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Chapter 1: Introduction

In the middle of the sixteenth-century Europe was in turmoil and the Catholic Church was divided. In 1541 members of the Lutheran Party and a Papal delegation, led by Cardinal Gasparo Contarini (1483–1542) met in Regensburg in an attempt to reunite the Lutherans with their former head, the Pope. Negotiations came to a breakdown when it became obvious that the different views of the Eucharist were too big to ever render the sought-after unity between the two parties.

Pope Paul III (1534–1549) convoked a council at Trent, on Habsburg territory, which lasted from 1545 to 1563 with interruptions. In the aftermath of the Council new strategies were decided on for a publication of a revised edition of the Vulgata bible and new pursuits for missionary activities in Catholic countries, as well as in those areas who had split with Rome, were sketched out. Resolutely, Roberto Bellarmino S. J. (1542–1621), and Antonio Possevino S. J. (1533–1611), for instance, set about to make changes made.

Antonio Possevino was sent as papal legate to Sweden, Russia and Transylvania in order to strengthen their ties with Rome, for religious as well as for political reasons. The Pope, of course, wanted to gather the whole of the European flock into his arms as the shepherd of Christianity, and the threat of Turkish invasion urged him to gather non-Catholic alliances to his mission of a crusade against the enemy of the east.

Moreover, France, a nation of Catholic faith, was yet divided between Catholic and Huguenots during the reign of Henri IV (1589–1610). Henri’s tolerant politic, as far as the Huguenots were concerned, only increased tensions between France and the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II (1552–1612), who was allied with the Papal States.

An important participant in European politics was of course the Republic of Venice, which ran its realm from the mythical lagoons. Apart from being the centre of trade between Europe and the Orient, they housed the largest fleet in the world. In 1571, at the Battle of Lepanto, Venice played a crucial role in defeating the Turks.

Venice and Rome was not always on good terms, which the interdict crisis of 1606 and 1607 clearly manifests. Interdicts had been placed on Venice before, but the one of 1606 set about a veritable flood of pamphlets and tracts, either in favour or against the interdict of Pope Paul V (1605–1621).

One of these tracts, which was written in favour of the Papal interdict, was the Nuova Risposta di Giovanni Filoteo di Asti, alla lettera di un theologo incognito scritta ad un sacerdote suo amico, sopra le censure, & interdetto di Papa Paolo V, contro la Signoria di Venetia, which I intend to analyse in this thesis.
1.1. The Interdict Crisis of 1606–1607

The Republic of Venice was put under an interdict for encroaching on the authority of the Pope, but, as stated above, it was not the first time in history that the Republic encountered such severe measures. On several occasions, Popes had placed interdicts on the Republic of Venice; in 1201 by Pope Innocent III (1198–1216), in 1282 by Martin IV (1281–1285), in 1309 by Clement V (1305–1314), in 1482 and in 1484 by Sixtus IV (1471–1484), and in 1509 by Julius II (1503–1513).¹

In 1508 the crisis between Rome and Venice led to the War of the League of Cambrai (1508–1516), which involved the Holy Empire, Spain, France and England. In 1509, at the Battle of Agnadello, Venice lost to the French army. Pope Julius II, moreover, considered the Venetian expansion on the Italian peninsula to be a threat to the Papal States, which prompted him to tie an alliance, or a league, with the Holy Roman Emperor and the king of France. Its mission was to restrict Venetian expansion and to take into possession what Julius regarded as his rightful territory.

In the wake of the settlement of the War of the League of Cambrai the Venetian government was reluctant to enter war on whatever frontier. In fact, this led to a process of stabilization within the Republic and many of the younger generation, in the early sixteenth-century, were educated according to humanist ideals and as it were enthusiasts of Church reform. Instead of taking up the physical sword Paolo Giustiniani (1476–1528) and Pietro Quirini (1479–1514), members of the Camaldolese Order, sought to reform the Church by using the pen. In 1513 they wrote the Libellus ad Leonem X in which they demonstrated the decay of the Church and thus urged Pope Leo X (1513–1521) to act in order to mend its server state. The Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia was written along the same lines, published in 1536 by, among others, Cardinal Gasparo Contarini. In this writing, Pope Paul III is exhorted to deal with the widespread trade of ecclesiastical benefices and the nepotism of the leaders of the Church. These efforts were, however, not fully given heed to by Paul III, but the turmoil during the middle of the sixteenth-century did cause him to convokw an ecumenical council.

After the opening of the Council of Trent, Venice became a place of different faces. On the one hand, Venice encouraged merchants of any religious affiliation to continue the exchange of trade. On the other hand, Venice became increasingly known for the harsh methods of the Venetian Inquisition, led by Giovanni Della Casa (1503–1556).

Additionally, there was a growing tendency, in the late sixteenth-century, of an incipient rift between Venice and Rome. The quarrel over temporal power of Ceneda, a town in the Veneto region, became the start of a debate with implications of opposite views on hierarchical

¹ Jaska Kainulainen, Paolo Sarpi: A Servant of God and State, p. 196.
structures, which eventually led to the interdict crisis of 1606–1607. The Pope claimed temporal power over Ceneda through its bishop, whereas the government of Venice considered all towns on Venetian territory to be under the temporal jurisdiction of the Republic of Venice.2

The growing pretensions of wanting to prove temporal power of its clergy moved Pope Clement VIII (1592–1605), in 1600, to decide that all things pertaining to temporal power, in Ceneda, should be dealt with by its bishop and not by the temporal magistrate of the Republic of Venice.3 Moreover, in 1605 the Venetian Republic imprisoned two clergymen accused of crimes, which fuelled Paul V to claim that they ought to be submitted to the tribunals of the Papal States. The Pope also wanted for the Republic to resign from inhibiting new church buildings from being constructed, which had been restricted by an act of Venetian law in 1604 and in 1605. The Papal pleadings came to nothing, consequently he placed Venice under an interdict in 1606.

The Venetian government, was not, however, left speechless by the actions of the Pope, on the contrary, their reaction to the interdict was anything but. On the eve of the interdict crisis the Venetians expelled, from its territory, the Order of the Society of Jesus, who had long disturbed the anticlerical governors of Venice with their zealous defence of the supreme power of the Pope.

The second phase of the interdict crisis marked the entrance of the Guerra delle scritture, in other words the war of writings. The government of Venice appointed the theologian and Servite Monk Paolo Sarpi (1552–1623) to be its main advisor in matters of Canon law and theology. In his writings, Sarpi related to ideas, which was presented by “conciliarists” during the latter part of the Middle Ages. These thinkers, supporters of the declarations Frequens and Heac Sancta of the Council of Constance (1414–1418), had in common that they regarded the Pope to merely be in charge of spiritual powers, whose rank, according to “conciliarists” is not superior to an ecumenical council. Sarpi wrote a defence of the Venetian cause on the basis of the thought of the conciliar theorist Jean Gerson (1363–1421), which eventually sparked the outburst of the Guerra delle scritture.

1.2. The Nuova Risposta

The Nuova Risposta, which I will analyse in this thesis, was a text born out of the Guerra delle scritture. It was published in 1606 in Bologna and in Ferrara, both locations were, at that period of time, a part of the Papal States. The Papal States were administered from Rome and included

---

3 Kainulainen, Paolo Sarpi, p. 217.
the nowadays regions of Lazio, Umbria, Marche and Emilia-Romagna, in the middle of the Italian Peninsula, as well as the ancient town of Avignon in the South of France. The Papal States were governed by the Pope until 1870, when Pius IX (1846–1878) surrendered to the pressure of the Kingdom of Italy to incorporate the territory of the Papal States into the new-born realm.

According to Matthew 16:18–20 Christ gave his powers to the apostle Peter to bind and loose in heaven and on earth. These biblical passages have traditionally been interpreted literally by the Catholic Church, but whether the primacy of Saint Peter covers powers in temporal matters or not was intensely debated during the Middle Ages and not so much during the beginning of the early modern period. In the late sixteenth-century and early seventeenth-century, however, it took a new turn in the debates between the Rome and Venice.

The Jesuit Order or the Societas Iesu was founded by Ignatius de Loyola (1491–1556) and was approved by Pope Paul III (1534–1549) in 1540. Unlike other Orders of the Catholic Church the members of the Society of Jesus are obligated to take an extra vow of obedience to the Pope, in addition to the common religious vows of poverty, celibate chastity and obedience. Thus, its members, the Jesuits, became the Pope’s very own men. It was during the post-reformation area that they began to vindicate a contrary idea to the “conciliarists,” which asserted to Papal supreme power in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. The theocratic idea of government, vindicated by Bellarmine and Possevino, for instance, can be seen to contrast the Venetian ideal of republicanism. The Nuova Risposta, written by the Jesuit Antonio Possevino, can, on a general level, be said to adhere to the idea of twofold Papal power, it would, however, be erroneous to reduce its content to be a mere reflection of this specific idea.

The Nuova Risposta, moreover, distinguishes between the two powers and regards the spiritual power as absolute and granted by divine law. The temporal power is considered by the Nuova Risposta to be tolerated by God and in multitude. The text, furthermore, argues for the right of the Pope to include clergymen of the Church, his family members, in his jurisdiction.

1.3. Purpose and Question

The purpose of this thesis is to study the text Nuova Risposta in order to analyse its historical context and its historiographical assumptions, as well as its argumentation in favour of the Venetian interdict, thus the relation between spiritual and temporal powers. Such a task of research has not, to my knowledge, been done before.

On a general level the Nuova Risposta is a part of the canon of tracts written during the interdict crisis of 1606–1607, which argued in favour the Papal interdict. I believe, however, that such categorisation of texts, of being in favour or against the Papal interdict placed on
Venice, is justified on a general level. Nevertheless, I conted that one might be a bit precautious not to stretch the categories too far, since they are merely general. On a deeper level I suggest that the tracts need to be studied in themselves, as well as being placed into their proper contexts.

By analysing the Nuova Risposta, on a particular level, it will be possible to return to a general level with a deeper understand of the characteristics of the Nuova Risposta itself, the interdict crisis of 1606–1607, as well as the interrelation of theology and politics in the early seventeenth-century debates of Papal claim to spiritual and temporal powers.

My main question in this thesis is if the central argument of the Nuova Risposta, which is Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters, is related to a historiographical framework. My subqueries are the following:

- What does the basic assumptions in such a historiographical framework consist of?
- Which ideological aspects are important for the understanding of why Papal claim to sovereignty in spiritual as well as in temporal matters, during the interdict crisis of 1606–1607, was distasteful for the supporters of the Republic of Venice, by reason of the Myth of Venice?
- How did the process develop, which ended in the Venetian interdict of 1606–1607?
- In what manner does the Nuova Risposta use symbolic language to argue in favour of Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters?
- How does the Nuova Risposta portray the Republic of Venice with regard to the Myth of Venice?

1.4. Sources, Prior Research, and Method

My main source in analysing the Nuova Risposta is the text itself. I have, since it exists in a printed edition dated in 1606, carried out a transcription of the text of my own. The transcription, which is found in the appendix to this thesis, compromises 37 pages, whereas the original compromises 56 pages. The reason for the difference in page numbers is due to the fact that they are presented in different typefaces. In my transcription, I have opted to place the lists

4 The Nuova Risposta, my main source, is available on google books: https://books.google.se/books?id=ubhLAAACAAAJ&pg=PA1&lpg=PA1&dq=Nuova+risposta+di+giovanni+Filoteo+di+Asti+alla+lettera+di+un+theologo+incognito+scritta+ad+un+sacerdote+suo+amico+sopra+le+censure+et+interdetto+di+Papa+Paolo+V.+contro+la+Signoria+di+Venezia&source=bl&ots=DFcPbv_3ct&sig=s05w95CzA5208wVS3hlMzJ1ZdY&hl=sv&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjxgfLrvL_PAhXJiSwKHSTOCaUQ6AEIIDAB#v=onepage&q=Nuova%20risposta%20di%20giovanni%20Filoteo%20di%20Asti%20alla%20lettera%20di%20un+theologo%20incognito%20scritta%20ad%20un+sacerdote%20suo+amico%20sopra+le+censure%2C%20et%20interdetto%20di%20Papa%20Paolo%20V.%20contro%20la+Signoria%20di%20Venezia&f=false
of references of the original printed text in footnotes, in order to make the text a bit more reader-friendly. Whenever I have found reason to comment on the text I have done so in the footnotes. In my study, I refer to the pagination of my transcription in the appendix.

Since no other research have been done on this specific text, except for the brief mentioning of the *Nuova Risposta* by William J. Bouwsma in *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty* (1968) and in *A Usable Past* (1990), I won’t be able to compare the results of my analysis of the *Nuova Risposta* to that of an equal study. Notwithstanding, the research of Bouwsma is thorough and proves substantial knowledge of the difficult-to-comprehend debates during the interdict crisis of 1606–1607. In addition, for the study of the Myth of Venice I will use the chapter of Marion Leathers Kuntz “Venice and Justice: Saint Mark and Moses,” in Delph, Ronald K, Fontaine, Michelle M, and Martin, John Jefferies (ed.), *Heresy, Culture and Religion in Early Modern Italy* (2006). I will use Jaska Kainulainen’s book *Paolo Sarpi: A Servant of God and State* (2014) for its useful discussion of Paolo Sarpi and his thought. Moreover, in elaborating on the historiographical aspects of the interdict crisis I will use the study of Stefania Tutino in *Shadows of Doubt: Language and Truth in Post-Reformation Catholic Culture* (2014).

My methodological approach to the *Nuova Risposta* is, using my transcription and my translation, to define such topics that is adequate for answering to my questions. I will pay extra attention to those passages, in the *Nuova Risposta*, that discuss the relation between temporal and spiritual powers, as well as those who touch upon ecclesiastical history. I will also argue for the attribution of authorship to Antonio Possevino, as well as argue for the attribution of the explicit recipient of the *Nuova Risposta* to Giovanni Marsilio. In these cases, I will define such passages that may explain who the author and the recipient of the *Nuova Risposta* are. In order to state these theses, the study of the *Nuova Risposta* will be added with comments by Bouwsma on the basis of a close-reading of his texts *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty* and *A Usable Past*.

In portraying the context during the interdict crisis of 1606–1607 I trust the historian Quentin Skinner who insisted that “context is not something obvious and given, [but] has to be constructed, indeed created by the commentator.”5 Relevant to the presentation of the context and its relation to the *Nuova Risposta*, in this thesis is the method of the Dante expert Umberto Cosmo (1868–1944) whose statement, that Dante’s *La Divina Comedia* was born out of a “vexation of spirit and was, as it were, its mirror,”6 is useful to me. I contend that this notion of Cosmo’s is in accord with the origin of the *Nuova Risposta*, inasmuch as Possevino himself, in

---

the introduction of his tract, states that the reason why he wrote the *Nuova Risposta* was phenomena that mirrored its time, in other words the fact that he was “urged by zeal to the honour of God and irritated by the injustice done toward the Vicar of Christ our Redeemer, to whom I am obligated to give my blood and life,” moreover Possevino says “I wanted, as far as I can, to try to vindicate it [the injustice] with these writings.”

Thusly, I will represent such contextual aspects that I consider will answer to my contextually related questions, and those that enhance the understanding of the debates of the *Nuova Risposta*, without which the characteristics of the text would be difficult to comprehend.

### 1.5. Central Concepts

In answering to my questions in this thesis I will use five concepts that I intend to sort out in this section. The first concept that will be defined is “interdict.”

With regard to the interdict crisis of 1606–1607, what is the definition of interdict and an excommunication, and what were their repercussions? An excommunication is an act of a bishop, in this thesis I will refer to an excommunication imposed the Pope himself. The excommunication prohibits the excommunicated person of receiving the Eucharist and is caused by an “obvious act against the faith and regulations of the Church.” An interdict, moreover, is a ban “of an entire territory and its inhabitants or […] a monastery.” In my opinion the word ‘interdict’ is the more appropriate in describing the events of 1606–1607 and will therefore be used, as I outline the basic background of the fractious sentiments between Venice and Rome in the early seventeenth-century.

The second concept that I will explain is “jurisdiction,” which is used in the *Nuova Risposta* and by myself in the analysis. From the Latin word *jurisdictio*, jurisdiction refers to “the competence of a certain office in administrative and judicial matters.” Closely connected to the concept of jurisdiction is the technical term “territory,” in other words a land is “the state that is institutionally organised on a large area […] territory is thus a space in which a solid construction of offices exists.” Thus, a territory is the space where a certain jurisdiction is valid. The Papal States, for instance, were constituted of territories and the sovereign, in other words the Pope, carried out the competence to administrate and to settle matters of judicial

---

7 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 69: “Spinto dal zelo dell’honore di Dio, & irritato dalla ingiuria fatta al Vicario di Christo nostro Redentore, per il qual son obbligato a dare il sangue, e la propria vita, hò voluto, quanto potrò, forzarmi, di vendicarla con questi scritti.”

8 Per Beskow, *Teologiskt lexikon*, p. 63.

9 Ibid, p. 89.


importance. Consequently, the inhabitants of the Papal States were under the jurisdiction of the Pope.

To administer and deal with judicial matters laws are required, or rather as the medieval principle says “where there is society, there is law (ubi societas ibi est ius).”\(^\text{12}\) In the Nuova Risposta, the divine law, the natural law, and the positive laws are being treated. The divine law refers to such law, which “God is considered the ultimate source [and has the] authority to bind.”\(^\text{13}\) The divine law is derived from, and reachable to man through revelation, in other words through the Holy Scriptures. The natural law, furthermore, refers to the law “that nature itself teaches to all living creatures […] on earth, in water and in air,”\(^\text{14}\) thus, it is through practical reason that natural rights, ethics and responsibilities are defined.\(^\text{15}\) In contrast, the positive laws, such as Civil law, Criminal Law and Law of Nations, are excluded from morality and enjoys “autonomy from other possible sources of normativity.”\(^\text{16}\)

The third concept that I will explain is “historiography.” The study of historiography refers to the interpretation of history and what the assumptions and premises are for writing history. As for writing ecclesiastical history in post-reformation Europe, Stefania Tutino stresses that the general question for historiographers was “how to conceptualize the relationship of traces, documents, and theology.”\(^\text{17}\) For Cesare Baronio (1538–1607), author to the Annales Ecclesiastici, the epistemological certainty of the truth of Catholic dogma was his basic assumption, thus the lens through which he could conceptualize documents and theology. Baronio was a skilful critic of texts and he did not agree with the philologist Agostino Steuco (1497–1548), whose claim that the document where Emperor Constantine (274–337) is said to have donated his Western Empire to Pope Sylvester I (314–335) was authentic. The methodical approach of Baronio of using textual criticism in history writing marked a progression away, as Carlo Ginzburg says “from evidentia (the narrative vividness) and embraced evidence as the proper way to reconstruct the past. [Baronio] explicitly rejected the elegant and organic narratives of other historians in exchange for the ‘rough and inelegant’ fragments of the past as they appear in primary documents.”\(^\text{18}\) Yet Tutino says that “Baronio thought that the truth of history and the Truth of the Catholic doctrines both stirred him in the same direction,”\(^\text{19}\)

\(^{12}\) John J. Coughlin, Law, Person, and Community: Philosophical, Theological, and Comparative Perspectives on Canon Law, p. 8.
\(^{13}\) Ibid, p. 5.
\(^{14}\) Anders Piltz, Medeltidens Lärda Värld, p. 69.
\(^{15}\) Coughlin, Law, Person, and Community, p. 5.
\(^{16}\) Ibid, p. 5.
\(^{17}\) Stefania Tutino, Shadows of Doubt: Language and Truth in Post-Reformation Catholic Culture, p. 74.
\(^{18}\) Ibid, p. 85.
\(^{19}\) Ibid, p. 83.
furthermore, “the Truth of theology was the condition for his distinctive documentary approach.”

Tutino, moreover, argues that contemporary scholarship often fails, as it values the notion of objectivity without regarding the hermeneutics of faith, to understand “early modern historical scholarship and ecclesiastical history in particular.” Furthermore, Arnaldo Momigliano (1908–1987) stated that the model of treating the Christian Church as a Universal Church, in accordance with the inventor of ecclesiastical history Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260–c.341), was abandoned sometime between the eighteen- and the nineteenth century, when the concept of an “Universal Church was no longer taken for granted.” Momigliano claimed that the history of the Church “began to be studied as the history of a human community instead of a divine institution.” In addition, I would like to argue that such change might have occurred earlier, at least traces of an historiographical abandonment of the “Eusebian model” is noticeable in the thought of Paolo Sarpi and Giovanni Marsilio.

The fourth concept that I will explain is “typology.” From the Greek word τύπος, which refers to types or figures. It is an historical approach of connecting figures of the Old Testament to Christ in the New Testament. In this thesis, I will study how the Nuova Risposta, as it uses types of the Old Testament, justifies the authority of Christ and his successor Saint Peter.

The fifth concept that I will explain is “analogy.” From the Greek word ἀναλογία; ἀνα refers to up, against, above, whereas λογία refers to word. I will use the word analogy in the thomistic sense, in other words of demonstrating similarities between two entities, whereby the first entity is similar to the other, thus their correlation is also understood as dissimilar. I contend that the Nuova Risposta discusses the relationship between Aaron and Saint Peter, for instance, in an analogous manner, inasmuch as they demonstrate similarities; both are administrators of an office granted to them, yet their offices are not the same, but similar to each other. The word analogy should, moreover, not be confused with an allusion, which refers to a reference. The two swords, mentioned in the Nuova Risposta, refers to the supreme powers, temporal and spiritual, of the successor of Saint Peter without taking notice of similarities or dissimilarities, the two swords are merely used as a reference.

---

20 Ibid, p. 86.
21 Ibid, p. 82.
23 Ibid, p. 85.
24 Brian J. Shanley O.P., The Thomistic Tradition, p. 44.
1.6. Outline

In chapter 2, I will discuss the concept of the myth of Venice. In order to follow the *Nuova Risposta* as it discusses Rome and Venice as two dichotomous entities it will be useful to keep in mind that not only Rome was regarded as a place of prominent heritage, but some advocates of Venice regarded its republic as more prominent that Rome itself. In chapter 2, I will discuss definitions of the myth of Venice, as well as how these definitions progress over time. Chapter 2 has the purpose of sketching a conceptual backdrop to the interdict crisis, as well as answering to my question of which ideological aspects are important for the understanding of why Papal claim to sovereignty, in spiritual as well as in temporal matters, was considered distasteful for the Republic of Venice, during the period of the interdict crisis of 1606–1607.

In chapter 3, I will account for the main factors that led to the interdict crisis, in order to answer to my question of how the process of the Venetian interdict developed. I will notice that Venice at the time of the interdict crisis was a place of anticlerical sentiments added with pretensions of wanting to prove temporal superiority all over its territory. I will, moreover, pay attention to the struggle for power in the town of Ceneda along with the quarrel of the right to judge clergymen accused of criminal acts.

In chapter 4, I will account for the style and form of the *Nuova Risposta* as well as summarising the contents of the text. Furthermore, I will present some biographical data of its author Antonio Possevino, as well as arguing for the justification of Giovanni Marsilio as the recipient of the *Nuova Risposta*. This serves the purpose of accounting for the main background details of the *Nuova Risposta*, which is important for my analysis.

In chapter 5, I will account for the importance of historiography as a characteristic of the post-reformation period and of its relevance to the *Nuova Risposta*, to answer to my question if the text can be said to adhere to a certain historiographical framework and if so, what the basic assumptions of such a historiography consists of. Moreover, I will discuss the arguments in favour of Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters in order to answer to my question of how the *Nuova Risposta* uses symbolic language as means to argue in favour of Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. The outline in chapter 5, which deals with the use of symbolic language is: 5.2. / The Relationship Between the Body and the Soul; 5.3. / Typologies and Analogies of the Old Testament; 5.4. / The Two Swords of the New Testament. Section 5.5. will deal with the discussion of the portrayal of the Republic of Venice with regard to the Myth of Venice. The last section in chapter 5 is provided in order to answer to my main question if the *Nuova Risposta* can be said be dependent on a historiographical framework.
Each chapter will contain brief discussions of contrary points of views to the *Nuova Risposta*, such as those of Paolo Sarpi and Giovanni Marsilio. I will account for such contrasting views in order to gain better knowledge of the contents of the *Nuova Risposta*, as well as to improve the contextual understanding.

In chapter 6, I will conclude the results of my analysis. Chapter 6 will be followed by a list of the literature used throughout the chapters of this thesis. I will now move on to Chapter 2, to study the definitions of the Myth of Venice.
Chapter 2: The Myth of Venice

Before I move on to the interdict crisis and its consequences I would like to discuss a few definitions of the concept of the Myth of Venice, expressed by notable scholars in the sixteenth-and seventeenth-centuries, in order to offer a perhaps better understanding of the nature of the conflict. I argue that it is vital to look at the mindset of the writers, with the purpose to, within the limited scope of this thesis, recreate such an attitude. Regarding the recreation of mindsets of scholars, the discerning approach to history of the Dante scholar Umberto Cosmo will be kept in mind, as he considered it important to recreate the literary atmosphere of a given space and time.25 This is what I aim to do by presenting different, yet hopefully complementary images of the Republic of Venice and her legacy, expressed by Gasparo Contarini, Paolo Sarpi, Giovanni Marsilio, Guillaume Postel (1510? –1581), Jean Bodin (1530–1596), Giovanni Maria Memmo (1503–1579), and Sir Henry Wotton (1568–1639). I will also discuss the concept of the Myth of Venice as presented Marion Leathers Kuntz, scholar of the early modern period.

First and foremost, I would like to point out that there is no single Myth of Venice shared by scholars and historians; rather there are several definitions of the myth, which have prevailed in different commentaries on the Myth of Venice. Contarini, Bodin, Postel, Sarpi, Marsilio, Memmo and Wotton differed in their motives of wanting to bring out tributes of respect for the Repubblica Serenissima (the most-serene republic, in other words the Republic of Venice), consequently, their focus of thought diverged in the way they presented the Myth of Venice. Not even scholars of today give a tangible explanation of the myth; Gina Fasoli stresses “political wisdom, moral strength, internal equity and dignified external firmness,”26 whereas the Franco Gaeta sees “the myth of freedom, the myth of mixed government and the myth of longevity”27 as elements contained in the so-called Myth of Venice.

2.1. The Dual Role of the Doge of Venice

The essential aspect of the Myth of Venice is, according to the historian Marion Leathers Kuntz, the blend between human and divine elements in Venice’s sacred spaces.28 This blend, Kuntz says, is manifest in the intertwining of the Ducal Palace and the Basilica of Saint Mark on the Piazza San Marco. The Ducal Palace was the home of the state machinery in the Republic of Venice, which in the beginning of the seventeenth-century stretched from the Venetian lagoon

to the mainland, the terraferma, the nowadays Veneto region; the Friuli-Venezia Giulia region; the coast of Dalmatia; and the Greek islands of Corfu and Zakynthos.

The symbol of Venetian power was the doge, who resided in the Ducal Palace. Apart from the doge there was a complex apparatus of councils and institutions: The Senate, the Council of Ten, the Major Council to name a few. The doge had no executive mandate, as far as decision-making was concerned, in effect he merely held the symbolic superiority of the Republic of Venice. Leathers Kuntz mentions Doge Andrea Gritti (1455–1538) as being portrayed on a picture, where he receives the Ten Commandments from Saint Mark and I trust that she, in her article, is vaguely referring to the time-period of the so-called Renovatio, which was a plan, launched by Doge Gritti, to reform the legal system of the Senate and to prepare Venice for becoming “the cultural and intellectual center of Europe.”

Leathers Kuntz, however, argues that because the Decalogue “served as a paradigm for Venetian law and hence for Venetian justice,” the doge, as the receiver and transmitter of the content of the Decalogue, was held to have had a religious function in addition to his political role. Moses, moreover, had passed the Ten Commandments to the Israelites and through mediation of the patron saint of Venice, the evangelist Mark of Levite origin, the Decalogue was handed over to the doge. Consequently, the Republic of Venice had “received her right to be portrayed as Justice herself and to administer justice based upon God’s law.” Leathers Kuntz seems to make it implicit that Saint Mark shared Peter’s wish, in opposition to Saint Paul, to preserve the Law of the Jews. Thus, according to Acts 15, Saint Paul and Saint Mark parted ways, as the latter sailed to Cyprus along with Barnabas, instead of going with Saint Paul.

According to the legend Saint Mark was sent from Rome by the Apostle Saint Peter to the Friuli region in Northern Italy to preach the Gospel. In Aquileia, in year 50 A.D, Saint Mark founded a diocese, where he chose Saint Hermagoras (d. 70) to be its bishop, hence the succession of bishops, or rather patriarchs, of Aquileia descends from Saint Mark himself. In the sixth-century, the ecclesiastical province of Aquileia split in two due to The Schism of Three Chapters, lasting from 553 to 698. When all parts where reconciled with Rome two patriarchates were recognised; one in Aquileia and one in Grado, the latter eventually had its seat transferred to Venice in 1451, and it became the Patriarchate of Venice. The circle was now closed, so to speak, as the chair that was founded by Saint Mark had been transferred to Venice, where the relics of the evangelist had rested since the year of 828 when it was brought
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from Alexandria to Venice by Venetian merchants. The Basilica of Saint Mark was not, however, the church of the Patriarch of Venice, but the private church of the doge. Along these lines, I contend that it is plausible that, as Leathers Kuntz argues, the office of the doge carried out political and spiritual functions.

2.2. Different Definitions of the Myth of Venice

To acquire the voice of a writer of early modern Venice I will now turn to the Venetian patrician, as well as cardinal of the Catholic Church, Gasparo Contarini. Contarini was a prolific figure in the Venetian state machinery as a member of the Council of Ten and as Venetian ambassador to the Emperor Charles V (1500–1558). In his thought about the Republic of Venice he distinguishes certain qualities inherit in the history of the Republic, such as prudence, harmony and peace. Contarini envisions Venice, although she is subject to change, as the maintainer of peace. Moreover, he depicts a bridge built from ancient Rome to Venice, inasmuch as some Romans fled from the Barbarian invasions to the Venetian lagoon in fifth-century. But, unlike the Romans, Contarini says, “the Venetians did not gear their men for war but for defence.”

In addition to this the French humanist Guillaume Postel said that “Divine Providence has had more care for Venice than all the rest of the world […] because Venice had maintained the Christian religion in a most devoted and prudent manner.” Postel adds that Venice is not only a new Rome “but also a new Jerusalem because of her emphasis on justice.” Postel, moreover, portrayed Venice’s temporal sphere as female. This notion is not an uncommon aspect of the portrayal of Venice, on the contrary, it is most obvious in paintings by renaissance artists and many of these painting are located inside the Ducal Palace to this day. In the comments on the Myth of Venice, however, the female aspect is not frequently stressed. Additionally, the topic of Venice as the new ancient Rome was expounded by the Venetian patrician Giovanni Maria Memmo, who claimed that “Venice exceeded Rome […] for it had ‘already passed more than eleven hundred years in its government […] having conserved and maintained its intact and incorrupt liberty.”

The French philosopher Jean Bodin, of whose writings Possevino said were “worn out in many hands,” also commented on the comparison of Venice and ancient Rome, but did not concede to Postel’s argument, on the contrary Bodin remarked that “Venice could not outshine the ancients as far as force, temperance, justice, moderation and artistic gifts were concerned.”
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Bodin did, however, appreciate Contarini’s homage to the mixed government, as the most praiseworthy manner in which to rule a state. According to Contarini, Venice had a “perfect balance of democracy, oligarchy, and monarchy.” The democracy was represented by the Major Council, the oligarchy by the Senate and the monarchy by the doge.

In *De officis viri boni ac probi episcopi* Contarini discusses the secular and the ecclesiastical authorities and their relationship to one another. Contarini envisions a close cooperation between the two, whereby the ideal bishop should “respect the state and its laws and not shield guilty clerics, who should be committed to the secular jurisdiction.” This is a fascinating remark by Contarini, since he, by the time of the interdict crisis of 1606–1607, had been dead for more than sixty-eight years, yet he touched upon a crucial issue of the conflict between Venice and Rome in the early seventeenth-century. I will return to the topic of whether clerics should be put to trial by a secular tribunal, or not, in my analysis of the *Nuova Risposta*.

When discussing the two authorities Contarini argued that there is a hierarchical difference between the two and that the ecclesial authority is superior to the secular and that the keys were handed to Saint Peter alone, but Contarini, however, never mentions the two swords of the Pope. I, moreover, find it difficult to clearly put a label to Contarini’s thought; he was not a “conciliarist,” since he refuted the notion, put forward by some Senators, of not consulting the Pope on a matter of buying ecclesiastical property in 1530. Nor was he in favour of Papal temporal power, as he stressed, along with nine other cardinals in the *Consilio de Emendanda Ecclesia* in 1536, that “it should not be lawful, even for the Vicar of Christ, to obtain any wealth through the use of power of the keys given him by Christ.”

The theologian and canon legist Paolo Sarpi was made Venice’s official theologian and legal adviser during the interdict crisis. Sarpi, unlike Contarini, did touch upon the ‘mixed-government’ as praiseworthy, instead Sarpi sought to stress freedom as the most important aspect of the Myth of Venice. If the Venetians, Sarpi held, should yield to the papal interdict this would harm “the natural liberty of the republic, given to it by God.” Sarpi favoured the idea of an absolute monarch, which reduced ecclesiastical powers to be mere spiritual. Although Sarpi corresponded with Lutherans he never gave up his Catholic faith and in this he rather
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seems to be in accordance with the “conciliarist” movement. Sarpi himself wrote a critique of the Council of Trent, the *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino*, in which he complained that Trent was “a tragic story of the failure of true reform.”

The Neapolitan priest Giovanni Marsilio, who was a resident in Venice expressed doubt concerning the Council of Trent, calling it “the misfortune of our times.” Marsilio also claimed that “God would be pleased if Christian princes joined in calling a council to reduce the papacy to conformity with primitive models.” In addition, Marsilio stated that “Venetians were men with a long record of freedom defending themselves against enslavement.”

The English ambassador to Venice Sir Henry Wotton thought of Venice as “more like old Rome than Rome herself.” Rome, according to Wotton, had become the place of vice and synonym with the Jesuits, which he disliked, a position which he shared with Sarpi. Venice would be better off as Lutherans, Wotton claimed, and he criticized the habit at the University of Padua, where English students had to “swear allegiance to the Pope on taking their doctoral degree.” On depicting the Myth of Venice Wotton presents Venice as, in accordance with Sarpi, always independent and considered the split with the Pope to be temporal and not spiritual.

It should be mentioned that there were writings of the so-called ‘Counter-myths of Venice’ published during the early modern period. The main criticisers Niccolò Macchiavelli (1469–1527) and Francesco Guicciardini (1483–1540) were both residents of Florens, which was a political adversary to the *Serenissima* republic. Macchiavelli thought of Venetians as “arrogant in prosperity but weak and cowardly in adversity.” Guicciardini, further on, argued that the Venetians were full of “hubris [and] self-interest.” Kainulainen also points out that “there was always the counter-myth of a Venice that was ‘miserable, vile, avid, tyrannical’ and ‘stupidly arrogant in its impotence’.”

In order to conclude this chapter, it is justified to ask the question if the Myth of Venice, as defined by Leathers Kuntz, Contarini, Memmo, Postel, Bodin, Wotton, Marsilio and Sarpi, answers to the question of why Papal claim to superiority, on an ideological level, was distatesful for the Republic of Venice during the interdict crisis of 1606–1607.

Leathers Kuntz focuses her attention on the dual role of the doge, both temporal and spiritual. From Moses, the doge received the Decalogue, mediated by Saint Mark, which served as the
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paradigm for the laws and justice of the Republic of Venice. Gasparo Contarini, on the other hand, put forward, not the doge, but the mixed-government, as did Jean Bodin, as the most important characteristic of Venetian ruling. Contarini, further on, focuses on certain qualities inherit in Venice, thus inherit in the residents of the town. Contarini ponders on prudence, harmony and peace as virtues more frequent in Venice than anywhere else. According to Postel God’s Providence had particularly safeguarded the Republic, thus, in the view of Postel, the virtues of the people of Venice are not stressed, rather it is God who have kept her free from war and vices. On entering the seventeenth-century I observe that Sarpi, Marsilio and Wotton held that freedom and independence were the most undisputed characteristics of the ‘Myth of Venice.’

When discussing the topic of Rome vis-à-vis Venice I noticed differences in handling with this issue. Contarini, for instance would not yield to the conciliarist theory of the Pope as a mere spiritual leader and tended to put Rome hierarchically above Venice. Postel, moreover, in accordance with Memmo, viewed Venice as not just the new Rome, but a new Jerusalem. Bodin, on the contrary, did not regard Venice as on the same level as ancient Rome, nor did he comment on Venice in comparison to the Rome of his day. Wotton and Sarpi, on the other hand, thought Venice above Rome and a keeper of the continuity of ancient Rome.

I am now able to conclude from the outlines given in this chapter that there was no consensus of the definition of the concept of the Myth of Venice. There is, however, a certain progression noticeable from a notion of Venice as consonant with Rome; both shearing the continuity of ancient Rome and the legacy of the founding of the Christian Church; Rome had Saint Peter and Venice had Saint Mark. In the years after Contarini’s living, however, there developed an explicit dichotomy between Rome and Venice, thus in the thought of Sarpi, Marsilio, and Wotton, Venice was indisputably superior to Rome. I argue that this latter notion of the Myth of Venice serves to answer to the question of why Papal claim to sovereignty in spiritual as well as in temporal matters during the interdict crisis, on an ideological level, was distasteful for the Republic of Venice. For the moment, I will leave the Myth of Venice and in the next chapter I will study the development of the interdict crisis of 1606–1607.
Chapter 3: The Development of the Interdict Crisis of 1606–1607

In this chapter, I will study those events, relevant for the analysis, that happened before, during, and immediately after the interdict crisis of 1606–1607. At first, I will discuss its background, thereafter I will discuss the significance of the interdict on Venice itself, and finally, briefly touch upon the aftermath of the interdict crisis. The purpose of this chapter will be to answer to the question of how the process of the interdicts crisis of 1606–1607 developed.

3.1. Anticlericalism in Venice

When discussing the interdict crisis of 1606–1607, I argue that it is necessary to take notice of the impact of the so-called giovani, the young ones. A shift, as far as influence on decision-making was concerned, took place, whereby the anti-clericalism of the patricians of the giovani paved way for a less tolerant take on Papal demands. Against this group stood the vecchi, the old ones, who held a pro-Papal position, and whose advocators were the Jesuits and the prominent families loyal to Rome, the so-called papalisti. The giovani, moreover, gathered in Venice, in Padua and in Belluno to engage in conversations on “natural phenomena, customs and divine things.”

Members of these circles were patricians such as the soon-to-be elected doge, Leonard Donà (1536–1612); Paolo Sarpi; the soon-to-be bishop of Ceneda, Leonardo Mocenigo (1553–1623); and the scientist Galileo Galilei (1564–1642). On one of these meetings the philosopher Giordano Bruno (1548–1600) attended. The senator Giovanni Mocenigo, a member of the circle, became somewhat suspicious, however, when hearing the discussion of Bruno about “the existence of plurality of worlds.” Mocenigo called for the inquisitors of Venice and thus denounced Bruno. The accusations against Bruno would eventually lead to his execution on Campo de’ Fiori in Rome in the year of 1600. This event was a victory of the vecchi, who were far from kindly disposed to the influx of heterodox ideas on Venetian territory.

Heterodox ideas in the eyes of the Catholic Church had, by the time of the interdict crisis of 1606 and 1607, a long tradition. Venice had been a meeting point of the so-called Spirituali in the first half of the sixteenth century, a circle which produced the controversial book Il Beneficio di Cristo, printed in Venice in 1543. In 1528 Martin Luther expressed his joy that Venice “sought the true word of God.” Furthermore, the General of Capuchin Order Bernardino
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Ochino, who fled to Geneva to resign his Catholic faith, hoped that Venice would be the door, in which Christ would enter with the purpose of reforming the Church.  

A prelude to the interdict crisis of 1606 and 1607 is noticeable in the growing deterioration of the relationship between the giovani and the vecchi and Jaska Kainulainen gives an example of such hostility: the cardinal Camilio Borghese, not yet elected Pope Paul V, supposedly had a heated conversation with Leonardo Donà, not yet elected doge of Venice, whereby Borghese purportedly exclaimed: “if I [was] the pope, I would place Venice under interdict and excommunication.” In response to this outburst of Cardinal Borghese, Donà is said to have replied “and if I were Doge, I would trample your interdict and excommunication under foot.” A sign of things to come no doubt, as Borghese became Pope in 1605 and in the following year Leonardo Donà was elected the doge of Venice.

When Donà was elected doge, his aim was to manifest the Republic of Venice as free and independent from Rome, consequently he steered a tolerant politic toward Lutherans, Anabaptists and Calvinists as well as Muslims and Jews, as long as it benefited Venetian interests on whatever politically and commercial level. Moreover, apart from a general reciprocal long-term hostility between Venice and Rome there are two concrete examples, that preceded the interdict crisis, where they utterly clashed. One was the ‘issue of Ceneda’.

3.2. The Struggle for Temporal Power in Ceneda

Ceneda, a small town in the Veneto region, whose bishop governed the town, in spiritualibus et in temporalibus, due to a concession given to bishop Sicardo in 962 by the Holy Roman Emperor Otto I (912–973). In 1388, however, the Republic of Venice overtook the reign of the terraferma from the Carrara family, hereinafter Ceneda became incorporated in the Republic of Venice. In the 1580s, moreover, the bishop of Ceneda was summoned to Venice on charges of abuse of power. Kainulainen reports of this event, but there are some problems concerning his representation of the event. Kainulainen claimed that the bishop of Ceneda was summoned in 1582 and that Pope “Sixtus V defended the bishop.”

Kainulainen does not mention the name of the bishop, who, in 1582, was Michele Della Torre (1511–1586). In 1582, however, Sixtus V (1585–1590) was not yet Pope, on the contrary, in 1582 it was Gregory XIII who presided on the Chair of Saint Peter. Either Kainulainen has got the name of the Pope wrong or he confuses the date of the summon. If, then, as Kainulainen
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suggests, it was Sixtus V who defended the bishop, the bishop of Ceneda was likely to have been Marc’ Antonio Mocenigo (bishop from 1586 to 1598). There is one more option though, that I find most likely to correspond to the actual events, which is that Kainulainen confuses reports of Ceneda and of the Patriarchate of Aquileia. The Patriarch of Aquileia, Giovanni Grimani (1506-1593) appealed to Gregory XIII for help, in the beginning of the 1580s, since the Council of Ten in Venice had claimed superior jurisdiction over Aquileian territory. Pope Gregory told the Venetians to keep their fingers off Papal land and consequently the Pope threatened to bring the emperor for settling the matter, if the government of Venice continued to stall.\textsuperscript{65} The situation did eventually settle. As follows I presume that it is the event of the tension over Aquileian territory, in the beginning of the 1580s, that Kainulainen, in his report, is referring to. Thus, I argue that Kainulainen has confused the events of Aquileia with the event of Ceneda, which occurred somewhat later.

In 1586 Pope Sixtus arranged for Marc’ Antonio Mocenigo to become bishop of Ceneda. Bishop Mocenigo was of a papalisti family, but even more a prelate of the Counter Reformation. Not long after his inauguration in Ceneda, the Pope claimed powers in temporal matters and Bishop Mocenigo opted for a substitution of the title ‘count-bishop’ in favour of ‘prince-bishop’.

The Senate of the Republic of Venice’s reply to the Papal claim of authority in temporal matters of Ceneda was late, only in 1599 did they send a message to the bishop of Ceneda, but it did not lack resentment, as it threatened the people of Ceneda to confiscate all their goods in the event that they should refuse the Republic of Venice acknowledgement of temporal superiority over Ceneda. Notwithstanding, Bishop Leonardo Mocenigo, a cousin and successor to the former bishop Marc’ Antonio Mocenigo, in consequence turned to the Papal nuncio in Venice, who asked the Pope to intervene. In due course a letter from the Pope claimed “the decrees, laws, and regulations of the Senate” annulled.\textsuperscript{66} Moreover, in 1600 the Pope prohibited the citizens of Ceneda to appeal their interests to no other authority, than to that of the ecclesiastical Court of Rome. In 1611 Paolo Sarpi complained that “it was the first attempt of the Court of Rome to treat Ceneda as a part of the ecclesiastical State.”\textsuperscript{67}

Bishop Leonardo Mocenigo, once a friend and student of Paolo Sarpi, who accompanied Mocenigo to Ferrara in 1598, when he was consecrated by Pope Clement VIII (1592–1605), had, became a bitter enemy to the Servite monk. In 1611 Sarpi commented on one of the main reasons for the deterioration in relation between Venice and Rome. According to Sarpi the
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former equilibrium upheld by Bishop Michele Della Torre became unbalanced and offensive when Marc’ Antonio Mocenigo “instead of entitling himself the bishop and count of Ceneda, as his predecessors had done, began to name himself the bishop and prince of Ceneda.”

According to Sarpi the title ‘count’ implied being a vassal and thusly being inferior to its superior, whereas the title ‘prince’ did not imply being inferior, consequently the bishop had not acknowledged Venice as his superior. Moreover, Leonardo Mocenigo had renounced the title ‘prince’, but since he did not restore the title ‘count’ he too, according to Sarpi, had failed in acknowledging Venice as his superior. Subsequently, Sarpi argued that the donation of Otto I was invalid and against divine law “because of succeeding wars.”

3.3. The Imprisonment of Clergymen and an Interdict placed

The other main issue that serves to explain why tensions grew large between Venice and Rome, in the prelude to the interdict crisis of 1606 and 1607, was the question of temporal vis-à-vis ecclesiastical authority, as far as putting prelates accused of criminal acts to trial. In the autumn of 1605 the Council of Ten in Venice ordered the canon Scipione Saraceno from Vicenza to be arrested on charges of having torn down a public manifesto, which was signed with the seal of Saint Mark, as well as having committed criminal acts against his nephew. Alongside him the abbot of Nervesa, Marc’ Antonio Brandolin, was arrested on charges of murder and “other severe crimes against the property and against people.”

Pope Paul V made the Council of Ten aware of the fact that the Church had tribunals of their own and asked the lords of the Serenissima to submit the imprisoned prelates to the Papal States for them to be put to trial at the ecclesiastical tribunal in Rome. The Pope, moreover, wished for the Republic of Venice to resign from their position, embodied in the laws of 1604 and 1605, of inhibiting new church buildings from being erected, without permission from the Serenissima. The Pope threatened to excommunicate the entire republic if they refused to cooperate with him. After some time of malfunctioning diplomatic negotiations, the Pope placed the Republic of Venice under an interdict, their reply, however, proved little care for the Papal sanctions and, in an edict declared the interdict “unjust, invalid and null.”

In order to present adequate theological retort to the Pope, the Senate appointed Paolo Sarpi, a friend of Doge Donà, to be its legal and theological adviser. Kainulainen mentions that an anonymous observer, in favour of the Papal interdict, claimed that Sarpi had “inherited the
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poison of Luther, [...] and the impiety of Marsilius of Padua.” One example that manifests how severe the tensions between Venice and Rome actually were, were the three attempts to assassinate Sarpi, committed after the lifting of the ban of the interdict crisis. During the first attempt in October 1607, the Servite monk was attacked by five assassins who stabbed him with a dagger. Sarpi, nonetheless, survived all attempts and succumbed due to natural causes in January 1623.

Almost immediately after the appointment of Sarpi, the government of Venice decided to translate and republicate “two short treatises directed against the abuse of power of the ecclesiastical censure,” by the French “conciliarist” theologian Jean Gerson. The treatises were published, in the Italian vernacular, with the title Trattato e risoluzione sopra la validità delle scomuniche di Gio. Gersone Theologo e Cancellier Parisino (Venice, 1606). In this text, Gerson is brought forward to argue that the Council of “Constance had declared it ‘to be heresy to deny the superiority of the council to the pope.’”

The publication of the Trattato fuelled the Jesuit Cardinal Roberto Bellarmino to defend the Pope, hence Bellarmino had his Risposta published in 1606, in which he contended that Sarpi had misinterpreted Gerson, who, according to Bellarmino, was in favour of the Apostolic See. He, moreover, suggested that the decree of Constance, the Haec Sancta, “was not to be read as applicable to any pope whatsoever and certainly not to any canonically elected pope universally held to be legitimate.” Finally, according to Bellarmino, the Catholic Church is not like the Republic of Venice, on the contrary, it is “a most perfect kingdom and an absolute monarchy, which depends not on the people [...] but on divine will alone.” Sarpi did of course answer to Bellarmino’s Risposta, but not only Sarpi, but a number of other writers. In effect the interdict crisis entered the Guerra della scritture, war of writings, which contained aggressive argumentation in favour or in disfavour of the interdict. I will return the one these writings, the Nuova risposta by Antonio Possevino, in the next chapter.

Giovanni Marsilio was one of the most prolific writers, besides Sarpi, of pamphlets, which directed severe criticism against Rome. Marsilo blamed the wars on the Italian peninsula, from the medieval period and onward, on the papacy “with its diabolical policy of divide and conquer.” Marsilio, moreover, defended the freedom of thought, which, according to Bouwsma, contrasted the Society of Jesus’s fourth vow of obedience to the Pope. Bouwsma, moreover, claims that such stress on the freedom of thought “helps to explain the antipathy to
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the Society of Jesus.” Marsilio was, furthermore, ordered by the Pope to appear in Rome in front of the Roman Inquisition, but remained in Venice which resulted in an excommunication on Marsilio. He died in 1612 and Paolo Sarpi suggests that the cause of death was poison, an utterance which I opt not to comment on.

Did the interdict effect ordinary life in the Republic of Venice? The answer seems to be no, even if the Patriarch of Aquileia and the bishops of Treviso, Ceneda and Verona, dioceses on the terraferma, were opposed to the Venetian government’s neglecting attitudes toward the interdict. In Venice, however, sentiments were different. Notwithstanding the fact that the interdict forbade clergy to celebrate Holy Mass, there was no disruption in ecclesiastical services of the churches in Venice. The Patriarch of Venice “not only celebrated mass, he ordained to the priesthood while the interdict was in force.” Moreover, although the Jesuits were expelled from the territory of the Republic, other religious Orders did not sustain such harsh treatment as the Society of Jesus. The Capuchin Order in Venice, for instance, was particularly kindly disposed toward the Republic and did not consent to the Papal interdict.

The contention between Venice and Rome officially ended in 1607 on April the 21st in a compromise, by the intervention of the French king Henri IV. Additionally, the anti-Papal sentiments by the Venetian patricians had shifted during the spring of 1607 and little by little they began to deviate from the advice of Paolo Sarpi. Furthermore, in the accord between the government of Venice and the Pope it was said that Venice did not have to resign from its restrictions of prohibiting entrance to members of the Society of Jesus, nor were they obliged to release the imprisoned clergy to be put to trial by Papal tribunals. In effect, the lifting of the ban changed nothing, but the Pope at least avoided the outbreak of a real war, not just the war of writings.

What signifies the mentality of the Venetian writings during the interdict crisis of 1606–1607 is that it in one aspect is in accordance with the traditional Venetian position of being a counterweight to Roman pretensions. On the other hand, the writings during the interdict crisis lack the significant Venetian characteristic of diplomacy, which they were known for. Thus, the radicalism of the Venetian tracts and pamphlets during the interdict crisis could in the end have been precisely the reason why the government of the Republic, in 1607, decided not to further follow the advice of Sarpi.

In this chapter I have studied the development of the interdicts crisis of 1606–1607. I conclude that Venice had been a place where the influx of heterodox ideas was strong, long
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before the interdict crisis. The 1580s, however, marked the beginning of the debate of Papal superiority in temporal matters on Venetian territory. Ceneda and Aquileia, at the dawning of the seventeenth-century, were places, in which this debate witnessed to have grown in proportion. Ceneda is a practical example of how serious the debate of Papal claim to temporal power on Venetian territory was. The issue of Ceneda, I conclude, is an important factor in the development of the interdict crisis of 1606–1607.

Another vital factor for the development of the interdict crisis was the anticlerical sentiments during the dogeship of Leonardo Donà, which reached its peak as the imprisonment of the two priests and the laws that forbade construction of new church buildings came about. The reply of writings to the Papal interdict placed on the Republic of Venice is, moreover, an importance source of knowledge, especially regarding theological based tensions, of the interdict crisis of 1606–1607. I will now pay attention to the analysis of the *Nuova Risposta*, a text written during the interdict crisis.
Chapter 4: The Nuova Risposta

In this chapter I will address the author of the Nuova Risposta Antonio Possevino. I will argue in favour of ascribing the authorship to Possevino as well as presenting details of his life, which will serve the purpose of providing the analysis with relevant facts of its author. Furthermore, I will argue in favour of ascribing Giovanni Marsilio as the explicit recipient of the Nuova Risposta, which will be complemented with some facts of Marsilio. The style and form of the Nuova Risposta will thereafter be discussed, with emphasis put on its polemical approach to its recipient. In the last section of this chapter I will outline topics that are being dealt with in the Nuova Risposta.

4.1. Text and Authorship

In this section I will discuss the text and the authorship, and I will argue in favour of ascribing the authorship of the Nuova Risposta to Antonio Possevino. The original title of texts is: Nuova Risposta di Giovanni Filoteo di Asti, alla lettera di un theologo incognito scritta ad un sacerdote suo amico, sopra le censure, & interdetto di Papa Paolo V, contro la Signoria di Venetia. The title in English, according to my translation, is: New Response, by Giovanni Filoteo from Asti, to a Letter of an Unknown Theologian, Written to a Priest, His Friend, about the Censures and Interdict of Pope Paul V, Against the Council of Venice. The edition of the Nuova Risposta that I have transcribed covers 56 pages, written in the Italian vernacular with inserted complementary quotes in Latin. The transcription is found in the appendix to this thesis.

The Nuova Risposta was printed in 1606 (M. DC. VI) in Bologna, by license of the superiors, at the Archbishop’s press. Bologna was, at this period of time, a part of the Papal States and William J. Bouwsma makes us aware of the fact that Bologna, along with Mantua, “became bases for agitation against the Venetian government and for dispatch of pamphlets and secret messages addressed to Venetian clergy.”

The Nuova Risposta was also printed in Ferrara at the Chamber’s press in 1606. By reason of the discussion in chapter 3, I am able to conclude that Antonio Possevino was expelled, along with his fellow Jesuits, from Venetian territory in 1606. He thereupon moved to Ferrara, a location also situated in the Papal States, not far from Bologna.

83 Fulgentio Tomaselli wrote the La mentite Filoteane, overo Invettiva di Giovanni Filoteo d’asti contra la Republica Serenissima di Venetia confutata, as a reply to the Nuova Risposta, in 1607 and printed in Padua.
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I rely on Bouwsma, who attributes the authorship of the *Nuova Risposta* to Antonio Possevino, albeit it is written under the pseudonym of Giovanni di Asti.\(^{85}\) I argue, however, that the pseudonym bears connection to Antonio Possevino himself, inasmuch as Asti, in the Piemonte region, was the birthplace of Antonio’s father, and Giovanni was the name of his brother.\(^{86}\) What’s more, in the opening lines of the *Nuova Risposta* I note the words: “the Vicar of Christ […], to whom I am obligated to give my blood and my own life,”\(^{87}\) which is, according to my suggestion, a probable reference to the fourth vow of obedience to the Pope, taken by the members of the Society of Jesus. Moreover, Bouwsma attributes the authorship of another text to Possevino, the *Risposta all’aviso, mandato fuori dal Sig. Antonio Quirino senator Veneto, circa le ragioni che hanno mosso la Santità di Paolo V pontefice a publicare l’interdetto sopra tutto il dominio venetiano*,\(^{88}\) printed in Bologna in 1607. This text was also written during the interdict crisis, this time though, under the pseudonym of Teodoro Eugenio di Famagosta.

Additionally, Possevino, in his correspondence, worked out ciphers as he kept dialogue with the Spanish provinces whilst carrying out his office as secretary to the Society of Jesus.\(^{89}\) John Patrick Donnelly, further, notifies that Possevino, in 1575, published a book under the name of Lorenzo Gambara.\(^{90}\) By virtue of these accounts I contend that the *Nuova Risposta* is written by Antonio Possevino, who was accustomed to write under pseudonyms, hence I consider Giovanni d’Asti to be a *nom de plume*.

As far as the dating of the text is concerned, there is no obvious reason, as far as I recon, to suspect that the *Nuova Risposta* was written at a later date than given in the cover page, in other words in 1606. Accordingly, I rely on Bouwsma, who inserts the *Nuova Risposta* in the canon of texts written during the interdict crisis of 1606–1607.\(^{91}\) As follows, I will treat the content of the *Nuova Risposta* as mirroring its time and not as a product, written in retrospect of the interdict crisis. In the next section, I will present some biographical facts of Antonio Possevino, which will be useful for the analysis of the *Nuova Risposta*.

### 4.2. Antonio Possevino

In this section I will account for details, which have the purpose of enhancing the picture of Antonio Possevino, the author of the *Nuova Risposta*. I will outline some of his other works

---


\(^{86}\) Marc Fumaroli, *L’âge de l’éloquence*, p. 163.

\(^{87}\) *Nuova Risposta*, Appendix, p. 69: “Vicario di Christo […], per il qual son obbligato a dare il sangue, e la propria vita.”


\(^{89}\) Donnelly, “Antonio Possevino: From Secretary to Papal Legate,” p. 325.

\(^{90}\) The “real” Lorenzo Gambara was an early modern poet. Ibid, p. 327.

\(^{91}\) Bouwsma, *A Usable Past*, p. 106.
and account for his whereabouts. Conclusively I will mention his time in Padua and Venice, which is connected to the prelude of the interdict crisis and the birth of the *Nuova Risposta*.

The *Nuova Risposta* was written, as stated above, in 1606 by the 73-year-old Antonio Possevino, former apostolic nuncio to Sweden, Poland and Russia, priest of the Catholic Church and a member of the Society of Jesus. Before he engaged himself in the task of defending the pro-Papal position during the interdict crisis, he published the three-volume work *l’Apparatus Sacer ad scriptores Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (1603–1606) that “is a compendium of the lives and views of more than 8,000 ancient and modern authors on ecclesiastical subjects.”

Notwithstanding the fact that Possevino had turned 73 years old when the publication of the *Appartus Sacer* came about, he did not seem to show any major signs of wear and tear as he took on such an enormous task of writing the compendium. Possevino was far from being a novice at writing books and the historian John Patrick Donnelly estimates that he wrote “more than forty books.” Furthermore, when Pope Pius V (1566-1572) instigated his plan of a crusade against the Turks, which culminated in the battle of Lepanto in 1571, he used the philosophic discussion of a just war presented by Possevino in his writing *Il Soldato Cristiano*, in order to encourage the participants of his composed *Holy League*.

Born in 1533 in the town of Mantua, that was ruled by the powerful family of Gonzaga, into a family of goldsmiths that had “changed their name from Ca(g)liani” to Possevino. There, in Mantua, he rose to a prestigious level by the Gonzaga family and “served as tutor to two young Gonzaga princes, Francesco and Gianvincenzo, who later became cardinals.”

One thing that should not be left unmentioned is the probable Jewish ancestry of Antonio Possevino. In 1986 the American Jesuit John Patrick Donnelly published an article on Possevino, which serves as the foundation for discussion of the ancestry of Possevino by the historian Robert Maryks. Maryks says that Possevino himself, after his appointment as secretary to the Society of Jesus in 1573 “was actively engaged in the *Casa dei Catecumeni*,” and that the bull *Vicus eius nos*, by Pope Gregory XIII (1572-1585) in 1577, legalised a way to illuminate Jews, whereby Jews were herded “forcefully into a church” and preached to.

In 1559, on September 30, Possevino entered the Society of Jesus after having been preached to by Benedetto Palmio and shortly afterwards Possevino was sent to France and Aquitaine to accompany Everard Mercurian, who was appointed to visit the Jesuit provinces. In 1573

97 Ibid, p. 62.
99 Ibid, p. 120.
Everard Mercurian, as newly elected superior general of the Jesuit Order, chose Possevino, in the words of Maryks “most probably a closet converso,” to become secretary to the Society of Jesus, which was “basically the general’s chief of staff.” According to Donnelly, Possevino complained about the heavy work load of his new office, as the piles of letters led Possevino to speak of “wading into a sea.” Much effort was devoted, as far as Possevino was concerned, to comment on the controversies between anti- and pro-converso parties within the Jesuit Order.

Possevino was, in addition to his occupation in writing, very much an active clerk and travelled far in the service of the Catholic Church, in order to help promote Papal affairs. During his stay in Piemonte, on the Italian peninsula, Possevino distributed about a hundred copies the *Parvus catechismus* (1556), written by the Dutch Jesuit Peter Canisius. This was in accordance with what the Council of Trent had decreed: “the catechism was to be the main instrument for the religious education of the faithful.” The distribution of catechisms was part of the strategy of Possevino, in order for Christians to resign from the exposure of heterodox ideas and instead stick to ‘good books’. Contents of ‘good books’ were, however, not attainable to the clear majority. Possevino would, therefore, at times, fasten placards which summarized the main articles of faith to walls of “churches, hospitals and inns,” for everyone to take notice of them. Moreover, the historian Elena Bonora tells us that illiterate farmers were taught the basics of Christian doctrines through prayers and songs that were “recited choirlike during the labour on the field, thus […] during the second half of the sixteenth-century the teaching of children and adults were carried out through nursery rhymes and little melodies.”

In September of 1577 Possevino was appointed legate to the king Johan III (1537-1592) of Sweden by Pope Gregory XIII. During his stay in Sweden, that, with some interruption, lasted between 1577 and 1580, Possevino was granted audiences with the king, to whom he discusses those conditions that the king demanded, in order to reunite his realm with the Catholic Church. The king stressed Communion under both species, the liturgy in the Swedish vernacular and a permission for married clergy. Possevino headed back to Rome where Pope Gregory arranged for a congregation of cardinals to discuss and evaluate the kings demands with the result that the cardinals rejected to grant Johan any concessions, inasmuch as the king’s demands were contrary to the decisions made at the Council of Trent.

---
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104 Elena Bonora, *La Controriforma*, p. 86.
106 Ibid, p. 53.
In 1579, the Pope appointed Possevino vicar apostolic for “all Scandinavia, the Baltic lands, Russia, and Hungary, wherever there were no Catholic bishops.” For another seven years Possevino would carry out his office as papal legate with great zeal. During these years, he became involved, as mediator, in the complex peace negotiations between Tsar Ivan IV of Russia and the Polish Monarch Stefan Báthory. Meanwhile Possevino staunchly tried to convince the Tsar to join the Pope’s alliance to fight the Turks, he also founded five Jesuit seminaries located in Vilnius in Lithuania, Dorpat in Estonia, Braunsberg in Poland, Olmütz in Moravia; and Klausenburg in Transylvania.

In 1587, after the death of Pope Gregory XIII, Possevino’s diplomatic service was terminated by Claudio Aquaviva (1543–1615), the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, and Possevino was transferred to Padua to teach at the Jesuit College. In Padua Possevino experienced the rivalry between the University of Padua and the Jesuit College, the former was subject to the Republic of Venice, whereas the latter was subject to the Pope. In 1591 the tensions reached such a point that “the senate forbade the Jesuits to teach any other than their own students.” The tensions were composted of different views on the curricula; the University of Padua encouraged an atmosphere of religious tolerance, as far as studies in jurisprudence, medicine and philosophy were concerned, and many of its students were non-Catholics. The Jesuit college, on the other hand, was in accordance with Possevino’s ideals of how philosophers needed to avoid “pestilential errors of morality of the soul or the like,” and therefore, according to Possevino, a philosopher must first be a good theologian.

In 1601 Possevino moved to the Jesuit college of Santa Lucia, near Venice, where he, apart from teaching, proceeded with the task of writing the second part of the Biblioteca Selecta. This work had been published in 1593 with a “warm prefatory letter from Pope Clement VIII.” In the Biblioteca Selecta, Possevino condemned the French philosopher Jean Bodin, the Florentine politician Niccolò Macchiavelli and the Dutch philologer Erasmus of Rotterdam. Writings of the latter Possevino called the “source of the anti-trinitarianism […] in the east European countries.” The second part of the Biblioteca Selecta was called Apparatus Sacer, licensed in 1602, which the historian Luigi Balsamo describes as “a reference book designed for easy consultation by every category of reader and as particularly useful in schools at every level.
In Venice Possevino continued to carry out his missionary zeal and thus instructed Venetian booksellers in how to censure words in heterodox books. A strenuous task no doubt, since the control of the printing presses was difficult to master, due to the fact that innovated technology “multiplied and disseminated written texts to an immeasurable extent.” One should keep in mind that Venice housed one of the world’s most prominent printing industries, introduced in the fifteenth-century by Aldo Manuzio (1449-1515). Luigi Balsamo tells us that “the protests of booksellers and publishers […] grew so vehement that the Venetian government authorities were compelled to intervene forcefully in support of their claims.”

At the dawn of the interdict crisis in 1606 the Jesuits were compelled to leave Venetian territory. Possevino himself withdrew to the Papal State of Ferrara, where he set out to defend the interdict placed on Venice. In 1606 he published the Nuova Risposta as an answer to a tract written by Giovanni Marsilio, who sought to vindicate the rejection of the interdict, officially made by the Serenissima. In 1611 Possevino passed away after a life lived as the promoter of the Counter Reformation par excellence. I will, in the next section, focus my attention away from the author of the Nuova Risposta to its recipient.

4.3. The Recipient

The discourse of the Nuova Risposta circles around the issue of Papal versus Venetian superiority in temporal matters and it is likely that the recipient of the text, in a broader sense, is anyone who denounces Papal claim to superiority in temporal matters on any given territory of Catholic faith. In a narrower sense, however, it is obvious that Possevino directs his arguments to an addressee in particular, since Possevino’s reply concerns “a Letter of an Unknown Theologian, Written to a Priest, His Friend.” Accordingly, Possevino mentions the “unknown theologian” on several occasions in a tone, which pervades with polemics and explicit hostility. The “unknown theologian” is, according to the Nuova Risposta’s opening lines, “someone, who addresses himself as Theologian, but rather [he is a] Diabologian, in other words [an] apostate of the true Theology [hence] full of errors, manifestly schismatic and heretic.”

Possevino begins his discussion in the prologue of the Nuova Risposta by stating: “I say, oh unknown theologian, whoever you are […] you show that you have little practice and knowledge of the civil and canonical laws, of the holy fathers, of the holy Theology and of the
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119 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 69: “Uno, il quale s’intitola Theologo, più tosto Diabologo, ò vero Apostata dalla vera Theologia pena di errori manifestamente schismatici, & heretici.”
same divine scripture.” Further on, in the Nuova Riposta, Possevino, who supports his arguments from a large amount of quotes taken from a great diversity of theologians, Popes, and emperors through the ages, discusses the impact of Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) on the understanding of the theology of the Catholic Church. According to Possevino, this is also what the “unknown theologian” sets out to do, but much to the displeasure of Possevino, who replies: “I don’t believe you, I say and confess that […] you are a huge ignorant, in other words, full of immense wickedness, writing and effecting similar consequences, which prove in you to be severely perverted false logic, and false theology; that if you should have the true theology and true Spirit of a good Catholic you would talk about the immunity of prelates in the same fashion as the angelic Doctor St. Thomas does.”

In portraying its opponent, the Nuova Risposta makes no effort in trying to avoid tendentious arguments, which corresponds to Bouwsma’s assertion of many writings during the interdict crisis of 1606-1607 as “tedious and repetitious.” Possevino’s criticism of the “unknown theologian” does not stop at the illustration of the misinterpretation of the meaning of Christian doctrines, but reaches the point whereby Possevino questions if his opponent is educated enough. The following examples serves to illustrate the questioning of the explicit recipient’s knowledge in languages: “if you understand Latin, you can see that the emperor, in profane matters, is subject to the judgment of the Pope,” and “if you do not understand the Greek, look at the Latin version.” Additionally, the Nuova Risposta expresses that “conclusively it would serve you better to study and to graduate once more, since you prove that you know too little.”

The Nuova Risposta polemicizes as it discusses the ignorance of its opponent, inasmuch as it is hard to believe that a baccalaureus in theology, in Renaissance Italy, would have passed graduation without being familiar with the Greek language, let alone the Latin language. I argue that the aim of the quoted passages above is to cast the “unknown theologian” in a bad light,
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120 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 69: “Dico dunque, ò Theologo incognito, qualunque tu sii […] che poca pratica, & cognizione mostrì di havere delle leggi civili, & canoniche, de santi padri, della sacra Theologia, & della stessa scrittura divina.”

121 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 82: “Non ti credo, dico et confesso che […] sei un grande ignorante, overo pieno di grandissima malignità scrivendo et facendo simili conseguenze, le quali dimostrano in te essere falsa logica, et falsa theologia et molta carnalità; che se havesti la vera theologia et vero Spirito di buon Catholico parlaresti dell’immunità ecclesiastica come ne parla l’angelico Dottor S. Thomaso.”

122 Bouwsma, A Usable Past, p. 97.

123 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 76: “Se tu intendi il latino, puoi vedere, che l’imperatore è sogetto in queste cose mondane al giudizio del Papa.”

124 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 96: ”Se non intendi il greco vedi la versione latina.”

125 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 94: ”In somma faresti meglio studiare et addottarti di nuovo perché mostri di saper molto poco.”
accordingly it associates its opponent with the “theologians in Geneva,”126 and with “Luther, Calvin, Jan Hus […] and all the shameless riffraff of heretics, apostasies and schismatics.”127

Let’s draw our attention to the polemical tone of the author of the Nuova Risposta against its explicit recipient. The question, if the “unknown theologian” is as unknown to Possevino as he initially claims, is justified. I suggest that, by virtue of the allusions in text, the Nuova Risposta reveals more knowledge of the identity of the “unknown theologian” than it initially states. The first clue is again given in the title, since the Nuova Risposta, by Possevino, refers to a letter Written to a Priest, His Friend. The priest in question is obviously Roberto Bellarmine, cardinal and a member of the Society of Jesus, which is apparent in the opening lines of the Nuova Risposta, where the purpose of writing the text is presented for:

It would not have been necessary that the lord Cardinal Bellarmine should lower himself to respond to the letter of one who addresses himself as Theologian, but rather [he is a] Diabologan, in other words [an] apostate of the true Theology [hence] full of errors, manifestly schismatic and heretic. But since we are placed and constituted in similar days, as [in the days of] St. Paul [who] says men are lovers of themselves, and the mentioned letter could cause more damage in the hearts of the bad Christians and [in the hearts of] the simple-minded. […] For this reason, it also concerns me, [though] inferior to the mentioned Cardinal, [I am] driven by the zeal to the honour of God and irritated by the injustice done to the Vicar of Christ, our redeemer, to whom I am obligated to give my blood and my own life. I wanted, as much as I could, to make efforts to avenge it with these writings, although the fire should be the appropriate punishment for such injustice and sacrilege. I will not dwell to reply the mentioned letter bit by bit […] in the fashion of the response of this Cardinal.128

The quote states that Possevino wanted “to make efforts in order to avenge [the injustice] with these writings.” The Italian text reads con questi scritti, which I don’t necessary believe to entail another written defence by Possevino. The passage could, however, refer to the Risposta all’aviso that I mentioned earlier, but this seems less likely because this text is written under another pseudonym, i.e. Teodoro Eugenio di Famagosta, and it was published the year after the publication of the Nuova Risposta. As follows, I consider it likely to believe that “these
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128 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 69: “Non sarebbe stato necessario, che il Signore Cardinale Bellarmino si fusse abbassato, a rispondere alla lettera di uno, il quale s’intitola Theologo, più tosto Diabologo, ò vero Apostata dalla vera Theologia pena di errori manifestamente schismatici, & heretici. Ma poi che siamo posti, & costituiti in simili giorni, nei quali, come dice San Paolo[128] sunt homines sui ipsius amantes, et la detta lettera potrebbe fare più colpo nei cuori dei mali Christiani, & de’ semplici, di quello, che dovrebbe di ragione seguire: per questo ancor’io, avvenga che inferiore al detto Cardinale, spinto dal zelo dell’honore di Dio, & irritato dalla ingiuria fatta al Vicario di Christo nostro Redentore, per il qual son obbligato a dare il sangue, e la propria vita, hò voluto, quanto potrò, forzarmi, di vendicarla con questi scritti, se bene il fuoco sarebbe la condegna pena di cattale ingiuria, & sacrilego; non dilungandomi però dalla traccia, & modo, di rispondere a parte per parte di essa lettera […], che stanno nella risposta di esso Cardinale.”
writings,” in the above-mentioned quote, refer to the written amount of text that compromises the Nuova Risposta.

The response by Cardinal Bellarmine, which Possevino, in the above-mentioned quote, refers to is probably the Risposta alla difesa delle otto propositioni di Giovann Marsilio Napolitano (Rome, 1606), written as a refutation of the Difesa di Giovanni Marsilio a favore della risposta dell’otto propositioni (Venice, 1606) and, possibly, the Risposta d’un dottore in theologia (Venice, 1606). It seems plausible to me that the title Nuova Risposta by Possevino is the continuation of the Risposta by Bellarmine.

I have already mentioned that Thomas Aquinas was appreciated by the “unknown theologian.” Moreover, in the second chapter of the Nuova Risposta there is a remark concerning another appreciated theologian by the “unknown theologian,” the Franciscan Professor at the University of Salamanca, Alfonso de Costo Navarro (1495–1558), who defended the Catholic Church against Lutherans, using Criminal law as his main weapon. The Nuova Risposta, furthermore, says that Navarro is “much appreciated by you, more taught than you, whom the Holy Spirit assisted. In you the holy spirit of flesh and flattery assists.” I note the dichotomy between the Holy Spirit and the “holy spirit of flesh,” as a means to polemicize. It may of course be a remark of a life lived in excesses by the “unknown theologian,” but such speculation would, I argue, push the quote too far, since I do not have access to sources, that can verify or deny such a speculation.

A further interesting detail is the mentioning of yet another a Spaniard, who is appreciated by the “unknown theologian.” Additionally, the Nuova Risposta puts it that “it surprises me […] that you, in the state of Venetians, to such a large extent take advantage of the authority of a Spaniard like Couarruuias.” Accordingly, the Nuova Risposta observes the peculiar use by the “unknown theologian” of the authority of Spanish theologians to argue in favour of a Venetian cause against the Pope, since the Apostolic See and the Habsburg Empire were allied at this period of time.

I propose that the Nuova Risposta points to a Spaniard as his narrow recipient, which becomes more convincing when, in the latter part of the Nuova Risposta, it is said: “you know your blindness, with which you go stumbling to the mezzogiorno.” The mezzogiorno is a common reference in the Italian language to the South of the Italian peninsula, and as it

130 According to Bouwsma this writing “was withdrawn from circulation after criticism.” Ibid, p. 395n273.
132 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 95: “Mi maraviglio che nello stato di Venetiani ti servi tanto dell’autorità d’uno spagnuolo come Couarruuias.”
134 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 93: “Conosci la tua cecità, con la quale vai a mezo giorno tentone.”
happened, this area of land was under Spanish dominion in the early seventeenth-century. Due to the facts that I have accounted for, I find it plausible to assume that the “unknown theologian” of the *Nuova Risposta* is Giovanni Marsilio, who was born in Naples, thus a Spaniard by birth.

Marsilio is, furthermore, explicitly mentioned, along with Sarpi, in the *Risposta all’aviso* by Possevino, and described as “nuovi alchimisti.” Marsilio was also, along with Sarpi, one of the leading advisers to the government of Venice. According to Bouwsma, Marsilio was a learnt theologian with a style “strikingly scholastic,” wherefore I argue that the remarks, in the *Nuova Risposta*, about the ignorance of Marsilio are belligerent statements, and therefore, according to me, not trustworthy. Additionally, Bouwsma elaborates on the two different styles of writing texts during the interdict crisis. The Roman discourse, according to Bouwsma, is systematic, rational and close to the scholastic dialectic fashion of displaying data from abstract thought as opposed to the Venetian discourse, which, according to Bouwsma, displays concrete data. Marsilio, however, do not fall into the Venetian category then, which could be explained by that fact that he was trained in the same school of theology as Bellarmine and Possevino, since Marsilio was a former member of the Society of Jesus.

I suggest that the fact that Marsilio was a former Jesuit could serve as an explanation of some of the harsh judgments of Possevino concerning Marsilio as an apostate. The fact that Marsilio had been a fellow Jesuit of Possevino and Bellarmine could, further on, explain why Possevino, in the title of the *Nuova Risposta*, says that the response regards a letter written to a priest, his friend. The reference to the “friend” in the title is, according to me, an allusion to the friend of Marsilio, rather than the friend of the author himself. Thus, I do not exclude that Possevino in one and the same writing can be both friendly in tone, a sort of *captatio benevolentiae*, yet in other passages unenthusiastic about his recipient. This tendency is likewise prevalent in the appraisal of the Republic of Venice, which appears in the conclusive chapter of the *Nuova Risposta*, which will be accounted for in section 5.5.

To fully disclose the impact of the thought of Giovanni Marsilio on the *Nuova Risposta*, I suggest that one would need to read the above-mentioned writings of Marsilio and of Roberto Bellarmine side by side with the *Nuova Risposta*. This is not, however, the purpose of this thesis, wherefore such a task won’t be accomplished within the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, I find a concern for the explicit recipient of the *Nuova Risposta* to be helpful in order to better grasp the arguments given in the text. Furthermore, after having dealt with the author as well as the recipient of the *Nuova Risposta* I will, in the next section, discuss its style and form.

---

4.4. Style and Form

The narrative point of view of the *Nuova Risposta* encompasses a first-person narrative, whereby the content of the text is presented. A new topic is often “opened up” by referring to the opinions of the “unknown theologian”, it thereafter usually seeks to refute the opponent’s position by using a wide range of theological sources, an approach, which I suggest is according to the method presented in the *Biblioteca selecta*. For Possevino it was important to manifest that the Catholic Church had kept its continuity from the primitive church, the Church Fathers, the medieval period and onward. Accordingly, he is eager to quote the “sacred theologians.” It is obvious though that Possevino gives himself the precedence of interpreting the quotes in the *Nuova Risposta*, thus I argue that Possevino’s interpretation is understood by himself to be in accordance with the interpretation of the Catholic Church.\(^\text{139}\)

Consequently, I contend that this mode of interpretation is considered by Possevino himself to be normative. A different interpretation than his, however, is regularly refuted. In the following manner, the *Nuova Risposta*, settles an argument regarding the question of whom it concerns to bless the pontiff: “tell me to whom it does concern to consecrate and bless the pontiff; the temporal prince or the spiritual? If you say the temporal prince, you are a great ignorant, because you never find this in the Old Testament nor in the New. […] If you say that it concerns the spiritual, you are telling the truth.”\(^\text{140}\) In this fashion, the bifurcated formula, “if you are not with me, then you are against me,” is often used in *Nuova Risposta* in order to complete disagreements, which the above-mentioned quote exemplifies.

The time aspect, moreover, of the *Nuova Risposta*, moves from present to past tense. The discussion is set in the present tense, but, since it is vital to Possevino to prove continuity with the Tradition of the Church, the presentation repeatedly moves backward, as far as the time aspect in the text is concerned. Interestingly enough, the *Nuova Risposta*, as it moves backward in time, appears not to draw from the *Vulgata Clementina*, whose third edition was published in 1598, while quoting from the New Testament. In the ingress Possevino discusses the topic of self-sufficient people of his time and uses a quote from 2 Timothy 3:2, to back up his words: “*sunt homines sui ipsius amantes,*” meaning “people *are* lovers of themselves.”\(^\text{141}\) The Vulgate, however, writes it: “*erunt homines seipsos amantes,*” meaning “people *will be* lovers of themselves.” Moreover, in the prologue, Possevino quotes from John 21:16: “*pasce oves meas.*”

---

\(^{139}\) Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 69.

\(^{140}\) Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 79: “*Dimmi dunque a cui tocca consecrare, & benedire il Pontefice, al principe laico, overo allo spirituale? Se dici al temporale & laico, sei un grande ignorante, perché mai non si trova questo nel testamento vecchio, ò nuovo […] Se dici, che tocca al principe spirituale, dici il vero.***

\(^{141}\) Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 69.
meaning “tend my sheep,”\textsuperscript{142} whereas the Vulgate reads “\textit{pasce agnos meos},” meaning “tend my lambs.”

It is interesting to note these semantic differences, but I suggest that it is of minor importance to the purpose of this thesis to discuss whether or not the arguments of the Nuova Risposta would have differed if Possevino had opted to quote from the Vulgata Clementina. For this reason, I won’t pursue such a discussion in this thesis. I hold that it is sufficient to have remarked on the fact that Possevino does not quote from the Vulgate, as far as the above-mentioned examples are concerned. I will now supply an outline of topics that the Nuova Risposta discusses. In this outline, I will not pursue a thematic discussion of the text, such a study will be done in the analysis. I will refer to the contents of each chapter of the text.

\textbf{4.5. Outline of Topics}

I have stated that the question of the twofold supremacy, in other words superior powers in temporal and spiritual matters of the Pope, is vital for the arguments given in the Nuova Risposta. As follows all other topics seems to be derived from this question. In this section I will briefly comment on different topics by referring to chapters. These divisions into chapters are thematic and vaguely indicated in the original printed text of the Nuova Risposta.

In the prologue, it is made clear that the author will prove his recipient that the Pope is superior in temporal and spiritual matters. In first chapter of the Nuova Risposta, Possevino refutes Marsilio’s statement of the regulations of the Catholic Church, the primacy of the Pope and the ecumenical Councils as human laws. In Possevino’s reply, he supports his arguments by quoting Saint Augustine. The second chapter, deal with the superiority of clergymen, thus, according to the Nuova Risposta their immunity before the Venetian law ought to be recognised. The third chapter, discusses Papal superiority in spiritual and temporal matters by referring to typologies and analogies of the Old Testament. This topic will be studied closer in section 5.3. in this thesis.

In the fourth chapter, the Nuova Risposta proves to Marsilio that the Emperor Justinian I (483–565) made regulations in favour of the Church, his regulations, according to the Nuova Riposta, sought to subdue heretics and not as Marsilio had stated, to minimise the power of the Church. The fifth chapter, discusses Emperor Constantine and his surrender of the Western Empire to the Papal States. This topic is closely studied in section 5.1. in this thesis.

Chapters six and seven addresses the harmony between the divine and the natural law, which, according to the Nuova Risposta is being violated by the Venetians. The Nuova Risposta says that the superior, in other words the Pope, should not be confused with the inferior and it would

\textsuperscript{142} Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 73.
be a shame if the head is a subject to its feet. Chapters nine and ten, elaborates on the question of the necessity for clergymen to pay tribute to Venice. This topic will be further discussed in section 5.4. in this thesis. Chapter eleven, states that God has not founded the temporal power, it is merely tolerated. Notwithstanding it was transferred, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, from Christ to Saint Peter, which is exemplified in how Saint Peter used the temporal power over Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5. The twelfth and thirteenth chapter, claims that the Pope is entitled to use his temporal power over Venice, thus if he wishes he could attack Venice by using physical arms. But, the *Nuova Risposta*, says that the Pope is merciful, just as Christ was merciful, therefore he withholds his physical weapons.

In chapters fourteen to eighteen, the *Nuova Risposta* debates the question of whether the immunity of clergymen is of divine or not. According to the tract of Marsilio the immunity of clergymen is of human origin and therefore not valid in accordance with Venetian law. The *Nuova Risposta*, however, states, in chapter sixteen, that the Pope is above the ecumenical councils. Nor has any emperor the authority to elect the successor of Saint Peter. In effect a superior, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, cannot be judged by an inferior. As follows, since the Pope is ranked above all councils and lay princes, he is entitled to decide for clergymen not to be judged by any lay tribunal.

In chapter nineteen, the *Nuova Risposta* argues that the divine law is not explicitly pronounced to its full by the evangelists. This topic is studied further in section 5.4. in this thesis. As is the topic of the dichotomy of Rome and Venice in chapters twenty and twenty-one, which will be studied in section 5.5 in this thesis. I will now move over to a closer study on the most important topics of the *Nuova Risposta*. 
Chapter 5: Analysis of the *Nuova Risposta*

In the first section of this chapter I will discuss if the central argument, in other words Papal superiority in spiritual and in temporal matters, of the *Nuova Risposta* is related to a historiographical framework, and if so what the basic assumptions in a such a historiographical framework consist of. In section 5.1. I will study the elaboration of the science of history in post-reformation Italy and the importance of Cesare Baronio for the development of the historiography of the Catholic Church. I will also add the *Nuova Risposta* into this discussion. Moreover, I will study in what manner the *Nuova Risposta* uses symbolic language to argue in favour of Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters, this will be done in sections 5.2., 5.3., and 5.4. In section 5.5., I will answer to my question of how *The Nuova Risposta* portrays the Republic of Venice. In section 5.6., I will summarise the results of this chapter.

5.1. History as a Framework for the Understanding of Doctrines

History as a science of examination became a much-appreciated discipline during the Renaissance. In 1530 Cardinal Pietro Bembo (1470–1547) was appointed to be the historiographer of the Republic of Venice, a duty which Paolo Paruta (1540–1598) eventually took over and passed on to Paolo Sarpi. The critical study of texts and its contexts, however, marked a new angle in how to study and write history and its founder can be said to have been Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457), whose philological method of criticism of sources was used and developed, at first in Florence, where Valla himself was a citizen, but then brought to Venice by the series uninterrupted dialogues between Renaissance scholars of Florence, for instance, Agnolo Poliziano (1454–1494) and Giovanni Pico Della Mirandola (1463–1494), and Venetian humanists such as Ermolao Barbaro (1454–1493), Domenico Grimani (1461–1523) and Aldo Manuzio.

According to the historiographical perspective of Paolo Sarpi the primitive church is depicted as perfect, which Sarpi contrasts by viewing history as a foe. Consequently, Sarpi argued for a conspicuous “discontinuity between his own age and antiquity.”\(^ {143}\) The progression and devolvement of Church institutions were to him a sign of decay and corruption, rather he considered “that the church ought to be identical and continuous with its primitive forms.”\(^ {144}\) In this respect Sarpi was very much consonant with the thought of Marsilio, who saw little tracks of the primitive church in the Catholic Church of his time, saying that “the original

\(^{143}\) Bouwsma, *A Usable Past*, p. 252.

\(^{144}\) Ibid, p. 252.
leaders of the church […] had been ‘poor and ignorant fishermen’ who never said, ‘Embrace our preaching […] else we will declare you excommunicated and abominable.’  
Moreover, on expressing doubt “whether Charlesmagne had actually received his imperial title from the pope,”146 Cardinal Bellarmine called Marsilio a heretic in history. Marsilio replied that there could not be such a thing as heresy in history “which is profane and not from Scripture.”147 Marsilio certainly manifested that, from a Venetian point of view, history functions on its own premises, whereas I find that in the thought of Possevino history and dogma are closely correlated, to the point of emphasising a historiography of the salvation of mankind, thus promoting dogma.

For the Venetian pamphleteers the primitive church and the Tradition of the Church were not looked upon as entities in consistence. In Rome, Cardinal Cesare Baronio (1538–1607), a member of the Order of Oratory of Saint Philip Neri, took on the task of writing a history of the Church, which argued for a contrary opinion to that of the Venetian pamphleteers. In 1588 the Annales Ecclesiastici was first published, which contained the history of the Catholic Church a Christo nato ad annum 1198, in other words, from the birth of Jesus Christ to the election, in 1198, of Pope Innocent III (1198–1216), who, at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, strengthened the centralisation of the Church. The voluminous piece of work by Baronio became one of the Counter Reformation’s more prominent writings of ecclesiastical history and “its thesis is the invulnerability of the visible church, despite its operating in the world, to historical change.”148

The Nuova Risposta, I argue, affirms the historiography of Baronio, in that progression of time is acknowledged, but change, in the Church, is not; the Church is semper eadem, always the same. The Nuova Risposta, further on, judges “the present things”, in other words the interdict crisis, as “dealing with histories.”149 I consider this remark, in the Nuova Risposta, to be an apropos opinion, as two diverse historiographies, that of Possevino and that of Marsilio, seeks to gain precedence. Consequently, the accusation of novelty was what both Rome and Venice endeavoured to avoid.

What represents the view of history in the Nuova Risposta is, according to me, that history bears no moment when it can be said to have reached a perfect state, on the contrary, history is per definition progression, not relativistic though, considering the notion held by the Nuova Risposta that the Holy Scriptures and the Tradition of the Catholic Church carry eternal truths and is unchangeable. The Nuova Risposta, however, argues that the Gospels do not explicitly

145 Bouwsma, Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty, p. 466.
146 Ibid, p. 471.
147 Ibid, p. 471.
148 Bouwsma, A Usable Past, p. 300; O’Malley, Trent, p. 274.
149 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 90: “Questa parte presente tratta d’istorie.”
pronounce the entire message of God, thence the *Nuova Risposta* refers to the Gospel of John 20:30: “Jesus did many things and other signs, which are not written in this book.” Consequently, according to me, the *Nuova Riposta* holds that the Tradition of the Church compromises and complements the Holy Scriptures.

Regarding the debated question during the Renaissance on whether the document of the Donation of Constantine, in which the emperor hands over his Western Empire and the city of Rome to Pope Sylvester I, was a forgery or not is sparsely commented on in the *Nuova Riposta*. Nevertheless, I consider this debate to be important for the discussions adduced in the text.

In 1590 the superior of the Oratorians in Naples, Antonio Talpa (1536–1624), asked Cesare Baronio to withdraw from his position and rather defend the authenticity of the *Donatio Constantini*. The authenticity of the document of the donation was disputed by Lorenzo Valla as being written in the eight-century. The “discovery” of Valla caused dismay of such theologians as Agostino Steuco (1497–1548), who might have considered the *Donatio Constantini* to be the determinant piece of evidence that proved the Papal States to be legitimately in temporal charge of former territory of the Roman Empire. Steuco, a librarian of the Vatican library and a humanist, wrote a refutation of Valla’s textual criticism in 1547, whereby he claimed Valla, who had come to his conclusion by studying a Latin manuscript, to be ignorant of the fact that the *Donatio Constantini* was not a document written in Latin, but in Greek. Steuco sought to prove that the manuscript, Balsamon’s Greek text, which he himself had studied, did not contain passages, that Valla had studied in his Latin manuscript.151

The debate did not, however, stop at the conclusions provided by Steuco, since Baronio was not convinced by Steuco’s reference to the Balsamon text, which Baronio repudiated as an interpolation “produced with the intention of discrediting the divine origin of the temporal power of the Pope and of proving the antiquity of the See of Constantinople over that of the Roman See.”152 Despite the request of his superior, Baronio did not rethink his position regarding his consideration of the *Donatio Constantini* as a document not produced by Constantine. In 1592 Baronio published the third volume of the *Annales Ecclesiastici*, which contained his ideas about the *donatio* document.

According to Baronio, the inadequateness of the *donatio* document did not, however, yield to the rejection of the temporal power of the Pope. On the contrary, the claim of the Catholic Church to *potestas in temporalibus* is affirmed, according Baronio, in the Holy Scriptures, which proves that these privileges were given to the Roman Pontiff by Christ himself. By

---

150 *Nuova Risposta*, Appendix, p. 96: “Multa quidem, & alia signa fecit Iesus, quae non sunt scripta in libro hoc.”

151 Stefania Tutino, “For the Sake of the Truth of History and of the Catholic Doctrines”: History, Documents, and Dogma in Cesare Baronio’s *Annales Ecclesiastici,* ” p. 142.

accepting that the privileges contained the twofold supremacy, in other words powers in spiritual as well as in temporal matters, the *Donatio Constantini* was considered by Baronio as superfluous.\textsuperscript{153}

When the interdict crisis of 1606–1607 was in force the “official” view on whether the donation of Constantine was a forgery or not, was still debated. This prompted Pope Paul V to consult Cardinal Bellarmine, who personally agreed with Baronio’s conclusion regarding the donation as “not necessary for the Roman Church. In fact, […] we have much more clear and better documented donations, i.e. Pippin’s, Charlemagne’s, and others.”\textsuperscript{154} Bellarmine, moreover, who, according to Stefania Tutino, did not agree with Baronio’s opinion that “the Pope did not need the emperors’ donation of something that was donated to them by Christ,”\textsuperscript{155} defended Baronio’s passages in front of the Pope, who presented his misgivings about the accuracy of the position introduced in the *Annales*, regarding the donation of Constantine. After the colloquy of Paul V and Cardinal Bellarmine, the latter wrote to Baronio in reassurances that the Pope “was not displeased.”\textsuperscript{156}

The *Nuova Risposta*, furthermore, seems to affirm the viewpoint of Baronio regarding the donation of Constantine as redundant, which is given in its prologue: “Perhaps you would like, […], to say, that […] the Pope does not have the power from God directly: but the Papal States from Constantine; to this I reply […] that the Pope have his power directly from God, even without the donation of Constantine.”\textsuperscript{157} Notwithstanding the loose weight put on the donation by the *Nuova Risposta*, it appears as if Possevino was unwilling to take a firm stand on the matter, since the Pope all the while considered the debate of the donation document to be tentative.

In order to avoid proving Constantine as unimportant in the debate of Papa’s temporal power, the *Nuova Risposta* brings forward two other documents *Decretiv* and *De Electione*,\textsuperscript{158} which I argue function as equilibria, to prove that Constantine left his Western Empire in the hands of the Roman Pontiff. The *Nuova Risposta* says that “in these [writings] Constantine admits that the Pope is greater than him and he confesses that he is obligated in honour of Saint Peter to renounce the city of Rome with the entire Western Empire as well as the supreme authority, not as [an excess] of goodwill, […] but because he actually said that he was obligated to act in this

\begin{footnotes}
153 Stefano Zen, “Cesare Baronio sulla Donazione di Costantino tra critica storica e autocensura (1590-1607),” p. 216.
154 Tutino, “For the Sake of the Truth of History and of the Catholic Doctrines,” p. 149.
155 Ibid, p. 149.
156 Ibid, p. 150.
157 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 70: “Forse vorrai […], con dire, che […] il Papa non ha la potestà da Dio immediatamente: ma da Constantino nell’ stati della Chiesa; al che ti rispondo […] che il Papa ha la potestà sua immediata da Dio, etiandio senza la donatione di Constantino.”
158 These texts seem to have been produced during the reign of Constantine. Unfortunately, the *Nuova Risposta* does not supply with further comments on these two texts. Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 82.
\end{footnotes}
manner.” I contend, that it is in order to justify the importance of Constantine in the yet undecided debate of the authority of the donatio document that the Nuova Risposta quotes other documents.

Conclusively, I am able to observe the similarity between the views of Baronio and Possevino as far as historiography is concerned. Both consider the Church to be semper eadem, thus unaffected by the progression of time and for both men the epistemological conviction of the truth of Catholic dogma is the very condition for approaching history. When discussing the Donatio Constantini I noticed that Possevino was willing to concede to the considerations of Baronio, but with a slight modification as the Nuova Risposta does not wish to totally downplay the importance of Emperor Constantine.

Possevino’s addition do not contradict Baronio, on the contrary, he merely adduces that Constantine transferred the Western Empire to the Pope. The authority of the Pope in temporal matters, according to the Nuova Risposta, is not, however, dependant on the donation of Constantine. Consequently, I suggest that the historiographical presentation of the Annales Ecclesiastici of the temporal power of the Roman Pontiff as transferred from Christ, thus a constitute part of the primacy of Saint Peter, helps to form the framework, in which the Nuova Risposta operates in order refute its counterpart. In the next section, moreover, I will focus my attention to the elaboration of the relationship between the body and the soul, as presented by the Nuova Risposta.

5.2. The Theme of the Relationship between Body and Soul

In this section, I will examine how the Nuova Risposta presents the symbolic relationship between body and soul. A concept relevant for our examination in this section is the ius naturale, in other words, the natural law. According to the tradition of Thomas Aquinas the ius naturale is often identified with the ‘divine natural law’, which refers to “the guiding information of God’s design and intentions implanted in men by God himself.” The highest good, according to Aquinas, is the will and the most praiseworthy of all other moral virtues is to resign the will for the sake of God, hence, man, according to Aquinas, is able to act accordantly to God’s intentions as we know them by virtue of the Holy Scriptures and by virtue of the divine natural law. The model for such praiseworthy obedience was Christ himself.

---

159 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 82: "In quelli Constantino riconosce il Papa maggiore de se et si confessa obbligato a rinunciarli per honore di San Pietro la città di Roma con tutto l’imperio di Occidente et la autorità suprema, non per […] eccesso di benignità, ma perché veramente cosi diceva essere obligated di fare."
160 Kainulainen, Paolo Sarpi, p. 231.
who, according to Aquinas, “obeyed out of charity,”\textsuperscript{162} which was an act of will, hence, not forced upon him.

Paolo Sarpi, the Venetian adviser to the government of the Republic of Venice, conceded to the thought of Aquinas, but, in addition, thought it crucial to affirm obedience to temporal monarchs, who Sarpi identified as “executors of God’s will.”\textsuperscript{163} Preachers and confessors, however, caused Sarpi’s distress and he believed them to be “a threat to civic harmony.”\textsuperscript{164} In reply to such appraisal of temporal monarchs – especially those of Venice – the \textit{Nuova Risposta} simply refers to Acts 5:29 “It is more praiseworthy to serve God, than men.”\textsuperscript{165} The \textit{Nuova Risposta}, I argue, is agnate with the thought of Thomas Aquinas, yet unprovided with the addition of Sarpi regarding the indispensable obedience to mere temporal monarchs.

Furthermore, the soul, according to the \textit{Nuova Risposta}, alludes to the spiritual realm, thus it is the soul that safeguards man’s adherence to God’s intentions, and deprived of this, man is unable to act according to the divine natural law. The \textit{Nuova Risposta} defines the soul, as do Aristotle and Aquinas, as the form of the body. It, moreover, concedes to the image presented by Saint Augustine of the soul as the armour of the body. The soul, according to the \textit{Nuova Risposta}, is its armour, which governs the body. Consequently, when discussing the hierarchical structure of power, it comes as no surprise that the \textit{Nuova Risposta} identifies the soul with the spiritual power and the body, which is governed by the soul, with the temporal power.

While approaching the relationship between body and soul, the \textit{Nuova Risposta}, however, carefully avoids a dichotomous understanding, rather the soul ought to be acknowledged as “a part of the whole,”\textsuperscript{166} as opposed to the notion of body and soul, as operating isolated from each other. Christ, the \textit{Nuova Risposta} says, was in command of the twofold supremacy, he had powers over the soldiers at Golgotha; both their bodies, which alludes to temporal power, and their souls, which alludes to spiritual power. Likewise, Saint Peter was in charge, not only of the spiritual power, but also of the temporal power, which was granted to him by Christ. The \textit{Nuova Risposta} refers to Acts 5:1–11 (the story of Ananias and Sapphira), as relating to the temporal power of Saint Peter, and rhetorically asks: “was it bodily or merely spiritual? I consider that he [Ananias] was dead to the body.”\textsuperscript{167}

The \textit{Nuova Risposta} obviously elaborates on the structure of hierarchy while presenting the discourse of the relationship between body and soul. I suggest that the \textit{Nuova Risposta} depicts

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{162} Ibid, p. 233.
  \item \textsuperscript{163} Ibid, p. 233.
  \item \textsuperscript{164} Ibid, p. 234.
  \item \textsuperscript{165} \textit{Nuova Risposta}, Appendix, p. 97: “Obedire oportet magis Deo, quam hominibus.”
  \item \textsuperscript{166} \textit{Nuova Risposta}, Appendix, p. 71: “Partem pro toto.”
  \item \textsuperscript{167} \textit{Nuova Risposta}, Appendix, p. 87: “Fu corporale, o mera spirituale? Io ritrovo che fu morte corporale.”
\end{itemize}
all temporal powers as bodies, who cannot function unless they are governed by the soul, which alludes to the spiritual power of the successor of Saint Peter. Since, moreover, the Pope, through the authority of Christ, oversees both temporal and spiritual powers, he is to be considered supreme head. The Pope governs himself, because his office consists of both body and soul and, by virtue of the twofold supremacy, ought to govern all others, who only consists of bodies. I will in the next section study the use of typologies and analogies of the Old Testament, as presented by the *Nuova Risposta*.

### 5.3. Typologies and Analogies of the Old Testament

The theme that I will analyse in this section is the use, in order for the *Nuova Risposta* to substantiate the division between Pope and doge, of typologies and analogies taken from the Old Testament.

In the ingress of the *Nuova Risposta* it is stated that: “the people placed in dignity and temporal state did follow the adulators and bad advisors to the imitation of Rehoboam rather than the good ones.”\(^\text{168}\) According to the Book of Kings 12:6–8 King Rehoboam “consulted the elders who had served his father Salomon […] but Rehoboam rejected the advice that the elders gave him and consulted the young,” eventually Israel rebelled against Rehoboam. I suggest that the use of the parable of Rehoboam is an allusion to the situation in Venice, whereby Doge Leonardo Donà had rejected the council of the elders, in other words *i vecchi*, the “party” that Possevino belonged to. Instead Donà favoured the council of the young, *i giovani*, which resulted in sentiments of anti-clericalism that caused the Society of Jesus to be expelled from Venetian territory.

Further on in the prologue, the figure of Melchizedek, king of Salem (Gen 14:18), is put forward, not as a *typos* of Jesus Christ, but as a figure of Saint Peter, thus implicitly, of his successor Pope Paul V. The *Nuova Risposta* says that “the victorious patriarch Abraham was blessed by Melchizedek, to whom he gave tithes and gifts, because the Pope does not need to have greater permanence than Melchizedek […] over the Doge of Venice to bless him, curse him and excommunicate him.”\(^\text{169}\) The purpose of putting forward the figure of Melchizedek is to contrast his office to that of Abraham. Abraham, although patriarch, is pictured as a temporal prince, who, in the presence of another king, humbled himself to subordination. I contend that the author depicts a difference that is hierarchically structured between the two kings, rather

\(^{168}\) Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 69: “Gli huomini posti in dignità, e stato temporale, non seguissero più tosto gli adulatori, e mali consiglieri ad imitazione di Roboamo\(^\text{168}\) che i buoni.”

\(^{169}\) Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 73: “Il patriarcha Abraamo vittorioso fu benedetto da Melchisadech, a cui offrse le decime, & doni, poiché non deve il Papa maggiore di Melchisadech, […] havere preminenza sopra il Doge di Venetia, & benedirlo, & maledirlo, & scommunicarlo.”
than that of two dichotomous entities, thus the contrast between Melchizedek and Abraham points forward to the contrast between the Pope and the doge of Venice, whereby the Pope, according to the *Nuova Ripsosta*, is hierarchically above the doge, by virtue of the authority granted to him by Christ.

In addition, I contend that there is reason, to question Bouwsma’s presentation of the supporters of Venice and protectors of Rome as “writing in different languages that perversely insist on using the same vocabulary.”\(^{170}\) It appears to me that the *Nuova Risposta* is not primarily anxious to prove the legitimacy of the spiritual powers, but rather that of the temporal authority of the Pope, and as such, the Pope, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, is hierarchically above any temporal prince. As follows, the *Nuova Risposta* touches upon the same topics that Marsilio and Sarpi do, in other words, the discourse whether or not the temporal power of the prince of Rome can claim superiority to other temporal princes. He can claim none, in the thought of Marsilio and Sarpi, but, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, he is entitled to claim such superiority and in return expect Venetian subordination.

I contend that the agitators during the interdict crisis of 1606–1607 could be said to have used the same “language.” Accordingly, the writings become means to prove authority and power at the expense of the opponent, but I argue, however, that there is little reason to believe that Possevino and Marsilio, for instance, were reciprocally unaware of the meaning and message of other, since Possevino, who had been a resident of Venice, was familiar with Venetian customs and their mythology. Marsilio, moreover, was a former Jesuit, therefore familiar, by formation, with the Roman discourse.

The ambition of proving the Pope’s superiority to any other temporal prince is, moreover, dealt with in the *Nuova Risposta*, in its third chapter, as it discusses the office of Moses. The account for the office of Moses is undoubtedly a reply to Marsilio’s position that Moses was a temporal prince and that Aaron was a spiritual leader. It seems as if Marsilio aimed to prove that Moses and Aaron had separated duties whereby Moses, analogously, is identified with the prince of Venice, and Aaron, according to Marsilio, symbolises the Pope.\(^{171}\) In its reply, the *Nuova Risposta* says that “the ceremonial precepts were given by God through Moses and not through Aaron, and Moses, not Aaron, talked with God and received the regulations by God regarding how to perform the offerings and the divine cult.”\(^{172}\) Moreover, the *Nuova Risposta* emphasises that there was no competition between the two, since Aaron “was there […] to

---


\(^{171}\) See chapter 2 "Myth of Venice" in this thesis, regarding the link, in the Venetians mythology, between Moses and Saint Mark, the patron saint of Venice.

\(^{172}\) Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 78: “I precetti cerimoniali furono dati da Dio per Mosè, & non per Aaron, & Mosè parlava con Dio, & riceveva le ordinazioni da Dio sopra la disposizione dei sacrifici, & culto divino, & non Aaron.”
support him […] and then the descendants of Aaron past on the entire priesthood, but not that Moses, after having consecrated Aaron, in his person, was deprived of such dignity.”

In addition, I suggest that it is valuable to keep in mind that according to the Myth of Venice it is Moses who is analogous to Saint Mark, who handed the Decalogue, the basis of Venetian justice, to Doge Gritti. Moreover, Marsilio sought to manifest the analogy of Moses and the prince of Venice, thus contrary to the position of Marsilio, the Nuova Risposta demonstrates the typology of Moses and Jesus Christ. Accordingly the Nuova Risposta says that “Moses was a figure of Christ in governing the Holy Church, and […] thereafter gave the power to Saint Peter […] and to his successors and with all this Christ kept him eternal priest, he did not lose the excellence of his power over the entire Church.” In the conclusive reply to Marsilio the Nuova Risposta refers to the duties of bishops and says that “I would like to know why the lay princes of today do not consecrate churches, chalices, altars, priest, bishops, Popes and Kings, which they could do, if Moses was merely a temporal prince.”

The topic of finding analogies in the Old Testament for Saint Peter was, moreover, not only debated in the Nuova Risposta, since Paolo Sarpi, in one of his discussions with Cardinal Bellarmine, found it hard to “understand how, so many years before there was a pope, he should have been spoken of in the book of Kings.”

As stated above the Venetian pamphleteer Marsilio found a figure of the prince of Venice in Moses, the Nuova Risposta, however, contrasts this view by identifying Josiah and Saul as temporal kings, “who wanted to interfere with the sacrificing and the spiritual jurisdiction, they were reprobated by God.”

The Nuova Risposta puts it that God tolerated authority to Saul and Nimrod, although they were bad princes, “otherwise the Turk would have the power from God.” Marsilio and Sarpi both held that the authority of a temporal prince was given directly by God, hence not by mediation. On the contrary, the Nuova Risposta considers the temporal power to be tolerated and introduced after the event of the Original sin (Genesis 1:1–3:24), as opposed to the spiritual

---

173 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 78: “vi fusse Aaron […] ad aiutarlo. […] & poi ne gli descendenti di Aaron passasse il sommo sacerdotio, ma non che Mosè dopo di havere consecrato Aaron, fusse privato di tale dignità nella persona sua.”

174 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 79: “Mosè fu figura di Christo nel governo della Chiesa Santa […] & poi diede la potestà a S. Pietro [...] a suoi successori, e con tutti ciò esso Christo ‘manet in aeternum sacerdos’, non perdette l’eccellenza della sua potestà sopra tutta la Chiesa.”

175 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 79: “Vorrei, sapere, perché hoggidì i principi laici non consacrano le chiese, i calici, gli altari, i sacerdoti, i vescovi, il Papa, & i Re, se lo possono fare, overo se Mosè era solo principe temporale.”


177 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 78: “I quali volessero mescolarsi nei sacrifici, & iurisdizione spirituale, furono reprobati da Dio.”

178 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 71: “Altrimente il Turco havrebbe la potestà da Dio.”
power, which is imbedded in the God’s creation. Appropriately, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, the ecclesiastical power is in one according to the divine law and not in multitude.\textsuperscript{179}

In addition, the *Nuova Risposta* says that Moses, this time a figure of Saint Peter, “was Christ’s vicar over the laity, and he was also that over the old of the temporal judges of the Hebrew people.”\textsuperscript{180} Apparently, this is another example in the *Nuova Risposta*, which serves to prove that the vicar of Christ’s temporal supreme position over any temporal jurisdiction ought to be recognised as unquestionable. As follows, not through the tribunals of other temporal princes, but the Pope, the *Nuova Risposta* argues, is entitled to act through his own tribunal, whilst judging his own family members accused of criminal acts. Just as Moses was head of the temporal judges of the Hebrew people, likewise is the Pope, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, head of the temporal judges of the Christian people, more precisely the clergy. What is more, the vicar of Christ, since the time of Saint Peter is no less supreme than Moses, on the contrary, the *Nuova Risposta* says that “the Pontificate of the new testament is more eminent than that of the old.”\textsuperscript{181}

By presenting typologies and analogies of the Old Testament the *Nuova Risposta* aims to demonstrate the supreme position of the Pope. Moses is presented as a *typos* of Christ, who passes his power to his successor. Moses, Aaron and Melchizedek are, moreover, depicted as figures of the Pope. I consider it plausible that the placement of the doge of Venice on equality with Abraham, who humbled himself to Melchizedek, along with Rehoboam, Josiah and Saul serves the purpose of proving a hierarchical order, that the *Nuova Risposta* argues in favour of, whereby the Pope is proven to be superior to the doge, since he also owned spiritual power. Thus, after having dealt with matters related to the Old Testament I will, in the next section, study the concept of the two swords in the *Nuova Risposta*, which is related to the New Testament.

5.4. The Two Swords of the Pope in the New Testament

In this section, I will examine the two swords, which, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, is, in a manner of expressing, in the hands of the Pope. The two swords refer to the twofold supremacy, in other words spiritual as well as the temporal powers. The Papal bull *Unam Sanctam*, issued in 1302 by Pope Boniface VIII (1294–1303), unfolds that the twofold supremacy is legitimately held by Apostolic See. The mere spiritual power of the Pope was not, however, questioned.

\textsuperscript{179} Kainulainen, *Paolo Sarpi*, p. 209.

\textsuperscript{180} *Nuova Risposta*, Appendix, p. 79: “L’ha d’havere il Vicario di Christo sopra i laici, come anco l’hebbe Mosè sopra i vecchi giudici temporali del popolo hebreo.”

\textsuperscript{181} *Nuova Risposta*, Appendix, p. 79: “È più eminente il Pontificato del nuovo testamento, di quello del vecchio.”
during the interdict crisis, rather it was his claim to supreme power in spiritual as well as in temporal matters, that annoyed the Venetians.

By referring to Luke 22:38, “Behold these two swords, and Christ responded it is sufficient, thus today Our Lord Pope Paul V have the same power,”\textsuperscript{182} the Nuova Risposta sets out to silence his opponent as it acknowledges that Christ have handed over his powers, which are twofold, to Saint Peter, accordingly the successor to his chair possesses the same powers. Moreover, the Nuova Risposta, proves its position by referring to Matthew 28:18 “All power in heaven and on earth is given to me,”\textsuperscript{183} and Hebrews 2:8 “All things did you put in subjection under his feet.”\textsuperscript{184} In addition, it can be useful to remember the contrasting handing, not of keys or swords but of the Decalogue to Saint Mark, according to the Myth of Venice. In effect, the doge, in a similar way to the Pope is in charge of the twofold power, both spiritual and temporal.

One image that the Nuova Risposta presents regarding the Church is that of a family, and its head and father is the Vicar of Christ. As follows, the children of the Church are its clergy, and as continuing members of the family these are “not under lay power.”\textsuperscript{185} No other jurisdiction is valid, as far as the prelates are concerned, the Nuova Risposta claims, and Thomas Aquinas is quoted saying “the laws of the princes are not binding if you are not a subject, but he who is greater cannot be a subject.”\textsuperscript{186} I suggest that the struggle of the validity of Papal jurisdiction over Ceneda could well be understood as an implicit conflict, as the Nuova Risposta is eager to show that no prelates are obligated to give heed to any other jurisdiction, but that of the Catholic Church’s.

The question of paying tribute is closely knit with the question of superiority and as the Nuova Risposta elaborates on the matter of whether or not clergymen are necessitated to pay tributes to the temporal prince, as residents in another territory than that of the Papal States, it emphasises that Jesus Christ did not pay tribute “not because he wasn’t a Jew, but because he was King, Messiah and God with his family.”\textsuperscript{187} Logically, “neither [does] his vicar with his family, in other words the prelates of the Church [have to pay tribute].”\textsuperscript{188} Paolo Sarpi, on the other hand, would not have conceded to the position of the Nuova Risposta, since he considered the temporal prince to be an absolute sovereign, by virtue of the divine law, in his own territory.

\textsuperscript{182} Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 78: “Ecce duo gladij hic, e Christo rispose ‘sufficit’, & c. cosi hoggidi N.S PP. Paolo V ha l’istessa potestà.” Note that Possevino uses “Sufficit” instead of the verb used in the Vulgate “Satis est.”

\textsuperscript{183} Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 86: “Data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo, et in terra.”

\textsuperscript{184} Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 86: “Omnia subiecisti sub pedibus eius.”

\textsuperscript{185} Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 84: “Non sono sotto la potestà de laici.”

\textsuperscript{186} Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 75: “Le leggi dei principi non obligano se non i sudditi, ma se non può essere suddito, che è maggiore.”

\textsuperscript{187} Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 88: “Non perché fusse Giudeo; ma più tosto come Re et Messia et Dio con la sua famiglia.”

\textsuperscript{188} Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 88: “Nè anco il suo vicario con la sua famiglia cioè gli ecclesiastici clerici.”
Thus Sarpi made a clear distinction between “the word of God and the clergy when he argued that it was necessary to show ‘absolute obedience to God,’ but to prelates a limited one.”

Marsilio, furthermore, questioned the temporal power of the Pope, since “Christ had exercised no temporal authority, he could have transmitted none to Peter.” The Nuova Risposta replies to this by stating that “there are many things that the prince does not do, by matters of respect, these he leaves for his vicar to undertake and so Christ our Lord did.”

In this section, I have studied the discussion of the two swords as presented by the Nuova Risposta. The text argues that Christ has guaranteed the Pope his twofold supremacy, thus the authority of the supremacy is traceable in the Holy Scriptures. The Pope can, according to the Nuova Risposta, claim the possession of body and soul, the dual role of Moses, and the two swords, therefore, he is hierarchically superior to the rest. I will in the next section study the arguments given in the conclusive part of the Nuova Risposta.

5.5. Portrayal of the Republic of Venice

In this section, I will study in what manner the Nuova Risposta portrays the Republic of Venice by reason of the Myth of Venice and, moreover, how the text compares Venice to Rome, which is a topic that Possevino deals with in the conclusive part of the Nuova Risposta.

The theme of the two swords that I discussed in the previous section was a remnant of the discourse, during the late Middle Ages, of the rank of the Pope vis-à-vis an ecumenical council. Allegedly, the Nuova Risposta, in its last chapters, says that “the Pope is above the Councils and above the lay princes, and that it is still true that the more eminent one is not judged by the less eminent, as Constantine, the Emperor, said.” The Nuova Risposta is in accordance with the position of Roberto Bellarmine, who, on his part, did not consider an ecumenical council to be superior to the Pope. Not even if the Pope should prove to be a heretic, can he, according to the Nuova Risposta, be discharged from his office by a council or by a temporal prince. He can be discharged “only through the verdict of Christ”

Subsequently, “he is no longer the rock over whom the Church stretches out.” The “rock” is of course a reference to Matthew 16:18 “And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church.” I presupposed that the literary meaning of Matthew 16:18 is recognised

189 Kainulainen, Paolo Sarpi, p. 228.
190 Bouwsma, Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty, p. 460.
191 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 89: “Molte cose non fa il principe per degni rispetti, le quali lascia fare al suo vicario et così fece Christo nostro Signore.”
192 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 94: “Il Papa è sopra i Concilij et sopra i principi laici, et che ancora è vero che ’maior a minore non iudicatur’, come disse Constantino Imperatore.”
193 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 95: “Per sentenza di Christo solamente.”
194 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 95: “Egli non è più pietra ’super quam fundetur Ecclesia.’”
by the *Nuova Risposta*, as opposed to the prior discussion, in section 5.3., of the analogous understanding of Moses, Aaron and Melchizedek as forbearers of the office of Saint Peter. Since the Chair of Saint Peter was initiated by Christ, only Christ, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, can discharge the Pope from his office, if he is proven to be a heretic. Moreover, the *Nuova Risposta* claims that the Emperor Constantine conceded to the superiority of the successor of Saint Peter, but the “conciliarists”, however, do not. Constantine chronologically preceded them by more than a thousand years, evidently, it is Marsilio the recipient, who, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, proves to demonstrate novelty.

Marsilio, as much as he commended the primitive church on its excellent institution, he rejected the Council of Trent, which he called “the misfortune of our times.” He questioned the validity of the acts of the council, based on French absence, and he thought nothing of Bellarmine’s interpretation of the council’s position on the immunity of the clergy. The *Nuova Risposta* is, I argue, a text formed by the Counter Reformation’s interpretation of the Council of Trent, wherefore Venice is considered by the *Nuova Risposta* to lack in respect, because it does not defend the immunity of the clergy, which, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, the Council of Trent had decided on.

Contrary though, to the polemical tone against its opponent that permeates the *Nuova Risposta*, is the panegyric appraisal of the Republic Venice in its last chapter. Despite all firm talk it is said in *Nuova Risposta* that “I still wish that your soul shall be saved.” The *Nuova Risposta* commences the homage of the Venetian Republic by saying:

> I have great occasion to glory in that we in our Italy have one such a noble city, which was miraculously founded on the waves of the Adriatic Sea without being covered by the same waves, which since the beginning of its foundation has always preserved and conserved its freedom intact.

I conclude by this quote that the *Nuova Risposta* positively infers the most profound notion, as far as Paolo Sarpi was concerned, of the Myth of Venice, which is that of the intact keeping of freedom. Although, Venice is a noble city and the success of its extended imperial ambitions is acknowledged by the *Nuova Risposta* “all this is nothing when one considers the purity of

---

196 Ibid, 569.
199 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 99: “Io ho grandissima occasione di gloriarvi che nella nostra Italia abbiamo una così nobile città miracolosamente fondata sopra l’onde del mare Adriatico senza però mai essere coperta dall’istesso onde; che sino dal principio della sua fondazione habbia sempre mantenuta et conservata la sua libertà intatta.”
the Catholic faith.” Thus, I contend that the appraisal of Venice serves the purpose of a captatio benevolentiae, which enables the Nuova Risposta to further, and once more, put Venice hierarchically inferior to Rome.

It is by the grace of the Papal States that the people of Venice still can claim their islands as theirs, since, the Nuova Risposta argues, it was through consent of the Roman Pontificate, that they were able to possess the lagoons. Such an argument by the Nuova Risposta is, I contend, the fruit of the acknowledgment of the donation of the Western Empire of Constantine to the Papal States, since the Papal States were not in charge of any power of the lagoon at the time of the foundation of the city of Venice.

The Nuova Risposta appraises yet another important aspect of the Myth of Venice, inasmuch as it presents the distinguished patron saint of Venice, Mark the evangelist, as a pure example of obedience. The virtue of obedience is thus recognised by the Nuova Risposta as a sign of holiness, which is in accordance with the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas; which I have already studied in this thesis. The Nuova Risposta does not, however, discuss the virtues of Saint Mark without adding that he was a disciple of Saint Peter, and as such he was hierarchically inferior to his master. Consequently, Venice ought to submit to subordination and obedience to the successor of Saint Peter, Paul V, because, the Nuova Risposta says, “this Catholic doctrine is not founded on the waves of the sea of Venice, but upon the apostolic rock and not fished up in the Canal Grande of Venice.”

Accordingly, the Nuova Risposta claims that Venice has broken its tradition with their patron saint. Instead Venice should learn from the doctrines of the Catholic Church

“because I know that Saint Mark if he had lived among us, he would have taught them the very same doctrine and would have been surprised to see his most noble daughter prostituted and exhibited to attempted rape by such a perverse schismatic failure and false doctrine taught to her by this modern theologian.”

I consider the remark of the modern theologian to be a contribution to the debate of history during the Counter Reformation. Since Saint Mark is claimed by the Venetians, and their mythology is based on the continuity between Moses and Saint Mark, which Marion Leather Kuntz has demonstrated, it is important for the Nuova Risposta to manifest that opposite doctrines cannot both be true. Saint Mark was a disciple of Saint Peter, thus he conceded to the Catholic doctrines, therefore the Venetians, who no longer were a part of the Christian

200 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 99: “Ma tutto quello è nulla quando si considera la purità della fede Catholica.”
201 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 73: “Questa dottrina catholica fondata non nell’onde del mare di Venetia, ma nella pietra Apostolica; non pescata nel canal grande di Venetia.”
202 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 100: “Perché so che S. Marco, se vivesse tra di noi questa stessa dottrina gli insegnerebbe et si maravigliarebbe di vedere quella sua nobilissima figliuola prostituta et esposta alla libidine di così perverso errore scismatico et falsa dottrina insegnatale da questo moderno Theologo.”
community with the Pope as its head, have, according to the Nuova Risposta, broken their ties to Rome and yielded to a modern theology. Accordingly, the Nuova Risposta says that “otherwise the Papal mitre would have to be given to the Doge of Venice and the ducal corno to the Pope […] if their stories are true.”

I suggest that the Nuova Risposta refers to the aspect of the Myth of Venice, whereby the doge is understood to have a twofold role, both spiritual and temporal. The handing of the Decalogue to Doge Gritti by Saint Mark symbolises the aspect of spiritual power, whereas the corno, the headgear of the doge of Venice, symbolises temporal power.

The parallel between Venice and Byzantine has been predominant in history, inasmuch as Venice and Byzantine had strong ties to one another before the Fall of Constantinople in 1453. The Basilica of Saint Mark in Venice was, for instance, constructed with the Hagia Sofia in Constantinople as its model. The Nuova Risposta takes advantage of this parallel as it warns Venice of the consequences of breaking with Rome. The invasion of the Turks was a “punishment because of their schism with the Vicar of Christ, these days they are suffering subjects and tyrannized by the barbaric cruelty.”

Moreover, England and Geneva are examples of nations, who have gone astray the Nuova Risposta argues, since its clergy can no longer appeal to the Pope and plea for his intervention against monarchs, who thirst for power.

Notwithstanding, the Republic of Venice still has time to remedy the damaged caused by the crisis, “it pleases God,” the Nuova Risposta says, “that it is not yet true what Isaiah says of Jerusalem: your unfaithful princes.” Venice has not yet become like Babylonia, but, according to the Nuova Risposta, Venice is too interested in earthly matters and ignorant of “the final goal for which we are created.”

The topic of Venice versus Rome, in the sense of entities with different goals for life was elaborated by Paolo Paruta in Della Perfezione della Vita Politica, published in Venice in 1599. The active life, according to the “Roman party,” is contrasted with a life lived in contemplation of eternal verities, for which men a truly created. Obviously the “Venetian party” speaks of the advantages of a life spent of worldly ambitions, whereas the spokesman for the “Roman party,” Bishop Michelle Della Torre of Ceneda, hold

---

203 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 72: “Bisognarebbe dare la mitra Papale al Doge di Venetia, & al Papa il corno del Doge […] se sono vere le loro historie”

204 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 100: “Per pena dello scisma loro contro il Vicario di Christo sono hora miseramente soggetti et tiranneggiati dalla barbaro crudeltá.”

205 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 94.


207 Nuova Risposta, Appendix, p. 101: “All’ultimo fine per il quale sono creati.”
the Aristotelian dialectic of teleology close to his chest.\textsuperscript{208} Thus, it is plausible to believe that the stereotype of the Venetians as “worldly,” which the \textit{Nuova Risposta} alludes to in the above-mentioned quote, was predominant in the late sixteenth-century and the beginning of the seventeenth-century, which in the thought of Possevino could be a useful argument against the Venetians and thus enhance his apologetic motive for publishing the \textit{Nuova Risposta}.

In this section, I have studied the arguments given in the \textit{Nuova Risposta} in favour of the Pope vis-à-vis an ecumenical council. Since Christ has passed on his powers to Saint Peter, and his to successors, an ecumenical council have no authority to discharge the Pope, even if he proves to be heretic. Only Christ himself can discharge him of his office, the \textit{Nuova Risposta} claims. The reforms in the wake of the Council of Trent was, moreover, crucial to men like Possevino, who dedicated his life to the supervision of the implementation of these reforms.

Consequently, Venice, who did not respect its decision, is thoroughly criticised by the \textit{Nuova Risposta}. The panegyrically presented passages of Venice, in the \textit{Nuova Risposta}, should, I contend, be considered as a means to capture the heart of its opponent, thus it thereupon claims that the possession of the lagoons depends on the Pope, and that Saint Mark, the patron saint of Venice, was a disciple of Saint Peter, and therefore primarily a disciple of Rome. In effect, I argue that the \textit{Nuova Risposta} considers the legacy of the Catholic Church to takes precedence over the Myth of Venice, which is inferred by Possevino as a \textit{captatio benevolentiae}.

The conclusion of the \textit{Nuova Risposta} reads as a warning to the worldly Venetians, because if Venice does not accept the Pope as her superior she will end up as Byzantine, England and Geneva. I will now, after having dealt with different themes of the \textit{Nuova Risposta}, move on the next section, in order to summarize and discuss the results of chapter 5, to state whether my thesis of the adherence of the \textit{Nuova Risposta} to a historiographical framework is justifiable or not.

\section*{5.6. Historiographical Adherence}

In this section, I will summarise the results of chapter 5 and discuss whether it is justified to consider the historiographical adherence of the \textit{Nuova Risposta} as its framework, within which it elaborates on Papal claim to superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. In section 5.1. I discussed to importance of historiographical perspectives and how such assumptions yielded to theologically, as well as politically, motivated conclusions. I suggested that the historiographical presentation of the \textit{Annales Ecclesiastici} of the temporal

\textsuperscript{208} Bouwsma, \textit{Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty}, p. 202. Teleology, furthermore, is an antique philosophic concept elaborated by Aristotle, whereby each individual is considered to seek to act according to its \textit{telos}, in other words its goal.
power of the Roman Pontiff as transferred from Christ, helps to form the framework in which the *Nuova Risposta* operates in order to refute its counterpart. I will now discuss the chosen themes of sections 5.2., 5.3, 5.4., and 5.5. to conclude whether my thesis is justifiable or not.

In section 5.2. I observed the discourse of the relationship of body and soul, a topic related to hierarchical structures. My conclusion is based on the arguments given in the *Nuova Risposta*, which make clear that Possevino considers the Pope to be of supreme rank, due to the fact that he is, symbolically, in charge of the body and soul, both temporal and spiritual power. I argue that the *Nuova Risposta* is dependent on the historiographical notion of Christ, and consequently Saint Peter, as overseeing the temporal power, which stems from the elaboration pursued in the *Annales Ecclesiastici* by Baronio.

This historiographical framework is moreover noticeable as I studied typologies and analogies of the Old Testament in section 5.3, albeit as a perhaps underlying distinctiveness. The fundamental premise of this historiographical perspective is, according to my suggestion, that God’s plan for salvation works through history. I identify this historiographical adherence in the way that Melchizedek, Aaron and Moses are being presented, thus they operate as forbearers of the Chair of Saint Peter, which, I contend, bears resemblance to the traditional view of the Church Fathers of Christ as pre-existent.

It is important, however, not to claim the pre-existence of Saint Peter himself in the *Nuova Risposta*, but rather that of his office. Thus, the *Nuova Risposta* argues that the historical events of the Holy Scriptures overlap each other harmoniously, according to God’s salvific plan, which moves toward its conclusion, wherefore the events of the Old Testament are considered to point forward to more perfected events in the history of the Church. I argue that the acknowledgement of such a historiography is the basis on which the *Nuova Risposta* discusses the order of hierarchy, hence its use of typologies and analogies taken from the Old Testament.

I contend that this historiography is the basis on which the discourse of the two swords are being discussed. The powers of Saint Peter were twofold, because Christ’s powers were twofold, the *Nuova Risposta* says. Accordingly, it is historically motivated, the *Nuova Risposta* argues, for clergy, as members of the family of the Church, not pay tribute, since Christ did not act in such a manner, consequently, neither did Saint Peter. Moreover, I noticed that Baronio’s main argument in favour of Papal power in temporal matters is identical to the *Nuova Risposta*’s. From this foundation, based on history, the *Nuova Risposta* is able to conclude its view on the natural structure of hierarchy, which, in section 5.4., concerned the theme of the two swords.

In section 5.5 the elaboration of the superiority of the Pope vis-à-vis an ecumenical council is, according to me, based on the notion on the importance of the primacy given to Saint Peter, which is historically motivated. Saint Peter is the “rock” on which the Church is built on; if you
throw away the rock, you will throw away the Church, only Christ himself can dispose the Pope from his office if he is proven to be a heretic, the *Nuova Risposta* says. I argue that all this rests on the epistemological conviction of Possevino, of the absolute truthfulness of the literary meaning of Matthew 16:18. Moreover, the possession of the lagoons, the *Nuova Risposta* claims, is reliant on the consent of the Roman Pontiff. This is another example of an argument, which is historically motivated.

Furthermore, the polemics of Saint Mark as a disciple of Rome is not just polemics. It is again historically motivated in accordance with the Holy Scriptures that Saint Mark, the patron saint of Venice, was a disciple of Saint Peter, the patron saint of Rome. This topic, moreover, exemplifies the distinguishing argumentation of the *Nuova Risposta*, because it alters that, which at first appears to be a dichotomic couple (in this case Saint Mark and Saint Peter), to become two units incorporated in the same hierarchical structure. Even this characteristic can be put into the historiographical understanding of the Church as in one, therefore no dichotomies can find its place in such a historiographical perspective.

The rejection of the Venetians, of the implementation of the decisions of the Council of Trent, is considered by the *Nuova Risposta* to be another crime to history, as the it emphasises the importance, not just of the Holy Scriptures, but of the historical councils of the Church. To reject an ecumenical council for whatever reason is considered by the *Nuova Risposta* to be a crime to its Tradition, thus to argue in favour of such a break would fit badly within the historiographical framework of the *Nuova Risposta*. Finally, the warning in the end is brought from history, since history shows that Constantinople fell. The reason for its invasion was, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, its cutting of the ties with Rome.

The summary and discussions of the sections of the analysis in chapter 5, lead me to conclude that my thesis of the adherence of the *Nuova Risposta* to a historiographical framework is justified. This framework is constituted by a profound assumption of the truth of the doctrines of the Catholic Church. There is no need, however, to label the historiographical perspective of the *Nuova Risposta* as “Baronian,” since I have already observed a slight modification in the *Nuova Risposta*, as far as the question of the *Donatio Constantini* is concerned. I contend that it is enough, for the purpose, of this thesis to demonstrate their resemblance, without drawing the conclusion of a strict dependence on the *Annales Ecclesiastici*, as far as the *Nuova Risposta* is concerned.

Furthermore, there is reason to believe that not only the *Nuova Risposta* understands and elaborates on hierarchical structures, within a historiographical framework. Marsilio too, seems to work within a historiographical framework, yet different from that of the *Nuova Risposta*. The view of the primitive church as the model for Christianity, which hints at the abandoning of the “Eusebian model” is such an example, the understanding of the Myth of Venice as based
on freedom and independence is another. These views have both in common that they are historically motivated. The twofold power of the doge, the handing of the Decalogue from Moses, through the mediation of Saint Mark, to the doge are other aspects of the Venetian historiographical content. Thus, I argue that it is plausible to believe that Marsilio too elaborated within frames of historiography.

I would not agree that the discussion of Bouwsma, in which he claims that the “Roman party” and the “Venetian party” spoke in two different languages, is precise enough. I argue that it is better to provide the two different historiographical frames of understanding Papal claim to superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters, as the explanation of why their conclusions were so utterly separated from one another.

A parallel to the two historiographical frames of understanding Papal claim to spiritual and temporal powers, during the interdict crisis, is the two models of understanding man during the theological debate of justification in the sixteenth-century. The premise of the “Lutheran” model considered man to be totally deprived of goodness, the premise of the council fathers of Trent, however, considered man to have restored some goodness after the Original sin. Thus, when discussing whether man’s good actions are favourable to the salvation of man, the parties clashed. The clash, however, must be understood due to different anthropological frameworks. Since their premises differed, naturally enough, so did their conclusions.

I have now reached the end of the analysis of the Nuova Risposta and I will therefore move to the conclusive chapter in order to sum this thesis up.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

In this conclusive chapter, I will present the results of the investigation of this thesis. I will begin with the conclusions of the results of the contextually related questions of the Nuova Risposta. Thereafter I will conclude the results of my investigation, that are related to the text itself.

6.1. Conclusions of the Contextually Related Questions

Regarding those questions that are related to context I rely on Quentin Skinner’s approach to context, as a concept that is not obvious and given and therefore needs to be constructed by its commentator. In the construction of context in this thesis I have relied on the approach of Umberto Cosmo, who treated La Divina Comedia as a piece of work that mirrored its time mind. Likewise, I have treated the Nuova Risposta as mirroring its time. Therefore, my starting point, regarding the contextual approach, has been the Nuova Risposta itself. By studying my transcription of the text I have identified such contextual details that have formed the basis for the construction of context in this thesis.

My first contextually related question was: which ideological aspects are important for the understanding of why Papal claim to sovereignty in spiritual as well as temporal matters was distasteful for the Republic of Venice, with reason to the Myth of Venice? In chapter 2, I answered to this question by illustrating different concepts of Venice as well as discussed, their progression over time. I concluded that there is no single definition of the Myth of Venice shared by scholars and historians; rather there are several definitions of the myth in different commentaries on the Myth of Venice.

Marion Leather Kuntz helped me to define the role of doge of Venice, which is an important ideological aspect of the Myth of Venice. I concluded that the doge had a twofold authority, both a spiritual-religious function and a temporal-political role. Venetian justice was dependent on the Decalogue, which, according to the legend, had been transferred through Saint Mark, the patron saint of Venice, to the doge. Saint Mark, moreover, who was a Levite, guaranteed the unbroken tradition from Moses to the doge as a keeper and maintainer of the Decalogue.

The study of the various definitions of the Myth of Venice led me to conclude that Gasparo Contarini, for instance, portrayed a harmonious picture of the relation between Rome and Venice, whereby the ecclesial authority is hierarchically distinguished and superior to the secular. The keys, Contarini said, were handed to Saint Peter alone, consequently the Pope is superior to any temporal prince. The Pope, should not, however, obtain any wealth using power given to him by Christ, according to Contarini. From the approach of Contarini a dichotomous
picture between Rome and Venice was depicted by Sarpi and Marsilio. Accordingly, Venice had always been independent and kept its tradition from ancient Rome intact, therefore Venice could not yield to Papal claim to superiority in both spiritual and temporal matters, because the split with Rome, during the interdict crisis, was merely considered by Sarpi and Marsilio to be temporal.

In chapter 3, I accounted for the development of the interdict crisis of 1606–1607. I concluded that two main factors led to the Venetian interdict, 1/ the struggle for temporal power in the town of Ceneda, 2/ the anticlerical sentiments during the dogeship of Leonardo Donà.

Ceneda had been granted a privilege in 962 from Otto I, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, which stated that the bishop of Ceneda governed its citizens in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. In the end of the fourteenth-century Venice incorporated Ceneda into its territory, but it was not until the bishop Marc’ Antonio Mocenigo, who, according to Sarpi, broke the former bishop-count equilibrium and began to title himself as bishop and prince of Ceneda, that the tensions between Rome and Venice geared up a notch. Neither did his successor bishop Leonardo Mocenigo restore the title of count, thus he was considered to take a stand against the Republic of Venice, despite the fact that Mocenigo himself was a Venetian by birth. In 1600, moreover, the Pope prohibited the citizens of Ceneda to appeal their interest to the Republic of Venice.

By the election of Leonardo Donà the anticlerical sentiments in Venice were reinforced. Accordingly, Doge Donà did not respect the Papal plea of sending the two imprisoned clergymen, who were accused of criminal acts committed on Venetian territory, since he, and Sarpi with him, considered Venetian jurisdiction to be valid on Venetian territory. The Pope, who considered clergymen to be under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, acted in reply by placing an interdict on the Republic of Venice. I argue that these two factors are of main importance in order to two answer to the question of how the process that led to the interdicts crisis of 1606–1607 developed. It also serves as an explanation of why the Papal interdict was indigestible to the Republic of Venice, considering the reaction and anticlerical sentiments of Leonardo Donà and Paolo Sarpi to the Papal claim of sovereignty in spiritual and temporal matters on Venetian territory.

6.2. Conclusions of the Textually Related Questions

To the textually related questions my methodological approach, using my transcription of the text, has been to define such topics of the Nuova Risposta that will answer to my questions. I have paid extra attention to those passages, in the Nuova Risposta, that discuss the relation between spiritual and temporal powers, as well as those who relate to ecclesiastical history.
In Chapter 4, I argued for the attribution of Antonio Possevino to the authorship of the *Nuova Risposta*, inasmuch as I rely on William J. Bouwsma who considers the name Giovanni d’Asti to be a pseudonym. I complemented this statement by discussing the fact that Giovanni was the name of the brother of Antonio Possevino and Asti, in the Piemonte region, was the birthplace of his father. Moreover, the *Nuova Risposta* was printed in Bologna and Ferrara, both places were a part of the Papal States in 1606 when the text was published. Ferrara was, moreover, the town where Possevino himself resided after having been expelled from Venice along with his fellow Jesuits.

I, furthermore, presented some biographical facts of Possevino. I accounted for the facts that Possevino entered the Society of Jesus in 1559 and that he, in 1573, was appointed to become the secretary to the Society of Jesus. I also stated that he distributed catechisms in the Piemonte region, was appointed Papal legate to Sweden, Russia and Poland. In 1587 he moved to Padua, in order to teach at the Jesuit college. In Venice, moreover, he instructed booksellers to censure heterodox books and there, in Venice, he was a member of the “*vecchi* party,” whose dedication to the Pope caused tensions with the *giovani*, the “party” of Sarpi and Donà. In effect, during the dogeship of Donà, the Jesuits were compelled to leave Venetian territory. While the interdict was in force the 73-year-old Possevino wrote the *Nuova Risposta*, which was one of many books that he authored.

I justified the attribution of Giovanni Marsilio as the recipient of the *Nuova Risposta* in section 4.3, on the basis of the allusion in the *Nuova Risposta* of the recipient as a Spanish theologian, who appreciated Thomas Aquinas and who was a friend of Cardinal Bellarmine. That Marsilio was a friend of Bellarmine and a trained theologian in Thomistic thinking and “an apostate” of Spanish origin are facts given in the *Nuova Risposta*, thus with the complementary information handed by Bouwsma, of Marsilio as a former Jesuit, I concluded that it is justified to hold that Giovanni Marsilio is the recipient that Possevino had in mind whilst writing the *Nuova Risposta*.

In section 4.4, I discussed the form and style of the *Nuova Risposta* and I stated that it encompasses a first-person narrative. I claimed that for Possevino it was vital to manifest the intact keeping of continuity of the Catholic Church with its origin in the primitive church. Its use of language is polemical and apologetic, and the topics are frequently added with quotes of “sacred theologians,” in order to strengthen and support its arguments. I, moreover, presented the fact that Possevino does not always quote from the *Vulgata Clementina*, but I treated this discussion as of minor importance to the purpose of this thesis.

In section 4.5, I commented briefly on other topics, than those that were thoroughly analysed in chapter 5. I stated that the *Nuova Risposta* proves to Marsilio that the Emperor Justinian I made regulations in favour of the Church, and not against it. I discussed
the notion of the *Nuova Risposta* of presenting a harmony between the natural and the divine law. Moreover, the *Nuova Risposta* questions the necessity for clergymen to pay tribute to the Republic of Venice, as well as arguing in favour of ecclesiastical immunity. Additionally, the temporal power is considered by the *Nuova Risposta* to be merely tolerated, whereas the spiritual power is considered to be absolute. The Pope, the *Nuova Risposta*, says is above any ecumenical council and cannot be judged nor elected by an inferior power.

I began the analysis of the *Nuova Risposta*, by accounting for the importance of historiography at the time of the Venetian interdict. This was pursued with the purpose of opening up the discussion that would answer to my main question if the *Nuova Risposta* is dependent on a historiographical framework, within which he elaborates on the central argument of the text, which is Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters.

I accounted for the Venetian historiographical aspects that Sarpi and Marsilio adhere to. Their assumptions are that any history is profane and that the progression and development of Church institutions were signs of decay. History is a foe, according to Sarpi, since the Church, had manifestly declined from its primitive state. Cesare Baronio and Antonio Possevino, on the contrary, affirm to a historiography whereby progression is acknowledged, the Church, however, is invulnerable to change. The Church is *semper eadem* and according to Baronio and Possevino it has, since its dawning, been in charge of spiritual as well as temporal powers. I concluded that the *Nuova Risposta* understands the authority of temporal power of the Pope in the same manner as Baronio, as not dependent on the donation of Constantine, but on the handing of the keys to Saint Peter by Christ himself. I, moreover, demonstrated that Possevino diverged somewhat from Baronio’s notion of Constantine as superfluous, as he inferred two other documents that witness of the emperor’s wish to hand over his Western Empire to the Pope. Thus, I concluded that it is justified to claim that the *Annales Ecclesiastici*, by Baronio, helps to form the historiographical framework of the *Nuova Risposta* and that it is within this framework that it elaborates on the idea of Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters.

In order to answer to my questions in what manner the *Nuova Risposta* uses symbolic language to argue in favour of Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters, I have identified three thematic topics by which the text makes use of symbolic language.

The first is the theme of the relationship between body and soul. The body, according to the *Nuova Risposta*, alludes to the temporal power, whereas the soul alludes to the spiritual power. The soul, the *Nuova Risposta* says, governs the body and because the Pope is in charge of both body and soul, in other words, both temporal and spiritual powers, he is entitled to govern all other bodies. I concluded that the *Nuova Risposta* argues for a hierarchical
structure by using symbolic language, in which, the Pope, as in charge of both temporal and spiritual powers, is entitled to govern all other temporal powers.

The second theme is the use of typologies and analogies in the Nuova Risposta. I concluded that the purpose of presenting typologies and analogies are to argue in favour of Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. Rehoboam, Abraham, Josiah and Saul are presented as analogous to the prince of temporal powers, whereas Melchizedek, Moses, Aaron represent the Pope. Moses is a key figure for it was he who received the authority from God, which he passed on to Aaron. In the discussion of Moses, in the Nuova Risposta, I identified the use of typology, inasmuch as Moses is a figure of Christ who hands his authority to his successor. Moses is also analogous to Saint Peter, who was Christ’s vicar over the laity with powers of tribunals.

The third theme is the use of the two swords. I concluded that the Nuova Risposta relies on Luke 22:38: “Behold these two swords, and Christ responded it is sufficient,” as it states that Christ handed the twofold power to Saint Peter. Consequently, the Pope, as the successor of Saint Peter, is in charge of the same powers as Saint Peter, according to the Nuova Risposta. I contrasted the view of Papal twofold power to the doge of Venice, which, according to the Myth of Venice, is in charge of, not the two swords nor the keys but, the Decalogue and the corno. In the discussion of the two swords I, moreover, concluded that the Nuova Risposta rejects the idea of the necessity for clergymen, members of the Papal family, to pay tribute to the temporal prince, because neither Christ nor Saint Peter paid tributes to temporal princes.

In section 5.5 I accounted for the conclusive discussion of the Nuova Risposta in order to answer to my question how the Nuova Risposta portrays the Republic of Venice with regard to the Myth of Venice. I concluded that the Nuova Risposta alters its tone when it, in its conclusive chapter, presents the Republic of Venice. The panegyrically inserted appraisal presents Venice as a noble city, which was miraculously founded on the waves of the Adriatic Sea as well as always having preserved and conserved its freedom intact. By giving heed to freedom of the Republic of Venice, Possevino observes the same aspect of the Myth of Venice as Paolo Sarpi does. The appraisal is, however, a way to capture the mind of the reader, because the Nuova Risposta, shortly after the appraisal, restores its former polemic tone.

Thereafter the Nuova Risposta argues that the Venetian possession of the lagoons depends on the goodwill of the Pope and that Saint Mark, the patron saint Venice, was a disciple of Saint Peter. As a disciple of Saint Peter the Venetian patron saint is a disciple of Rome. I concluded that the Nuova Risposta considers Venetians to be worldly and reprehensible for not respecting the decisions formulated by the Council of Trent, and if Saint Mark would have been alive he should, according to the Nuova Risposta, have taught the doctrines of the Catholic Church to the Venetians. I concluded that the Myth of Venice is treated by the Nuova Risposta
and inferred as a *captatio benevolentiae*, but in conclusion the legacy of the Catholic Church takes precedence the Myth of Venice.

In the last section of this thesis I discussed whether it is justified to consider the historiographical adherence of the *Nuova Risposta* as its framework, within which it elaborates on Papal claim to superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. I concluded that the historiographical presentation of the *Annales Ecclesiastici*, of the temporal power of the Roman Pontiff as transferred from Christ, helps to form the framework, within which the *Nuova Risposta* operates in order to refute its counterpart.

From the study of the use symbolic language in the *Nuova Risposta*, I concluded that its purpose was to argue in favour of Papal superiority in spiritual as well as in temporal matters and that the assumptions of such an argument relies on a historiographical framework, whereby the Catholic Church is considered to have kept its continuity with the primitive church and that the Church itself is invulnerable to change. I, furthermore, concluded that the *Annales Ecclesiastici* helps to form the framework, within which the *Nuova Risposta* elaborates on its central argument. In addition, I concluded that the recipient of the *Nuova Risposta*, Marsilio, also elaborates within a historiographical framework, which contrasts the historiographical notion of the *Nuova Risposta*. Finally, I concluded that the identification of two opposing historiographical frameworks serves as an explanation of why the argumentation of the *Nuova Risposta* appears to be fundamentally diverse from the argumentation of its adversary.
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NUOVA

RISPOSTA

DI GIOVANNI FILOTEO

DI ASTI,

ALLA LETTERA DI UN THEOLOGO INCOGNITO SCRITTA AD UN SACERDOTE

SUO AMICO,

SOPRA LE CENSURE, & INTERDETTO DI PAPA PAOLO V, CONTRO LA SIGNORIA

DI VENETIA.

Agnus Dei

Qui tollis

Peccata mundi

Miserere nobis

In Bologna, nella Stampa Archiepiscopale.

Et in Ferrara, nella Stampa Camerale.

M. DC. VI.

Con licenza de’ Superiori.
Se per la malignità de tempi, ne quali siamo, & viviamo, gli huomini posti in dignità, e stato temporale, non seguissero più tosto gli adulatori, e mali consiglieri ad imitazione di Roboamo\textsuperscript{209} che i buoni, & non si appigliassero ad ogni minima, & apparente ragione favorevole ai loro politici disegni, poco pii, & riverenti verso la loro Madre e Pastore; i quali sono la Chiesa Cattolica, & il Sommo Pontefice; non sarebbe stato necessario, che il Signore Cardinale Bellarmino si fusse abbreviato, a rispondere alla lettera di uno, il quale s’intitola Theologo, più tosto Diabologo, è vero Apostata dalla vera Theologia pena di errori manifestamente schismatici, & heretici. Ma poi che siamo posti, & constituiti in simili giorni, nei quali, come dice San Paolo\textsuperscript{210} sunt homines sui ipsius amantes, e la detta lettera potrebbe fare più colpo nei cuori dei mali Christiani, & de’ semplici, di quello, che dovrebbe di ragione seguire: per questo ancor’io, avvenga che inferiore al detto Cardinale, spinto dal zelo dell’honore di Dio, & irritato dalla ingiuria fatta al Vicario di Christo nostro Redentore, per il qual son obbligato a dare il sangue, e la propria vita, hò voluto, quanto potrò, forzarmi, di vendicarla con questi scritti, se bene il fuoco sarebbe la condegna pena di cotale ingiuria, & sacrilego; non dilungandomi però dalla traccia, & modo, di rispondere a parte per parte di essa lettera, la quale osserva il detto\textsuperscript{211} Cardinale, aggiungendo alcune cose, le quali mi occorrono, alle sue santissime, & dottissime risposte; tralasciando, d’inferire parole di essa lettera qui dentro, & rimettendomi a quelle, che stanno nella risposta di esso Cardinale.

Dico dunque o Theologo incognito, qualunque tu sii, rispondendo alla prima particella della lettera; che poca pratica, & cognitione mostri di havere delle leggi civili, & canoniche, de santi padri, della sacra Theologia, & della stessa scrittura divina. Io ritrovo appresso di Giustiniano\textsuperscript{212}. Che il Domino temporale, & servitù de gli huomini sopra gli altri huomini a modo di Principato despotico, è politico nella maniera, & che si vede, non è de iure naturali primaevi, perché ogn’uno era libero da principio; ma il Ius gentium secondario ha introdotto simile distinzione contraria alla prima ragione naturale: se bene concedo, & approvo la Cattolica dottrina di S. Thomaso d’Aquino, che nello stato dell’innocenza vi sarebbe stata soggettione di una persona all’altra non forzata di servitù, & vassallaggio, come hoggidi, ma direttriva, come del verso il figliuolo, & del più dotto verso il meno dotto, & più giusto, & savio verso il meno giusto, e savio\textsuperscript{213}. L’istesso afferma S. Agost.\textsuperscript{214} con queste parole. Quo iure defendis villas Ecclesiae? Divino, an humano? Divinum Ius in Scripturis habemus, humanum Ius in legibus Regum. Unde quisque possidet, quod possidet? Nonnè Iure humano? Nam Iure divino Domini

\textsuperscript{209} 3. Reg. 12.
\textsuperscript{210} 2. Timot. 3.
\textsuperscript{211} Sidbrytning 3–4.
\textsuperscript{212} Tit. de iure naturali, & nella 1.4. & 5. ff. de iustitia, & iure.
\textsuperscript{213} 1.q. 96. art. 3.4.
\textsuperscript{214} Tract. 6. in C.1. 10.
est terra, & plenitud eius. Pauperes, & divites Deus de uno limo fecit; & pauperes, divites una terra supportat: Iure tamen humano dicitur, haec villa mea est, haec domus mea, hic servus meus est.

Dove tu vedi manifestamente, che la potestà temporale è stata introdotta dopo il peccato, & non immediatamente da Dio senza eccettione alcuna, come tu dici, perché è permessa da Dio per castigo del peccato, o per la inhabilita de popoli a reggersi, o per l’importunità del popolo, il quale voleva un Re; dove Dio chiaramente gli mostra, che volere esso popolo un Re è un far torto a Dio, ma per minor male glie lo permette. & le Rep ancora con quella potestà, quale ha la Signoria di Venetia sono all’istesso modo introdutte, perché se non fusse stato il peccato, la Signoria di Venetia, non dominarebbe con quell’imperio sopra i suoi popoli, i quali hoggidi pretende di havere; così l’afferma S. Agostino. & percio non è vero quello che scrivi, cioè, che senza distintione dipende immediatamente da Dio la potestà humana; anzi più tosto è introdutea de iure gentium permittente Deo in pena del peccato, come S. Tomaso argomenta che ancora per il peccato l’huomo era soggetto alla potestà del Demonio giustamente dalla parte dell’istesso huomo. Et nel Genesi si legge, che Nemrod cepit esse potens in terra, & erat robustus venator coram Domino; cioè, come interpretano alcuni santi padri, cominciò a regnare violentemente. Ma forse vorrai cavillare, con dire, che a questo modo il Papa non ha la potestà da Dio immediatamente: ma da Constantino nelli stati della Chiesa; al che ti rispondo più basso, & spero di provarti sufficientemente, che il Papa ha la potestà sua immediate da Dio etiandio senza la donatione di Constantino. In oltre dove trovarai tu, essere vero senza distitione, che per il Jus belli, per la donatione, per l’elettion, & per heredità si doni da Dio il Dominio, & potestà a principi immediatamente? Quante guerre, donationi, eletzioni, & heredità sono ingiustamente fatte, & possedute? Leggi tutta la Scrittura divina, leggi il luogo di citata di San. Agostino contra Faustum; vedrai, che in simili casi potestas non est a Deo immediatè, aut directè, sed permissiùè. Dunque non affermare per indubitata dottrina senza distintione, che a potestà de’ principi temporali è immediatamente da Dio per quelli titoli allegati: anzi più tosto devi dire, che il popolo di Dio molte volte, come narra la Scrittura divina nel Genesi di Faraone; nelli Giudici, & libri de Re, & S. Thomaso & Ezek. è stato
permesso nella potestà de suoi nemici per la sua giustitia, se bene i vincitori erano ingiusti padroni.\textsuperscript{226} Onde noi sappiamo, che quello era vero Re, il quale era unto per comando, di Dio da Profeti,\textsuperscript{227} & al contrario erano da Dio riprovati i Re, come Saul, & altri; & consequentemente come poi mostrarò quella è legittima potestà, la quale è approvata dal Vicario di Christo, cioè dal Papa, maggiore in autorità, & dignità de gli antichi profeti, ai quali toccava di ungere i Re: & quella non è vera, né legittima, la quale è riprovata da esso Vicario di Christo cioè dal Papa, come poi ti provarò: altrimento il Turco havrebbe la potestà da Dio, & a lui non ubidire semplicemente senza distintione sarebbe peccato, come dici: né esso sarebbe Tiranno, come è. Et chi volesse sottilmente investigare la potestà de Venetiani, trovarebbe, che qualche parte ne hanno usurpata all’Imperio Romano, & qualche parte ne hanno per concessione di esso Imperio, & de Sommi Pontefici, per qualche loro merito verso la Sedia Apostolica\textsuperscript{228} & non immediate de iure divino: onde la tua dottrina semplicemente intesa, non è vera, perché se per ius divino intendi il ius naturale è falso: se intendi il ius divino positivo, già vedi, che non ogni potestà dipende immediatamente da Dio, & direttamente (accettuata la Pontificia) ma è, ò permissivè, overo se giustamente, è per consequenza sola: cioè, posto, che uno sia in vera possessione di potestà, all’hora la legge divina, & la ragione naturale \textit{ex consequenti} comanda, che s’ubidisca a quello, che è suo superiore, & non a quello, che si usurpa il nome di superiore contro ogni ragione, come fanno i Venetiani contro gli Ecclesiastici, non havendo essi mai havuto simile possesso di legittimo dominio sopra gli Ecclesiastici come poi provarò.

Alla seconda circa l’autorità di San Paolo.\textsuperscript{229} \textit{Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit;} Rispondo, che vorrei sappere, se intendi qui per anima, l’anima, che è forma del corpo humano, come più a basso accenni a proposito dell’oratione di S. Pietro nella festa della Sua Cathedra; perché a questo modo questa sentenza dell’Apostolo non fa al proposito nostro, poiché s’intenderebbe della soggettione spirituale: & se intendi l’anima per tutto l’huomo, \textit{ides, partem pro toto;} io dico, che è vero, che ogni inferiore ha da essere soggetto al suo superiore; ma bisogna provare che la Signoria di Venetia habbia superiorità sopra gli Ecclesiastici; anzi tutto il contrario ritrovo; perché chiaro stà, che è vero quello, che dice la legge civile tit. de acq. poss. che \textit{duo insolidum possidere non possunt;} onde se il Papa è vero superiore totale insolidum de gli Ecclesiastici per tutto il mondo, come provarò; in che maniera pretende tale superiorità nelli stati loro la Republica di Venetia?

Aggiungo di più, che molto bene parla\textsuperscript{230} l’Apostolo universalmente, & indefinitamente, perché dice, che ogni etiandio, che habbia qualche potestà, ha da essere soggetto ad altra

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{226} 3.p.q. 49. art 2.
\item \textsuperscript{227} Come si legge nel lib. 3 de Rea. c. 19.
\item \textsuperscript{228} Sidbrytning 6–7.
\item \textsuperscript{229} Rom. 13.
\item \textsuperscript{230} Sidbrytning 7–8.
\end{itemize}
più sublime potestà, poiché secondo S. Dionisio Areopagita, & i sacri Theologi, come è nella Celesta hierarchia, così ancora è nelle cose naturali, & ne gli huomini *subordinatione non confusa*, ma distincta di uno inferiore al suo superiore, anzi l’istesso Dionisio pone nel mondo l’Ecclesiastica hierarchia conforme a quello che scrive S. Girolamo *ad Rusticum Monachum*, della quale era capo S. Pietro, & non il Principe laico, la quale hoggidi dura sotto Paolo V. Successore di Pietro. Se dunque è vero, che *omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit*, vorrei sapere da te, quale è più sublime potestà quella del Papa, ò de Venetiani? Se dici quella de Venetiani, dici una grandissima menzogna, se dici quella del Papa dici il vero, come confesso Constantinino Imperatore nel Concilio Niceno. Ma forse dirai, che è mera spirituale, & io poi ti mostrarò, che ancora è temporale, & che almeno in questo caso de gli Ecclesiastici è vero, che il Papa è loro solo superiore, come capo della Ecclesiastica hierarchia:

Anzi io ti aggiungi, che gli stessi Venetiani per mezo de gli suoi Ambasciatori Molino, Mocenigo, Duodo, Contarino hanno a Papa Paolo V, resa obbedienza come a Principe, & Pastore di tutta la Chiesa, & Pastore, & superiore loro ancora, alla presenza della Corte Romana, & de gli Ambasciatori de Potentati della Christianità, & l’hanno riconosciuto per tale, quale lo riconoscono i sacri Canoni, & le leggi Imperiali comandano; & la Dottrina Evangelica gli insegna, & insieme per moderatore delle loro coscienze, & di tutti gli huomini, e come padre loro: e non al contrario, il Papa mai non ha confessato, ch’essi siano superiori a lui, 231 è vero esenti della giurisdizione sua, il che non può concedere; altrimenti bisognerebbe dare la mitra Papale al Doge di Venetia, & al Papa il corno del Doge; anzi alla loro presenza l’imperatore Federico, se sono vere le loro historie, rese ubidienza al Papa come a successore di San Pietro, & noi sappiamo, che a gli altri Re i Venetiani non mandano Ambasciatori a rendere ubidienza ma solo al Papa; al quale con tutto ciò in fatti la negano, quando gli mostra, che le attioni loro sono contra consciencia, & con pre giudicio delle anime loro; & vogliono con Sua Santità in tal caso disputare, come pari & uguali, & non come figliuoli & sudditi ubidienti; non ricercando, ne volendo il Papa da loro Stati di quella Republica; ma solo l’Ecclesiastica libertà da essi usurpata; come ancora sotto Giulio 2. Papa finalmente seguí quando se bene per forza d’arme (non temendo essi le scommuniche) restituirono al Papa la detta libertà, usurpata poi di nuovo da loro da poco a poco. laonde si può dire, che la ubidienza, che danno al Papa per mezo de gli Ambasciatori è più tosto vaa (?) cerimonia estrinseca, che affettione, che nasce dall’intrinseco ad usanza delle cerimone, & offerte, che sogliono farsi nelli brogi de loro consigli: havendo voluto ultimamente incorrere in così aperta contumacia.


---

231 Sidbrytning 8–9.
superiori; ma generalmente conforme alla Dottrina dell’Apostolo dice S. Christostomo, che ogn’uno sia suddito al suo superiore gradatim sino al Papa; ma il Papa ha solamente Dio per suo superiore; come a pieno provaro, & se gli Apostoli hanno il superiore suo, cioè Vicario di Cristo secondo S. Girolamo ad Rusticù Monachù, Chi ha fatta esente la Signoria di Venetia dalla ubbidienza del Sommo Pontefice? Contro quello, che comandano li sacri canoni; & il precetto divino, pasce oves meas. Si Ecclesiam non audient? Se il patriarcha Abraamo vittorioso fu benedetto da Melchisadech, a cui offerse le decime, & doni, poiché non deve il Papa maggiore di Melchisadech, quanto all’autorità del novo testamento havere preminenza sopra il Doge di Venetia, & benedirlo, & maledirlo, & scommunicarlo, quando viene l’occasione come si vede nel Genesi, se io sapessi di certo, tu fusi di quelli falsi theologi di Geneva, non procederei teco per via di Canoni, di sommi pontificii & concilii, per mostrarti l’autorità suprema del Papa nelle cose spirituali direttamente, non solo sopra tutti i stati, & principi del mondo; ma ancora la potestà temporale, come superiore in instituire dominii, & imperii, & confirmargli, & deponergli, & muovergli guerra, quando impediscono il culto, & servitio di Dio, il bene della Chiesa, & la salute dell’anime, & la pace universale, & la ecclesiastica libertà con le loro inique leggi, & attioni: ma perché non ti scuopri per tale, ma ti servi dell’autorità dei santi padri, & canoni nella tua lettera, se bene malamente, & dispregi alle volte i sacri canoni: pretendendo di mostrarti (?) in quanta riverenza siano tenuti i sacri canoni, non solo da gli Ecclesiastici; ma ancora da principi laici.

Secondo, la superiorità, de gli Ecclesiastici a secolari. terzo, l’eccellenza del Papato, & autorità sua sopra tutti i potentati, etiandio sopra l’imperatore Giustiniano, il quale tu falsamente alleghi per autore dell’ecclesiastica immunità; se bene anco nell’altre parti della tua lettera a proposito trattarò ancora di questo, ma per hora lo provo in questa parte con questi tre capi; se però haverai tanto lume da Dio, & tanto di patienza, che possi pacificamente bevere questa dottrina catholica fondata non nell’onde del mare di Venetia, ma nella pietra Apostolica; non pescata nel canal grande di Venetia, ma nel mare della dottrina de santi padri, de sacri canoni, & concilii, & ancora per tua maggiore confusione nelle leggi imperiali.

1.
Tu hai ardire di promulgare per leggi puramente humane li sacratissimi, & divini canoni apostolici, & pontificii, & de’ sacri concilii, & il sommo pontefice, de operis novi nunt. dice, che gli imperatori s’humiliano ai sacri canoni; & se non credi al detto del Papa, odi, & leggi
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l’imperatore Giustiniano, il quale gli chiama sacri; adunque non profani né puramente umani, ma divini, anzi egli stesso più chiaramente dice divinis canonibus sanctum est, se sono divini, dunque non umani, perché le humane leggi sono le Regie, ò laiche, come lo prova S. Agostino. Divinum Ius in scripturis habemus, humanum Ius in legibus Regum: & nella Greca eodem dice, sacris canonibus; se non sei ignorante, devi sapere che differenza sia inter sacrum, & prophanum. Pariamente Giustiniano, et non solo Giustiniano; ma ancora l’imperatore Leone & altri imperatori, et ultimamente il Concilio di Trento Spiritus Sancto congregato, gli chiama in molti luoghi, a differenza delle leggi imperiali, le quali da alcuni sono chiamate sacre perché, l’imperial potestà, le quali è confirmata & unta dalla Chiesa, & così sono sacre per quandam participationem, & non dirette come li sacri canoni.

2.
La preminenza de gli Ecclesiastici, & per consequenza la immunità loro oltre quello, che i sacri Theologi, & i santi padri di essa ne parlano, & scrivono, come poi mostrarò nella 5, la provo a maggiore confusione tua l’autorità del tuo Giustiniano Imperatore. Quomodo oporteat, le cui parole sono queste. Maxima quidem in hominibus sunt dona Dei a superna collata Clementia sacerdotium, & Imperium: & illud quidem divinis ministrans; hoc autem humanis praefidens, ac diligentiam adhibens, se dunque il divino servitio precede all’umano, per conseguenza gli Ecclesiastici sono maggiori de principi temporali, & a loro non devono, né tributi, né gabelle, né ubidienza, se non che in cose mere temporali, gli hanno da sovvenire, per edificatione de gli altri, & per servare ancora quello, che la ragione naturale insegna, di aiutare il temporale, & laico, come fa l’anima il suo corpo, & il capo aiuta le membra inferiori, & più ignobili.

Ma non perciò la legge humana gli obliga a questo, come ben dice Alfonso de Costro. Navarro tanto da te stimato, più dotto di te, al quale assisteva lo Spirito Santo, come in te, assiste lo Spirito Santo della carne, & dell’adulatione, dice, & afferma, che l’immunità ecclesiastica de iure divino. Queste parole sono d’un concilio universale Ecumenico Catholicco di tutte le nationi, nel quale sono stati presenti a tua, & loro confusione gli Ambasciatori della
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Signoria di Venetia, & l’hanno approvato & ricevuto, & molto prima questo medesimo confessò il Concilio Laternense sotto Alessandro,\textsuperscript{252} & se non credi\textsuperscript{253} *qui filij sunt legitimi*, & a molti altri canoni sacri, credi almeno al tuo S. Thomaso d’Aquino da te tanto lodato, il quale dice, che le leggi dei principi non obligano se non i sudditi\textsuperscript{254} ma se non può essere suddito, che è maggiore, come hai di ricognizione verso il superiore, come dice S. Thomaso sopra *ad Romanos*, & conseguentemente se i principi laici facessero qualche legge non solamente in pregiudizio; ma ancora in favore de gli Ecclesiastici come fece Giustiniano, & altri, tal legge non sarebbe valida, se il sommo pontefice non l’approvasse, come furono approvate da sommi pontifici le leggi dell’imperatore Giustiniano, favorabili all’Ecclesiastica immunità, e questo dottissimamente, & santissimamente decreto Innocentio 3\textsuperscript{255} con queste parole. *Nos attendentes, quod laicis (etiam religiosis) super Ecclesijs, aut personis Ecclesiasticis nulla sit attributa facultas: quos obsequendi manet necessitas, non auctoritas imperandi, a quibus si quid motu proprio statutum fuerit, quod Ecclesiarium etiam respiciat*\textsuperscript{256} commodum, & favorem, *nullius firmitatis existit nisi ab ecclesia fuerit approqatum: unde statutum Basilj de non alienandis praedijis rusticis, vel urbanis, ministerij, & ornamentis Ecclesiariurn, illa reprobatum fuit potissima ratione, quod auctoritate non fuit Rom. Pontificis roboratum*, & se il Cardinale Bellarmino ti pare, che altrimenti dica, egli già ti risponde abastanza.

3.

La eccellenza del Papato, e preminenza, & autorità sua etiandio temporale sopra tutti i principi laici, la quale tu nella tua lettera cerchi tanto di abbassare scismaticamente, e sminuire, la figurò Melchisedech in comparatione di Abraamo: ma chiaramente la dichiarò l’imperatore Leone,\textsuperscript{257} & l’imperatore Michele Paleologo, & Valentigiano imperatore,\textsuperscript{258} di più il tuo favorito Giustiniano imperatore\textsuperscript{259} scrive queste parole. *Ut legum originem anterior Roma fortita est, ita etiam Summi Pontificatus apicem apud eas esse nemo est qui dubitet; unde, & nos necessarium duximus, Notarium dnximus*; perché la neccesità lo costringe, cioè la conscienza, & c. soggiunge *patriam legum fontem sacerdotij, speciali nostri numinis lege illustrare, cioè honorare, & riverire con l’aiuto suo temporale*.\textsuperscript{260} *Ideoq. sancimus secundum earum definitiones sanctis. senioris Romae Papam primum esse omnium Sacerdotum: dunque molto maggiore è di tutti i laici, come sopra S. Ignatio vescovo & martire nell’epistola ad Antiocenes, vedi quanta riverenza, & ubidienza ricerca nei laici verso prelati ecclesiastici, & molto più verso il

\textsuperscript{252} 3 cap. 9. *De reformatione Curiae §. & cum a Iure & Innocentio 3. Nel ca. Ecclesia. S. M. de Constit.*
\textsuperscript{253} Al c.7. & 13.
\textsuperscript{254} I. 2.q. 96.art.5.
\textsuperscript{255} Nel cap. Ecclesia S. M. de constit.
\textsuperscript{256} Sidbrytning 13-14.
\textsuperscript{257} Nella nov.5.
\textsuperscript{258} Nell’historia tripartita lib. 7. Ca. 8.
\textsuperscript{259} Nella l.8. C. de summa Trin. & nella nov.9.
\textsuperscript{260} & nella nov. 1 31. Cap 2

La onde non solo questo s’ha da intendere in cose mere spirituali, ma ancora in cose temporalì, quando così temporalì, quando così ricerca la utilità, & necessitì, & quète, & pace, & dignità della Chiesa, come puoi leggere di Gregorio Papa. *Alius item Romanus Pontifex Zacharias scilicet, Regem Francorum, non tam pro suis iniquitatibus, quam pro eo, quòd potestati erat inutilis a Regno deposuit,* & *Pipinum Caroli Magni Imperatoris patrem in eius locum, substitute, omnesq. Francigenas a iuramento fidelitatis, quam illi fecerant, absolvit.* Et puoi verificare questo dall’istorie in molti altri casi simili. Tralascio il tuo favorito San Thomaso in tutta la somma della sacra sua Theologia in moltissimi luoghi, dove manifestamente prova la potestà del Papa essere amplissima nella Chiesa di Dio sopra tutti i Potentati. Vedi
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2, 300 Clem un (?), 301 & altri infiniti luoghi, i quali per brevità tralascio, perché so, che mal trattati i Canoni Pontificij, i quali dai veri, & santissimi Theologi, come da S. Thomaso d’Aquino tanto da te lodato, sono in grandissima riverenza tenuti; le quali autorità tutte unitamente confessano la suprema potestà del Pontefice Romano sopra tutti i principi della Christianità; come ne figura il pontefice Ioiada 4. 302 Et come dice Christo. Data est mihi potestas, dopo la resurrettione, & pace oves meas, & nel tempo della passione, disse S. Pietro. Ecce duo gladiij hic, e Christo rispose. Sufficit, & c. così hoggidi N.S PP. Paolo V ha l’istessa potestà, se bene poi mostrarò, che il Papa rare volte adopra il gladio materiale, & solo in grandissime necessità universali della Chiesa contro i principi ribelli ad essa Chiesa. 303

Nella terza particella della tua lettera, scrivi, che Mosè fu principe temporale solamente, & Aaron spirituale: & io rispondo, che questa è una grande falsità, poiché noi troviamo nell’Esodo, e Levitico, che i precetti cerimoniali furono dati da Dio per Mosè, & non per Aaron, & Mosè parlava con Dio, & riceueva le ordinationi da Dio sopra la dispositione dei sacrificij, & culto divino, & non Aaron. 304 Se però non facciamo, come dissi di sopra il Doge di Venetia Papa, & il Papa Doge di Venetia. Di più Mosè concecrò in sacerdote Aaron, & i suoi figliuoli. 305 Dimmi dunque a cui tocca consecrare, & benedire il Pontefice, al principe laico, overo allo spirituale? Se dici al 306 temporale & laico, sei un grande ignorante, perché mai non si trova questo nel testamento vecchio, o nuovo, anzi Ozia 2. Reg. 6. 7. Parab. 26 & Saul 1. Reg. c. 25, i quali volessero mescolarsi nei sacrificij, & iurisdittione spirituale, furono reprobati da Dio. Se dici, che tocca al principe spirituale, dici il vero: perché offerire sacrificio a Dio, consecrare il Tempio, & i vali, i sacerdoti, e leviti, & benedire i vestimenti sacerdotali, & benedire, & ungere i Re temporali, non fu mai ufficio di principe laico. Laonde se Mosè hebbe tale autorità è evidente, ch’esso fu pontefice, & sacerdote conforme alla legge naturale, & civile nemo dat quod non habet, 307 ma con tutto ciò volle Dio, che vi fusse Aaron ancora, ad aiutarlo, 308 i vecchi del popolo per l’istesso fine furono eletti, cioè per aiutare. Mosè nelle questioni, & differenze civili, poiché Mosè era occupato molto in governare quel popolo tanto numeroso, & volle Dio,

che Mosè per il governo di quel popolo, come in S. Paolo\textsuperscript{309} havesse un compagno nelle cose sacre nella casa di Dio, & poi ne gli descendenti di Aaron passasse il sommo sacerdotio, ma non che Mosè dopo di havere consecrato Aaron, fusse privato di tale dignità nella persona sua senza sua colpa, come anco nelle profane hebbhe i vecchi del popolo.\textsuperscript{310} Anzi aggiungio, che appresso gli idolatri nelle cose della religione loro, ò superstitione mai non si mescolò alcuno, che non fusse sacerdote, ò pontefice, & nella legge di natura i sacrificij publici gli offerirono solo i sacerdoti, perché Abraamo alla presenza di Melchisedech cede la preminenza di offrire il sacrificio.\textsuperscript{311} Se bene nella legge di natura non era talmente distinta l’autorità del sacerdote del laico, come nella legge scritta. Dirò di più, che come San Paolo\textsuperscript{312} dice che Mosè fu figura di Christo nel governo della Chiesa Santa, e come Christo promise, & poi diede la potestà a S. Pietro\textsuperscript{313} ultimo, di sommo sacerdote, & a suoi successori, e con tutti ciò esso Christo \textit{manet in aeternum sacerdos}\textsuperscript{314} non perdette l’eccellenza della sua potestà sopra tutta la Chiesa: così Mosè primo capo del popolo hebreo, & della casa di Dio, se bene consacrò Aaron, che gli succedesse poi con tutti i suoi discendenti, non per questo mentre visse fu spoliat di quella potestà, che Dio gli haveva dato. Altrimente vorrei, sapere, perché hoggidì i principi laici non consacrano le chiese, i calici, gli altari, i sacerdoti, i vescovi, il Papa, & i Re, se lo possono fare, overo se Mosè era solo principe temporale & pure nel cap. \textit{Venerabilem de electione} si dice, & S. Thomaso tanto stimato da te afferma, che il consecrare altri è proprio de vescovi.\textsuperscript{315} & l’imperatore Valentiniano lo confessò nella elettione di S. Ambrosio.\textsuperscript{316} Laonde è vero, che se Mosè, hebbe l’una. & l’altra potestà, molto più l’hà d’havere il Vocario di Christo sopra i laici, come anco l’hebbe Mosè sopra i vecchi giudici temporali del popolo hebreo quanto è più eminente il Pontificato del nuovo testamento, di quello del vecchio come prova San Paolo a gli hebrei dal cap. 7 fin’all’undecimo, & come ho provato nell’antecedente parte della lettera tua.

4.

È vero, che Giustiniano imperatore, come ho detto di sopra fece molte constitutioni circa le Chiese & Ecclesiastici, & loro privilegi,\textsuperscript{317} ma devi sapere, che esso lo fece per reprimere\textsuperscript{318} l’insolenza de gli heretici, schismatici, & mali Christiani, & per confermare i sacri canoni disprezzati, & per aiutare (come io diceva di sopra a proposito di Valentiniano imperatore) la

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{309} Hebr. 3.  
\textsuperscript{310} Hebr. 3.  
\textsuperscript{311} Hebr. 7. Genes. 14.  
\textsuperscript{312} Ad Hebr. 3. Sidbrytning 19-20.  
\textsuperscript{313} Math. 16. 10.  
\textsuperscript{314} Ps. 109; Hebr. 5. 7.  
\textsuperscript{316} Nell’istoria tripartita lib. 7. C. 8.  
\textsuperscript{317} Come appare nel ca. 1 de Iuram. Calumn.  
\textsuperscript{318} Sidbrytning 20-21.}
potestà ecclesiastica, ma non come fanno i tuoi venetitani nei loro decreti contra l’ecclesiastica libertà; ma più tosto esso lo fece, come appare in tutto il codice et autentiche, perché non havendo all’hora a sommi pontefici quella riverenza et alla ecclesiastica libertà quello amore i popoli et principi secolari, per la confusione di quei tempi et scismi che regnavano, la quale si doveva havere, egli pretese di favorire in questo la Chiesa: et il giudicio criminale che non gli si riserba non era perché il Papa all’hora non havesse tale potestà, ma per mancamento di ubidienza de’ laici verso gli ecclesiastici et per la modestia de pontefice come più a basso mostrarò; et come per esempio hoogidì vediamo nelle terre de venetiani et altrove essere vilipesa la ecclesiastica potestà. Perciò Giustiniano volendo supplire a questo mancamento fece le sopradette leggi, ma come già ho detto et hora ti provarò, egli si sottomette con le sue leggi al Pontefice Romano et al vescovo suo:

Cum velimus tuam sanctitatem omnia cognoscere, quae ad Ecclesiasticum statum spectant, & c. & infra. Sed per omnia custodiamus Constitutionem unionis sanctiffimarum (sanctissimarum) Ecclesiarum cum sanctissimo Papa senioris Romae, & Patriarcha, neque enim sustinemos quicquam eorum, quae ad ecclesiasticum statum spectant, non referri etiam ad eius Beatitudinem, utpotè quae caput est omnium pijssimorum Dei sacerdotum. Dalle quali parole vedi, che l'imperatore confessa, che gli ecclesiastici non hanno altro capo che il Papa, che le leggi sono sottoposte al giudicio del Papa.
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apostolice Sedi, & vestrae Sanctitati (quod semper in vobis voto fuit, & est) & ut decret patrem honorantes vestram beatitudinem omnia, quae ad Ecclesiarum statum pertinent festinavimus ad notitiam deferre vestre Sanctitatis, quoniam semper fuit nobis, magnum studium unitatem vestrae Apostolicae Sedis, & statum sanctarum Dei Ecclesiarum custodire, & c. Ideoque omnes Sacerdotes universi orientalis tractus, subijcere, & unire Sedis vestrae Sanctitatis properamus. Da questo vedi, che vi era scisma et poca ubbidienza al Papa per la malitia di quei tempi.

Soggiunge: Nec enim patimur quicquam quòd ad Ecclesiarum statum pertinet, quamvis manifestum, & indubitatum sit, quod movetur, ut non etiam vestrae innotescat Sanctitati, que caput est omnium sanctarum Eccles. Ecco che Giustiniano conferma la sua constituizione e la sua continuità. I presenti vogliono avere maggiore autorità dell’imp. Giustiniano. Segue: Per omnia enim ut dictum est, properavimus honorem, & auctoritatem crescere vestrae sanctae Sedis. Quello che non fa tu nei tuoi venetiani, perché più tosto volete sminuire et abassare l’autorità e dignità della Sedia Apostolica et del Vicario di Christo con la tua scandalosa lettera degna del fuoco con il suo autore et fauitori. Dalle quali parole dell’imperatore Giustiniano col quale defendi la tua perversa dottrina, si può raccogliere la grande riverenza che egli hebbe verso gli Ecclesiastici et verso il Pontefice Romano capo di tutti i fidelis cristiani et la soggetione et subordinazione delle sue leggi imperiali al detto sommo pontefice et ch’egli non pretendeva di fare alcuna cosa di nuovo in favore della immunità et foro ecclesiastico, ma più tosto confermarlo et fomentarlo con la sua potenza contra la malignità et disubbidienza de mali christianis et nel crimine concedesedere con consenso del Papa alla qualità di quei tempi. Come per esempio. Se la Signoria di Venetia facesse leggi et ordinasse pene contro il peccato nefando in quella Città sarebbe forse tale legge, e pena de iure Veneto Venetorum solamente et non de gli imperatori anzi de iure divino, et naturali punito nel Genesi co’l fuoco? Overo se Papa Pio V ha fatto una constituzione contro gli simoniaci, dunque prima non era prohibita la simonia per la legge naturale, divina et apostolica, come disse S. Pietro a Simone Mago? Overo se la Sig. di Venetia decretasse che tu falso Theologo fusi punito con la pena del falso, perché falsifichi la vera dottrina de Theologi; sarebbe forse nuova dalla legge di natura, dalla scrittura, et dalli sacri Canoni, e dalle leggi civili? Dunque è nuova la dottrina tua contro l’autorità del Papa insegntata da te a tuoi venetiani con li scritti abominevoli, et non più tosto vomitata da Lutero, Calvino, Vuiclef (?), Gio. Hus, Gieronimo da Praga, et nel Conc. Constantienese riprovata, et condennata per heretica con gli autori suoi? Dunque perché i venetiani hanno de facto nel presente Interdetto proceduto
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criminalmente contro gli Ecclesiastici per questo la Chiesa non ha la sua potestà temporale et gli interdetti et ordinationi ponteficie non hanno validità? Dunque se li venetiani volessero con suoi nuovi decreti osservare l’ecclesiastica immunità ella sarebbe solamente de iure Venetorum? Io in vero perché non ti credo, dico et confesso che ovvero sei un grande ignorante, ovvero pieno di grandissima malignità scrivendo et facendo simili conseguenze, le quali dimostrano in te essere falsa logica, et falsa teologia et molta carnalità; che se havesti la vera teologia et vero Spirito di buon Catholico parlaresti dell’immunità ecclesiastica come ne parla l’angelico Dottor S. Thomaso da te falsamente allegato, come scudo et difensore dell’empia tua dottrina.

5.

Alla quinta, nella quale dice, che Constantino,\(^{325}\) fece gli ecclesiastici esenti dal foro laico, più per eccesso di benignità che perché interiormente in verità così sentisse. Rispondo che vorrei che li tuoi venetiani imitassero l’eccesso della pietà di cotale imperatore, perché meritarebbero maggiore lode, che con la contumacia. Ma con tutto ciò vorrei sapere, se credi al Decrevit (e De Elect.),\(^{326}\) perché in quelli Constantino riconosce il Papa maggiore de se et si confessa obbligato a rinunciare per onore di San Pietro la città di Roma con tutto l’imperio di Occidente et la autorità suprema, non per cerimonia ovvero eccesso di benignità, ma perché veramente così diceva essere obbligato di fare. Et io per me non credo che havesse fatto tale eccesso se in consienza non havesse conosciuto di essere obbligato a farlo; poiché vediamo che i venetiani non vogliono concedere non solo la loro giurisdictione al Papa, ma ne anco quella che è ecclesiastica et pure essi fanno professione di bonissima consciencia, et di essere cattolichissimi; essendo che i principi sono difficilissimi a condescendere ad altri; et alla Chiesa anco un dito, non che un palmo di terra, ò di giurisdictione quello che non fece Constantino,\(^{327}\) per questo credo che sia falsissimo quello che dici Poiché nel 10 libro della historia ecclesiastica, e ne fanno fede di questo gli imperatori Valentiniano, Theodosio et Arcadio.\(^{328}\) Et ne gli atti del Concilio Niceno si trova il contrario; dove Constantino\(^{329}\) fa differenza dal foro laico et imperiale all’ecclesiastico, poiché il giudicio laico non è immediatamente da Dio, come hò provato di sopra, ma per conseguenza; ma l’Ecclesiastico è direttamente; onde propriamente i prelati ecclesiastici et il Papa quivi sono chiamati Dij in Sinagoga et li laici principi, sunt Dij per conseguenza, per l’autorità mediata, che hanno da Dio, et dalla Chiesa mentre sono legittimi principi et non quando non hanno gli stati et autorità


\(^{326}\) Dist. 88 alla 11.q.c.5 & c.41.c14.dist.96 & al c.17 de elect. Lib. 6

\(^{327}\) Come si legge nel detto cap. Futuram et nelli citati Canoni et nelle historie sacre.


legittima approvata dalla Chiesa. Ma per maggiore chiarezza ecco le parole di Constantino alli vescovi et quanto più al Papa? Dice dunque: Deus vos constituit sacerdotes, & potestatem nobis dedit de nobis quoque iudicandi; ma questo non lo confessa la tua Signoria di Venetia.

Soggiunge: Ideo nos à vobis recte iudicamur, vos autem non potestis ab hominibus iudicari. Nota bene queste parole, le quali non sono eccesso di benignità, ma confessione di foro maggiore de gli ecclesiastici sopra i secolari, etiam Imperator et d’immunità anteriore di molto tempo contro quello che dicevi di Giustiniano che fu il primo concederla, essendo stato Giustiniano molti anni dopo Constantino. Segue Constantino: Propter quod Dei solius inter vos expectate Iuditium cioè non laicorum, come mi ricercano alcuni nel caso presente; perché io non posso essere vostro giudice; vos enim nobis a Deo dati estis Dij idest iudices, applicabitur ad Deos, et così l’interpretano i santi Gregorio, Agostino, et Nicolo citati sopra a vergogna de tuoi venetiani, i quali giudicano de facto gli Ecclesiastici. Conveniens non est ut homo iudicet Deos, sed ille solus, de quo scriptum est. Deus stetit in Synagoga Deorum, et vuole inferire che gli Ecclesiastici ai secolari sono superiori come Dei a gli huomini; ma ne gli ecclesiastici non nega però, come falsamente affermi che non vi sia superiorità come prova S. Gregorio citato, havere detto Constantino: vos dij estis a vero Deo constituti: ite, & inter vos causas vestras discutite: Poichè a S. Pietro Christo diede l’autorità, di sciogliere et legare et di pascere le pecore sue: anzi l’istesso Constantino confessa de Iure divino non essere le cause ecclesiastice sogette al loro laico, ma di Dio, cioè del suo Vicario in terra immediato universale, essendo cosa chiara che uno stesso è il Tribunale del Vicario generale et del prelato, et così è vero che il corpo è governato dall’anima et non al contrario et l’inferiore dal superiore et più sublime come ben dice S. Paolo: omnis anima poestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit. Nota questo comparativo, sublimioribus, et leggi il c. Sacerdotibus. 11.q.1.

6. Dico che falsamente alleghi il Card. Bellarmino et l’autorità di S. Paolo perché ogn’uno deve essere soggetto a Dio et al suo principe superiore; ma non à quello che non è suo superiore, non est enim potestas nisi a Deo: quae autem a Deo sunt, ordinata sunt, non disordinate et confuse le superiorità et le inferiorità; et percì che non è vero superiore eius potestas non est a Deo, sed a Diabolo, come vediamo nelle cose naturali, le quali sono bene ordinate da Dio. Onde havendoti provato nelle precedenti risposte che gli ecclesiastici sono maggiori de laici, sarebbe cosa monstruosa che gli Ecclesiastici obedissero a laici come monstruoso è che il capo sia suddito dei piedi, i maggiori ai minori; quelli che sono consacrati al culto divino a gli huomini

---
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profani et le autorità indute da te del Salmo 81.2, Paral. 19.10.10 l’intendono che i principi laici *exercent Iuditia*335 *Dei*, quando giudicano i suoi sudditi, non i suoi superiori, vero esenti: come sarebbe per esempio il Leone è Re de gli animali, ma non de gli huomini et l’huomo è fatto da Dio per governare tutte le creature inferiori sensitiue,336 et si può chiamare un Dio di esse337 come Mosè è chiamato Dio di Faraone dall’istesso Dio,338 ma non perciò l’huomo è Dio et governatore de gli Angeli, anzi essi governano gli huomini, et li custodiscono in quella vita, essendo di natura inferiori a gli Angeli, così si ha da inferire nel presente caso et autorità da te male intese et allegate.

7.

Alla settima dico che è vero che *qui potestati resistit, Dei ordinationi resistit*, ma gli ecclesiastici come ho detto non sono sotto la potestà de laici, anzi al contrario; onde i tuoi venetiani, i quali hanno per suoi Ambasciatori come sopra riconosciuto la potestà del Papa come di pastore universale della Chiesa et delle loro anime, essendo contumaci alli precetti santissimi della potestà papale, *Dei ordinationi resistunt; & ipsi sibi damnationem acquirunt, traditi Satanae* per mezo della scommunica, & stanno di continuo nel peccato mortale; irritando contro se alla giornata con nove contumacie l’ira di Dio et del suo Vicario et come tu dici bene, se morissero, et tu che sei loro fautore, partecipe, et consultore339 sareste all’eterne fiamme dell’inferno condennati: Quanto poi à quello che scrivi della legge di Giustiniano già risposi d sopra nella quarta et nell’altre risposte.

8.

Aggiungo al Cardinal Bellarmino che mai il superiore non pagò tributo all’inferiore così lo dice S. Thomaso nel luogo da te citato.340 Onde se l’Ecclesiastico superiore al laico non deve ad esso pagare tributo come suddito,341 ma aiutarlo alle volte per ragione naturale come fa il capo al corpo, permittente Pontefice, il quale concede alcune volte, che i principi et i tuoi venetiani ex gratia Apostolica habbino le decime dalli ecclesiastici nomine subsidij et non per obligo di legge alcuna come ho provato nella seconda e perciò il privilegio de Principi laici non ha introdutta la immunità ecclesiastica, ma la ragione naturale glielo ha commandata et la divina legge ancora et se li venetiani facessero decreto et di ubidire al Papa in questi casi, nei quali da esso sono scommunicati et interdetti; non perciò simile ubidienza sarebbe ex privilegio, ma debita de Iure divino approvato da loro per lo stimolo della conoscenza de veri catolici et fidelì a Dio et al suo Vicario.

335 Sidbrytning 27–28.
336 Genes. 1
337 1. Par.q. 108. Art 5.
338 Exod. 7.
339 Rom. 1.
340 Rom. 13.
341 Sidbrytning 28–29.
A quello che scrivi secondo S. Paolo che i principi secolari portant gladium. Rispondo che S. Paolo non si ristringe alli laici, ma parla in universale di ogni potestà, poiché dà una regola generale alli suoi sudditi verso i suoi superiori: onde se è vero, come ho provato, che il Papa habet utrumque gladium nei casi sopra citati et anco d’imponere et effigere tributo come nella seconda meritamente molto più parla l’Apostolo della potestà Ecclesiastica che della laica; et se come tu dici i sudditi laici sono obligati in conscienza di ubbidire a principi laici, i quali hanno solo autorità nei corpi in cose giuste, quanto più in conscienza direttamente sono tenuti i laici di ubbidire al loro pastore et al pastore dei pastori, il quale è il Papa, etiando i veneti non solamente indirecte & consequenter, ma directe vi potestatis supreme super omnes fideles. Che se la Chiesa corresse a furia in metter mano alla spada temporale contro i suoi contumaci, già essi veneti dovrebbero essere distrutti; ma essa imita, la mansuetudine di Christo et aspetta a penitenza, lasciando la spada predetta per ultimo rimedio. Ho citato tanti testi, acciò vedi da essi unitamente che la mente da Pontefice è di non adoprare l’autorità temporale con la spada, se non quando vi è grandissima neccessità, ma non è già buono argomento il dire che la Chiesa non ha autorità temporale, perché degrada gli Ecclesiastici et poi dà al braccio secolare; ma dovresti più tosto dire et concludere che si il braccio secolare non punisce gli Ecclesiastici se non quando la Chiesa gli degrada et gli dà nelle loro mani: adunque la potestà sopra gli ecclesiastici non l’ha, se non quando la Chiesa lo permette et non essercita il pretato ecclesiastico tale autorità immediate nella pena del sangue, non perché non possa, ma perché imita la mansuetudine di Christo, se bene alle volte quando è necessità, il Papa piglia il flagello temporale et commanda a principi catolici che castighino con le armi i principi ribelli della Chiesa et perturbatori del bene commune, come confessano i veri teologi et cannonisti, non i falsi, come sei tu.

Anzi se il vero imperio si ritrova nel padrone di Roma, io non vedo come il Papa fatto da Dio nella persona di S. Pietro, come sopra, signore di Roma et i suoi successori per la libera cessione di Constantino non habbino l’autorità imperiale poiché se bene essi instituiscono

342 Rom. 13.
343 Math 16. Ioan vlt. Luc. 10. Math. 18 et come confessa tutta la Scuola de Sacri Theologi, dalla quale ti sei miseramente ribellato. Vedi S. Tomaso nella p. 2.q.91.art.3.q.95.vsque ad 99 (sidbrytning 29-30) q.19.ar.4 & 2.2.q.40.art.2.q.147.art.3 & 3.p.q.59.art.2. seq.q.81.art.1.6.q.72.art.12.suppl.quaest.54.art.4 & il c.9.extra de voto. Soto de Iust.lib.1.q.6.ar.4.ca Violatores 25.q.1. & il c.1 de nov.oper.nunt. & altri luoghi & autorità potrei adurre, le quali per brevità tralascio.
l'imperatore Romano laico, come bene contro questa tua lettera prova il Card. Bellarmino, et in un altro suo libretto de Translatione Imperij ad occidentales, lo fanno queste i Papi; per havere un braccio laico nell’essercizio della spada temporale contro i nemici della Chiesa, ma non per privarsi di tale autorità, la quale hanno sino a deponere i Re.\textsuperscript{346} Laonde S. Ambrosio nella epistola ad Vercellenses riferisce queste parole dell’imperatore Valentiniano a Sant’Ambrosio. \textit{Noli timere quia Deus, qui te elegit, semper adiuvabit, & ego adiutor, & defensor tuus (ut meum ordinem decet) semper existam.} Nota bene, ut meum ordinem decet, et questo è l’ufficio dell’imperatore et nell’istoria tripartita\textsuperscript{347} dice l’istesso imperatore a gli ecclesiastici \textit{talem itaque in pontificali constituite fede, cui, & nos qui gubernamus imperium, sycere (?) nostra capita subittamus.} Queste sono parole d’inferiore soggiunge:\textsuperscript{348} & \textit{cuius monita dum tanquam homines deliquerimus necessario:} Nota questa parola, necessario, et non voluntarie; \textit{velut curantis medicamenta suscipiamus.} Queste parole dovresti tu predicare alli venetiani et non essortargli a non sottomettere il capo et la loro vita al Vicario di Christo necessariamente come sono obligati de Iure divino in cose tanto giuste come queste conforme alla constitutione dell’imperatore Carlo\textsuperscript{349} et di S. Leone.\textsuperscript{350}

9.

Se Christo Nostro signore come tu dici inanzi la resurrettione non usò autorità di principe. Rispondo che nondimeno egli haveva Matth. ult: \textit{Data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo, et in terra.} Joann. 13: \textit{Sciens; quia omnia dedit ei pater in manus, et cap. 17: Sicut dedisti ei det eis vitam aeternam.} Nota quella parola, \textit{omnis carnis, & non solo omnis animae,} come tu malamente intendi nelle seguenti tre propositioni. Item S. Paolo Heb. 2. \textit{Omnia subiecisti sub pedibus eius.} In eo enim quod omnia ei subiecit, nihil dimisit non subiectum ei, adunque, \textit{etiam temporalia, nunc autem necdum videmus omnia subiecta ei,} cioè al tempo de gli Apostoli, et a nostri tempi ancora non vediamo tutto il mondo soggetto a Christo, perché non sono i tuoi venetiani al suo vicario, al quale ha dato la sua potestà.\textsuperscript{351} Apoc. 1: \textit{Princeps Regum terrae:} adunque della Signoria di Venetia. Et le bene Christo, et il suo vicario non sono uditi, non per questo mancano di haver l’autorità. Essemposia, se il Re và incognito per il Regno, mentre, che non è conosciuto, et non gli ubbidiscono i sudditi non perde per questo l’autorità, et mentre i vassali, si ribellano ingiustamente da lui, overo al suo luogotenente\textsuperscript{352} generale, non percì manca l’autorità, ma la debita ubidienza de’ sudditi, come nel caso de Venetiani; et se bene Christo mostrò Signore inanzi alla sua morte non essercitò tale potestà regolarmente dimmi con

\textsuperscript{346} 15.q.6.c. Alius
\textsuperscript{347} Lib. 7. Cap. 8
\textsuperscript{348} Sidbrytning 31-32.
\textsuperscript{349} Nel Concilio Tribur ca. 30.
\textsuperscript{350} Epist. 87 ad Vienenses.
\textsuperscript{351} Matth. 16, Ioan. Ult. Item.
\textsuperscript{352} Sidbrytning 32–33.
tutto ciò il flagellare con il flagello materiale quelli, che vedevano nel Tempio, ti pare che sia effetto di potestà spirituale sopra le anime et non sopra i corpi con pena corporale? Et se il Papa suo vicario hora vuole con il flagello non solo della scomunica spirituale, ma ancora col temporale, castigare te, che introduci falsa dottrina et mercantia indebita nel Tempio cioè nella Chiesa cattolica et i tuoi venetiani perché vogliono nella Chiesa di Dio contro gli Ecclesiastici introdurre et esporre le loro mercantie, cioè la loro facoltà et potestà temporale non sarebbe conforme a quello, che fece Christo et degno di molta lode? In oltre quando Christo fece cadere quei soldati à terra, i quali lo volevano legare, perché credi che lo facesse, se non per mostrare che esso era esente dalla loro giurisdizione et haveva potestà sopra i loro corpi? Onde esso permise loro che lo legassero di poi, ma commandò che non toccassero i Discepoli per darti ad intendere che gli ecclesiastici sono esenti dalla potestà de laici et che egli volontariamente per il misterio della nostra redenzione dispensative cedeva per quel tempo alla potestà temporale et immunità propria, conforme a quanto scrive Damasceno permettebat carnì patì, & agere quae propria per quel tempo: et perciò ancora nel tempo della sua passione volle mostrare la sua potestà temporale nel miracolo, che si vidde nelle creature, mostrando che moriva volontariamente, non perdendo però la detta potestà.

Ma doppo la Resurrettione, se bene gli Apostoli nella primitiva Chiesa regolarmente non solevano usare autorità temporale, perché regnavano gli imperatori gentili, et i primi fedeli erano ancora teneri nella fede et bisognava con l’esempio di mansuetudine tirargli alla fede con tutto ciò io vorrei sapere da te, se la pena, che regnava con spirito profetico come vicario di Christo, S. Pietro contro Anania et Saffira fu corporale, o mera spirituale? Io ritrovo che fu morte corporale se bene non con la spada che poco importa; ma basto a me, che cotale sentenza di S. Pietro come vicario di Christo, et principe della Chiesa con quello spirito profetico cagionò a quelli infelici la morte corporale et ciò non fu per delitto di cose spirituali: ma per conto della robbia già offerta a Dio, et poi defraudato con menzogna, havendo il detto Apostolo tale autorità come bene lo prova S. Hilario et S. Leone. Et peggio fanno hoggidì i tuoi venetiani, i quali non solo con menzogne, ma con violentie et decreti prohibiscono che non si dia alle Chiese et luoghi pii quello che i testatori o donatori liberalmente lasciano per honore di Dio, et Redentione delle anime loro contro la Constitutione de gli imperatori Carlo et Ludovico et defraudano la Chiesa in ritenersi gli ecclesiastici carcerati et facendo ricadere a
loro i beni enfiteutici\textsuperscript{362} delle Chiese, il che è maggiore sacrilegio come scrive S. Girolamo a Nepotiano, che quello di Anania, poiché la robbia era loro, et peccarono solo in bugia et in non manifestare la verità della robbia offerta.

Hora quella autorità di sententiare di morte corporale, la quale fu in S. Pietro è trapassata sempre nelli suoi successori, etiandio in Paolo V miracolosamente contro ogni\textsuperscript{363} aspettazione eletto da Dio, il quale se bene non fa miracoli con la sua sentenza come S. Pietro, questo è perché hoogidì la fede è tanto pubblicata et la sua potestà già riconosciuta da tutta la Christianità, cioè dalli veri catolici et perciò non si ricercano miracoli, come dice S. Thomaso,\textsuperscript{364} ma basta l’autorità ordinaria che egli ha sopra tutti i fedeli etiandio temporale et hora che la fede è pubblicata et esso riconosciuto etiandio dai venetiani per loro pastore, come già ho detto, non sarà più scandolo et impedimento della fede s’egli giustamente nell’i casi sopracitati senteniando adoparà la spada temporale ancora, non giovando la spirituale a convertire gli huomini perversi, ostinati, disbidenti, come già fece Papa Giulio Secondo contro i detti venetiani, poiché le armi papali ridussero a la debita ubidienza loro predecessori.

10.

Risponde dottissimamente il Card. Bellarmino che se Christo pagò il tributo con S. Pietro fu solo per non scandalizzare coloro. Aggiungo io che ancora osservò molte cerimonie di quella legge, alle quali tu fai, che veramente non era obligato con i suoi apostoli per non scandalizzare i Giudei; et volle anco riconoscere Cesare Augusto in Bethleem per mezo della madre sua santissima, ma con tutto ciò non osservò alcune usanze loro per mostrarsi esente dalle loro false tradizioni, provò che il figliuolo dell’huomo era padrone del Sabbato et che gli non era soggetto al sabbatismo\textsuperscript{365} et non era obligato alle leggi loro, se bene volontariamente ad esse si sottopose come dice S. Paolo\textsuperscript{366} per nostra istruzione. \textit{Cum omnis Christi actio nostra sit instiutio}. Ma quanto al tributo\textsuperscript{367} s’esso non era obligato a pagarlo con S. Pietro, come egli testifica, non perché fusse Giudeo; ma più tosto come Re et Messia et Dio con la sua famiglia per conseguenza nè anco il suo vicario con la sua famiglia cioè gli ecclesiastici clerici vocati in fortum domini scrive Isodoro\textsuperscript{368} et S. Girolamo\textsuperscript{369} S. Ambrosio\textsuperscript{370} propterea ergo dicti sunt Clerici, quia de forte Domini sunt, vel quia Domini partem habent, & perciò superiori a’laici. Di che furono figura quelli della Tribù di Levi, ai quali non fu assegnata parte de terreni.

\textsuperscript{362} Eggentligen: enfiteotici.
\textsuperscript{363} Sidbrytning 34-35.
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temporali, nella terra di promissione, perché Dio volle che fussero peculiariamente suoi familiari et egli volle separargli dalle altre Tribù con particolare privilegio et essere esso stesso haeredità et possessione et da questi luoghi della scrittura si può cavare la esentione et immunità ecclesiastica de Iure divino, cioè della separazione dei Leviti dalle altre famiglie della cura temporale e dall’obligo che havevano le altre famiglie di aiutarli et pagarli le decime, primitive e dalla speciale cura et protettione che Dio pigliò di loro; et quanto più s’ha da dire de Leviti del nuovo testamento lo lascio a te concludere.

11.

Rispondo che non è buono argomento questo, Christo non hà usato la potestà temporale, la quale haveva sopra tutti come alla nona hò mostrato, dunque non la doveva lasciare al suo Vicario ne instituí in persona di lui potestà temporale. Imperoche molte cose non fa il principe per degni rispetti, le quali lascia fare al suo vicario et così fece Christo nostro Signore se bene con tutto ciò hò provato che anco Christo innanzi la sua passione esercitò la sua potestà temporale et S. Pietro ancora nella primitiva Chiesa, con Spirito profetico sententiando alla morte corporale et S. Paolo contro Elima mago, sententiandolo all’istesso modo alla cecità corporale, come meritaresti tu plene omnidolo, & fallacia con i tuoi seguaci et discepoli filij diaboli, inimici omnis Iustitiae, non definentes subuertere vias domini rectas. Et quanto alla potestà che dici havere dato Christo a S. Pietro solamente sopra le anime, vorrei sapere oltre quello che risposi di sopra, in che modo esercitarà la sua potestà di pascere le pecore, cioè i laici quando commettono qualche ingiustitia, se non hà il bastone temporale per catigarli et quando non temono le scommuniche?

A me pare che sarebbe un pastore non di pecore, ma di animi ali indomiti, feroci selvaggi, fuggitivi et liberì da ogni castigo. È regola de giuristi che in maiori summa continetur minor. Item de filosofi: qui dat esse, dat consequentia ad esse. Item regula iuris accessorium sequitur principale. Item chi hà la maggiore potestà ha ancora la minore, perché qui habet superius, habet etiam eminentius, & per excessum id quod est inferius, come insegna S. Thomaso da te male inteso, quando tratta de gli Angeli, onde se è vero che l’anima è forma del corpo iuxta Philosophs et Theologos et il corpo serve et ubidisce all’anima come instrumento et il bene temporale è fatto da Dio in ordine a lo spirituale et i regni temporali per lo spirituale et
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ogni cosa temporale per Dio\textsuperscript{380} stesso\textsuperscript{381}. \textit{Universa propter semetipsum operatus est Dominus, impium vero ad diem malum}, come sei tu\textsuperscript{382} per me Reges regnant, non solamente come causa efficiente, ma come ultima causa finale,\textsuperscript{383} dunque se li stessi temporali fanno leggi ingiuste et con peccati non hà d’havere il pastore universale potestà temporale se hà la spirituale, quale è maggiore quando è impedito il bene dell’anime et offesa l’ecclesiastica libertà?

Dunque hàverà il Papa autorità di governare et reggere l’essere delle anime, come sono le cose temporali quando si tratta del bene della Chiesa et delle anime? Dunque se bene il corpo è accessorio a quello dell’anima, come dice Sant’Agostino,\textsuperscript{384} chi hà autorità sopra il principale che è l’anima non l’hàverà sopra il corpo che è accessorio? Dunque Christo Nostro Signore che ha dato a S. Pietro l’essere suo vicario, et la cura pastorale delle anime in ordine alla vita eterna, non solo de privati, ma ancora de principi non gli hàverà ancora lasciato la sua autorità temporale, concedendoli le consequenze all’essere vero, legittimo et potente pastore, senza essere attizzato da lupo infernale con le astutie invisibili et visibili dell’i membri suoi, come sono i mali principi? Certo ch’io non credo che Christo Nostro Signore voglia essere inferiore ad un principe mortale. Perché se li tuoi venetiani quando mandato un suo nobile in reggimento gli danno tutta quella autorità che si ricerca a tale grado; molto più è conveniente che Dio Nostro Signore per honore sua gli hàverà sopra il corpo che è accessorio et conservazione del grado suo.

12.

Mi rimetto a quanto scrive il Cardinale Bellarmino \textit{de translatione Imperij ad Occidentales}; perché questa parte presente tratta d’istorie, ne io, ne alcuno deve credere alle tue vanità: ma leggere l’istorie in fonte circa la suprema autorità del Papa c. Venerabile de Electione et vedere quello che ne tratta il Cardinal Baronio, la somma de Concilij et altre istorie a questo proposito et vedere ancora se li re catolico et di Portogallo pretendevano di eleggere il Papa per loro giudice compromissario, negando la sua suprema autorità come di pastore della Chiesa in decidere la controversie de principi; overo se ricorrevano da lui come a vero giudice supremo nelle difficoltà occorrenti. Una cosa desidero che intendi che Papa Zaccaria come hò già detto despose un re di Francia come inutile al Regno di Francia et elesse a quello Pipino padre di Carlo Magno imperatore, come scrive Gregorio Papa VII,\textsuperscript{385} il che è più che determinare della conquista de regni che si hanno da acquistare; quanto ancora è più scacciare uno del possesso et dal Ius in re che dare il Ius ad rem.
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Ma quando dici che il Papa essendo cacciato nel tempo di Leone iij dalla sua sedia non diede l’imperio di Occidente a Carlo, il quale già l’haveva Iure belli. Rispondo che è ragione fanciullesca poiché se la Signoria di Venetia fusse cacciata furore populi, o il Vescovo dalla sua diocesi ingiustamente non per questo mancarebbe la loro potestà et giurisdizione; ma bene l’ubidienza dei sudditi et già ho detto, che il Ius belli ha da essere giusto et gli imperij hanno da essere approvati et confirmati da Dio et dal suo vicario, altrimenti sono ingiusti, onde il fatto de gli huomini non togli la potestà et perciò i suoi scritti, i quali vogliono derogare alla potestà pontificia et le attioni de Venetiani, non per questo privano veramente Papa Paolo V della sua autorità, anzi il detto Papa de Jure potrebbe in simile caso dare la giusta invasione et occupatione delle Terre di coloro che negano la sua potestà: ma la sua molta mansuetudine paterna lo trattiene imitando Dio Nostro Signore qui Sap. 11. Neminem vult perire, sed dissimulat peccata eorum propter penitentiam.

13.

Già hò risposto nella undecima, nella seconda et provato l’autorità di San Pietro et de suoi successori esse ancora temporale in ordine allo spirituale et quello Hinno della Chiesa; Non eripit mortalia, qui regna dat Caelestia è verissimo perché né Christo, nei suoi Vicarij pretendono di volere spogliare alcuno del suo: poiché solamente cercano la salute dell’anime; ma quando le cose mortali impediscono le coelsti, allhora toglierle da chi le possiede per bene loro et della Chiesa, non dicitur, eripere, perché il Chirurgo non fa torto et non toglie violentemente il membro putrido dannoso a tutto il corpo, ne il principe quando toglie ad alcuno i bene per i suoi misfati dicitur, eripere, ma gli toglie quello ch’egli giustamente per la legge perde.

San Thomaso et vuole dire l’Hinno, l’intentione di Christo non essere guadagno temporale, ma solo il guadagno dell’anime, al quale deve cedere ogni guadagno terreno et temporale et quando duo Iura concurrunt, allhora, quod potentius est vincit, come in molti luoghi prova S. Tomaso né la concurrenza di due precetti, verbi gratia, togliere l’altrui in estrema povertà, et necessità non è rubbare propriamente et molto più per servitio del bene commune, per la giustitia et bene publico. Et quanto a quello che dici che la Monarchia temporale fu fondata nel principio del mondo. Et perciò Christo Nostro Signore non a instituì nella persona di San Pietro. Leggi quello che hò detto nel principio, nella prima, perché Christo nostro Signore non instituì Monarchia in generale nel suo vicario, la quale non fusse stata ab initio in qualche modo o in actu, o in similitudine come scrive S. Tomaso delle specie delle cose, le quali almeno furono, vel materialiter, vel causaliter, vel secundum similitudinem, nella
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prima creazione onde\textsuperscript{390}, \textit{nihil sub sole novuum; iam enim fuerunt in seculis, quae fuerunt ante nos;} ma solo diele la sua potestà Cristo come figliuolo naturale di Dio, hebbe ab eterno predestinato, come dice S. Paolo\textsuperscript{391} \textit{Filius Dei in virtute, qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum Carnem.} 

Onde se Christo, come sopra nella nona hebbe l’una et l’altra potestà, se in S. Pietro fondò et lasciò la sua potestà spirituale per conseguenza ancora nell’istesso S. Pietro lasciò la temporale, come hò provato nella undecima et nella seconda al terzo ponto. Si potrebbe dire che ancora in qualche modo la potestà spirituale fu nella legge vecchia, et perciò Christo non doveva instituire in S. Pietro ma alla tua ragione rispondo di più che il figurato è più perfetto della figura et che tutte le figure de tempi passati tendevano a Christo come ombra al corpo et perciò Christo adtempi perfettissimamente quello che spettava alla fondatione della sua Chiesa, nella quale sono membri et capo, etiandio in essere troncati dal corpo col ferro materiale, quando essi sono putridi et nocivi a l’universale bene di tutto\textsuperscript{392} il corpo; e così s’intende, \textit{data est mihi omnis potestas, & accipite Spiritum Sanctum, & c. & pasce oves meas, & c.} Che se tu essenso Christiano suddito della Chiesa non vuoi vivere sotto l’ubidienza del pastore, e non vuoi la remissione de peccati, ostitomi essi, e non riconosci tutta la potestà del Papa Vicario di Cristo, che s’ha da fare?

Hà dunque da stare il Papa con le mani a cintola e contentarsi solo, di scommunicar te et tuoi venetiani che vi burlate delle scommunich e permettere membri dannosì nella Chiesa? Anzi più tosto risecarli secondo il consilio di S. Girolamo, \textit{resecandae sunt putridae carnes, & scabiosaouiscaulis repellanda, né tota domus, massa, corpus, & pecora ardeant corrupmantur, putrescant, intereant, Arius in Alexandria una scintilla fuit; sed quia non statim suppresae est totum orbem eius flamma depopulata est, et queste parole s’hanno anco da intendere di castigo corporale.} Laonde si vede che quello che scrivi dell’autorità di S. Pietro solamente sopra le anime c’una favola pedantesca mal causata da quella oratione della Cath. di S. Pietro, poiché S.Thom. molte volte et Arist.\textsuperscript{393} dice che l’anima è forma del corpo et recedente anima, non è più l’istesso huomo, \textit{nisi aequivoce} però l’huomo si chiama à potiori \textit{parte anima}, come nel Gen. Cap. 14 disse il re di Sodoma ad Abraamo: \textit{da mihi animas, caetera tolle tibi.} Io non credo che letteralmente il re di Sodoma cercesse le anime separate del corpo nell’autorità spirituale, ma solo i prigioni de nemici et l’istesso modo di parlare è della scrittura:\textsuperscript{394} \textit{cunctae quae animae, quae egressae sunt de faemore eius, vedi se le anime escono
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dall’huomo, ovvero se sono infuse da Dio nel corpo organizzato et vedi a non dire qualche errore contro la Chiesa Catolica et tutti sacri theologi povero et miserabile et vilissimo nella grammatica tua pedantesca piena de ignoranza, conosci la tua cecità, con la quale vai a mezo giorno tentone per volerti separare dalla luce della catolica dottrina, e fede et se S. Pietro hebbe potestà sopra il peccato noi siamo hora nell’istesso caso con i tuoi venetiani perché le loro leggi fatte contro l’Ecclesiastica libertà contengono manifesto peccato come provai, essendo injuiste contro la legge naturale et divina S. Tomasos conforme a quanto narra et determina la 6. Sinodo et Carlo et Ludovico imperatori et S. Agostino et perciò s’essi non vogliono ubidire al capo della Chiesa et non temono le scommuniche hà da stare la Chiesa di Dio, senza rimedio, et il suo vicario disprezzato et vilipeso?

Anzio io ti dico, et siami lecito di parlare così che sarebbe manca et imperfetta la potestà del Papa, se non havesse ancora la temporale in tutta la Chiesa nei casi predetti et questa ragione è tanta vera che lauoleno 1. C. idolatra l’ha conosciuta et confessata cu iurisdiction data est, ea quoque concessa esse videntur, sine quibus iurisdiction explicari non potuit et perciò togli l’autorità temporale al Papa et il timore dell’armi Apostoliche materiali, vedrai, che molti Principi lasciaranno a dietro le scommuniche et caderanno in mille disordini, come hà fatto l’Inghilterra. In vero che sarebbono più perfetti principi laici, che non sono quelli de gli ecclesiastici se essi soli potessero reprimere l’insolenze de loro vassalli et non lo potessero fare i sommi pontefici verso le sue pecore, cioè suoi sudditi mali Christiani. In oltre quando scrivi che l’autorità del Papa è conditionata, io dico che i sacri canoni, le leggi et concilij et principalmente quello di Trento commandano che nissuno sia scommunicato senza colpa, la quale nel presente caso de Venetiani è manifesta facendo leggi ingiuste et non volendo ubidire al Papa essendosi osservato tutti li termini legali et giuridici se bene il Papa, come supremo Giudice nella Chiesa non è obligato a certi termini positivi, alli quali sono i giudici inferiori, se bene è vero che non vi essendo giusta causa di punire peccarebbe il supremo giudice e perciò bene disse l’imperatore Couaruiuias che Princeps solutus est legibus, cioè positiuis; ma però
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deve vivere conforme alle leggi positive, non per obbligo alcuno, ma per edificazione de sudditi, se però non contenessero la giustia naturale.

14.
L’opinione che l’immunità ecclesiastica sia solo de iure humano et non di ragione divina et naturale è una favola perché è contro S. Tho. Rom 13 et contro tutto quello che hò provato de santi padri et canoni et concilij nella seconda et altrove di sopra: però il dire che questa opinione è la più probabile, è mera sciochezza et mostri di havere studiato poco, overo di servirti male deli studij a compiacenza de Venetiani.

15.
Se si trova nella scrittura divina mentione della immunità ecclesiast. Assai di sopra ti hò risposto ancora il Cardinale Bellarmino. Ma quello che dici che Giustiniano fu il primo a dare privilegi alli ecclesiastici è falsità. Con tutto ciò voglio ancora provarti qui, che simile Immunità è de iure divino et dico così. Uno imperatore laico non può fare che un delitto sia sacrilegio propriamente parlando, cioè contro il culto divino, poiché già dicesti che questa potestà è del Papa et io hò mostrato che i laici non si mescolano nelle cose che concernono il culto divino et le cose sacre confome. (?) Dunque l’immunità è de iure divino, item proverò che molte cose sono iure divino etiam si non scripto, ma ex consequentia, vel per traditionem Apostolicam. In somma faresti meglio studiare et addottarti di nuovo perché mostri di saper molto poco.

16.
San Paolo era predicatore delle genti et non era vicario di Christo, come San Pietro, se bene nella predicatione dell’Evangelio dicono i Santi Padri, et canoni ch’erano uguali. In oltre in quei tempi non era riconosciuta l’autorità apostolica dalli Giudei et imperatori gentili onde per necessità et non di ragione appellò a Cesare verbi gratia se un’ecclesiastico fusse ingiuriato in Geneva, o in Inghilterra chiaro stà che bisognerebbe andare per giustitia non dal Vescovo che non vi hà de facto ubidienza de sudditi, ma da chi comanda et circa la depositione di Gio. 12 il Cardinal Bellarmino ti risponde a proposito. Voglio però aggiungere questo che se il Papa è sopra i Concilij et sopra i principi laici, et che ancora è vero che maior a minore non iudicatur, come disse Constantino Imperatore et come dissero a S. Marcellino Papa in Sinussa i vescovi.

Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur, che il Papa non può esser desposto da alcuno potentato, o
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Concilio; ma se il Papa fusse heretico all’hora per sentenza di Christo solamente non è Papa, et non d’alcu’n’huomo o concilio percioche egli non è più pietra super quam fundetur Ecclesia.

17.
Se l’autorità di nominare il Papa fu de gli imperatori et re; segui per permissione et gratia dei Papi per evitare le discordie et li scismi; ma essi imperatori et reggi poi la renuntiarono. Si vede che non era Ius proprium Regum & c. ma connessione Apostolica o papale per li meriti della bontà di quel principe Carlo, verum eadem distinctione. Può essere ancora che Gratiano in quella distintione s’inganni.

18.
Couarruuias, il quale tu alleghi, che dica, che l’immunità ecclesiastica è de iure humano, non ha tanta autorità quanto la scuola universale di tutti i sacri Theologi et canonisti et mi maraviglio che nello stato di Venetiani ti servi tanto dell’autorità d’uno spagnuolo come Couarruuias. Ma già sopra di questo hò trattato assai.

19.
Se il principi christiani concedono la esentione non pensando che sia de iure divino, overo lo fanno, perché già l’hanno per tradizione, overo per rispetto et riverenza del Papa (il quale, in caso che non osservassero la esentio sarebbe (farebbe?) a loro come hà fatto al presente a Venetiani) overo spinti da pietà et divotione voluntaria, ma non che nieghino questa essere de iure divino, come tu nieghi, et gli heretici et quelli che per solo rispetto humano la concedono. Tu dici che il Canone non è sopra il Ius divino, et io rispondo che è vero, ma la ubidienza alli sacri canoni è de Iure divino. Probatur Luc. 10: qui vos audit, me audit, qui vos spernit, me spernit. Item Matth. 18: si ecclesiam non audierit sit tibi tanquam Ethnicus & publicanus. I sacri canoni sono proposti alle orecchie nostre da gli Apostoli, cioè da prelati, dal Papa. La Chiesa è governata da prelati ecclesiastici, dunque chi non ode i canoni, i quali sono precetti de gli ecclesiastici et del Papa et chi gli disprezza, disprezza Christo et è un Ethnico et publicano et così lo prova S. Chrisostomo homelia in 1 Cor. 15. sopra quelle parole cum autem subiecta. Perciò se i sacri canoni comandato la immunità ecclesiastica, questo comandamento è di Christo, poiché non è necessario che tutto il ius divino sia dichiarato esplicitamente.
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nell’Evangelio, essendo che molte cose hanno insegnato gli Apostoli dette da Christo, le quali non si leggono nell’Evangelio, multa quidem, & alia signa fecit Iesus, quae non sunt scripta in libro hoc & c. parimente Christo disse, secondo che riferisce San Paolo: Beatus est magis dare, quam accipere et pure ciò non si legge nell’Evangelio, ma per tradizione dell’Apostolo, onde molte cose poi ordinaron gli Apostoli: Caetera, cum venero, disponam et tenere traditiones, le quali però crediamo noi Catholici, che siano de iure divino positivo, se bene non registrare nell’Evangelio, così lo prova il testo greco di S. Basilio, se non intendi il greco vedi la versione latina, et però sopra in principio essendosi provato che l’autorità Ecclesiastica è directe de iure divino & immediate, anco superiore alla laica, conclude, che la immunità sua ancora è de iure divino non essendo conveniente che il capo sia soggetto alli membri, et più imperfetti et ignobili, come sono i laici contro quello che già empiamente dogmatizarono prima di te Lutero, Calvino, Gio. Hus, Gio. Vuiclef, Gio. da Praga et tutta la scelerata marmaglia de glì heretici, apostati et scismatici.

20. Rispondo che il Doge di Venetia se è con tutta quella Signora Christiano hà per suo superiore il Vicario di Christo, come hò provato, et essi hanno confessato per li Ambasciatori loro a questo Papa vivente et quanto alli Stati posseduti da loro in Italia se siano dell’imperio, quanto al dominio supremo et ancora della Chiesa in qualche (?) parte, non è ufficio mio disputare, ma mi rimetto alla verità delle investiture che ne hanno et alle diete imperiali et risolutioni fatte o da farsi sopra questa ponto.

Le loro isole del mare, non hà dubio che erano dell’imperio Romano, overo spettino all’orientale, overo occidentale, l’uno, et l’altro poco giova. Il Golfo adriatico hanno per concessione del Pontefice Romano, la città di Venetia, onero quelle isolette, le quali costituiscono la città sempre furono di cui era quel mare et essi le usurparono, quando fuggirono da Roma et da Italia la furia de Barbari et si sono difesi in quelle lacune sino a questo giorno havendo ottenuto diversi privilegi da gli imperatori et sommi pontifici et con tutto ciò non possono provare che gli supremi principi massime il Papa gli habbia liberati dalla totale giurisdizione sua, come di Vicario di Christo, quando si governassero iniquamente contro l’ecclesiastica immunità et altri casi. Et che sia il vero tu fai, che essi sogliono impetrare dai Papi licenza et privilegi nelle loro publiche necessità di havere soccorso di decime dalli loro Ecclesiastici che se fussero padroni assoluti, non si curarebbono di chiedere tale privilegio et
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perciò non sono, come tu dici, in legittimo possesso: anzi è una falsità il dire, come (come ?) tu affermi; et essi stanno in peccato et contumacia; et il Papa giustamente proceude contro di loro: ma se si portaranno da veri Catholici et ubidienti alla Santa Chiesa, non pretende Paolo V. omno pontefice privargli della loro libertà: né alcuno principe Christiano deve questo pretendere; perché sarebbe iniquità, come ancora è giusto reprimere la loro temerità, quando fanno leggi contro persone non suddite a loro, e non riconoscono il Vicario di Christo per loro superiore.

Se la Signoria di Venetia stia in peccato e contumacia, non vi hà che dubitare supposto che il Papa vicario di Christo come sopra loro superiore in\textsuperscript{423} utroque foro né i predetti casi, che nella non è superiore a gli Ecclesiastici esenti de iure divino con li loro beni dalla giurisdizione laica. Et non volendo essa revocare i decretti fatti contro l’ecclesiastica libertà, ne ubidire a Monitorij del Papa santissimi et giustissimi aggravando et accumulando colpa a colpa, contumacia a contumacia, delitto a delitto giornalmente, per quanto s’intende da quella città; ben puoi vedere che giustamente sono escommunati et interdetti e che essi stanno in termine di perversa ostinatione et di perpetua dannazione.

21.

Dalle sopradette cose appare la scommunica di Papa Paolo V et l’interdetto essere giustissime sentenze per essersi servato il legittimo termine. \textit{Item validissime}, per esservi peccato mortale manifesto et ingiuria et contumacia manifesta al vicario di Christo et alla libertà ecclesiastica contro il \textit{Ius divino}, ragione naturale contro le leggi civili, contro sacratissimi et divini canoni, contro i sacrosanti Concilij ecumenici, contro la santissima dottrina di tutti veri Theologi et Santi Padri. Laonde tu dai un pestilentissimo consiglio in questa tua lettera a quel sacerdote tuo amico di non servare l’interdetto pontificio, volendolo obligare a separarsi dal suo vero capo, il quale è Vicario di Christo et adherire ad un capo scommunicato laico, il quale veramente non è capo de gli Apostoli:\textsuperscript{424} \textit{obedire oportet magis Deo, quam hominibus, quando comandano cose ingiuste o quando non superiori, o la maggiore potestà, altrimente comanda et contro quello che dice Christo nostro Signore:} \textsuperscript{425} \textit{Quid prodest homini, si universum mundum lucretur, animae vero suae detrimentum patiatur.}

Anzi più tosto\textsuperscript{426} io dico contro la tua falsa dottrina che quando concorre la maggiore potestà con la minore in contradatorio, s’ hà da lasciare la minore et ubidire alla maggiore et molto più in questo caso dove il Papa solo è superiore de gli ecclesiastici et in nessuna maniera gli sono i laici. Quella dottrina, oltre le autorità della scrittura già allegate,\textsuperscript{427} qui prevale l’autorità del
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Papa et non solo concorre perciò doveresti vergognarti di simile consilio et dottrina venenosa vomitata a danno tuo, di tante anime o per lo sdegno di qualche tuo disegno non ottenuto dalla Corte di Roma o per premio havuto o promessoti da Venetiani o per scisma o per heresia del tuo intelletto overo perché standing in quelli stati et vivendo con loro mantenesi gli amici vogli a richiesta loro esplicita o implicita o interpretativa scrivere simile lettera, adulandogli così miseramente incorrendo nella pena de gli perversi adulatori minacciata et apparecchiata dalla divina giustia et humana.428

Ambulate in lumine ignis vestri, & flamme quam ut succendistis, & c. se obduratum est cor eorum, ut scriptum est, ut non intelligerent & pastoris vocem ea,429 quae mea non erant, audire minime voluerant. Item Isa. 5. ve vobis, qui dieitis bonum malum, & malum bonum, ponentes tenebras lucem, & lucem tenebras, ponentes amarum in dulce, & dulce in amarum: agravando gli adulatori il peccato de gli altri con la loro adulatione, tanquam palpantes,430 Iobe dice così: sunt nonnulli qui dum malefacta hominum laudibus efferunt, augent quae increpare debuerant. Hinc enim per prophetam Ezech. 13 dicitur, vae qui consuant puluillos sub omni cubito manus & faciunt cervicalia sub capite universae aetatis. Ad hoc quippe puluillus ponitur, ut mollius quiescatur. Quisquis ergo male agentibus adulation, puluillum sub capite, vel cubito iacentis ponit, ut qui corripi ex culpa debuerat, in eo fultus laudibus molliter quiescat. Hinc rursum scriptum est ibidem. Ipse aedificat parietem, ille autem liniat eum & c. parietis quippe nomine peccati duritia designatur. Aedificare autem parietem est contra se quempiam obstacula peccati confluere, sed parietem liniat, qui peccata perpetrantibus adulantur, ut quod illi perverso agentes, aedificant ipsi adulanties quasi nitidum reddant; sed sanctus vir sicut mala de bonis non aestimat, ita iudicare bona de male recusat, dicens Absit a me ut iustos vos iudicem, donec deficitim, non recedam ab Innocentia mea.431

In somma se tu Theologo male instrutto et male disciplinato, sei clerico, essendo adulator perverso et pernicioso in cose di momento oltre le pene contro gli scismatici et heretici (quando anco non fussi scismatico et heretico) per il malo consiglio et adulatione con la quale vai approvando432 con i tuoi scritti male attioni della Signoria di Venetia contro il Sommo Pontefice, meriti la pena del Concilio 4. Cartaginse cap. 56, la quale è che, Clericus, qui adulationibus, & proditionibus vacare comprehenditur, ab officio degradetur et per consequenza, come dicesti, tradatur brachio temporali, seu seculari.
Della quale pena, per dirti l’intenzione mia non vorrei, che tu fusti punito; ne i Venetiani di quella, che meritano, perché charitas Christi urget nos & optabam ego ipse anathema esse pro fratribus meis, ma più tosto con Mosè desidaro deleri de libro, quem scripsit Dominus cioè desidero pure che si salvi l’anima tua et del tuo Doge di Venetia con tutti li magistrati di cotesta Sereniss. Rep. già per l’adietro qualche volta bene merita della Chiesa catholica è più tosto mancare di molte consolationi, le quali a me sarebbono carissime per potere all’incontro havere gratia, di vederla come principale membro della Christiana Republica di nuovo riunita al suo capo, che è Christo N.S. et il Sommo Pont. Paolo V suo. Vic. in terra.

Imperoche, ò nobilissima Repubblica di Venetia, siami lecito di parlare a te, come già parlò S. Chrisostomo alla Città di Roma nel natale de principi de gli Apostoli. Io hò grandissima occasione di gloriarmi che nella nostra Italia habbiamo una così nobile città miraculosamente fondata sopra l’onde del mare Adriatico senza però mai essere coperta dall’istesso onde; che sino dal principio della sua fondatione habbiamo sempre mantenuta et conservata la sua libertà intatta; che nelli maggiori travagli et rovine della Christianità contro il furor de barbari habbia et conservato et accresciuto il suo imperio; che abbia sempre amata la pace intrinseca et estrinseca; che habbia bilanciato et contrapesato con la sua autorità la potenza de gli altri principi; che con la sua autorità habbia riconciliato alla Chiesa di Dio grandissimi principi; che nelli consigli di quella Rep. si ritrovino nuovi Hortensij, nuovi Demosteni, nuovi Ciceroni; che il governo politico Aristocratico, et di Ottimati habbia sempre prevaluto in essa: che i popoli a lei soggetti habbino sempre amato il governo loro: che con la prudenza et suo buon governo habbia rappresentato a gli occhi humani un’esemplare dell’antica Rep. Romana: Che sia sempre stata l’ornamento et lo splendore della nostra Italia. Che hoggidi vediamo ancora così nobile thesoro conservarsi in essa città emporio di tutte le natione del mondo. Ma tutto quello è nulla quando si considera la purità della fede Catholica, la quale hà regnato nei cuori dei loro avoli; le guerre fatte per essa sino a tempi nostri: la molta religione et pietà sua verso le chiese et luoghi pij; la moltitudine delle reliquie et de corpi santi: la devotione sua verso il glorioso Evangelista S. Marco, il cui nome hanno con la toga et con l’armi propagato in molte provincie. Et con tutto ciò mi resta ancora da desiderare in esse a giorni nostri quella pietà et rivenienza et zelo dell’honore debito verso la Chiesa Romana et verso il Vicario di Christo Paolo V, quale hebbbero già gli Attavi loro verso il Sommo Pontefice Alessandro contro il perverso Federico imperatore et suo figliuolo, dal quale Pontefice per tanta pietà, come narrano l’istorie di quella città, hebbbero così nobili privilegi abusati a tempi nostri da loro posteri.
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A me duole sino al core di vedere quella città scordata di quella antica pietà, hora mescolata in amicitia et congiuntione con genti perverse et heretiche et scismatiche et permettere che quel Sacrosanto Concilio di Trento da loro Ambasciatori favorito et approvato non sia osservato tra di loro nel negozio della ecclesiastica immunità, nel permettere libri et scritti nefandi che vadano in luce senza approvazione del Santo Ufficio et delli prelati ecclesiastici come ordina il detto Concilio et insomma di vedere in essa (se bene pare, che la prudenza a loro nel politico temporale et fine particolare vada bene) tuttavia commettersi errori nel fine universale (per mancamento della vera prudenza) cioè nel primo principio in agilibus, quale è la fede catholica et l’ubidienza debita al loro pastore et Vicario di Christo, dalla quale dipende la vera et soda et perpetua conservatione dello stato et libertà loro, poiché come dicono i Filosofi et Theologi in tutte le scienze et arti, salvato il primo principio, se si fa qualche cosa si governa l’huomo bene in particolare, tuttavia bisogna finalmente cadere; come ci servono per esempio pio tutti i paesi occupati da Turchi, già dell’antico Imperio di Oriente, i quali per pena dello scisma loro contro il Vicario di Christo sono hora miseramente soggetti et tiranneggiati dalla barbaria crudeltà non solo nella robba, ma nelle proprie persone et figliuoli; et l’istesso dico di altre provincie già catholiche hora dominate da hereticici e scismatici.

Io diserderarei che quale è l’honore che portano al glorioso S. Marco discepolo di S. Pietro, tale fusse la devotione et pietà verso il successore del detto principe de gli Apostoli Paolo V perché so che S. Marco, se vivesse tra di noi questa stessa dottrina gli insegnarebbe et si maravigliarebbe di vedere quella sua nobilissima figliuola prostituta et esposta alla libidine di così perverso errore scismatico et falsa dottrina insegnatale da questo moderno Theologo et di vedere quello nobilissimo argento voltato in scoria, che quella vigna cosi nobile habbia prodotto in luogo di una dolcissima labrusche acerbe di falsa dottrina et la cagione non credo che sia, se non quella che descrive il Propheta Ezechiele: Haec fuit iniquitas sororis tuae Sodomae superbia, saturitas panis, & abundantia, & otium ipsius, & filiarum eius & c. Piaccia a Dio che non sia vero ancora di Venetia quello che dice Isaià di Gerusalemme: Princeps tui infideles. Piaccia à Dio che non sia vero, che i vecchi et senatori di quella Republica non imitino quelli perversi et malvagi vecchi di Babilonia, i quali cercarono di dishonorare la castissima Susanna; et essi non facciano così verso la S. Chiesa catholica et verso la Sedia Apostolica separandola del suo vero sposo, il quale è Christo et il suo Vicario Paolo V per volere essi.
declina re oculus suos, ut non videant caelum, neque recordentur iudiciorum iustorum; non risguardando all’ultimo fine per il quale sono creati, ma all’interesse mondano et alla ragione di stato nemica a quella di Dio perché se altrimente fusse, potrei dire che fusse necessario che suscitaret Deus Spiritum Iunioris, cuius nomen Daniel, che vuol dire, Iudicium Dei, cioè che non nuovo et giovane giudizio di sentenza et castigo con più udito in quella nobilissima Republica gli facesse perdere quella tanto famosa libertà et vita, la quale perdettero giustamente, quei falsi et tristi vecchi di Babilonia. Il che non piaccia a Dio.

IL FINE