

Wright, A.

Republican tradition and the maintenance of 'national' religious traditions in Venice

pp. 405-416

Wright, A., (1996) "Republican tradition and the maintenance of 'national' religious traditions in Venice", *Renaissance studies*, 10, 3, pp.405-416

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: Renaissance studies: "Republican tradition and the maintenance of 'national' religious traditions in Venice"

Name of Author: Wright, A.

Name of Publisher: John Wiley & Sons Limited - Journals

Republican tradition and the maintenance of 'national' religious traditions in Venice

ANTHONY WRIGHT

It was precisely during the papal Interdict of 1606–7 on Venice, coinciding with a vacancy in the patriarchal succession in the diocese of the city, that the Republic itself privately expressed alarm at the state of the Church in the *dogado*. This concerned not least the lax standards in the female convents of the city and lagoon: a matter of concern to the papal nuncio too, after the post-Interdict restoration of a diplomatic presence. The interim government of the diocese of Venice by the patriarchal vicar, who at the time was a supporter and follower of Sarpì, was also alleged by the revived nunciature to have led to a collapse of standards in the admission of candidates to clerical orders.¹ But the peculiar procedures maintained in the city meant that clerics were seldom of the type envisaged by the Tridentine decrees for improved training of the clergy.

The distinctive conditions in the patriarchal see of Venice were the more clearly defined by contrast with developments in Torcello, still a separate diocese of the *dogado* in the post-Tridentine decades. In that small and impoverished see Bishop Antonio Grimani was able, on paper at least, to order the affairs of clergy and laity according to standards which were truly reminiscent of Borromeo's Milan. The laity were ordered to obey ecclesiastical regulation on the observance of feast-days, the suppression of blasphemy, the accounting for confraternities, seating in churches, and other issues often contested elsewhere in post-Tridentine Catholic Europe, quite apart from Venetian territories. But the apparent apathy of the Republic to such an unusual assertion of episcopal independence, by synodal decrees, issued at the very heart of the state, within the lagoon itself, is arguably explained by the economic weakness of the Torcello bishopric. The small number of inhabitants and clergy in the localities constituting the bishopric, and the impoverishment of the Church there, left perhaps little room for practical as opposed to theoretical demonstrations of episcopal authority. To erect a diocesan seminary, for example, was admitted to be impossible in these circumstances.²

¹ Archivio Segreto Vaticano: Segreteria di Stato: Venezia: Volume xxxviii, fos. 2'ff [A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii; 2'ff]: 14 June 1607–24 May 1608; W. J. Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968), 268, 387 and n. 230, 488, 513; G. Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori dell' Interdetto', *Arch Veneto*, 126 (1970), 31ff; pp. 48, 51f, 56f, 71.

² G. Cappelletti, *Storia della chiesa di Venezia*, vi, i–ii (Venice 1850, 1855), 574ff, 893ff.

The training of the clergy in the diocese of Venice itself, however, remained for long divergent from Tridentine ideals for other reasons. Although a patriarchal seminary was eventually founded, the pre-Tridentine practices found originally throughout Western Christendom remained in force at Venice into the eighteenth century. Clerics attached to one of the parish churches of the city served there as parish clerks and altar servers, acquiring a knowledge of the externals of the cult rather than any directed spiritual formation or specially devised vocational training.³ The patriarchal examination of clerics who had attained the priesthood for suitability, on their presentation to a benefice, was difficult to impose with any rigour.⁴ For the patricians resident in each city parish exercised a determining influence, by a variety of related systems, in the choice of parish priests.⁵ Moreover, the priests of each clerical congregation, in a given part of the city, elected their own superior: in this they were distinct both from the archpriests and provosts, incumbents of the ancient mother church of an area, found elsewhere in Venetian and Italian territories, and from the post-Tridentine form of rural dean, the *vicari foranei* (vicars forane) favoured by Italian and other bishops as being entirely dependent for their office on the bishop's continuing goodwill. In the patriarchal see of Venice, moreover, some clerics claimed exemption from any episcopal examination on entry to a benefice, alleging the privileges of the ducal chapel of San Marco and its clergy. The mitred *primicerio* of St Mark's, appointed by the doge, indeed claimed to admit some clerics to holy orders without reference to the patriarch.⁶

Furthermore, the non-diocesan seminary instituted at St Mark's continued to provide some post-Tridentine extension of the ancient model of clerical education at cathedral or monastic schools, once common in parts of

³ A. Stella, *Chiesa e stato nelle relazioni dei nunzi pontifici a Venezia. Ricerche sul giurisdizionalismo veneziano dal XVI al XVIII secolo* (Vatican City, 1964), 249, 320f; cf. Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice [B.N.M.]: MSS Italiani, classe VII, no. 1556 (8890), fos. 77ff.

⁴ Archivio di Stato, Venice [A.S.Ven.]: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 128f: 21 Oct. 1570; Secreta Archivi Propri Roma, 17, fos. 60ff: 11 Aug. 1565-19 Apr. 1567; 18: 12 Apr.-23 Aug. 1567; Fondazione Cini, Venice: Microfilms [F.C.M.]: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 79ff: 8 Nov. 1573-11 Sept. 1574; *Nunziature di Venezia*, IX (Rome 1972), ed. A. Stella, nos. 221ff: 22 July 1570-10 Jan. 1571; XI (Rome, 1972), ed. A. Buffardi, nos. 14ff: 8 Aug. 1573-10 Apr. 1574; B. Cecchetti, *La Repubblica [sic] di Venezia e la Corte di Roma nei rapporti della religione* (2 vols., Venice, 1874), I, 176.

⁵ A.S.V. Venezia xxxii; 644ff: 10 Jan. 1604-12 Feb. 1605; xxxviii; 187f: 1607; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. VII, no. 1556, fos. 100ff, 104ff; *Nunziature di Venezia*, XI, no. 14: 8 Aug. 1573; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 39, 134f, 148f, 193, 249, 320f; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 134, 165ff, 441; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 77, 121f, 268, 448f; B. Pullan, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice: The Social Institutions of a Catholic State, to 1620* (Oxford, 1971), 8, 343; D. Wootton, *Paolo Sarpi Between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983), 170 n. 133.

⁶ A.S.V. Venezia xxxiii; 305ff: 28 Dec. 1602; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. VII, no. 1556, fos. 58^r, 112^rff, 127^r; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 193ff; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 190 n. 1; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 401 n. 311; Benzioni, 'I "teologi" minori', 51f; G. Cozzi, *Il Doge Nicolò Contarini. Ricerche sul patriato veneziano agli inizi del seicento* (Venice and Rome, 1958), 31, 254f; P. Prodi, 'The structure and organisation of the Church in Renaissance Venice: suggestions for research', in *Renaissance Venice*, ed. J. R. Hale (London, 1973), 409ff: p. 411 and nn.

Western Christendom.⁷ But by the early seventeenth century the seminary attached to St Mark's was no longer under the Counter-Reformation influence of the Somaschi, a sixteenth-century order with important Milanese associations. Instead the lectures which clerics might attend at St Mark's were given by lecturers predominantly associated with Sarpi and his anti-Roman teaching.⁸ The appointment of such lecturers, at the ducal chapel, just as much as the choice of professors at the state university of Padua or the succession of schoolmasters in each *sestier* of the city of Venice, was naturally controlled by the Republic and its various magistracies, supervising equally the state library, the Paduan botanical garden or the college of medical practitioners at Venice.⁹

The ritual splendours and musical establishment of St Mark's clearly outshone the liturgical life of the patriarchal cathedral, isolated at the edge of the city, at Castello.¹⁰ In the annual cycle of religious celebrations in St Mark's and the piazza, in which the laity of the city were involved through the appointed participation of the major confraternities, the *Scuole Grandi*, the patriarchs had no more prominent part than had been played by their predecessors, the mere bishops of Castello.¹¹ Yet the importance of the patriarchal office to the Republic was evident in quite other ways, not necessarily conducive however to the interests of pastoral government.¹² The Republic had, in the patriarchate of Venice, one undisputed instance of a right of nomination to an episcopal see.¹³ The greater patronage, in such full rights of nomination, enjoyed by other Catholic states, as in Spain and France still after the Council of Trent, was regarded with jealousy by

⁷ Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 191 and n. 2; D. Hay, *The Church in Italy in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1977), 22ff, 52ff, 81.

⁸ A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii; 233'ff: 26 Jan.-22 Mar. 1608; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 194ff; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 191 n. 1.

⁹ A.S.Ven.: Reformatori dello Studio di Padova: filza 64: 10 July(?) 1583-31(?) Dec. 1622; *Nunziature di Venezia*, IX, nos. 14ff: 27 Apr.-21 May 1569; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 50, 469; Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori', 51f; *idem*, *Venezia nell'età della controriforma* (Milan, 1973), 138f; P. F. Grendler, *The Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Press, 1540-1605* (Princeton, N.J., 1977), 137f, 220f, 256, 264ff, 269ff, 276; P. Brizzi, *La formazione della classe dirigente nel Sei-Settecento* (Bologna, 1976), 25, 52f.

¹⁰ Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 293f.

¹¹ A.S.V. Venezia xxxv; 57'ff: 6 May 1600; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 59, 288, 293f; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 108; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 74 and n. 79; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 51ff and n. 87, 125ff, 138, 142f, 146ff, 174f, 189ff; Prodi, 'Structure and organisation', 410f and nn.; B. Boucher, 'Jacopo Sansovino and the choir of St Mark's', *Burlington*, 118 (1976), 552ff; C. F. Black, *Italian Confraternities in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1989), 2, 110-11; cf. R. Mackenney, *Tradesmen and Traders: The World of the Guilds in Venice and Europe, c.1250-c.1650* (London, 1987), 60, 71, 170-1, 177, 198-9, 202.

¹² A.S.V. Venezia xxxiii; 181'ff; xxxv; 27'ff: 29 Jan. 1600-29 Jan. 1602; 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*, 3 (1961), 121ff.

¹³ A.S.V. Venezia xxxii; 660'ff; xxxv; 82'ff.; xl; 724'f: 29 July 1600-25 Dec. 1610; A.S.Ven.: Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18: 1 Dec. 1565-5 Apr. 1567; B.N.M.: MSS Ital. cl. vii, no. 1553 (8727), *passim*; P. Sarpi, *Historia particolare delle cose passate tra'l Sommo Pontefice Paolo V e... Venetia* (Lyon, 1624), 277f; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 26, 32, 80f, 133, 204; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 75, 114, 121, 485; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 130 n. 1; Prodi, 'Structure and organisation', 411 and nn.; A. D. Wright, 'The Venetian view of church and state: Catholic Erastianism?', *Stud Secent*, 19 (1978), 75-108.

the Republic,¹⁴ which in the immediately post-Conciliar years watched closely the process of episcopal appointments in other territories, such as Mantua,¹⁵ or Florence, where Medici co-operation with the papacy ever since the Council was rewarded with the grand-ducal title and much *de facto* patronage.¹⁶ For the appointment of bishops to sees elsewhere in the Republic was dependent on Roman goodwill, being in papal hands.¹⁷ Even the debated procedure for choice of the archbishop of Candia involved Venetian and papal co-operation, and the loss of Cyprus, offsetting the victory of Lepanto, removed another area of Venetian ecclesiastical patronage.¹⁸ Republican insistence on the necessary qualities for a patriarch of Venice, even before the Interdict, stressed the experience of public affairs which a patrician of some standing in secular office would best have.¹⁹ The translation of celibate patricians directly from lay noble status to clerical was overtly praised and pursued, even if not at every succession after Trent.²⁰ This was in a way the culmination of a wider tradition, typified also by Bollani, of Venetian noble families limiting the marriage of their sons as well as of their daughters. While undowered daughters were placed in female convents, unmarried nobles frequently maintained an extended bachelor life, with

¹⁴ A.S.Ven.: Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 17, fos. 2'ff: 3 Mar. 1565–15 Sept.; 18: 1 June 1566, 4, 25 Jan., 22, 29 Mar., 19 Apr., 19 July, 30 Aug. 1567; *Nunziature di Venezia*, xi, no. 114: 29 Apr. 1574; *La corrispondenza da Madrid dell'ambasciatore Leonardo Donà*, ed. M. Brunetti and E. Vitale (Venice and Rome, 1963), nos. 50, 130: 19 Oct. 1570–17 Nov. 1571.

¹⁵ A.S.Ven.: Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 17, fos. 59'ff: 11 Aug. 1565; 18: 16 Mar. 1566–2 Aug. 1567; cf. *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, no. 78: 24 Sept. 1569; cf. S. Pagano, *Il processo di Endimio Calandra e l'Inquisizione a Mantova nel 1567–1568* (Vatican City, 1991), 20–1.

¹⁶ A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25: nos. 23, 128f, 164f: 17 May 1567–24 Feb. 1571; Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 17, fos. 24'ff: 19 May 1565; 18: 6 July 1566–23 Aug. 1567; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1556, fos. 67'ff; F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 248ff: 14 Aug. 1574–18 Dec. 1574; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, nos. 17ff: 3 May 1569–10 Mar. 1571; xi, nos. 162ff: 14 Aug. 1574–25 Feb. 1576; *Corrispondenza da Madrid*, nos. 15ff: 12 May 1570–16 Apr. 1571; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 189; A. d'Addario, *Aspetti della Controriforma a Firenze* (Rome, 1972), 152ff, 212, 497ff; cf. A. Erba, *La chiesa Sabauda tra Cinque e Seicento. Ortodossia Tridentina, Gallicanesimo Savoiano e Assolutismo ducale (1580–1630)* (Rome, 1979), 3ff, 23ff, 73ff, 261ff.

¹⁷ A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25: nos. 80, 230: 10 Mar. 1569, 21 Nov. 1573; 26, nos. 61, 102: 13 Aug. 1575, 5 May 1576; Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18: 24 Nov. 1565, 16 Nov. 1566, 5 July 1567; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, nos. 38ff: 25 June 1569–17 Jan. 1571; xi, nos. 308, 332: 1 Oct., 3 Dec. 1575; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 156 n. 1, 439; cf. P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole. Eresia e santità nelle polemiche religiose del Cinquecento* (Rome 1977), pp. 17ff.

¹⁸ A.S.Ven.: Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18: 3 Nov. 1565–6 Sept. 1567; Inquisitori di Stato: Lettere agli Ambasciatori a Roma: busta 163: 82, 93: 19 June 1623, 26 Feb. 1628; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, no. 90: 22 Oct. 1569; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 422 n. 1; ii, 351f.

¹⁹ A.S.V. Venezia xxxv; 95'ff; xxxviii; 215 ff: 26 Aug. 1600–22 Mar. 1608; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1556, fos. 104'ff; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 487; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 37 and n. 3, 59 n. 2, 73 n. 3, 119, 218 n. 2, 294; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 343; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 269ff; Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori', 46; G. Soranzo, 'Rapporti di San Carlo Borromeo con la Repubblica Veneta', *Arch Veneto*, 5th ser., 27 (1940), 1ff: p. 25; cf. A. D. Wright, 'The Venetian Mediterranean Empire after the Council of Trent', in *The Church and Sovereignty: Studies in Church History, Subsidia IX in Honour of M. J. Wilks*, ed. D. Wood (Oxford, 1991), 467–77.

²⁰ A.S.V. Venezia xxxv; 77'ff; xxxviii; 246'ff: 15 July 1600–8 Mar. 1608; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, nos. 111, 114: 17, 24 Dec. 1569; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 182, 184; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 252f, 268, 511; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 222 n. 2.

service to the state in secular or ecclesiastical office or in both in succession.²¹ Only Republican concern to limit the extent of any one family's ecclesiastical wealth and possessions could occasionally be a complicating factor within this tradition.²²

As with Bollani of Brescia, so with those post-Conciliar patriarchs of Venice translated directly from the secular service of the Republic to clerical life, pastoral inexperience did not necessarily prove to mean pastoral incompetence.²³ The tradition, also found in many Venetian noble families, of conspicuous devotion among the male members, extending even to voluntary recitation of the clerical breviary, and often a theological literacy of a notable degree, partly compensated for the lack of more formal clerical training.²⁴ But it was equally natural that the papacy should attempt after Trent to impose on candidates for the Venetian patriarchate, just as on Spain's nominations for other Italian sees for example, a rigorous examination, to be conducted at Rome, to determine suitability by the letter of the Tridentine decrees on episcopal appointments.²⁵ While Spain resisted such examination with regard to Sicilian sees by claiming that they were transmarine, and not to be identified with other Italian sees, the position of the patriarchate in the Venetian lagoon, as primate also of Dalmatia, could not be used so easily in such an argument.²⁶ The contests over examination of Venetian nominations to the patriarchate not only coincided with the Interdict, but threatened a major breach with Rome outside that episode itself.²⁷ The claims of the post-Tridentine papacy that the patriarchs of Venice should be free to make *ad limina* visits to Rome, like bishops elsewhere in the Republic or in other Italian states, were also on occasion opposed at Venice,

²¹ B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1157 (9610), fos. 46f, 84f; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 117; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 409; Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori', 62f; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 137f; Brizzi, *La formazione*, 25; cf. G. Fragnito, *Gasparo Contarini. Un magistrato veneziano al servizio della Cristianità* (Florence, 1988).

²² A.S.V. Venezia vii; 4; xxxii; 543ff; xxxv; 167ff; xxxviii; 14'ff: 1569-24 May 1608; A.S.Ven.: Inquisitori di Stato: Lettere agli Ambasciatori a Roma: busta no. 165; 7f; 27 Apr., 11 May 1591; 19; 28 Mar. 1609; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, nos. 61, 160; 13 Aug. 1567, 11 Mar. 1570; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 421f; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 328; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 37f, 69, 70 and n. 1, 218 n. 2, 241ff, 279 n. 1, 286 and n. 1, 293, 294 and n. 1.

²³ A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 187f; 18 Oct. 1572; *Secreta Archivi Propri Roma*: 17, fos. 1'ff; 3 Mar. 1565; Cappelletti, *Storia*, vi, 377ff, 487ff, 491ff, 495ff, 749ff, 906ff; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 271; C. Cairns, *Domenico Bollani, Bishop of Brescia: Devotion to Church and State in the Republic of Venice in the Sixteenth Century* (Nieuwkoop, 1976), 140, 167, 178, 213ff, 225 n. 55, 233ff; A. Foscarini, *L'armonia e i conflitti: la chiesa di San Francesco della Vigna nella Venezia del '500* (Turin, 1983).

²⁴ A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii; 271'ff; 1 Mar. 1608; A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, no. 231; 11 Nov. 1573; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 445 and n. 132.

²⁵ A.S.V. Venezia xxxv; 220'ff; 28 Feb. 1601; A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 221ff; 5 Sept.-12 Dec. 1573; *Secreta Archivi Propri Roma*: 17, fos. 1'ff; 3 Mar. 1565.

²⁶ A.S.V. Venezia xxxiii; 241'ff; xxxv; 77ff; xxxviii; 14'ff; 15 July 1600-17 May 1608; P. Sarpi, *Istoria dell'Interdetto e altri scritti*, ed. G. Gambarin, III (Bari, 1940), 259; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 73.

²⁷ A.S.V. Venezia vii; 13f; Sept. 1569; xxxv; 31'ff; xxxviii; 14'ff; 26 Feb. 1600-31 May 1608; Sarpi, *Historia particolare*, 93f; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 38, 93; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 334, 347, 486, 511; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 63 n. 1, 73 n. 3, 119, 120 and n. 1; Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori', 62ff; *idem*, *Venezia nell'età della controriforma*, 62.

where there was always awareness of the successful resistance of Spain to demands that the bishops of Sicily, or of the Iberian peninsula itself, or of the overseas empire, should pay *ad limina* visits in person at intervals determined by the papacy.²⁸

Moreover, the private visit of Charles Borromeo to Venice and Padua in 1580 did not reflect Republican willingness to allow wide exercise of his legatine authority in the state. His role in 1575 as apostolic visitor in the part of the Milanese Church province lying within the Republic was not to be repeated in other areas of Venetian possessions, whether in the city of Venice itself or the patriarchate of Aquileia.²⁹ The inclusion of the papal nuncio at Venice in the limited apostolic visitation finally allowed in the city in 1580–1 was in addition to the involvement of Agostino Valier, bishop of Verona, since the patriarch as diocesan was supposed to be subject to investigation himself, as Borromeo formally was during the apostolic visitation of Milan by the Venetian prelate Ragazzoni.³⁰ Republican insistence on the exclusion from the visitation at Venice of the patriarchate's female convents and lay confraternities also secured freedom from any implementation of the important Tridentine provisions for episcopal supervision of such institutions.³¹

The Republic itself, from the end of the Council of Trent to the Interdict and beyond, continued to maintain its own control of these and other aspects of city religious life, by means of special government magistracies, operating in the *dogado*. The supervision of female convents had been entrusted in 1521 to a magistracy charged with excluding those without licence from the parlours of such institutions.³² For the maintenance of noble families' honour, by virtue of the conspicuous chastity of daughters placed as nuns, was the whole purpose of the magistracy, not the imposition of ascetic living nor the reduction of convents to houses for those only with an individual

²⁸ F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 66ff: 23 Oct. 1573–Dec. 1574; *Nunziature di Venezia*, xi, nos. 73ff: 16 Jan. 1574–21 Jan. 1575; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 268f, 272.

²⁹ A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, no. 240; 26, nos. 27ff: 19 Dec. 1573–24 Sept. 1575; Collegio: Relazioni di Rettori: Bergamo: busta 35: Relazione del Capo, Marc' Antonio Memo, 1576; cf. A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii; 154ff, 183ff: 3 Nov., 1 Dec. 1607; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, no. 126; 28 Jan. 1570; xi, nos. 327, 330; 26 Nov., 3 Dec. 1575; *Gli atti della Visita Apostolica di San Carlo Borromeo a Bergamo*, ed. A. G. Roncalli and P. Forno (2 vols. in 5, Florence, 1936–57), *passim*; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 73, 338f, 449; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 30ff, 113f, 121, 127ff, 147f; Cairns, *Bollani*, 140, 147 n. 76, 162ff, 168, 191 n. 135, 208ff, 212ff, 227f nn. 81, 97; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 327f, 350; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 338f; L. Căstano, *Gregorio XIV (Niccolò Sfondrati) 1535–91* (Turin, 1957), 226f and n. 77.

³⁰ Cappelletti, *Storia*, vi, 558ff; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 32, 39, 65f and nn. 2, 3; Cairns, *Bollani*, 160.

³¹ A.S.V. Venezia xxxii; 445ff; xxxiii; 248f; xxxv; 49ff; xxxviii; 167ff: 29 Apr. 1600–8 Mar. 1608; A.S.Ven.: Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18; 24 May 1567; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 134, 211; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 31 n. 44, 32 n. 46, 37, 39, 72 and n. 22, 103; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 100f; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 46 and n. 60, 47, 329f, 338, 343, 404f.

³² A.S.V. Venezia vii; 17f: 28 Sep. 1569; A.S.Ven.: Provveditori sopra Monasteri: busta 260; F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 98ff: Dec. 1573–31 July 1574; *Nunziature di Venezia*, xi, no. 291; 13 Aug. 1575.

and tested vocation to the religious life.³³ On the contrary any such reduction, by stricter enclosure or release from vows for those without an ascetic vocation, was overtly resisted, as spelling the ruin of noble economies – just as at Naples in fact.³⁴ Patriarchal authority over female convents, or that of the vicar of the bishop of Torcello elsewhere in the lagoon, was thus barely acknowledged, despite continuing scandals.³⁵

The nobles who had particular oversight of each individual convent were supposed to be of a suitably advanced age.³⁶ But another secular magistracy which extended its authority, first delegated in 1537 by the Council of Ten and its *Capi*, precisely in the post-Tridentine period, when the noble superintendents of female convents became more active after the disruption of the Interdict, had an even larger influence on the religious life of the city.³⁷ The magistrates charged with the suppression of blasphemy naturally extended their investigations and sentences to the popular brawls and gaming which so often gave rise to blasphemy.³⁸ But by a distinct if related extension this magistracy also dealt with certain cases of defamation and even of matrimonial disputes and irregularities, at least among the lower orders. Here again ecclesiastical authority, as represented by the patriarch and his vicar, was largely ignored. Yet elsewhere in Catholic Europe, as for example in Spain or Naples, either church courts or Inquisitorial tribunals were increasingly insisting, after Trent, that all departure from the newly codified church law on marriage, in the Conciliar decrees, was to be treated as disrespect for a sacrament, and so potentially as indicative of heresy. At Venice, however, such an implication was resisted, as was also the suggestion that blasphemy was indicative of heresy.³⁹ The Venetian practice, as opposed to more complex theory, was to judge almost all blasphemy as an offence against the authority of the Catholic Republic, without a presumption

³³ A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii: 307 ff: 29 Mar. 1608; A.S.Ven.: Provveditori sopra Monasteri: busta 260: 29 Mar. 1605–July 1615; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, nos. 98 ff: 16 Nov. 1569–31 Mar. 1571; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 208; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 73.

³⁴ A.S.V. Venezia xxxii: 507 ff; xxxiii: 259 ff; xxxv: 108 ff; xxxviii: 14 ff: 16 Sept. 1600–4 Oct. 1608; A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 239 f; 26, fos. 189 ff: 12 Dec. 1573–1 Mar. 1578; Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 17, fo. 84^v: 13 Oct. 1565; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1156 (8877): 12 Mar. 1588; no. 1556, fos. 82 ff; F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: *Nunziatura in Venezia*: filza 265, fos. 118, 168: 31 Jan., 1 May 1574; *Nunziature di Venezia*, xi, nos. 82–3, 123: 31 Jan., 6 Feb., 22 May 1574; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 200 f, 208; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 31 n. 44, 32 n. 46, 39 n. 66, 65 f and n. 3, 117, 192 f, 250; Cairns, *Bollani*, 200 n. 248, 274 ff; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 68, 69 and n. 1; Benzioni, 'I "teologi" minori', 51 f, 70 f; R. Villari, *The Revolt of Naples* (Cambridge, 1993), 225 n. 117.

³⁵ A.S.Ven.: Provveditori sopra Monasteri: busta 260: 31 July 1606–9 Feb. 1615; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 84 n. 6; Benzioni, 'I "teologi" minori', 51 f.

³⁶ A.S.Ven.: Provveditori sopra Monasteri: busta 260: 31 Mar. 1605; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 207 ff.

³⁷ A.S.Ven.: Esecutori contra Bestemmia: busta 57, fos. 1^v: 12, 22 June 1582; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 50 ff; B. Pullan, 'A ship with two rudders': "Righetto Marrano" and the Inquisition in Venice', *Hist J*, 20 (1977), 25–58: p. 32.

³⁸ A.S.Ven.: Esecutori contra Bestemmia: busta 57, fos. 5^v ff: 22 Sept.–23 Dec. 1582.

³⁹ A.S.Ven.: Esecutori contra Bestemmia: busta 57, fos. 2^v ff: 14 July 1582–15 Sept. 1583; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, i, 27, 34 f, 52 ff, 61, 79, 92 f; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 26, 207 ff, 213.

of heretical intent.⁴⁰ In any case the nobles who supervised the work of the tribunal of the Roman Inquisition at Venice itself, the *Savi all'eresia*, were required to control the extent of Inquisitorial claims of competence; just as were the *rettori* who attended the local tribunals elsewhere in the Republic.⁴¹

The distinct magistracy at Venice charged with supervision of the Jewish communities of the city also restricted any intervention by the Inquisition in Jewish life, as opposed to certain cases involving accusations of apostasy or judaizing by Christians of Jewish racial origin.⁴² The Republic equally guarded the subject population of the Greek rite, whether in the city or elsewhere in Venetian territory, from Inquisitorial intervention, in most cases at least.⁴³ Republican control over printing and publication, as over the licensing of imported books, was increased, not least at the time of the Interdict and thereafter, limiting in practice any independent episcopal or Inquisitorial action to enforce the authority of the Roman Index.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ A.S.Ven.: Santo Ufficio: busta 153: 12 Aug. 1595; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 27, 34f, 79, 439; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 212f; cf. R. Martin, *Witchcraft and the Inquisition in Venice 1550-1650* (Oxford, 1989).

⁴¹ A.S.V. Venezia xxxii: 851ff; xxxv: 134ff; xxxviii: 2ff; xlii (C): 348ff; xlii (G): 56ff; 4 Nov. 1600-20 Jan. 1618; A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 28ff, 26, nos. 8, 60: 19 July 1567-13 Aug. 1575; Santo Ufficio: busta 153: 1567, 19, 20, 25 June, 27 Sept. 1570, 8 Feb. 1611, 1 Apr. 1621, 1622, 14 Mar., 24 Apr. 1623, 14 July 1626, 25 May 1629; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1553 [10/60]; F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 78ff; 266, fos. 29ff; 7 Nov. 1573-13 Aug. 1575; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, p. xiii, nos. 13ff; xi, nos. 41ff; 27 Apr. 1569-26 June 1576; P. Sarpi, *Discorso dell'origine, forma, leggi, ed uso dell' Ufficio dell'Inquisizione* [Geneva] (1639), *passim*, esp. p. 114; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 22ff, 29, 30 and n. 1, 89f, 405ff; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 77, 281, 285f, 290ff; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 189, 251, 370, 488, 501, 513, 558 and n. 15, 561, 590; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 31, 120, 121 n. 1, 122 and n. 1; Cairns, *Bollani*, 152, 202ff, 224, 276; Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori', 48ff, 51f, 62ff, 65, 67, 70ff; Pullan, 'A ship with two rudders', 31 and nn. 25, 27, 28, pp. 32f; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 40 n. 40, 50ff, 54f, 61f, 104, 126, 134ff, 198, 206ff, 212ff, and n. 36, 215ff, 218ff, 222, 266ff, 273ff, 281ff; *idem*, 'The *Tre savii sopra eresia 1547-1605*: a prosopographical study', *Stud Venez.*, n.s. 3 (1979), 283-340: 287ff, 336ff; cf. F. Scaduto, *Stato e chiesa nelle due Sicilie* (2 vols., Palermo, 1969), I, 305, 311, 348.

⁴² A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii: 274ff; 1 Mar.-7 June 1608; A.S.Ven.: Inquisitori agli Ebrei: busta 19, fos. 258ff, 394^v, 395^r, 401ff, 457ff, 608ff; 1570-95; S. Ufficio: busta 153: 1581; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1553 [10/58]; F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 118ff; 31 Jan.-1 May 1574; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, no. 56; xi, nos. 41ff; 3 Aug. 1569-13 Mar. 1574; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 286f, 289; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 117; Cairns, *Bollani*, 153; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 89ff, 91ff, 117, 140ff, 212f, 255; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 536ff, 545f, 558f, 579ff, 588ff, 593f; *idem*, 'A ship with two rudders', 35, 45, 56f; *idem*, *The Jews of Europe and the Inquisition of Venice, 1550-1670* (Oxford, 1983); C. Roth, *History of the Jews in Venice* (New York, 1975), 131ff.

⁴³ A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii: 95ff; xlii (F): 143ff; xlii (H): 1 Sept. 1607-1621; A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 54-5: 6, 13 Mar. 1568; Collegio: Relazioni di Rettori: busta 84: 1567; Inquisitori di Stato: Lettere agli Ambasciatori a Roma: busta 155: 9f; 31 Dec. 1594, 7 Jan. 1595; S. Ufficio: busta 153: 4 Mar. 1576, 19 Dec. 1623; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1553 [2], [13]; Sarpi, *Discorso*, 12, 94ff; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, p. xiii n. 2, no. 116: 31 Dec. 1569; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 34f, 62, 79, 88ff, [455]ff, 464ff, 469, 489ff; II, 351f; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 26, 38, 159ff, 290, 305ff, 308, 310, 313ff; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 73 and nn., 75, 225, 248f, 354, 488, 513; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 120, 292; G. Fedalto, *Ricerche storiche sulla posizione giuridica ed ecclesiastica dei Greci a Venezia nei secoli XV e XVI* (Florence, 1967); P. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Venetians (1694)* (London, 1935); *idem*, *The Religious Minorities of Chios, Jews and Roman Catholics* (Cambridge, 1970).

⁴⁴ A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii: 301ff; 29 Mar.-19 Apr. 1608; A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, no. 87: 18 June 1569; S. Ufficio: busta 153: 25 Feb. 1570,

The devotional life of the laity in the city of Venice was in one respect more amenable to patriarchal direction. The humble parochial confraternities of Counter-Reformation inspiration, dedicated to the cult of the Reserved Sacrament, were, as elsewhere in Catholic Europe, subject to episcopal supervision.⁴⁵ Their relatively lowly social composition and economic standing distinguished them from the control exercised over the rich *Scuole Grandi*, as over testaments and bequests generally, by nobles of the ruling class and especially the Procurators.⁴⁶ Some advance was also made in the city in popular catechetical instruction, as pursued elsewhere too in post-Tridentine Catholic society, by means of the Schools of Christian Doctrine. The expulsion from the Republic during the Interdict of the Jesuits and the long refusal to allow the Society to return to Venetian territory, however, caused difficulties in the running of these Schools in the city.⁴⁷ Sensitivity elsewhere in the Venetian territories, whether on the terraferma or on the Dalmatian littoral, to any continued Jesuit influence after the Interdict, by educational attractions in neighbouring states, personal correspondence or publications, remained marked.⁴⁸

Control of ecclesiastical life and the loyalty of the lay population also raised particular problems in the extensive territories of the patriarchate of Aquileia.⁴⁹ The occupation by the Austrian Habsburgs of a part of these lands, and Austrian influence in the chapter of Aquileia led to Republican

19 May 1607; Riformatori dello Studio di Padova: filza 64: 28 Nov., 5 Dec. 1607, 7 Sept. 1609, 9 July 1616; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii. no. 1556, fos. 63ff; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, nos. 8ff; 16 Apr. 1569–10 June 1570; Sarpi, *Discorso, passim*, esp. 118ff, 145ff; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 33ff, 405, 407f, 412; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 120 and n. 4; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 26, 80f, 91ff, 138, 140ff, 151ff, 160ff, 163, 183, 197 n. 53, 201 n. 1, 209, 255, 262ff, 274ff, 281ff; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 117, 122, 252, 313 and n. 159; Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori', 50, 106; *idem*, *Venezia nell'età della controriforma*, 39.

⁴⁵ A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii: 35ff; 21 July 1607; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 279, 328, 377ff, 383ff and n. 50, 397ff, 400f, 637; P. Hills, 'Piety and patronage in Cinquecento Venice: Tintoretto and the Scuole del Sacramento', *Art Hist.*, 6 (1983), 30–43; cf. L. Châtellier, *The Europe of the Devout* (Cambridge, 1989), 3–4, 15, 42–3, 89, 91, 103, 106, 119–20, 134, 212–13.

⁴⁶ A.S.V. Venezia xxxv: 57ff; xxxviii: 123ff; 6 May 1600–3 May 1608; A.S.Ven.: Procuratori di San Marco: Procuratia de Supra, de Citra e de Ultra: Commissarie; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, nos. 1553 [8]; 1556, fos. 65f; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 84 n. 3, 110, 126f, 134, 165, 241; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 193; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 233f, 250, 345, 548; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 46f, 121, 253, 337 and n. 37, 339, 343f, 401; Hay, *Church in Italy*, 61ff, 78ff.

⁴⁷ A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii: 5ff; xlii (C): 222^v; 30 June 1607–22 Aug. 1615; cf. A.S.V. Spagna LXI: 1620s; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1556, fos. 140f; 15 Nov. 1619; Sarpi, *Historia particolare*, 69; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 156f; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 496, 510; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 282; Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori', 49, 67, 70; cf. Châtellier, *The Europe of the Devout*, 22, 133; cf. Villari, *Revolt*, p. ix; cf. F. Rurale, *I Gesuiti a Milano: religione e politica nel secondo cinquecento* (Rome, 1992).

⁴⁸ A.S.Ven.: Riformatori dello Studio di Padova: filza 64: 30 Aug. 1601, [1609]; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 408; Brizzi, *La formazione*, 52f; cf. G. Signorotto, 'Venezia e il ritorno dei Gesuiti (1606–1657)', *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* (Oct. 1992), 277–317.

⁴⁹ B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, nos. 1158 (9426), fos. 6ff., 34ff; 1160 (9427), fos. 2f, 44ff; 9 Sept. 1622–17 Mar. 1623; F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 157f, 175; 24 Apr., 15 May 1574; *Nunziature di Venezia*, xi, nos. 14ff; 8 Aug. 1573–9 May 1574; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 233, 384; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 21, 22 and n. 1, 37 n. 3, 282 and n. 1; P. Paschini, 'La nomina del Patriarca di Aquileia e la Repubblica di Venezia nel secolo XVI', *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, 2 (1948), 61ff.

determination to influence the governing of the remaining territories.⁵⁰ The choice of the patriarchal vicar was supervised by the local Venetian representatives, and secular authority was also asserted in relation to any inspection of lay confraternities and their funds within the patriarchate.⁵¹ The succession of Venetian nobles to the see was pursued by means of complicated negotiations at Rome, designed to provide at all times a coadjutor with right of succession, thus precluding an interregnum or any claim by the chapter to free election.⁵² But after the Council of Trent such questions were further vexed because of doubts at Rome about Patriarch Giovanni Grimani. The dismissal at the Council itself of suspicions of heretical leanings on the part of Grimani was not sufficient to persuade the papacy to allow him a cardinal's hat or even the pallium of a metropolitan archbishop.⁵³ The quality of his coadjutor was also much debated, while the see continued to suffer from non-residence.⁵⁴

Yet Venetian insistence on the Republic's own competence in all ecclesiastical questions remained constant.⁵⁵ In 1628 the Senate ordered Patriarch Tiepolo, a former *primicerio* of St Mark's, to restore to the local church calendar peculiar observances for St Mark and San Rocco, two saints whose cult was prominent at Venice. The patriarch had proposed alterations, to comply with regulations from the Roman Sacred Congregation of Rites. These liturgical peculiarities thus survived under his successor, Cardinal Federico Cornaro, just as they had always done, despite the attempts after the Council of Trent of Pope Pius V to reduce such local variations in the interests

⁵⁰ A.S.V. Venezia VII; 11ff, 13ff; Sept. 1569; A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 11f, 95f.; 26 July 1566–12 Nov. 1569; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1553 [3]; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, p. xv, nos. 56ff; xi, nos. 312, 317–18; 3 Aug. 1569–5 Nov. 1575; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 23, 339; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 204f; Cairns, *Bollani*, 168ff.

⁵¹ A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 178, 247; 26, nos. 192ff; 26 May 1571–12 July 1578.

⁵² A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 46, 87; 26, nos. 18, 144–5; 1 Nov. 1567–23 Feb. 1577; Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18: 19 Apr., 17 May, 26 July 1567; *Nunziature di Venezia*, xi, no. 46; 21 Nov. 1573; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 156, 188 n. 1, 346 and n. 2, 365.

⁵³ A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 82, 184; 30 Mar. 1569–27 Sept. 1572; Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18: 22 Dec. 1565, 5, 12, 26 Jan., 23 Mar., 6, 27 Apr., 14 May 1566; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, no. 93; 29 Oct. 1569.

⁵⁴ A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, no. 230; 26, nos. 6ff; 21 Nov. 1573–18 Oct. 1578; Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18: 16 Feb., 18 May 1566, 19 Apr. 1567; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, nos. 179, 184; xi, nos. 14ff; 12 Apr. 1570–30 June 1576; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 365; P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum* (Ratisbon, 1873), 774; G. Trebbi, *Francesco Barbaro, Patrio Veneto e Patriarca di Aquileia* (Udine, 1984).

⁵⁵ A.S.V. Venezia VII; 16ff; xxxiii; 266ff; xxxviii; 65ff; Sept. 1569–11 Aug. 1607; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, no. 1160, fos. 59f; 31 Mar. 1623; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, p. xiii n. 2, p. xiv, nos. 24ff; 14 May 1569–29 Nov. 1570; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 79 n. 44; Bouwisma, *Venice and the Defense*, 75, 120f, 326ff; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 68, 69 and n. 1, 95, 100f, 218 n. 1; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 59; Prodi, 'Structure and organisation', 409ff and nn.; G. Del Torre, 'La politica ecclesiastica della Repubblica di Venezia nell'età moderna: la fiscalità', in *Fisco religione stato nell'età confessionale*, ed. H. Kellenbenz and P. Prodi (Bologna, 1989), 387ff; cf. M. C. Giannini, 'Politica spagnola e giurisdizione ecclesiastica nello Stato di Milano: il conflitto tra il cardinale Federico Borromeo e il *visitador* regio don Felipe de Haro (1606–1607)', *Stud Borromaeica*, 6 (1992), 195–226.

of introducing a standardized Roman Rite in the Western Church. The post-Conciliar papal programme for liturgical uniformity also involved the standardisation of liturgical texts, which was a contributory factor in the difficulties encountered by the Venetian printing and publishing trade after Trent.⁵⁶ Yet in other ways popular and even more learned piety at Venice was changing in the post-Tridentine period.⁵⁷ The ceremonial distinctions accorded to the doge might survive, and the jurisdictional arguments asserted by the Republic's legal and theological advisers, certainly during Sarpi's lifetime, continued to draw on the Old Testament type of kings with priestly powers, as well as on the precedent of the Byzantine emperors' prerogatives.⁵⁸

But devotion to the quintessential Counter-Reformation figure of Charles Borromeo, after his early canonization, spread to Venice, in educated circles as well as among the people.⁵⁹ He indeed became an additional saint invoked against plague, together with the traditional patrons San Rocco and St Sebastian. This new cult thus existed alongside the traditional dedication of certain churches in the city to Old Testament figures.⁶⁰ And even those nuncios most disillusioned with jurisdictional obstinacy or clerical indiscipline at Venice remarked on the healthy devotional life of the city's laity, including the reception of sacraments and the frequenting of devotions particularly promoted by the post-Tridentine Church.⁶¹ The lower

⁵⁶ A.S.V. Venezia xxxviii; 167f, 269ff; 17 Nov. 1607–23 Feb. 1608; A.S.Ven.: Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18: 22 Feb. 1567; Riformatori dello Studio di Padova: filza 64: [1604]; F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 48ff; 266, fos. 10ff; Sept. 1573–25 June 1575; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, nos. 123ff; xi, nos. 21ff; 21 Jan. 1570–19 May 1576; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 9, 169ff, 171, 225ff, 229ff, 236, 238ff, 241ff, 245ff, 250ff, 257ff and n. 25, 261ff; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 316; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, II, 269; H. F. Brown, *The Venetian Printing Press* (London, 1891), 140ff; A. Battistella, 'La politica ecclesiastica della Repubblica di Venezia', *Nuov Arch Veneto*, 16 (1898), 386ff.

⁵⁷ Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 72 and n. 68, 112, 224f; Prodi, 'Structure and organisation', 410f and nn.; P. Burke, *Venice and Amsterdam: A Study of Seventeenth-Century Elites* (London, 1974), 76; cf. S. Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches* (London, 1988), 51–125.

⁵⁸ A.S.V. Venezia xlii (F); 143ff, 187ff; 29 Apr., 13 May 1617; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, nos. 1553; 1556, fo. 60^v; Sarpi, *Discorso*, 95ff; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 62, 466ff; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 306ff.

⁵⁹ A.S.V. Venezia xlii (I); 83^v: 18 Feb. 1623; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 26 n. 31; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 34 and n. 1; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 404f; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 250, 409f, 511.

⁶⁰ B.N.M.: MSS Ital., classe x, no. 69 (6710), fo. 10^v; 16 Feb. 1611; cl. vii, no. 1553 [16]; Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan: MSS G. 207 inf., fos. 136^v, 391^v; G. 208 inf., fo. 84^v; G. 208 bis inf., fos. 350^v, 424^v; 6 Aug.–31 Dec. 1611; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 348, 358, 399; Prodi, 'Structure and organisation', 410ff.

⁶¹ A.S.V. Venezia vii; 5ff; xxxii; 453ff; xxxiii; 198ff; xxxv; 49ff; xxxviii; 7ff; xlii; 290f; xliii, *passim*: Aug. 1569–12 Nov. 1611; A.S.Ven.: Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci: Lettere di Ambasciatori: Roma: busta 25, nos. 25f, 109, 128f; 26, nos. 113, 197ff; 12 July 1567–28 July 1578; Secreta Archivi Propri Roma: 18: 10, 17 Nov. 1565, 19 Jan., 6 Apr., 8 June 1566, 15, 22 Mar., 5, 12, Apr., 2 Aug. 1567; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. vii, nos. 1553 [4], [18]; 1556, fos. 38f; F.C.M.: A.S.V. Segr. di Stato: Nunziatura in Venezia: filza 265, fos. 2ff; 266, fos. 35ff; 12 Dec. 1573–30 July 1575; *Nunziature di Venezia*, ix, pp. xiiif, nos. 2ff; xi, nos. 2ff; 30 Mar. 1569–23 June 1576; Sarpi, *Discorso*, *passim*, esp. pp. 115, 121f; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 134, 264 n. 3, 267 and n. 1, 422 n. 1; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 56 n. 15, 66 n. 3, 80, 84, 110, 117f, 152, 154f, 286f; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 78, 81f, 112, 114, 116f, 251, 268, 327f, 333, 342, 346 and n. 28, 350, 368f, 383f, 385, 398, 491, 496, 511, 542; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 25 n. 1, 123, 218 n. 1, 294; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 209 n. 23, 222; Prodi 'Structure and organisation', 412; Benzoni, 'I "teologi" minori', 49, 62ff; *idem*, *Venezia nell'età della controriforma*, 82; Hay, *Church in Italy*, 89.

orders of the city at any rate were judged by the nuncios to be free of heretical sympathies.

In that sense at least the Republic's conspicuous celebration of its proclaimed Catholicism, in the face of the papal Interdict of 1606–7, was not unjustified, even if elsewhere in the Republic the subject population was evidently more concerned by the arguable need to obey the pope and observe the Interdict rather than accept the state's orders for non-observance and the maintenance of normal religious practice.⁶² The Republic's religious traditions thus survived, though modified, after both the Council of Trent and the Interdict.⁶³

⁶² A.S.V. Venezia XXXVIII: 21 ff; XLII (C): 222^v: 14 July 1607–22 Aug. 1615; A.S.Ven.: Senato: Dispacci di Rettori: Bergamo [1618]: 16 Jan. 1619; B.N.M.: MSS Ital., cl. VII, no. 1556, fos. 63 ff; *Atti... Visita... Bergamo*, I i, 128; II iii, 482; Sarpi, *Historia particolare, passim; Discorso, passim*, esp. pp. 46, 117, 121f; Cecchetti, *La Repubblica*, I, 85 n. 2; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 25, 26 n. 31, 38f, 58 n. 16, 249; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 250, 252, 268, 291, 319, 350, 368f, 552, 563; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 26 n. 2, 115, 118 n. 1, 122 n. 1, 130f, 292; Pullan, *Rich and Poor*, 55ff, 59f, 62, 335; Prodi, 'Structure and organisation', 410f and nn.; Boucher, 'Sansovino and the choir of St. Mark's', 552ff.

⁶³ A.S.V. Venezia XLIII: 1626–7; *Corrispondenza da Madrid*, no. 50; 19 Oct. 1570; Stella, *Chiesa e stato*, 73f and n. 29, 336f; Cozzi, *Contarini*, 294, 301; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defence*, 114, 333; Grendler, *Roman Inquisition*, 284 n. 86; *Histoire de l'église*, ed. A. Fliche and V. Martin (Paris, 1946ff), xviii, 420; cf. G. Signorotto, *Inquisitori e mistici nel Seicento italiano. L'eresia di Santa Pelagia* (Bologna, 1989), 89–104, 124–58, 300–1.