

Davidson, N.S.

The Clergy of Venice in the Sixteenth Century

pp. 19-31

Davidson, N.S., (1978) "The Clergy of Venice in the Sixteenth Century", *Bulletin of the Society of Renaissance Studies*, 2, n/a, pp.19-31

Staff and students of University of Warwick are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA licence which allows you to:

- access and download a copy;
- print out a copy;

Please note that this material is for use ONLY by students registered on the course of study as stated in the section below. All other staff and students are only entitled to browse the material and should not download and/or print out a copy.

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this Course of Study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by University of Warwick.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Course of Study: HI3G9 - Venice in the Renaissance

Title: *Bulletin of the Society of Renaissance Studies*: "The Clergy of Venice in the Sixteenth Century"

Name of Author: Davidson, N.S.

Name of Publisher: Society for Renaissance Studies

The Clergy of Venice in the Sixteenth Century*

by N. S. Davidson

Just over a decade ago, John Hale observed that 'fewer historians visit the archives of the Frari than those of Florence, fewer still settle in Venice for the long gestation of a major work'.¹ Since then, research on the records of the Venetian State Archive at S. Maria Gloriosa dei Frari has flourished; and Professor Hale has, with Professor Michael Mallett, published a major history of Venetian military organisation in the Renaissance.² But despite all this research, the history of the Church in Venice remains, as Professor Hale noted, 'as yet under-explored', and, as a result, even the most careful studies of the government's relations with the ecclesiastical authorities suffer from a lack of perspective.

This is not a fault restricted to Venetian historians alone; we know equally little about the clergy in other parts of Italy. The surviving evidence is not always easy to use, and frequently it deals with the clergy who went wrong — the immoral, the ignorant, the scandalous — who may not have been typical of their kind. But it is still common for historians of the Italian Church to write as if they wished to defend the Church, or the State, from criticisms which long ago lost all relevance.³ There are very few detailed investigations of the reality of ecclesiastical life at parish level, or of the place of the clergy in Renaissance society. It may therefore be useful to record here some of the information now available about the clergy in Venice during the sixteenth century.

We can start with a few uncontroversial facts. The diocese of Venice was composed of the city itself, some of its islands in the Lagoon, and a few isolated areas on the mainland. After 1451, it was administered by a bishop known as the patriarch.⁴ In the sixteenth century, the patriarch was always a member of a Venetian patrician family, and usually a layman with no previous ecclesiastical experience. Matteo Zane, for example, appointed patriarch in 1600, was a layman who had previously been Venetian ambassador to Urbino, Piedmont, Portugal, Spain, Austria and Constantinople; he had no theological training, and was not even a graduate. And although the Papacy retained the right to confirm the appointment, the selection of the patriarch was always made by the Venetian Senate.⁵

The city of Venice was divided by 1612 into seventy-two parishes.⁶ The size of the population within each parish varied enormously. According to figures presented by the parish priests to the government in 1581, Venice contained nearly 135,000 people. The largest parish was S. Pietro in Castello with more than 8,000 inhabitants; one of the smallest was S. Fantin, with 200.⁷ All but a dozen or so of these parishes were run by a college or chapter, headed by the parish priest, the *piovan*, but including a number of other priests and deacons holding titular positions. S. Maria Formosa, with less than 4,000 inhabitants, had a *piovan* and eight of these assistant *titolati*; S. Leonardo, with 600 inhabitants, had a *piovan* and two *titolati*. By 1581, there were 595 parish based clergy in Venice, almost 0.5 per cent of the total population; nearly all of them were Venetians, or came from the mainland territories subject to Venetian rule. The titular priests were elected to their positions by other members of the chapter; the *piovan* of a collegiate parish was elected by the local laity. As long as the successful candidates met the basic canonical requirements of age, reputation and learning, their elections were normally approved by the patriarch, and they could then take up their benefices without further authorisation.⁹ This system of giving parishioners the patronage of their own church was unusual, though not unique, in Italy; but despite the opposition of a number of clerical reformers, it was formally approved by Popes Leo X, Clement VII, Paul IV, Pius IV and Sixtus V.¹⁰ Occasionally there were disagreements over the elections — between 1549 and 1552, for example, the patriarch and the papal legate had to intervene when the parishioners of S. Vitale elected as their *piovan* one Sigismondo Damiani, who was reportedly the illegitimate son of his predecessor — but generally the system worked smoothly.¹¹

Attached to each parish church were a number of *mansionarie*, bequests to pay priests to say mass at stated intervals for the souls of deceased benefactors. Attached to S. Margherita, for example, were seven *mansionarie* ranging in value from 14 to 32 ducats, to pay for masses for the souls of members of the Corner, d'Armer, Lando, Rhenier and Baroverio families, and for a priest called Baffo.¹²

These bequests were used to pay only the priest saying the specified mass; but running a parish church was a costly business, and the main finances for parish expenses had to come from elsewhere. The largest parishes controlled a substantial income — usually enough to pay for accommodation for the entire chapter; but the smaller parishes were often less well endowed. Under a Venetian law of 1488, no *piovan* should have been paid less than 60 ducats a year — a healthy salary — but many parish incomes could barely stretch that far. The *piovan* of S. Margherita, for example, was paid about 50 ducats a year — though he also had free

accommodation in a parish house; the *piovan* at S. Basso received only eighteen and a half ducats a year, and no house.¹³ Separate sums were sometimes set aside for maintaining church buildings (at S. Geremia 200 ducats, at S. Fantin half a ducat), for paying the *titolati*, and for alms for the poor.¹⁴ Very often parish finances were augmented by independent lay organisations which used the church for their private devotions. At S. Cassian, for example, the local *Scuola del Sacramento* agreed to buy new vestments for the mass in 1517. From 1527 it helped to choose and pay the annual Lent preacher. In the later 1570s it offered to pay for gilding the cornices round the church interior.¹⁵ It is unfortunately not possible now to make a complete assessment of parish finances in the sixteenth century; many bequests and gifts came in kind, and the value of fees paid to, and property owned by, the parish cannot be estimated at all.

But the parish clergy represented only one part of the ecclesiastical army in Venice. Very much more numerous were the regulars — monks, friars and nuns — men and women attached to religious orders, living (in theory) in common and subject to a rule approved by Rome. By 1581, there were thirty-two nunneries in Venice, containing nearly 2,500 nuns, and thirty-one male religious houses, containing rather more than 1,000 men. The biggest male religious house was almost certainly S. Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, which in that year housed exactly 100 Conventual Franciscans; its Dominican rival, S. Zanipolo, could muster only about seventy, and the tiny Carmelite settlement on the Giudecca, S. Angelo della Concordia, contained only half a dozen.¹⁶

The religious houses controlled a very large capital. Nunnery incomes came largely from money and property bequeathed or transferred to the nuns by their families in place of the dowries the nuns would now never need to use.¹⁷ The male religious houses, like the parishes, received frequent financial assistance from the laity; in 1534, for example, Andrea Gritti gave the Franciscan Observants at S. Francesco della Vigna 1,000 ducats to pay for his family tomb in the chancel, and at his death in 1538, they received his ducal robes to make a set of new vestments.¹⁸ But such donations were occasional. The most reliable income for a monastery came from land and property, in Venice or on the Terraferma, and from investments in the government's public loan funds. The income from land, in rents or from mortgages, normally kept pace with inflation — especially in Venice, where by the 1580s there seems to have been a housing shortage; but it was sometimes expensive, or troublesome, to collect.¹⁹ Investments in the loan funds, on which the government paid lenders a regular return at fixed rates of interest, were more convenient — until the government liquidated the funds.²⁰

It is not yet possible to assess the total value of all the capital controlled by the male religious houses, though the figures we have can be

suggestive. The forty-three monks in the Benedictine house of S. Giorgio Maggiore claimed, in 1581, to have a regular income each year of 5,000 ducats; it was perhaps the richest house in the city. In the same year, the thirty-nine Dominican Observants at S. Dominico could scrape together only 1,300 ducats.²¹ For at least one house, however, it is possible to calculate income, expenditure, and debt, very closely indeed. The church of the Madonna dell'Orto was taken over by the order of S. Giorgio in Alga in 1461; in the sixteenth century, it housed between thirty and forty brothers, and half a dozen servants. Nearly all the brothers came from Venice, or the Veneto. In 1581, the monastery reported that its income totalled some 2,000 ducats a year. The house accounts show that part of this income was derived from rents and mortgages on property in Venice and on the mainland, and part from the sale of produce grown on those properties. Nearly a third of its income came from the interest paid on investments in the government loan funds. The remainder came from the laity — from alms, bequests, gifts, *mansionarie*, and from lay confraternities that used the church. But by the 1580s, the monastery's expenditure was enormous. Everything had to be provided for — food, clothing, travel expenses, and medicines for the sick. There were taxes to pay, and bills for equipment used in the liturgy, bills for heating, lighting and maintaining the buildings, bills for the barber, salaries for the staff, alms for the poor, outings on the Lagoon for the monks in fine weather. There was an organist to pay, and extra musicians on saints' days, hospitality expenses, special purchases on *feste*; wine, replacement glasses, sand (for cleaning the glasses), soap (for cleaning the monks).²² It comes as no surprise to learn that by July 1588, the Madonna dell'Orto had run up a debt of well over 500 ducats. In the 1590s, it was ordered to cut back on all outgoings — including the hospitality account, and postal expenses.²³

If we add together the number of secular priests, and male and female religious, we find the established clergy in the later sixteenth century form a significant proportion of the total Venetian population — more than three per cent in all. Add to that the number in minor orders — men not bound to celibacy, but still entitled to clerical benefits and privileges — and the clerics not attached to any parish or monastic organisation, and we can begin to see why the Venetian government, and Venetian society more generally, took the clergy so seriously. The government found the large number of parish clergy useful assistants in running the city's local administration. They played an important role in matters like tax collection, public health, charitable distribution, and taking census;²⁴ and the vast wealth controlled by the clergy naturally attracted the government's closest attention. From the fourteenth century, clerical ownership of land had been limited. Property in Venice bequeathed to

the Church had to be sold within a set period; the proceeds were then invested by the procurators of St Mark. In this way, the land was passed back to lay ownership (and so to full taxation), whilst the Church could still draw the interest on the investment. The system benefited everybody, and the Church authorities were therefore prepared to allow the government to tax Church wealth at more or less regular intervals. This tax — usually one-tenth of the estimated value of the Church property — was assessed in 1564 at 210,000 *scudi*, rather more than 230,300 ducats. Normally the Roman authorities were happy to assist the government to collect the tax.²⁵ Sometimes there were squabbles — the Interdict was one of the noisiest — but normally the system worked smoothly, to the benefit of both Church and State.

This theme — the mutually beneficial relationship of Church and State — lies behind many of the most interesting features of the society of Renaissance Venice. Members of the government found it natural to associate the State with Catholicism; as Giovanni Antonio Venier explained in 1546 to Cardinal Sadoleto, Venetians were 'by origin, from the foundation of the city, imbued with the Catholic faith and with the rites of the Apostolic Church alone'.²⁶ Legend recorded how the city had been founded on the anniversary of the Annunciation in A. D. 421; this, it was believed, was in accordance with the promise of Christ to St Mark, whose body had been miraculously preserved in the basilica named after him since the ninth century. Extravagant oratory repeatedly boosted the Venetian's self-conscious identification with religion: 'by common consent', one eulogy declared in 1577, 'Venice was not made by human hands, but was by the divine will miraculously raised up above the waters . . . O Venice, truly unique and blessed among all cities of the world, intact virgin, the one remaining, true, and secure refuge for the afflicted . . . the true and holy sheep of God's flock, the worthy and accurate image and semblance of Divinity'.²⁷ The same association of the city with the faith was reinforced every time the secular clergy and the male religious orders joined the government's regular public processions, by a roundabout route, from the ducal palace to St Mark's basilica.²⁸ Many patricians were undoubtedly very devout in private, and in public the government regularly advertised its attachment to what Aurelio Michiel in 1547 called significantly 'the true cult of the approved religion'.²⁹ Government legislation was designed to ensure that the Catholic faith was worthily celebrated, and the city was famous for its huge collections of relics — all, or parts of, at least fourteen imported saints, fragments of the true cross, and several home-grown *beati* and *santi* as well. The government obviously expected some material recognition for this achievement; as the senate declared in 1588, 'in addition to the prestige throughout the world that is derived from such a

precious and inestimable store of holy things . . . one must believe equally in the protection which these saints now give to our city'.³⁰ Sacrilege — committed by laymen or clerics, nobles or commoners — was a serious offence, frequently punished by the government, in public, with death.³¹

These government convictions did not seem to change substantially during the sixteenth century. It would therefore be wrong to see any wide ideological gap between clergy and laity in Venetian society; it is too easy to forget that every clergyman is born a layman, and spends his formative years in a lay institution, the family. Clergy and laity in Venice came from the same background. But towards the end of the sixteenth century, a number of observers commented on the apparent decline in respect for the clergy in Venice. Alberto Bolognetti, for example, formerly a papal legate in the city, believed in the 1580s that the local clergy had lost popular respect, and he blamed this on the clergy themselves.³² St Charles Borromeo expressed his opinion very forcefully in 1580; the discipline of the Venetian clergy had, he believed, 'been reduced here to so low a level that priests for the most part do not even wear the approved head-dress . . . one can say that nuns no longer observe any form of enclosure and the regulars . . . live with less observance here than anywhere else; one cannot expect any action from the patriarch . . . he is an unimportant man, who can achieve nothing significant'.³³

Naturally, if the Counter-Reformation campaign to recreate in the Catholic clergy a sense of vocation and an ideal of sacrifice and service was at all successful, the clergy themselves would have felt increasingly set apart from their neighbours, and lay expectations of the clergy would have risen; as a result, we would expect lay and clerical criticism of inadequate clergy to have become more common. But the opinions of men like Borromeo can apparently be confirmed by examples drawn from the archives in Venice and the Vatican. These records often make diverting, though unedifying, reading. Among the clergy attached to parish churches, for example, were many who were woefully ignorant. In 1574, the patriarch refused to confirm the election of Ermete de Bovis as *piovano* of S. Matteo di Rialto because he could not read and explain the catechism and breviary. Such ignorance was especially common among those who began their careers in the first half of the sixteenth century. Bishop Agostino Valier told a Rome correspondent in 1581 that 'one finds very little learning among the older priests here'.³⁴ Information about priests who did not say the offices regularly, or who did not confess regularly, or who did not say Mass regularly, is abundant, as are tales of priests like Bernardino Marigonelli at S. Fosca, who was reported to have committed sodomy with both men and women in his parish. After the 1581 visitation, thirty-five priests were punished for crimes ranging from

gambling to affairs with nuns.³⁵

In the circumstances, it is not surprising that the records should also contain complaints about the lack of adequate pastoral care and spiritual direction in the parishes. In 1548, all parish priests received a lecture from the papal legate in which they were informed that errors and abuses had grown among the laity 'because of the lack of concern that several of you have displayed in your parishes, appointing substitutes to do your own jobs for you without any legitimate cause'.³⁶ Many of these clergy were probably absent from their parishes because they had other jobs to do elsewhere in the city. In the 1540s, for example, Francesco Fabricio, *titolato* of S. Giuliano, had a second job as a school teacher; in the 1570s, Nicolò Balbi of S. Pantalon worked as a merchant at the Rialto. Baldassare de Piccoli worked as a lawyer while a *titolato* at S. Giovanni Decollato, and continued to live in his own house at S. Barnabà even when he had been appointed parish priest of S. Zeno at Fossalta on the mainland.³⁷

The ill-discipline of regulars and nuns was even more extreme. Rules of enclosure, which restricted the entry of outsiders, and prevented regulars and nuns from leaving, were frequently ignored. Don Tranquillo and Don Concordio, two canons of S. Salvatore, often stayed out together for twenty-four hours at a time;³⁸ and there was an apparently endless series of complaints about relatives, and non-relatives, who visited nunneries without permission. In 1509, for example, a group of young patricians was arrested after an all-night dance at the nunnery of the Celestia.³⁹ In the circumstances, lapses from strict monastic chastity were only to be expected. In November 1568, Grazia Tarlata eloped from her nunnery of S. Caterina with a young patrician with whom she then set up house at Giovanni in Bragora, and later at S. Provolo; in 1594, the papal legate was almost relieved when the Observant Franciscan, Benedetto da Mantova, left Venice during an investigation of reports that he had 'lived licentiously' with lay women.⁴⁰ Sexual liaisons within nunneries between nuns and visiting priests and monks were commonplace. The Franciscan nuns at S. Sepolcro even went so far as to display their charms through a window to passers-by on the *calle*.⁴¹

A final disciplinary problem was the frequency with which monks and friars simply left their religious houses, without permission, and never returned. Fra Aurelio Sticchiano walked out of at least three different religious orders in a long career of broken vows. Others were less blatant. In 1578, the Dominican Alessandro Maranta from Puglia left his monastery and settled quietly in Venice to teach Greek to the children of Giorgio Corner.⁴² These 'apostates' as they were known often had a virulent reputation with women; several survived only by begging.⁴³ The

papal legates repeatedly tried to reduce their number, but their own monasteries often did not want them back, and in many cases they filled useful jobs that the ecclesiastical authorities had to admit were unlikely to be filled by anyone else. As the former legate Bolognetti explained in the 1580s, with pardonable exaggeration, the 'apostates' almost monopolised the city's *mansionarie*, and they frequently served as school teachers too. There was in fact a large population in Venice of such men, fully ordained priests or monks, unattached to any parish or monastic organisation, and surviving on their incomes from chantries and teaching. It is impossible to guess at their total numbers.⁴⁴

Behind these cases of clerical indiscipline in sixteenth-century Venice, we can trace a number of common features. Firstly, many of the parish clergy suffered from the uneven distribution of regular clerical incomes; the *piovano* at S. Giovanni in Bragora earned 100 ducats a year, but the subdeacon of the chapter at S. Margherita only 1 ducat a year. Underpaid parish clergy had to find other means of supporting themselves, and so were often unable to fulfil their parish duties.⁴⁵ Secondly, many parish clergy in Venice had little theological or pastoral training, and so were perhaps ill equipped for full time parochial service.⁴⁶ Many regulars, too, suffered from poverty and ignorance, but reform attempts by the ecclesiastical authorities were always obstructed by the religious orders themselves, who guarded their autonomy jealously, and refused to allow the legate, the patriarch, the government or even the Inquisition any part in their disciplinary procedures.⁴⁷ And finally, many who entered monastic orders felt no real vocation, and were simply unsuited by background, character, and expectation for a rigorous religious life. A large proportion of Venetian nuns — probably the majority — were the daughters of patricians; paying for a daughter in a nunnery was often cheaper than paying a dowry. Many non-noble nuns entered as a result of a vow taken in an ill-considered moment of crisis. Grazia Tarlata, for example, the daughter of a moneyer at the mint, fell ill when fourteen with a 'mal de muzucho et febre pestilenziale'; on promising to become a nun if cured, she recovered only to fall ill again when she tried to renege on the vow. Eventually she entered S. Catarina, but in her early twenties, she fled.⁴⁸ Such early entry was not uncommon. Fra Arcangelo entered the Servites in Venice when thirteen, and fled when fourteen; suor Benetta entered a nunnery on Murano when fifteen or sixteen, and was still there thirty years later; Alessandro Maranto entered the Dominicans at eleven. Given the tender age of entry, the rough treatment some novices seem to have received, and the lack of commitment among both nobles and non-nobles, it might even have been expected that many should want to escape, or suffer severe mental and psychological strain in later life.⁴⁹ One of the most distressing cases was surely that of suor

Mansuetta, who entered S. Croce at an early age — possibly in penance for a teenage love-affair — but whose total revulsion from the enclosed monastic life twelve years later provoked her to vivid fantasies and visions, both mystical and sexual, and led eventually to a complete physical and psychological breakdown.⁵⁰

Unless these common problems were eliminated, clerical misbehaviour would be difficult to eradicate. Generally, the authorities in Church and State worked together well in a number of reform initiatives. The government supported the patriarch in his attempts to increase his authority over parish, monastery and nunnery.⁵¹ In 1579, the government founded a seminary to train clergy for St Mark's, partly financed by the papacy; in 1580, a diocesan seminary was founded to train parish priests elsewhere in the city, partly financed by the government.⁵² The patriarch and legate tried to exercise control over teachers and confessors in the city, and worked with the government to enforce Tridentine reforms in areas of private morality.⁵³ Patriarchal visitations and synods frequently reiterated the new standards required of the clergy, and Church and State worked together to punish monastic indiscipline.⁵⁴ But neither Church nor State could do much to redistribute clerical incomes more evenly; family connections between government and the nunneries prohibited any effective lay support for the patriarch's or legate's reforms; and the social conventions which drove nobles and non-nobles at an early age into unsuitable lives in monasteries and nunneries could hardly be eliminated by legislation.

There is still much to learn about the clergy in sixteenth-century Venice. But what is already known suggest they occupied a more significant place in the social landscape than we perhaps tend to realise. This was not simply a consequence of their numbers. Most of them were Venetians, or at least subjects of Venice from the mainland territories, and they were not therefore viewed by lay Venetians or the government as a necessarily alien or hostile force. The parish clergy in fact stood at the centre of a Venetian's communal perceptions; the parish was the immediate focus of his loyalty. The presence of the parish church, its associations with local families, fraternities and festivals, its locally elected clergy, all helped to link the community with Catholicism.⁵⁵ The annual routine of Easter confession and communion, and major events like baptisms and funerals, made the parish priest and his assistant clergy an expected part of the parishioner's life. No doubt many in Venice still considered that an ordained priest had some special gift of access to the spirit world which to an extent isolated him from the rest of the

community;⁵⁶ no doubt too the Counter-Reformation made life difficult for the uncommitted cleric, and helped to reduce the respect with which he was treated; but most clergy fitted comfortably into the society around them.

The visitation report of 1581 did not in fact corroborate Borromeo's condemnations. The visitors found little to criticise in parishes like S. Margherita, and at the Capuchin house of S. Maria degli Angeli they simply reported that they found everything 'correct and praiseworthy'.⁵⁷ Some nunneries may have been corrupt, but many were austere, with a high reputation for sanctity of life and worship. We can point too to the heroic monastic reforms fostered in Venice by saints like Gaetano Thiene or Ignatius Loyola.⁵⁸ But these were ultimately perhaps of less significance than the routine work of the parish clergy, or the regular attendance of a trusted confessor on the soul of a troubled penitent.

It may be appropriate to finish with fra Francesco da Bergamo, a Franciscan Observant at S. Francesco della Vigna. Born about 1500, and poorly educated, we know little about him, except that he was in constant demand, even in his eighties, as a confessor. The visitors who examined him in 1581 reported to Rome that 'he knows little book learning, but he has spirit, and he has experience'.⁵⁹ We inevitably know more about the corrupt clergy than about their more devout colleagues; but the clerics who left no trace in the records, because they did their jobs conscientiously, were probably in the majority.

Department of History, University of Leicester

NOTES

* This article is a slight revised version of a paper delivered at the Warburg Institute on 10 February 1984 during a conference organised by the Society for Renaissance Studies entitled 'The Society of Renaissance Venice'. The focus of the conference, and therefore of my paper, was the sixteenth century. I am grateful to Dr John Law, Dr Richard Palmer, Professor Geoffrey Parker and Professor Brian Pullan for their very helpful comments on an earlier version.

1. 'Editor's Preface' in J. R. Hale (ed.), *Renaissance Venice* (London, 1973) p. 14.
2. M. E. Mallett and J. R. Hale, *The Military Organization of a Renaissance State: Venice c. 1400 to 1617* (Cambridge, 1984).
3. Cf. the warning of 1973 in P. Prodi, 'The Structure and Organisation of the Church in Renaissance Venice: Suggestions for Research' in Hale, *Renaissance Venice*, p. 409, with that of 1983 in G. Greco, 'Ordinazioni sacre e istituzioni ecclesiastiche nell'età moderna', *Società e storia*, XXI (1983), pp. 667-9. For the later medieval Church, however, we can refer to D. Hay, *The Church in Italy in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1977).
4. S. Tramontin, 'La figura del vescovo secondo il Concilio di Trento ed i suoi riflessi veneziani nell'interrogatorio del Patriarca Trevisan', *Studi Veneziani*, X (1968), p. 443.
5. O. M. T. Logan, *Studies in the Religious Life of Venice in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries* (Ph. D. thesis, Cambridge, 1967) pp. 259-60; G. Benzoni, 'Una controversia tra Roma e Venezia all'inizio del '600: la conferma del Patriarca', *Bollettino dell'Istituto di Storia della Società e dello Stato Veneziano*, III (1961), pp. 122-4, p. 127; Prodi, 'The Structure', pp. 415-17.
6. Archivio Segreto Vaticano (ASVat), *Congregazione del Concilio, Relationes diocesum, Venezia e Vicenza, 1600-1807*, f. 15^r (a microfilm of this volume is available in the Fondazione Giorgio Cini in Venice; it is cited here simply as *Relationes*).
7. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BV), *Urb. Lat.* 817, p. 3, ff. 480^v-1^r; S. Tramontin, 'La visita apostolica del 1581 a Venezia', *Studi Veneziani*, IX (1967), p. 500, p. 507. The figure of 12,000 for S. Pietro recorded in the visitation was probably an exaggeration.
8. BV, *Urb. Lat.* 817, p. 3, ff. 480^r-90^v; Tramontin, 'La visita', p. 494, p. 501, p. 513. The text of the visitation report in ASVat, *Congregazione del Concilio, Visitaciones apostolicae*, 74 (cited here simply as *Visitaciones*) lists all parish clergy by name.
9. *Relationes*, f. 15^r; Prodi, 'The Structure', pp. 419-20.
10. The papal bulls discussing the Venetian system are in BV, *Ferraioli* 904, ff. 24^r-6^v; *Vat Lat.* 10450, ff. 1^r-3^v. Cf. Tramontin, 'La visita', pp. 478-9, p. 515, for S. Matteo di Rialto and S. Giacomo di Rialto.
11. *Nunziature di Venezia*, ed. F. Gaeta, V (Roma, 1967), p. 136, p. 145, p. 157, p. 163, p. 210, p. 213, p. 234, p. 318, p. 325, and VI (Roma, 1967), p. 36. The dispute was eventually solved with a papal brief in February 1552: ASVat, *Arm.* XLI, ff. 191^r-3^r.
12. *Visitaciones*, ff. 171^r-2^v.
13. A. Battistella, 'La politica ecclesiastica della repubblica di Venezia', *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, XVI (1898), p. 412; *Visitaciones*, f. 171^r; Tramontin, 'La Visita', pp. 505-6.
14. Tramontin, 'La visita', p. 501, p. 507.
15. P. Hills, 'Piety and Patronage in Cinquecento Venice: Tintoretto and the Scuole del Sacramento', *Art History*, VI (1983), pp. 35-7. Venetians paid no tithes to the Church: Tramontin, 'La figura', p. 444.
16. BV, *Urb. Lat.* 817, p. 3, ff. 491^r-3^v; *Visitaciones*, ff. 1^r-10^v. The figures presented by these two documents are not always consistent.

17. Logan, *Studies*, p. 342, p. 357, p. 359.
18. H. Burns, *Andrea Palladio 1508-1580: The Portico and the Farmyard*, (London, 1975), p. 134.
19. A. Stella, *Chiesa e Stato nelle Relazioni dei Nunzi Pontifici a Venezia: ricerche sul giurisdizionalismo veneziano dal XVI al XVIII secolo*, (Città del Vaticano, 1964), p. 132; B. Pullan, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice: the Social Institutions of a Catholic State* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 132-3, p. 140.
20. Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, p. 135, pp. 138-40.
21. *Visitationes*, ff. 75^r-6^r, ff. 88^r-92^r.
22. *The Church of the Madonna dell'Orto*, ed. A. Clarke and P. Rylands (London, 1977), pp. 10-11. Details of income and expenditure are in ASVat, *Fondo Veneto II, Monasteri soppressi*, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, and 30.
23. For the debt, see ASVat, *Fondo Veneto II, Monasteri soppressi*, 25, f. 31^v; for retrenchment, in the same *Fondo*, 27, f. 10^r, ff. 11^r-^v.
24. Cf ASVat, *Fondo Veneto II, Monasteri soppressi*, 30, f. 9^r; *I Diarii di Marino Sanudo*, I (Venezia, 1879), p. 836; F. C. Lane, *Venice: A Maritime Republic* (Baltimore and London, 1973), p. 332; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, pp. 297-300.
25. Battistella, 'La politica', p. 402, p. 409; B. Cecchetti, *La Repubblica di Venezia e la Corte di Roma nei Rapporti della Religione*, II (Venezia, 1874), pp. 74-6; Benzioni, 'Una controversia', p. 129; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, pp. 133-4, p. 136; ASVat, *SS. Venezia*, 19, f. 81^r, f. 145^r, f. 226^r. In November 1562, a *scudo* was worth 6 lire 16 soldi (I am grateful to Professor Reinhold Mueller and Gigi Corazzol for this information).
26. Archivio di Stato, Venice (ASVen), *Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci, Lettere di Ambasciatori, Roma*, b. 23, letter of 6 February 1545 m. v.
27. S. Sinding-Larsen, *Christ in the Council Hall: Studies in the Religious Iconography of the Venetian Republic* (Rome, 1974), pp. 142-4, pp. 182-3; the *Oratione di Madonna Issicratea Monte Rodigina*, published in Venice in 1577, is quoted on p. 144 n. 4.
28. E. Muir, *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice* (Princeton, 1981), p. 78, pp. 208-9.
29. ASVen, *Santo Uffizio* (cited here simply as *SU*), b. 6, 'Contra Petrum Vagnola sienensis, 1547', f. 11^r.
30. S. Tramontin, A. Niero, G. Musolino and C. Candiani, *Culto dei santi a Venezia* (Venezia, 1965), p. 183, p. 186.
31. E. G. Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice (BMV), *It. VII*, 2499 (11906), p. 3, p. 84.
32. Stella, *Chiesa e Stato*, pp. 108-16, pp. 153-6.
33. Tramontin, 'La visita', p. 455.
34. Tramontin, 'La figura', p. 446; Tramontin, 'La visita', p. 493, p. 519.
35. *SU* b. 33, 'Contra p. Bernardinum mediolanensem, 1572', ff. 2^r-^v, ff. 3^v-4^r; *SU* b. 33, 'Bortolotti Pietro', interrogations of 8 April, 28 April and 1 May 1592; Tramontin, 'La visita', pp. 499-500.
36. *SU* b. 156, decree of 15 March 1548.
37. BMV, *It. VII*, 2499 (11906), p. 30; *SU* b. 33, 'Contra p. Nicolaum Balbi, 1572', denunciation presented on 7 May 1572; *SU* b. 40, 'De Piccoli Baldassare', letters of 14 January and 29 December 1576, and f. 4^r, f. 25^r.
38. *SU* b. 28, 'Contra Donum Angelicum da Venezia congregationis Sancti Salvatoris, 1570', f. 6^r, f. 12^r.
39. P. Paschini, 'I monasteri femminili in Italia nel '500', *Problemi di Vita Religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento* (Padova, 1960), p. 44.

40. *SU* b. 33, 'Tarlata Grazia', charges of 19 July 1572; ASVat, *Fondo Borghese III*, IoA, f. 358^v.
41. E. g. ASVen, *Consiglio dei Dieci, Criminalium*, reg. 6, f. 30^r, a friar of S. Zanipolo and a nun of S. Caterina; Paschini, 'I monasteri', p. 53.
42. *SU* b. 31, 'Stichiano fra Aurelio', trial of 1543 and 1549, ff. 2^v-4^r, f. 5^v; *SU* b. 44, 'Maranta Domenico da Grumagna', denunciation of 8 October and interrogation of 13 November 1579.
43. See ASVat, *SS. Venezia*, 9, f. 88^r; *SU* b. 33, 'Contra Alexandrum Guarino Cremensem apostatam, 1572', f. 1^r.
44. E. g. ASVat, *Misc. Arm.* VII, 139, letters of 1580 from mainland bishops to the papal legate; Stella, *Chiesa e Stato*, pp. 117-18.
45. *Visitaciones*, f. 171^r; Tramontin, 'La Visita', p. 527.
46. Cf Tramontin, 'La visita', p. 493, p. 519.
47. E. G. ASVat, *Fondo Borghese III*, 126HI, ff. 63^{r-v}, f. 76^r, f. 354^r, f. 358^r.
48. *SU* b. 33, 'Tarlata Grazia', charges of 19 July 1572, depositions of 9 March, 10 April and 21 June 1573, and the two copies of the document entitled 'Votum Gratiae Capitulum'; Paschini, 'I monasteri', p. 59; Logan, *Studies*, pp. 174-5, pp. 340-1, pp. 346-7, p. 364, p. 378, p. 387, pp. 390-1.
49. *SU* b. 38, 'fra Arcangelo da Venezia', f. 1^r, f. 3^r, f. 4^v, f. 5^r, and the unpaginated deposition of the *lavandera*, donna Lucia, on 19 August 1574; *SU* b. 41, 'Giustinian Girolamo', unpaginated deposition of 11 July 1577; *SU* b. 44, 'Maranta Domenico da Grumagna', interrogation of 13 November 1579.
50. *SU* b. 38, 'Suor Mansuetta', especially the report of the pre-trial investigation dated 24 January 1574, ff. 3^{r-v}, ff. 7^v-8^r, f. 9^v, ff. 10^v-11^v, ff. 13^r, and the descriptions of exorcisms carried out between 8 and 12 February 1574.
51. E. g. ASVen, *Capi del consiglio dei Dieci, Lettere di Ambasciatori, Roma*, b. 23, letter of 30 August 1544, and b. 27, letters from 27 March to 5 June 1604.
52. S. Tramontin, 'Gli inizi dei due seminari di Venezia', *Studi Veneziani*, VII (1965), pp. 366-72, p. 374, pp. 376-7.
53. Cf *SU* b. 156, lectures to *piovani* and to heads of religious houses on 7 June 1547 and 15 March 1548; *Relationes*, f. 18^r; ASVen, *Consiglio dei Dieci, Comune*, reg. 33, ff. 61^v-2^r.
54. *Relationes*, ff. 15^v-16^r; A. Niero, 'L'"honestas vitae clericorum" nei sinodi di Giovanni Trevisan patriarca di Venezia', *Il Concilio di Trento e la Riforma Tridentina*, II (Roma, 1965), pp. 745-8. Despite an extensive modern literature on the subject, problems of disputed jurisdiction seem to have been rare in sixteenth-century Venice; in most cases, lay and ecclesiastical courts worked to mutual advantage. The papal bulls regulating the relationship are in ASVen, *Bolle Pontificie*, b. 7, n. 290; b. 8, n. 340; b. 9, n. 346; and cf ASVat, *SS. Venezia*, 19, f. 321^r.
55. The importance of the parish is emphasised by Lane, *Venice*, pp. 11-12, pp. 98-9, p. 244—though it is also important to remember that a number of devotional fraternities were not based in a single parish.
56. Priests were sometimes associated with magic; see e. g. *SU* b. 20, 'Fra Francesco e Alvisè Contarini', documents on Francesco, a Franciscan Conventual.
57. *Visitaciones*, ff. 84^r-6^r, f. 172^v.
58. See e. g. the legate's comments on S. Giovanni Laterano in ASVat, *SS. Venezia*, 19, f. 261^r; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, p. 235, p. 237, p. 258, p. 264.
59. *Visitaciones*, f. 10^v.