinal Antonio de Aragón	Cardinal	n.r.
33	Don Martín de Saavedra de Guzmán	Knight of the Order of Calatrava	52
34	Don Juan Jerónimo Pallavicino	Knight of the Order of Santiago	40
35	Father José Láinez	Augustinian; Bishop-elect of Solsona	63
36	Don Pedro Nápoles	Knight of the Order of Calatrava	24
37	Don Pedro Cartagnazia	Canon of Santa Fe Cathedral (Indies)	40
38	Don Diego Mendoza y Acevedo	Captain General of Santa Marta (Indies)	36
39	Don Duarte de Alburquerque	Marquess of Vasto; Count of Pernambuco; Gentleman of the Chamber	55
40	Don Pedro Gregorio y Buglio	Duke of Tremistère; Council of Italy	58
41	Don Francisco de Rojas	Judge (oidor) of the Chancery of Valladolid	60

Table 1. Cont.

Witness No.	Name	Office	Age
42	Don Jaime Manuel de Cárdenas Manrique de Lara	Duke of Nájera and Maqueda; Lord High Steward of the Queen	50
43	Don Gaspar Méndez de Rubiales	Royal lawyer of Santa Fe (Indies)	42
44	Don Jerónimo de Ataíde	Marquess of Colares and Count of Castañeyra	50
45	Father Gabriel Adarzo de Santander	Mercedarian friar, priest, and royal preacher	51
46	Don Juan de Cabrera y Benavides	Marquess of Rus; Knight of Santiago; maestrescuela of Lima Cathedral	70
47	Don Juan de Solórzano	Royal councillor and Knight of Santiago	70
48	Father Miguel de Cardona	Carmelite friar	54
49	Don Diego Aragón	Duke of Terranova; member of the Royal Chamber; trece of Santiago	40
50	Don Jerónimo Biffi	Representative of the Archduke of Innsbruck; Knight of Santiago	40
51	Don Fadrique Enríquez	Castellan of Milan; Councillor of War; Knight of Alcántara	50
52	Don Juan de Aguirre	Royal secretary	60
53	Doña Inés de Guzmán	Marchioness of Alcañices	65
54	Don Juan Salazar	Purveyor of the Convent of the Incarnation	50
55	Don Mateo Puelles y Escobar	Physician of the Supreme Inquisition; royal household	52
56	Doña Isabel de Morales	n.r.	40
57	Ana García	Wife of Nicolás Gutiérrez	37
58	Doña María Pérez	Wife of Juan Salazar	36
59	Father Juan de Muniesa	Franciscan friar; confessor of the Descalzas Reales	40
60	Don Diego de Arce y Reinoso	Bishop of Plasencia and Inquisitor General	60
61	Don Andrés de Palacio	Notary of the Holy Office	54
62	Doña Damiana de la Encina y Molina	Wife of Andrés de Palacio	40
63	Don Miguel Bautista de Lanuza	Knight of the Order of Santiago	58
64	Sor María Clara	Abbess of the Royal Convent of San Francisco (Descalzas Reales)	66
65	Sor Ana María de la Concepción	Nun of the Descalzas Reales	48
66	Sor Serafina María del Santísimo Sacramento	Nun of the Descalzas Reales	31
67	Sor María de la Santísima Trinidad	Nun of the Descalzas Reales	65
68	Don Diego de Riaño y Gamboa	President of the Council of Castile; Knight of Santiago	61

At the same time as the interrogations were being conducted, Pedraza and the procurators requested that copies be made of the documents preserved in the archive of the archbishopric of Toledo concerning the Blessed's miraculous intercession in a case that had occurred in the territory of New Granada. Likewise, Gabriel de Arenas undertook the examination of witnesses who were summoned in Madrid for this purpose; they appeared in obedience to an order issued by the king in order to promote the success of the proceedings.¹⁵ Accordingly, the presence—already recorded in the preceding table—was required of Martín de Saavedra, Knight of the Order of Calatrava and former president of the Audiencia of Santa Fe; of Pedro Cartagnazia, canon of the church of Santa Fe; and of Diego Mendoza y Acevedo, governor general of Santa Marta. They were joined by Vasco de Figueroa, dignitary of the church of Cartagena; Gaspar Méndez de Rubiales; Francisco de Piedrahita; Master Fray José Pacheco, provincial of the Augustinian Order in the kingdom of New Granada; Juan de Cabrera y Benavides, maestrescuela of Lima Cathedral, who was then in Madrid attending to matters concerning his church; and Juan de Solórzano, royal

councilor and Knight of the Order of Santiago, who had served as oidor of the Audiencia of Lima and as fiscal of the Council of the Indies, and who testified to the great devotion enjoyed by Borgia in the viceroyalty of Peru.¹⁶

4.1. *Miracles, Inquisitorial Scrutiny, and the Construction of Fama Sanctitatis*

Similarly, in July 1650, Archbishop Julio de Cortázar of Santa Fe was requested to forward to Cardinal Moscoso y Sandoval all the information contained in his archives on this matter. Although, following the provincial synod held in Santa Fe in 1625, a vow had been made to celebrate the feast of the Blessed as patron and protector against earthquakes, in 1627, news reached Santa Fe de Bogotá that an image of Saint Francis Borgia kept on an estate in Chitagoto—an *encomienda* of Félix Mújica Buitrón See: (Constanza Villalobos and Contreras-Guerrero 2023, pp. 53–79)—had been observed to sweat for several days. Both the parish priest responsible for the chapel where the painting was located and other witnesses to the phenomenon cooperated with the envoys of Archbishop Julián de Cortázar and with the commissioner of the Holy Office to ascertain all the details of the event. The fourteen witnesses who confirmed what they had observed—including changes in the image of the saint, such as alterations in color and movement—also attested that improvements in the health of certain individuals had occurred when cloths used to dry the perspiration and tears of the crucifix held by Borgia in the portrait were applied to them. Indeed, both the synodal initiative and the miracles attributed to this image provided a significant stimulus to the growing devotion, and in that year the Blessed was named patron of New Granada.

In 1629, the Jesuit Manuel de Vargas composed an account of the juridical investigations collected, dedicating it to the Blessed's grandson Francisco de Borja y Aragón, Prince of Esquilache and viceroy of Peru between 1614 and 1621; this work compiled the testimonies and descriptions of the miracles recorded in the original processes approved by the archbishop. Rumors of illicit enrichment led to a *juicio de residencia*, whose guilty verdict, issued in 1626, conditioned his political marginalization. He remained at court as a gentleman of the king's chamber, but the support of Sor Margarita de la Cruz from the Descalzas Reales proved to be of no avail in securing his political rehabilitation. The compilation and organization of testimonies carried out by Gabriel de Arenas was of particular importance for the advancement of the canonization cause, since it confirmed that an image of the Blessed inspired widespread devotion by virtue of its association with a series of extraordinary events that were duly reported to the Congregation of Rites. Moreover, the process benefited from the specialized testimony of Pedro López de Inarra e Isasi, senior canon of the fabric of Toledo Cathedral, who was responsible for negotiating and contracting the various artists commissioned to embellish the cathedral and who defended his professional judgment before the prelates and the other members of the cathedral chapter.¹⁷

As noted above, the majority of the witnesses gave their testimony in Madrid, since only the first thirteen testified in Toledo. Certainly, while the question of the extraordinary events attributed to the Blessed's intercession was essential for the continuation of the cause, it was equally necessary to clarify the situation arising from the inclusion of one of Francis Borgia's works in the Index of Prohibited Books published in 1559. The so-called Valdés Index was instrumentalized by the Inquisitor General Fernando de Valdés as a means of attacking those who represented a threat to his waning influence and political power, as was the case of the archbishop of Toledo, Bartolomé de Carranza, and of Francis Borgia himself, among others (Astrain 1914, p. 78). Although, as noted, the Index and *Expurgatory* published by Gaspar de Quiroga removed the Borgia work from censure and explicitly emphasized this measure, there remained in Rome a clear determination to examine all the implications of this matter (de Dalmases 1972; Cereceda 1950, 1951).

In this regard, the testimony of the Inquisitor General himself, Diego de Arce y Reinoso, was of particular importance, since his mere presence signified the backing of the Holy Office for the advancement of the canonization. Nor was it coincidental that the first witness to testify was Pedro de Losada y Quiroga, canon of Toledo and nephew of Gaspar de Quiroga, both of whom were closely associated with the Society of Jesus. The issue of inquisitorial oversight concerning works included in the Catalogues was likewise linked to the testimony of Alonso Morales y Ballesteros, canon of Toledo and vicar of Madrid, whose responsibilities included the ecclesiastical censorship of written works and the granting of publication licenses. Moreover, he was an accomplished jurist who had defended, in several lawsuits, the interests of various Jesuit colleges in Andalusia. Similarly, Fray Juan Ponce de León, a presbyter of the Order of Minims of Saint Francis of Paola, served as a qualifier of the Holy Office and as an inspector of bookshops in Spain.

This perspective also helps to explain the presence among the witnesses of Francisco de Chiriboga, Lord of the House of Chiriboga, who was married to Elena de Córdoba y Aragón and thus connected by kinship to the Blessed. At the conclusion of his testimony, reference was made to the statement of Gaspar Rodríguez de Soria, fiscal of the inquisitorial tribunal of Toledo, concerning the proceedings brought against Chiriboga in 1644. After spending twenty-six months in prison, he was released when it was established that his arrest had been based on false testimony, and he was consequently restored to his honor in all respects. This episode underscored how falsehoods could cause an innocent person to encounter serious difficulties with the Holy Office and suffer damage to his reputation. In this context, it is not insignificant that, as previously noted, the dedication of the biography published by Nieremberg was addressed to the dukes of Gandía, but above all highlighted the figure of Fernando de Borja y Aragón, with whom the author had dealt concerning the writings of the Blessed. The Jesuit's opposition to the policies pursued by Philip IV and Olivares in their confrontation with Urban VIII, together with his relationship with Fernando de Borja—an object of the Count-Duke's suspicions—placed both men within anti-Olivares political circles. In this regard, particular attention should be drawn to the close relationship linking Fernando de Borja with the religious María de Jesús de Ágreda, whose counsel was highly valued by Philip IV, as well as to their association with a group of visionaries, among whom Chiriboga became entangled, whose aim was to bring about the political downfall of Olivares. See: (Morte Acín 2010; Martínez Millán 2012).

4.2. Court, Nobility, and Religious Orders in the Promotion of the Cause

While both issues—the documentation of miracles and the demonstration that Borgia's encounter with the Inquisition had been the result of the self-interested actions of his enemies—were of primary importance, it was also necessary to show the existence of a solid and growing devotion underpinning his reputation for sanctity. The adaptation of Borgia's biography to the accepted model was promoted by the Society of Jesus itself through the work of Francesco Sacchini. In this same light, one may understand the appearance as a witness of the chronicler Gil González Dávila, who sought to follow the guidelines laid down by the Congregation of Rites while simultaneously integrating all orders and charisms into his proposal to promote causes of officially recognized sainthood (López Vela 2024, p. 201). Relevant experience in this regard was also possessed by Francisco Miranda y Paz, chaplain of the Reyes Nuevos, who in 1636 had written a work submitted to Urban VIII arguing the illegitimacy of publicly celebrating Adam as a saint prior to the pope's issuance of the requisite decree. Taken together, the testimonies clearly demonstrated that devotion to the Blessed was both deep-rooted and widespread. Of particular note is the testimony of Fray Andrés Pacheco, abbot of San Bernardo and qualifier of the Holy Office, who stated that the Count of Salvatierra possessed a relic of the Blessed and venerated it,

and that he was aware of other nobles and grandees who did likewise.¹⁸ Father Vicente Guevara, bishop-elect of the Philippines, declared that the Jesuits did not distribute relics of the Blessed and that, on the contrary, they received many requests that they entirely refused. He believed that only after persistent insistence had one relic been granted to the Convent of the Descalzas Reales, whose foundation was closely linked to Francis Borgia.¹⁹

Likewise, representatives of the city of Madrid addressed a letter to the pope dated 19 September 1650. They noted that, once the collection of remission information had been completed, the cause would return to the pontiff's hands, and they therefore requested permission for the city to enjoy a day of celebration upon the attainment of canonization. They affirmed that the body deposited in the Jesuit Professed House was visited both by the entire court nobility—many of them members of the Borgia clan—and by the population at large, who sought his protection and miraculous intercession.²⁰ The testimonies gathered clearly aimed to substantiate the validity of the Blessed's intercession in matters of health, as reflected in the statements of the Carmelite royal preacher Miguel de Cárdenas, qualifier of the Holy Office within the Council of the Inquisition and procurator of the Spanish provinces, as well as of Mateo Puelles y Escobar, physician of the Supreme Inquisition, of the royal household, and of the chamber of Don John of Austria, whose declaration was particularly extensive with regard to miraculous healings.²¹

In this respect, the testimonies of several women summoned in connection with the rights invoked by the Society of Jesus for the advancement of the cause were of special significance. Among them was Inés de Guzmán y Pimentel, Marchioness of Alcañices by her marriage to Álvaro Enríquez de Borja, who had died in 1643 and was a grandson of the Blessed. She was required to testify in her own home owing to illness. She was the sister of the Count-Duke of Olivares, who maintained close ties with the Jesuits (Rivero Rodríguez 2025, pp. 209–20). Likewise, among the women who appeared at the chapel of Pascual Bailón—an invocation closely associated with the dukes of Gandía and linked to difficult childbirths—were Andrés de Palacio, notary of the Holy Office, and his wife Damiana de la Encina y Molina, who both testified to the Blessed's intercession in a similar ordeal caused by the unusually large size of a child's head, from which the infant nonetheless survived.²²

Testimony was also gathered from several nuns of the convent of Our Lady of Consolation of the Franciscan Recollect nuns in Madrid, known as the Descalzas Reales, which was closely linked to the life of the Blessed. Several nuns were summoned, in addition to the abbess María Clara de la Cruz, known in the world as Clara de Alarcón y de Andrade, daughter of the Lords of Buenache and Marchesses of Palacios. Ana María de la Concepción, known as Ana Pacheco, a native of the town of San Clemente and daughter of Rodrigo Pacheco and María de Mendoza, was likewise cited. Testimony was also given by Serafina María del Santísimo Sacramento, known as Serafina Fardella y Pacheco, a native of Palermo and daughter of Plácido Fardella and María Pacheco y Mendoza, Princes of Pacheco and Marchesses of San Lorenzo; and finally, by María de la Santísima Trinidad, known as María Pacheco Mendoza, Princess of Pacheco and Marchioness of San Lorenzo, who before professing had been married to Pedro de Verástegui (Vilacoba Ramos and Muñoz Serrulla 2010, pp. 127, 133). See also: (López Ruiz and Martín 1988). All of them emphasized the Blessed's mediatory role and his miraculous intervention against pains and illnesses of various kinds. All testimonies were delivered in the presence of the nuns' confessor and qualifier of the Holy Office, the Franciscan Juan de Muniesa, who also testified in the process. His asceticism led him to disseminate the School of Christ in Aragon, where he moved after completing his duties in the convent confessional in 1658 and assumed the office of Commissary General. The influence of Cardinal Barberini was decisive in this appointment, as was the support of Philip IV through his designation as royal preacher (Vilacoba Ramos 2013, pp. 411, 457ss).

It should also be noted that the nun María Fardella y Pacheco was the niece of the ambassador to Rome and viceroy of Sicily, Juan Fernández Pacheco y Toledo, Marquess of Villena, and thus represented the ties of these families to the Italian territories. Accordingly, the extension of the Blessed's reputation for sanctity was also reflected in the presence of other witnesses connected to these networks, such as Pedro Gregorio y Buglio, Duke of Tremistère, Knight of Santiago, and regent for Sicily on the Council of Italy, as well as Fadrique Enríquez de Luján, castellan of Milan, councilor of War, and Knight of the Order of Alcántara. In this way, the Blessed's reputation for sanctity was shown not to be confined to the cities in which he had lived and died. In this respect, one must also consider the influence exerted by Melchor de Borja, member of the Council of War and captain general of the galleys of Spain, Naples, and Sicily, as one of the principal promoters and financial supporters of the continuation of the canonization cause.

Likewise, one testimony that stood out within the corpus was that given by Miguel Bautista de Lanuza, a Knight of Santiago, protonotary and councillor of Aragón, as well as a familiar of the Holy Office in Zaragoza and Toledo. His deposition was far more extensive than that of the other witnesses, as it addressed in detail the practice of heroic virtues, the blessed's miraculous intercession, the devotion derived from it, and his reputation for sanctity, which Lanuza went so far as to compare with that of Saint Teresa of Jesus. In support of his arguments, he compiled a wide range of texts and works on which he based his assertions, referring to all the authors who had written about the blessed's reputation for sanctity and thereby demonstrating a profound literary erudition.²³

Similarly, among the witnesses were several Portuguese individuals who had remained loyal to Philip IV after the crisis of Évora in 1637 and the proclamation of the Duke of Braganza. These men had distinguished themselves in the military sphere and held various positions within both the administrative apparatus of the monarchy and the royal household. Thus, Duarte de Albuquerque, Marquis of Vasto, Count of Pernambuco, and Gentleman of the Chamber to Philip IV, suffered severe consequences and reprisals as a result of João IV's political actions after remaining loyal to the Habsburg monarch. For his part, Jerónimo de Ataíde, majordomo to Queen Isabel of Bourbon, Marquis of Colares and Count of Castañeyra, played a prominent role in the household of Prince Baltasar Carlos, whom he served as tutor, as well as during the final decade of the existence of the Council of Portugal. In the case of Miguel de Noronha, Count of Linares and Marquis of Villareal, member of the Council of State and General of the Galleys in the Kingdom of Sicily, this office was granted toward the end of his eventful life, at which time he also celebrated his marriage to Lucrecia de Silva, lady-in-waiting to Queen Mariana of Austria.

The support provided by the monarchs—and especially by the queens—was likewise highly significant. This patronage is evidenced in the testimonies of members of the royal households. Thus, Friar Alonso de Sanvítores, a Benedictine religious, attested to Queen Isabel of Bourbon's devotion to the blessed's relics, a point corroborated by Pedro de Rojas, Count of Mora, the queen's majordomo, Knight of Calatrava, and member of the Council of Italy, as well as by Master Gabriel Adarzo de Santander, a Mercedarian friar, defensor general of his order, and royal preacher. The religious testified that the celebration of the blessed's feast on 1 October became one of the most solemn events at court, frequently attended by the king, accompanied by ambassadors and nobles who came to pray for his intercession. The queen customarily attended in the afternoon with the prince and the infanta, while on the remaining days of the octave, the celebrations were financed by numerous grandees and nobles.²⁴ Moreover, this devotion on the queen's part was reinforced by her chief lady-in-waiting, Juana Fernández de Velasco, Duchess of Gandía, who intervened decisively to secure Queen Isabel's donation of the silver urn in which the blessed's remains were placed.

No less significant was the connection between the religious witnesses and the royal chapel or royal foundations and convents, whether through their service as royal preachers—such as the Franciscan Francisco de Santa Ana or the Trinitarian Francisco de Ricos—or through positions held by Antonio de Verástegui, royal chaplain and chaplain of the Reyes Nuevos; Juan Francisco Pacheco, dean of the cathedral of Jaén and *sumiller de cortina* to Philip IV; and Antonio Calderón, canon of Toledo, chief chaplain of the Convent of the Encarnación and tutor to the infanta. It should be recalled that this convent was the site of Francis Borgia's first burial place in Madrid. Testimony was therefore also taken from Juan Salazar, purveyor of the Convent of the Encarnación, and from his wife, María Pérez.

The presence among the witnesses of Jaime Manuel de Cárdenas y Manrique, Duke of Maqueda and Nájera, chief steward to Queen Mariana and head of the entourage responsible for accompanying her journey to Madrid, as well as of the Infanta María Teresa's gentleman of the chamber and Knight of the Order of Alcántara, exemplifies the interest of the knights of the various Military Orders—particularly that of Santiago—in seeing a representative of the ideals of the Spanish nobility attain recognized sanctity.²⁵ Accordingly, testimony was given by Don Francisco de Rebollo, Knight of Santiago; by Francisco Ramírez de Haro y Gaitán de Ayala, later Count of Bornos, also a Knight of Santiago and *alférez mayor* of Motril; and by Juan Jerónimo de Pallavicino de Rojas, likewise a Knight of Santiago, belonging to a Genoese family established in Toledo in the late sixteenth century and whose father was one of the principal financiers of the monarchy. The Pallavicino family's staunch defense of Philip IV's interests in Catalonia after the revolt of 1640 was comparable to that of another witness, Cardinal Antonio de Aragón y Córdoba, who, among other dignities, served as councilor of the Military Orders. Another witness, the Augustinian José Laínez, bishop-elect of Solsona, was unable to take possession of his see as a result of the wars that followed in Catalan territories. Likewise, noteworthy was the testimony of Diego Aragón Tagliavia, Duke of Terranova, member of the royal chamber, commander of Villafranca, and one of the *trece* of the Order of Santiago, a dignity he was obliged to relinquish upon receiving the Order of the Golden Fleece. After a long career, he was appointed ambassador to Rome in 1654 and intervened in the canonizations and beatifications processes, such as those of Thomas of Villanova and Peter of Alcántara. He also coordinated the cardinals of the 'Spanish part' in preparation for the conclave to elect the successor of Innocent X, whose fragile health suggested an imminent outcome. In the diplomatic sphere, mention should also be made of Jerónimo Biffi, ambassador of the Archduke of Innsbruck and Knight of the Order of Santiago.

It is also necessary to refer to the ecclesiastics who testified as witnesses, among whom members of the Toledo cathedral chapter constituted a particularly prominent group. Diego Osorio de Escobar, who had served as inquisitor, canon, and vicar general, was elected bishop of Puebla de los Ángeles on 4 April 1655. His appointment was made at the proposal of Cardinal Moscoso y Sandoval, who considered it essential that the nominated prelate be close to the Society of Jesus. Likewise, Mateo Segade Bogueiro, *canónigo magistral* and a trusted associate of the primate prelate, was appointed archbishop of Mexico. Miguel Ferrer was elected bishop of Tuy on 10 September 1656, while Antonio de Isla y Mena, treasurer and *canónigo doctoral*, was elected bishop of Osma on 4 April 1672. Alonso de la Palma, for his part, was the last bishop of Ceuta appointed at the proposal of Philip IV as king of Portugal in January 1647; it is believed that he never resided in his diocese, as the king wrote to the cathedral chapter requesting the appointment of a governor. Similarly, Juan Pérez Delgado, bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo, was promoted in 1655 to the see of Salamanca. Representatives of all religious orders were also present, including Friar Luis de San Bernardo, provincial of the Discalced Franciscans, and Friar Diego Niceno, provincial of the Order of Saint Basil.

In an exceptional case, Diego de Riaño Gamboa, president of the Council of Castile and Knight of the Order of Santiago, went to the Convent of the Descalzas Reales to give testimony.²⁶ He was the sixty-eighth witness and brought the series of interrogations conducted in Madrid to a close. The Society of Jesus concluded the collection of testimonies in Madrid on 20 August 1650.²⁷ A few days later, the commissioners carried out a visit to the tomb containing the remains of Francis Borgia, conducting a thorough inspection of the chapel with regard to its adornments, lamps, ex-votos, paintings, jewels, and other elements subject to verification. This review, attended by a considerable number of individuals, was accompanied by Father Manuel Pardo, prepositus of the Casa Profesa, and Father Cosme Zapata, among other Jesuits.²⁸

4.3. Territorial Scope of Devotion: The Valencian Evidence

Likewise, witnesses originating from the Kingdom of Valencia contributed to sustaining the blessed's reputation for sanctity, the growth of devotion, and belief in his miraculous intercession, such as Gaspar de Rocafull, Count of Albaterra and councillor of Aragón, who testified in Madrid. It should be noted that the witnesses summoned to testify in Valencia in September and October 1650 were fewer in number and differed in profile from those examined in Toledo and Madrid (Table 2).²⁹

Table 2. The witnesses in Valencia.

Witness No.	Name	Office/Status	Age
1	Don Cristóbal Cabanillas	Count of Casal	52
2	Don Luis Crespí	Archdeacon of Sagunto	43
3	Fray Pedro Oñate	Friar of the Order of Preachers (Dominicans)	54
4	Felipe Pesantes	Valencian presbyter	76
5	Don Carlos Juan de Torres	Count of Peñalba	50
6	Don Pedro Catellus	Member of the Order of the Militia of the Blessed Virgin	63
7	Father Jerónimo Crespo	Member of the Society of Jesus	63
8	José Polo	Lord of Todolella	40
9	Fray Juan Insa	Friar of the Order of St Francis	82
10	Father Juan Agustín de Palacios	Member of the Society of Jesus	50
11	Miguel Vidal	Jesuit lay brother (coadjutor)	44
12	Magdalena Vicenta Ferrer	Domestic servant	45
13	Don Juan Urgellus	Doctor of Medicine	33
14	Juan Vicente Martí	Layman	48
15	Fray Lluís Bonaventura	Friar of the Order of Discalced Franciscans	55
16	Vicente Sepúlveda	Presbyter	37
17	Father Pablo de Rojas	Member of the Society of Jesus	66
18	Vicenta Pelliffer	Widow	66
19	Mariana Sanz de la Llosa	Laywoman	58
20	Dorotea Puig	Laywoman	47
21	Marcela Marro	Laywoman	37
22	Bruno Sorino	Layman	27
23	Vicenta Marro	Laywoman	38
24	Catalina Pazuelo	Laywoman	50
25	Bárbara Pasqual	Laywoman	50
26	Ángel Fuster	Friar of the Order of Carmel	67
27	Vicente Miguel Gil	Doctor of Medicine	63

Indeed, the witnesses who testified in Valencia did not possess the same degree of social prominence as those who had appeared at court, since neither high-ranking noble titles nor knights of the Military Orders are to be found among them. Cristóbal

Cabanillas, Count of Casal, was connected to the Borja family through kinship ties. This close relationship likewise linked Carlos Juan de Torres, Count of Peñalba. As a Knight of the Order of Santiago, he served as *comendador* of Museros and *alcaide* of the Royal Palace of Valencia. As *maestre de campo* under the orders of the viceroy Fernando de Borja, he also acted as a lender and tax farmer.

In the ecclesiastical sphere, however, particular attention should be paid to the significant figure of Luis Crespí de Valldaura y Brizuela, archdeacon of Sagunto and founder of the Oratory of Saint Philip Neri in Valencia. Appointed bishop of Orihuela in 1650, he was later named by Philip IV as extraordinary ambassador to the Holy See in order to defend the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. A similar profile is found in Pedro Catellus, a member of the Order of the Militia of the Blessed Virgin.

Undoubtedly, the witnesses selected in Valencia reinforced through their testimonies the same issues that had been addressed in Toledo and Madrid, most notably the blessed's miraculous intercession, as reflected in the presence of two physicians among the deponents.³⁰ In this regard, the testimonies given by José Polo concerning the illness of his servant Magdalena Vicenta Ferrer—who had been declared beyond medical hope—proved crucial for the culmination of the canonization process. These events took place in August 1650. The physician Juan Urgellus stated in his deposition that the cure had been effected through a relic of the blessed that was brought to Polo's residence in Valencia. These declarations were further corroborated by a considerable number of additional witnesses.³¹

5. Conclusions

The witnesses selected to give testimony attested to those aspects that were required to be proven at this stage of the cause. On the one hand, several deponents testified to the healing power attributed to Borgia's miraculous intercession, with particular emphasis on the statements obtained in Toledo, at the Descalzas Reales, and in Valencia. Likewise, the substantial presence of members of the Holy Office served to redress the negative perception created by the inclusion of a work by Francis Borgia—written prior to his profession as a Jesuit—in the Index of Prohibited Books of 1559, and supported the rehabilitation promoted by the Inquisitor General Gaspar de Quiroga.

The determined intervention of the Society of Jesus was not limited to the selection of witnesses, but also extended to the adaptation of Borgia's biography in accordance with the directives of the Congregation of Rites. The ecclesiastical sectors most closely aligned with the Jesuits collaborated in this endeavor, most notably members of the Toledo cathedral chapter—particularly those who obtained prelacies in the American territories and supported the activities of the order—and Cardinal Moscoso y Sandoval, nephew of the Duke of Lerma.

The testimonies of the royal preachers were likewise numerous and significant, in a context of reduced tension between the Holy See and the Hispanic Monarchy compared to that which had prevailed during the pontificate of Urban VIII. Similarly noteworthy is the presence of servants of Queen Isabel de Borbón, who died in 1644, in whose household members of the Borgia family had served, such as Juana Fernández de Velasco and her son, the seventh Duke of Gandía, who held the office of *mayordomo mayor*.

Indeed, the prominence of the family clan remained essential to the financial support of the cause. The extensive network of noble houses connected to it, together with their ties to the Military Orders, conditioned the manner in which aristocratic ideals were reflected at a particularly delicate moment. The political changes that occurred from 1640 onward were evident in the witnesses appointed, all of whom represented the nobility of the various kingdoms that had distinguished themselves by their loyalty to Philip IV during the uprisings that took place. At the same time, the evolution then underway in the sphere

of spirituality is also perceptible, as several witnesses appear connected to the expansion of the Oratorian congregations and the Escuela de Cristo in the Hispanic realms.

Once the phase devoted to the collection of testimonies had been completed, the process of compulsa was set in motion in order to remit the documentation to the Congregation of Rites.³² These procedures were carried out with relative speed, as the brevia remissorialia were issued in 1655. This progress encouraged renewed initiatives before Rome by various institutions and groups seeking to prevent further delays, including the deputies of the Kingdoms of Aragón and Valencia, the consiliarii of Barcelona, and the Borja family itself through the mediation of Cardinal Moscoso y Sandoval.

Nevertheless, the death of Innocent X in 1655 and the election of Alexander VII marked a new turning point, as the pope decreed an *interim* period that was devoted primarily to the review of the alleged miraculous interventions.³³ In 1662, the Congregation of Rites dispatched emissaries to the tribunal of the Inquisition of Toledo to examine the documentation relating to the Catalogue of Prohibited Books compiled under Cardinal Quiroga during his tenure as Inquisitor General. Once these investigations had been concluded, the matter was resolved and the process advanced to the validation phase in 1665 and to the compulsatoria in the following year.³⁴

The death of Alexander VII in 1667 meant that the final ratification took place under the pontificate of Clement IX. In September 1668, the Congregation of Rites confirmed that the candidate fulfilled all the requirements established by Urban VIII. The canonization of Francis Borgia was formally effected with the signing of the bull on 21 June 1670, and the solemn celebration of his elevation to the altars was scheduled for 29 May 1671.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

ARSI Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu

APG Archivio della Postulazione Generali (Santi)

Notes

- ¹ On the process initiated following his death and the growing reputation for sanctity, see [García Hernán \(2010b\)](#).
- ² On the motivations that led to the creation of this body, see [Noyes 2011](#).
- ³ ARSI (Archivum Romanum Societatis IESU), APG (Archivio della Postulazione Generali (Santi), Franciscus Borgia, n. 58.
- ⁴ Although he was very close to Urban VIII and the Barberini family, he was regarded as a cardinal inclined to favor Spanish interests.
- ⁵ ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 53.
- ⁶ ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 58.
- ⁷ ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 49, fol. 1.
- ⁸ ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 5v–12v.
- ⁹ ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 49, fols. 21r–24r; n. 52, fols. 1r–5r. The schedule for the collection of witness testimonies was set from 8:00 to 11:00 in the morning and from 4:00 to 7:00 in the afternoon. Provisions were also made regarding the preparatory arrangements and the commencement of the summonses. Also: fols. 16, 21v–22r.
- ¹⁰ ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 260r–266v.
- ¹¹ ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 11r–12v. The Vicar General of the Society of Jesus granted power of attorney to the provincial Ignacio Víctor before Pedro Francisconio, notary of the Sacred Rota; Víctor, in turn, delegated this authority to the

- Jesuits Julián Pedraza, Bernardino de Villegas, and Alonso Yáñez, entrusting them with the continuation of the cause (fols. 12v–14r).
- 12 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fol. 170.
- 13 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 22–63.
- 14 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 49, fol. 116v; n. 52, fols. 187v–188r.
- 15 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 49, fols. 341r–v.
- 16 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fol. 219v, 396v, 401r.
- 17 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 49, fols. 220v–221r, fol. 341r–v; n. 52, fol. 132 ss.
- 18 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fol. 318r.
- 19 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fol. 330r.
- 20 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 58.
- 21 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 404r–410r, 439r–v.
- 22 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fol. 454r.
- 23 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 457v–458r.
- 24 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 308r, 312r, 392v.
- 25 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 378r.
- 26 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 239r–260v.
- 27 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 479v.
- 28 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 480v–491r.
- 29 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 50.
- 30 The miracles recorded at this stage, which numbered thirty, were compiled into a single volume: ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 56–57.
- 31 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 56, fols. 140–147.
- 32 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 52, fols. 491v–496r.
- 33 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 65, n. 20.
- 34 ARSI, APG, Franciscus Borgia, n. 53.

References

- Aldea Vaquero, Quintín. 1986. *España y Europa en el Siglo XVII. Correspondencia de Saavedra Fajardo*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Armogathe, Jean Robert. 2005. La fábrica de los santos. Causas españolas y procesos romanos de Urbano VIII y Benedicto XIV (siglos XVII–XVIII). In *Homenaje a Henri Guerreiro. La Hagiografía Entre Historia y Literatura en la España de la Edad Media y del Siglo de Oro..* Edited by Marc Vitse. Madrid: Universidad de Navarra, Iberoamericana and Vervuert, pp. 149–68.
- Astrain, Antonio. 1914. *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España: Tomo II (Laínez–Borja, 1556–1572)*. Madrid: Razón y Fe.
- Batllo, Miquel. 1999. *La Familia Borja*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia.
- Cereceda, Feliciano. 1950. Episodio inquisitorial de San Francisco de Borja. *Razón y Fe* 142: 174–91, 355–66.
- Cereceda, Feliciano. 1951. Episodio inquisitorial de San Francisco de Borja. *Razón y Fe* 142: 277–91.
- Chaparro, Sandra. 2011. Juan Eusebio Nieremberg (1595–1658). Un intelectual de la Monarquía católica hispana. *Razón y Fe* 264: 427–35.
- Coloma, Luis. 1903. *Historia de las Sagradas Reliquias de San Francisco de Borja*. Bilbao: Imprenta del Corazón de Jesús.
- Constanza Villalobos, María, and Adrián Contreras-Guerrero. 2023. Sudor, llanto y malos augurios: El cuadro de San Francisco de Borja de Chitagoto (Nueva Granada). In *En las Sombras del Barroco. Una Mirada Introspectiva*. Edited by Adrián Contreras-Guerrero, Ángel Justo Estebaranz and Fernando Quiles García. Santiago de Compostela and Sevilla: Enredars, pp. 53–80.
- de Dalmases, Cándido. 1972. San Francisco de Borja y la Inquisición española, 1559–1561. *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 41: 48–135.
- Eire, Carlos M. N. 1996. *War Against the Idols. The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Felipo Orts, Amparo. 2012. La actitud institucional ante el proceso de canonización de San Francisco de Borja. In *Francisco de Borja y su Tiempo. Política, Religión y Cultura en la Edad Moderna..* Edited by Enrique García Hernán and María Pilar Ryan. Valencia and Roma: Albatros-IHSI.
- García Hernán, Enrique. 2010a. Francisco de Borja, patrono de la nobleza española. Aproximación a su figura desde una perspectiva nobiliaria. In *Francisco de Borja. Santo y Duque*. Edited by Feliciano Barrios Pintado. Madrid: Fundación de la Nobleza Española, pp. 1–135.
- García Hernán, Enrique. 2010b. Francisco de Borja. La construcción de un santo. In *San Francisco de Borja Grande de España: Arte y Espiritualidad en la Cultura Hispánica de los Siglos XVI y XVII*. Edited by Ximo Company and Joan Aliaga. Catarroja and Barcelona: Afers, pp. 33–50.
- García y García, Antonio. 1989. Religiosidad popular y derecho canónico. In *La Religiosidad Popular*. Edited by María Buxó Rey, Salvador Rodríguez Becerra and León Carlos Álvarez Santaló. Barcelona: Anthropos, pp. 231–45.

- Gotor, Miguel. 2002. *I beati del Papa. Santità, Inquisizione e Obbedienza in età Moderna*. Firenze: Olschki.
- Gotor, Miguel. 2004. *Chiesa e Santità nell'Italia Moderna*. Bari: Editori Laterza.
- Jedin, Hubert. 1972. *Historia del Concilio de Trento. T. IV. Tercer Periodo: Conclusión. Vol. 2. Superación de la Crisis. Conclusión y Ratificación*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra.
- Kaziri, Pierre. 2014. Estudio histórico-jurídico de las pruebas en las causas de canonización. *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 71: 401–33. [[CrossRef](#)]
- La Parra López, Santiago. 2011. *Historia de la Vida del P. Francisco de Borja. Por Dionisio Vázquez, S.I.* Gandía: CEIC Alfons el Vell.
- López Ruiz, Antonio, and Antonio Moreno Martín. 1988. Quevedo y la nobleza andaluza. *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Almerienses. Letras* 8: 91–129.
- López Vela, Roberto. 2024. Una monarquía de ciudades, iglesias y santos. González Dávila y Salamanca en 1606. *Estudis. Revista de Historia Moderna* 50: 165–205. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Martínez Millán, José. 2003. La crisis del ‘partido castellano’ y la transformación de la Monarquía hispana en el cambio del reinado de Felipe II a Felipe III. *Cuadernos de Historia Moderna. Anejos* 2: 11–38.
- Martínez Millán, José. 2008. La transformación del paradigma ‘católico hispano’ en el ‘católico romano’: La monarquía católica de Felipe II. In *Homenaje a Antonio Domínguez Ortiz*. Edited by José Luis Castellano and Miguel Luis López-Guadalupe. Granada: Universidad de Granada, pp. 521–56.
- Martínez Millán, José. 2012. Política y religión en la corte de Felipe IV y sor María de Jesús de Ágreda. In *La Corte en Europa: Política y Religión (Siglos XVI–XVIII)*. Edited by José Martínez Millán, Manuel Rivero Rodríguez and Gijs Versteegen. Madrid: Polifemo, pp. 1377–456.
- Martínez Millán, José. 2013. La evaporación del concepto ‘Monarquía Católica’: La instauración de los Borbones. In *La Corte de los Borbones: Crisis del Modelo Cortesano*. Edited by José Martínez Millán, Concepción Camarero Bullón and Marcelo Luzzi. Madrid: Polifemo, pp. 2143–96.
- Martínez Millán, José. 2018. El cambio en el modelo de santidad en la segunda mitad del siglo XVII. In *Subir a los Altares: Modelos de Santidad en la Monarquía Hispánica (Siglos XVI–XVIII)*. Edited by Inmaculada Arias de Saavedra, Esther Jiménez Pablo and Miguel Luis López-Guadalupe Muñoz. Granada: Universidad de Granada, pp. 79–108.
- Martínez Millán, José, and Maria Antonietta Visceglia. 2008. *La Monarquía de Felipe III: La Casa del Rey*. Madrid: Mapfre.
- Martín López, David. 2010. Vázquez y Ribadeneira, dos jesuitas y la primera hagiografía de Francisco de Borja. In *Escrituras Silenciadas: Historia, Memoria y Procesos Culturales: Homenaje a José Francisco de la Peña*. Edited by Manuel Casado. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, pp. 222–31.
- Morte Acín, Ana. 2010. *Misticismo y Conspiración. Sor María de Ágreda en el Reinado de Felipe IV*. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.
- Noyes, Ruth S. 2011. On the Fringes of Center: Disputed Hagiographic Imagery and the Crisis over the Beati Moderni in Rome ca. 1600. *Renaissance Quarterly* 64: 800–46. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Papa, Giovanni. 2001. *Le Cause di Canonizzazione nel Primo Periodo della Congregazione dei riti: 1588–634*. Rome: Urbaniana University Press.
- Rivero Rodríguez, Manuel. 2025. La espiritualidad del conde duque de Olivares. In *La herencia del Renacimiento: La Literatura de Espiritualidad Católica*. Edited by Henar Pizarro Llorente and Mariano de la Campa Gutiérrez. Madrid: Dykinson, pp. 209–20.
- Rodríguez de G. Ceballos, Alfonso. 2011. San Francisco de Borja: La formación de una imagen. *Goya* 337: 294–311.
- Simón Díaz, José. 1992. *Historia del Colegio Imperial*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Suire, Éric. 2001. *La Sainteté Française de la Réforme Catholique (XVIe–XVIIe siècles) d’après les Textes Hagiographiques et les Procès de Canonisation*. Pessac: Presse Universitaires de Bordeaux.
- Vauchez, André. 1981. *La Sainteté en Occident aux Derniers Siècles du Moyen Age: D’après les Procès de Canonisation et les Documents Hagiographiques*. Rome: École française de Rome.
- Vilacoba Ramos, Karen María. 2013. *El Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales y sus Confesores en la Edad Moderna*. Madrid: Visión Libros.
- Vilacoba Ramos, Karen María, and María Teresa Muñoz Serrulla. 2010. Las religiosas de las Descalzas Reales de Madrid en los siglos XVI–XX: Fuentes archivísticas. *Hispania Sacra* 62: 115–56. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Visceglia, Maria Antonietta. 2003. Congiurarono nella degradazione del papa per via di un concilio: La protesta del Cardinale Gaspare Borghia contro la política papale nella guerra dei trent’anni. *Roma Moderna e Contemporánea* 11: 167–93.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.