




BX 955 .P35 1891 v.10
Pastor, Ludwig, 1854-1928
The history of the popes,
from the close of the



HISTORY OF THE POPES.

VOL. X.



THE
HISTORY OF THE POPES,

FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

DRAWN FROM THE SECRET ARCHIVES OF THE VATICAN AND OTHER
ORIGINAL SOURCES.

FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR. LUDWIG PASTOR,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF INNSBRUCK, AND
DIRECTOR OF THE AUSTRIAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE IN ROME.

EDITED BY

RALPH FRANCIS KERR

OF THE LONDON ORATORY.

VOLUME X.

LONDON :

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., LD.,
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET.

1910.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME X.*

	PAGE
Table of Contents	vii
List of Unpublished Documents in Appendix	xxxii

CLEMENT VII., 1523-1534.

Clement VII. in exile at Orvieto and Viterbo. The Imperialists leave Rome. Disaster to the French army in Naples. The weakness of the Pope's diplomacy. His return to Rome	1-31
Reconciliation of the Emperor and the Pope. The treaties of Barcelona and Cambrai	32-67
The meeting of Clement VII. and Charles V. at Bologna. The last Imperial Coronation. Restoration of the Medicean rule in Florence	68-105
The religious divisions in Germany	106-140
Negotiations as to the Council, to the Pacification of Nuremberg, 1532	141-169
Clement VII.'s efforts to protect Christendom from the Turks	170-203
Clement the Seventh's second meeting with the Emperor at Bologna. The Conciliar question in the years 1532-1533. The Pope and Francis I. at Marseilles. The marriage of Catherine de' Medici	204-237
The divorce of Henry VIII. and the English Schism	238-287

* For Bibliography see Volume VII.

	PAGE
The Protestant revolt in Scandinavia and Switzerland.	
Heretical movements among the Latin Races	288-315
The close of the Pontificate of Clement VII. His position towards Literature and Art	316-363
Clement VII. and the internal affairs of the Church.	
His attitude towards the questions of the Council and Reform	364-387
The beginnings of the Catholic Reformation. The Oratory of the Divine Love. Gaetano di Tiene and Carafa	388-423
Gian Matteo Giberti. The Somaschi and the Barnabites	424-453
Reform of the older Orders. The Capuchins	454-477
Appendix of Unpublished Documents	479-510
Index of Names	511

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME X.*

CHAPTER I.

CLEMENT VII. IN EXILE AT ORVIETO AND VITERBO. — THE
IMPERIALISTS LEAVE ROME. — DISASTER TO THE FRENCH
ARMY IN NAPLES. — THE WEAKNESS OF THE POPE'S
DIPLOMACY.—HIS RETURN TO ROME.

A. D.	PAGE
1527 Deplorable situation of the Pope at Orvieto (December)	1
And of the Cardinals	2
Bull relating to graces bestowed during the captivity (December 18th)	3
Poverty of the court at Orvieto.	3
Clement VII. receives congratulations on his deliverance	4
He is compared to the Popes of the infant Church, but still represents a mighty power	5
Eager competition to obtain his patronage. Corre- spondence with the Emperor (January 1528)	5
Who as early as December proposes a formal alliance	6
Clement unwilling to give pledges to the League or to the Emperor; writes to Francis I. (December 14th)	6
And to Henry VIII. and others, describing his afflictions	7
1528 The Pope urged to join the League (January)	7
Which makes tempting promises; but Clement refuses a decided answer, as he fears the Emperor.	8
Other motives for not trusting the League.	9
The Papal envoys arrive in Paris (January) and appeal to Francis to put pressure on Venice and Ferrara	10

* Unpublished documents are marked by an asterisk (*); documents to be published in "Acta Pontificum Romanorum" are designated by two asterisks (**).

A.D.		PAGE
1528	Mission of Pucci to Spain—his instructions	11
	Lautrec leaves Bologna on the 10th of January	11
	And enters the kingdom of Naples	12
	The Imperialists recognize their peril	12
	Their army, ravaged by the plague, leave Rome, rendering the neighbourhood like a wilderness	13
	A rabble under the Abbot of Farfa enter the city (February 17th)	14
	Efforts of the Pope to mitigate the distress	14
	Deputation to invite the Pope to return to Rome	15
	The officials of the Curia return (end of April)	15
	Harassing position of Clement VII.	16
	Re-appearance of Brandano (March); his prophecies	16
	Operations of Lautrec in Naples	17
	The Imperial fleet destroyed by Doria (April 28th)	17
	Alarm in Rome and anxiety of the Pope	18
	Famine in Orvieto	18
	Clement VII. moves to Viterbo (June 1st). Cardinal Farnese appointed Legate in Rome (June 8th)	19
	Unsuccessful attempt of the French fleet to take Civita Vecchia	20
	Provocation given by Venice to the Pope	20
	Who complains to Contarini	21
	His displeasure also with Francis I.	21
	Arrogance of the French and firmness of the Papal representative, who insists on the surrender of Ravenna and Cervia	22
	The scene of war in Naples—great distress in the city	23
	Naples set free by sea (end of July), and Genoa is lost to France (September 12th)	24
	Death of Lautrec (August 15th) and disorderly retreat of the French army from Naples (August 29th)	25
	Complete triumph of the Emperor, to whom Clement VII. determines (September) to make approaches	26
	Assurances of Orange to the Pope (September 18th)	27
	Who decides to return to Rome in spite of Contarini.	28
	Attempts of Francis I. to thwart the understanding between the Pope and the Emperor	29
	Clement VII. leaves Viterbo on the 5th of October and the following evening enters Rome	29
	Horrifying picture of the misery of the city	29
	The Pope orders all Cardinals to return (October 14th) and writes to Charles V. (October 24th)	30

CHAPTER II.

RECONCILIATION OF THE EMPEROR AND THE POPE.—THE
TREATIES OF BARCELONA AND CAMBRAI.

A.D.		PAGE
1528	Care of the Pope to restore order in Rome	32
	Wretched plight of the inhabitants—lack of church ornaments	33
	Quiñones nominated to the Cardinalate	33
	Clement VII. between the League and the Emperor	34
	Quiñones arrives in Rome (December 30th)	35
1529	Interview of Contarini with the Pope (January 4th)	35
	His suggestions	36
	Reply of Clement VII.	37
	The Pope sends Quinoñes and Schönberg to negotiate at Naples (January)	38
	Illness of the Pope (January 8th)—Ippolito de' Medici created Cardinal (January 10th)	39
	Critical condition of the Pope; dismay in Rome	40
	Anxiety of the Cardinals as to the freedom of the conclave	41
	Opinion of Mai, the Imperial envoy	41
	The Cardinals kept as hostages in Naples are set free	42
	The Pope recovers	43
	But on February the 18th has another attack; his alarm at report of the Emperor's descent upon Italy	43
	The Pope, the occasion of a diplomatic struggle between the League and the Emperor	44
	Giberti with the Pope. Anger of Mai	45
	Report of da Burgo to Ferdinand I. (March 2nd)	45
	Clement insists on his duty of remaining neutral	46
	Efforts of both parties to gain the Pope, who has a relapse brought on by excitement	47
	Restoration of Ostia and Civita Vecchia (March)	47
	Promises of the Imperialists concerning Florence, Cervia, and Ravenna; but Clement still hesitates	48
	Report of Cardinal Trivulzio (April 9th), who is mistaken	49
	Clement VII. makes up his mind	49
	And appoints a new Nuncio to the Imperial court	50
	The League seems deliberately to drive the Pope towards their adversary	51
	Giberti leaves Rome (April 26th)	52
	The Pope's attitude influenced by Florentine affairs	52
	State of things in Florence; everything done there to exasperate Clement	53

A.D.		PAGE
1529	Anger of the Pope ; his conversation with the English envoy and with Contarini	54
	He writes to the Emperor on May the 7th and sends as Nuncio, Girolamo da Schio. Reports of Mai and da Burgo (May)	55
	Schio arrives in Spain on the 30th of May and concludes with Charles V. the treaty of Barcelona (June 29th)	56
	Terms of the alliance between the Pope and the Emperor	57
	The conditions are favourable to the Pope	57
	The friendship of Clement a necessity to Charles V.	58
	The treaty accelerates peace negotiations between Francis I. and the Emperor	58
	The Archduchess Margaret and Louisa of Savoy	59
	Conclude the treaty of Cambrai (August 5th)	60
	Its terms disadvantageous to Francis I.	60
	The Pope rejects all the offers of the League (June 17th)	61
	Schönberg and Salviati at Cambrai	61
	The treaty of Barcelona made known in Rome on the 15th of July. On the following day, Papal decision in the matter of divorce of Henry VIII	62
	Envoys from the Emperor have audience with the Pope in bed	63
	Rejoicings in Rome at the conclusion of peace (August 1st)	63
	Negotiations concerning Florence	64
	The Abbot of Farfa ; his capture of Quinoñes (August)	65
	Agreement on the question of subjection of Florence and Perugia	66
	Gattinara created Cardinal (August 13th)	66

CHAPTER III.

THE MEETING OF CLEMENT VII. AND CHARLES V. AT BOLOGNA.—THE
LAST IMPERIAL CORONATION.—RESTORATION OF THE MEDI-
CEAN RULE IN FLORENCE.

1529	On August the 12th Charles V. lands at Genoa. The Pope sends his nephew and three Cardinals to meet him	68
	On account of the Turks, Charles obliged to act with caution towards Venice ; his rude treatment of the Florentine envoys	69

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xi

A.D.		PAGE
1529	Expedition against Perugia ; its capitulation on September the 10th	70
	Cardinal del Monte takes possession in the Pope's name (September 11th)	70
	The Imperialist army advances on Florence	71
	And arrives before the city on October the 24th	72
	The Florentines prepare to fight to the death	72
	Michael Angelo, overseer of the fortifications	73
	Popular excitement fanned by the Dominican preachers	73
	Gibes against the Pope. Hatred of the Medici	73
	Request of Charles to be crowned at Bologna	74
	Opposition of the Cardinals and Romans	74
	On September the 19th the treaty of Cambrai announced in Rome. The Pope announces his intention of going to Bologna	75
	The Florentines send an envoy to Rome (September 22nd). Their obstinacy	76
	The Pope leaves Rome (October 7th). His route	77
	Wish of Charles to settle Italian affairs quickly, on account of the advance of the Turks	77
	A Florentine deputation meet the Pope at Cesena	78
	His solemn entry into Bologna on October the 24th	78
	Holds a Consistory (October 29th) to make the preparations for the coronation. The Turks abandon the siege of Vienna	79
	Charles V. leaves Piacenza on November the 5th ; at Reggio meets Alfonso of Ferrara	80
	Makes his entry into Bologna on November the 5th	80
	Prodigality of the decorations	81
	Clement and Charles face to face	82
	Careful preparation made by Charles for his conference with the Pope	83
	Impression of Contarini. The Pope's advisers	84
	Clement VII. still distrustful of the Emperor	84
	Views regarding Milan, Ferrara, and Florence	85
	Sforza summoned to Bologna ; he is invested with Milan (December 3rd)	86
	Venice makes concessions	87
1530	Treaty of peace proclaimed in the Cathedral at Bologna on January the 6th	88
	The two points still left unsettled	89
	The Pope's irritation against Alfonso of Ferrara	89
	Reasons for the coronation taking place at Bologna rather than in Rome	89

A.D.		PAGE
1530	The Pope confirms the election of Charles (February 22nd)	92
	The coronation takes place in the church of San Petronio (February 24th)	92
	Description of the ceremony	93
	Florence remaining stubborn, Clement makes two further concessions to Charles V.	96
	Appoints three Cardinals	96
	And permits Alfonso of Ferrara to come to Bologna	97
	Influence of Charles V. over the Papal States	97
	Italian independence at an end. The Emperor is supreme	98
	Charles and Clement leave Bologna (March 22nd and 31st)	99
	The Pope impatient for the capitulation of Florence. Deplorable state of his finances	100
	"Would that Florence had never existed"	101
	Battle of Gavinana (August 3rd)	102
	At last Florence capitulates (August 12th)	103
	Savage reprisals of the Medicean party	104
	Clement VII. settles the government of the city	105

CHAPTER IV.

THE RELIGIOUS DIVISIONS IN GERMANY.

1523	Steady increase of Lutheranism	106
	Consistory of the 2nd of December	106
	Clement invites Eck and Aleander to furnish him with reports	107
	Aleander on the means to be employed to suppress heresy in Germany	107
	The report of an anonymous writer	108
	The Pope decides to appoint Campeggio as legate ; sends Rorario (December) as Nuncio to prepare the way	109
	Aleander prepares instructions for the Legate	109
1524	Campeggio reaches Nuremberg on the 14th of March	111
	Popular feeling against him on the journey	111
	His great caution, and first speech in the Diet (March 17th)	112
	"The complaints of the German nation"	112
	The Estates demand a National Council	113
	Campeggio objects to this	113

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xiii

A.D.		PAGE
1524	But promises to use his influence in favour of a General Council	114
	And holds an assembly at Ratisbon (June) for the reform of the national clergy	114
	Importance of this meeting. Ordinances published in a legatine decree (July 7th)	115
	Consultation of Clement VII. with the Cardinals	115
	Determination arrived at	116
	Charles V. prohibits the National Council and orders the observance of the Edict of Worms	116
1525	Campeggio's successes brought to an end by the out- break of the social revolution	117
	Delusion in Rome as to the real state of affairs	118
	Recall of Campeggio (October)	118
	His hopes soon shown to be entirely futile	119
	Absurd reports that obtain credence in Rome	119
	Even in Consistory (September 6th)	120
	Apostasy of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order	120
	Consternation of the Pope	120
1526	Who appeals to King Sigismund and to the Emperor (January 31st)	121
	"Cujus regio illius religio." Development of the Lutheran State Church system	122
	Political troubles cause relations between Germany and Rome to be broken off	123
1529	Representation of the Holy See in Germany resumed	123
	Extraordinary alteration in state of affairs	124
	The protesting party appeal (April 25th) to a "free council"	124
1530	Charles V. appoints (January 21st) a diet to be held at Augsburg. He arrives at Innsbruck (May 3rd)	125
	Campeggio's letter to Rome of May the 4th	126
	A General Council or a National Council?	126
	Written opinion of Campeggio laid before the Emperor	127
	Opening of the Diet of Augsburg (June 20th)	127
	Speech of Campeggio (June 24th). The "Augsburg Confession" presented by the Protestants (June 25th)	128
	False reports of the decline of Lutheranism	129
	Optimism of the Roman Curia (July 10th)	129
	Campeggio reports the three Protestant demands	130
	Which are deliberated upon in Consistory, and rejected	130
	Opinions of Campeggio and of the Emperor's council on the treatment of the religious question	131

A.D.		PAGE
1530	His conversation with Charles V. on the subject of a General Council	132
	And declares a Council would be of no avail	132
	But advocates firmness of action	133
	The Emperor sends (July 14th) to Clement VII. a full account of the negotiations at Augsburg	133
	The Pope calls together the Cardinals to consider the question of a Council	134
	Did Clement VII. really wish for a Council? Opinion of Loaysa. Conduct of Cardinal de Gramont	135
	The Pope states the conditions under which he consents to summon a Council	136
	These conditions must be accepted by the Protestants	137
	Great differences of opinion in the Curia	137
	“God grant a reformation may not be brought about by the Turks instead of by a Council”	138
	Delusive hopes of Charles V.	139
	His discussion with Campeggio (September 23rd)	139
	The Protestant princes reject the Emperor’s message and leave the Diet (September)	140

CHAPTER V.

NEGOTIATIONS AS TO THE COUNCIL, TO THE PACIFICATION OF NUREMBERG, 1532.

1530	The transactions of the Diet, followed with strained attention in Rome. The Pope willing to give way on two points	141
	All attempts at union miscarry—force the only resource	142
	The patience of Charles V. exhausted; he determines to punish	143
	And requests (October 4th) the Pope to invite other princes to co-operate with him	143
	Indecision of Clement VII. He ultimately calls on the Italian States to help	144
	They show no enthusiasm in the matter: Venice refuses	145
	The Emperor abandons the whole scheme	145
	And sends Cueva to Rome to renew the demand for a Council	146
	Arguments used by Charles in support of this request	147
	Clement VII. replies (November 18th) without committing himself definitely	148

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xv

A.D.		PAGE
1530	The "pros" and "cons" considered by the Cardinals	148
	The secret Consistory of the 28th of November . . .	149
	Opinion of Loaysa on the vote of the Cardinals. . .	149
	And on the aim of the Pope	150
	The Pope declares (December 6th) he has made up his mind to conform his opinion to that of Charles	150
	And sends Gambara on a mission to the Emperor . .	151
	The six objections against a Council, presented by the Envoy	151
	And the five conditions attached by Clement to the convening of a Council	153
1531	Charles delays replying to the Legate until the 4th of April	154
	And thinks it necessary to sound Francis I. . . .	154
	The sincerity of whom is very questionable . . .	155
	The Emperor gives his answer touching the five conditions	156
	Gambara draws up a counter reply	157
	Clement agrees to summon the Council if the King of France consents (April 25th)	158
	The Cardinals determine that the Council be sum- moned for dealing with specific objects only . .	159
	Unfavourable answer from the King of France . .	159
	Cardinal Gramont arrives in Rome on May the 17th .	160
	His instructions show the intention of Francis I. to thwart the Council	160
	Charles expresses to the Pope his displeasure at the hindrances raised against it (July)	161
	And suspects Clement of a secret understanding with Francis I.	161
	The responsibility for the failure of the Council . .	162
	The Emperor announces his intention of holding a Diet at Spire	163
	Campeggio of opinion that force is the only method to pursue with the heretics. Clement VII. in- clined to give way on three points, and is sup- ported by Cajetan	163
	Aleander appointed Nuncio to Germany (end of August)	163
	Clement recommends caution in regard to concessions	164
	The Diet postponed.	164
	Aleander's interview with the Emperor on November the 14th	164
	False report of the reconciliation of the Elector of Saxony (November 15th)	165

A.D.		PAGE
1532	Clement assures the Emperor he is straining every nerve to ensure the Council (May)	166
	The League of Schmalkald	166
	The Diet opens at Regensburg on April the 17th	166
	Fear of the Turks	166
	Efforts made at Rome to find some <i>via media</i> (April 19th)	167
	Indignation of the Nuncio at the Emperor's negotiations with the Protestants	167
	Memorial of Aleander denouncing the concessions (June 1st).	167
	The Catholic Estates blame the Emperor and demand a Council	168
	Charles attributes the delay to the King of France	168
	Division of opinion in Rome and Germany as to the policy to be pursued	169

CHAPTER VI.

CLEMENT VII.'S EFFORTS TO PROTECT CHRISTENDOM FROM THE TURKS

1523	Clement deals with the question of Hungary in his first Consistory (December 2nd)	170
1524	He sends Burgio as Nuncio to Hungary with a subsidy (April)	171
	Burgio's experiences. The country torn by party strife	172
	At Ofen (in August) he finds utter chaos, and appeals to deaf ears at the Diet	173
	The Turks take Severin	173
1525	Tomori and the Archbishop of Kalocsa alone faithful	174
	The former goes to the defence of Peterwardein (February)	174
	Gathering of the nobles at Hatvan (July 2nd)	175
	Zapolya and Verböczy overthrow the existing Government	175
	But nothing is done for the defence of the kingdom	175
1526	Alarming reports from Burgio (January)	176
	Clement urges the Christian princes to come to the aid of Hungary (February)	176
	Indolence of King Louis	177
	"The magnates are afraid of each other, and all are against the King"	177
	The Sultan sets out from Constantinople (April)	178

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xvii

A.D.		PAGE
1526	The resolutions of Hatvan annulled and Verböczy deposed	178
	The Pope alone sends help. Fall of Peterwardein (July 28th)	179
	Disastrous defeat at Mohács (August 29th)	179
	Flight and death of King Louis	180
	The Sultan enters the capital (September 10th)	180
1527-8	Rival competitors for the Hungarian crown	181
1529	The Sultan sets out for the capture of Vienna (May).	182
	Measures taken by the Pope (August 27th)	183
	The Turks invest Vienna (September), but after a final assault (October 14th) withdraw	183
	Letter of Suleiman to the Venetians (November 10th)	184
1530	Increased military preparations of the Turks	185
	Speech of Clement VII. to the Ambassadors, who nearly all make excuses (June 24th)	185
	He again sends Briefs to the princes of Christendom (August)	186
	But all his efforts are unavailing	187
	The Pope and the Knights of St. John. Bestows Malta upon them (March 23rd).	188
1531	The Turkish difficulty "the only topic of conversa- tion" (February 20th)	189
	Peril to middle and lower Italy.	189
	The Pope endeavours to utilize the power of France	190
	And urges the necessity of raising funds	191
	Allegations against the house of Hapsburg	191
	Difficult position of Ferdinand's Ambassador	192
	The Pope promises a subsidy (September 16th)	192
	Intelligence of preparations by the Turks for attack on Italy and Hungary (December)	193
1532	Clement resolves to fortify the Papal seaports (January).	194
	Party strife in Hungary. Repeal of Zapolya's excom- munication refused by the Pope	194
	Refusal of the Venetians to interrupt the peace with the Turks.	195
	"The God of Venice is their own aggrandizement"	196
	Panic in Rome (March)	196
	Measures taken by the Pope	197
	Bad behaviour of King Francis I. His threats.	198
	The fortification of Ancona by Ant. da Sangallo	199
	Firmness of Clement in Consistory (June 21st). The Cardinals to be taxed	199
	Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici despatched to Germany	200

A.D.		PAGE
1532	The Sultan advances to the Austrian frontier, but has to fall back on Belgrade	201
	Maritime successes of Andrea Doria	202
	The hopes thus raised come to nothing	202
	The Italian soldiers refuse to go into Hungary	202
	And the Protestants object to strengthen the Catholic Ferdinand	203
	Charles V. decides on an interview with the Pope	203

CHAPTER VII.

CLEMENT THE SEVENTH'S SECOND MEETING WITH THE EMPEROR AT
BOLOGNA.—THE CONCILIAR QUESTION IN THE YEARS 1532—
1533.—THE POPE AND FRANCIS I. AT MARSEILLES.—THE
MARRIAGE OF CATHERINE DE' MEDICI.

1532	Questions upon which Clement VII. and Charles V. are at variance	204
	Predominance of the Emperor in Italy	204
	Charles arrives in Italy (October). His anxiety to soothe the Pope	205
	He has but few adherents in Rome	205
	Character of Cardinal de Loaysa ; his quarrel with Mai Negotiations in 1531 about the creation of Cardinals .	207
	Giberti refuses the Pope's proposal to recall him to his service	208
	Whatever Clement does, the rival parties complain .	209
	He complains of the conduct of Loaysa	209
	Dissensions between the Emperor's representatives .	210
1531	Tact of the French envoy, de Gramont	210
	Who tries to bring about an alliance between the houses of Valois and Medici	211
	The Pope, after long indecision, favours this project .	211
	And consents to it by treaty of June the 9th, 1531 .	212
	But will not break with the Emperor, and evolves a scheme to reconcile Charles and Francis	213
1532	Cueva arrives in Rome (October) to arrange for the conference between the Pope and Charles	214
	Bologna fixed upon as the place of meeting	214
	Clement VII. leaves Rome on the 18th of November	215
	And arrives in Bologna on December the 8th	215
	Where Charles V. makes his entry on the 13th	216
	Eagerness of the Pope to reconcile Francis I. and Charles V.	217

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xix

A.D.		PAGE
1533	Arrival of the French representatives (January)	217
	The Emperor wishes Catherine de' Medici to marry Sforza	218
	When Francis I. at once ratifies the marriage contract with his son, and invites the Pope to meet him	218
	Treaty between the Pope and the Emperor signed on February the 24th	218
	Negotiations with the Italian envoys concluded (February 27th)	219
	Clement refuses to draw back from the French marriage agreement	219
	Creation of Cardinals. The Imperialists little pleased	220
	Negotiations and resolutions concerning the Council	221
	Briefs sent to the Christian princes inviting their consent	221
	Unsatisfactory reply from Francis I.	223
	Instruction drafted by Aleander for Rangoni, the Nuncio for Germany (February 27th)	223
	This contains eight conciliar conditions	223
	Charles agrees with the Pope's intentions and quits Bologna (February 28th)	224
	The Pope also leaves (March 10th)	224
	Agreement of Ferdinand and of George of Saxony (April and May)	224
	The Nuncio visits all the Electors	225
	Who on the whole give a ready consent	225
	Opinions of Melanchthon and Luther	226
	The Protestant princes demand a "free council"	226
	And reject the Pope's articles in offensive terms (June 30th)	226
	Clement VII. returns to Rome (April 3rd)	227
	Salviati sent to the relief of Koron	227
	Francis I. presses for a conference	227
	Continued enmity between the Emperor's envoys	228
	Cardinal Tournon turns this to advantage	228
	Opposition of the Curia to a conference with Francis	229
	But Clement refuses to withdraw	229
	Catherine de' Medici starts on her journey (September 1st)	230
	Departure of the Pope (September 9th). He avoids Florence	231
	Makes his entry into Marseilles on October the 12th	232

A.D.		PAGE
1533	On the 28th marries Catherine de' Medici to the Duke of Orleans	232
	Nomination of French Cardinals (November 7th)	233
	Secrecy of the transactions with Francis I.	234
	Falseness of the accusations against Clement	235
	Who is deceived by Francis	236
	The Pope's exhortations to a reconciliation with Charles X. fail	236
	Substantial success for Francis I.	236
	Transactions about the Council	236
	Pliability of Clement, who returns to Rome (November)	237

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DIVORCE OF HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH SCHISM.

	Separation of England from the Holy See not like that of Germany	238
	Character of Henry VII. His work	238
	Popularity of his successor, Henry VIII.	239
	Exceptional position of Wolsey. His leniency to heretics	239
	Henry VIII. no convert to Luther	240
	Marriage of Henry with Catherine of Aragon	240
	Her character	241
	Henry's early adulterous relations	241
1526	His scruples about the validity of his marriage	241
	Anne Boleyn. Her protectors are enemies of Wolsey	242
	Who hope for his downfall by means of the divorce	243
	Wolsey not the originator of the divorce scheme	243
	Henry's cunning dishonesty	243
1527	Words attributed to the French Ambassador	244
	Wolsey initiated for the first time (May 8th)	244
	With Warham holds a court of justice (May 17th)	245
	Opinions invited from Bishops and Canonists	245
	Fisher's reply causes Wolsey to reflect	245
	Wolsey dare not oppose Henry	246
	Brutal order to Catherine (June 22nd). Her reply	246
	Wolsey starts for France (July 3rd)	247
	Tries to win over Warham and Fisher	247
	Wolsey's project of marriage for Henry (August)	248
	Wishes to be made Papal Vicar-General (September)	248
	Mission of Knight to Rome	249
	Wolsey kept in ignorance of its real object	249

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xxi

A.D.		PAGE
1527	He hurries back to England, and at last perceives Anne Boleyn's position	249
	And implores Henry to depart from his resolve	250
	The King again deceives Wolsey	250
	The two drafts for a Bull of dispensation carried by Knight to Rome	250
	The Bull given (December 23rd) to Knight by the Pope is conditional only	251
	And therefore valueless	251
	Five points raised by Henry to invalidate the dis- pensation of Julius II.	252
	The Decretal Bull which Wolsey asks for	253
	Unheard-of powers demanded for Wolsey	253
	Knight and Casale unsuccessful	254
	Two fresh envoys from England, Gardiner and Fox	254
1528	Their negotiations with the Pope (March and April).	255
	Insolence of Gardiner's demands	255
	But Clement VII. not to be shaken	256
	No justification for the charge against the Pope.	256
	Bull of Commission (June 8th) to Wolsey and Campeggio. Powers conferred by it.	257
	Wolsey not satisfied	258
	His last effort to obtain the Decretal Bull	259
	And to deceive the Pope	259
	Who promises to send it by Campeggio	260
	The Bull, withheld from the free disposal of Henry and Wolsey, is rendered useless	261
	Campeggio arrives in England. His audiences with Henry and Catherine (October 22nd and 27th)	262
	Wolsey dissatisfied. His falsehood	263
	The Pope remains firm and refuses to do more. His declaration about the Decretal Bull (December 17th)	264
	Catherine produces the Brief of Dispensation of the 26th of December 1503	265
	Wolsey's attempts to nullify this	266
1529	Important letter from Campeggio to Salviati (Feb- ruary 18th)	267
	Wolsey makes a last attempt for an extension of his legatine powers.	268
	The court of the Legates constituted (May 31st)	268
	The pleading is on one side only. Courage of Bishop Fisher	269
	Campeggio on the 23rd of July adjourns the court	269
	The case transferred to Rome. Departure of Campeggio	270

A.D.	PAGE
1529	Downfall of Wolsey (October) 270
1530	His arrest and death (November) 271
	Wolsey as a statesman and as a churchman 272
	Rise of Cranmer. Mission of Anne Boleyn's father to the Pope and the Emperor 273
	Opinions of the universities 274
	Address to the Pope by the English prelates and nobles 275
	The proposal of the "double marriage" (September) 275
	Henry's violent complaints to the Pope (December) 277
1531	The convocation of the English clergy (January) 278
	Catherine banished from court (August) 279
1532	Clement VII. remonstrates with Henry (January) 279
	Meeting between Henry VIII. and Francis I. at Boulogne (October) 280
	The Pope threatens excommunication 280
	Henry's retort 281
1533	His marriage with Anne Boleyn (January) 281
	Cranmer becomes Archbishop of Canterbury (March) And declares Henry's marriage with Catherine to be null and void (May 23rd) 282
	Excommunication of Henry VIII. 283
1534	Anti-Papal Acts of Parliament 284
	Final sentence of the Pope (March 24th) 285
	Pusillanimity of the English clergy 286
	Oppressive measures of Henry 286
	An "outburst of despotic caprice and adulterous passion." Its result 287

CHAPTER IX.

THE PROTESTANT REVOLT IN SCANDINAVIA AND SWITZERLAND.
—HERETICAL MOVEMENTS AMONG THE LATIN RACES.

1523	Frederick I. and Gustavus Wasa encourage Lutheran teaching 288
	The capitulation of the 3rd of August at the election of Frederick. Its anti-papal decrees 289
1526	Tausen appointed as chaplain to the King (October) 289
	The Diet of Odense (November) 290
1530	Lutheran preachers present a Confession of Faith at the Diet of Copenhagen 290
	They are supported by Frederick 291
1533	Death of Frederick (April 10th). Want of energy by the bishops during the interregnum 291
1525	Gustavus Wasa introduces Lutheranism into Sweden 291

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xxiii

A D.	PAGE
1525 His system of spoliation	292
Five sees uncanonically occupied. Johann Brask stands alone	292
The revolt in Dalekarlien quelled by the King	293
1526 Clement VII. addresses (September 19th) the bishops of Linköping and Vesterås	293
Catholics in Sweden completely cowed	294
1527 Execution of Knut and Sunnanväder	294
The Diet of Vesterås (June). Weakness of the bishops, except Brask	294
Complete surrender to the King. Exile of Brask (November)	295
1528 Schismatical consecration of bishops (January 5th)	295
1529 National Council at Örebro	295
1531 Worldliness and servility of the clergy	296
Ease with which Gustavus Wasa destroyed the ancient Church	296
1523 Rise of Ulrich Zwingli in Switzerland	297
1525 The Pope sends Filonardi to Switzerland (February). Failure of his mission	298
The Curia pay little attention to the Church affairs in that country	298
1531 Defeat of the Zurichers at Kappel (October 11th). Death of Zwingli	299
Papal relief comes too late. The Catholic cantons make peace with Zurich (November 20th)	300
1532 The reports of Filonardi (July)	301
1533 His recall (October 17th)	301
1523 Activity of the Lutherans in France	302
1525 Firmly opposed by the Sorbonne and Parliament	302
1528 Catholic feeling in Paris	303
1529 Execution of L. de Becquin (April)	303
1534 Doubtful attitude of Francis I.	304
Impediments to the diffusion of Protestantism in Italy	305
1519-20 First appearance of Luther's writings in Upper Italy.	306
1524-28 Vigilance of the Pope	307
1530 His decree to the Inquisitor Butigella (January 15th) Protestant tendencies in Geneva	308
.	310
1528-30 Luther's followers in Venice	309
1532 Memorial from Carafa to the Pope (October)	310
Carafa draws up a programme for reform of the clergy	312
1533 Is warmly supported by Aleander (March)	313
Outside Venice, only isolated Lutherans to be found	315

CHAPTER X.

THE CLOSE OF THE PONTIFICATE OF CLEMENT VII.—HIS
POSITION TOWARDS LITERATURE AND ART.

A.D.		PAGE
1533	Return of Clement VII. from Marseilles	316
	Is viewed with suspicion by the Imperialists	316
	Spread of anti-papal feeling in Germany	317
	State of Bohemia	317
	Strange attitude of the Pope and the Curia	318
	Inadequate support of deserving Catholic scholars	319
	Craftiness of the King of France	319
1534	Who supports the Landgrave of Hesse	320
	And misleads the Pope	320
	Clement VII. refuses to support Ferdinand (June)	321
	And determines to defer the Council	321
	Bitterness aroused in Germany by this	321
	Clement VII. taken ill (June)	322
	Changes in his condition. Deaths among the Cardinals	323
	The Pope has a renewed attack (August 18th). Receives extreme unction (August 24th)	324
	Rallies on September the 8th. Is visited by Giberti	325
	His death on September the 25th	326
	Up to the last is occupied with the prospects of his nephews. His Brief to the Emperor	327
	Description of his tomb	327
	Clement VII. quickly forgotten in Rome	328
	Severity of contemporary judgments upon him	329
	Not altogether fair. His character	329
	His absorption in the interests of his family	331
	And his temporizing and dilatory policy	331
	His conduct of English affairs	332
	In all great questions his policy breaks down	333
1523	Delight in literary circles at the election of Clement VII.	334
	His earliest secretaries	335
	His measures to increase the Vatican Library	336
1526	The mission of Johann Heitmers	336
	Relations of Clement with Erasmus	337
	Sannazaro and Vida	338
	Services rendered by Guicciardini to the Pope	339
	Clement VII. and Machiavelli	340
	Agnolo Firenzuola—Francesco Berni	340
	Quarrel between Berni and Aretino	341
	The latter banished from Rome	342
	The number of literati associated with Clement	342

A.D.		PAGE
1526	Disastrous consequences of the sack for art and literature	345
	At the election of Clement artists flock to Rome	346
	Cellini, Giulio Romano, and others	346
	The decoration of the Stanze resumed	347
	The work of Penni	348
	Giulio Romano and his pupils	349
	Experiences of artists during the sack	350
1530-31	Giovanni da Udine and Sebastiano del Piombo	350
	The illuminator, Giulio Clovio	351
	The works at St. Peter's	351
	The "Fabbrica di S. Pietro." Peruzzi appointed architect for life	352
	Completion of the court of St. Damasus	353
	Works at castle of St. Angelo	353
	Restorations in many churches. Construction of streets	354
	Quick revival of the city after the sack	355
	Fortifications in the States of the Church	355
	Clement's patronage of goldsmiths' work	356
	Benvenuto Cellini	357
	Medallists and workers in intaglio	358
	Works of sculpture in Rome	359
	And on the Holy House at Loreto	359
	Baccio Bandinelli's work at Florence	360
	Michael Angelo and Clement VII.	361
	The painting of the Last Judgment suggested by Clement	363

CHAPTER XI.

CLEMENT VII. AND THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH.
—HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE QUESTIONS OF THE
COUNCIL AND REFORM.

	The converts of the New World	364
	Two hundred friars sent to the East Indies	365
1524	Creation of the Patriarchate of the West Indies (May 11th)	365
1530-31	And of other Sees	365
1524-28	Negotiations with Russia	366
	Clement VII. and the Maronites and Armenians	367
	Embassy from the King of Æthiopia	367
	The Jubilee of 1525. Regulations for it	368
	The Passion Play in the Colosseum	369

A.D.	PAGE
1524-28	Protestants ridicule the Jubilee 369
	Beatification of saints 369
	The Rosary encouraged. Special Bulls of this time . 370
	Clement obliged to make concessions to temporal princes 371
	The Inquisition in Portugal. The Pope protects the Jewish Christians against the King 371
	"Clement, the gracious friend of Israel" 372
	Disputes with Venice about bishoprics 373
	Appointments to the Cardinalate. Ruling motives in Clement's creations 374
	Political character of these appointments 375
	Manner of life of the Cardinals 377
1524	Clement VII. on the reform of the Curia (January) . 378
	His three administrative proposals (September) . . 378
	Appoints a visitation commission. Urges the observ- ance of the Lateran decrees 379
	Decree against vagrant Minorites 380
	Instructions to Carafa concerning candidates for holy orders 380
	Enactments for reform of the clergy in many dioceses 380
1525	And of the Carmelites and Humiliati 381
	But these measures lay almost dormant. The cause of this 382
	Things drift back into a contrary course 384
	The demand for a Council. Clement shrinks from this 385
	His objections to a Council. The recollection of Constance and Basle. 386
	The influence of the Emperor and of Francis I. . . 387
	Painful feelings aroused by the Pope's attitude . . 387

CHAPTER XII.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION.—THE ORATORY OF THE DIVINE LOVE.—GAETANO DI TIENE AND CARAFA.

True reformers always to be found in the Church . .	388
The work of Ximenes in Spain	388
The one thing lacking to the Lateran decrees . . .	389
Yet when all seems lost a change begins in perfect quiet	389
Rise of the Oratory of the Divine Love (c. 1517) . .	390
Its unpretentious beginnings and main principles . .	391
Strong Catholic feeling of its members	391

A.D.	PAGE
	Raphael and the Oratory 392
	The "Confraternità della Carità" (founded in 1519 by Clement VII. when a Cardinal) 393
	Is endowed by Clement VII. with the church of S. Girolamo 394
	Many officials of the Papal household members of it 394
1524	Valerio Lugio describes its work 394
	Rise of other institutions 395
	Increase in members of the Oratory of Divine Love. Some of its most illustrious associates 395
	Sets an example to other Italian cities 396
	And causes a revival of spiritual life 397
	Gives rise to the Theatine Order 397
	Gaetano di Tiene, his birth (1480) and early life 398
	His work in Vicenza, Verona, and Venice 399
1523	His return to Rome and intercourse with Carafa 400
	Different characters of the two men 401
	Birth (1476) and early life of Gian Pietro Carafa 402
	Made bishop of Chieti (1504) and Nuncio to Naples (1506) 403
	Labours to set his diocese in order 404
	Sent to England (1513), and Nuncio to Spain (1515) 404
	Great importance of his residence in Spain 405
	His intercourse with Ximenes and Adrian of Utrecht 405
	His occupations on his return from Naples (1520) 406
	Adrian VI. calls him to Rome. The impression he makes 406
	His close intimacy with members of the Oratory of the Divine Love 407
	With Gaetano matures plans for founding the Theatines 408
	Fundamental ideas of the founders 408
	Opposition and difficulties. Carafa resigns his two sees 410
1524	Papal Brief founding the new Order (June 24th) 410
	Gaetano and Carafa distribute their property and take solemn vows (September 14th) 411
	Carafa chosen Superior. Manner of life of the Theatines 412
1525	Deep impression they make in Rome 413
	And the change wrought by their quiet labours 414
	Tommaso Campeggio and Carafa 415
1527	At the sack of Rome the Theatines escape to Venice 415
	Their life in Venice. Relations with Contarini, Pole, and Cortese 416
1530-33	Rules of the Order drawn up by Carafa 416
1533	Clement VII. enjoins the erection of a house in Naples 417
	Strictness in the reception of new members 418

A.D.		PAGE
1533	The Order a "Seminary for bishops"	418
	The Pope encourages the Theatines. Carafa is indefatigable	419
	His correspondence with Bishops	420
	Important position he acquires in Venice	420
	Where he combats heresy	421
	His reports of abuses among the clergy	422
	And unprincipled titular bishops	423
	Corruption of the religious orders. All need regeneration, especially the Franciscans	423

CHAPTER XIII

GIAN MATTEO GIBERTI.—THE SOMASCHI AND THE BARNABITES.

	Early piety of Gian Matteo Giberti (born 1495)	424
	Enjoys the friendship of Leo X. and Cardinal Medici	425
	His relations with the humanists, especially Vida	425
	Clement VII. appoints him Datary	425
1524	And Bishop of Verona (August). His irreproachable conduct	426
	His intimacy with Carafa and loyal devotion to the Pope	427
1528	Withdraws to his diocese. State of things he encounters there	428
	Begins the task of reform. Change in his character. Embraces a strict asceticism	429
	Report of the change in Verona (November)	430
1529	Undertakes the visitation of his diocese	430
	His mode of procedure	431
	And stringent enactments	432
	Regulations for confessors, even in externals	433
1530	Strong edict on preaching (April 10th)	433
	His visitation of the religious orders. Clement VII. gives him special powers	434
1531	His regulations for nunneries confirmed by the Doge of Venice	435
	Difficulties with his Chapter. Their stubbornness	435
	Conflicts with the corrupt clergy. He receives steady support from the Pope	436
	Social activity of Giberti	437
	Founds the Society of Charity to cope with mendicancy	438
	His only recreation is study	439
	The "Accademia Gibertina." His private printing press	439

A.D.		PAGE
1531	Many other prelates follow his example	440
	Revival of Synods in Italy and in other countries	441
	Popular character of the Catholic reformation begun by Giberti	442
	The distresses of the time give it an impetus	442
	The sack marks the end of the Renaissance	443
	“A world had disappeared; a new one had to arise”	443
	Admission by Pierio Valeriano	444
	Sadoletto on the gleam of a new dawn	445
	Speech of Stafileo on the reassembling of the Rota on May 15th, 1528	446
	The sack had “cleared the air”	446
	Misery and distress in Lombardy	447
	The Venetian noble Girolamo Miani (born 1481)	448
	Becomes a priest (1518). His labours in the year of famine and plague (1528)	448
	His work among the poor children. Supported by the Venetian government	449
	Orphanages founded in Brescia and Bergamo	449
	The Somaschi; their special characteristics	449
	Miani extends the work into the Milanese territory	450
	Tommaso Nieto introduces a procession of the Bl. Sacrament	450
	Antonio Maria Zaccaria (born 1502) goes to Milan	451
1530	Joins the confraternity of the Eternal Compassion	451
1533	Founds the Barnabite Order	451
	Constitutions and manner of living of its members	452
	In what they differ from the Theatines	452

CHAPTER XIV.

REFORM OF THE OLDER ORDERS.—THE CAPUCHINS.

1517-23	Paolo Giustiniani and the Camaldolese Hermits	454
	Egidio Canisio and the Augustinian Hermits	455
	The Benedictine reform of S. Justina, and Gregorio Cortese	455
	Efforts at the reform of Franciscan Observants	455
1525	The “Riformati” supported by Quiñones	456
	Opposed by the General, Pisotti	457
1532	Clement VII. issues a Bull in their favour (November) Rise of Matteo da Bascio (b. 1495, d. 1552)	457
	His early life and entry into the Observants	458
1523	His self-denying activity at Camerino attracts the attention of Caterina Cibo	459

A.D.		PAGE
1523	His strict observance of the rule. Change in the habit	460
1525	Goes to Rome. His petition to Clement VII. . . .	460
	The Provincial orders him to be incarcerated . . .	461
	Is set free and joined by Lodovico and Raffaello da Fossombrone	462
	They are empowered to set up houses of their Order .	463
1528	The Brief confirming the new branch of Franciscans (Capuchins)	464
	Foundation of the first houses	465
	Bernardino da Colpetrazzo's account of their manner of life	466
	They are "preachers of repentance" to the common people	467
1528-29	Their heroic self-sacrifice during the plague . . .	467
1529	The first General Chapter at Alvacina	468
	Matteo da Bascio chosen Vicar-General	469
	Constitutions of the new institute	469
	First Capuchin settlement in Rome	470
	Rapid extension of the new community	470
	Opposition of the Observants	471
	Unreflecting zeal of Lodovico	471
1532	Papal decision (August 14th) in favour of the Capuchins	472
1534	Ochino and Bernardino of Asti join them	473
	The Observants again complain to the Pope	473
	The Capuchins banished from Rome (April)	474
	Indignation of the Roman people at this	475
	Action of Vittoria Colonna and Caterina Cibo	475
	Clement VII. sanctions the return of the Capuchins .	476
	Ignatius Loyola at Montmartre begins the Society of Jesus	476

LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS
IN APPENDIX

	PAGE
I. Pope Clement VII. to Donato de Marinis . . .	481
II. Safe-conduct of Pope Clement VII. for Johann Heitmers	482
III. Pope Clement VII. to the Dominicans of Ghent . . .	484
IV. Remarks on the oldest sources for the history of the Capuchins, and on the criticism of Boverius . . .	485
V. Francesco Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua	488
VI. Cardinal Trivulzio to Girolamo N.	489
VII. Francesco Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua	492
VIII. Consistory at Bologna on the 22nd of December 1529	492
IX. Pope Clement VII. to Cardinal Farnese	493
X. Consistory of the 4th of February 1530	493
XI. Andrea da Burgo and Martin de Salinas to Ferdinand I.	493
XII. Pope Clement VII. to the Duke Charles of Savoy . . .	494
XIII. Francesco Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	496
XIV. Francesco Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	496
XV. Francesco Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	497
XVI. Francesco Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	498
XVII. Fabrizio Peregrino to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	499
XVIII. Girolamo Cattaneo to the Duke of Milan	499
XIX. Francesco Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	500
XX. Francesco Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	500

xxxii LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS IN APPENDIX.

	PAGE
XXI. Pope Clement VII. renews the appointment of Baldassare Peruzzi as architect for St Peter's .	501
XXII. Fabrizio Peregrino to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	502
XXIII. Andrea da Burgo to Ferdinand I.	502
XXIV. Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	503
XXV. Fabrizio Peregrino to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	503
XXVI. Pope Clement VII. to Johann von Metzenhausen, Archbishop of Treves	503
XXVII. Pope Clement VII. to the Dominicans of Ghent	504
XXVIII. Pope Clement VII. to Petrus Eras	505
XXIX. Pope Clement VII. to Cardinal Albert, Arch- bishop of Mayence	505
XXX. Fabrizio Peregrino to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	506
XXXI. Pope Clement VII. to his Nuncio in Naples .	507
XXXII. Giovanni Maria della Porta to the Duke of Urbino	507
XXXIII. Pope Clement VII. to Baldassare Peruzzi	508
XXXIV. Pastron to the Marchioness of Monferrato	508
XXXV. Fabrizio Peregrino to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	509
XXXVI. Fabrizio Peregrino to Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua	510

CHAPTER I.

CLEMENT VII. IN EXILE AT ORVIETO AND VITERBO.—THE IMPERIALISTS LEAVE ROME.—DISASTER TO THE FRENCH ARMY IN NAPLES.—THE WEAKNESS OF THE POPE'S DIPLOMACY.—HIS RETURN TO ROME.

IN the old town of Orvieto, guarded by its strong citadel on the cone-shaped hill which separates, like a boundary stone, the Roman and Tuscan territory, the personal freedom of the Pope was secure; yet his situation must still be described as a deplorable one. His ecclesiastical rank excepted, he had lost all he could call his own: his authority, his property, almost all his states, and the obedience of the majority of his subjects.¹ Instead of the Vatican adorned with the masterpieces of art, he was now the occupant of a dilapidated episcopal palace in a mean provincial town. Roberto Boschetti, who visited the Pope on the 23rd of January 1528, found him emaciated and in the most

¹ In consequence Clement VII. was not able to keep his promise to Cardinal Colonna with regard to the Legation of the March of Ancona; see the *despatch of G. M. della Porta to the Duchess of Urbino, dated Lodi, 1528, Jan. 24: *Da Orvieto s' intende quelli di la Marca non haver voluto obedire alli brevi del papa che comandava accettassero per legato il card. Colonna. Senza ch' io dicho altro la Ex. V. si deve imaginare il dispiacere che ne piglia S. S^{ta}, la quale fu gran favore al sig. Malatesta Baglione, che sta in Orvieto (State Archives, Florence). As a compensation, Cardinal Colonna was appointed Governor of Tivoli for life on January 18, 1528. *Min. brev., 1528, III., vol. 20, n. 1706 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

sorrowful frame of mind. "They have plundered me of all I possess," said Clement VII. to him; "even the canopy above my bed is not mine, it is borrowed."¹ The furniture of the Papal bedchamber, the English envoys supposed, could not have cost twenty nobles. They describe with astonishment how they were led through three apartments bare of furniture, in which the hangings were falling from the walls.² In this inhospitable dwelling Clement was confined to bed with swollen feet; there were suspicions that poison had been given him by the Imperialists, but the mischief was caused by his unwonted exertions on horseback on the night of his flight.³

At first only four Cardinals,⁴ then, on a special summons from the Pope,⁵ seven betook themselves to Orvieto. Their position was also a hard one, for no preparations had been made for the fugitives in the town; provisions could only be got with difficulty and at the highest prices, and there was such a scarcity of drinking water that the Pope had at once to give orders for the construction of four wells.⁶

¹ See Boschetti's remarkable report of January 24, 1528, in BALAN, Boschetti, II., App. 41-42.

² See Gardiner and Fox, report of March 23, 1528, in State Papers: Henry VIII., VII., 63, and in BREWER, IV., 2, n. 4090.

³ OMONT, Suites du Sac de Rome, 19-20.

⁴ In a *letter of Bonaparte Ghislieri, dat. Orvieto, 1527, December 20, Monte, Pucci, Accolti, and Spinola are mentioned as being present (State Archives, Bologna).

⁵ See the *Briefs, dat. Orvieto, 1528, January 4. Min. brev., 1528, IV., vol. 21, n. 6 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁶ FUMI, Orvieto, 188-189. Cf. BALAN, Boschetti, II., App. 44; SANUTO, XLVI., 580, 662. Ghislieri remarks in his *letter of December 20, 1527: "It is not supposed that the Pope will remain long in Orvieto on account of the angustia e carezza. Il star di S. S^{ta} qua dipende della speranza di ridrizzar le cose di Roma." On February 2, 1528, he reports that lodgings and provisions are not to be had, and that all wish to get away (State Archives, Bologna). G. M. della Porta writes on

In spite of the distress in Orvieto, little by little numerous prelates and courtiers made their way thither. The business of the Curia, for a long time almost wholly suspended, was again resumed. On the 18th of December 1527 a Bull relating to graces bestowed during the captivity was agreed to in secret Consistory.¹ The conduct of the more important affairs lay in the hands of Jacopo Salviati and of the Master of the Household, Girolamo da Schio, Bishop of Vaison.²

The poverty and simplicity of the new court at Orvieto were such that all who went thither were filled with compassion. "The court here is bankrupt," reported a Venetian; "the bishops go about on foot in tattered cloaks; the courtiers take flight in despair; there is no improvement in morals; men here would sell Christ for

January 31, 1528, from Lodi to the Duchess of Urbino: *Quà si sta in expe'ttatione desideratissima d' intender che resolutione habbiano da far gli nemici di Roma da li quali questi nostri qua pigliarono indrizzo del governarsi et levarsi di questo alloggiamento nel quale più non si po stare essendosi quasi in tutto mancato il modo del viver senza che al mondo non fu veduta mai la più noiosa stanza (State Archives, Florence).

¹ The *Bull contained the following: "During our captivity, owing to the insistence and incessant entreaties of ecclesiastics and laymen, many graces, privileges, dispensations, etc., were agreed to and granted more under compulsion than of our own free will, to the scandal, injury, and prejudice of the Church and contrary to the example of our predecessors. Now, being at liberty, *dictae sedis honorem conservare et futuris scandalis obviare volentes*, we repeal collectively, in agreement with and on the advice of the Cardinals, all privileges, graces, dispensations, etc., granted to clergy and laity, excepting those conferred on *veri et antiqui familiares, continui commensales*, and on Cardinals and laymen bearing the title of Duke or other higher degree. D. Orvieto, 1527, XV. Cal. Januar. A° 5°. Clement VII. Secret A., I.-VI., Regest., 1437 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See the report in BALAN, Boschetti, II., App. 42-43.

a piece of gold.”¹ Of the Cardinals only Pirro Gonzaga was able to live as befitted his rank; the rest were as poor as the Pope himself, who, in the month of April, was still without the most necessary ecclesiastical vestments.² The congratulations on his deliverance, addressed to him in writing by the Cardinals assembled in Parma,³ personally by the Duke of Urbino,⁴ Federigo Bozzolo,⁵ and Luigi Pisani, and in letters or by special envoys from nearly all princes and many cities, must have seemed to him almost a mockery.⁶ As Clement had only a few troops at his disposal and the neighbourhood of Orvieto was rendered insecure by the bands of soldiery,⁷ he was

¹ SANUTO, XLVI., 488.

² SANUTO, XLVII., 394; *cf.* XLVI., 488. See also FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 33.

³ *Letters of Cardinals Farnese, Passerini, Cibo, Ridolfi, and E. Gonzaga to the Pope, dat. Parma, 1527, December 15, in *Lett. d. princ.*, IV., f. 170. *That of Cardinal Salviati, dat. 1527, December 27, in *Nunziat. di Francia I.*, f. 138-139 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ As a consummate diplomatist Clement VII. received the man, who had contributed so much to his misfortune, in a friendly way; see UGOLINI, II., 243; REUMONT, III., 2, 223.

⁵ Clement VII. had soon to deplore his death; see MOLINI, I., 287 *seq.*, and SANUTO, XLVI., 447 *seq.*

⁶ *Cf.* BONTEMPI, 325. The letter from Venice in SANUTO, XLVI., 401-402. The *reply of Clement of December 30, 1527, in *Min. brev.*, 1527, IV., vol. 17, n. 414 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Clement wrote to the Marquis Federigo Gonzaga from Orvieto, 1527, December 24: *Haud necessaria nobiscum, tamen summe grata nobis fuit tuae Nobilitatis gratulatio, quam nobis de nostra liberatione per dil. fil. Capynum de Capys amantissime exhibuisti (original in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Even Alfonso of Ferrara sent congratulations. *Cf.* the diplomatic reply of Clement of December 28, 1527, in FONTANA, Renata, I., 431.

⁷ “No one can come to us without peril of his life,” complained Clement in a *Brief, dat. Orvieto, 1528, January 11, to the *dom. de Vere*. *Min. brev.*, 1528, IV., vol. 21, n. 24 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

practically shut up in his mountain fortress. He had to complain repeatedly that even communication by letter had become difficult,¹ while any attempt to escape into the surrounding territory was out of the question. The care-laden Pope, wearing the long beard which he had allowed to grow during his captivity, was seen passing through the streets of Orvieto with a small retinue.² Rumour exaggerated his poverty still further; he was compared to the Popes of the infant Church.³

In spite of spoliation and exile the Pope continued to represent a mighty power. This was best seen in the eager competition of both the forces inimical to him to obtain his patronage. The attempts of France and England in this direction were well known to the Emperor, who made it a matter of express reference in the letter of congratulation addressed to Clement. In his answer of the 11th of January 1528 Clement thanked him for the restoration of freedom, assured him that he had never held him guilty of the occurrences in Rome, and declared himself ready to do all that lay in his power to aid him in the questions of peace, the Council, and all other things which Charles desired for the highest good of Christendom;

¹ *See the Brief to F. Alarcon, dat. Orvieto, 1528, Januar. 16, *loc. cit.* n. 131.

² “Ha una barba longa canuda, cavalca con 8 cavalli et 30 fanti di la sua guardia. Sta sempre maninconico.” Report in SANUTO, XLVIII., 226. A coin of Clement VII. shows him with the beard, and on the obverse Peter and the Angel with the inscription: “Misit Dominus Angelum suum. Roma”; see CINAGLI, 98, n. 52, and Vol. IX. of this work, page 467, n. 1. It had become forgotten that Julius II. wore a beard, and now offence was given by Clement wearing one. Pierio Valeriano therefore published in 1533 an “Apologia pro sacerdotum barbis” dedicated to Cardinal Ippolito de’ Medici. Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, page 591, and STEINMANN, II., 38, n. 1.

³ SEGNI, I., I (ed. 1830, I., 47). Cf. the Sienese reports in FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 32-33.

the Emperor, moreover, would see for himself how powerless the Pope was, as long as the hostages were retained and the ceded cities still occupied; Francesco Quiñones would report in detail on all other circumstances under consideration.¹ To an Imperial envoy who had come to Orvieto as early as December 1527 to propose a formal alliance with Charles on the basis of the restoration of the States of the Church, the answer was given that the question could not be considered until the occupied cities had been given back and the hostages set at liberty.²

Clement was as little willing to give definite pledges to the League as to the Emperor. In the autograph letter in which, on the 14th of December 1527, he announced his release to Francis I., he certainly thanked the King for the help he had rendered, but showed in no ambiguous terms how insufficient, in reality, it had been. Yet Lautrec's army had not hastened a step. It was clear from this letter that the Pope had no intention of giving pledges to France; he excused his treaty with the Imperialists as a measure wrung from him by force. "For months, together with our venerable brethren, we had endured the hardest lot, had seen all our affairs, temporal and above all spiritual, go to ruin, and your well-intentioned efforts for our liberation end in failure. Our condition grew worse, indeed, day by day, the conditions imposed upon us harsher, and we saw our hopes threaten

¹ LANZ, *Korrespondenz*, I., 257-259; also 256-257, the premature letter of congratulation from Charles of November 22, 1527. Cf. SANUTO, XLVI., 584, 588; PIEPER, *Nuntiaturen* 71, and WADDING, 2nd ed., XVI., 243 *seqq.* The text of the Pope's letter in Lanz is incorrect; see BALAN, *Clemente VII.*, 86.

² SANUTO, XLVI., 382. After the above had passed through the press appeared FRAIKIN'S important article: *La Nonciature de France de la délivrance de Clément VII. à sa mort (Decembre 1527 à 25 Septembre 1534)* in the *Mél. d'Archéol.*, 1906, 513 *seqq.*

to vanish away. Under these circumstances we yielded to the pressure of a desperate state of things. Neither our personal interest nor the peril in which each one of us stood was the mainspring of our action; for eight long months we suffered ignominious imprisonment, and stood daily in danger of our lives. But the misery in Rome, the ruin of the States which had come down to us unimpaired from our predecessors, the incessant affliction in body and soul, the diminished reverence towards God and His worship, forced us to take this step. Personal suffering we could have continued to endure; but it was our duty to do all in our power to remove public distress. Our brothers, the Cardinals, have not shrunk from submitting, as hostages, to a fresh captivity in order that we, restored to freedom, may be in a position to ward off from Christendom a worse calamity." The bearer of this letter was Ugo da Gambarà, who together with Cardinal Salviati was to give fuller information by word of mouth.¹ On the same day (December 14) Clement wrote in similar terms to the Queen, Louisa of Savoy, to Montmorency, Henry VIII., and Cardinal Wolsey, referring also in these letters to Gambarà's information.²

Ever since January 1528 Clement had been besieged with the most pressing entreaties to join the League, whose army persisted in its wonted inactivity. In company with Lautrec, who had advanced as far as Bologna, were Guido Rangoni, Paolo Camillo Trivulzio, Ugo di Pepoli, and Vaudemont.³ In February they were joined

¹ MOLINI, I., 280-282. Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 224-225.

² MOLINI, I., 283-285; RAYNALDUS, 1527, n. 49-51; EHSES, Dokumente, 10-11, and the **Brief to Cardinal Du Prat of December 17, 1527, in the National Archives, Paris.

³ See Lautrec's letter to Clement VII., dat. Reggio, 1527, December 14. (His joy at the deliverance. Sends P. C. Trivulzio and G. Casale

by Longueville, who brought the good wishes of Francis I. As envoys of Henry VIII., Gregorio Casale, Stephen Gardiner, and Fox were active; the last-named was especially occupied with the question of the divorce on which the English King was bent.¹

The League made the most tempting promises to the Pope. Not only should he receive back the Papal States, but also designate to the kingdom of Naples and be compensated for all damages and costs of the war.² But the events of the past year had made Clement very cautious.³ Despite all the pressure brought upon him, he would give no decided answer, and insisted that he was of more use outside the League than within it.⁴ His inmost sympathies at this time were certainly with the League,⁵ for he feared the power of the Emperor, who, in possession of Naples and Milan, was the "Lord of all

to express the same and with other messages. Will do everything for the Pope.) Lett. d. princ., IV., f. 261 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. **Lautrec's letter of January 1, 1528, *ibid.*, V., f. 1, and the *reports of G. M. della Porta to the Duchess of Urbino, dat. Lodi, 1528, January 25 (Stamane è gionto qua il conte Guido Rangone mandato da M. di Lautrech a N. S., etc.) and February 6, in Florentine State Archives. Cf. also the Brief to Lautrec in FONTANA, Renata, I., 434 *seq.*

¹ State Papers: Henry the Eighth, VII., 63; BREWER, IV., 2, n. 4090, 4118, 4120; Lett. d. princ., III., 1 *seq.* Cf. *infra*, Chap. VIII. Montmorency announced Longueville's mission to the Pope in a letter dat. St. Germain, 1528, January 1; Lett. d. princ., V., f. 2 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Cf. GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 281.

³ SCHULZ, Sacco, 161 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. SANUTO, XLVI., 410, 490, 543, 554 *seq.*, 557 *seq.*, 592; REUMONT, III., 2, 229. See also the report of *N. Raince, January 28, 1528, in RANKE, Deutsche Gesch., III., 24. MS. Beth. 8534, now marked franç. 3009 in the National Library, Paris.

⁵ See SANUTO, XLVI., 507, 508; cf. also FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 40.

things,"¹ and wished for the expulsion from Italy of those who had done him such unheard-of wrong.² But from any attempt of this kind he was deterred by weighing closely the actual state of things; a waiting attitude, giving to both parties a certain amount of hope, appeared to the Pope to be the best, and this policy was also in accordance with his natural indecision.³

Perhaps the conduct of the League itself had even more influence on Clement than his feeling of helplessness when pitted against the victorious Spaniard. He could not trust a confederacy, the members of which, each engrossed in his own interests, had left him to his downfall in the year of misfortune 1527. Might not this trick be played again at any moment? Above all—and this was decisive—the League had assumed a character which made it quite impossible for the Pope to enter into it. Florence, from which his family had been expelled, was supported by France, Venice had seized Ravenna and Cervia, the Duke of Ferrara, Modena, and Reggio. Both were unwilling to give back their plunder, and yet such were the allies whom Clement was to join against the Emperor!⁴

¹ "Omnium rerum dominus"; see report of Gregorio Casale in FIDDES, *Life of Wolsey*, 467.

² Cardinal Salviati represented to the Regent Louisa: *che io era certo che S. B., se bene haveva come catholico perdonato ogni injuria, non poteva desiderare alcuna cosa più che veder fuori d' Italia et delle sue terre quelli che havevono fatte tante impietà et tante scelerateze et offese a Dio et alla chiesa, se non per altro per non haver più da temere, etc. * Letter to Jacopo Salviati of January 1, 1528. *Nuziat. di Francia I.*, f. 142 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ SANUTO, XLVI., 490. Cf. Casale's report cited *supra*, n. 1. See also GUICCIARDINI, XVIII., 5, and FONTANA, 108.

⁴ Cf. SANUTO, XLVI., 543, 557, f. 592. Venice had expressly promised to restore Ravenna and Cervia as soon as the Pope was set free; see Salviati's *report of January 1, 1528, cited *infra*, p. 10, n. 1.

In view of this situation, the Pope and his diplomatists directed their efforts towards securing the restoration of the States of the Church under a guarantee of neutrality.

On New Year's Day 1528 Cardinal Salviati informed the French Government that the League must be satisfied with a benevolent neutrality on the part of the Pope, deprived, as he was, of all material resources. At the same time he made it clear that Clement insisted on the restoration of the cities taken by Venice, and would consent to no dishonourable agreement with the Duke of Ferrara, the originator of all the misfortunes of the Church.¹ On the 12th of January Gambara arrived in Paris; and, together with Salviati, made the most urgent appeals to the French Government to compel the Venetians and Ferrara to surrender their plunder; if they failed to do so, then the Pope would be forced to try some other means of getting back his possessions.² Salviati did not let the matter drop, but afterwards forcibly renewed his representations. But he gained little at first, since the French were afraid that Venice might quit the League, and hesitated to take any steps.³ It was not until France and England had formally declared war against the Emperor that a stronger pressure was put on Venice.

It was almost coincident with this turn in affairs that Clement determined to send a new Nuncio to Spain in the person of Antonio Pucci, Bishop of Pistoja, who together

¹ *Report of Cardinal Salviati to Jacopo Salviati, January 1, 1528. Nunziat. di Francia I., f. 142 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See the *report of Cardinal Salviati to Jacopo Salviati, January 16, 1528. Nunziat. di Francia I., f. 152 *seqq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. the *reports of Cardinal Salviati to Jacopo Salviati of February 1, 1528, and to Gambara, February 13, 1528, *loc. cit.*

with Castiglione was to open up the way to a general peace.¹ If Charles, declared Sanga,² now Clement's chief adviser in place of Giberti, would not agree to Pucci's conditions of peace, then the Pope would join the League, but only after his own just grievances had been redressed. The League, so ran the fuller instructions, must undertake to restore Ravenna, Cervia, Modena, and Reggio, settle upon whom Naples should devolve, and finally bring about a general pacification in Florence. Pucci was to travel through France, to treat personally with Francis I., and explain why the Pope was obliged, for the time being, to remain neutral. The French King, however, was by no means disposed to carry out the wishes of which Pucci was to be the exponent; the mission of the new Nuncio to the Emperor made him uneasy, and he made a plan to put obstacles in his way.

Lautrec's successes certainly encouraged Francis in his projects. The former had at last left Bologna on the 10th of January 1528, and was pressing towards Naples through the Romagna. Clement now recovered Imola, and, somewhat later, Rimini also.³ On the 10th of

¹ See the Papal credentials, dated Orvieto, 1528, February 10, in Gayangos, III., 2, n. 337, 338, and the plenary powers for Antonio, episc. Pistorien. prelado et nuntio nostro. Dat. Orvieto, 1527 (st. fl.), V. Id. Febr. A° 5°. Clem. VII., Secret. Regest., 1437, f. 30 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Letter to Gambarà, dat. Orvieto, 1528, February 9, together with the answer to Longueville, in Lett. d. princ., I., 111-114.

³ When Lautrec came to Imola on January 11, Giov. da Sassatello at once surrendered the town; SANUTO, XLVI, 478. There were greater difficulties with Rimini (see *ibid.*, 514, 617; GUICCIARDINI, XVIII., 5; BALAN, Boschetti, II., App. 52-53, and the *report of G. M. della Porta, dat. Orvieto, 1528, May 19, State Archives, Florence). The Pope did not recover this city till June; see SANUTO, XLVIII., 132 *seqq.*; YRIARTE, Rimini, 366; ADIMARI, Sito Riminese (Brescia, 1616), II., 59; BALAN, Clemente VII., 89.

February the French army crossed the Tronto and entered the kingdom of Naples. In Rome, and throughout Papal circles generally, this advance of the French was coupled with the hope that a final deliverance from the dreadful incubus of the landsknechts was at hand.¹ Lautrec gave assurances on all sides that, after reducing Naples, he would set free the Papal States; since his whole course of action was only undertaken in the interest of the Pope, he renewed his insistent entreaties that Clement would now resume his place in the League.²

The Imperialists, at first, had not feared Lautrec;³ now they recognized the peril threatening them. If they were unable to move their army from Rome, then Naples would fall without a blow into the hands of the enemy.⁴ Philibert of Orange, who had been in chief command since January, Bemelberg, and Vasto negotiated with the mutinous troops. Money was scraped together in every possible way,⁵ and even Clement had to raise 40,000 ducats.⁶ Thus, on the 17th of February 1528, the

¹ Cf. OMONT, *Suites du Sac de Rome*, 32 *seqq.*, and the certainly exaggerated report in FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 44. How delighted Cardinal Ridolfi had been already by the appearance of Lautrec in October 1527 is shown by his letter in *Mél. d'archéol.*, XVI., 417 *seq.*

² Cf. the *letters of Cardinals Numai and B. Accolti, dat. Ancona, 1528, January 28 and 29, to Clement VII. *Lett. d. princ.*, V., f. 75 *seqq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ This is proved by the intercepted letters of Lope Hurtado de Mendoza in SANUTO, XLVI., 584.

⁴ See SANUTO, XLVI., 648.

⁵ Cf. SCHULZ, *Sacco*, 166.

⁶ Lautrec complained of these sums; see GUICCIARDINI, XVIII., 6. 20,000 ducats were paid in the name of the Roman people and 20,000 for the release of Cardinals Orsini and Cesi, detained as hostages by the Colonna. This release, fervently urged by Clement (*Min. brev. 1528, IV., vol. 21, n. 118 and 147, Briefs to Cardinal Colonna of February 13 and 20, Secret Archives of the Vatican), is mentioned by

soldiery, who up to the last indulged in acts of violence and depredation,¹ were induced to move.² The army, which eight months previously had numbered twenty thousand men, had melted down to one thousand five hundred cavalry, two or three thousand Italians, four thousand Spaniards, and five thousand Germans; so great had been the ravages of the plague among the troops. On the 13th of January Melchior Frundsberg fell a victim; his tomb in the German national church of the Anima recalls one of the most terrible episodes in the history of Rome.³ "The troops," says a German diarist,⁴ "had destroyed and burnt down the city; two-thirds of the houses were swept away. Doors, windows, and every bit of woodwork even to the roof beams were consumed by fire. Most of the inhabitants, especially all the women, had taken flight."⁵ The neighbourhood for fifty miles around was like a wilderness.⁶ The columns of flame, rising up from Rocca Priora and Valmontone, showed the road which the landsknechts had taken for Naples.⁷

The sufferings of the unfortunate Romans were even G. M. della Porta in a *report, dat. Orvieto, 1528, February 26. Cardinal Colonna now went to Naples; see *his report of February 27, 1528, in the State Archives, Florence. Cesi and Orsini went at once to Orvieto; see SANUTO, XLVII., 28.

¹ Cf. the statements in the diary in OMONT, *Suites du Sac de Rome*, 29; GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 262, 289, 302, and BALAN, Boschetti, II., App. 42, 44.

² SANUTO, XLVI., 602, 613, 616, 645, 662. Cf. ORANO, I., 345 note. The Italian and some of the Spanish soldiers were already withdrawn by the 14th; see OMONT, 37; ROBERT, 170. The news reached Orvieto on the 20th; see SANUTO, XLVI., 662.

³ GUICCIARDINI, XVIII., 6; cf. SCHMIDLIN, 277.

⁴ CORNELIUS DE FINE in his *Diary in the National Library, Paris.

⁵ Cf. also GUALDERONICO, 92; ALBERINI, 360-361.

⁶ MOLINI, II., 21.

⁷ ALBERINI, 360. Cf. OMONT, *Suites du Sac de Rome*, 40.

then not yet at an end. On the afternoon of the same day (February the 17th) on which the Imperialists departed, the Abbot of Farfa, with a leader of a band from Arsoli, accompanied by a pillaging rabble, who were soon joined even by Romans themselves, entered the city. The streets rang with shouts of "Church, France, the Bear (Orsini)!" and plundering began anew, where anything was left to plunder, especially in the houses of the Jews. All stragglers from the Imperial army were put to death, even the sick in the hospitals were not spared.¹

On hearing of these fresh outrages Clement sent Giovanni Corrado, and afterwards a detachment of troops under the Roman Girolamo Mattei, to restore order.² At the same time the Pope made strenuous efforts to mitigate the distress in Rome caused by the scarcity of provisions and to guard against the danger of plague. The letters of Jacopo Salviati to the Cardinal-Legate Campeggio, who had remained in Rome, throw light on the difficulties which had to be encountered in re-victualling the city; transport on land as well as by sea was extremely difficult, and there were those in Rome who did not scruple to take advantage of the existing necessity to sell corn at prices advantageous to themselves. But Clement VII. persevered; the extortionate sale of corn came under the sharpest penalties, and to ensure free carriage to Rome Andrea Doria was appointed to guard the coasts.³

¹ See the reports in SANUTO, XLVI., 646, 649, 663. Cf. ALBERINI, 361; OMONT, 38 *seqq.*, and GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 289.

² Cf. the **letters of G. M. della Porta of February 20 and 27, 1528: "Intendendo N. S. che in Roma si continuava più che mai di far ogni sorte disordine, S. B. ha spedite a quella via compagnie de fanti et de cavalli: capo Hieronymo Matteo Romano" (State Archives, Florence). Cf. OMONT, 43.

³ Cf. the *letters of Jacopo Salviati to Campeggio, written from Orvieto, from the 1st to 24th March, especially those of March 1, 5, 6,

In the beginning of March a deputation came from Rome to Orvieto to invite the Pope to return to his capital, where the desecrated churches had already been purified.¹ Clement replied that no one longed more eagerly than he to return to Rome, but the scarcity and disorder then prevailing, as well as the uncertainty of the issue of the war in Naples, made any immediate change of residence impossible. Thereupon the Roman delegates begged that at least the officials of the Rota and Cancellaria might go back.² Clement, after long hesitation, gave way, on the advice of Cardinal Campeggio; but the officials in question delayed complying with the Papal orders³ on account of the famine in the city. But by the end of April the majority of the officials of the Curia had to return,⁴ though the situation in Rome continued to be critical,⁵ and Cardinal Campeggio's⁶ position was beset with difficulties.

8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 24; Litt. divers. ad Clement VII., Vol. III. See also the *letter of Campeggio to Clement VII., dat. Rome, 1528, March 21; Lett. d. princ., V., f. 148 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). For Campeggio as Legate in Rome see EHSES, Dokumente, XXVIII., *seq.*

¹ Cf. the *letter of T. Campeggio, dat. Orvieto, ult. febr. 1528 (State Archives, Bologna), and also for the expiatory procession then held. Cf. also the *Diary in Cod. Barb. lat. 3552, Vatican Library.

² Cf. the *letters of Jacopo Salviati to Campeggio, dat. Orvieto, 1528, March 5, 9, and 12, *loc. cit.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican). T. Campeggio reports on the "carestia" in Rome in a *letter, dat. Orvieto, 1528, March 5 (State Archives, Bologna).

³ Cf. the **report of G. M. della Porta of March 14, 1528 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE in the National Library, Paris.

⁵ The scarcity in particular was excessive. *Calamitas intolerabilis ita quod multi pauperum fame interirent, writes C. de Fine, *loc. cit.* See also T. Campeggio's *letter, dat. Orvieto, 1528, April 8 (State Archives, Bologna).

⁶ BONTEMPI, 337, calls him *vice-papa*.

The Pope's own position was so harassing that Jacopo Salviati wrote to Cardinal Campeggio, "Clement is in such dire necessity that, like David, he must, perforce, eat the loaves of proposition" (1 Kings xxi. 6).¹ In the beginning of March, Brandano, the prophet of misfortune of the year 1527, appeared in Orvieto. He foretold for Rome and Italy new and yet greater tribulations; these would continue until 1530, when the Turk would take captive the Pope, the Emperor, and the French King and embrace Christianity; whereupon the Church would enter on a new life.² The Papal censures, the hermit went on to say, were void, inasmuch as Clement, having been born out of wedlock, was not canonically Pope. When Brandano proceeded to incite the people of Orvieto against the Pope, the latter gave orders for his arrest.³ On Palm Sunday (April 5) Clement addressed the Cardinals and prelates then present in earnest language on the need for a reform of the Curia, exhorted them to a better manner of life, and spoke emphatically of the sack of Rome as a chastisement for their sins.⁴ On Holy Thursday the customary censures on the persecutors of the Church were published.⁵

Lautrec, in the meanwhile, had achieved successes beyond all expectation. The towns of the Abruzzi hailed him as

¹ *Letter, dat. Orvieto, 1528, March 14; Litt. div. ad Clem. VII., Vol. III. (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Above statements are taken from **reports of G. M. della Porta of March 9, 1528 (State Archives, Florence).

³ So reports TIZIO, printed in *Novelle Letterarie*, 1746, and PECCI, Brandano, 44.

⁴ Letter of A. Lippomano of April 6, 1528; see SANUTO, XLVII., 235.

⁵ SANUTO, XLVII., 269 *seq.* The Bull "In Coena" was at once printed in Rome; see OMONT, *Suites du Sac de Rome*, 60.

their deliverer; but after that his operations came to a standstill, for Francis I. sent no money for his troops; besides, this valiant soldier was deficient in promptness of decision. Consequently, the Imperialists found time to put Naples in a state of defence; they judged rightly that here the decisive issue must be fought out. Lautrec did not realize this, and wasted time in reducing the towns of Apulia, and not until the end of April did he approach Naples from the east. But the luck of the French did not yet desert them; dissensions, especially between Orange and Vasto, divided the Imperialist generals, the landsknechts were as insubordinate as ever, and hated the Spaniards.¹ On the 28th of April the Imperial fleet was totally destroyed by Filippino Doria off Capo d'Orso, between Amalfi and Salerno. Moncada and Fieramosca fell in the battle; Vasto and Ascanio Colonna were taken prisoners.² The fall of Naples, where great scarcity of food was already making itself felt, seemed to be only a question of time. The Emperor's enemies were already busy with the boldest schemes, and Wolsey, through the

¹ See SANUTO, XLVII., 241, 279, 350, 360.

² For the sea-fight off Capo d'Orso see the detailed account by P. GIOVIO (Lett. volg. di P. Giovio, Venetia, 1560, f. 4-8; also a more correct account in SANUTO, XLVI., 664 *seq.*); the accounts in SANUTO, XLVII., 381 *seq.*, 387 *seq.*, 389, 391, 411 *seq.*, 415, 467 *seq.*, and BALAN, Boschetti, II., App. 56 *seq.*; *Vita di D. Alfonso d'Avalos, Marchese del Vasto, in Cod. 34, E 23, f. 156 *seq.* of the Corsini Library, Rome; JOVIUS, Hist., XXV., 45 *seq.*; GUICCIARDINI, XIX., 5. See also BALAN, Clemente VII., 93; DE BLASIS, Maramaldo, II., 351; Arch. Napol., XII., 41 *seq.*; GAVOTTI, La tattica nelle gr. battaglie navali, I., Roma, 1898, 180 *seq.*; ORANO, I., 356 n.; Atti d. Soc. Lig., X. (1876), 659; Giorn. stor. d. Liguria, 1900, 457 *seq.*; ROBERT, 189 *seq.* F. Doria excused himself on July 17, 1528, for not having acquainted Clement VII. with his naval victory; *Lett. d. princ, V., f. 200 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

English envoys, called upon the Pope to depose the Emperor without delay.¹

Clement VII. watched with strained attention the result of the great contest, on which for him so much depended.² The Neapolitan war filled the unfortunate Romans with renewed alarm; they dreaded a repetition of the sack; the landsknechts had, in fact, threatened to return and burn the whole city to the ground.³ Clement sent Cardinal Cesi to support Campeggio, and later on some troops.⁴ The Pope's anxieties were increased by the stormy demands of the English envoys insisting on the dissolution of their King's marriage, and by the not less stormy entreaties of the League, especially of Lautrec, to declare immediate war on the Emperor.⁵ To crown all came the pressure of famine in Orvieto, which the Sienese would do nothing to relieve on account of their enmity towards the house of Medici.⁶ Since a return to the capital, so much desired by the Romans, was impossible,⁷ owing to the insecure state of the country, the Pope was counselled to change his residence to Perugia, Civita Castellana, or

¹ See in STRYPE, *Eccles. Memorials*, V., 427, some undated accounts belonging, according to RANKE (*Deutsch. Gesch.*, III., 26), to April 28, 1528.

² *Cf.* the *letters of Jacopo Salviati to Cardinal Campeggio, dat. Orvieto, 1528, March 9, 11, 15, and 16. *Litt. divers. ad Clement. VII.*, Vol. III. (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ For the plans for the defence of Rome see Casale's account in MOLINI, II., 20 *seqq.*

⁴ SANUTO, XLVII., 235, 336.

⁵ *Cf.* the refusal of Clement to Lautrec in the *Briefs, dat. Orvieto, 1528, March 31, April 7, and May 15. *Min. brev.*, 1528, vol. 21, n., 288, 310, 418 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁶ FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 35; BALAN, *Clemente VII.*, 94 *seq.*

⁷ SANUTO, XLVII, 359. *Cf.* BALAN, *Boschetti*, II., App. 56.

Viterbo;¹ it was decided to remove to the last-named place, the fortress having come into the Pope's possession at the end of April.²

On the 1st of June Clement reached Viterbo³ and was received by the pious and aged Cardinal Egidio Canisio; he first occupied the castle, and afterwards the palace of Cardinal Farnese. Here too, at first, suitable furniture was wanting,⁴ while, at the same time, there was great scarcity in the town;⁵ but a return to Rome seemed impossible until the Pope should be again master of Ostia and Civita Vecchia. In place of Campeggio, who was under orders to go to England, Cardinal Farnese was appointed, on the 8th of June, the Legate in Rome; three hundred men were to garrison the castle of St. Angelo,⁶ and Alfonso di Sangro, Bishop of Lecce, was sent to the Emperor to effect the release of the three Cardinals detained as hostages in Naples.⁷

On the 4th of June Gasparo Contarini, as Venetian envoy,

¹ With SANUTO, XLVII., 235, 260, 280, 351, 529, 537, *cf.* the *letter of G. M. della Porta, dat. Orvieto, 1528, May 19 (State Archives, Florence).

² SANUTO, XLVII., 242; BALAN, Clemente VII., 94; *letter of G. M. della Porta, dat. Orvieto, 1528, May 25 (Il papa è risoluto esser nanti pasqua in Viterbo), in the State Archives, Florence.

³ *Cf.* Blasius de Martinellis in GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 3rd ed., 584, and Storia del Duomo d' Orvieto, 77; see also *Despatch of Fr. Gonzaga, dat. Viterbo, 1528, June 2 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). BUSSI, 306, is wrong in dating the Pope's arrival in Viterbo, June 11.

⁴ *Cf.* the *report of G. M. della Porta, dat. Viterbo, 1528, July 7 (State Archives, Florence).

⁵ SANUTO, XLVII., 128; FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 35.

⁶ *Brief to Farnese of June 8, 1528; Min. brev., 1528, vol. 22, n. 471 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). *Cf.* Acta Consist. in EHSES, Dokumente, 205; SANUTO, XLVIII., 127.

⁷ Clement VII. to the Emperor, 1528, June 13; GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 452; HINOJOSA, 62.

and Giovanni Antonio Muscettola, commissioned by the Prince of Orange, made their appearance in Viterbo; the latter was instructed to try and induce Clement to return to Rome. The Pope, shrinking from thus placing himself in the hands of the Spaniards, laid the matter before the Cardinals, who were unanimous in declaring the return to Rome desirable but impossible of execution so long as the Spaniards were masters of Ostia and Civita Vecchia.¹ Just then a prospect of recovering these places was opened up; a French fleet appeared off Corneto, and Renzo da Ceri made an attempt, but an unsuccessful one, to take Civita Vecchia; the Pope, unmindful of his neutrality, gave material assistance towards this attempt.²

In the meantime Contarini had done all he could to persuade the Pope to surrender his claims on Ravenna and Cervia, but his endeavours were unsuccessful; Clement stood firm, and insisted that he was pledged by honour and duty to demand the restoration of those towns.³ The support lent by Venice to the Pope's enemy, Alfonso of Ferrara,⁴ and the provocation given to Clement himself by the excessive taxation of the clergy of the Republic and the usurpation of his jurisdiction, did not lessen the difficulties of Contarini's position. On the 16th of June the Pope complained to Contarini of such actions as constituting a breach of the treaty made with Julius II.; he had bestowed the bishopric of Treviso on Cardinal Pisani, but the Republic had not allowed the latter to take

¹ Report of Contarini of July 3, 1528, in DITTRICH, Regesten, 32. Cf. SANUTO, XLVIII., 187, 231. The famine prevailing in Rome was also a weighty consideration. Cf. the *letter of T. Campeggio to Bologna, dat. Viterbo, 1528, July 10, in the State Archives, Bologna.

² SANUTO, XLVIII., 276, 320, 323.

³ DITTRICH, Contarini, 128 *seqq.*

⁴ Cf. BALAN, Clemente VII., 93, and Boschetti, II., 49 *seqq.*

possession of his see. His disposal of patronage was entirely disregarded in Venice, and it seemed as if the Venetians wished to show him how little he was considered by them. "You treat me," he said, "with great familiarity; you seize my possessions, you dispose of my benefices, you lay taxes upon me." The Pope's irritation was so great that, a few days later, in the course of another interview with Contarini, he said to himself in a low voice, but so that the Ambassador could understand him plainly, that, strictly speaking, the Venetians had incurred excommunication.¹

All doubt as to Clement's determination to recover the captured towns vanished in the course of Contarini's communications with Sanga, Salviati, and other influential personages of the Papal court. The Master of the household, Girolamo da Schio, informed the Venetian Ambassador that he had spoken in vain to the Pope of some compensation in the way of a money payment; Clement had rejected the suggestion at once with the greatest firmness and, moreover, had complained not only of the conduct of Venice but also of France.²

Clement VII. had good grounds for displeasure with Francis I., who had supported Alfonso of Ferrara³ and at last taken overt measures against the Pope. Seized with alarm lest the new Nuncio, Pucci, should prepare the way for an understanding between Pope and Emperor, Francis I. determined to detain the Papal envoy by force.

¹ Cf. Contarini's letter in DE LEVA, II., 503, n. 3, and DITTRICH, Regesten, 33. Clement's violent language about Venice is also confirmed by a *report of Salimbeni, dat. Viterbo, 1528, June 29 (State Archives, Siena); according to the latter (cf. FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 35) the Pope exclaimed: "Costoro vogliono ch'io faccia l'Imperatore Signore d'Italia e io lo farò." For the encroachments of Venice on ecclesiastical territory cf. also SANUTO, XLVII., 200.

² DITTRICH, Regesten, 32.

³ Cf. BALAN, Clemente VII., 94.

To this, however, his English ally would not agree; Henry VIII., who had more need than ever of the Pope's favour in the matter of his divorce, was doing all in his power to arrive at some accommodation with Clement in his demands on Venice.¹ The French Chancellor, on the other hand, told Pucci that Francis I. could not permit him to make his journey to Spain, since he was certain that he would otherwise lose the support of Venice, Ferrara, and Florence; rather than give up such indispensable allies, France would sooner dispense with the aid of the Pope and England.² The arrogance of the French increased with the news of Lautrec's successes.

At the end of April the French Chancellor gave the Nuncio, Pucci, to understand that the king insisted on an immediate declaration from the Pope. Salviati replied that his master would make his intentions known if Ravenna and Cervia were surrendered at once, and Modena and Reggio after the war.³ In consequence of the firm behaviour of the Papal representative the French court at last became aware that something must be done, at least in the case of Cervia and Ravenna. Strong representations were made to the Venetians;⁴ but at the same moment a grievous wound was inflicted upon Clement by the formation of an alliance of the closest kind with the Pope's bitterest enemy, Ferrara: Renée, the daughter of

¹ See the *letter of Cardinal Salviati to Jacopo Salviati of March 1, 1528. *Nunziatura di Francia I.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. *EHSES, Dokumente, 255 seq.*

² Cf. the letter of Cardinal Salviati to Jacopo Salviati of April 4, 1528, in *EHSES, Dokumente, 257.*

³ *Letter of Cardinal Salviati to Jacopo Salviati of May 5, 1528. *Nunziatura di Francia I., f. 201 seqq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ Cf. the *letter of Cardinal Salviati to Jacopo Salviati of May 25, 1528. *Ibid., I., f. 223 seqq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

Louis XII., was betrothed to Ercole, the hereditary Prince of Ferrara.¹

The French proposals to the Venetian Government² proved futile. Contarini had, as hitherto, to try and justify the robbery. The Pope, however, prone as he was in other respects to give way, showed in this instance inflexible determination. He repeated his declaration that an agreement with the League was impossible while Venice and Ferrara withheld from him his legitimate possessions. Contarini thought he saw signs of a leaning towards the Emperor on the part of Clement, although the latter feared the power of Charles and placed little trust in him.³

A step, however, in this direction was taken after the opening of hostilities on the scene of war in Naples. The victory of the 28th of April had destroyed the Imperialist fleet, and since the 10th of June Naples had been completely cut off at sea by Venetian galleys; the necessaries of life were hardly procurable in the great city.⁴ With the rising heat of summer came a new enemy with whom not only the besieged but also the besiegers had to engage. Typhus and a bad form of intermittent fever broke out and spread daily.⁵

¹ See SANUTO, XLVIII., 219, 260 *seqq.*; DECRUE, Montmorency, 128 *seq.*; *Histor. Zeitschrift.*, XXV., 132 *seq.*; FONTANA, Renata, I., 45 *seq.*, 50 *seqq.* Cf. *Lett. d. princ.*, III., 22.

² Cf. for this the *report of the French Ambassador in Venice, J. de Langeac, to Clement VII., dat. Venice, 1528, June 25. **Lett. d. princ.*, V., f. 186 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ DITTRICH, Contarini, 136-137. For the Pope's behaviour with regard to the acceptance of the "chinea" see Contarini's report in SANUTO, XLVIII., 402, *cf.* also 382; FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 39-41, and *Lett. d. princ.*, III., 29^b *seqq.*, 32.

⁴ SANUTO, XLVIII., 161, 174.

⁵ See SANUTO, XLVIII., 282, 301, 302, 365. Cf. Morone's report in DANDOLO, Ricordi, 270; ALBERINI, 363; SANTORO, 95 *seq.*, and the *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE (National Library, Paris). For the nature of the plague see HAESER, III., 358.

In July, when the disease was at its worst, an event occurred bringing with it far-reaching results; this was the rupture between Francis I. and his Admiral, Andrea Doria. Charles consented to all Doria's demands; the Genoese squadron set sail,¹ and Naples, which the French had looked upon as certain to fall into their hands by the end of July,² was thus set free by sea. Later, Genoa also,³ so important on account of its situation, was lost to France.

Lautrec had made the greatest exertions to bring about the fall of Naples. By the 5th of July it was believed, in the French camp, that further resistance was impossible.⁴ But the Imperialists held out and defended themselves so skilfully that Philibert of Chalon, Prince of Orange, who had succeeded on Moncada's death to his command, was able to report to his master: "The French in their entrenchments are more closely besieged than we in the city."⁵ The Imperialists' best ally, however, was the sickness which made great strides in the marshy encampment of the French. "God," said a German, "sent such a pestilence

¹ See SISMONDI, XV., 389 *seq.*; DE LEVA, II., 475-481; DECRUE, 112 *seqq.*; FONTANA, Renata, I., 61 *seq.*; PETIT, 75 *seq.*; ROBERT, 214 *seq.*; RANKE (Deutsche Gesch., III., 6th ed., 19, note 2), without particularizing more precisely, commented on the accounts in a "manuscript biography of Guasto in the Chigi Library." There is certainly some mistake here, as the passages mentioned by Ranke are in the *Vita di Don Alfonso d'Avalos, Marchese del Vasto, in Cod. 34, E 23 (Corsini Library, Rome).

² "Costoro sono in certissima speranza che Napoli a questa hora sia del Christianissimo, et Madama ha usato di dir haverne tal sicurtà che non ne dubita punto et gia ragionono chi debba essere vicere." *Cardinal Salviati to Jacopo Salviati, 1528, July 26. Nunziatura di Francia I., f. 255 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ On September 12, 1528. DE LEVA, II., 486 *seq.*; BALAN, Clemente VII., 108 *seqq.*

⁴ Florentine account in SANUTO, XLVIII., 223.

⁵ REUMONT, Vittoria Colonna, 92.

among the French hosts that within thirty days they well-nigh all died, and out of 25,000 not more than 4000 remained alive."¹

Vaudemont, Pedro Navarro, Camillo Trivulzio, and Lautrec fell ill, and on the night following the Feast of the Assumption Lautrec died.² As Vaudemont also was carried off by the disorder, the Marquis of Saluzzo assumed the chief command. He soon perceived that the raising of the siege had become inevitable, and on the night of the 29th of August, amid storms of rain, began his retreat. The Imperial cavalry at once rode out in pursuit; Orange, with his infantry, turned back to meet them; but the sickly French soldiers could not face the onslaught; quarter or no quarter, they were forced to yield; they were stripped and disarmed and then left to the mercy of God and to the peasantry, "who put nearly all of them to death."³ The wretched scattered remnant of the great French army wandered about in beggary; a few bands made their escape as far as Rome, where they

¹ See RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 20. According to Morone (in DANDOLO, *Ricordi*, 269) more than half the army died. CORNELIUS DE FINE reckons the number of dead at about 14,000. *Diary in National Library, Paris.

² SANUTO, XLVIII., 403, 409; Lautrec's body (see portrait in YRIARTE, *Rimini*, 365) was buried in camp (see DE BLASIS, *Maramaldo*, II., 369) and later brought to Naples by a Spaniard and laid in the church of S. Chiara; see SANTORO, 115. Ferrante of Cordova, Duke of Sessa, "humanarum miseriarum memor," ordered a monument to be raised to the French general in S. Maria la Nuova. In Rome the Senate commanded funeral solemnities for Lautrec, and for long afterwards masses were said for one who was looked upon as the "liberatore di questa alma città." TORRIGIO, *Grotte*, 263; ORANO, I., 359, note; ROBERT, 222.

³ REISSNER, 162. Cf. SCHERTLINS, *Biography*, 25-26; SANUTO, XLVIII., 484; SEPULVEDA, I., viii., c. 43; BALAN, *Clemente VII.*,

were compassionately succoured,¹ but forced to depart by the landsknechts. A German resident in Rome relates how he had supplied the sick and naked with food and clothing, and how in the streets and environs the corpses of those who had perished miserably lay exposed.²

"Victoria, victoria, victoria," wrote Morone on the 29th of August 1528 to the Imperial envoy in Rome. "The French are destroyed, the remainder of their army is flying towards Aversa."³ Cardinal Colonna and Orange at once informed Clement of the victory, and at the same time sent more special messages. Orange added that he had tried persistently to describe as faithfully as possible the position of affairs, and had always foretold the issue as it had come to pass; he besought the Pope to attach himself as much as possible to Charles V.⁴ The complete triumph of the Emperor was, in fact, no longer in question. Although the campaign still lingered on in Apulia and Lombardy, yet, such was the weakness of the French and the lukewarmness of the Venetians, that the end could be foreseen with certainty.

Clement thanked God that he had not accepted the baits of the League. "If he had acted otherwise," wrote Sanga, "in what an abyss of calamity should we now be."⁵ In the beginning of September Clement VII. and Sanga determined, in spite of Contarini's warnings, to make serious approaches to the victorious Emperor. "The

¹ ALBERINI, 363 *seq.*

² *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE (National Library, Paris).

³ MOLINI, II., 81, and SANUTO, XLVIII., 458 *seqq.*; *cf.* Riv. stor., XII., 419.

⁴ Both *letters, that of Colonna, dat. Gaeta, 1528, August 30, and that of Orange, dat. Naples, August 31, I found in Lett. d. princ., V., f. 232 and 233 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ Letter to Campeggio (undated) in Lett. d. princ., III., 41^b.

Pope," as Contarini expressed it on the 8th of September 1528, "is accommodating himself to the circumstances of the hour."¹ His own position, as well as that of Italy, left him, in fact, no other choice.² In letters and messages Orange expressed his loyalty to the Pope; he assured Clement, in a letter of the 18th of September, that he might look upon the Imperial forces as his own and return without anxiety to Rome: "in case of necessity we are ready to sacrifice our lives in defence of your Holiness."³

¹ DITTRICH, Regesten, 34; *cf.* Lett. d. princ., III., 40^b.

² REUMONT'S opinion, Toscana, I., 23. *Cf.* FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 40.

³ *Cf.* the important and hitherto unknown *correspondence in *Lett. d. princ., V., f. 248: Orange to Clement VII., dat. Naples, 1528, September 12: Announcement of the mission of Count Guido Rangoni. f. 254: *Cardinal Colonna to Clement VII., dat. Naples, 1528, September 13: After the hard-won victory he had gone at the request of Orange to Naples, "et trovando che per anchora non era expedito alla S. V., si come il debito ricercava, ho procurato che si mandi il sig. conte Guido Rangone." f. 255: *Ascanio Colonna to Clement VII., dat. 1528, September 17: Assurances of loyalty; he is rejoiced to hear of the Pope's return with the court to Rome. f. 256: *Orange to Clement VII., dat. Torre del Greco, 1528, September 18: The Abbate di Negri, sent by Andrea Doria, had recently come with a report corresponding to the personal information given by the Nuncio Girol. Rorario. As Negri was about to return to the Pope he would not write a long letter. Negri is to be relied on. "Non perho tacerò che V. S. po interiamente fidarsi de li exerciti o ministri de la Ces. M^{ta} non altramente che de li soi proprii et io o con to exercito o con mia persona sempre la servirò et farò soi mandati non altramente che si fosse la M^{ta} Ces. Et cerco al venir de V. S. in Roma la supplico che venghi senza suspecto alcuno et stia in sua sede come li conviene che noi bisognando moririamo tutti per mantenercela et N. S. Dio la rev^{ma} sua persona et soi statⁱ guardi et augmenti come per epsa se desidera." f. 261: *Cardinal Colonna to Clement VII., dat. Naples, 1528, September 18: Thanks for the two briefs; assurances of loyalty. f. 263: *Orange to Clement VII., dat. Torre del Greco, 1528, September 29: He had heard of the Pope's great displeasure at the

Charles also tried to gratify the Pope in circumstances of a different sort, for he gave a promise, through Orange, to restore the Medicean rule in Florence.¹ But from Venice came the tidings, through the French envoy, that all his efforts to induce the Signoria to give back Ravenna and Cervia were unavailing. So great was the acquisitiveness and lust of possession of the Venetians that, instead of giving back the Pope his own, they were more likely to make further aggressions.²

In September Clement made up his mind to return to Rome, in accordance with the Emperor's strong desire, although Civita Vecchia and Ostia were still occupied by the Spaniards. Contarini vainly tried to dissuade him. Orange had given his solemn oath to protect the Pope, if the latter would only go back to Rome and save the Emperor, who was actually and in intent a faithful son of the Church, from the contumely which would certainly accrue to him if Clement VII. refused, from distrust, to return to his See.³ Already, on the 17th of September

expedition of Sciarra Colonna to take Paliano and against other places held in sequestration by the Pope. He was himself much displeased, as he wished in everything to be in accordance with the Pope; he had therefore addressed to Ascanio as well as Sciarra Colonna the most urgent injunctions to respect all property subject to the Papal claims until the final decision should be pronounced. He hoped that the matter would thus be settled; in any case he would deal with the circumstances in such a way as to relieve the Pope of all anxiety (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ Siense report of September 22, 1528, in FOSSATI-FALLETTI, 41, note 2. Cf. SANUTO, XLVIII., 485, 490 *seqq.*

² *Letter of J. de Langeac to Clement VII., dat. Venice, 1528, August 29. *Lett. d. princ., V., f. 231 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ DITTRICH, Contarini, 139. "The departure for Rome was certain, the day not fixed," reports *T. Campeggio on October 2, 1528, to Bologna (State Archives, Bologna).

1528, the Pope had sent Cardinals Sanseverino and Valle to Rome.¹ His own return was delayed owing to a violent feud between the Colonna and Orsini, whereby the neighbourhood of Rome was laid waste.²

At the last hour France made an attempt to thwart this beginning of an understanding between the Pope and the Emperor. On the 1st of October a messenger from Carpi approached the Pope. He brought a promise of the immediate restoration of Ravenna and Cervia as soon as Clement gave his adhesion to the League; while Modena and Reggio would be given back simultaneously with his acting in the interests of France. The Pope sent a refusal.³ On the 5th of October he left Viterbo with his whole court, under the protection of about a thousand soldiers, and on the following evening, amid torrents of rain, re-entered his capital. He forbade any public reception on account of the distressing state of the times; he first paid a visit to St. Peter's, to make an act of thanksgiving, and then repaired to the Vatican.⁴

The city presented a truly horrifying picture of misery and woe. Quite four-fifths of the houses, according to the computation of the Mantuan envoy, were tenantless; ruins were seen on every side—a shocking sight for anyone who had seen the Rome of previous days. The inhabitants themselves declared that they were ruined for two genera-

¹ SANUTO, XLVIII., 542; XLIX., 18. Cf. also 19 and 21 for the probable departure of the Pope.

² ALBERINI, 366 *seqq.*; cf. BALAN, Clemente VII., 97 *seq.*, 113.

³ GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 589.

⁴ See SANUTO, XLIX., 49; Contarini's report in DITTRICH, Regesten, 36; GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 576; the **letters of F. Gonzaga of October 7, 1528 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and *Diary of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS in Cod. Barb. lat. 2799, Vatican Library.

tions to come.¹ The same authority, quoted above, emphasizes the fact that of all his many acquaintances, inmates of or sojourners in Rome, hardly anyone was left alive. "I am bereft of my senses," he says, "in presence of the ruins and their solitude."² The churches were one and all in a terrible condition, the altars were despoiled of their ornaments, and most of the pictures were destroyed. In the German and Spanish national churches only was the Holy Sacrifice offered during the occupation of the city.³

A Papal Encyclical of the 14th of October 1528 summoned all Cardinals to return to Rome.⁴ Clement wrote in person to Charles, on the 24th of October, that, relying on the promises of Orange and the other representatives of his Majesty, to whom this intelligence will be certainly acceptable, he had returned to Rome, "the one seat" of the Papacy. "We too," he added, "must rejoice on coming

¹ F. Gonzaga thus reports in his letter of October 7, 1528, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; cf. LANCELLOTTI, III., 410, 449, and Lett. d. princ., III., 46, 56^b. The Ricordi di Bontempi, 238, puts the number of houses destroyed by the Imperialists at 13,600. GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 3rd ed., 590, thinks this an exaggeration.

² See in Appendix, No. 5, *F. Gonzaga on October 12, 1528 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). "Io no saprei con qual formula di discorso narrare le miserie di Roma dopo il sacco e quali fossero le lacrime de' cittadini, quali i sospiri profondi che durarono nel petto de' mortali, poichè tutti universalmente si lagnavano, chi piangeva la madre, chi il fratello e chi il padre e chi gli altre suoi più prossimi consanguinei," so runs the *Relazione delle miserie dopo il sacco in Cod. R., 6, 17 (Angelica Library, Rome).

³ See the *Relazione quoted in note above: "Erant enim Romae omnes ecclesiae derelictae atque omnia sacra profanata, et in tota urbe non celebrabantur missae nisi in hospitali Teutonicorum et Hispanorum." *Diary of CORNELIVS DE FINE in the National Library, Paris.

⁴ Min. brev., 1528, II., vol. 19, n. 898 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

safe to shore, after so great a shipwreck, even if we have lost all things; but our grief for the ruin of Italy, manifest to every eye, still more for the misery of this city and our own misfortune, is immeasurably heightened by the sight of Rome. We are sustained only by the hope that, through your assistance, we may be able to stanch the many wounds of Italy, and that our presence here and that of the Sacred College may avail towards a gradual restoration of the city. For, my beloved son, before our distracted gaze lies a pitiable and mangled corpse, and nothing can mitigate our sorrows, nothing can build anew the city and the Church, save the prospect of that peace and undisturbed repose which depends on your moderation and equity of mind.”¹

¹ RAYNALDUS, 1528, n. 15. Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 232, who remarks that the Pope's words were so many reproaches to those who were the chief culprits. The letter to Castiglione sent together with this Brief is undated in Lett. d. princ., III., 56 *seqq.*

CHAPTER II.

RECONCILIATION OF THE EMPEROR AND THE POPE.—THE TREATIES OF BARCELONA AND CAMBRAI.

ON the day after his return to Rome, Clement assembled the Cardinals and conservators in order to confer with them on the restoration of the city.¹ The Pope's first care was to provide for the most pressing necessity, the import of articles of food, of which there was the greatest scarcity. Steps were also taken to set in order the despoiled churches, and to repair the destruction wrought on buildings. The business of the Curia now resumed its regular course; persons belonging to the court tried to install themselves as best they could.² Life in the city showed signs of a complete change; the luxury and frivolity of previous days had vanished, for the general poverty stamped an

¹ See the **letter of F. Gonzaga of October 7, 1528 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² Cf. SANUTO, XLIX., 96, 134, 155; report of Contarini of December 19, 1528, in BROSCHE, I., 118; letter of Salviati in SERASSI, II., 157 *seq.*; LANCELLOTTI, III., 449; *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE in the National Library, Paris. A terrible picture of the *gran carestia* which continued in Rome is given by G. M. della Porta in a *letter to the Duchess of Urbino, dat. Rome, 1529, January 9: "Ogni giorno si veggono gli morti per le strate—non si sente per la città altra voce che questa de poveri gridando; aiutatemi ch' io moro della fame" (State Archives, Florence). The Pope's endeavours to give succour are *reported by F. Gonzaga on January 7, 1529 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. also Studi e doc., III., 89 *seq.*

impress of seriousness and gloom on everything.¹ Instead of the throng of showy equipages, religious processions made their way through the deserted streets.² The unlucky inhabitants were in want not only of nourishment but of clothing; traders from Venice and other places came in numbers, but hardly anyone had money to make purchases.³ Strangers were especially struck by the wretched plight of most of the Cardinals.⁴ Ecclesiastical ceremonies, even those in which the Pope took a part, were shorn of their splendour owing to the lack of ornaments and vestments.⁵ Yet, notwithstanding the general misery, the Pope was glad to be back in Rome, his own See.⁶

While in Viterbo, Clement had published the nomination of Quiñones, the General of the Franciscans, then at the Emperor's court, to the Cardinalate.⁷ He awaited his

¹ *Relazione delle miserie dopo il sacco in Cod. R, 6, 17 (Angelica Library, Rome).

² Thus on November 25, 1528, in order to solemnize the restoration of the plundered relics; see BLASIVS DE MARTINELLIS, *Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Relazione, etc., *loc. cit.*

⁴ See LANCELOTTI, III., 449.

⁵ *24 Decemb. 1528 fuerunt vesperae papales in capella magna, quia ob defectum mitrarum et paramentorum papa in consistorio sic ordinaverat. On December 25 also the service was held in the *capella magna*. BLASIVS DE MARTINELLIS, *Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁶ Report of F. Gonzaga of October 20, 1528, in SANUTO, XLIX., 134.

⁷ PANVINIUS, 367, gives no day, and makes it appear that Quiñones had already been nominated together with the Cardinals mentioned above (see Vol. IX. of this work, p. 465). This is a mistake. According to CIACONIUS, III., 495 *seq.*, and CATALANUS, 303, Quiñones' nomination took place on December 7, 1527, but the publication, as SANUTO, XLIX., 20, proves with certainty, was deferred until September 25, 1528. This is in agreement with the *letter of T. Campeggio, dat. Viterbo, September 28, 1528 (State Archives Bologna).

return, with more precise information as to the Emperor's intentions, with anxious impatience.¹ In the meanwhile the agents of the League, led by Contarini, were active in trying to hinder the advances of the Pope to the Emperor, and a new French envoy was also busy in the same direction as Contarini.² These attempts were not, at the time, altogether without hope of success, for Charles V., with icy reserve, let the Pope feel that he was dependent on his favour.³ The Emperor's servants in Italy did not fail their master in keeping up this impression.⁴ The return of Quiñones was delayed in such a remarkable manner that the Pope was nearly worn out with impatience.⁵ Expressions made use of by Clement VII. and by his advisers as well, in November and the first half of December, show how heavily the Emperor's preponderance weighed upon him, and how gladly he would have seen a weakening of the Imperial power, whether from the side of Bavaria or from that of the Voivode of Siebenbürgen.⁶

¹ Cf. *Lett. d. princ., III., 56^b *seq.*, 61 *seqq.*, 63 *seqq.*, 67 *seqq.*; RAYNALDUS, 1528, n. 15; SANUTO, XLIX, 95, 133, 155 *seq.* Cf. the *reports of T. Campeggio, dat. Viterbo, October 2, and Rome, November 5, 1528 (State Archives, Bologna).

² See DITTRICH, Contarini, 138 *seq.*

³ Gregorovius' opinion, VIII., 3d ed., 605.

⁴ This was seen most clearly in the negotiations for the surrender of Ostia and Civita Vecchia. Charles had already, on September 16, 1528, given orders that Civita Vecchia should be restored to the Pope; see VILLA, Italia, 249-250.

⁵ Cf. SANUTO, XLIX., 158, 186, 218, 279, 280.

⁶ Cf. along with the report of Giov. Joachim [Passano] of November 7, 1528, in MOLINI, II., 122, those of *Rince, December 14, 1528, and of Bellay, January 1, 1529 (National Library, Paris), made use of by RANKE, Deutsche Gesch., III., 6th ed., 21 *seq.* The titles of the MSS. in question, missing in Ranke, are in DE LEVA, II., 494, where it is to be remarked that MS. Beth. 8534 now bears the sign. franc. 3009.

The Pope had begun to despair of Quiñones' return when, on the 17th of December 1528, came the intelligence that the latter had landed at Genoa in the company of Miguel Mai.¹ This was welcome news, for now there seemed a certainty of ascertaining the Emperor's position. On the 30th of December Quiñones reached Rome, and was immediately provided with a lodging close to the Papal apartments.² The hopes that the Emperor's attitude would now be clearly explained proved illusory, for Quiñones brought with him only civil speeches; all matters of detail were to be discussed with the Viceroy of Naples.³

Contarini considered this a favourable moment for expending all his gifts of eloquence on the Pope in order to persuade him to renounce his claims on Cervia and Ravenna, and to win him over to the League. He thought it necessary to show all the more energy in the matter as a report was current that the Pope had a mind to lay Venice under an interdict. On the 4th of January 1529 he entered the Papal presence; he announced that he had come not as the envoy of Venice, but as an Italian,

¹ Report to the Marquis of Mantua of December 17, 1528, in SANUTO, XLIX., 281, *cf.* 331, and Lett. d. princ., I., 118. In the *letters of credence of Charles V. for M. Mai, dat. July 17, 1528, the Emperor wrote to the Pope: "Si praesentes S. V. praesentem alloqueremur, non facilius animum nostrum ea perspiceret quam ex magnifico equite Michaelae Mayo, consiliario et oratore nostro, quem ad S. V. mittimus." Lett. d. princ., V., f. 202 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² SANUTO, XLIX., 348 *seqq.* For the causes which delayed the arrival of Quiñones see R. ANCEL, D'un recueil de docum. appart. à l'héritage du Card. A. Trivulzio, Bruges, 1906-7.

³ BROWN, IV., 186. Contarini's relation in ALBÈRI, 2 Series, III., 262. It is interesting and explanatory of Charles's conduct as described above that, as Mai told Andrea da Burgo, he should have lost confidence in Quiñones since the latter became a Cardinal; see the *report of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, March 2, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

as a private personage and as a Christian, in order to submit to his Holiness his opinion on the state of affairs. The Pope having invited him to speak freely, Contarini set forth, in impressive language, that the whole question resolved itself into one point, namely, that at that given moment the Head of the Church should not, like the rulers of secular states, pursue particular interests only, but fix his eyes on the general welfare of Christendom, and thereby divert the other princes of Europe also from their purely selfish systems of policy. Proceeding further, Contarini suggested to the Pope nothing less than the renunciation of a portion, nay, even of the entirety, of the Papal States. "Let not your Holiness suppose," he said, "that the welfare of the Church of Christ stands or falls with these morsels of worldly dominion. Before their acquisition the Church existed, and, indeed, existed at her best. She is the common possession of all Christians; the Papal States are like any other states of an Italian prince, therefore your Holiness must set in the forefront of your responsibilities the welfare of the true Church, which consists in the peace of Christendom, and allow the interests of the temporal states to fall for a time into the background." The Pope made answer: "I well perceive that you are speaking the truth and that I, as one faithful to his trust, ought to act as you exhort me; but then, those on the other side ought to act in like manner. Nowadays it has come to pass that the craftiest man is held to be the most capable, and wins most applause in this world; of anyone who acts otherwise, all that is said is that he is a good-natured but impracticable fellow, and, with that, they leave him to himself." Contarini rejoined: "If your Holiness were to explore all the contents of Holy Scripture, which cannot err, you would find that nothing is prized therein more highly than truth, virtue, goodness, and a noble purpose. On

many private occasions I have tested this standard and found it true. Let your Holiness take courage and go on your way with a good intention, and God, without doubt, will support you and give you glory, and you will find the right path without toil and without intrigue."

In his reply the Pope kept to his former standpoint. He referred to the danger of an alliance of the Emperor with Florence, Ferrara, and Venice. "You," he added, "would be allowed to keep all that you have got, while I, as the good-natured man, who has been robbed of all his belongings, would be left where I am without a chance of recovering one single thing." To Contarini's assurance that Venice would not conclude a separate treaty with Charles apart from the other members of the League, the Pope replied with the remark, "With you everything depends on a single ballot." All further representations of the Ambassador were in vain, although his words had not been without a certain effect. "I admit," said Clement, "that the course you recommend would be the right one; otherwise Italy falls entirely into the power of the Emperor, and you will try to get some advantage from the Turkish danger. But I tell you, we have no common ground to meet on, and the good-natured man is treated as a simpleton."¹

Contarini's advice certainly sounds like that of an idealist; but a dispassionate critic will admit that the Venetian was confusing the interests of his native city and the still unrecovered independence of Italy with the welfare of Christendom.² The Medici Pope did not try to conceal that he was a practical politician to the core; if,

¹ Contarini's account of his famous audience, dated January 4, 1529, was first given in a summary by DE LEVA, II., 503-505; then more fully by DITTRICH, Regesten, 41-46.

² BAUMGARTEN is of the same opinion, Karl V., II., 676.

in an age when hardly anything was respected except material power, when political considerations controlled every question, even the purely ecclesiastical, he refused to renounce his secular sovereignty, he certainly was acting intelligibly from a merely human standpoint;¹ but higher and more Christian conceptions were demanded in one holding the office of the Vicar of Christ. The pursuit of temporal power was to a certain extent fully justified, but ought always to have been subordinated to the supreme interest, that of devotion to the supernatural claims of the Church. That Clement only too often forgot this, throws a heavy shadow over his pontificate.

In January 1529 Quiñones went to Naples in order to negotiate on the spot for the surrender of Ostia and Civita Vecchia, the liberation of the hostages, and an understanding between the Emperor and the Pope. Clement also appointed Schönberg as his colleague,² and sent a token of high distinction to the Viceroy.³ At this time Miguel Mai arrived in Rome to represent the Emperor, "a bold, unscrupulous character, wholly devoted to his master's interests."⁴ Mai announced that he had full powers to give

¹ Cf. DITTRICH, Contarini, 152. "If the Venetians treat me already in this way, now that they have need of me," said Clement, "what will they do later on!" Contarini's report of November 14, 1528, in DITTRICH, Regesten, 38.

² Contarini's relation in ALBÈRI, 2 Series, III., 262. Cf. SANUTO, XLIX., 350, 384, and Salviati's letter of January 3, 1529, in the Lett. d. princ., I., 120^b.

³ A consecrated hat and sword (*Brief of January 8, 1529, Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 7, Secret Archives of the Vatican) which, owing to the Pope's illness, were not presented until April 28, 1529; see DE BLASIS, Maramaldo, III., 335, n.

⁴ BAUMGARTEN, II., 685. For Mai's arrival see SANUTO, XLIX., 415, and SERASSI, II., 165; for his personal relations, GAYANGOS, IV., 1, *Intro.*, x.

back Ostia and Civita Vecchia; the restitution would take place as soon as he had spoken with the Pope.¹ This was impossible, for, just at this juncture, Clement was taken with a serious illness, the consequence, very probably, of the agitation and suffering of the previous year.

In spite of a cold, contracted on the Feast of the Epiphany, in the Sistine Chapel, Clement VII. had held a Consistory on the 8th of January;² thereupon he fell ill; on the evening of the 9th he was in a state of high fever, and the following morning his life was despaired of.³ Although an improvement set in, the case seemed to give so clear a warning of his approaching end that on the night of the 10th of January the Pope summoned the Cardinals to him and with their approval bestowed the purple on Ippolito de' Medici.⁴ Somewhat earlier the same honour had been intended for Girolamo Doria, nephew of Andrea Doria, who had promised to relieve the scarcity of food in Rome. After some hesitation, all the Cardinals

¹ SERASSI, II., 165.

² See F. Gonzaga's *letter, January 7, 1529, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and Contarini's report in DITTRICH, Regesten, 46.

³ *Diarium of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS in Secret Archives of the Vatican and Cod. Barb. lat. 2799, Vatican Library.

⁴ *Die dominica X. ianuarii 1529 prima hora noctis cum Sanctitas Sua egrotaret fuit congregatio in qua fuit receptus r^{mos} sancte Crucis ad osculum ab omnibus dominis. Deinde clausum est [os] et statim appertum preter consuetudinem propter Sanctitatis Sue egritudinem. Deinde fuit assumptus ad cardinalatum dominus Hipolitus Medicis Sanctitatis Sue nepos ex statim publicatus cui fuit data in administrationem ecclesia Avinionensis cum retentione tituli sancte Praxedis. *Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor (Consistorial Archives). The Bull by which Ippolito was made Cardinal (*Regest., 1438, f. 9 *seq.*) was published on January 22, 1529; see *Varia polit.*, 47, f. 109 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. the **report of F. Gonzaga of January 10, 1529 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and SERASSI, II., 164.

assented to this nomination also.¹ On this occasion Clement declared to the Sacred College that if God restored him to health it was his intention to journey into Spain in order to restore peace to Christendom.² During the next few days the condition of the sick Pontiff continued to be very critical,³ and on the evening of the 15th of January Clement was so weak that it was not believed he could live through the night.⁴

The sudden assembling of the Cardinals at the Vatican had already thrown the Romans into dismay, and the excitement was increased by the spread of more and more alarming accounts of the Pope's illness. Not a few believed that he was already dead;⁵ the citizens began to arm. The Cardinals met together in the Palazzo Monte for consultation, as the doctors had for the moment given Clement

¹ SANUTO, XLIX., 368-369, 384, 386, and DITTRICH, Regesten, 46. From Blasius de Martinellis in CIACONIUS, III., 501, it appears that Doria was nominated before Medici; the consent of the Cardinals to this came later, according to SANUTO, XLIX., 386, but before January 15, 1529.

² So Quiñones reported to the Emperor on February 15, 1529. GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 625.

³ Cf. BOURRILLY DE VAISSIÈRE, Amb. de J. du Bellay, 548, n. 2.

⁴ See Sanga's letter in SERASSI, II., 162.

⁵ DITTRICH, Regesten, 46; cf. LUZIO, Aretino a Venezia, 31, and Röm. Quartalschrift, XIV., 257, 263 *seq.* As no one was admitted to the sick man's chamber, many contradictory reports arose. In the *despatches of F. Gonzaga the following bulletins were given:—Rome, 1529, January 12: The Pope is feeling better. January 13: In the *notte passata* the Pope had a *parossismo*. January 15: The Pope shows a marked improvement. January 16: The Pope is ill. January 17: Since yesterday the Pope's condition has greatly improved; he has risen from the dead. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.) For the physicians of Clement VII. and Berni's verses upon them, see GIORDANO, App. 65, and MARINI, I. *seqq.* According to ALBERINI, 368, Mariano de Doxis della Palma cured the Pope in this illness.

up. Since Ostia and Civita Vecchia were still in the Imperialists' hands, and the unruly host under Orange was still encamped at Naples, the freedom of a Papal election seemed in serious danger. The majority of the Cardinals were therefore of opinion that the conclave ought not to be held in Rome. Even Quiñones, with his Imperialist sympathies, took this standpoint, and feared a schism, the responsibility for which would be thrown on the Emperor. Miguel Mai declared later that Wolsey had roused the anxiety of the Cardinals as to the freedom of the conclave in order to induce them to transfer it to Avignon, where this ambitious churchman considered his election would be sure.¹

However that may be, it is a fact that the Cardinals took into consideration the issue of a Bull in which the seat of the conclave should be assigned to Bologna, Verona, Civita Castellana, or Avignon. Cardinals Enkevoirt and Quiñones approached Mai secretly, and told him that if the fortified places were not given up immediately there would be an uproar in Rome. Almost all the Sacred College threatened him with dismissal in the event of the Pope's death. "The majority of the Cardinals," Mai was forced to inform the Emperor, "are unfriendly to me on account of the ruthless havoc committed by our soldiery throughout

¹ Report in cipher of Mai of March 16, 1529, in GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 653. Cf. also Valdes' letter in HOMENAJE Á MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, 399; EHSES, *Dokumente*, 263; SÄGMÜLLER, 164, *seq.*, the extract from A. da Burgo's *report, dat. Rome, 1529, March 7. Here with reference to the recent occurrences (for in February the question of a Papal election was still prominent): "Circa electionem novi pontificis scribit nihil aliud fuisse nisi confusionem et dubium de scismate, quum major pars sit de factione Gallica et quae decreverat ire in Avenionem et card. s. Crucis non erat alienus, sed orator Caesaris bono modo corripuit eum" (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

Italy, from Piedmont to Apulia.”¹ It was seen on the Imperialist side that something must be done to allay the excitement. Accordingly, the Cardinals kept as hostages in Naples were set free, and the order was given for the surrender of Ostia and Civita Vecchia.²

In the meantime Clement had made a remarkably quick recovery from his illness,³ although the fever did not wholly leave him; his condition varied from day to day, but remained so far stationary that it was impossible for him to grant audiences.⁴ It was feared in the Vatican that the constantly recurring fever would at last wear out the Pope’s strength,⁵ and a commission of Cardinals was appointed

¹ Mai’s report of March 22, 1529, in GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 657. In a cipher despatch of March 16, Mai said to the Emperor he feared the almost universal hatred, called forth by the excesses of the Spanish soldiery, more than all the allied forces together. GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 654. Francis I. also declared himself in favour of Civita Castellana as a meeting-place for the Cardinals; see DESJARDINS, II., 1044.

² Cf. SANUTO, XLIX., 384, 386, the report of Quiñones in GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 625, and the **letter of Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga of January 18, 1529 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The *Acta Consist. of the Camerarius note under January 26, 1529: “Congregatio cardinalium: R. dom. Augustinus s. Hadriani diaconus cardinalis de Trivultiis ex Neapoli, ubi per aliquot menses detentus fuerat per capitaneos Caes. Majestatis exercitus, egit gratias s. collegio pro liberatione sua.” Cod. Vat., 3457, P. II., Vatican Library.

³ Cf. with SANUTO, XLIX., 386, 415, and SERASSI, II., 163, the Cardinal E. Gonzaga’s **report of January 18, 1529 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ See SANUTO, XLIX., 415, 424, 432, and the *letters of F. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, 1529, January 22 and 27; The Pope has fever. February 2: The Pope is still ill. February 3: Parossismo. February 4: Improvement (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). See also the *letter of T. Campeggio, dat. Rome, 1529, January 31 (State Archives, Bologna).

⁵ Report of Guido da Crema of February 4 in SANUTO, XLIX., 433. In Rome many believed that the Pope had been poisoned; see *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE in the National Library, Paris.

to despatch the most pressing business.¹ On the 18th of February Clement had another bad attack, and the question of the freedom of election came once more to the front. The negotiations of the Cardinals over the delivery of Ostia and Civita Vecchia proved as fruitless as ever, for, in spite of the orders from Orange, communicated by Mai, the commandants of the fortresses refused to evacuate them until their soldiers' clamours for pay had been satisfied.² "If the Pope were to die," reported Quiñones to the Emperor, "before the fortresses belonging to him are given up, a schism will be inevitable."³

By the middle of February the report gained ground that the Emperor was making serious preparations for his descent upon Italy. These tidings aroused great excitement among the diplomatists resident in Rome; the Pope was greatly alarmed, and declared himself ready to visit Spain and France in person, accompanied by six or seven of the Cardinals, on a mission of peace-making, in order to show his impartiality towards King and Emperor alike.⁴

The Pope's neutrality was displeasing to the representatives of the Emperor and of the League. The former saw in the Pope's projected journey only an attempt to thwart

¹ *Briefs for Antonio Portuen. et Laurentio Prenest. episcopis ac Augustino tit. s. Ciriaci in thermis. presb. card. camerario, dat. Rome, 1529, February 7. Min. brev. 1529, vol. 23, n. 79 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² SANUTO, XLIX., 496-497, 506; cf. Mai's report in GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 636, 643; SERASSI, II., 165, and the 'Acta Consist. of the Camerarius of January 26 and February 3, 1529 (Vatican Library).

³ Report of March 1, 1529, in GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 635. On March 22 Quiñones reports his renewed attempts to convince the Cardinals that Charles would not bring influence to bear on a Papal election. *Ibid.*, n. 658.

⁴ GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 636, 642; cf. DITTRICH, Contarini, 158.

the expedition of Charles ; the latter hoped that Clement, in his alarm at the Emperor's coming, might be drawn to their side. Thus the Pope, not yet wholly recovered from his illness, became the occasion of a sharp diplomatic struggle in which neither threats nor enticements were spared on either side.¹

The Emperor's agent, Miguel Mai, had been commissioned to obtain the Pope's consent to an offensive, or, if this was not possible, at least to a defensive alliance.² The League hoped to attain its object by inviting Giberti, who had so often already won Clement over to France, to come to Rome.³ On the 23rd of February the Bishop of Verona arrived. He was at once able to corroborate Contarini, that Clement was now more inclined to a general peace. But, he added, two things are necessary: in the first place, no one must try to force him to change his views; and, secondly, no one must give him cause for fresh complaint. This last hint referred to Ravenna and Cervia, which the Venetians, in spite of the pressure

¹ *The Acta Consist. of the Camerarius note under February 8, 1529; "Orator imperatoris praesentavit sacro collegio litteras Caes. M^{tis} quibus hortatur rev. dominos, quod studeant et assistant S. D. N., ut universalis pax tractetur et concludatur." Cod. Vat., 3457, P II., Vatican Library. Mai himself informed the Emperor on March 6, 1529, of the threat he had used towards one of the Cardinals; see GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 643.

² "Dixit [Mai] praeterea se habere commissionem a Caesare procurandi ligam cum pontifice offensivam, quam si non posset obtinere, Caesarem esse contentum de defensiva." See *infra*, note 3, extract from A. da Burgo's *report of March 2, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ *Andrea da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, 1529, March 2. The letter consists only of a contemporary extract made in Ferdinand's Chancery in which it says: "Joh. Math. Giberti venit ad urbem suasu aliquorum ex parte ligae" (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

brought to bear on them, especially by England, had no intention of giving up.¹

Giberti was almost all day with the Pope, who was showing marked improvement.² Even though their conversation has not been reported, it is yet easy to conjecture its import. The Imperialists were fully aware of the danger threatening them. Miguel Mai wrote angrily to the Emperor that "these devils of Leaguers are besieging the Pope might and main, and spinning round him a web of lies and artifices of all sorts."³ Andrea da Burgo, the representative of Ferdinand I., also saw with anxiety how the Pope, in his alarm and indecision, was being plied with every possible promise by the French and English, and encouraged in his distrust of the Emperor. Already, on the 2nd of March 1529, he reported that the French were promising Cervia and Ravenna, and anything else that the Pope wished, if he would only declare himself for the League. From his timidity, and the wholly French character of his surrounding influences, Andrea, and many others with him, inferred that Clement would certainly not make any advances towards the Emperor and Ferdinand I.; they ought to be glad, thought Andrea, if he remained neutral.⁴

In the meantime the Pope's condition had improved so much that on the 7th of March he was able to leave his bed,⁵ and his audiences, although on a limited scale, were

¹ See Contarini's report in SANUTO, L., 13-14; *cf.* DITTRICH, Contarini, 159.

² SANUTO, L., 14, 16.

³ Report of March 6, 1529, in GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 643; *cf.* BARDI, Carlo V., 27.

⁴ *A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., 1529, March 2 (Court and State Archives, Vienna, Romana).

⁵ F. Gonzaga in a *report of the Pope's health, March 3, 1529: "S. S^{ta} sta ben." In another of March 7: "S. S^{ta} si puo metter par sana.

resumed. On the 9th of March Burgo sent a report to Ferdinand on Mai's negotiations with the Pope and Schönberg. Clement, in his conversation with Charles's envoy, insisted on his duty of remaining neutral, and on his poverty, which was so great that he was hardly able to afford the upkeep of his household. He refused an alliance, offensive or defensive, with the Emperor. At the same time he again went over his plan of visiting France and Spain in person, and, with this object in view, he spoke of sending Schönberg to the Emperor, and Giberti to Francis I. To Burgo the absence of Schönberg seemed dangerous, for the latter was the Emperor's most loyal representative in Rome,¹ and in his audiences with the Pope expressed himself in the same way.²

Miguel Mai was in close communication with the Cardinals as well as with the Pope; but he found out that the former were for the most part inclined towards France.³ Even if Mai, occasionally, had recourse to threats,

Hoggi ha dato principio a levarse de letto" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. also the *report of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, 1529, March 7: "Papa X. diebus fuit sine febre, et hodie exivit ex lecto et incipit aliquid audire" (Court and State Archives, Vienna, Romana).

¹ *A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., 1529, March 9 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). Cf. GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 636, 647.

² A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., 1529, March 18 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ Mai also complains of the inactivity of the Imperialist Cardinals. Report of March 22, 1529, in GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 657. On March 16 he wrote in cipher to Charles V.: "I cannot deny that the Pope at present shows a certain amount of goodwill towards your Majesty and has a just conception of your Majesty's power and wisdom, whereby he distinguishes himself from the allied princes, whose hatred of your Majesty is deeply rooted. The Pope at the same time fears the members of the League; looking upon both parties as his natural enemies, he would gladly see the Ultramontanes, as he calls them, quit Italy. In this sense the Pope declared himself to Quiñones in past

yet his chief endeavour was, by meeting the Pope's wishes, especially in financial matters, to induce him to renounce his neutrality and ally himself with Charles.¹ But in all their efforts to gain the Pope, the Imperialists sought to drive home the argument that Charles could give assistance towards the restoration of the Medici as rulers of Florence.² To play on Clement's fears, the League made use of the reports, then taking definite shape, of the approaching arrival of the Emperor in Italy. He was told that in the end Charles would make himself master of the whole of the Papal States.³

The excitement occasioned by these transactions and the more threatening aspect of the divorce suit of Henry VIII. brought on a relapse, and Clement was unable to celebrate Mass in St. Peter's on Easter Day. On Easter Monday 18,000 ducats were paid into the hands of the Imperial envoy, whereupon Ostia and Civita Vecchia were restored to the Pope.⁴ At the same time came the sorrowful news of Castiglione's death; this was a heavy loss for the Pope, for none stood higher in the Emperor's favour than this gifted diplomatist.⁵

years when the latter was leaving for Spain; he had added, however, that if he were forced to choose between Charles and Francis, he would certainly decide in favour of the former. On the other hand, he seems to fear the usual unsettled state of things in Spain where, as he says, promises are never kept." GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 653.

¹ Cf. BAUMGARTEN, II., 687.

² *A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., March 9 and 18, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ *A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., 1529, March 28 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁴ SANUTO, L., 124 *seq.*, 126, 134 *seqq.*, 136 *seqq.*, 166; cf. the *Despatches of Romeo of March 27 and 28, 1529, to the Duke of Ferrara (State Archives, Modena).

⁵ See the report of March 29, 1529, in SANUTO, L., 127. Castiglione

The repeated promises of the Imperialists to render service¹ to the Pope both in respect of the restoration of the Medici as rulers in Florence, and of the restitution of Cervia and Ravenna, could not fail to make a deep impression on Clement. But, amid the uncertainty of affairs in Italy, nothing was less easy than a decision,² and thus he continued to hesitate. The feeling that, notwithstanding the surrender of Ostia and Civita Vecchia, his hands were as much tied as before, weighed heavily in the balance in favour of procrastination. On the whole, shrewd diplomatist that he was, Clement did not betray this; but sometimes his emotion had the mastery of him. Thus on the 9th of April he complained to Cardinal Trivulzio, whose

had already, on January 22, 1529, *written from Toledo to G. Calandra: "Io sto, Dio gratia, sano, cosa che non sono stato sempre in Hispagna che molte volte sono stato valetudinario" (copy in the Mantuan Library). Soon afterwards he had a bad attack of fever which caused his death on February 7, 1529. His last days were overcast by the reproaches of Clement VII. that he had trusted too much in Charles V. and had therefore incurred complicity in the sack of Rome. Castiglione tried to vindicate himself in a dignified letter from Burgos on December 10, 1527 (SERASSI, II., 147-152). His remains were brought home and laid in the famous resort of pilgrims, S. Maria delle Grazie in Mantua. Giulio Romano designed his tomb and Bembo wrote his epitaph; see MARTINATI, 56-57. Castiglione's mother recommended her grandchildren to the Pope; see her beautiful *letter, dat. Mantua, April 3, 1529, in *Lett. d. princ., VI., f. 21 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). In his *answer Clement warmly acknowledges Castiglione's services in Spain, and promises to befriend the children. The *Brief is dated Rome, 1529, April 27; Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 143; *ibid*, n. 155, *a Brief to the heirs of Castiglione, dat. Rome, 1529, May 5, telling them to hand over to the Nuncio G. da Schio all monies, papers, and writings relating to his nunciature (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ Cf. the *report of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, 1529, April 2 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² BAUMGARTEN rightly lays stress on this, Karl V., II., 688.

sympathies were French, of the way in which the Emperor's agents tried to hurry him into a treaty with Charles. He would gladly withstand them if he could, but his position in this matter was still just as bad as it had been during his imprisonment in St. Angelo; the only difference consisted in this, that now, at least, he had personal liberty; in the former condition of things he had no other choice left him than to fly from Rome, leaving the Papal territory to its fate, or to come to the least disadvantageous terms with those whose troops were so close at hand that they might at any hour have overwhelmed him. "What the Pope will do in the last resort, I do not know," wrote Trivulzio; "it is certain that he is in the greatest anxiety and perplexity, and will avoid a settlement as long as possible. When at last he does make one he will be driven to it by main force, pulled along, as it were, by the hairs of his head."¹

Trivulzio was mistaken, for a few days after his despatch was written, the Pope made up his mind. He had been greatly influenced by a personal letter from the Emperor, dated Toledo, the 28th of February, the contents of which were communicated to Contarini by the Pope on the 12th of April. Charles first of all congratulated his Holiness on his recovery, and then announced definitely his speedy voyage to Italy; he wished to start from Toledo as early as the 8th of March, since personal negotiations with his Holiness could alone conduce to that general peace for which the initial preparations must begin in Italy, the victim of so much calamity.² Therefore by the 16th of

¹ See Trivulzio's interesting *report of April 9, 1529, in App., No. 6 (National Library, Paris). Cf. also the anonymous cipher report of April 8, in MOLINI, II., 164 *seq.*

² Contarini's *report of April 13 (Cod. Marc., 1043, St. Mark's Library, Venice), runs: . . . "Io heri per intender meglio le nove di Spagna mi
VOL. X.

April a new Nuncio to the Imperial court with full legatine powers was appointed to succeed Castiglione; this was Girolamo da Schio, Bishop of Vaison, Master of the Papal Household.¹ This staunchly Imperialist diplo-

son conferito alla Santità del Pont^{ce}. Et per più d' un hora ho ragionato cum sua Beat^{ne}, ma in brevità refferirò la summa di quello che da lei ho inteso; mi ha ditto haver lettere scritte de man propria delo Imp^{tor} de 2 del mese preterito da Tholedo, per le qual sua Maestà li scrive che per uno istesso corriero havea inteso la nova dispiacevole dela morte di S. Sant^{ta} et l' altra che li era sta gratissima dela sua convalescentia, dil che ne ringratiava Dio et si congratulava cum quella; doppoi li scrive che per il rev^{mo} card. de S. Cruce [Quiñones] li era fatto intender quanto alla venuta sua in Italia, che alhora non havea fatto rissolutione alcuna, ma subito che si haveasse rissolta, non lo haria fatto intender ad alcuna altro prima che a Sua Beat^{ne}. Et però che hora li significava che essendo desiderosissimo de venir ad una pace universal et parendoli che non ci fusse modo di condurla se non si trovasse personalmente cum Sua Beat^{ne}, però havea deliberato venir a vederla in Italia et che dovea partir da Tholedo adì 8 del preditto mese preterito et pensava ritrovarsi a mezo il presente mese a Barzelona, dove poi secondo come ritrovasse le cose disorte et le nove, delibereria quel che dovesse far circa questa sua venuta. Disseme etiam Sua Santità che in preditte lettere si conteneva una altra particularidade la qual scriveva, che lui havea gran compassion de le miserie de Italia et che li pareva conveniente, si come li travagli sonno principiati prima in Italia che in altri loci dela christianità cosi dovesseno prima quietarsi in Italia." This shows that there were not (as DITTRICH supposes, Regesten, 51) two letters of Charles V., but only one. The original of this letter, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, is dated, however: "De Toledo el postrero de hebrero." The contents are correctly reported by Contarini, only the passage about Quiñones is wanting. The letter has the Chancery endorsement: Ricevuta 15 Aprile. This cannot refer to the first receipt of the letter, but only to the day of registration by the Chancery clerks. The letter of Charles V., assigned by LANZ, I., 296, to April 1529, belongs to the year 1526 (see Vol. IX. of this work, p. 350, n. 2). LEVA, II., 521, requires correction on this point.

¹ See *Regest., 1438, f. 81 *seq.*, 85 *seq.* Cf. EHSES, Concil. IV., xxvii. See also MORSOLIN, Girol. da Schio, Vicenza, 1875, 37 *seq.* Ehses

matist,¹ who had kept up assiduous intercourse with Miguel Mai and Andrea da Burgo, received secret instructions from the Pope.²

The complete reconciliation, the alliance between Emperor and Pope, was now close at hand, and with good reason, since the members of the League seemed deliberately to be doing their best to drive Clement into their adversary's arms.³ Venice and Ferrara, now as before, refused to hand back their spoils, while France kept up a lingering warfare in upper and lower Italy, encouraged the obduracy of Florence, and even gave trouble to Clement in his own territory by protecting his enemies Malatesta Baglioni and the domineering Abbot of Farfa.⁴ "The misdeeds which can be laid to the account of the Leaguers," said Salviati,

remarks very conclusively that the question of the Council did not influence Clement's decision to the extent ascribed to it by Mai in his report of May 11, 1529 (in HEINE, *Briefe an Karl V.*, 520 *seq.*; again in BAUMGARTEN, II., 715 *seq.*, but unnecessarily and in ignorance of Heine's publication). I do not think it is conclusively proved that Mai was right in taking credit to himself in this matter. It is in any case remarkable that Burgo, in the report to Ferdinand I. (Court and State Archives, Vienna), makes no mention of the audience of the 24th of April, in which he and Mai set the Pope at rest about the Council and which Mai represents as having had such important results.

¹ Mai lays stress on this; see GAYANGOS, IV., 2-6. For Schio see GIORDANI, App. 90, and Vol. IX. of this work, p. 460.

² Cf. **A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. 1529, April 22 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ REUMONT, III., 2, 325.

⁴ Clement VII., whose bodily health was better (*cf.* the *report of N. Raince of April 21, 1529: "N. S. Père fait bonne chère et se porte très bien," Fonds franç., 3009, f. 33-34, National Library, Paris), had on May 3 appointed Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici Legate at Perugia (*Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor in Consistorial Archives and Secret Archives of the Vatican). Malatesta attempted to murder the bearer of the Brief; see BONTEMPI, 333.

“are such that they must force the Pope to side with the Emperor.”¹

In addition to these considerations, it had been known in Rome since the beginning of April that France was prepared to make, single-handed, conditions of peace with the Emperor. Even Giberti said at the time, “I am afraid that the French may make a treaty of their own with the Emperor, and then put off their allies with fair speeches.” Contarini was not willing to believe this, but it was soon made evident that Giberti had discerned aright.² With a full knowledge of the state of affairs, a further sojourn in Rome seemed superfluous to this skilled politician; under the pretext of compliance with the duty of residence in his diocese, he earnestly begged for permission to return. Contarini and the Pope detained him for some time longer,³ but he soon gave up all hope, and on the 26th of April, regardless of the entreaties of his friend Contarini, left Rome.⁴

Undoubtedly the Pope's attitude towards the Emperor was greatly influenced by the hope that, through the help of Charles, Florence would once more be governed by the Medici. With what dissimulation Clement tried to disguise this anticipation is described in the reports of Contarini⁵ and other diplomatists.⁶ He tried to keep the plan a secret even from his most trusted and intimate friends,⁷ but without success, for in the beginning of March

¹ Report of Contarini, April 26; see DITTRICH, Regesten, 53.

² DITTRICH, Regesten, 51; *cf.* also EHSES, Dokumente, 265.

³ DITTRICH, Contarini, 160 *seq.*

⁴ SANUTO, L., 279; DITTRICH, Regesten, 52.

⁵ DITTRICH, Contarini, 165.

⁶ *Cf. e.g.* Report of Mai in GAYANGOS, III., 2, n. 647.

⁷ *Cf.* **report of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., March 2, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). Also GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 191.

Girolamo Balbi said to Andrea da Burgo that Clement wished nothing so much as a change of government in Florence.¹

Just at this moment news reached Rome of a turn in Florentine affairs which Clement attributed wholly to the help of Charles.

For a long time the Pope had hoped to attain his object in Florence by peaceable means. As long as Capponi, a well-disposed and moderate man, stood at the head of affairs there, this expectation was by no means altogether visionary, especially when the timid character of the Pope, then in such sore distress, is taken into consideration. Capponi formed a scheme for freeing his native city by means of an arrangement with the Pope; with Jacopo Salviati as a go-between, he opened up secret communications with Rome;² their discovery led to his fall on the 17th of April 1529.³ His successor was Francesco Carducci, a violent partisan, in whose circle Clement was spoken of only as the tyrant and bastard. The hatred of this democrat towards the Medici made any accommodation impossible. The fate of Florence was thus decided; everything was done there to exasperate the Pope to the utmost. The half-forgotten fact of his illegitimate birth was dragged to light; he was made the butt of scorn

¹ "Balbus retulit Andreae, pontificem nihil plus appetere quam mutationem status Florent." Extract from a *report of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, 1529, March 7 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² CAPPONI, III., 226 *seq.*; REUMONT, Toskana, I., 23 *seq.*; CIPOLLA, 950 *seq.*; PERRENS, III., 186 *seq.*

³ The disclosure was conveyed in a letter which Capponi lost. The text of the letter, still preserved in the State Archives, Florence, is in BIGAZZI, *Miscell. storica*, Firenze, 1840, Arch. stor., Append. VII., 259 *seq.* and in FOSSATI-FALLETTI, *Assedio*, I., 232; *cf.* also ROSSI, Guicciardini, I., 118 *seq.*, 126.

and ridicule in verses and pictures, and his Papal authority was often repudiated.¹

On the 18th of April, Clement, as feudal lord of Perugia, had forbidden all its citizens, under threat of the severest penalties, to take foreign service. Nevertheless, on the 4th of May the Florentines appointed as their captain Malatesta Baglioni; further, they paid two hundred soldiers to occupy Perugia.² Clement was carried away by anger, and declared to the English envoy he would rather be the Emperor's chaplain or equerry than allow himself to be insulted by his rebellious subjects and vassals.³ To Contarini he declared that the disgraceful mortifications inflicted on him by the Abbot of Farfa and Baglioni were instigated by the French and Florentines. They had compelled him to look to his private interests and no longer to maintain an indeterminate position. He did not wish to be made prisoner a second time and be carried off to Florence. To the counter-representations of Contarini the Pope replied, "What ought I, in your opinion, to do? I have taken no decided course, and thereby given satisfaction to none; rather have I exposed myself to the contempt of all." He feared that the peace negotiations between France and the Emperor would end badly for Italy, that both one and the other would leave him in the lurch as one who could not be safely relied on. "For appearance' sake there will be a stipulation that I am to be the protector of the peace, and with that they will rest satisfied. I tell you, Ambassador," said

¹ JOVIUS, Hist., XXVII., 90; VARCHI, I., 248 *seq.*, 492; PERRENS, III., 267.

² Cf. **A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, 1529, May 17 (Court and State Archives, Vienna); BONTEMPI, 332; PERRENS, III., 201 *seq.*

³ Report of Casale in HERBERT, 233; cf. RAUMER, Briefe, I., 256.

Clement in conclusion, "I am forced to act as I do. What do you wish me to do? I cannot act otherwise."¹

The decisive step was taken in the first days of May.² On the 7th of that month the Pope sent to the Emperor an autograph letter of thanks for the restoration of the fortresses. His illness had hindered him from sending an earlier answer; he now sends to him his Master of the Household, Girolamo da Schio, Bishop of Vaison, whom his Majesty can trust as he would Clement himself, since the Nuncio knows all the secrets of his heart.³ Schio, who carried together with this letter the Bull of the Cruzada and other tokens of grace, had full powers to conclude a treaty with the Emperor; he left Rome on the 9th of May.⁴ Two days later, Andrea da Burgo reported to Ferdinand I. this mission of such decisive importance, and the favourable dispositions of the Pope.⁵ Miguel Mai wrote at the same time to Charles V. that the choice of a Nuncio could not have fallen on a better man than Schio, since he was a person of marked distinction, and a good Imperialist at heart.⁶

¹ Contarini's report of June 7, 1529; see DITTRICH, *Regesten*, 57 *seqq.*, and CONTARINI, 166 *seq.*

² Lett. d. princ., III., 72; the *pass for G. da Schio is dated Rome, 1529, May 5, Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 154 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ In the *Lettere di principi*, where the letter is printed in I., 122^b, the date is given as May 7; BUCHOLTZ, III., 137, gives May 8. The official **letter to Charles V. with credentials for G. da Schio is actually dated May 5; Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 160 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ Cf. the cipher **report of A. da Burgo of May 11, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). See also GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 2 and 6. For Schio's task see also MOLINI, II., 164. For the Bull of the Cruzada see EHRENBERG, Fugger, I., 128.

⁵ Cf. the **report of A. da Burgo of May 11, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁶ GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 6.

Schio embarked on the 25th of May at Genoa for Barcelona, where Charles had been staying since the 30th of April. The Emperor ordered preparations to be made to receive the Papal Nuncio with every mark of honour.¹ He arrived on the 30th of May; the negotiations began at once, and ran very smoothly, and on the 10th of June Charles committed to Mercurino di Gattinara, Louis de Praet, and Nicholas Perrenot the necessary powers.² By the 23rd of June a compact relating to the marriage of Alessandro de' Medici with Margaret, the Emperor's natural daughter, had been concluded.³ There was no longer any possible doubt for whom Florence was intended. On the 29th the signatures were attached to the treaty, to which the Emperor on the same day bound himself by oath before the splendid high altar of the Cathedral of Barcelona.⁴

In view of the Turkish encroachments and the trouble arising from heresy, a defensive alliance was struck between Pope and Emperor. The Emperor promised his help towards restoring the Medicean rule in Florence and reinstating the Church in her temporal possessions, by insisting on the restitution of Ravenna and Cervia on the part of Venice, and of Modena, Reggio, and Rubbiera on the part of Alfonso of Ferrara, the rights of the Empire being left unimpaired. The Duke of Ferrara was to be declared forfeited of his duchy, a fief of the Church, and the Emperor's support was to be given to the execution of the Papal sentence. In taking possession of the Duchy

¹ DITTRICH, Regesten, 54; SANUTO, LI., 19 *seq.*

² GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 39.

³ GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 51; *cf.* n. 59. For the young bride see RAWDON BROWN, Margaret of Austria, Venice, 1850. *Cf.* REUMONT in Arch. Stor. Ital., 1880.

⁴ GAYANGOS, IV. 1, n. 56.

of Milan, "the fountain-head of the troubles of Italy," Charles, in the event of Sforza being found guilty of felony, would act in conjunction with the Pope, although not bound to do so legally. All arbitrary usurpation of the patronage of the Neapolitan bishoprics on the part of the Imperial Government would cease. All amicable means of dealing with the reform in Germany having been exhausted, Charles and Ferdinand, his brother, who was included in the terms of the treaty, were to take forcible measures for the suppression of that movement. The Pope, on his side, supported these undertakings. In the renewed assumption of the Neapolitan fief he contents himself with the palfrey tax (*chinea*, in Spanish *hacanea*), hands over to the Emperor and his successors the nomination to four-and-twenty Neapolitan bishoprics, and permits the passage of Imperialist troops through the Papal territory. Two additional articles relate to the Pope's support of the war against the Turks. Besides the spiritual means at his disposal, Clement promises to further the work by guaranteeing to Charles and Ferdinand, for this purpose, a fourth of the ecclesiastical revenues of their countries, on the same scale as under Adrian VI., and absolves the Imperial army from all the ecclesiastical penalties incurred in consequence of the attack on Rome. Lastly, Clement increases the privileges of the recently issued Bull of the Cruzada.¹

At the first glance it seems astonishing that Charles should have conceded such favourable terms to the despoiled and vanquished Pope. But on closer inspection the leniency of the Emperor admits of an easy explana-

¹ DUMONT, IV., 2, 1-7; *cf.* SANUTO, LI., 120, 127, 252. See also DE MARTINIS, *Le 24 chiese del trattato di Barcelona*, Napoli, 1882, and CALENZIO, *Metropolit. eccl. Neapolit. provisiones consistoriales*, Romae, 1878.

tion. In spite of all humiliation, the status of the Papacy in human society was still one of high importance. The friendship of Clement was an imperative necessity to Charles, unless his interests in England, in Scandinavia, in Switzerland, in Hungary, and Germany were to suffer the most grievous injury.¹ Moreover, the exhaustion of the Imperial finances and the doubtful outlook of the continuation of the campaign in Italy came into consideration. Lastly, Charles hoped that his alliance with the Pope would deal a mortal blow to the League; and even if his concessions to Clement were considerable, his own interests in Italy were not nullified by the treaty.²

The treaty of Barcelona accelerated the peace negotiations between Francis and Charles.³

The contradictory reports from Lombardy had caused the French king to fluctuate between one policy and another. Sometimes he unfolded before the Italian envoys far-reaching plans of campaign, and spoke of attacking the Emperor in Spain or of leading in person a great army into Italy.⁴ But these were passing paroxysms of war-like ardour. One look at his kingdom would have told Francis that the burdens of war were no longer endurable.⁵

¹ More fully in RANKE, *Deutsche Geschichte*, III., 6th ed., 74 *seqq.*; *cf.* DE LEVA, II., 535.

² *Cf.* SISMONDI, XV., 447 *seqq.*; CIPOLLA, 953. Charles V. tacitly renounced his claims on Parma and Piacenza, but not in express terms; see SUGENHEIM, *Kirchenstaat*, 414.

³ That Clement, not merely through Schönberg, but personally, tried to influence the negotiations at Cambrai, is plain from the *Brief of July 24, 1529, to the Regent, the Archduchess Margaret (Secret Archives of the Vatican, Min. brev., vol. 26, n. 310).

⁴ See Cardinal Salviati's *letter to Jacopo Salviati, dat. January 23, 1529. Nunziat. di Francia I., f. 385 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ BAUMGARTEN, II., 695 *seq.*

Then there was the dissatisfaction of the French Government with their English allies, who were liberal of criticism but not of money. The scheme for entering on peace negotiations grew in popularity at the French court. In November 1528 there were thoughts of appealing to the Pope's mediation, but the notion was soon given up. There was a greater leaning towards the Regent of the Netherlands, the Archduchess Margaret, and the Queen Mother, Louisa of Savoy, entered into direct communication with the Archduchess in order to bring about a peace.¹ Cardinal Salviati, in May 1529, was still disinclined to believe in the seriousness of these negotiations.² Nevertheless, these two women, distinguished alike for intellectual qualities and political experience, succeeded in their difficult task.

The French Government showed consummate skill in concealing their transactions from the other members of the League. On the 23rd of June 1529 Francis declared to their envoys that he would sacrifice his own life and that of his son to save the allied Leaguers; the Queen and the Admiral, Anne de Montmorency, spoke in the same sense. On the 10th of July the latter made the most solemn disclaimer of the report that France intended to desert Venice. Twelve days later the King, with equal solemnity, swore that Florence would be included in the treaty of peace, and on the 3rd of August Francis still affirmed that nothing would be concluded without the consent of his allies.³ On the

¹ Cf. DECRUE, Anne de Montmorency, 123.

² Letter to Jacopo Salviati, May 2, 1529. Nunziat. di Francia I., f. 430 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See Baldassare Carducci's reports from June 23 to 26, July 9, 10, and 22, and August 3, 1529, in DESJARDINS, II., 1064 *seq.*, 1069 *seqq.*, 1078 *seqq.*, 1081 *seq.*, 1087 *seq.*, 1098 *seqq.*; cf. DE LEVA, II., 544.

5th the treaty was signed at Cambrai in which he completely threw them over.¹ Up to the last there were still great difficulties to be overcome,² but matters were brought quickly to a conclusion by the news that de Leyva's victory over St. Pol at Landriano (21st of June) had made Charles master of Lombardy and at one with the Pope.³

The treaty concluded by Francis was highly disadvantageous; he saved nothing except the integrity of his own country. He had to promise that thenceforward he would abstain from all interference in Italian and German affairs; within six weeks all his troops were to be withdrawn from Italy; he was to compel Venice and Ferrara to surrender the stolen cities; in case of necessity to expel with arms the Venetians from Apulia; he was to pay Charles for the expenses of his coronation journey 200,000 thalers and furnish him with twenty galleys, and his son was to be set free at a ransom of two million crowns.⁴

In Rome the result of the negotiations at Barcelona and Cambrai had been watched with anxious attention, above all by Contarini, who, with the tenacity of a born diplomatist, had up to the last moment urged the cause of the League, but without the least success,⁵ on the Pope, who

¹ *Cf.* the despairing despatch of Carducci on the treachery of the French King, dat. St. Quentin, 1529, August 5, in DESJARDINS, II., 1102 *seqq.*

² Louisa of Savoy even wished to leave on July 24, but was prevented by the Papal envoy. DECRUE, Anne de Montmorency, 131.

³ *Cf.*, for what Francis I. said to Schönberg, SANUTO, LI., 372.

⁴ DUMONT, IV., 2, 7-17; *cf.* SANUTO, LI., 373 *seq.*, 377 *seq.*, 388 *seq.* GUICCIARDINI, XIX., 5; LAVISSE, Hist. de France, V., 2, 62 *seq.*

⁵ DITTRICH, Contarini, 167 *seq.* For Clement's continued ill-health

was still unwell. On the 17th of June Andrea da Burgo could report that Salviati, by order of the Pope, had told him that the latter rejected all the offers of the League.¹ Two days earlier Schönberg had left Rome in order to take part in the negotiations at Cambrai.² On the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul the Pope, in presence of all the Cardinals, received the "China" from Miguel Mai; on the same day came the news of the overthrow of the French at Landriano.³ The reports then current as to the

see GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 4, 17: *A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, 1529, May 15 ("Papa nulli adhuc dat audientiam nec oratoribus nec cardinalibus; dicunt ex consilio medicorum." Court and State Archives, Vienna); Lett. d. princ., III., 72^b, 92; SANUTO, L., 320, 346, 385, 386 *seqq.*, 426, 458. Not till June 8 did G. M. della Porta report: "N. S. sta assai bene"; SANUTO, L., 477. The accounts of Clement's condition were so disquieting that Charles V. was seriously occupied with the question of the Papal election; see GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 17, 61, 63.

¹ *A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, June 17, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² Schönberg's mission was a certainty on June 5; see the *Brief to Charles V. of June 5, 1529 (Secret Archives of the Vatican, Min. brev., vol. 26, n. 204). Schönberg left Rome on June 15 (GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 42) and reached Cambrai on July 6, where his appearance was not welcome (SANUTO, LI., 163, 177; *cf.* DESJARDINS, II., 1080, and PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 75). The outcome of his action at Cambrai is not yet fully cleared up; Carducci ascribes it to him that the result was unfavourable to the League. Schönberg left Cambrai on August 2 (SANUTO, LI., 323) and returned to Rome on September 19 (not as early as the 12th, as Pieper [75] supposes); see SANUTO, LI., 602, 604, and the *despatches of N. Raince, dat. Rome, 1529, September 21, "Schönberg came on Sunday" (Fonds Français, 3009, f. 43-44, National Library, Paris). Cardinal Salviati, who was at Cambrai at the same time, was displeased at Schönberg's mission; he would have liked to have concluded the peace himself. Nuziat. di Francia, I, f. 325 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ SANUTO, LI., 19 *seqq.*, and GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 96.

Emperor's frame of mind justified Clement in having the best hopes.¹ On the 15th of July the conclusion of the treaty with the Emperor was made known for certain in Rome through the Abbate de' Negri.² On the following day came the decision on the divorce suit of Henry VIII., which the Pope cited before the court of the Rota in Rome.³

The treaty of Barcelona was conveyed to Italy by the Emperor's special messenger, Louis de Praet,⁴ who arrived in Rome on the 22nd of July, where he was visited at once, by command of the Pope, by Salviati, Sanga, Alessandro de' Medici, and Cardinal Ippolito. Nor was the remainder of the Sacred College, the majority of whom now showed Imperialist leanings, wanting in marks of attention. In the afternoon of the 24th of July, Praet, together with Mai and Burgo, had an audience of the Pope, whom they saw in bed, bearing evident traces of his long illness. Clement read the Emperor's letter, brought to him by Praet, and expressed his delight at the peace, and his hope that Charles, on his arrival in Italy, would be a protection to the Holy See. For Florentine affairs he referred the Imperial envoys to Cardinal Pucci. After a conversation with this Prince of the Church, whose devotion to the Emperor and the Medici was entire, they had a

¹ Cf. the *despatches of G. M. della Porta of June 29, 1529 (State Archives, Florence).

² DITTRICH, *Regesten*, 57, and SANUTO, *LI.*, 107, 109; MOLINI, *II.*, 230 *seq.* Still, the Briefs in which Clement announced to Francis I. and Henry VIII. the conclusion of the treaty, are dated July 15; see RAYNALDUS, 1529, n., 65, 66.

³ This is treated more fully in cap. VIII.

⁴ Praet delivered an *Imperial letter, dat. Barcelona, July 8, 1529 (Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm. XI., caps. I., n. 180); cf. EHSES, *Concil.*, IV., xxviii. GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 3rd ed., 608, is mistaken in making Praet the bearer of the Treaty of Cambrai.

second audience, on the 25th of July, in which the Pope, still forced to keep his bed, swore fidelity to the Treaty of Barcelona. Salvos of musketry from the Vatican, St. Angelo, and the palaces of the Imperialists announced the great event to Rome. Clement's condition having much improved by the end of July, the envoys were able to discuss with him personally the Florentine enterprise which Praet had warmly advocated with the Emperor. On Sunday, the 1st of August, the Pope participated in person at the thanksgiving service in St. Peter's on the occasion of the conclusion of peace.¹

Some days before, Philibert, Prince of Orange, had made his entry with a body of fifteen hundred foot.² The negotiations concerning the submission of Florence, with which those relating to Perugia were combined,³ now reached a

¹ *1 Aug. 1529 Papa de improvviso voluit interesse missae ex officio propter publicationem foederis cum Caesare, etc.; *Diarium of B. DE MARTINELLIS in Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. the important despatches of Praet to the Emperor of July 30, August 3 and 5, 1529, in LANZ, I., 318 *seqq.*; see also DITTRICH, Regesten, 59 and 60; SANUTO, LI., 282, 292, 294 *seqq.*; *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, of Vatican Library, and BARDI, Carlo V., 39 *seqq.* For Clement's opinion of the Treaty of Cambrai see the latter and DE LEVA, II., 546. The absolution bestowed on all those who took part in the sack of Rome as agreed to in the Treaty of Barcelona was published on August 6, 1529; see GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 400, and FONTANA, Renata, I., 449 *seq.* The public announcement of the treaty with Charles V. is dated as far back as July 24; Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 312 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). In the *Mandati secreti, 1529-1530, f. 45^a, dat. October 10, 1529, there is a bill for the wax used "pro missa publicationis pacis" (State Archives, Rome).

² See SANUTO, LI., 244 *seq.*; *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE, (National Library, Paris); VARCHI, I., 363; ROBERT, 283.

³ Already, on July 11, 1529, the *order was sent to Perugia for the withdrawal of all hostile troops from the city, otherwise the Imperialists

definite stage. Since the Treaty of Barcelona contained no terms relating to the cost of the war with Florence, serious difficulties were not wanting. It was said that the ambitious Orange demanded for himself nothing less than the hand of Catherine de' Medici, the Pope's niece—a marriage which would have made him master of Florence. In Clement's immediate circle it was pointed out to him that he would be exposing his native city to great peril if he turned against her an army composed of such different nationalities. Among those who opposed the Florentine expedition, Jacopo Salviati, Roberto Pucci, and Sanga were named—those, in fact, who were in the Pope's confidence.

No wonder that Clement fell back on his usual vacillation.¹ If there were difficulties in coming to an understanding, the blame lay to a great extent with the Florentines, who kept up their methods of provocation towards the Pope. They were not only in the closest alliance with Malatesta Baglioni, but also with that Abbot of Farfa who had already caused Clement so much trouble.²

would advance. This order was repeated on July 24 in a *Brief calling on the city to return to obedience. In a *Brief of August 5 complaint is specially made that Perugia tolerates the rule of Malatesta Baglioni, after the latter "nobis inconsultis et invitis ante exactum stipendii tempus" had gone over to another's service, although the Pope had done all that he could to retain him; also bitter reproaches that the Perugians, without informing the Pope, had accepted the offer of the King of France, the Florentines, and the other allies to send reinforcements into their city. Up to the present he had observed leniency, but in the end he would be forced to deal severely with a contumacious city. *Min. brev.*, 1529, vol. 26, n. 281, 313, and 324 (*Secret Archives of the Vatican*).

¹ Cf. LANZ, I., 326 *seq.*; REUMONT, Caterina von Medici, 132 *seq.*, and Rom, III., 2, 239 *seq.*

² See Vol IX. of this work, p. 367. The *excommunication of Napoleone Orsini, on account of the kidnapping of some Franciscans,

To this turbulent leader of faction they sent 3000 ducats towards the recruiting of troops; this sum, however, was intercepted by the Papal party, whereupon the Abbot determined on revenge. In the beginning of August Clement had sent Cardinals Farnese, Medici, and Quiñones to greet the Emperor on his arrival at Genoa.¹ Quiñones was set upon in the hill forest of Viterbo and kept prisoner until the 3000 ducats were repaid.² How is dated July 8, 1529. Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 269 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ The designation of the three Cardinals had already taken place on July 24, 1529; see *Acta Consist. in Consistorial Archives and Secret Archives of the Vatican and the *deed of nomination, dat. Romae, 1529, IX. Cal. Aug. in Regest., 1438, f. 132^b-133^a; *ibid.*, f. 146-147, the *legatine faculties for the above, dat. Romae, 1529, VIII. Id. August. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). On August 3 Clement VII. informed the Emperor of the mission of the three Cardinals (Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 322, Secret Archives of the Vatican; *cf.* RAYNALDUS, 1529, n. 70, and GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 93); and on August 8 he recommended the three Cardinals to Gattinara and other Imperial office-bearers (Min. brev., *loc. cit.*, n. 329). In the *Mandati secreti, 1529-1530, f. 20, 1000 ducats are entered on August 2, 1529, for Farnese for his journey to the Emperor's court and the same amount for Quiñones (State Archives, Rome). For the departure see SANUTO, LI., 295-296. On August 11, 1529, Clement addressed from Rome an *autograph letter to Charles V. containing good wishes for the peace of Cambrai and his journey into Italy. The original letter in the Pope's hand, but without signature, in Lit. divers. ad Clement. VII., vol. I. (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² GUICCIARDINI, XIX., 5; *cf.* also SANUTO, LI., 313; ALBÈRI, Relaz., 2 Series, I., 196; *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, of the Vatican Library, and *letter of T. Campeggio, dat. Rome, 1529, August 10 (State Archives, Bologna). In a *Brief of August 10 Clement informed Cardinal Farnese of the capture of Cardinal Quiñones, and ordered him to hasten his journey as the Emperor had already landed. A *Brief of August 12 to the Cardinals Farnese and Medici contains a similar command; Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 334 and 337 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

bitterly the Pope must have resented this unprecedented occurrence¹ can easily be understood.² An agreement on the question of the subjection of Florence and Perugia was arrived at by the special interposition of Cardinal Pucci, who from his private resources advanced such a considerable sum that Clement was able to dispose of 36,600 scudi.³ But with this he could only at first clear off a small instalment of his obligations, for, on the 17th of August, Clement had to concede the demands of Orange: 80,000 scudi to be paid down, 50,000 to be added after the capture of Florence, and a final 150,000 to be raised by taxation on the city.⁴ The Pope, besides, was to support Orange with artillery and recruits, and once more Rome and the Papal territory became the scene of active military movements. The Pope's thoughts henceforward were absorbed in this unhappy enterprise against his native city.⁵ On the 13th of August Mercurino da Gattinara received from Clement, now fully restored to health, the long-coveted rank of

¹ "Res inaudita," says BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS in his *diary (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² *Acta Consist., 1529, August 10: "Stas Sua multum conquesta est de abbate [Farfae] propter capturam rev^{mi} d. s. Crucis legati de latere ad M^{tem} Caesaris et consuluit collegium, quid in hac causa sit agendum, super quo conclusum fuit quod S. Sua capiat penas de abbate capta occasione" (Consistorial Archives and Secret Archives of the Vatican). Napoleone Orsini was treated as a rebel; Farfa supported Fr. de' Orsini; cf. the *documents of August 21 and 28 in Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 353 and 354.

³ DE BLASIIS, Maramaldo, III., 339, n. 3.

⁴ Lettere di G. Busini a B. Varchi (ed. MILANESI, Firenze, 1861), 65. In BARDI, 50, there is mention of an earlier agreement of August 12 fixing other amounts.

⁵ "Quant à l'affaire de Florence ils sont tousjours en leur déliberacion de pousser oultre," *reports N. Rance from Rome on August 24, 1529. Fonds franç., 3009, f. 41 (National Library, Paris).

Cardinal, as a reward for his services in bringing the Treaty of Barcelona to a conclusion.¹

¹ *Deed of nomination, dat. Romae, 1529, Idus Aug., in Regest., 1438, f. 152-153 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); *cf.* **Clement VII. to Charles V., dat. 1529, August 18 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); SANUTO, LI., 359, 376, and the **Despatches of F. Gonzaga of August 15, 1529 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The red hat was sent to Gattinara in September 1529; see GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 149, and *Clemens VII. Mercurino tit. s. Joh. ante port. lat. presb. Card., dat. Romae, 1529, III. Non. Sept. in Regest., 1438, f. 209 and 1440, f. 34. The three Cardinal-Legates at the Imperial court were commissioned, in a *Brief of September 14, 1529, to invest Gattinara with the insignia of the Cardinalate as far as was admissible; Min. brev., 1529, vol. 24, n. 249 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

CHAPTER III.

THE MEETING OF CLEMENT VII. AND CHARLES V. AT BOLOGNA.

—THE LAST IMPERIAL CORONATION.—RESTORATION OF THE
MEDICEAN RULE IN FLORENCE.

ON the 12th of August, 1529, Charles V., with a stately retinue of Spanish grandees, had landed at Genoa, where he was welcomed with shouts of "Long live the Ruler of the World!"¹ The coming of the Emperor raised the hopes of his followers to the highest pitch. Typical of the pride with which Charles was regarded by the Germans in Rome is the diary of Cornelius de Fine, who even associates the plenteous harvest of the autumn of 1529 with the coming of the Emperor.² By command of the Pope, Cardinals Farnese, Medici, Quiñones, and his nephew Alessandro de' Medici³ awaited his coming at Genoa. The Imperial troops, twelve thousand infantry and two thousand cavalry, landed for the most part at Savona. With this force Charles might have attacked Venice and Sforza

¹ See ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 79 *segg.*, and SANUTO, LI., 398 *segg.* Charles V. informed the Pope of his arrival by a *letter, dat. Genoa [1529], August 13 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), Arm., XI., caps. 1.

² CORNELIUS DE FINE praises Charles beyond measure; he is "vir rectus atque timens Deum et Deus cum eo in omnibus negotiis" (**Diarium* in the National Library, Paris).

³ ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 88 *seg.* Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga and Giberti also went to Genoa; but Giberti was received so ungraciously by Charles that he at once returned to Verona; see SANUTO, LI., 379, 415; DITTRICH, *Contarini*, 176.

successfully, had not his brother Ferdinand at this very moment reported the threatening advance of the Turks in Hungary. This intelligence forced Charles to act with foresight and caution; he gave up the idea of an aggressive movement against the Venetians and expressed himself in a pacific sense.¹ The hopes of the anti-Imperialists in Italy, those of Venice before all, were, in fact, based on the victory of the Turks; the Venetian Senate instructed their Ambassador at Constantinople, on the 25th of August, to stir up the Moslem to push on against Ferdinand.² In this state of things Charles was thrown more than ever on his friendship with the Pope; this accounts for the rude treatment of the Florentine envoys at Genoa who had come to plead for a postponement of the expedition against the city. Charles refused this peremptorily as an engagement undertaken without the cognizance of the Pope; he exhorted them, but certainly in vain, to come to terms with Clement. Gattinara spoke even more clearly, since he told the Florentines that they would have to reinstate Clement and his family in their former position.³ This, indeed, was the whole end and aim of the Pope; heedless of all warnings and dangers, he pursued without scruple the policy of the aggrandizement of the house of Medici.⁴

Orange had left Rome in the middle of August.⁵ His

¹ Cf. the important and strictly confidential letter of Charles V. to Ferdinand I., dat. January 11, 1530, in LANZ, I., 366 *seq.*

² ROMANIN, V., 462.

³ SEGNI, I., 171; VARCHI, I., 358; REUMONT, III., 2, 243; PERRENS, III., 222 *seqq.* The letters of Charles in BARDI, Carlo V., 51 *seqq.*, show that the Emperor was in close understanding with the Papal Nuncio before meeting the Florentine envoys.

⁴ PALLAVICINI (I., II., c. 16) had already condemned this policy. Among the moderns BROSCHE (I., 113 *seq.*) is the most severe.

⁵ See Praet's letter in BARDI, Carlo V., 42, and ROBERT, 293. At first the expedition against Perugia was not believed in at Rome; cf.

troops were gathered in the flat country between Foligno and Spello; there were three thousand landsknechts, the remnant of Frundsberg's army, and four thousand Italians under Pierluigi Farnese, Camillo Marzio, Sciarra Colonna, and Giovan Battista Savelli; the Spanish infantry were to be brought up from Apulia by Vasto.¹

The expedition against the rebellious Malatesta Baglioni was carried out swiftly. While reconnoitring near Spello, Giovanni d' Urbino, the bravest of the Spanish captains, was indeed killed, but Spello surrendered in September. Vasto had now come up; on the 6th of September the army crossed the Tiber and pitched camp before Perugia, and by the 10th this stronghold had also capitulated. The conditions were very favourable to Malatesta Baglioni: he was allowed free egress for himself and his artillery, protection for his property, and permission to take service for Florence. Perugia returned to its former relations with the Holy See, retaining its privileges, and, on the evening of the 11th of September, Cardinal del Monte took possession of the city in the Pope's name.²

the **despatch of F. Gonzaga of August 17, 1529 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ GUICCIARDINI, XIX., 5.

² Along with contemporary accounts in SANUTO, LI., 386 *seqq.*, 463, 494, 508, 542, 559, 562 *seqq.*, see especially BONTEMPI, Ricordi, 335 *seq.*, and also the *Diary of Cornelius de Fine in the National Library, Paris. Cf. also VERMIGLIOLI, Vita di Malatesta IV. Baglioni, Perugia, 1839, 66 *seq.*, XXXIX. *seqq.*; FABRETTI, Capitani venturieri, IV., 77, 113 *seq.*, and Documenti, 528 *seqq.*, 541 *seqq.*; PELLINI, III., 499 *seqq.*; FONTANA, Renata, I., 451 *seq.*; ROBERT, 300, and Lett. et Docum., 339 *seq.* For the ravages of the war see the *Diary of Cornelius de Fine. The *Monitorium against Malatesta, dat. Rome, 1529 (without day of month), in Regest., 1437, f. 314-318 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Also Lett. d. princ., VI., f. 65, a *letter of Orange to the Pope, dat. 1529, September 11, in which he begs for a ratification of the treaty with Malatesta Baglioni.

The hopes of the Florentines, that the campaign would be concentrated on Perugia, were thus baffled; once more the war was confined exclusively to their own territory. They also failed completely in their attempts to drive Orange off by means of negotiations. Since Malatesta had betaken himself to Montevarchi without giving a thought to the protection of the Florentine frontier towns, little resistance was offered to the Imperialist troops. In a short time they became masters of Cortona, Castiglione Fiorentino, and finally of Arezzo. The further advance of Orange into the valley of the Arno was very slow; this gave the inhabitants of Florence time to defend themselves.¹ Orange laid himself open to the suspicion of acting with a view to his own interests rather than to those of the Pope, but there is no adequate proof of this; on the contrary, his delay arose from altogether different causes. The letters of Charles V. to Orange show that the former expressly wished for a protracted advance against Florence, in order that, if possible, an agreement might be reached between the Pope and the citizens of his own town. Only in the case of this being altogether unsuccessful did the Emperor, that he might not incur the loss of Clement's friendship, consent to carry the expedition through.²

Clement VII. grants this at once; see the *letter of thanks to Orange of September 13, 1529, in *Min. brev.*, 1529, vol. 24, n. 247; *cf.* vol. 26, n. 378, 379, and 380, the *briefs dated on the same September 13 to Perugia, Malatesta Baglioni, and the Cardinal del Monte.

¹ The work was carried on day and night; see Capello's report of September 24, 1529, in *ALBÈRI, Relaz.*, 2 Series, I., 121.

² See Charles V.'s important letter to Orange in *BARDI, Carlo V.*, 56 *seqq.*, 64 *seqq.* Before the publication of these documents *PERRENS* (III., 266) had already, on the evidence of the Sienese reports (in *FOSSATI-FALLETTI, Assedio*, II., 21, 42, 55, 76), rejected the imputation that Orange was pursuing personal aims; also *ROBERT*, 315 *seq.* Charles V. also instructed his envoy in Rome to obtain from the Pope

Orange's advance, moreover, was retarded, since he had to wait for artillery from Siena. Not until the 20th of October did he reach Ripoli, and at last, on the 24th, he took up his position on the lovely chain of hills by which Florence is bounded on the south-east.¹

Up to the last, Clement had hoped that the Florentines, isolated from all help, would surrender and avoid the issue of a struggle with the fierce soldiery. He was doomed to see how far he had deceived himself. With admirable heroism, the Florentines had made preparations to fight for their freedom to the death.² With their own hands they had devastated the fair surroundings of their city in order to deprive the enemy of any points of advantage. By every means in their power, even to the sale of Church property, money had been raked together to provide pay for the troops. They would rather, declared some, see their city in ashes than stoop to obey the Medici.³ The walls were manned by soldiers ready to resist any assault of the Imperialists. Orange had to make up his mind to invest the city, and at the end of October his artillery fire

an arrangement with Florence, and declared himself ready to make over to the Duke Alexander, as a compensation, a portion of the Duchy of Milan; see *Despacho que el Emperador Carlos V. mandó escribir á sus Embajadores en Roma, para que procurasen arreglar con Su Santidad los asuntos de Milan y Florencia, 1 Octubre de 1529.* Publ. da G. DE LEVA, Padova, 1859 (per nozze).

¹ GUICCIARDINI, XIX., 6; REUMONT, III., 2, 241 *seq.*; ROBERT, 319 *seq.*

² The earlier literature on the siege of Florence in GIORDANI, App. 24 *seqq.*, and REUMONT, III., 2, 850. Of modern works the most important is that of FOSSATI-FALLETTI, already quoted; for criticism of the latter *cf.* Arch. stor. Ital., 4 Series, XVIII., 139 *seq.*, and Rev. hist., XXXII., 408 *seqq.* For the Russian work of V. PISKORSKY (Kiev, 1892) see Arch. stor. Ital., 5 Series, IX., 372 *seqq.*

³ *Cf.* CIPOLLA, 957.

was trained upon the heights of San Miniato. Michael Angelo, who, on the 6th of April 1529, had already been appointed¹ overseer of the fortifications, had transformed the noble basilica, on its lofty eminence, into a bulwark of such strength that the fire from Orange's guns was ineffectual.

The success of their measures of defence filled the Florentines with fresh courage. Preachers of the order of which Savonarola had been a member sought zealously to revive the old belief in the inviolable security of the city; the holy angels, it was declared, would be the saviours of Florence; to gainsay such teaching was deemed a transgression against the State. The popular excitement was fanned especially by the Dominicans Fra Zaccaria of San Marco and Benedetto da Fojano. Like Savonarola, once the object of their heated adulation, these religious made their pulpits resound with politics. Their sermons, according to the testimony of Varchi, were filled with derisive gibes against the Pope and flattery of the government in power. The hatred of the Medici in some amounted at last to madness. It reached the length of a proposal that vengeance in a shameful form should be visited on Catherine de' Medici, a child of ten, who was then detained as a hostage in a convent.²

While in Genoa, Charles V. had sent a request to the Pope that his coronation might be solemnized at Bologna.

¹ See decree in *Giorn. stor. d. arch. toscan.*, II., 66-67.

² *Cf.* GRIMM, Michelangelo, II., 95 *seq.*; REUMONT, Caterina de' Medici, 120 *seq.*; BALAN, Clemente VII., 160. For the Dominican Preachers see VARCHI, I., 292; PERRENS, III., 241 *seq.*; CAPPONI, III., 266; *cf.* also SANUTO, LII., 327. For the demand for a revision of Savonarola's case see FOSSATI-FALLETTI, I., 445. The "Epistola" addressed to Clement VII. by Girolamo Benivieni, in defence of Savonarola, was published by MILANESI as an appendix to his edition of Varchi and in pamphlet form, Florence, 1858.

Such threatening intelligence had come from Germany that it became more necessary than ever that the head of the Empire should speedily have recourse thither. The pressure to which Ferdinand was exposed from the Turks had altered the situation in such a way that it appeared impolitic for Charles to be at too great a distance from the hereditary domains of the Hapsburgs.¹ Nor could Clement deny the force of this argument; but the state of his health, only just restored, and the cost of the journey were against it. Moreover, an Imperial coronation outside the walls of Rome was something unknown, contrary to all precedent, the closest adherence to which was in Rome a fixed and unchanging principle. Many of the Cardinals, the Curia, and the Romans, almost without exception, were against the journey.² But the Legates who had followed Charles to Piacenza supported him in his wish, to which he gave renewed expression in a letter of the 20th of September 1529.³ They also announced that Charles had sworn at Piacenza, as at Parma, to undertake nothing to the detriment of Holy Church.⁴ Clement was strongly influenced by the knowledge that he was dependent on Charles for the Florentine enterprise and

¹ ROMANO, Cronaca, 94.

² DITTRICH, Regesten, 64.

³ I also found this autograph *letter of Charles V.'s to Clement, "de Piacenza de XX. de Setiembre," in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm., XI., caps. 7.

⁴ ROMANO, 95; *cf.* DITTRICH, Contarini, 177. On August 29, 1529, Charles V. wrote from Genoa to the Pope, how glad he was to make the acquaintance of Ippolito and Alessandro de' Medici, and informed him of his departure for Piacenza (Lett. d. princ., I., 123^b, and GIORDANI, App. 2 *seqq.*), which took place on the 30th; see Capello in ALBÈRI, Relaz., 2 Series, I., 207. On August 23 nothing had been decided as to the Pope's departure for Bologna; see the *report of F. Gonzaga from Rome on that day (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

the restoration of the Papal territory. He had also repeatedly previously announced his intention of going into Spain in the cause of peace. How could he now decline to make a comparatively trifling journey? By the end of August¹ he had made up his mind to gratify the Emperor's wish; but he kept his resolve a secret for some days, and allowed the belief to prevail that the notion of a Roman coronation had not been given up.² On the 19th of September the Treaty of Cambrai was officially announced in Rome; before the Pope proceeded to the ceremony of its publication he made known to the Cardinals his intention of going to Bologna, but he left it optional to the members of the Sacred College whether they accompanied him or not. On that the Cardinals withdrew any opposition, and the Romans were pacified by the arrangement that the Rota and Cancelleria were to remain in Rome.³

The date of the journey, for which preparations were now⁴ beginning to be made, depended a good deal on the

¹ Cf. the Papal *injunction, dated August 29, 1529, with regard to the necessary quarters for soldiers and the Papal suite at Bologna during the approaching visit. Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 404 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 140; Lett. d. princ., III., 98^b; *report of F. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, 1529, September 17 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. Contarini's letter of the same date in DITTRICH, Contarini, 177.

³ SANUTO, LI., 601 *seqq.*, and LII., 16; *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatican Library); *Diary of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS (Secret Archives of the Vatican); CLARETTA, Carlo V. e Clemente VII., 9. Clement's joy at the Peace of Cambrai and the reasons for his rejoicing are laid before the Emperor in a letter, in BARDI, Carlo V., 39 *seqq.*

⁴ Report of F. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, 1529, September 20 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The "Gubernator generalis curiae" during the journey was Francesco Pesaro; see GARAMPI, 246.

news from Florence. The frightful danger hanging over his native city was a source of increasing agitation to Clement. He still hoped for a peaceful solution, and this hope was encouraged by Contarini.¹ On the 22nd of September a Florentine envoy arrived in Rome. As he was the bearer only of general expressions, the Pope determined to send Schönberg to Orange and to Florence with the task of arranging a peaceful settlement, if such were by any means possible. Schönberg, who had only returned from Cambrai on the 19th, was once more on his way by the 23rd. But his mission was as unsuccessful as was that of one of the Papal Chamberlains despatched by Clement when he was already on the road to Bologna.²

The obstinacy of the Florentines occasioned alterations in the Pope's travelling arrangements. Instead of going through Tuscany, he had to take the road through the Romagna. Before starting, Clement drew up a series of precautionary regulations. By a special Bull the freedom of the Papal election, in case he died at Bologna,³ was secured. Cardinal del Monte was made Legate in Rome,⁴

¹ See DITTRICH, *Regesten*, 65, and Contarini, 178 *seq.*; BARDI, Carlo V., 42, 44. For the Pope's indignation against Florence see in App., No. 7, *the report of F. Gonzaga (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² See DITTRICH, Contarini, 178 *seq.* For Schönberg's departure see SANUTO, LII., 15. The *pass for Schönberg, as well as the letter recommending him to Orange, is dated September 22; *Min. brev.*, 1529, vol. 26, n. 392 and 393 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ DITTRICH, *Regesten*, 65, and Contarini, 179. The text of the Bull in RAYNALDUS, 1529, n. 75 *seqq.*; *cf.* SÄGMÜLLER, *Papstwahlen*, 12.

⁴ On October 1. See *Acta Consist. of the Camerarius in Cod. Vatic., 3457, P. II., Vatican Library, and the *report of F. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, 1529, October 2 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cardinal del Monte came to Rome on October 10, according to the Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library. The "Tavola di li prezzi del vivere" published by this Cardinal on October 25, 1529, is in the Studi e docum., III., 89 *seq.*, and shows that scarcity still continued in Rome.

and special Nuncios were ordered to go to France and England to acquaint their respective governments with the circumstances of the Pope's journey, and to ask that full powers should be sent to Bologna for dealing with the Turkish question.¹ Cardinal Cibo was instructed to make the necessary preparations in Bologna.²

On the afternoon of the 7th of October the Pope left Rome amid torrents of rain. In immediate attendance were Cardinals Accolti, Cesi, Cesarini, and Ridolfi;³ most of the remaining Cardinals as well as the Ambassadors followed. The insecurity of the road made an escort necessary and considerably impeded the progress of the journey, which the Emperor, with renewed insistence, begged might be accelerated. The Pope's route lay by Civita Castellana, Orte, Terni, Spoleto, and Foligno to Sigillo on the Via del Furlo.⁴ On the way, important despatches were brought by members of the Imperial court. They contained Charles's wish that the settlement of Italian affairs might be made as quickly as possible, seeing that the Turks were advancing on Vienna. He therefore would give up Parma to the Pope, although still in his (the Emperor's) possession, and would deal with the affairs of Milan in conformity with Clement's advice.⁵ At Sigillo the new Imperial envoy, Gabriele

¹ PIEPER, *Nuntiaturen*, 85. Cf. A. da Burgo's *report to Ferdinand I. of October 7, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² STAFFETTI, *Cybo*, 88.

³ **Diarium of Blasius de Martinellis de Caesena mag. caerem. Bibl. Barb.*, XXXV., 45 (now lat. 2801), f. 1 *seq.* (Vatican Library and Cod. 12547, National Library, Paris); cf. RAYNALDUS, 1529, n. 78; SANUTO, LII., 78.

⁴ *See *Diarium, loc. cit.*; SANUTO, LII., 118; BONTEMPI, 338. The Itinerary was as follows: October 8, Civita Castellana; 9, Orte; 10, Terni; 11, Spoleto; 12, Foligno; 13, Nocera; 14, Sigillo.

⁵ See Contarini's report, October 15, 1529, in DITTRICH, *Regesten*,

Merino, Bishop of Jaen and Archbishop of Bari,¹ together with Praet and Mai, had his first audience with the Pope, whom he found full of confidence in the Emperor's good intentions.²

On the 20th of October Clement was at Cesena, where a Florentine deputation appeared, to announce that their city would make a willing submission if honourably treated.³ On the 21st the distinguished travellers were welcomed at Forli by the Bolognese envoys. On the 23rd *feux de joie* and peals of bells informed the inhabitants of Bologna that the head of the Church had reached the convent of the Crociferi,⁴ one mile distant from the city. On the following day the solemn entry, for which preparations on a vast scale had been undertaken, was made.

The road to San Petronio was overspread by draperies from which hung green garlands enclosing the arms of the Medici. Magnificent triumphal arches in the Doric order

61 ; *cf.* GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 183, 184, and 186. See also F. Gonzaga's *despatch, dat. Spoleto, 1529, October 16 : "S. Sta si mantien benissimo et per il più del tempo cavalca lassando de andar in lettica : si continua li viaggio e forse si accelererà alquanto più che non s' haveva pensato per queste male nove del Turco, quali hanno penetrato nel cor di S. B^{ne}" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ Charles V. recommended him to Clement VII. in an *autograph letter, "De Placencia VIII. de Octobre" (Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm., XI., caps. 1).

² See Merino's report of October 16, 1529, in GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 190. "in sigello" is incorrectly translated "in secret." "In castro Sugelli Perus. dioc.," October 14, 1529, is the date of the *instruction of Clement VII. to the officials of the Cam. Apost., that during his absence from Rome no interdict was to be pronounced in cases of debt ; Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 434 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ *Cf.* BALAN, Clemente VII., 137.

⁴ GIORDANI, 6.

of architecture, with allegorical reliefs, paintings, and stucco groups of figures, had been constructed at the Porta Maggiore, the Palazzo Scappi, and on the Piazza Maggiore. The Pope made his entrance borne on the *sedia gestatoria*; sixteen Cardinals, numerous Archbishops and Bishops, as well as bodies of Bolognese officials, went with him to San Petronio, from whence, after giving his solemn benediction, he betook himself to the Palazzo Pubblico, where splendid apartments had been prepared for him.¹ A special messenger of the Emperor, Pedro de la Cueva, greeted Clement VII., a compliment acknowledged by the Pope in an autograph letter.²

In a secret Consistory held on the 29th of October, six Cardinals were appointed to make all the needful preparations for the Emperor's coronation, and it was decided, in the event of the rite being performed in Bologna, that a Bull should be issued declaring the solemnity to have the same validity as it would have had if carried out in Rome.³ At the same time the Pope was able to proclaim the joyful news that the Turks had abandoned the siege of Vienna. In celebration of this event a solemn function was held in San Petronio on the last day of October, at which the Pope gave his benediction and absolution.⁴

¹ To the sources used by GIORDANI, 6 *seqq.* (especially MSS. chronicles of Negri and Ghiselli), have more recently been added ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 100 *seqq.*; SANUTO, LII., 138, 142 *seq.*, 144 *seqq.*, and the report in CLARETTA, Carlo V. e Clemente VII., 14 *seqq.*

² Printed in *Lett. d. princ.*, I. 122^b. The autograph *letter of Charles V. to Clement VII., "Dy Martes, XXVI. d' Octobre," delivered by P. de la Cueva (Secret Archives of the Vatican, *loc. cit.*).

³ This Bull was issued on the coronation day; see Bull. Vat., II., 402 *seq.*

⁴ RAYNALDUS, 1529, n. 81. Clement VII. congratulated Charles on the deliverance of Vienna, October 29, 1529; see *Lett. d. princ.*, I., 123.

The entry of Charles V. was looked for on the 5th of November. He had left Piacenza on the 27th of October. In Borgo San Donnino he received a letter from his brother announcing the complete failure of the Turkish attack on Vienna.¹ Thus Charles's position in Italy was remarkably improved, and his enemies, who had reckoned on the Turks, lost spirit.²

With renewed hopes Charles went by Parma³ to Reggio, where the Duke Alfonso of Ferrara besought him on his knees to support him against the Pope. This crafty Prince made lavish promises in order to gain the favour of the powerful Emperor, whom he accompanied as far as Modena.⁴ The personal intercourse between them was destined to have important results. When Charles reached Borgo Panigale on the 4th of November, he found almost all the Cardinals and a numerous company of prelates there assembled; Cardinal Farnese welcomed him in the Pope's name and escorted him to Certosa.⁵ On the following day the Emperor made his state entry into the second city of the Papal territories.

On this occasion the decorations of Bologna far surpassed those employed on the arrival of the Pope. If on the

¹ ROMANO, Cronaca, 102. Ferdinand I.'s letter from Linz of October 19, 1529, in GEVAY, Urkunden u. Aktenstücke zur Gesch. der Verhandl. zwischen Österreich, Ungarn und der Pforte. Gesandtschaft an Sultan Suleiman I., 1529, Vienna, 1840, 49 *seq.*

² J. PITTI, Apol. de' Cappucci in Arch. stor. Ital., 1 Series, IV., 2, 362.

³ From here on October 31, 1529, Charles V. wrote to Clement VII.: "Yo continuare my camyno con el deseo que traygo de bazar los pies de V. S^d como dira su camarero a quien me remyto." *Original in Secret Archives of the Vatican, *loc. cit.*

⁴ See ROMANO, Cronaca, 108 *seq.*; *cf.* CAMPORI in Arch. stor. Ital., App. VI., 144 *seqq.*

⁵ Together with GIORDANI, 21 *seq.*, see the report in CLARETTA, *loc. cit.*, 15 *seq.*

former occasion the ecclesiastical element was the most prominent, the chief place was now occupied by secular pomp. In correspondence with the character of the Renaissance, now at its zenith, the festal decorations were marked by the utmost prodigality. Architects, sculptors, and painters competed in the creation of a scheme of ephemeral decoration striking the eye with magnificence and colour and transporting the spectator into the very heart of ancient Rome. From the windows of every house hung coloured tapestries, and awnings overspread the streets; garlands of green leaves formed an admirable contrast to the arches which make Bologna a city of arcades. On the ravelin of the Porta S. Felice, through which Charles was to enter, was seen, on one side, the triumph of Neptune surrounded by tritons, sirens, and sea-horses, and on the other, Bacchus in the midst of satyrs, fauns, and nymphs, with the inscription, "Ave Cæsar, Imperator invicte!" On the gateway itself were conspicuous the Papal keys and the Imperial eagle, inscriptions in imitation of those of ancient Rome, medallion portraits of Cæsar, Augustus, Titus, and Trajan, and lastly the equestrian statues of Camillus and Scipio Africanus. The architectural illusions were also, on this occasion, of exceptional splendour; the triumphal arches erected in the Doric style were all profusely adorned with stucco figures and paintings, mostly in chiaroscuro. Besides the painters of Bologna, those of other cities, such as Giorgio Vasari and a Flemish pupil of Raphael, were employed on these works.

At three o'clock in the afternoon the head of the Imperial procession reached the Porta S. Felice: first came lancers, then the artillery, two hundred landsknechts, cavalry, and again numerous foot-soldiers, followed by many princes and knights on horseback and in gleaming armour. Cardinal

Campeggio, recently returned from England, as bishop of the city, met the Emperor at the gate, before whom were borne the standard of the Empire, the banner of St. George, and an unsheathed sword. Surrounded by Spanish grandees in magnificent attire rode Charles, on a white charger, in flashing armour inlaid with gold. His baldachino was carried by nobles and senators of Bologna. Behind him came the Count of Nassau, Alessandro de' Medici, the Marquis of Montferrat, Andrea Doria, the Cardinal Chancellor di Gattinara, Cles, Bishop of Trent, Bishop George III. of Brixen, Antonio Perrenot, Bishop of Arras, his confessor Garcia de Loaysa, and numerous ecclesiastical and secular dignitaries; the rearguard was composed of Spanish troops. While treasurers flung coins and medals to the closely packed crowds, who were shouting "Cesare, Imperio," the procession slowly made its way to San Petronio, before which a richly decorated platform had been raised; here the Pope, in full pontifical garb, the triple crown upon his head, with five-and-twenty Cardinals around him, awaited the Emperor, on whose approach fanfares from trumpets were blown, all the city bells pealed, and the cannon thundered forth salutes. Two members of the Sacred College led Charles to the platform, where he knelt, and kissed the foot, hand, and forehead of the Pope. Thus, for the first time, the two men came face to face who had been engaged in such a long and bitter contest until their common interests brought them together. Charles addressed the Pope briefly in Spanish, and Clement made a friendly reply. The Emperor was then conducted to the church by the Pope, who afterwards withdrew. A Te Deum was sung in San Petronio.

It was six o'clock in the evening when the Emperor left the church and betook himself to the Palazzo Pubblico,

where his lodgings also had been prepared.¹ His apartments immediately adjoined those of the Pope. A private door of communication enabled them both to hold intercourse, at any time, free from interruption and observation.² A well-known picture in the palace of the Signoria in Florence represents the Emperor and Pope in animated conversation.³

Charles as a politician was more than a match for Clement in shrewdness; nevertheless he made most careful preparation on each occasion of conference with the Pope, noting down on a slip of paper all essential points.⁴ Italian writers of despatches were struck in Charles, who was not yet full thirty years old, by his seriousness, his sense of religion, and a certain slow

¹ For the decoration of Bologna and the Emperor's entry see GIORDANI, 12 *seqq.*, where the rare work, *Il superbo apparato fatto in Bologna alla incoronazione della Ces. M^{ta} di Carlo V.* (copy in the Trivulzio Library, Milan) is made use of, and other sources are given in App. 13 *seqq.* For the preparations of the Master of Ceremonies, Blasius de Martinellis, see *Mél. d'archéol.*, XXIII., 170 *seq.* Cf. also for the entry ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 113 *seqq.*; CLARETTA, *Carlo V. e Clemente VII.*, 16 *seqq.*; SANUTO, LI., 180 *seq.*, 182 *seq.*, 184 *seqq.*, 187 *seqq.*, 192, 195 *seq.*, 197 *seqq.*, 205 *seqq.*, 209, 259 *seqq.*, 266 *seqq.*, 273 *seq.*, 275 *seqq.*; VANDENESSE, *Journal d. voyag. de Charles V.*, II., 85; V. DUYSE in *Bull. de la Soc. d'hist. de Gand*, 1898. The allocution of Charles to the Pope (touched up in ULLOA, *Vita di Carlo V.*, Venice, 1566, 118) is given accurately in a letter of Isabella of Este in *Arch. stor. Ital.*, App. II., 320. For the understanding of the decorations of the city, cf. BURCKHARDT, *Gesch. der Renaissance*, 372 *seq.*

² ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 124; cf. SANUTO, LII., 267.

³ Reproduced in HEYCK, *Die Mediceer*, 120.

⁴ Contarini in ALBÈRI, *Relazioni*, 2 Series, III., 269 *seq.* That Clement had a very good memory is clear from A. da Burgo's *report to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, 1529, March 18, in Court and State Archives, Vienna.

deliberation of speech. Contarini, who had followed the Pope to Bologna, was impressed by the Emperor's absorption in affairs while there; he seldom left the palace except in order to hear Mass. Of the Pope, then in his fifty-first year, he says that the traces of the long and dangerous illness he had gone through were plainly visible on his countenance. Among the Pope's advisers the Venetian Ambassador mentions as the most influential Jacopo Salviati, French in his sympathies, but now accommodating himself to the conditions of the time; then Sanga, the friend of Giberti; Cardinal Pucci, entirely occupied with the Florentine business; as well as Schönberg and Girolamo da Schio, both Imperialists.¹

The negotiations of Clement VII. with Charles were made easier by the conclusion of the treaties of Barcelona and Cambrai. But there still remained certain points which were very difficult of adjustment between them. The Pope was still distrustful of Charles, and, if Contarini is to be believed, it was not until after long intercourse with him at Bologna that Clement's opinion in this respect underwent a change.²

Clement insisted, as was to be expected, on an exact fulfilment of the stipulations in his favour of the Treaty of Barcelona.³ Charles, for his part, was determined to

¹ Contarini in ALBÈRI, *Relaz.*, 2 Series, III., 265 *seqq.*, 269 *seqq.*; *cf.* for Charles V., SANUTO, LII., 210. See also GIORDANI, *App.* 100. For J. Salviati *cf.* DESJARDINS, II., 787, 794; REUMONT, III., 2, 266; EHSES, *Dokumente*, 266.

² Contarini in ALBÈRI, *Relaz.*, 2 Series, III., 266.

³ Gregorio Casale told Contarini that Clement VII. had threatened that, if Charles broke his word, he would return to Rome and there have the Treaty of Barcelona publicly printed, so that all the world might know that he had been duped (DITTRICH, *Regesten*, 70).

retain the Pope's friendship¹ in any event, on account of the Turkish danger, not as yet by any means extinct, the condition of Germany, and the exhaustion of his resources. But his views regarding Milan and Ferrara differed essentially from those of Clement.² The expedition against Florence gave rise to difficulties only in so far as Orange was incessant in his demands for money and reinforcements; an understanding on this point was made easier because Charles saw in the Florentine alliance with France a standing menace to his supremacy in Italy.³ It was otherwise with the Milanese question, to a favour-

¹ Cf. the very important and interesting private letter, already quoted, from Charles V. to Ferdinand I., of January 11, 1530, in LANZ, I., 367 *seq.* "Je désire," says Charles, "ne plus perdre son amyte et pour le moings, si je ne lay pour amy, qu'il ne me soit ennemy."

² For the peace negotiations at Bologna the best source is Niccolò da Ponte's *Maneggio della pace di Bologna* in ALBÈRI, *Relaz.*, 2 Series, III., 147 *seqq.*, the importance of which GACHARD (*Relations*, VIII. *seq.*) rightly insists upon. Contarini's reports are more complete than those in SANUTO, LII., although the latter is of importance as enabling one to fix the dates of individual reports and in giving (LII., 376 *seqq.*) a number of new Mantuan despatches. Cf. also Contarini's relation in ALBÈRI, *loc. cit.*, 264 *seq.*, and the accounts in ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 126 *seqq.*, which confirm N. da Ponte's statements. The author of the *Cronaca* edited by ROMANO is, as the latter shows (59 *seq.* and 285-286), Luigi Gonzaga di Borgoforte, who, in parts, uses the words of the Mantuan envoys. For an understanding of the Pope's views on the peace there is important evidence in the *Lett. d. princ.*, III., 95-99, where a letter is published addressed to the Bishop of Vaison, G. da Schio, while staying at the Emperor's court, coming, as RANKE (*Deutsch. Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 153) rightly supposes, from Sanga.

³ Cf. LANZ, I., 367; GUICCIARDINI, XIX., 6; and BARDI, Carlo V., 31, 34, 72. For the unsuccessful negotiations with the Florentine envoys see FOSSATI-FALLETTI, *Assedio*, I., 373 *seqq.* For the consultations with Orange, who came to Bologna, see ROMANO, 132 *seqq.*; cf. CLARETTA, 20.

able settlement of which Charles attached the greatest value. Previous to the meeting at Bologna, negotiations on this matter had already begun. In September and October the Imperialist envoys had proposed to Clement that Alessandro de' Medici should be given Milan; but they received the negative reply that the Pope could not commit himself to so great an undertaking, productive as it would be of perpetual difficulties to those of his own house. Nevertheless, the Emperor at Bologna returned to this proposal, but with no better success; on the other hand, influences were at work to secure Milan for Federigo Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua.¹ As things were, any investiture of the duchy on another than Francesco Sforza would have kindled afresh another war in Italy.² It was therefore fortunate that Charles listened to the representations of the Pope, Gattinara, and Contarini, and summoned Sforza to appear at Bologna to vindicate his claims. On the 23rd of November 1529 Sforza had his first audience with the Emperor; he conducted his case with such skill that the Pope succeeded in bringing Charles completely round. By the 3rd of December the investiture of Sforza with Milan was practically settled.³

The Venetian Government having already, on the 10th

¹ NICCOLÒ DA PONTE, *Maneggio*, 178 *seqq.*; ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 134. See DITTRICH, *Contarini*, 186, 192; DE LEVA, II., 573; DAVARI in *Giorn. ligust.*, 1890, 461, according to documents in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. The Marquis of Mantua came to Bologna on November 20; see the **Diarium* of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS in *Cod. Barb.*, XXXV., 45 (now lat. 2801), Vatican Library.

² NICCOLÒ DA PONTE, *Maneggio*, 183-184.

³ ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 139, 140, 142; **Diarium* of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS, *loc. cit.*; NICCOLÒ DA PONTE, *Maneggio*, 179 *seq.*, 189, 192, 199 *seq.*, 212 *seqq.* Cf. SANUTO, LII., 304, 332 *seq.*; *Giorn. ligust.*, 1891, 101; BARDI, Carlo V., 33 *seq.*

of November, given full powers¹ to Contarini to restore Ravenna and Cervia to the Pope, now declared themselves also ready to evacuate the Apulian towns; they objected, however, at first to enter into the defensive Italian league desired by the Emperor. On the 26th of November the Senate determined to make this concession also, in the hope that Charles would then make reductions in his demands for money from Milan and Venice. On the representations made to him by Contarini, the Emperor consented to a substantial reduction of the war indemnity payable by the Republic; but from Sforza he demanded as before, together with enormous sums of money, the castles of Milan and Como as security for payment. On the 12th of December a messenger from Venice arrived with instructions to Contarini to comply with the Emperor's wishes.²

The Pope, yielding to the requests of Venice, recognized

¹ NICCOLÒ DA PONTE, *Maneggio*, 171 *seq.*; *cf.* ROMANIN, V., 465 *seq.*; DE LEVA, II., 585 *seq.* Even in Bologna, Contarini had repeatedly endeavoured, but in vain, to induce the Pope to waive the restitution of the cities; see DITTRICH, *Contarini*, 181 *seq.* On November 14, 1529, Clement VII. thanked Venice for the restitution as decided on, and promised to use his influence with the Emperor on behalf of peace. The Brief is published in PASOLINI, *Documenti riguard. antiche relazione fra Venezia e Ravenna, Imola*, 1881, 108-109; *cf.* *Libri com.*, VI., 203 *seq.* The *Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor note on November 15, 1529: "Item relatum fuit, Venetos velle restituere terras ecclesie ut puta Cerviam et Ravennam per eos occupatas" (Consistorial Archives and Secret Archives of the Vatican). Rome, January 21, 1530, is the date of Clement's order to "Leonello Pio praesidenti Romandiolae" to take charge of Ravenna and Cervia with their citadels until further orders; *Min. brev.*, 1530, vol. 27, n. 23 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² *Cf.* DITTRICH, *Contarini*, 193 *seqq.* Como and Milan were to be delivered over to a Spaniard chosen by the Pope out of five nominees of Charles; see Casale in MOLINI, II., 265.

the right of the Duke of Urbino to the possession of his entire dominions. The Emperor, made uneasy by the news from Germany and the renewal of danger from Francis I., now decided to bring the negotiations to an end at once. The interests of Ferdinand were no longer considered, and his representatives were obliged, perforce, to agree with the Emperor's determination. Thus, on the 23rd of December 1529, it became possible to conclude a treaty of peace, the parties to which were Clement, Charles, Ferdinand, Venice, Sforza, Mantua, Savoy, Montferrat, Urbino, Siena, and Lucca. On New Year's Day the treaty was solemnly proclaimed in the Cathedral of Bologna, and on the 6th of January 1530 ratified on oath by all the contracting parties.¹

The only points still left unsettled were the dispute between Clement and Alfonso of Ferrara, and the conclusion of a confederacy against the Turks. The Pope's antagonism to Alfonso had been made all the more vehement by the encroachments of the latter on purely ecclesiastical matters.² With regard to political controversies, Clement let Alfonso understand that he was quite

¹ ROMANO, Cronaca, 151 *seqq.*, 161 *seqq.*, 174 *seqq.*, and the reports in SANUTO, LII., 307 *seq.*, 309 *seq.*, 438 *seqq.*, 445 *seqq.*, 475, 477. The text of the League in DUMONT, IV., 2, 56 *seqq.* Cf. GIORDANI, Doc., 38 *seqq.*; SUDENDORF, III., 195 *seq.*; Libri Com., VI., 204 *seq.* For the treatment of Ferdinand's envoys, STOEGMANN, 180 *seq.*, gives information from the letters of A. da Burgo to Cles in the Court and State Archives, Vienna. Use has not been made *of the reports of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., in the same collection, partly in cipher, dated Bologna, 1529, December 26; cf. also that of December 29, 1529. Clement VII. gave permission in a *Bull of January 17, 1530, to the Duke of Milan to raise a full tithe on all the benefices of the duchy in order to raise the large sums which he had to pay on his investiture.

² See FONTANA, Renata, I., 452 *seqq.*

willing not to interfere with him, but if he were to renounce his claim to Modena and Reggio, Parma and Piacenza would then be separated from the Papal States in such a way that it would be almost equivalent to their alienation. Clement appealed expressly to the promises given by Charles at Barcelona; but in vain, for Alfonso had succeeded in completely winning over to his side the Emperor's advisers, as well as the Emperor himself. In this he was greatly helped by the secret intention of Charles to curb the power and independence of the Papal States. In public Charles spoke threateningly to Alfonso's envoys; but they knew very well that his anger was all assumed.¹ The Pope, in his irritation, said to the French Ambassador, "I am being betrayed, but I must act as if I were unaware of it."² Yet he declared expressly that under no circumstances would he allow Alfonso to participate in the coronation of the Emperor.³

For a long time the claims of Rome to be the scene of this solemnity had been seriously considered; but at last, after lengthy deliberation, the choice had fallen on Bologna. The reason for this decision was principally the gloomy account of the state of Germany sent by Ferdinand I., which rendered necessary the presence of Charles, as speedily as possible, in that portion of his empire.⁴

¹ Cf. ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 171-173, 181, where two very interesting reports from the Gonzaga Archives are published. The Papal grievances against Alfonso were collected together in a special document for Charles V. It is printed in SUDENDORF, III., 187 *seq.*

² Letter of Gramont, Bishop of Tarbes, dat. Bologna, February 25, 1530, in LE GRAND, *Divorce*, III., 386.

³ ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 196.

⁴ The question whether Rome should be the place of coronation was again brought forward on account of Charles's wish to visit Naples and the difficulties raised by Gattinara against the choice of Bologna. For the Chancellor was afraid that the "Lutherans and others" might call in

Charles was desirous that a certain number of the princes of the German Empire should attend his coronation; but

question the validity of the rite. (See the despatch of G. B. Malatesta of November 4, 1529, in ROMANO, Cronaca, 145, n. 1; *cf.* also GAYANGOS, 147 n., 208; SANUTO, LII., 192; and GIORDANI, App. 71.) Charles V., who received the consecrated sword on Christmas Day (see Jahrbuch der kunsthistor. Samml. des österr. Kaiserhauses, XXII., 135 *seq.*), did not make up his mind for some time. On December 26, 1529, A. da Burgo *reported to Ferdinand I.: "De loco coronationis et tempore adventus imperatoris in Germaniam adhuc res stat in suspenso" (original in Court and State Archives, Vienna). Ferdinand's representative, A. da Burgo, was opposed to the coronation in Rome, since the Emperor's visit to Germany would be delayed, where the danger was very great. (See Burgo's *report to Ferdinand I., dat. Bologna, 1529, December 29. The answer of B. von Cles to this is given by BUCHOLTZ, III., 427 *seq.*) Some of Charles's advisers dissuaded him from going to Germany, the risks being too great. They advised him to return to Spain by Rome and Naples. Burgo strongly opposed them (see STOEGMANN, 183 *seq.*). Charles for his part wished, on account of the Florentine undertaking, to go to Siena and from there to his coronation in Rome. On January 4, 1530, Burgo informed Ferdinand I.: "The Emperor is *in recessu*" (*report of this date in Court and State Archives, Vienna; *cf.* SANUTO, LII., 483); on January 14: "The Emperor and Pope are going to Siena" (*report of this date; *cf.* SANUTO, LII., 490, 495, 497, 499, 501-503). On the 11th, in a long autograph letter (in LANZ, I., 360 *seqq.*), Charles V. asked his brother's advice on this important matter. As Burgo informed Ferdinand by letter on January 30, 1530, Charles impatiently awaited his answer. As the Emperor was unwell on the 22nd of January, the journey to Rome had to be put off (SANUTO, LII., 531; *cf.* 530). Burgo made use of this time to work for the coronation at Bologna. On January 28 (*letter of this date) he was able to tell Ferdinand that the Pope was prepared to comply; but Charles still clung to the Roman journey. On January 22 he wrote to Margaret of Austria that he was determined to be crowned at Rome (BARDI, 34). On January 30 Burgo made counter-representations to Charles which were so effectual that the former wrote to Cles that he had good hopes that the coronation would take place at Bologna (STOEGMANN, 184); and so, in fact, it was settled (*cf.* the information in GIORDANI, 87, from Negri, Annali

Burgo and Salinas, representing Ferdinand I., convinced him that there was no longer any time to await their arrival.¹ Ferdinand, wrote the envoys on the 12th of

MSS. for February 1, 1530). On February 1, 1530, Burgo informed his master: "The Emperor is not going to Rome. He remains in Bologna." (A p.s. dated Febr. 2, to *letter of Febr. 1, 1530, says: "Some are advising the Emperor to have himself crowned in Germany by a Papal Legate as soon as he is certain of Ferdinand's election as King of the Romans. Ferdinand must forward his view speedily.") On February 2 he *writes: "Hoc mane post deliberationem externam Caesar fecit expedire mulos quos conduxerat pro profectioe Romae, et hic fiet coronatio die S. Mathie"; cf. SANUTO, LII., 553, 562, and in Appendix, n. 9, the *Brief of February 2, 1530, to Cardinal Farnese, who was summoned to Bologna for the coronation (Min. in Secret Archives of the Vatican; original in State Archives, Naples). On February 4: "A congregation of Cardinals was entrusted with the business of the coronation" (see in App., No. 10, *Acta Consist., Consistorial Archives). In a *letter of Burgo's to Ferdinand I. of February 4, 1530, he says: "Si M^{tas} V. non dissuadebit coronationem hic fiendam, melius hic fiet, sed si scribit non esse fiendam hic, credimus Caesar omittet non obstante quod alii venerint." At last on February 5 came Ferdinand's answer, dated January 28, 1530 (in BUCHOLTZ, III., 430 *seqq.*, in extract; given entire in GEVAY, Urkunden und Aktenstücke v. Gesandtschaft König Ferdinands I. an Suleiman I., Vienna, 1838, 59 *seqq.*). In a *report of February 8, 1530, Burgo relates how Charles behaved on receiving this, the decisive answer (see Appendix, No. 11). He *reports on the 12th: "Caesar perseverat omni celeritate in provisionibus suae coronationis hic Bononiae": cf. also a **second letter of this date. On the 13th Charles informed Margaret, "After long deliberation Bologna has been chosen as the place of coronation" (BARDI, 35). The reason given by JOVIUS, Hist., XXVII., 105, that Rome was unsuitable for the occasion owing to its recent destruction, is not mentioned in any of the documents. The whole of the *letters of A. da Burgo quoted above, some of which are countersigned by Salinas, I found in the Court and State Archives, Vienna.

¹ See the p.s. of February 2 to Burgo's letter of the previous day. (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

February 1530, could make excuses for his brother to the German princes and show them that it had not lain in Charles's power to fix beforehand the date of the coronation, which he was now compelled to proceed with without preparation in order to accelerate his arrival in Germany.¹

All the necessary arrangements were, in fact, made in great haste.² On the 16th of February the Pope confirmed, in a Bull, the election of Charles and his coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle, and gave orders that he should be crowned with the iron and the golden Imperial crowns.³ As early as the 22nd of February, the festival of St Peter's Chair at Antioch, Charles received in the chapel of the Palazzo Pubblico the iron crown of Lombardy,⁴ which had been brought from Monza.⁵ Two days later the coronation as Emperor was to take place in San Petronio; Charles had chosen this day because it was his birthday and the anniversary of the victory of his forces at Pavia.⁶

Except as regarded the customary place for the enactment of this solemn rite, all other observances of the

¹ Cf. A. da Burgo's report of February 12, 1530, *loc. cit.* The electors protested to safeguard their rights, on July 29, 1530, that the Imperial coronation had taken place in their absence and that others had partially fulfilled their duties. RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, VI., 6th ed., 139.

² See *Acta Consist. of February 16, 1532 (Consistorial Archives and Secret Archives of the Vatican), and *Diary of BLASIIUS DE MARTINELLIS, *loc. cit.*

³ RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 5, 6.

⁴ Together with Blasius de Martinellis in RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 7 (cf. GIORDANI, 99 *seqq.*, and *Mel. d'archéol.*, XXIII., 171 *seq.*), see SANUTO, LII., 604 *seq.*, 610 *seqq.*, 633 *seqq.*, and ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 202 *seqq.*; see also KROENER, *Wahl und Krönung der deutschen Kaiser in Italien*, Freiburg, 1901, 96 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. GIORDANI, 95 *seqq.*

⁶ It is worth noticing as a curiosity that FONTANA, *Renata*, I., 135, gives February 7 as the date of the coronation.

coronation were carried out with painstaking exactitude. In San Petronio the very side-chapels and the *rota porphyrea* itself were copied from St. Peter's, so that the entire ceremony could be held as if at the tombs of the Apostles Peter and Paul in Rome. A wooden bridge decorated with tapestries and garlands, and high enough to allow the passage of vehicles beneath, led from the palace to the church, which was adorned with Flemish tapestries of great value. Four hundred landsknechts guarded the bridge, two thousand Spaniards and ten pieces of artillery were drawn up on the piazza. All the city gates also were guarded by landsknechts and Spaniards.

At nine o'clock the Pope, clad in a mantle embroidered with gold and studded with precious stones, and wearing the triple crown, was borne to the church; the Cardinals and all the members of his court followed him. In the meantime the secular dignitaries, all, especially the Spanish grandees, wearing the most costly garments, had assembled in the palace to meet the Emperor. Pages and servants of the princes and the Emperor opened the procession; then came the nobles, the Imperial bodyguard, and all the envoys. Before the Emperor, the Marquis of Montferrat carried the golden sceptre; the Duke of Urbino, the sword; the young Count Palatine Philip, the nephew of the Elector, the orb of the Empire; the Duke of Savoy, the kingly crown. Charles wore the iron crown of Lombardy; having on his right Cardinal Salviati, and on his left Cardinal Ridolfi; the Counts of Lannoy and Nassau followed with a great train of nobles, mostly Spanish.

Before the church, on the right-hand side, a wooden chapel had been erected, representing S. Maria in Turri at Rome. After the Papal Bull relating to the coronation had here been read aloud by the Bishop of Malta, Charles swore on a book of the Gospels held before him by Cardinal

Enkevoirt, to be the faithful champion of the Holy Roman Church, whereupon he was received into the Chapter of St. Peter's. Charles had hardly crossed the wooden bridge when a portion of it fell in. In spite of this perilous incident he maintained his composure, and knelt down in the portal of the church, where two Cardinals recited the customary prayers. He was then conducted into yet a second chapel, to which the Roman name of S. Gregorio had been given, and was there clad in the Deacon's tunic and a *pluviale* sown with pearls, rubies, and diamonds. He then took his place at the *rota porphyrea*, going on to a spot arranged in imitation of the confession of St. Peter's, and finally passing into a chamber, representing the chapel of S. Maurizio at Rome, to be anointed with the holy oil. During these proceedings a sharp dispute arose between the envoys of Genoa and Siena as to precedence; not until this had been composed could the ceremonies proceed.

The solemn act of the coronation itself was reserved for Clement. After the reading of the Epistle, Charles was girt with the sword; then he likewise received from the hands of the Pope the orb and sceptre, and lastly the Imperial crown; whereupon Clement spoke the words: "Receive this symbol of glory and the diadem of the Empire, even this Imperial crown, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou, despising the ancient enemy and guiltless of all iniquity, mayst live in clemency and godliness, and so one day receive from our Lord Jesus Christ the crown of His eternal kingdom." Before the oblation the Emperor offered the three customary gold pieces and served as Deacon, bringing to the altar the paten with the wafers and the cruet of water, "in so seemly and devout a fashion, as one long accustomed to fulfil such services, that all standing around were filled with wonder and joy." After

receiving Holy Communion the Emperor kissed the Pope's forehead, after which the latter bestowed the benediction. Together the two heads of Christendom, in all the pomp of their respective dignities, left the Church. Although Clement tried to prevent him, the Emperor insisted on holding his stirrup and on leading his palfrey a few paces forward; then with youthful alacrity he mounted his own charger.

Then came the great cavalcade. "Under the same golden canopy," says a contemporary, "shone, like sun and moon, these two great luminaries of the world." In the procession, the gorgeous outlines of which the artists of the day were swift to fasten on their canvases, were conspicuous, first the banners of the Crusade, then those of the Church and of the Pope, followed by the standards of the Empire, of the city of Rome, Germany, Spain, the New World, Naples, and Bologna. Treasurers flung gold and silver coins among the vast crowds with which all the streets were filled. At San Domenico the Pope left the procession, while the Emperor from a throne conferred knighthood on about a hundred persons. Not until four o'clock in the afternoon was Charles, amid the jubilant greetings of his troops, able to regain his apartments. The coronation banquet brought the celebrations to an end.¹

¹ The chief source for the solemnities of the coronation is the Diary of Blasius de Martinellis, the Papal Master of Ceremonies, the most important passages of which are in RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 17 *seq.* Many other accounts, some rare and unpublished, have been collected by GIORDANI for his description, 111 *seqq.*; here (Doc., 176 *seqq.*) also is printed the "Lettera inedita del Bolognese Ugo Buoncompagni (afterwards Pope Gregory XIII.) nella quale si descrive la incoronazione di Carlo V." This had been printed previously in Bologna in 1841. Giordani was not acquainted with the German account in BUCHOLTZ, III., 441 *seq.*, nor with two other authorities recently made accessible: (1) the Cronaca, edited by ROMANO, 207-223, and (2) the contemporary

At nightfall bonfires blazed everywhere. The Duke of Milan, although suffering from illness, allowed these demonstrations to last three days. On the 1st of March a Papal Bull was issued declaring the coronation as fully valid as it would have been if solemnized at Rome, and renewing the dispensation permitting Charles to combine the possession of Naples with that of the Imperial dignity.¹

Since Florence remained stubborn in her resistance, Clement saw that he must make two further concessions of great importance to Charles; first of all by nominating three Cardinals acceptable to the Emperor. The appointments were made public on the 19th of March. These were Bernhard Cles, Bishop of Trent, on whose behalf Burgo had been active for some time past; ² the Emperor's

notices in SANUTO, some of which are of great interest; see LII., 624 *seqq.*, 628 *seqq.*, 638 *seqq.*, 640 *seqq.* The curious statement of GUICCIARDINI (XX., 1), that the coronation took place "con piccola pompa e spesa," has already been refuted by GIANNONE, XXX., 6; *cf.* also GIORDANI, App., 73. This laborious compilation also treats thoroughly the pictorial representations of the great event (App., 117, and Doc., 69 *seqq.*, 165 *seqq.*, 175 *seqq.*). The finest of these pictures, still well preserved and often reproduced, is that of the Cavalcata, painted in the Palazzo Ridolfi, Verona, by the Veronese, Domenico Ricci, called Brusasorci; *cf.* G. B. DA PERSICO, Descriz. di Verona, I., Verona, 1820, 181 *seq.* Hogenberg's representation of the Cavalcata (*cf.* BLANC, Bibliographie, I., 597, 604, 612) has been recently reproduced in 250 copies only: The Procession of Pope Clement VII. and the Emperor Charles V. after the Coronation on February 24, 1530. Designed and engraved by Nic. Hogenberg, and now reproduced in facsimile with an historical introduction by W. Stirling Maxwell, Edinburgh, 1875.

¹ RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 46 *seqq.* Here also is the second Bull of March 1, concerning the ratification, with the consent of the Cardinals, of the Imperial election and the subsequent coronation.

² See the *reports of A. da Burgo of October 15, 1529, January 4 and February 12, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

confessor, Garcia de Loaysa; and the Savoyard, De Challant.¹ With much greater reluctance Clement granted his permission that Alfonso of Ferrara should, after all, come to Bologna. But although on this point also he gave way,² the Duke was not allowed to make his entry in state.³ Clement also demanded once more the restoration of Reggio, Modena, and Rubbiera. An agreement was at last reached on the 21st of March; Alfonso was to cede Modena to the Emperor, who, on the expiration of six months, should pronounce a final decision as to the ownership of the three towns and the computation of the assessment of Ferrara.⁴ This gave Charles, who had never acquired a real trust of Clement,⁵ a decided influence over the fortunes of the Papal States; the exceptional favour shown by him to the Duke of Urbino was also of service in this direction.⁶

¹ The Spaniard Stunica was also nominated on March 9, according to the *Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor, but not publicly announced. On March 19 Clement VII. nominated a French Cardinal, F. de Tournon, in order not to give too much offence to Francis I.; see CIACONIUS, III., 506 *seqq.*, 518; NOVAES, IV., 115 *seq.* Cf. the **report of A. da Burgo of March 9, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna), and the *Diary of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS, *loc. cit.*

² The decision was given on February 27; cf. the **report of A. da Burgo of February 27, 1530, *loc. cit.*

³ *Et licet instantiam fecerit, ut sibi honor fieret in introitu, papa denegavit; ille autem noctis tempore ingressus magna quidem nobilium suorum comitiva. BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS, *Diarium, *loc. cit.*; cf. ROMANO, Cronaca, 223 *seq.*, 229. The *Salvocondotto of Clement VII. for Alfonso, dated Bologna, 1530, March 2 (State Archives, Modena).

⁴ MOLINI, II., 295 *seqq.*; SANUTO, LIII., 67; MURATORI, Ant. Esten., II., 237.

⁵ Cf. the letter of Charles V. to Ferdinand I. of January 11, 1530, quoted *supra*, p. 69, n. 1.

⁶ Francesco Maria came to Bologna on February 22, 1530 (GIORDANI, 106 *seqq.*), "with the intention of weakening the solidarity

Charles, moreover, knew how, in a masterly way, to widen the firm foundations of his power in Italy by means of the possession of Naples and the dependent position of the Duke of Milan, and to link closely to himself the minor states of the Peninsula. In order to secure Alfonso absolutely he invested him with the fief of Carpi, wrested from Alberto Pio as a punishment for his attachment to France. He gave Asti to his brother-in-law, the Duke of Savoy, who was at Bologna during his stay, and the marquisate of Mantua was erected into a duchy. He could reckon besides on the republics of Siena, Lucca, and Genoa with certainty. For centuries no Emperor had wielded so much power in Italy;¹ national independence was practically at an end. By no means the least share in this guilt belongs to Clement VII., even although a good deal may be said to excuse his ultimate reconciliation with Charles. But the Pope was not the only culprit; all the heads of the Italian states without exception contributed towards the subjection of their fair lands to the supremacy of the alien Spaniard.² Yet in the existing state of things even this was a boon; for otherwise Italy must have fallen

of the Papal monarchy." BROSCHE well remarks, I., 115, "Charles consented also, evidently with satisfaction, to the recognition of the Duke of Urbino, although he pretended that he was only giving way to pressure from Venice!"

¹ RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 160 *seq.*; SISMONDI, XV., 473 *seq.* For the journey of the Duke of Savoy to Bologna see ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 196 *seq.* The investiture of Federigo Gonzaga with the ducal title is dated April 8, 1530; see VOLTA, *Storia di Mantova*, II., 352; C. D'ARCO, *Studi intorno al municipio di Mantova*, IV., Mantova, 1872, 38; DAVARI in *Giorn. ligust.*, 1890, 467.

² REUMONT, III., 2, 237 *seq.*; *cf.* BALAN, *Clemente VII.*, 127 *seq.*, 129.

a prey to the Turks,¹ to whose aid not only Venice but even Florence had appealed.²

When Charles left Bologna on the 22nd of March to take his journey into Germany he was able to do so with feelings of satisfaction.³ Not so the Pope.⁴ The Papal territories had certainly been restored in essentials, but in many respects they were dependent on the Emperor. More galling even than this was the continued resistance of Florence, for when he made his way to Bologna, Clement had expected its speedy subjection. During his residence there his impatience had grown greater day by day;⁵ now, after five months, the heroic spirit of the Florentines flouted, as at the first, all the efforts of their besiegers. It was reported that as Clement's distrust of Orange grew more intense the latter might have fallen upon him in Bologna and renewed the lessons of the sack of Rome, and that this suspicion hastened the Pope's departure.⁶ He left early on the 31st of March, touching Urbino, Gualdo, and Foligno on his way, and by the 12th of April he was once more in

¹ See *Histor. Zeitschr.*, N.F., XIV., 273.

² With regard to the Florentines see Capello in ALBÈRI, *Relaz.*, 2 Series, I., 279. With regard to Venice see *supra*, p. 69.

³ ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 234 *seq.*; cf. GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 273.

⁴ "Papa Clemente," says VARCHI, II., 37, "trovandosi senza danari e senza riputazione, si partì tutto malcontento."

⁵ See ROMANO, *Cronaca*, 144.

⁶ According to Negri, *Annali manoscritti di Bologna* (GIORDANI, *Doc.*, 182, and *App.* 173), this danger was discussed in Consistory; but there is no mention of it in the **Acta Consist.* The latter, however, for this period, are certainly very incomplete. A. Soriano, in his report of March 23, remarks on the sudden decision of the Pope to take his departure (the cause of which Salinas could not find out); see GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 282 and 283: "Ha dubito di qualche inconveniente atento le gente del campo voleno danari."

Rome; his entry, however, was unaccompanied by any public reception.¹

Consumed with impatience, Clement now waited daily for the capitulation of his native city, whose inhabitants were defending themselves with the courage of despair.² The war was consuming vast sums of money; besides, since June, the Pope had been engaged in attempts to suppress the Abbot of Farfa,³ so that his finances, deplorable enough in any case, were threatened with total bankruptcy.⁴ There was also the fear that France and England might help the Florentines;⁵

¹ VARCHI, II., 37, names the 9th; A. Soriano, in SANUTO, LIII., 149, gives the 12th April as the date of the Pope's arrival. I prefer the latter statement, as it coincides with the *Diary in the Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatican Library), and Varchi, as regards dates, is inaccurate: thus, for example, he incorrectly gives October 25 as the date of the Pope's arrival in Bologna.

² The fact that no quarter was given to prisoners throws light on the mutual bitterness of the contending parties. Capello's report in ALBÈRI, Relaz., 2 Series, I., 242.

³ Cf. SANUTO, LIII., 330, as well as the reports of *A. da Burgo of June 26, July 12, and August 30, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna), and GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 319, 349, 352, 356, 361, 363, 374, 398, 404, 418, 420, 428, 452, 476, 535, 567.

⁴ A. da Burgo *reported from Rome on June 13, 1530: "S. S^{tas} ita laborat in impensa hujus expeditionis Florentinae quod vix providet in victu curiae suae." On July 3 Burgo relates a conversation with the Pope, who remarked that he hardly knew how to provide for his financial needs any longer (quo vertere caput), "quia in illa necessaria expeditione Florentina usque nunc expendit supra septem centum millia ducatorum, quam speraverat posse finire cum 80,000." Both letters in Court and State Archives, Vienna. The total expenses, according to Soriano's (ALBÈRI, Relaz., 2 Series, III., 312) information, amounted to 1,900,000 gold guldens; cf. also the *Mandati of the Roman State Archives in GORI'S Archivio, IV., 112 *seqq.*

⁵ Cf. for this GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 319, 320, 349, 361, and the *reports of A. da Burgo, dat. Rome, June 26 and July 12 and 23 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

but, on the other hand, in the city on the Arno things might be pushed to the last extremity and Florence be stormed and plundered.¹ What would then happen might be presaged from the frightful havoc and cruelty perpetrated by the ungovernable troops of the besieging army.² With these fears mingled the consciousness of the heavy reproaches levelled far and wide against this almost fratricidal enterprise. When the French envoy, Gabriel de Gramont, Bishop of Tarbes, in April 1530, represented this fully to Clement and earnestly exhorted him to come to terms, the Pope exclaimed distractedly, "Would that Florence had never existed!"³

Yet this same Florence still held out. As it was in May, so it was in June; as it was in June, so it was in July. Neither the enemy without nor dissension within, neither hunger nor pestilence, could break down the desperate resistance of the inhabitants. They were resolved to carry it on to the last extremity; better that Florence should be reduced to ashes than that their city should fall into the hands of the Medici.⁴ There were even rumours that a plot had been made to put the Pope to death by poison.⁵

Affairs began to take a final turn after the failure of Francesco Ferruccio in his heroic attempt to raise the

¹ GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 342, 356, 374, 560.

² The *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE (National Library, Paris) is here very detailed.

³ "Il me dist qu'il estoit contant que Florence n'eust jamais esté." Gramont to Francis I. from Rome, 1530, April, in Arch. stor. Ital., App., I., 476.

⁴ See Capello in ALBÈRI, Relaz., 2 Series, I., 306; see *supra*, p. 72.

⁵ SANUTO, LIII., 299-300, 302, 367; LANZ, I., 390; HEINE, Briefe, 12 *seq.* Cf. DE LEVA, II., 631; ROBERT, 391 *seq.* The matter was inquired into but without discovery of any certain grounds for further proceedings; see EHSES in the Röm. Quartalschr., XVIII., 360.

siege.¹ On the 3rd of August an engagement was fought at Gavinana, in the hills of Pistoja, in which Ferruccio, as well as Orange, met their death.² Florence, ravaged by

¹ The life of this commander, whom CIPOLLA, 962, compares with the generals of the first period of the French Revolution, was written by FR. SASSETTI, published in *Arch. stor. Ital.*, 1 Series, IV., 2, 467 *seqq.*

² See ALVISI, *La battaglia di Gavinana*, Bologna, 1881, and D. CINI, *La battaglia di Gavinana*, Firenze, 1890; *cf.* further DE BLASIIS, *Maramaldo*, III., 367, and Fr. Ferruccio e la guerra di Firenze 1529–1530, *racc. di scritti e doc. rari* ed. F. CURZIO, Firenze, 1890, and ROBERT, 423 *seq.* Clement VII. received the news of the battle on the afternoon of August 5; see *A. da Burgo's report of August 5, 1530, in the Court and State Archives, Vienna. The attempt of ALVISI to rehabilitate Maramaldo has been met by VILLARI (*Rasseg. settim.*, VIII., 278, repeated in *Arte storia e filosofia*, Firenze, 1884), RENIER (*Preludio*, V., 237), and LUZIO (*Maramaldo*, 32 *seqq.*): it is certain that Maramaldo assassinated Ferruccio during his captivity; *cf.* also BALAN, *Clemente VII.*, 168, n. 1; G. SFORZA, *F. Maramaldo*, Parma, 1898; and RODONI, *L'Animo e la fama di F. Ferruccio*, Firenze, 1899. The place of Orange in Naples was taken by Cardinal P. Colonna, whose viceregal dignity had already been foretold in the autumn of 1528 (SANUTO, XLVIII., 543). A *Brief of the Pope's to Cardinal Colonna touches on this. It is dated Viterbo, 1528, September 22: "The Pope rejoices that the Cardinal is going to Naples: he is certain to attain a high position in the Emperor's service: Girolamo Rorario will give him fuller information" (copy in the Colonna Archives, Rome, *Brevi*, n. 69). Cardinal Colonna died at the end of June 1532, not from poison (see REUMONT, *Caraffa*, II., 35). The contrary grounds adduced by AIDA CONSORTI (*Il Card. P. Colonna*, Roma, 1902, 112) prove nothing. *Cf.* in App., No. 25, the *letter of F. Peregrino of June 29, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Colonna is said to have instigated a plot to poison Clement VII. BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS relates: *Circa principium Augusti [1532] decretum fuit et diffamatum, qualiter card. de Columna conjuraverat in mortem pontificis in die assumptionis b. Mariae de mense Augusti praesentis. Propter hoc d. Innocentius, secretarius d. cardinalis, incarceratus, deinde quidam Augustinus de Monteferrato et successive r. d. archiepisc. Surrentinus [F. Strozzi], qui est Florentinus, similiter retenti et incarcerati. D. Bernardus de Alexandris

famine and plague, was now lost. Malatesta Baglioni, who since the beginning of the year had chief command of the Florentine troops, made further resistance impossible by turning his guns against the city. On the 12th of August the final capitulation was agreed upon: within four months the Emperor was to appoint a constitution with "safeguards of freedom"; the exiles were to return home, 80,000 scudi to be paid to the Imperial troops, and the Florentine territory preserved without diminution; a complete amnesty to be declared for all who had acted as opponents of the house of Medici.¹

ob timorem talis materiae aufugit et contra eum proceditur (Cod. Barb., lat. 2799, Vatican Library.) Pedro de Toledo now became Viceroy, and did more than anyone else to establish firmly Spanish rule in Naples and to beautify the city; *cf.* along with Giannone, especially REUMONT, Caraffa, I., 49 *seq.* The post of Vice-Chancellor was held by Ippolito de' Medici; see the *Bull with the signatures of Clement VII. and twenty-four Cardinals, dated Rome, 1532, V. Non Julii [= 3 July], in Regest., 1440, f. 268^b *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ VARCHI, II., 137 *seqq.*; FOSSATI-FALLETTI, Assedio, I., 458 *seqq.* *Cf.* also RANKE, Studien, 373. Clement VII. sent Domenico Centurione to Malatesta with a Brief of August 13, 1530, to thank him for having saved the city from a sack. (This Brief and a second, of August 23, are in VARCHI, II., 149-150.) The fear that the city might be plundered was the cause, as REUMONT, Toskana, I., 29, specially remarks, of Clement's negotiations with Malatesta, "who, if not to all intents and purposes a traitor, as many have accused him of being, nevertheless did all he could to keep the resistance of the besieged within such limits as should prevent a final and decisive struggle." *Cf.* also BALAN, Clemente VII., 171, n. 1. For the question of Malatesta's behaviour, the letters of Ferrante Gonzaga to his brother Federigo, given by Varchi, are of importance. RANKE, Zur Kritik, 84,* has thrown doubts on their authenticity; but without grounds, as REUMONT, in a recension which has fallen into undeserved oblivion, points out (Allg. Zeitung, 1875, No. 103, Biel.). VARCHI only gives the letters in part; they were first published in full from a Strozzi MS. in the Magliabecchiana Library by ALBÈRI, Docum. sull' assedio di Firenze, Firenze, 1840, 307 *seqq.*,

After Malatesta's departure (12th of September) two hundred landsknechts, under the Count of Lodron, occupied the city, where the Medicean party, in shameful violation of the terms of capitulation, began to take savage reprisals on their enemies. Carducci, Bernardo da Castiglione, and four other members of the former government were beheaded; numerous sentences of exile and confiscation were passed.¹ The Dominican, Benedetto da Fojano, who had inveighed heavily against the person of the Pope, was handed over to Rome by Malatesta, where, if Varchi is to be believed, Clement allowed him to suffer lingering imprisonment, on bread and water, in the foul dungeons of St. Angelo.²

The Pope, at first, gave Bartolomeo Valori, Francesco Guicciardini, and Roberto Acciaiuoli permission to rule the sorely visited city as they thought best, but afterwards he took things into his own hands. Valori was made governor of the Romagna, Guicciardini of Bologna; but in February 1531 Schönberg was sent to Florence.³ The

and with more correct text by CAPPONI, III., 377 *seqq.* A letter from Clement VII. to Orange, of August 4, points also to an understanding between the latter and Malatesta (in FONTANA, Renata, I., 460-461). SANESI (Arch. stor. Ital., 5 Series, IX., 67 *seqq.*) shows that Malatesta on his departure from Florence was presented with no gifts, but was only paid what he asked in order to be got rid of. On the question of his guilt Sanesi says: "Nessun dubbio ch' egli tradi." For Clement's further dealings with Malatesta, who died on September 24, 1531, see VERMIGLIOLI, Vita di Malatesta, doc. XXX. *seqq.*, and BALAN, *loc. cit.*, 174, 177 *seq.*

¹ Cf. RASTRELLI, Alessandro de' Medici, I., Firenze, 1781, 221 *seq.*; REUMONT, Toskana, I., 30 *seqq.*; BARDI in Arch. stor. Ital., 5 Series, XIV., 9 *seqq.*; ROSSI, Guicciardini, I., 223 *seq.*, 231 *seq.*

² VARCHI, II., 154; cf. BALAN, Clemente VII., 173, n. 2.

³ REUMONT, Toskana, I., 31-32; PERRENS, III., 351 *seqq.* For Guicciardini's appointment as Vice-Legate of Bologna see ROSSI in Arch. Stor. Ital., 5 Serie, V., 51 *seq.*, and GUICCIARDINI, Op. I., 269 *seq.*

Emperor made no haste to despatch Florentine affairs; he allowed nearly a whole year to pass before paying attention to the wishes of the Pope, whose impatience grew from day to day. In the summer of 1531 he at last issued a decree which secured to the Medici "a sort of hereditary presidentship" in the Florentine republic, but also contained a reassertion of the Imperial supremacy. Alessandro de' Medici, bearing the decree, appeared in Florence in July 1531.¹ In the following year Clement succeeded in doing away with the Republican forms of the constitution, although their preservation was recognized by the Emperor's decree. In attaining this end he acted, as in other cases, according to the well-known saying of Varchi, that "he could sling a stone so that no one should see the hand of the slinger." On the 27th of April 1532 the new constitution was made known, whereby Alessandro de' Medici became hereditary Duke of Florence. The actual reins of government remained, none the less, in the hands of Clement VII.²

¹ See DUMONT, IV., 2, 72 *seqq.*; RASTRELLI, I., 75 *seqq.*; REUMONT, Toskana, I., 34 *seq.*; RANKE, Studien, 378; PERRENS, III., 357 *seqq.*

² Cf. REUMONT, *op. cit.*, I., 37 *seqq.*; PERRENS, III., 368 *seqq.*; CAPPONI, III., 327; ROSSI, Guicciardini, II., 34 *seq.*, 60.

CHAPTER IV.

THE RELIGIOUS DIVISIONS IN GERMANY.

THE grave political complications with which the first six years of the Pontificate of Clement VII. were filled reacted with decisive influence on the spread of the Lutheran heresy throughout Germany.

Immediately after his election Clement received disquieting reports on the subject; the adherents of the new belief were steadily increasing in numbers, and, the decentralization of the Empire having made great strides, it was practically impossible to put the Edict of Worms into execution.¹ Consequently, in his first consistory,² held on the 2nd of December 1523, Clement spoke of the dangers menacing Christendom, quite as much from the side of the Lutherans as from that of the Turks. In accordance with his own proposal, a commission of Cardinals, which soon included the names of Egidio Canisio and Numai, was appointed to³ deal with both aspects of the question.

¹ Cf. the *letter of V. Albergati, Rome, 1523, November 24 (State Archives, Bologna).

² See Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 86. In a *Brief to Cardinal Lang, 1523, December 1, Clement expressed the hope that the Cardinals would give him their help against the German heresy: "ut Germania, fortissima et piissima semper provincia et Rom. Imperii sedes incluta, his venenis, quibus inficitur, libera christiano candori tua quoque praestanti opera restituatur." Arm., 39, vol. 43, n. 8 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 86; cf. Quellen und Forsch., III., 2-3, and SANUTO, XXXV., 278.

The immediate result of their deliberations was, that the commission, on the 14th of December, recommended the despatch of two Nuncios, one to Germany and a second to Switzerland.¹

Clement, in his anxiety concerning the advance of Lutheranism,² also invited men thoroughly acquainted with German affairs, such as Eck and Aleander, to furnish him with reports as to what should be done with regard to the heretical movement. While Eck laid before him what was substantially a summary of his conversations with Adrian VI.,³ Aleander composed a special memorandum on the means to be employed to suppress heresy in Germany. In this he requested the Pope to remove the abuses in the Curia, and to punish unworthy priests with the extreme penalty of deprivation; he further advised him not merely to summon the Emperor and the other temporal princes to take steps against the heretics, but also to exhort, under pain of censure, the negligent German bishops to the performance of their duties. The concordats should be strictly observed, and diocesan and provincial synods held under the presidency only of men of approved loyalty to the Holy See. The Inquisition Aleander wished to see transferred, not to princes or monks, who were objects of popular hatred, but to the bishops. He deprecated the total abolition of indulgences, but urged that they should be issued sparingly and with caution. The Nuncios in Germany should narrowly watch the monks, the men of learning, and the printers, since with these classes they would have to reckon before all others if they wished to provide an effectual antidote to the diffusion of poisonous doctrine. He then made very

¹ Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 86.

² SANUTO, XXV., 320, 339, 348.

³ See our remarks, Vol. IX. of this work, p. 108 *seqq.*

detailed proposals for dealing with the above-named classes of persons in order to foster the good in them and counteract the evil. In cases of contumacious heresy, Aleander counselled, with a reference to the procedure of a Gregory VII. and an Innocent III., the application of the severest penalties: the interdict and an embargo on trade for the cities of the Empire, withdrawal of privileges from the University of Wittenberg, and the proclamation of the Ban of the Empire and deposition against the Elector of Saxony. Since all the good-will of Leo X. and Adrian VI. had proved fruitless, lenient measures were no longer of any avail; they only helped to spread the evil, until it had at length reached Rome itself. For the sins of Christendom God had permitted this affliction to fall upon the Church; therefore the only real and lasting succour must be sought in the revival of her ancient virtues.¹

The report of an anonymous writer is occupied with a thorough examination of the complaints of the German nation presented to the Diet of Nuremberg in the year 1523. The author, evidently a member of the Curia, seeks to throw the responsibility, for the most part, on the German Bishops. With a strange hallucination, he will admit no guilt on the part of the Roman Curia, and only recommends an improvement of the existing system in a few points. The report comes to a point in the proposal to send a Nuncio of unimpeachable character and eminent learning, with the powers of a Legate *a latere*, to the

¹ DOLLINGER'S version is not quite correct, Beiträge, III., 268 to 284. Cf. DITTRICH, Kath. Reformation, 367 *seq.*, and HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 347 *seq.* The latter has also more in detail concerning the advice of J. Haner, published by BALAN in Mon. ref., n. 141. The opinion of the Bishop of Breslau is given by EHSES in Histor. Jahrb., XIV., 834 *seq.*; for that of Cochläus see SPAHN, 109 *seq.*

German Empire, there to use his authority with moderation and firmness towards the patrons of the erroneous teaching.¹

Clement VII. followed the advice given in this document, but it was not easy to find the personage fully qualified for the German legation. The Pope's choice fell at last on Cardinal Campeggio, who had proved himself to be an experienced diplomatist and to have a knowledge of German affairs; a staunch Churchman, he was yet profoundly convinced of the necessity of thorough reforms. At the same time, at the end of December 1523, Clement VII. determined to send his chamberlain, Girolamo Rorario, as a Nuncio to Germany, to be Campeggio's forerunner and to prepare the way.²

For the instruction of the Legate, Aleander prepared a memorandum on the measures to be adopted in dealing with Luther. He here lays great stress on the necessity of the Legate and those with him being conspicuous for their good reputation and observance of all the laws and customs of the Church. The Legate himself must use his faculties with moderation and circumspection; all benefices are to be conferred only on good and learned men of German birth; in his demeanour he must show the utmost modesty, friendliness, seriousness, and dignity, and, above all, discretion; he is not to be drawn into disputations concerning truths of the Faith; he must be thoroughly acquainted with the points of controversy, and draw his proofs from the Scriptures and the Fathers rather than from the scholastic system, then in great odium in

¹ *Cod. Vat., 4896, f. 218 *seqq.*, in Vatican Library. Extracts in DITTRICH, Kath. Ref., 359 *seq.*

² BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 136-140. Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, I., xlvi.; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 88 *seq.*; Reichstagsakten, IV., 476, n. 2, *cf.* BAUER, Anfänge Ferdinands I., 221.

Germany; and especially he must avoid sophistries and paradoxes. Aleander examines in close detail the grievances of the German nation, declaring them to be only in part justifiable; for these redress should be promised; but he complains of the superfluous trouble caused to the Holy See by the manufacture of gravamina. For the refutation of unfounded complaints he gives full and thorough recommendations. He does the same with regard to dealings with the bishops and the mendicant Orders. On no account whatever is the Legate to show his instructions to anyone, so that he may not undergo experiences similar to those of Chieregati at Nuremberg. He is neither to promise nor refuse a Council; if he calls attention to the difficulties standing in the way of one, let him point out, in that connection, that, in the meantime, the laws against heresy must be put in force. Aleander tries to refute in detail the objections made to the collection of annates, and then concludes by once more imparting counsels to the Nuncio concerning his behaviour: he is not to be arrogant or violent, neither is he to show timidity, but to maintain a steady courage and, above all, a wise discretion. Especially must he and his personal following avoid all cause of scandal or offence, adapt themselves as much as possible to the customs of Germany, and with unbiassed minds recognize the existing good in that nation.¹

Campeggio, whose appointment as Legate *a latere* for the whole of Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and the three northern kingdoms was ratified² in a consistory

¹ DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, III., 243-267. For the date of composition see DITTRICH, Kath. Ref., 361; *cf.* Reichstagsakten, IV., 471.

² Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forsch., 87; Bull. of January 11, 1524; *Regest., 1242, f. 153 *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican). *Cf.* Reichstagsakten, IV., 471, n. 1, and Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXVI., 373, n.

held on the 8th of January 1524, was primarily and before all other considerations to represent the Catholic interests in the forthcoming Diet at Nuremberg, but also to urge on the support of Hungary against the Turks. In order to make fitting preparation for Campeggio's mission, and in support of it, Clement VII. undertook a series of steps the success of which had at first to be waited for.¹ For this reason the Legate did not leave Rome until the 1st of February,² and then travelled slowly; on the 26th of February he was at Trent, on the 3rd of March at Innsbrück, on the 9th at Augsburg, and on the 14th he reached Nuremberg.³ In the course of this journey he had already an opportunity of realizing the critical and increasing alteration in popular feeling, due to the unscrupulous agitation conducted against Catholic institutions from the pulpit and the printing press, at the instigation of the Lutheran leaders. In Augsburg he was made the object of popular derision. At Nuremberg the ecclesiastical ceremonies of his reception were omitted, while the preacher Osiander was allowed to discourse on the Roman Antichrist.⁴

Campeggio received monthly 500 ducats; see *Lib. deposit. gen. 1524 (State Archives, Rome).

¹ Cf. RICHTER, Reichstag zu Nürnberg, 92 *seq.*

² Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forsch., 87.

³ The previous accounts of his journey (Reichstagsakten, IV., 471, n. 1) were enlarged in important particulars by a **report of some length (also interesting from a literary point of view) from Eremita [Girolamo Rigini] to B. Castiglione, dat. Nurenberga il 3^o di di Pasqua, 1524 (Mantuan Library), which I intend to publish in the Acta pontif.

⁴ Cf. SANUTO, XXXVI., 279-280; UHLHORN, U. Rhegius, Elberfeld, 1861, 58 *seq.*; FÖRSTEMANN, Neues Urkundenbuch, I. (1842), 153 *seq.*, 158, 160; WILKEN, A. Osiander, I. (1844), 49; Reichstagsakten, IV., 467 *seq.*, 727.

In the presence of these hostile dispositions towards the Holy See, which were almost general throughout the Empire, and were specially dominant in Nuremberg,¹ Campeggio thought it wise to proceed with great caution. His first speech in the Diet, on the 17th of March, was therefore conciliatory in tone; nevertheless he spoke quite distinctly of the task assigned to him, for he called for the execution of the Edict of Worms. To the question of the Princes concerning the joint complaints of the German nation presented at the Diet of the previous year, Campeggio explained that the Pope had no official knowledge of the document, which had been transmitted to Rome only in a private manner; he, Campeggio, had seen a copy, but did not believe that a document of such "exceeding impropriety" could have been agreed to by the Estates. If he had no present instructions concerning this particular missive, yet he had full powers to treat with the Estates on the question of the national grievances; in his opinion, it was to be recommended that the Germans, like the Spaniards, should send envoys to Rome; he did not doubt that the Pope would meet the just demands of their nation. Thereupon the old complaints, with some fresh ones added, were presented.²

Although Campeggio, supported by learned Italians and Germans, such as Cochläus and Nausea,³ was zealously

¹ Eremita in the *letter cited *supra*, p. 111, n. 3, remarks: "Certo è che queste genti sono pessimamente disposte verso la chiesa Romana" (Mantuan Library). For the hostile feeling in Nuremberg, see also the *letter of an intimate friend of Campeggio in TIZIO, *Hist. Senen. G II., 39 (Chigi Library, Rome).

² JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18th ed., 353 *seq.*; RICHTER, 98 *seq.*; Reichstagsakten, IV., 468 *seq.*, 487 *seq.*

³ Cf. DE LEVA, III., 326; OTTO, Cochläus, 138; GESS, Cochläus, 26; SPAHN, 115 *seq.*; RICHTER, 93; METZNER, Nausea, 24.

active in the Diet,¹ the negotiations over the new doctrines entered upon a new phase which was, to him, highly unacceptable. The Estates did not, indeed, deny their obligation to carry out the Edict of Worms, but at the same time they demanded a National Council empowered to deal, not merely with the complaints against the Curia and the complaints of the laity against the clergy, but with the controversies on religious doctrine. This proposal, full of danger to the Catholic cause, if not directly put forward by Bavaria, was at any rate supported by that Catholic country.²

The Cardinal-Legate, who represented the view that the reformation of the Church would be better carried out in any other way than by a General Council, must have been still more averse to an independent authoritative National Council. In consequence of his opposition, concessions were so far made that, in the resolutions presented at the recess of the Diet, only a provisional settlement of controversial questions was assigned to the National Council, the final ruling being reserved for the General Council; also the expression "National Council" was dropped, and "General assembly of the German nation"—to meet at Spire in November—substituted for it. To this also the Legate objected, but without result. The Lutheran towns and nobles protested, on their side, against the renewal of the Edict of Worms in the final decree, although to please the Estates the execution of the

¹ What great hopes were built on his ability and enthusiasm is shown by a *letter from Nuremberg to Clement VII. of March 23, 1524, describing vividly the danger from Lutheranism (original in Lett. div. ad Clem. VII., Vol. I., Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Cf. v. DRUFFEL in *Abhandl. der Münch. Akad.*, 3 Klasse, XVII., 659; RICHTER, 104 *seq.*; RIEZLER, IV., 101; *Histor. Zeitschr.*, LXIV., 204.

Edict was qualified by the significant phrase "as far as is possible."¹ Campeggio disclosed his attitude towards the decree of the Diet by promising to use his influence with the Pope in favour of a General Council, and declaring himself ready to enter into negotiations over the German grievances and the reform of the clergy; to the assembly at Spire he refused to give his approval. His standpoint seems to have been, so far, the correct one; for, if the Edict of Worms held good, a fresh investigation of the doctrines therein repudiated was an absurdity.²

During his stay in Nuremberg, Campeggio was kept closely informed of the serious defects of the German Church by men who had the Catholic cause deeply at heart; he had also convinced himself of the pressing necessity for that reform of the German clergy demanded by so many of the princes, if Lutheranism was to be successfully encountered.³ On the receipt of his report at Rome, Clement VII., on the 14th of April 1524, gave him full authority to hold a convention in Germany for the reform of the national clergy.⁴ This Assembly, in which the Archduke Ferdinand, the Bavarian Dukes, many bishops of South Germany, and the most important literary champions of German Catholicism (Cochläus, Eck, Johann Faber, and Nausea) took part, opened in June at Ratisbon. A scheme of clergy reform prepared by Campeggio and already produced at Nurem-

¹ See WEIZSÄCKER in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, XLIV., 200; *cf.* FRIEDENSBURG in *Quellen und Forsch.*, III., 1.

² BALAN, *Mon. ref.*, n. 152, and also EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., xviii.; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 359 *seq.*; RICHTER, 109 *seq.*; *Reichstagsakten*, IV., 521 *seq.*

³ *Cf.* the proposals of the Franciscan A. Bomhouwer for encountering the Lutheran heresy, published by KIRSCH in the *Histor. Jahrb.*, X., 807 *seq.*; see also GESS, *Kirchenpolitik Georgs von Sachsen*, 653.

⁴ BALAN, *Mon. ref.*, n. 148; *cf.* RICHTER, 101.

berg was here discussed, accepted, and published for the whole of Germany in a legatine decree with full apostolic authority on the 7th of July. The ordinances formed a first and important step towards a reformation of the Church from within; in carrying them out she would be freed from many defects, and many grievances would be removed. At the same time Campeggio succeeded at Ratisbon in combining for the first time the forces of at least the South German Catholics (the Archduke Ferdinand, the Bavarian Dukes, and twelve bishops) by an act of union. The above-named pledged themselves to uphold the Edict of Worms, and to resist all religious innovations.¹

At Rome the proceedings at Nuremberg had been followed attentively. The fatal delusion that only Saxony was on the side of Luther² had soon to give way in the face of facts.³ In the beginning of May, Clement and the Cardinals consulted as to the measures to be taken to meet the resolutions of the Diet, and Cardinals Monte and Numai drew up special reports. It was determined not to refuse the demand for a General Council absolutely; attention, of course, was to be drawn to the hindrances in the way arising from the warlike complications in Europe, but at the same time the prospect of negotiations was to be held out. With regard to the grievances, redress was promised

¹ For the Regensburg Reformation and Union see JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18th ed., 360 *seq.*; FRIEDENSBURG, Regensburger Konvent, 502 *seq.*; DITTRICH, Kath. Ref., 382 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 374 *seq.* See also STÖY, Bündnisbestrebungen (1888), 6; BRISCHAR, I., 63 *seq.*; SPAHN, 117 *seq.*, and NECKERMANN in the Augsb. Postzeitung, 1905, Beil. 23 and 25. For the great difficulties standing in the way of the Bishops' reforms *cf.* HAUTHALER, Kardinal M. Lang und die religiös-soziale Bewegung seiner Zeit, II., Salzburg, 1896. The Protestants attacked the Legate's reforms in pasquinades; see BUCHOLTZ, II., 67.

² SANUTO, XXXVI., 232.

³ *Ibid.*, 268.

by the suspension of the regulations of the Lateran Council, and the appointment of a commission of Cardinals to investigate further. If on these two important questions an understanding was come to with the German opposition, the execution of the Edict of Worms was all the more strongly insisted on, and the National Council at Spire was not the less strongly opposed. Not merely the Emperor, but even foreign sovereigns, such as the kings of England, France, and Portugal, were asked to protest,¹ and a series of briefs, couched in this sense, was despatched in May. At the same time also the Nuncios were ordered to take action;² especially full instructions were sent to the Papal representatives at the Emperor's court.³

This action of Clement had as its result that Charles V. repeatedly and in sharp and peremptory terms prohibited the National Council of Spire, and ordered the observance of the Edict of Worms and the avoidance of all religious innovation.⁴ If Charles directed his envoys at Rome to acquaint the Pope with these measures, he made it plain at the same time that he considered that it would be of advantage to summon a General Council; he recommended Trent, a place which was practically a German

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, II., 10; EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xviii. *seq.*; FRIEDENSBURG in Quellen und Forsch., III., 2 *seq.*, 6 *seq.*; SANUTO, XXXVI., 346, 387, 412. The Bull *In Coena, dat. 1523 (st. fl.) 9 Cal. April, condemns all heretics and especially Luther and his adherents; Regest., 1245, f. 152 *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Cf. PALLAVICINI, II., 10; RAYNALDUS, 1524, n. 15 *seq.*; EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xix.; BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 157; WEIZSÄCHER in the Histor. Zeitschr., LXIV., 205 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 363; and BRASSE, Die Geschichte des Speierer Nationalkonzils (Diss.), Halle, 1890.

³ BALAN, Mon. ref., 154; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 365 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. Notizenblatt zum Archiv für österr. Gesch., II., 97 *seq.*, 245, and also Histor. Zeitschr., LXIV., 208 *seq.*

town, although within Italian territory ; but the Pope would be at liberty to transfer the Council to Italy at some later date.¹

The union of Ratisbon and the reforms undertaken there, the Emperor's strict insistence on the observance of the Edict of Worms, and the obstruction of the National Council at Spires were undoubtedly remarkable successes. Campeggio, who remained in Vienna until the 8th of December, actively engaged from thence in his campaign against the Lutherans in Germany and in his reconciliation of the Bohemian Utraquists,² might well be proud of them ; he believed that half of his principal task had been achieved.³ But the great social revolution so soon to break out in Germany brought all his fair hopes again to an end.

Clement VII. was thoroughly informed by the reports of Girolamo Rorario, Nuncio to Ferdinand I., and through various private persons, of the bloodshed which was turning Germany into a second Bohemia. Campeggio also, who remained in Ofen till well on in June, sent him numerous communications.⁴ The Pope was greatly alarmed,⁵ and informed Ferdinand on the 29th of May of the despatch of a subsidy to the amount of 20,000 ducats ; the Emperor, who, unfortunately, was still lingering in Spain, he exhorted to more strenuous action in order to avert yet greater

¹ See HEINE, Briefe, 518 *seq.*, and EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xix. Sessa was convinced on political grounds that it was better not to carry out the injunctions concerning the Council ; see BERGENROTH, II., n. 675.

² Cf. Lett. d. princ., I., 79^b, and BALAN, Mon. ref., pp. 365, 371, 392 *seq.*, 395 *seq.*, 402.

³ BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 164, p. 362 ; cf. FRIEDENSBURG, Regensb. Konvent, 531 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 435.

⁵ Cf. SANUTO, XXXVIII., 293, 348, 356 ; XXXIX., 19.

dangers.¹ The disorders in Germany and the enmity between France and Spain were adduced by the Pope as reasons which prohibited him from convening a Council.²

Notwithstanding the detailed reports received in Rome, as in foreign countries generally, of the peasants' insurrection, there was no correct conception of the real state of affairs. The accounts that came in were fatally misleading, and men were under the delusion that Lutheranism had, to all intents and purposes, been suppressed simultaneously with the sanguinary extinction of the social revolution, in which both friends and foes of the new teaching had co-operated.³ The only person who did not share in this delusion, Campeggio,⁴ was recalled⁵ because, in the opinion of many, his mission had not been sufficiently successful,⁶ and also, as is most probable, because his sympathies were too Imperialist.

The functions of the Nunciature were now concentrated in the person of Rorario, the Nuncio to Ferdinand. And yet, in face of the difficult and complicated situation, not

¹ BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 210, 216, 222; *cf.* Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forsch., 91; SANUTO, XXXIX., 9, 19 *seq.* Why only half of the 20,000 ducats was paid is explained by Sessa's *despatch to Charles V., dat. Rome, 1525, December 10, in Col. Salazar, A 35, f. 255 *seq.*, Biblioteca de la Acad. de Historia, Madrid.

² See SADOLETI, Epistolae, appendix, Romae, 1767, XXII.; *cf.* EHSES, XXI.

³ *Cf.* Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forsch., 91 *seq.*; see also G. de' Medici's *letter, dat. Rome, 1525, July 8 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ Campeggio had announced the end of the peasants' war on August 5, 1525, "but"—so he added—"things are not going well, as the princes and nobles are turning their advantage to account." LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 23.

⁵ His return was under consideration on October 13, 1525; see *Acta Consist. in Consistorial Archives. Campeggio did not return to Rome until October 20; *Acta Consist., *loc. cit.*

⁶ *Cf.* SANUTO, XXXIX., 33.

merely was the presence of a permanent Cardinal-Legate necessary, but also the despatch of a fresh Nuncio in the interests of accurate information. How defective information was as to the real state of affairs in Germany is best shown from the fact that, when Clement VII. on the 23rd of August 1525 wrote numerous letters of congratulation¹ to the German princes on their victory over the Lutherans, one of those thus addressed was the Landgrave Philip of Hesse.² The Pope, and the Cardinals appointed to sit as a commission on Lutheran affairs had evidently not the slightest notion that since the end of 1523 Philip had been a patron of the new teaching.³ The affairs of Bohemia also had been grossly misrepresented in Rome. The sanguine hopes fostered by Campeggio of the return of the Utraquists to the Church and of the defeat of Lutheranism were soon shown to be entirely futile.⁴

What random and, in some instances, nonsensical reports obtained credence in the Curia, is illustrated by the circum-

¹ BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 247, 248.

² See GEISTHIRT, Hist. schmalcald. in the Zeitschr. für henneberg. Gesch., III., Suppl.-Heft (1885), p. 68. In this letter, composed by Sadoleti and hitherto overlooked by all investigators, the peasants and the "imp̄ii et nepharii Lutherani" are completely identified.

³ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 58, n. 1. Of the commission of Cardinals, consisting of fourteen members, there is, unfortunately, only a general mention in the *letters of G. de' Medici of the 24th and 27th May 1525 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forsch., 90, and Relat. orat., ed. FRAKNÓI, 148 *seq.* Cf. also *letter of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1525, February 25 (State Archives, Florence), and the Brief of Clement VII., quoted by WIEDEMANN, Gesch. der Reformation im Lande unter der Enns, I., Prag, 1879, 292. For the destruction of these hopes cf. PALACKY, V., 2, 537 *seq.*; FRAKNÓI, Ungarn, 84 *seq.*; BUCHOLTZ, IV., 446; GINDELY, Böhm. Brüder, I., 182 *seq.* For the ignorance of German affairs in Rome see also KALKOFF in Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, III., 70.

stance that in the consistory of the 6th of September 1525 it was stated that Catholic worship had been restored at Wittenberg and that Luther had narrowly escaped capture.¹ It was excusable that the sentiments of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order should long have deceived the Roman court; for this prince had allayed with consummate ability the early awakened distrust of Clement VII.² The first certain intelligence of the apostasy of Albert of Brandenburg was brought to Rome in letters from German bishops in the latter half of March 1525.³ Of the alliance of the Grand Master with King Sigismund of Poland so little was known that the Pope intended to present⁴ the latter with the consecrated sword on the 27th of March. It was not known until the beginning of May that Albert had broken his oath to the Church, the Order, and the Empire, that he had constituted himself secular lord of the territory of the Order, and had received the latter as a fief from the Polish king.⁵ The consternation of the Pope and his advisers was very great⁶ on the subsequent receipt of a letter from King Sigismund, in which he tried to justify his behaviour and made protestation of his Catholic zeal.⁷

¹ See Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, 92.

² Cf. JOACHIM, III., 91 *seq.*; TSCHACKERT, I., 29 *seq.*, II., 81 *seq.*, 105; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 77 *seq.*

³ Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, 90.

⁴ *Acta Consist. in Consistorial Archives; cf. Acta Tomic., VII., 295.

⁵ See Acta Tomic., VII., 283 *seq.*, and Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, 91.

⁶ Acta Tomic., VII., 283.

⁷ THEINER, Mon. Pol., II., 429 *seq.*; BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 212. Cf. DITTRICH, Gesch. des Katholizismus in Altpreussen, I., Braunsberg, 1901, 11 *seq.*, 19 *seq.* *Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor note on July 3, 1525: "Fuerunt lectae binae litterae ser. regis Poloniae, alterae continentes causam concordiae initaе inter Majest. suam et magnum magistrum olim ord. Theutonic., alterae vero continentes indutias initas cum tyranno Turcarum" (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican).

Clement comforted himself with the assurance that the king, whose intentions were so good, would, if he could once more gain the ascendancy over Prussia, make amends for his faults and again help on the ancient faith to victory.¹ In a Brief of the 20th of July 1525 he urgently appealed to Sigismund to this effect.² On the 31st of January 1526 the Pope approached Charles with the entreaty that he would not give his sanction to Albert's alteration of the constitution of the Order.³ A commission of Cardinals examined the whole case thoroughly,⁴ whereon Clement, on the 21st of January 1527, empowered the loyal remnant of the Teutonic knights to elect a new Grand Master.⁵

Although the Bishop of Trent and the Nuncio Rorario himself had asked in August 1525 for the despatch of a special representative of the Holy See to Germany,⁶ this

¹ Acta Tomic., VII., 333 ; DITTRICH, *loc. cit.*, 20.

² BALAN, Mon. saec., XVI, 165 *seq.* (n. 123).

³ RAYNALDUS, 1526, n. 121.

⁴ Cf. Acta Consist. of January 14, 1527, in KALKOFF, 92. The Commission had been appointed on November 28, 1526: "S. D. N. deputavit rev. d. A. de Monte ep. Portuen., L. Campegium et de Cesis super rebus ordinis B. Mariae Theutonic. Prusiae et Livoniae" (*Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor in Consistorial Archives). For the spread of the new teaching in Livonia, and Clement's anxiety to maintain the Catholic Church in that country, see PFÜLF'S articles in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, LII., 413 *seqq.*, 536 *seqq.*

⁵ See v. PETTENEGG, *Die Urkunden des Deutschordens-Zentralarchivs*, I., Prag, 1887, 616. Cf. KARGE in the *Altpreuss. Monatschrift*, XXXIX., 394. Here, as well as in Pettenegg, the Brief has been assigned incorrectly to 1526. In the copy in the General Archives of the Teutonic Order in Vienna the date is clearly given: "Romae die 21 Jan. 1527 pont. nostri anno quarto." Clement's *Brief of January 21, 1527, to Ferdinand I. refers to the same circumstance (original in Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁶ BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 239, 242 ; cf. 257. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 450-453.

had not been done. Consequently the final decrees of the Diets of Augsburg and Spire (9th of January and 27th of August 1526) were framed in a sense unfavourable to Catholic interests. The resolution of the Diet of Spire, that in the matter of the Edict of Worms each Estate, pending the summons of a General Council, should act in such a way as they could answer for before God and the Emperor, did not certainly afford a legal basis for the self-development of the Protestant system of State Churches, but it was used as a starting-point for their formation.¹ A change was in process of accomplishment, the vast scope of which was hardly understood in Rome, where purely political concerns were more and more absorbing men's attention. Luther conceded to the princely and civic authorities a power over their territories far greater than that hitherto possessed by the Pope. Not merely the constitution and government, but the worship and doctrine of the Church were surrendered to the princes and civic magistrates as State bishops; the latter forthwith determined what their subjects had to believe as their "Evangelium." From this absolute episcopate of the rulers of the State was reached, as a logical conclusion, the application of the axiom which flouts all freedom of conscience: "Cujus regio illius religio."

The development of the Lutheran State Church system and the forcible suppression of the Catholic Church, first in Hesse and the Saxon Electorate, and then in many of the territories belonging to the princes and cities of Germany, were singularly favoured by the unhappy strife between Emperor and Pope; while they were alternately checkmating one another, the half-political, half-religious opposition unfriendly to them was securing a firm

¹ See JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 31 *seqq.*, 52 *seqq.*

footing in Germany. The Protestants rejoiced to see the heads of Christendom at warlike variance with each other, and made full use of this circumstance to spread their doctrines and apply coercive measures against Catholics. The conflict between Emperor and Pope weakened also the resistance of the Catholics, and checked the progress of the reform of the Church from within begun by the latter in 1524, and thus the fruits of Campeggio's labours were, for the most part, again wasted. In consequence of the same struggle, the activity of the Catholic scholars in defence of the ancient faith, so zealously encouraged by the Cardinal, and the significant action of Erasmus in taking part openly against Luther,¹ failed to have the anticipated effect. Political troubles made such claims on the attention of the Curia that the affairs of Germany gradually passed out of sight. It was a sign of the times that the Papal briefs dealing with Germany became fewer and fewer;² for a considerable length of time the relations between Germany and the Roman Curia were practically broken off.³

At last, in 1529, the regular representation of the Holy See in Germany was resumed by the mission of Gian Tommaso Pico della Mirandola, a layman, to the Diet

¹ Cf. the literary references in JANSSEN-PASTOR, 14th ed., 576, and MAURENBRECHER, *Kath. Ref.*, 247 *seq.*

² Belonging to the year 1526, I noticed also *instructions to the Abbots of Tegernsee, Altaich, and so forth, to take strong proceedings against the Lutherans, and a *Brief to the Dominicans of Augsburg "Ad perseverandum adversus Lutheranos," dat. February 26; likewise *to the Convent of St. Catherine in that city, dat. February 27, and on the same date a *Brief for "Hebrardo de Chicis mag. provinc. per totam Germaniam ord. praed. (hortatorium in re Lutherana)." *Min. brev.*, 1526, vol. 46, n. 59, 118, 119, 122 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ FRIEDENSBURG, *Nuntiaturberichte*, I., xlvii.

of Spires.¹ This nobleman announced on the 13th of April that the Pope was prepared to give hearty support to Germany against the Turks, to make efforts for the restoration of peace, and, finally, to summon a Council for the ensuing summer. But this declaration made no impression on the Estates.² To what an extraordinary extent things had altered to the disadvantage of Catholics was shown in the deliberations on the recess of the Diet. Although the latter confirmed to the Protestant States the retention of the new forms of doctrine and Church order within their own boundaries, and only asked for toleration towards the Catholics among them, a protest was raised on the 19th of April by the Elector of Saxony, the Margrave George of Brandenburg-Kulmbach, the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, the Dukes Ernest and Francis of Lüneberg, and Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt. On the 25th of April the protesting party appealed from all existing and future grievances to the Emperor and the forthcoming free council. This set the seal on the religious severance of the German nation.³

Two months later came the conclusion, at Barcelona, of the treaty of peace between Charles V. and Clement VII., coupled, in the February of the following year, with the meeting of the Emperor and the Pope at Bologna. At this conference, Charles, who had never lost sight of

¹ RAYNALDUS, 1529, n. 15; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 90. Important additional information about Rorario is given in a *Brief of Clement's to Duke Henry of Brunswick, dat. Viterbo, 1528, June 12, announcing Rorario's arrival (Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm., 40, vol. 22, n. 477).

² REY, *Gesch. der Reichstags zu Speier im Jahre 1529*, Hamburg, 1880, 207 *seq.*

³ JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 153 *seqq.*

the conciliar question even during the recent troubles,¹ obtained Clement's consent to a General Council, to be held as soon as this means of overcoming heresy and restoring the unity of the Church should be proved to be necessary. It was the Emperor's object to induce the Protestants to submit temporarily to the authority of the Church, so that on this basis some reasonable expectation might be founded that the Council would terminate once for all the religious divisions of Germany. In the hope of attaining this end with the co-operation of the States of the Empire, Charles wrote from Bologna, on the 21st of January 1530, appointing a Diet to be held at Augsburg on the 8th of April.²

Charles left Bologna on the 22nd of March on his journey to Germany. He was accompanied by Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, who had been appointed Legate to Germany in the Consistory of the 16th of March 1530.³ At Innsbruck, where the Emperor arrived on the 3rd of May with the intention, at first, of staying a few days in order to acquaint himself more fully with the state of affairs in Germany, his halt lasted until the 6th of June. Here Charles was awaited by his brother Ferdinand and the

¹ Cf. DE LEVA, III., 16.

² Cf. for what follows, especially EHSES, Concilium Tridentinum, IV., xxvii. to cxi.; also EHSES, Kardinal Lorenzo Campeggio auf dem Reichstage von Augsburg, 1530, Röm. Quartalschr., XVII., 383-406, XVIII., 358-384, XIX., 129-152, XX., 54-81; PASTOR, Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen, 17-89; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, Konzilengeschichte, IX., 699 *seqq.*

³ Acta Consist. in EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xxxii. Already on February 12, 1530, A. da Burgo had *reported to Ferdinand I. from Bologna: "Papa omnino vult mittere cum Caesare unum legatum et sermo est de card. Campegio, tamen adhuc ille non acceptavit. Apud M^{tem} V. vult S. Stas quod nuntius suas perseveret" (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

Cardinals of Salzburg and Trent, while the Dukes of Bavaria and George of Saxony came later.¹ Charles found special gratification in the reconciliation to the Church of his brother-in-law, Christian of Denmark,² which took place in the capital of the Tyrol. On the other hand, the reports brought in from the States of the Empire as to the religious conditions there existing were disquieting. On the ground of the information then received, Campeggio wrote on the 4th of May to Rome, to the Pope's private secretary, Jacopo Salviati, that Germany was, as he had supposed, in great disorder. A principal difficulty concerning the Council wished for by both parties was whether it should now be a General Council of the Church or a council of the nation; the Dukes of Bavaria, prominent Catholic princes, especially looked upon the council as the most effectual means of salvation. There were weighty reasons for opposing a national council; as regards a General Council, he would do his duty.³ On the 8th of May the Emperor asked Campeggio to lay before him a written opinion on the most suitable means to be resorted to for the removal of the religious contentions—a request which was complied with on that or the following day.⁴

¹ EHSES, Röm. Quartalschr., XVII., 384 *seq.*, 387, 388.

² See *infra*, cap. IX.

³ EHSES, Röm. Quartalschr., XVII., 385. The Italian text in EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xxxii. *seq.*

⁴ Campeggio on May 9 to the Papal private secretary, Giov. Batt. Sanga: see EHSES, Röm. Quartalschr., XVII., 386 *seq.*, and on May 13 to Salviati: see LAEMMER, Monumenta Vaticana, 35. The Italian text of this document, along with an appended "Sommario" (marked "Parecer sobre las cosas de Alemaña"), has been published from a copy in the Spanish Archives at Simancas by MAURENBRECHER, Karl V. und die deutschen Protestanten, Düsseldorf, 1865, 3*-16*. For other copies *cf.* EHSES, Röm. Quartalschr., IX., 406 *seq.*, XVII., 387 *seq.*; Conc. Trid., IV., xxxii.; PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 65.

Campeggio did not expect much from the good-will of the Protestant princes; he was much more in favour of decisive measures against the innovators. He advised, in the case of failure to restore unity by measures of kindness,¹ the use of force, especially by the execution of the terms of the Edict of Worms. He also expressed himself in the same sense a few days later in conversation with the Emperor and King Ferdinand.² He was particularly opposed to negotiations on the subject of the Council; the Protestants, in demanding one, were not actuated by an honourable intention of submitting to its decisions, but only of keeping the Emperor in check so that, during his sojourn in Germany, he could take no serious measures against them. Thereupon the Emperor himself explained to him that he had come to an agreement with the Pope at Bologna that the Council should be held at a time of general peace and quiet in Christendom; but he hoped that, despite the many difficulties, all would yet go well, if the Kings of England and France did not encourage the Protestants in their opposition. Campeggio also discussed the circumstances with the other Catholic princes in Innsbruck, who were in favour of a council being held; he was successful in convincing Duke George of Saxony of the dangers therein involved.

On the 15th of June the Emperor entered Augsburg, and on the 20th the Diet was opened. After the Mass of the Holy Ghost the Papal Nuncio, Vincenzo Pimpinella, who had accompanied Campeggio, delivered an oration on the war against the Turks, and the unity of belief which that

¹ Clement had consented to employ such in the first instance; see *A. da Burgo's report of January 28, 1530, in the Court and State Archives, Vienna, in part in BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., III., 24 n.

² Campeggio to Salviati on May 20, 1530; see EHSES, Röm. Quartalschr., XVII., 388 *seq.*; Conc. Trid., IV., xxxiii. *seq.*

undertaking demanded.¹ In the second session, on the 24th of June, Campeggio made a speech on the removal of disunion, in which he avoided any expression likely to offend the Protestants.² On the 25th of June the Augsburg Confession, as it came to be afterwards called, was read to the Diet. It began with a demand on the part of the Protestants that a "general free Christian council" should be held in the event of their failing to come to an agreement in the present Diet. The document, which was signed by the protesting princes of the Diet of Spires, and on behalf of the cities of Nuremberg and Reutlingen, attempted to mitigate and disguise,³ as much as possible, the deeply rooted points of controversy, in order to keep up the delusion that the innovators only formed a party within the Church, which could easily be reconciled by means of a mutual understanding. Immediately after the presentation of the Confession the Emperor had written to Rome declaring that it afforded an excellent beginning for the return of the Protestants to the Church.⁴ In Papal circles the arrival of the Emperor in Germany and his accord with Campeggio on the religious question had given great satisfaction.⁵ As early as the 3rd of June, Clement, in a letter addressed to the Emperor, had expressed the hope that the latter, after the expected fall of Florence, would devote himself without interruption to the Turkish war

¹ Contemporary publication; see KUCZYŃSKI, *Thesaur. libell. hist. ref. ill.*, Lipsiae, 1870, n. 2156. For the oration *cf.* also PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 19-20.

² *Cf.* SCHIRRMACHER, *Briefe und Akten*, Gotha, 1876, 362; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 704.

³ *Cf.* PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 23 *seqq.*

⁴ HEINE, *Briefe*, 13 (*cf.* *Docum. ined.*, XIV., 36 *seq.*, 43 *seq.*); PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 52.

⁵ See Salviati's letters of May 23 and 24, 1530, in EHSES, *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XVII., 390.

and the cleansing of Germany from heresies. With reference to the reconciliation of Christian of Denmark through Charles's influence, the Pope remarked that already, on his first appearance, his resplendent virtue had begun to scatter the darkness. Christian's example would have an incalculable influence; he hoped in God that Charles would bring to a glorious conclusion an undertaking so happily begun for the welfare of Christendom and the Apostolic See.¹

This sanguine hope was stimulated by false reports of the decline of Lutheranism,² as well as by the Catholic attitude of the Emperor, who was acting hand in hand with the Cardinal-Legate, and by the moderate terms of the Augsburg Confession. How great the optimism of the Roman Curia had become is shown by a report of the Venetian envoy on the 10th of July; it was hoped that the Emperor's appearance on the scene would soon make short work of Lutheranism.³ Another noteworthy symptom of Roman opinion is apparent in a letter of Charles's former confessor, Garcia de Loaysa, who relates that in a Consistory held on the 6th of July the Emperor was hailed by almost all the Cardinals as an angel sent from heaven for the salvation of Christendom.⁴ In this Consistory a despatch from Campeggio, dated the 26th of June,⁵

¹ Lett. d. princ., I., 123. Cf. Salviati's letter of June 5, 1530, in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 392.

² Cf. SANUTO, LIII., 256, 266.

³ SANUTO, LIII., 368; cf. 330.

⁴ HEINE, Briefe, 16; cf. 10, and Docum. ined., XIV., 36. Already, on July 3, 1530, A. da Burgo had *reported to Ferdinand I.: "Et habuit S. Stas magnam voluptatem ex scriptis quod res bene sint inceptae in dieta" (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁵ Best copy in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 395. The entry affixed to the letter "il 14 detto" (July) as the date of its receipt is a clerical error. The letters did not, at the most, take more than ten days, and in the *Acta

was read, containing the triumphant announcement that the Protestant princes had agreed to the Emperor's prohibition of Protestant preaching in Augsburg. Campeggio, who saw in this a first and hopeful step towards the attainment of his object, reported further that the Emperor, in matters of religion, and in a scheme for confuting the Augsburg Confession, was acting on his, the Legate's, advice. "I cannot write more to-day," he added, "but this I can say: things are in a good way." With regard to the Protestant demands, Campeggio in the same letter reports that they concern, apart from the Council, three points: communion under both kinds, the marriage of the clergy, and the reformation of the Canon of the Mass and many ecclesiastical ceremonies.

The concession of these demands was the subject of close deliberation in the Consistory of the 6th of July; the decision arrived at was a refusal. The demands were incompatible with faith and discipline, and in contradiction to the principles of the Church; they must therefore be rejected. It was decided further, however, to thank the Emperor for his zealous endeavours to bring back the adherents of error to the truth.¹ In order to accomplish this there was a willingness to make concessions, but none so prejudicial as those just dealt with could be considered.²

Consist. it says expressly July 6, 1530; "Lectae litterae Campegii in causa haeresis Luth." (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.)

¹ The fullest account of the Consistory of July 6, 1530, is in PALLAVICINI, III., 4, who relies on the authority of a *Diario* in the Ludovisi Library. By this is certainly meant some more detailed version of the Acta Consist., for which, unfortunately, I have looked without success in the Roman collections of MSS. Cf. also Mai's report in DE LEVA, III., 13, and in Appendix, No. 13, the *report of Gonzaga of July 18, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² Cf. Appendix, No. 13. In 1529 Clement was still willing to make some concessions to the Protestants; see DE LEVA, III., 16.

All other decisions would depend on the course of the negotiations at Augsburg, where the Cardinal-Legate was indefatigable in his exertions, not only with the Catholic members of the Diet and the theologians engaged on a rejoinder to the Confession, but with the Emperor.

Campeggio, to whom Charles had given a Latin copy of the Confession, wrote for him on the 28th of June an opinion in Italian and Latin on the treatment of the religious question.¹ In this he opposed the Council in terms similar to those employed in his letter from Innsbruck of the 20th of May.² On the receipt of this memorial from the Legate Charles summoned his council, who handed him a written opinion³ on the 30th of June or thereabouts. In this the Emperor was strongly advised to ask the signatories to the Confession if, in the first place, they would accept his adjudication on the religious questions. If they declined to do so, and if it appeared that a betterment could only be reached by means of a General Council, then the proposals for the latter would be made at the suitable time, but on condition that in the interval all innovations contrary to the belief and institutions of the Catholic Church should be put on one side and the Edict of Worms observed to the letter. Besides this, it seemed absolutely necessary, in order to gain the Lutherans more easily, that by means of the Papal and Legatine authority a stop should be put as soon as possible to the abuses in the Church and in the lives of the clergy. No public disputation was to be allowed; but the Legate might choose men of learning to examine the articles of the Confession.

¹ The Italian text published by K. LANZ, *Staatspapiere zur Geschichte des Kaisers Karl V.*, Stuttgart, 1845, 45 *seqq.* A fragment of the Latin text in EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., xxxv. *seq.*

² EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., xxxvi.

³ First published by EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., xxxvi. *seq.*

Not until the Protestants showed themselves unwilling to submit either to the authority of the Emperor or to that of the Council, and remained stubbornly contumacious, should forcible measures against them be considered, subject to the express opinion of the Legate.

Campeggio, with whom the Emperor had a long conversation as to this view of his advisers, gave a general assent, but declared himself decidedly against a Council, while the Emperor explained that he still held to the standpoint agreed upon at Bologna between himself and the Pope; namely, that a Council would be good and useful if Christendom were at peace, but not under present circumstances, and that the convening of such a synod might be effective for good, provided that there was a recurrence to the former state of things.¹

On the 4th of July, Campeggio handed to Charles V. his written reply to the Imperial suggestions.² In this he proceeded to show in detail that a Council would be of no avail to restore religious order, even if, at first sight, the contrary appeared to be the case. As the Lutherans had openly discarded previous Councils and their decisions, it was not probable that they had any serious intention of submitting themselves to a future synod. They persisted in their demand for one only in order to gain time in the meanwhile to push forward without hindrance their monstrous schemes, since they knew well that it would be a very long time before the Council itself could assemble. But the Emperor, if such were his pleasure, might consult the Pope further on the matter. Campeggio was in full agreement with the Emperor and the Catholic princes in their intention to insist on the

¹ Campeggio's letter, July 5, 1530; the chief sources in EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xxxvii.; in full in the Röm. Quartalschr., XVIII., 358-361.

² In Latin text in EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xxxvii.-xxxix.

observance of the Edict of Worms. As regards the removal of abuses, he recommended that men of approved virtue and pure life should be sent to Rome to report on these matters to the Pope; there was no doubt that the latter would prescribe remedies where proof of actual abuses was forthcoming, and he, as Legate, would not be wanting in his co-operation when cases were presented to him which, on due examination, were shown to be genuine abuses. To bring the religious division of Germany to an end, Campeggio held that the right and necessary way was to act with requisite firmness.

The Catholic princes, to whom Charles presented the answer of the Legate on the 5th of July, approved, in their reply of the 7th, and also in a second communication on the 13th,¹ of the Emperor's proposal concerning the Council.

On the evening of the 13th of July, Campeggio once more stated his objections, in the sense of his former declarations,² to Granvelle, who had been sent by the Emperor to inform him that he was on the point of writing to the Pope on the subject of the Council. Thereupon, on the 14th, the Emperor sent to Clement a full account of the state of the negotiations at Augsburg.³ As things then stood, the Protestants refused to accept the Emperor as judge in religious questions; on the contrary, they held out for the Council, and if their wishes were not granted in this respect they would grow yet more obdurate;

¹ BRIEGER, *Zeitschr.*, XII., 130 *seqq.*, 134 *seqq.* Cf. EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., xxxix.

² Campeggio to Salviati on July 14, 1530, in EHSES, *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XVIII., 362 *seq.*, and *Conc. Trid.*, IV., xxxix.

³ In original Spanish text in HEINE, *Briefe*, 522-525; German translation, *ibid.*, 284-289. Cf. also PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 52-54. A contemporary Italian translation in *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 5th series, VIII. (1891), 129-134.

therefore the Emperor, in agreement with the Catholic princes, was also of opinion that this should be promised them on the condition that, in the meanwhile, they returned to the obedience of the Church.¹ Charles had also written shortly before to his Ambassador in Rome in similar terms.² On the 24th of July he again had a long conversation with Campeggio, in which he gave his opinion on the seat of the Council, expressing his strong preference for an Italian city, in opposition to the view of the princes, who were desirous that it should be held in Germany. He mentioned Mantua in particular, that city having already been spoken of in his discussions with the Pope at Bologna.³

On the 18th of July, immediately after the receipt of the Emperor's letter to the Ambassador, Clement called together the twelve Cardinals specially commissioned to deal with German affairs to hear their views on the question of the Council; no final decision was come to, as the Cardinals held that the matter was one for the full Consistory to consider. "Although many of the Cardinals," wrote Loaysa, one of the twelve, on the same day,⁴ in his report of the conference to the Emperor, "object to the Council for factitious reasons, yet the most of us in this congregation held it fitting that a Council should be promised, on the condition that the Protestants in the meanwhile abandon their errors and live as their forefathers lived before them. It would be much better, however, if the Protestants would accept the Emperor as their arbitrator, since

¹ HEINE, Briefe, 532.

² Cf. the letter of Cardinal Loaysa of July 18, 1530, in HEINE, Briefe, 18 *seq.* and 357 *seq.*

³ Campeggio to Salviati on July 29, 1530, in EHSES, Röm. Quartal-schr., XVIII., 367 *seq.* Cf. Conc. Trid., IV., xl.

⁴ HEINE, Briefe, 18-20, 359-361. Cf. EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xl.

the success of a Council is in itself doubtful, and even its meeting perhaps impossible, owing to the difficulties that other Christian princes may in some way raise, and to the dangers of the Turkish invasion." Loaysa feared, however, that they would not accept the Emperor's arbitration with a good will, and that in the end no other means would remain but to have recourse to force.

On the arrival of the Emperor's letter of the 14th of July, Clement, at the end of the month, once more assembled the twelve Cardinals and acquainted them with its contents. Both the Pope and the Cardinals received it, as Loaysa wrote to the Emperor, with great satisfaction. Loaysa had not, indeed, been present at the meeting owing to illness, but he had a private interview with Clement afterwards, to whom he spoke in support of the Emperor's opinion. Clement replied that Charles was right, the Council could not be avoided; it was Loaysa's opinion, however, that Clement wished in his heart of hearts that it might not take place. He would certainly agree to one, and even go the length of convoking it, but in the meantime he would secretly use his influence with the Christian princes in order to put hindrances in the way. He was led to this presumption by the conduct of the French Cardinal, Gabriel de Gramont, Bishop of Tarbes, who in the first meeting of the Cardinals had spoken strongly in favour of a Council, while in the second conference he dwelt on all the difficulties, especially on those which had arisen on the part of the King of France; this inconsistency, Loaysa surmised, was due to the influence of the Pope. In spite of this "evil" suspicion, as he himself calls it, Loaysa was still in hopes that Clement, "on perceiving the truthfulness and uprightness of your Majesty's behaviour in this matter, and how necessary a Council is for the quieting of his conscience

and the avoidance of lasting dishonour," would eventually control events in accordance with the Imperial wishes.¹

In two audiences held on the 28th and the 30th of July, Clement addressed Andrea da Burgo in terms favourable to the Council, provided that the conditions fixed by Charles should be fulfilled, namely, that until it assembled the Lutherans should desist from their innovations; Rome he considered suitable as the seat of the Council; but, if the Emperor objected, he would propose Mantua, Piacenza, or Bologna.² In this sense Clement sent a reply to the Emperor on the 31st of July.³

He first of all went thoroughly into the reasons against a Council adduced by some of the Cardinals, but, trusting to the good sense and insight of the Emperor, whose sojourn in Germany had made him a better judge of the situation than those at a distance, he promised to convene the Council when he deemed it necessary, and under the conditions of which he had already written, namely, that the Protestants should renounce their errors and return immediately to the obedience of their Holy Mother the Church and the observance of her customs and doctrine, so long as it was not otherwise appointed by the Council, to the decisions of which in all points and unreservedly they were willingly to submit. Apart from these conditions, a Council could only cause scandal and set a

¹ Loaysa to the Emperor on July 31, 1530, in HEINE, Briefe, 21-24, 359-361. Cf. EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xl. *seq.*, and **letter of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I. of July 28, with P.S. of July 29. The **letter of da Burgo to Ferdinand of July 23, 1530, shows the tone of gratification in which Clement spoke to him about the Emperor's correspondence.

² See the *reports of A. da Burgo of July 28 and 31, 1530, in the Court and State Archives, Vienna.

³ The Italian text in EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xli.-xliii. Also Archivio storico Italiano, 5th Series, VIII., 134-138. Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 759-763.

most evil example. It was therefore absolutely necessary that the Emperor should insist on these conditions being accepted, so that there might also be certainty of their actual fulfilment; for otherwise, not the removal of error, but only pernicious and deadly effects, were to be expected. The Pope then promised that, as soon as the Emperor informed him of the acceptance and observance of these conditions by the Protestants, he would summon a Council at such time as appeared to him suitable; the Emperor might feel assured that the earliest possible date would be appointed, and that certainly no postponement would be allowed. Regarding the seat of the Council, since it was highly necessary that it should not be held anywhere else than in Italy, Rome had the first claim to consideration—a claim, moreover, favoured by the circumstance that, after all the misfortunes the city had undergone, another lengthened withdrawal of the Curia would involve total ruin. But if Rome were not acceptable, then the Pope proposed Bologna, Piacenza, or Mantua. Concerning abuses, Clement remarked in conclusion, he was waiting for the reply of the Legate, who would report wherein a reformation was called for; on receipt of this reply he would take such measures that everyone would acknowledge his intention to reform what was amiss, and to meet where it was possible the wise and charitable exhortations of the Emperor.

In the Curia the greatest difference of opinion on the question of the Council prevailed. Clement VII., partly from personal and partly from higher reasons, had such strong apprehensions that it seemed to him even less dangerous to tolerate the prolongation of the existing state of affairs in Germany than to summon a Council.¹ That the Pope's anxiety was to a certain extent justified was admitted

¹ HEINE, Briefe, 360.

by the Imperial envoy Mai himself.¹ On this account many doubted whether the Council would be held; but others looked upon this as certain.² It was not surprising that such an assembly, bound to take into consideration the question of reform, should be displeasing to the many prelates of a worldly type. The latter took comfort in the supposition that the Protestants were not in earnest in their demands for a General Council. The envoy of the Duke of Mantua had special satisfaction in knowing that his city was eligible as a meeting-place. "A reformation," he said in closing his report, "is certainly necessary in view of the great corruption. God grant that it may not be brought about by the Turks instead of by the Council."³

The Papal letter of the 31st of July reached Augsburg on the 7th of August, where a few days before the refutation of the Augsburg Confession had been publicly read.⁴ This important document was presented by Campeggio to the Emperor on the 9th; but, in consequence no doubt of Loaysa's letter of the 31st of July already mentioned, he found Charles biassed against the Pope and distrustful of his good intentions.⁵ The Emperor himself no longer held to his former tenacious insistence on the Protestant acceptance of the conditions, but now asked that, waiving the latter entirely, the Council so necessary for the general welfare of Christendom should, under any circumstances,

¹ See DE LEVA, III., 19-20.

² Cf. the **report of Guido da Crema to Isabella d'Este-Gonzaga of Mantua, dated Rome, 1530, July 28 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See **report of Francesco Gonzaga to the Duke of Mantua, dated Rome, 1530, July 24. *Ibid.*

⁴ Cf. FICKER, Die Konfutation des Ausburger Bekenntnisses, Leipzig, 1891, and JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 190 n.

⁵ Campeggio to Salviati on August 11, 1530, in LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 49-54 (here dated August 10; for the correct date see EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xliii.).

be summoned as soon as possible, without prejudice to the objections and representations made by Campeggio in the sense of their former agreement. As regards the seat of the Council Charles avoided any definite pronouncement on the choice of Rome, as desired by Clement and recommended by the Legate, by calling attention to the Pope's own alternative suggestion of Bologna, Mantua, or Piacenza.¹

Charles, meanwhile, was still possessed by the delusive hope² that he might succeed in arriving at a temporary suspension of the religious strife until such time as a general synod should assemble. On the 7th of September he once more ordered the promise of the Council under the specified conditions to be tendered to the protesting Estates, who thanked him for his exertions and urged speedy action, but refused in round terms the abandonment for the time being of the innovations.³ On the 23rd of September Charles once more had a discussion with Campeggio on the Council; ⁴ after his experience, during this very month of September, of the obstinacy of the Protestant princes, he again declared to the Legate that the Council, quite irrespective of the Lutheran situation, was absolutely necessary, or otherwise, within the space of ten years, there would be no obedience left in Germany. He added, however, that, if Clement nevertheless thought otherwise, he, as an obedient son, would submit; but in that case he hoped the Pope would inform him openly and as soon as possible, as this would be better than that the Council should be hindered by the King of France, when in the

¹ EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xliii. *seq.*

² JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 193 *seq.*

³ PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 54.

⁴ Campeggio to Salviati, September 23, 1530, in LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 56-58; *cf.* EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV. xlv.

general opinion the blame would still be laid upon the Pope.¹

In the draft of the decree of the Diet which Charles laid before² the protesting Estates on the 22nd and 23rd of September, he once more charged the latter "to discuss and consider among themselves, until the 15th of April of the forthcoming year, whether, as regards the articles on which there was still disagreement, they would reunite themselves with the Christian Church, the Pope, the Emperor's Majesty, and the princes of the Empire and other heads and members of Christendom at large, until such time as the future Council should open its discussions." The protesting princes rejected this message finally; their spokesman, the Elector of Saxony, at once left the Diet, from which the Landgrave of Hesse had already withdrawn on the 6th of August in precipitate haste. Duke Ernest of Lüneburg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt, the Chancellor Brück, and the Saxon theologians also left Augsburg. They thus destroyed all further possibility of reconciliation.

¹ This groundless suspicion of the Pope's integrity was aroused in Charles by Loaysa's letter mentioned above, see *supra*, p. 135.

² JANSSEN-PASTOR, 18th ed., 214 *seq.*

CHAPTER V.

NEGOTIATIONS AS TO THE COUNCIL, TO THE PACIFICATION OF NUREMBERG, 1532.

IN Rome the transactions of the Diet had been followed with strained attention. Even if as early as the beginning of August the provocative attitude of some of the Protestant princes had made the armed interference of the Emperor a possibility to be reckoned with,¹ there was still a desire to await fuller information,² and a temporary hope of a peaceful agreement, especially as Melanchthon continued to show his previous conciliatory disposition. When afterwards the Catholic princes succeeded in once more setting in motion negotiations for a settlement,³ Salviati wrote, on the 8th of September, to Campeggio that the Pope was ready to permit communion in both kinds and the marriage of the clergy if the protesting party would give way on the remaining points.⁴

Clement VII. wished by these means to facilitate the Emperor's negotiations for a settlement. At this time

¹ Cf. *report of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, 1530, August 4 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² See F. Gonzaga's *letter to the Duke of Mantua, dat. Rome, 1530, August 18 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 45 *seq.*

⁴ *Salviati to Campeggio, dat. Rome, 1530, September 8, *Lett. d. princ., X. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Clement had already expressed himself in similar terms at the end of July; see GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 386.

he was especially active in his endeavours to gratify the wishes of Charles V.;¹ only in the matter of the Council did he raise difficulties. "This," wrote the Roman correspondent of the Duke of Mantua on the 7th of September, "will be a tedious matter, even if the Council takes place, which I do not believe."² The longer the question was treated in the Diet the greater grew the suspense in Rome.³ On the 4th of October came the announcement of the departure of the Elector of Saxony;⁴ it was now as clear as day that all attempts at union had miscarried. To the whole Sacred College it now appeared that force was the only resource available,⁵ and it was hoped that Charles would have recourse to it.

The Emperor had certainly promised the Pope, in the Treaty of Barcelona, that, in the case of contumacy on the part of the Protestants, he would terminate the schism, which had been the cause of so much violence towards Catholics, with the sword. But such a policy was alien to his character; nor was he adequately prepared for it, and the support of the Catholic Estates was by no means certain. Urgent as were the recommendations of Campeggio to apply force, Charles still persisted in his

¹ *E cosa incredibile la osservantia chel Papa porta allo Imperatore e come S. S^{ta} vadda regardata e timorosa in tutte le cose che possino portar una minima molestia a S. M^{ta}, writes F. Gonzaga on September 24, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² *Letter of F. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, 1530, September 7 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ *Hic sunt omnes in mirabili expectatione conclusionum illius dietae circa fidem et alia, writes A. da Burgo on September 23, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁴ *Letter of A. da Burgo, October 5, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁵ **Report of F. Gonzaga, October 6, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

preference for peaceful methods.¹ His patience seemed to have no limits, and only when he could no longer shut his eyes to the fruitlessness of all his efforts at peace did he turn his thoughts to a policy of repression, but without being able even then to come to a firm decision in its favour. "Force," he wrote to his Ambassador in Rome on the 4th of September 1530, "would certainly be the most productive of results, but the necessary weapons are not forthcoming."² The insulting departure from the Diet of the Elector of Saxony was certainly the cause of this change in the Emperor's feelings. Further obstinacy on the part of the Protestant princes, so he declared to the Cardinal-Legate, he was determined to punish, but it was an undertaking which he could not carry out single-handed.³ On the 4th of October he addressed a letter to Clement VII. in which he expressed himself still more clearly and incisively. In it he announced his intention of putting forth all his power to subdue in open warfare the contumacious Protestants; the Pope would see that the other princes were invited to co-operate with him and support him with contributions in money.⁴

Clement VII. met this communication in a most characteristic way. Already, on the 13th of October, when the Ambassador Miguel Mai made known the contents of

¹ *Cj.* Campeggio's report, August 11, 1530, in LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 51, and more exactly in EHSES, *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XIX., 129 *seq.*

² SANDOVAL, *Carlos V.*, Barcelona, 1625, II., 103.

³ Campeggio on September 24, 1530, in LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.* 57-58. For the discussions in the Imperial Council see MAURENBRECHER, *Karl V.*, App. 16 *seq.*

⁴ The Emperor's letter of October 4, 1530, is missing in the Secret Archives of the Vatican. Its contents are to be found not merely in N. Raince's report (given by RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 2nd ed., 307) but also in the important *despatch of F. Gonzaga, October 19, 1530, in Appendix, No. 14.

the Imperial letter, Salviati had emphasized the Pope's confidence in the Emperor's course of action, since the latter had already exterminated by his might other and even greater heresies than those of Luther.¹ But after the letter had been received Clement relapsed into his habitual indecision and pleaded various objections. Besides the considerable pecuniary resources required he referred to the danger of an invasion of the Turks, with the Lutherans as confederates; but, on the other hand, the Pope realized the extreme danger of allowing the Lutherans to remain unpunished; the Imperial authority as well as the Catholic cause would, in such a case, suffer incalculable injury.² Soon afterwards Charles ordered Muscettola to unfold his plans more minutely in Rome. The defiance of the Lutherans, he was charged to explain, had been on the increase since the disbanding of the Imperial army; he therefore intended to collect a force of ten thousand Spaniards and Italians for service in Germany, in order not merely to strike fear among the Lutherans but also, if circumstances should call for it, to act on the offensive towards the Turks; to keep up such an army he must have financial help from the Pope and the princes of Italy.³ Clement now called on the Italian States to help,⁴ while Charles, in a letter of the 25th of October, in which he requested the Cardinals to further the cause of the Council, solemnly declared that he would, in the affair

¹ Salviati to Campeggio, October 13, 1530 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See in Appendix, No. 14, the *letter of F. Gonzaga, October 19, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See in Appendix, No. 15, the *letter of F. Gonzaga, October 27, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 459, 462, 472.

⁴ See Salviati's *letter to Campeggio, dat. Rome, October 26, 1530 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 470, 475, 476.

of Luther, spare neither kingdoms nor dominions in order to accomplish what was necessary.¹

Immediately after the Emperor's first announcement Clement had invited the opinion of the Venetian Government concerning warlike operations against the Protestants; that their answer would be in the nature of a refusal he was led to infer from the objections previously tendered by the Ambassador of the Republic.² The remaining Italian states showed no enthusiasm in the matter, notwithstanding the Pope's advocacy,³ and to Clement's great disgust the Republic sent a direct refusal.⁴ The whole scheme fell through, for the Emperor, in view of the unreliability of the Catholic Estates,⁵ soon abandoned it. On the 30th

¹ *Lettre de l'Empereur au collège des Cardinaux. Copy in MS. Franç., 3014, f. 8 (National Library, Paris). Cf. RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 2nd ed., 308.

² Cf. in Appendix, No. 14, the *letter of F. Gonzaga, October 19, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See *Salviati's letters to Campeggio, October 21 and 26, November 5 and 13, and December 6, 1530 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ See GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 476, 484, 499, and in App., No. 16, the *letter of F. Gonzaga, November 13, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ Cf. Tiepolo in ALBÈRI, 1st Series, I., 69 *seq.*; and JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 220 *seq.* The final resolutions of the Diet of Augsburg deferred the decision (BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., III., 36 *seq.*). Concerning the Council the official document runs thus: "Seeing that for many years a general Council of the Catholic Church has not been held, and that during this long period various abuses and troubles have arisen in Christendom, we, on the common advice and motion of our councillors and of the electors of the Holy Roman Empire and other princes and states, as well as of their representatives, here in Augsburg assembled, and indeed in answer to their humble request and petition, have therefore determined, in full accordance with them, to propose to the Holy Roman Pontiff and all Christian kings and potentates that a Christian Council should be convoked in a suitable place within six months from the end of this present assembly, and held as soon as possible, at the utmost within a year from the issue

of October he sent his majordomo, Don Pedro de la Cueva, to Rome to inform the Pope that owing to the advanced season of the year it was no longer possible to think of an immediate undertaking against the Lutherans, for which Clement might be engaged in preparations. Cueva was also instructed to represent to Clement that, since all hopes of converting the heretics by friendly means had been shattered by their obstinacy, the summons of a Council was the only means remaining of saving Germany from permanent apostasy; his Holiness should therefore take the necessary steps to convene the same as soon as possible, since every delay was detrimental. The choice of locality was left by the Emperor to the Holy Father; but the Ambassador was to do his best to secure the choice of some place as near as possible to German territory, say Mantua or Milan.¹

Charles spoke in a similar sense in the letter to Clement to be personally handed to him by the Ambassador. He thanked the Pope for his reply of the 31st of July,² and showed him that he had left nothing undone to bring the Protestants to accept the conditions on which the Council was to depend. But notwithstanding the failure

of this summons, in the good hope and confidence that we thereby may bestow lasting and happy unity and peace on the spiritual and temporal affairs of Christendom," HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 743, 745; see here also 737 *seq.* on the renewal of the gravamina and the negotiations concerning them; also *cf.* EHSES in the Röm. Quartalschr., XVIII., 369 *seq.*, 373 *seq.* The resolutions of the Diet contained a promise that the Imperial Ambassador should treat with the Pope regarding the redress to be given.

¹ Instrucción original que dió el Emperador á don Pedro de la Cueva in HEINE, Briefe, 525-529; in German, 289-295. *Cf.* PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 74.

² See *supra*, p. 136.

of these endeavours he was now of opinion that the Council, the demand for which came not only from the Protestant but also from the Catholic princes, must not be abandoned as, in view of these very circumstances, it offered the only remaining means of salvation. He held it to be his duty to declare plainly and distinctly "that the meeting of the Council must take place for the cure of the present errors, the welfare of Christendom, the settlement of belief, the elevation of the Apostolic See, and the personal honour of your Holiness; failing this, no adequate course is open, and far greater are the evils contingent on the Council not taking place than those which, it is supposed, would accrue from its deliberations, for the present errors are many, various, and daily increasing in number." Nor could the danger of the Turkish war be made a valid argument against the Council, for, on the contrary, it would afford the best means of uniting the whole of Christendom in effectual opposition to the infidels. Charles V. therefore begged the Pope, in the most urgent terms, to sanction the summons of the Council as soon as possible, and to obtain the agreement of the other Christian sovereigns. In the meanwhile Clement might also consider what steps could be taken against the Lutherans. The Emperor accounted for his wish that the Council should be held near German territory on the ground that, in this way, the Lutherans would be deprived of any excuse for non-attendance.¹ Cueva reached Rome on the 15th of November, and on the following day he waited on the Pope together with the Imperial Ambassador. In addition to the letter already referred to, he presented a second touching the election

¹ In HEINE, 530-533, 295-390; *cf.* PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 74, and EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xlvi. *seq.* See also Loaysa's letter to the Emperor, November 18, 1530, in HEINE, 386-389, 62-68.

of Ferdinand I. as King of the Romans, and a communication on Florentine affairs.¹

Clement VII. sent an answer to Charles as early as the 18th of November, without at first committing himself definitely. He had so much confidence in the Emperor's sympathy and discretion that he would like nothing better than to be guided by his advice entirely; but, as a matter of decorum, he must first consult the Cardinals; yet, seeing how important the matter was for Christendom in general, he would give a definite reply as soon as possible.² Accordingly the deputation of Cardinals was summoned to meet on the 21st of November. The "pros" and "cons" were thoroughly considered. Opinions differed so greatly that the final vote was postponed until the 25th of November.³ The interval was made use of by the Imperialist Cardinals and envoys in trying to bring about a speedy decision favourable to the policy of Charles.⁴ At the second meeting of the deputation the Cardinals who shirked reform again brought forward the dangers involved in a Council; still, the majority

¹ Cf. Cueva's report in GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 497 *seq.*, and a *letter of A. da Burgo, November 17, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² HEINE, 533 *seq.*, 301 *seq.* Cf. EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xlvii. Clement VII. told the Mantuan agent F. Gonzaga, before the meeting of Cardinals on November 21, that the holding of the Council would be determined upon; *letter of F. Gonzaga of November 21 in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. A. da Burgo reports thoroughly on the dangers feared by Clement in his *letter of November 20, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ Cf. A. da Burgo's *letter of November 22, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁴ *Interea Card. Osmen. et S. Crucis et alii Caesarei et ego non desumus praestare officia convenientia, ut fiat bona et celeris conclusio et quod principale et gravius periculum imminens sit si concilium non feret aut differatur. † A. da Burgo, *loc. cit.*

were of opinion that the Emperor's advice should be followed, since still greater dangers were to be expected if the Council did not take place; yet, if the presence of the Emperor were called for, that of the other Christian princes ought also to be invited.¹

On the 28th of November the Pope, who had still the gravest apprehensions, laid the matter before a secret Consistory, in which Cardinals Farnese, Monte, and Canisio spoke so warmly in favour of a Council that all the six-and-twenty Cardinals present gave their unanimous support.² Nevertheless Loaysa, and with him Mai and Cueva, did not alter their opinion that the Pope and Cardinals shrank from a Council and were working against it. "If they now vote otherwise," wrote Loaysa, "it is because they see that, in your Majesty's opinion, all is lost if the Council is not held; they realize that the consequence of their rejection would be to offend all Christian people and especially your Majesty. These Cardinals in thus voting are acting like merchantmen, who fling their goods into the sea in order to save their own lives. With the exception of five or six, among whom is Monte in particular, I do not know one among them whose heart is really in the matter. So true is this, that although the Pope has said exactly what I have written, I am yet afraid that, under the condition of inviting the other

¹ Along with passages from Salviati's letter of November 26, 1530, given by EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xlvii., and GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 510, 512, 517, 518, I have also made use of A. da Burgo's cipher *report of November 26, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² Loaysa to the Emperor on November 30, 1530, in HEINE, 391, 70 *seq.* Cf. the extract from the Acta Consistoria in EHSES, xlviii. *seq.*, the **report of Francesco Gonzaga to the Duke of Mantua, dat. Rome, 1530, November 28, and **that of Guido da Crema to Isabella d'Este-Gonzaga, dat. Rome, 1530, December 2 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); see also GAYANGOS, IV., I, n. 518.

princes to the Council, opportunities will be sought and made to hinder and destroy the objects which your Majesty, as the servant of God, is aiming at. The Pope is so astute and crafty that we shall only find this out when your Majesty comes yourself to recognize the impediment, and to say that the Council is impossible; then the blame will not fall on the guilty party, but, with much greater probability, will be dealt out to the innocent.”¹ On the other hand, there were those who believed that Clement really wished for a Council. One was the agent of the Duke of Mantua, to whom the Pope had spoken approvingly of Mantua as the place of assembly.²

On the 30th of November the deputation of Cardinals was consulted on the form of the briefs to be addressed to the princes. Already, on the following day, the 1st of December, the work of composing and despatching them began.³ On the 6th of December the Pope sent a brief communication to the Emperor that he had written to the princes, and had made up his mind to conform his opinion to that of Charles.⁴ Even Loaysa’s unfavourable view of Clement underwent a change.⁵

¹ See HEINE, 392, and DE LEVA, III., 29. Cf. GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 520, 523.

² See **F. Gonzaga’s reports of November 28 and December 4 and 6, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ EHSES, xlix.

⁴ HEINE, 302, 534. Cf. Salviati’s letter of December 6 in EHSES, xlix.

⁵ He wrote on December 6 (HEINE, 397): “The affair of the Council depends on this: Should your Majesty set the Pope’s mind at rest as to the difficulties, and your Majesty be of opinion that these would not arise out of the Council and that you are willing to be present at it, then one may take it as well-nigh certain that his Holiness will summon it with heartfelt joy. . . . My supposition is that he has a great dread and dislike of the Council, but that after reading your

For the purpose of closer verbal communication, Clement sent Uberto da Gambara, Bishop of Tortona, to the Emperor,¹ in place of Nicolas von Schönberg, Archbishop of Capua, originally nominated for the mission, but prevented by illness² from making the journey. In his instructions,³ drawn up by Cardinal Cajetan, the objections to the Council, which the envoy was once more to lay before the Emperor in the name of the Pope and the Cardinals, held a special place. They were six in number. (1) If the heretics were allowed to raise fresh disputations concerning their errors, already condemned by several councils, a bad and dangerous precedent would be established; but if they were forbidden discussion they would complain that they had been condemned

Majesty's letters and those of Don Pedro de la Cueva and hearing the various reasons adduced by all your Majesty's ministers, I venture to declare that he will be profoundly influenced and, I believe, that already he is almost entirely persuaded, for he sets the highest value on the truthfulness, the virtue, the consistency, the good intentions, and the feelings of religion and honour in your Majesty's heart."

¹ Cf. the *letter of A. da Burgo of December 28, 1530, *ibid.*; in App., No. 17, the *letter of F. Peregrino of December 10, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and EHSES, xlix., 1-lxxiv.; see also PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 76 *seq.*, and HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 767 *seq.* For Gambara cf. GARAMPI, 252.

² According to A. da Burgo's account in a *letter of December 12, 1530, Schönberg said to him that, even if he had been in good health, he would not have gone: "cum non videat viam rei bene gerendae nec per concilium nec per arma." Pope and Emperor certainly are sincere as to the Council, but not the rest. Yet a war against the Lutherans is not to be recommended. Better to come to a peaceful agreement with them, conceding some things, while retaining intact the main articles of belief (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ Printed in EHSES, lii.-liv. Cf. the statement of contents in HEINE, 106; PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 76 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 767 *seq.*

unheard, and, while repudiating the decrees of the Council, would adhere more closely to their errors. (2) If they refused to acknowledge the authority of previous councils what ground was there for the hope that they would submit to the forthcoming one? But, this being so, the situation would be changed very much for the worse if conciliar decrees were to be passed which could not be put into execution. (3) The Protestants would stand by the letter of the Bible, and, rejecting the authority of councils and fathers, refuse to be convinced with the obstinacy habitual in heretics. (4) The whole conduct of the heretics at the Diet of Augsburg showed that in their demand for a Council, they were only carrying out their intention of persisting in their tenets up to the moment of its summons and decisions, in the hope that in this way much time would be consumed and that eventually the Council might be dissolved without coming to any general decision. (5) If, as might easily happen, the old controversy as to the supremacy of the Pope or Council were to be revived, a schism might thus be brought about and great injury would be inflicted on the authority of the Emperor as well as on that of the Pope. (6) It was open to question whether the other princes would attend a Council held under the protection of the Imperial power, while, on the other hand, the Pope could only preside if that protection were given. The dangers arising from the Turks, and the objections put forward on this score, were also urged for further consideration. Gambara, who had left Rome on the 30th of December 1530, reached Aix on the 15th of January 1531, just as Charles V. was taking farewell of his brother Ferdinand, and preparing to begin his journey into the Netherlands; on the 16th or 17th of January, in Liége, he had the first opportunity of speaking to the Emperor;¹ he

¹ EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., li. *seq.*, liv. *seq.*

handed him the Pope's letter and unfolded to him his objections in accordance with his instructions.¹

It is impossible to say definitely whether, on the occasion of this interview, Gambara also laid before the Emperor the five conditions attached by Clement to the convening of the Council, or whether this took place at some other time.² These five conditions were: (1) The Council was to be summoned and held only for the discussion of the affairs of the Turkish war, the reconciliation of the Lutherans, the extirpation of heresies, and the adequate punishment of the contumacious. (2) The Emperor was to attend the Council in person from its beginning to its end, and on his departure the sessions were to terminate. (3) The Council was to be held in Italy and nowhere else, the Pope nominating beforehand a city for its seat. (4) Those only to have a decisive vote who were canonically qualified. (5) The Lutherans were to sue formally before the Council and to send their plenipotentiaries with proper mandates, a course which appeared to be of great use towards facilitating their safe return.³

The effect of Clement's present mood, who, during the deliberations with the Cardinals in November 1530, was prepared to carry out the Emperor's wishes in reliance on the latter's friendly dispositions, was to throw the responsibility of a decision entirely on Charles. If he gave a

¹ See EHSES, *op. cit.*, lv.-lvii.

² This apparently took place on the occasion of the second audience on January 25, 1531, at Brussels, when Bishops Gambara and da Schio were present. Cf. EHSES, *op. cit.*, lvii.

³ "Capitula sive conditiones a Clemente VII. per Ubertum de Gambara episcopum Dertonensem Carolo V. exhibita," in EHSES, xlvii.; with the Emperor's reply in LAEMMER, *Meletematum Romanorum mantissa*, 137, and in HEINE, 537 *seq.*, cf. PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 77; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 769 *seq.*

favourable reply and accepted the conditions, then without doubt the speedy summons of the Council would have been decided on.¹

But it was now the Emperor who, by his delay in sending the anxiously expected answer to Rome,² hindered the further progress of affairs. It was not until the 4th of April 1531 that Charles, who was then in Brussels, caused his reply to be made known to the Legate, Cardinal Campeggio, and to the Bishops Gambara and Girolamo de Schio in Ghent through Covos and Granvelle.³ He had, as he here explains, first informed his brother Ferdinand of the hindrances and objections to a Council as set forth by Gambara, and by Ferdinand they were to be made known to the other Catholic princes of Germany. The result of their consultation was that the princes declared themselves "bound by their former determination, and that no other adequate method of healing the existing disorders was to be found except in the Council; even if the matters to which the Pope had called attention were of great importance and significance, yet it appeared to them that neither the existing errors nor those to be looked for in the future could be met by any other means; nor had the evils in question reached such a pitch as to justify the abandonment of the Council." Charles showed less discernment in thinking that it was necessary to sound Francis I. beforehand on his opinion with regard to the Council.

Charles V., as well as the Pope, had allowed himself to be deceived for a while as to the real sentiments of his wily adversary by the letter written by Francis to

¹ EHSES, lviii.

² Cf. the letter of Loaysa to Charles V. on February 25, 1531, in HEINE, 410, 102.

³ In HEINE, 535-538, 303-308.

Clement VII. on the 21st of November 1530,¹ and communicated in December to the Emperor at Mayence. The French King's policy had been directed unfalteringly to frustrating a Council which was to heal the disunion in the German Empire. In his letter he seemed to proclaim his thorough good-will towards such a project, but he expressed himself in such a way that, in the event of the Council becoming a serious probability, many pretexts should remain open to him whereby he might yet nullify the action of that assembly. But when the letter was read in Consistory on the 5th of December 1530, such an impression was made that the Pope and Cardinals were filled with joy and thanked God that the two greatest rulers were now of one mind on this weighty topic.² On the 13th of December, Clement wrote a letter of thanks to Francis, full of lavish praise for having shown himself worthy of the title of "most Christian King."³ Trusting to the present sincerity of Francis, Charles sent to him, on the 1st of February 1531, Louis de Praet to inquire of him how he stood with regard to the question of the Council. Francis kept the Emperor waiting two months for an answer; when at last it was received at Ghent, on the 28th of March, it was seen to contain the demand that the agreement of all princes to the Council should first be invited, and that for this object a convention should be held at Rome to which all Christian kings and princes should send their repre-

¹ In EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., 1.

² Loaysa to Charles V. on December 6, 1530, in HEINE, 396, 79 *seq.* Cf. *the report of F. Gonzaga of December 6, 1530, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and the *letter of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, January 12, 1531, in the Court and State Archives, Vienna.

³ EHSES, I.

sentatives.¹ "That," wrote Loaysa to the Emperor, when the terms of this answer were made known in Rome on the 14th of April, "makes the Council quite impossible and shows a determination that it shall not take place."² The further negotiations of Charles with the King had also no better success.³

The Emperor, in the answer already mentioned, which was at length given to the Papal Ambassador on the 4th of April, accounted for the long delay, for which he was not to be blamed, on the ground of his previous negotiations with Francis I., and announced that he left it to the Pope to make a final decision, with the petition that the latter would avoid the scandal which must be expected if the Council were delayed; he gave his assurances that the Pope might count upon him and his brother Ferdinand.⁴ At the same time, Covos and Granvelle gave the Emperor's answer touching the five conditions under which the Council was to be summoned.⁵ On the first point the Emperor remarked that, in order to safeguard the procedure hitherto observed in the Holy Councils and strictly regulated by law, as well as to obviate any opportunity for depreciating or calumniating a Council

¹ EHSES, lix. Loaysa's report of March 27 on the difficulties of Francis I., in Doc. ined., XIV., 134. Cf. also, for the sudden hesitation of Francis I., with the answer, the *report of A. da Burgo to Ferdinand I., dated Rome, March 20, 1531 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² HEINE, 416, 112 *seq.* Cf. the **reports of Guido da Crema from Rome to Isabella d'Este-Gonzaga of April 8, 1531, and of F. Peregrino to the Duke of Mantua of May 3, 1531 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ EHSES, lix.

⁴ HEINE, 536 *seq.*, 305 *seq.*

⁵ In EHSES, lx. Also in LAEMMER, Melet. Rom. mantissa, 137 *seq.*, and in HEINE, 537 *seq.* (German, 306-308), together with the text of the *Capitula*. Cf. PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 77; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 770.

held under such limitations, it seemed to be more fitting that it should be summoned simply and without restrictions. Having been summoned, the Pope could then decide what matters were to be brought forward and dealt with. To the second condition the Emperor assented, and, putting his own affairs in the background, promised to attend the Council so long as this was deemed to be conducive to favourable results. As to the seat of the Council, he expressed himself as personally satisfied with all the cities proposed by the Pope, but the German princes and others of that nation asked for Mantua or Milan. On the fourth point, the Emperor observed that the laws and usages of the Holy Councils must be observed in accordance with former precedents. The fifth condition had been already dropped by the Bishop of Tortona himself. The Emperor added that there was, besides, no object in disputing with the heretics in cases of recognized contumacy.

Gambara, on the receipt of this answer, should, in accordance with the Emperor's intentions, have left immediately for Rome,¹ but he wished to speak with the latter once more on the affair of the Council. He went to him at Brussels, Charles having deferred his journey from thence to Ghent, from which former place, on the 19th of April, he was dismissed, after an interview, with a letter for the Pope.² At the same time, Gambara had drawn up, while in Brussels, for the Imperial Council a counter document to the Emperor's reply on the five conditions; he explained, in particular, how much better it would be to restrict the synod to a definite task than to assign to it an entirely general purview.³

¹ See Charles's letter to the Pope on April 2, 1531, in EHSES, lx.

² EHSES, Conc. Trid. IV., lxi., n. 5.

³ EHSES, lxi.-lxiv.

When the Emperor's answer was at last received in Rome, it was understood that the strange delay was not due to him, but that the obstacle standing in the way of the Council was Francis I., and that all efforts were unavailing if it proved impossible to bring that monarch to another mind. Clement VII. therefore agreed that the Emperor should continue his negotiations through Louis de Praet, and wrote himself to the Nuncio in France, Cesare Trivulzio, as to the methods for winning Francis. He also conceded to the Kings of England and France, who were preparing to raise difficulties about the seat of the Council, that to Milan and Mantua, already proposed by the Emperor, the choice of Piacenza and Bologna should be added, places to which no objection could be taken.¹

On the 25th of April 1531, Clement VII. wrote to the Emperor that if the consent of the French King were procured, he would summon the Council at once; but if Francis were unwilling or made difficulties it would be better to refrain, since a Council held in the face of disagreement between two such sovereigns would only embolden the Lutherans to be more obstinate.² At the same time the Pope, through Salviati, informed the Legate Campeggio of the deliberations in Consistory.³ The

¹ Cf. Salviati to Campeggio on April 24 (25), 1531, in HEINE, 541, 312. On April 20, 1531, A. da Burgo wrote from Rome to Ferdinand I.: *Disputavimus cum S. S^{tas} multa de malis secuturis si amplius differatur providere istris periculis imminentibus ex Lutheriana et aliis sectis. In fine conclusit S. S^{tas} me vere dicere quod opus sit vel medio concilii vel medio armorum vel per concordiam cum Lutheranis providere, sed dolere se quod videat in omnibus tribus illis tot difficultates quod nesciat quid faciendum, tamen ex latere suo se non defuturum in quolibet illorum trium suprascriptorum mediorum (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² Cf. EHSES, lxx.

³ HEINE, 540-554, 309-316; EHSES, lxx. seq.

Cardinals were determined that the Council should not be summoned for general purposes, but with the specific object of dealing with matters of belief and the Turkish war. Moreover, the Cardinals, dissatisfied with the general terms of Charles's announcement, wished him to give a direct promise that he would assist at the Council throughout its entire duration, and they requested that the fifth point, too easily granted by Gambara, that the Lutherans should be represented, should be again withdrawn. If the Emperor made these concessions and the King of France agreed to its summons, then the Council would take place. But if Francis (and Henry VIII.) were not willing, then it would be better that the Council should fall through and no more time be wasted, and other steps taken to restore order in Germany, either by the Emperor endeavouring to suppress Lutheranism by force, in which case the Pope would assist him with all the means in his power, or by trying to bring them back to obedience by means of Confessions of Faith stated in terms not detrimental to Catholic belief. These letters were so long on the way that Campeggio could not discuss them with the Emperor before the 5th of June, and then without making any progress, for the latter was stubborn in his determination regarding the summons of the Council and his own attendance at it.¹ At the same time, he was informed by Charles that an answer had come from the King of France which was even more unfavourable than his previous communication on the subject.

Gambara returned from his mission on the 13th of May,

¹ Cf. Campeggio's letter to Salviati from Ghent, June 13, 1531, partly given in LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 71 *seq.* The portion relating to the negotiations with Francis I., wanting in Laemmer, is given by EHSES, lxvi,

and gave a full report to the Pope.¹ Four days later Cardinal Gramont, whose coming was eagerly desired, arrived; on his instructions the fate of the Council depended.² Unfortunately, they no longer left it doubtful that Francis was determined to thwart the general assembly of the Church. He would never consent in any way to the Council, unless it were held in Turin and he present in person. If the Emperor also wished to attend, well and good, but in that case each of them must be attended by an equal number of armed men. To the question of Clement VII.: Why then did the king object to Piacenza or Bologna? Gramont answered, because His Majesty did not wish to travel through the Duchy of Milan if it did not belong to him. To the Pope's further remark that it was not really necessary that Francis should be present in person, and that he could send a representative in his name, Gramont rejoined that that was impossible. The Emperor must not suppose that he can lay down laws for the French.³ That Clement VII. was not in any underhand way connected with this French policy, as has often been asserted without proof,⁴ is shown also by Salviati's letter of the 31st of July 1531 to Campeggio on the subject of French practices.⁵

On the 23rd of June Charles V. informed Campeggio that

¹ See Guido da Crema's *letter, May 13, and that of F. Gonzaga, May 17, 1531, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, as well as A. da Burgo's *report of May 17, 1531, in the Court and State Archives, Vienna.

² See A. da Burgo's *report of May 20, 1531, in the Court and State Archives, Vienna, and that of F. Gonzaga *of May 20, 1531, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

³ Loaysa's letter to the Emperor, May 26, 1531, in HEINE, 424 *seqq.*, 126 *seqq.*, and *that of F. Gonzaga of May 20, 1531, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Cf. PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 78; EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., lxvii.

⁴ Cf. *contra*, PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 78.

⁵ In EHSES, lxxviii.

he intended to assemble a new Diet before his return to Spain. He expressed, indeed, a doubt whether he would be able in this way to produce any effect on the obstinate Lutherans; but he wished to hold the Diet, for he had promised at Augsburg that the Council should be held, and the latter was still a remote contingency.¹ On the question of the Council the Emperor held out the prospect of an answer at a later date; this was presented to the Legate by Covos and Granvelle on the 17th of July,² and on the 27th it was forwarded to Rome with a letter from the Emperor.³ Charles expressed his displeasure at the hindrances always being raised against the Council; he did not fail to recognize their importance, but begged that the Pope would persevere in his efforts to remove them, since he knew of no other remedy than a Council. He would soon visit Germany in person and exert himself to the same end. Other expressions of the Emperor⁴ showed that at this time he very strongly suspected that the Pope was in secret understanding with the French policy of obstruction. This suspicion was nourished by the French proposal for a marriage between Catherine de' Medici, Clement's niece, and the second son of King Francis, Henry, Duke of Orleans, by which alliance the French King thought to draw the Pope over to his side.⁵ But on this occasion even Loaysa, who in prior circumstances had spoken his mind so sharply,⁶ defended Clement's sincerity against the suspicions of Charles V. in letters of the 9th of

¹ Campeggio to Salviati, June 24, 1531, in LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 72-74; *cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 771 *seq.*; EHSSES, lxviii.

² Campeggio to Salviati, July 17, 1531, in EHSSES, lxviii.

³ The Spanish in HEINE, 544; German, *ibid.*, 317 *seqq.*; EHSSES, lxix.

⁴ *Cf.* EHSSES, lxix.

⁵ *Cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 795 *seq.*, 797.

⁶ See *supra*, pp. 135, 149 *seq.*

June and the 26th of July.¹ Loaysa also informed the Emperor that the arrangement of this marriage, so far as it depended on the Pope, was not by any means an accomplished fact.

The responsibility for the failure of the Council under Clement VII. falls undoubtedly in the first instance on Francis I. But it certainly was a great mistake on the part of the Pope to have been drawn into negotiations with the King of such a kind that he was bound to incur the suspicion of complicity with Francis in this question. In any case the prospects grew worse and worse, so that even Loaysa wrote to the Emperor, on the 12th of September, that he could only entreat him a thousand times "to withdraw as soon as possible from this dark undertaking, the Council; for on many grounds," he went on to say, "which are clear to me, I see no advantage in it for your Majesty, and what has hitherto taken place has only brought you harm. Your intentions could not be better; . . . but since you perceive plainly that you are here opposed by envy and pusillanimity, rest satisfied with having secured the favour of God, and lead your affairs some other way by which you will quicker attain your own advantage; the blame of having abandoned the good which you might have done will fall on others to their condemnation, while your glory will remain unimpaired."²

The communication to Clement of the Emperor's intention of holding a Diet at Spire on his return to Germany was received by the former with joy, which found expression in his letters to Charles on the 24th and 26th of July.³ In the latter he even assented to certain concessions being made to the heretics in Germany, if

¹ HEINE, 429 *seqq.*, 136 *seqq.*, 443, 157.

² *Ibid.*, 447, 163 *seq.*

³ EHSES, lxxi.

there were good hopes that by this means their obedience could be secured, in order that undivided attention might be given to the Turkish question.¹ The Legate Campeggio held other views on the latter point. Having had opportunities of studying events close at hand, he could not discard his opinion that armed force, and armed force alone, was the only method to pursue with the heretics.²

The Pope was inclined to give way on three particular points: communion under both kinds; the marriage of the clergy as practised by the Greeks; and, further, that in respect of the transgression of ecclesiastical ordinances, only that which was forbidden *de jure divino* was to be looked upon as mortal sin.³ Cajetan was especially in favour of an agreement based on such far-reaching terms, while other Cardinals were opposed to it.⁴

In the Consistory of the 11th of August 1531 it was determined that a special Nuncio should be sent to the Diet. A resolution was passed that the Pope should apply himself to the removal of the hindrances which stood in the way of the meeting of the Council. At the end of August, Aleander, who had been nominated Nuncio by the Pope, left Rome with Briefs for the Emperor, King Ferdinand, and other temporal and spiritual princes of the Empire.⁵ In his Brief to the Emperor, Clement VII.

¹ EHSES, lxxi.

² Campeggio to Salviati, June 24, 1531, in LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 73; EHSES, lxxi.

³ EHSES, lxxii.; HEINE, 154 *seq.*, n. Cf. MAURENBRECHER, Katholische Reformation, 329, 413.

⁴ See FRIEDENSBURG in Quellen und Forsch., III., 4 *seq.*, 15 *seq.*

⁵ Aleander's credentials are of August 29; see RAYNALDUS, 1531, n. 6; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 78. Aleander had left Rome by August 27; see *F. Peregrino's letter of August 28 in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; Aleander, in a *letter of Girolamo Gonzaga (Aug. 27) in this collection, is spoken of as "è molto caro a S. S^{ta} et è persona stimata assai."

spoke especially of his wish, on which point the Nuncio also had received full instructions, to support Charles in his good intentions concerning the Council. In another letter to the Emperor, which reached Aleander when he was already on his way, Clement recommended special caution in the contingency of any concessions being made; if the Emperor were convinced of the necessity of such concessions, in order to avoid greater evils, he must take care that they were not entered into recklessly, for otherwise scandal might be given to the rest of Christendom. Charles must make such a settlement in Germany as should render a return to the former disorders impossible. Moreover, any concessions allowed to the Germans must be of such a character as not to give an impetus to other nations to make similar demands for themselves.¹

As the Diet appointed to be held at Spires was postponed and transferred to Regensburg at a later date, Aleander at once betook himself to the Netherlands to meet the Emperor, to whom he presented the Papal messages at Brussels on the 6th of November 1531. On the 14th Aleander had a long interview with the Emperor, to whom he read the Brief.² To the expressions of the Pope relating to the Council, Charles observed that he "thanked God that his Holiness kept true to his promise and gave the lie to those who asserted that he wished with heart and soul to be rid of the Council." Aleander replied that the Pope had no wish to be rid of it, if only it could be held in a befitting manner; that is, if Charles, before all things, were always present in person, as were the Emperors of old at œcumenical

¹ PALLAVICINI, III., 6; EHSSES, Conc. Trid., IV., lxxii. *seq.*; PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 86 *seq.*; BUCHOLTZ, IV., 285 *seq.*; *cf.* IX., 22.

² Aleander to Sanga, November 19, 1531, in LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 86-88. *Cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 773 *seq.*; EHSSES, lxxiii.

councils ; if, further, there were solid grounds for hoping that the Lutherans would consent and return to the bosom of the Church, that no other schism with Catholic nations arose, as would happen if France, England, and Scotland did not join, and finally, that a good and holy reformation of the whole Church of God in head and members would be taken in hand. To this the Emperor replied that the Pope's first hope was well grounded ; that, on the other hand, the fear of a schism had no foundation ; with the desire for a reformation he was in entire agreement—the laity, indeed, stood in need of one themselves.

On the 18th of November 1531 the report reached Rome that the Elector of Saxony had become reconciled and had ordered the restoration of Catholicism throughout his territories. As this astonishing announcement came from the Imperial Court, it obtained credence with Clement.¹ But subsequently it proved just as fallacious² as the other numerous reports of Lutheran advances towards the Church, which were occasioned not a little by the vacillating and often ambiguous attitude of Melanchthon. Clement VII. in his hours of weakness gave only too ready an ear to such fantastic rumours.³ In the beginning

¹ See in App., No. 22, the *report of F. Peregrino of November 19, 1531 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua) ; cf. also, *ibid.*, the *letter of Girolamo Gonzaga of November 21, 1531, and the *letter of V. Albergati, dated Rome, 1531, November 28 (State Archives, Bologna).

² Salviati's doubts are first strongly expressed on December 9, 1531, in his **letter to Campeggio (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See SCHLECHT, Ein abenteuerlicher Reunionsversuch, in the Röm. Quartalschr., VII., 333 *seq.* ; KOLDE in the Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., XVII., 258 *seq.* ; and KAWERAU, Die Versuche, Melanchthon zur katholischen Kirche zurückzuführen, Halle, 1902. Cf. Histor. Jahrb., XXIII., 628 *seq.*, and Röm. Quartalschr., XVIII., 361, 363 ; for Melanchthon's negotiations with Campeggio, 1530, see

of May 1532 Clement VII. again wrote to the Emperor that the Council must in any case be held, and that he was straining every nerve to ensure its assembling, only the consent of the French King must be obtained, for without that it might lead to results contrary to those hoped for.¹

In the meantime the Protestants in Germany had created a strong political organization. This was the League of Schmalkald, formed in February 1531. Confident of their strength, they not only let the term allowed for their submission (15th April 1531) by the decree of Augsburg to pass by, but they also refused to give any help to the Emperor in his struggle with the Turks, now a serious menace to Austria and Hungary. Thus, at the opening of the Diet of Regensburg, on the 17th of April 1532, Charles found himself compelled to enter on fresh negotiations. In these Campeggio, who had come in the Emperor's suite, took a part. The reports of the small attendance of princes at Regensburg had from the first the most depressing effect on the hopes aroused at Rome on this occasion.²

In his crying need for help against the Turks, Charles was prepared to make extraordinary concessions to the Protestants. He was strengthened in this resolve by his fear lest the latter should put their threats into execution and turn their arms against the Catholics during an attack of the infidels.³ Even in Rome this danger was fully

now also KOLDE, *Die älteste Redaktion der Augsburger Konfession*, Gütersloh, 1906; the Consistory placed by BUCHOLTZ, IV., 286, in the year 1531 belongs to the previous year, see EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., *xlvi.*, n. 2; *Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte*, XXVII., 333 *seqq.*

¹ *Lett. d. princ.*, III., 129; BUCHOLTZ, IV., 290, n.

² *Cf.* the *report of G. M. della Porta, dat. Rome, 1532, March 10 (State Archives, Florence).

³ See Aleander's report in LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 131, 135.

understood. Consequently Clement VII., as Muscettola relates, urged the Emperor, in March, to persevere in his negotiations with the Protestants: if he could not get all that he wished, he might at least get what was then practicable, so that, if the Turks should come, they would be met by a resistance not in any way weakened by the dissensions of Germany; although their opponents were Lutherans, they were yet, for all that, Christians. It is clear from a report of Muscettola, of the 19th of April, that efforts were being made at Rome at this time to find some *via media* whereby the German troubles might be disposed of.¹

When the Papal Nuncio became aware of the Emperor's negotiations with the Protestants for a temporary religious peace, he gave way to an outburst of indignation. Campeggio, who, on other occasions, in opposition to Aleander, had advocated a policy of procrastination, was now entirely at one with his colleague. On the 1st of June he presented a memorial to the Emperor in which he pronounced the concessions offered to the heretics, especially the permission to adhere to the Augsburg Confession until the next Council should meet, to be pernicious in the highest degree; he also objected that no express statement about the Council had been made to the effect that it was to be held in conformity with the ancient œcumenical councils, and that submission to its decrees was to be promised. By the agreement as proposed, so Campeggio declared, the return of the erring would be made more difficult and the path of the Protestants' advance more easy.²

In spite of this urgent warning, the Emperor, taking into consideration the invasion of Hungary by the Turks, guaranteed his toleration to the members of the Schmal-

¹ See HEINE, Briefe, 257; cf. PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 86.

² LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 123 *seq.*

kaldic League, as well as to Brandenburg-Culmbach, and the cities of Nuremberg and Hamburg, to the greatest portion, that is to say, although not to all, of the Protestant Estates, "until the next general, free, Christian Council as decided on by the Diet of Nuremberg." He added that he would devote all his energy to having the Council summoned within six months and held within a year from then; should circumstances turn out to the contrary, a fresh Diet would be assembled to deliberate. These ample concessions were not made, however, on the authority of the Empire; the Emperor guaranteed them on his own personal responsibility.¹ Of this agreement he only laid before the Estates at Regensburg the stipulation concerning the Council. This gave rise to heated debate; the Catholic Estates, under the influence of the Bavarian Chancellor, Eck, an old enemy of the house of Hapsburg, demanded a Council with unwonted vehemence, and cast upon the Emperor the blame for its delay. They even went so far as to abandon the Catholic standpoint altogether and to call upon the Emperor, if the Pope did not soon summon the Council, to exercise his Imperial authority by convoking one, or, at least, a council of the German nation.²

Charles informed the Estates that the delay in holding a Council was not to be attributed to the Pope, but to the King of France, from whom, regardless of all the letters and embassies sent to him, no agreement could be obtained either regarding its character or the place where it should be held. He would do all in his power to urge the Pope to send out his summons within six months and to hold the Council within a year. Failing this, he would convene a fresh Diet, lay before the Estates the causes of the

¹ See MAURENBRECHER, *Kath. Ref.*, 339, 414.

² JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 280; EHSES, lxxvii., lxxix.

delay, and take counsel with them as to the best means of relieving the pressing needs of the whole German people, whether by a Council or by other means, and in a decisive way.¹ To the suggestion that he should call a Council on his own responsibility, the Emperor declined to listen, as it was not any affair of his.²

In Rome, as in Germany, opinion as to the policy to be pursued towards the Protestants was much divided. It seems that Clement personally, confronted with the appalling danger threatening Christendom from the Turks, was in agreement with the Emperor's policy of indulgence.³ Aleander therefore from the first had pledged himself to the Pope to refrain from any approval of the religious compromise and to recommend complete neutrality on this very delicate question.⁴ Clement VII., on his part, abstained from any express approval of the pacification of Nuremberg, which was followed by the participation of the Protestants in the war of the Empire against the Turks.

¹ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 280 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 783. In a subsidiary agreement of August 2, 1532, concealed from the Catholics, Charles also promised that cases connected with belief should be carried before the Imperial private tribunals. HORTLEDER, *Von den Ursachen des deutschen Krieges Karls V.*, I, 11.

² Cf. Aleander's report in LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 143.

³ See the *letter of G. M. della Porta to the Duke of Urbino, dat. Rome, 1532, August 17 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ Cf. LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 134 *seq.*; MAURENBRECHER, *Kath. Ref.*, 341.

CHAPTER VI.

CLEMENT VII.'S EFFORTS TO PROTECT CHRISTENDOM FROM THE TURKS.

FROM the beginning of his pontificate, Clement VII., like his predecessors, was repeatedly occupied with the Eastern question.

Already, in his first Consistory, on the 2nd of December 1523, the Pope dealt with the dangerous position of Hungary, of which kingdom he had, when Cardinal, been the Protector. A special Commission of Cardinals was appointed to deal with the conduct of Turkish affairs and the restoration of peace.¹ In view of the prevailing financial distress, it was exceptionally difficult to raise the sums necessary for the Turkish war. Clement VII., in extreme disquietude² on account of the powerful military preparations of the enemy, did what lay in his power. When he learned that the garrison of Clissa in Dalmatia was hard pressed, he sent thither considerable help, thus rendering possible the relief of that important frontier stronghold. To the Hungarian King Louis he gave the assurance that he would continue to do all that his predecessors had done in the interests of his kingdom.³ The

¹ See Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 86; *cf.* SANUTO, XXXV., 278.

² See the *reports of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1524, January 18 and 26, February 15 and 20, in State Archives, Florence.

³ FRAKNÓI, *Relat. orat. pontif.*, xxx.

Cardinal-Legate for Germany, Campeggio, also accredited to Hungary, was commissioned to urge upon the Diet of Nuremberg the community of interests between these two countries and to work for the sanction of a liberal grant towards the expenses of the Turkish war.¹ Clement also sent a special Nuncio to Hungary in the person of Giovanni Antonio Puglioni, Baron of Burgio, in place of Cardinal Cajetan,² recalled on the 28th of January 1524. This accomplished diplomatist knew the country from former residence there, and was accurately informed on the extremely difficult circumstances of the situation.³ Clement, like previous Popes, also formed an alliance with Achmed of Egypt, one of the intestine enemies of the Turk.⁴

Burgio was instructed to convey to the King of Hungary the subsidy, collected with difficulty by Clement, and the Papal permission to sell Church property in order to maintain the war against the infidel. In the beginning of April 1524 he reached Ofen, and was at once successful

¹ RICHTER, Regensb. Reichstag, 91; also 112 *seq.* for the negotiations relating to the help against the Turks. For the pleasure with which King Louis hailed Campeggio's mission see *Copia d' una lettera d' Ungheria de 29 Marzio as a supplement to the *letter of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1524, April 20 (State Archives, Florence).

² Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 87.

³ Cf. FRAKNÓI, Le Baron Burgio, nonce de Clément VII. en Hongrie, Florence, 1884, 6 *seqq.* The very interesting reports of Burgio and Campeggio, imperfectly and incorrectly given in THEINER, Mon. Hung., II., have been edited in full by FRAKNÓI in Mon. Vat. hist. Hung. illustr. Relationes orat. pontif., I., Budapest, 1884.

⁴ RAYNALDUS, 1524, n. 76 *seq.* Proposals on a large scale against the Turks were brought in March 1524 by a Jewish envoy from Arabia; see together with SANUTO, XXXVI., 76 *seq.*, and VOGELSTEIN, II., 42 *seq.*, the full report in *TIZIO, Hist. Senen., Cod. G, II., 39, f. 243, Chigi Library, Rome. The safe-conduct for this envoy in BALAN, Mon. saec., XVI., 28 *seq.*

in dissuading the King from his scheme of making peace with the Turks. For his remaining task, the organization of the defensive forces of the Hungarian kingdom, circumstances could not possibly have been less favourable. The country was torn by fierce party strife, and her ruler, youthful, pleasure-seeking, and empty-headed, was the personality the least fitted to counteract the elements of disruption working in the kingdom. The saying applied by his contemporaries to the last of the Jagellons, "Woe to the country whose sovereign is a child!" was about to receive a frightful fulfilment.¹ But among the magnates there was none who could have superseded the King. Party spirit, want of patriotism, combined with widespread corruption, held sway everywhere.² On his arrival at Zengg, where Burgio first set foot in Hungarian territory, he found that of all the stores of grain sent by Adrian VI. for the provisioning of the Croatian border castles, only the scantiest portion of each had reached the place of its destination, for the Captain of Zengg and his officials had sold the greater part and spent the proceeds on themselves.³ In Ofen the Papal representative had no better experience; during his sojourn there of four months, he had convinced himself that neither from the King nor from the magnates at the head of the Government was the deliverance of the country to

¹ Cf. P. PICCOLOMINI, *Due lettere di Ludovico II. re di Ungheria*, Siena, 1904, 8.

² Together with the reports, unfortunately incomplete, of Clement's representative, *cf.* especially those of the Venetian, V. Guidoto, in FIRNHABER, *Quellen und Forschungen zur väterländ. Gesch.*, 105 *seq.*, and Magyar tört. tár., xxv.; and among more recent, FRAKNÓI, *Ungarn vor der Schlacht bei Mohács*, German translation by Schwicker, Budapest, 1886, 40 *seqq.*

³ Clement VII. took measures against the Captain; see FRAKNÓI, *Ungarn*, 40.

be looked for. Therefore in the beginning of July he left for Cracow in order to obtain help from Sigismund of Poland, the King's uncle. This mission also was a complete failure, for Poland was suffering from the same conditions of internal dissolution and decay as Hungary.¹

In August 1524 Burgio returned to Ofen. There he found utter chaos; the nobility were in vehement opposition to the King and his associates, and were busy with the scheme of invoking, on their own authority, the intervention of a Diet. Meanwhile the danger in southern Hungary grew apace: the Turks were already besieging the fortress of Severin, the last bulwark of the kingdom on the lower Danube. Burgio did all he could to obtain relief for the besieged, but he appealed to deaf ears. The King referred him to his council; the council sent him back to the King; everywhere the most short-sighted selfishness prevailed. Burgio, during the Diet held on the Rákosfeld at Ofen, with emotion adjured the nobility to lay aside their old dissensions and come to the rescue of the kingdom in the hour of trouble. On this occasion he promised, if the Estates would do their duty, to place at once at the disposal of the kingdom the Papal subsidies deposited in the banking house of the Fuggers at Ofen. His words died away in a storm of party hatred, and thus Severin was lost, a calamity which only gave rise in Hungary to an outburst of mutual recrimination.²

On Burgio's invitation the Cardinal-Legate, Campeggio, left Vienna for Ofen in the beginning of December 1524.

¹ Relat. orat. pontif., ed. FRAKNÓI, XXXV., 6 *seqq.* Sigismund of Poland, although urgently called upon by Clement to give assistance, left Hungary in the lurch on the pretext of his armistice with the Turks; see RAYNALDUS, 1526, n. 61 *seq.*; *cf.* FRAKNÓI, Ungarn, 47 *seq.*

² See Relat. orat. pontif., ed. FRAKNÓI, 30, 36, 49 *seq.*; FRAKNÓI, Burgio, 15 *seq.*, and Ungarn, 50 *seq.*

There he was received by King Louis with marks of friendship on the 18th of the same month.¹ Both the Papal representatives worked together to induce the King and the magnates to take steps to equip the border fortresses and to raise an army; but in Paul Tomori alone, the excellent Archbishop of Kalocsa and commandant of the troops in the southern division of the kingdom, did they find a faithful and self-sacrificing ally. When the latter, in the beginning of January 1525, came in despair to Ofen, bent on his resignation, they prevented him from taking this step, and also insisted on his receiving support in money from the Government. Campeggio, at his own cost, raised three hundred foot-soldiers for the defence of Peterwardein. These Papal troops were the only force which Tomori was able to take back with him from Ofen in the beginning of February 1525 to the hard-pressed fortress. As they marched out, the populace gathered on the banks of the Danube raised their voices in praise of the Pope who had not forsaken their country in its extremity.²

In the Diet also, held in May 1525, it was recognized that Clement VII. and his Ambassadors were doing all they could to help the kingdom. Stephen Verböczy, the head of the national party among the nobles, praised in enthusiastic terms the services rendered to Hungary by the Holy See. But Burgio's summons to war against the Turks, in obedience to the mandate of Clement VII., was uttered in vain. The Diet could attend to nothing but the complaints against the Palatine Stephan Bathory,

¹ Cf. *Relat. orat. pontif.*, 101 *seq.* See also **Acta Consist.* (December 14, 1524) in Consistorial Archives, Vatican.

² See *Relat. orat. pontif.*, 114 *seq.*, 119 *seq.*, 125 *seq.*, 136 *seq.*, 141 *seq.* Cf. FRAKNÓI, Burgio, 17 *seq.*, and FRAKNÓI, *Leben Tomoris*, in *Századok*, 1881.

the Primate Ladislaus Szalkay, the Treasurer Emmerich Szerencsés, and the hated German courtiers. The removal of the latter was angrily demanded by the followers of Johann Zapolya, the richest and most powerful of all the magnates. As the King's answer to this request was to some extent evasive, the resolution was passed that the combined nobility should meet in arms on the 24th of June at Hatvan, to the north-east of Ofen, to take counsel for the interests of the kingdom.¹ On the 2nd of July King Louis appeared in person at this gathering; he was accompanied by Burgio, now, on the recall of Campeggio, the sole representative of the Pope. The assembly, in which Zapolya's adherents had a majority, overthrew the whole existing government; the disloyal councillors were deposed, and Verböczy acclaimed as Palatine.² With regard to the most pressing need of all, the defence of the kingdom against the Turks, nothing was done then or even subsequently—only the Pope sent sums of money for the pay of the troops upon the frontier.³ In Hungary itself the bitterness of party strife continued.

While this political chaos, productive of the gravest crisis in the State, prevailed, the Sultan Suleiman continued his offensive preparations on the most comprehensive scale. Burgio sent reports on these to Rome, on the 18th of January 1526, while at the same time deploring the deficiencies in the Hungarian defences. Not even the

¹ *Relat. orat. pontif.*, 184 *seq.*, 188 *seq.*; FRAKNÓI, Ungarn, 101 *seq.*; HUBER, III., 527.

² *Cf.* RANKE, *Deutsche Geschichte*, II., 6th ed., 288; FRAKNÓI, Ungarn, 146; HUBER, III., 528 *seq.*

³ See the reports of Burgio of August 9 and 30, 1525, in *Relat. orat. pontif.*, 251, 257 *seq.*; *cf.* POPESCU, *Die Stellung des Papstums und des christl. Abendlandes gegenüber der Türkengefahr*, Leipzig, 1887, 67 *seq.*

garrisons of the border strongholds could be paid; the King was so poor that he even often suffered from want of food; the great as well as the lesser nobility were split into factions. Moreover, there was little prospect of assistance from the powers abroad, or of a federation of the Christian princes. "Thus," said Burgio in conclusion, "your Holiness alone can give help; yet I know full well the hardships of the Church and that there is but little in her power to do, deserted as she is by all. My intelligence cannot fail to depress your Holiness; but it is my duty to write truthfully; willingly would I forward to you more favourable reports."¹

In Rome, throughout the whole year (1525), the anxiety caused by the Sultan's preparations was intensified by the danger to which the Italian coasts had for some time been exposed from the attacks of Turkish pirates.² In November it was determined to send to Hungary fresh support in the form of liberal supplies of money, provisions, and ammunition.³ On receiving Burgio's alarming reports, Clement called together the Sacred College in the beginning of February, 1526, and received on this occasion the representatives of the Christian princes. He communicated to them the reports that had reached him, and called upon them to urge their rulers to come to the aid of Hungary; as the time of year no longer permitted the despatch of troops, they might forward supplies of money

¹ *Relat. orat. pontif.*, 305-306.

² *Cf.* the *reports of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1525, May 14 and 30, June 1 and 20, and July 8 (State Archives, Florence). In *Cod. Vat.*, 3901, f. 184, Vatican Library, there is a *report belonging to the year 1525, by a traveller in Turkey, on the state of things there.

³ See **Acta Consist.* (November 6, 1525) in Consistorial Archives, and a *letter of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1525, November 17 (State Archives, Florence).

for recruiting. The Pope set in this respect a good example; he addressed invitations to the Emperor, to the King of France, and to many other Christian princes to come to the assistance of Hungary.¹ Clement VII. informed King Louis of these steps taken on his behalf and exhorted him to perseverance and a vigorous resistance. When Burgio, on the 4th of March 1526, informed the Council of State, assembled round the King, of the Pope's proceedings, many of his hearers were moved to tears; they vied with each other in expressions of gratitude and passed excellent resolutions to defend their country.² But this conversion to patriotism soon proved to be only a short-lived flare of excitement; the resolutions were never more than a dead letter. Even when there was no longer any possible doubt of the imminent approach of the Turks, no decisive measures of resistance were taken. In the Council of State, which met in the afternoon, when the King had thrown off his slumbers, nothing was done save to indulge in mutual accusations. Burgio, who reports this, adds: "Here there is neither preparation for defence nor obedience; the magnates are afraid of each other, and all are against the King; some even are unwilling to take precautions against the Turk." No wonder that the Nuncio repeatedly begged to be recalled. Of what use was he to a country that was rushing headlong to its ruin? "The spirit of faction grows more bitter every day," reported Burgio; "the King, in spite of my remonstrances, has gone hunting as if we were living in the midst of profound peace."³

¹ See THEINER, *Mon. Hung.*, II., 659, 661; RAYNALDUS, 1526, n. 57; FRAKNÓI, *Ungarn*, 218 *seq.*

² *Cf.* *Relat. orat. pontif.*, 327 *seq.*

³ *Cf. ibid.*, 346 *seq.*, 355, 360.

On the day after the King's departure, on the 13th of April, Tomori arrived with the alarming news that the Sultan had left Constantinople with the intention of making himself master of the capital of Hungary. The Nuncio thereupon betook himself at once to the King, and, representing to him the greatness of the danger, induced him to return to his capital. There a Council of State was at once held and Tomori, who had to defend Peterwardein, was promised ample help. The Nuncio supplied him with fifteen hundred infantry, two hundred hussars, and thirty small pieces of artillery; but his example produced little effect; the Council relapsed into their previous indolence. "If the Sultan really comes," wrote Burgio on the 25th of April 1526, "then I repeat what I have so often said before: your Holiness may look on this country as lost. Here the confusion is without bounds; every requisite for the conduct of a war is wanting; the Estates are given over to hatred and envy; and if the Sultan were to emancipate the subject classes, they would rise against the nobles in a bloodier insurrection than that of the Crusade (the Hungarian peasants' war of 1514); but if their emancipation were to come from the King, he would then alienate from himself the nobility."¹

Some still hoped that a remedy would be found in the Diet then about to assemble. Here the victory of the court party was complete; Verböczy was deposed and fined; Bathory was restored to the office of Palatine; the resolutions of Hatvan were annulled and a sort of dictatorship conferred on the King. But Louis had no means of enforcing obedience, for the authority of the Crown had fallen into desuetude, and the finances of the country were as bankrupt as its defences. How could absolute power be

¹ Cf. *Relat. orat. pontif.*, 363 *seq.*, 368.

wielded by a king whom nobody obeyed, whose credit was gone, and who, in the presence of overwhelming danger, slept undisturbed until midday?¹

Neither the Diet nor the King brought deliverance. The foreign powers also, to whom the country had turned, did nothing; the Pope alone made the affairs of Hungary his own. He turned anew to the princes of Europe, gave his consent to a Crusade indulgence, sent 50,000 ducats, and permitted the taxation of ecclesiastical benefices and the sale of a large amount of Church property.² Had the King and the Estates of Hungary shown the same ready self-sacrifice and energetic action, the catastrophe then threatening might perhaps have been yet averted. Unfortunately, this was not the case; thus the doom drew nearer every day, and on the 28th of July 1526 Peterwardein fell. The garrison, half of whom were Papal troops, died like heroes. The Pope's representative continued up to the last to do all that was possible, and raised 4000 soldiers.³ The forces of the King, with the reinforcements brought in at the last hour, amounted to 28,000 men. With them he moved southwards to the plain of Mohács. Here a battle was fought on the 29th of August which decided in an hour and a half the fate of the Hungarian kingdom. Many magnates, five bishops, and the Archbishops of Gran and Kalocsa, were left lying on the field of battle. Two thousand heads were ranged as trophies of victory before the tent of the Sultan; on the following day

¹ See FRAKNÓI, Ungarn, 235 *seq.*; HUBER, III., 530-531.

² Cf. THEINER, Mon. Hung., II., 670; RAYNALDUS, 1526, n. 58 *seq.*; FRAKNÓI, Burgio, 37, and Ungarn, 254 *seq.* Cf. also *Acta Consist. (April 20, May 7 and 16, June 13, 1526) in Consistorial Archives, Vatican.

³ FRAKNÓI, Ungarn, 286 *seq.*, 289.

fifteen hundred prisoners were slaughtered.¹ King Louis was one of the few who succeeded in saving their lives by flight; but in crossing a small brook swollen by heavy rains his horse stumbled from exhaustion and buried the King in the watery morass.²

On the 10th of September 1526 the Sultan made his entry into the Hungarian capital; far and wide, as far as Raab and Gran, his hordes swarmed over the unhappy kingdom, and there was already a fear lest they should attack Vienna also.³ But the approach of the colder season and the tidings of revolts in Asia Minor caused Suleiman to retire at the end of September, without leaving a garrison behind him in a single place.⁴

The forward advance of the Turks and the catastrophe of Mohács caused the greatest alarm in Rome, as in the rest of Christendom.⁵ Clement VII. gave expression to

¹ Cf. the report of Steph. Brodarics, in KATONA, XIX., 616 *seq.*; HUBER, III., 355 *seq.*; KÁPOLNAI, in Századok, XXIV. (1890), Heft 10; KUPELWIESER, Die Kämpfe Ungarns mit den Osmanen, Vienna, 1895, 239 *seqq.* A contemporary estimate of the fallen in Cod. Vat., 3924, P II., f. 252 *seq.*; cf. Acta Tomic., VIII., 228 *seq.*

² See Burgio's account taken from the description of an eye-witness in Relat. orat. pontif., 451.

³ The same fear was also prevalent in Rome. On *October 11, 1526, Landriano wrote from there: "Vienna is exposed to great danger"; and on *October 12: "Vienna tiensi perduta secondo li advisi si hanno perchè il Turco li era vicino et nulla o pocha provisione li era fatta." This report in cipher is in the State Archives, Milan.

⁴ Cf. ZINKEISEN, II., 655 *seq.*; SMOLKA, in Arch. für österr. Gesch., LVII., 16 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. *Acta Consist. of June 18 and 25, July 4, 13, 20, and 27, August 8, 17, and 24, 1526 (Consistorial Archives), and the Briefs in BALAN, Mon. saec., XVI., 236 *seq.*; CHARRIÈRE, I., 152 *seq.* See also the *reports of F. Gonzaga of June 19, 1526, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and that of G. de' Medici of July 4, 16, 27, and August 17 and 22, 1526,

his grief in a Consistory held on the 19th of September, when he called on all Christian princes to recover their unity and give their aid, and declared himself ready to go to Barcelona to negotiate in person for peace.¹ On the following day the Pope saw himself plundered in his own capital by the troops of the Emperor!²

If the dissensions between the two heads of Christendom had hitherto reacted most injuriously on the project of a Crusade against the Turks, so now the danger from the latter was almost entirely forgotten amid the raging flames of the present conflict between Pope and Emperor.³ But in Hungary civil war was raging. The brother-in-law of Louis, Ferdinand I., and the Voivode Zapolya were rival competitors for the crown; the Sultan soon found himself the recipient of solicitations from both parties.⁴ All the enemies of the Hapsburgs, especially France and Bavaria, favoured Zapolya, who also lost no time in making strenuous efforts to gain the Pope. Clement cannot be absolved from the reproach of having been drawn for a time into transactions of doubtful import⁵

in the State Archives, Florence. The first news of the battle of Mohács was received by the Venetian envoy on the evening of September 18. See G. de' Medici's *letter of that date, who further reports that the Pope was greatly overcome, but was in no way responsible, as he had done all that lay in his power (State Archives, Florence).

¹ See *Acta Consist. in Vol. IX., Appendix, No. 35. Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1526, n. 65; SANUTO, XLII., 681 *seq.*

² Cf. our remarks, Vol. IX., 328 *seqq.*

³ Clement VII., Charles V., and Francis I. were all equally to blame. Acciaiuoli, in his *reports from Amboise, September 9, 1526 (Ricci Archives, Rome), and Poissy, February 5, 1527 (FRAIKIN, 253), throws the blame, in a one-sided way, entirely on the Emperor.

⁴ ZINKEISEN, II., 656 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. SMOLKA, in Archiv für österr. Gesch., LVII., 118, and FRAIKIN, I., xlii., note.

with this man; but the statement of one of his bitterest enemies, that he had given pecuniary support¹ to the Voivode, is without confirmation; on the contrary, there exists a Papal letter, of the 30th of August 1528, in which Clement refuses a request of this kind.²

The warlike condition of Italy and the contest for the throne in Hungary, whereby the spread of Protestantism in that country was promoted,³ encouraged the Sultan to mature his plan of striking a blow at the heart of Christian Europe. In the beginning of May 1529 "the ruler of all rulers," as Suleiman styled himself, left Constantinople at the head of a mighty host, bent on the capture of Vienna and the subjugation of Germany. Fortunately his advance was so slow, owing to heavy rainfalls and the consequent inundations, that he did not reach Belgrade until the 17th of July.⁴

Ferdinand I., whose forces were quite inadequate to cope with those of the Turks, looked round on every side for help. His Ambassador in Rome and that of the Emperor made the most urgent representations on the pressing danger.⁵ Clement VII. therefore determined to send Vincenzo Pimpinella, Archbishop of Rossano,⁶ as

¹ Ziegler in SCHELHORN, II., 308; RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, II., 6th ed., 293, rightly considers this account as lacking confirmation.

² RAYNALDUS, 1528, n. 44.

³ Cf. SZLAVIK, *Die Reformation in Ungarn*, Halle, 1884, 7 *seq.*; FESSLER-KLEIN, III., 632 *seq.*; HUBER, IV., 105 *seq.*; *Mon. eccl. temp. innov. in Hung. relig. illustr.*, I., Pest, 1902.

⁴ Cf. Suleiman's *Diary of his march on Vienna*, edited by BEHRNAUER, Vienna, 1858.

⁵ Cf. the numerous *reports of A. da Burgo (Court and State Archives, Vienna), beginning from March 2, 1529. See also F. Gonzaga's *report of April 30 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁶ Already reported by *G. de' Medici on May 30, 1529 (State Archives, Florence).

permanent Legate to the court of Ferdinand.¹ The subsidies in money, subsequently approved by the Pope and Cardinals, were perforce slender owing to the limited means at their disposal.² On the other hand, it was of importance that in the Treaty of Barcelona (29th June 1529) the Pope agreed to give the Emperor, for the expenses of the Turkish war, a fourth of the incomes of the ecclesiastical benefices to the extent already conceded to him by Adrian VI.³ A Bull of the 27th of August 1529 gave full authority to Pimpinella to dispose, in upper Germany, of the treasures, and, in case of necessity, even of the landed property of churches and convents, in order to levy an army to meet the Turks,⁴ who, welcomed by Zapolya, had captured Ofen on the 8th of September, and before the end of the month had invested Vienna. But all their attempts to take possession of this bulwark of Christendom were frustrated by the heroic spirit of the defenders. After a final ineffectual assault on the 14th of October, the Sultan withdrew, warned by the approach of adverse seasons and the news that relief was close at hand.⁵ For the first time he saw an enter-

¹ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1529, n. 32 *seq.*; FRIEDENSBURG, Nuntiaturberichte, I., xlviii. *seq.*; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 91 *seq.*

² See RAYNALDUS, 1529, n. 33 *seq.*, and *Acta Consist. (July 1, 1529) in Cod. Vat., 3457, P II. The contributions of the Cardinals in *Min. brev., vol. 22, n. 321. Cf. also the *Brief of July 9, 1529, to the Cardinals Farnese, del Monte, Piccolomini, Cupis, Cibo, and E. Gonzaga (Min. brev., vol. 26, n. 274, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See *supra*, p. 57, and *Regest. Vatic., 1438, f. 148 *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican); cf. Lett. d. princ., III., 91.

⁴ *Regest. Vatic., 1438, f. 234 *seq.* Cf. EHSES in the Röm. Quartal-schr., 1904, 381. In a *Brief to Ferdinand I. of August 31, 1529 (Court and State Archives, Vienna), Clement expresses his sorrow at being able to do nothing more against the Turks.

⁵ Cf. HAMMER, Wiens erste türkische Belagerung, Pest, 1829;

prise, on which all his resources had been brought to bear, broken by an enemy whom he had likened to "the dust."¹ Hungary, certainly, was still in his power, and to the Venetians, who had done him service continually as spies, Suleiman wrote on the 10th of November: "I have overcome this kingdom and bestowed its crown upon Zapolya."²

After the disasters of the year 1529, a cessation of the Turkish lust of conquest was not to be thought of; the capture of Vienna was only postponed. In the West there were no illusions on this score. During the conferences between the Pope and Emperor at Bologna, the Turkish question played an important part. Clement VII. promised, on this occasion, to pay a subsidy of 40,000 ducats, a sum which certainly could not be raised without great difficulty.³ Another and not less important result of the Imperial policy was the sentence of excom-

NEWALD in the reports of the Wiener Alterthumsverein, XVIII.; HUBER, IV., 23 *seq.* Further literary references in KÁBDEBO, *Bibliographie zur Gesch. der beiden Türkenbelagerungen Wiens 1529 und 1683*, Wien, 1876; HÖFFINGER, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Türkenbelagerung Wiens (Programm)*, Budweis, 1897; *Gesch. der Stadt Wien*, II., 1, 334 *seq.*; *Mitteilungen des k. und k. Kriegsarchives*, 1882. The news of the deliverance of Vienna was communicated to the Cardinals in a consistory of October 29, 1529 (see *Acta Consist., Camer. III., in Consistorial Archives). *Cf. supra*, p. 79. Mention is made of a procession in Rome on November 11, 1529, to celebrate the withdrawal of the Turks, in the *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatican Library).

¹ RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 147.

² JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 172.

³ *Cf.* the *Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor for December 10 and 17, 1529, in Consistorial Archives; GIORDANI, App., 31; GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 227, 251, 272; BONTEMPI, 340. See also the *reports of A. da Burgo of January 4, 6, 14, 15, 28, and 30, February 8, 16, and 18, April 12, 24, and 28, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

munication passed on Zapolya on the 21st of December 1529.¹

As the consultations at Bologna on the comprehensive measures of defence to be taken against the Turks had led to no final result, it was determined to pursue the matter further at Rome.² This was all the more necessary as in the spring of 1530 news had arrived of increased military preparations on the part of the Turks.³ A congregation of six Cardinals was entrusted, in the beginning of June, with the consideration of the whole matter.⁴ On the 24th of that month the Pope assembled these six Cardinals and the Ambassadors, all of whom, including even the Venetian envoy, were present. Clement VII. made an opening speech, in which he insisted upon the necessity for taking steps to meet the attack which the Sultan was making vast preparations to deliver in the coming year. To the question of the Pope, whether the Ambassadors were furnished with the requisite mandates, only the representatives of Charles V. and Ferdinand I. replied in the affirmative. Cardinal Gramont and the English envoys announced that they had none; the Portuguese Ambassador made excuses for his sovereign, who was actively engaged in Africa; the Milanese envoy assured Clement that it would be impossible for his master to raise any extra taxes this year. When the

¹ Cf. *Acta Consist. of December 22, in Appendix, No. 8 (Consistorial Archives), and A. da Burgo's report in STOEGMANN, 182, 231.

² Cf. A. da Burgo's *report of April 28, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ See the Brief of April 8 in RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 71, and Röm. Quartalschrift, XVII., 391. Cf. also the *letters of Bernhard Pomazaniki from Constantinople, March 5 and 8, 1530 (State Archives, Brussels, *Diètes*).

⁴ Cf. A. da Burgo's *reports of June 5 and 21, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

envoy of Ferdinand, Andrea da Burgo, observed that three things were necessary: money, money, and always money, Cardinals Farnese and del Monte agreed, with the remark that unity among the Christian powers was equally essential. It was resolved that the Pope should address himself to all the Christian princes and call upon them to support the holy war with all their might and supply their envoys with the fullest powers.¹ Briefs to this effect were drawn up on the 27th of June.² Since the answers of the princes were long in coming, Andrea da Burgo asked the Pope to make up his mind at once as to the sums to be guaranteed to Ferdinand I.³

Clement VII. was obliged to insist that his resources had been so drained by the war with Florence that he had no means left at his disposal. He made sanguine representations to the Ambassador as to the time when Florentine affairs would be settled;⁴ once the city had fallen, the Turkish Crusade would be taken up again with energy. By the 9th of August fresh Briefs had been despatched to the princes of Christendom;⁵ it was

¹ Above according to **A. da Burgo's reports of June 25, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² See Min. brev., 1530, vol. 31, n. 221 *seq.*, in Secret Archives of the Vatican, and RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 178.

³ *Report of A. da Burgo, July 18, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁴ *A. da Burgo's report, July 12 and 31 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). *Clement VII. then said: "Notum omnibus esse quod exposuit et exponit sanguinem in hac expeditione Florentina et superesse jam solummodo spiritum."

⁵ See Min. brev., 1530, vol. 31, n. 335 and 337 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 182, gives the Brief to Lucca without date. From a copy in the Court and State Archives, Vienna, this must have been August 20. The original Brief *to Federigo of Mantua is dated August 19 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

proposed that a monthly levy of 80,000 ducats should be paid towards the war; of this the Pope and Cardinals were to raise 10,000, the Emperor and Francis I. 20,000 each, Henry VIII. 10,000, the Kings of Portugal, Scotland, and Poland jointly 15,000, the Italian States 5000.¹ All these efforts were unavailing; on the 23rd of August not one of the Ambassadors, except those of Charles and Ferdinand, had received full powers from their sovereigns.² Neither the Italian powers,³ England or France were willing to support the Crusade;⁴ the Pope alone gave Ferdinand assistance.⁵ At a later date the Turkish war and the proceedings against the Lutherans were combined—but still no results were obtained.⁶ The Pope, da Burgo reported from Rome on the 11th of December 1530, wished to raise funds for the Turkish war, but he had no means of so doing.⁷ His relations with Ferdinand I. remained friendly, and it was of great value to the latter that Clement VII. promoted in every way the Hapsburg candidature for the kingship of the Romans and gave his recognition ungrudgingly.⁸ In

¹ Cf. A. da Burgo's *report, August 9, and the P.S. of the 18th to that of August 17, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). See also F. Gonzaga's *letter of August 18, 1530 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² *Report of A. da Burgo, August 23, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ See A. da Burgo's *report, August 30, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna), and the *Brief to the Duke of Urbino, December 14, 1530 (Min. brev., 1530, vol. 31, n. 600, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ See GAYANGOS, IV., 1, n. 486, *cf.* 414.

⁵ Cf. *Ferdinand's letter of thanks to Clement, Augsburg, November 13, 1530, Lett. d. princ., VI., 156 *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁶ Cf. *supra*, p. 144.

⁷ *A. da Burgo's letter, December 11, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁸ Cf. BUCHOLTZ, IX., 17 *seq.*; LANZ, I., 406 *seq.*; RAYNALDUS, 1531,

March, 1531, he sent the King a consecrated sword and hat¹ by the hands of Albertus Pighius.

Of late the Pope had been repeatedly occupied with the affairs of the Knights of St. John. Clement VII. gave them hearty support in their efforts to reinstate themselves in the possession of Rhodes;² on their failure to do so he asked the Emperor to bestow Malta on the Knights as a residence. It was an excellent suggestion, for the central situation of the island made it a place of high strategical importance. Charles V. was favourable to the Pope's request; on his return journey from Bologna, on the 23rd of March 1530, at Castelfranco, he issued the document by which he bestowed on the Knights of St. John, Malta and its adjacent islands as a

n. 2, and *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, VI., 147 *seq.*; see also *Acta Consist.*, January 23, 1531, in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 93. Under *February 12, 1531, is entered the reading to the Sacred College of the letter of Ferdinand I. on his election (*Consistorial Archives*).

¹ See the *Brief of March 8, 1531, to Ferdinand I. (*Min. brev.*, 1531, vol. 37, n. 122, *Secret Archives of the Vatican*), and *that of the same day to Cardinal Cles (*Arch. ep. Trid. in Vice-regal Archives, Innsbrück*); *cf.* *Jahrb. der Kunsthistor. Samml. des österr. Kaiserhauses*, XXII., 144. This distinction was already resolved on by February 5, 1531; see BLASIVS DE MARTINELLIS, **Diarium*, in *Secret Archives of the Vatican*.

² VERTOT, III., 401 *seq.*; BALAN, *Clemente VII.*, 153 *seq.* *Cf.* **Macharii cujusdam litterae ad Clementem VII. de insul. Rhodi iterum ad manus Christianor. reverti facienda*, 1526, in *Cod. Vatic.*, 3924, f. 244 *seq.* The plan of an expedition against the Turks met with Clement's full encouragement in a *letter to the Grand Master of the Knights of St. John, dated Rome, 1528, November 24 (*Secret Archives of the Vatican*, A. 44, t. 9, f. 347 *seq.*). For Leone Strozzi, appointed Prior of Capua 1527, who became a Knight Hospitaller, see PIERO STROZZI e ARNALDO POZZOLINI, *Mem. p. l. vita di L. Strozzi*, Firenze, 1890 (*Nozze Publ.*).

Sicilian fief.¹ The Order, now known as that of the Knights of Malta or the Maltese Order, fortified the new bulwark of Christendom in accordance with all the rules of military science as then known, and defended it with the utmost valour. Through the Knights the Pope was kept closely informed of the intentions of the Turks.²

In 1530 Clement VII. found the Turkish difficulty even more engrossing than in the previous year. For a time this filled the foreground of affairs so completely that all other considerations, even the threatening aspects of the Lutheran movement, seemed to become of minor importance. "This is the only topic of conversation here," wrote an envoy on the 20th of February 1531.³ In March all preachers within the Papal States were directed to explain to the people the dangers to which they were exposed from the Turks.⁴ The perils of the Mahommedan attack on Christendom were felt all the more keenly in middle and lower Italy, for the navigation of the Mediterranean was so insecure owing to the corsairs of Barbary that in many places, even in Rome, the difficulty of importing

¹ LÜNIG, *Cod. It. dipl.*, IV., 1494; VERTOT, III., 406 *seq.*; BALAN, *Clemente VII.*, 154; CHARRIÈRE, I., 133; REUMONT, *Beiträge*, IV., II. The Papal Confirmation in Bull. VI., 140 *seq.*, the date, "Kal. Maii," is here incorrect. According to **Regest. Vatic.*, 1440, f. 99-102 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), it should rather be, "7 Kal. Maii" (April 25).

² In order to obtain more accurate information, Clement sent a secret emissary to Constantinople; see A. da Burgo's *report, August 17, 1530 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ "Nuovo non ci è da dar perchè non si parla se non delle cose del Turco," *writes B. Buondelmonti on February 20, 1531 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. also the letter in MOLINI, II., 362.

⁴ "Papa facit predicare religiosos hic Romae et in aliis locis et terris ecclesiae de periculis Turcarum in Italia et alibi," *reports A. da Burgo, March 12, 1531 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

provisions was beginning to cause distress. As a measure of relief the Pope was planning the despatch of a fleet under the command of Andrea Doria.¹

Clement was assiduous in taking counsel with the Ambassadors and Cardinals on the subject of the Crusade. The question was especially considered whether the war should be carried out on defensive or offensive lines.² Francis I. let it be understood that he would take part only in operations of the former class; thereupon the Genoese and others withdrew from their previous agreements concerning the support to be given to the Emperor's forces. "The Pope alone," wrote Andrea da Burgo, "adheres to his promise to pay 12,000 ducats per month; in this case," he added, "I certainly cannot see how, wanting money as he does, he can give any help to your Majesty."³

In spite of the pretensions of Francis I., Clement was never weary of making plans to utilize the power of France on behalf of the common undertaking, as well as to raise the necessary sums for the protection of the Italian seaboard and the support of Charles and Ferdinand.⁴ He met with not a little

¹ Cf. SANUTO, LIV., 302, 308, 329, 336, 360 *seq.*, 378, 385, 427 *seq.*, 481, 550; *letters of F. Gonzaga of January 31 and March 22, 1531, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; *ibid.*, *report of Guido da Crema, March 18, 1531, in which the scarcity in Rome is said to be so great that the court can hardly remain there; *reports of A. da Burgo, February 26, 1531, and May 17, 1531 (Court and State Archives, Vienna); *Salviati's letter to Campeggio, March 24, 1531, Lett. d. princ., X. (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Cf. the *report of A. da Burgo, February 26, 1531 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ BUCHOLTZ, IX., 90.

⁴ See *A. da Burgo's reports of February 16 and March 13, 1531 (Court and State Archives, Vienna), and of March 2, 1531, in

opposition on the part of some of the Cardinals. When the Pope urged the necessity of raising funds in presence of the common danger, it was put forward in reply that the princes had very often expended such levies for totally different purposes, and that, on that account, no one in Italy was willing to contribute. Clement VII. proposed that the sums intended for the protection of the coasts of Italy against the attacks of Mohammedan pirates should be collected and then forwarded to the spot where the most immediate succour was required. All the Cardinals were unanimous that the funds for the Crusade should not be raised by the creation of new Cardinals or the sale of Church property.¹ It was at last agreed that there should be a tax on grain.²

The enemies of the Hapsburgs pointed to the general policy of Charles V. and the increase of his brother's power by the acquisition of the Hungarian and Bohemian crowns, as standing in the way of the aggrandizement of Italy and of the Pope in particular. It was said plainly that the empire and monarchy of the Hapsburgs threatened to establish a world-power even more dangerous than that of Turkey: their agents in Italy were, it was alleged, on the one hand, always asking the Pope for money and, on the other, by their incessant demands for a Council, frustrated the very means by which money could be raised, and sowed the seeds of endless difficulties for the Holy See in Italy.³ In addition, there was also the Emperor's

BUCHOLTZ, IX., 90 *seq.*; also the *letters of F. Gonzaga of March 4 and 22, 1531 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ Cf. the reports of A. da Burgo in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 93 *seq.*

² See SANUTO, LIV., 330, 336, 361; *report of Guido da Crema, March 24, 1531 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and A. da Burgo's *letter, May 26, 1531 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

³ A. da Burgo in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 94 *seq.*

decision in the dispute with Ferrara, which must have offended the Pope in the highest degree. Since Charles V., in spite of the counter-representations of Ferdinand I., clung obstinately to this determination, the negotiations over the subsidy against the Turks came to a standstill.¹

Andrea da Burgo, Ferdinand's Ambassador, was in a difficult position. Repeatedly in the course of these negotiations he had been made to understand by the Pope that no serious arrangement could be come to in this matter unless the Emperor consented to some relaxation of the too rigid conditions of the treaties of Madrid and Cambrai.² In spite, however, of the imprudence of the Imperialists and the constant intrigues of the French, this indefatigable diplomatist achieved a great success in the autumn of 1531. In a Brief of the 16th of September of that year, Clement VII. promised Ferdinand, in view of the menacing reports of Turkish preparations,³ the payment of 100,000 ducats in six months in the case of invasion, unless Italy itself were visited by a like calamity.⁴

Contradictory as the reports often were concerning the Turkish plans,⁵ yet in the second half of December they

¹ Cf. STOEGMANN, A. da Burgo, 186, 195; BUCHOLTZ, IX., 99 *seq.*; SANUTO, LIV., 475.

² STOEGMANN, A. da Burgo, 207.

³ Cf. the *letters of V. Albergati, dated Rome, 1531, August 5, 10, and 20 (State Archives, Bologna).

⁴ See reports of A. da Burgo, September 10 and 17, 1531 (Court and State Archives, Vienna); the Brief in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 103 *seq.* Cf. SANUTO, LIV., 614, and the *letter of G. M. della Porta, dat. Rome, 1531, September 20 (State Archives, Florence).

⁵ A. da Burgo reported on *November 11, 1531, that the Pope had received letters saying that the Sultan had been thrown from his horse; according to other reports he had gone mad (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

all agreed in announcing for the coming spring a fresh attack from the Sultan, for which he was making preparations in force.¹ On the first receipt of this information Clement showed great zeal.² On the 16th of December he informed a full Consistory of Cardinals that, according to most trustworthy intelligence, a Turkish fleet of three hundred ships, with forty thousand men on board, would in the early spring set sail for Italy, while at the same time the Sultan, at the head of a hundred and fifty thousand, would advance on Hungary.³ On the 26th of December the Cardinals again met to deliberate on the Turkish question.⁴

Two days later the Pope assembled the Cardinals and Ambassadors; of the latter none were absent except the Venetian envoy, whose Government was determined not to break the peace with Turkey, and the envoy of Ferrara. The Pope made a long speech, showing that a combined attack by sea and land was in preparation by the Turks for the coming spring, and urging the necessity of speedy assistance. The representatives of the Emperor and King Ferdinand gave the strongest assurances; those of Henry VIII. and Francis I. only proffered fair speeches, although the Pope had been urgent and even threatening in his appeal. In his closing words Clement again warned his hearers that

¹ The accounts came from L. Gritti; see, together with the letter of Burgo cited by STOEGMANN, 238, and HEINE, Briefe, 208, 210, 213 *seq.*, also Gritti's letter in HATVANI, Brüsseli okmány-tar, I., 81, and B. Buondelmonti's *report, dated Rome, 1531, December 26, in State Archives, Florence.

² See *report of G. M. della Porta, dated Rome, 1531, December 10 (State Archives, Florence).

³ Cf. **the letter of F. Peregrino, written in great alarm, dated Rome, 1531, December 17 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ Cf. the **letter of F. Peregrino, December 27, 1531 (*loc. cit.*).

not a moment should be lost, and declared himself ready to do his utmost.¹

In the beginning of January 1532 the Pope's calls for help addressed in the preceding August to the Christian princes² were emphatically renewed.³ At the same time it was resolved to fortify the Papal sea-ports, especially Ancona, the most exposed to danger, and to support with ample supplies of money the two Hapsburg brothers, whose extremity was the greatest. A commission of twelve Cardinals was appointed with full powers to deal with the whole Turkish question.⁴ The coming invasion of the Turks seemed all the more perilous as there were three opposing parties at strife in Hungary; Ferdinand and his adherents, Zapolya, and a party of independence led by Peter Perényi.⁵ The friends of Francis I. in Rome, including many of the Cardinals, had been trying for a long time to obtain from Clement the repeal of Zapolya's excommunication. In spite of all the pressure brought to bear on him by the French party, Clement refused to give way, but, on the other hand, he told several Cardinals that Ferdinand, who was not in a position to subjugate Hungary, might hand over that kingdom to the Voivode, as the latter, once in tranquil possession

¹ For the above see *A. da Burgo's letter, dated Rome, 1531, December 29 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). Cf. also HEINE, Briefe, 210; GAYANGOS, IV., 2, n. 871, and the *letter of G. M. della Porta, dated Rome, 1531, December 28 (State Archives, Florence).

² Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1531, n. 68; Corp. dipl. Port., 332 *seq.*

³ Min. brev., 1532, vol. 41, n. 4-8 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1532, n. 2-5; THEINER, Mon. Pol., II., 485 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. SANUTO, LV., 309, and LVI., 176, where the names of the members of the Commission are given.

⁵ Cf. KRETSCHMAYR in Archiv für österr. Gesch., LXXXIII., 38 *seq.*

of the country, would willingly break with the Turk and ally himself with the Christians. But the Pope took no decided step in favour of Zapolya.¹ His intervention in the troubles of Hungary was confined to the despatch of a letter on the 17th of February 1532 exhorting all the inhabitants of the country to unite in their own defence against the infidels; their danger had reached the present pitch, he said expressly, owing to some among themselves having courted the favour of the Turks; but they must not allow themselves to be deceived, only dishonourable subjection awaited them if they did not at once put aside their delusions.²

It would have been of exceptional importance if Venice had taken a part in the Turkish war. In January 1532 Clement had already instructed Giberti to make representations in this sense to the Signoria. The answer given to the Papal agent cut off all hope; Venice had no intention of interrupting the peace with the Turks.³ The tension between Venice and Rome on the question of the bishoprics was thus strained much further, and the Signoria went the length of imposing war taxes on the clergy without asking for the approval of the Pope. Clement felt himself deeply aggrieved by such conduct; he issued a Brief threatening excommunication to all rulers who demanded taxes of the clergy on their own sole authority. Attempts were made in vain on the part of the Republic to move Clement; he often said that the Republic had never shown respect to the

¹ See STOEGMANN, Andrea da Burgo, 191 *seq.*

² BUCHOLTZ, IV., 104.

³ Cf. SANUTO, LV., 345; ZINKEISEN, II., 717; GIBERTI, Opera, XXIV. In Venice, however, every preparation was made for the war; cf. SANUTO, LV., 559 *seq.*, and the *Discorso di Ventiani sopra la guerra che preparava il Turco contra Don Carlo d' Austria l' Imperatore in Cod. 35, B 8, f. 1 *seq.* (Corsini Library, Rome).

Apostolic See.¹ Once before, on an earlier occasion, he had remarked that the God of Venice was their own aggrandizement, they always tried to fish in troubled waters.² How steady he was in his enmity to the overweening policy of Venice is shown by the fantastic schemes propounded by him in May 1532 to Andrea da Burgo, concerning the reconstruction of political conditions in Hungary and Italy.³

The intentions of the infidels continued to be the subject of the most varying reports in Rome during the spring of 1532. The Imperialists declared that all the rumours of Turkish invasion were inventions of the Venetians and French in their own interests.⁴ They gave this as their opinion until a letter arrived from the Emperor which left no further doubt as to the gravity of the situation.⁵ A Turkish fleet of two hundred vessels was bound for Sicily and Apulia and a large army was to attack Hungary. The result of this news was a regular panic in Rome.⁶ The Pope declared on the 13th of March that he intended to levy taxes at the rate of 80,000 ducats a month for

¹ Cf. SANUTO, LV., 595, 627 *seq.*, 630, 632 *seq.*, 660 *seq.*, 679 *seq.*; HEINE, Briefe, 217 *seq.*; *reports of G. M. della Porta of March 17, 20, and 31, 1532 (State Archives, Florence); *letters of F. Peregrino, March 14 and 25, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² HEINE, Briefe, 432.

³ For these see A. da Burgo's reports in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 110 *seq.*, and STOEGMANN, 208 *seq.*

⁴ See the *reports of F. Peregrino of January 5 and 8, February 17 and 22, and March 3, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ Cf. the report of F. Peregrino, March 14, 1532 (*loc. cit.*).

⁶ See *reports of G. M. della Porta, March 10 and 17, 1532 (State Archives, Florence), and the *letter of A. da Burgo, March 16, 1532 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). Cf also the *letter of Salviati to Campeggio, March 16, 1532 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); HEINE, 219, 221-223, and CHARRIÈRE, I., 197.

three months; it was matter of daily consultation how this sum was to be raised.¹ Although at the Pope's command processions passed through the streets² offering up prayers of intercession, the fickle-minded Romans very soon recovered their tranquillity.³

In the beginning of April Clement received letters from Constantinople dated the 18th of February; according to these an attack on Hungary was certainly impending; from the fleet, further reports declared, there was nothing to fear, as the ships would only make a demonstration.⁴ In May these reports were confirmed;⁵ nevertheless, Clement declared that all the measures of defence must be taken; he wished nothing to be omitted.⁶ He was active in three directions. In the first place, he pushed on the equipment of a fleet at Genoa under the command of Doria to ensure the safety of the Mediterranean. At the same time he was anxious for the protection of the coasts of Italy; Ancona in particular was to be strongly fortified. Lastly, the Emperor and his brother were to receive 40,000 ducats monthly as a subsidy.⁷ All this

¹ Cf. the letter of F. Peregrino, March 14, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), the *report of G. M. della Porta, March 17, 1532 (State Archives, Florence); and Burgo's *letter, March 26, 1532 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² See the *report of A. da Burgo, March 27, 1532 (Court and State Archives, Vienna); HEINE, 234 *seq.*, 327; GUGLIELMOTTI, Guerra, I., 295 *seq.*

³ Cf. the *reports of F. Peregrino, March 25 and April 8, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ *Letters of G. M. della Porta, April 3 and 8, 1532 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. also HEINE, 224 *seq.*

⁵ *Letter of G. M. della Porta, May 25, 1532 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. CHARRIÈRE, I., 202.

⁶ See *letter of G. M. della Porta, June 7, 1532 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. SANUTO, LVI., 388.

⁷ Cf. the report of G. M. della Porta, June 10, 1532 (State Archives,

demanded an immense outlay of money, and innumerable difficulties arose in obtaining it.¹

The situation was still further complicated by the bad behaviour of King Francis, whose intentions with regard to Italy scarcely admitted of doubt. He had demanded from the Pope, under a threat of apostasy, the grant of a double tithe on the Church revenues in consideration of the danger from the Turks. Clement gave his consent, but added the condition that ten French galleys should join the Imperial fleet under the command of Doria. The French King replied that this would be inconsistent with his honour. He had likewise, on first hearing of the Pope's naval undertaking, launched out against Clement in very violent terms, in the presence of the Nuncio; he, the Pope, allowed himself to be plundered by the Emperor, who, under the cloak of the Turkish war, concealed designs against France; when the proper time came he, Francis, would come down on Italy with such a power that he would be able to drive thence Pope and Emperor. Let Clement look to it lest his protection of Genoa did not one day cost him the loss of Florence. All the Pope's attempts to make Francis give way were unavailing. Urged and harassed by the Imperialists, distrusting the French, Clement at last had no other course open to him than to withdraw his consent, already given, to the appropriation by France of the ecclesiastical tithes.²

Florence). Cf. HEINE, 229, 339. At the end of May the Corsairs had carried off about 100 of the inhabitants of Ostia, among them a number of Dominicans who had come to Rome for a general chapter of the Order. *Letter of F. Peregrino, June 1, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ See G. M della Porta's report, June 7, 1532 (State Archives, Florence); that in Corp. dipl. Port., II., 402 *seq.*, and the *letters of F. Peregrino, June 8 and 14, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² HEINE, 243, 248, 253, 255 n., 320 *seq.*, 332 *seq.*; STOEGMANN,

The Pope addressed himself with all his energy to the fortification of Ancona, Ascoli, and Fano. Antonio da Sangallo was appointed master of the works; his plans for the fortification of Ancona are still to be seen in the Uffizi; a huge citadel arose manned in September by Papal troops. To the extreme dissatisfaction of Venice, the independence of Ancona was thus brought to an end, and the direct Papal authority established. This proceeding was uncommonly characteristic of the Pope; not less so was the sale of the legatine government of the marches of Ancona to Cardinal Benedetto Accolti for the sum of 19,000 ducats.¹

All manner of proposals were made to raise money for the Turkish war, but no one showed any readiness to make sacrifices for the cause, and the Cardinals refused to hear of a reduction of their incomes. But Clement on this point stood firm, and in a Consistory held on the 21st of June 1532, carried a resolution that the Cardinals should be included in the Bull imposing on the whole

216 *seq.*; SANUTO, LVI., 294, 387, 399, 454, 553, 986; ZINKEISEN, II., 720 *seq.*; DECRUE, 187. For the threats of Francis I. see in Appendix, No. 23, the *report of A. da Burgo, June 5, 1532 (Court and State Archives, Vienna), and the *letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga, June 10, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ Cf. PERUZZI, Storia d'Ancona, II., 442 *seq.*; SANUTO, LVII., 24 *seq.*; BALAN, Clemente VII., 188 *seq.*; and STORIA, VI., 247 *seq.*; BROSCHE, I., 120 *seq.*; COSTANTINI, Il Card. di Ravenna, 24 *seqq.*, 45 *seq.*; GUGLIELMOTTI, Fortificazioni, 511. That Antonio da Sangallo drew up the plans for the fortification of Ancona is stated *by G. M. della Porta from Rome, March 20, 1532 (State Archives, Florence). The mission of A. da Sangallo had been already announced by Clement VII. to the Governor of the March on January 19, 1532, *Min. brev., vol. 41, n. 39 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). For the dissatisfaction of the Venetians see the *letters of R. Maggio to J. Salviati, dated Venice, 1532, September 26 and December 16 (Nunziatura di Venezia, I., in Secret Archives of the Vatican).

body of the Italian clergy the payment of half their yearly incomes.¹ Later on a hearth-tax of one ducat was levied throughout the Papal States.²

In the same Consistory of the 21st of June the despatch of Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici to the Emperor and Ferdinand I. was agreed to; the latter received 50,000 ducats for the pay of troops.³ The preparations for his journey were hurried on as quickly as possible.⁴ The Cardinal, who had always lived in the most secular manner, now assumed the Hungarian dress; he has thus been painted in a masterpiece of Titian's, now one of the ornaments of the Pitti Gallery. A robust figure clad in a reddish-brown garment with gold buttons; on the head a red biretta with peacocks' feathers; the left hand grasps a scimitar, with the right he rests a Hungarian mace upon his knee.⁵ Ippolito de' Medici, whose mission gave rise

¹ See A. da Burgo's *report, June 21, 1532 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). Cf. also F. Peregrino's letters of June 11, 20, and 21 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). A copy of the *Bull, dat. Rome, June 21, 1532, in Colonna Archives, Rome, and in State Archives, Florence, MS. Torrig.

² Cf. the *Brief to Perugia, July 28, 1532 (Communal Library, Perugia).

³ Cf. A. da Burgo's *report, June 21, 1532 (Court and State Archives, Vienna); *that of F. Peregrino, June 21, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); and that of Buondelmonti, June 21, 1532 (State Archives, Florence). See also RAYNALDUS, 1532, n. 21 *seq.*; Lett. d. princ., III., 131; *Briefs to Ferdinand I. of July 4 and 7, 1532, in Vice-regal Archives, Innsbrück, Arch. ep. Trid.; SANUTO, LVI., 456, 480, 512; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 80; FERRAI, Lorenzino de' Medici, 131. Clement VII. first informed the Imperialists of Medici's mission on June 16, and begged that they would keep the matter as yet secret: see *cipher of A. da Burgo, June 16, 1532 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁴ F. Peregrino's *letter, June 21, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ Cf. JUSTI in the Zeitschr. für bildende Kunst., N.F., VIII., 37.

to various conjectures,¹ left Rome on the 8th of July,² and travelled by rapid stages to Regensburg, which he reached on the 12th of August.³

A few days before, the Sultan with the bulk of his army had arrived before Güns, a few miles distant from the Austrian frontier. He at once opened the siege, but met with a very stout resistance. Nicholas Jurischitsch defended the small town with heroic determination and held out against the enemy until the 30th of August. The Sultan, who had set forth in true oriental pomp, reckoned on an easy victory on account of the divisions in Germany. On closer consideration he did not deem it advisable to risk a decisive battle at so advanced a season of the year and at such a distance from home; the accounts he had received of the strength of the Imperial army did not justify him in expecting a swift and certain triumph. Therefore the Turkish forces, after having made a rush forward as far as Oedenburg, fell back through Styria on Slavonia and Belgrade, suffering terrible losses on their way. In the Wienerwalde the

¹ Cf. in Appendix, No. 24, Cardinal E. Gonzaga's opinion of June 23, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² Cf. A. da Burgo's report, July 9, 1532 (Court and State Archives Vienna), and the *letter of G. M. della Porta, July 9, 1532 (State Archives, Florence); BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS, *Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican); GAYANGOS, IV., 2, n. 971. C. Calcagnini was in Ippolito's suite; Ariosto declined to go with him; see Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXV., 242. In the *Mandati, VIII. (1531-1534), of Clement VII. there is an entry on August 20, 1532, of *duc. 20,900 auri* for Cardinal Medici (State Archives, Rome).

³ Cf. SANUTO, LVI., 817 *seq.*; Lett. d. princ. (Venetian edition), III., 19^b; CASANOVA, Lett. di Carlo V., 18 *seq.*; Ferdinand's autograph *letter of thanks to the Pope for sending Medici, dated Regensburg, 1532, July 25, in the Lett. d. princ., VII., 167 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); *ibid.*, an autograph letter of Medici to the Pope, dated Regensburg, 1532, August 21, describing Ferdinand's helpless condition.

army corps commanded by Kasimbeg was almost annihilated.¹

Misfortune also overtook the Turks by sea; for Andrea Doria was successful in sweeping the Ottoman fleet from the Ionian waters as well as in capturing Koron and Patras.² To both these successes the Pope had materially contributed by his aid. Unfortunately, the hopes³ thus raised came to nothing; Doria did not think his forces sufficient for further enterprises, and returned to Genoa after plundering the territory of Corinth. Charles V. also, notwithstanding the exhortations of Clement and Loaysa⁴ to follow up the advantages of the fortunate opening of the campaign, remained inactive. The accounts that reached him of the unruly and undisciplined spirit of his army, composed as it was of the most incongruous elements, made it appear to him inadvisable to persevere in the war except under the most urgent necessity. Not merely the Italian soldiers but many troops of the Empire refused to go into Hungary; the Protestants took up the cry that the aid supplied by the Empire was intended exclusively

¹ Cf. HUBER, 41 *seq.* To the literary references here given must be added HOMENAJE Á MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, 408 *seq.*, and TÖRTÉNELMI-TAR, 1891, 160 *seq.*

² Cf. together with SANUTO also JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI.; LANZ, II., 16; ZINKEISEN, II., 735 *seq.*; GUGLIELMOTTI, Guerra, I., 319 *seq.*; BALAN, Clemente VII., 194 *seq.*, and Storia, VI., 252 *seq.*; PETIT, 142 *seq.* His departure from Messina and the superior equipment of the Papal ships described by A. Doria to the Pope in a *letter, *Dat. di galera al Zante*, 1532, September 6; Lett. d. princ., VII., 347; *ibid.*, f. 477 *seq.* Andrea Doria's report, entirely in his own handwriting, *Dat. di galera nel golfo di Corone*, 1532, September 16, on the taking of Coron (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. G. M. della Porta's *report, September 11, 1532 (State Archives, Florence), and F. Peregrino's letters, September 17 and 28, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ Cf. HEINE, 264 *seq.*; STOEGMANN, 219 *seq.*

for the defence of Germany; they objected to strengthen the Catholic Ferdinand.¹ Above all there was the danger threatening the Emperor from France and England,² as well as the unfavourable condition of Italian affairs.³ The latter as well as the question of the Council seemed to call imperatively for a personal discussion with the Pope. Therefore Charles made up his mind that on his journey to Spain he would take Italy on his way.

¹ Cf. ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, V., 342 *seq.*; ZINKEISEN, II., 733 *seq.*; HUBER, IV., 46; RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 310; DE LEVA, II., 84; LUZIO, *Pronostico*, 85 *seq.*

² Cf. HAMY, 153 *seq.*; LAVISSE, V., 2, 74.

³ See DE LEVA, III., 85; BAUMGARTEN, III., 112.

CHAPTER VII.

CLEMENT THE SEVENTH'S SECOND MEETING WITH THE EMPEROR AT BOLOGNA.—THE CONCILIAR QUESTION IN THE YEARS 1532-1533.—THE POPE AND FRANCIS I. AT MARSEILLES.—THE MARRIAGE OF CATHERINE DE' MEDICI.

ALTHOUGH Pope and Emperor were drawn into a position of close interdependence on account of the dangers threatening them from the Turkish and Protestant side alike, there were yet, at the same time, many questions open between them which, unfortunately, gave rise to disagreement and friction. Arbitrary enactments concerning Neapolitan benefices, excesses and hostile behaviour of the Imperialist troops in Italy, drew forth many complaints from Clement, and in addition to these grievances he and Charles were at variance on the question of the Council.

The political predominance of the Emperor in Italy and the dependence of the Papacy on Spain, as the great world-power, were felt all the more bitterly by the Pope as Charles had, without any disguise, favoured the Duke Alfonso of Ferrara in every way, and confirmed to him in April 1531 the entire possession of his states as well as of Modena and Reggio, to which the Pope had a counter-claim. This decision, which was contrary to the Emperor's previous engagements, was disapproved of even by Ferdinand's representative in Rome.¹

¹ Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2; FONTANA, I., 151 *seq.*; BUCHOLTZ, IX., 99 *seq.*; HEINE, Briefe, 125 *seq.*, 132, 150; BALAN, Clemente VII., 181 *seq.*

This was a blow that Clement could never get over ; his relations with Charles were henceforward destroyed.¹ In order to reconcile the Pope, to promote the cause of the Council in accordance with the promises of Regensburg, and to restore some order in the unsettled condition of Italy, Charles was anxious to meet Clement personally ; therefore, in October 1532, he came into Italy from Friuli. His anxiety to soothe the Pope would have been still greater if he had known how badly his affairs had been represented in Rome.

The number of Cardinals in the Curia on whom the Emperor could count was not great ; most of the Italians adhered to France. The principal cause of this was the fear, only too well grounded, of the supremacy of Charles, which was a pressing burden on Italy and the Holy See. The Italian national feeling grew restive under the Spanish supremacy, represented by men who did nothing to wipe out the remembrance of the sufferings endured by the Romans during the sack of their city. Many of the Roman prelates were under obligations to Francis I. on account of pensions and preferments. Further causes of unpopularity were the insistence of the Hapsburgers on the dreaded Council, and injudicious demands on the part of Charles and Ferdinand which would have had the effect of diminishing the Cardinals' incomes.² As Cardinal Quiñones had almost altogether withdrawn from affairs, and Charles's close adherent Cardinal Lorenzo Pucci

¹ See Agnello's *report, May 15, 1531, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua ; JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI., 218, *cf.* 223 ; GAYANGOS, IV., 2, n. 725, 747 ; BALAN, Clemente VII., 199.

² STOEGMANN, Andrea da Burgo, 187 *seq.* For the French pensions see JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI., 225. Cardinal E. Gonzaga was also won by French benefices : it was only after the second meeting between Charles and Clement at Bologna that he became an Imperialist.

was dead (September 1531),¹ the conduct of the Imperial interests was in the hands of Cardinal Garcia de Loaysa. He was without doubt a remarkable man, of high moral character and a great ecclesiastic, full of energy and ability, and thoroughly loyal to the Emperor, but wanting in the qualities of statesmanship; he showed a lack of consideration and a rigid hardness, not uncommon in Spaniards, which gave general offence.² Loaysa was entirely wanting in the one great essential of a diplomatist—tact; he was at the mercy of his impetuous temperament. He soon found himself in difficulties with everyone, even with the Emperor's Ambassador Mai, calling him in his despatches a blockhead in plain words,³ and demanded of the Emperor his recall. The indignation of Mai, who was acquainted with all this, can be imagined. Andrea da Burgo, Ferdinand's clever representative, and much esteemed by Clement VII., had great difficulty in preventing an open breach between Mai and Loaysa; all the deeper on this account was the secret grudge between them.⁴

It cannot be matter of surprise that Loaysa should have also given free vent to his vehement nature, even towards the Pope, to whom he repeatedly gave open offence.⁵ This was especially the case in the transactions over the appointment of fresh Cardinals, when the

¹ He was buried in the choir of S. Maria Sopra Minerva, near his patron Leo X.; see FORCELLA, I., 441 *seq.*

² For the following *cf.* STOEGMANN, *loc. cit.*; see also ESCHER, Glaubensparteien, 281; DITTRICH, Contarini, 198; GAYANGOS, IV., 1, Introd., xii. *seq.*, and HEIDTMANN, G. de Loaysa, Neustettin, 1850.

³ HEINE, Briefe, 40 note; *cf.* 52, 76 nn.

⁴ *Cf.* Burgo's reports in STOEGMANN, 188 *seq.*, 232 *seq.*; see also BALAN, Clemente VII., 199.

⁵ *Cf.* HEINE, Briefe, 341.

Imperialist and French parties measured their strength. Clement VII. was averse to new creations chiefly because, if he made concessions to the Emperor's wishes, England and France would at once put forward claims of their own.¹ In March 1531, after the creation of two Spaniards, Alfonso Manrico and Juan Tavera, the Pope was exposed to the gravest reproaches; the English Ambassador told him outspokenly that he had become the Emperor's slave.² In May 1531 the Consistory again became the scene of agitating negotiations; Francis I. demanded the nomination of a Cardinal, whereupon the Imperialists put forward claims for two. As no agreement could be come to, the matter was left in suspense.³ In order to pacify Francis I. to some extent, Clement VII. determined, in June 1531,

¹ A. da Burgo *reported in cipher on March 12, 1531: "Tantum institerunt card. Osmen. et D. Petrus apud Pontificem quod consensit tandem ultra cardinalem, quem alioquin est obligatus facere ad omnem requisitionem Caesaris, etiam nunc facere alium Hispanum ad voluntatem S. M^{tis}, sed quod permittant Suam S^{tem} quod illud possit facere sine scandalo, quia sunt multi alii, qui instant habere cardinales, et a quo S. St^{as} abhorret." After the nomination (decided upon March 21 and published on the 22nd according to the *Diary of Blasius de Martinellis, while the *Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor, II., 182 [Consistorial Archives] give February 22; cf. RAYNALDUS, 1531, n. 92 seq.; CIACONIUS, III., 519 seq.; CARDELLA, IV., 124 seq.) A. da Burgo *writes on March 26, 1531: "Incredibiliter laborarunt in eo cardinales Osmen. et D. Petrus. Papa erat aversus ob multa non minus pro bono Caesaris ut demonstrabat quam ne magis incenderet reges Franciae et Angliae, qui continue instant, ut Papa faciat etiam unum pro ipso rege Franciae et alium pro rege Angliae" (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² "Longe pejora dicunt oratores Anglici, v. quod Papa dederit se in praedam Caesari nec audeat S. St^{as} facere nisi quod Caesar vult." *A. da Burgo on March 26, 1531, *loc. cit.* Cf. MOLINI, II., 364, 366 seq.

³ Cf. HEINE, Briefe, 133 seq., and the *reports of A. da Burgo, May 25 and 27, 1531, in Court and State Archives, Vienna.

in spite of Loaysa's opposition,¹ to concede to the French monarch the right of nomination for life to those abbacies which in virtue of their privileges had hitherto enjoyed powers of free election.² Soon afterwards Clement proposed to recall Giberti to his service. The Imperialists viewed the plan with anything but satisfaction, and the Pope's intentions were frustrated by the refusal of Giberti, who met this pressing invitation with the plea that his presence was necessary in Verona.³

As Clement in the following year showed himself ready to make special efforts to support the Emperor and his brother in their urgent need of aid against the Turks, the French were again in the highest degree dissatisfied with him.⁴

¹ See A. da Burgo's *report, June 2, 1531. According to this, Cardinal Gramont was the principal agent in the matter (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² A. da Burgo's second *report, June 2, 1531 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). Cf. for Clement's concessions: STAUDENMAIER, *Bischofswahlen*, 347; GÉRARDIN, 147; MADELIN, 164; BAUDRILLART, 93 *seq.* Clement made another concession in the Consistory of September 6, 1531: *S. D. N. ad supplicat. ducis Albaniae egit cum rev. dominis de concedendis litteris in forma brevis ipsi duci, in quibus illi polliceretur, cum primum aliqua cardinalium promotio fieret, creare unum ex fratribus ipsius ducis, in quo consenserunt omnes praedicti mei rev^{mi} (Consistorial Archives).

³ Cf. the cipher *despatch of A. da Burgo, July 19, 1531, in Court and State Archives, Vienna; it says: "Papa autem de eo confidit et eum mirifice diligit." The *letter of Clement VII. to Giberti, dat. Rome, 1531, May 18, contains a postscript in the Pope's own handwriting: "Venias, si nobis satisfacere cupis, habita tamen tuae valetudinis et commodi ratione" (Cod. Barb., lat. 6508, f. 1, Vatican Library). On the 30th of January 1532 Clement VII. again made proposals to Giberti to settle in Rome; see Sanga's letter of January 30, 1532, with autograph postscript by the Pope (Cod. Barb., lat. 5698, Vatican Library). Cf. GIBERTI, *Opera*, XXIII.

⁴ Cf. *supra*, p. 198, and G. M. della Porta's report, June 10, 1532 (State Archives, Florence).

He fared in the same way in the negotiations relating to the divorce of Henry VIII.¹ Whatever Clement might do, one of the rival parties was sure to complain of his conduct.²

In May 1532 Clement was willing to bestow the purple on G. A. Muscettola, the Imperial agent. Although the Sacred College objected to this, as generally to every other creation, Clement held to his resolve, for Muscettola stood high in his favour. But France now demanded the elevation of Giberti at the same time. Clement was quite willing, but found a strong opponent in Loaysa; Giberti, the latter protested, was a bastard, and on that account could not become a Cardinal; that this was a grave affront to the Pope did not trouble him a whit. Clement VII. complained of Loaysa's conduct to the Emperor's representative; he would rather live in a desert than endure such behaviour. Loaysa was so little conscious of his stupidity that he stubbornly declared that he had only done his duty, and would not depart from it; if the Pope showed his displeasure, he would then take up his residence in Naples until the Emperor came!³ The costs of this wanton outburst fell upon his friend Muscettola, who had already

¹ Cf. *infra*, Cap. VIII.

² Cf. the report of F. Peregrino, June 8, 1532: "L' Imperiali dicono haver sospetto che N. S. habbia intelligentia con Francesi et mostrano di dolersene, da l' altro canto Francesi dimostrano mala satisfaction verso di loro di S. S. Hor veggia V. E. in quanti dubbiosi pensieri debbia rimaner S. S. et che via o modo ella possi tenere a dover contentar l' una et l' altra parte, che è cosa quasi impossibile, ce ritroviamo fra li calci et l' muro" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ Together with the *reports of A. da Burgo, May 25, 1532, in Court and State Archives, Vienna, made use of by STOEGMANN, 188 *seq.*, see BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS, 1532, May 22 and 24. Also the **letter of G. M. della Porta, May 10, 1532, in State Archives, Florence, and HEINE, Briefe, 341.

given orders for his Cardinal's insignia ; for the Pope now gave up all idea of a creation.¹

The breach between Loaysa and Mai also showed itself in their opinion of the Pope, concerning whom their views were in direct contradiction. While the former accounted and made excuses for Clement's constant vacillation by his character and the circumstances in which he was placed, Mai saw in all the Pope's dealings only duplicity and dangerous craft. His hatred of Clement was also extended to Muscettola, who was regarded favourably by the Pope. The relations between the two assumed in time the character of an actual feud. Things had gone so far in the autumn of 1530 that Muscettola applied for his recall ; but he nevertheless remained two years longer in Rome. Obviously a dissension of this kind between the representatives of the Emperor must often have given a very unwished-for turn to his affairs in the Roman Curia.²

The French envoys worked with much greater tact, and they had also this advantage over the Imperialists, that, being supplied with plenty of money, they were able to keep up a great establishment and make handsome presents. Their leader, Gabriel de Gramont, Bishop of Tarbes, a Cardinal since the 8th of June 1530,³ understood admirably how to play constantly on the Pope's distrust of the Emperor, and even to intimidate him in case of necessity

¹ "La nova creation de cardinali per questa volta è ita a niente non ostante che chel Musettola s' havesse fatto fare gli habiti cardinaleschi et la mazza d' argento ancora." G. M. della Porta, May 25, 1532 (State Archives, Florence).

² Cf. GAYANGOS, IV., 2, Introd., vii. *seqq.*

³ Cf. *Acta Consist. in Cod. Vat., 3457, P II., of the Vatican Library. Gramont was with the Pope at first, from June 1529 till November 1530, then together with Tournon from November 1532 until autumn 1533 ; see BOURILLY-DE-VAISSIÈRE, Du Bellay, 53.

by open threats.¹ Gramont at the same time was trying to bring about a family alliance between the houses of Valois and Medici which should bind Clement inseparably to France. The second son of Francis I., Henry, Duke of Orleans, was to marry Catherine de' Medici, born in 1519, daughter of Lorenzo of Urbino.² When Gramont brought the matter forward in the autumn of 1530, he also hinted that Parma and Piacenza might go with the bride as her dowry. Clement VII. refused to agree to such an alienation of Church property, and indeed acted as if the whole scheme were not seriously meant; evidently he did not wish then to go further into the affair out of regard for Charles V., who, on his side, looked with favour on a marriage between Catherine and the Duke of Milan.³ Clement for a long time acted in the matter with his habitual indecision. That finally he decided in favour of France cannot cause surprise. What comparison was there between the Dukedom of Milan, with its precarious tenure, and the brilliant alliance with the royal house of France, which at the same time guaranteed a hope of firm support against the Spanish supremacy in Italy! The Venetian Ambassador Soriano was also of opinion that another inducement to incline the Pope in favour of this marriage was the hope of gaining thereby the French partisans in

¹ STOEGMANN, A. da Burgo, 189 *seq.* How also in the summer of 1531 (the *diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, dates his arrival on August 18) the French Ambassador to Rome, François de Dinteville, Bishop of Auxerre, forwarded this *politique d'intimidation*, is shown by DECRUE, Anne de Montmorency, 184 *seq.* For Dinteville (the *credentials from Francis I., of April 25, 1532, are in Lett. d. princ., VII., Secret Archives of the Vatican) see also Rev. d. Bibl., IV., 84 *seq.*, and Rev. d. quest. hist., 1902, I. 490. He was recalled on January 26, 1533; see the letter *of Francis I. to Clement VII. in *Lett. d. princ., VIII., *loc. cit.*

² For earlier plans see Vol. IX. of this work, p. 269.

³ BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 276 *seq.*

Florence.¹ In addition, the project of marriage was espoused by the French themselves with the greatest eagerness. In the beginning of November 1530 John Stuart, Duke of Albany, arrived in Rome on a mission from Francis to push forward the arrangements initiated by Gramont. Catherine had left Florence in October, where she had lived with her aunt, Lucrezia Salviati. The Milanese envoy who saw her in the streets of Rome thought her tall and comparatively good-looking, but still of such a tender age that he was of opinion her marriage could not be thought of for another year and a half.² Nevertheless, the affair was negotiated more ardently than ever. Clement's indecision was increased by his fear of Charles' and Albany's great demands. As Gramont in the meantime was once more in Rome, the Pope gave his consent in secret to the marriage and to the conditions which Francis attached to his "gift of the Danai." In a treaty of the 9th of June 1531 Clement VII. declared himself ready to give Catherine, after her marriage with the Duke of Orleans, Pisa, Leghorn, Modena, Reggio, and Rubbiera, and also to hand over Parma and Piacenza in return for a compensation to be agreed upon. He even was willing to assist in the reconquest of Urbino; only as regards Milan and Genoa, which Francis had also demanded for the young bridal couple, he gave no conclusive answer.³ A few days later Cardinal Gramont returned to France: the Pope gave orders that he should be received in Florence with all honour.⁴

¹ ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 291.

² BASCHET, 279 *seq.*, 282. Albany's arrival took place on November 3, 1530; see *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library.

³ Cf. BASCHET, 285, 309 *seq.*; RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 313; STOEGMANN, A. da Burgo, 204.

⁴ Cf. the *letter of G. M. della Porta, June 13, 1531, in State Archives, Florence.

The members of the French court were under a great delusion if they believed that the old influence over Clement VII. had been regained and that he was once more securely in their hands. When the Pope weighed more closely the conditions of the agreement of June, he was alarmed at having committed himself in advance to such an extent; he now tried, under different pretexts, to have the marriage postponed. So little was the "astute, circumspect, and timid" Medici thinking of a breach with the Emperor, that, on the contrary, he determined to work with all his power for the reconciliation of Charles and Francis. On this he brought to bear all his penetration and all his diplomatic ability.¹ Thus was conceived the visionary plan of bringing the two rivals together at the expense of Venice;² a project, however, which nowhere met with a favourable reception. As the Ottoman invasion later on drew attention in another direction altogether, the Pope bethought him of a fresh scheme applicable to the wholly altered state of affairs. Charles V. and Francis I. were to be reconciled and unite all their military forces in one comprehensive onslaught on the Turks, after whose destruction Ferdinand I. should receive Hungary and the adjoining territories, Venice the possessions taken from her in the Levant, and, finally, France should receive Milan, which until then should be retained by the Emperor and the Pope, as the friends of both parties!³

But the situation had once again entirely changed; on the withdrawal of the Sultan the Emperor had abandoned the Turkish war and undertaken his journey

¹ STOEGMANN, 206 *seq.*

² *Cf. supra*, p. 196 *seq.*

³ STOEGMANN, 218 *seq.*; and at 245 *seq.* is the important *despatch of A. da Burgo of October 8, 1532.

to Italy to meet the Pope. For the place of conference Bologna, Parma, Piacenza, then also Genoa and Pisa, had been proposed; particulars were to be settled by Pedro della Cueva at Rome.¹ While the negotiations were in progress an accident threatened to interfere finally with the proposed meeting. On the 25th of October 1532 the Pope received a report of which he complained, with tears in his eyes, to Mai and Burgo: the Emperor had placed Cardinal Medici under arrest for a day; for the latter, displeased with the suspension of the Turkish war, had foolishly tried to play the part of commander-in-chief. The incident led to no further results,² owing to the apologies of the Imperialists, who wished to ward off a misunderstanding, and the hopes of Clement that the meeting would be efficacious in bringing about a peace with France.

Cueva reached Rome at the end of October and announced that the Emperor wished the conference to be held at Piacenza. The matter was discussed in Consistory; most of the Cardinals, Farnese at their head, declared it fitting that Charles V. should come to Rome. This was hotly opposed by the Imperialist group and was also contrary to Clement's own wishes. Since in the meantime Medici made it known that Charles agreed to Bologna, as proposed by the Pope, the departure of the latter thither was fixed for the 12th of November in a Consistory held on the 4th. Owing to the necessary

¹ Cf. SANUTO, LVII., 46, 97, 126, 133, and the *reports of G. M. della Porta, dated Rome, October 13 and 14, 1532 (State Archives, Florence).

² See the *letter of G. M. della Porta, dated Rome, 1532, October 25, in State Archives, Florence. Cf. SANUTO, LVII., 197; GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2; ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 301; STOEGMANN, A. da Burgo, 239; GAYANGOS, IV., 2, n. 1007, 1009, 1014; FERRAI, Lorenzino de' Medici, 132; LUZIO, Pronostico, 84.

preparations the departure was put off until the 18th, and before this a Bull was issued making regulations in the event of a Papal election; Cardinal Salviati acted as Legate in Rome.¹

The late season of the year, unfavourable weather, and the bad condition of the roads made the journey a very arduous one for the Pope, who was hardly recovered from the gout. Six Cardinals travelled through Tuscany, and six others went with the Pope. Their way was by Castelnuovo, Cività Castellana, Narni, Terni, Trevi, Perugia, Città di Castello, S. Sepolcro, S. Agata, Cesena, Forlì, and Castel S. Pietro. On Sunday the 8th of December he entered Bologna on horseback, where he was received with the customary solemnities.² On the following day a Consistory was held in which it was

¹ SANUTO, LVII., 198, 217 *seq.*, 258. *Report of F. Peregrino, October 17, 1532, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. GAYANGOS, IV., 2, n. 1014. *Letter of G. M. della Porta, dated Rome, 1532, October 28 (*Gionse finalmente in Roma quel D. Petro della Cova expettato tanto tempo per la resolution dell' aboccamiento di S. M. con N. S., col quale è stato hoggi), and November 4 (*N. S. dice esser resolutto partire ad ogni modo per Bologna alli 12), in State Archives, Florence. *Report of Cardinal E. Gonzaga of November 4, 1532, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Already on November 2, 1532, Clement VII. had asked the Italian States to send representatives to the meeting at Bologna; see Min. brev., 1532, vol. 41, n. 375, dated incorrectly in Raynaldus on October 2. Cf. the *Briefs to the Duke of Milan (State Archives, Milan) and to the Duke of Mantua (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), both of November 2. On November 5, 1532, Clement VII. wrote about the meeting to the city of Bologna, and again on November 23; see Min. brev., *loc. cit.*, n. 563 and 592.

² Cf. BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS, *Diarium in Archives of the "Ceremonieri" in the Vatican, also in Cod. Barb., lat. 2801 (formerly XXXV., 45), and Cod. lat., 12547, National Library, Paris; RAYNALDUS, 1532, n. 55 *seq.*; BONTEMPI, 350; SANUTO, LVII., 335, 365; E. Bonner's report in State Papers, VII., n. 337; N. D. TUCCIA, 429 *seq.*

resolved to send Cardinals Grimani and Cesarini to meet the Emperor.¹

Charles, on the 13th of December 1532, made his entry into Bologna with military pomp and was received with great ceremony by the Papal court and the most prominent citizens. Over five thousand men-at-arms escorted him; he rode between Cardinals Farnese and Spinola; in his suite were noticed the Dukes of Milan, Mantua, and Florence. The Pope awaited him in San Petronio on his throne, in full pontificals and wearing a costly tiara. Charles made the customary triple obeisance on bended knee and kissed the Pope's foot. The latter, waiving the kissing of his hand, rose and embraced the Emperor. After the Emperor's suite had paid their reverence to his Holiness, Clement led the Emperor to the state apartments prepared for them in the Palazzo Publico. On the following days also there was no lack of demonstrative friendliness between Pope and Emperor, the latter receiving on Christmas Eve as a gift of honour a sword and hat.² Great as were the confidence and friendship displayed in public between the two potentates, in the long conferences, held almost always in private, it was only too evident that there was a lack of unanimity.³ In Bologna the influx of strangers⁴ had given rise to a high cost of living,⁵ and the Emperor, on this account, would have been glad to quit the city soon,⁶ but the

¹ SANUTO, LVII., 363, 365; LANZ, II., 43.

² RAYNALDUS, 1532, n. 57 *seq.*; SANUTO, LVII., 388.

³ SANUTO, LVII., 368, 384, 385; BALAN, Clemente VII., 201.

⁴ Titian also was then there; see GIORDANI, App., 150, 153.

⁵ *Letter of G. M. della Porta, dat. Bologna, 1532, December 24 (State Archives, Florence).

⁶ *Letter of G. M. della Porta, dat. Bologna, 1532, December 29 (State Archives, Florence).

negotiations shaped themselves with such difficulty that his departure was deferred from week to week.¹

Clement VII. was eager to make a reconciliation between Francis I. and Charles V.² The Emperor considered this quite hopeless, and thought only of securing Milan and Genoa against any French attacks; with this object he proposed the formation of an Italian defensive league. On his instructions Granvelle, Covos, and Praet conducted the matter with Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici, Francesco Guicciardini, and Jacopo Salviati. It was soon evident that such a confederacy was little in keeping with the policy of a Pope who was considered neutral; his representatives asserted that Venice would absolutely oppose such a league; they also made it clear that Clement still clung to the restoration of Modena and Reggio, and would not suspend his claims on this score during the existence of the League.³ But the influence which bore with most force on Clement VII. was the threatening attitude of Francis I., the ally of Henry VIII.,⁴ when the representatives of the former, Cardinals Gramont and Tournon, appeared in Bologna in the beginning of January 1533.⁵

¹ The following *statement by G. M. della Porta, Bologna, 1533, January 6, is noteworthy: "S. S^{ta} remanda la maggior parte della famiglia sua a casa e remane con pochi volendo continuar appresso S. M^{ta} per accompagnarla sino a Genoa entro la galera" (State Archives, Florence).

² See SANUTO, LVII., 369, 383 *seq.*

³ Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2; PALLAVICINI, III., 12.

⁴ See the *reports of G. M. della Porta of December 23, 1532, and January 7, 1533, in State Archives, Florence. Cf. SANUTO, LVII., 389.

⁵ Cf. *letter of G. M. della Porta, dat. Bologna, 1533, January 2, in State Archives, Florence; *Acta Consist., Camer. III., in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican; SANUTO, LVII., 418, and BASCHET, 290 *seq.*

To make sure of Milan the Emperor wished Clement to give his niece Catherine de' Medici in marriage to Francesco Sforza. The Pope's objection to this was that the contract with Francis had priority, and the King would feel it to be an extreme affront if the intended wife of one of his sons were to wed his declared enemy. Unfortunately, the Emperor was under the impression that Francis I. had not been in earnest over the marriage contract; he therefore asked the Pope to urge upon Francis that the marriage should speedily take place. He assumed in this that Francis would refuse, and then the Pope would convince himself that he had been the dupe of vain words. In this case the friendship of Clement for Francis would certainly have been turned into bitter enmity. But the contrary came to pass; Francis, perceiving the impending danger, sent at once to the Cardinals above-named full powers to ratify the marriage contract of his son with Catherine de' Medici; at the same time he sent an invitation to the Pope to meet him in Nice. Clement VII. now declared that such a wish was all the more to be complied with as he had already on two occasions undertaken a journey in order to meet the Emperor. Thus the latter saw the connection between the Pope and France only further strengthened. He suspected that Clement would combine with Francis in order to conquer Milan for the Duke of Orleans, but the Pope did all he could to convince him that such a suspicion was groundless.¹ Thus a secret treaty between Pope and Emperor was signed on the 24th of February, a day of momentous significance to Charles, for it was the date of his birth, of his victory at Pavia, and of his coronation. Clement VII. and Charles gave mutual pledges not to form alliances with other princes; they

¹ Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2; PALLAVICINI, III., 12.

exchanged promises as to the holding of the Council, help against the Turks, the maintenance of the existing state of things in Italy, and the hearing of the English divorce case in Rome.¹

The negotiations with the Italian envoys, already begun in January,² were brought a few days later to a conclusion. On the 27th of February Clement VII., Charles V., Ferdinand I., the Dukes of Milan, Mantua, and Ferrara, with Siena, Lucca, and Genoa, united themselves on acceptance of certain contributions of troops and money to defend Italy against any attack. The difficulty with Ferrara was removed in this way, that Clement VII. undertook, only for eighteen months, to leave the Duke in peace. Florence and Savoy, and above all Venice, were not named in the bond.³ If this was annoying to the Emperor, much more so was the failure of his then renewed attempts to draw Clement out of the French marriage agreement. The Pope stood firm; in this he could take no backward step.⁴

The negotiations concerning the nominations of Cardinals demanded by the Emperor went also contrary to his wishes. He had proposed Schönberg, Muscettola, and Stefano Gabriele Merino, Archbishop of Bari. The Pope's nominees were Giberti, Simonetta, Auditor of

¹ The text of the secret treaty after the original in Secret Archives of the Vatican (Arm. XI., Caps. II., n. 67) has been published by EHSES in the *Römischen Quartalschrift*, V., 301 *seq.*

² Cf. SANUTO, LVII., 481 *seq.*, 486 *seq.*, and the *reports of G. M. della Porta of January 21, 24, 25, and 30, 1533 (State Archives, Florence).

³ Pap. d'État de Granvelle, II., 7 *seq.*; SANUTO, LVII., 564, 567, 574, 577, 600 *seq.*; GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2; JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI.; BALAN, Clemente VII., 203.

⁴ Cf. SANUTO, LVII., 506, and the *report of G. M. della Porta, dat. Bologna, 1533, February 18 (State Archives, Florence).

the Rota, and the Bishop of Faenza, Rodolfo Pio. But at the same time Francis I. and Henry VIII. demanded the purple for three of their dependents. The general feeling of the Sacred College was against new creations; an effort was therefore made to defer the question until the Pope had returned to Rome, and Clement, who inclined to this view, handed over the matter to Cardinals Farnese, Campeggio, and Cesi to report upon.¹ On the 19th of February the Consistory debated the subject far into the night without coming to a decision. Loaysa took up the cause of Muscettola with all his energy but met with the most decided opposition.² On the 21st of February the Cardinals voted for the elevation of Merino in order to defeat the creation of Muscettola and Schönberg. Also, as a satisfaction to France, the nomination of Jean d'Orléans to the Sacred College was soon afterwards made public.³ The Imperialists were little pleased with this result.

Not less stirring were the negotiations at Bologna on the question of the Council. On the 15th of December 1532 Charles had already discussed the question with Clement in an interview lasting two hours. On the following day the Consistory was consulted; only a few Cardinals

¹ Cf. SANUTO, LVII., 537, 539; *Diarium of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS in Secret Archives of the Vatican; *letter of G. M. della Porta, 1533, February 18 (State Archives, Florence). See also SÄGMÜLLER, 167.

² *Letter of G. M. della Porta of February 10, 1533 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. SANUTO, LVII., 553.

³ *Acta Consist. in Cod. Vatic., 3457, P II. (Vatican Library); SANUTO, LVII., 547, 551, 585, 590; JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI., 219; CIACONIUS, III., 523 *seq.*; NOVAES, IV., 129 (with wrong date). The concession of two-tenths on February 10, 1533, shows that Clement VII. wished also in other ways to ingratiate himself with Francis I.; see CHARRIÈRE, I., 239 note.

were in favour of an immediate summons; the majority were of the opinion that peace must first be restored to Christendom and the agreement of all the princes be secured; a decision was postponed until the next sitting.¹ In this, held on the 20th of December, the whole matter was once more thoroughly considered. The use of the temporal sword against Protestants was also made subject of remark. Only a few, however, voted for such measures; the majority of the Cardinals were for a Council; they certainly objected to it being held in Germany, and still more to a national council of that nation, as the latter would only give occasion to the Kings of France and England to bring about a schism. The final resolution was that the Council should be held in a suitable place, and after the consent of all Christian princes had been invited.² For the execution of this decision a congregation was formed in which the Pope was represented by Farnese, Campeggio, Cesi, and Aleander, and the Emperor by Merino, Covos, Granvelle, and Mai.

After the Emperor had agreed to the Council meeting in Italy, it was possible, as early as the 2nd of January 1533, to prepare the Briefs to the Kings of France and England, and to other Christian princes inviting their consent to and presence at the Council.³ More protracted negotiations were occasioned by the question whether the princes and States of the German Empire should also be written to at the same time. This was agreed to, for

¹ SANUTO, LVII., 368, 369. *Cf.* the letter of the Bishop of Auxerre in RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 316, and DE LEVA, III., 104; see also EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., lxxxii.

² Besides SANUTO, LVII., 385, and the letter of the Bishop of Auxerre cited in note above, *cf.* also in Appendix, No. 32, the *report of G. M. della Porta, December 23, 1532 (State Archives, Florence).

³ EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., lxxxii.

Aleander was strongly in favour of such a step. Accordingly, about the 10th of January, letters of the Emperor were addressed to all the States, as well as from the Pope to King Ferdinand I., the six Electors, and the six Circles of the Empire.¹ In these letters the Pope praised the Emperor's zeal on behalf of the Council, whereby he had been led to consent to its summons, although for other reasons he was not yet quite prepared for it. But as it was necessary that all members and nations of Christendom should participate, he would not neglect to procure the consent of other princes than those of Germany by means of letters and Nuncios. While the answers, that of France in particular, were awaited, the Emperor did not desist in the course of negotiations in demanding through his deputies that the Council should be summoned at once, for he had given his promise on this point to the German princes, and in no other way could the desire for a national German council be successfully opposed. On the other hand, the Papal deputies insisted that Clement was ready to proclaim the Council in accordance with the usage hitherto observed by the Church, and on condition that the dogmatic decrees of earlier synods were acknowledged by all, and that all promised their willingness to submit to the decrees of the forthcoming assembly; but in any case the answers of the princes must still be waited for.

As the Emperor was always insistent and the time of his return was drawing near, while no answers had as yet been received, the Papal deputies proposed that under these circumstances Nuncios should be sent to Germany, France, and England, an arrangement with which Charles expressed his agreement. The Nuncio appointed for

¹ EHSES, lxxxiii. The text of the letter to the Electors and Circles of the Diet is given by RAYNALDUS, 1533, n. 6; that to King Ferdinand, in some parts differently drawn up, in EHSES, lxxxiv.

Germany was Ugo Rangoni, Bishop of Reggio; for France and England the Papal chamberlain and protonotary, Ubaldino de Ubaldinis.¹ On the 20th of February the two Nuncios were presented with the Briefs of which they were to be the bearers.²

In the meantime Cardinals Tournon and Gramont had presented the long-expected answer of Francis I. It was short, cold in tone, and insisted on the necessity of the questions of religion being dealt with in a becoming manner, in accordance with the wishes of those taking part in the Council assembled in a place agreeable to them, and of the decrees being of such a kind that no one afterwards would refuse his consent to them.³ This reply was all the more unsatisfactory as Francis, besides these general observations, said nothing about his wishes regarding the representation at the Council.

The Instruction drafted by Aleander for the Nuncio Rangoni on the 27th of February 1533 contained the conciliar conditions under eight articles:—(1) The Council is to be free, and to be held according to the customs obtaining in the Church since the first General Councils. (2) The members of the Council are to promise obedience to its decisions and their unbroken observance. (3) Members unable to be present for legitimate reasons are to send deputies with full legal powers and satisfactory mandates. (4) In the meantime, no fresh matter of controversy is to be introduced into the religious questions in debate in Germany until the Council shall have given its decisions. (5) A choice, on which all should agree,

¹ EHSSES, lxxxiv. *seq.* Cf. *report of G. M. della Porta, February 10, 1533 (State Archives, Florence).

² The Brief addressed to King Ferdinand, with which the others agree in essentials, in EHSSES, lxxxvi.

³ Cf. EHSSES, lxxxvi. ; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 801.

must be made of some suitable place; the Pope proposes Mantua, Bologna, or Piacenza. (6) Should any princes, without just cause, reject the summons and meeting of the Council, the Pope is nevertheless to proceed with the same. (7) Against those princes who wish to put obstacles in the way of the Council, the remainder are to support the Pope in its favour. (8) On receipt of the consenting replies the Pope shall convene the Council within six months and take steps for opening it within a year.¹ To Lambert von Briarde, who accompanied Rangoni as Imperial orator, Charles communicated special instructions² agreeing with the Pope's intentions. The Emperor left Bologna on the 28th of February and the Pope on the 10th of March.³

Rangoni and Briarde first visited the court of Ferdinand I. at Vienna and stayed there from the 1st of April to the 13th of May. Ferdinand expressed his full agreement with the meeting of the Council and the articles. Duke George of Saxony did likewise, whom they visited at Dresden on the 25th of May.⁴ Thence they made their way to Weimar, where on the 3rd of June they were courteously received by the Elector John Frederick⁵ and listened to by him; in his answer to the Nuncio, communicated on the following day, he expressed his joy at the prospect of

¹ The text of the Instruction in EHSES, lxxxvii. *seq.* Cf. PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 87 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 801 *seq.* Rangoni received 240 ducats for two months; see *Introit. et Exit., 1533-1534, in State Archives, Rome.

² EHSES, lxxxviii. *seq.*

³ SANUTO, LVII., 568, 571 *seq.*, 574. *Diarium of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

⁴ EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., lxxxix. *seq.*

⁵ Authentic documents on the Nuncio's address to the Electors and the answer of the latter published in EHSES, xc.-cxiii., from the Vatican Archives.

a Council but explained that, greatly as he wished personally to give a definite answer at once, he could only do so in company with his allies, who in the approaching assembly of Protestant princes at Schmalkald would take counsel on the matter. With this message Rangoni and Briaerde left Weimar on the 5th of June and proceeded to Mayence to Cardinal Albert, who expressed personally his full agreement and his adhesion to everything that the Pope and Emperor might further determine, even with regard to the meeting-place of the Council, but for a definite answer he referred them to the Congress of the Catholic Electors about to be held at Mayence. The same answer was given by his brother, the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg, with whom the envoys discussed the question at Berlin on the 17th of June.¹ Through Brunswick, where they missed Duke Henry, they came to Cologne on the 5th of July, and on the 9th at Bonn had an interview with the Elector Hermann of Wied; on the 13th they were similarly occupied at Coblenz with Johann von Metzhausen, the Elector of Trèves, and on the 20th at Heidelberg with the Elector Palatine Louis.²

After all the Electors had thus been visited, the Imperial envoy Briaerde, having accomplished his mission, returned to the Netherlands, while the Nuncio Rangoni went yet further to Munich in order to treat also with the Dukes William and Louis of Bavaria.³ To the meeting of a General Council all the princes interrogated had, on the whole, given their ready consent; in respect of the articles enumerated above, only the two Bavarian Dukes were unwilling to give a final reply on their own responsibility. The Nuncio and Briaerde were not without grounds for indulging in hopes on the

¹ EHSSES, xciii. *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, xciv. *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, xciv. *seq.*

close of their round of inquiries. In the course of the foregoing deliberations the principal question under discussion had been the meeting-place of the Council. On this as on the other points, by the exercise of a little good-will on all sides, there ought not to have been difficulty in coming to an agreement. This was especially the case as the Elector of Saxony himself had shown apparently the best intentions, and in all probability at the last would have given his final decision in a favourable sense. But his theologians and the other princes of Protestant Germany were of a different way of thinking. John Frederick, in the first place, asked the theologians of Wittenberg to give their opinion and furnish him with reports. Melancthon, indeed, declared that on account of the other nations the Council could not well be refused, nor had he any objections to Protestants appearing there under a safe-conduct, but he repudiated in the most express terms the article on the duty of submission to the conciliar decrees.¹ Luther spoke in the same sense, only in a much more offensive manner, for he called the Pope a "liar" and a "cursed bloodhound and murderer."² This position of the theologians corresponded therefore with the answer, dated the 30th of June 1533, of the Protestant princes and Estates³ assembled at Schmalkald. They demanded a "free council" to be held in Germany, with the Bible as the only standard; the Pope's articles were rejected in coarse and offensive terms. By this declaration all previous exertions on behalf of a Council were brought to nothing.

No better success attended the mission of the Nuncio

¹ EHSES, xcvi.; PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 88 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 803.

² EHSES, xcvi. *seq.*; PASTOR, 88.

³ In EHSES, xcvi.-ci.

Ubalдино to Francis I. of France and Henry VIII. of England. Both monarchs avoided any definite declaration.¹

On leaving Bologna Clement VII. had gone first to Fano in order to compose the disorders which had broken out in that place; he then paid visits to Ancona and the sanctuary of Loreto; on the 3rd of April 1533 he was once more in Rome.² Here awaited him a mass of business which had accumulated in his absence. There was, moreover, anxiety on account of Koron, hard pressed by the Turks,³ and still greater anxieties arising from the divorce suit of Henry VIII.⁴ The Pope's nephew Bernardo Salviati was sent to the relief of Koron with twelve galleys.⁵ Francis I., meanwhile, was pressing for the conference agreed to by the Pope, and the conclusion of the family alliance;⁶ his representatives, the Cardinals Gramont and Tournon, encountered, however, unsuspected difficulties. These were in part the outcome of the intrigues of the Imperialists, who were naturally doing all they could to frustrate the dangerous interview and still more dangerous marriage.

Before the conference at Bologna was over, a fundamental change had taken place in the diplomatic service of the Emperor at Rome. Charles V. had at length come

¹ EHSES, ci. *seq.*

² Besides the sources cited by RAYNALDUS, 1533, n. 36 *seq.*, *cf.* also SANUTO, LVIII., II *seq.*, 27, 35, and BALAN, Clemente VII., 204. The Pope's return to Rome had been eagerly expected; see the *reports of F. Peregrino of March 1 and 23, 1533 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ *Cf.* SANUTO, LVIII., 35, 56, 194, 227, 240.

⁴ See *infra*, Cap. VIII.

⁵ BALAN, Clemente VII., 206.

⁶ *Cf.* the *report of F. Peregrino, April 30, 1533 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

to see that Loaysa with his immoderate temper, and Mai with his brusque ways, were not the men to conduct his affairs aright. With Loaysa fell also Muscettola. In their place Fernando da Silva, Count of Cifuentes, was appointed Ambassador, and Rodrigo Davalos as agent; in the Sacred College the place of Loaysa was taken by the Cardinal of Jaen, Stefano Gabriele Merino, as representative of the Imperial interests. Charles soon found out that the change was in no way a fortunate one, for the evil of disunion had been handed on and made itself felt with undiminished intensity, as the enmity between Cifuentes and Merino was acute.¹

The French party reaped the advantage of this feud. Cardinal Tournon played his part with great skill; he knew how to paint in the most glowing colours the advantages of the French alliance to Clement, and even to encourage in him the hope that this connection would be a means of bringing order into the tangle of the English divorce. Personally the Pope was strongly inclined to an alliance with France in order to secure a counterpoise to the Emperor's power in Italy.² But unexpected hindrances now arose on the side of the Cardinals. Farnese and others adduced the most various objections; Cardinal Gramont declared haughtily: "The Pope has more need of my king than my king of him."³ Meanwhile a letter came from Charles to the effect: "Since his Holiness persists in

¹ See BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., III., 122. Cifuentes had come to Rome on April 17, 1533; R. Davalos not until June 14; see GAYANGOS, IV., n. 1059, 1083.

² Cf. JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI., 223, whose information is confirmed by two cipher reports of **F. Peregrino of September 4 and December 28, 1533 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See SANUTO, LVIII., 135, 163, 228. Cf. the *report of Agnello, dat. Venice, 1533, May 5 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

his interview with Francis, he (the Emperor) makes no further difficulties but warns him to look to the preservation of peace in Italy." On the 25th of May 1533 Clement showed the letter to a full Consistory; but although he used every argument to prove the necessity of the conference, the majority of the Cardinals remained quite unconvinced. As the question was one of such great importance, a decision upon it was deferred.¹

Notwithstanding the almost general opposition of the Curia, Clement did not in the least abandon the plan of the conference, but put it off until the month of September.² On the 28th of May he wrote in this sense to Francis I.³ At the same time he sent to him the Bishop of Faenza to settle the details of the interview which was to take place at Nice.⁴ A fresh postponement was subsequently caused by the breach with England which took place in July, at the very moment when the marriage treaty signed by the French King reached Rome.⁵ Francis I. would now have willingly put off the interview, but Clement refused to withdraw.⁶

¹ Besides SANUTO, LVIII., 241, see the **report of G. M. della Porta of May 25, 1533, in State Archives, Florence. Cf. also ROSSI, Guicciardini, II., 53, and CASANOVA, Lett. di Carlo V., 20.

² See the *letters of F. Peregrino of May 24 and 27, 1533, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Cf. the *report of G. M. della Porta of May 27, 1533, in State Archives, Florence.

³ *Brief of May 28, 1533, in Min. brev., 1533, vol 46, n. 254 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). The answer of Francis I. in Lett. d. princ., I., 126 *seq.*

⁴ Lett. and pap. of Henry VIII., VI., n. 548; GAYANGOS, IV., 2, n. 1082; SANUTO, LVIII., 241, 278; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 87.

⁵ See the **letter of G. M. della Porta of July 17, 1533 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. BAUMGARTEN, III., 123 *seq.*

⁶ Cf. the *letter of Ant. Maria Papazzoni of July 21, 1533, in State Archives of Bologna, and the *report of G. M. della Porta of July 24, 1533, in State Archives, Florence. On July 31, Clement VII. said he

On the 1st of August the Papal officials were formally notified that their presence would be required at Nice on the 3rd of September.¹ As no reply came from France concerning the ship on which the Pope was to be conveyed to the latter place, many looked upon the journey as doubtful, but the majority believed that it certainly would take place.² The Pope also expressed himself in the same way.³ Then there was a rumour that Marseilles would be the place of meeting, as the Duke of Savoy, in consideration of the Emperor, had made difficulties about Nice.⁴ This was unacceptable to the Pope, for on French soil Francis could bring to bear upon him a preponderant influence. Meanwhile the bride's dowry was settled; on this occasion Clement laid aside his usual parsimony; the jewels alone were valued at more than 30,000 ducats.⁵ On the 1st of September Catherine de' Medici set forth on her journey, accompanied by Caterina Cibo, Duchess of Camerino, Maria de' Medici-Salviati, the widow of Giovanni "delle Bande Nere," Filippo Strozzi, and the historian Guicciardini. At Portovenere the galleys of the Duke of Albany awaited her.⁶

would leave at the latest on September 8; *report of F. Peregrino of July 31, 1533 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ "Il Papa fece intimar alla Cancelleria et altri offitiali che si devessero trovar in Nizza alli 3 di Settembre." G. M. della Porta on August 1, 1533 (State Archives, Florence).

² Cf. the **letter of G. M. della Porta of August 11, 1533 (State Archives, Florence).

³ *Report of G. M. della Porta of August 22, 1533 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ Cf. EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., ciii.

⁵ See the *letter of G. M. della Porta, July 17, 1533 (State Archives, Florence), and BASCHET, 176 *seq.* Cf. Arch. d. Soc. Röm., XII., 376 *seqq.*

⁶ See BASCHET, 186 *seqq.*

The departure of the Pope, who at the end of August had heard with delight of the relief of Koron,¹ took place on the 9th of September.² Three days before, the death had taken place of the man who, among the Pope's relations, had been his peculiarly trusted adviser, Jacopo Salviati.³ Cardinal del Monte remained behind in Rome as Legate, and Salviati's place, whose death was generally lamented, was taken by Alessandro Farnese.⁴ The Pope's departure was a hard blow for the Romans; their city had now the appearance of being deserted.⁵ Clement on this journey⁶ avoided his native city, Florence, and passed slowly through Sienese territory to Pisa, which he reached on the 24th of September, remaining there on

¹ Andrea Doria announced this success to the Pope in a *letter dated Koron, August 9, 1533; *Lett. d. princ., VIII. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. the Brief to Ferdinand I. in RAYNALDUS, 1533, n. 93, and Nuntiaturberichte, I., 118.

² See Gualterius in RAYNALDUS, 1533, n. 78, and the *Diarium of BLASIVS DE MARTINELLIS in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

³ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, I., 119 *seq.* For Salviati's position and the jealousy in Clement's circle see Soriano in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 286 *seq.* See also Histor. Jahrbuch, V., 631.

⁴ Cf. *Acta Consist. in Cod. Vatic., 3457, P II. (Vatican Library); see *Regest. Vatic., 1451, f. 322 *seq.*, 326 *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican); SANUTO, LVIII., 676, 750; RAYNALDUS, 1533, n. 78. For Monte see the *report of F. Peregrino, September 24, 1533 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ See the complaints in F. Peregrino's *letters of September 19 and 24, 1533, *loc. cit.*

⁶ For the journey to Marseilles see Gualterius in RAYNALDUS, *loc. cit.*, the *Acta Consist., Camer. III. (Consistorial Archives), and BLASIVS DE MARTINELLIS, *Itineratio in Archives of the "Ceremonieri" of the Vatican, in Cod. Barb., lat. 2801, f. 187 *seq.* (Vatican Library), and Cod. lat. 12547 (National Library, Paris). Cf. also BALAN, Clemente VII., 208 *seq.*; LUZIO, Pronostico, 40 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, I., 130; DECRUE, 212 *seq.*, and MAZZINI, Cat. de' Medici e Clemente VII. alla Spezia nel 1533, La Spezia, 1901.

account of bad weather until the 3rd of October. On the 22nd of September, at San Miniato al Tedesco in the valley of the lower Arno, he saw Michael Angelo for the last time.¹

Not until the 5th of October did Clement set sail from Leghorn. The Papal galley was entirely covered with gold brocade; ten French vessels, and many others, especially those of the Knights of St. John, accompanied the Pope, in whose suite were nine Cardinals. A favourable wind carried the stately fleet—consisting in all of sixty sail—to Villafranca on the 7th of October, where Catherine de' Medici was taken on board. On the 11th the fleet entered the harbour of Marseilles, in which city the Grand Master Anne de Montmorency had made splendid preparations for the solemn entry of the Pope. This took place on the 12th of October. Fourteen Cardinals and nearly sixty prelates surrounded the Pope, who was carried on the *sedia gestatoria* by nobles of the highest rank. On the following day Francis I. made his state entry, after having had already a secret interview with Clement. Both were lodged so near to each other that visits could be exchanged without remark.²

Despite the youth of Catherine de' Medici, her marriage with Duke Henry of Orleans took place on the 28th of October; the Pope himself performed the ceremony.³ In

¹ GOTTI, I., 225.

² Cf. BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS, *Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican); JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI.; GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2; FONTANA, I., 170 *seq.*; DECRUE, 212, and HAMY, Entrevue de François I^{er} avec Clément VII. à Marseilles, Paris, 1900. See also J. PELISSON, Panegyricus de Clementis VII. ad christ. regem in terram Franciam magnifico adventu etc., Lugdun., 1534.

³ See the reports in BASCHET, 319 *seq.*; in Arch. Stor. Lomb., I., 20 *seq.*; in LUZIO, Pronostico, 42 *seq.*; FONTANA, I., 174 *seq.*, and HAMY, *loc. cit.*, 17 *seq.* Cf. for the solemnities, which Vasari

the brilliant festivities of the wedding Cardinal Medici was conspicuous; his display of magnificence surpassed even that of the King himself.¹ On the 7th of November three French Cardinals were nominated in Consistory (Jean Leveneur de Tillier, Claude de Languy, and Odet de Coligny); a fourth (Philippe de la Chambre) was publicly declared as such.² Long and animated transactions had preceded this act, for Clement himself seems to have had objections to this large increase of the French element in the Sacred College.³ The Imperial envoys objected that a creation should only take place in Rome; the majority, however, led by Gaddi and Sanseverino, and under pressure from Francis I., determined otherwise; Clement gave his consent reluctantly.⁴

Pope and King vied with each other at Marseilles in displays of friendship and exchanged rich gifts.⁵ During the

immortalized in a painting in the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence, the *letter of G. M. della Porta of October 28, 1533, in State Archives, Florence. The Emperor's good wishes, bound up with the credentials of the envoy sent on behalf of Ferdinand I. in his appeal for help against the Turks, in the *letter to Clement VII., November 4, 1533, in Lett. d. princ., VIII., 163 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ *Letter of G. Sanchez to Ferdinand I. of December 20, 1533, in Court and State Archives, Vienna.

² Cf. Acta Consist., Camer. III., in Consistorial Archives; Gaultierius, *Diarium in Secret Archives of the Vatican; CIACONIUS, III., 525 *seq.*; CARDELLA, IV., 132 *seq.*; DECRUE, 214 *seq.*; MARCKS, Coligny I., 16.

³ GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2.

⁴ Cf. the *report of Sanchez of December 20, 1533 (Court and State Archives, Vienna), who names as opponents Quiñones, Piccolomini, and Pucci.

⁵ See the *report of T. Cardi, dat. Marseilles, 1533, October 18, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; Sanchez' letter of December 20 in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 122; JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI., 225; Arch. stor dell'Arte, I., 18 *seq.*; the Bull of Absolution in CHARRIÈRE, I., 240 note, was also a present.

ecclesiastical ceremonies Francis made an ostentatious show of his subjection to the Papal authority.¹ Notwithstanding the numerous festivities, Clement and Francis, during their meeting of more than four weeks' duration, completed numerous negotiations, the nature of which, however, was kept a profound secret.² All the accounts given by envoys and chroniclers of these oral transactions, carried on without any intermediary, are mere conjectures. The only written document of importance is the draft of a secret treaty drawn up in Francis' own hand; according to this not merely Urbino, but Milan also, was to be taken possession of for the Duke of Orleans, whereupon Clement would raise no difficulties even on account of Parma and Piacenza.³

¹ Blasius de Martinellis reported November 1, 1533: "Post evangelium Papa osculatus est librum, rex vero noluit, licet porrectus sibi fuerit, ob reverentiam papae et honorem Sedis Ap., quandoquidem multum laudabile ex magna humilitate et devotione quam habebat, non sic alter Bononiae" (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See besides, State Papers, VII., 522, and JOVIUS, Hist., XXXI., 224; also the reports of G. M. della Porta, dat. Marseilles, October 16 (*Il Re è stato ogni giorno una volta in secreto longamente con S. S^{ia}, ma persona insin qui pare non si trovi che penetri queste loro trattationi, tanto vanno secrete), and October 24, 1533 (*Il Papa et il Re cenaro heri insieme in secrete soli), in State Archives, Florence, and the *letter of Sanchez, December 20, 1533, cited *supra*, p. 233, n. 4.

³ Text in BASCHET, 325-326. BAUMGARTEN (III., 124 *seq.*) is of opinion that one may labour in vain to arrive at any accurate knowledge of the conversations held between the Pope and King Francis at Marseilles. Yet in contradiction hereto he assumes a knowledge of what Clement consented to on these occasions. Cf. for a criticism of Baumgarten also EHSES, Dokumente, 273, note 3. In a *report, half written in cipher, to the Duke of Urbino, dated Marseilles, October 30, 1533, G. M. della Porta dismisses the reports concerning the promises supposed to have been made by Clement to Francis I. on the following grounds: "Questo raggionamento par ch' abia del colorato assai, ma in una cosa parmi ben tutto contrario al verisimile,

How far Clement agreed to demands of this kind is uncertain; in any case he cannot here have gone beyond verbal assurances, since no written agreement was completed;¹ but even in conversation so experienced a politician would most certainly have observed the utmost caution.² The enemies of Clement VII., at a later date, brought against him, among other accusations, the charge of having acquiesced at Marseilles in the alliance between Francis I. and the Turks and Protestants; the onus of proof rests with them. Clement VII. was so little in agreement with the shameful project of giving support to the hereditary foe of Christendom, spoken of by Francis at their conference, that he had information of the same conveyed to the Emperor.³ As to the support given to Philip of Hesse in his forcible restoration of the Protestant Duke Ulrich of Würtemberg, the communications of Guillaume du Bellay⁴ appear to

che non è da credere, ch' el papa huomo cauto sopra tutti gli huomini del mondo s' habia lasciata uscir di bocca una minina parola che li possa portare danno appresso hic [= Cesare], et tanto più è verisimile così quanto che si sa ch' el papa ne la negotiation sua non s' è fidato d' altro che di se medesimo, e il cardinal de' Medici m' ha giurato, che nè il Guicciardini reputato consultor d' ogni suo secreto nè huomo del mondo sa l' intrinseco di questa negotiatione col re, col quale molte volte S. S^{ta} è stata da solo a solo in secreto le quatro e cinque hore continue, mostrando pur nel dir suo che vi potesse essere qualche extravagante, ma che nol sapea. Io poi me credo che [u]na parte bona di questa trattatione così secreta sia stata sopra la materia del Concilio" (State Archives, Florence).

¹ GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2; *cf.* ROSSI, Guicciardini, II., 56. See also SOLDAN, I., 126.

² See G. M. della Porta's *despatch, October 30, as above.

³ See Pap. de Granvelle, II., 341. *Cf.* the critical paper especially directed against DE LEVA (III., 114) in the periodical, Bessarione, III., 489 *seq.*; see also BALAN, Clemente VII., 209 *seq.*

⁴ HERMINJARD, Corresp. de Réform., III., 183 *seq.*

exonerate "Clement VII. as having been deceived by Francis."¹

All the Pope's exhortations to a reconciliation with Charles fell on the French King's pugnacious temperament like seed on a barren soil. It is undoubted that during the conference Clement exerted himself to bring about a peace between the two; very well-informed envoys state this expressly.²

Substantial successes for Francis I. were, besides the above-mentioned nomination of Cardinals, the gift of the last tithe for the Crusade³ and the recall of the Swiss Nuncio Filonardi.⁴ Clement excused himself to Ferdinand I. for this act of submissiveness by suggesting that he had found himself at Marseilles in the French King's power, and that the latter had threatened him with apostasy from Rome.⁵

Very important transactions also took place on the subject of the Council. Francis was inflexible in his opposition to one held in Italy; he also insisted that in the actual condition of Christendom such an assembly should be deferred until more propitious and peaceable

¹ Opinion of BROSCHE, *Kirchenstaat*, I., 126 note. See also BUCHOLTZ, IV., 297 *seq.*, and BRISCHAR, I., 80 *seq.* Cf. in Appendix, No. 35, the report of F. Peregrino, March 6, 1534 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² See especially the *report of G. M. della Porta, dat. Marseilles, 1533, October 19, in the State Archives, Florence; the *report of F. Peregrino, dated Rome, 1533, September 10; and that of *Pastron, Marseilles, 1533, November 10, in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; see Appendix, No. 34. Cf. Clement's interesting letter to Charles V. in EHSES, *Dokumente*, 274 *seq.*

³ Cf. the *Bull of November 4, 1533; original in National Archives, Paris, L 937.

⁴ See WIRZ, *Filonardi*, 94 *seq.*

⁵ See A. da Burgo's report in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 122 *seq.*

times. His arguments succeeded in inducing Clement, with feeble pliability, to consent to a postponement.¹ Even in the divorce suit of Henry VIII. he yielded to the request of Francis I., and on the 31st of October 1533 consented to a fresh respite of a month before giving effect to the threatened excommunication.²

Clement VII. left Marseilles on the 12th of November 1533, whereupon Francis started for Avignon. The Pope's voyage to Spezia was made under difficulties owing to heavy storms; as far as Savona he made use of French vessels; from thence he was conveyed to Civita Vecchia by Doria's squadron, and three days later he re-entered his capital, where he was joyfully received.³ Soon afterwards an event occurred of vast consequence to the Church and the world. The complete separation of England from the Holy See, long threatened, became an accomplished fact.

¹ See EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., civ. *seq.*

² Consistory of October 31, 1533. *Acta Consist., Camer. III., in Consistorial Archives. Cf. EHSES, Dokumente, 214.

³ See *Diarium of BLASIUS DE MARTINELLIS in Secret Archives of the Vatican, and *Acta Consist., Camer. III., in Consistorial Archives. Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1533, n. 88; BALAN, Clemente VII., 210; FONTANA, I., 181 *seq.*, 485 *seq.*; PETIT, 145.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DIVORCE OF HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH SCHISM.

THE separation of England from the Holy See was not like that of Germany, the result of a combined movement of the common people and the learned classes; it arose rather from the sensual passion and autocratic temper of the sovereign, and consequently for a considerable length of time had a schismatical rather than an heretical character. The separation was favoured by the ecclesiastical and political development of the nation, which since the fourteenth century had begun to slacken its ties with Rome.¹ The dependence of the clergy on the throne had already become close under the first Tudor, Henry VII., whose accession, in 1485, not only put an end to the "War of the Roses" of the houses of York and Lancaster, but was the beginning, especially for England, of a new epoch. Henry VII. resembled in character Ferdinand the Catholic. A man with strong gifts of government, imbued with a sense of the prerogatives of the Crown, he let the weight of his authority fall heavily on the nobility and the Church. When he died, on the 21st of April 1509, he had laid deep the foundations of absolute monarchy in England; the Parliament had learned docility, the nobles and churchmen submission. His successor, Henry VIII., then in his eighteenth year, determined in these respects to walk firmly in his father's footsteps. The capricious and

¹ See Vol. I. of this work, p. 159 *seqq.*

despotic side of his character was at first kept in the background ; all the more conspicuous was his love of pleasure and enjoyment. Good-looking, expert in all chivalrous accomplishments, the youthful King made a most favourable impression on the people by his spendthrift liberality, his splendid appearance, and the endless succession of festivities at his court. Nor was England long in playing a great and often successful part in the politics of Europe. After the dissolution of Parliament in 1515 the King and his Chancellor, Cardinal Wolsey, governed without it.

Wolsey's position, not only as a politician but as an ecclesiastic, was an exceptional one. Since 1518 he had held the rank of Papal Legate ; this office had been conferred on him at first for one year, and the tenure of it was afterwards prolonged to three. The extensive faculties thus acquired, and the extraordinary plenary powers, as visitor of monasteries, wrung by him from Leo X. in August 1518, gave him an altogether abnormal influence over Church affairs. He made use of it without scruple to gratify his love of power and wealth.¹ Still dissatisfied with what he had already attained, this ambitious man demanded from Adrian VI. that his legatine office should be extended to the term of his natural life.²

Luther's new doctrine had found adherents also in England. Wolsey was comparatively lenient in his punishment of such ; he indeed threatened them with the laws against heresy, but was restrained from enforcing them by his temperament of man of the world.³ The

¹ Cf. GASQUET, Henry VIII., I., 67 *seq.*, and BROSCHE, England, VI., 106.

² Cf. Vol. IX. of this work, p. 180. Clement VII. confirmed his predecessors' concessions ; see GASQUET, I., 74 *seq.*

³ BROSCHE, VI., 135 ; cf. ZIMMERMANN, Die Universitäten Englands in 16 Jahrhundert, Freiburg i. Br., 1889, 38.

Cardinal endeavoured to maintain discipline and order among the clergy. Worthy also of recognition are his benefactions to the University of Oxford, where he raised a lasting memorial to his name in the truly regal foundation of Christ Church. It was characteristic of him that he obtained the necessary means by the dissolution of monasteries, under special powers obtained after a struggle from Clement VII.¹

The English King, in recompense for his book against Luther, had received from Leo X. the title of "Defensor Fidei," from Clement VII. the golden rose, and from Luther, on the other hand, a "counter-reply of unspeakable coarseness and obscenity."² Henry complained of Luther's insults to the Elector of Saxony, and employed Thomas More and John Fisher to compose fresh refutations of the reformer. Nevertheless, Luther for some time afterwards indulged in the flattering hope that he might make a convert of the King of England, to whom with this object he addressed a very servile letter in September 1525 begging for pardon. But Henry dismissed his approaches with contempt.³ Ten years later the same King tried by flattery to obtain from the doctor of Wittenberg an opinion favourable to his divorce. Only this one circumstance, only the desire to discard his lawful wife in order to marry a wanton, was the cause that led Henry to rend asunder the links that for nearly a thousand years had bound his kingdom to the See of Peter.

Soon after his accession, Henry VIII. had married the widow of his brother Arthur, Catherine of Aragon, who, as a daughter of King Ferdinand the Catholic, was the

¹ Cf. GASQUET, I., 72 *seq.*

² Opinion of K. MÜLLER, II., i., 514.

³ WALCH, XIX., 470 *seq.*; ENDERS, Luther's Briefwechsel, V., 229 *seqq.*, 412 *seqq.*

aunt of Charles V. On the 26th of December 1503 Pope Julius II. had issued a Bull¹ granting the necessary dispensation from the obstacle to a valid marriage caused by the first degree of affinity. Catherine was five years older than Henry, but from the first the marriage appeared to be a perfectly happy one. Five children, three boys and two girls, were born, but the only one who lived was Mary, born in 1516. The Queen, as pious and virtuous as she was tender-hearted, bore these successive losses with Christian resignation. Like others of her countrywomen she aged early; she also had frequent illnesses, and the hope of a male heir vanished. Consequently the passionate King turned to other women. As early as 1519 he had adulterous relations with Elizabeth Blount and later with Mary Boleyn. Yet so little did the thought of a divorce occupy his mind that in 1519 he commissioned the Florentine sculptor, Pietro Torregiano, who had also executed the monument of his father, to prepare for him and his wife a common tomb.²

That Henry VIII. had other mistresses besides the two already named is probable, but not proven. According to his own testimony, conjugal relations between him and the Queen had ceased since 1524. The King, moreover, asseverated that serious scruples had arisen in his mind regarding the validity of his marriage; as the Scripture forbade marriage with a brother's wife, he feared that he

¹ For the Brief of Dispensation and its close connection with the Bull of Dispensation see *infra*, p. 265. There is no important difference between the two documents; in each case the impediment of affinity by marriage is removed and the way opened for the possibility of a valid declaration of consent.

² Cf. BREWER, III., 1, 2; BROSCHE, VI., 212-213; LINGARD, VI. 130 *seq.* See also JUSTI in *Jahrb. der preussischen Kunstsaml.*, XXVII. (1906), 254 *seq.*

might have been living incestuously with Catherine. It became evident only too soon that this scruple coincided with the passion, amounting almost to an obsession, which seized him in 1526. A lady of Catherine's court, Anne Boleyn, had by her attractions aroused the King's sensual admiration. Her resistance to his unlawful addresses, mingled as it was with coquetry, kindled her suitor's ardour to the highest pitch. Anne was sister of that Mary Boleyn who had previously been Henry's mistress. A marriage with her was confronted by exactly the same obstacle, only in an intensified degree, as that which now so grievously troubled the tender conscience of the King with regard to his union with Catherine.

The bold thought of ousting the legitimate Queen and supplanting her could hardly have entered into the head of Anne Boleyn.¹ Behind her stood two members of the great English nobility: her uncle, the Duke of Norfolk, and the Duke of Suffolk. For long these two had looked with jealousy and hatred on the position of Cardinal Wolsey in the councils of the King. From this quarter came the notion of a divorce; the idea itself originated in a subtly contrived plan to overthrow the all-powerful

¹ This "frivolous, pert, and intriguing young woman," says EHSES (*Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 610 *seq.*), "insignificant both in intellect and character, was personally and morally no better than her sister Mary, who had been seduced by Henry VIII. If Anne Boleyn had not been taken aback by the contemptuous brusqueness with which the Royal libertine and niggard brushed aside the discarded instruments of his lust, she would have had as little need to play off upon the King her feigned prudery and affected maidenliness as upon any others who before or after sought her favours." For the actual existence of an illicit intercourse between Henry VIII. and Mary Boleyn (b. after 1503, married 1520, in the Queen's service since 1523) see POCOCK, *Records of the Reformation: The Divorce*, Oxford, 1870. Cf. GAIRDNER, *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1893, 53 *seq.*

Chancellor. Should the divorce and the marriage with Anne succeed, the downfall of the Cardinal would follow upon them; if they did not succeed, then Wolsey would incur the King's wrath on account of their miscarriage, so that in either case the fall of the hated favourite seemed certain.¹ In entire contradiction to the facts is the theory, at one time often upheld, that Wolsey, who was at first antagonistic, had, against his better conscience, and to his own undoing, consented to become the King's tool in carrying out the business, and was the originator of the scheme of divorce.²

It is impossible to say precisely at what moment the thought of divorce in order to remarry with Anne Boleyn took possession of Henry, at first as a secret between him and his advisers of the Norfolk party, and without Wolsey's previous knowledge; the scheme can be traced back as far as the spring of 1527, when Henry took the first steps towards its realization.³ With a cunning dishonesty he managed at first to conceal the design lurking in his heart from those who were not initiated, even from Wolsey. The strange circumstance that, all at once, after eighteen years' marriage with Catherine, conscientious objections to the validity of that union should have arisen within him, he explained by referring to expressions used by the French Bishop, Gramont of Tarbes, who, in March and

¹ Cf. EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 610 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 590; BUSCH, in *Histor. Taschenb.*, 1889, 280 *seqq.*

² Against this view see also GAIRDNER in *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, 674 *seqq.*

³ Brewer's view (BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 163 *seq.*) that already in 1526 negotiations with Rome concerning the divorce were in progress, is based on an erroneous construction of a document relating to an entirely different circumstance. Cf. for the contrary view EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 614; GAIRDNER in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, 676.

April 1527, stayed in England as head of an embassy to the English court, and then discussed a proposal of marriage between Mary, Henry's daughter, and Francis I. or one of his sons. The Bishop, so Henry asserted at a later date, had given utterance to suspicions of the legitimacy of the Princess Mary, as the marriage of Henry and Catherine had not been valid. There can be no doubt that the words attributed to the Bishop of Tarbes were a pure invention and Henry's pretended scruples sheer hypocrisy.¹

On the day after the departure of the French Ambassador (May 8th) Wolsey appears to have been initiated, for the first time, into the secret of the divorce, but not in any way into the ulterior object, the fresh marriage with Anne

¹ Historians of more recent date, however, have still been taken in and take both statements as of genuine value; thus REUMONT, *Beiträge*, III., 75. See on the other hand EHSES, in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 612 *seq.*; BAUMGARTEN, Charles V., III., 637; GAIRDNER in *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, 675 *seq.* BUSCH (*Histor. Taschenb.*, 1889, 285 *seq.*) says "that pangs of conscience on account of a sinfully contracted marriage with his brother's widow led the King to suspect the validity of his marriage is hypocrisy and falsehood. It would have required a sensitively scrupulous conscience to have raised religious objections to the immunity given by the Church itself. The Pope and the Church did all they could and offered all they could to allay any existing scruples of conscience, but Henry, with ever-increasing irritation, waived such attempts aside: for he did not wish his conscience to be set at rest. He wished the divorce. . . . In the whole process the most pitiable part played was that of the King." BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 178: "Granting that the King was troubled with thoughts of his succession, and doubts of the legitimacy of his marriage with Catherine, can anyone imagine that a pure and scrupulous conscience would have adopted such a method as this for removing his perplexities?" *Cf.* also DREUX, *Le premier divorce de Henry VIII.*, in *Posit. de thèses de l'école d. chart.*, 1900, 42 *seq.*, and BOURILLY-DE-VAISSIÈRE, *Amb. de J. du Bellay*, 464 note.

Boleyn. If at first he made objections and pointed out difficulties, later events showed that his opposition could not have lasted very long nor have been of great importance;¹ for on the 17th of May he was already holding, after previous arrangement with Henry, as Apostolic Legate, with Archbishop Warham of Canterbury as assessor, a Court of Justice before which the King was cited "to answer for eighteen years' sinful cohabitation with Catherine."² The whole business had been preconcerted; by means of this farce a sentence of divorce in Henry's favour was to be concocted, so that the King, by contracting a fresh marriage, might establish as soon as possible an accomplished fact.³ After two further sittings, on the 20th and 31st of May, it became evident that this was not the way by which the desired end was to be reached. It was now determined to try to obtain, as far as possible, episcopal sanction for the divorce. Opinions were invited from bishops and canonists, but not with the wished-for result; the reply of Bishop Fisher in particular—and he did not stand alone among the rulers of the Church — was unconditionally in favour of the validity of the marriage. This probably caused Wolsey to reflect; but the Cardinal had taken the first fatal step, and he could now withdraw only with the greatest difficulty. As he allowed the whole month of June to go by without carrying the matter any further, Henry showed him clear signs of his dissatisfaction, so that he thought it well henceforward to beat down all objections and pursue the business with the utmost energy.⁴

The Cardinal had now come to be pointed at generally as the originator of the whole affair, and his enemies lost no

¹ EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 614.

² EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 614 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 615.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 615 *seqq.*

time in spreading this report in all directions. In reality Wolsey had entered only with great reluctance into a matter which appeared to him almost hopeless. As he knew the King's obstinate will, he held that no other choice was possible for him than to maintain his position. On former occasions he had always bowed before Henry's expressed wishes, and only ruled his master by convincing him that in a given case the conduct of his servant was the means most suitable for attaining the royal end. Confronted with the fierce passion of the King it now never entered his mind to offer a direct opposition; and to exhibit negligence seemed a course full of danger.

On the 22nd of June 1527, Henry, in a brutal manner, ordered Catherine to separate from him; he told the unhappy woman in plain words that after questioning various theologians and canonists he had become certain that during the whole of their married life she had been living in mortal sin. Catherine refused with determination to admit the charge, and in her rejoinder she brought into prominence a point which hitherto had been overlooked. Even if it were granted that serious objections might be raised against the Papal dispensation permitting a marriage with the wife of a deceased brother, yet in her case they could not apply, for, as her husband well knew, she had been Arthur's wife only in name, for their marriage had never been consummated.

For this disclosure Wolsey and the other advisers of the King were not prepared. They consulted as to what should now be done. On the 1st of July, just as the Cardinal was on the point of starting for France, the King caused him to be told that he was no longer deceived, that he, the Cardinal, seemed to be calling in question the justice of the King's "secret business." Wolsey at once replied with the assurance that this was not the

case. Even on the assumption that the marriage with Arthur had never been consummated, the fact still remained that he and Catherine had been married "in facie ecclesiæ"; this established the impediment of open wedlock from which the Papal Bull gave no dispensation. Therefore the invalidity of the King's marriage could be asserted as much as ever, for the dispensation had been insufficient.

After Wolsey had thus completely identified himself with the King's cause he started on his journey to France on the 3rd of July, in order to meet Francis I. at Amiens, and as representative of his master conclude the treaty with the French King. On his way from Westminster to Dover he made an attempt to win over, or rather to circumvent, Archbishop Warham and Bishop Fisher. To the latter he alleged, with total want of truthfulness, that the recent steps had been taken only in order to refute the objections to the validity of the marriage. He had another object in view as well: to blacken Catherine in the eyes of Fisher, who possessed the Queen's confidence, by suggesting that it was a totally unjust supposition on her part that Henry was aiming at a divorce, and that by her violence and impatience she was thwarting the good intentions of the King.¹ Wolsey, in acting thus dishonestly, had not the least suspicion that he himself throughout the whole affair was playing the part of the dupe duped; he was still in entire ignorance of Henry's ulterior aims and of the sordid character of the business of which he had made himself an agent. He therefore believed that he would achieve a masterpiece of political ability if, when in France, where his mission, besides its main and avowed task, had also the secret object of

¹ Cf. EHSES in Hist. Jahrb., 1888, 617; GAIRDNER in Engl. Hist. Review, 1896, 679 *seq.*; BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 194 *seqq.*

cautiously initiating Francis into the scheme of divorce, he were to pursue, on his own responsibility, the project of preparing the way for a second marriage at some future time between Henry and a French Princess, Renée, the daughter of Louis XII.¹ As he remained in France after the conclusion of the treaty with Francis (16th of August 1527) up to the middle of September, it is presumable that during that month he set his plan in motion. He believed that under the circumstances of the hour he could carry the divorce through before the Pope became aware of it. His ambitious scheme was nothing less than this: he wished during the continuance of the imprisonment of Clement VII. to be appointed Papal Vicar-General, with the fullest conceivable powers, and by means of this delegated authority to settle the marriage question in Henry's favour.² To secure this appointment he sent, on the 15th of September 1527, the Protonotary Uberto da Gambarara to the Pope.

Meanwhile Henry VIII. himself was about to take steps totally destructive of the schemes of the Cardinal, who hitherto was under the belief that he held in his hands the conduct of the whole affair. In the beginning of September Wolsey was informed that Henry was on the point of sending his secretary Knight to Rome. Anticipating mischief, he wrote on the 5th of September to the King dissuading him from this step; nevertheless Knight arrived at Compiègne on the 10th of September. As Wolsey himself had despatched agents to Rome on the King's behalf, he hoped that Knight's mission would be regarded as superfluous, and that the next King's messenger, Christopher Mores, would bring with him his recall. In

¹ EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 620 *seqq.*; GAIRDNER, *loc. cit.*, 680 *seqq.*

² EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 221 *seq.*; GAIRDNER in *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, 680. *Cf.* Vol. IX. of this work, p. 440 *seq.*

order to avoid suspicion, Knight consented to wait for Mores' arrival; as the latter did not bring with him Knight's recall, the Cardinal had, on the 13th of September, to allow the latter to continue his journey to Rome. To deceive Wolsey, Knight was enjoined to take instructions from him; therefore the Cardinal gave the King's secretary the draft of a Bull conferring on him the appointment of Vicar-General of the Pope.¹ But Wolsey was carefully kept in ignorance of the real object of Knight's mission. Henry, in fact, had given the latter a draft of a Bull by which the King should obtain a dispensation to contract a fresh marriage, and that too either without a dissolution of his marriage with Catherine—in other words, to commit bigamy—or after a legal divorce.²

Knight's mission must have convinced Wolsey that the intention now was to take the management of the whole affair out of his hands. Now for the first time the suspicion arose that Anne Boleyn was the person designed to supplant the Queen. Accordingly he changed his plans and determined to return to England as quickly as possible, in order to regain that place in the King's confidence now imperilled by the secret intrigues of his enemies. Before leaving Compiègne he addressed, on the 16th of September, together with four other Cardinals, a letter to the Pope praying him to delegate his authority during the period of his captivity;³ then, on the following day, he began his journey to England. On his first reception at court he at once perceived what a recognized position Anne Boleyn now

¹ In POCOCK, I., 19-21.

² Cf. BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 224; EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 224 *seq.*; GAIRDNER, *loc. cit.*, 684 *seq.*

³ EHSES, Dokumente, 6 *seq.*

held with the King.¹ The Cardinal's eyes were at last opened to the real state of things. Then it was that he remained upon his knees long imploring Henry to depart from his resolution. Bitterly he repented the willingness with which he had flung himself from the first, under mistaken suppositions and unconditionally, into the scheme of divorce; but now it was too late to draw back; he saw that his position and his life depended on this issue.

The only point on which Wolsey was able to move Henry was that the latter should at least at first abstain from the scandalous demand for a dispensation involving bigamy, to which the Pope, even if he were in the last extremity, could not be expected to consent. Consequently the King agreed to send Knight a fresh draft of a dispensation to take the place of that previously given him. But even now the King was again deceiving Wolsey. While Henry and Wolsey between them drew up a new draft of dispensation, destined for Knight, the King had already secretly despatched another draft, of the contents of which Wolsey knew nothing; moreover, Knight had received a strictly confidential intimation not to make use of the draft concocted with Wolsey until the secret draft should prove impracticable. The Bull of dispensation which Henry asked for in order to contract marriage with Anne Boleyn after divorce from Catherine, was to contain a clause dispensing from the impediment of affinity in the first degree caused by his previous illicit and adulterous intercourse with Anne Boleyn's sister.²

Knight reached Rome in November 1527, but owing to the Pope's confinement in St. Angelo he could not gain

¹ Cf. FRIEDMANN, I., 58 *seq.*; EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 625 *seq.*

² Cf. EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 224 *seq.*

access to him. Through intermediaries, however, he received Clement's assurance that, if he would withdraw from Rome and wait at Narni, he should obtain all that he asked for.¹ After the Pope's liberation Knight went with him to Orvieto, and here he actually obtained, after some hesitation, the Bull desired by Henry. It certainly had been revised in form by the Pope and the Grand Penitentiary Pucci, but in substance was in agreement with Henry's draft. The Bull was drawn up on the 17th of December 1527 and sent off on the 23rd.² It was only a conditional Bull dependent on the proof of the invalidity of the marriage with Catherine. Before this proof was clearly established, the Bull was absolutely valueless. Its contents were unimpeachable. The only evil results that might follow from it were that it tended to harden the King's determination to procure a divorce, and gave him a hope that Clement would be ready to give a prompt adhesion to his wishes.³ The King was all the more prone to indulge in such expectations as the political situation was highly favourable to him.

¹ EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 225.

² Printed in EHSES, *Dokumente*, 14-17; *cf.* EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 226 *seq.* In opposition to BREWER-GAIRDNER (II., 231 *seq.*) and FRIEDMANN (I., 64 *seq.*), who speak severely of Knight's stupidity and incompetence in drawing up a document, without any value, as long as Henry's first marriage was binding, EHSES maintains (*loc. cit.*, 227 *seq.*) that Knight on his first visit to Orvieto secured all that he was commissioned to obtain. His task was not to obtain the divorce but simply a dispensation for Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn in the event of the union with Catherine being at a later date legally dissolved. The whole transaction was certainly inept (*cf.* GAIRDNER, in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, 687), but the ineptitude lies rather on the shoulders of the King than on those of his agent.

³ BROSCHE, VI., 217, well describes the dispensation as a knife without blade or handle.

The Pope, smarting from the deep injuries inflicted on him by the Emperor, was, together with Francis I., still his ally. The material and moral support guaranteed to him by France was subsequently of still greater importance.¹ On his journey home Knight met, near Bologna, an English courier carrying fresh instructions for him, Gregorio Casale, and the Protonotary Gambara. He was therefore obliged to return to Orvieto.

The instructions contained the above-mentioned draft of dispensation, as jointly composed by the King and Wolsey, but also a document of much greater importance, by which Wolsey, in accordance with an original plan of his own, sought to intervene decisively in the whole train of circumstances. This was the draft of a Decretal Bull to be signed by the Pope, transferring to Wolsey the entire adjudication of the case. On the English side five points were raised to invalidate the dispensation of Julius II. of the 26th of December 1503:—²

1. The Bull states falsely that Henry VIII. wished for the marriage with Catherine, whereas his father, Henry VII., without his son's knowledge, had procured the Bull.

2. The reason adduced for the issue of the dispensation, the maintenance of peace between England and Spain, was null or at least insufficient, as the two States had not been previously at war.

3. Henry VIII. was at the time (1503) only just twelve years old, and therefore not yet capable of a marriage dispensation.

4. The dispensation had lapsed, for at the time of the consummation of the marriage one of the persons, between

¹ This with special reference to the decisive years 1531–1534; see TRÉSAL in the Rev. d. quest. hist., LXXIX., 359 *seqq.*

² EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 216; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, XI. 600.

whom peace was to be maintained by this alliance, Isabella, Queen of Castille, was dead.

5. Henry VIII. had protested against the marriage with Catherine before its consummation, and thereby had renounced the benefits of the dispensation.

In the Decretal Bull which Wolsey asked Clement to publish, the Pope was to declare that these five points, if capable of substantiation, were sufficient to invalidate the dispensation of Julius II. and therewith the marriage itself.¹ Nothing therefore now remained to be done but to test the soundness of these five points, and if their validity were established in one single instance only, then Wolsey, either alone or along with the Illyrian prelate Stafileo, was to have full powers given him to declare null and void the dispensation of Julius II., and therewith the marriage of Henry and Catherine; for this decision, placed in Wolsey's hands, the Papal ratification was to be guaranteed unconditionally and irrevocably. Never before had such a demand as this of Henry's been submitted to a Pope and his spiritual authority.²

The draft of this decretal commission was laid by Knight and Gregorio Casale before the Pope at Orvieto at the end of December. They appealed to the King's submissiveness towards the Church and urged that if the

¹ EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 217, 231; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 597 *seq.*

² EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 231. Cf. BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 236: "Never was a more extravagant demand made on a Pope's good nature, and never was a stronger proposal submitted to the highest spiritual authority of Christendom. A man of even less firmness than Clement VII. and less regard for justice would have resented the suggestion that he should abdicate his functions of supreme judge and lend himself a willing and unresisting instrument to such a gross act of injustice."

doubt concerning the dispensation of Julius II. were not laid to rest there was the greatest danger in England of a contested succession. Greatly as Clement appreciated the dangers that threatened England from the failure of a male succession to the crown, yet it appeared to him impossible to accede to the immoderate demands of the English envoys. He first of all referred them to Cardinal Pucci, who was charged with the management of this affair. The envoys had no greater success in this quarter; an attempt to bribe Pucci failed. The latter moreover declared, after an examination of the draft, that the Bull as it then stood could not be granted without bringing indelible disgrace on the Pope as well as on Henry VIII. and Wolsey.¹ The envoys obtained instead a commission for Wolsey and Stafileo, drawn up by Pucci, from which the very point was omitted on which Wolsey set the greatest value, namely, the declaration that the five points laid down, if substantiated, would suffice to annul the marriage, so that he was also deprived of the wished-for possibility of a final decision being given in England. As a matter of fact the plenary powers conferred on Wolsey were thus made worthless.

Two fresh envoys were therefore sent to Orvieto, Dr. Stephen Gardiner, Wolsey's chief secretary and one of the most gifted canonists in England, and Dr. Edward Fox, with instructions to obtain the decretal commission in its original form, only, this was no longer to be drawn up for Wolsey alone or in conjunction with Stafileo, but a Papal Legate, if possible Campeggio, was to be sent in order to decide the case together with Wolsey. In the case of the decretal commission being unobtainable, the envoys were instructed at least to secure a general commission

¹ EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 232; GAIRDNER in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, 690.

of the most comprehensive character possible for Wolsey and Campeggio, or even for Wolsey alone, or for him and Archbishop Warham of Canterbury.¹ Gardiner and Fox left London on the 11th of February 1528, and on the 21st of March, at Orvieto, met the Pope, now stripped of every vestige of temporal power. The negotiations began on the 23rd of March and lasted until the 13th of April. During their progress the English envoys were unceasing in their efforts to wring from Clement the plenary powers as specified in the English drafts. Almost daily the Pope and Cardinals held discussions of from three to four hours' duration, and on one occasion a conference of five hours lasted until one in the morning. According to his own reports, Gardiner, even if he exaggerated a good deal in order to emphasize his own zeal, displayed towards the Pope the most unblushing arrogance; but he did not succeed thus in extorting a full consent to the English demands.²

The Pope and the Cardinals were on their guard, and met the importunity of the English officials with great calmness and self-control. In spite of the insolence of Gardiner's demands, Clement never for a moment allowed himself to give way to a hasty expression. He as well as the Cardinals were firm in their rejection of terms which they could not and dared not concede.³

¹ Cf. EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 234 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 598.

² The reports of Gardiner and Fox in POCOCK, I., 95-140. One of Cardinal Pucci addressed to Clement himself, written with thorough knowledge of the affair, and clear exposition of the negotiations, is in EHSES, *Dokumente*, 22-27. Cf. EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 217 *seqq.* See also GAIRDNER in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, 696 *seqq.*

³ GAIRDNER, *loc. cit.*, 696; the Pope and Cardinals were determined "never to make such concessions as would enable injustice to be done with the sanction of the Holy See."

The Pope was not shaken even by the intervention of Francis I., who, in a special letter, gave his advice on the affair of Henry VIII. There is no justification for the charge then brought against Clement by the English party,¹ and renewed in our own days by recent historians,² that throughout the whole matter he was actuated entirely by political motives, that fear of the Emperor was the only ground on which he resisted the claims of England. The fear of the Emperor was a catchword constantly in men's mouths, and it was often used by the Pope himself as an excuse for his lack of acquiescence in the English demands. But in this particular case this was not the ruling motive; that was to be found in his conscientious regard for the duty of the chief ruler of the Church. What Gardiner had at last perforce to content himself with were

¹ Cf. EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 241 *seq.*, 641 *seqq.*

² BUSCH in *Histor. Taschenb.*, 1889, especially 307. Against him EHSES, in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1892, 470 *seqq.* BROSCH, who (221 *seq.*) takes the same standpoint, at least admits (222), "If the Pope's attitude was open to censure, some excuse at least was to be found for him in his precarious situation and the fear which haunted him since the sack of Rome. When, on the other hand, Wolsey made every effort to bring about the divorce, and in the same breath overflowed with solemn protestations of the sanctity of wedlock, this was sheer hypocrisy and inexcusable."—"Even," says EHSES (*loc. cit.*, 1888, 242), "if Clement had had nothing to expect or fear from Charles, was he not bound, in a matter so highly affecting the honour of the Emperor, to avoid the least semblance of partiality? Even if it had been possible to dissolve, in accordance with law and justice, the union between Henry and the Emperor's aunt, it would have been imperative to have done this in a way congruous with the strictest law and precedent. . . . Henry could not have demanded of the Pope that he should take into consideration all the pleas he put forward on his own behalf and entirely ignore those of the Emperor." GAIRDNER also (*Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, 699 *seq.*) rejects the charge against Clement VII. that he and his advisers were influenced by fear of the Emperor in their decisions in the English divorce suit.

the Bulls of commission of the 13th of April and the 8th of June 1528 respectively, which, in order to leave an opening for two possibilities, were drawn up in similar terms for Wolsey and Warham as well as for Wolsey and Campeggio.¹ The first Bull was despatched at once on the 13th of April, the second, also dated from Orvieto, the 13th of April, with the commission for the two Cardinals, was not officially executed until the 8th of June, at Viterbo.² As the mission of Campeggio to England was a certainty, the second Bull only was made use of. By this Bull the Cardinals received full powers thoroughly to examine whatever could be brought forward for or against the marriage of Henry and Catherine, and especially for or against the dispensation of Julius II.; then, after hearing both sides, to take summary proceedings, to declare the dispensation and the marriage severally, according to the just circumstances of the case and their convictions, to be valid and legal, or invalid and null, if judgment should be called for by one of the parties. In case of invalidity, in the same summary proceedings, the decree of divorce was

¹ Cf. EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 245 *seqq.*

² The Bull of commission for Wolsey and Campeggio is given in POCOCK, I., 167-169, and in EHSES, *Dokumente*, 28-30; *ibid.*, 30 *seq.*, the *Promissio Clementis VII.*, with which *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XII., 225 *seq.*, may be compared. Under the date of April 13, 1528, yet a second and more comprehensive Bull of dispensation for a fresh marriage on Henry's part was prepared in the event of that with Catherine being declared invalid; published by GAIRDNER in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1890, 544-550, and by EHSES, *Dokumente*, 33-37; cf. also GAIRDNER in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, 1896, *loc. cit.* For the matter still pending this Bull also was without practical importance. It did not come near the question of the validity of the marriage with Catherine; see *Katholik*, 1893, II., 309. Gairdner says justly that Henry's conduct in submitting such a proposal to the Pope was a piece of incredible effrontery. If Clement had entered into it this would have been the culmination of subserviency.

to be declared and liberty be given to the King and Queen to contract a fresh marriage, but in suchwise that, if it seemed good to the Cardinals, the children of the first marriage, as well as those of the second, should be declared legitimate, and their legitimacy protected from all question under the usual punishments and censures of the Church.¹

The two Cardinals were jointly delegated for this examination and adjudication; the English envoys, however, had carried the clause that either of the two would be justified in carrying on the proceedings alone, if the other were either unwilling or prevented by death or by some other just cause. Against the procedure of the Cardinals no objection, no appeal would be admissible; on the contrary, they were the representatives of the full and unlimited Papal authority. But the Bull did not contain that which for Wolsey had become the essential thing. There was no guarantee that the Pope would confirm the decision of the Cardinals; there was no specification of the ground on which the invalidity of the dispensation and of the marriage in the given instances was to be pronounced.²

When Fox returned to England with these results he was received on the 3rd of May by Henry and Anne Boleyn with great delight; it seems that both were of opinion that the goal was now almost reached. Wolsey, on the contrary, who saw deeper, knew that from the results brought back by Fox nothing was gained for the final decision of the case in England; but on closer reflection he concealed his dissatisfaction in order at least to gain time and postpone as far as possible the downfall that he knew to be inevitable.³ He therefore immediately

¹ EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 247 *seq.*

² *Cf. ibid.*, 248 *seq.*

³ *Cf. ibid.*, 249 *seq.*; GAIRDNER in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, 1896, 702; FRIEDMANN, I., 70 *seq.*

made a last effort to obtain the Decretal Bull by means of Gardiner, who had remained behind in Italy. In connection with this scheme Wolsey, on the 10th of May 1528, arranged a curious scene.

In the presence of Henry VIII., Fox, and several of the King's procurators, he gave utterance to the solemn declaration: Although no other subject was so devoted to his prince as he was to his King, and though, on that account, his obedience, truth, and loyalty to Henry were so steadfast that he would willingly sacrifice goods, blood, and life to satisfy his "just desires," yet he felt that his duty towards his God was greater, before whom he must once for all give an account of his actions, and therefore in this matter he would rather incur the King's gravest displeasure, rather allow himself to be torn limb from limb, than do any act of injustice, or that the King should demand of him in this question anything that justice could not sanction. On the contrary, if the Bull (of Julius II.) should be pronounced sufficient, he would declare it so to be.¹ It was a pure piece of acting, got up simply in order that Fox, who was taken in by it, and on the following day was to send Wolsey's new instructions to Gardiner, should send an account of it to the latter, who would in turn relate the incident to the Pope. In this way Clement would be brought round to such an assurance of Wolsey's conscientiousness and love of justice that he could have no further objections to granting him the Decretal Bull.²

The instructions sent by Fox to Gardiner on the 11th of May were to the effect that he must carry through in any possible way the secret execution of the Decretal Bull. It must be represented to the Pope that Wolsey's esteem

¹ Fox to Gardiner, May 11, 1528, in *POCOCK*, I., 153 *seq.*; *GAIRDNER*, *loc. cit.*, 1897, 3; *EHSES*, *loc. cit.*, 629 *seq.*

² *Cf.* *EHSES*, *loc. cit.*, 629 *seq.*; *GAIRDNER*, *loc. cit.*, 3 *seq.*

and influence with the King, and therewith the esteem attaching to the Holy See itself, are greatly dependent on the granting of such a Bull. In order to remove the Pope's objections Gardiner and Casale were instructed solemnly to declare and swear in Wolsey's name that the latter would "never on the ground of this Bull begin the process of divorce, nor show the document to a single person or in any way make use of it so as to expose the Holy See to the least prejudice or scandal. He would only show it to the King, and then keep it in his own private custody simply as a pledge of the Pope's fatherly disposition towards Henry, as a token of personal confidence in himself, as a means of maintaining and strengthening his position in the King's esteem with a view to the best interests of the Pope."¹ There is no doubt that these solemn promises were only attempts to deceive, and that they would not have been kept if the Pope had committed the blunder of placing unreservedly such a compromising document in the hands of so unscrupulous a diplomatist as Wolsey;² for, if the promised secrecy were observed, the Bull, on the whole, would be useless.

After repeated and lengthy negotiations and much pressure from the English envoys, Gardiner was at last able, on the 11th of June 1528, to report to Henry VIII. that Campeggio's mission to England was settled and that the Pope had promised to send the Decretal Bull by him.³ In granting the Bull, Clement had carried consideration for Henry and Wolsey to its furthest limits, but he had taken

¹ EHSES in *Hist. Jahrb.*, 1888, 628 *seq.*

² *Cf.* EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 634 *seq.*

³ EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 635. GAIRDNER in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, 1897, 6. On the earlier controversies as to the existence or not of such a Decretal Bull *cf.* EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 28 *seqq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 607 *seq.*

the precaution to do so under such conditions that in reality it could never be anything more than what Wolsey, in asking for it, had pretended it to be. The latter saw to his great disgust that he had, in the strictest sense of the words, been taken in.¹ The object, put forward by Wolsey as a pretext, that the Decretal Bull was only a means of protecting his position as much as possible and proving to the King that he had done all that lay in his power to carry out his wishes, was attained when Campeggio showed the document and read it aloud to the King and Chancellor. But the misuse of the Bull, in spite of all Wolsey's promises, could only be prevented by Campeggio keeping the document in his own hands and destroying it at the right moment. The contents of this document can only be conjectured, but it must have been of such a character as to have made the divorce between Henry and Catherine possible and even an accomplished fact, had not the Pope entirely withheld it from the free disposal of Henry and Wolsey.² Even if Clement, in granting this illusory document, which confirmed the demands of Henry to their full extent, was guilty of incredible weakness, yet he was acting under the belief that the grievous blunder thus committed could be repaired by depriving the Bull of any possible practical use, and that he could avoid all difficulties and misunderstandings, by declaring firmly and clearly that he could never have allowed it to be put into execution, since, as the guardian of faith and truth, he must have repudiated its contents.³

Campeggio, who entered on his mission in July 1528,⁴ was instructed to prolong his journey as much as possible,

¹ Cf. EHSSES, *loc. cit.*, 636 *seqq.*; GAIRDNER, *loc. cit.*, 6 *seq.*

² EHSSES, *loc. cit.*, 640.

³ *Ibid.*, 643.

⁴ Cf. the Itinerary in EHSSES, *Dokumente*, xxix. *seq.*

to defer crossing the channel as long as he could, and even when in England to do his utmost to protract the process of the divorce, and if possible to bring about a reconciliation between the King and Queen, but in no case was he to pronounce a final verdict without fresh and express faculties from the Pope; for it was hoped that in the meantime God's saving grace would perhaps incline the heart of the King to abstain from asking the Pope to grant what could only be granted with injustice, danger, and scandal.¹ Campeggio reached London on the 7th of October, suffering severely from gout.² Although the court rejoiced, his reception by the people was cold and even unfriendly. He appeared, among other aspects, to be the harbinger of a closer approximation to France. Men said openly that he came to be the ruin of England and to complete a deed of injustice.³ After several interviews with Wolsey he had his first audience of Henry on the 22nd of October.⁴ On the very next day the King in his impatience came to Campeggio, and in a long conversation announced his inflexible resolve to separate from Catherine. He urged strongly that in order to facilitate this step the Queen should spontaneously renounce her rights and retire into a convent. Campeggio and Wolsey were on the following day to begin to use all their arts of persuasion on the unfortunate woman. Before seeing her they were both received by the King;

¹ Sanga to Campeggio on September 16, 1528; see EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 643; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 609 *seq.*

² Campeggio to Salvati, October 17, 1528, in EHSES, *Dokumente*, 47.

³ EHSES, *Dokumente*, 259; BROSCHE, VI., 226.

⁴ See for this and the events of the next day Campeggio's report to Salvati, October 26, 1528, in EHSES, *Dokumente*, 53 *seqq.* Cf. EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 36 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 610 *seq.*; GAIRDNER, *loc. cit.*, 13 *seqq.*

in this audience, held on the 24th of October, Campeggio read both the Bulls, of the 13th of April and the 8th of June respectively, in which the examination of the case was entrusted to the two Cardinals. Afterwards Henry expressed a wish to see the Decretal Bull; Campeggio showed it to him and read it aloud, but did not let it leave his hands, nor did anyone see it except the King and Wolsey. If no other order came from the Pope the document, after it had achieved its object, was to disappear. After this the Cardinals repaired to the Queen, who received them with deep distrust; the proposal that she should betake herself to a cloister was refused decisively on this as well as on a second occasion on the 27th of October.¹ Nothing would have been gained even if she had consented, for the question of the validity of the marriage was still open. That Catherine should have clung to her rights is quite intelligible. A Spaniard, a daughter of the Catholic King, she certainly could not have admitted to all the world that she had been anointed and crowned unlawfully, that for four-and-twenty years she had been her husband's concubine, while in her inmost heart she believed in the validity of her marriage. She therefore was convinced that she durst not endanger, by an act of surrender, the right of her only child to the succession to the throne.

Wolsey, much dissatisfied with the course things had taken up to this time, made yet another attempt to obtain the Pope's permission that the Decretal Bull should be shown also to the King's advisers, for in the instructions to Gregorio Casale of the 1st of November 1528 he wrote down the deliberate falsehood that it was the Pope's intention that the Bull should be used for the information

¹ End of the report to Salviati, October 28, 1528, in *EHSES, Dokumente*, 59 *seq.*

of Cardinal Campeggio and the King's councillors. The Pope, who now clearly perceived how imminent the danger was that the English double-dealing might lead to some misuse of the Bull, bitterly bewailed, when Casale presented to him Wolsey's demands, his previous complaisance, accused the English Cardinal of falsehood, and declared that if it were possible he would willingly lose a finger of his hand to undo what he had done. All Casale's further representations were useless, even his suggestion of the evil results which would follow on the Pope's refusal, the apostasy of the King and with him that of the country. But Clement now stood firm and disclaimed the responsibility for the effects upon England of Henry's action; he had done all that he could do, reconcilable with his conscience, to serve the King.¹ According to a later report from J. Casale to Wolsey of the 17th of December 1528, he repeatedly declared that he had drawn up the Decretal Bull in order that it might be shown to the King and after that burned forthwith.²

If from the date of Campeggio's arrival in October 1528 until far on in the following year nothing essential was done, not even the Court of Justice itself being constituted, this delay was certainly in correspondence with the Legate's intentions. It was, however, on the whole, occasioned by Wolsey's persevering efforts to guard the decision to be given in England from any uncertainty regarding its legality and to be forearmed against any appeal, before the suit began. In order to secure this he was bent either on obtaining the Papal confirmation beforehand or on so tying the Pope's

¹ Cf. EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 638 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 611; BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 320 *seqq.*

² Cf. EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 38.

hands that it would be impossible for him to refuse his ratification.¹

An incident highly unfavourable to Henry's case and at the same time the cause of further delays was the sudden appearance in England of a hitherto unknown Brief of Dispensation of the 26th of December 1503, a copy of which Catherine had procured from Spain from Charles V. and produced, probably, in November 1528. By this document Henry's plea against the validity of the dispensation resting on the phraseology of the Bull of Dispensation was shaken. This Brief, auxiliary to the Bull of Dispensation, differed from the latter in certain particulars. In the Bull the actual consummation of the marriage of Catherine with Arthur was left open to doubt, by the addition of the word "perhaps," while in the Brief this word was absent, the consummation of the marriage thus being taken for granted; again, in the Brief, after stating the grounds on which the dispensation was given, the words were also added, "and on other definite grounds."²

¹ EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 40 *seq.* "Whoever," says EHSES (p. 40), "will give himself the trouble to examine closely the policy of Wolsey and his agents in Rome, will not dispute our assertion that in the English demands the regard for law and admissibility was pushed into the background, and their one underlying practical motive was the unbridled passion of Henry, who was determined at any cost to be divorced from his wife Catherine. On this point also Wolsey stood firm, not because he approved of the King's passion but, at least from the year 1528, because he foresaw the apostasy of the Church of England if Henry was baffled in forcing his will on Rome."

² Cf. HERBERT THURSTON, The Canon Law of the Divorce, in the Engl. Hist. Review, XIX. (1904), 632-645, who sees in this latter point, not in the presence or absence of the "forsan," the essential difference between Bull and Brief and the particular ground why, in the eyes of Henry VIII. and Wolsey, the Brief was viewed as dangerous to their intentions. For the genuineness of the Brief, on which Froude has of late thrown doubts, cf. EHSES, Das Dispensbrevé Julius II. für die Ehe

Wolsey exerted himself to render the Brief innocuous¹ in two ways. He first tried to obtain possession of the original, the Queen herself being treacherously induced, as though it were in her own interest, to obtain this from the Emperor. As this attempt failed, an endeavour was then made to get the Pope to declare that the Brief was a forgery; this was the main object of the mission of Bryan and Vannes at the end of November 1528, who were followed by Knight and Bennet on the same errand. The dangerous illness of Clement VII. in the beginning of 1529, when his death seemed not improbable, once more aroused Wolsey's longing for the tiara and in Henry the hope that all he wished for might be obtained without trouble; but the progress of negotiations was thereby suspended. On his recovery the Pope declared definitely that he could not pronounce the Brief to be a forgery.²

Even Campeggio felt so certain of the reports from various quarters of the Pope's death that on the 4th of February 1529 he discontinued his despatch of reports to Rome. He did not again resume them until the 18th

Heinrichs VIII. von England mit Katharina von Aragonien, in the Röm. Quartalschr., 1893, 180-198; also in his Dokumente, xxxi.-xlili. Further, BELLESHEIM in Katholik, 1893, II., 305 *seq.*, and in the Histor.-polit. Blättern, CXXIV. (1899), 578 *seqq.* Cf. also FRIEDMANN, II., 328-337; BORÉE, 34 *seqq.*; POCKOCK, I., 181-201.

¹ Cf. BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 307-333. GAIRDNER in the Engl. Hist. Review, 1897, 237 *seqq.*

² BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 332 *seqq.* "It is not easy to see at what other conclusion the Pope could have arrived consistently with the least respect to himself or his high position. Even a man of much less firmness and self-respect than Clement would have hesitated before he committed himself to such an extraordinary step as to pronounce a Brief of his predecessor to be forged, on an *ex parte* statement, when he had not yet seen the original."

when he addressed a letter¹ to the Secretary of State, Jacopo Salviati. This document, written for the most part in cipher, is in many respects of great importance and throws a very interesting light on the "whole tragic wretchedness of the subject." It relates how Wolsey with clasped hands adjured the Legate to co-operate with him so that the Pope, at any price, might give a decision favourable to the King, as in no other way could the impending calamities be kept back. "And in fact," Campeggio continues, "so far as I can see this passion of the King's is a most extraordinary thing. He sees nothing, he thinks of nothing but his Anne; he cannot be without her for an hour, and it moves one to pity to see how the King's life, the stability and downfall of the whole country, hang upon this one question."

¹ Campeggio's letter, February 18, 1529, was first published by EHSES in an article in the *Röm. Quartalschrift*, 1900, 263 *seq.*, who has finally relegated to the sphere of fable the assertion of several historical writers, derived from untrustworthy sources, that Clement VII. proposed to the King as a way out of his difficulties that the latter should pronounce an arbitrary and to a certain degree bigamous dissolution of his marriage. The original letter in the *Carte Farnes.*, f. 689, litt. C, of the Neapolitan State Archives, was published by Ehse from a copy made by one of the other side and in many places incorrect. The necessary corrections kindly put at my disposal by Mgr. EHSES are as follows:—Page 264, line 9, insert after *R^{mo}*: "Eborancense et etiam a questa *M^{ta}* con la giunta del *R^{mo}*." In line 14, after *che*: "*N. S^{re}* omnino indicat inducias biennales et poi." Line 28, instead of "mostrano" read "*S. M^{ta}* monstrò." Line 30, "*sua*" instead of "*sola*." Line 31, instead of "*han*" read "*ha*." Page 265, line 1, instead of "*in cio*" read "*tunc si*." Line 4, instead of "*nell' ultimo caso*" read "*in illud tempus*"; line 6, instead of "*possa*" read "*ponno*"; line 35, insert "*che*" after "*potendo*." Page 266, lines 17–18, instead of "*sato restar da gi*" read "*ma usato questo stratagema*." Page 267, line 13, instead of "*A*," read "*lei*." Line 16, instead of "*in termine*," read "*per pentirsene*." Line 21, instead of "*meo saltem a terra et regno perpetuo exilio*" read "*me o saltem me terriano perpetuo exule*."

Wolsey made through Gardiner one more attempt to obtain from the Pope an extension of the legatine powers so as to include absolute power of decision ; but Clement now stood firm against any further concessions.¹ In the meantime also Charles V. had intervened at Rome on behalf of Catherine, with such success that already in April the question had arisen of revoking the powers given to the Legates in England, and transferring the whole case to Rome. In presence of this danger Wolsey found it advisable to abstain from pushing any further his unattainable demands, and to open the suit and bring it as quickly as possible to an end.²

On the 31st of May the court of the two Legates was constituted,³ and the King and Queen were cited to appear on the 18th of June.⁴ Catherine appeared on the first summons only in order to protest against the tribunal.⁵ At the next sitting, on the 21st of June, at which the King and Queen were present, the latter repeated her protest, threw herself at the King's feet to entreat him once more to have compassion, declared that she would lodge an appeal with the Pope, and withdrew,⁶ never to appear again

¹ Cf. GAIRDNER in the Engl. Hist. Review, 1897, 243 *seqq.*

² Cf. EHSES in Histor. Jahrb., 1888, 41 ; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 613 *seq.* ; BROSCHE, VI., 231.

³ For his negotiations, see Campeggio's reports in EHSES, Dokumente, 98 *seqq.* Other papers in POCOCK, I., 206 *seqq.* Cf. BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 338 *seqq.* ; BORÉE, 49 *seqq.* ; EHSES in Histor. Jahrb., 1888, 41 *seqq.* ; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 614 *seq.* ; BUSCH in Histor. Taschenb., 1890, 65 *seqq.* ; GAIRDNER in The Cambridge Modern History, II., 431 *seqq.* See also STEVENSON, Henry VIII. and Card. Campeggio, in The Month, 1882, October.

⁴ Campeggio to Salviati, June 4, 1529 ; EHSES, Dokumente, 99.

⁵ Campeggio to Salviati, June 18, 1529 ; *ibid.*, 103 *seq.*

⁶ Cf. the two reports of Campeggio to Salviati, June 21, 1529 ; *ibid.*, 106, 108 *seq.*

before the Legates' court. She was consequently declared to have acted *in contumaciam*, and the case proceeded without her with great rapidity and on the pleading of one side only. In a cipher despatch to Salviati, Campeggio complained: "In the house of a foreigner one cannot do all one wishes; the case has no defence. A king, especially in his own house, has no lack of procurators, attornies, witnesses, and even laity who are hankering after his grace and favour. The Bishops of Rochester and St. Asaph have spoken and written in support of the marriage, also some men of learning have done the same, but in fear and on their own responsibility; no one comes forward any longer in the Queen's name."¹ The only person who championed the unhappy princess with unfaltering courage was John Fisher, the saintly Bishop of Rochester. The marriage of Henry and Catherine, so he declared in the fifth sitting, on the 28th of June, was indissoluble, no power could break their union; for this truth he was ready, like John the Baptist, to lay down his life.² Contrasted with the diplomacy and temporizing of almost all the rest, this declaration roused twofold sympathy. But all Fisher's determination was powerless to effect anything. Notwithstanding Campeggio's objections, the case was hurried on with precipitate speed and the decision was already looked for on the 23rd of July.³ This, however, Campeggio prevented, for in the sitting of that date he adjourned the court during the Roman law vacations until the 1st of October. The sittings were never resumed, and in this way Wolsey was defeated.

¹ EHSES, Dokumente, 119-120.

² See the report of Campeggio's Secretary, Floriano, June 29, 1529, in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 116 *seq.* Cf. BRIDGETT (German translation by Hartmann), 178 *seq.*

³ Campeggio to Salviati, July 13, 1529, in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 119.

It was high time for the case to be transferred to Rome; there had been too much delay. Not until Clement VII. felt that he was strongly backed by his alliance with Charles V. did he urge him to take decided steps. A Consistory of the 16th of July 1529 determined that on the ground of the Queen's appeal the case should be brought before the judicial court of the Rota at Rome.¹ This did away with the powers of the English Legates. On the 19th of September Campeggio had his farewell audience of Henry and took leave of him on friendly terms.² His journey was delayed by an attack of gout; he had intended to leave Dover, where he had been since the 8th of October, on the 26th of that month, but before he could do so he had to submit to treatment of a most disrespectful kind; his luggage was searched on the pretext that he might be taking to Rome treasure and compromising letters from Wolsey; the real reason, at all events, was that it was hoped in this way still to get possession of the Decretal Bull. As this, however, had been long since destroyed, this inquisition was without result.³

Before Campeggio left, the news of Wolsey's downfall had already reached him. The latter was now paying for the miscarriage of the divorce suit; by the 9th of October the proceedings against him had begun; on the 16th he was called on to deliver up the Great Seal. Robbed of

¹ The appeal presented in the Queen's name and countersigned by the Pope in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 122-123. The ratification of the transfer of the case to the Rota was communicated to the Queen and Wolsey on July 19; see the letter in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 120 *seqq.*; the further letters of the Pope of August 29 and September 4, *ibid.*, 125 *seqq.*

² Campeggio to Salviati, dated Canterbury, October 7, 1529, in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 133-135.

³ Cf. BREWER-GAIRDNER, II., 375 *seqq.*; FRIEDMANN, I., 96 *seq.*; EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 46 *seq.*; EHSES, *Dokumente*, 137 *seq.*

his property and forbidden the court, again for a brief moment appearing to be restored to his sovereign's favour, he was finally charged with high treason. Arrested at Cawood on the 4th of November 1530, he died on the 29th of that month at Leicester Abbey, a house of Augustinian canons, on his way to London, where, it may well be, the supreme penalty awaited him.¹

Together with Henry VIII., whose adulterous passion would submit to no check, Wolsey, by his base servility to the King, undoubtedly shares a great portion of the guilt of the severance of England from the Church.² He himself passed judgment on his conduct in the words spoken shortly before his death: "If I had served God as diligently as I have done my King, He would not have given me over in my grey hairs. But this is the just reward I must receive, for in my diligent pains and studies to serve the King, I looked not to my duty towards God, but only to the gratification of the King's wishes."³

¹ Cf. especially in BREWER-GAIRDNER (II., 378-464) the full account of Wolsey's fall; see also STEVENSON'S excellent article in the Month, 1883, January. For Wolsey generally cf., apart from the literature of the divorce, the article "Wolsey" by BELLESHEIM in the 2nd ed. of Wetzer and Welte's Kirchenlexikon, XII., sp. 1747-1756; among earlier writers A. v. REUMONT, Kardinal Wolsey und der Heilige Stuhl, in his Beiträgen zur italienischen Geschichte, III., Berlin, 1855, 1-100; FOLKESTONE WILLIAMS, Lives of the English Cardinals, II., London, 1868, 246 seq.; HOOK, Archbishops of Canterbury, N.S., I., London, 1868; CREIGHTON, Card. Wolsey, London, 1888.

² Cf. EHSES in Histor. Jahrb., 1888, 644 seq.

³ As related by Cavendish; see EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 647, and REUMONT, *loc. cit.*, 98. "A severe but nevertheless certainly the justest epitaph which could be placed upon his monument," says EHSES, *loc. cit.* Shakespeare has made use of the words in his Henry VIII., Act III., Scene 2. If the recent publication of original documents has brought to light in all its grandeur the hitherto insufficiently appreciated statesmanship of Wolsey, this ought not to lead to a one-sided admiration for

In the light of history Wolsey stands out as the powerful statesman to whom the England of Henry VIII. was indebted for her greatness and importance, but also his whole personality, viewed from this side exclusively, so as to make us forget that the very same documents in equal proportion reveal him to us in a saddening light as a servant of the Church. EHSSES, *loc. cit.*, 647 *seq.*, sums up: "So long as it was only a question of external policy and calm, diplomatic calculation, so long as only his qualities as a statesman were called into action, Wolsey's position was a brilliant and lofty one, if not in the achievement of conspicuous successes, yet in the constant defence and elevation of the influence and reputation of England. The period subsequent to his fall, as has often already been remarked, offers his best panegyric. But where moral character and inner personal consistency ought to have shown themselves, there was revealed a deplorable weakness which places him in sharp contrast to a great predecessor in a similar position, Thomas Becket. With the frivolous king he could, when occasion called for it, be frivolous himself; proud and arrogant both above and below the surface, he was obsequiously devoted to his sovereign and therefore could not subordinate the glamour of the court and the favour of the wayward king to the thorny conflicts of conviction and duty. When Henry's passion proved itself stronger than the Cardinal's craven tears and abject entreaties, he preferred to lower himself beneath that passion and, reluctantly indeed and with protesting wishes in his heart, but outwardly at the hazard of all his ecclesiastical and political position, to become the contemptible agent of a contemptible job." BELLESHEIM writes in the *Kirchenlexikon*, XII., 2nd ed., 1755: "Misunderstood amid the pressure of the religious passions of the 16th century, Wolsey, judged by the various collections of State papers, is to the modern historian one of the greatest statesmen of his age and a founder of England's present position in the world. His private life, however, was not free from shadows, and Campeggio's despatches give us the picture of a minister who was double-tongued, dishonest and servile, and dissembling before his king. Wolsey's services to the Church were wholly bad, for, by his repeated threats to the Holy See, his combination in himself of the highest temporal and spiritual power as Legate and Lord Chancellor, and his disgraceful dissolution of monasteries, he taught Henry VIII. a lesson which the latter carried still further into practice by the introduction of the Royal supremacy and the dismemberment

as the pliant and unconscientious prelate who, by his unworthy obsequiousness in subserving the King's shameful desires, became in a degree responsible for the unhappy rupture in the Church which he wished to avoid. Too willing courtiers and servile diplomatists, even when clothed in ecclesiastical garb, have in all ages only been a cause of misfortune to the Church.

After Wolsey's fall, Anne Boleyn, as the French Ambassador clearly pointed out, wielded through her uncle and father an influence in the Cabinet as unlimited as that which she had hitherto for long held over her suitor, the King. There now appeared gradually on the scene another counsellor not less ambitious and not less unscrupulous than Wolsey, who was ready to shrink from nothing that could serve the purposes of the lustful king. This was Thomas Cranmer, the domestic chaplain of the Boleyns. He eagerly pursued the scheme of procuring from the most famous universities of Europe opinions favourable to the divorce. In England the same attempt was made by the issue from the press of writings unfit for publication. In France and Italy recourse was had to bribery.¹

At the same time Henry made a fresh effort to win over to his side the Emperor as well as the Pope. In the beginning of 1530 he sent Anne Boleyn's father, recently raised to the earldom of Wiltshire, to Bologna with the ostensible mission of conferring with the Pope and Emperor on the general peace and confederation against the Turks; in reality he was sent in the interests of the divorce.² He

of his kingdom from the unity of the Church." See also BELLESHEIM in the *Histor.-polit. Blättern*, CXXIV. (1899), 582.

¹ Cf. FERET in the *Revue des quest. hist.*, 1898, II., 63 *seq.*, 66 *seqq.*, 72 *seqq.*

² Cf. FRIEDMANN, I., 105 *seqq.*; BUSCH in *Histor. Taschenb.*, 1890, 81 *seq.*; GAIRDNER, *The Cambridge Modern History*, II., 433 *seq.*

was to lay before the Emperor strong arguments against the validity of Henry's marriage with Catherine, but Charles made short work of his representations. He was not more successful with the Pope, who eight days before Wiltshire's arrival had, by a Brief of the 7th of March 1530, transferred the matter of the English marriage to Capisucchi, Auditor of the Rota.¹ A Brief of the 21st of March prohibited anything being said or written against the validity of the marriage. The presence of the English Ambassador was made use of to deliver to him the citation summoning Henry to appear at Rome before the tribunal of the Rota. Yet the Pope consented to a postponement of the case, if Henry would promise in the meantime not to make any alteration in the state of things in England,² and the King accepted the offer upon this condition.³

In the meantime the opinions of the universities, extorted by force and cunning, were coming in. Henry's delight at the favourable replies, many of which he was particularly successful in obtaining from French seats of learning,⁴ was diminished by the fact that other universities declared that the dissolution of his marriage with Catherine was only justifiable on the ground of the consummation of her marriage with Arthur, which the Queen denied on oath and the King was unable to prove. The hope also that the favourable opinions of the universities would move the Pope to give way proved idle. It now occurred to Henry VIII. that a meeting of Parliament might bring pressure to bear on the Holy See. On the 13th of July

¹ Cf. EHSES, *Dokumente*, 139 *seq.*

² Clement VII. and Henry VIII., Bologna, March 26, 1530, in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 140-142.

³ April 10, 1530; *ibid.*, 143-145.

⁴ See HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 809 *seq.*, and BOURRILLY, 99 *seq.*

1530 an address to the Pope, composed at Henry's instigation, was issued by the English prelates and nobles.¹ In it, with a reference to the opinions of the universities, the demand was put forward that Clement without delay should pronounce the dissolution of the King's marriage; with this was coupled the threat that otherwise England would settle the question unaided. The Pope's answer, of the 27th of September,² was a calm refusal of this demand. His decision would be given with such speed as was consonant with justice; neither the King nor his subjects could demand any other treatment.³

About this time the English envoys seem again to have importuned the Pope with a demand for his sanction of a double marriage. Gregorio Casale, on the 18th of September 1530,⁴ sent a report on the matter giving the impression that the proposal had come from the Pope, and that the latter was inclined towards such a solution of the difficulty. Casale represents himself as having, "with an astonishing semblance of sanctimoniousness,"⁵ replied that he durst not write in such terms to the King, as he

¹ In POCOCK, I., 429-433; *cf.* EHSES, Dokumente, 153 *seq.*

² In POCOCK, I., 434-437; *cf.* EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 161 *seq.*: on p. 163 *seq.* another rendering, in substantial agreement, of this answer.

³ "We shall not go wrong," remarks BROSCH (VI., 244), "if we see in this correspondence between Parliament and Pope the opening of the period in which Henry's marriage controversy became a conflict between England and Rome. For even if all hope of a mutual understanding had not yet disappeared, it is still obvious that Henry at this time had in view the possibility of a breach with Rome, although without any fixed plan, and Parliament was prepared to follow the King if he were willing to take the first steps towards a rupture."

⁴ POCOCK, I., 428: "Superioribus diebus Pontifex secreto, veluti rem quam magni faceret, mihi proposuit conditionem hujusmodi, concedi posse vestrae Majestati, ut duas uxores habeat." *Cf.* EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1892, 477 *seq.*

⁵ So characterized by EHSES, *loc. cit.*

feared that the Royal conscience, which it was the main object in this whole affair to pacify, would not consent to such an issue.

How unreliable this account was is shown by the despatch of William Bennet, in any case a more trustworthy man, sent to Henry on the 27th of October 1530.¹ Soon after his arrival² Clement had engaged him in conversation on the subject of a dispensation to have two wives, but his remarks were so ambiguous that Bennet suspected that the Pope either intended to draw from Henry a recognition of the unlimited nature of the dispensing power—since a dispensation to contract a bigamous marriage was at least no easier matter than the previous one for the marriage with Catherine—or that he wished in this way to keep the King in check in order to gain time. “I asked Clement VII.,” Bennet continued, “if he were certain that such a dispensation was admissible, and he answered that he was not; but he added that a distinguished theologian³ had told him that in his opinion the Pope might in this case dispense in order to avert a greater evil; he intended, however, to go into the matter more fully with his council. And indeed the Pope has just now informed me that his council (known as the Consistory of Cardinals) had declared to him plainly that such a dispensation was not possible.” If Clement had thus really hesitated for a

¹ In POCOCK, I., 458 *seq.* Cf. EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 479 *seq.*; with PAULUS in the *Histor.-polit. Blättern*, CXXXV. (1905), 89 *seq.*

² PAULUS, *loc. cit.*, 89, “therefore well on in summer 1529, for Bennet had his first audience of Clement VII. on June 21.”

³ Cajetan is very likely meant, for he held the view that polygamy was not against the law of nature and nowhere forbidden in the Old Testament, although he did not share Luther’s standpoint regarding its admissibility under the law of Christ. Cf. PAULUS, Cajetan and Luther on Polygamy, in the *Histor.-polit. Blättern*, CXXXV., 81 *seqq.*, 90 *seq.*

time over the possibility of a dispensation for a dual marriage, his uncertainty was soon brought to an end¹ by this categorical denial of its admissibility, and there are not the remotest grounds for speaking of a parallel between Clement's attitude and that of Luther towards double wedlock.²

On the 6th of December 1530 Henry VIII. wrote a letter to the Pope containing violent complaints and taunting him with complete subserviency to the Emperor.³ Cardinal Accolti was instructed to send a reply. "As," said Clement, "we stand between the Defender of the Faith on one hand and the Advocate of the Church on the other, no suspicion

¹ PAULUS, *loc. cit.*, 90.

² Cf. EHSES, article in literary supplement to Köln. Volkszeitung, September 11, 1902, No. 37. See *ibid.*, 1903, No. 48 (November 26), NIK. PAULUS on Luther and Polygamy. W. KÖHLER (Die Doppelhehe Landgraf Philipps von Hessen, in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, N.F., LVIII., 1905, 407) admits frankly: "It cannot be doubted that Catholicism *in puncto* bigamy comes off better than Luther. Pope Clement VII. who, in the case of King Henry VIII. of England, had to face the problem of bigamy, did not declare for the possibility of a dispensation to contract a double marriage, although to all appearance he was not convinced of its impossibility: his Cardinal, Cajetan, had certainly laid down that polygamy was not contrary to the law of nature and was nowhere forbidden in Holy Scripture, but he did not on that account come near to asserting its admissibility. 'For,' it has been rightly observed (by NIK. PAULUS in the literary supplement of the Köln. Volkszeitung, April 30, 1903, No. 18), 'together with the authority of Holy Scripture there exists for the Catholic that also of tradition and the Church. But Cardinal Cajetan never thought of disregarding the canon law, which most strictly forbids polygamy.' It is quite clear that on this point the legitimation by the State, society, and civilization under the law of nature are on the side of Catholicism, while Luther's view, as is to be noticed in other instances, was much more sharply dualistic."

³ Cf. EHSES, *Dokumente*, 167-170; *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 244 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 811.

of partiality ought to be raised against us, since we are governed by the same sentiment of affection towards the one as towards the other. Besides, we call on God as our witness and give the surety of our pontifical word that the Emperor has never asked of us anything except simple justice. For he said to us that if the Queen's cause was unjust it was not his intention to uphold it, rather must he in that case cast the burden of the matter on those who were the means of bringing such a marriage about. But if the Queen was in the right he would then be doing shameful despite to his honour if he allowed her to be unlawfully oppressed. Whether the English envoys have demanded justice from us in like way is a matter of which the King cannot be ignorant." The Pope protested that his decision would be given only in accordance with justice.¹

A Papal Brief of the 5th of January 1531 renewed the edict of the 7th of March 1530 containing the threat of ecclesiastical punishments and censures for Henry VIII. and any female who should contract marriage with him while the case was under adjudication by the Rota.² Henry, who had now no further hope of bending Clement to his will, took, without further delay, the first step on the road leading inevitably to the total separation of England from the Holy See. A general convocation of the English clergy, held in the middle of January 1531, was called upon to acknowledge the King as supreme head of the Church and clergy of England, to which declaration convocation, now forced to abandon their previous opposition,

¹ EHSES, *Dokumente*, 172 ; *Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 244 *seq.* ; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 811.

² In POCKOCK, II., 104-108. *Cf.* EHSES, *Dokumente*, 175 *seq.* ; BROSCHE, VI., 246.

added at least the clause "so far as the law of Christ permits."¹

The inquiry set on foot in Rome made no advance of any importance in the year 1531.² Henry neither appeared in person on his citation nor did he send a representative, but he protested through his Ambassador and Dr. Carne,³ who had been sent to Rome as "Excusator" for his non-appearance and to demand that the case should again be remitted to England. The proposal, by way of compromise, emanating from Rome that the case should be transferred to⁴ some neutral locality, such as Cambrai, was rejected both by the English King⁵ and by the Emperor as Catherine's representative.⁶ Henry then proceeded to discontinue the recognition of Catherine as Queen *de facto*, for in August 1531 he banished her from court, while the apartments formerly belonging to her were occupied by Anne Boleyn.⁷

On the 25th of January 1532, Clement, according to an agreement with the Emperor, addressed a Brief to Henry containing earnest but temperate remonstrances against his course of action and exhorting him to recognize Catherine as his lawful wife and to dismiss Anne Boleyn until the decision in the case was given.⁸ This Brief was

¹ Cf. BROSCHE, VI., 247 *seq.*; BRIDGETT (German translation by Hartmann), 200 *seqq.*

² GAIRDNER, Cambridge Modern History, II., 436 *seq.*

³ Cf. EHSES, Dokumente, 195 *seq.*; GAIRDNER, *loc. cit.*, 436 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. Salviati's letter to Campeggio, June 9, 1531, in EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 176 *seq.*

⁵ Henry VIII. to the Pope, December 28, 1531, in POCOCK, II., 148-151. Cf. EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 191.

⁶ Cf. EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 179.

⁷ Cf. FRIEDMANN, I., 149; BROSCHE, VI., 248 *seq.*

⁸ In POCOCK, II., 166-168. Cf. EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 192 *seq.*; BROSCHE, VI., 249.

delivered to the King on the 13th of May, but produced no effect. On the contrary, in the spring of this year he took another and more important step hostile to the Holy See, for he carried an Act of Parliament abolishing annates, the execution of which was left to the King's discretion.¹ At the end of October 1532 a meeting between Henry VIII. and Francis I. took place at Boulogne. The former hoped at that time that Francis would succeed in inducing the Pope to lay aside his opposition to the divorce. France in that case might depend on the support of England in the event of a war with the Emperor.²

Francis entered into this plan. He sent Cardinals Gramont and Tournon to Rome with instructions to threaten the apostasy of the Kings of France and England if the Pope did not assist the one in his schemes for the acquisition of the Duchy of Milan and the other in his marriage with Anne Boleyn. In consequence, however, of Charles's successful campaign against the Turks, the terms of this message were considerably toned down.³ Before leaving Bologna the Pope once more addressed an admonition to Henry⁴ which was also couched throughout in gentle language. This was occasioned by the elevation of Anne Boleyn on the 1st of September 1532 to the rank of Marchioness of Pembroke, and her journey in company with Henry to Calais in October, when she was presented to Francis I. as the future Queen. The Pope threatened the adulterous couple with excommunication if they did not

¹ Cf. BROSCH, VI., 249 *seq.*; GAIRDNER, *loc. cit.*, 437, 439.

² Cf. the detailed description in HAMY, *Entrevue de François I^{er} avec Henry VIII. à Boulogne-sur-Mer en 1532*, Paris, 1898.

³ PALLAVICINI, III., II. The original instructions for the two Cardinals in the *Preuves des Libertez de l'Église Gallicane*, 630 *seq.*

⁴ In POCOCK, II., 378 *seqq.* Cf. EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 200 *seq.*; BROSCH, VI., 252.

separate before the expiration of a month and Henry did not return to his legitimate consort; at the same time he renewed all former enactments against attempts to procure a divorce in England and the marriage with Anne Boleyn, and declared afresh the nullity of all such proceedings. Henry retorted by the strict prohibition "of the publication of anything whatever against the Royal authority if coming from Rome, or any attempts to hinder the execution of those Acts passed in the last Parliament for the removal of abuses abounding among the clergy."¹

On the 25th of January 1533 Henry VIII. was secretly married to Anne Boleyn, whose pregnancy as affecting the future child's right of succession made further delay impossible, although of the final decision regarding the dissolution of his marriage with Catherine not a syllable had hitherto been uttered.² On the 12th of April (Easter) Anne Boleyn appeared publicly for the first time as his consort.³

In the meantime the death of Archbishop Warham of Canterbury, in August 1532, was of great advantage to Henry, for he was thus enabled to appoint a successor to

¹ BROSCHE, VI., 253.

² Cf. FRIEDMANN, I., 182 *seq.*, 338 *seq.*; BROSCHE, VI., 253. Several historians have given November 14 as the date of the marriage; this ante-dating, however, rests on purposely false statements made later by the court party in order to make it appear that Elizabeth, born on September 7, 1533, was conceived in wedlock and not in adultery. The undutiful priest who performed the ceremony has usually been spoken of by earlier writers as Dr. Lee. According to FRIEDMANN (II., 183 *seq.*), he was more probably the Augustinian, George Brown, Prior in London in the spring of 1533, Provincial 1534 (afterwards Protestant Archbishop of Dublin). GASQUET (Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries [German translation by ELSÄSSER, Mainz, 1890, I., 131]) also thinks this likely.

³ FRIEDMANN, I., 199.

the see on whose entire subserviency he could depend. His choice fell on Thomas Cranmer,¹ who had become his secretary through Anne Boleyn's influence. He was "an obsequious servant and an intriguer, fertile in ideas, whose services were also at the disposal of his master's wishes."² Although for long alienated at heart from the Church, this immoral priest succeeded in deceiving the Pope as to his position, so that after receiving the confirmation of his appointment on the 30th of March 1533, he was able to be consecrated. In him Henry and Anne found a worthy instrument ready to carry out all their wishes. Henry, in previous collusion with Cranmer, went through the farce of a judgment on his marriage.³ Cranmer cited Henry and Catherine before his court at Dunstable, where the proceedings began on the 10th of May. Catherine, however, only signed two protests, for she refused to recognize Cranmer as judge, and took no further notice of his proceedings. On the 23rd of May Cranmer pronounced the marriage of Henry with Catherine null and void, and on the 28th he declared the marriage with Anne Boleyn valid. Thereupon the latter was, on June the 1st, crowned with great pomp as Queen.

On being informed of these proceedings, Clement VII. hesitated in characteristic fashion for some time, and then at last, on the 11th of July 1533, he gave sentence against Henry,⁴ pronounced the marriage with Anne Boleyn null

¹ FRIEDMANN, I., 174 *seqq.*

² Thus the author of the article on Anne Boleyn in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1893, Supplement No. 195. *Cf.* STEVENSON, Cranmer and A. Boleyn, in *Hist. pap.*, of J. Morris (S.J.), I., London, 1892 (Publicat. of the Cath. Truth Society).

³ *Cf.* FRIEDMANN, I., 201 *seqq.*; GAIRDNER, *Cambridge Modern History*, II., 439 *seq.*; EHSES, *Dokumente*, 202; *Briefs and Documents in POCOCK*, II., 473 *seqq.*

⁴ In EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 212 *seq.*; less accurately in POCOCK, II., 677 *seq.*

and void, and the offspring, if any, of the union illegitimate, and laid the King under the greater excommunication. But even yet a time of grace was given him up to the end of September. The excommunication was not to take full effect until he showed his final disobedience in retaining Anne Boleyn and refusing to restore Catherine to her rightful place as Queen and wife. Cardinal Tournon succeeded in obtaining from Clement a further respite of a month¹ from the 26th of September. The latter hoped, it would seem, that a reconciliation might be brought about, although all hope of one had for long been abandoned,² and consented, on his meeting Francis I. at Marseilles, to a yet further postponement to the end of November at that King's request and out of regard for the new English envoys whose arrival was expected. The mission, headed by Gardiner, treated Clement, to the great disgust of Francis,

For the Consistory see also the *report of F. Peregrino, dat. Rome, July 11, 1533, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Cf. BROSCHE, VI., 262 *seqq.* The latter remarks: "The Pope himself was no longer under delusion as to the importance and consequences of this sentence; he was aware that Henry would renounce his obedience and estrange England from the Apostolic See, and he said so often. 'I am sure,' he declared (Bishop Merino's despatch to Charles V., August 18, in GAYANGOS, IV., 2, 772), 'that I have now lost the obedience of England for good and all.'" On this Brosch observes from his one-sided, purely political view of the Pope's behaviour: "But Clement durst not oppose his just insight into the position of things to the wishes of the Emperor. For Charles was lord of Italy; at a sign from him the rule of the house of Medici in Florence would have vanished." This criticism entirely overlooks the fact that if the Pope had acted otherwise than he did he would have committed a gross outrage on his sacred office.

¹ LE GRAND, III, 569; EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 214.

² In August the English envoys were recalled from Rome (*cf.* BROSCHE, VI., 263 *seq.*). *Letter of F. Peregrino of August 16, 1533, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

with extreme insolence and demanded the withdrawal of the sentence against Henry. To the Pope's friendly proposal that the whole case should be reheard at Avignon by special Legates, on condition that Henry recognized the Papal authority and promised to accept the final decision, Gardiner replied that he had no powers. On the 7th of November 1533 the English envoys presented to the Pope Henry's appeal to a council.¹

In the session of Parliament opened on the 15th of January 1534 Henry passed a series of resolutions of an anti-Papal tendency; ² the annates and other payments to Rome were finally abolished; the power of jurisdiction hitherto exercised by the Pope was transferred to the King; the bishoprics were to be filled by capitular election, which, however, was to be determined in favour of the person chosen by the King. A further Act contained a declaration against the "usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome," as the Pope henceforward was to be designated. By the Act of Royal Succession the marriage with Catherine also was declared null from the beginning and the Princess Mary illegitimate, while on the other hand the children of Anne alone were in the rightful succession to the throne. The sanguinary measures against the opponents of Henry's policy began with the trial of the "Maid of Kent"; the execution of this nun and her fellow-sufferers opened up a period which lasted throughout the following thirteen years of Henry's reign and may well be described ³ as a "reign of terror."

¹ FRIEDMANN, I., 247-253. Cf. also HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 812, and HAMY, *Entrevue à Boulogne-sur-Mer*, 194 *seq.*

² Cf. BROSCH, VI., 271 *seq.*

³ BROSCH, VI., 270. Cf. GASQUET, *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries* (Elsässer's German translation), I., 96-126; BRIDGETT (Hartmann's German translation), 248-277.

Almost simultaneously with Henry's last step, so long dreaded¹ by the Roman Curia, towards severing the bonds which for a thousand years had linked England with the Church and the Papal authority, came the final decision in the Rota on the question of the divorce. If the Pope, hoping that the King's passion would cool down with time, had previously carried compliance to too great a length and repeatedly arrested the course of true justice, while also exposing himself by his imperturbable silence to the unjust reproaches of the English envoys, there was one thing still remaining which he would not sacrifice at any cost, namely, the sanctity of the marriage bond. Even at the risk of losing England to the Church he withstood the tyrannical king on this point from the consciousness of a higher duty. After long and thorough deliberation² Clement, on the 24th of March 1534, pronounced in secret Consistory the final sentence,³ in which the marriage with Catherine was declared valid and lawful and the King bound in duty again to receive and honour the unhappy woman as his wife. As a rejoinder thereto Henry VIII. and Thomas Cromwell now proceeded to carry out without scruple the recent Parliamentary enactments.⁴ Those who, like Sir Thomas

¹ Cf. the **reports of F. Peregrino of November 30 and December 16, 1531 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² Besides EHSES, Dokumente, 214 seq. and 228, cf. also the **reports of F. Peregrino of January 10 and March 22, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and **those of Andreasius of January 14, February 6, 14, 24, and 27, 1534, in State Archives, Milan.

³ In EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 215 seq.; less accurately in POCOCK, II., 532 seq. Cf. BROSCH, VI., 278. A printed copy of the *Sententia diffinitiva* in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, as a supplement to F. Peregrino's *report of May 10, 1534.

⁴ BROSCH, VI., 278 seq.

More and Bishop Fisher of Rochester,¹ refused the new oath of the Royal succession, containing by tacit implication a recognition of the King's supremacy over the Church, fell victims to the tyrant's wrath. The severity of Henry's action surprised his people, who had not anticipated so extreme a crisis, and in a credulous optimism had hoped that the storm would soon pass over.² In addition there was the unfortunate circumstance that the exceptional position long held by Wolsey as Chancellor and Legate had habituated men's minds to the combination in one person of the highest temporal and spiritual power.³

The boundless pusillanimity of the majority of the clergy was fatal. The full significance was now made clear of the principle of the supreme authority of the English Crown in matters spiritual which was involved in the so-called statute of *Præmunire* passed as long ago as 1365. If so learned a man as Thomas More held erroneous and perverted views on the Primacy⁴ until closer study brought him to the light, we can measure the extent to which such views were current among the majority of Englishmen. The oppressive measures of Henry, unflinchingly carried out, did the rest. When, in the summer of 1534, the oath was tendered to the whole of the secular and regular clergy, abjuring the Papal and acknowledging the Royal supremacy over the Church, almost all submitted. The Observants of the Franciscan Order were conspicuous in their resistance, but among the secular clergy the threat of the confiscation

¹ Cf. BRIDGETT, 277 *seqq.*

² Cf. CAMM, *Lives of the English Martyrs*, I., London, 1904, *Introd.*

³ Cf. MARTIN, 87.

⁴ Cf. CAMM, I., 194, and ZIMMERMANN in *Wissenschaftl. Beilage zur Germania*, 1906, n. 6.

of their benefices had for the most part the desired effect.¹

When Clement VII. died on the 25th of September 1534, the English schism had become an accomplished fact.² The Parliament and most of the clergy were in complete subjection to the King, who now held the temporal and spiritual authority combined, and had raised his mistress to the throne. If Henry, in dragging down the English Church to a state of schism in an outburst of despotic caprice and adulterous passion, had not at first thought of more inward revolutions in faith and worship, yet assuredly it was only a matter of time that by the further exercise of the arbitrary power of the sovereign, that Church should be transformed into a community based on principles of Protestantism.

¹ Cf. BROSCH, VI., 278 *seq.* ; GASQUET, I., 130 *seq.*

² Henry VIII. is said to have remarked on hearing of Clement's death : "Whoever is elected Pope, I will take no more notice of him than of any priest in my kingdom." BROSCH, VI., 282.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PROTESTANT REVOLT IN SCANDINAVIA AND SWITZERLAND. —HERETICAL MOVEMENTS AMONG THE LATIN RACES.

THE separation of the Scandinavian kingdoms from the centre of Christian unity had a close affinity with the same movement in England. In the former case as in the latter the momentous change originated with and was accomplished by the despotic authority of the Crown. One feature, however, differentiated the two ; while Henry VIII. was an opponent of the teaching of Luther, the latter was encouraged by all the means in their power by Frederick I. of Denmark and Gustavus Wasa of Sweden.

That the overthrow of the ancient Church among the vigorous peoples of the Scandinavian kingdoms was carried out in a comparatively short space of time is more easily understood if we reflect that Christianity was of late growth in those regions and that, lying at the furthest bounds of the sphere of Papal authority, they felt but feebly the influence of the Holy See. Other circumstances leading up to an apostasy and making it easier were the secular lives of so many of the clergy, the great riches of the Church exciting the covetousness of needy kings, and last, but not least, the deep implication of the episcopate in political affairs.¹

In order to ward off the dangers threatening the

¹ Cf. v. SCHUBERT in the *Zeitschr. für schleswig-holstein. Gesch.*, XXIV., 104 *seq.*, and SCHÄFER, IV., 136, 138.

Catholic religion, the bishops of Denmark had inserted in the capitulation on the election of the new King, formerly Duke Frederick of Holstein, not merely a promise to protect "Holy Church and her servants," but also the express stipulation never to permit a "heretic, whether a follower of Luther or others, to spread his teaching privately or publicly" in his kingdom. The capitulation of the 3rd of August 1523 established further that only Danish nobles were to be appointed to bishoprics, only Danish subjects to benefices, and that no foreigner—thus not even the Pope—should dare take proceedings against Danish prelates, or pronounce any decision in Rome in connection with the Danish episcopate on any ecclesiastical matter. These decrees can only be partially explained and excused on the ground of the abuses in the Roman Curia, but they shot far beyond the mark; indeed, they opened the road to a Danish National Church on the lines of the Gallican,¹ and that at a moment when it was of vital importance that the ties of Church unity should not be relaxed. From this time onwards the spirituality were compelled, in their opposition to the Protestant teaching already permeating Denmark, to seek their only support in the nobles and the Crown. That no reliance could be placed on either was, only too quickly, to be shown.

As soon as King Frederick I. felt himself secure on his throne, he began with great caution and shrewd calculation to take steps prejudicial to the Church. He broke his oath and gave assistance to the Protestant movement; on the 23rd of October 1526 he appointed as his chaplain² Hans Tausen, a Knight Hospitaller who had

¹ See PALUDAN-MÜLLER, 515. For Clement's foresight with regard to Denmark *cf.* MARTIN, Gustave Vasa, 191 *seq.*

² *Cf.* RÖN, J. Tausens Liv, Kopenhagen, 1757; SCHÄFER, IV., 134 VOL. X. 19

broken his vows. At the Diet at Odense in November of the same year he demanded that the fees on presentation to livings paid to the Papal treasury, as well as the annates, should in future be spent on the defences of the kingdom. The Royal Council agreed, and, as it seems, the Bishops also, who hoped to save the main position by making concessions. Their endeavours to win over the nobility through a "questionable servility" to take part against Luther's "unchristian teaching" also came to nothing, and all further compliance proved useless.¹ The King extended his protection to the Protestants in an increasing degree, tolerated their violence towards Catholics, and filled vacant sees with creatures of his own, who were neither consecrated, nor acknowledged by the Pope. At the Diet at Copenhagen in 1530 upwards of one-and-twenty Lutheran preachers appeared and presented as their Confession of Faith forty-three articles containing passionate and injurious attacks on Catholics.² The Catholic prelates, who were accompanied by their ablest theologians, in particular by the Carmelite Paulus Heliä,³ a noted disputant, raised bitter complaints of their unjust

seq.; SCHMITT, *Der dänische Luther*, in the *Hist.-pol. Bl.*, CXIV., 629 *seq.*; J. Tausen, by the same, Köln, 1894, and *Sthyr's Theologisk Tidsskrift*, VII.

¹ SCHÄFER (IV., 138) says: "It leaves a sorrowful impression to trace in detail the helplessness and defencelessness of the Danish clergy, oppressed on every side and curtailed of their rights, retreating step by step, always hoping that the surrender of untenable positions would at least secure the safety of essentials, while the enemy, cheered by success but never satisfied, kept up their relentless pursuit."

² See PONTOPPIDAN, *Annal.*, II., 836 *seq.*; MÜNTER, *Kirchengesch. von Dänemark*, III., 308; SCHÄFER, IV., 163.

³ See L. SCHMITT, *Der Karmeliter P. Heliä*, Freiburg i. Br., 1893. *Cf.* also his *Verteidigung der katholischen Kirche in Dänemark gegen die Religionsneuerung in 16 Jahrhundert*, Paderborn, 1899.

treatment. They appealed to the election capitulation, and demanded the suppression of the Protestant movement. It was all in vain. Frederick I. came forward openly on the side of the Lutheran preachers and declared that throughout the kingdom "he who had grace" should have permission to teach.

Under cover of the King's favours the Protestants in Copenhagen and other places took possession by force of churches and convents¹ A further impetus was given to the Lutheran cause by the unsuccessful attempt of Christian II.,² who had ostensibly become reconciled to the Church, to recover his kingdom. After the death of Frederick I. (10th of April 1533) an interregnum ensued in the hands of the nobles and bishops, who deferred the election of a new king. While this lasted the majority in the Royal Council who were still Catholic tried to restore the Church to her ancient rights, but the attempt was a complete failure from the beginning, for the higher clergy thought more of power and property than of the old faith. Although the recess of the Diet in June 1533 afforded legitimate opportunity for strenuous action against the preachers, the bishops showed no energy. Therefore the Lutheran agitation, even if not quite openly, was able to pursue its course.³

Almost at the same time as Denmark, Sweden was torn from the Catholic Church. Here also the decisive steps were taken by the Crown; Gustavus Wasa knew that the introduction of Lutheran teaching was the surest

¹ Cf. SCHÄFER, IV., 169 *seq.*

² Cf. LAEMMER, Mon. Vatic., 35; Röm. Quartalschr., XVII., 391; RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 58 *seq.*; SCHÄFER, IV., 172 *seq.*; MARTIN, 427 *seq.*

³ Cf. SCHÄFER, IV., 212 *seq.*, and SCHMITT, in Hist.-pol. Bl., CVI., 660 *seq.*

method of breaking down the power of the bishops and improving his scanty revenues from Church property.¹ Although Clement VII. showed a very conciliatory spirit, and at the end of 1525 confirmed Johann Magni in the administration of the Archbishopric of Upsala² until the affair of Trolle should be settled, the King gave powerful support to everyone who showed hostility to Catholicism; members of religious orders especially who were disloyal to their vows could be sure of his protection. At the same time, on the plea of the "revolutionary axiom that necessity knows no law, human or divine," he set to work, by a system of open spoliation, to destroy the material foundations of the ancient Church.³

It was a circumstance of great advantage to the King that five sees (Upsala, Strengnäs, Vesterås, Skara, and Åbo) were uncanonically occupied and that Bishop Ingemar of Vexjö was aged and compliant, so that the noted Bishop Johann Brask of Linköping, "the cleverest and most learned Swede of his day and the truest friend of his country," stood alone.⁴ Yet the majority of the

¹ "The King," says WEIDLING (156), "made his compact with the reformation with the intention of pocketing the pecuniary results, and, with the acute perception of the practical man, saw that a reformation in Luther's sense gave him the means of breaking up the hierarchy and appropriating their riches to himself. How well Gustavus understood how to look after his own advantages is best proved by the circumstance that at the end of his reign 12,000 former Church properties had passed into the Royal treasury." *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1893, Suppl., 29.

² *Cf.* MARTIN, *Gustave Vasa*, 300.

³ See WEIDLING, 150 *seq.*, 152 *seq.*, 162 *seq.*; GEIGER (II., 42) says that Gustavus Wasa, in introducing the new doctrines, acted with a characteristic mixture of cunning pliancy and audacity; *cf. ibid.*, 45 *seq.*

⁴ GEIGER, II., 49, 54.

nation, especially the country folk, held fast to their old faith. The brave and stubborn inhabitants of the province of Dalekarlien, with whose help Gustavus Wasa had once gained his victory over the Danes, were, in particular, roused to serious revolt. Their uprising was fanned by former favourites of Gustavus who had quarrelled with him: the deposed Bishop Peter Sunnanväder of Vesterås and his capitular provost Knut. The poverty and suffering among the people was a punishment, they declared, for the conduct of the King, who although, on his election, he had sworn to defend the Church, was now despoiling churches and convents, priests and monks, and carrying off monstres and chalices and shrines of saints.¹

Gustavus Wasa, however, knew well how to get the upper hand of the movement in Dalekarlien; judicious leniency and promises of money quelled the rebellion; Sunnanväder and Knut fled to Norway. Yet the King only displayed greater ruthlessness towards the property of the Church, and the truly catholic Johann Magni he got rid of by sending him on an embassy to Poland and Russia.²

On the 19th of September 1526 Clement VII. addressed the Bishops of Linköping and Vesterås. He complained that the Swedish clergy took wives, changed the ritual of the Mass, gave Communion in both kinds, and neglected Extreme Unction; he ordered the bishops to invoke the aid of the secular arm, and adjured his beloved son Gustavus and the nobles of Sweden to take up the cause of the endangered faith.³ That the Pope even now continued to hope in Wasa shows strikingly how insufficiently they were informed at Rome as to the true state of things in the north. By the next year all illusions on the subject

¹ WEIDLING, 164 *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, 173 *seq.*, 179 *seq.*; MARTIN, 308 *seq.*

³ RAYNALDUS, 1526, n. 128; MARTIN, 325 *seq.*

of the Swedish King's position were at an end. The conflict between the Pope and Emperor had entered on its most acute phase when Gustavus broke away. On this occasion as on others he had grasped, with the intuition of genius, the appropriate moment to choose. With no less skill he knew how to turn opinion against Clement VII.¹

At this time the Swedish Catholics were completely cowed. Under letters of safe-conduct Gustavus had enticed into Sweden the two leaders of the Dalekarlian rising: first Knut and afterwards Sunnanväder as well. As soon as they were there he gave them over to the harshest insults and later ordered their execution.² While the impression made by these vindictively penal measures against two great ecclesiastics was still fresh, the separation of Sweden from Rome ensued by means of the *coup d'état* of the Diet of Vesterås in June 1527. Before the assembly had yet opened the bishops drew up a protest against the threatened persecution of the Church; but none had the courage to present it! In the Diet itself, the Bishop of Linköping, Johann Brask, alone at first had the spirit to speak out against the proposals of the King; without the Pope's assent he could not agree to alterations in doctrine and the existing condition of the Church. After the leader of the nobles had spoken in the same sense, the King announced with tears that he must abdicate the crown and leave the country he had freed from Danish servitude to its fate. This "brilliant piece of acting" did not fail of its effect. As the Bishop-elect of Strengnäs, Magnus Sommar, weakly counselled compliance, and the nobles saw a vision opening before them of a share in the plunder of the Church, the acceptance of the King's demands was

¹ Cf. MARTIN, 345.

² GEIGER, II., 53; WEIDLING, 196 *seq.*; MARTIN, 250 *seq.*

not withheld. Accordingly the Crown took free possession of the appointment to bishoprics, chapters, and convents, with the disposition of their revenues. "The pure word and Gospel of God" was also to be preached within the realm; the nobility were empowered to demand back gifts made by their predecessors since 1454, and the bishops declared in a special decree that "they rejoiced to leave their riches or their poverty to the King's will."¹ By a special enactment the Church in Sweden was thus at once made dependent in every respect on the will of the sovereign. The first step that followed was a great spoliation of churches and convents in which the victims were specially enjoined to submit to secularization "without making much fuss." Bishop Brask went into exile, and on the 7th of November 1527 Gustavus instructed the Bishop-elect of Strengnäs that, as the common people would not be contented with unconsecrated bishops, he might take steps for his early consecration, although the rite in itself was not necessary.² Thereupon the above-named, together with two others, had himself consecrated by Bishop Magni of Vesterås on the 5th of January 1528. Magni had given his consent to this schismatical act on receiving a written promise from the *consecrandi* that they would afterwards seek confirmation from Rome.³ Naturally the matter was never heard of again. In February 1529 a "National Council" held at Örebro agreed to the retention of many Catholic externals in order to deceive the people, the majority of whom were averse to a change of faith. Nevertheless, the people on the whole refused to

¹ GEIGER, II., 66 *seq.*; WEIDLING, 201 *seq.*; MARTIN, 351 *seq.*

² Gustav d. Förstes Registratur, IV., 368.

³ MARTIN, 378. The validity of Swedish orders is challenged in *Mém. hist. sur la prétendue succession apost. en Suède*, par Msgr. DE FORTEMPS DE WARRIMONT, 2nd ed., Liège, 1854.

be deceived. In many provinces, especially in Småland, East and West Gothland, and also in Dalekarlien, risings occurred; but the King, by judicious kindness in some cases, by merciless severity in others, was able to overcome such troubles.¹

In 1531 Gustavus ordered the election to the Archbishopric of Upsala of Laurentius, younger brother of Olaus Petri. The Bishops of Vesterås and Strengnäs, who at heart were still Catholics, drew up a protest against it. Indeed, even the Bishops of Skara and Vexjö declared that they only consented because otherwise they had nothing to expect but imprisonment and the ruin of their churches—a clear evidence that Lutheranism had not sunk deep into the Swedish clergy.² Still, the opposition of the Catholic-minded clergy could only be expressed in private.³ For their overthrow the Swedish clergy were not free from responsibility. Weak-spirited servility and worldliness of life⁴ made it easy for a monarch gifted intellectually and possessed of all the resources of an effective monarchy, to destroy the ancient Church and from its wealth bestow on the Crown a solid basis of material power. In Sweden as in Denmark the monarchy had of course to surrender to the nobility a share of the plunder of the inheritance of the Church; for the great bulk of the people the social and

¹ Cf. GEIGER, II., 69 *seq.*; WEIDLING, 247 *seqq.*, 283 *seq.*; MARTIN, 399 *seqq.*, 438 *seq.*

² Cf. MARTIN, 416 *seqq.* The recently discovered protest of the Bishops of Vesterås and Strengnäs, in the *Svensk. Hist. Tidskrift*, 1897, 61. Johann Magni, finally appointed by Clement VII. Archbishop of Upsala, naturally was unable to take possession of his see; see RAYNALDUS, 1532, n. 88.

³ WEIDLING, 288.

⁴ Cf. Olaus Magnus in RAYNALDUS, *loc. cit.*; see also GEIGER, II., 39.

political consequences of the change of religion were highly unfavourable.¹

The Swiss were more fortunate than the Swedes in their opposition to the introduction of the new teaching. The man who headed the Protestant movement in Switzerland, Ulrich Zwingli, had certainly come under Luther's influence, but in many respects was entirely independent of him. There were points of essential difference in their doctrines. This man, who at the same time was flinging himself into schemes of vast scope and of grave danger to the existence of the Confederation,² went far further than Luther, and in his antagonism to the Catholics was more uncompromising. The movement for the overthrow of the Catholic Church let loose in Zurich by Zwingli had spread itself very soon over a considerable portion of German Switzerland, yet Lucerne, Zug, and the three forest cantons Schwyz, Uri, and Unterwalden, the original nucleus of the Confederation, remained true to the Catholic faith. Clement VII. had already turned his attention to Swiss affairs in a Consistory held on the 14th of December 1523. The Swiss Nuncio Ennio Filonardi was recalled to Rome to make a report and receive fresh instructions. At the end of February 1524 Filonardi returned to his post, but he was obliged at first to remain at Constance, for the French envoys were working against him in the Catholic cantons; but in Zurich, now given over to the new teaching, the very mention of a Papal representative was scouted.³ Clement, on his part, made the payment of the outstanding arrears of pay to Zurich

¹ Cf. the evidence in DÖLLINGER, *Kirche und Kirchen*, 97 *seq.*, 102 *seq.*

² See GHINZONI in *Boll. d. Svizz. ital.*, XV. (1893), and *Theol. Zeitschrift a. d. Schweiz*, XIII., 131 *seq.*

³ WIRZ, *Filonardi*, 62-63.

dependent on the fidelity of the canton to the Catholic religion.¹

The Catholic cantons, in view of the wide dissemination of the new doctrine, wished a learned theologian to be sent them who should make head against Zwingli and at the same time have full powers to provide for the reforms to be taken in hand for the remedy of ecclesiastical evils. To the latter request Clement gave an evasive answer,² and in February 1525 once more delegated Filonardi, a man who had proved himself a clever diplomatist in secular affairs but who, notwithstanding all his knowledge of the situation in Switzerland³ was wanting in the deeper understanding of the ecclesiastical question. No wonder that his mission was a failure.⁴ How little the real state of things was understood in Rome is shown by Clement's action in sending in 1526 a summons to the Government of Zurich to send deputies to Rome to discuss the settlement of questions in dispute.⁵ The Curia was at that time so engrossed in high policy of state that it was impossible to bestow the necessary attention on the Church affairs of Switzerland. For this reason the success obtained by the Catholics in May 1526 at the Disputation of Baden was

¹ BALAN, *Mon. saec.*, XVI., 192 *seq.*; RIFFEL, III., 43; WIRZ, 64.

² The Catholic statesmen of central Switzerland—but without success—tried to take in hand the work of reform without the Pope and in opposition to him. *Cf.* ROHRER in *Geschichtsfreund der fünf Orte*, XXXIII., 27 *seq.*; OECHSLI, *Das eidgenössische Glaubenskonkordat von 1525*, in *Jahrb. für schweiz. Gesch.*, XIV., 236 *seqq.*, and in *Anz. für schweiz. Gesch.*, XXI. (1890), 18 *seq.*

³ This is emphasized by Clement VII. in the Brief in BALAN, *Mon. saec.*, XVI., 78, 81, 84, 88.

⁴ WIRZ, Filonardi, 66 *seq.*, 68 *seq.* *Cf.* EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, XV., 469, who also refers to *Acta* in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, still left unnoticed by Wirz.

⁵ See the Brief in BALAN, *Mon. saec.*, XVI., 246 *seq.*

never adequately followed up; support from Rome was lacking; communication with the Holy See grew less and less,¹ while the ecclesiastical revolution sped upon its way.

Even after the settlement of Italian affairs the Pope, irresolute and parsimonious, did not give sufficient support to the champions of the Catholic cause in Switzerland. Even when Zurich laid an embargo on the transport of provisions to the Catholic cantons, thus conjuring up the outbreak of the civil war, Clement confined his assistance to the despatch of briefs and recommendations. Things reached a climax when at last he forbade the transport of grain and salt, and tried to rouse the Catholic princes, especially the Emperor, to intervene with military force.² Charles V., summing up the situation coolly, refused to be drawn in. Although the Catholic cantons were thus thrown on their own resources, the wager of battle was in their favour. On the 11th of October 1531 the men of Zurich were defeated at Kappel, and Zwingli, who had taken part in the fight in full armour, was among the slain. The illusions already cherished³ by Clement VII. regarding the Zurichers now acquired fresh strength; he hoped that the success just gained would bring to an end the Swiss revolt from Rome.⁴ "Now," after the Catholic victory, wrote Loaysa from Rome on the 24th of October

¹ It at last ceased altogether; see WIRZ, *Filonardi*, 70.

² See the Briefs in *Archiv für schweiz. Ref.-Gesch.*, II., 16 *seq.* Cf. ESCHER, *Glaubensparteien*, 256, 260 *seq.*; WIRZ, *Akten*, 230 *seq.*; HYRVOIX in the *Rev. d. quest. hist.*, 1902, I., 499.

³ See the flattering Brief to Zurich of May 7, 1531, in RAYNALDUS, 1531, n. 22, and WIRZ, *Bullen und Breven*, 331 *seq.*

⁴ Proof is furnished by the letter of good wishes of October 23, 1531 (*Archiv für schweiz. Ref.-Gesch.*, II., 17), described by HYRVOIX, *loc. cit.*, as "banal." See also Albergati's *report, dated Rome, 1531, November 28, in State Archives, Bologna.

1531, "Clement will persevere in trying to persuade them to return and retrace their steps"; only if the other cantons are determined on revenge, should help, in the Pope's opinion, be given to the Catholic cantons.¹

When this proved to be the case, Clement at last, on the 29th of October 1531, sent 3000 ducats to the gallant defenders of the Catholic cause.² In November, after long consultation, he gave orders for the enlistment of four thousand men, and appointed Filonardi Legate to the Swiss and Commissary-General of the Catholic forces. Further generous help would be raised by a tax on the Italian clergy in general; this plan, however, was frustrated by the opposition of Venice,³ and the Papal relief came too late, for by the 20th of November 1531 the five cantons had made peace with Zurich on very moderate conditions—so moderate that Luther deeply deplored that "they had left any room in their treaty for the continuance of Zwinglism, and had not even condemned that error, but allowed it to exist alongside of what they call their ancient, unquestioned faith."⁴ Clement also regretted that the Catholics had not followed up their victory more completely, and expressed the hope that the unity of Switzerland might be restored by the return of the

¹ HEINE, Briefe, 177.

² See the *letters of Girol. Gonzaga, dated Rome, 1531, October 29 and 31, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; *Mandati, 1531-1532, in State Archives, Rome; WIRZ, Akten, 237; Archiv für schweiz. Ref.-Gesch., II., 18, and FONTANA, I., 477 *seq.* Cf. Eidgenössische Abschiede, IV., 1^b, 1305; ESCHER, 295; HYRVOIX, *loc. cit.*, 500.

³ Cf. SANUTO, LIV., 557; LV., 126, 195, 241, 338; HEINE, Briefe, 180 *seq.*, 199; *letter of F. Peregrino, November 19, 1531 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), in Appendix, No. 22; WIRZ, Akten, 243 *seq.*; Geschichtsfreund der fünf Orte, XII., 226; BROSCHE, I., 125, note 2; WIRZ, Filonardi, 75; ESCHER, 304.

⁴ DE WETTE, IV., 349.

separated members to the Church.¹ What took place in the latter respect was greatly exaggerated by Filonardi. His despatches² to Rome show how his judgment on affairs was influenced by his optimism.

The Swiss Catholics also overestimated the success at first secured in a series of places by the restoration of Catholic order.³ Only gradually did the Nuncio, who had hoped to recall the rebellious to their obedience by means of friends and money, begin to realize the deeper significance of the movement of revolt.⁴ Once more despatched to Switzerland in July 1532, Filonardi's reports dwelt no longer on the reconquest of the lapsed cantons by the Church; on the other hand, his presence in the country proved to be of even greater utility for the religious strengthening of those portions which remained true to the faith.⁵ Since he was the rallying-point for the true elements of the Catholic system, his recall, ordered from Marseilles on the 17th of October 1533, out of consideration for Francis I., was a measure bound to do harm to the interests of that system in Switzerland.⁶

If the Swiss Catholics did not make as good a use of their victory as they might have done, this was due, in great part, to the envoys of Francis I., who, in pursuit of their master's policy of conquest, encouraged the religious

¹ Brief of December 10, 1531, in *Archiv für schweiz. Ref.-Gesch.*, II., 18 *seq.*

² See *Acta Consist.* in WIRZ, *Akten*, 250.

³ SANUTO, LV., 378.

⁴ See *Relatio V. N. Joannis Basadone*, in RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 265. Cf. SANUTO, LV., 377.

⁵ WIRZ, *Filonardi*, 80, 91.

⁶ HYRVOIX, *loc. cit.*, 533. Out of consideration for the Emperor, Clement VII. withdrew the recall later on, but Filonardi refused to remain; see *Nuntiaturberichte*, I., 160, 182.

dissensions of Switzerland as well as those of Germany.¹ In his own country, in which Luther's followers had already begun to be active,² although at first only within a narrow circle, the King's attitude from the beginning had been an undecided one. As a man "in whom an insatiable love of pleasure was joined with a thoroughly Gallic frivolity," Francis was entirely wanting in that genuine catholicity of feeling which animated his rival Charles V. The King's sister, Marguerite of Angoulême, was in open sympathy with the reformers. The French Catholics had strong support in the Parliament and the Sorbonne; the latter had immediately declared against Luther,³ and, notwithstanding an attitude by no means friendly to the Papacy, was stoutly opposed to the Protestant doctrine. Also the Chancellor Du Prat, since 1525 Archbishop of Sens, and the Grand Master of France, Anne de Montmorency, stood firm for Catholic interests.⁴ The captivity of Francis I. appeared to earnest Catholics to be a punishment for his previous negligence regarding the heretics. The Queen Regent now associated herself with the Pope in taking penal measures, and the Parliament took several steps against the reformers, two of whom were executed.⁵ In December 1527 the clergy demanded, in return for their financial support of the King, among other things, the "destruction of the Lutheran sect," to

¹ Cf. HYRVOIX, *loc. cit.*, 521.

² Besides SOLDAN, I., 85 *seq.*, cf. STHYR, Reformationens forberedelse og begyndelse i Frankrig indtil 1523, Kopenhagen, 1870, and Lutheranerne i Frankrig 1524-1526, Kopenhagen, 1879. See also FRAIKIN, 397 *seq.*, 428 *seq.*

³ See our remarks, Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 39.

⁴ See DECRUE, 217; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 627 *seq.*

⁵ See BALAN, Mon. saec., XVI., 344 *seq.*, cf. 146 *seq.*; SOLDAN, I., 104 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 629; Mél. d'Archéol., XII., 316 *seq.*

which Francis had to agree.¹ In several provincial synods, to the satisfaction of Clement VII., measures were taken for the reform of ecclesiastical evils and the punishment of the new teachers.² The latter injured their cause seriously by seizing, on a night in May 1528, in Paris, a picture of Our Lady and the Infant Christ, and throwing it in the mud. The Catholic feeling of the populace was aroused by this impiety to such a degree that even Francis I. found it advisable to take part in the procession of reparation which followed.³ As the total defeat of the French army in Naples in August 1528 forced the King to seek the friendship of the Pope, the Government completely threw over the Protestant party. The Lutheran, Louis de Becquin, who had on two occasions been protected by Francis (1523 and 1526), was now condemned and executed (April 1529).⁴

That Francis I., in questions of religion, was governed by motives of political expediency only, is proved by his alliance in 1531 with the German Protestants, whose support seemed to him valuable since they were a source of weakness in the Emperor's dominions. It is worth noting in this connection that immediately after his meeting with the Head of the Church at Marseilles, Francis engaged in a conference with the most enterprising of all the leaders of Protestantism in Germany, Philip of Hesse.⁵

¹ *Letter of Cardinal Salviati, December 28, 1527, Nunziatura di Francia, I., f. 127 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 629 *seq.*; Mél. d'Archéol., XII., 315 *seq.*

³ See the *letter of Cardinal Salviati, June 16, 1528, *loc. cit.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican), and the Brief in RAYNALDUS, 1528, n. 80.

⁴ Cf. ROLLAND in Mél. d'Archéol., XII., 314 *seq.*, 324 *seq.* For the severe proceedings against Lutherans in Toulouse in June 1532, see SANUTO, LVI., 527.

⁵ SOLDAN, I., 124, 127.

On his way back from Marseilles, where Clement VII. had issued a Bull against the French Lutherans,¹ he sent written instructions to the Archbishop of Paris to take proceedings against heresy in the capital.² But six months later the King's Councillor, Guillaume du Bellay, was opening up negotiations with Melanchthon to bring about an agreement on the religious question.³ Du Bellay gave the German Protestants to understand that Francis was inclined to approve of the Lutheran doctrine and prepared to enter into an alliance for the protection of that sect from the attacks of the Emperor.⁴

Such was the position of things in the spring of 1534, when Clement VII., who with an eye to the spread of heresy in France had sharply prohibited⁵ preaching without episcopal permission, died. The attitude of the French King was more than doubtful, while the Sorbonne continued as before to maintain a strongly Catholic position.⁶ At this juncture two circumstances combined to the advantage of the Catholic cause; the Church, bound up with the greatest traditions of the French nation, was dear to the bulk of the population; an opposition between the

¹ *Bull, dated Marseille, IV. Id. Nov. (November 10) 1533, in National Archives, Paris, L. 333, 13.

² Letter of December 10, 1533, in Bull. de la Soc. de l'hist. des protest. franç., I., 436.

³ Cf. SCHMIDT in the Zeitschr. für histor. Theolog., XX., 25 *seq.*; SCHMIDT, Melanchthon, 268 *seq.*, and HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 877 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. LANZ, II., 144

⁵ *Bull, dat. Rome Id. Febr. (13 Februar) 1534, in National Archives, Paris, L. 333, 15.

⁶ How strong was the opposition of the Sorbonne not merely to every sign of Lutheranism but to the writings of Erasmus is shown by DELISLE, Notice sur un registre des procès-verbaux de la fac. de Théol. de Paris 1505-1533 (Notices et Extr. des MSS. de la Bibl. Nat., XXXVI.), Paris, 1899.

people and the clergy, such as was to be found in many places in Germany, did not exist.¹ Another factor of not less importance was the absence, owing to the Concordat, of any temptation for the Crown to lay hands on Church property; on the contrary, it was to the advantage of the monarchy that the *status quo* should be maintained in France.

Like France, Italy did not escape the impact of the new teaching; but in the latter country there were almost insuperable impediments to a widespread diffusion of the Protestant doctrine. In the first place, throughout the length and breadth of the Italian people there existed, in spite of all ecclesiastical abuses, a great body of traditional religious feeling of a genuine Catholic character.² This raised a barrier against any defection on a large scale from the Church of the past ages. In no other country in Europe, with the exception of Spain, had the Catholic faith struck deeper roots and knit itself more completely into the fibres of national life. The manifold development of Christian beneficence and, not less, the magnificent creations of art, bore witness to the living energy of this Catholic force.³ The genuine Catholic instinct, resident in all classes of the Italian people, taught them to distinguish, with precision, between persons and things.⁴ Therefore the dangerous feeling of hostility to the secularized Papacy was kept within strict limits and in all matters of importance was limited to the middle and higher ranks of society. Yet the latter were influenced by material and national points of view which made any idea of a breach with the Holy See abortive. The Italian saw with pride that Italy comprised the central point of Christendom

¹ Cf. MARCKS, Coligny, I., 268 *seq.*

² Our remarks, Vol. V. of this work, pp. 11 *seq.*, 21 *seqq.*, 89 *seqq.*

³ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 59 *seqq.*, 67 *seqq.*

⁴ Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, pp. 181-182.

together with the highest civilization in art and learning, and thus acquired the sure position of leader among all the countries of the West. Again, there were the countless but very tangible advantages, especially to the middle and higher classes, accruing from the fact that the "magisterium" of the Church was wielded on Italian soil. Granted that indignation at the secularization of the Papacy was sometimes acute, a sober consideration of actual facts brought men back to the conviction that the general interest lay not in the destruction but in the maintenance of the Holy See. Again, the Pope and the deeply Catholic-minded Emperor possessed a political power in Italy which made any support of Lutheranism by the minor principalities of the peninsula a sheer impossibility. Lastly, it was a point of vital importance that Clement VII. was thoroughly informed on Italian affairs and was therefore in a position to intervene in them with success.

The first intrusion of Lutheran views began, naturally enough, in upper Italy, where communication with Germany and Switzerland was always active. A constant stream of travellers, drawn mainly from the mercantile and student classes, passed to and fro and very early brought Lutheran notions and Lutheran writings into these localities. As early as 1519 and up to 1520 Luther's writings were sold not only in Venice but also in Pavia and even in Bologna,¹ and in the spring of 1520 a monk named Andrea da Ferrara, who followed Luther's doctrine, preached sermons in Venice;² a similar preacher in Milan was

¹ Cf. BENRATH, *Reformation in Venedig*, 2, where read 1519 for 1518. There is a very complete bibliography of the history of the Reformation in Italy in HERZOG, *Realencyklopädie*, IX., 3rd ed., 524 *seq.*; cf. also BENRATH, *Über die quellen der ital. Ref.-Gesch.*, Bonn, 1876.

² For Andrea cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 41, note, where the literature is given.

mentioned in despatches in the following year.¹ Leo X., as well as the Patriarch of Venice, was not slow in taking preventive measures corresponding to the occasion.² Nor was Clement VII. deficient in vigilance; on the 24th of January 1524 he urged on the Nuncios at Venice and Naples that the decrees of the Lateran Council concerning preachers and printers should be observed.³ At the same time the Pope took measures against those who were suspected of heresy in Mirandola, Padua, and Naples.⁴

Not merely Luther's views but the far more advanced tenets of Zwingli found early acceptance in Italy. Letters of the Augustinian Egidio della Porta of Como prove that he and some of his associates were prepared in 1525 to quit Italy and throw in their lot with Zwingli.⁵ In November 1526 Clement VII. instructed the Chapter of Sitten, and in January 1527 the Minorite, Tommaso Illyrico, to take proceedings against the Lutherans in Savoy.⁶ A Papal Bull of July 1528 ordered the Bishop and Inquisitor of Brescia to support the gratifying activity of the citizens of that city against Lutheranism, and in particular to pronounce judgment on the Carmelite Giambattista Pallavicini, who in the preceding Lent had proclaimed Lutheran doctrines from the pulpit.⁷ In Bergamo the

¹ See the epigram of 1521, in SCHELHORN, *Amoenit.*, II., 624. *Cf.* also *Arch. Stor. Lombard.*, VI., 480.

² BENRATH, *Reformation in Venedig*, 2 *seq.*

³ FONTANA, *Docum. Vatic.*, 76 *seq.*, 80 *seq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 78 *seq.*, 85 *seq.*, 87 *seq.*

⁵ See HOTTINGER, *Hist. Eccl. Saec. XVI.*, VI., 2, 611; M'CRIE, *History of the Reformation in Italy*, 38 *seq.*; CHRISTOFFEL, H. Zwingli, Elberfeld, 1857, 179 *seq.*

⁶ FONTANA, *Docum. Vatic.*, 96-101 (read here 1527, not 1547).

⁷ Bull. VI., 115 *seq.* Pallavicini, who also caused scandal in Chieri (*Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 3rd Series, XXIII., 442 *seq.*), laid before the Pope in

excellent Bishop Pietro Lippomano had been busy since 1527 in preventing the spread of Lutheran writings smuggled in from Switzerland.¹ On the 27th of August 1528 Clement addressed from Viterbo a circular letter to the bishops of Italy exhorting them as good pastors of the flock of Christ to suppress the heresy now beginning to penetrate the fold; the penitent were to be treated graciously, but the obstinate punished severely with the help of the secular power.²

The decree sent by Clement VII. from Bologna on the 15th of January 1530 to the General of the Dominicans, Paolo Butigella, inquisitor in Modena and Ferrara, had also a general character. In it the Pope dwelt on the spread of Lutheran error among clergy and laity in various parts of Italy, so that some by speeches, some even by sermons in church, were trying to turn away the faithful in Christ from their obedience to the Church. The Arian heresy, at first merely a spark, had, because unsuppressed, become a conflagration embracing the whole world; he wished therefore to take measures in time. Butigella and all inquisitors of his order were therefore exhorted to act vigorously against Luther's adherents; at the same time full powers were given for the reconciliation of the penitent as well as spiritual graces for the associations founded by the inquisitors for the prevention of erroneous teaching.³ Besides these general directions special orders were also sent in individual

a *letter dated Turin, 1529, June 8, a penitent statement of his errors (Lett. d. princ., VI., 47, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ Cf. UCCELLI, Dell' Eresia in Bergamo, in *La Scuola Catt.*, Milano, 1875.

² FONTANA, *Docum. Vatic.*, 103.

³ RAYNALDUS, 1530, n. 51 *seq.* Cf. GIORDANI, 68, and App. 46.

instances, and these especially concerned the Duchy of Savoy and the Venetian Republic.

The propagation of Lutheran views in the Duchy of Savoy was another outcome of the proximity of Switzerland. Clement VII. called on the inquisitors, the bishops, the Nuncio, and before all the Duke Charles III., to take measures.¹ Charles viewed the whole situation from a purely political point of view. The outbreak of Protestant tendencies in Geneva was very advantageous to him, as he was now able to invest his long-standing dispute with that city with a religious character.² His reports to Clement of the state of things in Geneva were so bad that the Pope, in his increased anxiety, placed at his disposal a portion of the Church revenues for the subjection of the city.³ Clement was not aware that Charles had greatly exaggerated the danger to Catholicism in Geneva, nor had he perceived that the Duke, working only in his own interest, was rendering a sorry service to the Church by mixing up the political question of Genevan independence with that of the religious innovations.⁴ The Pope only saw in the Duchy of Savoy a strong bulwark against the intrusion of Protestantism into Italy, and therefore issued exhortations in all directions to give support to Charles III.⁵

While Clement VII. was alarmed at the introduction of Protestant views into the west of upper Italy, their

¹ FONTANA, Docum. Vatic., 104, 109, 110.

² KAMPSCHULTE, Calvin, I., 100.

³ FONTANA, Docum. Vatic., 105 *seq.* Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1531, n. 21.

⁴ KAMPSCHULTE, Calvin, I., 101. Cf. *ibid.*, 107 *seq.*, for the bad results of Clement's declaration of the general Jubilee Indulgence, "unwarned by the experience of his predecessor," in Geneva in 1532.

⁵ RAYNALDUS, 1531, n. 23-25; FONTANA, Docum. Vatic., 119 *seq.* Cf. RENATA, I., 488 *seq.*

influence had already become firmly established in the east. Notwithstanding the repeated burning of heretical books¹ and the sermons of Dominican preachers,² Luther's followers had increased to such an extent that at Easter 1528 he was able to give public expression to his delight.³ In March 1530 the Council of Ten expressly refused to take action, as the Republic of Venice was a free state.⁴ The purveyors of Lutheran teaching were, in the main, members of religious orders who had broken their vows. The activity of such Protestant "brothers" was not confined to Venice; they were busy in many other places as well.⁵ The attitude of the Venetian Government made the position of the Nuncio and his sympathetic predecessor Gian Pietro Carafa by no means an easy one. The latter, in October 1532, had sent the Pope a memorial which made the dangers of the situation clear as day.⁶ Herein Carafa, in the plainest terms, drew the Pope's attention to the half-hearted fidelity of the Venetians to the ancient faith shown in their neglect of fasts and the confessional, and in their toleration of heretical teaching and heretical

¹ Cf. BENRATH, *Reformation in Venedig*, 4. See also ELZE, *Gesch. der protest. Bewegung in Venedig*, Elberfeld, 1883, 3 *seq.*

² SANUTO, XXXV., 449.

³ DE WETTE, III., 289.

⁴ SANUTO, LIII., 66.

⁵ See F. Negri's letter in CANTÙ, *Eretici*, III., 153, in full in the *Riv. Cristiana*, 1872, 122 *seq.*; cf. BENRATH, *Reformation in Venedig*, 40 *seq.* Lutheranism was spread in Padua by Michael Geismayr, the peasant leader who had fled from Salzburg; see BUCHOLTZ, IX., 650. There is exaggeration in a *letter of Jerome Ferrus, dated Venetiis, 1531, VI. Cal. Dec. (November 26): "Patavium quoque haec impridem invasit pestis, ut jam nemo in ea civitate litteras scire videatur qui Lutheranus non sit." Cod. Vatic., 3922, f. 241 (Vatican Library).

⁶ There is a copy of this important document in *Caracciolo, *Vita di Paulo IV.*, II., 9 (Casanatense Library). It is printed in part in

books. The leaders of the movement were members of religious orders, many of whom had broken their vows and were roaming about. Carafa named some of them, disciples of a deceased Franciscan. He announced that the Franciscans Girolamo Galateo and Alessandro of Pieve di Sacco were in confinement, while their associate and sympathizer Bartolomeo Fonzio had fled to Augsburg.¹ The latter had powerful friends in the Curia² who had procured for him a Papal Brief; to this Carafa opposed earnest remonstrances. "A heretic," he said, "must be treated as such; the Pope lowers himself if he writes to him and flatters him or even allows graces to be procured for him; it is, indeed, possible that in this or that instance some good result may follow, but as a rule the recipients of such favours are only made more obdurate and gain fresh adherents." He then urged the Pope to hold the reins more tightly on his officials and to be less generous in the matter of apostolic Briefs. In the cause of God's honour and his own responsible office he must apply

BROMATO, I., 101 *seq.*, 191 *seq.*, 205 *seq.*, and in RANKE, Pápste, III., App., No. 29; given in full in Riv. Cristiana, Firenze, 1878, 281 *seqq.* but not by any means correctly. The best text is that of the authentic copy in the Carafa papers which I found in *Cod. Barb., lat. 5697, f. 1-10 (Vatican Library). BENRATH (Reformation in Venedig, 8) places the memorial "about 1530," which is a mistake, for A. Averoldo, who did not die till November 1, 1531, is spoken of in the document as dead. The exact date I venture to establish from the credentials of the bearer, P. Bonaventura, Provinciale de' minori osservanti (without date in BROMATO, I., 205); it is the 4th of October 1532. I found the credentials among the Carafa papers in *Cod. XIII., AA 74, n. 3, of the National Library, Paris.

¹ Cf. for the persons mentioned, BENRATH, Reformation in Venedig, 8 *seq.*; Riv. Cristiana, I., 18, and COMBA, I nostri Protestanti, II., Firenze, 1897.

² Pietro Carnesecchi, Clement's influential private secretary, is probably meant.

himself to measures of opposition; in times of danger such as the present, it is inadmissible to remain in the old grooves. On the outbreak of a war every day some new preparations for defence are called for, so also in the spiritual contest in which the Church is now engaged the Pope must be ever on the alert. His Holiness should provide an able inquisitor, such as was Martino da Treviso, and despatch a special Papal Legate to Venice. Since heresy, in most cases, is the product of erroneous writings and preaching or of evil living, the attack should be made in that direction. Owing to the apathy of the bishops and heads of religious orders the Pope should insist strongly on the faculties for preaching and hearing confessions being exclusively confined to priests of blameless character. Moreover, it is absolutely necessary that an end should be made to the monstrous prevalence of vagrant monks—"the apostates," as Carafa calls them. The Penitentiary should abstain henceforth from dispensing permissions to leave the cloister; for these "apostates," to the incalculable scandal of religion, had unfortunately become masters within a wide circle of the cure of souls and only too often were the servants of heresy and men of evil life. The Pope therefore would do well to reserve to himself the permission to leave the cloister, and only grant such permission in cases of pressing necessity; but to the "apostates" no pastoral charge should be given. Carafa, in addition, drew up a formal programme of reform of the secular and regular clergy, of which further mention will be made later on.

As a fountain-head of heresy Carafa noted the dissemination of heretical writings which were sold in Venice without any attempt at concealment, were bought by many persons, clerical and lay, by whom they were read, sometimes in contempt of the ecclesiastical censures

thereby incurred, and sometimes on appeal to the possession of the necessary permission. Such licences must in future be granted very rarely, while those already issued should be recalled.

Clement VII. was not the man to carry out such stringent precautions; in single instances, *e.g.* with regard to the sale of heretical writings, he certainly directed his Nuncio to take steps,¹ and also renewed some earlier ordinances against itinerant monks.² But the comprehensive regulations for reform called for by Carafa, especially in the case of the regular and secular clergy, came to nothing. Since in this way the sources of heresy were not dammed up, repressive measures, such as the appointment of the Augustinian Callisto da Piacenza as Inquisitor-General for the whole of Italy,³ gave only a superficial help. Although Carafa in his struggle with heresy was warmly supported by Aleander, sent as Nuncio⁴ to Venice in March 1533, the situation continued to be dangerous.

Aleander's reports as Nuncio contain many complaints both of the corruption of the clergy and of the growth of heresy, now making its way in Venice even among the lower classes.⁵ Among the preachers of Lutheran opinions there was a carpenter⁶ who, on being brought to trial at the instance of Aleander, defended himself by

¹ FONTANA, Docum. Vatic., 128.

² *Ibid.*, 114, n. 1.

³ January 4, 1532; FONTANA, Docum. Vatic., 127 *seq.*

⁴ *Cf.* Nuntiaturberichte, I, 3, 37 *seq.*

⁵ *Nunziatura di Venezia, I. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). *Cf.* BENRATH, Reformation in Venedig, 114 *seq.*, 116 *seq.* (instead of 1523 read 1533, instead of 1524 read 1534), and TOLOMEI, Nuziat. di Venezia, 39 *seqq.*

⁶ *Cf.* Aleander's **report, May 9, 1533 (State Archives, Munich).

quoting sentences from the Bible. In October 1533 Aleander set in motion a Papal prohibition against the misuse of the Pauline epistles as commented upon from the pulpit in Italian by some illiterate members of the mendicant Orders.¹ The ferment in the city was increased by the preaching of the Florentine, Fra Zaccaria, who publicly depicted in glowing colours the corruption in the Curia, and even spoke of the Pope in insulting terms. The Signoria, then on strained relations with Clement VII., took no steps against the offender,² and in the matter of heresy Aleander repeatedly had to complain of their indifference. Not until an improvement took place in the Pope's relations with Venice, consequent on the change in his political and ecclesiastical position, did an alteration begin.³ The trial of the Lutheran carpenter, who had found many protectors,⁴ now came to a close after having dragged on through a whole year, and ended in the condemnation of the accused to perpetual imprisonment. The same punishment befell Pietro Buonavita of Padua, who held Lutheran views.⁵ While Aleander was occupied in contending with other promoters of Lutheranism, among them being a French glovemaking,⁶ he received the news in June 1534 of the appearance of the new doctrines in

¹ See FONTANA, *Docum. Vatic.*, 137 *seq.* Cf. Aleander's *edict in *Cod. Vatic.*, 3889, f. 17 *seq.* (Vatican Library).

² Cf. TOLOMEI, 45.

³ See *ibid.*, 43 *seq.* Cf. BENRATH, 115.

⁴ "Questo heretico mastro di legnami ha molti favori da ogni banda." *Aleander, May 29, 1533 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ Cf. TOLOMEI, 50. Aleander's **Sententia contra Antonium fabr. lignarium haereticum*, dat. June 2, 1534, I found in *Cod. Vatic.*, 3889; also f. 25: **Articuli haereticales de quibus iudicio meo magister Antonius Marangonus delatus convictus est per testes* (Vatican Library).

⁶ Cf. Aleander's *report, July 2, 1534 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

Istria.¹ In Venice itself the announcement of the success of the Protestants in Würtemberg reacted on the Government and their zeal against the Protestants slackened.²

Outside Venetian territory, in the closing days of Clement VII., only isolated followers of the German teachers were to be found in Italy,³ although writings by Luther and Melanchthon, in Italian translations, were scattered about among the people, sometimes under false names.⁴

¹ See Aleander's *report, June 28, 1534 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), also *Cod. Vatic., 3889, f 21 (Vatican Library), and Vergerio's letter, August 30, 1534, in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, I., 301 *seq.*

² See Aleander's *report, June 20, 1534 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ This was the case in 1529 in Florence, where Cerretani, as early as 1520, had declared himself a Lutheran (see Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 179 *seq.*). For G. Buonagrazia, who was banished from Florence as a Lutheran on December 19, 1531, see *Arch. stor. Ital.*, 4th Series, III., 337 *seq.* For the crypto-protestant P. A. Manzolli of Ferrara see BURCKHARDT, *Kultur*, I., 7th ed., 289; II., 7th ed., 263 *seq.* For Lutherans in Rome in Clement VII.'s time see SANUTO, LIV., 284, as well as the evidence quoted by HYRVOIX in the *Rev. d. quest. hist.*, 1902, I., 497. Unfortunately authentic information in fuller detail is wanting. For the burning of a witch on the Capitol in September 1525 see the account in BERTOLOTTI, *Martiri del libero pensiero*, Roma, 1892, 13, and *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIII., 33 *seq.*

⁴ Luther's letter to the Christian nobles appeared in 1533 under the title: *Libro de la emendatione et correctione dil stato christiano* (*cf.* BENRATH, II *seq.*, 115 *seq.*; *Nuntiaturberichte*, I., 166, 170; *Wissenschaftl. Beil. zur Germania*, 1896, No. 4, 1897, No. 17), Melanchthon's *Loci*, as: *I principii della teologia di Ippofilo da Terra Nigra* (see *Corp. Ref.*, XXXII., 654 *seq.*); *cf.* also M'CRIE, *Reformation in Italy*, 37 *seq.*

CHAPTER X.

THE CLOSE OF THE PONTIFICATE OF CLEMENT VII.—HIS POSITION TOWARDS LITERATURE AND ART.

WHEN in December 1533 Clement VII. returned from Marseilles to Rome, a Milanese envoy reported that the Holy Father was in such good health that he looked as if he had only come back from an excursion to his villa on Monte Mario.¹ No one suspected, at that moment, that the life of this man of fifty-three was nearing its end. Least of all did it occur to the French party that all the far-reaching schemes interwoven with the marriage of Catherine de' Medici were destined to come to nothing. On the Imperialist side this alliance had been looked upon with the greatest suspicion. Both before and during the conference at Marseilles, Vergerio, the resident Nuncio at the court of Ferdinand I., "had sent reports of his distrust"²—a distrust which grew although Clement laboured to counteract it. The Nuncio found his position one of increasing difficulty. Little fitted for diplomacy,³ this representative of the Pope was surrounded by the worst feelings of suspicion and by bitter animosity against Clement himself.

¹ BASCHET, 296. Cf. F. Peregrino's *report of December 12, 1533, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and *that of Ant. Maria Papazzoni of January 10, 1534, in State Archives, Bologna.

² Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, I., 115 *seq.*, 129, 132, 139, 144, 146 *seq.*, 158 *seq.*, 176 *seq.*, 192 *seq.*

³ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, I., 29, and besides, Mitteilungen aus der historischen Literatur, XXI., 34.

Vergerio's communications on German affairs were a source of grave anxiety. In the very first despatch sent to Rome after his arrival in Vienna he had to report the advance of Lutheranism and the evil plight of the Catholic Church in Germany.¹ The anti-Papal feeling which had taken possession even of circles loyal to the old faith was intensified by various ill-sounding rumours concerning the Marseilles conference. "It is my belief," he wrote on the 18th of November 1533 to the Papal private secretary, Carnesecchi, "that here not only the Pope and Italians, but also the Catholic faith and Jesus Christ, have many enemies; but in Rome they have no real notion how corrupt the minds of almost all men here have become."² From Prague, whither he had followed the court, he sent on the 28th of December to Rome a despatch of a very agitating character. "Listen," he appealed to Carnesecchi, "to the state of the Church of Christ in this country. In the whole kingdom of Bohemia at this time only six priests have been ordained, and these are quite poor men to whom, on account of their necessity, I gave gratuitously the dispensations enabling them to receive their orders from any bishop. The Bishop of Passau told me that in his entire diocese within four years only five priests have been ordained. The Bishop of Laibach said that out of his diocese in eight years only seventeen had become priests. The reports of benefices standing empty on account of this lack of clergy are quite incredible. But this is not the case merely in schismatical Bohemia, but in the whole of Austria and the whole of Germany."³

With his reports on the existing decline of the Catholic

¹ See *Nuntiatgeberichte*, I., 84, 85, 86; *cf.* 88, 97, 99, 145.

² *Ibid.*, I., 140.

³ *Ibid.*, I., 152. *Cf.* JANSSEN-PASTOR, VIII., 14th ed., 419 *seq.*

faith in Germany, Vergerio combined urgent representations that efforts should be made in Rome to supply so many endangered souls with the needed succour; he recommended especially the support of the literary champions who, like Eck in Bavaria, Cochläus in Saxony, Nausea on the Rhine, and Faber in the Austrian patrimonial states, were courageously defending the Catholic faith.¹ The behaviour of Clement in this particular matter is only too significant of his ecclesiastical policy. Already in 1530 Campeggio, and in 1532 Aleander, had called attention to the necessity of giving substantial help to these writers who were, for the most part, men of very slender means.² Cardinal Cles had discussed the matter personally with the Pope at Bologna and received the best assurances; nevertheless, by the spring of 1533 practically nothing had been done. Cles therefore made serious representations to Vergerio, and the Nuncio himself left nothing undone to advance the matter at Rome. He was even ready, he said, to spend 200 ducats from his own pocket on these learned men, if he could entertain the hope of being repaid.³ The attitude of the Curia also was a strange one. There was certainly no attempt to deny the necessity of supporting the Catholic men of learning, but a warning was given not to exceed the strictest economy in so doing, since the finances were in a very distressed condition; Ferdinand I., it was suggested, could do something much more easily.⁴ It is stranger still that even when the opportunity arose of contributing to the support of these scholars it was not made use of. In conformity with an evil custom of

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, I., 84, 141, 156.

² See LAEMMER, *Mon. Vatic.*, 59, 99, 119.

³ Nuntiaturberichte, I., 84, 89.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., 120. Cf. BIRCK in the *Preuss. Jahrb.*, LXXXV., 279.

long-standing, rich livings continued to be given to men who had no need of them. Thus in October 1533 a man who had already an income of 4000 ducats received 1000 ducats more in rents by the transference of some German benefices. Vergerio protested against this with justice; such a proceeding would give occasion of fresh complaint to numerous enemies of the Church, and drive the few deserving Catholic scholars to despair in their continual supplications for benefices.¹ Nevertheless, the Curia withheld any adequate support. In the following spring Vergerio could still report that the poor Catholic scholars were being starved to death; still, something might be done for them in Rome, for in Germany there were no benefices to dispose of; the few that were vacant he had bestowed upon them, but on account of certain reservations they were of no use. It was therefore urgently requisite that the Pope should supply them with support in hard cash;² no guarantee for such was given. Further, the Nuncio himself was so badly paid that he was not in a position to give pledges to any great extent.

All this proves how lacking in earnestness Clement VII. was as regards duties of an essentially ecclesiastical kind, and at the same time it shows how greatly he underestimated the danger with which the Papacy was threatened from the side of Germany. In this he was encouraged by the crafty King of France, who succeeded in producing the impression in Rome that the leaders of the Lutheran cause were dependent on France, and that French mediation would easily bring about an agreement with them.³

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, I., 134.

² *Ibid.*, I., 184.

³ See A. Soriano in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 304. The report was also then current in Rome that Francis intended to marry two of his

How little Clement appreciated the full significance of the politico-religious tendencies in Germany and how blindly in this respect he trusted in Francis I., is shown by his behaviour in a matter of great moment to the existence of the Church in southern Germany. In the spring of 1534 the Landgrave of Hesse, who received French support, began war for the restoration of the Protestant Duke Ulrich of Würtemberg to his duchy. Francis I. managed to conceal so cleverly from the Pope that the successful issue of this conflict would be the surrender of Würtemberg to Protestantism that Clement looked upon the Landgrave's whole enterprise as merely a counter-stroke to the private interests of the Hapsburgs, involving no danger to the Church.¹ The Ambassadors of Ferdinand I. sought in vain to turn him from this erroneous view, and in vain appealed to him for help. Clement assured them of his sympathy, but excused himself on the score of his exhausted treasury. The war, the Pope considered, misled by French misrepresentations,² was a personal contest in which he could not interfere unless the Landgrave did something against the Catholics; also, without the consent of the Sacred College, no such support as he was called upon to give would be possible.³ But among the Cardinals

daughters to Protestant German princes and thereby convert them to Catholicism; see the *letter of F. Peregrino of February 28, 1534 (in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), who certainly had reasonable doubts on the matter.

¹ Cf. SUGENHEIM, *Frankreichs Einfluss auf Deutschland*, I., 57 *seq.* RANKE (*Deutsche Gesch.*, III., 6th ed., 332, n.) supposes that Francis I. had given his word to the Pope that the Landgrave's enterprise would not entail any consequences to the Church.

² See HEYD, *Ulrich von Würtemberg*, Tübingen, 1841, II., 490-491.

³ See Sanchez' report of June 15 (not July), 1534, in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 247 *seq.*

Francis had secured a certain majority by means of liberal pensions,¹ thus preventing any help being given to Ferdinand.²

Accordingly, in a Brief of the 16th of June 1534, any support of Ferdinand was flatly refused.³ This inexcusable conduct called forth not merely at the courts of Charles and his brother, but also among the most loyal adherents of Rome in Germany, strong expressions of disapproval.⁴ Finally came Clement's behaviour in the question of the Council. In accordance with the engagements made at Marseilles the Pope had already, in March 1534, officially declared his determination to defer, until a more propitious and peaceable season, the Council announced in the previous year.⁵ In a letter from Duke George of Saxony to Vergerio the clearest expression is given to the bitterness aroused in the German Catholics at this fresh postponement by the Pope, under the influence of fear and his French sympathies. In this document the most Catholic of all the Catholic princes of Germany complains with vehemence that the Pope, in the question of the Council, has allowed himself to be befooled by Francis, the inveterate enemy of Germany. If the Roman Church, he exclaims in his indignation, were

¹ On October 19, 1533, G. M. della Porta *reported from Marseilles : "Il Re ha publicato voler dar pensione a tutti li rev^{mi} ch' anno seguitato N. S^{re} qua. (Medici was said to have had 10,000 *franchi*, Salviati and Ridolfi 5000 each, and so forth.) Se Roma non fosse ruinata, potriasi dir quelle parole : Urbem venalem cito perituram si emptorem invenerit" (Florentine State Archives).

² Cf. BUCHOLTZ, IX., 251 ; Nuntiaturberichte, I., 271, n.

³ RAYNALDUS, 1534, n. 16.

⁴ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, I., 271 *seq.*, 274 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. the letter of March 20 to Ferdinand I. in LAEMMER, Melet., 144 *seq.*, and that to the German Circles in EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., cvi.-cviii.

to lose 10,000 ducats of her revenues, excommunications would be hurled and swords drawn and all Christendom called upon for aid; but if a hundred thousand souls, through the fraud of the devil, are brought to ruin, the Chief Shepherd listens to the counsels of him who is continually bent on injuring and enslaving Christendom.¹ Utterances such as these, the violence of which could hardly be surpassed, were dictated by a genuine anxiety for fatherland and religion.

Under these circumstances it must be considered fortunate for the Church that the Pope's days were numbered.²

In June 1534 Clement VII. was taken ill;³ this was attributed to the agitation caused by the senseless conduct of his nephew Ippolito de' Medici.⁴ After a short improvement⁵ his condition changed for the worse, and gave rise to great anxiety. The doctors were uncertain as to the nature of the malady; some thought that the Pope had been poisoned on his journey from Marseilles, and accusations were not wanting in which the Florentines on one hand and the French on the other were charged with the crime.⁶ In

¹ See GESS, *Die Klostersvisitationen Herzog Georgs von Sachsen*, Leipzig, 1888, 48 *seq.*, and *Nuntiaturberichte*, I., 266, n.

² For Clement's weak behaviour towards the Margrave George of Brandenburg-Kulmbach see GESS in the elucidations to Janssen's *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, edited by Pastor, V., 312.

³ *Cf.* GUICCIARDINI, *Op. ined.*, IX., 297, and A. M. Papazzoni's *letter of June 20, 1534, in State Archives, Bologna. The first signs of indisposition were announced by him as early as May 30.

⁴ *Cf.* F. Peregrino's cipher *reports of June 19 and 25, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

⁵ *Cf.* A. M. Papazzoni's *letter of June 27, 1534, in State Archives, Bologna.

⁶ *Cf.* Sanchez' *letter of July 25, 1534, in Court and State Archives, Vienna.

reality his complaint was probably a gastric one, perhaps of a malignant character. As the doctors were unable to agree, Clement lost confidence in them ;¹ his condition meanwhile underwent extraordinary changes. At the beginning of July he seemed to have recovered,² but then followed a relapse of such a dangerous kind that he was reported to be dead,³ but this rumour, in consequence of which all Rome had taken to arms, was premature ; the strong constitution of the Pope was once more victorious, and by the beginning of August he showed a marked improvement.⁴ On the 30th of July he had made his will, by which Florence was left to Alessandro and all his remaining possessions to Cardinal Ippolito.⁵

Rome was not then in a healthy condition, and many deaths occurred in the ranks of the Sacred College. On the 19th of July 1534 Enkevoirt died ;⁶ on the 4th of August

¹ Cf. the *report of July 25, 1534, published by TEZA in the Atti. d. Ist. Venet., 6th series, VII., 902 ; here also for information on the Pope's physicians. A. M. Papazzoni speaks expressly of a gastric complaint in his *reports of June 20, 1534, in the State Archives, Bologna. That Clement VII., like Leo X., also suffered from a fistula, is mentioned by Card. Gonzaga in a *report of October 19, 1532, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

² See F. Peregrino's *letter of July 6, 1534, in Appendix, No. 36.

³ See Sanchez' *report of July 28, 1534, in Court and State Archives, Vienna. "Omnia Romae armis scotent," he says.

⁴ See the *letter of C. H. Denonville, Bishop of Macon, dated Rome, 1534, August 4, in MSS. franç. 2968, f. 86, National Library, Paris ; the *report of Sanchez of August 8, 1534, in Court and State Archives, Vienna, and Peregrino's *letters of August 10 and 14, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Cf. TEZA, *loc. cit.*, 905 *seq.*

⁵ Giorn. d. Arch. Toscani, II., 126 *seq.* ; cf. Carte Strozzi., I., 106. For his anxiety about Ippolito see also Appendix, No. 36.

⁶ *Letter of Sanchez of July 25, 1534, in Court and State Archives Vienna. *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library. Cf. SCHMIDLIN, 290 *seq.*

he was followed by Cardinal della Valle.¹ The renowned Cajetan was also stricken with grievous illness, and died in the night of the 9th or early on the 10th of August. It was the wish of this high-minded and learned Cardinal to be buried in the simplest manner.²

The Pope, meanwhile, continued to improve, although he was still very weak.³ On the 18th of August, while the Romans were filled with alarm⁴ at the news of the sack of Fondi by the pirates employed by Chaireddin Barbarossa, the city was moved to its depths by the announcement that the Pope was lying between life and death owing to a renewed attack of fever and sickness.⁵ On the following day Clement's condition seemed so dangerous that on the evening of the 24th of August he received Extreme Unction. The day after that death seemed certain; fever was exhausting his strength, and as he lay writhing in cramp

¹ *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, *loc. cit.* Sanchez, who announced the decease on August 8, speaks in the *letter with anxiety of the preponderance of Frenchmen in the Sacred College (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² According to Sanchez' *letter to Ferdinand I. of August 17, 1534, Cajetan died on the 10th (ECHARD, II., 15, gives the 9th): "jussit se sepeliri sine ulla pompa"; he was "homo integer vitæ et servitor V. et Ces. M^{ts}" (Court and State Archives, Vienna). For Cajetan's tomb see CARDELLA, IV., 45, and FORCELLA, I., 443.

³ See Trivulzio in MOLINI, II., 370, and Sanchez' *letter of August 17, 1534, in Court and State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ Cf. the *reports of F. Peregrino of August 10 and 14, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and Sanchez, *loc. cit.* Cf. also GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2; Corp. dipl. Port., III., 85; BALAN, Clemente VII., 214; FUMI, Ippolito de' Medici, 66.

⁵ See Sanchez' *report in Court and State Archives, Vienna, and *that of F. Peregrino of August 18, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. For the excitement and fear of Turkish invasion in Rome during the Pope's long illness see FANTINI, Lettera dei successi di Roma per l' infermità di Clemente VII., Roma, 1534.

he rejected all nourishment.¹ But again, in the beginning of September, there was another sudden change for the better. Notwithstanding their patient's great exhaustion, the doctors believed that he would make another rally.² The vital crisis lasted until the 8th of September;³ after that his condition daily became more hopeful.⁴ Giberti visited the sick man, whose delight at seeing his old and trusted friend was intense.⁵ "The improvement continues," reported Ferdinand's Ambassador on the 21st of September: "The Pope talks with those about him and laughs over the manœuvres and ambition of the Cardinals. He still has a certain amount of fever; the court oscillates between hope and fear; but the former predominates so greatly that all conclave intrigues have ceased."⁶ But on

¹ See the full *reports of F. Peregrino of August 19, 22, 23, 24, and 25, in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. F. Chierigati's *letter of August 26, 1534 (the Pope received Extreme Unction "et S. Sta per due volte rispose Amen"), *loc. cit.* Also BASCHET, 352 *seq.*; TEZA *loc. cit.*, 909; FUMI, Ipp. de' Medici, 67; Carte Strozzi., I., 104.

² See besides F. Peregrino's *letter of September 4, 1534 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), the *copy of a letter dated Rome, 1534, August 28, in the *Romana* of Court and State Archives, Vienna. *Cf. ibid.*, Sanchez' *report of August 30, 1534; the *Diarium of P. P. Gualterius in Secret Archives of the Vatican; Corp. dipl. Port., III., 87, and FUMI, 67 *seq.*

³ See the *letter of Sanchez of September 18, 1534, in Court and State Archives, Vienna. *Cf. COSTANTINI*, Card. di Ravenna, 225.

⁴ See F. Peregrino's *letters of September 15 and 17, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

⁵ See Sanchez' *letter of September 18, 1534, in Court and State Archives, Vienna. *Cf. the* *letters of Cardinal E. Gonzaga to Covos and G. Agnello of September 19, 1534, in Cod. Barb., lat. LXII., 48, Vatican Library, and the *Aviso of September 14, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

⁶ The last remark is in cipher. *Sanchez on September 21, 1534 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

this very 21st of September there came a permanent change for the worse. The fever increased in intensity and day by day his strength ebbed away.¹ On the 25th of September, three hours after midday, Clément VII. was released from his sufferings after hovering for a month between life and death.²

Many troubles had combined against him during his last days. While corsairs were plundering his coasts and filling Rome with terror,³ his own position between Francis I. and Charles V. was one of acute anxiety.⁴ Then a dangerous quarrel threatened to break out in his own family; Cardinal Ippolito, whose dissolute life had already

¹ See the *reports of F. Peregrino of September 22 and 25, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; of *Sanchez, September 23 and 25, in Court and State Archives, Vienna, and the *letters of Cardinal E. Gonzaga to the Duke of Mantua of September 23 and 24, 1534, in Cod. Barb., *cit.* Cf. FUMI, 70.

² "Hora tertia post meridiem," says Sanchez in his first *letter, September 25, 1534, in Court and State Archives, Vienna. Cf. Cardinal E. Gonzaga's *letter of September 25, 1534, to G. I. Calandra, in Cod. Barb., lat. LXII., 48, Vatican Library; F. Peregrino's *report of September 25, 1534, and *that of Guido da Crema of the same day (he died "christianamente et quietamente") in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; the *Diary of P. P. Gaulterius in Secret Archives of the Vatican and the *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library. See also GATTICUS, 442; Firmanus in STEINMANN, II., 110. Cf. STAFFETTI, 126; BALAN, Clemente VII., 215, and Storia, 272; Corp. dipl. Port., III., 116 *seq.*; GORI, Archivio, IV., 248 *seq.*; Rime e lett. di v. Gambara, 211, note; FUMI, 70, and L. Granae oratio in funere Clementis VII., in Anecd. litt., IV., 255 *seq.*

³ On February 22, 1534, Clement VII. addressed a *letter to all the authorities of the Papal States with reference to preventive measures. Min. brev., vol. 48, n. 83, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

⁴ See Soriano in ALBERI, 2nd Series, III., 308-309. The Colonna were also a trouble to the Pope in the summer of 1534; see ALBERINI, 382 *seq.* There was also the insolent behaviour of B. Accolti; see Giorn. di lett. Ital., XXXIX., 229.

caused him many hours of care,¹ wished to renounce the purple in order to expel Alessandro de' Medici from Florence.² In order that this "foolish devil," as Clement once called his nephew, might be otherwise employed he bestowed upon him, on the 5th of September 1534, the Legation of the Marches, which Accolti was obliged to vacate.³ In the delirium of fever Clement was still occupied with the prospects of his nephews, and one of the last briefs of the dying Pope, addressed on the 23rd of September to the Emperor, contained, besides the entreaty that he should care for the interests of Italy and the Church, a warm recommendation of Ippolito and Alessandro.⁴ The trusted Carnesecchi was to be the bearer of the letter.⁵

The mortal remains of Clement VII. were at first laid in St. Peter's and afterwards transferred to S. Maria sopra Minerva. There on the right side of the choir, opposite the tomb of Leo X., Baccio Bandinelli, from plans drawn up by Sangallo, erected a monument to Clement VII. in the form of an antique triumphal arch in white marble that might be mistaken for the monument of his cousin. In the central niche is a seated statue of Clement,

¹ See the *report of G. M. della Porta of May 15, 1532, in State Archives, Florence, and LUZIO, *Pronostico*, 143 *seq.*

² See Soriano, *loc. cit.*, 309. *Cf.* REUMONT, *Toskana*, I., 58 *seq.*; ROSSI, *Guicciardini*, II., 66, and LUZIO, *Pronostico*, 143 *seq.*

³ *Acta Consist.* in BALAN, *Clemente VII.*, 214.

⁴ In RAYNALDUS, 1534, n. 67. The last sentence here missing runs: "Sed haec M^{ti} Tuae dicet copiosius et particularius idem protonotarius, cujus verbis illa haud minorem fidem habere velit quam si nos praesentes eam alloqueremur." *Dat.*, etc., *Blosius*. *Min. brev.*, vol. 48, n. 341, in Secret Archives of the Vatican. *Cf.* also the *letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga in *Cod. Barb.*, *cit.*

⁵ *Cf.* *Nuntiaturberrichte*, I., 120, note, and AGOSTINI, P. *Carnesecchi*, Firenze, 1899.

sculptured by Nanni di Baccio Bigio, surmounted by a relief representing the coronation of Charles V. In the niches on either side are statues of St. Jerome and St. John the Baptist; the reliefs above show the former saint in the desert, and the Baptist in the act of preaching.¹ There is hardly another spot in Rome conducive to more serious reflection than these tombs of the two Popes of the house of Medici. Differing widely in character and fortunes they were both, in their pontificates, of momentous import to the Church.

Clement has been called the most unlucky of all the Popes.² This verdict is justified not merely as regards his reign but as regards his memory. It was astonishing how quickly he was forgotten in Rome.³ The Romans remembered only the misfortunes of his reign, his financial disasters, and his heavy taxation; ⁴ they no longer recalled

¹ Cf. CIACONIUS, III., 473 *seq.*; LITTA, Medici, 124; KENNER, 145, and Zeitschr. für bild. Kunst, XI., 141 *seqq.* For the first sketch see WICKHOFF in Jahrb. der kunsthistor. Samml. des österr. Kaiserhauses, XIII., cclxxx., No. 212.

² RANKE, Pápste, I., 6th ed., 82. Cf. GUICCIARDINI in Arch. Stor. Ital., 5th Series, V., 51, note 1. See also MATHIEU, Pouvoir Temp. des Papes, Paris, 1863, 496.

³ See ROSSI, Guicciardini, II., 70. Cf. F. Peregrino's *letter of September 24, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

⁴ Clement VII., whose total income is computed by Foscari in 1526 at 499,000 ducats against an expenditure of 412,250 ducats (ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 139), suffered from the first from the prodigality of Leo X. (see *op. cit.*, 269) and from the stoppage of the sums of money which, in earlier days, had come in from Germany (cf. on this point SANUTO, LIII., 16). The gravest incident, from the financial side, in Clement's reign was the duplication of the public debt, for in addition to the "offici vacabili," which ceased with the death of the owner, there were the "monti non vacabili" or simply "monti." A beginning was made in 1526 of raising money through consolidated loans by the erection of the "monte della fede" with a capital of

the judicious regulations of the deceased Pope for the commissariat of the city.¹

Clement VII. has had no biographer, and almost all the historians of his time, with Guicciardini and Giovio at

200,000 ducats and 200 "luoghi" (shares), with interest at ten per cent. paid through the Customs (*cf.* COPPI, Discorso s. finanze d. stato pontif. dal sec. xvi al xix, Roma, 1855, 3, and RANKE, Pápste, I., 6th ed., 266 *seq.*). To 1526 also belongs the "monte di sale ed oro" (284,000 ducats, interest at 8 per cent.). These loans were totally inadequate to meet the enormous ransom demanded by the Imperial army in 1527. A third loan, on the "monte del macinato" (290,000 ducats), had to be taken up, thus raising the new public debt to 774,800 ducats (COPPI, *loc. cit.*, 3-4). The sack of the city, the expedition against Florence, on which two millions must have been spent, and the Turkish war also led to fresh burdens of expense and to the sale of Church property and Legations (see REUMONT, III., 2, 285 *seq.*; *cf.* ADEMOLLO in the Riv. Europ., 1877, II., 421). Much of the aversion to Clement VII. in Rome (*cf.* the *Diary of Cornelius de Fine, National Library, Paris, even from the year 1526, and JOVIUS, Columna, 157) and elsewhere (*cf.* TIZIO, Hist. Senen. in Cod. G II., 39, f. 366, of the Chigi Library, Rome) was due to the levies of taxation. Even the Italian clergy offered, in many places, a violent opposition to the Papal demands for tithes; see LANCELOTTI, IV., 310 *seq.*, 325 *seq.*, 332 *seq.*, 370 *seq.*

¹ Clement's agricultural policy has generally been praised as enlightened; *cf.* BENIGNI, Getreidepolitik der Pápste, 25, 32 *seq.*, 123; REUMONT, III., 2, 289 *seq.*; NAUDÉ in Schmoller's Jahrb. des Deutschen Reiches, 1899, N.F., XXIII., 3, 10. The famous "Bulla de agricultura in districto urbis" of February 26, 1524 (Bull. VI., 56-62, incorrectly dated; according to *Regest. Vatic., 1245, f. 269-277, we ought to read IV. Cal. Martii), for which TRIPEPI (Papato, VII., 221), ZAMA (Agro Romano, Roma, 1879, 54 *seq.*), and ARDANT (Papes et Paysans, 47, 127 *seq.*) are still consulted, was enlarged by a second constitution on August 1, 1524; see DECUPIS, Per gli usi civici nell' agro Romano, Roma, 1906, 20. The troubles of the war made these excellent regulations of no effect. In 1529 a "carestia incredibile" was reigning in Rome; see Contarini in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 262; REUMONT, III., 2, 290.

their head, pass severe judgments upon him.¹ Even those who recognize his praiseworthy qualities, his piety, purity of life, and indefatigable love of work, blame "the coldness of his heart, his indecision, his weakness coupled with duplicity, his pettiness of spirit."² To judge with fairness it ought to be borne in mind that Clement in many instances had to expiate the sins of his predecessors, that only too often he was the victim of circumstances for the existence of which he was not responsible. Terrible was the retribution brought on him for the introduction of the Spaniards into Naples by Alexander VI. Vettori has already pointed out that "Clement VII. was not cruel, nor proud, nor a simonist, nor avaricious, nor dissolute, but temperate, simple, pious, zealous in the fulfilment of his religious duties — nevertheless, upon him and Rome came dire calamity, and others who were full of vices lived and died happily as far as this world goes."³

Even granting that this eulogy is just, yet the second Medici Pope cannot escape the reproach that during his eleven years' pontificate he never showed himself competent to deal with the difficulties of the situation. Incapable of large calculations, he allowed himself to be led by petty considerations when great interests were at stake. Timid in the extreme, he only arrived at a decision slowly and then was easily induced to alter it, for he was only too prone to substitute for every good plan some other that he considered better. With him "the fresh hues of determination were sicklied o'er with the pale

¹ Both certainly are by no means impartial; see BALAN, *Clemente VII.*, 216. For the pasquinades on the Pope's death see *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXI., 401, 402, 405.

² REUMONT, III., 2, 266.

³ VETTORI, 381; GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 3rd ed., 641.

cast of thought." He was entirely wanting in masterly initiative and courageous decision. What the reign of so irresolute a personality must inevitably produce has been hit off to perfection by Berni in an epigram of excessive bitterness:¹

" Un papato composto di rispetti
 Di considerazioni e di discordi,
 Di piu, di poi, di ma, di si di forsi
 Di pur, di assai parole senza effetti."

The most regrettable feature of Clement's pontificate was his absorption in politics and family interests, whereby he was blinded to the specially spiritual tasks of the Papacy, the most essential thing of all. Consequently he must undoubtedly bear a share of the blame for the loss of great portions of Germany to the Church. Clement was not sufficiently informed on German affairs, and therefore did not realize the momentum with which events were developing. If Germany was the central point of the interest of Adrian VI., the very reverse was the case with Clement VII. At first greatly disturbed by Luther's success, he was too much a Medici to allow anxiety for Germany to take precedence of political and Italian preoccupations.² By making himself the centre of resistance to Charles V. he allowed the politico-ecclesiastical upheaval in the German Empire to have full scope. Later on he swung between two extremes, between plans of forcible suppression of the reformers and plans of mutual agreement. A temporizer by nature, he was incapable of

¹ BERNI, Rime, ed. Virgili, 43 *seq.*; *cf.* VIRGILI, Berni, 100 *seq.*, and REUMONT, III., 2, 268.

² I refer in this connection to a hitherto unnoticed remark of Vergerio's. He wrote on July 1, 1535, to Aretino: "Tutte le faccende di Clemente erano rivolte in ogni altro luogo che in Germania"; Lett. al Aretino, I., 179. *Cf.* also CREIGHTON, V., 249.

a strong, clearly defined course of action, all the more so as the King of France cleverly kept him deceived as to the dangers in Germany.

His conduct in English affairs is also open to objection. The charge that the Pope, by his precipitate sentence of excommunication on Henry VIII., made himself responsible for the separation of England from the Holy See is certainly without justification.¹ On the other hand, it does not admit of doubt that he was wanting in the necessary resolution to intervene firmly and, before it was too late, place an imperative alternative before Henry VIII.² As the King had come forward decidedly against Luther his threats of apostasy had not been taken seriously at Rome where, hoping against hope, it was thought that time would cool the adulterous passion which had reached a pitch almost of frenzy. The Pope therefore adopted a dilatory policy, did not speak out at once and unmistakably, made unintelligible concessions, and even consented to the elevation to the episcopate of opponents of the Holy See. While the Curia still clung to the empty expectation that sooner or later some settlement must be reached, Henry was paving the way towards separation. However much Clement's weakness may admit of explanation from the point of view of human nature, it was inconsistent with the ideal of the high office with which he was invested,³ and did injury to the interests of the Church.⁴

¹ Against this view (see *Hist. Zeitschr.*, XXXIX., 451 *seq.*; *cf.* PIEPER in the *Hist.-polit. Bl.*, XCIV., 482 *seq.*), which later was also widely spread in Rome, see LINGARD, VI., 226 *seq.*, note, and FERET in the *Rev. d. quest. hist.*, 1898, II., 85 *seq.*

² *Hist. Jahrb.*, XIV., 923.

³ RANKE (*Englisch. Gesch.*, I., 177) calls attention to this.

⁴ "What a different shape things would have taken" is the opinion of ZIMMERMANN (*Wissensch. Beil. zur Germania*, 1906, No. 6), "if

Clement had no greater success in his European policy than he had in Church affairs. Employing with restless activity all the arts of a diplomatist of the Renaissance and conducting all his undertakings with cleverness and acumen, he yet achieved nothing. His constantly shifting policy, the outcome of over-subtlety and a lack of courage and stability, could produce only small results. In all great questions his policy completely broke down, and involved him in incessant discomfiture.¹ Clement VII. dug the grave of Italian freedom, while the great political authority of the Papacy moved steadily to its downfall. Nothing but misfortune attended Clement's purely political machinations, so much so that one might be tempted to see therein a sign that Providence was bent on once more leading back the Papacy to its special vocation. This much was evident when Clement passed away; all his political schemes had come to nothing; the road along which he had travelled was henceforth closed. A radical change was necessary if the Church was not to lose still more than she had already lost within the last few years.

The ill-fortune which set its stamp on the pontificate of Clement VII. also threw its shadow over his relations to literature, science, and art.

True to the traditions of his family, the Pope, during his Cardinalate, had already gathered round him a throng of poets and men of letters. To this day the Vatican Library preserves an imposing series of works dedicated to him at this period.²

Rome had made public the document so deeply compromising to the King, if the Pope had exposed to light the whole course of the marriage proceedings."

¹ Cf. VOIGT-HAUCK in Herzog's Realencyklopädie, IV., 3rd ed., 147.

² Cod. Vatic., 3641; *Francisci Priscianensis in hymnos secundum

It is easy to imagine the delight with which, on the death of the unsympathetic Adrian VI., the election of such a man as Giulio de' Medici was hailed in literary circles.¹ Amid eulogies of the house of Medici, always

Romanam Curiam Castigationes cum metrorum reformatione (dat. ex Florentia Nonis Sextilib. 1517).

5797: *Vetirii Rubei Lictii Carmen sive somnus de Italia et Insubria a Gallis oppressa.

5798: *Andr. Daxii Sylva.

5800: *Christ. Marcelli (archiep. Corcyr.) Dialogus de fato Julidas inscriptus.

5801: *Christ. Marcelli (archiep. Corcyr.) Quaestio de cadentis Angeli ordine.

5802: *Luciani Dialogi maritimi interprete Livio Guidolacto Urbinate.

5803: *Octavii Roscii Carmina (with his miniature: the poet presenting his work to the Cardinal).

5804: *Zachar. de Rhodigio, Quaestio de donatione Constantini (the latter still exists *de jure!*).

5805: *Opusculum incerti auctoris contra medicos qui negligunt astronomiam in medendis aegritudinibus.

5806: Pii Bononiens. Tropheum Julii Card. Medicis de victoria contra Gallos habita in Insubria (carmen bucolic.).

5807: *Bernardi Guicciardini (monachi) Opusculum angelicum (on the angels, after S. Thomas Aquinas).

5808: *Aegidii Viterbi (ord. S. Aug. gen.) Explanatio litterar. hebraicar.

5809-5810: *Guidi Posthumi Silvestr. Elegiar. lib.

5811: *Jacobi Argyropuli Epistola (dedicating to him the work of his father Johannes, De institutione eorum qui sunt in dignitate).

5812: *Franc. Speruli Villa Julia Medica versibus fabricata. Almost all these MSS. are the original dedication copies. To this period also belongs the work of P. Bembo: "Prose nelle quali si ragiona della volgar lingua scritte al Card. de Medici (poi Clemente VII.)," Firenze, 1549, and often reprinted. Cf. NARDUCCI, Catal., 632; Atti d. Lincei, 4th Series, X., 15; Lett. d. princ., I., 117^b; TIRABOSCHI, VII., 2, 382; REUMONT, IIJ., 2, 364.

¹ Cf. Lett. d. princ., I., 101, 102.

the patron of the learned, the return of the golden age was proclaimed in prose and verse, and many voices began to celebrate the events of the new reign.¹

Clement VII. had every wish to continue the traditions of Leo X. In spite of the misfortunes of the time he did more in this respect than is commonly supposed.² Among his secretaries names of note appear early: Angelo Colocci, Blosio Palladio, Evangelista Tarasconio, Giovanni Battista Sanga, Sadoletto.³ The latter, however, returned in April 1527 to his diocese of Carpentras. Pietro Bembo also had friendly relations with Clement VII. through letters and dedications, and saw the Pope during the Jubilee year of 1525, and afterwards at the first meeting of the latter with Charles V. at Bologna.⁴ On this occasion Romolo Amaseo delivered before the Emperor and Pope his oration on the Latin language which excited an admiration that is hardly intelligible at the present day.⁵

¹ Cf. *Capit. in laude del S.S. N.S. P. Clemente VII. et della sua ill. et fel. casa de Medici composto et scripto per Jacomo Bartholi, 1523; Cod. Vatic., 3700, of the Vatican Library. Raimondo Lepido da Sulmona published in 1523 a poem on the coronation of Clement VII.; see PANSA in the *Rasseg. abruzzese*, IV., 10. See also C. Silvani Germanici In pontificatum Clementis VII. panegyris prima, Romae, 1524, and C. Ursini Velii Germani ad Rhodum gratulatio ob Clementis VII. electionem, Romae, 1524. Ant. Ferrosius* says already in 1524: "Reversa sunt Saturnia regna"; Cod. Vatic., 4125, f. 206 (Vatican Library). How quickly Clement's parsimony dispelled the illusion, see SANUTO, XXXVI., 388.

² See CIAN in *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XVII., 386.

³ See TIRABOSCHI, VII., 3, 214; RENAZZI, II., 81; GIORDANI, App., 122, 124, 126; JOLY, 134 *seq.*; *Histor.-polit. Bl.*, XCV., 929 *seq.*

⁴ See MAZZUCHELLI, II., 2, 743; a mark of favour of Clement VII. for P. Bembo in the *Regest. Vatic., 1527, f. 88 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ See FLAMINI, 98, and CIAN in *Miscell. in onore di A. Graf. Bergamo*, 1903.

The attention bestowed by Clement VII. on the Vatican Library¹ is shown remarkably in this; that, following in the steps of Leo X. he took measures, notwithstanding the necessitous times, to increase the printed and manuscript treasures of this collection. Thus, in the year 1526, Johann Heitmers, who had already been entrusted with a literary mission in 1517, was again sent to the North to make fresh discoveries.² He was assisted by the Dominican Wilhelm Carnifex, whose activity Clement sought to encourage in every way.³ The Pope on this occasion was not merely recalling the exertions of Leo X.; he bore expressly in mind those of Cosimo, Giuliano, and Lorenzo de' Medici in finding out new Greek, Latin, and Hebrew manuscripts.⁴ If the Pope hoped by these searches after manuscript treasures to confer an advantage also on religion in the hour of danger, this may be explained by the fact that a clue was supposed to have been found to the existence of a valuable manuscript of St. Paul's Epistles.⁵ From the Gonzaga, Clement borrowed a manuscript of Eustathius to which Lascaris had called his attention.⁶ The Pope, who was also interested in the reform of the calendar,⁷ is entitled to special honour for

¹ Cf. MÜNTZ, *Bibl.*, 65 *seq.*

² Cf. the Brief of January 17, 1526, to Christian of Denmark in *Dipl. Norvegic.*, VI., 2, 736 *seq.*

³ Cf. the *pass for Carnifex and the *Brief to the Dominicans in Ghent, January 17, 1526 (*Secret Archives of the Vatican*), in *Appendix*, Nos. 3 and 27.

⁴ See in *Appendix*, No. 2, the remarkable *pass of January 17, 1526.

⁵ *Dipl. Norvegic.*, VI., 2, 736 *seq.*, 756.

⁶ See *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIII., 25 *seq.*

⁷ See MARZI, 215 *seq.*; also 51, for the dedication of a writing by P. a Middelburg. Cf. *Atti d. congress. stor. di Roma*, III. (1906), 649, for the dedicated works of R. Cervini.

the attitude he assumed towards the new system of Nicolas Copernicus; in 1533 he ordered the learned Johann Albert Widmanstadt to explain it in the gardens of the Vatican.¹

Clement VII. also had friendly relations with Erasmus, who tactfully greeted the Pope on his accession by presenting him with a copy of his paraphrase of the Acts of the Apostles; he also wrote a very respectful letter in which he apologized for the imprudent tone of his earlier writings by saying that at that time he could not have anticipated the outbreak of the religious divisions. Clement VII. thanked him in a very kind letter on the 3rd of April 1524, accompanied by a present of 200 gold gulden; he exhorted Erasmus to place his talents at the service of the Church, and assured him that his enemies would be ordered to hold their peace.² On this friendly footing they continued to stand, all the more so when Erasmus, in the autumn of 1524, attacked the heart of the Lutheran doctrine in its denial of the freedom of the will.³ Clement so highly appreciated⁴ the outspoken opposition of Erasmus to Luther that in 1527 he imposed silence on the Spanish opponents⁵ of the former,

¹ See MARINI, II., 351, and *Histor.-polit. Bl.*, LXIII., 497 *seq.*; PROWE, I., 2, 273 *seq.* Cf. COSTANZI, *La Chiesa e le dottrine cop.*, Roma, 1893.

² See ERASMI, *Opp.*, III., 1, 783, VII., 651 *seq.*, and BALAN, *Mon. ref.*, 324, and *Mon. saec.*, XVI., 10 *seq.*, 12 *seq.*; cf. HARTFELDER, 148.

³ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, VII., 14th ed., 576. There is an *entry in the account books under October 24, 1524: "10 duc. a uno chorier che portò uno libro di Erasmo a S. S^{ta}" (State Archives, Florence, S. Maria Novella, 327).

⁴ Cf. BALAN, *Mon. ref.*, 380.

⁵ See VILLA, 253; BAUMGARTEN, *Karl V.*, II., 631; EHSSES in the *Röm. Quartalschr.*, 1894, 477; MAURENBRECHER, *Kathol. Ref.*, 270, 406. That Maurenbrecher attributes much too great a part to Erasmus

and kept silence himself regarding Erasmus' own attempts to bring about a reconciliation, which were in part not easy to understand, and the objections to which had been brought before the Pope's notice.¹ If Clement had hitherto always kept himself aloof from the learned controversies between the friends and foes of Erasmus, he now thought it a counsel of expediency that such a man should be spared as much as possible and that he should express himself satisfied with his assurances of loyalty.²

Among the poets to whom Clement VII. extended his favour, Sannazaro and Vida hold the first place. The former dedicated to the Pope, in the autumn of 1526, his celebrated poem on the Nativity of Christ, to the appearance of which Leo X. had looked forward so eagerly. Seripando had the honour of presenting the work to the Pope, who, in a Brief composed by Sadoleto, thanked the poet, for whom he foretold an immortality of renown.³ The Pope's invitation to come to Rome was declined by Sannazaro on account of the period of calamity which had begun to break over the Eternal City. He remained in Naples, where he found his resting-place in the church of his own foundation, S. Maria del Porto on the Mergellina. His monument, the work of Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, does not discredit the pupil of Michael Angelo. The tomb is flanked by marble statues of Apollo and Minerva;⁴ inscriptions added by a later hand have

is well brought out in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, LIII., 155. For the Spanish affair of Erasmus see HESS, *Erasmus*, I., 317 *seq.*, and MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, *Hist. de los heterodoxos españ.*, II., 36 *seq.*

¹ See *Nuntiaturberichte*, I., 138, 139. For the proposals of mediation see JANSSEN-PASTOR, VII., 14th ed., 576 *seq.*, and DITTRICH, in *Histor. Jahrb.*, II., 613 *seq.*

² *Cf.* BUCHOLTZ, I., 469; *Histor. Zeitschr.*, LIII., 155.

³ *Cf.* ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 87 *seq.*, 533 *seq.*

⁴ *Cf.* B. CROCE, *La tomba di G. Sannazaro*, Trani, 1892.

transformed these figures into a David and a Judith. Strange as is the admission into a Christian church of these two pagan deities, they are yet strikingly appropriate in the case of a poet like Sannazaro, who in his works indulged to excess in illustrations drawn from heathen mythology.¹

Vida, still at work on his *Christiade*, begun under Leo X., was made Bishop of Alba² by Clement VII. However fitting this post may have been for the poet, the bishopric of Nocera de' Pagani was certainly not the place for Paolo Giovio the historian, appointed in 1528.³ Giovio badly requited the favour shown to him by Clement.

Early in 1524 Francesco Guicciardini was made President of the Romagna, where a very bad state of things prevailed; he succeeded, although his task was often made difficult from Rome, in restoring order.⁴ The part taken by him in the campaigns subsequent to the League of Cognac has been already narrated. After a short interval of rest he re-entered the Papal service in 1530 and gave valuable assistance towards the

¹ See the remarks, Vol. V. of this work, p. 141 *seq.*, and Vol. VIII., p. 202 *seq.*

² See Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 200 *seq.*, the writings quoted, and VAIRINI, Mon. Crem., II., 8 *seq.*, 109.

³ See Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XVII., 300; *cf. ibid.*, XXXVI., 385 *seq.*, the characteristic letter of Giovio of 1524. On July 6, 1527, Clement wrote *ex arce* to Lannoy that he had chosen the eminent physician and historian P. Giovio for the vacant bishopric of Nocera; Lannoy might see to it that Giovio obtains possession. In that way he can confer an obligation on the historian of present events (*Min. brev., 1527, vol. 14, n. 132). A "licencia testandi usque ad 2000 duc." for "P. Jovius" in *Brev., 1533, vol. 53, n. 407. Other favours shown to P. Giovio in *Regest. Vatic., 1252, f. 139^b *seq.*, and 1438, f. 118^a and 129^b (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ BROSCH, I., 77 *seq.*

restoration of the Medicean rule in Florence. From June 1531 Guicciardini was Vice-Legate of Bologna, and not merely here but in other directions also, especially against Ferrara, he rendered most important services to the policy of the house of Medici.¹

Machiavelli visited Clement VII. in 1525 in order to present him with the five books of his Florentine history. His reception was gracious, and a gift of 100 ducats was accorded him. He made use of this occasion to recommend to the Pope his old plan of a national militia. Clement for a moment seemed disposed to enter into the scheme, but he very soon drew back from the dangerous undertaking.²

In spite of their dissolute lives Agnolo Firenzuola and Francesco Berni³ received tokens of favour from the Pope. From 1524 Berni was secretary to the Datary Giberti, who with extraordinary patience and certainly with too great indulgence put up for a considerable time with the eccentric behaviour of the highly talented poet; but at last he had to be dismissed. At a later date Berni attached himself to the court of Ippolito de' Medici, of all the Cardinals the most devoted to pomp, enjoyment, and secularity.⁴

¹ Cf. ZANONI, Vita pubbl. di F. Guicciardini, Bologna, 1896; Nuova Antologia, 4th Series, LXVII., 459 *seq.*; ROSSI, F. Guicciardini e il gov. fiorent., Bologna, 1896 *seqq.* (2 vols.); Arch. Stor. Ital., 5th Series, V., 20 *seq.*, XI., 386 *seq.* For the Bolognese Legation see TEZA in the Atti d. Ist. Venet., 6th Series, XIII., 897 *seq.*

² See VILLARI, Machiavelli, III., 2nd ed., 326 *seq.*

³ Cf. GUERRINI, Le novelle di A. Firenzuola, Firenze, 1886, 173, and Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XIX., 172; see also KRAUS, Geschichte der christlichen Kunst, II., Bd. II., 1, 18 *seq.*

⁴ See VIRGILI, 95 *seq.*, 120 *seq.*, 433 *seq.*, and REUMONT in the Allgem. Zeitung, 1881, Beil. 250; cf. also FERRAJOLI in Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XLV., 67 *seq.* For Ip. de' Medici's brilliant court see JOVIUS, Elogia vir. bell. virt. ill., Florentiae, 1551, 273 *seq.*

Berni's irreconcilable enemy appears in the person of Pietro Aretino, the master of the art of scandalous pasquinade, of which he considered himself to have the monopoly.¹ The friction between the two dated from the very beginning of Clement's reign, into whose favour Aretino had already insinuated himself. Berni liked Giberti as much as Aretino detested him. Although Giberti's opponents, Girolamo da Schio and Schönberg, took sides with Aretino, whose pen inspired fear, the latter got the worst of it and had to fly from Rome at the end of July 1524; but he was back again in November, now singing the praises of Clement² and receiving rewards for so doing.³ On a night in July in the following year Aretino was implicated in a stabbing affair and was wounded in several places. As his assailant was in Giberti's service and went unpunished, Aretino attacked the Datary in the bitterest terms and finally went on to revile the Pope also.⁴ The scandal was so great that he left Rome and joined Giovanni "delle Bande Nere." After the death of the latter he lived at the court of the Marquis of Mantua, from whence he launched forth such biting invectives against the Pope and the Roman court that Clement's confessor complained to the Mantuan envoy.⁵ Meanwhile Aretino had found a safe refuge in Venice. Here he displayed a most remunerative industry, for, by sending his poisoned shafts in every direction, he extorted huge sums of money from

¹ See LUZIO, P. Aretino e Pasquino, Roma, 1890.

² Laude di Clemente VII. (copy in the State Library, Munich); *cf.* Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXIX., 231 *seq.*

³ *1524 December 13: "50 duc. a Piero Aretino d' ordine di S. Sta" (State Archives, Florence, Sta. Maria Novella, 327).

⁴ See VIRGILI, 102 *seq.*, and BERTANI, 42, 45, 48 *seq.*; *cf.* Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XLIII., 193 *seq.*

⁵ See LUZIO, P. Aretino, 8 *seq.*, 62; *cf.* BERTANI, 32.

those highly placed in the world and the Church. The sack of Rome gave Aretino an opportunity for composing a touching elegy and a pasquinade of savage ferocity. The latter was of such a tenor that Clement flung it to the ground exclaiming, with tears: "Is it to be borne that a Pope should be spoken of in such cruel terms!"¹ This time Clement's displeasure lasted longer. Aretino's attempts, through influential persons, to obtain pardon were unavailing. It was only when no less a personage than the Doge Gritti himself applied to the Pope that he succeeded, in September 1530, in obtaining an official reconciliation. But the banishment from Rome continued in force, and so for a long time to come did the feelings of rancour and hatred in the mind of Aretino.²

The great throng of literati of all sorts, poets and men of learning, who since the days of his Cardinalate had been associated with Clement, would form a catalogue too long to enumerate. The following only may be mentioned: Zaccaria Ferreri,³ Bernardo Accolti,⁴ Giangiorgio Trissino,⁵ Giovanni Rucellai,⁶ Fra Sabba da Castiglione,⁷ Pietro Alcionio,⁸ Giglio Gregorio Giraldi,⁹ Andrea

¹ See LUZIO, *loc. cit.*, 13 *seq.*

² See LUZIO, *loc. cit.*, 29 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*, 50; *cf.* also MORSOLIN, G. da Schio, 68 *seq.*, and LUZIO, *Pronostico*, XVIII., 12, 79. For a condemnatory edict of Clement's of 1525, which certainly was not strongly enforced, see BONGI, *Annali di Gioliti*, I., xxxiv., II., 469 *seq.*, 483 *seq.*, and Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XX., 507 *seq.*

³ *Cf.* our remarks, Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 208 *seqq.*

⁴ See GUARNERA, Accolti, 117.

⁵ MORSOLIN, 117 *seqq.*, 125, 131; see also Vol. VIII., 218 *seq.*

⁶ *Cf.* MAZZONI, *Opere di G. Rucellai*, Bologna, 1887.

⁷ *Cf.* v. RANIERI, *Fra S. da Castiglione*, Lugo, 1821; GIORDANI, App. II, and the articles quoted by FLAMINI, 569.

⁸ MAZZUCHELLI, I., 1, 378.

⁹ *Cf.* WOTKE, L. G. *Gyraldus de poetis nostri temp.* (preface), Halle, 1894.

Fulvio,¹ Maria Fabio Calvo,² Pierio Valeriano,³ Johann Eck,⁴ Santes Pagnino,⁵ Cardinal Cajetan,⁶ Cristoforo Marcello,⁷ Antonio Pigafetta,⁸ Achille Bocchi,⁹ Stefano Joanninense,¹⁰ Giovanni Gennesio Sepulveda¹¹ Albert Pighius,¹² Giano Lascaris,¹³ and many others.¹⁴

¹ See A. Fulvii Antiquitates Urbis Romae, Praef. The licence is the composition of Sadoleto; *cf.* LANCIANI, I., 229.

² *Cf.* Vol. VIII. of this work, pp. 244, 248; GIORDANI, App. 65; CIACONIUS, III., 474, and LANCIANI, I., 240 *seq.*

³ See CALI, Valeriano, 27 *seq.*

⁴ CIACONIUS, III., 474.

⁵ For his translation of the Bible see ROSCOE, II., 165; ECHARD, II., 114, and Frieb. Kirchenlexikon, II, 2, 138, IX., 2, 1270.

⁶ Comment in Pentateuchum, Romae, 1531, and De fide et operibus adversus Lutheranos, both dedicated to Clement VII.; see NIEDNER, Zeitschr. für Theol., 1858, 455 *seq.*

⁷ Ch. Marcelli *In psalm: Diligam te Domine, fortitudo mea, expositio ad Clementem VII., Cod. Vatic., 3649, Vatican Library.

⁸ Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXIII., 39 *seq.* WIESER, Magelhaenstrasse, 48 *seq.*

⁹ *Cf.* GIORDANI, App. 62 *seq.*, and the *Brief of March 6, 1533, Arm., 39, vol. 53, n. 106, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

¹⁰ In Mediceam Monarchiam Pentatheucus ad div. Cle. Mediceum VII. P. M., Anconae, 1524. Very rare and of importance for history of Leo X.

¹¹ Graces for him of 1528 and 1530 in *Regest. Vatic., 1271, f. 19 *seq.*, and 1447, f. 175 *seq.*, of Secret Archives of the Vatican. On September 24, 1524, the *account books enter: "50 duc. a Giov. Sepulveda philosopho che traduce" (State Archives, Florence, S. Maria Novella, 327).

¹² *Cod. Vatic., 4575, and 6176: A. Pighius, De progymnasmatis geographicis, and 7804: Adversus Graecorum errores, both dedicated to Clement. Payments to Pighius in the *account books (Florentine) for 1526.

¹³ BALAN, Mon. saec., XVI., 209 *seq.*; NOLHAC, Bibl. de F. Orsini, 156 *seq.*

¹⁴ The following may be briefly mentioned: G. V. Bonomi (see MAZZUCHELLI, II., 3, 1683; FANTUZZI, II., 308) Cl. Tolomei (*ibid.*,

The sack of Rome brought ruinous loss to all men of 58), Cinzio de' Fabrizi (GRAF, Cinquecento, 378), G. Casio (see our remarks, Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 217 n.; FANTUZZI, III., 131, and Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXVIII., 59), Matteo Franco (NARDUCCI, Cat., 394), I. F. Ferretti (KEHR, Röm. Berichte, 1903, 87, 91). In addition to the dedications mentioned above (see *supra*, p. 334 n.) I also call attention to the following:—

Cod. Vatic., 3577: *Caroli Pinelli ord. praed. Epist. ad Clem. VII. (dedication copy with miniature).

3665: *Ad. S. D. N. Clem. VII. Petri Albiniani Tretii De confessione epistola (against the Lutherans; dedication copy with miniature).

3709: *Callisti Placentini [can. reg.] Dialogus ad Clem. VII. de recte regendo pontificatu (dedication copy).

3721: *G. T. Galli Epist. ad Clem. VII.

3728: *Hieron. Maripetri In. d. Francisci vitam, I. IX. ad Clem. VII.

3742: *Ant. Allii ep. Vult. de vitis et gestis sanctor, I. X. ad Nic. V. unacum epist. A. card. de Monte ad Clem. VII., cui hoc opus denuo transscriptum in melioremque formam reductum dedicat. See our remarks, Vol. II. of this work, p. 206.

3743: Hier. Balbi ep. Gurc. De virtutibus liber tertius ad Clem. VII. (*cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 474, and RETZER, 97 *seqq.*, 103 *seq.*, 107 *seq.*; ASCHBACH, Wiener Universität, II., 159).

5795: *P. Martyris Epist. ad Clem. VII. (*cf.* RAYNALDUS, 1523, n. 134 *seq.*).

5799: *A. Admoracti Granarien. Civit^{is} Florentiae Mediceorumque laudes (poem) ad Clem. VII.

5828: *J. Ferretti, Defensorium fidei sive de max. Sed. Ap. auctoritate contra omnes haereticos, with Praef. ad Clem. VII.

5829: *J. Ferretti, De ecclesia Dei in haereticos omnes ad Clem. VII.

Reg. 1980. Jacobi Flori (presb. Samnitis e Fonte Roseo), Fasti christiani sive de sanctor. gestis ad Clem. VII. versu hexametro.

Barb. XXIX., 166 (lat. 1822): *Balac Arimin. Epist. ad Clem. VII. (1528).

Barb. XXXIV., 64 (lat. 2747): *Evangel. Tarasconii Parmen. ad Clem. VII. in calamitatum Italiae comment., lib. IV.

Barb. XXXII., 73 (lat. 2282): *Io. Staphylei In bullam Julii II. super elect. Rom. pontif. (dedicated to Clement VII.).

To Clement VII. and Giberti is dedicated *the History of the Turks

letters living there, while many perished.¹ The humanist Pierio Valeriano described the fate of individuals in his well-known treatise "On the Misfortunes of the Learned."² The Roman University was completely ruined. Clement VII. had shown the greatest interest in its erection, and gave orders that the buildings should be restored. He failed, indeed, in securing the services of Erasmus, but was successful in his invitations to many other scholars.³ The Papal archives and the Vatican Library also suffered badly in the year of misfortune 1527, but Clement VII. made vigorous efforts to make good the losses.⁴

The consequences of the sack were perhaps more disastrous for art than for literature. Not merely had the whole brilliant group of painters, sculptors, and goldsmiths been scattered in all directions, and many of their works destroyed, but the exhaustion of the finances was injurious, for it made all work impossible for a great length of time, and then, when the worst difficulties had been overcome, no one was able to come forward as a general patron of the arts. In this respect, too, Clement VII. differed from

by Teod. Spandugnino Cantacusino in *Addit. MS.* 15316 of the British Museum, London. Gammarus dedicated to Clement VII. his Commentary on the Bull of Julius II. on the Papal election; see PAULUS in *Katholik*, 1899, II., 379 *seq.* For Folengo and Clement VII. see *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIII., 454.

¹ Besides REUMONT, III., 2, 369 *seq.*, and GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 3rd ed., 594 *seq.*, see also *Rev. d. Bibl.*, V., 16; KALKOFF, *Forsch.*, 28; FANTUZZI, 278; ROSSI, *Pasquinate*, 111 *seq.*, and VOGELSTEIN, II., 49.

² *De Infelicitate Litteratorum*, Venetiae, 1620.

³ See RENAZZI, II., 82 *seq.*; MARINI, *Lettera*, 117 *seq.*, 119; *Arch. Veneto*, N.S., I., 2 (1901), 134 *seq.*

⁴ See the Brief of 1529 that CIAN published in *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, IX., 454, and for the search for MSS. in 1532 the Brief of that year, July 22, in *Dipl. Norvegic.*, VI., 2, 756 *seq.*, and in Appendix, Nos. 26-29, the *Briefs of 1532.

his cousin Leo X. The heedless prodigality of the latter was as foreign to Clement as his rich versatility of culture; dry, earnest, sparing of his purse, he was not the man to act the Mæcenas for whom the world of art had been hoping; they were soon to undergo a great disappointment.

On the announcement of the election of Clement VII. most of the artists who had been driven from Rome by the death of Leo X. and the pontificate of Adrian VI. at once returned. Their recollections of the reign of the first Medici filled them all with the most pleasing hopes for the future. To have survived the day of the "barbarian" Pope and of the plague filled the joyous band with fresh spirit. "Friends sought each other out again," says Benvenuto Cellini, "and embraced and greeted with cheering words those whom they once more met alive. Painters, sculptors, and goldsmiths, the best in Rome, drew closer together in a society founded by the jovial Michael Agnolo of Siena, and held joyous festas in which Giulio Romano and Penni also took part."¹ What Cellini tells us of these festas makes it clearly evident that the austere Adrian VI. would have nothing to do with such folk. Clement VII. himself was soon obliged to take steps against Marcantonio Raimondi for having made copper-plates of some obscene drawings of Giulio Romano; had the latter not already made his way to Mantua, the anger of the Pope would have fallen upon him heavily.²

In spite of the financial difficulties which Clement VII.

¹ CELLINI, *Vita*, I., 5; DOLLMAYR, 352.

² See DOLLMAYR, 353, and DELABORDE, M. A. Raimondi, Paris, 1888, 52 *seq.*, 238 *seq.* Vasari's story, that Aretino at that time had composed for his scandalous pictures still more scandalous sonnets, is not in accordance with the dates of Aretino's life. His sonnets must belong to a later period.

had to contend with from the first, in spite of the political embarrassments and the unprecedented blows of fate which were so soon to overwhelm him, he had set on foot many works of importance, while in another direction his pontificate saw the development in Rome of artistic activity on no small scale.¹ The most remarkable work of painting belonging to this reign was undoubtedly the decoration of the great hall leading to the Stanze, then called the Papal Hall, and later the Hall of Constantine; for the victorious entry of Christianity into universal history under that Emperor is there depicted.

The programme of this monumental work was, as regards essentials, settled under Leo X.² But as yet nothing had been executed, except the general division of subjects and the figures of Virtue and Justice which Raphael's pupils, Giulio Romano and Penni, had painted in oil on the wall; besides this the background of the Battle of the Milvian Bridge had been begun. This, however, was taken down when Clement gave orders for the resumption of the work interrupted by his cousin's death. The new method of painting chosen out of consideration for the co-operation of Sebastiano del Piombo was now given up and the customary use of fresco retained. In this great undertaking Giulio Romano executed the "Apparition of the Cross" and the battle-piece, while the "Baptism" and "Donation" of Constantine fell to Penni.

These great frescoes are painted apparently in the style

¹ REUMONT, III., 2, 433 *seq.*, where the buildings of private persons, especially the most beautiful, the Palazzo Massimo, are commented upon. More will be said of the Palazzo Farnese (see GEYMÜLLER, *Les Du Cerceau*, 13) in the next volume. The villa Salone of Cardinal Ag. Trivulzio has been excellently treated of by v. FABRICZY in the *Jahrb. der preuss. Kunstsamml.*, XVII., 190 *seqq.*

² Cf. GOTTI, I., 138; WOLTMANN, II., 653.

of vast tapestries stretched along the walls, an evidence how fashionable this kind of decoration had become since the production of Raphael's famous hangings. Only the incomparable "Battle of Constantine" was sketched by the great master himself, and it was his thought that placed in the centre of this colossal picture, at the head of the band of horsemen pressing forward in the irresistible onset of victory, the youthful Emperor mounted on a noble white charger, with lance in poise, while the angels hovering over him point to his opponent Maxentius, who falls headlong into the rushing Tiber. The turning-point in this world-famed battle is thus most happily indicated. All around rages the turmoil of battle with its thrilling episodes represented with vivid fidelity to truth.¹

The results of the victory, the "Baptism" and "Donation" of Constantine, were painted by Penni; in both frescoes St. Sylvester is represented with the features of Clement VII. The former event takes place in the baptistery of the Lateran; the "Donation," which by a stroke of genius is symbolized by the presentation of a golden figure of Rome, gives an admirable sketch of the interior of the old church of St. Peter.²

Between these two powerful frescoes are throned in painted niches under baldachini the figures, larger than life size, of famous Popes of the early Church, among whom Clement I. and Leo I. bear the traits of the two Medici

¹ A good description of the "Battle of Constantine" by GRIMM, *Leben Raphaels*, 482 *seq.* Cf. also PASSAVANT, II., 365 *seq.*; WOLTMANN, 655; MOLTKE, *Wanderbuch*, 131; LILIENCRON in the *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1883, Beil. 309; GRAF VON SZÉCSEN in the *Ungar. Revue*, IX. (1889), 560.

² BURCKHARDT'S favourable criticism (*Cicerone*, 671) of the "Baptism" and "Donation" requires to be considerably discounted in the light of Dollmayr's arguments. In the "Baptism" Clement appears with, in the "Donation" without, a beard.

Popes.¹ Around these likenesses of the predecessors of Clement VII. are grouped angels and allegorical figures, whose crudely realistic forms as well as the almost nude mythological figures on the pilasters are characteristic of the age.² Giulio's pupils, Giovanni da Lione and Raffaello del Colle of Borgo San Sepolcro, executed the ornaments and arabesques which border the frescoes as well as the caryatides with the badges of the Medici on the brackets.³

According to the account books the above-named painters were engaged for the greater part of the year 1524 in the Hall of Constantine, which might perhaps be better named after St. Sylvester. The last instalment of the stipulated 1000 ducats was paid on the 3rd of July 1525,⁴ but the work, in all essentials, was finished as far back as September 1524.⁵ Giulio Romano thereupon left Rome in October 1524, for no more work of importance was to be expected there. Clement VII. was not merely struggling with his money difficulties, but politics were making increas-

¹ The Popes, whose names are often incorrectly given, are Peter, Clement I., Urban I., Silvester I., Damasus I., and Leo I. *Cf.* PALIARD, *Remarques sur les Papes représentés dans la salle de Constantin au Vatican*, *Chronique des Arts*, Paris, 1884. Here also the indentification of two figures with Felix III. and Gregory VII. is rejected, although it is overlooked that the inscriptions under the figures are in some instances incorrectly attributed. As a proof, the inscription under Clement I., who unmistakably bears the features of Leo X. It is not to be supposed that the painter here meant Clement I., but his intention certainly was to represent Leo I.

² DOLLMAYR, 348, says that the Popes with the allegorical figures were always painted by the same artist who executed the principal picture on that wall.

³ *Cf.* DOLLMAYR, 348.

⁴ See *Arch. Stor. dell' Arte*, I., 447 *seq.*

⁵ This is proved by a hitherto unnoticed letter of B. Castiglione in SERASSI, I., 142.

ing claims on his attention;¹ thus it was that Penni and Giovanni da Udine also came to be engaged on tasks of only a trivial character, the painting of banners in particular.²

The catastrophe which befell the artistic world in the sack of Rome was so terrible that it must once more be considered. The few, such as Benvenuto Cellini and the sculptors Lorenzo Lotto and Raffaello da Montelupo, who were able to find occupation as gunners on St. Angelo, were to be counted lucky. The remainder underwent the hardest experiences. The painter Maturino died of the plague; Perino del Vaga, Marcantonio Raimondi, Giulio Clovio, and many others were tortured and robbed of all they had. Those who could took refuge in flight, and the school of Raphael was completely broken up.³ Although Clement VII., after 1530, made strenuous efforts to restore the patronage of art, the life-blood of art itself had been drained. The gifted Giovanni da Udine was now extensively employed. He restored, in 1531, the mosaics in the apse of St. Peter's, and painted, two years later, the ceiling of the sacristy of S. Lorenzo in Florence; the glass windows of the Laurentian Library are, probably rightly, also attributed to him.⁴ The artistic activity of Sebastiano del Piombo was affected by his appointment in 1531, by Clement VII., to be a "Bullarum plumbator" or medallist of Papal Bulls, a remunerative function. After that this distinguished painter confined himself almost entirely to portraits.⁵

¹ See DOLLMAYR, 358. Giulio Romano was not paid for finishing the "Transfiguration" until 1526; see Arch. Stor. dell' Arte, I., 449.

² Arch. Stor. dell' Arte, 448 *seq.*

³ MÜNTZ, Hist., III., 232; REUMONT, III., 2, 445 *seq.*; GREGOR-OVIUS, VIII., 3rd ed., 593 *seq.*; Graphische Künste, 1883, 91.

⁴ Arch. Stor. dell' Arte, I., 448; GOTTI, I., 170.

⁵ See CROWE, VI., 410 *seq.*; REUMONT, III., 2, 444. Here and in Arch. Stor. dell' Arte, I., 450, for other painters of that period. For Master Andrea see also ROSSI, Pasquinate, 106 *seq.*

Clement VII. had always taken a special interest in the art of illumination.¹ He ordered several specimens to be executed for the choir books of the Sistine Chapel.² But in the account books, which, to be sure, are not in complete preservation, the name of Giulio Clovio, the greatest illuminator of the age, does not appear.³

The troubles of the time were the principal cause why Clement, in the domain of architecture, had to restrict himself to what was absolutely necessary. The reconstruction of St. Peter's had a prior claim to anything else. One of the Pope's first acts of administration was the appointment of a commission of sixty members for the special purpose of seeing that the money collected for this purpose was not diverted to other objects.⁴ To raise the necessary sums, the right application of which was a matter of such extreme importance with the Pope,⁵ the same measures were used as under Leo X.;⁶ but the same

¹ For his missals that he had executed when Cardinal (now in the cabinet of copperplates in Berlin), see *Repert. für Kunstwissensch.*, VII., 84.

² See MÜNTZ, *Bibliothèque*, 73 *seq.*, and HABERL, *Bausteine f. Musikgesch.*, II., 66. *Cf.* PASINI-FRASSONI, *Armorial des Papes*, Rome, 1906, 34.

³ *Cf.* KUKULJEVIČ-SAKCINSKI, *Leben des J. Clovio*, 3rd ed., Agram, 1868; *Atti Mod.*, III., 259 *seq.*; BERTELOTTI, *G. Clovio*, Modena, 1882; BRADLEY, *G. Clovio*, London, 1891.

⁴ Bull., VI., 48 *seq.* A contemporary printed copy of the Bull (dated 1523, December 12) in TIZIO, **Hist. Senen.* in the Chigi Library, Rome.

⁵ See F. Gonzaga's **report* of December 31, 1524, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

⁶ *Cf.* Bull., ed. COCQUELINES, IV., 1, 49 *seq.*; WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 206, 213; LANCELLOTTI, IV., 179 *seq.* Numerous pieces relating to this in the volumes of **Briefs*: *cf.* vol. 44 (1524), n. 18, 329, 621; vol. 45 (1525), n. 65, 444; vol. 46 (1526), n. 164; vol. 52 (1532), n. 79, 348, 351, 478, 479; vol. 53 (1533), n. 107 (Secret

difficulties had also to be met.¹ As the clumsy machinery of the College of Sixty proved unsuccessful, a special congregation of the "Fabbrica di S. Pietro" was afterwards appointed.² The seal of the Fabbrica was the work of Benvenuto Cellini.³ The accounts from 1525 have been preserved,⁴ and afford a good survey of the slow progress of the work, the completion of which, as the Venetian Ambassador remarked in 1523, would hardly be seen by the generation of their grandchildren.⁵ Giuliano Leno continued to be master of the works under Clement VII. Before the sack Baldassare Peruzzi had been appointed architect of St. Peter's for life; during the catastrophe he saved his life with difficulty, and on the 1st of July 1531 Clement VII. renewed his former appointment.⁶

(Archives of the Vatican). That Clement VII. was lukewarm towards the rebuilding of St. Peter's is one of the many unproved assertions of H. GRIMM, *Michelangelo*, II., 5th ed., 379.

¹ See Sessa's *report, October 5, 1525, in the Biblioteca de la Acad. de Hist., Madrid, Salazar, A 36.

² See VESPIGNANIUS, *Compend. privileg. fabricae S. Petri, Romae*, 1762, 9, *cf.* 106 *seq.*

³ PLON, 193 *seq.*, only gives two entries for this seal for 1531. In the *"Conti," however (p. 3^a), mentioned in note below, we find, as early as January 30, 1527, seven scudi paid to Benvenuto Cellini for a seal of the Fabbrica.

⁴ The most important is a folio volume entitled: *Conti della Fabbrica sino al tempo di Clemente VII., from 1525 to 1529 inclusive. Here are to be found the payments made to Antonio da Sangallo, Baldassare Peruzzi, Francesco da Sangallo, and Giovanni Francesco da Sangallo. Also a folio volume with the title: *Entrata et uscita del 1529 sino al 1542. A more thorough examination of the archives of the Fabbrica of St. Peter's would be well worth the trouble. The extracts in Cod. H, II. 22, of Chigi Library, are insufficient.

⁵ See ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 103. In the raid of the Colonna the money-chest of the Fabbrica was stolen; see SANUTO, LII., 727.

⁶ See in Appendix, No. 21, the important Brief of July 1, 1531 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), by which the hitherto accepted

Although the nomination in this instance also was for life, Peruzzi withdrew himself from Rome for a long time, so that in April 1533 Clement VII. had to summon him back.¹

In the palace of the Vatican Clement VII. completed the court of St. Damasus. Here² as well as in the castle of St. Angelo³ many minor works and improvements were carried out. In the castle, the defences of which were strengthened, two chambers are shown at the present day, one of which served as the Pope's bedroom. The most recent restorations have also brought to light the Pope's bathroom; it contains mythological scenes from the life of Venus very characteristic of the licence which marked the spirit of the age.⁴ The decoration also of the Papal villa on the eastern slope of Monte Mario, which was

view, that Peruzzi occupied a subordinate position (BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER, *Gesch. der Renaissance*, 127), is upset. Peruzzi's name disappears from the *account books in 1527 and reappears in February 1532, not 1535, as given by JOVANOVIĆ, 75.

¹ See in Appendix, No. 33, the *Brief of April 30, 1533. *Min. brev.*, 1533, vol. 46, n. 162 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² *Cf.* *Introit. et Exit., 561, f. 205^a: "Juliano Leno civi Rom. pro fabrica palat. apost. duc. 160" (monthly statement), Secret Archives of the Vatican. See also the *Mandati of 1527 in State Archives, Rome, and S. Maria Novella, 329 (payments for work on the Belvedere, 1528-9), in State Archives, Florence, as well as STEINMANN, II., 8. The collapse of the corridor leading to the Belvedere, wrongly placed by Michaelis (*Jahrb. des deutschen archäol. Instituts*, V., 32) in the year 1534, caused great talk at the time. *Cf.* the *letter of Girol. Cattaneo of January 7 in State Archives, Milan, and of F. Gonzaga of January 9, 1531, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; see Appendix, Nos. 18-19.

³ *Cf.* CLAUSSE, II., 297 *seq.*; BORGATI, 121.

⁴ Over the marble doorway of the entrance to the "Bagno," formerly used as a latrine, is the inscription: Clemens VII. P. M. The paintings are in the style of Giulio Romano.

partly destroyed by fire during the sack, was purely mythological in character.¹

In Rome itself, besides the rebuilding of the Mint (now Banco di S. Spirito)² restorations were undertaken by Clement in the baptistery of the Lateran,³ in S. Agostino, S. Maria sopra Minerva, S. Pietro in Montorio, S. Pietro in Vincoli, S. Maria Maggiore, S. Matteo in Merulana,⁴ S. Gregorio de' Muratori,⁵ S. Maria in Domnica,⁶ and in the cloister of S. Maria in Ara Coeli.⁷ On S. Giovanni de' Fiorentini, Jacopo Sansovino was employed. On the northern portion of the Campo Marzio Clement VII. in 1525 finished Leo X.'s construction of the three streets leading to the Porta del Popolo.⁸ The Pope also did a great deal for the improvement of traffic in Rome.⁹ The sack, which had reduced the population from 55,000 to 32,000;¹⁰ the plague, and the great inundation of the Tiber in 1530¹¹ had done heavy damage to the Papal capital.

¹ Cf. for the Villa Madama, Vol. VIII. of work, p. 370 *seqq.*

² By Antonio da Sangallo; see CLAUSSE, II., 152; cf. SCHULTE, I., 209.

³ This is recalled by the inscription on the fresco of the Baptism of Constantine: Clemens VII. | Pont. Max. | a Leone X. | coeptum | consummavit. | 1524.

⁴ See ARMELLINI, Chiese, 465.

⁵ LANCIANI, I., 244.

⁶ CIACONIUS, III., 476.

⁷ The arms of Clement VII. were still there in 1879. Since then all has been destroyed to make room for the monument to Victor Emmanuel.

⁸ Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 127. The inscription of 1525 in REUMONT, III., 2, 873.

⁹ Cf. LANCIANI, I., 226, 247; II., 10.

¹⁰ See GNOLI in Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVII., 382, and GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 3rd ed., 592. The statement in LANCELLOTTI, III., 459: 20,000, is certainly exaggerated.

¹¹ Cf. SANUTO, XXX., 54 *seq.* See also FORCELLA, I., 441.

Notwithstanding these calamities Rome had revived with comparative alacrity, and at the time of Clement's death the condition of the city was fairly satisfactory.¹ For fortifications in Rome² and elsewhere throughout the States of the Church Clement VII. availed himself of Antonio da Sangallo and Michele Sanmicheli.³ The former, at his orders, constructed at Orvieto the great well (Pozzo di San Patrizio) which, after the cathedral, the inhabitants look upon as the second wonder of their city.⁴ In Fano the reconstruction of the harbour, and in Loreto the erection of the apostolic palace were undertaken.⁵ In Florence in 1533 the erection of the citadel of S. Giovanni Battista was set on foot.⁶

¹ See REUMONT, III., 2, 449, and LUZIO, Pronostico, 107.

² "N. S. fa fare certe bastioni verso la porta di S. Spirito e su quelle colline di S. Onofrio et anche a lo ponte Syxto." *Letter of Casella of October 2, 1526 (State Archives, Modena).

³ See RAVIOLI, Notizie s. lavori di arch. milit. d. Sangallo, Roma, 1863, 46 *seq.*; A. Sangallo (il giov.) e Sanmicheli, Relaz. sullo stato delle rocche di Romagna nel 1526, Milano, 1902. *Cf.* the scarce publication: Intorno alla relazione delle rocche della Romagna pontificia fatta nel 1526 da Ant. Picconi da Sangallo e da Michele Sanmicheli, Roma, 1855. For the fortifications of Parma, Modena, Piacenza, and Ancona see LANCELOTTI, II., 341 *seq.*, and CLAUSSE, II., 291 *seq.*, 294. See for Ancona also *supra*, pp. 197, 199. On December 22, 1529, Clement VII. sent Antonio da Sangallo to the army, as he had recommended his capacity to the Imperial generals; *Min. brev., 1529, vol. 26, n. 494, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

⁴ Besides CLAUSSE, II., 255, *cf.* also Hist.-polit. Bl., LXXIX., 366 *seq.*; PICCOLOMINI-ADAMI, 233 *seq.*; NOHL, Tagebuch, 135; FUMI, Orvieto, 189 *seq.*, and PARDI, Guida storico-artistica di Orvieto, Orvieto, 1896, 36 *seq.* For a strengthening for the cathedral at Foligno see FALOCI-PULIGNANI, XVII° centenario di S. Feliciano, 210 *seq.*

⁵ *Brief of June 16, 1526; see Cod. Barb., XXXII., 219, of the Vatican Library.

⁶ LANDUCCI, 371.

Clement VII. was too true a Medici to neglect the adornment of the Vatican with noble tapestries,¹ costly faience,² carved doors,³ and gold and silver vessels. Here also the sack caused serious losses, but it was not long before the work of restoration began. This was especially the case with regard to the goldsmiths' art, which under Clement VII. was in a most flourishing condition. As soon as to any extent his finances permitted it, the Pope began to renew his personal appointments.⁴ His principal commissions were for the golden roses, swords of honour and other Papal gifts, and for articles of ecclesiastical use. Besides Caradosso, who died in 1527, his most famous workmen were Benvenuto Cellini, Valerio Belli, and Giovanni Bernardi da Castel Bolognese. In the accounts many other names occur of more or less note.⁵

¹ *Cf.* our statements, Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 298. BERTOLOTTI, *Artisti Urbinati in Roma, Urbino, 1881*, 54; MÜNTZ, *Tapiss. de Raphaël, 36 seq., 41 seq.*, and *Hist. de la tapiss., 139 seq.*; *Athenaeum 1896, July, 72 seq.*; *Carte Strozzi, II., 647*, as well as FARABULINI, 35, and DOLLMAYR, 325 *seq.*, 350. *Cf.* in Appendix, No. 31, the *Brief of November 12, 1532; LANCIANI, II., 29.

² *Cf.* State Archives, Florence, S. Maria Novella, 329, f. 20. Many pieces of this work perished in the sack; see *Rev. d. Bibl., IV., 86*. A fine plate of Master Giorgio of Gubbio, with the arms of the Cardinal del Monte, of 1531 in the Museo Art.-Indust., Rome; *cf.* *Riv. d' Italia, 1898, II., 341*. Clement VII. supported a "fabbrica di vetri" in Bologna; see *Arch. dell' Arte, II., 169*.

³ The carved doors in the Loggie, with the arms of Clement VII. and great lions' heads are, according to BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER (*Renaissance, 314*), perhaps the finest existing pieces of work of this description. One of the doors has the inscription: *Munificentia Clementis VII. P.M.* *Payments for G. Barile, see State Archives, Florence, S. Maria Novella, 327, f. 50, 52, 59, 70, 77.

⁴ In March 1529 a new tiara was ordered; see MÜNTZ, *Tiare, 78*.

⁵ *Cf.* BERTOLOTTI in Gori's *Archivio, I., 31 seq., 78 seq.*, and *Artisti Lombardi a Roma, Milano, 1882*; MÜNTZ in *Arch. dell' Arte, I., 14*

This brilliant coterie of artists does not, perhaps, always appear in the most favourable light; fierce, reckless characters predominate, and acts of violence were frequent. The well-known autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini¹ reveals with a startling fidelity to nature the sharp contrasts between culture and savagery, faith and superstition, the fantastic mixture of outward splendour and moral laxity which gave the tone to these artistic circles. In June 1529 Clement bestowed on this versatile genius the post of an engraver in the Roman Mint.² Vasari considers that no such beautiful coinage had ever been designed for the Popes before; the pieces that have been preserved are certainly splendid works of art.³ The bust of Clement reproduces with remarkable fidelity his cold though handsome features; many of the designs drawn by Cellini for Papal coins are uncommonly original. Thus on a gold doubloon the Pope and Emperor are represented upholding the cross together; on the reverse side of a silver piece a very effective composition shows the Saviour rescuing Peter from the waves, with the inscription, "Wherefore hast thou doubted?" A medal with Moses bringing water from the rock refers to the well made by

seqq., 35 *seq.*, 68 *seq.*, VII., 372 *seqq.*, and PLON, Cellini, 10 *seq.*, *cf.* 143 *seq.*, 162, 316 *seq.* For the "Nécessaire de toilette" with Clement VII.'s name and arms, see BARBIER, *Bibl. Vatic.*, 109. A sword sent by Clement to Charles V. in the armoury at Madrid. *Cf. supra*, p. 90, note.

¹ Vita di B. Cellini, testo critico con introd. e note storiche p. c. di Bacci, Firenze, 1890-1891; *cf.* REUMONT, *Beiträge*, III., 333 *seqq.*, and FLAMINI, 563. Goethe's translation is unfaithful literally and artistically; *cf.* VOSSLER in the *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1900, No. 253.

² *Cf.* MÜNTZ, *L'Atelier monétaire de Rome*, Paris, 1884, 35 *seq.*, and PLON, Cellini, 194 *seq.*

³ Fine specimens in the Papal collection of coins in the Vatican.

Clement at Orvieto; another medal of 1534 celebrates the then prevailing peace.¹

As a medallist Giovanni Bernardi da Castel Bolognese held an even more distinguished place than Cellini.² In the art of "intaglio" Valerio Belli of Vicenza surpassed all his contemporaries.³ Distinguished also as a medallist, this artist executed for Clement VII. the costly crystal reliquary presented to the basilica of S. Lorenzo in Florence.⁴ But his most famous work was the magnificent casket of which the principal adornment was scenes from the life of our Lord cut in crystal; this, executed on the occasion of the marriage of Catherine de' Medici, is now an object of admiration in the galleries of the Uffizi.⁵

The best-known work of sculpture in Rome, belonging to the reign of Clement VII., is Lorenzetto's not very successful statue of St. Peter placed, at the Pope's command,

¹ See FRIEDLÄNDER, *Münzen und Medaillen des B. Cellini*, Berlin, 1885; CIABATTI in *Period. di numismatica*, I., Firenze, 1868; HABICH in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, 1900, No. 300; PLON, 196 *seq.*, and ARMAND, I., 148. *Cf.* ARMAND, I., 136, 138 *seq.*, 141; II., 165 *seq.*, 302; III., 144, 227, 231, for other medals of Clement VII. CINAGLI (94 *seq.*) enumerates 120 coins of Clement VII. See also KOCH-LOCHNER, *Samml. merkwürdiger Medaillen*, XXII. (1744); GIORDANI, *Docum.*, 176; GENTILI DI ROVELLONE, *Di una moneta ined. di Clemente VII.*, Camerino, 1882, and MONTI, *Motti sopra alc. monete di pontefici*, in *Period. di numismatica*, V., 3.

² *Cf.* LIVERANI, *Gior. da Castel Bolognese*, Faenza, 1870; *Atti Mod.*, IV., 1 *seq.*; ARMAND, I., 137 *seq.*; MÜNTZ, *L'Atelier*, 36 *seq.*, and *Hist.*, III., 711.

³ MÜNTZ, III., 711.

⁴ See LANDUCCI, 370; RICHA, *Chiese fiorent.*, V., 45 *seq.*; MORENI, *S. Lorenzo*, I., 188, 277, 347; *cf.* *Chronique des Arts*, 1895, 72. About other gifts for Florence see PELLI, *Saggio stor. d. Galleria di Firenze*, II., 14, 53.

⁵ See VASARI-MILANESI, V. 379 *seq.*; BASCHET, 180 *seq.*; PLON, 296, 389.

in 1530, alongside of Paolo Romano's statue of St. Paul at the lower end of the bridge of St. Angelo.¹ For the fortress, Raffaello da Montelupo executed a new angel of colossal size to take the place of the bronze effigy which had been melted down.² At Monte Cassino the sepulchral monument of Pietro de' Medici was begun in 1531 and only completed in 1559.³ At Loreto, Sansovino made progress with work on the Holy House remarkable for beauty and truly Christian feeling; as early as 1523 he had finished the relief of the Annunciation, which is conspicuous for its dramatic movement; the relief of the Adoration of the Shepherds with its noble group of angels, set up in 1528, is full of sincerity; the Adoration of the Kings, the Birth and Espousals of Mary, already begun by Sansovino, were finished by his pupils after his death in 1529; to his drawings is also to be referred the panel of the Visitation. Of the statues placed in the twenty niches, that of Jeremias belongs for the most part to Sansovino; all the others came from his pupils. The latter also carried out the subordinate decoration of the structure. Tribolo, Sangallo, and Montelupo have here left work which is very effective. The lions' heads, eagles and festoons of Mosca are especially good, and the same can be said of the panels with pictorial decorations introduced at the sides and at the foot of the doors. The former contain the arms of the Medici, and the latter ornamental figures of angels praying, tritons, sphinxes, birds, vases, and candelabra.⁴

¹ See CIACONIUS, III., 456.

² VASARI-MILANESI, IV., 545; Studi e docum., XIII., 302.

³ Cf. GAYE, II., 356 *seq.*; CARAVITA, I codici e le arti a Monte Cassino, III., 80 *seq.*; CLAUSSE, II., 277 *seq.*, and Orig. Bénédict., Paris, 1899, 154.

⁴ SCHÖNFELD, Sansovino, 27 *seq.*; LÜBKE in the Zeitschr. für bild.

The Pope's predilection for Baccio Bandinelli was unfortunate.¹ The latter, ambitious and self-seeking, tried to enter into a discreditable competition with Michael Angelo which was only productive of unpleasing creations. Bandinelli's best work was the copy of the Laocoön executed for Leo X. and placed, under Clement VII., in the second court of the Palazzo Medici at Florence. It is now in the Uffizi.² On the right of the principal entrance of the Palazzo Vecchio stands Bandinelli's marble group of "Hercules slaying Cacus," as a pendant to Michael Angelo's "David." The satirical wit of the Florentines soon made a butt of this pompous composition. Another work entrusted to Bandinelli, the Archangel Michael triumphing over the seven deadly sins, and intended to adorn the castle of St. Angelo, was never executed.³

Like Bandinelli, Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli had an apartment set apart for him in the Belvedere. Montorsoli

Kunst, VI., 158 *seq.*; Kölner Domblatt, 1862, No. 211-212; BURCKHARDT, Cicerone, 412; GRAUS in Kirchenschmuck, 1891, 37; Arte, III., 254; CLAUSSE, II., 242 *seq.*, III., 145 *seq.*, Jahrb. der preuss. Kunstsamml., XXVI., 100. See also CIACONIUS, III., 475, Rassegna naz., 1884, and SACCONI, Relaz. dell' ufficio reg. p. l. conservaz. d. monum. delle Marche e dell' Umbria, 2nd ed., Perugia, 1903.

¹ Cf. PERKINS, Sculpt. Ital., II., 442 *seq.*

² See REUMONT, Beiträge, III., 445 *seq.*; Kunstblatt, 1849, No. 7; Arch. dell' Arte, II., 108 *seq.*; Repert. für Kunstwissenschaft, XIX., 163; Jahrb. des deutschen archäol. Instituts, V., 30; Jahrb. des preuss. Kunstsamml., XXVII., 160. The copy of the Laocoön was brought to Florence earlier than is usually supposed. Cf. Cod. Barb., XXXII., 219, and *Introit. et Exit., 561; "10 Dec. 1524; duc. 144 auri de camera de mand. sub die prima pres. Barth. merciariorum S. D. N. pro pluribus expen. factis in conducendo statuum marmoream Laocoontis ex urbe Florentiam" (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. A. JANSEN in the Zeitschr. für bild. Kunst, XI., 98 *seq.*

was accounted a master in the art, then coming into repute, of restoring antique statues by additions which were often the result of a correct calculation. At Clement's bidding he added the left arm to the Belvedere Apollo and the right to the figure of Laocoön. The Pope, who liked to visit the Belvedere in the morning when saying his office, took great interest in the progress of this work.¹

Like many other artists, even the greatest of all saw in the elevation of Clement to the Papacy ground for far-reaching expectations. "You will have heard," wrote Michael Angelo on the 25th of November 1523 to a friend, "that Medici is chosen Pope. This, it seems to me, has been a matter of general congratulation, and I believe we shall see great things." Clement VII. had, in fact, throughout the whole of his pontificate a strong appreciation of the worth and greatness of this unique genius. The letters in particular of Sebastiano del Piombo and Giovan Francesco Fantucci bear eloquent testimony to this feeling. In the letters of the latter we have often verbatim reports of the conversations he had with Clement VII. Full of kind feeling, the Pope bore with truly astonishing patience the rudeness and ill-temper of the irascible artist. On one occasion he asked him to remember two things; first, that he is not able to make everything himself; and secondly, that we have only a short time to live. The thought that Popes do not for the most part have long reigns was recalled by Clement on another occasion in a postscript written in his own hand, in which he begged that he would make as much speed as

¹ See REUMONT, III., 2, 439; Jahrb. des deutschen archäol. Instituts, V., 30 *seq.* In the account books for September 30, 1525, is the *entry: "Duc. 500 a M. Jac. Liryco per certe maschere antiche" (State Archives, Florence, S. Maria Novella, 327).

possible in the execution of some work on which he was engaged.¹

Three tasks of great magnitude were entrusted by Clement to Michael Angelo: the construction of the Medici memorial chapel (Sagrestia Nuovo) of S. Lorenzo, the execution of the monuments to be placed therein, and the erection of the Laurentian Library in Florence.² At first Michael Angelo devoted himself with all his energy to this new and fascinating work, but the political events between 1527 and 1529 deprived him of all artistic capacity. Inflamed with love of the freedom of his native city, he flung chisel and hammer aside and undertook the indispensable service of providing defences for Florence, especially for the protection of San Miniato. When the Medici finally prevailed Michael Angelo was in very great danger; but Clement not only shielded him

¹ See FREY, *Sammlung ausgewählter Briefe an Michelangelo Buonarroti*, Berlin, 1899, 271. *Cf.* GOTTI, I., 199 *seq.*, 211 *seq.*, 215, 217, 226; JUSTI, 308 *seq.*, and STEINMANN, II., 478 *seq.*, where on p. 742 there is the Brief of November 21, 1531, also published by H. Pogatscher, showing the paternal interest of Clement VII. in the great artist's failing health. The *two letters of F. Gonzaga of June 5 and 24, 1531 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), are also of importance for the relations of Clement VII. with Michael Angelo; see Appendix, No. 20.

² See MORENI, *Descriz. stor. crit. d. cappella de' principi nella basilica di S. Lorenzo*, Firenze, 1813 (also p. 36 *seq.* for the building of the Laurentiana). *Cf.* MORENI, *S. Lorenzo*, I., 260; GAYE, II., 222 *seq.*, 229 *seq.*; RIEGEL, *Beitr. zur Kunstgesch. Italiens*, 131 *seq.*; RIO, IV., 378 *seq.*; *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1898, Beil. 61; GRIMM, I., 5, 504 *seq.*, II., 5, 157 *seq.*, 176 *seq.*, 224; MÜNTZ, *Hist.*, III., 396 *seq.*; SPRINGER, 380 *seqq.*, 402 *seq.*; GOTTI, I., 150 *seq.*, 164, 166, 200; FREY in *Jahrbuch der preuss. Kunstsamml.*, XVII., 5 *seq.* While this volume was in the press STEINMANN's *Das Geheimniss der Medicigräber Michelangelos*, Leipzig, 1906, appeared. For the Laurentiana *cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 456; BLUME, *Iter Ital.*, II., 46, and BIGAZZI, *Iscriz. di Firenze* (1887), 120 *seq.*

from the injuries instigated by a pitiless party hatred, but preserved unimpaired the old terms of intercourse. With what deep sorrow and anger Michael Angelo once more grasped his chisel can be seen clearly in the immortal verses laden with despondency which he composed for his statue of Night. At the end of his reign Clement had in his mind yet another work to be executed by Michael Angelo in Rome: the painting of the Last Judgment.¹ It was certainly his greatest service to art that he should have suggested this magnificent subject for the display of the great painter's Titanic power.

¹ Cf. GOTTI, I., 225; CROWE, VI., 414; STEINMANN, II., 479. As the accounts of the beginning of the great work are meagre, importance attaches to the extract from a letter contained in a *report of Agnello, dated Venice, March 2, 1534, and running thus: "Del Nino [probably Rodrigo Nino, Imperial Ambassador in Venice] alli 20 [febr.]: Chel Papa ha tanto operato che ha disposto Michelangnolo a dipinger in la capella et che sopra l' altare si farà la resurrectione, si che gia si era fatto il tavolato" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua)

CHAPTER XI.

CLEMENT VII. AND THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH.— HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE QUESTIONS OF THE COUNCIL AND REFORM.

WHILE in Europe the ancient Church was suffering loss upon loss, many thousands were coming within her obedience in the newly discovered countries beyond the Atlantic.¹ Exposed in her former domains to the bitterest reproaches and insults, from the lips of the converts of the New World came blessings for their deliverance from the darkness of heathendom, gratitude for protection from the cruelty of their conquerors.²

To the sons of St. Dominic and St. Francis this beneficent work was mainly due. The two Orders vied with each other in sending out a continuous stream of devoted missionaries to the continent of America, and in this work were supported in many ways by Clement VII. How ample were the measures taken by the Pope to forward the missionary work in Spanish America may be

¹ In a *letter of March 25, 1534, directed to "Balth. episc. Scalen," Clement VII. thanks him for the accounts of the new discoveries which may be of such importance for the spread of religion, and adds: "Agimus igitur Deo omnipotenti gratias quod in dies temporibus nostris illud propheticum implere dignatur: In omnem terram ex. son. eorum." *Min. brev.*, 1533, vol. 46, n. 119, where the date is pasted over and the document is therefore wrongly included in the year 1533.

² Already in 1524 America had felt the first pulsation of the conciliar life of the Church; see HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 389 *seq.*

clearly seen from a letter written on the 19th of October 1532 to Charles V., empowering him to choose a hundred and twenty Franciscans, seventy Dominicans, and ten Hieronymites for the East Indian colonies, and to send them there, in case of necessity, even if contrary to the wishes of the rulers of the Orders.¹

Clement VII. gave strong support to the Christianizing of the newly discovered portions of America by constituting a hierarchy for the purpose of providing regular ecclesiastical guidance for those who had become converts. On the 11th of May 1524 he created the new Patriarchate of the West Indies, entrusting this post to Antonio Rojas, Bishop of Palencia.² On the 28th of December 1528 the two dioceses of Haiti were consolidated into the single bishopric of San Domingo.³ The autumn of 1530 saw the creation of the see of Mexico and the appointment of Gabriele Merino as Patriarch of the West Indies; in 1531 sees were erected in Nicaragua, Venezuela, and Honduras, and in 1534 S. Marta and Panama in Colombia were made bishoprics.⁴ Clement bestowed similar attention on the

¹ Bolet. de la R. Académia de la Hist., XXI., Madrid, 1892, 380. Cf. Docum. selecta e tabul. sec. Vatic. quae Romanor. Pontif. erga Americae populos curam ac studia . . . testantur phototypia descripta, Typis Vatic., 1893 (only 25 copies printed), n. 23, p. 42; *ibid.*, n. 22, p. 41, a letter of Clement VII. of July 7, 1526, to the General of the Franciscan Order, Fr. Quiñones, encouraging the latter to adhere to his intention of visiting in person the missions of the Order. The great successes of the Franciscans in Mexico, described in 1532, by N. Herborn; see PAULUS, Dominikaner, 157. Much material in WADDING, XVI.

² The date, wanting in Gams (138), from the Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor, II., 24 (Consistorial Archives).

³ Acta Consist. of Vice-Chancellor, II., 145 *loc. cit.*

⁴ Acta Consist., edited by EHSES, in the Röm. Quartalschr., VI., 225 *seq.* Cf. HÄBLER in the Allgem. Zeitung, 1894, Beil. 285; F. SOSA,

possessions of Portugal. The bishopric of Funchal in Madeira, created by Leo X., was elevated on the 31st of January 1533 into an archbishopric, with four suffragan bishoprics attached to it.¹ These were San Miguel in the Azores, the island of Santiago in the Cape Verde group, St. Thomas in Ecuador, and Goa in the East Indies. This formed certainly the largest Metropolitan see in the world.

In harsh contrast to the happy results in the New World was the complete failure of the attempts to reunite Russia and the Holy See. Clement had already written on the 25th of May 1524 to the Grand Duke Vasili calling upon him to recognize the Roman Primacy and appealing to the negotiations that had already taken place under Alexander VI. and Leo X. This recognition he made conditional to his bestowing upon him the kingly title. Thereupon in the autumn of 1525 Demetrius Gerasimov appeared in Rome as Russian Ambassador and was treated with the most marked attention. Gerasimov was admirably fitted to foster the Pope's optimism with regard to the views prevalent at the Russian court. At the end of 1525 he went back to Russia accompanied by the Minorite, Francesco da Potentia, Bishop of Skara, as Papal Legate. The latter certainly was successful in arranging an armistice between Poland and Russia, but on the other hand he failed in the question of ecclesiastical union. In 1527 another embassy visited the Pope from

El episcopado mexicano, México, 1877, and ICAZBALCETA, Fray Juan de Zumárraga, primer obispo de México, México, 1881. For Texas Juan Xarez was nominated in 1528 to the newly created bishopric; see E. J. P. SCHMITT, A Catalogue of Franciscan Missionaries in Texas, Austin (Texas), 1901, 5 and 12 *seq.*

Acta Consist., edited by EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 230; *cf.* also Corp. dipl. Port., II., 416 *seq.*, 418 *seq.*

Russia, and a meeting took place at Orvieto in January 1528. From the Briefs handed to them by Clement VII. on their return, it is clear that the Pope's illusions concerning Russia were as strong as ever. The true state of affairs remained hidden from the Roman Curia; this was not surprising on account of the great distance and the difficulty of means of communication.¹

Clement VII. tried to confirm the Maronites and Armenians in their loyal adherence to the Union of Florence, and with this object he wrote many Briefs and sent many special messengers.² During his second meeting with Charles V. at Bologna he received an embassy from the King of Æthiopia bearing letters and gifts and tendering solemn obedience.³

In the year 1525 the great Jubilee took place. Although the disturbed state of ecclesiastical and political affairs

¹ Besides FIEDLER, *Ein Versuch der Vereinigung der russischen mit der römischen Kirche* (Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad., 1862), 38 *seq.*, cf. especially PIERLING, I., 291-315. See FRAKNÓI, *Ungarn*, 75 *seq.*, and UEBERSBERGER, I., 205 *seq.*

² Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1526, n. 79 *seq.*, 1532, n. 77; *Brief, dat. January 25, 1531, A. 8°, to the Patriarch of the Maronites (Min. brev., 1532, vol. 41, n. 55), in Secret Archives of the Vatican; ASSEMANNI, *Bibl. Orient.*, I., 523; *Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1845, 48. For the delegation of the envoy to the Maronites see *Acta Consist. of July 20, 1526, in Consistorial Archives. The *appointment of the "Nuntius ad regem Armeniae, dat. 1526, XIII. Cal. Aug.," in *Regest. Vatic.*, 1439, f. 207 *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See *Botschaft des grossmechtigen Königs David aus dem grossen und hohen Morenland, den man gemeinlich nennet Priester Johann, an Papst Klemens den Siebenden, zu Bononia verhort in offenem Consistorio am XXIX. tag Januarii A° 1533*, Dresden, W. Stöckel, 1533. Cf. for this extremely rare pamphlet HARRISSE, *Bibl. Americ.*, n. 177, and HEIRSEMANN, *Bibl. Mejicana*, n. 542. See also for the Æthiopian Embassy, RAYNALDUS, 1533, n. 20 *seq.*; CIACONIUS, III., 459 *seq.*, and GIORDANI, *App.*, 69.

made it seem to many injudicious to hold this solemnity, Clement had already decided on the 18th of April 1524 that it should take place.¹ Nor did the outbreak of the plague in Rome move him from this decision.² He took account of the altered circumstances by a reform of the Roman clergy³ and by setting aside the obligation of paying a sum of money to obtain the Jubilee indulgence.⁴ Stringent regulations were enacted to ensure the safety of pilgrims.⁵ Nevertheless, principally on account of the rupture of peace and terrible confusion in Germany, the pilgrims came in smaller numbers than at any previous Jubilee.⁶ Some alterations in the ceremonial were intro-

¹ Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 88.

² For the plague and the fast ordered by Clement to avert it *cf.* the *reports of Castiglione of June 18 and 28, 1524, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and the *letters of G. de' Medici, dated Rome, 1524, April 1, 6, 8, 11, 17, 20, May 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 25, 27, June 1, 3, 9, 12, 14, 17, 20, 22, 25, and 28, July 13 and 29, in State Archives, Florence. According to them the plague diminished from June 20; in July it ceased.

³ *Cf. infra*, p. 378 *seq.*

⁴ See RAYNALDUS, 1525, n. 1. On the other hand, those who did not come to Rome, while obtaining by an exceptional privilege the Jubilee indulgence, were expected to pay a sum of money; see the Brief in FONTANA, Renata, I., 419.

⁵ See the *Bando in Tizio, Hist. Senen. in Cod. G, II., 39 (Chigi Library, Rome). *Cf.* *Arm., 39, vol. 44, n. 657, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

⁶ *Cf.* SANUTO, XXXVII., 350, 357 *seq.*; MANNI, 107; NÖTHEN, 88 *seq.*; PRINZIVALLI, Anni Santi, 240. The statement in TARTINIUS, I., 1027, about a great concourse of people is without value when set against other evidence. The close of the Jubilee (*cf.* also RAYNALDUS, *loc. cit.*; RODCANACHI, Capitole, 64; THURSTON, 52 *seq.*, 80 *seq.*, 224) is described by the Mantuan envoy in his *reports of December 24 and 27, 1525, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. The warlike aspect of the Holy Year is dwelt on by Cornelius de Fine in his *Diary (National Library, Paris). For a little book on Rome of the

duced on this occasion; among others the Pope, on opening the Holy Door, made use of a golden hammer.¹ A noteworthy feature was the resumption of the impressive Passion Play in the Colosseum during the year of Jubilee.² To the hindrances already mentioned were soon added the perils of a Turkish³ descent on the coasts of Italy and a fresh outbreak of the plague in August 1525.⁴ Almost up to the end of the Jubilee year the plague prevailed in Rome. Also during the extension of the Jubilee into the following year the Pope insisted that the money contributions of the faithful should be left to their free discretion.⁵ Nevertheless, the Protestants continued to declare that the Jubilee was instituted only to gain money, ridiculing it in coarse and odious satires.⁶

The Bull announcing the beatification of Archbishop Antonino of Florence, delayed owing to the death of Adrian VI., was published by Clement VII.⁷ He canonized the Venetian, Lorenzo Giustiniani and the

year 1525 see MOLL, *Kirchengesch. der Niederlande*, II., 734 *seq.* For the memoir of Bernhard von Luxemburg see PAULUS, *Dominikaner*, 110.

¹ THURSTON, 218; MORONI, LII., 69.

² See VATASSO, *Per la storia del dramma sacro in Italia*, Roma, 1903, 84.

³ *Cf.* the *reports of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1525, March 17, June 20, July 8, in State Archives, Florence.

⁴ *Cf.* *reports of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1525, August 13, 15, 20, 21, 23, 30, September 1, 5, 15, 19, 22, 25, 29, October 4, 18, 21, 24, 28, 31, November 4, 5, in State Archives, Florence.

⁵ See SANUTO, XL., 754; THEINER, *Mon. Slav.*, I., 590 *seq.*; NÖTHEN, 90.

⁶ *Cf.* PANTZER, II., 395, 2836; GÖDEKE, II., 280; THURSTON, 83; KAWERAU, H. Sachs, 61. That Luther's (Erlanger Ausg., XXIX., 297) opinion, that the Jubilee originated only in greed, has no historic foundation is shown by KRAUS in the *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1900, Beil. 76.

⁷ Bull., VI., 26-38.

made it seem to many injudicious to hold this solemnity, Clement had already decided on the 18th of April 1524 that it should take place.¹ Nor did the outbreak of the plague in Rome move him from this decision.² He took account of the altered circumstances by a reform of the Roman clergy³ and by setting aside the obligation of paying a sum of money to obtain the Jubilee indulgence.⁴ Stringent regulations were enacted to ensure the safety of pilgrims.⁵ Nevertheless, principally on account of the rupture of peace and terrible confusion in Germany, the pilgrims came in smaller numbers than at any previous Jubilee.⁶ Some alterations in the ceremonial were intro-

¹ Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 88.

² For the plague and the fast ordered by Clement to avert it *cf.* the *reports of Castiglione of June 18 and 28, 1524, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and the *letters of G. de' Medici, dated Rome, 1524, April 1, 6, 8, 11, 17, 20, May 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 25, 27, June 1, 3, 9, 12, 14, 17, 20, 22, 25, and 28, July 13 and 29, in State Archives, Florence. According to them the plague diminished from June 20; in July it ceased.

³ *Cf. infra*, p. 378 *seq.*

⁴ See RAYNALDUS, 1525, n. 1. On the other hand, those who did not come to Rome, while obtaining by an exceptional privilege the Jubilee indulgence, were expected to pay a sum of money; see the Brief in FONTANA, Renata, I., 419.

⁵ See the *Bando in Tizio, Hist. Senen. in Cod. G, II., 39 (Chigi Library, Rome). *Cf.* *Arm., 39, vol. 44, n. 657, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

⁶ *Cf.* SANUTO, XXXVII., 350, 357 *seq.*; MANNI, 107; NÖTHEN, 88 *seq.*; PRINZIVALLI, Anni Santi, 240. The statement in TARTINIUS, I., 1027, about a great concourse of people is without value when set against other evidence. The close of the Jubilee (*cf.* also RAYNALDUS, *loc. cit.*; RODCANACHI, Capitole, 64; THURSTON, 52 *seq.*, 80 *seq.*, 224) is described by the Mantuan envoy in his *reports of December 24 and 27, 1525, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. The warlike aspect of the Holy Year is dwelt on by Cornelius de Fine in his *Diary (National Library, Paris). For a little book on Rome of the

duced on this occasion; among others the Pope, on opening the Holy Door, made use of a golden hammer.¹ A noteworthy feature was the resumption of the impressive Passion Play in the Colosseum during the year of Jubilee.² To the hindrances already mentioned were soon added the perils of a Turkish³ descent on the coasts of Italy and a fresh outbreak of the plague in August 1525.⁴ Almost up to the end of the Jubilee year the plague prevailed in Rome. Also during the extension of the Jubilee into the following year the Pope insisted that the money contributions of the faithful should be left to their free discretion.⁵ Nevertheless, the Protestants continued to declare that the Jubilee was instituted only to gain money, ridiculing it in coarse and odious satires.⁶

The Bull announcing the beatification of Archbishop Antonino of Florence, delayed owing to the death of Adrian VI., was published by Clement VII.⁷ He canonized the Venetian, Lorenzo Giustiniani and the

year 1525 see MOLL, *Kirchengesch. der Niederlande*, II., 734 *seq.* For the memoir of Bernhard von Luxemburg see PAULUS, *Dominkaner*, 110.

¹ THURSTON, 218; MORONI, LII., 69.

² See VATASSO, *Per la storia del dramma sacro in Italia*, Roma, 1903, 84.

³ Cf. the *reports of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1525, March 17, June 20, July 8, in State Archives, Florence.

⁴ Cf. *reports of G. de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1525, August 13, 15, 20, 21, 23, 30, September 1, 5, 15, 19, 22, 25, 29, October 4, 18, 21, 24, 28, 31, November 4, 5, in State Archives, Florence.

⁵ See SANUTO, XL., 754; THEINER, *Mon. Slav.*, I., 590 *seq.*; NÖTHEN, 90.

⁶ Cf. PANTZER, II., 395, 2836; GÖDEKE, II., 280; THURSTON, 83; KAWERAU, *H. Sachs*, 61. That Luther's (Erlanger Ausg., XXIX., 297) opinion, that the Jubilee originated only in greed, has no historic foundation is shown by KRAUS in the *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1900, Beil. 76.

⁷ Bull., VI., 26-38.

Cardinals Aleman and Peter of Luxembourg.¹ The Pope also sanctioned the cultus of St. Hyacinth of Poland and the office composed by Bernardino da Busti in honour of the Name of Jesus.² In many ways he encouraged devotion to Our Lady and the recitation of the Rosary.³ Special Bulls dealt with the Rota, the Vice-Chancellorship, the observance of the German Concordat, and the prohibition of duelling.⁴

In ecclesiastical policy Clement repeatedly found himself forced to make great concessions to temporal princes who, like the sovereigns of Spain,⁵ France,⁶ Poland,⁷ and Bavaria,⁸ did not yield to the inducement to apostatize. Owing to his powerlessness when opposed to the Emperor, his representations of the constantly recurring encroachments on the freedom of the Church in Spain,⁹ and especially

¹ Cf. Acta Sanctorum, January 8, September 5; CIACONIUS, III., 459; SANUTO, XXXVI., 509 *seq.*; MANNI, Vita e culto del b. L. Alemani, Firenze, 1771; Freib. Kirchenlexikon, IX.², 1924; ROBERT, 331 *seq.*

² RAYNALDUS, 1527, n. 105; Freib. Kirchenlexikon, IX.², 27; THEINER, Mon. Pol., II., 468 *seq.* Other enactments in CIACONIUS, III., 475 *seq.*, and WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 348. Decrees against witches in HANSEN, Quellen, 36 *seq.* For exemptions from episcopal authority see Rev. d'hist. ecclés., I., 482 *seq.*

³ Cf. CIACONIUS, III., 475 *seq.*, and Bull., VI., 168 *seq.*

⁴ Bull., VI., 81 *seq.*, 153 *seq.*, 169 *seq.* The *Bulla contra duellium facientes, dated 1524, Id. Febr. A° 2°, in Regest. Vatic., 1276, f. 80^a *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ Cf. *supra*, pp. 55, 57, and PHILLIPS-BERING, VIII., 201. See also SANUTO, LIV., 191, and HEINE, Briefe, 90.

⁶ Cf. *supra*, p. 208.

⁷ Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 437 *seq.*

⁸ Cf. SUGENHEIM, Bayerns Volkzustände, 184 *seq.*; M. RITTER, Deutsche Gesch., I., 303.

⁹ Cf. BALAN, Mon. saec., XVI., 226 *seq.*, 228 *seq.*; SERASSI, II., 33 *seq.*; HERGENRÖTHER in Archiv für Kirchenrecht, X., 28.

in Sicily, produced no effect.¹ In this respect the Pope had many causes of complaint against other princes, Francis I. in particular.² Even King John III. of Portugal, otherwise so friendly to him, had to be strongly admonished in the year 1524 for the arbitrary imprisonment of two bishops.³ At the end of his pontificate the question of the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition in Portugal gave rise to serious differences.⁴ Clement only gave a partial assent to the wishes of King John when, on the 17th of December 1531, he appointed a Commissary Apostolic and Inquisitor for the whole of Portugal, to institute, in conjunction with the bishops, an inquiry into the accused Jewish Christians, with orders to punish the guilty. As the King, on the 14th of June 1532, by a new law tried to subject the Jews and Jewish Christians to his arbitrary authority, they appealed to the Pope, complaining of the violent treatment and the unjust and harsh proceedings of the King and the Inquisition.

Clement would not associate himself with the King's unjust treatment of his subjects. He first suspended, on the 17th of October 1532, the Bull of December 1531. As all his representations remained ineffectual, on the 7th of April 1533, to the entire exclusion of the Portuguese Inquisition, he cited the guilty before his own special court and gave the Nuncio full powers to effect the reconciliation on the easiest terms possible. He thus declared expressly that

¹ Cf. CARUSO, *Discorso d. Monarchia di Sicilia*, ed. Mira, Palermo, 1863, 71, 240, 242.

² Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1524, n. 99 *seq.*; BALAN, *loc. cit.*, 22 *seq.*

³ BALAN, *loc. cit.*, 20 *seq.* For his friendly behaviour in other respects towards John III., whose rights over the Orders of Knighthood were extended, see MACSWINEY, III., 187 *seq.*, 195 *seq.* Cf. also Vol. IX. of this work, p. 433, n. 1.

⁴ The whole matter will be discussed later on under Paul III.

the Jews who had been treated so severely were not to be punished as heretics. John III. raised objections to these injunctions, and forbade their publication. The Pope therefore instructed his Nuncio to defer the publication of the Bull for a while; in a Brief he justified himself against the King's complaints by explaining the reasons for his clemency towards the Jewish Christians. Already nearing his end, on the 26th of July 1534 he ordered the Nuncio to execute the orders of April 1533, which were as just as they were merciful.¹

In other instances as well the Pope showed such tenderness and large-hearted good-will towards the Jews that a learned member of their nation of that day did not refrain from calling him "Clement, the gracious friend of Israel." The position of the Jews in Rome as well as in the Papal States was, in consequence, a prosperous one.²

The absolutism of the Venetian Republic was a source of repeated and angry conflict. Towards the jealous Signoria, Clement, in several questions of ecclesiastical policy, showed

¹ Cf. Corp. dipl. Port., II., 319 seq., 335 seq., III., 1 seq., 64 seq., 76 seq.; KUNSTMANN in Münch. Gel. Anz., XXIV., 638 seq.; HEINE in Schmidt's Zeitschr. für Gesch., IX., 162 seq.; SCHÄFER, III., 336 seq.; ERLER in Archiv für Kirchenrecht, LIII., 26 seq.; TANNER in Kath. Schweizerbl., I. (1885), 337 seq.; HERCULANO, Inquisição em Portugal, I.^o, Lisboa, 1897, 259 seq.; MACSWINEY, III., 210 seq.

² See VOGELSTEIN, II., 38 seq.; BERLINER, II., 82 seq., 86, 91 seq., 98, 104; Arch. Stor. Ital., 5th Series, XI., 398 seq. Cf. VERNET in L'Université Cath., XIX. (1895), 100 seq.; LEVI, Clément VII. et les juifs du comtat Venaissin, in Rev. d. études juiv., 1896, 63 seq. Vernet made use principally of the *Camerabilia*; I collected numerous documents bearing on this question among the registers of Briefs in the Secret Archives of the Vatican; they will be published in another place.

great readiness to conciliate ;¹ nevertheless, the Venetian Government renewed their claim, abandoned expressly in the treaty of peace of 1510, to the right of appointing to bishoprics within their territory. This treaty was infringed with the utmost disregard of obligations, and treated as if it were non-existent. The disputes about the possession of bishoprics began as early as 1524.² Afterwards,³ particularly between 1530 and 1532, the question played a prominent part and, in the latter year, became acute owing to the Venetian Government taxing, on its own initiative, the clergy of the Republic for the purposes of the Turkish war.⁴ In this question of nomination to bishoprics Clement showed great steadfastness ; the consequence was that the Signoria finally yielded in June 1533 as far as five bishoprics were concerned,⁵ but would make no concession concerning Treviso or Corfù, although Clement VII. in May had already threatened the heaviest ecclesiastical penalties.⁶ The Pope made passionate complaints to the Venetian Ambassador ; in Venice itself the procurator Francesco Donato said that "Christ had deputed the pastoral office to Peter ; do not let us interfere in questions of Church benefices which belong to the Pope." Others

¹ Cf. CECHEZZI, *Venezia e la corte di Roma*, I., 321 *seq.*, and 440 *seq.* ; Libri Comm., VI., 207, and CANTÙ, *Scorsa di un Lombardo*, negli archivi di Venezia, Milano, 1856, 107. For the *Clementina* cf. also LEBRET, *Venedig*, II., 2, 1180 *seq.*

² Cf. SANUTO, XXXVI., 508, 511, 522.

³ Cf. *supra*, p. 20. For 1527 see SANUTO, XLV., 636, 650 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. SANUTO, LIII., 120, 193, 279, 379, 484 ; LIV., 19, 120, 152 *seq.*, 224, 266, 402, 423, 523, 557, 572, 582, 615 ; LV., 72, 102, 142, 679 *seq.* and *supra*, p. 20 *seq.*

⁵ SANUTO, LVIII., 361 *seq.*

⁶ Cf. F. Peregrino's *report, May 14, 1533, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

pointed to the danger of Clement, in his approaching conference with Francis I., making terms unfavourable to the Republic. The majority therefore decided in favour of giving way as regarded Corfù; on the other hand, the controversy over Treviso, which had been in suspense since 1527, remained unsettled. Up to the last the Venetian diplomatists hoped that from political motives the Pope would in the end give way.¹

The appointments to the Cardinalate made by Clement VII. are uncommonly characteristic of his reign. The assertion, however, that, of all his nominations, he did not make one as a free agent, is an exaggeration; but, in justice, it must be admitted on the other hand that in the majority of cases the ruling motive in his creations was political expediency or compulsion.²

In the first four years of his reign Clement VII. was especially reluctant to increase the number of the Sacred College.³ Although the Emperor had already, in June 1525, asked for the appointment of two new Cardinals, and there was repeatedly talk of approaching creations,⁴ the Pope always deferred as long as possible the decisive step. His first creation was not made until the eve of the sack of Rome. To the six Cardinals then appointed seven others

¹ Cf. SANUTO, LVIII., 270, 363, 485 *seq.*, 537 *seq.*, 560 *seq.*, 570, 579, 601, 610 *seq.*; ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 311; LEBRET, II., 2, 1183 *seq.*, and GOTHEIN, Ignatius, 529.

² See REUMONT, III., 2, 273.

³ He appealed at first to the necessity, in accordance with the election capitulations, of agreement on the part of the Cardinals. See *Brief to Archduke Ferdinand, October 25, 1524, Min. brev., 1524, vol. 8, n. 477 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ Cf. the *reports of G. de' Medici, April 27, June 14, and October 4, 1525, in State Archives, Florence, and Sessa's *letter, October 5, 1525, in the Biblioteca de la Acad. de Hist., Madrid.

were added¹ on the 21st of November of the same year, with whom on the 7th of December Quiñones,² and on the 20th of December 1527 Francesco Cornaro were associated.³ In the beginning of 1529 Ippolito de' Medici, who had only entered his eighteenth year, and Girolamo Doria, were made Cardinals. The nomination of Mercurino di Gattinara took place on the 13th of August of the same year.⁴ During the first conference at Bologna on the 9th of March 1530, Clement agreed to the elevation of four Imperialists (Cles, Loaysa, de Challant, and Stunica). To satisfy Francis I., Tournon was received into the Sacred College on the 19th of March and Gramont on the 8th of June.⁵

¹ Cf. Vol. IX. of this work, pp. 384 and 465. The publication of Cardinal Grimani, nominated *in petto* on May 3, 1527, did not take place until later. See the letter of thanks from Grimani to Clement VII. on his elevation, dat. Venice, 1528, February 19, *Lett. d. princ., V., 111 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Cf. *supra*, p. 33.

³ See CATALANUS, 503; CIACONIUS, III., 500, and *CONTELORIUS, De Pontif. et Cardinal, Miscell. Arm., XI., 48, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

⁴ Cf. *supra*, pp. 39, 66 *seq.* Gattinara died soon after, on June 5, 1530; see EHSSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xxx., n. 4. Cf. also CLARETTA in Mém. de la Soc. Savoisiennne, XII., Chambéry, 1898; HUART, Le Card. de Gattinara, Besançon, 1876; BORNATE, Ricerche intorno alla vita di M. Gattinara, Novara, 1899. On Ip. de' Medici, *Contelorius, *loc. cit.*, remarks: "Hic in 18 anno creatus Card. diaconus cum tunc temporis esset tantum clericali caractere insignitus de quo mentio facta non fuerat nec fuit dispensatus sup. defectu aetatis nec se fecit promoveri ad diac. vel subdiaconatus ordinem licet pluries monitus fuisset, quare Clemens absolvit a censuris et poenis, restituit ad beneficia, ecclesias et cardinalatum et declarat eccles. presbyt. s. Laurentii in Dam. esse tenendam uti diaconalem ut in brevi D. R. 30 Julii 1534" (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ Cf. *supra*, p. 96 *seq.* B. Cles well deserves a monograph. The Vita, by GAR, Trento, 1856, is not satisfactory; cf. BAUER, Anfänge Ferdinands I., 173 *seq.*

As a matter of fact, in the first year of his pontificate he showed himself a zealous reformer, acting evidently under the influence of the excellent Giberti.¹

Already on the 18th of January 1524 Clement had addressed a Consistory on the reform of the Curia and invited the Cardinals to make proposals.² Together with this went a scheme for a general reform of the conditions of the Church; for this purpose prelates and bishops of Italy and other countries, such as Spain, were summoned to Rome,³ and a special commission of Cardinals was formed to consider the question of reform.⁴ On the 24th of February 1524 the Pope made more detailed proposals to the Cardinals on a reform of the Curia and ordered the decisions of the Lateran Council bearing on this point to be strictly enforced.⁵ In the autumn of 1524 the conditions of reform were dealt with in a series of consistories and drawn up with greater precision.

With express reference to the coming Jubilee the Pope introduced, on the 9th of September, three administrative proposals: first, a general visitation of the churches of Rome; secondly, an examination of the Roman secular clergy; those among them who were found to be unfitted for their functions should be prohibited from saying Mass at least during the Jubilee year; thirdly, precautions were to be taken to procure qualified confessors during this sacred time. These proposals were carried,⁶ and were at

¹ See *Engl. Hist. Review*, XVIII., 272.

² See *Acta Consist.* in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 87.

³ This is clear from the Brief to Charles V., July 31, 1524, in BALAN, *Mon. saec.*, XVI., 26 *seq.* Cf. also *Engl. Hist. Review*, XVIII., 271 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. *Quellen und Forschungen*, III., n. 3.

⁵ See *Acta Consist.* in KALKOFF, 87. Cf. SANUTO, XXXV., 423.

⁶ See *Acta Consist.* in KALKOFF, 88 *seq.*, and EHSSES, *Conc. Trid.*, xvii. See also ATANAGI, *Lett. facet*, I., 144. Cf. the proposals in

once put into operation. A strict supervision was also made of the observation of the rules appertaining to the dress of the priesthood and the disuse of the beard. The measures taken were so stringent that those ardent for reform began to indulge in the brightest hopes.¹ Many of the laxer prelates submitted only with great reluctance to these ordinances, but they did submit.² For the visitation a special commission was appointed, which met every Sunday and at the same time exhorted the Cardinals to support this salutary work, and to set good examples to those under their authority. Strong measures were also taken against open immorality.³ On the 7th of November 1524 Clement again called the attention of the Consistory to the reform of the Curia. He insisted primarily on the observance of the Lateran decrees of the 5th of May 1514 on reform being pressed home, for they were weapons against a legion of abuses. He entrusted Cardinal Pucci with the drawing up of a Bull on this subject⁴ which was agreed to on the 21st of November and forthwith published.⁵

*Cod. Vat., 3924, II., f. 234 *seq.* (Vatican Library), and the *letter of A. Germanello from Rome, September 24, 1524, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

¹ Cf. SANUTO, XXXVII., 88 *seq.*

² Cf. G. B. Sanga's characteristic letter of October the 29th, 1524, in ATANAGI, Lett. facet, I., 144. See also *F. Gonzaga's letter, November 16, 1524, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

³ Cf. SANUTO, XXXVII., 89.

⁴ See Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 89, and EHSSES, Conc. Trid., IV., xvii. For the decrees of the Lateran Council see, besides Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 410, the admirable treatment of the subject in GUGLIA, Studien zur Gesch. des fünften Laterankonzils, N.F., Wien, 1906, 21 *seq.*

⁵ I found in TIZIO, *Hist. Senen., Cod. G, II., 39 (Chigi Library, Rome), a contemporary copy of the Bull "Meditatio cordis nostri, dat. Romae, 1524, XI. Cal. Dec." (Nov. 21).

In the execution of these reforms Giberti and Sadoletto were Clement's supporters.¹ In the beginning of December the Cardinals were exhorted to take care of their churches;² soon after three commissaries were appointed to visit all churches, convents, and hospitals in Rome.³ Already on the 8th of September the Pope had issued an emphatic decree to remove the scandal of the Minorites frequenting Rome without wearing the habit of their Order. On the 30th of November he commanded the Roman magistrates to throw such vagrants into prison.⁴

A wholesome measure for the improvement of the clergy was the issue of instructions to Bishop Gian Pietro Carafa, then resident in Rome, concerning the candidates for holy orders, by which every form of simony was repressed.⁵ In certain cases also Clement showed himself averse to the accumulation of benefices; while recognizing the gravity of this abuse, he was yet often compelled to yield to the force of circumstances.⁶ A whole series of Papal enactments for the year 1524 dealt with the reform of the secular and regular clergy of the dioceses of

¹ See DITTRICH, *Kathol. Reformation*, 389.

² Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, 89. On February 25, 1524, Cardinal de Valle, archipresb. S. Mariae Maj., received the **facultas reformandi statuta ejusdem basilicae*; Brevia, 1524, Arm., 39, vol. 44, n. 194, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

³ There is also a contemporary copy in TIZIO, *loc. cit.*, of this Bull, "Romanus Pontifex, dat. Romae, 1524, VI. Id. Dec." (Dec. 8).

⁴ *Brief to "Almae urbis baricello, capitaneis caeterisque justitiae ministris, Dat. Romae, ult. Nov. 1524." Arm., 39, vol. 55, f. 15, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

⁵ *Brief of May 2, 1524; Brevia, 1524, Arm., 39, vol. 44, n. 340, in Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. BZOVIVUS, 1524, n. 35, and BROMATO, I., 93 *seq.*, 99 *seq.*

⁶ Cf. Corp. dipl. Port., II., 214; MACSWINEY, Portugal, III., 191, and BALAN, Mon. saec., XVI., 39 *seq.*

Florence, Parma, Naples, Venice, Milan, Burgos, and Mayence.¹ In the same year the Pope gave orders for a general reform of the Carmelite Order,² and in 1525 similar measures were taken in regard to the Order of the Humiliati.³

Unhappily these hopeful beginnings had no corresponding results. Political distractions soon absorbed more and more the attention of the Pope, and, in consequence, the measures of reform slackened.⁴ On the 2nd of March

¹ Cf. for 1524, Arm., 39, vol. 44, n. 241 : *Facultas abbati monast. Casinen. s. Benedicti alias Justinae reformandi prioratum s. Mariae Angel. Camaldul. Flor., dat. March 26 ; n. 247 : *Vincentio archiepiscop. Neapolit. (against bad clerics), dat. April 1 ; n. 253 : *Excommunicatio contra omnes intrantes monasteria monialium sub cura frat. cong. Lat. sine licentia generalis dicti ord., dat. April 2 ; n. 341 : *Patriarchae Venet. committitur reformatio clericor. et religios. in dominio Venet., dat. May 5 (cf. the Brief of January 13 in SANUTO, XXV., 449) ; n. 385 : *Patriarchae Aquilej. facultas visitandi omnes ecclesias et monasteria monial. etiam exemptu eccl. Aquil. subject. et reformandi tam in capite quam in membris, dat. June 8 ; n. 403 : Reform of the Observantines in Navarre, dat. June 22 (WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 568) ; n. 493 : *Bull pro correctione cleric. in toto dominio ducis Mediol. delinquent., dat. September 17 ; n. 573 : *Card. Maguntino, dat. November 15 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Here also belongs the *Brief of March 28, 1524, for the reform of the monastery of the Paradiso (State Archives, Florence, Bonifazio). Reform of the French monasteries is treated in a *Brief of Clement VII., November 3, 1524 (National Archives, Paris). About the reform of the nuns of Parma see the *letter of Cardinal G. Salviati to Clement VII., dat. Parma, 1524, November 28 ; *Lett. div. ad Clem. VII. in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

² See the *Briefs to the General, February 1 and April 1, 1524. Arm., 39, vol. 44, n. 136 and 250 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See the *Briefs to the General, June 1 and November 10, 1525. Arm., 39, vol. 45, n. 210 and 312 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ Besides the Briefs for Verona, to be noticed later on, I noticed for 1525, in Arm., 39, vol. 45., n. 99 : *Episcopo Suessano, dat. February

1526 Clement stated in writing that he had certainly not abandoned his plans for a reformation of morals but that, owing to the adverse conditions of the time, he was forced to defer their execution.¹ During the troubles that afterwards arose practical measures of reform lay almost entirely dormant.²

That Clement VII. had always realized the necessity of raising the standard of life within the Church is evident from the earnest address made to the Cardinals at Easter 1528,³ when he spoke of the sack of Rome as a judgment of God. But he still held back from decisive and comprehensive action.⁴ Political and ecclesiastical troubles of every kind beset him but, over and above, he was preoccupied by the interests of the house of Medici.

The years 1529 and 1530 were marked, however, by a

23; n. 118: *Episc. Conchensi, dat. March 15; vol. 55, f. 22: *Generali et provincialibus ord. frat. min. b. Francisci convent, dat. January 25 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). See also WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 583; THEINER, Mon. Slav. merid., 587, and FONTANA, Docum. Vat., 92. For 1526 see Arm., 39, vol. 46, n. 34: *Vicario episc. Papien., dat. January 19; n. 67: *Vicario gen. frat. ord. min. conv., dat. February 9; vol. 55, f. 41: *Francisco Angel. totius ord. frat. min. gen. ministro, dat. January 5; f. 208: *Ministro prov. s. Francisci frat. min. de observ., dat. December 10. See also the two Briefs in FONTANA, 93 and 94.

¹ BALAN, Mon. saec., XVI., 222.

² For 1527, except three documents in WADDING (XVI., 2nd ed., 603), I found only one *item: "Franc. fingo. can. eccl. Burgi s. Sepulcri facultas corrigendi monachos prioratus s. Victoris extr. mur. Gebennen. Cluniac. ord., dat. ex arce 1527, Aug. 6." Arm., 39, vol. 47, n. 248 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). The Brief in FONTANA (101) relates to 1528.

³ Cf. *supra*, p. 16.

⁴ Cf. DITTRICH, Kathol. Reformation, 390.

series of special enactments of reform,¹ but inadequate to existing circumstances. There was no vigorous attack on abuses in the Curia, no thorough application of the measures already laid down.² In this respect Clement lies

¹ Besides the orders relating to Giberti we may mention for 1529 Arm., 39, vol. 49, n. 215: *Card. Pisano (Reform of clergy in Padua and Treviso), April 16; n. 235: *Io. de Zanettis et Aurelio de Durantis et Thomae de Capreolis, can. eccl. Brixien. (Reform of a convent of nuns), April 27; n. 240: *Card. Pisano (Reform of nuns in Padua), April 28; n. 242: *Priori et antianis et deputatis sup. reform. monast. civit. nostr. Placent., April 29; n. 287: Herculi Card. Mantuan. (Reform of convent of S. Marco, Mantua), May 13; n. 378: *Vicario epis. Parmen. (Reform of the clergy there), June 16; n. 435: *Alto-bello nuntio Venet. (Reform of nuns), July 16; n. 450: *Item, July 24; n. 592: *Pro Ragusinis (Reform of nuns), September 23; n. 801: *Abbati monast. S. Spiritus prope Sulmon. ord. Coelest. (closure), dat. Bononiae, December 10; n. 818: *Generali ministro frat. min. de observ., dat. Bononiae, December 14 (Mendicants in Poland, see THEINER, Mon. Pol., II., 461 *seq.*).

For 1530 see Arm., 39, vol. 50, n. 446: *Ludovico episc. Barchin. (Reform of convents of nuns), September 5; n. 451: *Franc. Card. Pisano (Reform of convents of nuns), September 6; n. 769: *Generali et prov. provinc. ord. heremit. s. August., July 4; n. 780: *Priori prov. prov. Hispan. ord. regul. observ. (Convent in Aragon), August 12; n. 801: *Priori prov. frat. ord. praed. prov. Tholos., September 28; n. 811: *Archiep. Arelat. (Reform of the Poor Clares), October 20; n. 812: *Episc. Magalon. (Reform of Benedictine nuns), October 20; n. 817: *Jacobo de Ancona ord. frat. min. conv. vic. generali (Reform of Poor Clares), November 14; n. 825: *Didaco episc. Ovetan. (Reform of frat. min. conv.), November 24; n. 826: *Abbati monast. s. Georgii Venet. (Reform of Benedictine nuns), November 26. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. also OLIVIERI, Carte p. l. storia Genovese, 224. For discussions on reform, in August, 1530, see HEINE, Briefe, 37 n. Here also belongs the Bull against the sons of priests, June 3, 1530, in Bull., VI., 143 *seq.*

² In this connection F. Peregrino remarks in a *letter of October 26, 1531, in which he reports on the discussion held in Consistory on the previous Friday concerning reform: "L'ordini sono belli, buoni

open to the grave reproach of having receded from the path opened by Adrian VI.; he allowed things to drift back into a contrary course.¹ Outside Rome itself the condition of things was no better.² The evils had passed beyond the reach of special regulations,³ and the cure lay

et laudevoli, se dureranno et non si facci all' usanza di Roma, dove un ordine et un bando suole durare tre giorni et non più" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ For the harsh opposition to Adrian VI. see GOMEZ, Comment. in reg. canc., Paris, 1547, 26.

² Cf. opinions of Sadoletto and Caracciolo in DITTRICH, Kathol. Ref., 390.

³ In the Secret Archives of the Vatican I noted for 1531, Arm., 39, vol. 51, n. 118: *Ferd. ep. Venusin. (Visitation and reform in Apulia and the Basilicata), February 4; n. 190: *Electo Fesalun. Nuncio (Reform of convents in Piedmont and Savoy), February 27; n. 241: *Franc. Card. Pisano (Reform of nuns in Treviso), March 15; n. 249: *Vicar. gen. min. conv. facultas reformandi moniales s. Clarae in Italia et extra, March 18; n. 702: *Convent reform in Benevento, October 29; n. 860: *Visitatio et reformatio conv. ord. min. in Spain, France, and Portugal, December 29. See also the Brief to the Bishop of Cracow (convent reform) in THEINER, Mon. Pol., II., 475 seq., and for the Roman clergy, F. Peregrino's *letter of September 2, 1531, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

1532. Arm., 39, vol. 52, *loc. cit.*; n. 112: *Vincent. Card. Neapolit. (Reform of convents of nuns), February 23; n. 142: *Jacobus de Ancona vic. gen. frat. ord. min. conv. destinatur reformator frat. ejusd. ord. et monial. s. Clarae in regnis Hisp., Franc. et Portug. ac civit. Aven. et comit. Venassin., March 10; n. 171 and 207: *Thomae Guerrierio (Reform in Reg. Sicil.), March 19 and April 5; n. 177: *Reform of Dominican nuns in Parma, March 22; *cf.* n. 406 (June 3); n. 210: *Nic. Audet gen. Carmelit. committitur reformatio ordinis totius, April 5; *cf.* n. 222 (s.d.), n. 229 (April 9), n. 239 (April 12), n. 508 (July 10), n. 509 (July 14); n. 263: *Episc. Camerin. (Reform of clergy), April 16 (Fontana, Docum., 129); n. 438: *Reform of the frat. min. in Spain, June 11; n. 440: *Reform of Benedictine nuns in Benevento, June 14; n. 463: *Generali frat. praedic. ituro ad visit. et ref. dom. int. et ext. Italiam, June 21; n. 476: Vic. ep. Mantuan. com-

beyond the scope of ordinary remedies. Far and wide the demand for a Council was raised; but this was an heroic measure from which Clement shrank with the utmost misgiving.

Clement dared not openly refuse a Council; but with the innate diplomacy of an Italian he tried by a policy of delay to weaken the necessity of convoking one; he was afraid that more harm than good would result from such an assembly. He weighed beforehand all the dangers that a Council undoubtedly might involve, and in his treatment of the whole matter showed such timidity and indecision that, in the end, he forfeited the belief of all

mittitur reformatio monast. s. Benedicti de Palodirone, June 28; n. 484: *J. Poggio fac. visitandi in regnis Hisp. et Nav. eccl. saec. et regul. et exemptas, July 7; *cf.* n. 703 (Nov. 14); n. 617: *Card. Cornelio (Reform of loca exempta eccl. Brixien.), October 19; n. 706: *Card. Ispalen. (Reform of nuns), November 15. See also Min. brev., 1532, vol. 41, n. 188: *To Francis I. (Reform of the frat. ord. min. conv.), April 27; n. 323: *To the Doge A. Gritti (Reform of the Carmelite congreg. Mant. by the General, Jac. de Ancona), October 4.

1533. Min. brev., vol. 46, n. 47: *Card. Trident., March 1; n. 157: *Ministro gen. ord. min. de observ., April 27; n. 160: *Vicario gen. ord. min. convent, April 30; Arm., 39, vol. 53, n. 134: *Honorius Chaianus de Florentia ord. frat. min. de observ. deput. commiss. ad visit. prov. Bonon. ejusd. ord., March 8 (*cf.* n. 170: *Card. Cornelio, April 8); n. 296: *Card. Pisano (Reform of convents in the dioceses of Padua and Treviso), June 30; n. 297: *Archiep. Bremen. committ. ref. monast. Verden. et Bremen. dioc., July 1; *cf.* n. 298: *Joachimo, march. Brandenburg., July 1.

1534. Arm., 39, vol. 54; n. 126: *Joh. archiep. Paris. fac. visit. et corrigendi monachos monast. s. Honorati insulae Lirinen. ord. s. Benedicti, April 22; n. 262: *Vicario gen. Carmelit. de observ., April 13; n. 268: To Aleander, February 9 (in Fontana, Docum., 139 *seq.*). In addition there are the Briefs to Giberti to be mentioned later on, to E. Gonzaga, and so forth, and the Curial **Reformatio vestimentorum praelat. et clericor. of January 11, 1534, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

men in his sincerity.¹ The Pope's objections to the Council were, in the main, half religious and half political. Nor was he unaffected by personal considerations; his illegitimate birth and certain defects of character counted for something, but this could not, as Charles V. and his party believed, have formed the decisive motive for the Pope's behaviour;² that was partly grounded on politics and partly on religion.

The synods of Constance and Basle, with their aggressive attempts to weaken Papal authority, were still fresh, with their ominous import, in the memory of the Roman See. What security was there that the controversy over conciliar authority might not revive again? Should this happen, developments beyond the ken of man were to be feared.³ To the Pope, always a prey to anxiety, a not less serious consideration was the reaction which a thorough-going system of reform would effect in the conditions of life in Rome. If we grasp that the mere rumour of the summons of a Council caused a sudden fall in the price of all saleable offices,⁴ we can estimate the amount of pressure brought to bear on the Pope in his financial necessity by the officials of the Curia. Further, there was the serious apprehension that the all-powerful Emperor would exercise a preponderant influence in the Council and practically annul the independence of the Holy See.⁵

Again, how often during the previous century had the

¹ See EHSSES, *Conc. Trid.*, IV., cix.

² Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 584.

³ Cf. REUMONT (V. Colonna, 125), who shows forcibly how complicated the conciliar question was. See also DITTRICH'S (*Histor. Jahrb.*, II., 616) arguments against Maurenbrecher.

⁴ *Let. d. princ.*, III., 121.

⁵ See RANKE'S (*Päpste*, I., 6th ed., 76) defence of Clemente VII.; VOIGT-HAUCK go further, perhaps too far, in their vindication of the Pope in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, IV., 3rd ed., 149.

demand for a Council been basely misused by the Pope's enemies to subserve the worst purposes.¹ Already in 1526 Charles V. had not disdained, in his political contest with Clement, to employ the Council as a weapon against him. How easily might such proceedings be repeated! And a factor of great influence was the policy of the King of France, who laboured assiduously to prevent a general assembly of the Church, and in pursuit of this object did not seem to shrink even from schism. Finally, the conditions tendered by the Protestants with regard to the participation in "a free Christian Council" not merely of the temporal princes but even of heretical preachers, were such that no Pope could entertain them.² Thus there was urgent need for the greatest caution. Nevertheless, the most painful feelings were aroused³ by the Pope's opposition to a general Council, and especially by his unnatural subordination of the religious and ecclesiastical tasks of his office to those which were political. This unfavourable impression was only partially mitigated by the encouragement given by Clement, in a measure, to the efforts at reform which took practical shape in the hands of men such as Gaetano di Tiene, Giberti, Carafa, Miani, Zaccaria, and others.⁴

¹ Cf. our remarks, Vol. III. of this work, 129 *seq.*; IV., 359 *seq.*; VI., 35 *seq.*, 201 *seq.*, 428 *seq.*, and SCHLECHT, *Zamometic*, 75 *seq.*

² Cf. PALLAVICINI, II., 8; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 584.

³ See REUMONT, III., 2, 257.

⁴ TUCKER (*Engl. Hist. Rev.*, XVIII., 275) has raised a protest, with reference to the encouragement given to Giberti, against MAURENBRECHER'S (*Kathol. Reformation*, 231) view that Clement took up a position of complete indifference towards reform. Our statement of the case has adduced much fresh evidence to the contrary.

CHAPTER XII.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION.—THE ORATORY OF THE DIVINE LOVE.—GAETANO DI TIENE AND CARAFA.

EVEN in times of deepest depression true reformers have arisen within the Church. In spite of abuses and secularity in high places they have never sought occasion to renounce their loyalty to the divinely appointed authority, but have striven to bring about the necessary ameliorations in lawful ways and in closest adhesion to Catholic dogma and the Holy See. Working in this direction, they have rejected every change incompatible with the permanent and divine institutions of the Church, and with her authority and doctrine.

During the fifteenth century, in every country in Europe, men of high character were pursuing reforms in this spirit on the firm foundations of the Catholic faith. But nowhere were these efforts to secure a completely satisfactory renewal crowned with success. In Spain itself, where Cardinal Ximenes, that powerful and far-seeing Franciscan, was achieving, comparatively speaking, the most remarkable results in Catholic reform, his work was lamentably injured in its permanent effect by the absolutism of the Royal power.¹

¹ Cf. DITTRICH in *Histor. Jahrb.*, II., 608, who refers expressly to the inadequate representations of MAURENBRECHER in his *Kathol. Reformation*, 41 *seq.* It is difficult to understand how Maurenbrecher

In Italy Egidio Canisio of Viterbo had laid down the programme of the Catholic reformation at the opening of the Lateran Council in words of weighty meaning: "Men must be transformed by religion, not religion by men." Even if the Council drew up its decrees of reform in agreement with this principle, yet the most important thing of all was wanting: the practical execution of the same.¹ Even the outbreak of the religious severance did not draw Leo X. into a different course; consequently the state of the Church became so menacing that many despaired of a remedy. When all seemed lost a change for the better was coming to pass in perfect quietness, and this proceeded from the inner circles of the Church. It was essentially a new expression of the indwelling element of the divine life and an evident witness to the protection promised by Christ to the Church for all time.

While almost the whole official world of the Curia was given up to politics, and the Italian clergy, conspicuous among whom were the Roman prelates, to corruption and frivolity to an alarming degree,² while Leo X. himself, heedless of the threatening signs of the times, was sunk in æsthetic enjoyment amid the whirl of a gorgeous secular life, a certain number of men, clerics and laymen, noted for virtue and knowledge, had united themselves, under the guidance of the spirit of God, in a confraternity under could have ignored HÖFLER'S important work "Die romanische Welt und ihr Verhältniss zu den Reformideen des Mittelalters," which was published as early as 1878. For criticism of Maurenbrecher, who greatly overestimates Spanish reform (*cf.* 153), see also BELLESHEIM in the *Hist.-polit. Bl.*, LXXXVIII., 608 *seq.*, and GOTHEIN, Ignatius, 781. For Ximenes *cf.* HEFELE, *Der Kardinal Ximenes*, Tübingen, 1853; ULRICH, *Ximenes, Langensalza*, 1883, and NAVARRO Y RODRIGO, *El Card. Cisneros*, Madrid, 1869.

¹ See Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 410 *seq.*

² *Cf.* CARACCILO, *Vita di Paolo IV.*, in JENSEN, *Caraffa*, 191-192.

the protection of St. Jerome bearing the significant name of the Society or Oratory of the Divine Love.¹ Deeply penetrated by the extent of the corruption around them, they started as true reformers with the view that they ought not to indulge in useless lamentations, but begin the much-needed reformation of the whole body with a reform of themselves and their immediate surroundings. From

¹ The accounts hitherto known of the "Compagnia ovvero Oratorio del Divino Amore" are contained in the description by A. Caracciolo in his *Vita di Paolo IV.* (one passage in RANKE, *Päpste*, I., 6th ed., 89, the rest in JENSEN, *Caraffa*, 190 *seq.*) and in *Collect. de Paulo IV.*, 181 *seq.* These are the sources for the *Vita Cajetani* by J. B. CARACCIOLO in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug., II., 283; BZOVIVUS, *Annal.*; SILOS, *Hist. cler. regul.*, I.; BROMATO, I., 83; RANKE, I., 6th ed., 89 *seq.*; KERKER, *Kirchl. Reform.*, 8 *seq.*; DITTRICH, *Kathol. Ref.*, 345 *seq.*, and BENRATH in *Herzog's Realencyklopädie*, XIV., 2nd ed. 424. In the Secret Archives of the Vatican is to be found in the compilation of J. A. Brutius (*Arm.*, 6, vol. 27, f. 64-65), otherwise so full of valuable material, only a fragment of a report on the "Stato della chiesa parrocchiale di S. Dorotea" not bearing on our subject. On the other hand, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican I succeeded in discovering important information in Garampì's files and in a memorandum (see Vol. VIII. of this work, Appendix No 5) of the time of Morone which form an important addition to the meagre statements of A. Caracciolo. To these sources can be added a hitherto unnoticed and very characteristic letter of one "Hieronimus de la Lama, presbyter indignus Ispanus," dated Rome, 1524, October 1, describing his reception into the "Società divini amoris" (SANUTO, XXXVII., 35 *seq.*). The earliest testimony, the important Bull of Leo X., is unfortunately only preserved in the following *register of Garampì's: "Pro confraternitate presbyterorum et clericorum ac laicorum sub invocatione divini amoris nuper in urbe instituta unio parochialis SS. Silvestri et Dorotheae regionis Transtib." *Arch. bull. Leonis X.* [A] 4 [= March 11, 1516, to March 10, 1517] T. 24, p. 177. The subsequent dissolution of this parochial union by Clement VII., with the consent of the members of the confraternity, is, on the other hand, twice preserved (see Appendix, No. 1). The archives of the confraternity apparently disappeared during the first French occupation. In the Roman State Archives, into which much matter of

these small and unpretentious beginnings they, in the fulness of their holy enthusiasm, laid the foundations of a citadel for the observance of the means of grace, for the contest against vice and abuses, and for the exercise of works of charity.¹

The main principle of the members of the Oratory of the Divine Love, to begin with the inward renewal of their own lives through religious exercises, common prayer, and preaching, frequentation of the sacraments and works of neighbourly love, and to point the right way to reform by means of example, was a thoroughly Catholic one; for the Church, in accordance with the will of her Founder, has always considered and set forth inward sanctification as the essential thing. All the members of the Oratory were also united by a strong Catholic feeling. Not one of these men thought even remotely of abandoning the foundations of Church doctrine on account of defects in the clergy, high and low, or of seeking reforms in unlawful ways.² Their

this kind has found its way, I came across, in the series "Chiese," only the *following: "SS. Silvestro e Dorotea. Busta IV. L' archiconfraternità del Divino Amore di S. Gaetano fu istituita dal medesimo Santo l' anno 1517 nella Chiesa di S. Dorotea in Trastevere e sussequentemente l' anno 1750 ai 13 Settembre fa trasferita nella Chiesa di S. Andrea della Valle già de' Padri Teatini, dove fa le sue funzioni, specialmente quelle che riguardano la devozione di S. Andrea Avellino nella sua capella ivi esistente."

¹ See A. CARACCIOLLO, Vita di Paolo IV. (Casanatense Library, Rome).

² With the doubts, now generally abandoned, of Contarini's orthodoxy (who besides, as KERKER had already pointed out in the Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr., 1859, 8 *seq.*, was not one of the founders of the Oratory) was connected RANKE'S (Päpste, I., 6th ed., 88 *seq.*) inclusion of the Oratory among the "analogies of Protestantism in Italy." This fundamental error of the great historian (*cf.* besides KERKER, *loc. cit.*, also BUSS, Die Gesellschaft Jesu, 601 *seq.*, and LAEMMER, Misericordias Domini, Freiburg, 1861, 98) is now rejected on the Protestant

place of meeting was the little church of SS. Silvestro and Dorothea, which, near to S. Maria in Trastevere, lay in a quarter of the city to which the then existing tradition assigned the dwelling-place of St. Peter; on the adjoining slope of the Janiculum the Prince of the Apostles had, as was then believed, suffered martyrdom. Thus when the members of the confraternity betook themselves to their meetings the loftiest associations of Christian Rome were called up before their eyes.

As the Oratory was founded in 1517 at the latest,¹ it is probable that its institution was an echo of the intensified religious feeling connected with the Lateran Council closed on the 16th of March of that year. This religious feeling had found incomparable expression in the visions of Christian art displayed in the masterpieces of Raphael. What devotion radiates from the forms of the Sixtine Madonna and the Divine Child whom she shows to mankind from her height of glory! It has been said with justice that the great lustrous eyes with which the infant Christ meets the gaze of the beholder might well urge an unbeliever to confess the faith.² The same deep life of faith and grace

side (see MAURENBRECHER, *Kath. Ref.*, 208 and 399 *seq.*; *cf.* BENRATH in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, XIV., 3rd ed., 424, and HARNACK in Schürer's *Theol. Literatur-Zeitung*, 1882, 254). Doctrines alien to Catholic dogma cannot be attributed to any member of the Oratory. It is quite as erroneous when Ranke represents the Oratory as "a literary reunion tinged with religion." There is no evidence in support of this view. It was a confraternity, and as such subsists to this day.

¹ This follows from the Bull of Leo the Tenth quoted *supra*, p. 390, n. 1, and is in agreement with the fact that Gaetano di Tiene left Rome as early as 1518 (*Acta Sanctor.*, Aug., II., 244). The early date of the foundation shows clearly that this was not connected, as GOTHEIN thinks (*Ignatius*, 99), with the dangers of the Lutheran movement.

² WOLTMANN, II., 670. *Cf.* Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 333 *seq.*

is mirrored in the Transfiguration. The ancient Umbrian piety speaks here in the more powerful accents of the art of a new age.¹ There is certainly no evidence that Raphael was a member of the Oratory of the Divine Love; but with two of its most distinguished members, Sadoletto and Giberti, he was on terms of friendship and spiritual sympathy. It may be said at least that these, his greatest masterpieces, were executed in the spirit of the Oratory.²

The greater elevation of religious feeling in those days found expression also in the foundation of yet other confraternities which, together with the encouragement of a Christian tone of life, especially devoted themselves to works of practical charity. In the first rank mention must here be made of the "Confraternità della Carità." It had been founded in 1519 by no less a man than Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, afterwards Clement VII., for the support of poor persons above the mendicant class, for the visiting of prisoners, and the burial of the destitute. As early as 1520 this association numbered more than eighty members, including bishops, prelates, and officials of the Curia. Leo X., on the 28th of January 1520, raised it to the status of an archconfraternity and bestowed upon it indulgences and spiritual graces.³ In the first year of his pontificate Clement provided for this, his own institution, by endow-

¹ Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 336 *seq.*

² This connection was first pointed out by BURCKHARDT (Cicerone, 659), later by HETTNER (*Studien*, 236 *seq.*), SELL (*Raffael und Dürer*, Darmstadt, 1881, 15), SCHNEIDER (*Theologisches zu Raffael*, Mainz, 1896), and SPAHN (*Cochläus*, 35). The last-named goes somewhat too far (*cf.* KALKOFF, *Capito*, 46). It is certain that Raphael enrolled himself in a confraternity in Urbino; see PUNGILEONI, 147.

³ See the Bull of January 28, 1520, in Bull. ed. Cocquelines, III., 473. Cf. also BERTELOTTI, *Le prigioni di Roma*, Roma, 1890, 5, and the *Cenni sulle Confraternità di Carità in Cod. Vat., 5796, f. 1 *seq.* (Vatican Library).

ing it with the Church of S. Girolamo,¹ in the neighbourhood of the Farnese palace, and ever since known as "della Carità," together with the buildings belonging to it. The protectorate, which Clement as Pope had to resign, was held by Cardinal Antonio Cocchi del Monte; he was followed by Enkevoirt (1529), Cupis (1533), Carafa (1537), and Morone (1553).² During Clement's lifetime we find among the deputies of this confraternity, together with lesser officials, the Pope's Master of the Household, Girolamo da Schio, and the Cardinals Enkevoirt, Quiñones, and Ercole Gonzaga.³

The Confraternity of S. Girolamo della Carità was, by the autumn of 1524, in such prosperity that Valerio Lugio saw therein the hand of God. "Twelve chaplains," he reported to Venice, "attend to divine worship in the church; the members are unwearied in visiting the hospital, the poor, the wounded, the sick, the imprisoned; they bestow burial on the dead and perform every imaginable work of charity."⁴

The members also of the Oratory of Divine Love did not restrict themselves to purely religious exercises. They were not less diligent in offices of neighbourly charity, and there is an express tradition that in the days of Leo X.

¹ Bull of September 24, 1524, in Archives of the Compagnia di S. Girolamo della Carità, Rome. Cf. WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 574 *seq.* Previously the meetings had been held in S. Andrea in Arenula.

² List of Protectors in Archives of S. Girolamo della Carità.

³ In the *list of the "deputati charitatis" I noted:—1524: Giov. Pietro Crivelli, Milanese. 1525: Fr. Pallavicino, episc. Alerien.; Evangelista Tarasconi, segret. del papa; G. B. Gibrleon, scritt. apost.; Eduardo Cicala, abbrev.; Aless. de Cesena, doctor. 1526: Card. Enkevoirt; Biagio di Cesena. 1530: Bald. de Pesca. 1532: Card. s. Crucis and Card. E. Gonzaga. 1536: Giberti, vesc. di Verona (Archives of the Compagnia di S. Girolamo della Carità).

⁴ SANUTO, XXXVII., 88.

they devoted themselves to the maintenance of the ancient Hospital of S. Giacomo degli Incurabili. Here arose another confraternity in which Leo X., all the Cardinals, and many prelates and courtiers were enrolled.¹ The convent for female penitents on the Corso owed its origin to the Oratory of the Divine Love.² Cardinal Medici obtained the sanction of Leo X. for this institution, and when Pope continued his support.³

The members of the Oratory of the Divine Love, whose numbers rose in course of time to between fifty and sixty, were men differing from one another considerably in culture and social position. Together with those whose interests lay exclusively in ecclesiastical life, such as Giuliano Dati, parish priest of SS. Silvestro and Dorotea,⁴ Gaetano di Tiene, Gian Pietro Carafa, Luigi Lippomano, with whom, later on, in the person of Giberti, a politician and diplomatist also became associated, we find several humanists like Sadoleto, Latino Giovenale Manetti, and Tullio Crispoldi.⁵ The influence of these latter explains

¹ This hitherto unknown fact rests on the memorandum of 1553 in Vol. VIII. of this work, Appendix, No. 5.

² See Vol. VIII. of this work, Appendix, No. 5.

³ See Bull., V., 742 *seq.*; VI., 92 *seq.* Clement VII. conferred on the ancient Confraternity of the Gonfalone the distinction of the gift of the golden rose; see RUGGERI, *L'Archiconfraternità del Gonfalone*, Roma, 1866, 209 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. UGHELLI, IX., 514; the inscriptions in FORCELLA, II., 344, VII., 429, IX., 359, 362, and Caracciolo in JENSEN, Caraffa, 191. G. Dati and the Romans Bernardo di Mastro Antonio and Mariano Particappa composed for the Brotherhood of the Gonfalone the oldest Passion play. First printed at Rome, 1515; last edition, Amati, Roma, 1866.

⁵ It is uncertain when the individual admissions took place. Gaetano certainly was one of the first members, but he was no longer living in Rome in 1518, and Sadoleto left the city in 1523. The letter of

to some extent the curious form of the single contemporary memorial that brings back to day in Rome the memory of the Oratory at S. Dorotea. This is a holy water vessel in stone in the shape of an ancient heathen altar, bearing on the front side the name, title, and arms of Giuliano Dati, who died previous to 1524. The inscription on the right side shows that it was composed by persons who delighted in expressing their thoughts in the language of classical antiquity.¹ Here, if anywhere, is evidence that the employment of phraseology not only classical but even pagan in tone, does not warrant the conclusion that this was the outcome of unchristian sentiment.

It was of great importance that the quiet activity of the Oratory of the Divine Love, the members of which, under Clement VII., also showed care for the poor class of pilgrims to Rome,² should have set an example to different cities of Italy, Verona, Vicenza, Brescia, and Venice being among the earliest to imitate the Roman model.³ These

Hieronymus de la Lama, in SANUTO, XXXVII., 36, shows that Giberti was not a founder, as GOTHEIN (Ignatius, 180) thinks, but joined the society subsequent to October 1524.

¹ The inscription on the front of this stone, now standing on the right side of the lower floor of the Presbytery adjoining the church, runs thus: Julianus || de Dathis || penitentiarius || et rector ; on the right : D. O. M. || Divo Silve || stro ac dive || Dorothee v. || manibus la || ribusq. avi || tis sacrum || an. jubilei. Not given correctly in FORCELLA, IX., 361.

² Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, Appendix, No. 5.

³ Gaetano di Tiene at once procured a Brief from Leo X. for the Confraternità segreta del SS. Corpo di Cristo, founded about 1517 in Verona ; see BARZIZA, S. Gaetano in Verona, Mantova, 1719, 24 *seq*. At the end of 1518 the Olivetans handed over to this confraternity, which still exists to this day and has comprised many artists among its members (see Jahrb. der preuss. Kunstsamml., 1903, 63), the church of SS. Siro and Libera, standing on the upper half of the Roman theatre. Cf. V. SALVARO, La Chiesa dei SS. Siro e Libera e la ven. compagnia in essa eretta, Verona, 1882, 16 *seq.*, 40 *seq.*, 43 (Ratification of the

communities were connected with their brethren in Rome. They held to the same genuine Catholic principle that the sanctification of the individual must necessarily precede any attempt to bring a reforming influence to bear on others. How important for the revival of the inner life of the Church was the Oratorian practice of the frequent use of the sacraments of penance and of the altar, long before the days of Jesuit activity had come, is evident from the well-authenticated fact that, prior to this, the number of those who approached the altar more than once a year, namely, at Easter, was very small.¹

Important and full of blessing as the work of the Oratory and its offshoots proved to be, yet, from their very nature, associations of this kind were debarred from exercising a wider and more penetrating influence. As confraternities they lacked a strict organization. In addition to the constant fluctuation in the number of members, there were the repeated claims of duties and business of other sorts calling them away from the good work for the sake of which they had united together.²

The recognition of these drawbacks led to a plan for the formation of a special order of regular clergy, the so-called Theatines. This Order, which was essentially a product of the Oratory of the Divine Love, soon won a position of exceptional importance in the progress of Catholic reform and restoration. We can thus understand the enthusiastic praise lavished by the historian of the

conveyance by Leo X., 1521, July 29). Here also for the Brotherhood of S. Girolamo in Vicenza (*cf. infra*, p. 398 *seq.*). The existence of confraternities in Brescia and Venice is shown from the letters of Hieronymus de la Lama in SANUTO, XXXVII., 35 *seq.*

¹ See CARACCILO, *Vita di Paolo IV. (Casanatense Library); BROMATO, I., 5.

² See CARACCILO, *loc. cit.*

Theatines on the Oratory of the Divine Love as the cradle of their society.¹ If at first the Oratory was only a hopeful omen of the quiet reaction towards reform² working within the Church, its full significance became known at last through the new and powerful organization which owed to it its birth.

To two men of very different character the foundation of the new Order was due; they were Gaetano di Tiene and Gian Pietro Carafa.

The ancestors of Gaetano di Tiene were nobles of Vicenza who bore the title of Count.³ Born about 1480, he studied jurisprudence at Padua and came to Rome in 1505, where he was appointed Protonotary-Apostolic by Julius II. Not until he had reached his thirty-sixth year, in the autumn of 1516, did he receive minor and sacred orders. It is evident from the letters of this devout priest to the Augustinian nun Laura Mignani of Brescia that he had hitherto held back from entering the service of the sanctuary from humility and a holy fear of that high vocation. Gaetano, who devoted eight hours a day to prayer, dwells in these letters in touching language on his unworthiness to offer up the sacrifice of the Mass wherein he, "a poor worm of earth, mere dust and ashes, passes, as it

¹ SILOS, *Hist. Cler. Regul.*, I., 6.

² *Cf.* KERKER, *Kirchliche Reform.*, 9.

³ See *Acta Sanctor.*, Aug., II., 240 *seq.*, also 280 *seq.*, for the older biographies, of which the most important, that of A. Caracciolo, published 1612, is reproduced. *Cf.* also J. B. CARACCIOLUS, *Vita*, Pisis, 1738; MAGENIS, *Vita*, Napoli, 1749 (reprint, *ibid.*, 1845); ZINELLI, *Mem. Stor.*, Venezia, 1753; BARRAL (Paris, 1789); DUMORTIER (Paris, 1882); LÜBEN (Regensburg, 1883); DE MAULDE LA CLAVIÈRE (Paris, 1902; *cf.* for this unsuccessful work, SCHRÖRS in the *Lit. Rundschau*, 1904, 4 *seq.*). Documents concerning the Tiene family in Cod. 152 of the Library of Ferrara. *Cf.* also BORTOLAN, *S. Corona*, Vicenza, 1889, 360 *seq.*

were, into heaven and the presence of the Blessed Trinity, and dares to touch with his hands the Light of the sun and the Maker of the universe." Such a priest must have found in the Oratory of the Divine Love the expression of his innermost soul. If Gaetano nevertheless left Rome as early as 1518, it was in obedience to a call of filial duty bidding him return to Vicenza, where his mother had just undergone a heavy loss in the death of a second son. There he worked in the spirit of the Oratory in Rome and urged worthy and repeated reception of the sacraments. In this direction Gaetano's efforts were specially effective, for he infused fresh life into the Confraternity of S. Girolamo.¹ It was he also who induced this society to take over the administration of a decayed hospital for incurables. On this work of compassion he spent large sums of money, and also obtained for it from Leo X. all the privileges and indulgences belonging to the great Hospital of S. Giacomo in Rome.²

In the summer of 1519 a brotherhood at Verona, the Secret Confraternity of the Most Holy Body of Christ, which had also been one of Gaetano's revivals,³ addressed a petition to the confraternity at Vicenza to be admitted into fellowship with them in spiritual possessions, prayers, and good works. In his great humility Gaetano inverted the petition and requested admission to the brotherhood in Verona, whither he went, accompanied by the leading members of the community of Vicenza. When it came to the signing of the form of aggregation he made his

¹ Diarium Vicent. Sodalit. from Caracciolo in Acta Sanctor., Aug., II., 283. BARZIZA, *loc. cit.*, 22. The confraternity founded 1494 was originally called the Compagnia segreta della Misericordia; see BORTOLAN, *Nozze Bottazzi-Bertolini*, Vicenza, 1887, 1888.

² Cf. the documents in BORTOLAN, *loc. cit.*, 11-12.

³ Cf. the work of Salvaro, cited *supra*, p. 396, n. 3.

companions take precedence. His own subscription was as follows: "I, Gaetano di Tiene, wholly unworthy to be a priest of God, have been received as the last among the members of this holy community in July 1519."¹

From 1521 to 1523 Gaetano, with the exception of a short visit to Brescia where he saw Laura Mignani, devoted himself to works of spiritual and temporal compassion in the city of Venice. There also he bestowed much attention on the hospital for incurables, and in an astonishingly short time brought it into a better condition.² In spite of this success he was not satisfied; the worldliness of life in the city of the lagoons grieved him deeply. From thence on the 1st of January 1523 he wrote to his friend Paolo Giustiniani: "How pitiful is the state of this noble city! One could weep over it. There is indeed not one who seeks Christ crucified. Jesus waits and no one comes. That there are men of good will among this fine people I do not deny. But they will not stand forth 'for fear of the Jews.' They are ashamed to be seen at confession or Holy Communion."³

These discouraging conditions probably led to Gaetano's return to Rome at the end of 1523. There, in the Oratory of the Divine Love, he found Bonifazio da Colle, Paolo Consiglieri, and Gian Pietro Carafa all full of reverence for his own ideals. His intercourse with Carafa especially was to be followed by most important results.

Seldom have two such different characters combined in the pursuit of the same aim as these two men whose

¹ See SALVARO, *loc. cit.* In Cod. DCCLXXXIII., f. 252, Chapter Library, Verona, there is a copy of the registration with the date July 10, 1519.

² Cf. the quite unbiassed testimony of SANUTO, a thorough man of the world, XXXIII., 299; XXXIV., 38; XXXVI., 103.

³ LÜBEN, 61; DE MAULDE LA CLAVIÈRE, 59 *seq.*

activity in the beginning of the great movement of the Catholic reformation was fertile in influence. A waft of sacred poetry breathed through the life of Gaetano, who, like the saint of his deep veneration, Francis, glowed with a mystic love for the poor Child in the manger. Amid all the fire of his religious emotion he was yet a personality of exceeding gentleness and tenderness. Yielding, given to self-communing, silence, and reserve, it was only with great reluctance that he took a public place. He thus gave rise to the remark that he wished to reform the world, but without letting the world know that he was in it.¹ A beautiful saying, and the best description of the peculiar character of a man who was filled with a boundless trust in the providence of God. In long hours of meditation Gaetano prepared for the sacrifice of the Mass. He was often seen to burst into tears at the moment of consecration. Daily, in the sacrament of penance, he clad his soul in the purest wedding garment, and was himself unwearied in the duties of the confessional and in the visitation of the sick and poor.

Carafa also was full of love towards God and his neighbour. His sense of religion was not less deep than that of Gaetano; but in him, the typical southern Italian, it found a very different expression. Brimming over with eloquence, impetuous, glowing with a zeal not always tempered with wisdom, capable of inconsiderate obstinacy and hardness, he flung his whole being into the work that seemed to him to be necessary. The embodiment of strength of will, and driven by an irresistible urgency to work and originate, he formed a striking supplement to Gaetano, the tranquil servant of prayer and meditation.

Carafa's career was also much more troubled and full of

¹ See RANKE, *Päpste*, I., 6th ed., 114.
VOL. X.

vicissitude than that of his friend.¹ Born on the vigil of the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul (June 28) 1476, this scion of one of the oldest, noblest, and most influential families in the kingdom of Naples wished, while yet in his twelfth year, to enter the Dominican Order, but was prevented by his father, Gian Antonio, Baron of S. Angelo della Scala and, in right of his wife, Vittoria Camponesca, also Count of Montorio.² Gian Pietro's sister Maria, eight years his senior, felt the same vocation for the cloister. On Christmas night 1490 they both escaped from their parents' house. The brother sought out the Dominicans, the sister the nuns of the same Order. Once more the father snatched his son from the cloister; but, on the other hand, he gave him permission to study theology for, as the nephew of an Archbishop and Cardinal, brilliant advancement seemed certain. On completing his studies in 1494 Gian Pietro received the tonsure, and in accordance with his father's wishes he went to Rome to his uncle, Cardinal Oliviero

¹ For the early lives of Carafa see C. BROMATO (Bartol. Carrara), *Storia di Paolo IV.*, I., 1 *seqq.* The most valuable materials on which Bromato relied for the greatest part of this work are in Ant. Caracciolo's (d. 1642) industrious compilation of sources: (1) *Collect. Hist. de Vita Pauli IV.*, Coloniae, 1612; (2) **Vita di Papa Paolo IV.* (2 vols., frequently in manuscript, as in Cod. 993 of the Casanatense Library; Cod. Barb., lat. 4953, 4961, 5370; Secret Archives of the Vatican, XI., 101; British Museum, 20011-20012). Three MSS. of the *Vita*, one of which is apparently from the hand of Caracciolo, are in the Library of the National Museum in the Certosa di S. Martino, Naples. This exceedingly important life is based partly on original papers of Carafa. I was successful in finding two volumes of such original papers which often give additions to Caracciolo; in the first place, one ought to mention here the *Collection of letters in Cod. Barb., lat. 5697, Vatican Library, and in the second that in Cod. XIII., AA 74, of the National Library, Naples.

² Cf. PANSA in the *Rassegna abruzz.*, IV. (1900).

Carafa. The latter wished at once to procure a bishopric for the lad of eighteen, who conscientiously refused to entertain the notion. Even later (about 1500), when a Papal chamberlain, he only accepted benefices to which the duty of residence was not attached. Entirely given up to study, prayer, and works of charity, he passed through the corrupt court of Alexander VI. pure and unspotted. The keen insight of Julius II. soon recognized his worth; by 1503 he had appointed him a Protonotary and in 1504 Bishop of Chieti in the Abruzzi. Carafa accepted this honour unwillingly. From this and from the opposition of the Spanish government to the appointment of an offshoot of a family always inimical to their interests, we can explain why Carafa's consecration did not take place until 1506. Immediately afterwards he was sent by Julius II. as Nuncio to Naples to welcome Ferdinand the Catholic on his arrival from Barcelona. On this occasion also Carafa had to experience the hardness of the Spanish character. Ferdinand flatly refused to pay the annual tribute on investiture with the kingdom demanded by the Nuncio in the Pope's name. He rejoiced when, in 1507, his mission came to an end, and at once returned to Chieti to find his diocese in an evil plight.

Carafa as a genuine reformer began to introduce an improvement by his own example and the change of behaviour in his household, in accordance with the motto adopted by him at this time: "For the time is, that judgment should begin at the house of God."¹ In his new position Carafa had often to resist the encroachments of the Spanish officials on his own jurisdiction. But no obstacle turned back this man of iron purpose. In every way, especially by his visitations, he laboured for

¹ Cf. 1 Petr. iv. 17.

five toilsome years to raise the standard of the diocese; so intent was he on this work that he did not attend the first four sittings of the Lateran Council. As soon as his diocese was to some extent set in order he went to Rome in the beginning of 1513 where, as a member of the commission for the restoration of peace and the removal of the schism, he soon attracted the attention of Leo X., who in 1513 appointed him Legate to Henry VIII. During his stay in England he came to know Erasmus, on whom he urged the duty of preparing an edition of the works of St. Jerome. Erasmus praised Carafa in a letter, speaking with admiration of his dignity, his eloquence, and his knowledge of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and theology.¹ Leo X. in 1515 sent him as Nuncio to Spain. On his journey thither he formed a friendship in Flanders at the court of Margaret of Austria with the Dominican, Juan Alvarez de Toledo, an earnest supporter of reform. At first his reception at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic was of the best; the King gave him a place on his Council and made him Vice Grand Chaplain. Carafa tried to make his influence felt in Aragonese affairs, on behalf of the independence of Naples. But all his attempts to move Ferdinand to a renunciation of that kingdom were unsuccessful. He appealed in vain to the conscience of the dying King, reminding him of his broken pledges to Frederick of Naples and his sons. This attitude also reacted on his relations with the new King, Charles. Although Carafa was on the King's side during the revolt of the Comuñeros, he was viewed with dislike at court. He was suspected of disclosing State secrets to the Pope,

¹ BROMATO, I., 63 *seq.* Since Erasmus could not at that time expect much from Carafa, his praises were sincere; see GÖTHEIN, Ignatius, 171. The Episcopal Archives at Chieti, so far as they have been arranged, unfortunately contain nothing relating to Carafa.

and one of his colleagues on the Council even taunted him with the words: "If the Neapolitans had their deserts, they would get dry bread and a stout stick."¹ When, on the appointment of a new Grand Chaplain, Carafa was passed over, he requested leave to retire. Charles V. tried to reconcile him by appointing him Archbishop of Brindisi, but Carafa withdrew from the court in bitter displeasure. Henceforth a deep-rooted distrust and dislike of the Hapsburg King of Spain took possession of him.

But in other respects his long residence in Spain had been of great importance to Carafa. While it lasted he had formed friendly relations with the men who were anxious to carry out a scheme of reform on sound Catholic principles and without making a breach in the established order of things. He was in near touch not merely with Cardinal Ximenes but with Adrian of Utrecht and the Neapolitan, Tommaso Gazella di Gaeta. Powerful as the Spanish influences were in this connection, yet they must not be overrated. Like Adrian, Carafa had been a friend of reform long before he had come to know in Spain the fruits of the activity of a Ximenes.² In one important point his plan of reform differed from the Spanish programme. He abominated any intrusion of the secular power into the ecclesiastical sphere, and had, especially, a higher sense of his position as a churchman than the Spanish prelates. What was the amazement of the latter when Carafa once in the Chapel Royal replied to a court official who had asked him to delay beginning Mass until the King arrived: "Within these sacred walls I represent the person of Christ, and therefore, vested with such an office, would

¹ Cf. BROMATO, I., 74.

² Cf. DITTRICH in *Histor. Jahrbuch*, II., 610 *seq.*

deem it an indignity to await the coming of an earthly king.”¹

Carafa returned to Rome from Spain by Naples, where he restored the Confraternity of the Bianchi, who ministered to persons lying under sentence of death.² When in 1520 he reached Rome, the affair of Luther was being discussed. Leo X. made use of him during the deliberations; he also may have had a share in formulating the Bull of Condemnation,³ otherwise his chief occupation in Rome was the pursuit of works of charity; he was most constantly seen in a hospital for incurables he had founded earlier with the help of Ettore Vernacci,⁴ and in the Oratory of the Divine Love. Devoted as he was to the objects of this association, agreeing as they did with the motto of his choice, yet he was soon once more in his dioceses of Brindisi and Chieti, where a great field lay open for his reforming energies. He did not return to Rome until an express summons from Adrian VI. called him back in 1523. He gladly obeyed the request of the Pope, who was determined to give practical shape to his idea of reform. Of the impression made in Rome by Carafa we have some information from a letter of Paolo Giustiniani in which he gives an account of some of the devout men whose acquaintance he had made in the city. Carafa, he says, was a man of learning and humility, and so holy in his manner of life that no one in Rome could be compared

¹ CARACCIOLO, *Vita di Paolo IV., *loc. cit.*

² *Ibid.*, *Vita di Paolo IV.; BROMATO, I., 76.

³ *Ibid.*, *Vita di Paolo IV.; BROMATO, I., 77; BENRATH in Herzog's Realencyklopädie, XV., 3rd ed., 41; A. SCHULTE (Quellen und Forschungen, VI., 39) has overlooked Carafa's participation in this matter. It seems to me doubtful whether Carafa's treatise "De justificatione" had yet appeared.

⁴ BROMATO, I., 36, 83.

with him.¹ How much might have been hoped if such a man had been permitted to co-operate for long with the lofty-minded German Pope in his reforming efforts! But Providence had decreed otherwise. Carafa, in July 1523, had just obtained for Paolo Giustiniani a confirmation and extension of plenary powers for the congregation of the hermits of Camaldoli when Adrian died.²

Carafa, with the penetration which was peculiar to him in such matters, perceived that Clement VII., notwithstanding his previous good intentions, could not be expected to follow the course on which his predecessor had entered. For a moment he dwelt on the thought of withdrawing himself into the solitude of the hermits of Camaldoli: fortunately for the Church, the bent of his character towards energetic work had the upper hand. Carafa was not mistaken in supposing that political interests would more and more predominate at the court of Clement VII.

In closest intimacy with the members of the Oratory of the Divine Love, and especially with Gaetano, he drew up new plans. With all their enthusiasm for the Oratory, these two friends were well aware that a mere confraternity offered no guarantee for a comprehensive and permanent renewal throughout the Church. Besides, since all ordinances from higher authority and all Papal decrees of reform were almost a dead letter, the idea was pressed home to them that, by the force of example, the deeply needed improvement might be begun first of all among the ranks of the secular clergy. Thus there ripened in the conversations of Carafa and Gaetano, to which some other friends, such as Bonifazio da Colle of Alessandria and the Roman Paolo Consiglieri had been admitted, the plan of

¹ The letter, addressed to Gaetano di Tiene, is in SANUTO, XXXV., 252.

² Cf. Vol. IX. of this work, p. 117 *seq.*

substituting for the Oratory a special foundation with fixed rules and a life in community consisting of regular clerics in immediate dependence on the Holy See.¹ Instead of the old orders which, partly from deterioration, partly from their organization, were no longer adapted to the needs of the times, a new institution, instinct with life, was to arise, the members of which, as simple priests of blameless life and faithfulness to their vocation, were to shed a guiding light of example before the great mass of the secular clergy, numbers of whom were sunk deep in the prevailing corruption. The fundamental idea of the founders was to form a society of devoted priests who should give themselves up entirely to the administration of the sacraments, the work of preaching, and the conduct of ecclesiastical ceremonies so as to set an example before the Church. Of friars there were plenty, and many were disreputable men; the members of the new Order, therefore, were not to bear names, many of which had fallen into wide discredit. At their head there was to be neither prior nor guardian, but simply a superior. Attention was also paid to the form and colour of their clothing; the customary black garment of the ordinary priest seemed the only suitable one for a community with the primary task before it of effecting by example and hard work a thorough reform in the secular clergy, and a return to apostolic standards of life.²

¹ The first idea certainly came from Gaetano; Caracciolo himself (*Vita di Paolo IV., II., 1) says this, appealing to the lost biography of Gaetano by G. A. Prati. The Bull of Beatification therefore rightly speaks of Gaetano as the founder (Acta Sanctor., Aug., II., 246. Carafa, therefore, cannot be called (CARACCILO, *loc. cit.*, II., 2), "autore et fondatore"; but he is justly entitled to be regarded as joint founder of the Theatines; see ZINELLI, *Memorie*, 38.

² See CARACCILO, *Vita di Paolo IV., II., 1, 2, 3. Cf. CARACCILO in the Acta Sanctor., Aug., II., 285, § 19, and BROMATO, I., 109 *seqq.* His intention in founding the Theatine Order is very clearly expressed

While any imitation of the externals of the existing orders was thus avoided, Carafa and his associates were all the more anxious to be true to the inner character of lives devoted to a religious rule. They therefore demanded a secluded community life and the observance of the three vows of chastity, obedience, and poverty. On this last point they went much further than the followers of the poor man of Assisi. The members of the new institution were to practise poverty in its most rigorous form. They were to have no capital, no income; they might not even once ask for alms. Depending calmly on the divine providence, they were to wait for spontaneous gifts and in this way bring back clergy and people to the enthusiasm of the first Christians. A fountain-head of evil in the Church was the immoderate striving after possessions, whereby so many were enticed without vocation into the sanctuary. This grievous abuse was to be torn up by the roots by an association of priests subject to vows, and leading lives of poverty in the fullest sense. This idea had taken possession of two men sprung from families of noble descent, who thus sought to make expiation for the scandals brought on the Church by others in their own station in their pursuit of worldly possessions.

This summons to absolute poverty aroused in the Curia of Clement VII., where most men were absorbed in money

in a *letter to Giberti, dated Venice, 1533, January 1, in which he asks him to obtain from Clement VII. a fresh and, in some points, revised Bull of approval; he *says: "Et per ricordo riverentemente si fa intender a V. S. che nella detta bolla tra le principal cose si voria contenere la approbatione di questo instituto clericale talmente, che non paresse che si volesse far nova religione, si como in verità non volemo nè potemo, et si ben potessimo non voriamo perchè non volemo esser altro che chierici viventi secondo li sacri canoni in commune et de communi et sub tribus votis, perciocchè questo è il mezzo convenientissimo a conservare la commune vita clericale." Cod. Barb., lat. 5697 f. 32 (Vatican Library).

and the acquisition of money, general observation and great opposition. If amid the chilling of Christian love the mendicant Orders were hardly able to exist, how could a new order maintain itself by repudiating the appeal to the alms of the faithful? To such objections Gaetano replied in the words of Christ: "Be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat; nor for your body, what you shall put on." So fervently did he dwell on God's providence in the presence of the Pope that the latter exclaimed: "I have not found such faith in Israel." But difficulties of a more serious kind were not wanting. Gaetano had scruples in allowing Carafa to become a member, as he was already a bishop. Clement VII. on his side saw with reluctance so capable a man, to whom he had given an important function in respect of the reform of the Roman clergy, removed from his service. The Pope also feared the difficulty of finding a substitute for him in the dioceses of Chieti and Brindisi. But the fervent Carafa, supported by his old friends Giberti, Sadoletto, and Schönberg,¹ gave Clement no rest until he yielded and consented to his resignation of the two sees.² The decisive Brief, drawn up by Sadoletto, was issued on the 24th of June 1524. It gave permission to Carafa, Gaetano, and their associates, after solemnly taking the three essential vows, to live in community as regular clergy while wearing the garb of the ordinary ecclesiastic. They were to be in immediate subordination to the Pope, to choose a superior holding office for a period not longer than three years, while secular clergy and laymen were to be admitted to the vows after a probation of one year; they, moreover, held all the privileges of the Canons of the Lateran, together

¹ Cf. BROMATO, I., 96.

² Cf. Lett. d. princ., II., 52; SANUTO, XXXVI., 326.

with permission to accept benefices with a cure of souls. The special constitutions were not to be presented for acceptance until later, when greater experience of their working had been acquired.¹

Gaetano now resigned all his benefices and handed over his patrimony to his kinsfolk. "I see Christ in poverty and I am rich," he wrote on the 24th of August 1524; "He is despised, and I am honoured. I wish to draw one step nearer to Him, and therefore have resolved to renounce all yet remaining to me of this world's goods."²

Carafa also distributed his property among needy relations and the poor; at the same time he resigned both his sees. This instance of a self-sacrifice unprecedented in that age created a great sensation; to many such a heroic step was simply unintelligible; others indulged in depreciation or ridicule,³ but Gaetano and Carafa went on their way unheeding. On the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (September 14), 1524, in company with Bonifazio da Colle and Paolo Consiglieri, after receiving Holy Communion they presented, at the tomb of St. Peter, to Bonziano, Bishop of Caserta, as Apostolic Commissary, the Brief by which their institute was recognized as an Order, and then proceeded to take the solemn vows.⁴ Carafa was immediately afterwards

¹ Bull., VI., 73 *seq.* Cf. BROMATO, I., 112, 115, 117 *seq.* The original Brief is in the General Archives of the Theatine Order in Rome.

² Copies were very soon circulated of this beautiful letter, justly extolled by the saint's biographers (see LÜBEN, 89), and signed "Frater Gaietanus miser presbyter." One of these old copies is in the General Archives of the Theatine Order in Rome.

³ BROMATO, I., 105 *seq.*

⁴ The notarial deed in SILOS, 37, and Acta Sanctor., Aug., II., 248 *seq.* Cf. also SANUTO, XXXVII., 35; ATANAGI, Lett. facet., I., 138, and the *report of Gernanello of September 24, 1524, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

chosen Superior, retaining, according to the desire of Clement VII., his title as Bishop. The new foundation was in closest communication with the Holy See, and its members, directly subject to the Pope, looked upon St. Peter as their special patron.¹

The new regulars, who were called Theatines or Chietines from Carafa's first see, and sometimes Cajetans or Clerks Regular of the Divine Providence, were clad entirely in black; they always wore the cassock, high collar, and white stockings, and their head covering was the clerical biretta. Carafa strictly required them to be clean shaven and wear a large-sized tonsure.² They lived, as much as possible, in seclusion; but when they appeared in public their demeanour was full of dignity. They began with a small house in the Strada Leonina, leading to the Campo Marzio, once the property of Bonifazio da Colle.³ On the 30th of April 1525 the first novice was received; he was the learned priest Bernardino Scotti, afterwards a Cardinal.⁴

Before the close of 1525⁵ Giberti provided the Theatines with a new dwelling on the Pincian, then quite unbuilt upon, where the Villa Medici now stands.⁶ There

¹ Cf. Carafa's characteristic *letter to Giberti of March 1, 1533, in the Vatican Library, Cod. Barb., lat. 5697.

² Cf. SANUTO, XXXVII., 90.

³ The house was near the little church S. Nicola di Campo Marzio, and was given to the Order on September 13, 1524. CARACCIOLO, *Vita di Paolo IV., II., 3.

⁴ CARACCIOLO, Vita di Paolo IV., II., 4; BROMATO, I., 131 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. the *Dichiarazione di bona fede di Giberti che la vigna comprata a Monte Pincio per il prezzo di duc. 1000 fu comprata di denari prop. della congreg. Teat., dat. October 7, 1525 (original in General Archives of the Theatine Order, Rome).

⁶ In the deed of sale (in CARACCIOLO, *Vita, II., 4) the situation is *described: "Inter moenia urbis, in loco qui dicitur lo monte de' Pinci,

they gave themselves up assiduously to prayer, meditation, the study of Holy Scripture, and the care of souls. Especially were they diligent in preaching, avoiding all profane alloy in their sermons and fervently teaching devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the frequentation of the sacraments. At the same time they aroused violent enmity and vulgar contempt; Carafa in particular suffered in this respect,¹ for he stood high in Clement's favour and, being the Superior of the community, was a representative personality.² The worldly-minded ridiculed the new Order as a collection of laughable eccentrics who were neither monks nor simple clergy,³ but among the people respect for them increased on account of their mortified lives and their exemplary devotion to the sick and the poor pilgrims during the outbreak of the plague in the Jubilee year of 1525. A deep impression was made by the sight of men of illustrious and noble lineage, to whom all the enjoyments of life might have lain open, choosing of their own accord the strictest poverty and, without fear of infection, visiting the poor and plague-stricken in hospitals and private houses, to tend, cheer, and succour them in the pains of death. It was then that a nun

cui ab uno latere sunt res s. Mariae de populo, ab alio vinea, quae nunc possidetur per dom. Emiliū de Capisucchis, ab altero moenia urbis et ante viculos vicinales"; *cf.* BROMATO, I., 133. Clement VII. wished to assign S. Girolamo to the Theatines, but this church seems to have been in an unquiet neighbourhood; see the *letter of A. Germanello, September 24, 1524 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and SANUTO, XXXVII., 10.

¹ See SANUTO, XXXVII., 357. *Cf.* ROSSI, Pasquinate, 111, and LUZIO, Pronostico, 8, 12, 16, 30, 62.

² *Cf.* *Annales Venetae domus (General Archives of the Theatine Order, Rome).

³ See CARACCIOLIO in the Acta Sanctor., Aug., II., 287, and SANUTO, XXXVII., 37.

of Ravenna declared that God was now sending His saving help to reform the Church and renew the lives of men.¹

Whoever led a more interior life, with greater piety and strictness than others, was spoken of as a Theatine.² Even among the Roman clergy the earnestness and asceticism of the new Order, whose members, notwithstanding the almost insupportable scarcity, never lacked the necessaries of life, began to produce a wholesome effect. What a change was brought about in Rome by the quiet, plodding labours of the first Theatines is seen from a letter written on the 5th of January 1527³ by one of themselves to their friends of like mind in Venice, who had charge of the Hospital for Incurables there. "Christ," he says, "is now more feared and honoured here than in days past. The proud humble themselves, the good praise God, the wicked are without hope. Let us pray for their conversion, pray for the fathers, and specially for Carafa! God is making use of his own in the Church. Bethink you, the first prelates and lords in Rome, who at first despised us in their pride, now come daily to us with such submission, as if they were our servants, that I am quite ashamed. They show a willing spirit of penitence, prayer, and pious works. They do all that the fathers bid them. And yet more—daily the Holy Father asks for the prayers of us poor wretches." He then goes on to relate how the great Tommaso Campeggio came one day to Carafa and asked him very humbly to bestow on him the episcopal consecration, which he had hitherto deferred, as he desired henceforward

¹ See CARACCILOLO, *Vita, II., 1 and 4; BROMATO, I., 128 *seq.*; RANKE, Pápste, I., 6th ed., 115, and DITTRICH, Kathol. Ref., 392 *seq.*

² CARACCILOLO, *Vita, II., 3, in DITTRICH, 393. Cf. ATANAGI, Lett. facet., I., 24; Lett. volg., I., 178 *seq.*

³ SANUTO, XLIII., 609 *seq.*

to be a true bishop of the see of Feltre. Although Campeggio was a man of learning, Carafa examined him as if he had been a simple priest. He submitted with touching humility, and might have received all the grades at once, and even have asked for consecration at the hands of the Pope himself; but he preferred to act in obedience to Carafa's wishes. He fasted with the Theatines, kept the canonical hours along with them, and at each ordination communicated with such humility that all present were put to shame. Giberti too, at that time next to the Pope the most influential man in Rome, visited Carafa daily, and often shared with him his frugal meals. Just then Clement VII. showed his attachment to the Theatines by the bestowal of new indulgences. The new community grew day by day in men's regard, but their labours in support of the hospitals and other benevolent institutions did not diminish in zeal.¹

Carafa and Gaetano looked to the future in hope and joy. Then came the catastrophe of the sack of Rome; Carafa, Gaetano, and their twelve associates were brutally treated by the soldiers and thrown into prison.² They managed, as by a miracle, to escape from the hands of their tormentors. The Venetian envoy, Venier, took compassion upon them in Ostia and was the means of enabling them to make the journey to Venice, which they reached in June. The Confraternity of the Hospital for Incurables, with whom they had always had close ties, procured for them in their entire destitution a refuge at S. Eufemia.³ Thence they migrated to S. Gregorio, and finally found

¹ SANUTO, XLIII., 611-612; *cf.* 533.

² CARACCILO, *Vita, II., 5; BROMATO, I., 153 *seq.*

³ SANUTO, XLV., 343. For the connection with the Hospital for Incurables see BROMATO, I., 138 *seq.*

a suitable community house in the Oratory of S. Nicola da Tolentino.¹

The Theatines, who had, on the 14th of September 1527, chosen Gaetano as Superior, lived as retired a life in Venice as in Rome, so that they were spoken of as the "hermits." They continued to urge the frequent use of the sacraments; they were also occupied with raising the observance of divine worship to a higher level of solemnity and with the improvement of the Breviary by the excision of unhistorical narratives.² Their pastoral zeal, their heroism amid the famine and plague of 1528, won them an increase of friends, and one of their greatest benefactors was the Doge Andrea Gritti.³

It was of the greatest importance for the Theatines that in Venice they came into closer relations with such eminent advocates of Catholic reform as Gasparo Contarini, Reginald Pole, and the regenerator of the Benedictine Order, Gregorio Cortese. The garden of S. Georgio Maggiore, Cortese's monastery, was the scene of many learned and pious conversations, for which reason Bruccioli chose it as the background for his "Dialogue on Moral Philosophy."⁴

Carafa drew up the earliest rules for the Theatines, over whom he was again Superior from 1530 to 1533. The object of these statutes was the formation of a

¹ Cf. CARACCILO in the *Acta Sanctor.*, Aug., II., 290, and *Vita, II., 6; see also SANUTO, XLVI., 193, 333, 418, and BROMATO, I., 160 *seq.*, 163 *seq.*, 173.

² Cf. CARACCILO, *Vita, II., 7; BROMATO, I., 174 *seq.*, 180 *seq.*; BAÜMER, 412 *seq.*

³ Cf. *Annali dei Teatini della casa di Venezia (General Archives of the Theatine Order, Rome).

⁴ Cf. DITTRICH, Contarini, 212 *seq.* A fine eulogy on Pole in *Carafa's letter to Giberti, January 1, 1533, in Cod. Barb., lat. 5697, . 33 (Vatican Library).

blameless type of priestly character enjoying the utmost possible freedom for the exercise of the different branches of the pastoral office. The several rules were not to bind the members of the Order under sin.¹

Carafa showed great prudence in his guidance of the Order. When Clement VII., in February 1533,² enjoined the erection of an affiliated house in Naples, the Superior raised difficulties, for he feared lest his slender forces should be broken up.³ The Pope, in entire confidence, left the matter to Carafa's sole decision. The latter did not make up his mind until August, and then sent two of his best colleagues, Gaetano and Giovanni Marino, to Naples, where the Theatines, supported by Gian Antonio Caracciolo, soon secured a firm footing. Gaetano, who was the Superior in Naples, although in other respects a gentle character, was inflexible in the observance of the strictest poverty, as he showed in his resistance to the Count of Oppido, who wished to press upon the Neapolitan house settled revenues. In order to escape from him Gaetano moved into the Hospital for Incurables. Afterwards he obtained a new house through the good offices of the devout Maria Laurenzia Longa, who was to become the foundress of the Capuchin nuns.⁴

¹ See BROMATO, I., 143 *seq.* There is nothing in the earliest rule in support of BENRATH'S statement (Herzog's Realencyklopädie, XV., 3rd ed., 41) that "the peculiar characteristic of the new Order" was that the members should devote themselves to detecting and encountering heretics.

² Acta Sanctor., Aug., II., 291 *seq.*

³ See the letter to Fuscano in BROMATO, I., 234. The missing date (March 29, 1533) is in Cod. Barb., lat. 5697.

⁴ Cf. *Annali della casa di Napoli in the General Archives of the Theatine Order; CARACCIOLO, *Vita, II., 8 and 10; Acta Sanctor., *loc. cit.*; BROMATO, I., 229 *seq.*; VOLPICELLA, Studi, Napoli, 1876, 214.

Gaetano was also quite as strict as Carafa in the reception of new members.¹ This and the requirement of complete poverty accounts for their numbers not having exceeded, after nine years, one-and-twenty persons.² Consequently the burden of work falling on the individual members became so heavy that Clement VII., in 1529, ordered other forms of prayer to be substituted for the daily office to relieve those who were already overcharged with the duties of study, visiting the sick, and the confessional.³

The system of scrupulous selection observed by the founders of the Order had thoroughly justified itself. The great success of the Theatines undoubtedly is to be attributed to no small extent to this characteristic, that here a small, carefully chosen circle of men, deeply schooled in obedience to the Church, formed, as it were, a *corps d'élite* with which Carafa won his victories. Thus the Theatine Order was not so much a seminary for priests, as at first might have been supposed, as a seminary for bishops who rendered weighty service to the cause of Catholic reform.⁴ One of the chief causes of the failure attending the efforts of Adrian VI. was the want of a suitable organism to carry into effect the right measures; such an organism was found in the new Order.

In Rome Carafa had many opponents, especially among the worldly minded Cardinals.⁵ It is to the credit of Clement VII. that he almost always was on the side of

¹ Cf. BROMATO, I., 115, 145 *seq.*, 224 *seq.*, 236 *seq.*

² Letter to Silvago in BROMATO, I., 236. The date (March 23, 1533), according to Cod. Barb., lat. 5697 (Vatican Library).

³ BROMATO, I., 173; further facilities, 1533; see Bull., VI., 161.

⁴ Cf. BROMATO, I., 111. A copious *collection of lives of Theatine bishops is preserved in their General Archives in Rome.

⁵ See SANUTO, LV., 171; CARACCILOLO, *Vita, II., 10.

Carafa in his many encounters, and that he fostered the development of the Order by means of extensive privileges.¹ In the presence of the secularized character of the episcopate, Carafa held it to be of the greatest importance that his community should remain in direct dependence on the Holy See.² He knew no rest until this vital point was expressly settled by a Brief issued on the 7th of March 1533, which also contained yet other graces and privileges.³

Full of rejoicing and encouragement at the Pope's support the Theatines worked, as Carafa expressed it in writing, day and night.⁴ Although often visited with illness⁵ Carafa was indefatigable in hearing confessions and preaching; an ardent lover of souls, he sought out the erring, thinking the conversion of sinners the priest's first task.⁶ It is astonishing how he also found time for other occupations as well. From the time when Clement VII., in 1529, had appointed him to bring order into the complicated situation of the Greeks in Venice⁷ and to renew a better life in the eremitical settlements in Dalmatia,⁸ his activity had gone on increasing; where the question of reform arose he was at once active. He endeavoured to influence the Pope through Giberti, and made representa-

¹ CARACCILOLO, *Vita, II., 10.

² See *Carafa's letter, March 1, 1533, in Cod. Barb., lat. 5697 (Vatican Library).

³ Bull., VI., 161. Cf. *letter to Giberti, March 31, 1533, in Cod. Barb., lat. 5697 (Vatican Library).

⁴ *Letter to the Theatines in Naples, dat. Venice, 1534, January 1, in Cod. Barb., *cit.*

⁵ See *letters, September 15, 1530, and December 1, 1531, in Cod. Barb., *cit.*

⁶ See a very beautiful *letter, August 25, 1530, in Cod. Barb., lat. 5697.

⁷ Cf. SANUTO, XLIX., 93, and BROMATO, I., 170 *seq.* Material belonging to this period in Cod. Vat., 9464 (Vatican Library).

⁸ See CARACCILOLO, *Vita, II., 17; BROMATO, I., 172 *seq.*

tions to him with frankness and courage. In his correspondence he addressed himself not merely to members of religious orders¹ who had gone astray, but to bishops who neglected their duties. "Why do you not preach?" he wrote to one of them, "it you are not able to, you ought not to have taken the bishopric."² In Verona, again at the Pope's special request, he supported the work of Giberti. In Naples in 1530 his advice was of powerful aid to his sister in her reform of the Dominican convents.³ In the same year Clement entrusted him with the process against the Lutheran Galateo and with the much-needed reform of the Franciscans of the province of Venice.⁴ A more suitable choice seemed impossible, for Carafa was on excellent terms with the Venetian authorities and he praised the Republic as the seat of Italian freedom and the bulwark against the barbarians. In course of time he acquired in Venice a peculiar and important position. He intervened in the politico-ecclesiastical disputes between the Republic and the Pope; in this as in other instances it was to his advantage that the Signoria preferred the services of a man uninfluenced by private interest, who was more than a prelate merely in name and not absorbed in ecclesiastical affairs only, to those of the Nuncio.⁵ Carafa's reputation in the highest circles stood so high that the ambitious Signoria, even in purely political affairs, such as the boundary disputes with Ferdinand I., made use of his

¹ See BROMATO, I., 202 *seq.* (according to Cod. Barb., lat. 5697, p. 44, this letter belongs to 1531, not to 1532).

² *Letter dated Venice, 1532, October 9; Cod. Barb., lat. 5697.

³ BROMATO, I., 177 *seq.*, 184 *seq.*

⁴ SANUTO, LIII., 212; BROMATO, I., 190 *seq.* Many *letters in Cod. Barb., *cit.*

⁵ *Cf.* GOTHEIN, Ignatius, 174. Carafa's letter to Contarini, dated Venice, 1533, October 17, printed in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, V., 586, is characteristic of him as a strong censor of morals.

services¹ and asked him to draw up for them a memorial on the reform of ecclesiastical conditions. Even if his intention to punish heresy before all things² met with no response, his position in the Republic was none the less a most influential one.³

Carafa was not discouraged when his endeavours to meet heresy in Venice with severity fell through.⁴ He now had recourse to Rome, for in October 1532, in an exhaustive memorial to the Pope, he drew a deplorable picture of the religious condition of Venice and with the greatest candour made far-reaching proposals for the removal of abuses.⁵ Together with stringent measures against heretics Carafa called most emphatically for a thorough reform of the degenerate Venetian clergy; for he knew well that mere measures of repression would only touch the symptoms of the disease without being able to cut at its root.

Carafa laid down that the sources of heresy were three-fold: bad preaching, bad books, and bad ways of living. What he had already for three or four years been calling the attention of his Holiness to, he once more exposed: a commission, consisting of the Patriarch, the bishops, and some men of approved piety, should be appointed to examine all clergy desirous of preaching and hearing confessions, with regard to their probity and manner of life, their vocation, and the Catholic faith. Those only who were found worthy should be allowed in future to exercise pastoral functions. Henceforth no exceptions should be

¹ Cf. SANUTO, LIV., 26, 33, 138. But Ferdinand refused Carafa as *sospetto*; *ibid.*, 266.

² CARACCILOLO, *Vita, II., 8; cf. BENRATH, Ref. in Venedig, 6.

³ Cf. SANUTO, LIII., 311, 568.

⁴ Cf. SANUTO, LIV., 239, 241.

⁵ For this memorial, to which GOTHEIN (Ignatius, 175) rightly attaches much importance, see our remarks *supra*, p. 310 *seq.*

made to this rule. Carafa, without hesitation, gives a warning against these examinations being left in the hands of the generals of orders. He dismisses as absolutely unworthy of notice the fear that monks suspended from the pulpit and the confessional would become heretics, or that the number of qualified priests would be a small one; better that they should be few but good. How much depends on the preacher requires no illustration. Of still greater importance is the function of the confessor; what Carafa here reports of the abuses that had crept into this institution make his indignation intelligible. There were convents of Conventuals in which friars, who were not even priests, installed themselves in the confessionals in order to filch a couple of soldi. In consequence of the horrible scandals caused by such proceedings, the majority of the Venetian upper classes neglected their Easter confession. In this connection Carafa went on to speak of the monstrous abuse of the vagabond monks, against whom the strongest measures should be taken. The penitentiaries, greedy of fees, must be restrained from the heedless issue of dispensations to leave the cloister. A new Grand Penitentiary¹ having just been appointed, now was the exact moment to take steps, and monks who had become secularized should be deprived of all pastoral charges.

Carafa saw a further source of grave abuses in the decay of the episcopate. The great majority of the bishops neglecting the duty of residence, the office of chief shepherd had become an unreality. Ambition led the bishops from court to court, while they relegated their

¹ The aged Cardinal Grand Penitentiary L. Pucci (see Vol. VII. of this work, p. 83) had died in the autumn of 1531; see CIACONIUS, III., 338. For Pucci and the affairs of M. Bandello in the year 1526 see *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIV., 85 *seq.*

diocesan duties to degenerate monks who called themselves titular or suffragan bishops. These subordinates conferred orders in many instances for money on unworthy and incompetent men, even on boys of sixteen. Hence the contempt for the priesthood and the Holy Mass among the people. In the presence of such scandals, what reply could be made to the heretics who saw in them cause of exultation? So noisome is this state of things, exclaims Carafa, that every place reeks with its foulness. If, in spite of the excellent enactments of 1524, there are still to be found in Rome many who will without conscience bestow holy orders, what measure can one take of the state of things in Venice? All these unprincipled titular bishops should be deprived of ordaining faculties, but those already ordained must be thoroughly examined, and all who are unworthy be suspended.

Carafa ends by speaking once more of the incredible corruption of the religious orders, on whose condition the salvation or the ruin of mankind depends. That Carafa does not exaggerate in his description of the disorders here prevailing is proved by the contemporary reports of the Nunciatures. But deep as the wounds of the Church at large were, Carafa still saw the means of healing if only the Pope would make use of them. Two things, above all, were necessary: in the orders in which abuses prevailed, further decay must be arrested; a free hand must be given to the few good remaining by separating them from the bad. Thus only can a real reform be opened up, as even Eugenius IV. had perceived in his day, and as Spain and Portugal have attempted with good results in more recent times. Although every Order has need of a regeneration, yet this is especially the case with the Franciscans; therefore with them a beginning might be made, and that certainly at once in Venice.

CHAPTER XIII.

GIAN MATTEO GIBERTI.—THE SOMASCHI AND THE BARNABITES.

THE comprehensive reform of the secular and regular clergy as demanded by Carafa for Venice in his memorial of 1532, had already been begun since 1528 in the diocese of Verona by a member of the Oratory of the Divine Love. The man from whom, in this case, came the impetus towards improvement was one of Carafa's most sincere friends, and at the same time deep in the confidence of Clement VII., Gian Matteo Giberti.¹

He was born at Palermo in 1495, the illegitimate son of a Genoese admiral, and while yet a youth of eighteen became a secretary to Cardinal Medici, greatly against his wish, for, being of a pious disposition and fond of retirement, he had longed to enter some religious order.

¹ Cf. the still valuable biography by P. Ballerini in J. M. GIBERTI, *Opera* (Veronae, 1733, and *Hostiliae*, 1740, together with the documents there collected), as well as KERKER, *Kirchl. Reform.*, 13 *seq.*, and DITTRICH, *Kathol. Ref.*, 1 *seqq.* Cf. also SPOTORNO, *Stor. lett. di Liguria*, III., 112 *seq.*; TUCKER in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, XVIII. (1903), 24 *seq.*, 266 *seq.*, 439 *seq.* Much fresh material was recently produced by G. B. PIGHI, *Gian Matteo Giberti*, Verona, 1900, where in Appendix, III. *seqq.*, there is also a revised copy of Giberti's "Giustificazione" to the Venetian Government, a document of great importance for the history of his life. Papers not yet made use of referring to Giberti exist in the archives of the Missini-Giberti family at Orvieto; unfortunately they are not accessible.

He submitted, however, to his father's wishes.¹ As secretary to the Cardinal, Giberti showed such devotion to his work that he not only won the entire confidence of his master, but also the special favour of Leo X.² As time went on he was initiated into the most important political and ecclesiastical business. In the completion of the offensive alliance of the 8th of May 1521, between the Pope and the Emperor, he took a part of no small importance.³ Notwithstanding his many political pre-occupations, Giberti found time as well for his spiritual and mental development. He was in close relations with many of the humanists of Leonine Rome, who were glad to find a rallying-point in his house; one of his particular friends was Vida, who had also celebrated Giberti's ordination to the priesthood in a beautiful ode.⁴

After Leo X.'s death Giberti continued to be of the household of Cardinal Medici, who sent him on a mission to Henry VIII. and Charles V. On his return from Spain he came with Adrian VI. to Rome. Even then, although he looked young in years, he seemed to have the wisdom and virtue of the aged;⁵ it therefore caused no surprise when Clement appointed him his Datary and at once made use of him as his first minister.⁶ Giberti would have preferred the quiet fulfilment of his priestly duties to his novel position, which, although highly influential, was also an agitating one. But he did not possess

¹ See "Giustificazione," in PIGHI, VI.

² Cf. our remarks, Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 142.

³ "Giustificazione," in PIGHI, VII.

⁴ GIBERTI, Opera, V.; cf. *ibid.*, 332 *seq.*, other poems to Giberti. For his relations with M. A. Flaminio see CUCCOLI, 53 *seq.*, and Atti d. Ist. Veneto, LXXV. (1905-1906), 208 *seq.*

⁵ ORTIZ, 224.

⁶ Cf. Vol. IX. of this work, p. 254.

enough determination to say "No" with firmness; his loyalty to his master turned the scale against himself. For the same reason, from having been in the highest degree friendly to the Emperor, he became one of the most ardent champions of the League of Cognac.¹ In these years of unresting political activity at Rome, as well as on foreign embassies, he displayed astonishing capacity for work; but the excessive strain sowed the seeds of great irritability. As Datary his conduct was irreproachable; in other respects also he gave evidence of a sterling character in close sympathy with the noblest personages of his time, among others with Vittoria Colonna.² The Pope was justified in placing full confidence in him.

In August 1524 Clement had already bestowed upon him, to his great reluctance,³ the bishopric of Verona.⁴ He would now gladly have broken with Rome, and devoted himself to the administration of his neglected see; but the Pope held back his trusted servant. Giberti from Rome did all he could to regenerate morally and intellectually the regular and secular clergy of Verona, a work in which Clement gave him ready support.⁵ He

¹ Cf. Vol. IX. of this work, p. 286 *seqq.* How Giberti apprehended his position comes out very clearly from the "Giustificazione" in PIGHI, VI. *seq.*

² Cf. GOTHEIN, Ignatius, 180, and REUMONT, V. Colonna, 45, 84 *seq.* See also Lett. di V. Colonna to G. M. Giberti, ed. GIULIARI, Verona, 1868 (*Nozze-Publ.*); FERRERO-MÜLLER, Carteggio di V. Colonna, Torino, 1892, and P. D. PASOLINI, Tre lettere ined. di V. Colonna, Roma, 1901 (*Nozze-Publ.*).

³ Cf. Lett. d. princ., II., 49^b.

⁴ See *Acta Consist. of the Vice-Chancellor in Consistorial Archives. Cf. SANUTO, XXXVI., 522 *seq.*, 526 *seq.*, 584. For a poem then published, "Verona ad Clementem VII.," see GIORDANI, App. 7.

⁵ Cf. Ballerini in GIBERTI, Opera, IX. *seq.*; PIGHI, 51 *seq.*; see also SANUTO, XLI., 82, 142, 289.

also took an active share in the efforts at reform during the opening years of this pontificate, as well as being the animating spirit of all that was good in Rome.¹ With Carafa he was on terms of closest intimacy, and rendered him most important services in connection with the founding of the Theatine Order.² His greatest delight was to pass his time in their pious circle and that of the Oratory of the Divine Love, regretting that there was so little of it to spare from the hard claims of his political engagements.

Notwithstanding his increasing distaste for political life,³ Giberti persevered in his loyal devotion to the Pope; with him he passed through the calamitous years 1526 and 1527 in Rome, and shared the captivity in St. Angelo. Thence he went as a hostage to the Imperialist camp, where he was placed in chains and narrowly escaped execution.⁴ During those terrible days the old unquenched longing for a life of tranquil occupation in sacred things revived with increased energy. He now reproached himself bitterly for not having listened earlier to the voice of God calling him to carry out his duties as a bishop resident amid his people. From his captivity, he begged Carafa, on the 15th of November 1527, to go to Verona in his stead and reform that diocese; at the same time he expressed the hope that his misfortunes might open a way for that which had so long been the object of his desire—to withdraw from political life and give himself up entirely to his ecclesiastical work. "Willingly will I carry these fetters," he added, "if they should become the occasion for freeing myself

¹ Cf. *supra*, pp. 378, 380, and KERKER, Kirchl. Ref., 11.

² Cf. *supra*, p. 407 *seq.*, and SANUTO, XLIII., 533.

³ Cf. the letter in PIGHI, 40 and xxix.

⁴ Cf. Vol. IX. of this work, p. 463.

from other bonds which I have found not less heavy to bear."¹

Giberti succeeded in escaping from his persecutors, and at Orvieto informed the Pope of his resolve to withdraw to his diocese;² Clement tried in vain to keep him at his side. On the 7th of January 1528 he had already reached Venice. One of the first whom he visited was Carafa,³ with whom he was in full agreement on the points of Church reform, the better preparation and closer examination of the clergy, and the radical restoration of discipline in the religious orders.⁴ If Carafa had been formerly his counsellor in spiritual matters, so was he also now when the arduous work was about to begin of transforming a diocese given over to the secular spirit into an example of what a reformed bishopric should be.

What he did in this respect is best understood from a description of the state of things he had to encounter on entering his see. Many of the clergy were non-resident, leaving the cure of souls to hirelings who, for the most part, were persons of demoralized habits. The ignorance of many of them was so great that Giberti had to order the rubrics of the Missal to be translated into Italian for the sake of those who knew no Latin. Preaching in many places had been given up altogether. The confessional was treated with laxity, and the churches were so neglected that they looked like stables. There was a corresponding

¹ GIBERTI, Opera, 239-240. Cf. BROMATO, I., 166 *seq.*

² See *Salviati's letter to Castiglione of January 29, 1528, in Nunziat. di Francia I., 159 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. SANUTO, XLVI., 463.

⁴ The great resemblance between the ideas of reform of these two men has been well brought forward by BENRATH in Herzog's Realencyklopädie, VI., 3rd ed., 657.

disorder in the lives of the people, who had sunk into the worst vices.¹

Giberti entered on the difficult task of reform with great courage, but with even greater wisdom and calmness. First and foremost he relied on the influence of his personal example. In accordance with the bad custom of his times, even Giberti had gone further than was right in the accumulation of benefices;² now he resigned all those to which a cure of souls was attached. The incomes of the rest, which he conscientiously believed himself entitled to retain, he spent only on worthy objects.³ But in other respects also he underwent a great change of character. The geniality, which no burdens of statecraft could destroy, disappeared, and he embraced the strict asceticism for which he became famous.⁴ His day was divided between prayer and work, and his table was one of the most frugal. In the performance of his ecclesiastical functions he set the best example.⁵ Unwearied in giving audience, he first gave access to the poor, then to country-folk, and lastly to the citizens of Verona. Naturally prone to impulsiveness, he listened with the utmost patience to everything brought before him; in deed and word he was at every man's disposal.⁶

¹ See GIBERTI, Opera, lxi. *seq.*, and KERKER, Kirchl. Reform., 14 *seq.*

² Cf. besides Giorn. d. lett. Ital., VI., 273, and XLV., 68, Clement's *bestowal of graces in Regest. Vatic., 1244, f. 17; 1245, f. 4, 41; 1246, f. 69; 1247, f. 42^b; 1248, f. 217; 1260, f. 106; 1263, f. 235; 1275, f. 245; 1283, f. 162^b; 1291, f. 220; 1297, f. 4 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See GIBERTI, Opera, IX., and PIGHI, 65 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. FERRAJOLI in Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XLV., 68 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. SANUTO, XLVI., 604, and LV., 96.

⁶ See GIBERTI, Opera, 304 *seq.*, 312 *seq.* In SANUTO, XLI., 289, Giberti is described as "colerico."

In his diocese he at once started on trenchant reforms in which he displayed the practical sense acquired during long years of experience of affairs. How much depended on the presence of a resident bishop was now made apparent. Formerly he had made attempts at reform through his representatives, but in an inadequate way; now, under his own eye, a different state of things was set in motion. In November 1528 it was already reported from Verona: "The priests in this diocese are marked men; all are examined; the unworthy or unsuitable suspended or removed from their offices; the gaols are full of concubinarii; sermons for the people are preached incessantly; study is encouraged; the bishop, by his life, sets the best example."¹

In January 1529 Giberti undertook the visitation of his diocese.² He wished in this way to carry into practical effect his numerous ordinances, and devoted the closest attention to the visitation, which was partly conducted in person and partly by delegates.³ With a small retinue he

¹ SANUTO, XLIX., 161.

² See PIGHI, 71, 99 *seq.* Cf. for the following, especially BALLERINI, *De restituta per Gibertum ecclesiastica disciplina*, and P. F. ZINI, *Boni pastoris exemplum*, in GIBERTI, *Opera*, lxi. *seq.*, 253 *seq.*, as well as the excellent accounts in KERKER, 15 *seq.*, and DITTRICH, 28 *seq.* The former describes the visitation of his diocese as the nerve of Giberti's episcopal administration. Giberti has laid down his principles in the famous "Constitutiones Gibertinae" (*Opera*, I *seq.*), which will be discussed in our next volume.

³ In the Episcopal Archives of Verona the following volumes of *visitation deeds are still preserved: (1) Documents of the fifteenth century; (2) *Visitatio dioc. Veron. facta per rev. d. vicar. Calist. Amadosi A. 1525 et 1527 sub rev. ep. J. M. Giberto* (interesting illustrations of the moral degradation of the laity); (3) *R. d. J. M. Giberti ep. visitatio ecclesiarum Veronae, 1529, 1530-1531, 1534, 1537*; (4) *Visitatio dom. Marcelli episc. commiss. et vicar., 1529*; 5 and 6

went from village to village undeterred by any obstacle, so great was his holy zeal; on one occasion he was nearly drowned in a flooded stream. When he reached a parish he chose in preference the worst quarters for the night, and went into a minute examination of the conduct of the clergy, the condition of the churches, and the lives of the common people. In a volume specially set apart for this purpose he noted down the actual facts of each case. That his information might not be one-sided, he also heard laymen and gave them practical encouragement in their troubles. In order to bring long-standing enmities to an end, this man of refined culture did not shrink from seeking out the rudest peasants and exhorting them on his knees to be reconciled to one another. He had a wonderful way of combining gentleness with strength. In cases of gravity he was inexorable in using excommunication and public penances. With his clergy he was urgent in insisting on the exact observance of the duty of residence and the maintenance of irreproachable conduct.¹ Whoever failed in these respects was dismissed without regard to the patron, even if he were a bishop. At first Giberti refused to allow any female, not even a sister, to be the inmate of a priest's house; but at a later date he

were wanting in 1897 when I visited the Archives; (7) *Visit. rev. d. episc. Veronen. inc. die 18 Aprilis 1532, usque ad diem 17 Aug. 1533 facta per rev. d. Philippum Stridonium deleg. a rev. d. Giberto*; (8) *Visitationes Veronen. dioc. a J. M. Giberto* (begins thus: "In nomine dom. amen. A^o 1541 die vero merc. 4 mensis Maii rev. J. M. Gibertus Dei et apost. sedis gratia episc. Veron. et ejusdem s. Sedis legatus post generalem visitationem civitatis factam intendens similiter visitare diocesim contulit se primo ad hospitale aurificum," etc.); (9) *Visit. dioc. Veron. facta per J. M. Gibertum* begins with May 30, 1541. Further documents for Giberti's time are not forthcoming.

¹ The edict of 1535 in GIBERTI, *Opera*, 234 *seq.*, shows how very difficult it was to put in force the duty of residence.

somewhat relaxed on this point, and permitted women of whose integrity he was personally convinced to act as housekeepers. In order to put a stop to the tenure of a plurality of benefices with cure of souls attached, he caused all dispensations, hitherto given in such cases by Rome, to be revoked. The execution of the visitation orders was to be carefully watched over by his *vicarii foranei*; in addition to which the parish priest or preacher was to send him reports.

In order to ensure a regular and continuous discharge of the cure of souls, Giberti took particular pains to restore the former dignity of the office of parish priest.¹ He therefore forbade stringently any encroachment on their rights by the religious orders, and insisted on parishioners attending on Sundays and festivals the parish priest's Mass, while the latter was not to be celebrated in the other churches. The erection of new chapels and the saying of Mass in private houses he tried to limit as much as possible.²

The worship of the parish church was to be conducted with the utmost possible solemnity and dignity; therefore the closest observance of the ritual and due reverence on the part of the celebrant were strictly enjoined. Giberti's exactitude in these respects is shown by his reprimanding such an apparently insignificant offence as a priest laying his biretta on the altar. But of greater importance to him than any externals were inward piety and purity of heart. He therefore enjoined on all priests weekly confession. He sought to ensure a faultless administration of the sacraments by numerous instructions, some of which went into minute details. The reservation of the Holy Eucharist in

¹ Cf. GOTHEIN, Ignatius, 189, who rightly calls attention to this point.

² See GIBERTI, Opera, lxxvi. *seq.*

a locked tabernacle on the high altar, and the ringing of the bell at the elevation seem to have been introduced first by him.¹ He also sought to promote the adoration of the most Holy Sacrament by means of confraternities. He subjected confessors to the strictest discipline, and by the suspension of all who were unfit and by repeated examinations he cleansed their ranks inexorably. Here also he was not indifferent to externals; confessors were always to exercise their office wearing cotta and stole and seated as judges, not standing, as often happened when the penitents were persons of high station. It is not improbable that the confessionals of the shape now generally in use originated with Giberti.²

Parish priests were also exhorted to administer conscientiously the revenues of their churches, and to keep a watchful eye over the schools, hospitals, associations and confraternities, the poor, the widows and orphans; but especially he bade them lay to heart the need of a fruitful ministry of preaching. This was well timed in view of the danger of Lutheran teaching being introduced, against which Giberti had already issued a strong edict on the 10th of April 1530.³ In every parish church throughout the year on Sundays and festivals the Gospel of Christ was to be preached to the people in "love and simplicity of heart, without superfluous quotations from poets or the discussion of theological subtleties." Without the permission of the bishop, preaching was not to be allowed preachers from without were enjoined to consult the parish priest as to the special requirements of the congregation. Giberti tried to secure the best preachers in Italy for

¹ See Zini in GIBERTI, *Opera*, 272; DITTRICH, *Kathol. Ref.*, 34; *cf.*, however, PROBST in *Freib. Kirchenlexikon*, I., 2nd ed., 591.

² *Cf.* ZINI, *loc. cit.*, 273, and DITTRICH, 36.

³ GIBERTI, *Opera*, 232 *seq.*

the cathedral and conventual churches of Verona. He often despatched them into country places where the priests were frequently not competent to preach; he also instituted instructions for children on Sunday afternoons. Even the peasants gathered round the church doors before the beginning of divine service were not forgotten by this zealous bishop; an acolyte was to be sent out to them to read aloud from some sacred book.

Together with the reform of the secular clergy went that of the Orders. There were certainly still some monasteries of excellent character, but in many others corruption had reached an unbearable pitch. Giberti entered on the campaign with spirit.¹ Clement VII. gave him special powers with regard to the exempt convents of men. All preachers and confessors were put under the same strict regulations as the secular clergy, and visited with the severest punishment in cases of moral delinquency.² With great vigour Giberti also set himself against the abuses connected with the system of indulgences, which for the most part was carried on by monks. Through his representations to the Holy See it was settled that in future no *quæstor* was to collect alms in the diocese of Verona without Giberti's permission, and all powers to the contrary, even if they originated with the Pope himself, were to be declared null.³ In the autumn of 1528 Giberti had already begun the visitation of the convents of nuns. He often made his appearance at an entirely unexpected hour. He collected detailed information on all points. Some convents he closed; others he improved by the introduction of good elements; in all he took care, as a matter of

¹ *Cj.* PIGHI, 89 *seq.*, 93 *seq.*

² Examples in SANUTO, LVIII., 67, 70.

³ "Constitutiones Giberti" in the Opera, 129 *seq.*; *cf.* KERKER, 20 *seq.*, and DITTRICH, 36 *seq.*

the first importance, to have good confessors.¹ In some convents of women where the corruption was deep-seated, and where rich and powerful relatives were mixed together, Giberti met with incredible difficulties.² He therefore in 1531 had his regulations for the reform of nunneries confirmed by the Doge. In these convents he even forbade the use of the organ and artistic choir singing. The severest precautionary rules were drawn up for the observance of the enclosure and the probation of novices. Here Giberti recurs to the principle of his old friends Gaetano and Carafa: better to have few and good, than many and useless.³

Still greater difficulties than those caused by refractory nuns awaited Giberti in his Cathedral Chapter. Here as elsewhere exemptions stood in the way of the execution of his enactments. On this account Clement VII. had already given him, in 1525, full jurisdiction over all exempts.⁴ As the Canons proved stubborn, the Pope on the 26th of March 1527 removed by express order the Cathedral Chapter from the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Aquileia, and placed them directly under that of the Holy See, naming Giberti, for life, *Legatus natus*⁵ for the city and diocese of Verona. When Giberti, on the ground of this appointment, installed a provost in 1529, the Canons

¹ Cf. BIANCOLINI, *Chiese di Verona*, I., 120, III., 78, IV., 376; PIGHI, 93 *seq.*

² Cf. PIGHI, 95 *seq.*

³ GIBERTI, *Opera*, 183 *seq.* The authentic copy of the "Constitutioni de le monache" is now in the Communal Library of Verona Cod. 1359. Cf. also SANUTO, LVIII., 148.

⁴ Brief of May 23, 1525; GIBERTI, *Opera*, xi. *seq.*

⁵ See GIBERTI, *Opera*, xii. On April 8, 1534, Giberti also received the **facultas absolvendi quoscunq. laicos et clericos a casibus reservatis* except. cont. in bulla *Coena Dom.* Brev., 1534, vol. 54, n. 97, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

left the cathedral and held their choir services in S. Elena. Although Rome pronounced in the Bishop's favour, the Chapter kept up their resistance. Not until January 1530 was Carafa, as mediator, able to bring about an agreement to which Giberti, with great magnanimity, consented. Nevertheless, at a later date there were fresh misunderstandings with the Chapter.¹

On other occasions also serious conflicts arose with the corrupt clergy as well as with the citizens;² Carafa, and on one occasion also Gaetano, had to intervene.³ It went so far that Clement VII. thought that Giberti ought to give up his difficult post and return to Rome,⁴ but he had no intention of doing so. He certainly obeyed the Pope's summons to come to him in 1529 and 1532,⁵ but he went back to his diocese as soon as it was possible. Even the Cardinalate, in connection with which his name was so often mentioned, had no attraction for him.⁶ Patiently and gently he worked at the reform of his clergy, always receiving steady support from Clement.⁷

¹ See GIBERTI, Opera, xvii. *seq.*; DITTRICH, Kathol. Ref., 25 *seq.*; FIGHI, 71 *seq.*, and in particular the special Notizie spett. al capitolio di Verona, Roma, 1752 (composed from the most opposite points of view), and De privilegiis et exempt. capit. cath. Veron., Venetiis, 1753. The arrangement of 1530 in UGHELLI, V., 963 *seq.* See also SANUTO, LIV., 46, 63 *seq.*, 87, 121; LV., 24.

² Cf. SANUTO, LI., 113.

³ See BROMATO, I., 177 *seq.*, 219.

⁴ Cf. *supra*, p. 208.

⁵ Cf. DITTRICH, Kathol. Ref., 13 *seq.*

⁶ See BERGENROTH, II., n. 358. Cf. GAYANGOS, IV., 2, n. 749, 751; SANUTO, XLVIII., 385, LVI., 91, 109, 302.

⁷ Besides the examples already cited, reference may be made to the following Papal enactments belonging to this period. Min. brev., 1532, vol. 41, n. 130: *Zach. Zuccensi ord. praed. prof. Venetiis commor. (is to betake himself to Giberti at once), dat. March 19. Brev., 1533, vol. 53, n. 65: *Pio episcopo Veronen., dat. Bologna, March 3

Giberti never allowed his devoted efforts to relieve the physical and moral wretchedness of his people to relax. The social activity of the Bishop of Verona was an almost unique phenomenon in that age. It formed a beautiful complement to his activity as a Church reformer, although in that capacity he always kept his eyes steadily fixed on the broad ranks of the people. With fatherly love he provided for the accommodation of the sick, poor, and orphaned children, and opened Sunday schools for the lower classes. He founded in Verona a refuge for poor young women in way of temptation, and another for those who had fallen. A sign of the practical sense which was uppermost in all he did was his endeavour to find domestic service or husbands for those who, under such circumstances, had come back to a better life. At the same time he made regulations to check the prevalence of public immorality in the city.¹

Giberti endeavoured to give an entirely new start to works of public benevolence by reforming the confraternities intended to carry out such purposes, but most

(against such regulars who wish to get out of the way of reform by obtaining Briefs from Rome). Brev., 1534, vol. 54, n. 12: *Episc. Veron. committitur, ut moneat rectores eccles. paroch. civit. et dioc. Veron. tam non residentes quam residentes, qui ad regendas eor. eccles. per seipsos idonei non sunt, ad providendum suis ecclesiis de idoneis capellanis per eum approbandis infra compet. termin., quo elapso ipse auct. apost. provideat et compet. portionem fructuum dict. eccles. eis assignet, dat. January 18. n. 95: *Episc. Veron. dispensatur, quod, quoties sacris lectionibus et aliis piis operibus fuerit occupatus, loco officii possit recitare orat. domin. decies et symbolum apost. semel etiam in suo cubiculo, dat. April 8 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ Cf. Ballerini in GIBERTI, Opera, xxi.; PIGHI, 99 *seq.*, 115 *seq.*; GOTHEIN, Ignatius, 191. See also BAGATTA, Storia degli Spedali in Verona, Verona, 1862.

of which had become disorganized. On the model of the Monte di Pietà at Verona he caused similar institutions to be set up by the country priests in their parishes. They were not to be used merely as pawnshops, but also as mutual loan societies which should prevent the peasantry from having recourse to Jewish usurers.¹

In order to remedy the mendicancy which, in true Italian fashion, had become intolerable in Verona, he founded the Society of Charity, composed of clerical and lay members, and obtained for it from Clement VII. all the graces conferred on the "Societas Pauperum" in Rome. The new association, which met every month, was a sort of Society of St. Vincent de Paul for the material and moral elevation of the poor.² The members supplied the really deserving with money, provisions, and articles of clothing, procured medical attendance for the sick, furnished dowries for poor girls, dissolved concubinage, undertook legal proceedings for widows and orphans, and made peace between obstinate enemies. Francesco Zini is right in calling this "society of Christian love" the greatest and noblest of all Giberti's works, surpassing all the rest together in the way that charity surpasses all other virtues.³ This most benevolent institution, which Giberti first of all raised with such care in Verona, was afterwards spread by him throughout the country. In every parish seven men were chosen to carry out, together with the priest, all works of Christian charity, and at the same time to act as a sort of moral police. The object of such an association, writes Francesco Zini, is "that no

¹ Cf. GOTHEIN, 192.

² Cf. KERKER, Kirchl. Ref., 18 *seq.*; and DITTRICH, Kathol. Ref., 45 *seq.*

³ GIBERTI, Opera, 295.

man should offend God, no man suffer hunger, no man do injury to his neighbour, no man, above all things, commit sin, no man be deprived of the necessities of life; finally, that enmity and all hatred and anger should be taken away, so that we, as men once did in the first and happiest days of the Church, should all live with one heart and one soul in the fear and praise of God."¹

Giberti, in the midst of his strenuous exertions, found his one recreation in the pursuit of knowledge and the society of learned men. Every leisure hour he devoted to study, especially of the Holy Scriptures in the original text and the commentaries of the Fathers; from the primitive sources he wished to become familiar with the discipline of the ancient Church, the ever-present ideal of his efforts at reform. To many of the humanists, scattered abroad by the tempest of the sack of Rome, his see of Verona became an asylum of hospitality. Under his patronage arose an association of men of learning and poets known as the Accademia Gibertina.² In the pleasant loggia of the episcopal palace, looking down on the Adige, this company met together within sight of one of the most beautiful of Italian landscapes. But even in this atmosphere Giberti did not forget the question of ecclesiastical reform. He tried to entice the poets from the profane to the religious muse, he urged the philologists to translate and comment on works of religion, notably the Greek Fathers. For this purpose he set up in his house a private printing press in which Greek types were specially prepared. The humanist Tullio Crispoldi, a member of the

¹ See Zini in GIBERTI, Opera, 295, 296.

² Cf. TIRABOSCHI (edit. Neapolit.), VII., I, 117 *seq.*; KERKER, Kirchl. Ref., 26; GOTHEIN, 182; PIGHI, 126 *seq.*

Oratory of the Divine Love, prepared, at his instance, a small Catechism and a Manual for Preachers.¹

The example thus set was not lost on other bishops. To confine oneself to the reign of Clement and his personal encouragement,² among the foremost may be named Cardinal Bernhard Cles in Trent, Cardinal Cornaro in Brescia, Pietro Lippomano in Bergamo, Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga in Mantua, Cardinal Ridolfi in Vicenza, Aleander in Brindisi, Vincenzo Carafa in Naples, Vida in Alba, Federigo Fregoso in Salerno and Gubbio, Girolamo Arsagi in Nice, Sadoletto at Carpentras, Ludovico Canossa at Bayeux, who were all followers of Giberti's reforming zeal.³ Each of these prelates had a high sense of his official responsibility; some of their ordinances, for example the visitations conducted by Cardinal Gonzaga in his diocese, point unmistakably to the influence of the Bishop of Verona.⁴

¹ Cf. Ballerini in GIBERTI, Opera, xiv. *seq.*. xl., L. *seq.*; DITTRICH, 19, 31; PIGHI, 129; GIULIARI, Tipogr. Veron., Verona, 1871; FUMAGALLI, Lex. typ. Ital., Florence, 1905, 515.

² Cf. Brev., 1533, vol. 53, n. 170: *Pro F. Card. Cornelio eccl. Brix. admin. facultas per se vel alium visit., corrig. et reformandi ecclesias et personas tam saec. quam cujusvis ordin., dat. April 8. 1534, vol. 54, n. 67: *Nicol. Card. de Rodolphis episc. Vicent. conceditur quod non obstant. revalidat. privileg. regularibus civit. et dioc. Vincent. concessis possit uti priore facultate sibi concessa circa eor. visit. et correct., date March 8. n. 113: *Herculi Card. Mant. conceditur quod quamdiu praefuerit eccl. Mant. possit per se vel alios visitare omnes parroch. ecclesias civit. et suae dioc. Mant., dat. April 14. n. 123: Fuller powers for the reform of the parishes in his diocese, dat. April 22. n. 162: *Extension of these powers to chaplaincies also, dat. May 25 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ More details about the activity of the above-named persons in the next volume of this work in the proper context.

⁴ The visitation documents of the diocese of Mantua, beginning from 1534, and found by me in the Episcopal Archives of Mantua, will be dealt with in the next volume of this work.

That this change in the character of the episcopate was due in great part to Carafa's untiring energy is substantiated by not a few witnesses,¹ and his influence was often direct.²

There was, at the same time, a slow but gradual revival of synodal life in Italy. Clement VII. while yet a Cardinal had organized a Provincial Council³ at Florence in accordance with the regulations of the Lateran Council. Cardinal Farnese, supported by his excellent Vicar-General, Bartolommeo Guidiccioni, after beginning in 1516 to lay the foundations of reform in his diocese of Parma by visitations, held in the same city in November 1519 a diocesan synod.⁴ Rangoni, in 1522, did the same in Modena,⁵ and in the autumn of 1534 Giberti was thus active in Verona. Synods held in Poland, Germany, France, and England⁶ showed, under Clement VII., the same interest in Church reform. Amid the general confusion signs of fresh life were stirring at points of the Church's life the most remote from one another. That this reaction should have found its greatest impetus soonest and most decisively in Italy was due largely to Giberti. His example was a stimulus raising a zealous emulation in an increasing number of bishops; St. Charles Borromeo himself did not disdain to follow in the steps of Giberti, and the voice of the latter has been embodied in not a few of the decrees of the Council of Trent. Verona,

¹ Cf. in Appendix, No. 30, F. Perugino's characteristic *letter of October 17, 1532 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² Thus on Aleander; see PAQUIER, 351 *seq.* For Aleander's altered attitude cf. CIAN in Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXVII., 157 *seq.*

³ Cf. our remarks in Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 411 *seq.*

⁴ See SCHWEITZER in the Röm. Quartalschr., XX., 42.

⁵ BERNABEI, Vita del Card. Morone, Modena, 1885, 4.

⁶ Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 576 *seqq.*, 629 *seq.*, 856 *seq.*

although a see of small extent, became a source of superabundant blessing to the Church at large.¹

The Catholic reformation set on foot by Giberti was eminently popular in character. It was not devised in a scholar's study, and thus did not primarily apply to the learned but to the great bulk of the middle and lower classes. Among the latter a point of contact was reached with an undercurrent of religion which, even in the worst days of the Italian Renaissance, had always been a living force.²

The distresses of the time—and this was a point of great importance for the carrying through of Catholic reform—played their own part in giving a stronger impetus to this movement. The horsemen of the Apocalypse, war, famine, and death, depicted at the close of the fifteenth century by Dürer as portents of things coming on the earth, made the circuit of Italy with their accompanying horrors. Like a hurricane let loose the furies of war harried the land, devastating dwellings and fields and driving men before them. The garden of Europe was changed at last into a field of slaughter covered with dead, and soon to become a hotbed of pestilence. The frightful events they saw, the sufferings they underwent, roused the population to a pitch of excitement which was not diminished by the constant predictions of hermits and solitaries.

An exceptionally deep impression was made by the crowning catastrophe of the sack of Rome, by which the leading members of the Oratory of the Divine Love were driven from the city to upper Italy, where a fresh sphere of fruitful activity was opened to them. The moral

¹ See DITTRICH, *Kathol. Ref.*, 49 *seq.*

² *Cf.* our arguments, Vol. V. of this work, p. 9 *seqq.*, 89 *seqq.*, with which TUCKER agrees in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, XVIII., 268.

effect of this disaster was greater even than the material loss.

Throughout all Italy, and in all other countries of Europe as well, the sound of lamentation arose over the ruin of a city which, from century to century, had exercised a matchless witchery over the minds of men. Unheard-of atrocity and infamy, murder, violence, robbery, plunder, fire and sacrilege of the worst kind had visited Rome the eternal, and turned the scene of a brilliant civilization, the centre of the literary and artistic Renaissance, the seat of the supreme government of the Church, into a waste place over which hovered the breath of pestilence. As in the days of St. Jerome so now many a writer bewailed in prose and verse the downfall of the lordly city. In a letter to Sadoletto, Erasmus expressed himself in the words: "It is not the city, but the world that has gone to ruin."¹ Here spoke the humanist. The sack marked, in fact, the end of the Renaissance, the end of the Rome of Julius II. and Leo X.

A world had disappeared, a new one had to arise in its place. The connection between the Papacy and the Renaissance on its pagan side was doomed to be dissolved in time, and the catastrophe which brought their union to such a pitiful end introduced the subsequent great sobering of human society and prepared the way for the Catholic reformation. This terrible event became one of the great landmarks not merely of literary and artistic but also of religious history. Generally, among heretical Germans as well as orthodox Spaniards and easy-living Italians, the horrors of the sack of Rome were looked upon as a just judgment of God on the deep depravity of the chief city of Christendom, a frightful retribution for the evil example given to the world

¹ Opera, epist., 988

by many prelates and not a few Popes during the age of the Renaissance. In Italy this was the view taken not merely by the educated,¹ but by the masses of the people.²

The knowledge that God had punished with fire and sword the iniquity that cried to heaven from the Eternal City³ brought many to examine their own hearts. Even so ardent a disciple of the culture of the Renaissance as Pierio Valeriano had now to admit that they had had no firm principles of life to offer, and that a revolution in morals had become a necessity.⁴ In the school of suffering men were beginning to learn better and purer things. As once amid the storms which accompanied the downfall of the Roman Empire, so now many men of noble birth took

¹ Cf. G. Negri in SADOLETI, *Epist.*, I., Romae, 1760, 189 *seq.*; VETTORI, 380 *seq.*; PICCOLOMINI, Tizio, 113, n. 2; *L. Canossa's letter to Francis I., dated Venice, 1527, May 16, in the Communal Library, Verona; CAJETANUS, *Exposit. evang. S. Matth.*, c. 5, as well as the famous *Dos diálogos escritos por Juan de Valdés* (ed. LUIS USÓZ Y RIO in *Reformist. ant. Español.*, IV., Madrid, 1850). For J. Valdés cf. MAURENBRECHER, *Kathol. Ref.*, 268 *seq.*, 406; BAUMGARTEN, II., 632 *seq.*, and PFÜLF in *Freib. Kirchenlexikon*, XII., 2nd ed., 536 *seq.* To the special literature here mentioned must be added HOMENAJE A MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, I., Madrid, 1899, 396 *seq.*

² Cf. LANCELLOTTI, III., 263, 304, and the *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE in the National Library, Paris.

³ A vivid picture of the immorality of the Rome of Leo X. is given in the "Propalladia" (*Libros de antaño*, IX., Madrid, 1880; cf. SCHACK, *Dramatische Literatur in Spanien*, I., 181), and for the days of Clement VII. the "Lozana Andaluza" (written before the sack in 1524) of F. Delicato in the *Libros esp. rar. e curios.*, I., Madrid, 1871, and Paris, 1888; cf. *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XIII., 316 *seq.* See also our remarks, Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 171 *seqq.*, as well as ADEMOLLO, *Teatri di Roma*, 3; LUZIO, *Pronostico*, 47 *seq.*, 61, and *Giorn. ligust.*, 1890, 195 *seq.*

⁴ See GOTHEIN, *Ignatius*, 96.

refuge in solitude and penance.¹ All the better elements in the Church recognized the guilt in which all more or less were implicated. This self-knowledge was bound by degrees to bring on a reaction. No less a person than Sadoleto saw therefore, with prophetic vision, in the misery of the present the gleams of a new dawn, the coming purification of the souls of men. "If," he wrote to the Pope, "the wrath and might of God have been satisfied by our calamities, if this fearful punishment should open a way once more for a better morality and better laws, then perhaps our misfortune has not been the greatest that could befall us. What is God's own, God can take care of; but we have before us a life of renewal that no power of the sword can wrest from us; only let us so direct our acts and thoughts as to seek the true glory of the priesthood, and our own true greatness and strength in God."²

Clement VII. and many Cardinals and prelates with him had indeed, in their hour of calamity, entered into their own hearts.³ But the former, a Medici to the core, was brought back only too soon into the labyrinth of politics; many prelates also led lives as before, but an entire restoration of the previous state of things was

¹ The *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo dwells on the number of solitaries who appeared after the sack, when so many persons fled from the world (General Archives of the Capuchin Order in Rome).

² Letter, dated Carpentras, 1527, September 1, printed in *Anecd. litt.*, IV., 335. The original in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, XLV., 42.

³ In the remarkable account of the sack by Francesco Pesaro, he describes minutely the religious life led by the besieged in St. Angelo: "El Papa celebrava spesso ecc.—et in vero, ancora che fusseno molta zente in castello, pareva però che fusse una religione." SANUTO, XLVI., 132.

impossible. With Clement's successor came the immediate perception of the task imposed on the Papacy for a century to come by the apostasy of the North. The speech delivered by Bishop Stafileo on the reassembling of the Rota on the 15th of May 1528 is a remarkable proof of the serious change in many members of the Curia as well. After a description of all that Rome had undergone through plunder, pestilence, and famine, the Bishop put the question why the capital of the world had been so sorely visited. He answered with a frank confession of sin recalling that of Adrian VI.: "Because all flesh has become corrupt, because we are not citizens of the holy city of Rome, but of Babylon, the city of corruption." Stafileo did not shrink from applying to Rome the apocalyptic image of the woman of Babylon. From the terrible catastrophe whereby the Lord had driven the buyers and sellers from His temple he drew for himself and his colleagues the lesson that they should now amend themselves and administer justice incorruptibly. "We have all sinned grievously," he exclaimed; "let us reform, turn to the Lord, and He will have pity upon us."¹

The sack had, like a storm, cleared the air of Rome and left ineffaceable traces behind. The city had suffered too much ever again to become the brilliant, deeply corrupt Rome of Leo X.² The indiscriminate enthusiasm for classical antiquity, the life of splendour and festivity with its moral decay, which the great masters of art with difficulty concealed, all the joyous spirit of the Renaissance, had gone for ever. The feast of Pasquino, once neglected but restored in 1525, became a failure;³ the frolics of the Carnival fell

¹ "Oratio ad Rotae auditores hab. per rev. episc. Staphyleum," in SCHARDIUS, *Script.*, II., 613 *seq.*

² BUCKHARDT, *Kultur*, I., 7th ed., 134 *seq.*

³ Cf. LUZIO in *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XIX., 99; cf. XXXIII., 43 *seq.*

flat.¹ Instead of the half-pagan masquerades on feast-days religious processions were now seen in the streets, and the voices of preachers of penance had more attraction for the Romans than the compositions of poets and musicians.²

The destruction had, indeed, been so great,³ so much that what was good had been swept away with the bad, that Rome at first was but a barren field for such religious efforts. The Oratory of the Divine Love, indeed, renewed its life,⁴ but Carafa's attempt to bring about a fresh settlement of the Theatines did not succeed.⁵

The horrors of war were not confined to the Papal States. Lombardy in particular suffered hardly less, on the whole, than Rome; war, hunger, plague, and the Spanish methods of extortion drove the inhabitants to despair.⁶ The

¹ See SANUTO, LIV., 303. The old carnival festivities were not renewed until 1536; see *letter of F. Peregrino of February 18, 1536, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

² The Imperialists were much displeased at the preachers constantly calling to remembrance the horrors of the sack; see GAYANGOS, III., 2, 943.

³ G. Casale wrote on May 23, 1528, from Orvieto: "50 miglia di quà da Roma non solamente non vi è vittuaglia, ma non vi è grano di biave seminate nè cosa del mondo; similmente 30 et 40 miglia di là da Roma." MOLINI, II., 21. Cf. the report of September 1528, *ibid.*, 87.

⁴ BENRATH (Herzog's Realencyklopädie, XIV., 3rd ed., 424) is mistaken in supposing that the Oratory had not survived the storm of the sack. From a *letter of Carafa, dat. Venice, 1533, March 1 (Cod. Barb., lat. 5697, f. 45^b, Vatican Library), it seems rather that existence of the Oratory in that year is proved.

⁵ See Carafa's **letter to Giambattista Silvago the Genoese of May 23, 1533, *loc. cit.*

⁶ Cf. BURCKHARDT, Kultur, II., 7th ed., 211, who refers to G. Capella and Burigozzo. See also the Ambassador's report in State Papers VII.: King Henry the Eighth, V., 226.

most productive portions of the country resembled a desert infested by prowling wolves; by 1528 the famine was so great that the peasants looked on the flesh of dogs, cats, and mice as dainties. These half-famished wretches fled to Venice in such numbers that there also there was a heavy rise in prices. Among those who were foremost in their heroic efforts of charity to aid the prevailing misery, the Venetian noble Girolamo Miani was conspicuous.¹

Born in 1481, Miani had devoted himself to military service and had lived entirely for the world. In the war of the Republic with Maximilian I. he was taken prisoner, but had a wonderful deliverance and in consequence became converted. By penitential exercises and works of charity he sought to atone for his former life; his favourite prayer was, "Most sweet Jesus, be not my judge but my redeemer." In 1518 he entered the priesthood and thenceforward lived only for good works, closely attached to Carafa and directed by him. His labours in the famine and plague year of 1528 aroused the admiration of all; he sold the whole of the furniture of his house to help the needy; at night he buried the dead, their bodies, on account of the great mortality, often being left lying on the streets. An attack of typhus, contracted during his self-sacrificing work, raised him to still higher stages of perfection. On his recovery he renounced, in February 1531, all his means of living in order to devote himself as a mendicant to the service of the poor. He was specially moved to compassion by the troops of orphan children wandering about

¹ Miani's life has been written by Sc. Albanus, Andrea Stella, and Aug. Turtura; see *Acta Sanctorum*, Febr., II., 217 *seq.* Cf. also C. DE ROSSI-BORGOGNO, *Vita di S. G. Miani*, Roma, 1867; HUBERT, *Der hl. H. Emiliani*, Mainz, 1895, and *Notizie stor. s. vita di S. G. Miani*, Sondrio, 1896.

in utter destitution. He collected them in a house near San Rocco, where they were simply provided for, received religious instruction, and were trained in some handicraft, a point which he thought of great importance. In order that the children might not in tender years become accustomed to ways of idleness and beggary, he repeated to them constantly, "The man who will not work, shall not eat." The Venetian Government supported his philanthropic efforts, in which Miani was helped by a settler from Vicenza.¹

Orphanages were also founded on the same footing by Miani in Brescia and Bergamo; in the latter town he also instituted a house of refuge for the fallen. He soon included in his programme instruction for the country people, and gathered round him a number of excellent priests and also devout laymen. Thus a religious association was formed occupied in the first instance with the management of the orphan asylums founded by Miani, but with the special care besides of other victims of misfortune, the sick, the poor, the ignorant. From their place of meeting, the lonely village of Somasca, near Bergamo, the members got their name of Somaschi.

Miani had always followed Carafa as his spiritual guide; if the latter declined the honour of being at the head of this new association of Clerks Regular, he was yet their intellectual founder.² So impartially did the founder of the Theatines watch the growth of the community of Somasca that he never attempted to win over Miani to his own congregation. As soon as he recognized Miani's special characteristics he handed over to him even the orphan schools hitherto conducted

¹ Cf. SANUTO, LIV., 419.

² Opinion of GOTHEIN, Ignatius, 194. Cf. BROMATO, I., 169 *seq.*
VOL. X. 29

by the Theatines in the Hospital for Incurables in Venice.¹

It was also due to Carafa that Miani extended his work into the Milanese territory.² For the mitigation of bodily and spiritual suffering hardly any field was more suitable at that time than that district, ravaged as it had been by unspeakable inroads of war, hunger, and plague. In Milan, as in Venice, many were converted by the troubles of the time. What had seldom happened before, the sons of distinguished families now gave up riches and honours in order to follow Christ as His poor.³ Preachers called on the people to repent; among them one especially distinguished himself, the Spanish Dominican, Tommaso Nieto. In the year 1529 he introduced a solemn procession of the Blessed Sacrament, when the Host was carried in a sort of ark borne by four priests.⁴

More hidden and more permanent work in Milan was carried out by Antonio Maria Zaccaria,⁵ a nobleman of

¹ BROMATO, I., 199.

² See Acta Sanctor., Febr., II., 251.

³ In Venice in the one year 1531 four sons of the most distinguished families were Friars; see SANUTO, LIV., 600. In Milan the conversion of J. A. Morigia presents a typical instance; see *Vita del v. Morigia in the General Archives of the Barnabite Order in Rome (Y, a 3). Cornelius de Fine, in the entries in his *diary for 1525, speaks very remarkably of the rarity of entrances into the cloister.

⁴ Cf. BURIGOZZO, 485 *seq.*, 491 *seq.*, 498.

⁵ Besides the writers of the Order, Bascapé, Tornielli, Barelli, and Gabuzio, *cf.* especially A. M. TEPPA, Vita del v. A. M. Zaccaria, Moncalieri, 1853 (6th ed., Milano, 1897), a work which, although the author unfortunately gives no quotations, is based throughout on the rich *collection of materials for Zaccaria's life preserved in the General Archives of the Barnabite Order in Rome and kindly placed at my disposal. A series of passages, tested off-hand, convinced me how

Cremona, whose character strongly resembled that of Gaetano di Tiene.

Zaccaria, who was born in 1502 and was at first a doctor, turned in his twenty-sixth year to the study of theology, and after his ordination as priest he displayed an eager pastoral activity in his native city. At the end of 1530, at the wish of the pious Countess Lodovica Torelli of Guastalla,¹ he went to Milan. There, in the Confraternity of the Eternal Compassion, he made friends with kindred souls in Bartolommeo Ferrari and Jacopo Antonio Morigia, who had already become famous for conspicuous works of charity. These good men believed that the best way of checking the misery and immorality caused by the war was to form a society of Clerks Regular primarily devoted to the instruction of the young and the cure of souls. After the adhesion of two other Milanese, Jacopo de' Casei and Francesco Lecchi, Clement VII., in a Brief drawn up at Bologna on the 18th of February 1533, gave permission to Bartolommeo Ferrari and to Antonio Maria Zaccaria to live in community with three other associates in accordance with special statutes, under a superior, but subject to the jurisdiction of their Ordinary, to receive new members, and make their vows before the Archbishop of Milan.² The new community took possession in autumn 1533 of a small house near S. Caterina, not far from the Porta Ticinese of Milan.

carefully the author had done his work. On Teppa (of whom a German edition appeared at Fulda in 1900) is also based the *Vita de S. A. M. Zaccaria*, Firenze, 1897, by F. A. MOLTEDO.

¹ Cf. for L. Torrelli and her conversion, AFFÒ, *Storia di Guastalla*, II., 160, 180 *seq.*

² Bull., VI., 160 *seq.*, and Litt. et constit. s. pontif. pro congr. cleric. S. Pauli. Apost., Romae, 1853, 3 *seqq.*

This they soon enlarged with the permission of the Duke of Milan.¹

The constitutions, as drawn up by Zaccaria, who was chosen Superior, have many points of resemblance with those of the Theatines.² The manner of living of these "sons of St. Paul," as they called themselves in their deep veneration for the Apostle of the Gentiles—a name long afterwards changed to that of "Barnabites," from the seat of the community in the ancient Milanese monastery of St. Barnabas—closely resembled that led by the members of the foundation of Gaetano and Carafa. In the foreground they placed a life of mortification, an eager care for souls, and the visiting of the sick. The chronicler Burigozzo relates the astonishment caused by these priests, who went about their duties in threadbare garments and round biretta, their heads bent and, in spite of their youth, an air of earnestness about them all.³ Zaccaria instructed his sons to influence especially priests and parents; only in this way could the coming generation be improved. He therefore very soon opened his house to priests desirous of making spiritual exercises and founded a confraternity of married people. The Barnabites differed from the Theatines in seeking publicity. They took pains to stir the feelings of the ruder sort of people by open-air missions and public exercises of penance; they were to be seen, crucifix in hand, preaching in the most crowded thoroughfares; some

¹ *The original of the ducal decree of October 27, 1533, permitting Zaccaria and Ferrari to buy landed property up to the amount of 600 gold ducats, is in the General Archives of the Barnabite Order in Rome, Z, f. 2.

² The original of the statutes is to be found in the General Archives of the Barnabite Order, Rome. As to the period when they were drawn up, see Teppa, 72 *seq.*

³ BURIGOZZO, 522.

carried heavy crosses, others confessed their sins aloud. Complaints were made that they were disturbers of the peace, but as Zaccaria in his full trust in God had foretold, they came through this first persecution completely justified. This community, though slow in growth,¹ became a powerful instrument of which St. Charles Borromeo made use in reforming his diocese.

¹ Cf. the *Registro dell' atti di professione, beginning in 1534, in General Archives of Barnabite Order, Rome.

CHAPTER XIV.

REFORM OF THE OLDER ORDERS.—THE CAPUCHINS.

WHILE the new foundations of the Theatines, Somaschi, and Barnabites were rising into existence, the older orders also were awakening to the necessity of reform. In their case also the movement started from small and obscure circles. In order to withdraw themselves from the spirit of the world, which was now too generally prevalent, the better spirits in the older orders sought out a life of solitude. Paolo Giustiniani of the Camaldolese had already introduced in this way improvements in the Order under Leo X., for he had erected¹ at Pascelupo in the Apennines and Massaccio in the province of Ancona, hermitages of Camaldolese under very strict regulations. Each member lived by himself in a small separate hut, and together with a strict observance of the vows, Giustiniani attached a high importance to complete seclusion. In one of his letters he extols this manner of life, far apart from the movement of the world in a sublime isolation, as the best way to attain the peace of the soul and spiritual perfection.² Like Adrian VI., Clement VII. also gave encouragement to this congregation of Camaldolese hermits. Giustiniani's (d. 1528)

¹ Cf. FIORI, Vita del b. P. Giustiniani, Roma, 1724; BROMATO, I., 90; HEIMBUCHER, I., 206; Studien aus dem Benediktinerorden, XII., 64 *seq.*

² See the letter to Carafa in BROMATO, I., 136 *seq.*

second successor, the recluse Giustiniani of Bergamo, made Monte Corona at Umbertide in the upper valley of the Tiber the headquarters of the foundation, which has given the whole congregation its name. The industry of these hermits changed the inhospitable slopes of the mountain into one of the most picturesque settlements of recluses in the world. Here also Clement VII. gave his support by graces and privileges, and confirmed the statutes.¹

Among the Augustinian hermits the learned General, Egidio Canisio, also pursued under Leo X. the reforming activities² on which he had previously entered,³ while the congregation of Benedictines of Monte Cassino settled at S. Justina in Padua were led in the same direction by the classical scholar, Gregorio Cortese.⁴

Serious efforts at reform had also already been made by the Franciscan Observants under Leo X. Their excellent General, Francesco Lichetto, in 1517 advised those of stricter aspirations to follow the Spanish example and make use of the houses of so-called Recollects, that is, convents to which they might voluntarily repair in order without disturbance there to carry out as strictly as possible the rules of the Order, and to devote themselves especially to penitential exercises and continual meditation. The oldest houses of this kind, Fonte Colombo and Grecio, lay in the valley of Rieti, hallowed by the

¹ Bull., VI., 117-119; HELYOT, VII., 313. In Monte Corona also, since the expulsion of the Orders, the former aspect of the spot has been altered to its disadvantage. The beautiful woods of great antiquity have been cut down, a crowning act of destruction.

² See the *letter of Egidio Canisio, dat. Rome, 1515, July 8, in Cod. 1001, f. 298^b, in the Angelica Library, Rome.

³ Cf. LAEMMER, Beiträge zur Kirchengesch., 65 seq.

⁴ See GREG. CORTESII, Opera, I., Patavii, 1724, 19 seqq.; for Cortese cf. DITTRICH in Freiburger Kirchenlexikon, III., 2nd ed., 1135 seqq., and GOTHEIN, Ignatius, 110 seq.

sojourn of St. Francis himself. The inmates were called Brothers of the Stricter Observance, and later, Riformati.¹ They found, however, more resistance than encouragement from the cismontane commissary-general Ilarione Sacchetti, who was a strong upholder of the unity of the Order. On the other hand, the earnest Spanish reformer,² Quiñones, chosen General in 1523, was a great friend of the Brothers of the Stricter Observance, to whom he at once gave a strict rule in Spain, and assigned five houses of Recollects.³ When Quiñones came to Italy in 1525 he supported these special reforms,⁴ as well as all others in the Order. Two high-minded fellow-countrymen, Martino di Guzman and Stefano Molina,⁵ could congratulate themselves on his special favour. He appointed them to plant the new institution of the Stricter Observance—afterwards known as that of the Riformati—in the Roman province. These Riformati led an exceptionally hard life. Only on two days of the week did they eat cooked food; for the rest they were satisfied with bread, fruit, and vegetables; their bed was either the bare ground or a board, and the day began and ended with prolonged meditation; at night there was prayer in common. Had Quiñones remained longer at the head of the Observants this institution would certainly at that time have risen to

¹ DOM. DE GUBERNATIS, *Orbis Seraph.*, III., I., 263; *cf.* MORONI, XXVI., 154; BENEDETTO SPILA, *I santi luoghi della Palestina e la Franciscana Riforma*, Napoli, 1892, 26.

² *Cf.* WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 188 *seq.*, 205 *seq.*, 226 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 167 *seq.*

⁴ *Cf.* *Croniche dei frati minori*, III., 302; GONZAGA, *De orig. seraph. relig.*, Venet., 1603, I., 56, II., 110; DOM. DE GUBERNATIS, *Orbis Seraph.*, III., I., 262 *seq.*; B. SPILA, *I santi luoghi*, 28.

⁵ WADDING, XXI., 220 *seq.*; SIGISMUNDO DA VENEZIA, *Biografia Serafica*, Venezia, 1846, and the *Chronicle of the Roman Province*, I., 282, 293.

great importance, for, especially in the years of terror after the sack of Rome, the number of those Observants who were working for the most exact possible compliance with the rule,¹ increased greatly. Unfortunately the new General, Paolo Pisotti, was an opponent of this and every other tendency to strict observance.²

At this critical moment Clement VII., on the advice of Carafa, took up the cause of the Riformati. In a Bull of the 14th of November 1532 he ordered the General and Provincials of the Observants to abstain from molesting in any way the Riformati, but rather to give them every assistance and to reserve for them an adequate number of convents. The Riformati were now privileged to receive novices, and to choose for themselves a Guardian in each province. But their dress and hood were not to differ from those of other Observants, and they were to be subject to visitation from the Provincial.³

Although the Pope thus showed his favour towards the new institution, it did not at first make much way in Italy. All the more remarkable was another reform which grew up among the Italian Franciscan Observants. This was begun by Matteo da Bascio (born about 1495, died 1552), a native of the hill-country of Umbria. Nowhere else in Italy did the mystic and yet popular spirit of St. Francis survive with such vitality as among the poor, contented, believing, and brave-spirited populations dwelling in the remote valleys and gorges of this picturesque district, which, in a wider sense, included also the territory beyond

¹ Cf. *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo in the General Archives of the Capuchins in Rome.

² Cf. WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 303, and *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, I., in the General Archives of the Capuchins, Rome.

³ Bull. Rom., VI., 155 *seqq.*; WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 328; BOVERIUS, I., 988 *seqq.*; BROMATO, I., 219.

the Apennines. Here, on a hill not far from Pennabilli, lay the market town of Bascio,¹ politically under the Dukes of Urbino and ecclesiastically within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Montefeltro.

The earliest accounts of Matteo's youth as well as of his later years already bear a legendary character; it is no longer possible to examine their statements, but the historical residuum may be given as follows:—At an early age, about his seventeenth year, as alleged, Matteo entered the Order of Franciscan Observants at Montefalcone in the March of Ancona. Here he was conspicuous for piety and his strong grasp of his vocation. On his entry into the Order he brought with him little education,² nor did he afterwards make much progress beyond what was necessary for the immediate tasks of his calling. Perhaps it was exactly on this account that the homely sermons of the simple peasant's son won the hearts of the poor folk dwelling among the hills. Matteo became known to a wider circle by the spirit of self-devotion displayed by him in 1523, when Camerino was visited by the plague.³

¹ See AMATI, *Dizionario geograf. d' Italia*, I., 640. "Matteo de Grassis" in GOTHEIN, *Ignatius*, 107, is an error.

² Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, here certainly an unimpeachable witness, says: "Nell' età tenera frequentò alcuni mesi la scuola e imparò un pogo di grammatica positiva, ma perchè suo padre faceva il contadino, non puote il buon fanciullo sequitar le lettere, gli restò nondimeno non so che de buona creanza, e perchè sapeva leggere, se diede con molta devotione a legger libri spirituali." *Cronica, I., General Archives of the Capuchin Order, Rome; *cf.* the remarks in Appendix, No. 4, on the earliest sources for the history of the Capuchins.

³ SANTONI (*I primordii del Cappuccini*, 8), on the authority of LILLI (*Hist. di Camerino*, II., 301), places the epidemic in 1524; but the *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo (General Archives of the Capuchins, Rome) states repeatedly 1523. Perugia in 1524 was carried off by the plague.

Voluntarily he left his convent at Montefalcone and hastened to the above-named town, where he shrank from no peril of death in order to succour the sick and dying. This self-denying activity of Matteo drew at once the attention of the Duke of Camerino, Giovan Maria Varano, and his wife Caterina Cibo to the humble Franciscan.¹

Caterina Cibo belonged, like Vittoria Colonna,² to that class of women of the Italian Renaissance who combined wide cultivation with deep piety and a great purity of life.³ She knew Latin and Greek, and also took lessons in Hebrew in order to read the Old Testament in the original. As a niece of Leo X. and Clement VII. she often visited Rome, where she came into contact with the men of letters living there.⁴ She was interested in an exceptional degree in religious matters, and especially in the reform of the clergy in her husband's duchy.⁵ Herself a rough and almost virile character, she must have been attracted by Matteo's strong qualities.

After the plague had ceased at Camerino, Matteo returned to his seclusion at Montefalcone; while there he often withdrew into the woodland solitudes so beloved

¹ *Bernardino da Colpetrazzo testifies to this expressly, and adds that Matteo among others had attended to two noblemen of the Duchess's court.

² On V. Colonna, who at the end of 1525 retired into the convent of S. Silvestro in Capite in Rome, more will be said in the next volume.

³ "Donna di santissimi costumi" is VARCHI'S (I., 173) expression; *cf.* also FELICIANGELI (p. 140) in the work mentioned in the next note. For Blessed Battista da Varano (died 1526, May 31) of the Order of Poor Clares, see *Miscell. Francesc.*, I., 161 *seqq.*; *cf.* IV., 18 *seqq.*

⁴ *Cf.* REUMONT, *Beiträge*, IV., 205 *seqq.*, and V. Colonna, 132 *seqq.*, 269, as well as FELICIANGELI, *Notizie e docum. sulla vita di Cat. Cibo-Varano, duchessa di Camerino*, Camerino, 1891. Caterina became a widow in 1527.

⁵ FONTANA, *Docum.*, 129.

of St. Francis. The life of his brethren seemed to him to correspond less and less to the original severity of the Order. He seemed to hear the voice of the seraphic Patriarch calling to him in threatening tones, "I wish my rule to be observed, to the letter, to the letter, to the letter." Deeper and deeper grew Matteo's resolve to live entirely according to the holy rule in the utmost possible solitude and in strictest poverty. While such thoughts were working in his inmost soul he learned by accident from a pious countryman that his dress was not in keeping with that of the founder of the Order, who had worn a habit of the coarsest sort on which was sewn not a round but a four-cornered pointed hood.¹ After receiving this information Matteo did not rest until he had procured for himself this new habit. All his fervour for the strict observance of the rule was now concentrated on this one point; wearing his new hood, he started without leave on the road to Rome in the Jubilee year 1525.² He had to endure much on this journey on account of his unusual attire. Nevertheless, he reached Rome safely and made his way into the presence of Clement himself. He made his petition that he might retain his new habit, live as a

¹ The controversy over the real habit of St. Francis and the correlated question as to the true and uninterrupted succession of his sons was carried on in the seventeenth century with such violence between Franciscans and Capuchins that the Congregation of the Index and Rites repeatedly had to intervene; see REUSCH, *Index*, II., 260; *cf.* also GAUDENTIUS, 276 *seq.* That the Capuchins were genuine and undoubted sons of St. Francis was declared by Paul V. and Urban VIII.; see *Bull. Capuc.*, I., 57 and 77 *seqq.*

² SANTONI, 61, has taken up the earlier opinion which places the origin of the Capuchins in 1524. This view became authoritative in 1624, on the occasion of the centenary celebrations. The **Cronica* of P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, however, repeatedly gives 1525 in agreement with Joh. de Terranova (*cf.* Appendix, No. 4).

solitary according to the rule of St. Francis, and preach the Word of God. Clement VII.—so it is related—gave his consent, but imposed the condition that Matteo should annually declare his adhesion to the Observant Order by presenting himself before the Provincial Chapter.¹

When Matteo, in April 1525, obeyed this injunction, but could produce no written authorization from the Pope for his new manner of life and garb, the Provincial of the March of Ancona, Giovanni da Fano, who was as energetic as he was learned, ordered the too simple-minded brother to be incarcerated as a runaway and contumacious. Giovanni could appeal to the authority of John XXII., who had already forbidden the introduction of a new hood, while Leo X. and Clement VII. had forbidden any absence without leave from the society of the Order.²

¹ Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, *Cronica, relates that Matteo had said to the Pope: "Sappiate, P. S^{to}, che a questi tempi nostri non s'osserva universalmente la regola, e io desidero de osservarla ad lettera, e per questo humilmente vi prego, che me concedete de portar quest' abito e osservar la regola ad lettera, e perchè i nostri padri non vorrebbero che tra di loro quest' habito si portasse, vi prego che vi piaccia de concederme ch' io possa andare per il mondo predicando i commandimenti di Dio e più con l' esempio che con le parole secondo la mia semplicità esortar ogn' uno alla via di Dio e all' opere buone; respose S. Sta: così è la volontà nostra e nostra intentione che la regola si osservi a lettera secondo il voler del N. S. Giesu Cristo e di S. Francesco e per questo di bonissima voglia ve concedemo quanto voi me dimandate per l' osservanza della regola, ma in segno de obediencia in tempo del capitolo," etc. Thus the extension of the Papal permission to other persons is not as yet to be found here. On the other hand, this version is given by MATTHIAS DE SALO, I., 74, and after him by BOVERIUS, I., 43; for criticism on this point see Appendix, No. 4. That Matteo asked the Pope's permission for himself only and not for others is also clearly stated by Joh. de Terranova, Acta Sanctor., Maji, IV., 284.

² See *Miscell. Francesc.*, IV., 153; *WADDING*, XVI., 2nd ed., 576 *seq.*, and *SANTONI*, 11-12, and 62.

Matteo's misfortune did not long remain unknown ; even the Duchess Caterina Cibo became aware of it. Through her powerful intercession Matteo was free again by July ; he now betook himself to Camerino, and had a great success as a preacher of penance, and was soon joined by other Observants. Among the first were the two brothers Lodovico and Raffaello da Fossombrone, the first a priest, the other a lay brother. Matteo had no thought of founding an order ; all he desired was to carry out to the very letter the rule of St. Francis.¹ In Lodovico he was joined by a kindred spirit, who by his energy and boldness was well fitted to carry far what Matteo had set in motion.

At first, indeed, the co-operation of the two brothers with Matteo led to a serious crisis. The Superiors, bent on maintaining the unity of the Order, threatened the former with excommunication for having left their convent without leave, and even tried to get permission from Rome to arrest them.² Lodovico da Fossombrone, convinced that his case was a thoroughly sound one, himself made haste to Rome in the beginning of 1526 with letters of recommendation from the Duchess of Camerino, and there addressed himself to Carafa, "the friend of all reforms."³

¹ Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, who always treats Matteo as *santo huomo*, insists on this in his *Cronica I. (General Archives of Capuchins, Rome).

² This hitherto unknown fact I derived from **a letter of Clement VII., dat. Rome, 1526, March 8, found in the Secret Archives of the Vatican (Arm., 39, vol. 55, f. 36^b *seq.*), and the text of which I intend to publish in the Acta Pontif. In it are specially mentioned "Lud. et Raphael de Forosempronio ac Mattheus de Bascia."

³ *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, I., *loc. cit.* To these sources BOVERIUS (I., 63) also appeals, and afterwards BROMATO (I., 140 *seqq.*). Boverius, however, has elaborated the matter ; of a testing of Lodovico's intentions by Carafa the *Cronica says nothing. Cf. also Appendix, No. 4.

The latter, on principle, was by no means favourably disposed to those religious who separated themselves from their Order; but he very soon perceived that in this case the cause of separation was not laxity but its opposite, and this, like all other efforts at reform, also received his support. Through Carafa's influence Lodovico soon attained his object. The Cardinal Grand Penitentiary, Lorenzo Pucci, on the 18th of May 1526, gave vouchers to Lodovico and Raffaello da Fossombrone as well as to Matteo da Bascio by which, in the case of their Superiors refusing the permission asked for, they were empowered by Papal authority to lead the life of anchorites under the rule of St. Francis outside the houses of their Order in the new district, but certainly subject to the supervision of Bishop Giangiacomo Bon-giovanni of Camerino.¹

The quiet hill town now became the centre of the new movement, which Giovanni da Fano continued to look upon as an unlawful act of separation.² Firmly convinced that he was dealing here with a case of apostasy, he did all that lay in his power to compass its suppression. He had no idea that the reform of the Order, which even he was striving for, was to come from below, from very simple and insignificant men. The position of the Franciscan hermits, as Matteo's associates at first were called, became so bad that for some time they had thoughts of going out as missionaries to the infidels.³

¹ BOVERIUS, I., 64-65; Bull. Capuc., I., 1-2, from the original in General Archives of the Capuchins in Rome, where the document is not now to be found. MAURENBRECHER (Kathol. Ref., 231) is incorrect in speaking of a Papal Brief. FONTANA (Arch. d. Soc. Rom., IX., 346) even mentions a Bull. HEIMBUCHER (I., 316) attributes the document, in error, to 1528.

² "Setta," says the *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo in General Archives of the Capuchins in Rome.

³ This statement is found in the *Cronica aforesaid, I., *loc. cit.*

In this time of distress, the Bishop of Camerino, the like-minded Camaldolese, and especially the ducal family stood by the persecuted community. But these simple men won the love of the people in the terrible times of trouble which broke over Camerino after 1527. When all others fled before the plague they remained steadfast at their posts. On the 10th of August 1527 the Duke himself fell a victim to the disease.¹

In consequence of the continued hostility of the Observants, Lodovico da Fossombrone put himself into communication with the Provincial of the Conventuals in the Marches, who later took him and his colleagues into his province, on condition that they reported themselves once a year either to him or to the Chapter and submitted themselves to visitation. Through the influence of the Duchess Caterina Cibo,² Lodovico obtained the Pope's confirmation of this ordinance. This was contained in a Papal brief addressed from Viterbo on the 3rd of July 1528, to Lodovico and Raffaello da Fossombrone. It conveyed the ecclesiastical confirmation of the branch of the Franciscans, subsequently known, from their habit, as the Capuchins. This document sanctioned the mendicant life in hermitages or other places according to the rule of St. Francis; the beard was permitted to be worn as well as the new habit with the four-cornered hood. Finally, new members were permitted to be chosen from the ranks of the secular clergy and the laity. At the same time, all

¹ BOVERIUS, I., 109, places the Duke's death in 1528, but wrongly. Cf. SANTONI, 64.

² The statements in the *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, I. (General Archives of the Capuchin Order in Rome), about the intercession of Caterina Cibo, are confirmed by an entry on the original minutes of the Brief in the Secret Archives of the Vatican; see *infra*, p. 465, n. 1.

the privileges of the Conventuals and of the Camaldolese hermits were extended to the new congregation.¹

The Bishop of Camerino ordered this Brief to be solemnly published, and then followed the foundation of the first settled establishment outside the gates of the episcopal city.² Within the territory of the latter a second convent on Monte Melone very soon arose.

¹ The document, a Bull in the fuller sense (*littera* with formal greeting and *sal. et apost. bened.*, year of our Lord and date of day according to the Roman Calendar), beginning "Religionis Zelus," is published from a copy in the Archives of the Order in Bull. Capuc., I., 3-4. The copy in BOVERIUS, I., 94-96, is inadequate; the same must be said of the copy in WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 257 *seq.*; see Bull. Rom., VI., 113, 114, where the Brief is also. In the form of a Brief "dat. 3 Julii 1528" the document appears without the preamble and beginning at once with "Exponi nobis" in Min. brev. in Secret Archives of the Vatican (Arm., 40, vol. 20, n. 1191). Towards the end it runs: *Volentes quoque ut, si vobis videbitur opportunum, has litteras nostras etiam sub plumbo expediri facere valeatis. Under the date come the following signatures: *Visa Ja. Symoneta—Videtur concedendum A. Car^{lis} de Valle Protector—L. Car^{lis} S. Quattuor.—Evangelista. On the back one reads: *Julii 1528. "Intercedente ducissa Camerin. pro Ludovico et Raphaelle fratribus et fratribus ord. conventualium minorum. R^{mus} S. Quattuor et protector viderunt." The General Archives of the Capuchin Order in Rome still preserves the *petition of Lodovico and Raffaello da Fossombrone. In this petition much was asked that was not immediately granted. Thus, permission: "unum superiorem et custodem, qui in eos similem auctoritatem, habeat quam ministri provinciales dicti ordinis fratres provinciarum suarum habent, eligere necnon omnibus et singulis tam clericis *etiam ordinum quorumcunque religiosis*, superiorum suorum licentia petita licet non obtenta, quam laicis qui divina inspiratione ducti similem solitariam et austeram vitam ducere voluerint, ut ad illam commorari seu transire et eam agere et in illa[m] per dictos fratres et socios recipere libere et licite valeant."

² The little convent lay one and a half miles from Camerino, near the church S. Cristoforo, on the road to Varano. Since it soon proved to be too small, Caterina Cibo prevailed on the Hieronymites to hand over to the Franciscan hermits their nearly deserted convent at Colmenzone

Though the number of Franciscan hermits at that time was comparatively small, yet their activity must be described as exceptional. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, who had personally known the earliest fathers, has left a sketch of their first entrance on their mission, which is striking in its bare simplicity.¹ Their garments were the roughest that could be procured. They went barefoot always, even in winter, holding the crucifix in their hands. Their nourishment consisted of water, bread, vegetables, and fruit; flesh was eaten only very seldom; the fasts were kept rigorously—many fasted almost continually. Their dwellings, built by preference in lonely places, were as inconspicuous and poor as possible; they were composed only of wood and loam. A board served for a bed; for those who were weaker there was a mat; the doors of the cells were so low that they could not be entered without stooping; the windows were very narrow and small, and unfurnished with glass. This simplicity extended even to the churches. Everything, even outwardly, was to preach the utmost poverty in an age in which not only the worldly, but also many great ecclesiastics, and even members of the mendicant Orders themselves,² worshipped the lavish display of wealth.

close to S. Marcello. The five Observants named in the indult of Cardinal Pucci of September 11, 1528, here took possession (BOVERIUS, I., 987 to 988). As the spot was unhealthy they built themselves, four years later (so says Bernardino da Colpetrazzo in his *Cronica, I.), again assisted by Caterina Cibo, a modest convent at Renacavata, in a retired neighbourhood, three miles from Camerino, on the road to Tolentino. This convent is still standing; see SANTINI, 37 *seqq.*, where there is also a sketch.

¹ *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, I. Cf. also MATHIAS DA SALO, *Hist. Capuc., I. (General Archives of the Capuchins, Rome).

² WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 323. DOM. DE GUBERNATIS, Orbis Seraph., III., 1, 279.

The inmates of these literally poverty-stricken convents had, in the first period of their existence, two main objects in view, and, above all, to be preachers of repentance to the common people. The plain speaking of these simple men, which spared no man, had such power that the hardest hearts quailed and the most stubborn sinners were converted. People often went five or six miles to hear the Franciscan hermits. "They preached," says Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, "the Holy Scriptures, especially the Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ, exhorting their hearers to fulfil the commandments of God."¹ The same chronicler mentions as strange novelties that they brought with them a crucifix into the pulpit and urged a frequent reception of the Blessed Sacrament.²

The behaviour of the poor hermits during the epidemic called forth even greater admiration than their preaching. A rich field for heroic acts of genuine Christian charity was opened up during the terrible days of the sack of Rome. The plague was soon followed by scarcity of food and famine, which lasted, according to Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, during 1528 and 1529.³ Like other contemporaries, this narrator saw in the sufferings by which Italy was visited a punishment of the general wickedness. The streets and roads were covered with dead, some cut

¹ "Predicavano la scrittura sacra, principalmente il vangelo santo del N. S. Gesù Cristo, esortando le persone all' osservanza de' comandamenti di Dio." *Joh. de Terranova (Acta Sanctor., Maji, IV., 284) says of Matteo da Bascio that he preached: "ad infernum usurarii ad infernum concubinariii, et sic de reliquis vitiis: tanta erat libertas dicentis, ut nulli personae parcens, saepe a minus consideratis contemptui habitus propterea fuerit."

² Bernardino da Colpetrazzo in *Cronica*, I. (General Archives of the Capuchins, Rome), frequently draws attention to this.

³ "De quando i frati Capuccini si diedero a servire agli appestati." **Cronica, ut supra.*

off by the plague, some by famine, some by the sword; wolves gnawed the corpses, for in the districts devastated by war there were none left to dig graves. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, who at that time was also suffering from the plague, was unable in after years to find words to describe the panic that prevailed.¹ As watchers of the sick could not be got in Camerino and its neighbourhood, the Franciscan hermits voluntarily undertook their duties. They carried the Viaticum to the dying and buried the dead; they took care of orphan children and collected alms for the famishing survivors of the population. They refused all offers of gifts to themselves; all was done for the love of God. With heroic self-sacrifice the little band worked on until the plague died out at the close of 1529; half of the population had fallen prey to its ravages.²

This example of Christian love, which, to the end of the century, clung to the memory of the thankful people,³ combined with their inspired preaching, drew to the Franciscan hermits after the extinction of the plague many new members. The two first settlements were no longer sufficient, two more had to be built; one at Alvacina in the district of Fabriano, the other at Fossombrone in the Duchy of Urbino. For these four places, all, with the exception of the last, in the diocese of Camerino, guardians were appointed in 1529 at the first General Chapter held in a wretched hut at Alvacina. At this meeting Matteo da Bascio, in spite of his

¹ “*Pareva che l’aria piangesse.”

² *Cronica, *ut supra*.

³ “E tanto fu il rumore che si sparse la fama loro per tutta Italia e tutti quei popoli se scolpirono nel cuore quei servi di Dio che insino ad hoggi se ne ricordano e non puoco giovò alla povera congregatione quest’ottimo esempio.” *Cronica, *ut supra*.

resistance,¹ was chosen Vicar-General,² and at the same time the constitution of the new institute was sketched in outline. The main principle was the closest observance of the rule of St. Francis, particularly in respect of the "virtue of holy poverty." Therefore, in collecting alms they were never to accept provisions beyond a week's supply at the utmost. Their cells were to be very narrow, more like jails than dwellings. Their very churches were to reflect their poverty; precious metals and stuffs were banished, and the psalmody was not to be sung. Moreover, the most austere life was prescribed, nightly prayer, severe discipline, the roughest and worst clothing; bare-headed and unshod, they were never to journey except on foot. The duty of earnest preaching for those thus gifted is still a noticeable feature of the rule. They are to avoid all flowers of speech and all subtle speculations, to keep in view the practical needs of their hearers, and to proclaim "purely and simply the Holy Gospel of our Lord."³

The change in the direction of the new community was of great importance. Matteo, who wished to give himself entirely to preaching, resigned his post in a very short time, whereon, with the Pope's consent, the energetic, self-confident Lodovico da Fossombrone took his place. He

¹ The *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo relates that Matteo had pleaded that preaching was his real vocation and that, even if the Pope would have it so, he was not fitted to rule the Friars ("e di più io no ho gratia di regger frati").

² Under the General of the Conventuals. This arrangement lasted till 1619; see Bull. Capuc., I., 62. Strictly speaking, it is not until that date that one can speak of a new and independent order.

³ BOVERIUS, I., 117 *seq.* Cf. HEIMBUCHER, I., 317.

entered into communication¹ with a number of Calabrian Observants who were at the same time seeking a stricter compliance with the rule, and established a settlement in Rome. Here also it was Caterina Cibo who, through her brothers, opened a way for these Observants, already known as Franciscan hermits. Her brothers were guardians of the Hospital of S. Giacomo for incurables. The little church of S. Maria dei Miracoli, near the Piazza del Popolo and attached to the hospital, became the first Capuchin settlement in Rome.² They now took charge of the hospital, and the care which they there bestowed on the sick drew to them the sympathy of the lower as well as the higher classes in Rome.³

The rapid extension of the new community made a deep impression on the Observants, and spurred them on to fresh action against the hermits. Many saw in the behaviour of the members of the new body an excess of enthusiasm on the part of some, on the part of others defiance and rebellion. The latter view found favour with the masterful Giovanni da Fano, who was convinced that he was carrying out a good work in opposing the upstarts.⁴ In other Observants the

¹ "Instrumentum aggregationis frat. Calabriae," dat. 1529, August 16, in BOVERIUS, I., 133 *seq.* Cf. F. SECURI, Mem. stor. s. prov. d. Capuccini di Reggio di Calabria, Reggio di C., 1885.

² Cf. the sound and scholarly discussion, directed at Boverius, of EDOARDO DA ALENÇON, Il primo convento dei Capuccini in Roma: La Madonna dei Miracoli, Alençon, 1907. Later the Capuchins settled on the Esquiline at S. Eufemia, near S. Pudentiana, where now stands the Hospital of the Bambino Gesù. The old church of S. Maria dei Miracoli stood where now the Ponte Margarita begins.

³ "Come il P. fra Ludovico andò a Roma e come prese il primo luogo in Roma." *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo (General Archives of the Capuchins, Rome); afterwards BOVERIUS, I., 131 *seqq.*

⁴ *Non fu mai Abel tanto odiato dal suo fratello Chain e meno Giacob così perseguitato dal suo fratello Esau quanto furono per-

leading motive was simply jealousy, and in Paolo Pisotti, then their General, there was undoubtedly a repugnance to all reform.¹

To all these antagonists Lodovico now gave good grounds for complaint, for in his unreflecting zeal to obtain as many new members as possible for his community, he drew into it² not a few Observants. The reception of the latter was a consequence of the Grand Penitentiary's indult. The Observants, fearing a gradual dismemberment of the whole Order, made such passionate representations to the Pope of the injuriousness of the indult and of the misuse of it, that Clement VII. in May 1530 cancelled all his concessions to the new Franciscan offshoot. But the Papal Brief of July 1528 was not expressly mentioned in this enactment. Lodovico, in his opposition to the new measures, was able to take his stand on the earlier

seguitati et odiati i poveri Capuccini da questo venerabile padre fra Giovanni da Fano, ministro in quel tempo della provincia della Marca, e fu con ammirazione molta d' ogn' uno ch' un huomo tanto da bene, dotto, attempato, giuditioso e di buonissima conscientia precipitasse in un errore così grande, ma da molti servi d' Iddio di quel tempo ne fu fatto giuditio che no da lui si muovesse e con malignita, ma per zelo della religione parendogli veramente di far bene e cosa grata a Dio e per questo parve che quel che faceva il facesse con grand' odio, non era pero odio sicome egli medesimo disse dipoi quando venne tra Capuccini, ma perchè era huomo spiritoso, di bell' ingegno, in tutte le sue cose procedeva risoluto e nelle sue operationi era huomo efficacissimo; nondimeno da quei che pescavano più al fondo fu fatto giuditio che questa fusse una permissione di Dio per maggior prolatione di quei venerandi padri, primi Capuccini. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo. *Cronica, I., *loc. cit.*

¹ See DOM. DE GUBERNATIS, *Orbis Seraph.*, III., 1, 279. Joh. de Terranova states expressly that Pisotti intrigued against the Franciscan hermits with Clement VII. Pisotti got at first the Brief of December 14, 1529, published in WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 279-280.

² Even BOVERIUS admits this, I., 137.

document; besides, he and his patrons did all in their power to show that the complaints raised were unfounded, and to nullify the Pope's severe regulations. At first they were unsuccessful,¹ but at last they succeeded in having the whole dispute referred by Clement VII. to the Cardinals Antonio del Monte and Andrea della Valle for fresh examination; these gave as their decision, on the 14th of August 1532, that in future the Franciscan hermits must not receive any more Observants, but that the Observants must abstain from any molestation of those who had left them for the Franciscan hermits, and of the hermits themselves.²

This decision, pronounced in the Pope's name, was a striking success for the new institution over the old. The Franciscan hermits now spread their settlements not only through the Marches and in Calabria, but in other parts of Italy and even in Sicily.³ A certain increase of

¹ The documents relating to events of this period in WADDING (XVI., 2nd ed., 291 *seqq.*, 300 *seqq.*, 605 *seq.*) and the narrative in the *Cronica of P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo are so incomplete that much remains to be cleared up. Unfortunately I only succeeded in finding in the Secret Archives of the Vatican two documents relating to these events, viz.: (a) The *commands of May 27, 1530 (and again on December 2, 1531; see FONTANA, Docum., 122 *seq.*) to the Vicar-General of the Observantines to reinstate in their convents those who had gone away, repeatedly mentioned in the Bulls given in WADDING; Brevia, 1530, vol. 50, f. 750. (b) A *Brief of July 3, 1532, in which all, who after May 27, 1530, had left, are ordered to return to their convents; Arm., 40, vol. 39, n. 184.

² The decision is given in BOVERIUS, I., 172-175. Cf. WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 335.

³ Already by 1530 they were firmly established at Naples (see GALANTE in La Scienza e la Fede, 3rd Series, XVIII. [1872], 7, and BONAVENTURA DA SORRENTO, I Capuccini della prov. monast. di Napoli e Terra di Lavoro, S. Agnello di Sorrento, 1879) and at the same time in Liguria (see F. Z. MOLFINO, Cod. dipl. d. Capuccini

difficulty as regards admission into their ranks was nothing but beneficial, for there were some who presented themselves from motives which were not without worldly alloy.¹ All the storms through which the new foundation had to pass served only to impart inward strength. The defection of the Observants was mainly due to the aversion of the General, Pisotti, to all plans of reform. When Clement VII. was in possession of the proofs of this man's bad government, he insisted on his resignation (December 1533).² By neglect of the lax and persecution of the strict, Pisotti had brought his Order to the brink of ruin; no wonder that the better spirits passed over to the Franciscan hermits. In 1534 they were joined by the most famous preachers in Italy, Bernardino Ochino and Bernardino of Asti.³ In the same year the man who had been their most violent opponent, Giovanni da Fano, took the same step.

The Observants were as much convinced as ever of the danger in which their Order was placed; their complaints were so importunate that Clement thought that he must once more give them a hearing. On the 9th of April 1534 a Brief was addressed to Lodovico and to all his associates forbidding them henceforward, without special Papal permission, to receive any Observants or take over any convents belonging to them. This prohibition was also

Liguri, Genova, 1904, xxiii. *seq.*), and by 1532 in Tuscany (*cf.* SISTO DA PISA, Storia d. Capuccini Toscani, Firenze, 1906, I., 35 *seq.*).

¹ This is confirmed by *MATTHIAS DE SALO, Hist. Capuc., I., 259: "Vi entrarono da principio ogni sorte di frati che uscirno dagli osservanti fra quali molti ve n' erano portati da caprici, da sdegni et da altri rispetti humani."

² WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 303 *seqq.*, 323 *seqq.*, 342 *seqq.*; DOM. DE GUBERNATIS, III., I., 279 *seq.*

³ Bernardino da Colpetrazzo (*Cronica, I.) often gives the year 1534 as the date of Ochino's entry into the new congregation.

extended to those who had gone over to the Conventuals or had left the Order entirely.¹ To this document the first use of the expression "Capuchin," in the mention of Lodovico, can be traced.

The opponents, emboldened by this success, now hoped to achieve the overthrow of the whole hermit congregation. But Clement VII. positively refused to repeal the Bull of 1528, although he consented to the banishment of the Capuchins from Rome. On the 25th of April 1534 appeared the edict enjoining their departure. The fathers were just about to partake of their simple mid-day meal when the order was brought to them; without a moment's demur they obeyed the command of the Head of the Church, and without touching their food they went forth. Thirty in number, they walked, two and two, with the cross carried before them, through the city to S. Lorenzo outside the walls, where they were kindly received. While the majority stayed there temporarily, a few, among them Giovanni da

¹ WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 380-381, and Bull. Capuc., I., 11-12, give the text of the Brief which proves that the story told by BOVERIUS (I., 191 *seq.*), that Clement VII. had broken off his intended injunctions against the Capuchins on account of a terrible storm, is fabulous. In the *original minutes in the Secret Archives of the Vatican the words, afterwards struck out as being too harsh, are still standing: "Vitamque admodum austeram et rigidam ac fere non humanam ducentes." Here also belongs a supplementary *Brief of Clement VII. to Cardinal della Valle, dated Rome, 1534, April 15, dealing with the return of the Observants who had gone over to the Capuchins. The minute of this Brief has the following *endorsement: "Non videtur decens ut religiosus invitus cogatur ad laxiorem vitam; si tamen S. D. N. aliquo respectu id velit, nullo modo approbo quod procedatur per Sanct. Suam, sed committatur alii, non enim talis processus est dignus processu per ipsummet Papam. Hier. [Ghinucci] Auditor." Arm., 40, vol. 47, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

Fano, went into upper Italy, there to found new settlements. Thus the misfortunes of the Capuchins turned eventually into a blessing.

The banishment of the worthy friars from Rome caused a storm of indignation among the people, who had come to value them as the succourers of the sick. As interpreter of public opinion the hermit Brandano, so well known during the sack, appeared on the scene. "All the wicked, all the sinful," he exclaimed, "can come to Rome; the good and the virtuous are driven out."¹ At the same time many of the Roman nobility came forward on behalf of the exiles. It was precisely the utter poverty and entire contempt of the world of the Capuchins that had made an ineffaceable impression on the nobler characters. Among the Roman aristocracy, Vittoria Colonna hastened from Marino, and she and Camillo Orsini made representations to Clement as frank as they were touching. Caterina Cibo also made

¹ *Come i frati Capuccini per una grave persecutione furono dis-cacciati dell' alma città di Roma al tempo di Clemente VII. *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, I. (the prophet is here called: "Meo Sanese detto il Brandano, il quale era romito del Sacco"), and MATTHIAS DE SALO, *Hist. Capuc.*, I., 195 *seqq.* He expressly says: "erano da trenta frati." Bernardino da Colpetrazzo speaks of 150 who had been brought to Rome by Lodovico a few days before, a statement accepted by BOVERIUS, I., 190. Matthias de Salo also related that the Pope's decree was executed with greater severity than he had originally intended. "Hebbe (the General of the Observants) per tanto da quanti prencipi erano amorevoli della religione lettere in favore a S. S^{ta} et il mezo di molti Cardinali della corte e quello singolarmente del protettore, e tanto fù l' istanza et importunità sua, che il pontefice stimò di non poter resistere e lasciosi uscir di bocca che i Capuccini fossero mandati fuor di Roma, il che fù eseguito molto più rigorosamente di quello che il pontefice ne intendeva ne detto haveva. Imperocchè accesa la candela fù intimato a Capuccini che prima che ella finisce fossero fuori di Roma" (General Archives of the Capuchins, Rome).

her way to Rome, but when she reached the city Clement VII. had already sanctioned the return of the Capuchins.¹

So this storm also passed over happily. Others, heavier still, were to arise under Clement's successor, but they too had their hour, and the Capuchin Order grew up in the Church to be a great instrument of reform and restoration in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Poor themselves, they became the friends of the poorer classes, whose needs and sufferings they knew as few others did, and to whom in the time of trouble they brought aid with heart and hand.

The pursuit of practical aims, before all others the care of souls, preaching, and the tending of the sick to which the Capuchins, as well as the Theatines, Somaschi, and Barnabites, in accordance with the needs of the age, had devoted themselves, was to reappear even more sharply accentuated in another company of regular clergy which, in activity and diversity of aims, in inward power and outward range of influence, was far to surpass the older orders as well as their more recent successors.

The days of Clement VII. were drawing to a close when this new organization started on its career. It was on the Feast of the Assumption, 1534, that Ignatius Loyola, on the height of Montmartre, on the spot where the first Apostle of Paris had met a martyr's death, unfolded to a gathering of six trusted friends his plan of enlisting a spiritual army "whose leader should be the Saviour Himself, whose banner the Cross, whose watchword God's honour, and whose meed of victory the salvation of men and the

¹ Above according to the *Cronica of Bernardino da Colpetrazzo. MATTHIAS DE SALO, *Hist. Capuc., I., 282, relates that such was the love of the people that the expelled Fathers had in S. Lorenzo more means of subsistence brought to them than they ever had had given them in Rome. See also FELICIANGELI, Cat. Cibo, 161 *seq.*

glory of the Church.”¹ Only one of these inspired men was a priest, Peter Faber, a Savoyard. From his hands, on consecrated ground, the group of friends received Holy Communion ; into his hands, together with the vows of poverty and chastity, they laid yet another—to go, at the close of their theological studies, to Jerusalem, to engage in the conversion of the infidels, or, if this were not possible, to place themselves at the disposal of the Pope for any apostolic mission on which he might choose to send them.

Such was the origin of the Society of Jesus, destined to attain to a world-wide importance in the history of the Church as the most powerful bulwark of the Papacy during the catastrophe of the sixteenth century.

¹ HEIMBUCHER, II., 47. In the Middle Ages Montmartre was covered with convents and hermitages of which, except the Church St. Pierre, dating in part from the ninth century, close to the new Church of the Sacré Cœur, not a trace remains. The chapel in which St. Ignatius and his companions assembled on August 15, 1534, was destroyed in 1790 ; it stood where the Chaussée des Martyrs abuts on the Rue Antoinette. See L. Michel's note to BARTOLI, *Hist. de S. Ignace*, Bruges, 1893, 380.

APPENDIX
OF
UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS
AND
EXTRACTS FROM ARCHIVES.

APPENDIX.

I. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO DONATO DE MARINIS.¹

1525, September 15, Rom.

Grata familiaritatis obsequia . . . Cum itaque postmodum parochialis ecclesia sanctorum Silvestri et Dorothee in regione Transtiberim de urbe confraternitati societati christifidelium divini amoris nuncupate sub invocatione s. Jeronymi canonice institute perpetuo unita annexa et incorporata ex eo, quod nos unionem annexionem et incorporationem predictas, dilectis filiis modernis confratribus sociis nuncupatis confraternitatis huiusmodi in hoc expresse consentientibus, harum serie dissolvimus, per dissolutionem huiusmodi apud sedem predictam vacaverit et vacet ad presens nullusque de illa preter nos hac vice disponere potuerit sive possit reservatione et decreto obsistentibus supra dictis, nos tibi presbitero et etiam continuo commensali nostro asserenti confratres predictos seu eorum maiorem partem forenses existere premissorum obsequiorum et meritorum tuorum intuitu specialem gratiam facere volentes . . . ecclesiam predictam, cuius et illi forsannexorum fructus redditus et proventus vigintiquatuor ducatorum auri de camera secundum communem estimationem valorem annum ut etiam asseris non excedunt, . . . cum dictis annexis ac omnibus iuribus et pertinentiis suis apostolica tibi auctoritate conferimus et de illa etiam providemus. . . .

Datum Rome apud sanctum Petrum anno incarnationis dominice millesimo quingentesimo vicesimo quinto decimoseptimo kal. octobr. pontificatus nostri anno secundo.

Orig. with leaden seal in Arm. XI., caps. 1, n. 217 (a tergo: A° inc. d. 1525 die XII. Novemb. rev^l confratres presentes consentierunt dissolutioni . . .). Cf. Regest. Vat. 1481, f. 288-290.

[Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 390.
VOL. X.

2. SAFE-CONDUCT OF POPE CLEMENT VII. FOR
JOHANN HEITMERS.¹

1526, Januar. 17, Rom.

Universis et singulis patriarchis, archiepiscopis, episcopis ac quibuscunque in dignitate ecclesiastica constitutis, presbyteris quoque et clericis nec non ducibus, principibus, baronibus, comitibus, nobilibus, officialibus, communitatibus, hominibus et particularibus personis inclytarum nationum Germaniae, Franciae, Daciae, Angliae et Scotiae, aliarumque nationum, ad quas dilectum filium Ioannem Heytmers commissarium et accolitum nostrum² declinare contigerit, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Cum in minoribus adhuc essemus animo nostro cogitantes, Cosmum et complures progenitores nostros et praesertim Iulianum et Laurentium de Medices necnon fel. rec. Leonem Papam X. praedecessorem et patruelem nostrum secundum carnem in primis infinitam curam et sollicitudinem impendisse ac incredibiles impensas fecisse, ut ad communem studiorum ac studiosorum utilitatem veteres libros Graecae, Latinae et Haebraicae linguae in diversis et remotissimis mundi partibus etiam infidelium ditioni subiectis latentes per viros doctos inquirerent ac in Italiam conduci et in publicis bibliothecis per eos erectis et constructis reponi et custodiri curarent : nos, qui etiam hos linguarum viros ex omni studio generali et in omni scientia peritissimos semper enutrivimus ac magnis stipendiis et donis traximus et vocavimus talemque inquirendi libros diligentiam imitari desideramus eorumque in privata domo nostrorum praedecessorum et progenitorum bibliothecam a doctis omnibus frequentatam servamus, postquam ad summi apostolatus apicem, divina favente clementia, assumpti fuimus, inter alia revolventes, librorum copiam Christianae religioni in primis fructuosam esse indeque multis nostrae fidei arcana et secreta elici, nihil duximus omittendum, quod ad eam rem conducere arbitrati fuimus, ut in his miseris et afflictis Christianae reipublicae temporibus et perfidorum haeticorum tumultibus divina et humana omnia permiscens tum caeteris curis et sollicitudinibus tum hoc etiam perquirendorum librorum studio orthodoxam fidem iuvaremus. Et propterea certiores facti quamplurimos desideratos vetustos libros in diversis provinciarum

¹ See *supra*, p. 336.

² In MS. there follows : ad quas ipsum.

et regnorum praedictorum locis latere, qui si in lucem ederentur, rempublicam litterariam diu antea periclitantem et pene intermortuam plurimum iuvare et praecipuae Christianam religionem iam aliquantulum fluctuantem ac etiam studiosorum animos inflammare possent, dictum Ioannem nostrum commissarium et accolitum istuc destinamus, ut bibliothecas omnes dictarum provinciarum et regnorum perlustret librosque omni studio et diligentia inquirat et illos vel eorum exempla ad nos transportet seu transportari faciat. Quare vos omnes et singulos et in primis charissimos in Christo filios nostros Carolum Romanorum regem in imperatorem electum necnon Franciae, Daciae, Angliae et Scotiae reges illustres paterna hortamur charitate ac maiori quo possumus studio et affectu requirimus, ut pro nostra et in hanc sanctam sedem reverentia atque Christianae religionis et doctrinae intuitu velit ipsum Ioannem benigne recipere sinceraque charitate tractare ac permittere, ut quascunque bibliothecas ingredi possit, eidemque, si ei videbitur, de opportunis salvis conductibus providere; demumque in exequenda huiusmodi commissione nostra circa tam laudabile opus ita favere atque adesse, ut quod nos de re litteraria et fide orthodoxa ac de commodo et ornamento studiosorum omnium mente concepimus, idipsum, auctore Domino, vobis etiam adiuvantibus facilius perficere valeamus. Offerentes nos vestram in nos et hanc sanctissimam sedem voluntatem et observantiam memori animo prosecuturos, et quando-cunque se occasio tulerit in Domino parem etiam vobis gratiam relatu-ros. Detentoribus insuper et occupatoribus huiusmodi librorum et ad nos et dictam sedem illos mittere indebite recusantibus ac scientibus occupatores et detentores huiusmodi et non revelantibus sub excommunicationis latae sententiae poena, quam ferimus in his scriptis, et a qua non nisi per nos quemvis absolvi posse volumus, districte praecipientes mandamus, quatenus visis praesentibus dictos libros vel exhibeant vel manifestent, ut censuras et poenas praedictas effugiant ac de obedientia et religionis Christianae conservatione, promptitudine a nobis et dicta sede atque omnibus litterarum studiosis merito commendari necnon a Deo bonorum omnium remuneratore immortale praemium sperare et consequi possint. Et ut facilius et citius dictus Ioannes praemissa exequi valeat, damus per praesentes [ei] facultatem substituendi unum vel plures ad praemissa et quodlibet praemissorum

cum pari aut limitata potestate et ab eisdem rationem gestorum et administratorum exigendi et cogendi. Super quibus plenam etiam harum serie concedimus ei potestatem. Dat. Romae etc. die xvii ianuarii 1526 anno 3^o. Ja. Sadoletus.

[Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm. 39, vol. 46, n. 31.]

3. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO THE DOMINICANS OF GHENT.¹

1526, Januar. 17, Rome.

Dilectis filiis priori et conventui ordinis praedicatorum civitatis Gandensis. Dilecti filii salutem etc. Rempublicam litterariam diu antea periclitantem et pene intermortuam, a quibusdam vero annis reviviscentem volentes Deo propitio, fel. rec. Leonis X praedecessoris et secundum carnem patruelis nostri vestigiis inhaerendo, fovere prospicientesque ei rei magno usui fore, si nonnulli libri, qui propter iniquas hominum conditiones adhuc incogniti latent, ad communem studiosorum omnium utilitatem in lucem edantur, nihil duximus omittendum, quod ad eam rem pertineret. Certiores itaque facti a dilecto filio Ioanne Heytmers commissario et accolito nostro, quem istuc in praesentiarum destinavimus pro huiusmodi inquirendis vetustissimis libris utriusque linguae auctorum desideratorum in diversis locis regnorum et provinciarum diversorum latentibus, a fel. rec. Leone X praefato ad hoc laudabile opus alias emisso, dilecti filii fratris Wilhelmi Carnificis ordinis sancti Dominici opera et industria se in primis fuisse adiutum eiusdem auxilio et virtute non minus quam antea ad dictos libros inquirendos . . . [sic] indigere, vos et eundem Wilhelmum pro sua in nos et erga hanc sanctam sedem reverentia et devotione ac in bonarum artium studiosos officio impenso plurimum in Domino commendamus et discretionem vestram impensius hortamur in Domino et in virtute sanctae obedientiae requirimus, ut ipsi Wilhelmo plenam et liberam facultatem et potestatem concedatis sex menses extra vestrum ordinem et claustra monasteriorum ipsius ordinis exeundi, manendi, standi et pernoscendi ac una cum dicto Ioanne commissario nostro omnia et singula loca, civitates, terras et provincias perlustrandi ad huiusmodi inquirendorum librorum effectum duntaxat, prout etiam nos per praesentes eidem

¹ See *supra*, p. 336.

Wilhelmo plenam et liberam facultatem et potestatem, ut praeferatur, auctoritate apostolica concedimus et elargimur. Mandantes insuper eidem et sub excommunicationis poena districtius praecipientes, ut dicto commissario in quantum poterit omnem suam operam, industriam, auctoritatem, diligentiam et animi promptitudinem dicto semestre durante ad huiusmodi libros in quibusvis bibliothecis et locis existentes perquirendos et inveniendos et ad commissarii manus ac potestatem tradendos impendat et exhibeat. Non obstantibus quibusvis dicti ordinis et monasterii vestri generalibus vel specialibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus iuramento vel quavis firmitate alia roboratis, quibus caveatur, quod religiosi extra ordinem et monasteria sua permanere nec debeant nec possint, a quibus omnibus et singulis praefatum Wilhelmum ad huiusmodi laudabilem effectum per dictos sex menses absolvimus et eximimus eadem auctoritate. Quod erit nobis a discretionibus vestris gratum et acceptum, vobisque et monasterio vestro in iis gratiis, quas haec sancta sedes in Domino potest concedere, grati animi signa ostendemus. Ac nihilominus eidem Wilhelmo pro simili alias suscepto labore et pro ea, quam, sicut in Domino confidimus, . . . [sic] et diligentem in huiusmodi libris investigandis nostro intuitu eidem Ioanni modo praestabit operam, si quando nobis iusta se occasio obtulerit, grati animi effectum demonstrabimus. Dat. Romae etc. die XVII ianuarii 1526 anno 3^o.
Ja. Sadoletus.

[Secr. Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. 39, vol. 46, n. 30. *Ibid.*, Brief to the Dominican Guillelmus Carnifex of the same date.]

4. REMARKS ON THE OLDEST SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE CAPUCHINS, AND ON THE CRITICISM OF BOVERIUS.¹

Boverius in his important work (I., 33 *seq.*) has treated the rise of the Capuchins and their earliest history in the most interesting way, but sometimes to the disadvantage of the objective side of history; he is not always free from bias in dealing with the Franciscans. This naturally aroused vehement opposition on the part of the latter, especially from Wadding (XVI., 209 *seqq.*). The Bollandists (*Acta Sanctor.*, Maii, IV., 205 *seqq.*) summed up the controversy with unprejudiced judg-

¹ See *supra*, pp. 458, 460, 461, 462.

ment; they weighed calmly the relative claims of the old and the new foundations.

An original document of primary importance, the account of Joannes de Terranova (Capuchin from 1532; †1573), has also been made accessible (Act. Sanct., *op. cit.*, 283 *seqq.*) in a Latin translation.¹ It is of the utmost importance to examine the authorities cited by Boverius to see whether he has been impartial; Wadding made a beginning by pointing out clearly that Boverius made use of an interpolated edition of the "Chroniche de' frati minori" by Marco da Lisboa, which appeared in 1598 in Venice (an edition had already appeared in 1597), and that he had added to it on an important point (the permission given by word of mouth by Pope Clement to Matteo da Bascio), in a party sense favourable to the Capuchins. Perhaps, Wadding concludes, the additions are to be found in the four unpublished Chronicles to which Boverius appeals as his principal authorities, but which until now have not appeared. The authors of these Chronicles, according to Boverius, were the Vicars-General of the Capuchins, "Marius a Forosarsinio" and "Hieronymus a Monteflorum" (the former elected 1567, the latter 1575), and the Capuchins, "Matthias Salodiensis" (†1611) and "Bernardarius a Colpetraccio," who had been a contemporary of Matteo da Bascio and Bernardino of Asti. A part of the chronicle of Marius a Forosarsinio is at Venice in the Museo Correr (Cicogna, 551); the three others, in the General Archives of the Capuchin Order, I was able to make use of through the kindness of the archivist, Fr. Edouard d'Alençon. The *Cronica del P. Bernardino da Colpetrazzo fills two volumes, or 1392 quarto pages: it is divided into three books—(1) "Una semplice et divota istoria dell'origine della congregazione de' frati Capuccini"; (2) "Le vite et miracoli di s. huomini d. congreg. d. frati Capucc."; (3) "Del modo di vivere, delle virtù et buoni costumi di quei primi padri che

¹ The original of this chronicle is unfortunately lost; but an excerpt from it ("Dell'origine et principi della congregazione de' padri Capuccini nella provincia della Marca et di Calabria, cavato dagli scritti del P. Fr. Giovanni di Terra nova") is contained in the rare work, "Historia sagra intitolata Mare Oceano di tutte le religioni del mondo da D. Silvestro Maruli o Maurolico," Messina, 1613, 375 *seq.* A new edition is being prepared by F. Edouard d'Alençon.

diedero principio alla s. riforma de' Capuccini." We learn from the introduction that Bernardino da Colpetrazzo was born in that place (near Todi) in 1514, and had already entered the Capuchin Order in his sixteenth year; he was led to compose his work by a false report, set in circulation against the Order, that Ochino was their founder. Girolamo da Montefiore, Vicar-General from 1575 to 1581, following his example, undertook a historical refutation of this legend; he wrote to all the early fathers of the foundation and asked for their reminiscences. "I too," says Bernardino da Colpetrazzo, "was asked: 'massimamente per esser stato familiarissimo della maggior parte di quei primi padri.'" Some time before this, Fra Mario de Mercato Saracini had taken part in this task; Bernardino adds that he was not master of the "alto stile" of this writer, he only related the "semplice verità." A portion of the Chronicle was finished by 1580; the Vicar-General intended to have a history of the Order printed in 1584; Bernardino was therefore called to Rome and there resumed his work. His excellent memory stood him in good stead, his whole aim being to set down everything as truthfully as possible. Bernardino said on this point: *"E quei primi tutti gli ho conosciuti eccetto tre che morsero che io non gli veddi perchè stettero poco nella nostra congregatione e quel che più m' importava fù che io hebbi stretta familiarità con tutti quei padri che governorno in quel principio la nostra congregatione, i quali familiarissamente mi riferivano tutte le cose secrete che eran trattate così in corte come ne' capitoli per esser da loro molto amato, come fù il P. frate Bernardino d' Asti, il P. f. Francesco da Jegi, il P. f. Bernardino da Monte del Olmo, i quali furono che qualche spatio di tempo miei maestri. Conobbi il P. f. Matteo, il P. f. Lodovico da Fossombrone che quando egli reggeva io mi feci capuccino. Non mi curarò di molto abellire, ma solo mi sforzerò di narrare la semplice verità di quelle cose che co proprii ochi ho visto o intese da quei che l' hanno viste e son testimonii degni di fede." The work, which was not finished until 1592, is, notwithstanding a want of artistic form, very valuable, and, together with Joannes de Terranova, whose information is also drawn from the recollections of the earliest fathers, is, up to the present time, the most important of our existing sources.

The author of the interpolated passage in the "Croniche de' frati minori" (III., 289 *seqq.*) was in all probability acquainted with the "Cronica" of Bernardino. In the **Historia Capuccina*" of Matthias Stellintani da Salo (2 vols.) also, which I saw in the General Archives of the Order, frequent use has been made of Bernardino da Colpetrazzo; for although Matthias has a few good pieces of information which partly come from the "old fathers," still his work is based upon that of Bernardino. Boverius did not notice this circumstance; he uses Matthias da Salo when the statements of the latter suit his purpose; thus, for example, in relating the audience given to Matteo by Clement VII. (I., 43), he passes over in silence the fact that Bernardino as well as the Venetian edition of the Chronicle know nothing of the Pope's amplified permission (see *supra*, p. 461, note 1). But in another instance Bernardino's improbable statement, that as early as 1534 about 150 Capuchins were already gathered together in Rome, is made use of because it gives an impression of the rapid increase in numbers of the Order; on the other hand, the statement of Matthias da Salo, which has an appearance of credibility in it, that the number of Capuchins in Rome in 1534 was thirty, is disregarded by Boverius. The manuscript cited by Santoni (63): **Del principio della riforma e congregazione de' frati Capuccini*, in Cod. D. VI., 24 of the Casanatense library, is not an independent work but an excerpt from the **Cronica* of Bernardino da Colpetrazzo. On this last authority, together with the **Documents* in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, and Joannes de Terranova, I especially rely for my representation of the facts in the text, freed from the exaggerations and embellishments of Boverius.¹

5. FRANCESCO GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA, MARQUIS
OF MANTUA.²

1528, October 12, Rom.

Ho recercato Roma a questi di et retrovatola in effetto molto ruinata et deshabitata, tanto che è cosa maravigliosa; infenite

¹ The work of Mario de Mercato Saracini will be augmented by the **Chronicle* of Girolamo da Montefiore, containing an account of the lives of the early Capuchins.

² See *supra*, p. 30.

case ce sono senza patroni et destrutte de solari et de tetti, prive de porte, fenestre et simile altre cose, di modo che è una compassione ad vedere tanto exterminio; molta gente conoscea a tempi passati si de Romani come de forestieri, hora non ce ne vedo alcuno di quelli, et havendone dimandato, ritrovo che sono morti quasi tutti, maxime li Romani, che hora non se ne vede pur uno, mancato ogniuno di peste. Io certamente resto stupefatto vedendo appresso le ruine una tanta solitudine; potria essere che poi che la corte è qui almeno moltiplicarà la gente, et consequentemente seranno restorate le case, ma non spero gia de vedere questo così presto, perchè da fare ci serà prima che si reduchino le cose a primi termini, che a dire il vero la ruina è stata troppo grande.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

6. CARDINAL TRIVULZIO TO GIROLAMO N.¹

1529, April 9, Rom.

M. Hieronymo, non havendo prima possuto trovarmi con N. S. per altro che per visitarlo per la indispositione sua hoggi terzo giorno hebbi comodità di vederlo et anche de ragionare delle occurrentie che al presente accascano. Trovai Sua S^{ta} non molto ben contenta si per le cose passate di Cervia et Ravenna, delle quali ha recentissima memoria, si anche del appuntamento fatto di Malatesta parendoli non esser ragionevole che Sua M^{ta} lo pigliasse a servitio et soldo suo et levarli un suo subdito; pur attribuisce tutto più presto ad Firenze, Ferrara et Urbino che ad alcuna mala intentione del re. Furno sopra queste due cose longhi discorsi per il che io me igeignai quanto fù in poter mio responder al uno et l' altro articulo mostrando ad Sua S^{ta} quale me haveva detto haver aspettato hormai 18 mesi et non posser star più in questo modo; li dissi che la restitutione delle sue terre era propinqua et ch' a Venetia si aspettava la venuta del mar^{al} Trivultio che per questo effetto principalmente era destinato dal re benchè ne da voi ne dal s^{or} Pomponio non ne habbiamo aviso, pur Sua S^{ta} lo sapeva et dice che dal canto suo non si premetteva cosa alcuna perchè si metta in opera questa

¹ See *supra*, p. 49.

restitutione. Alla parte de Malatesta Baglione li dissi ch' io non sapeva questa certeza del suo appuntamento per esser cosa trattata nel tempo che Sua S^{ta} etiam in Roma era tenuta per morta et che non era maraveglia che in quella occasione havesse Sua M^{ta} appontato questo homo per la importanza de Perogia non per far danno et deservitio ad Sua S^{ta}, ma per assecurarsi che non pigliasse appuntamento con li inimici et benchè li ragionamenti fussero più lunghi nondimeno questo è la substantia del tutto. Non lassaro de dirvi che Sua S^{ta} quasi ridendo me disse che discorrendo Sua M^{ta} con il legato le provisioni fatte per le cose de Italia aggonse ch' haveva anche appontato Malatesta Baglione, io li resposi che da qui posseva far iudicio certo non esser fatto che per bene, perchè se malitia et malignità vi fusse l' harebbe Sua M^{ta} celato et ascosto guardandosi de dirlo maxime al legato. Intrò poi Sua S^{ta} in discorso de la pressa li fanno questi agenti del Imp^{or} per condurlo ad appuntamento et declaratione, il che dice esser molto alieno dalla volontà et iudicio suo, purchè potesse resister che se vede ad mal partito trovandosi da lhor¹ serrato in Castello et pregione più che mai fusse, ne cognoscie altra differentia, se non che hora potrebbe andarsene in posta et alhora non posseva, tal che ad lui è necessario overo fugire da Roma et abbandonare lo stato suo di qua, overo accomodarsi men mal che si po a star ben con quelle genti che li sono tanto vicine che hora per hora possano farli insulto et danno; de gia incomenciano voler, che Sua S^{ta} se advedi de la necessità et intendi per discretion et hanno mandato il s^{or} Gio. Bap^{ta} Savello sotto color de sue differentie particolari a turbar et metter rumor nelle terre sue vicine et altre genti hanno incominciato ad levar ad Asculani verso il Tronto de molti castelli et, benchè del uno et del altro si escusino et dichino che faranno provisione, pur se cognoscie la causa perchè lo permettano. Sua S^{ta} ne sta de mala voglia vedendo dove si trova et parli che imperiali vorrebbero che senza alcun suo profitto se mettesse in manifesta ruina, per il che non havendo genti ne maggior forze che se habbino cognoscie che stringersi con lo Imp^{re} non serveria ad altro che ad ruinarsi, et me dice che cognoscie bene chel debito suo serrebbe dir lhor² a bona cera io non voglio farlo perchè non mi si pertiene, ne meno

¹ = loro.

² = loro.

conviene che io me stringhi con lo Imperatore perchè ruini la Christianità et levar il mezo de possèr condurre la pace de Christiani, perho ch' stando ne termini dove si strova è sforzato per mantenere quel poco che li resta intertenersi como po; ad me parse in questo proposito far intendere ad Sua S^{ta} non como servitore del re, ma como cardinale et Christiano desideroso del ben de Sua S^{ta} et de la Chiesa, alla quale son più obligato ch' ad altra cosa, quanta consideratione li tocca haver in questa pratica vedendo in manifesta anzi certa ruina di quel ch' è restato ogni volta che S. S^{ta} passi in quella parte, mostrandoli quanto poco po creder a chi l' ha ingannato tante volte, quello che possi seguir sopra tutto il stato temporale de la Chiesa et quel che possi seguire in lo spirituale vedendo Sua M^{ta} et altri suoi collegati non esser stimati da Sua S^{ta}, ch' da giudice et arbitro sia fatto parte, incontinenti li levaranno la obedientia et dolerannosi quanto potranno de Sua S^{ta} havendo fatto tutto per servitio della Chiesa, che pur è vero che per causa sua tutta la ligha si trova nel stato che si trova et hora intender che Sua S^{ta} sia condisciesca ad far convention che debbi portar pregiudicio alli affari lhor¹ et con molte più ragioni mi son sforzato senza rispetto et certo non ho havuto molta fatica perchè Sua S^{ta} non solo accetta quel che se li dice, ma discorre il medesimo con argomenti maggiori et ragioni efficaci. Io non so quello sia per far se benchè Sua S^{ta} sta in grandissimo affanno et perplessione et se per caso venesse mai ad effetto alcuno vi verrà per viva forza et tirato per li capegli et lo differirà quanto più potrà; credo per quel che ne vedo et per le parole non possèr de far di meno se accomodarà di sorte che chi vorrà judicar bene dirrà che non ha possuto far di mancho. Mi ha anche detto che questi Imperial fanno instantia grande per la cruciata et che in effeto non possendo altramenti se ne contenterà, imperho con conditione da non darla insino ad 6 mesi et così ne ha pregato et fatto scriver allo Imperatore pensando in questo tempo haver occasione di condursi a confini per la pace universale et alhora donarla et che de gia se ne era scritto al legato quale lhaveva fatto intendere al re et che Sua M^{ta} gli haveva detto ben N. S. P. non darà altro et tanto ad nos. Questo me lo diceva in proposito del discorso faceva con Sua S^{ta} che se pur non posseva far di mancho di darla

¹=loro.

che era cosa che si posseva pareggiar dando altrettanto a Sua M^{ta}, ma che de venir ad alcuna particolare conventione per secreta che fosse che pur se intenderebbe et ne seguirebbe troppo inconveniente, me dice haver fatto intender l'horò che per amor de Dio non lo astringhino alla ruina sua et che non vole ne restitutione di terre ne de cosa che li possino dar purchè non lo sforzino far contra il iudicio et voler suo et certo che da uno homo da bene che tiene la parte del Imp^{re} et mio amico intendo che Sua S^{ta} ha fatto il medesimo discorso et pregatolo vogli persuadere alli agenti del Imp. che non vogliano senza proposito ruinarlo a fatto.

Non scrivo le querele che mi ha fatto Sua S^{ta} de portamenti de s^{ri} Fiorentini verso de lui et suoi perchè penso che siate da ogni banda informato et di questo et daltro ho parlato ad longo con lo ambassador che è qua, quale penso non harrà manchato de scriver il tutto.

In Roma alli IX d' aprile 1529.

[Orig. Concept. National Library, Paris, Fonds Franç. .
3091, f. 27-30.]

7. FRANCESCO GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA, MARQUIS
OF MANTUA.¹

1529, October 7, Rom.

. . . Non potrei dire el martello chel papa ha, che Firenze non vada a saccho, intendendose che dentro vi sono cinquanta cervelli galiardi de cittadini inimici della casa de Medici, li quali si sono coniuarati de stare saldi et non volere accordo per modo alcuno. Molti homini da bene si sono absentati per fugire quel periculo che è imminente a quella cità, et de questi una bona parte c'è delli amici de S. S^{ta}, de modo che non è punto in proposito per la pratica dello accordo. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

8. CONSISTORY AT BOLOGNA ON THE 22ND OF
DECEMBER, 1529.²

Die merc. 22 decembris [1529]. Rev. dom. Senen. ut unus ex deputatis cum rev^{mis} de S. Severino et Cesarino qui egritudine

¹ See *supra*, p. 76.

² See *supra*, p. 185.

impeditus adesse non potuit retulit super privatione comitis Iohannis Baiboda Transilvani tanquam eius qui iniverit amicitiam cum Thurcarum tiranno qui ipsius ductu et promissis regem Ludovicum tunc et nuperrime totum regnum occupaverit, incenderit et deleverit, ex quibus privatus, excommunicatus et declaratus existit iuxta tenorem minutae per rev. primum diaconum lectae.¹

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

9. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO CARDINAL FARNESE.²

1530, Februar. 2, Bologna.

Posteaquam fraternitas tua discessit a nobis, occurrerunt gravissima quaedam, propter quae aliquibus etiam diebus hic permansuri sumus, and must request Farnese to be present. Earnest entreaties that he should be in Bologna within twenty days, as the Pope would then proceed with the Imperial coronation. Similia card. Senen., Sanseverin., Neapolit., Materan., Pisan., Nurcen., Iporegien.

[Min. brev. 1530, vol. 27, n. 83, in Secret Arch. of the Vatican; original despatch for Farnese in State Archives, Naples, Perg. Farnese.]

10. CONSISTORY OF THE 4TH OF FEBRUARY 1530.³

Die 4 februarii [1530] fuit consistorium Bononiae in loco consueto, in quo S^{tas} Sua declaravit mentem Imperatoris coronandi se Bononiae in festo s. Mathiae, et fuerunt deputati ad cogitandum necessaria ad incoronationem rev^{mus} d. Anconitanus, d. Dertusen. et rev. d. de Cibo. . . .

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

11. ANDREA DA BURGO AND MARTIN DE SALINAS TO FERDINAND I.⁴

1530, Februar. 8, Bologna.

. . . Die quinta venit posta cum litteris M^{tis} V. datis die 29 praedicti et dum extraherentur ex ziferis, quae longae et multae

¹ The Bull, "Cum supremus coeli terraeque moderator," dat. Bononiae 1529, XI Cal. Jan., was already printed in 1529. A copy (s. l. 1529) is in the British Museum.

² See *supra*, p. 91.

³ See *supra*, p. 91.

⁴ See *supra*, p. 91.

erant, ego Salinas portavi Caesari litteras M^{tis} V. ad manus proprias qui illas legit. Ego etiam legi illa quae mihi scripta erant in lingua hispani a M^{te} V. Caesar legit integre litteras M^{tis} V. et attente etiam audivit mihi scripta et nihil aliud mihi respondit nisi quod postea intelligeret nobis scripta in latino quando essent extracta. Post autem illas litteras acceptas subito mandavit, ut cum diligentia mittatur ad providendum de necessariis pro solempni banchetto fiendo per S. Caes. M^{tem} in coronatione quae fiet die 24 praesentis, et ad eam vocati sunt vocandi et etiam revocati cardinales qui recesserant. Iussit etiam Caesar ut ego Andreas denuo scriberem domino Friderico ut accelleret adventum suum et etiam aliquorum Tridentinorum ad finem quem scripsit M^{tas} V^{ra}. . . Hodie post prandium fuimus cum Caesare ad longum et particulariter declaravimus scripta per M^{tem} V. circa singula. Audivit attente omnia et dixit M^{tem} V. etiam manu sua multa sibi scripsisse et unum punctum magis vid. quod M^{tas} V. responderat circa illud quod scripserat M^{ti} V. in genere circa coronationem quando omnino vellet ire Romam. Praeterea dixit quod nunc venit praepositus de Felwich qui retulit quod Germani non habebant gratum quod Caesar accipiet hic coronam et melius esse ire Romam. Demonstravimus credere nos, quod M^{tas} V. et d. Tridentinus respondissent posse hic accipi corona et melius esse quam ire ad perdendum tempus ad profectionem Romae et credere nos ita bene intelligere res Germaniae sicuti ipse praepositus, tamen quod M. Sua Caes. intellexerat litteras manu propria M^{tis} V. et scripta nobis et faceret ut sibi placeret. Respondit iam esse tardum ire amplius Romam et ob causas scriptas a M^{te} V. nolle ire, sed hic accipiet coronam, sed post illam die prima martis recederet hinc venturus in Germaniam.

[Orig. Court and State Archives, Vienna.]

12. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO DUKE CHARLES OF SAVOY.¹

1530, Mart. 24, Bologna.

Dil. fil. etc. Cum nuper tam cariss. in Christo filius noster Carolus V. Imp. semper august. quam nob^{as} tua ac dil. in Christo filia nobilis mulier Beatrix infans Portugalliae conjux tua ipsiusque imperatoris sororia summa cum instantia a nobis petierint, ut

¹ See *supra*, p. 376.

vestrum secundogenitum infantem in S. R. E. cardinalem assumere dignaremur, nos in hujusmodi petitione non illud quidem affinitatis vinculum, quo nobis et fe. re. Leoni P. X. fratri patrueli et predec. nostro conjunctus es, ne carni et sanguini indulgere in hiis videremur, sed praecleara ipsius imperatoris erga nos merita ac tuam et predecess. tuorum erga sed. apost. inconcussam devotionem fidemque perpendentes, testis est nobis Deus cujusque nostrum scrutator cordium, tam piis in ipsum infantem desideriis vestris satisfacere posse optavimus, nec quicquam quod ad conceptum cordis nostri faceret pretermisimus; licet enim res nova et penitus inusitata ac propterea impossibilis potiusque difficilis videretur, cum non presentibus sed futuris promovendi infantis cardinalis meritis foveretur, non multo post tamen, quam requisiti fuimus, cum ven. frat. nostris in consist. nostro secreto super hujusmodi negotio non minus pie quam provide verbum fecimus scrutantes pariter et petentes a quolibet vellent libenter annuere libereque proferre quod tibi et conjugii tuae circa praemissa cum nostro et et hujus s. sedis honore concedere et gratificari possemus; verum hujusmodi nostra propositione audita, et si cardinales ipsi in omnibus quae Imperatori et nobilitati tuae ejusque conjugii possint satisfacere se paratos et prontos ostenderint, propositionem tamen ipsam velut rem novam et inusitatam et quae si in exemplum transiret plus detrimenti ap. sedi quam tibi et conjugii tuae honoris et commoditatis allatura foret, abhorrentes adeo se difficiles reddiderunt, ut non parum nos et Imperatori ac nobilitati tuae ejusque conjugii facturos in hoc satis arbitrati fuerimus; postquam praefatos cardinales concurrentibus omnium votis in hanc sententiam adducere trahereque potuimus, ut praefatum infantem secundogenitum vestrum quem speramus talem futurum ut merito ad cardinalatus honorem promoveri posset, cum legitimae aetatis fuerit in cardinalem ex nunc prout ex tunc et de eorundem cardinalium voto et consensu eligemus idque eidem nobilitati tuae de eorundem cardinalium consilio et unanimi consensu in verbo veri Ro. pontificis nos indubie facturos esse vigore praesentium promittimus et pollicemur.

Dat. Bononiae die 24 martii 1530, a^o 7^o. Evangelista.

[Cop. Secret Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. XI., vol. 48,
f. 197-201.]

13. FRANCESCO GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1530, Juli 18, Rom.

. . . Si sono fatte a questi di alcune congregationi et uno consistorio sopra le cose che ultimamente hanno ricercato questi Luterani, et secondo intendo la resolutione che si farà per N. S^{te} e per il collegio sarà in la negativa parendo che portava troppo grande alteratione alle cose della fede a consentir alle dimande che si fanno, ma si cercherà di trovare qualche altro expediente per aquietare l' animi loro al meglio si potrà con concessioni non tanto prejudicali como seriano queste.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

14. FRANCESCO GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.²

1530, October 19, Rom.

L' imperatore per queste lettere de IIII che sono venute ultimamente fa instantia al papa che se resolvable de la intentione sua circa l' impresa contra Lutherani et che parimente contribuisca de denari alla spesa che occorrerà havendosi a fare la impresa contra essi, persuadendosi S. M^{ta} che S. S^{ta} habbia da essere conforme alla voluntà sua in fare la guerra a detti Lutherani. Così questi oratori de Spagna et Hungaria stimolano molto S. S^{ta} per l' una e l' altra cosa. Ella sta suspesa sopra la resolutione che habbia a fare, perchè li pare che undique sint angustiae e far questa guerra al presente non si sa come la sia cosa bene intesa, che oltre la gran spesa che gli occorrerà serà uno incendere maggiormente la voluntà del Turco contro Christianità et a farne la impresa. Et essi Lutherani faranno tutte le opere che potranno per tirarlo al soccorso loro, depingendoli la facilità che esso Turco haverà de eseguire lo intento suo de venire contra Christiani havendo loro per compagni et per complici in questa impresa. Da laltro canto a lassare che non si faccia demonstratione contra essi Lutherani essendo seguito quello che è in Augusta et havendo fatto lo imper^{te} tanta bravura come fece nel partire del duca di Sassonia, de là serà un perdere de riputatione, et le cose catholiche si

¹ See *supra*, p. 130.

² See *supra*, pp. 143, 144, 145.

diminuiranno di sorte che poi se li vorrà dare rimedio e non si potrà, tanto più che hora si pensa che questa maladetta setta Lutherana si andrà augmentando, già che è anichilato quel rispetto che si havea allo imperatore, et reuscita in nulla la speranza et la espettatione in che si stava che S. Mth avesse a fare qualche bona resolutione in questa sua dieta. Il papa ha fatto recercare a Venetiani il parer loro in questa materia per il loro ambasciatore quale ha scritto, ma anchor non c'è la resposta. Ben esso ambasciatore iudica per quello chel sa dell' animo de quel dominio, chel consiglio suo serà che si fuga la guerra più che si può, et che a questi tempi, che si veddeno de che sorte siano li preparamenti che fa il Turco per la guerra, sia molto mal a proposito a suscitare questi fuochi, quali potranno portare tanto incendio a tutta Christianità, che mal beato chi se gli incapparà, et dice quello che in effetto a me anchora par vero, chel dritto era a non escludere questa pratica della sorte che è stata fatta, che considerata la qualità di tempi si era da vedere di venire a qualche compositione con Lutherani, tollerando alcuna di quelle sue opinioni più presto che romperla in tutto con loro come è stato fatto. Perchè Dio sa se ci serà il modo de mostrarli il volto così gagliardamente come si dice, et se così de facili si potranno radicare con le armi et con la forza come se dissegna. Staremo a vedere et pregaremo dio che ne aiuti. . . .

Roma 19 de ottobre 1530.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

15. FRANCESCO GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1530, October 27, Rom.

N. S. ha mandato oggi per me et me ha fatto intendere che a questi dì, doppoi la resolutione de la dieta fatta sopra il caso de Lutherani vedendo lo imperatore la ostinatione de li seguaci de quella secta, perchè era cessato quel timore che haveano a principio che S. Mth se transferisse in Ellemagna, il che non era proceduto da altri che dal vedere la dissolutione del exercito de Italia, pareali in proposito tirare in Ellemagna una summa de X^m fanti, fra Italiani et Spagnoli, et perchè si persuadea che quella

¹ See *supra*, p. 144.

demonstratione era causa de reprimere la insolentia et temerità de essi Lutherani, perchè se riduriano a qualche termino ragionevole, dubitando del castigo de l' arme, si anche che una banda de questa sorte intertenendola per questo inverno, in caso chel Turcho pensasse al danno de Christianità, potria fare bono servitio per opponersi a la venuta sua; augumentando poi il numero de le fantarie cum la natione todescha a la summa che si giudicasse essere expediente; ma perchè ad fare quella spesa S. M^{ta} non si conosca sufficiente insieme cum il re suo fratello de portare tanto peso, implorava lo aiuto di S. B^{ne} et de li altri principi d' Italia et potentati a fine che si potesse mandare ad executione quello suo laudevole pensiero, il quale concernendo il beneficio universale de tutta Christianità si persuadea che ciascuno per la parte sua non mancaria de contribuire volentieri pro rata, secondo che da S. S^{ta} seria taxato et ordinato. Però p^{ta} S. S^{ta} havendo a questi dì fatto matura consideratione sopra tal proposta, et parendoli che le ragioni addutte per S. M^{ta} habino del ragionevole, et che il far quanto la ricerca sia per portare bon servitio et sicurezza ad le cose de Christiani, ha determinato significare a li oratori de li s^{ti} de Italia che se ritrovano appresso S. B^{ne} la comprobatione che ella fa del partito, accioche ciascuno ne dia aviso a li loro principi, cum ordine che li scrivano oltra li brevi che li manda S. S^{ta} anchel parere et intentione sua, et che si conferisca a la spesa che occorrerà per sei mesi, secundo la limitatione che è stata fatta. Dove che per tal causa havea mandato per me, come l' havea fatto anche per li altri, accioche ne scrivessi a V. Ex. et la exhortassi et pregassi in nome suo ad volere essere contenta de consentire a la resolutione presa sopra ciò, et satisfare per la parte sua, secundo che li era stato deputato, che per quanto me ha ditto S. B^{ne} sonno mille ducati al mese. . . .

Roma alli 27 de ottob^e 1530.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

16. FRANCESCO GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1530, November 13, Rom.

[In cipher:] Venetiani hanno disuaso extremamente S. B^{ne} a conconner in opinione della guerra contra Lutherani et per molte

¹ See *supra*, p. 145.

ragione li hanno dimostrato che questo serà la ruina de la Christianità quando non si muti proposito. S. B^{ne} è stata sopra di se quando se li è fatta questa relatione, et pare che in effetto hinc inde sint angustiae: da un canto la guerra non è bona, da l'altro il concilio non piace; staremmo a veder.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

17. FABRIZIO PEREGRINO TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1530, December 10, Rom.

. . . Si è resoluto di mandare un personaggio al' imp^{re} per l' interesse del concilio, et doppoi molta discussione de chi sarebbe al proposito come l' arcivescovo di Capova o il Theatino o l' arcivescovo di Brindisi mes^r Girolamo Alleandro, persona litterata molto et dotta, alla fine sonno calati al protonotario de Gambera, quale s' aspetta hoggi overo dimane, et in suo luogo in Bologna se lasserà il vescovo di Casale, mes^r Bernardino della Barba. . . .

Roma 10 decembre 1530.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

18. GIROLAMO CATTANEO TO THE DUKE OF MILAN.²

1531, Januar. 7, Rom.

. . . Hoggi ad hore 17 vel circa al medesimo solito che S. S^{ta} va in Belvedere è caduto el muro dil corridore che va a Belvedere de la zima sino al fondamento et sonno 3 volte una sopra de l' altra perchè sonno ancora tre gli corridori. La longhezza del muro fracto ponno passar 20 canne alusanza romana. La causa è stata che mai fu coperto dipo che lo fece fare papa Julio et è quella parte fora dil muro di Nicola, dove sta quella porta bella de trevertino et dove è quello cordone duplicato di pietra cotta et in mezzo certe lettere majuscule de lettera nostrana di marmaro che cominciano Julius II Pont. Max. etc.

[Orig. State Archives, Milan.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 151.

² See *supra*, p. 353.

19. FRANCESCO GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1531, Januar. 9, Rom.

. . . Erano XVI hore e mezza che N. S. havendo udita la messa si mosse per inviarsi verso Belvedere, dove S. S^{ta} è solita di andare spesso la matina, pur aprendo la fenestra della camera sua et vedendo chel tempo era humido e tristo, mutò proposito. Non stette un ottavo d' hora, che del corridore per il qual si va a Belvedere, ne ruinò dalla cima in fino alli fundamenti più di XXX braccia per lungo e per traverso, talmente che se S. B^{ne} andava, portava grandissimo pericolo insieme con quelli che erano in sua compagnia, di ritrovarsi in quel luoco a punto quando accadette il caso. Et se per disgratia cossi fosse stato, tutti saressimo morti, dove che non si ha poco da ringratiare Dio di haver schivato un tanto pericolo. . . .

Di Roma il IX di gen^{ro} 1531.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

20. FRANCESCO GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.²

1531, Juni 5, Rom.

Ho parlato cum N. S^{re} sopra quanto V. Ex^a me scrive per la sua de 26 del passato, del desiderio che ella haveria che mes^r Michele Angelo li facesse qualche opera de sua mano per mettere nel pallazo suo del Te, et havendo fatto intendere a S. S^{ta} la difficultà che esso mes^r Michelangelo fa de poterla compiacere, la ho supplicata ad volersi dignare de non solo darli licentia de potere lavorare, ma commetterli anche chel voglia servire p^{ta} V. Ex., che per una gratia S. B^{ne} al presente non li po fare la maiore de questa. Ella me ha risposto che la pensa chel sia impossibile

¹ See *supra*, p. 353.

² See *supra*, p. 362. On the 24th of June Francesco Gonzaga wrote: “. . . *Hor regratio S. B^{ne} de l' haver fatto scrivere a Michelo Angelo, secondo che a questi dì V. Ex^{ia} ne la supplicò, la quale me ha ditto che non accade renderli altre gratie, ch' ella haverà charo che V. S. Ill^{ma} resti compiaciuta, purchè il cervello di esso Michel Angelo se accomodi a satisfare al desiderio suo. . . .”

che egli attendesse a pictura se V. S. Ill^{ma} volesse opera de quella sorte, perchè essendo lui occupato in la scoltura, come è et è per essere per molto tempo, non può havere la mano disposta al dipingere, sel non interlassarre per un tempo lo exercitio del scarpello, per essere totalmente diversa luna cosa da l'altra. Et oltra ciò S. S^{ta} dice conoscere la natura del homo, de sorte che nel termino chel se ritrova de presenti, occupato nel lavorero che de sopra è detto, non se mettaria ad fare cosa de pictura, dubitando che de l' opera chel facesse non ne riportasse più presto carico che laude, per essere molto severo nelle cose sue. Pur cum tutto ciò ella non mancarà di satisfare alla richiesta de V. Ex. facendoli scrivere in bona forma, acciochè se possibile ela sia compiaciuta di qualche cosa rara,¹ et per lei non restarà de darli la commodità del tempo, ancor che li sia molto al core chel vaddi perseverando indesinatamente l' opera chel ha per mano, che è artificio de multa longhezza. Io non ho voluto differire altrimenti ad fare l' officio cum S. S^{ta}; havendo per lettere de mes^f Gio. Borromei inteso che egli non è per venire de presenti in Roma, le sue le indrizarò, et daroli aviso de la risposta havuta da S. B^{ne}, procurando che si scriva a Firenze secundo la promissione de quella. . . .

Roma alli V de zugno 1531.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

21. POPE CLEMENT VII. RENEWS THE APPOINTMENT OF
BALDASSARE PERUZZI AS ARCHITECT FOR ST. PETER'S.²

1531, Juli 1, Rom.

Dil. filio magistro Baltassari Perutio Senensi, nostro ac fabricae basilicae S. Petri de urbe architecto.

Dil. fil. salut. etc. Cum nos dudum ante ruinam urbis proximam te nostrum ac fabricae basilicae S. Petri de urbe architectum cum salario annuo centum quinquaginta ducat. auri de camera ad vitam tuam deputaverimus, nos operam et scientiam tuam in futurum continuare cupientes te de novo nostrum et dictae fabricae architectum ad vitam tuam cum salario annuo 150

¹ Or: rica.

² See *supra*, p. 352.

duc. auri praedicto auctoritate apostolica tenore praesentium deputamus mandantes . . .

D. Romae 1 julii 1531 A. 8°.

Blosius.

[Min. brev. vol. 37, n. 301. Secret Arch. of the Vatican.]

22. FABRIZIO PEREGRINO TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1531, November 19, Rom.

. . . Hier sera vi furono lettere dalla corte Cesarea et fresche, che fanno aviso comè il duca di Saxonia è ritornato a essere buon Christiano, et mandati bandi per tutto il suo dominio, che si debbiano aprire le chiese, che si faccino l' oratione, le processione, et se dicano le messe, come prima, et che si vole conformare con la buona Christiana. Et tal nuova questa mattina che è il giorno della sua creatione, S. S^{ta} con allegrezza grande l' ha publicata a tutti i r^{mi} s^{ri} card^{li} et per certa ge lha confirmata, che veramente è una segnalada et boniss^a nuova. La pred^{ta} S^{ta} in aiuto et soccorso delli cinque cantoni de Svizari Christiani, manda di presente il cap^{no} Zuccharo con cento cinquanta cavalli et doi millia fanti tutti archibuxeri, quali penso farà fra Spoleti et Perosa, dimorando esso capitano a Spoleti per stanza già parecchi mesi sonno, et la p^{ta} S^{ta} dice che l' imper^{re} ancora dal canto suo promette di mandarne altri doi millia et di più se bisogneranno, quali già debbano essere inviati. . . .

Roma XVIII di novembre 1531.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

23. ANDREA DA BURGO TO FERDINAND I.²

1532 [Juni 5, Rom].

Hodie in congregatione fuit proposita temeraria et inhonesta peticio Galli qua petit decimas dominiorum suorum adjungens impudenter quod nisi concedatur occupabit ipse propria temeritate. Horret Papa hominis impudentem audaciam et quid faciat dubitat. Si concedat videt suppeditari arma Italiae, si denegat temet sublatum iri obedientiam prout minatur. Dixere sententiam, nihil tamen conclusum propter rei magnitudinem, tum quod duo

¹ See *supra*, pp. 165, 300.

² See *supra*, p. 199.

ex senioribus vid. Fre[nese] et Monte aberant. Dilata est res ad proximam congregationem. Creditur tamen quod abnegabitur regis peticio.

P.S. [in cipher]: Subscriptam cedula[m] misit mihi card. s. Crucis quinta junii.

[Orig. Court and State Archives, Vienna.]

24. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1532, Juni 23, Rom.

Long report (in cipher) explaining why Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici is sent as Legate to Hungary, with statement of different opinions. Io per me dico che la potissima [causa] sia stata la desperatione del papa di removerlo mai dalla vita che tiene senza mandarlo alla disciplina del imperatore la quale è grave e severa.

Sanga and Salviati exercise the greatest influence over the Pope.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

25. FABRIZIO PEREGRINO TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.²

1532, Juni 29, Rom.

Cardinal Colonna died at Naples from drinking cold water,³ "et altri disordini." Clement VII. and the Medici had lost a "grande e grosso nemico." Cardinal Colonna was the instigator of the sack.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

26. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO JOHANN VON METZENHAUSEN,
ARCHBISHOP OF TREVES.⁴

1532, Juli 20, Rom.

Venerabili fratri . . . Archiepiscopo Treverensi.

Ven. frater, salutem etc. Cupientes quantum cum Deo licet bonarum litterarum et artium splendorem multa superiorum temporum negligentia obscuratum in lucem restituere volventesque animo, quantum et fidei Catholicae, ac humani generis ornamentis litterae prosint, quae ingenia alunt, animum corroborant, intelligentiam illustant, avocant a vitiis, impellunt ad

¹ See *supra*, p. 201.

² See *supra*, p. 102.

³ ALBERINI (372) says the same.

⁴ See *supra*, p. 345.

virtutes, statuimus librorum, et auctorum veterum monumenta ad hoc facientia ubique perquirere, in eaque re nec impensis parcere nec laboribus. Misimus igitur dilectum filium Ioannem Heitmerum¹ clericum Leodiensis dioecesis capellanum nostrum multorum testimonio probatum commissarium nostrum ad partes istas diligentem operam, ut speramus, daturum, quo nostro desiderio satisfiat. Intelligentes autem quantum tuae fraternitatis auctoritas nobis et huic studio nostro possit esse proficua, illam hortamur in Domino, teque pro tua majorumque tuorum virtute vehementer requirimus, ut praefato Ioanni commissario nostro ad mandatum sibi opus libere expediteque exequendum assistere omni tuo favore atque auxilio velis et de salvo conductu, si ita duxerit, providera. Quod ita nobis gratum facturus es ut si, quodamodum confidimus, sperati ex opera tua fructus proveniant, praeter aeternam laudem, quam ab omnibus reportabis, nos tibi vicissim et honoribus et commodis tuis, data occasione, largius senties responsuros.

Dat. Romae etc. die XX iulii 1532 anno IX. Evangelista.

[Secret Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. 39, vol. 52, n. 536; *ibid.* 538, a similar Brief of July the 20th, 1532, to Cardinal Eberhard de la Mark, Bishop of Liége.]

27. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO THE DOMINICANS OF GHENT.²
1532, Juli 20, Rom.

Priori et conventui domus Gandaven. ord. praed. Tornacen.³
dioc.

Rempubicam etc.⁴ . . . desideratorum per dil. fil. Wilhelmum Carnificem istius conventus vestri professorem ex diversarum provinciarum bibliothecis collectos et praesertim Ciceronis de gloria, consolatione, republica et ioculatione equestri in domo vestra seu illius bibliotheca existere, ipsum Joannem commissarium istuc destinare curavimus, qui librorum hujusmodi fidelia exempla ad nos adducat. They must therefore hand over to him the aforesaid codices. Exhortation to obedience. Dat. Romae 20 iulii 1532, anno 9^o.

[Secret Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. 39, vol. 52, n. 537.]

¹ MS.: Heitinerum. ² See *supra*, pp. 336, 345. ³ MS. irrig: Treveren.

⁴ Exordium, the same as in document No. 3, p. 484 *supra*.

8. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO PETRUS ERAS.¹

1532, Juli 20, Rom.

Dilecto filio Petro Eras professori et bibliothecario conventus divi Francisci Mechlinien. Cameracensis dioecesis.

Dilecte fili, salutem etc. Quia sicut nobis retulit dilectus filius Ioannes Hytiners [sic] clericus Leodiensis dioecesis, capellanus noster, quem alias pro inquirendis et colligendis vetustissimis probatissimorum auctorum codicibus quadam superiorum temporum incuria fere deperditis ad diversas mundi partes destinavimus, te in huiusmodi pio et sancto opere semper sibi plurimum utilem extitisse, hanc tuam operam plurimum in Domino commendamus, teque paterne hortamur, tibi nihilominus in virtute sanctae obedientiae iniungentes, ut ab incoeptis non desistas, sed ut consuevisti, eidem Ioanni adiumento esse, etiam ad quaecunque loca utriusque Germaniae et Francia et Angliae regnorum cum dicto Ioanne commissario, vel sine eo, prout ipsi Ioanni magis expedire cognoveris te conferendo perseveres. Et ut tutius et liberius valeas huiusmodi operi intendere, tibi, ut per 4^{or} menses a die qua per praefatum Ioannem super hoc fueris requisitus ad loca praedicta ad effectum praemissum tui superioris vel cuiusvis alterius licentia minime requisita, tuo tamen habitu semper retento, te conferre et in eis stare et pernoctare absque alicuius censurae vel poenae incursu libere et licite valeas, licentiam et facultatem concedimus per praesentes pariter et elargimur. Laborem autem et officium tuum huiusmodi habita occasione tibi ac conventui Mechliniensi dictae dioecesis, cuius, ut accepimus, bibliothecarius existis, proficuum fuisse enitemur.

Dat. Romae etc. die XX iulii 1532 anno IX. Evangelista.

[Secret Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. 39, vol. 52, n. 539.]

29. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO CARDINAL ALBERT,
ARCHBISHOP OF MAYENCE.²

1532, Juli 23, Rom.

Dilecto filio nostro Alberto tituli S. Petri ad vincula presbytero cardinali Maguntino nuncupato.

¹ See *supra*, p. 345.

² See *supra*, p. 345.

Dilecte fili noster, salutem etc. Magno studiosorum omnium, quinimo totius humani generis commodo et decori cedere non ignorantes, si antiquissimi codices, praesertim disertissimorum auctorum, qui hactenus quadam superiorum temporum incuria variis in locis infructuosi latent, in lucem ederentur, nihil duximus omittendum quod ad hanc rem pertinere cognovimus. Commisimus itaque dilecto filio Ioanni Heytmero¹ clerico Leodiensis dioecesis capellano nostro, cuius fides et integritas iamdiu nobis cognita est, ut pro huiusmodi codicibus inquirendis et colligendis diversas mundi partes perlustret. Cum autem, sicut a fide dignis accepimus, tres decades celebratissimi historiographi Titi Livii Patavini, eiusdem Livii tempestate, ut creditur, exaratae, et nonnulli alii tam Caii Plinii quam aliorum auctorum desideratissimi codices in bibliotheca tuae ecclesiae Maguntinae et castro tuo Genelemsteyn² reconditi sint, circumspectionem tuam et capitulum tuum Maguntinum hortamur et attentius in Domino requirimus, ut huiusmodi libros, et si qui alii in tuis dioecesi et dominio fuerint reperti, quos praefatus Ioannes dignos putaverit qui exemplentur, ad effectum ut exempla ex eis sumere possit, edi facias, eique pro tua solita in nos et hanc Sanctam Sedem reverentia omne auxilium et favorem praestes, ut, quod de re litteraria mente concepimus, id auctore Domino, perficere valeamus. Erit autem id nobis gratissimum et tuae laudis et gloriae non modicum preconium et augmentum.

Dat. Romae etc die XXIII iulii 1532 anno IX.

Evangelista.

[Secret Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. 39, vol. 52, n. 548.]

30. FABRIZIO PEREGRINO TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.³

1532, October 17, Rom.

. . . Questi s^{ti} prelati quando nell' animo loro gli entra qualche mala satisfatione mi pare habbino preso per costume de ritirarsi alle loro chiese a fare il santo et dicono al servizio di Dio contrafacendo il Chietтино et sua vita sancta, et in exempio vediamo un

¹ MS. : Heytinero.

² Probably Giebichenstein is here meant.

³ See *supra*, p. 441.

vescovo di Verona Baiosa morto, l' arcivescovo di Salerno et Eugubio, un vescovo de Nizza¹ in Franza predicare la sanctimonia al re Christ^{mo} et alle madame, et hora l' arcivescovo de Capova a fare il medesimo, et ognuno havere incominciato a raspare e santi giù dalle mura, gittare le berette a i crucifixi et altre simili cose, che per me non le voglio già chiamare ypocrisie perchè non ho il secreto del cuore del huomo quale el si sia, che alle volte potrei errare in volere giudicare altri et altro giudicasse poi me. De secolari non habbiamo ancora visto se non la del s^r Ascanio Colonna, ma di già è passata parecchi giorni sonno. . . . Roma XVII d' ott^e 1532.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

31. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO HIS NUNCIO IN NAPLES.²

1532, November 12, Rom.

Nuntio^o Neapolitano. Dil. fil. nob. vir marchio Villaefrancae vicerex Neapolis inclyta pietate usus curavit nobis restitui plura tapetia et quattuor cum una parte alterius petias serici a quibusdam militibus . . . tempore direptionis Urbis ex palatio nostro ablata. He tells the Nuncio to remove all censures, penalties, etc., which have been incurred by the theft of the aforesaid articles; with special acknowledgment to the Viceroy. Dat. Romae 12 nov. 1532, anno 9^o.

[Min. brev. vol. 41, n. 402, Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

32. GIOVANNI MARIA DELLA PORTA TO THE
DUKE OF URBINO.³

1532, December 23, Bologna.

Qua s' è comenzato a ragionare delle cose Luth^{ne}, alle quali si ha per resoluto, non fosse expediente remedio il concilio particular in quella natione che darebe assetto a modo suo alle sue oppenioni et non v' essendo forma di sperarlo generale per la discordia de principi Christiani correno de pareri, fosse ben fatto intimare questi Luthⁿⁱ unitam^{te} con Christiani alla deffensione contra il Turco lasciandoli in pace insin che Dio mandara occasione chel Concilio generale si possa far, et questa openion

¹ Girol. Arsagi; *cf.* Gallia christ. III. 1291.

² See *supra*, p. 356.

³ See *supra*, p. 221.

è la più universale, contraria a quella d'alcuni che persuadono a dar aiuto alli Catholicì che potesseron usar la forza contra Lutherani.

[Orig. State Archives, Florenz.]

33. POPE CLEMENT VII. TO BALDASSARE PERUZZI.¹

1533, April 30, Rom.

Dil. filio Balthassari Perutio Senen, architecto nostro.

Dil. fili, salutem. Cum opera tua uti intendamus, volumus ut statim receptis presentibus ad nos venire matures, quod, ut commodius ac securius facere possis, tibi, ut, non obstantibus quibusvis repressaliis contra communitatem et homines civitatis Senarum ratione quorumvis tam publicorum quam particularium etiam tuorum debitorum et ad quarumcunque personarum etiam camerae apostolicae instantiam emanatis et concessis, ad almam urbem nostram venire ac in ea et toto S. R. E. statu tuto ac secure stare et permanere possis et valeas ad sex² menses a dat. presentium computandos et interim ad nostrum beneplacitum cum disdicta octo dierum, auctoritate apostolica tenore presentium concedimus et indulgemus, mandantes omnibus et singulis urbis et status eorundem gubernatoribus officialibus barisellis et executoribus presertim eiusdem camerae generali auditori, ne te contra presentium tenorem molestare quoquomodo audeant vel presumant sed eas tibi iuxta suum tenorem inviolabiliter observent et observari faciant, premissis ac constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis . . . non obstantibus quibuscunque.

Dat. Romae etc. ultima aprilis 1533, a^o X^o.

Car^{lis} de Salviatis.

Blos.

[Secret Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. 40, vol. 46, n. 162
(Min. brev.).]

34. PASTRON TO THE MARCHIONESS OF MONFERRATO.³

1533, November 10, Marseille.

Da poi l'altre mie, oghi essendo andato a visitare uno gran prelado et mio amicissimo, stringendolo pur amorevolmente de intendere

¹ See *supra*, p. 353.

² On the margin, "sex," in another hand; in text, "duos," erased by "quatuor," which is also erased.

³ See *supra*, p. 236.

quello particolare, al fin me ha dicto queste parole: Pastron, io non posso manchar de dirti qualche cosa, te prego ben se pur vorai dirlo et scriverlo, non me ne faci auctore. Sia certo che la S^{ta} di N. S. non cercha altro ne mira ad altra cosa che di unire in bona intelligentia lo imper^{re} et il Christ^{mo} re, ma lo imp^{re} se trova tanto buono in mano chel non vol consentire a moversi ne disonzarsi in grado alcuno. Da l' altro canto il re se trova tanto carizato ne li capituli sono tra loro, che per niente vol stare cussì. La S^{ta} del N. S. fa tutto per removeve l' una parte e l' altra da queste loro tanto ferme deliberationi, ma li vede poco modo. Questi s^{ti} Francesi se havessero mille catene a piedi non se potriano tener che non rumpeno. Quello altro li pare essere in grande reputatione, non vol lassarsi condure di sorte chio tengo per certo vedaremo la più grande et crudel guerra che sia stata a tempi nostri. . . .

In Marsilia X novembre 1533. Di V. Ex. hum. ser. el Pastron.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

35. FABRIZIO PEREGRINO TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1534, Mart. 6, Rom.

. . . Ancora di qua dicono che l' ancraivio d' Assia principe grande de Alemania et gran Lutherano o è venuto o debbe venire a ritrovare el re Ch^{mo} in Francia et abbocarsi con S. M^{ta}; la cagione per ancora non s' intende per il certo, ma si crede che più presto sia per generare qualche sospetto a l' Imperiali, ch' insieme habbino intelligentia et unione, che per altro conto, ben che hoggi da un r^{mo} card^{le} mi sia detto, che quando N. S. fù a Marsilia dal p^{to} re Ch^{mo} li fù ragionato di volersi abbocare con il p^{to} lancaivio a benefitio et servitio di S. S^{ta} et della sede apost^{ca}, che per altro conto, che se così fossi farebbe l' opera da quel buon Ch^{mo} re che S. M^{ta} è et debbe essere tenuto. . . .

Roma 6 di marzo 1534.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 236.

36. FABRIZIO PEREGRINO TO FEDERIGO GONZAGA,
DUKE OF MANTUA.¹

1534, Juli 6, Rom.

. . . Di nuovo altro non ve è per hora eccetto chel N. S. è assai bene convaluto della sua indispositione et risanato et il r^{mo} di Medici hormai dimostra havere diposta quella sua fantasia di non più scappellarsi et vuole attendere al ecclesiastico et essere buon figliuolo come sempre è stato et, se non ha incominciato presto incomincerà a prendere li ordini sacri per non possere più tornare addietro, cosa ch' al giuditio mio credo ch' l se ne renderà beniss^o consigliato. S. S^{ta} gli paga tutti i debiti che sonno di molta somma et gli dona 100 ducati al mese per sua provisione del vivere, restando in questo grado se ritrovarà un bello, riccho et adventurato prelato. Se ragiona pur de i card^{li} che a divotion sua si faranno, et di quelli che a V. Ecc^a già ho scritto. . . .

Roma 6 di julio 1534.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 323, and LUZIO, Pronostico, 144.

INDEX OF NAMES IN VOL. X.

- ACCIAIUOLI, Roberto (Florentine envoy), 104, 181 n. 3.
- Accolti, Benedetto, Cardinal, 2 n. 4, 12 n. 2, 77, 199, 327.
- „ Bernardo (poet), 326 n. 4, 342.
- Achmed of Egypt, 171.
- Adrian VI., Pope, 57, 107 *seq.*, 183, 239, 331, 334, 346, 369, 377, 384, 405, 406 *seq.*, 418, 425, 446, 454.
- Agnolo, Michael (of Siena), 346.
- Alarcon, F., 5 n. 1.
- Albany, Duke of, *see* Stuart.
- Albergati, Vianesio (envoy from Bologna), 165 n. 1.
- Albert of Brandenburg, Cardinal (Archbishop of Mayence), 225, 505.
- „ „ (Grand Master of the Teutonic Order), 120 *seq.*
- Alcionio, Pietro (poet), 342.
- Aleander, Hieronymus (Archbishop of Brindisi, Nuncio), 107-110, 163 *seq.*, 167, 169, 221 *seqq.*, 313 *seq.*, 318, 385 n., 440, 441 n. 2, 499.
- Aleman, Cardinal, B., 370.
- Alessandro of Pieve di Sacco (Franciscan), 311.
- Alexander VI., Pope, 330, 366, 403.
- Alfonso I. (Duke of Ferrara), 9 *seq.*, 20 *seq.*, 56, 80, 88 *seq.*, 97 *seq.*, 204, 219.
- Alvarez de Toledo, Juan (Dominican), 404.
- Amaseo, Romolo, 335.
- Andrea, Master (painter), 350 n. 5.
- Andrea da Ferrara, 306.
- Antonino, S. (Archbishop of Florence), 369.
- Aretino, Pietro, 331 n. 2, 341 *seq.*, 346 n. 2.
- Ariosto, Lodovico (poet), 201 n. 2.
- Arsagi, Girolamo (Bishop of Nice), 440, 507.
- Arthur of England (Prince of Wales, brother of Henry VIII.), 240, 246 *seq.*, 265, 274.
- Averoldo, A., 311 n.
- BAGLIONI, Malatesta, 1 n., 51, 54, 64, 70 *seq.*, 103 *seq.*, 490.
- Balbi, Girolamo (Bishop of Gurk), 53.
- Baldassare de Pescia, 394 n. 3.
- Bandello, M., 422 n.
- Bandinelli, Baccio (sculptor), 327, 360.
- Barba, Bernardino della (Bishop of Casale), 499.
- Barton, Catherine (the “Maid of Kent”), 284.
- Bathory, Stephan, 174, 178.

- Beatrice of Portugal, 494.
 Becket, Thomas, St. (Archbishop of Canterbury), 272 n.
 Becquin, Louis de, 303.
 Bellay, Guillaume du (Sire de Langey, French envoy), 235, 304.
 Belli, Valerio (medallist and lapidary), 356, 358.
 Bembo, Pietro, Cardinal, 48 n., 334 n., 335.
 Bemelberg, Conrad von, 12.
 Benedetto da Fojano (Dominican), 73, 104.
 Benivieni, Girolamo (poet), 73 n. 2.
 Bennet, William (English envoy), 266, 276.
 Bernardi, Giovanni, da Castel Bolognese (lapidary and die-sinker) 356, 358.
 Bernardino of Asti (preacher), 473, 486, 487.
 „ da Busti, 370.
 „ da Colpetrazzo (Capuchin), 458 n. *seq.*, 463 n., 466 *seqq.*, 475 n., 486 *seq.*
 „ da Monte del Olmo (Capuchin), 487.
 Bernardo di Mastro Antonio, 395 n. 4.
 Berni, Francesco (poet), 40 n. 5, 331, 340 *seq.*
 Biagio di Cesena, 394 n. 3.
 Blount, Elizabeth (mistress to Henry VIII.), 241.
 Bocchi, Achille, 343.
 Boleyn, Anne, 242 *seqq.*, 249 *seq.*, 251 n. 2, 258, 273, 279-284.
 „ Mary (sister of Anne, mistress to Henry VIII.), 241, 242 n. 1, 250.
 Bomhouwer, A. (Franciscan), 114 n. 3.
 Bonaventura, P. (Provincial of the Minorites), 311 n.
 Bongiovanni, Giangiaco-
 mo (Bishop of Camerino), 464, 465.
 Bonomi, G. V., 343 n. 14.
 Bonziano (Bishop of Caserta), 411.
 Borromeo, Charles, St., 441, 453.
 „ Giovanni, 501.
 Boschetti, Roberto, Count, 1.
 Boverius, 462 n. 3, 485 *seq.*
 Bozzolo, Federigo, 4.
 Brandano, 16, 475.
 Brask, Johann (Bishop of Linköping), 292 *seq.*, 294.
 Briaerde, Lambert von (Imperial orator), 224 *seq.*
 Brown, George (Augustinian), 281 n. 2.
 Bruccioli, 416.
 Brück, Gregor, 140.
 Bryan (English envoy), 266.
 Buonavita, Pietro, 314.
 Buondelmonti, B., 189 n. 3, 200 n. 3.
 Buongrazia, G., 315 n. 3.
 Burgio, *see* Puglioni.
 Burgo, Andrea da (envoy of Ferdinand I.), 35 n. 3, 44 n. 3, 45 *seq.*, 51, 53, 55, 61 *seq.*, 83 n. 4, 90 n., 91, 96, 100 n. 4, 136, 148 n. 2, 158 n. 1, 186 *seq.*, 190, 192 n. 5, 196, 206, 214, 494.
 Burigozzo (chronicler), 452.
 Butigella, Paolo (General of the Dominicans), 308.
 CAJETAN, Thomas de Vio, Cardinal, 151, 163, 171, 276 n. 3, 277 n. 2, 324, 343.
 Calcagnini, Celio (scholar), 201 n. 2.

- Callisto da Piacenza (Augustinian, Inquisitor-General), 313.
- Calvo, Mario Fabio, 343.
- Campeggio, Lorenzo, Cardinal, 14 *seqq.*, 18 *seq.*, 82, 109 *seq.*, 112, 114 *seq.*, 117 *seqq.*, 121 n. 4, 123, 125-134, 139, 141, 154, 158 *seqq.*, 163, 166 *seq.*, 171, 173 *seqq.*, 220 *seq.*, 254 *seq.*, 257, 260-264, 268 *seqq.*, 318.
- „ Tommaso (Bishop of Feltre), 15 n. 5, 28 n. 3, 414 *seq.*
- Camponesca, Vittoria (mother of Gian Pietro Carafa), 402.
- Canisio, Egidio, Cardinal, 19, 106, 149, 389, 455.
- Canossa, Lodovico di (Bishop of Bayeux), 440.
- Cantacusino, Teod. Spandugino (chronicler), 345 n.
- Capisucchi (Auditor of the Rota), 274.
- Capponi, Niccolò (Gonfaloniere of Florence), 53.
- Caracciolo, Gian Antonio, 417.
- Caradosso, Ambrogio (goldsmith), 356.
- Carafa, Gian Antonio (father of Gian Pietro), 402.
- „ Gian Pietro (Bishop of Chieti, afterwards Pope Paul IV.), 310-313, 380, 387, 394 *seq.*, 398, 400-407, 409-423, 424, 427 *seq.*, 435 *seq.*, 449 *seq.*, 452, 457, 462 *seq.*
- Carafa, Maria (sister to Gian Pietro), 402.
- „ Oliviero, Cardinal, 402 *seq.*
- „ Vincenzo, Cardinal (Archbishop of Naples), 381 n. 1, 384 n. 3, 440.
- Carducci, Baldassare, 60 n. 1, 61 n. 2.
- „ Francesco, 53, 104.
- Carne, Dr. (English envoy), 279.
- Carnesecchi (papal secretary), 311 n. 2, 317, 327.
- Carnifex, Wilhelm (Dominican), 336, 484, 504.
- Carosi, Bartolomeo, *see* Brandano.
- Carpi, *see* Pio.
- Casale, Gregorio (envoy of Henry VIII.) 8, 9 n. 1, 54, 84 n. 3, 252 *seq.*, 260, 263 *seq.*, 275, 447 n. 3.
- „ Johann, 264.
- Casei, Jacopo de', 451.
- Casio, G. (poet), 344 n.
- Castiglione, Baldassare, 31 n. 1, 47, 48 n., 50, 349 n. 5.
- „ Bernardo da, 104.
- Catherine of Aragon (Queen of England), 240 *seqq.*, 244-247, 249, 251, 253, 257 *seq.*, 262 *seq.*, 265, 268 *seqq.*, 274, 276, 278 *seq.*, 281 *seqq.*, 284 *seq.*
- Cattaneo, Girolamo, 353 n. 2.
- Cellini, Benvenuto, 346, 350, 352, 356 *seq.*
- Centurione, Domenico, 103 n. 1.
- Cerretani (Lutheran), 315 n. 3.
- Cesarini, Alessandro, Cardinal, 77, 216, 492.

- Cesi, Paolo Emilio, Cardinal,
12 n. 6, 18, 77, 121 n. 4,
220 *seq.*
- Chaireddin Barbarossa, 324.
- Challant, Louis de, Cardinal,
97, 375.
- Chambre, Philippe de la, Cardinal,
233.
- Charles III. (Duke of Savoy),
93, 98, 230, 309, 376.
- „ V. (The Emperor), 5
seq., 8-11, 16 *seq.*, 21,
23 *seq.*, 26, 28, 30, 34
seq., 38, 41, 43-47,
49, 51 *seq.*, 54-58, 60,
62 *seq.*, 65, 68 *seq.*,
71, 73 *seqq.*, 77, 80-
99, 103, 116 *seq.*,
121-140, 142-169,
177, 181 n. 3, 184
seq., 187 *seq.*, 190-
194, 196 *seqq.*, 200,
202 *seq.*, 204-211,
213 *seq.*, 216-222,
224, 227-230, 235
seq., 241, 256, 265,
268, 270, 273 *seq.*,
279, 299, 302, 304,
306, 321, 326, 328,
335, 357 n., 367, 376,
386 *seq.*, 404 *seq.*, 425,
483.
- Chierigati, Francesco (Nuncio),
110.
- Christian II. (King of Den-
mark), 126, 129, 291.
- Cibo, Caterina, 230, 459, 462,
464, 465 n. 1, 466 n.,
470, 475.
- „ Innocenzo, Cardinal, 4 n.
3, 77, 183 n. 2.
- Cicala, Eduardo, 394 n. 3.
- Ciocchi, Antonio (del Monte
Sansovino), Cardinal, 2 n.
4, 70, 76, 115, 121 n. 4,
149, 183 n. 2, 186, 231,
394, 472, 503.
- Clement VII., Pope, 1 *seq.*, 4-
12, 14 *seqq.*, 18-23, 26-30,
32-49, 51-66, 69, 71-80,
82-89, 92-101, 105 *seqq.*,
109, 111. 114-117, 119-
127, 129, 132-158, 160-
169, 170 *seq.*, 174-177,
179-199, 202, 204-222,
224, 227-237, 240, 248-
256, 259 *seqq.*, 266 *seqq.*,
270, 273-280, 282 *seqq.*,
287, 292 *seqq.*, 297-300,
303 *seq.*, 306-315, 316-
342, 345-358, 360 *seqq.*,
364-387, 393-396, 407,
409 *seq.*, 412, 415, 417-
421, 424-428, 434 *seqq.*,
438, 441, 445 *seq.*, 451,
454 *seq.*, 457, 459, 461,
471-476, 486, 503.
- Cles, Bernhard, Cardinal (Bis-
hop of Trent), 82, 90 n.,
96, 121, 126, 318, 375, 440.
- Clovio, Giulio (miniaturist), 350
seq.
- Cochläus, Joannes, 112, 114,
318.
- Coligny, Odet de, Cardinal, 233.
- Colle, Bonifazio da, 400, 407,
411 *seq.*
- „ Raffaello del (painter),
349.
- Colocci, Angelo (poet), 335.
- Colonna, Family of the, 12 n.
6, 29, 352 n. 5.
- „ Ascanio, 17, 27 n. 3.
- „ Pompeo, Cardinal, 1
n., 12 n. 6, 26, 27
n. 3, 102 n. 2, 503.
- „ Sciarra (leader of mer-
cenaries), 27 n. 3,
70.
- „ Vittoria, 426, 459,
475.
- Consiglieri, Gaspar, 400, 407, 411.
- Contarini, Paolo (Venetian
envoy), 19 *seqq.*, 23, 26

- Contarini, Gasparo—*continued*.
seqq., 34-37, 38 n. 1, 44,
 52, 54, 60, 76, 84, 85 n.
 2, 86 *seq.*, 416.
- Copernicus, Nicolas, 337.
- Cornaro, Francesco (Bishop of
 Brescia), Cardinal, 375,
 440.
- Corrado, Giovanni, 14.
- Cortese, Gregorio (Benedictine),
 416, 455.
- Covos, 154, 156, 161, 217, 221.
- Cranmer, Thomas, 273, 282.
- Crispoldi, Tullio (humanist),
 395, 439.
- Crivelli, Giov. Pietro, 394 n. 3.
- Cromwell, Thomas, 285.
- Cueva, Pedro de la (Imperial
 envoy), 79, 146 *seq.*, 149,
 214, 215 n. 1.
- Cupis, Giandomenico de, Cardi-
 nal, 183 n. 2, 394.
- DATI, Giuliano (parish priest),
 395 *seq.*
- Davalos, Rodrigo (Imperial
 agent), 228.
- David (King of Æthiopia), 367.
- Dinteville, François II. de
 (Bishop of Auxerre), 211
 n. 1, 221 n. 2.
- Donato, Francesco (Venetian
 Procurator), 373.
- Doria, Andrea (Admiral), 14,
 24, 27 n. 3, 82, 190,
 198, 202, 231 n. 1.
- „ Filippino (Admiral), 17.
- „ Girolamo, Cardinal, 39,
 40 n. 1, 375.
- Doxis della Palma, Mariano de
 (physician), 40 n. 5.
- Du Prat, Antoine Bohier, Cardi-
 nal (French Chancellor), 7
 n. 2, 22, 302.
- Еск, Johann, 107, 114, 168,
 318, 343.
- Elizabeth (afterwards Queen of
 England), 281 n. 2.
- Enkevoirt, Wilhelm von, Cardi-
 nal, 41, 94, 323, 394.
- Eras, Petrus (Franciscan), 505.
- Erasmus, Desiderius, 123, 304
 n. 6, 337 *seq.*, 345, 404.
- Ercole of Ferrara (son of Duke
 Alfonso), 23.
- Eremita, *see* Rigini.
- Ernest of Bavaria, Duke (Bis-
 hop of Passau), 317.
- „ of Lüneburg, Duke, 124,
 140.
- d'Este, Isabella (wife of Fran-
 cesco Gonzaga, Marquis of
 Mantua), 83 n. 1.
- Eugenius IV., Pope, 423.
- FABER, Johann (Dominican),
 114, 318.
- „ Peter (Jesuit), 477.
- Fabrizi, Cinzio de', 344 n.
- Fantucci, Giovan Francesco,
 361.
- Farfa, Abbot of, *see* Orsini,
 Napoleone.
- Farnese, Alessandro, Cardinal,
 4 n. 3, 19, 65, 68,
 80, 91 n., 149, 183
 n. 2, 186, 214, 216,
 220 *seq.*, 228, 231,
 441, 493, 503.
- „ Pierluigi (leader of
 mercenaries), 70.
- Ferdinand I. (brother to
 Charles V.), King of
 Hungary and Bohemia,
 45, 51 n., 55, 57, 69,
 74, 85 n. 1, 88 *seq.*,
 91, 114 *seq.*, 117 *seq.*,
 125, 127, 148, 152, 154,
 156, 163, 181 *seqq.*, 185
seqq., 190, 192 *seqq.*, 200,
 201 n. 3, 203, 205, 219,
 222, 224, 236, 316, 318,
 320 *seq.*, 325.

- Ferdinand the Catholic (King of Aragon), 240, 403 *seq.*
- Ferrari, Bartolommeo, 451, 452 n. 1.
- Ferreri, Zaccaria (Bishop), 342.
- Ferretti, J. F., 344 n.
- Ferrosius, Ant., 335 n. 1.
- Ferruccio, Francesco, 102.
- Ferrus, Jerome, 310 n. 5.
- Fieramosca, Cesare (Imperial agent), 17.
- Filonardi, Ennio (Nuncio), 236, 297 *seq.*, 300 *seq.*
- Fine, Cornelius de, 26, 68, 368 n. 6, 450 n. 3.
- Firenzuola, Agnolo (poet), 340.
- Fisher, John, B. (Bishop of Rochester), 240, 247, 269, 286.
- Flaminio, Marc Antonio (humanist), 425 n. 4.
- Floriano (secretary to Campeggio), 269 n. 2.
- Foix, Odet de, *see* Lautrec.
- Fonzio, Bartolomeo (Franciscan), 311.
- Foscari, Marco (Venetian ambassador), 328 n. 4.
- Fox, Edward, Dr. (English envoy), 2, 8, 254 *seq.*, 258 *seq.*
- Francesco da Jegi (Capuchin), 487.
- „ da Potentia (Minorite, Bishop of Skara), 297, 366.
- „ Maria, Duke of Urbino, *see* Rovere.
- Francis I. (King of France), 6, 8, 11, 16 *seq.*, 21 *seq.*, 24, 42 n. 1, 46 n. 3, 58 *seqq.*, 64 n., 88, 101 n. 3, 116, 127, 135, 139, 154 *seqq.*, 158 *seqq.*, 161 *seq.*, 166, 168, 177, 181 n. 3, 187, 190, 193 *seq.*, 198, 205, 207, 211 *seqq.*, 217 *seq.*
- Francis I.—*continued.*
220 *seq.*, 223, 227, 229 *seq.*, 232–237, 247, 252, 256, 280, 283, 301–304, 319 *seqq.*, 326, 371, 374 *seqq.*, 387, 483.
- Francis, Duke of Lüneburg, 124.
- Francis of Assisi, St., 456, 460 *seq.*
- Franco, Matteo, 344 n.
- Frederick I. (King of Denmark) 288–291.
- „ III. (“The Wise,” Elector of Saxony), 124, 140, 142 *seq.*, 165, 240.
- Frederick of Naples, 404.
- Fregoso, Federigo (Archbishop of Salerno and Gubbio), 440.
- Fruntsberg, Melchior, 13, 70.
- Fuggers, Family of the (bankers), 173.
- Fulvio, Andrea (poet, archæologist), 343.
- GADDI, Niccolò, Cardinal, 233.
- Gaetano di Tiene, S., 387, 392 n. 1, 395, 396 n. 3, 398–401, 407, 408 n. 1, 410 *seq.*, 415–418, 435 *seq.*, 451 *seq.*
- Galateo, Girolamo (Franciscan), 311, 420.
- Gambara, Uberto da (Bishop of Tortona), 151–154, 157, 159, 248, 252.
- „ Ugo da, 7, 10, 499.
- Gammarus, 345 n.
- Gardiner, Stephen, Dr. (English envoy), 2, 8, 254 *seq.*, 259 *seq.*, 268, 283 *seq.*
- Gattinara, Mercurino di, Cardinal, 56, 66, 67 n., 69, 82, 86, 89 n. 4, 375.

- Gazzella, Tommaso (jurist), 405.
- Geismayr, Michael (leader of peasants), 210 n. 5.
- George, Bishop of Brixen, 82.
- „ Duke of Saxony, 126, 127, 224, 321.
- „ Margrave of Brandenburg-Kulmbach, 124, 168, 322 n. 2.
- Gerasimov, Demetrius (Russian envoy), 366.
- Ghislieri, Bonaparte, 2 nn. 4, 6.
- Giberti, Gian Matteo (Bishop of Verona) 44 *seqq.*, 52, 68 n. 3, 84, 195, 208 *seq.*, 219, 325, 340 *seq.*, 378, 380, 383 n. 1, 385 n., 387, 393 *seq.*, 409 n., 410, 412, 415, 420, 424-442.
- Gibrleon, G. B. (scritt. apost.), 394 n. 3.
- Giorgio da Gubbio (miniaturist), 356.
- Giovanni da Fano (Provincial of the Franciscans), 461, 463, 471 n., 473.
- „ da Udine (painter), 350.
- „ d'Urbino (Spanish captain), 70.
- Giovio [Jovius], Paolo, 329, 339.
- Giraldi, Giglio Gregorio (humanist), 342.
- Girolamo da Montefiore (Vicar-General of the Capuchins), 486, 487, 488 n. 1.
- Giulio Romano, 48 n., 346 *seq.*, 349, 350 n. 1, 353 n. 4.
- Giustiniani of Bergamo (Camaldolese hermit), 455.
- „ Lorenzo, S. (Patriarch of Venice), 369.
- Giustiniani, Paolo (Camaldolese), 400, 406 *seq.*, 454.
- Goethe, 357 n. 1.
- Gonzaga, Family of the, 336.
- „ Ercole, Cardinal, 4 n. 3, 42 n. 2, 68 n. 3, 183 n. 2, 205 n. 2, 215 n. 1, 323 n. 1, 385 n., 394, 440.
- „ F. (Mantuan agent), 29, 40 n. 5, 42 n. 4, 138, 142, 148 n. 2, 150, 500 n. 2.
- „ Federigo (Marquis, afterwards Duke of Mantua), 4 n. 6, 86, 98 n. 1, 103 n. 1, 138, 142, 219.
- „ Ferrante (brother of Federigo), 103 n. 1.
- „ Francesco (Marquis of Mantua), 341.
- „ Girolamo, 163 n. 5, 165 n. 1.
- „ Isabella, *see* Este, Isabella.
- „ Luigi (di Borgoforte), 85 n. 2.
- „ Pirro, Cardinal, 4.
- Gramont, Gabriel de (Bishop of Tarbes), Cardinal, 101, 135, 160, 185, 208 n. 1, 210 *seqq.*, 217, 223, 227 *seq.*, 243 *seq.*, 375.
- Granvelle, Antonio Perrenot de (Bishop of Arras), 82.
- „ Nicolas Perrenot de, 56, 133, 154, 156, 161, 217, 221, 280.
- Gregory VII., Pope, 108.
- Grimani, Marino, Cardinal, 216, 375 n. 1.
- Gritti, Andrea (Doge of Venice), 342, 416, 435.

- Gritti, L., 193.
 Guicciardini, Francesco, 104,
 217, 230, 235 n., 329, 339
seq.
 Guidiccioni, Bartolomeo, 441.
 Guido da Crema, 42 n. 5, 190
 n. 1.
 Gustavus I. Wasa (King of
 Sweden), 288, 291-296.
 Guzman, Martino di (Francis-
 can), 456.
- HANER, J., 108 n. 1.
 Heitmars, Johann, 336, 482
seq., 484, 504 *seqq.*
 Heliä, Paulus (Carmelite), 290.
 Henry VII. (King of England),
 238.
 „ VIII. (King of Eng-
 land), 7 *seq.*, 22, 47,
 62, 116, 127, 158 *seq.*,
 187, 193, 209, 217,
 220 *seq.*, 227, 237,
 238-254, 256-287,
 288, 332, 404, 425,
 483.
 Henry, Duke of Brunswick,
 124 n. 1, 225.
 „ Duke of Orleans (2nd
 son of Francis I.), 161,
 211 *seq.*, 218, 232, 234.
 Herborn, Nic. (Franciscan),
 365 n. 1.
 Hieronymus de la Lama, *see*
 Lama.
 Hogenberg, Nic. (engraver),
 96 n.
 Hurtado de Mendoza, Lope,
see Mendoza.
 Hyacinth of Poland, St., 370.
- IGNATIUS of Loyola, St., 476.
 Ingemar (Bishop of Vexjö),
 292, 296.
 Innocent III., Pope, 108.
 Isabella the Catholic (Queen
 of Castille), 253.
- JAMES IV. (King of Scotland),
 187, 483.
 Jerome Emilian, St., *see* Miani.
 Joachim I. (Elector of Branden-
 burg), 225.
 Joanninense, Stefano (historian),
 343.
 John III. (King of Portugal),
 116, 187, 371 *seq.*
 „ XXII., Pope, 461.
 John Frederick (Elector of
 Saxony), 224, 226.
 „ of Terranova (Capuchin)
 460 n. 2, 467 n. 1,
 471 n. 1, 486 *seq.*
 Jovius, *see* Giovio.
 Julius II., Pope, 5 n. 1, 20,
 241, 252 *seqq.*, 257, 259,
 403, 443.
 Jurischitsch, Nicholas, 201.
- KASIMBEG (Turkish general),
 202.
 Knight (English envoy), 248
seqq., 251, 266.
 Knut (Provost of Vesterås),
 293 *seq.*
 Kolpehk, Sebastian (Bishop of
 Laibach), 317.
- LAMA, Hieronimus de la, 390
 n., 396 n., 397 n.
 Landriano (Milanese envoy),
 180 n. 3, 185.
 Lang, Matthæus, Cardinal, 106
 n. 2, 126.
 Langeac, J. de (French envoy),
 23 n. 2, 28 n. 2.
 Langey, Sire de, *see* Bellay, G. du.
 Languy, Claude de, Cardinal,
 233.
 Lannoy, Charles de (Viceroy of
 Naples), 93, 339 n. 3.
 Lascaris, Giano, 336, 343.
 Lautrec, Odet de Foix, Vicomte
 de, 6 *seq.*, 8 n., 11 *seq.*, 16
seqq., 22, 24 *seq.*

- Lecchi, Francesco, 451.
 Lee, Dr., 281 n. 2.
 Leno, Giuliano (architect), 352,
 353 n. 2.
 Leo X., Pope, 108, 239, 240,
 307, 323 n. 1, 327, 328 n.
 1, 335 *seq.*, 338 *seq.*, 346
seq., 351, 354, 360, 366,
 389, 393 *seqq.*, 396 n. 3,
 399, 404, 406, 425, 443,
 446, 454 *seq.*, 459, 461,
 482, 484, 495.
 Lepido, Raimondo, da Sulmona
 (poet), 335 n. 1.
 Leveueur de Tillier, Jean,
 Cardinal, 233.
 Leyva, Antonio de (Imperial
 general), 60.
 Lichetto, Francesco (General of
 the Observants), 455.
 Lione, Giovanni da (painter),
 349.
 Lippomano, Luigi, 395.
 „ Pietro (Bishop of
 Bergamo), 308,
 440.
 Loaysa, Garcia de, Cardinal,
 82, 97, 129, 134 *seq.*, 138,
 149 *seq.*, 156, 161 *seq.*,
 202, 206, 208 *seqq.*, 220,
 228, 375.
 Lodovico da Fossombrone
 (Capuchin), 462 *seqq.*, 465
 n. 1, 469, 470 n. 3, 471,
 473, 475 n., 487.
 Lodron, Count of (brother-in-
 law to Fundsberg), 104.
 Longa, Maria Laurentia (foun-
 dress of the Capuchin
 nuns), 417.
 Longueville (French envoy), 8.
 Lorenzetto (sculptor), 358.
 Lotto, Lorenzo (sculptor), 350.
 Louis XII. (King of France),
 23, 248.
 Louis (Duke of Bavaria), 126,
 225.
 Louis (King of Hungary and
 Bohemia), 170-180,
 493.
 „ (The Elector Palatine),
 225.
 Louisa of Savoy (mother of
 Francis I.), 7, 9 n. 2, 59,
 60 n. 2, 302.
 Lugio, Valerio, 394.
 Luther, Martin, 109, 115, 116
 n. 1, 120, 123, 144 *seq.*,
 226, 240, 276 n. 3, 277 n.
 2, 288 *seq.*, 297, 300, 302,
 307 *seq.*, 315, 331 *seq.*, 337,
 406.
 MACHIAVELLI, 340.
 Magni, Johann (Bishop of
 Vesterås), 292 *seq.*, 295
seq.
 Mai, Miguel (Imperial envoy),
 35, 38, 41, 42 n. 1, 43
seqq., 51, 55, 61 *seq.*, 78,
 138, 143, 149, 206, 210,
 214, 221, 228.
 Manetti, Latino Giovenale
 (humanist), 395.
 Manrico, Alfonso, Cardinal,
 207, 376.
 Manzolli, P. A. (crypto-Protes-
 tant), 315 n. 3.
 Maramaldo, Fabrizio, 102 n. 2.
 Marangonus, Antonius, 314 n.
 5.
 Marcello, Cristoforo (Arch-
 bishop of Corfu), 343.
 Marco da Lisboa (Franciscan),
 486.
 Margaret of Angoulême (sister
 of Francis I.), 302.
 „ of Austria (aunt of
 Charles V.), 404.
 „ of Parma (natural
 daughter of Charles
 V.), 56, 58 n. 3, 59,
 90 n.
 Marinis, Donato de, 481.

- Marino, Giovanni (Theatine), 417.
- Mario de Mercato Saracini (Capuchin), 487.
- Marius a Forsarsinio (Vicar-General of the Capuchins), 486.
- Martin, Don (Portuguese Ambassador), 185.
- Martinellis, Blasius de (Papal Master of Ceremonies), 83 n. 1, 95 n. 1, 234 n. 1.
- Martino da Treviso (Inquisitor), 312.
- Mary Tudor (daughter of Henry VIII.), 244, 284.
- Marzio, Camillo (leader of mercenaries), 70.
- Mattei, Girolamo, 14.
- Matteo da Bascio (Capuchin), 457-463, 467 n. 1, 468 *seq.*, 486 *seqq.*
- Matthias da Salo (Capuchin), 475 n., 486, 488.
- Maturino (painter), 350.
- Medici, Family of the, 18, 47 *seq.*, 52 *seq.*, 62, 69, 72, 101, 103, 105, 211.
- „ Alessandro de' (Duke of Florence), 56, 62, 68, 72 n., 74 n. 4, 82, 86, 105, 323, 327.
- „ Catherine de', 64, 73, 161, 211 *seq.*, 218, 230, 232, 316, 358.
- „ Cosimo de', 336, 482.
- „ Galleotto de' (Florentine envoy), 119 n. 4.
- „ Giovanni de' (leader of the "Black Band"), 230, 341.
- „ Giuliano de' (brother of Lorenzo the Magnificent), 336, 482.
- Medici, Ippolito de', Cardinal, 39, 40 n. 1, 51 n. 4, 62, 65, 68, 74 n. 4, 103 n., 200, 201 n. 2, 214, 217, 233, 235 n., 321 n. 1, 322 *seq.*, 326 *seq.*, 340, 375 *seq.*, 503, 510.
- „ Lorenzo II. (Duke of Urbino), 211, 336, 482.
- „ Lucrezia de' (wife of Jacopo Salviati), 212.
- „ Pietro de', 359.
- „ (-Salviati), Maria de', 230.
- Melanchthon, 141, 165, 226, 304, 315.
- Mendoza, Lope Hurtado de, 12 n. 3.
- Merino, Stefano Gabriele (Archbishop of Bari, Imperial envoy), 78, 219 *seq.*, 221, 228, 365, 376.
- Metzenhausen, Johann von (Archbishop of Treves), 225.
- Miani, Girolamo [St. Jerome Emilian], 387, 448 *seqq.*
- Michael Angelo, 73, 232, 338, 360-363, 500.
- Mignani, Laura (Augustinian nun), 398, 400.
- Mirandola, *see* Pico.
- Molina, Stefano (Franciscan), 456.
- Moncada, Ugo de (Imperial envoy), 17, 24.
- Monte, Cardinal, *see* Ciocchi.
- Montelupo, Raffaello da (sculptor), 350, 359.
- Montferrat, Marquis of, 82, 88, 93.
- Montmorency, Anne de (Grand Master of France), 7, 8 n. 1, 59, 232, 302.

- Montorsoli, Giovanni Angelo (sculptor), 338, 360.
 More, Thomas, Sir, 240, 286.
 Mores, Christopher (English envoy), 248 *seq.*
 Morigia, Jacopo Antonio, 450 n. 3, 451.
 Morone, Giovanni, Cardinal, 394.
 „ Girolamo, 26.
 Mosca, Simone (sculptor), 359.
 Muscettola, Giovanni Antonio, 20, 144, 167, 209 *seq.*, 219 *seq.*, 228.
- NANNI DI BACCIO BIGIO (sculptor), 328.
 Nassau, Count of, 82, 93.
 Nausea, 112, 114, 318.
 Navarro, Pedro, 25.
 Negri de', Abbate, 27 n. 3, 62, 99 n. 6.
 Nieto, Tommaso (Dominican), 450.
 Nino, Rodrigo (Imperial envoy), 363 n. 1.
 Norfolk, Duke of (uncle to Anne Boleyn), 242.
 Numai, Cristoforo, Cardinal, 12 n. 2, 106, 115.
- OCHINO, Bernardino, 473, 487.
 Odet de Foix, *see* Lautrec.
 Oppido, Count of, 417.
 Orange, Prince of, *see* Philibert.
 d'Orléans, Jean (Archbishop of Toulouse), Cardinal, 220.
 Orsini, Family of the, 29.
 „ Camillo, 475.
 „ Fr. (Commendator of Farfa), 66 n. 2.
 „ Franciotto, Cardinal, 12 n. 6.
 „ Napoleone (Abbot of Farfa), 14, 51, 54, 64 *seq.*, 66 n. 2, 100.
- Osiander, 111.
- PAGNINO, Santes (Dominican), 343.
 Palladio, Blosio (poet), 335.
 Pallavicini, Fr., 394 n. 3.
 „ Giambattista (Carmelite), 307.
 Paolo Romano (sculptor), 359.
 Papazzoni, A. M., 229 n. 6, 316 n. 1, 323 n. 1.
 Particappa, Mariano, 395 n. 4.
 Passerini, Silvio, Cardinal, 4 n. 3.
 Pastron, 236 n. 2, 509.
 Pedro de Toledo (Viceroy of Naples), 103 n.
 Penni, Gianfrancesco (painter) 346 *seq.*, 348, 350.
 Pepoli, Ugo di, 7.
 Peregrino Fabrizio, 193 n. 3, 200 nn., 209 n. 2, 231 n. 5, 236 n., 322 n. *seqq.*, 383 n. 2, 441 n. 1.
 Perényi, Peter, 194.
 Pericoli, Niccolò, *see* Tribolo.
 Perrenot, Antonio (Bishop of Arras), *see* Granvelle.
 „ Nicolas (Imperial envoy), *see* Granvelle.
- Peruzzi, Baldassare (artist), 352, *seq.*, 501, 508.
 Pesaro, Francesco, 75 n. 4, 445 n. 3.
 Peter of Luxemburg, B., Cardinal, 370.
 Petri, Laurentius (Archbishop of Upsala), 296.
 Philibert of Chalon (Prince of Orange), 12, 17, 20, 24 *seqq.*, 27 *seq.*, 30, 41, 43, 63 *seq.*, 66, 69, 71 *seqq.*, 76, 85, 99, 102, 104 n.
- Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, 119, 124, 140, 235, 303, 320.

- Philip, The Count Palatine
(Bishop of Freising), 93.
- Piccolomini, Giovanni, Cardinal,
183 n. 2, 233 n. 4.
- Pico della Mirandola, Gian
Tommaso, 123.
- Pigafetta, Antonio, 343.
- Pighius, Albert, 188, 343.
- Pimpinella, Vincenzo (Arch-
bishop of Rossano, nuncio),
127, 182 *seq.*
- Pio, Alberto (Count of Carpi),
29, 98.
,, Leonello, 87 n. 1.
,, Rodolfo (Bishop of Fa-
enza), 220, 229.
- Piombo, Sebastiano del (paint-
er), 347, 350, 361.
- Pisani, Francesco, Cardinal, 20,
383 n.
,, Luigi, 4.
- Pisotti, Paolo (General of the
Franciscans), 457, 471,
473.
- Pole, Reginald, Cardinal, 416.
- Pomazaniki, Bernhard, 185 n.
3.
- Porta, Egidio della (Augus-
tinian), 307.
,, Giovanni Maria della
(envoy from Urbino),
2 n. 6, 32 n. 2, 199
n. 1, 217 n. 1, 234 n.
2, 321 n. 1
- Portugal, King of, *see* John III.
- Praet, Louis de (Imperial
envoy), 56, 62 *seq.*, 78,
155, 158, 217.
- Pucci, Antonio (Bishop of
Pistoja, Cardinal), 10
seq., 21 *seq.*, 376.
,, Lorenzo, Cardinal, 2 n.
4, 62, 66, 84, 205,
233 n. 4, 251, 254,
255 n. 2, 379, 422 n.,
463, 466 n.
- Pucci, Roberto, 64.
- Puglioni, Giovanni Antonio
(Baron of Burgio), 171-
175, 176 *seq.*
- QUIÑONES, Francesco, Cardinal,
6, 33 *seq.*, 38, 41, 43, 46
n. 3, 50 n., 65, 68, 205,
233 n. 4, 365 n. 1, 375,
394, 456.
- RAFFAELE DA FOSSOMBRONE
(Capuchin), 462 *seq.*, 465
n. 1.
- Raimondi, Marcantonio (en-
graver), 346, 350.
- Raince, Nicolas (secretary to
French Embassy), 51 n. 4,
61 n. 2, 66 n. 5.
- Rangoni, Ercole, Cardinal, 441.
,, Guido, 7, 8 n., 27 n.
3.
,, Ugo (Bishop of Reg-
gio, envoy), 223
seq., 225.
- Raphael, 346 *seq.*, 393.
- Renée [Renata], daughter of
Louis XII. of France, 22,
248.
- Ricci, Domenico (artist), 96 n.
- Ridolfi, Niccolò (Bishop of
Vicenza), Cardinal, 4 n. 3,
12 n. 1, 77, 93, 321 n. 1,
440.
- Rigini, Girolamo [Eremita], 111
n. 3.
- Rojas, Antonio (Bishop of
Palencia), 365.
- Romano, Giulio, *see* Giulio
Romano.
- Rorario, Girolamo (nuncio),
27 n. 3, 102 n. 2, 109, 117
seq., 121, 124 n. 1.
- Rovere, Francesco Maria della
(Duke of Urbino), 4, 88,
93, 97.
- Rucellai, Giovanni (poet), 342.

- SABBA DA CASTIGLIONE, Fra (poet), 342.
- Sacchetti, Ilarione (Franciscan), 456.
- Sadoletto, Jacopo, Cardinal, 119 n. 2, 335, 338, 380, 393, 395, 410, 440, 443, 445.
- Salinas, Martin de, 91, 99 n. 6, 494.
- Salo, Matthias de, *see* Matthias.
- Saluzzo, the Marquis of, 25.
- Salviati, Bernardo (nephew of Clement VII.), 227.
- „ Giovanni (Bishop of Fermo), Cardinal, 4 n. 3, 7, 9 n. 2, 10, 22, 59, 61 n. 2, 93, 215, 321 n. 1.
- „ Jacopo (husband of Lucrezia de' Medici), 3, 10 n., 14, 16, 21, 53, 61 *seq.*, 64, 84, 141, 144, 158, 165 n. 2, 217, 231, 267, 269.
- „ Lucrezia, *see* Medici, Lucrezia de'.
- Sanchez (envoy of Ferdinand I.), 233 n., 324 n.
- Sanga, Giovanni Battista (poet, papal secretary), 11, 21, 62, 64, 84, 208 n. 3, 335.
- Sangallo, Antonio da, 199, 352 n. 4, 354 n. 2, 355.
- „ Francesco da, 327, 352 n. 4, 359.
- „ Giovanni Francesco da, 352 n. 4.
- Sangro, Alfonso di (Bishop of Lecce), 19.
- Sanmicheli, Michele (architect), 355.
- Sannazaro, Jacopo (humanist), 338 *seq.*
- Sanseverino, Antonio, Cardinal, 29, 233.
- Sansovino, Andrea (sculptor) 359.
- „ del Monte, Cardinal, *see* Ciocchi.
- „ Jacopo (architect), 354.
- Sanuto, Marino (chronicler), 400 n. 2.
- Sassatello, Giovanni da (condottiere), 11 n. 3.
- Savelli, Giovanni Battista (leader of mercenaries), 70, 490.
- Savonarola, 73.
- Savoy, the Duke of, *see* Charles III.
- Schio, Girolamo da (Bishop of Vaison), 3, 21, 48 n., 50, 55 *seq.*, 84, 85 n. 2, 153 n. 2, 154, 341, 394.
- Schönberg, Nicolas von (Archbishop of Capua), 38, 46, 58 n. 3, 61, 76, 84, 104, 151, 219 *seq.*, 341, 410.
- Scotti, Bernardino (Theatine), 412.
- Sepulveda, Giovanni Gennesio, 343.
- Seripando, Cardinal, 338.
- Sessa, Ferrante of Cordova, Duke of, 25 n. 2.
- „ Luis of Cordova, Duke of, 118 n. 1.
- Sforza, Francesco (Duke of Milan), 57, 86 *seqq.*, 96, 98, 211, 218 *seq.*, 452.
- Siebenbürgen, Voivode of, *see* Zapolya.
- Sigismund (King of Poland), 120 *seq.*, 173, 187.
- Silva, Fernando de (Count of Cifuentes, Imperial ambassador), 228.
- Simonetta (Auditor of the Rota), 219.
- Sommar, Magnus (Bishop of Stregnäs), 294 *seq.*, 296.

- Soriano, Antonio (Venetian ambassador), 99 n. 6, 100 n. 4, 211, 377.
- Spinola, Agostino, Cardinal, 2 n. 4, 216.
- Staffileo, Giovanni (Bishop of Sebenico, nuncio), 446.
- Stafileo (Illyrian prelate), 253, 254.
- Strozzi, Filippo, 102 n. 2, 230.
- „ Leone, 188 n. 2.
- Stuart, John (Duke of Albany), 208 n. 2, 212, 230.
- Stunica, Cardinal, 97 n. 1, 375.
- Suffolk, Duke of (brother-in-law to Henry VIII.), 242.
- Suliman I. (The Sultan), 175, 178, 180 *seqq.*, 183 *seq.*, 192 n. 5, 193, 201, 213.
- Sunnanväder, Peter (Bishop of Vesterås), 293 *seq.*
- Szalkay, Ladislaus (Primate of Hungary), 175, 179.
- Szerencsés, Emmerich, 175.
- TARASCONIO, Evangelista (papal secretary), 335, 394 n. 3.
- Tausen, Hans (Danish reformer), 289.
- Tavera, Juan, Cardinal, 207, 376.
- Thomas de Vio, Cardinal, *see* Cajetan.
- Tiene, Gaetano di, S., *see* Gaetano.
- Titian, 200.
- Tolomei, Cl., 343 n. 14.
- Tommaso Illyrico (Minorite), 307.
- Tomori, Paul (Archbishop of Kalocsa), 174, 178 *seq.*
- Torelli, Lodovica (Countess of Guastalla), 451.
- Torregiano, Pietro (sculptor), 241.
- Tournon, F. de, Cardinal, 97 n. 1, 210 n. 3, 217, 223, 227 *seq.*, 280, 283, 375.
- Tribolo, il [Niccolò Pericoli], 359.
- Trissino, Giangiorgio (poet), 342.
- Trivulzio, Agostino, Cardinal, 42 n. 2, 48 *seq.*, 347 n. 1.
- „ Cesare (nuncio), 158.
- „ Gianjacopo (condottiere), 489.
- „ Paolo Camillo, 7, 25.
- Trolle, Gustav (Archbishop of Upsala), 292.
- UBALDINIS, Ubaldino de, 223, 227.
- Udine, Giovanni da (painter), *see* Giovanni.
- Ulrich (Duke of Württemberg), 235, 320.
- VAGA, Perino del (painter), 350.
- Valeriano, Pierio (humanist), 5 n. 2, 343, 345, 444.
- Valle, Andrea della, Cardinal, 29, 324, 472.
- Valori, Bartolomeo, 104.
- Vannes (English envoy), 266.
- Varano, Battista da, B. (Poor Clare), 459 n. 3.
- „ Giovan Maria da (Duke of Camerino), 459, 464.
- Varchi (chronicler), 73, 100 n. 1, 104.
- Vasari, Giorgio, 81, 346 n. 2, 357.
- Vasili (Grand Duke of Moscow), 366.
- Vasto, Alfonso d'Avalos del, 12, 17, 70.
- Vaudemont, René, Count of, 7, 25.

- Venier, Domenico (Venetian envoy), 415.
- Verböczy, Stephen, 174 *seq.*, 178.
- Vergerio (nuncio), 316-319, 321, 331 n. 2.
- Vernacci, Ettore, 406.
- Vettori, Francesco (Florentine envoy), 330.
- Vida, Marco Girolamo (humanist, Bishop of Alba), 338 *seq.*, 425, 440.
- Villafranca, Marquis of (Viceroy of Naples), 507.
- WADDING (Franciscan annalist), 486.
- Warham (Archbishop of Canterbury), 245, 247, 255, 257, 281.
- Wasa, Gustavus, *see* Gustavus.
- Widmanstadt, Johann Albert, 337.
- Wied, Hermann von (Elector of Cologne), 225.
- William IV. (Duke of Bavaria), 126, 225.
- Wiltshire, Earl of (father of Anne Boleyn), 273.
- Wolfgang (Prince of Anhalt), 124, 140.
- Wolsey, Thomas, Cardinal, 7, 17, 41, 239 *seq.*, 242-250, 252-255, 256 n. 2, 257-264, 266-273, 286.
- XIMENES, Cardinal, 388, 405.
- Xuarez, Juan (Bishop of Texas), 366 n.
- ZACCARIA, Fra (Dominican), 73, 314.
- „ Antonio Maria, St., 387, 450-453.
- Zapolya, Johann (Voivode of Siebenbürgen), 34, 175, 181, 183 *seqq.*, 194 *seq.*, 493.
- Zengg, The Captain of, 172.
- Zini, Francesco, 438.
- Zwingli, Ulrich, 297 *seqq.*, 307.

DATE DUE

~~JUN 18 1982~~

~~JAN 01 81~~

~~JUN 15 1983~~

~~JUN 25 1984~~

BW851 .P294 v.10
The history of the popes, from the close

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00030 7977