Peace in the Post-Reformation

Christians are supposed to love their neighbours, including their enemies. This is never easy. When feud and honour are common realities, it is even harder than usual.

This book sketches the history of peacemaking between people (not countries) as an activity of churches or of Christianity between the Reformation and the eighteenth century. The story is recounted in four countries (Italy, France, Germany and England) and in several religious settings (including Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Church of England and Calvinist). Each version is a variation upon a theme: what the author calls a 'moral tradition' which contrasts, as a continuing imperative, with the novelties of theory and practice introduced by the sixteenth-century reformers. In general the topic has much to say about the destinies of Christianity in each country, and more widely, and strikes a chord which will resonate in both the social and the religious history of the West.

John Bossy is Professor of History, University of York. His many publications include *The English Catholic Community, 1570–1850* (1975), *Christianity in the West, 1400–1700* (1985) and *Giordano Bruno and the Embassy Affair* (1991) which shared the Wolfson Prize.

Peace in the Post-Reformation

THE BIRKBECK LECTURES
1995

John Bossy

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011–4211, USA http://www.cup.org
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

First published 1998

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Monotype Fournier 12.5 / 14.75pt, in QuarkXPress™ [GC]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data
Bossy, John.
Peace in the Post-Reformation / John Bossy.
p. cm. – (The Birkbeck lectures; 1995)
Includes index.
ISBN 0 521 64061 X (hardback). – ISBN 0 521 64605 7 (pbk.)
1. Peace – Religious aspects – Christianity – History. 2. Counter
– Reformation. 3. Reformation. I. Title. II. Series.
BT736.4.B675 1998
261.8′73′094—dc21 98–24990 CIP

ISBN 0 521 64061 X hardback
ISBN 0 521 64605 7 paperback

FOR

C. C.

Et in terra pax hominibus
bonae voluntatis

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The Mill Lane lecture rooms in Cambridge are full of voices, and it was very agreeable for an undergraduate of the early 1950s to have the chance of adding one more to them in the autumn term of 1995. Those who were kind enough to come and listen will find that the four lectures have been heavily rewritten since. But I have continued to think of them as lectures, and if some of them are now a little long for an hour's talk, they may make amends for the one which turned out to be ten minutes too short. I am very grateful to those who entertained me so nicely at the time, and especially to the Master of Trinity, Sir Michael Atiyah, to Patrick Collinson, Boyd Hilton, Peter Burke and Ulinka Rublack. This is also the moment to remember those whose gifts and tips have enabled me to deal with my subject less scantily than I should otherwise have done: Simon Ditchfield, Eamon Duffy, Steve Hindle, Amanda Lillie, Daniele Montanari, Adriano Prosperi, Mary Stevenson, Marc Venard, Danilo Zardin. Despatches from Italy have been particularly numerous and particularly welcome, and I hope I have done justice to them in the first lecture. More thanks to Libby Walker, who has turned my spotty typescript into an elegant printout; to Linda Randall, the copyeditor; and again and especially to Amanda Lillie, who put me in the way of finding the Sansovino statue which appears on the cover.

John Bossy

Italy

At the beginning of these four lectures I should like to thank the Master and Fellows of Trinity who have done me the honour of inviting me to give them; and to remember two previous lecturers. One of them is Outram Evennett, who gave his lectures on the Counter-Reformation in 1951, and the other is Denys Hay, whose series on the church in Italy in the fifteenth century came twenty years later.[1] In brilliance and coherence, in learning and humanity, not to say eloquence, they are a hard pair of acts to follow. Their shadows will loom. I shall be less optimistic than Evennett, and less pessimistic than Hay; which is partly because I shall be talking, most of the time, about something a little different from either. Meanwhile I express my gratitude to Evennett for the bird's eye view of the Counter-Reformation without which I doubt if I could have got the subject into historical focus at all. These lectures may be found to complement his or to contradict them; but they will always be somewhere around. To Denys Hay I owe a more particular thank-you for introducing me to that magic moment in the history of the West when Duke Giovanni Maria Visconti of Milan ordered, in vain, that the word *pax* be left

[1] H. O. Evennett, *The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation* (Cambridge, 1968); Denys Hay, *The Church in Italy in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1977; given in 1971).

out of the mass and the word *tranquillitas* put in instead.[2] 'Et in terra tranquillitas.'

My original title was 'Moral Tradition and Counter-Reformation', and it will do for the first two lectures. I put no spin on the second term, and have only to say that I shall be using words like 'reform' sparingly, if at all. On the Catholic side at least, and from where I shall be standing, we can readily get on without them. 'Moral tradition' is a coinage of my own, with some reference to Alasdair MacIntyre's *After Virtue*.[3] It joins together three items: the notion or practical instinct that to be a Christian means to love your neighbour, and in particular your enemy; the fact that in these times and places it was very likely that people might be in a state of enmity towards others, which would call for arrangements of peacemaking if it was to be resolved; and the historic or perhaps archaic connection between these arrangements and the sites, rites and persons of the church. The connection might come in various forms; in so far as it was with ecclesiastical persons, it was very far from exclusive.[4]

That is my moral tradition. Since the term is not self-explanatory, I have substituted for it in my title, 'peace'; but I shall use it throughout these lectures. I take what it represents to have been rather deeply embedded in the consciousness of the populations of the West at the time of the Reformation, and want to know what happened to it thereafter. First, what happened to it in some of the lands where the Roman church maintained its sway; but also what happened to it in lands that became Protestant, which has seemed to me, as I have proceeded, an increasingly

[2] Hay, *The Church in Italy*, p. 82 (1409). [3] 2nd edn (London, 1985).

[4] I have pursued this theme in 'Blood and Baptism', *Studies in Church History*, x: *Sanctity and Secularity*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1973), pp. 129–43; 'Holiness and Society', *Past and Present*, no. 75 (1977), at pp. 130–5; in my edition of the essays in *Disputes and Settlements: Law and Human Relations in the West* (Cambridge, 1983), and in other pieces cited below.

substantial part of my story. Hence the rest of my title, which has the extra benefit of putting due weight on the state of affairs, on both sides of the confessional fence, as the seismic upheavals of the sixteenth century settled down into everyday continuity. I shall say now, so as not to have to repeat it, that I do not see any of the branches of the western church as they emerged after the Reformation as having a special claim to be the vehicle of my moral tradition. At the end of the lectures I shall enquire whether one of those branches had a bias against it.

A few other remarks before I begin. I shall not be asking why people got to hate each other; and I shall be dealing with parties who were roughly on a footing of equality. The focus of my interest, because I think it was probably the centre of gravity of the moral tradition at this time, will be the middle and upper reaches of more or less rural communities. I shall try not to get too involved with the particular case of human relations between Protestants and Catholics as such, or between different kinds of Protestant: it is sometimes important to the main theme, but more often, I think, presents a temptation leading out of the way. I shall take the four countries I discuss separately, because there is a different story in each, and because sometimes I shall need to put the politics back in. Finally I ask your indulgence for having chosen a topic which is both unmanageably large and perhaps rather novel: I feel that it is still in a very plastic state, and that its final shape and import remain uncertain.

It is proper to start with Italy, because Italy has been a favoured environment of the moral tradition. That tradition here had a special force, and was constitutive of a great deal of social and political life. In the back country of Liguria, now classically described by Osvaldo Raggio, law and government amount to the peace in the feud: pacification and arbitration between those in a state of *inimicizia* (enmity), with compensation to *parenti*,

who may be natural or artificial, for offences. The instrument, one may say, of continuing existence is the *instrumentum pacis* drawn up by, and lodged with, the notary. Churches have altars where such *paci* are celebrated: in the plainest case, Our Lady of the Miracles, no less. The kiss of peace is exchanged; marriages may follow, projecting amicable relations or new hostilities into the future. Here the priests of the parish or *pieve* are not involved, except as parties, since every one of them represents his *parentela*: the notary, the local grandee, the visiting commissioner of the state, which is the Genoese Republic, are the arbitrators. Virtually nothing to do with the clergy, the peace process is nevertheless – possibly all the more – a work of Christianity. It is also essential to everything else. I quote Raggio: 'The political unity of the group of kinsmen is built . . . above all on enmities, their settlements, and the *paci*.'[5]

You will say: the back-blocks of Liguria are the back-blocks of Liguria, not the Po valley, or Venice or Milan. But what we have found there is a model of what prevailed throughout the peninsula and its appendages, and not only in the mountains and the islands, though it stood out more starkly there, and had less competition. The moral tradition, of which Liguria offers a particularly functional example, throve in mountain and plain, city and countryside, north and south. At the highest levels of Renaissance sophistication we may think of it as weakening; the state, which holds the ring in Liguria, will act more directly in Tuscany. Such things will matter in the long run: they had not yet disturbed the centrality of this tradition in the moral consciousness of Italians. Italy was the homeland of the fraternity, one of

[5] Osvaldo Raggio, *Faide e parentele: lo stato genovese visto dalla Fontanabuona* (Turin, 1990), introduction and chaps. 1, 4, 7, quoted at p. 177; the only comparable study that I know is Otto Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, 4th edn (Vienna and Wiesbaden, 1959), pp. 1–110.

whose marks was the settlement of disputes among members; of friars like San Bernardino, endlessly preaching the social miracle to vast crowds in fifteenth-century cities; of the real and fictional Piovano Arlotto, whose pursuit of charity and good humour in and out of the *Uccellatoio* (the Fowlhouse, an inn at Macioli outside Florence) made him a classic representative of the moral tradition and the hero of a best-seller of long standing which the Counter-Reformation failed to suppress. It was home, to finish, to the now equally but tragically famous miller Domenico Scandella *alias* Menocchio, who thought, if I understand him, that the Gospel could be reduced to the words 'Forgive us our trespasses.' He was not the only one.[6]

There was plenty of confusion in the peninsula during the fateful decades between the emergence of Luther across the Alps and the closure of the Council of Trent, and one of the things subject to confusion was the status of this moral tradition. I am not thinking here of Machiavelli's radical scepticism about the utility of Christian ethics, but of confusion in the ranks of those from whom the counter-reformation church was to emerge. I illustrate it, briefly, from the career of Gianmatteo Giberti, split by the dreadful sack of Rome in 1527 between his European politics as Pope Clement VII's secretary of state, dedicated as much as Machiavelli to the 'liberty of Italy', and his ecclesiastical government as bishop of Verona, from then until his death in 1543. The first part was a fiasco, the second inspired a generation of successors. He was an intensely vigorous and, his doctor said,

[6] Ronald Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood in Renaissance Florence* (New York, 1982), pp. 1–105; Iris Origo, *The World of San Bernardino* (London, 1963), chap. 6; G. Folena (ed.), *Motti e facezie del Piovano Arlotto* (Milan and Naples, 1953), nos. 36, 64, 143, etc.; F. W. Kent and Amanda Lillie, 'The Piovano Arlotto: New Documents', in P. Denley and C. Elam (eds.), *Florence and Italy: Renaissance Studies in Honour of Nicolai Rubinstein* (London, 1988), pp. 347–67; my *Christianity in the West, 1400–1700* (Oxford, 1985), p. 64; C. Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms* (London, 1980), pp. 11, 87–8, 108–9.

choleric man, and displayed both characteristics in each phase of his *curriculum vitae*: in his impatience to 'renew the world' he had pursued Charles V with unrelenting enmity, and his episcopal mode was not very different. He was not, he claimed with some complacency, a 'bon compagno'. He was held by many, including another personal enemy, Pietro Aretino, to be a tyrannical destroyer of the good old ways of Italian Catholicism, the creator of a system of social espionage, a bringer of discord and hatred into the city of Romeo and Juliet. Aretino was no great advertisement for his cause, but we need to think about it: it launches a number of themes which will return in due course.[7]

Giberti was certainly conscious that peacemaking was one of the duties of a bishop; he may not have thought that he was very good at it, since in Verona itself he gave the job to one of his canons, the cathedral organist.[8] Like most people in the sixteenth century, when he set down what he meant by charity he put the settlement of enmities at the end of a list of works of public beneficence.[9] He made the momentous innovation of the *liber pro descriptione animarum*, later *status animarum*, which he told his curates to keep. This was a nominal roll of those in their charge, with a record of whether they had fulfilled their obligation of Easter confession and communion: a list of those who had not was to be kept and used to enforce conformity. This surgical intervention laid open the heart of our matter, since enmity was one of the two principal reasons for absence from communion: the other was sexual or marital trouble, which is not in itself

[7] Adriano Prosperi, *Tra Evangelismo e Controriforma: G. M. Giberti* (Rome, 1969), especially chaps. 2 and 4; on Aretino, *ibid*., pp. xvi, 105–6, 292–3; Barry Collett, *Italian Benedictine Scholars and the Reformation* (Oxford, 1985), pp. vii–viii, 112–13, shows that Aretino was no traditionalist, just an enemy of Giberti.

[8] A. Fasani (ed.), *Riforma pretridentina della diocesi di Verona: visite pastorali del vescovo G. M. Giberti, 1525–1542* (3 vols., single pagination, Vicenza, 1989), p. xcix.

[9] Prosperi, *Giberti*, pp. 265–6, 205–6 (formula of visitation).

our business. A party who was 'out of charity' with another, who would not abandon what were called the signs of rancour, might not have his sins absolved or participate in the rite of 'common union', the Lord's supper. Giberti's sanction for non-communicating was severe: public excommunication by name, by the priest at mass, meaning not simply exclusion from the sacraments but expulsion from church and social ostracism, and expressed in the most aggressive terms ('cutting out putrid members'). The time offenders were given to come round was, at least at the beginning, no more than a week or two. I quote Adriano Prosperi: 'With the institution of the *liber animarum* as an instrument for continual recourse to a severe practice of excommunication, the settlement of disputes and irregular situations was entrusted definitively, no longer to the sacrament as a vehicle of moral economy, but to ecclesiastical authority [as such].' Giberti added to the grounds for instant excommunication irreverent behaviour in church and standing outside during mass.[10]

Strictly interpreted, this programme would, as Giberti's enemies complained, have left the diocese after one of his visitations in a state of social trauma. When he began to visit in person, in 1530, he toned it down somewhat, proved more amenable to the recommendation of priests for delay, and distinguished between sexual irregularities and problems of *inimicizia*. In the limited time he had available when visiting three or four parishes a day, he did use his authority to act as a peacemaker. So his bark was worse than his bite; but it was his bark that was transmitted to posterity.[11] There is also a central point of theology that may be

[10] Fasani, *Visite*, introduction, pp. cx–cxii, cxxiv–cxxv; text, pp. 93, 372 (time), 499, 636, 794 (language); 669, 681 (church behaviour), and *passim*. Prosperi, 'Le visite pastorali del Giberti', in *ibid*., p. 1vi, quoted.

[11] These are my conclusions from Fasani, *Visite*, pp. 447–828, which record Giberti's personal visitations from April to November 1530: peacemaking, pp. 553, 562, 584, 657, 742, 808 and *passim*. Prosperi, *Giberti*, p. 261.

relevant to Giberti's work. He himself was not what is called a 'spirituale', a person who, like his colleague Reginald Pole, had taken on board the doctrine of justification by faith alone; but many of his team of helpers could be so described, and one of them was his preacher and popular educator Tullio Crispoldi. Crispoldi published a commentary on 'Forgive us our trespasses'; the Veronese may have had, as I do, some difficulty in following him, but he appears to have interpreted the text as a quixotic gesture by God to accept what was intrinsically a matter of civil convenience as worthy of his grace; an incentive to devout contemplation of God's generosity and to a life of other good works. This sounds more like Ockham than Luther; but it touches on two influences which are fundamental to our story, the pull of Reformation theology and the push of Renaissance civility. It embodied what Giberti had said when preaching, and I take it to reveal a good deal of uncertainty about the moral tradition.[12]

It is not usual to diagnose uncertainty in the doings of the Society of Jesus, whose operations were getting under way as Giberti's were finishing, and that is not exactly what I have to propose. The Society will have a part in the story, and often a positive one: surprisingly, to me at least, because I had not thought, and Evennett's analysis of the Jesuit ethos had not suggested, that it had peacemaking much on its mind. One had underestimated the flexibility of the institution and its founder; nevertheless, this may be one of the cases where flexibility borders upon incoherence. Ignatius was a 'spiritual' in his own way, which was not the way of the Lutherophiles or of Erasmus, but the way of a fifteenth-century *dévot* whose favourite reading was the *Imitation of Christ*; and I see nothing wrong in making a distinction in

[12] Crispoldi's *Alcune ragioni del perdonare*, cited in Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms*, p. 40.

fifteenth-century piety between the devotional and the social.[13] The activism with which Ignatius transformed the *devotio moderna* was an activism of works: works of charity, works of mercy. A programme of works designed to help 'souls' to a salvation which was to be achieved by infusing the church's sacraments into converted individuals did not focus attention on charity in the sense of the moral tradition. There is nothing about it in the Spiritual Exercises or the original documents of the Jesuit 'institute', little or nothing in the pre-history of the Society. In its mode of life and its dealings in the world, the ties that bound were simply not its thing; in Ignatius's meditation on that part of the Nativity story which recorded a second crux of the moral tradition (after the Paternoster), the angels say: 'Glory to God in the highest', but do *not* say: 'Peace on earth to men of goodwill'.[14]

Peacemaking first appears in the expanded version of the *Formula Instituti* of 1550, ten years after the foundation: here, *dissidentium reconciliatio* (reconciliation of those at dispute) is put down as one of the works of charity the Society exists to promote.[15] It seems pretty clear what had happened. Early Jesuits sent out on preaching tours in the towns and villages of central Italy had found themselves invited to arrange the public ceremonies of peacemaking which would have been expected to occur in the preaching tours of the friars. They had come to flush out Protestants and sympathisers, to teach catechism, to preach penitence and confession; they meant, one way and another, to generate interior conversion. They found that what amounted to

[13] 'Prayers', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, 1 (1991), p. 138; cf. the remarks of Virginia Reinburg, pp. 148ff.

[14] *The Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius Loyola*, para. 264 (in the translation by T. Corbishley, Wheathampstead, 1973, p. 87); Evennett, *Spirit of the Counter-Reformation*, p. 36.

[15] John O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1993), pp. 165–71.

conversion for most of their hearers was the visible reconciliation of public hostilities, the throwing down of weapons, the kiss of peace. The principal voice in favour of accommodation to the demand was that of Silvestro Landini; it was well received at headquarters, I guess as an orthodox and popular alternative to the preaching of virtual justification by faith which had been the message of the *spirituali*. Thereafter, as Jesuits continued to serve as 'missionaries' to what they thought of as an indigenous Indies, peacemaking became a standard item of their work and propaganda.[16] But it may be significant that Landini's is not a famous name in the conventional annals of the Society, for there is a problem about Jesuit peacemaking, which is not really a 'work' in the same sense as their other enterprises. It got under the wire as one of the spiritual works of mercy, two of which, converting the sinner and instructing the ignorant, were central to Ignatius's inspiration. But peacemaking is not actually one of them: they include the patient bearing of wrongs and the forgiveness of injuries, which are something else. If we take it in under this rubric we need to remember that mercy 'is distinguished from love and kindness, as connoting in its object a certain inferiority . . . It excludes the idea of equality between giver and receiver.' It drops, indeed, as the gentle rain from heaven, but upon the place beneath.[17] Peace, as we are to understand it here, is not at all like

[16] Adriano Prosperi, 'Il missionario', in R. Villari (ed.), *L'uomo barocco* (Bari, 1991), pp. 211–18; and *idem*, *Tribunali della coscienza. Inquisitori, confessori, missionari* (Turin, 1996), pp. 551–5, 568ff (where he is called Cristoforo: were there two of them?); David Gentilcore, '"Adapt Yourselves to the People's Capacities": Missionary Strategies, Methods and Impact in the Kingdom of Naples, 1600–1800', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 45 (1994), pp. 269–96.

[17] O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, pp. 88, 166. I have failed to find any historical account of the spiritual works of mercy, which seem to be a late mediaeval compilation. H. R. Mackintosh, art. *Mercy* in J. Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, VIII (Edinburgh, 1915).

this. It is much more like a marriage, and even according to the Council of Trent the priest did not make a marriage: the parties made it themselves. I do not think I am making a meal of what may seem a purely theoretical difficulty. The Jesuits' adoption of a peacemaking role in this special context was an event of importance for the persistence of the moral tradition in counter-reformation Italy, and perhaps elsewhere. We shall have to see whether it entered the genes of the Society as a whole.

The Council of Trent had nothing to contribute to our story except a supremely vague proposal that bishops on their visitations should exhort the people to 'religion, peace and innocence':[18] it was generally deaf to suggestions that the sacraments, or indeed the church, were social institutions in any respectable sense. It did indeed get a lot of bishops into dioceses, with what result for us I now enquire. We must start with the most memorable of those bishops, Carlo Borromeo, whose nineteen years in the field, running his archdiocese of Milan and supervising the activity of a string of other bishops, are bound to occupy the centre of any story about the Italian Counter-Reformation. As a saint, he is well known: virtually teenage cardinal-nephew and secretary to the amiable Pius IV; convert of the Roman Jesuits; dour ascetic, living on bread and water in his palace; champion of Lent in the battle of Carnival and Lent; saviour, more or less, of Milan in the plague of 1576. As a working bishop he is much less familiar, for all the hundreds of pages of normative matter in his *Acta ecclesiae mediolanensis*, and their subsequent fame; acres of his compulsive paperwork have still to be ploughed through,

[18] Session XXIV, *De Reformatione*, chap. 3. I think the word here means 'tranquillity'; it is only to be encouraged by 'exhortation and admonition'; and it does not appear to be regarded as a moral problem, since it comes, in third place, after orthodoxy / heresy and 'bonos / pravos mores'.

and he may well become more, not less, inscrutable as more is known.[19]

Twenty years ago I took the simple view that, in his work and that of his colleagues, 'the motive of imposing Christian ethics on social behaviour had lost ground to the motive of imposing conformity in religious observance'. Comforted as I am by Adriano Prosperi's convergent opinion, I ask myself now whether that was a fair judgement. A bird's eye view of Borromeo's episcopate will suggest that it was. St Ambrose was not the model of a peacemaking bishop, and Borromeo's variety of holiness was not that of the holy man above the *mêlée* which we owe to Peter Brown. His early biographers do not make much of him as a peacemaker, except for a case in the city of Vercelli, just before his death. His model was hard-edged, enacting Christian *disciplina* by a mass of episcopal *ordini*: a command economy of salvation. He regarded with impatience or plain hostility most of the institutions with which traditional Catholicism had sought to create a Christian sociability: fraternities of *disciplinati*, church feasting, dancing, carnival. He would have responded differently from Archbishop Antonino of Florence to the claim of the Piovano Arlotto that by making friends in the *Uccellatoio* he had secured more than one *pace*.[20]

[19] Biography by A. Deroo, *Saint Charles Borromée* (Paris, 1963); many good things in J. M. Headley and J. B. Tomaro (eds.), *San Carlo Borromeo* (Washington, 1988). I have used Federico Borromeo's edition of the *Acta ecclesiae mediolanensis* (Milan, 1599), except in one case (see n. 31).

[20] 'The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Europe', *Past and Present*, no. 47 (1970), p. 56; above, p. 7; Peter Brown, 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 61 (1971), pp. 80–101; Folena, *Motti e facezie del Piovano Arlotto*, no. 36, p. 65. Lives: A. Valier, *Vita Caroli Borromei* (Verona, 1586) (nothing); C. Bascapè, *De vita et rebus gestis Caroli . . .* (Ingolstadt, 1592), p. 369 (people submit things to his *arbitrio*); G. P. Giussano, *Vita di San Carlo Borromeo* (Brescia, 1613), pp. 72, 440 (Vercelli, done at the request of Gregory XIII); but cf. F. Molinari, *Il Cardinale Teatino Paolo Burali e la riforma tridentina a Piacenza* (Analecta Gregoriana, LXXXVII, Rome, 1957), p. 342.

Almost wherever one can see his personal input, the effect seems discouraging to the moral tradition: the notion of the clergy as a hierarchical order of angels who ought not to get their hands dirty; the ecclesiastical law seen as a coercive criminal jurisdiction punishing moral offences like adultery; the hectic pace of his visitations; the invention of the confessional-box, which still seems to me the illustration and agent of an unsocial idea of sin and forgiveness.[21] His obstruction by the walls of the confessional of the priest's act of reconciliation, the *impositio manus* (laying of the hand) on the head of the penitent, was indeed symbolic of unenthusiasm about social rituals.[22] We can add to it his reform of the *pax* in the mass. The Ambrosian or Milanese rite, which he put a lot of effort into defending, contained a rich celebration of the act. After the Paternoster and the *Libera nos*, with its prayer for 'peace in our days', the priest says to the congregation: 'Offerte vobis pacem' (Offer peace to one another). He then kisses a cross he has made on the altar, or a crucifix in his missal, saying to himself: 'Pax in caelo, Pax in terra, Pax in omni populo, Pax sacerdotibus ecclesiarum. Pax Christi et ecclesiae maneat semper nobiscum' (Peace in heaven, peace on earth, peace among all the people, peace to the priests of the churches. The peace of Christ and of the church remain always with us). When he lifts his head, he gives the peace (a light embrace with a touching of cheeks) to his deacon, and says: 'Receive the bond of peace and charity, that you may be worthy of the most holy mysteries [the eucharist].' Which is what the Sarum rite says as

[21] Adriano Prosperi, 'Clerics and Laymen in the Work of Carlo Borromeo', in Headley and Tomaro, *San Carlo Borromeo*, pp. 115, 130; Bascapè, *Vita*, pp. 357–8; my 'The Social History of Confession in the Age of the Reformation', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 25 (1975), pp. 21–38; on ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Agostino Borromeo 'Archbishop Carlo Borromeo and . . . the State of Milan', in Headley and Tomaro, *San Carlo Borromeo*, pp. 85–111.

[22] My 'Social History of Confession', pp. 23, 29.

well. All this Borromeo cut out, leaving only the laconic 'Pax tecum' (Peace be with thee) of the Roman rite and inserting, where appropriate, an episcopal blessing from on high. Giovanni Maria Visconti, he who had wanted to remove the word *pax* from the mass and replace it by *tranquillitas*, could hardly have wished for more.[23]

I should say that Borromeo was influential in diffusing the instrumental *pax*, the object, in Italy and elsewhere;[24] and that a sturdy defence has been offered for Borromeo's intentions, at least, as a peacemaker. From his early days in Rome he can be found commending peacemaking as a spiritual work of mercy; I have said that I do not think this was a very satisfactory idea, but it shows willing. He also, in his synods and otherwise, encouraged or required the erection of peacemaking fraternities: not brotherhoods in the traditional sense whose members would keep peace among themselves, but bodies of notables who were to undertake the function as a general work. The most ambitious of these was the Confraternità della Concordia, set up in Milan in 1571. It was to operate, at least partly, on the basis of anonymous informations, to be received in a box and entered in a register; it would call on the unpaid services of lawyers in securing arbitration. The rules envisaged it as spreading throughout the diocese, in town and country, and as paying attention to those, especially the poor, who would not pardon offences unless they received satisfaction in cash. It was to collect funds for the purpose.[25]

[23] Pierre le Brun, *Explication . . . des prières et des cérémonies de la Messe* (4 vols., Paris, 1726), II, pp. 212–15; Archdale A. King, *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees* (London, 1957), pp. 445–7; above, n. 2.

[24] *Enciclopaedia cattolica*, IX (Vatican City, 1952), p. 499 (*pace*).

[25] Angelo Turchini, ' "A beneficio pubblico e onor di Dio." Povertà e carità nella legislazione e nella pastorale della chiesa milanese', in D. Zardin (ed.), *La città e i poveri: Milano e le terre lombarde dal Rinascimento all'età spagnuola* (Milan, 1995), pp. 191–252, at pp. 196–7, 201, 211, 230–8.

The last point, as well as a sensible concern about intra- as well as inter-family feud, show that Borromeo wished to get to grips with real life. I do not think he succeeded. Angelo Turchini, who has presented the evidence and promises more, puts *inimicizia* down as a 'moral misery' to be dealt with in the same way as poverty, ignorance or sickness, and I imagine that he is representing Borromeo's own view.[26] But it was not a moral misery: it was a moral alternative. And what on earth were anonymous denunciations, as of heretics or witches, doing in the scheme? I can hardly imagine anything more likely to increase the incidence of neighbourly hatred. The scheme seems almost constructed so as not to work, as it indeed appears not to have done: Borromeo's successor found that it was not doing its job even in its own parish (S. Maria della Fontana), let alone in the far-flung diocese.[27]

That left Easter communion and the *status animarum*, on which Borromeo followed Giberti, except that he took a cue from the Council of Trent and substituted for excommunication the lesser 'interdict': meaning prohibition of entry into any church and refusal of Christian burial. The curate, at Easter, was to tell his people that all who did not communicate within the octave would be *interdetti*; during the week, he was to pursue the 'due offices of charity', or go and talk to them, to persuade recalcitrants to come. If they did not he was to publish them, next Sunday, by name. 'Per qualche buon fine' (For some good end), if he thought fit, he might put publishing them off for another week; a third week was only permitted with licence from the vicar-forane (rural dean) and for grave cause. Anything longer

[26] *Ibid*., p. 211.

[27] *Ibid*., p. 236 n. 112; A. D. Wright, 'Post-Tridentine Reform in the Archdiocese of Milan under the Successors of St. Charles Borromeo' (Oxford University DPhil thesis, 1973), p. 178: 'a more active search was to be made for discords and strife in the parish, settlement of which was the confraternity's object' (?1586, perhaps later).

was a matter for the bishop.[28] The timetable and heavy-handed threat behind it were quite inappropriate for cases of *inimicizia*, whose resolution must be a 'buon fine' which might entitle people to a week's respite. If this were all, we should have no difficulty in dismissing Borromeo's claims as a peacemaker. It is not, though you have to look hard to find the qualification or contradiction which emerges from the instructions for his vicars-forane on page 700-odd of the *Acta ecclesiae mediolanensis*. The vicar-forane may allow a curate to give an *inconfessus* for enmity until the Feast of the Purification (2 February) 'per poter in quel tempo trattare qualche pace' (so as to be able in that time to negotiate a peace). That is to say, the parties have the best part of a year to settle; after that, if one of them is still *inconfessus*, or if he has confessed but not communicated, he will be *interdetto*. The second case is quite common: I think it means that an expression of willingness to forgive will allow the person to be absolved, but without a proper formal *pace* he will not be willing to communicate. The time allowed here is generous indeed: the only other mention of a reasonable timetable I have seen puts the Assumption (15 August) as the deadline.[29]

I can only (and shall soon) speculate on the reason for the discrepancy between the two sets of rules, and report what I know of Borromeo's practice from his 'apostolic' or papal visitation of the diocese of Bergamo (1575), and from odds and ends of information from his own. It leaves a mixed impression: instructions to enemies to come to concord in ten days, a curate stopping in the middle of mass on the Sunday after Easter to run out of church a

[28] *Acta ecclesiae mediolanensis*, p. 720; Prosperi, 'Clerics and Laymen', p. 121.

[29] *Acta ecclesiae mediolanensis*, p. 796; M. Grosso and M.-F. Mellano, *La controriforma nella arcidiocesi di Torino* (3 vols., Rome, 1957), II, p. 208. On peace and non-communicating see David Sabean, *Power in the Blood* (Cambridge, 1984), and below, chap. 3; an example in A. Roncalli and P. Forno (eds.), *Atti della visita apostolica di San Carlo Borromeo a Bergamo (1575)* (5 vols., Florence, 1936–57), II / 2, p. 19.

man *inconfessus*, he said, because of a lawsuit. But in a large parish near Bergamo, with a good, learned, old-fashioned priest and birds' nests in the church, A is *inconfessus* for enmity with B, and C *incommunicatus* for enmity with A. A has eventually confessed and communicated on 1 January; the priest, I suppose, has been quietly doing his job of reconciliation. Borromeo does not rebuke him, but tells him to put in a confessional-box and get the birds' nests out. Elsewhere he makes gestures of vindictive rigour and gestures of generosity, which perhaps increase as time goes on.[30]

The signs are divergent, but I shall be rash enough to offer a conclusion. One of the most famous items in the *Acta*, and one into which he put his intimate feelings, was the *Memoriale* which he wrote for the Milanese after the plague. The theme of the *Memoriale*, expounded with unusual eloquence and at unusual length (seventy-five folio columns), is how people should behave so as not to provoke God's wrath in future. San Bernardino, even Savonarola, would have pointed to the sin of *inimicizia* as bearing a good deal of the responsibility; Borromeo simply left it out. The real sins of the Milanese were their pleasure in spectacles, games, dressing-up, dancing and carnival. In the more practical *Ricordi*, issued at the same time and for the same purpose (twenty folio columns), peace and concord occupy about three inches; they are among the things heads of households are to instil into their children and servants.[31] This seems almost as off the point as encouraging anonymous denunciation of feuders: it was the adults who needed persuading. Such misjudgements fortify my conclusion

[30] Roncalli and Forno, *Atti*, 1/1, p. 315, 11/3, pp. 126ff; D. Zardin, *Riforma cattolica e resistenze nobiliari nella diocesi di Carlo Borromeo* (Milan, 1983), pp. 15ff, 62–3, 101; M. Franzosini, 'Clero e società locale nel secondo '500: la ristrutturazione borromaica in una pieve della Brianza', *Nuova rivista storica*, 70 (1986), pp. 275–300.

[31] *Acta ecclesiae mediolanensis* (Lyon, 1683), pp. 1045–220 (*Memoriale*: not quite as long as it looks because the printer went straight from p. 1099 to p. 1200) at pp. 1046, 1048, 1076 etc.; *Acta ecclesiae mediolanensis* (Milan, 1599), pp. 1075ff, 1084, 1106 (*Ricordi*).

that Borromeo did not think very hard about peacemaking, or see it as having much to do with the sacred. He legislated about it because he legislated about everything; and if he had not been so at odds with the civil authorities in Milan he might well have put it down as a civil matter.[32] In practice he seems to have placed it uncomfortably in between: something it was his duty to attend to, but altogether a distraction from essential matters of holy discipline and active charity.

Borromeo's companions and subordinates may be divided into the hard and the soft, the dry and the wet. On the dry side we have the absentee bishop of Trent, Ludovico Madruzzo, whose visitations and other activity date from 1579 onwards: no great figure in himself but the object of a particularly scrupulous investigation.[33] Madruzzo's deference to the old philanthropy seems entirely formal, and there is no allowance for peacemaking in his rules about *inconfessi* and non-communicants. At the visitation the curate is told to send a list of these to the episcopal establishment promptly at the end of Easter week: those who have been admonished 'time and again' and failed to respond are to be publicly *interdetti*. 'Time and again' sounds reasonable, but is a one-off concession: in future years this was to be done instantly on the Sunday after Easter. If interdict does no good, the priest will report the offender to the episcopal curia, who will proceed against him as a heretic; he is also to be *bandito* by the civil authorities. Except for the last, which reflects the position of the bishop as a prince of the Empire, these were the usual rules: they caused heart-searching for a number of the parish priests, who agreed with their parishioners that *inimicizia* was a different kind of thing from heresy or adultery, and looked for a *pace*. They asked

[32] Cf. Turchini, ' "A beneficio pubblico . . ." ', pp. 203, 235.

[33] Cecilia Nubola, *Conoscere per governare: la diocesi di Trento nella visita pastorale di Ludovico Madruzzo* (Bologna, 1993), pp. 401–19, 517–19, 531.

for more time. Officially, the answer was no: enmity was not a special case. In private a vicar-general who knew his territory recommended 'a decent extension of time', but told the priest to keep quiet about it.[34] I suspect that resistance by local clergy to the guillotine-effect of the *status animarum* was rather common, and accounts for some of the dither we find in Borromeo's *acta*.

No dither in the acts of Carlo Broglia, archbishop of Turin in Piedmont from 1592. Broglia thought that dioceses should resemble 'well-organised armies, which have their generals, colonels and captains', and his view of the peacemaking process may be gathered from his intervention in a case of gang-rape in 1600. It had been settled by financial composition, arranged by the *podestà* and a local nobleman. Everybody tried to keep it from the ears of the archbishop; but he found out, and sent in troops to arrest the main culprit. They were defeated in their first encounter with the family; but eventually the man was arrested, tried and condemned in the archbishop's court, to what punishment I do not know. In this cowboy story one may sympathise with either side, but Broglia will not have helped to keep the peace of Piobesì, where it happened.[35]

Perhaps it is unfair to draw a contrast with two other bishops who have both been candidates for canonisation, one successful. Paolo Burali was bishop of neighbouring Piacenza during the first half of Borromeo's episcopate at Milan; his rigour was tempered by something more humane. Prosperous as the city was as a financial centre during the sixteenth century, it was notably feud-prone, and Burali put peacemaking high among the concerns of his preaching, his visitations and his advice to his parish priests: the population remembered him for it at his

[34] *Ibid*. pp. 406–11.
[35] Grosso and Mellano, *La controriforma nella arcidiocesi di Torino*, III, pp. 216, 270.

beatification. He recruited Borromeo to help with cases of feud among the nobility; they were not especially close, and it is a tribute to Borromeo's objectivity that Burali was his first preference for the papacy on the death of Pius V in 1572.[36] Alessandro Sauli was a devoted follower of Borromeo who went off bravely to be bishop of the undistinguished see of Aleria in Corsica in 1570. Corsicans had earned their reputation as practitioners of the feud; and Sauli was a man 'whose sense of the realities kept pace with his holiness'. He ignored the confessional-box; offered his priests a sensible and not over-optimistic talk, beginning with the Paternoster, which they might give to penitents set upon vengeance; he worked hard at the erection of fraternities to make peace between members and among outsiders like Borromeo's. He was a Genoese, and had, as it were, read his Raggio.[37]

So those who worked under Borromeo's influence did not necessarily share his relative coolness, as I judge, towards the moral tradition. But there was a tension in his legacy which inspired his first biographer, Agostino Valier, bishop of Verona, to recommend a 'cautious imitation' of the future saint to his cousin and successor Federico. Valier's view was that holiness needed to be subordinate to charity, and zeal to patience; zeal might indeed be a disguise for the sin of anger, and cause far more trouble with the laity, the parish priests and the civil authorities

[36] Molinari, *Il Cardinale Paolo Burali*, pp. 37–8, 285–6, 335–44; Daniele Montanari, 'L'immagine del parroco nella riforma cattolica', *Archivo storico per le province parmensi*, 4th series, 30 (1978), pp. 93–105.

[37] F. Casta, *Evêques et curés corses dans la tradition pastorale du Concile de Trente* (Ajaccio, 1965), pp. 110, 135–40, and note p. 141 on the *impositio manus* after confession; Marc Venard, 'The Influence of Carlo Borromeo on the Church of France', in Headley and Tomaro, *San Carlo Borromeo*, p. 210 n. 8. On feud in Corsica, F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (2 vols., London, 1975), 1, p. 36; Stephen Wilson, *Feuding, Conflict and Banditry in 19th Century Corsica* (Cambridge, 1988).

than it was worth.[38] Valier did not discuss peacemaking; but there were contemporaries of Borromeo for whom it was a central matter, and they may be said to have constituted a sort of official opposition to the Borromean mode. Since Paolo Prodi published his classic biography in the climate of the second Vatican Council, Gabriele Paleotti, archbishop of Bologna from 1565 to 1595, has figured, properly, as a different sort of model bishop from the one we are used to. A critical friend of Borromeo, his reservations perhaps arose from his earlier history as a law professor in Bologna: they included a sympathy with 'decent human custom' and a distaste for legislation, compulsion and new administrative structures. Paleotti erected in Bologna his own Congregazione della Concordia, staffed by Dominicans, as a forum for the extra-legal pacification of disputes. This was a much grander effort than Borromeo's, and clearly over-ambitious; although Paleotti made efforts not to tread on the corns of the legal profession, he was not successful, and his invention did not last. But it is not the only sign of his priorities. On his visitations, to general astonishment, he pursued *inconfessi* for *inimicizia* into their hideouts in the mountains and persuaded them, we are told, to peace and the sacraments. He expounded the sacraments as social institutions in the moral tradition, and his exposition of confession was constructed around the deadly sins, not the Commandments; at Trent, where he had worked hard, he had been in favour of communion in both kinds, though not of other Lutheran innovations. Dermot Fenlon has criticised him for obstructing the campaign of the papacy as a civil power against banditry, for which Gregory XIII and especially Sixtus V were famous. The answer to that, I think, as we can discover from Raggio, is that banditry and the moral tradition were hard to separate. Both entailed the

[38] *De cauta imitatione sanctorum episcoporum* (1595; printed in *Spicilegium Romanum*, VIII (Rome, 1842), pp. 89–116), pp. 93, 100, 102, 105–6, 108, 111.

resolution of offences by peace and family composition, not by the criminal law; sanctuary, which Paleotti defended against the papal administration, was a standard recourse for *banditi* and provided time for settlements.[39]

Paleotti may have been a little high-flown, a bit too theoretical, too much the professor for his own good or that of his diocese. With Domenico Bollani, bishop of Brescia, we have someone very down to earth. He was not a saint or a hero, and Borromeo acidly rebuked him for leaving Brescia during the plague. He was a civil servant and ex-diplomat of the Venetian Republic, and was *podestà* of Brescia, and a layman, at the time he was appointed bishop. His biographer says that arbitration and pacification were 'the keynote of Bollani's pastoral image'. During the Jubilee of 1575 he managed a public reconciliation between two leading families in Brescia, before the high altar of his cathedral; he was a successful joint-arbitrator of a long-standing civil dispute between Brescia and Cremona. The claim is pretty well borne out by an account of his episcopal activities. He had, we are told, a holistic view of church and state which came from his Venetian background and career; on his visitations he took his time, and talked as much to the *sindaci* and others of the commune as to the priest and churchwardens (so did Borromeo, but he was in more of a hurry). In his personal visitations (1565–7) we find detailed narratives of the histories of *inconfessi* for *inimicizia* or otherwise; from his successors we get little more than the publication of names and interdicts, or an equally unsatisfactory *omnia bene*. He

[39] Paolo Prodi, *Il Cardinale Gabriele Paleotti* (2 vols., Rome 1959–67), I, pp. 139–40 (communion), II, p. 33 (*paci*), pp. 47–8 (Borromeo), 127–8 (sacraments), 189ff (*Cong. Della Concordia*); Turchini, '"A beneficio pubblico . . ."', p. 237; M. Turrini, *La coscienza e le leggi* (Bologna, 1991), pp. 233ff (deadly sins); Dermot Fenlon, review of Prodi in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 44 (1991), p. 124, cf. Prodi, *Paleotti*, II, pp. 373ff, 384; Raggio, *Faide e parentele*, chaps. 1 and 8. A bandit (*bandito*) is a man who has been outlawed for a criminal offence, often done in retaliation, by a court whose authority he has not recognised.

was no Paleotti, but he knew what he was doing. He said things about Borromeo which went rather beyond the 'cautious imitation' of Valier: absurd zealotry, piles of laws, no idea of the practicable, priest and people driven to desperation, the things that mattered not done. On the positive side, I think he was the only Italian bishop of the time to require his parish priests to possess a copy of William Durandus's liturgical exposition of the moral tradition, the *Rationale divinorum officiorum*.[40]

The Italian episcopate of the Counter-Reformation left behind it, if not exactly two models, two versions of the same model. The stricter, which became identified with Carlo Borromeo, was most influential in France from some time later; the laxer, in spite of Paleotti's lack of obvious success, in Italy. In the peninsula, the wet outlasted the dry. We are told on various hands that 'Tridentine' reform in Italy had more or less collapsed by about 1630. The tight parochial model decayed and fragmented through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the face of a *revanche* of religious orders and fraternities. Fraternities drifted back to the free-standing guildhalls and oratories which Borromeo had sharply attacked; they boomed, not least the *casacce* of Genoa and Liguria, until the arrival of the French at the end of the eighteenth century. Football on Sunday afternoons, as it would, survived the competition of catechism.[41] Much of this story is unwritten; but

[40] C. Cairns, *Domenico Bollani* (Nieuwkoop, 1976), pp. 155–6, 177, 248–9; Daniele Montanari, *Disciplinamento in terra veneta* (Bologna, 1987), pp. 46–7 (on Borromeo, also quoted by Giuseppe Alberigo in Headley and Tomaro, *San Carlo Borromeo*, p. 255 and n), 62–4, 125 (Durandus), 184ff; G. Gamba and D. Montanari, in C. Nubola and A. Turchini (eds.), *Visite pastorali ed elaborazione dei dati* (Bologna, 1993), pp. 169–247, esp. pp. 196–203.

[41] Eric Cochrane, ed. Julius Kirshner, *Italy, 1530–1630* (London, 1988), pp. 199–202 (moderate); Mario Rosa, 'Organizzazione ecclesiastica e vita religiosa in Lombardia . . .', in *Problemi di storia religiosa lombarda* (Como, 1972), which I cite via Danilo Zardin, *Confraternite e vita di pietà . . . La pieve di Parabiago-Legnano* (Milan, 1981), pp. 34, 56; *ibid*., pp. 54, 58, 245ff; E. Grendi, 'Le confraternite come fenomeno associativo e religioso', in C. Russo (ed.), *Società, chiesa e vita religiosa nell 'Ancien Regime'*

we can see something of what was happening from the story of the parish in seventeenth-century Piedmont sketched by Angelo Torre. Here we find, in the doings of an otherwise unmemorable set of successors to the militaristic Broglia, a sort of creative compromise emerging between the different trends in the Italian episcopate, and between them and the population. This *pace*, so to call it, entailed a multiplication of new parishes, which was always popular with communities and for which there was plenty of room; and the recognition of the parish as a 'composite entity' which was Bollani's advantage over Borromeo. Side-chapels and oratories were auctioned off to families, fraternities and neighbourhoods; sweetened with a tax-break, the demand contentedly mopped up the supply, and everybody was happy except the shade of San Carlo. I have the impression that these arrangements were made rather widely, and dissolved some of the tensions created in the age of high episcopalism. Some of them, from our point of view, may look ambiguous. In Liguria the pressure for new parishes might come from single *parentele* who did not want to come face to face with their rivals at the rites and festivals of the larger *pieve*. It is hard to say whether in such cases bishops were encouraging people to opt out of the moral tradition, or prudently safeguarding it from excessive strain.[42]

In tradition, as embodied by Alessandro Manzoni in *I Promessi Sposi*, but probably in fact, the outstanding episcopal personality of the age was Federico Borromeo, Carlo's cultivated younger cousin and successor in the see of Milan for thirty years or more (1595–1631). He has been variously judged. As presented by Paolo Prodi – and by myself following him – his work was a

(Naples, 1976), pp. 115–86; Zardin, *Riforma cattolica e resistenze nobiliari*, pp. 34–53 (football (*pallone*) versus catechism).

[42] Angelo Torre, 'Politics Cloaked in Worship: State, Church and Local Power in Piedmont, 1570–1770', *Past and Present*, no. 134 (1992), pp. 42–92; Raggio, *Faide e parentele*, pp. 227–60.

routinised version of his cousin's, propping up a vacuous concept of hierarchy in an age of economic and political disaster for his people. Anthony Wright has rejected the judgement, and seen little difference between the two apart from Federico's more genial way of life. Neither line seems satisfactory. Despite his terrified veneration for Carlo, the strongest personal influences on his adult career came from the critical side: from Valier, who addressed his critique of Carlo to him personally; from Paleotti; and from the alternative saint-figure of Philip Neri, whose cult of the Piovano Arlotto ought to be remembered at this point. Pamela Jones contrasts his humanistic 'optimism' with the Augustinian pessimism of Carlo: this is to paint with a broad brush, but accurately enough.[43]

In 1608 Federico Borromeo conducted a visitation in and around Lecco on Lake Como, as it happens the scene of the opening of the *Promessi Sposi*. He suspended a man from communion for not accepting a decent *pace* offered by the killer of his brother. He preached, at Lecco and probably elsewhere, two sermons on peace and enmity which are preserved in the visitation record. One picked up a common theme about pursuers of *inimicizia* doing more harm to themselves than to their enemies; *inimicizia* was rude, rustic and uncivilised. The other revived the traditionalist notion, expounded by William Durandus, of the Incarnation as a universal *pace*. There does not seem to be a precedent for it in Carlo's homilies; and I should think there were few precedents at all for his addition to the forms of Christian peace of the peace

[43] *The Betrothed*, chaps. 22–8 – the problem which provides the story is solved jointly by Federico and a bandit; P. Prodi, 'Nel iv° centinaio di Federico Borromeo: note biografiche e bibliografiche', *Convivium* (Bologna), 33 (1965), pp. 337–59; my own 'Postscript' to Evennett, *Spirit of the Counter-Reformation*, p. 138; Wright, 'Post-Tridentine Reform', pp. 211ff; L. Ponnelle and L. Bordet, *Saint Philip Neri and the Roman Society of his Time* (London, 1932; repr. 1979), pp. 56–62 (Piovano Arlotto), 493–9; Pamela Jones, *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana* (Cambridge and New York, 1993), chap. 1 and *passim*.

to be received from communion with the natural world, which the lucky people of Lecco might breathe in from their valleys, their woods and their shining lake. The two conceptions, of the Incarnation and the Creation, ran together in Federico's sensitive mind: he had no doubt that peace was more than a matter of civility.[44]

Under the more relaxed episcopal regime which occupied the century or so between the death of Federico Borromeo and the coming of the Enlightenment, one may imagine many parish priests continuing to manage the machinery of annual confession and communion in the spirit of the moral tradition. But if we are looking for the most visible channel of the tradition in the age of the baroque we shall need to return to a topic we may have forgotten: to the country missions which had been invented by Landini and the Jesuits in the middle of the sixteenth century. In the following decades we can find Jesuits, who would have preferred a more impressive career in the Indies, nevertheless working patiently at peacemaking in out-of-the-way places in the papal state, while elsewhere they hunted heresy or taught catechism or, as in the Milanese and perhaps the Veneto, were not allowed to missionise at all. During the seventeenth century they got it down to a system: a week's mission, preaching of pardon on Friday, followed by grand reconciliation, penitential procession on Saturday, communion on Sunday; much drama, flagellation, bare feet, crowns of thorns. This machine invites many of the objections suggested by a strict application of the *status animarum* to Easter communion. Despite or because of the charisma of many of the missioners, it seems rather likely that the gimmicks

[44] C. Marcora (ed.), *La pieve di Lecco ai tempi di Federico Borromeo: degli atti della visita pastorale del 1608* (Lecco, 1979), pp. 28–9, 204, 622–4; cf. my own 'The Mass as a Social Institution', *Past and Present*, no. 100 (1983), p. 34. As well as Bollani's instruction (above p. 23), Nubola and Turchini, *Visite pastorali*, pp. 74ff, show that Durandus was in circulation in the region.

and arm-twisting which were needed to keep to the timetable often made for a superficial or indeed a contrary effect.[45]

Jesuit dominance in the field was challenged by others, notably by Vincent de Paul's Lazarists who, encouraged perhaps for political reasons by Pope Barberini, began operations around Rome about 1640 and spread thereafter through much of north-west Italy. Their mission was a great success, and its success came largely from the seriousness with which they cultivated the moral tradition.[46] At least for the male half of the population, reconciliation was the principal object of their doings. They worked in appropriate fields: the papal state, Genoa and its territories including Corsica, Piedmont. In all of them the model described by Raggio applied: if counter-reformation *disciplina* or state formation had superseded it elsewhere in Italy, it had not done so there. The Lazarists confronted the ethics of feud. Probably what they said was much the same as what the Jesuits said: forgiveness of trespasses, the consequences of not forgiving, exclusion from communion for a start. They said it more simply and perhaps more quietly, avoiding hell-fire. They required the standard audible expressions and visible acts of reconciliation, from congregations where men, armed to the teeth in Corsica, might think their own thoughts or walk out in disgust. But they had, or may have borrowed from the Jesuits, the useful idea of asking first for the kissing of a crucifix, which evidently stood to the formal acts of reconciliation as kissing the *pax* at mass did to the embracing of enemies. In two respects their practice seems to have surpassed their Jesuit model in working with the grain of real life. This was certainly true in respect of time. They stayed in parishes a month

[45] Prosperi, 'Il missionario', pp. 211–18; *idem*, *Tribunali della coscienza*, pp. 597–8, 642–9; Louis Châtellier, *La religion des pauvres* (Paris, 1993), pp. 64, 205, 209; Gentilcore, ' "Adapt Yourselves . . ." ', pp. 280–1.

[46] P. Coste, *The Life and Labours of St Vincent de Paul* (3 vols., London, 1934–5), III, pp. 47–64; Gentilcore, ' "Adapt Yourselves . . ." ', pp. 273, 283.

or more; worked at 'loosening knots' until parties at enmity on account of a murder, an insult or a crashed marriage were willing to come and make a proper *pace* in church; waited for propitious days like Corpus Christi. Sometimes they could not stay long enough: at Cherasco in Piedmont in 1658, forty days could not bring the parties to agree, and the missioners left a town unreconciled. I think they probably also differed from the Jesuits in another respect. They are known, as Vincent's rule required, for cultivating relations with parish priests and not, as some Jesuits may have done, descending like gods from a machine. They are less known for cultivating relations with notaries. The thing that makes me believe that their missions of peacemaking were more than a flash in the pan is that they always, so far as I can see, required that the reconciliations they promoted should be properly registered by a notary.[47] We hear of notaries spending a week writing out *paci* until their arms dropped off: overworked, but not I imagine underpaid. As Raggio has explained, the notary was the central personage in the moral tradition as practised in Italy; the missionaries had put their finger on the spot. I do not think we need to respond with scepticism to the achievements they claimed: we may believe that people were often waiting for a suitable occasion to lay down the burden of social hostility without dishonour. A mission might be just this kind of jubilee; it also had the advantage over annual communion that the spectre of law was not present to disturb the proceedings.

On that unexpectedly cheerful note I pass across the Alps, leaving the Italian scene for the French. My conclusion is that the relation between moral tradition and Counter-Reformation in

[47] Coste, *Vincent de Paul*, III, p. 64 (Cherasco), 50–3, 55, 58. I find only one case where a Jesuit mentions fetching a notary, and that was to a dying man (Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza*, p. 647); no doubt it was common enough, but it does not seem to have been part of the strategy. Cf. Origo, *San Bernardino*, p. 19, on Vincent Ferrer, who was a famous peacemaker and took a notary with him on his preaching tours.

Italy was mixed, but on the whole surprisingly positive. I express surprise, because it seems to me that there were intrinsic difficulties, both with the harder-edged sort of Tridentine episcopalism, and with the activist ethos of the Jesuits and their like. Peacemaking had an old-fashioned, unstrenuous, earthbound, one might say populist air which did not instantly recommend it to improvers and reformers, whether humanistic *spirituali* or dyed-in-the-wool *zelanti*. It might be thought to concede too much to barbarous or unchristian *mores*. It was not favoured by the panic which ensued upon the thunderclap of the Reformation in the north; by the institution of the Roman Inquisition; by the conclusions of the Council of Trent; nor, all told, by the charismatic doings of Carlo Borromeo. The strenuous climate of the late sixteenth century was not its natural milieu. It is a tribute to the moral sensitivity or simple realism of many of those who laboured in that climate that it came out of the storm in a distinctly healthy condition. I guess that its survival, it may be its enhancement, was a weighty influence in securing the continued loyalty of Italians to their church.