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Abstract

This study charts the developing relationship between the Zurich church and Italian-speaking Protestants between around 1540 and 1620. It explores the close ties that were established between Zurich's senior minister, Heinrich Bullinger, and Italian evangelical exiles in Switzerland and elsewhere from the early 1540s, and describes how the Zurich church facilitated the spread of Protestantism in Italian-speaking regions such as Locarno and southern Graubünden. That process culminated in the setting-up in Zurich, under Bullinger's patronage, of an Italian Reformed congregation.

A particular concern of the thesis is the threat to the integrity of the Zwinglian settlement posed by the ideas and activities of religious radicals within the Italian exile community. To begin with, Bullinger was confident that those 'heretics' could be accommodated within the emerging Reformed consensus. However, a series of doctrinal disputes during the 1540s, 1550s and 1560s revealed the extent of the radicals' differences with Reformed orthodoxy and compelled the Zurichers to revise their judgement. Bullinger's hostile reaction to the publication of the allegedly heterodox Dialogi XXX by his Italian colleague, Bernardino Ochino, signalled a move from conciliation to confrontation. From the early 1560s, the Zurich divines assumed an active role in the Reformed campaign to shore up Nicene orthodoxy against the criticisms of Italian antitrinitarians, and to expel radicals from the Italian-speaking churches of the Rhaetian Freestate. In the process, they endeavoured to counter the charges of heresy that had long bedevilled Zwinglianism by articulating a conservative, 'catholic' definition of their church's identity.

The study concludes by examining how relations between the Zurich church and the Italian Reformed communities of Graubünden and its subject lands were placed on a new, co-operative basis once the radical challenge had been repelled. Through its support for those vulnerable congregations, I suggest, the Zurich church gave evidence of its continued commitment to the international Protestant cause during the period following Bullinger's death.

The correspondence of Bullinger and other Zurich ministers forms the dissertation's most important source. The study also draws on works produced by the Zurich divines in the context of their exchanges with Italian evangelicals, the works of the Italian exiles themselves, and the records of Zurich's Italian-speaking community.
Acknowledgements

While researching and writing this dissertation, I received support from many quarters. Thanks are due first of all to my supervisor, Dr Bruce Gordon, who gave unsparingly of his time, advice and profound knowledge of sixteenth-century Switzerland. In Switzerland, I wish to thank Dr Heinzpeter Stucki of the Institut für Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte, Zurich, for helping me to locate some of the sources used in this study; Dr Hans-Ulrich Bächtold, Rainer Henrich and Kurt Rüetschi, the current editors of Bullinger’s correspondence, for placing their superb resources at my disposal and always responding generously to requests for material; Frau Annaluisa Bonorand, for her kind hospitality during my stay in Chur in May 1997; Professor Emidio Campi and his research student, Emanuele Fiume, for sharing insights gained from their work on Bernardino Ochino and Scipione Lentolo; and the Orelli family, for supplying me with microfilm copies of some of their unique holdings. I am grateful to the British Academy for funding me throughout my time in St Andrews, and to the Friends of the St Andrews Reformation Studies Institute and the Royal Historical Society for contributing towards the cost of research trips. I should also like to thank the staff of all the libraries and archives that I have used in the course of my research, especially the Staatsarchiv and Zentralbibliothek Zürich, the Staatsarchiv Chur, the Bodleian Library, Oxford, the British Library, and St Andrews University Library. In St Andrews, thanks go to all my colleagues, past and present, at the Reformation Studies Institute, whose research in a variety of fields has enriched my own. Finally, a special debt of gratitude is due to Sarah Colvin, whose comments on successive drafts of the text have proved invaluable, and whose presence has sustained me throughout.
### Abbreviations

<table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondance</td>
<td>Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze, edited by F. Aubert et al. (Geneva 1960-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTJ</td>
<td>Calvin Theological Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>Dizionario biografico degli italiani (Rome 1960-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Amtliche Sammlung der ältern eidgenössischen Abschiede, 1245-1798, edited by A.P. von Segesser et al., 8 pts (Lucerne and Bern 1839-78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Epistolae Tigurinae de rebus potissimum ad ecclesiae Anglicanae Reformationem pertinentibus (Cambridge: Parker Society 1848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHGG</td>
<td>Jahresbericht der Historisch-antiquarischen Gesellschaft von Graubünden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRS</td>
<td>Nuova rivista storica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSI</td>
<td><em>Rivista storica italiana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiess</td>
<td><em>Bullinger's Korrespondenz mit den Graubündern</em>, edited by T. Schiess, 3 vols (Basel 1904-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCJ</td>
<td><em>Sixteenth Century Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StAG</td>
<td>Staatsarchiv Graubünden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StAZ</td>
<td>Staatsarchiv Zürich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wotschke</td>
<td><em>Der Briefwechsel der Schweizer mit den Polen</em>, edited by T. Wotschke (Leipzig 1908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td><em>Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke</em>, edited by W. Köhler <em>et al.</em> (Leipzig 1905- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZB</td>
<td>Zentralbibliothek Zürich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZL</td>
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Over the past thirty years, our understanding of the reception of Protestantism in sixteenth-century Italy has been transformed. What was previously regarded as merely a sideshow to the main drama of religious change that was being played out north of the Alps has begun to be recognised as a significant movement for reform in its own right. Work on the archives of the Roman Inquisition – in Venice, Modena and elsewhere – has shed new light on the popular dimension of Italian ‘evangelism’, revealing the existence of a network of conventicles across the peninsula which met to read the Bible, exchange Protestant literature and (occasionally) to celebrate the reformed Lord’s Supper. Eva-Maria Jung’s definition of the Italian movement for religious reform as undogmatic, aristocratic and transitory is simply no longer tenable: rather, Italy was home to a vociferous minority of genuine Protestants, committed to the northern reformers’ understanding of salvation and drawn from a reasonably broad section of society, until concerted repression began to take its toll in the 1560s.1 The work of Massimo Firpo and Dario Marcatto on the trial of cardinal Giovanni Morone has shown that even the ‘spirituali’, that group of reform-minded senior clerics which has been seen to stand for a middle way between schismatic Protestantism and the harshly defined orthodoxy of the Tridentine Counter-Reformation,

---

were more directly implicated in introducing reformist ideas to the Italian reading public than is traditionally assumed. Now, following the appearance of a number of excellent local studies, a comprehensive picture of the Italian response to Protestantism is emerging; this is reflected in the recent publication of general surveys of the Reformation in sixteenth-century Italy by several leading scholars.

Protestant or crypto-Protestant ideas may have attracted more popular support in Italy than was previously realised, but Italian magistrates remained committed to the Catholic status quo (despite occasional wavering that raised evangelical sympathisers’ hopes for a state-sponsored Reformation along German or English lines). Ultimately, emigration was the only option for those Italian evangelicals unwilling to conform outwardly, but fearful of persecution. From the early 1540s, Italian exile communities emerged in the Swiss Reformed cities, in Geneva, in the Rhaetian Freestate (Graubünden) and in London. Like their French, Dutch and English equivalents, the Italian evangelical exiles – who included virtually the entire intellectual leadership of the movement – helped sustain the cause of reform in their homeland, producing Protestant devotional and polemical literature for Italian consumption. As one might expect, their contribution has come to figure prominently in the study of what we may now call the Italian Reformation. Of the various Italian exile communities, that of Geneva – which boasted around 1,000

---
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members, 5% of the city’s total population, at its height – has received most attention from scholars, although a definitive modern study is still lacking. The much smaller Italian church in London has also attracted some interest. More abundant still is the literature on individual exiles, which extends not only to such celebrated emigres as Bernardino Ochino, Celio Secundo Curione and Pier Paolo Vergerio, but to lesser-known figures: for example, Francesco Pucci and Giovanni Bernardino Bonifacio. Over recent years a veritable industry has grown up in Peter Martyr studies.

This dissertation offers a new assessment of the activities of early modern Italian religious exiles through an investigation of their relationship with the Reformed church of Zurich. The Zurich church has long been recognised, along with Geneva, as one of the two mainsprings of the Reformed tradition within Protestantism, but interest has usually centred on the period up to Huldrych Zwingli’s death in October 1531. More recently, however, the focus of research has shifted to Zwingli’s successor as Antistes (senior minister), Heinrich Bullinger: several recent monographs have added considerably to our knowledge of the Zurich church’s institutional development under his leadership; those have been

---


complemented by the ongoing publication of Bullinger's voluminous correspondence. For much of his career, Bullinger exercised a pastoral office that extended far beyond Zurich and its immediate neighbours (although the Swiss Confederation, understandably, remained the principal focus of his concerns). Correspondents from across Europe sought his advice, commendation and support; his many published sermons and commentaries were translated into a host of European vernaculars, and his Second Helvetic Confession was adopted by Reformed believers throughout the continent along with their own national statements of belief.

In his classic study *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento* — still an essential point of reference for students of the Italian Reformation — Delio Cantimori suggested that the theology of the Zurich church exercised a special hold over the imaginations of Italy’s evangelicals. Although one ought not to exaggerate the extent to which the latter had imbibed Zwinglian doctrine prior to their emigration — the Italian evangelical movement was subject to a wide array of theological influences, as we shall see — there can be no doubt that Bullinger’s special concern for fellow believers who had suffered persecution or

---


10 J. Staedtke, *Heinrich Bullinger Bibliographie: Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der gedruckten Werke von Heinrich Bullinger* (Zurich 1972); idem (ed.), *Glauben und Bekennen: Vierhundert Jahre Confessio Helvetica Posterior: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und Theologie* (Zurich 1966). For the relations of Bullinger and his colleagues with the English church, see the correspondence published by the Parker Society. On their contacts with the French Reformed, see A. Bouvier, *Henri Bullinger, réformateur et conseiller oecuménique, le successeur de Zwingli, d’après sa correspondance avec les réformés et les humanistes de langue française* (Neuchâtel 1940).
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hardship on account of the faith laid the foundations for a close relationship with those Italian-speaking exiles who settled in the Swiss Confederation and Graubünden. The resulting correspondence, some of which has been published or calendared by historians such as Theodor Wotschke, Traugott Schiess and Antonio Rotondò, forms one of the principal sources for this study. Besides correspondence, the dissertation draws on a variety of material held at libraries and archives throughout Switzerland: published and unpublished theological works by the Zurich divines and Italian evangelicals with whom they had contact, synodal records, and documents relevant to the history of Zurich's own Italian-speaking community.

A central concern of the thesis is the role of the so-called 'heretics', the group of doctrinally heterodox exiles described by Cantimori as 'ribelli ad ogni forma di comunione religiosa organizzata, ecclesiastica' and subsequently dubbed evangelical rationalists (rather inappropriately, to my mind) by George Williams. Cantimori took the heretics as his principal subject, identifying their radicalism, which reached its apogee in Socinianism, as Italy's unique and original contribution to the Reformation: a contribution that owed more to the legacy of quattrocento humanism than to the ideas of the northern reformers. Subsequent scholarship has made clear that heresy of the kind emphasised by Cantimori was a minority tendency. The religious landscape of sixteenth-century Italy was not thickly peopled with Anabaptists or antitrinitarians, although the by and large informal structure of the Italian evangelical conventicles did create space for a diversity of theological viewpoints unseen in those parts of Europe whose Protestant communities were subject to a process of 'confession-building' from an early stage. At least as many Italian exiles distinguished themselves by their commitment to Reformed orthodoxy as did by the profession of heretical ideas, and the majority of emigrants swiftly accommodated

---

12 Cantimori, Eretici, p.5; G. Williams, The Radical Reformation, 3rd edition (Kirksville, Mo. 1992), pp.16-18. The term 'heretic' is used in this specific Cantimorian sense throughout the dissertation.
themselves to the doctrinal and disciplinary regimes prevalent in the northern Protestant churches. However, the impact of the heretics' activities, both on the exile communities which harboured them and on relations between the exiles and their Swiss, German or English hosts, was out of all proportion to their numbers. Their criticisms of Reformed orthodoxy – and the Zurich church’s response – form the centrepiece of this study, because they influenced how Italian evangelicals as a whole came to be perceived by the Protestant establishment: as intellectually restless, quarrelsome, and resistant to discipline.

The characterisation is one associated particularly with Calvin, whose ‘dogmatism’ is sometimes played off against the ‘free-thinking’ of the heretics. It was accepted less readily by the Zurich church, whose definition of orthodoxy was comparatively flexible in some areas – notably predestination – up until the early 1560s. Bullinger was averse to doctrinal hair-splitting and the acrimonious disagreements between theologians which often flowed from it: as we shall see, he was prepared to make concessions to tender consciences in private, in the interests of preserving the public unity of the church. Such moderation goes some way towards explaining why Bullinger and the church over which he presided continued to be held in high regard by some Italian radicals long after they had become alienated from other Reformed leaders. However, it should not be confused with modern conceptions of religious tolerance: Bullinger’s record of fighting Anabaptism, and his unabashed support for the execution of Michael Servetus, provide evidence of his determination to combat heresy wherever it manifested itself openly. The Antistes’ initial reluctance to move swiftly from correction to condemnation when dealing with the Italian radicals seems to have stemmed from a basic misunderstanding of the heretics’ intentions – often articulated as a desire for clarification rather than as open criticism of Reformed doctrine – and from a failure to comprehend the extent to which their

---

13 But see the criticisms of this approach by V. Subilia, ‘Libertà e dogma secondo Calvino e secondo i riformatori italiani’, *Ginevra e l’Italia*, pp.191-214.
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radical reconception of the Reformation enterprise differed from his own, essentially conservative, vision. Once the incorrigibility of the heretics had become apparent, Bullinger and his colleagues were as vigorous as any in their efforts to combat dissenting activity. This dissertation is an attempt to explain how they moved towards that position.

The thesis is divided into six chapters. After a brief examination of the Zurich church’s contribution to the spread of Protestant ideas in Italy itself, Chapter 1 summarises the initial contacts between the Zurichers and Italian evangelical exiles, beginning with the arrival in Switzerland of the first significant wave of religious refugees in the early 1540s. It also considers some instances of doctrinal tension and disagreement between Bullinger and his colleagues on the one hand, and the more heterodox exiles – Camillo Renato, Celio Secundo Curione and Lelio Sozzini – on the other, during the years up to 1555, and assesses their implications for future relations.

Chapter 2 opens with a discussion of the events which led to the formation of an Italian-speaking church in Zurich, made up primarily of evangelical refugees from the Swiss-rulled territory of Locarno. A special emphasis is placed on the role of Bullinger and his fellow ministers in persuading the Zurich authorities first to receive the Locarnese exiles, and then to fund the establishment of a semi-autonomous Italian congregation in the city, led by Bernardino Ochino; this episode offers one of the most graphic examples of the Zurich church’s commitment to the international Reformed cause in general, and to the plight of its Italian-speaking co-religionists in particular. Building on the work of earlier historians of the Zurich Locarnesi, such as Ferdinand Meyer,14 I proceed to examine the make-up and organisation of Zurich’s Italian church, its contacts with other Italian exile communities (in Geneva, Graubünden and Basel), and its relations with the Zurich authorities and population during the eight years of its separate existence (1555-63).

---

Chapter 3 offers a reassessment of what I term the ‘Ochino affair’: the controversy triggered off by the unauthorised publication of Bernardino Ochino’s *Dialogi XXX* in spring 1563, which resulted in Ochino’s dismissal and the end of formal Italian-language worship in Zurich. Particular emphasis is placed on this traumatic episode because it provides clear evidence for the Zurich church’s adoption, from around 1560, of a much less indulgent attitude towards those Italian exiles who found themselves unable to give unqualified assent to Reformed teaching on matters such as soteriology and the Trinity.

The ‘treachery’ of Ochino, who had hitherto enjoyed considerable prestige in Reformed circles on the basis both of his published works and of the publicity generated by his conversion to Protestantism in August 1542, was not easily forgotten by Bullinger and his colleagues. It influenced the stance that they took in other doctrinal disputes generated by Italian exiles, notably in eastern Europe and Graubünden, during the 1560s and early 1570s. Those disputes are the subject of Chapters 4 and 5, which provide a counterweight to the traditional perception of the Zurich theological tradition as eirenical and undogmatic by highlighting the increasing ‘confessionalism’ of Bullinger and younger Zurich divines such as Josias Simler: all now emphasised the need for an explicit and comprehensive definition of orthodoxy, which would safeguard the doctrinal integrity of the church against subversion by the sort of queries and veiled criticisms that they had previously been prepared to tolerate from some of their Italian associates. This stance was endorsed by a vociferous group of clerics drawn from among the exiles themselves: for example, Agostino Mainardi, Scipione Lentolo and Giulio da Milano. In the Reformed churches of Italian-speaking Graubünden those ministers were able, with the active support of the Zurchers, to ensure that dissenting elements were either eliminated or silenced.

The defeat of the heretics did not end the Zurich church’s association with the Italian exiles: rather, the alliance forged between the Zurchers and the more orthodox
Introduction

exiles in the course of the struggle against religious radicalism became the basis for renewed co-operation over subsequent decades. Because of scholars’ understandable fascination with the dramatic confrontations of the earlier period, this later phase of the relationship has not been adequately explored in the existing literature: we are left with the impression that doctrinal conflict was a consistent feature of the Zurich church’s relations with those Italian evangelicals with whom it had contact. However, that was true only for the years prior to 1570 – and even then only in part. Chapter 6 identifies ways in which Bullinger’s successors in the Zurich church continued to offer the Italian congregations of Graubünden practical assistance and encouragement, through an examination of their correspondence with exiles based in Chiavenna and the Valtellina (principally Scipione Lentolo, Scipione Calandrini and Ulisse Martinengo). The relationship was only interrupted by the ‘sacro macello’ of July 1620, which destroyed the thriving Reformed communities of the Valtellina and serves as the end-point for this study.

The dissertation aims to contribute to the ongoing reassessment of Zurich’s role in the wider European Reformation – itself testimony to scholars’ increasing awareness of the multicentredness of sixteenth-century Reformed Protestantism – and to the wider literature devoted to the phenomenon of exile religionis causa during the sixteenth century. It also offers insights into the process by which a distinctive and precisely articulated Reformed ‘confession’ became established around the middle part of the century. The case of Bernardino Ochino, which is pivotal to the entire study, is particularly instructive in this regard. During the 1540s and early 1550s, Ochino’s eclectic brand of

---

15 The close working relationship which developed between Bullinger and Peter Martyr Vermigli, who spent his final years in Zurich, is a case in point. Michael Baumann of the University of Zurich is currently preparing a doctoral thesis on Vermigli in Zurich. In the meantime, see M. Anderson, Peter Martyr: A Reformer in Exile (1542-1562): A chronology of biblical writings in England and Europe (Nieuwkoop 1975); idem, ‘Visita Tigurina: Peter Martyr and European Reform (1556-1562)’, Harvard Theological Review 83 (1990), 181-206.

16 This is best exemplified by A. Pettegree, Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London (Oxford 1986).
Protestantism, anchored in justification by faith but not easily reducible to a single confessional system (hence, perhaps, his ability to move between such different contexts as Geneva, Basel, Augsburg and England) had proved broadly acceptable in Reformed circles. By 1563 that was no longer the case: the trend within Reformed theology was towards systematisation, towards reconstructing a precise doctrinal framework into which the exegetical achievements of Reformed biblical scholarship could be incorporated. Ochino, and the other heterodox Italian exiles whose relations with Zurich are considered here, were casualties of that process. To that extent, their fate illuminates a crucial phase in the development of Reformed orthodoxy.
Most of the quotations in this study are taken from sources in one of three languages: Latin, German and Italian. The use of use of u/v has been adjusted throughout to conform to modern usage. In Latin quotations, i/j has been consistently rendered as i. In quotations from Swiss German, certain forms of the vowel have been simplified: thus ä/ö/ü become ã/õ/û, and ü is rendered as u. Original punctuation has been retained where possible; however, occasional changes have been made for the sake of clarity.

Following a well-established practice, I have used the term Antistes to designate the senior minister of the Zurich and other Swiss Reformed churches, although it is of later provenance. The sixteenth-century federation – and modern Swiss canton – often known in English as the Grisons is here referred to either as Graubünden, the Rhaetian Freestate, or simply Rhaetia.
During the late medieval period, Zurich’s contacts with the Italian peninsula were comparatively limited in scope. Some economic ties are documented: Zurich supplied northern Italy with basic commodities like cattle, hides and tallow, while importing iron and steel (from Como) and wine (from the Valtellina).\footnote{H. Peyer, \textit{Vom Handel und Bank im alten Zürich} (Zurich 1968), p.11; W. Schnyder, \textit{Handel und Verkehr über die Bündner Pässe im Mittelalter zwischen Deutschland, der Schweiz und Oberitalien}, 2 vols (Zurich 1973/5), pp.55, 59.} Because of Zurich’s geographical position – along the vital north-south axis linking the commercial centre of Nuremberg with Como, Milan and Genoa – some city merchants were able to engage in transalpine trade; however, their activities did not contribute greatly to what was, by the late fifteenth century, a more or less self-contained economy.\footnote{Schnyder, \textit{Handel}, 1, pp.96-7.} Strategically, too, Italy was peripheral to the concerns of Zurich’s rulers, whose expansionist ambitions had historically been directed eastwards, against such territories as the Thurgau, Toggenburg and St Gallen. Although the Swiss Confederation emerged as a major player on the Italian political and military scene in the mid-1490s, the driving force behind the Swiss Italian campaigns of the early sixteenth century was not Zurich, but the inner states of Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden, which were eager to secure control of the southern approaches to the Gotthard. In any case, military involvement in the affairs of Italy does not seem to have...
been accompanied by enhanced intellectual or cultural ties. During the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries Italian universities ceased to attract Swiss students in large numbers, as the latter flocked to the newer centres of higher education springing up across the Empire (Basel, Vienna, Heidelberg and Erfurt were among the more popular choices).³ Zurich itself remained largely untouched by the culture of the Italian Renaissance.⁴

With the onset of the Reformation, new opportunities for contact between Zurich and Italy manifested themselves. The humanist intellectual culture that took root in Zurich as a result of Zwingli's educational reforms appropriated many of the ideals and philological techniques of Italian Renaissance scholarship. Two of the early lecturers at the Zurich Prophezei, Jakob Ammann and Rudolf Collin, had studied in Milan prior to their conversions.⁵ Zwingli himself owned an impressive collection of Italian humanist texts, among them works by Sabellicus, Poliziano, Ficino, and Giovanni and Gianfrancesco Pico;⁶ comparisons have been drawn between elements of his mature theology and Florentine Neoplatonism.⁷ Zwingli's successor, Heinrich Bullinger, had less direct exposure to Italian Renaissance thought, but nevertheless held its intellectual

³ S. Stelling-Michaud, 'La Suisse et les universités européennes du 13ème au 16ème siècle: Essai d'une statique de fréquentation', Revue universitaire suisse (September 1938), 148-60. Only two Zurichers are known to have attended the university of Pavia, for instance, between 1500 and 1520 (see C. Bonorand, 'Mitteleuropäische Studenten in Pavia zur Zeit der Kriege in Italien (ca.1500 bis ca.1550)', Pluteus 4-5 (1986-7), 295-357 [336, 356-7]).

⁴ P. Bänziger, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Spätscholastik und des Frühhumanismus in der Schweiz (Zurich 1945), p.85.

⁵ Bonorand, 'Mitteleuropäische Studenten', 326-7.

⁶ Some of these works contain extensive marginal annotations dating from Zwingli's time in Glarus. These have been analysed by A. Schindler, 'Zwingli's Randbemerkungen in den Büchern seiner Bibliothek: Ein Zwischenbericht über editorische Probleme', Zwa 18:1 (1989/1), 1-11; and I. Backus, 'Randbemerkungen Zwinglis in den Werken von Giovanni Pico della Mirandola', Zwa 18:4 (1990/2), 291-309.

⁷ Schindler detects echoes of Giovanni Pico's Oratio de dignitate hominis in the opening to Zwingli's De providentia, although the anthropology of the work as a whole is pessimistic and unmistakably 'Reformed'. He also notes Zwingli's openness to the possibility of extra-biblical revelation in the pre-Christian dispensation, reminiscent to some degree of Pico's syncretistic approach (A. Schindler, 'Huldrych Zwingli e Giovanni Pico della Mirandola', in Dall' Accademia neoplatonica fiorentina alla Riforma: Celebrazione del V centenaria della morte di Lorenzo il Magnifico (Florence 1996), pp.51-65 [60-3]).
achievements in high regard; in particular, he commended the Florentine revival of Greek studies, which had made a return to the original text of the New Testament possible.\(^8\)

More importantly for our purposes, Italy provided the Zurich reformers with a potential mission-field. From the early 1520s, evangelical ideas were attracting support from sections of the Italian reading public; the works of northern reformers were relatively easy to come by in both Latin and (often disguised) vernacular translations. In the first part of this chapter, I shall offer a brief assessment of the Zurich church’s contribution to the spread of Protestantism in Italy, and attempt to piece together what is known of its relations with the nascent Italian evangelical movement. Those formed the backdrop to what is the principal subject of this dissertation: the relationship between the Zurich divines and the increasing number of Italian evangelicals who, from around 1540, chose exile in the Swiss Confederation, Geneva and the Rhaetian Freestate. As I shall show in sections two and three of the chapter, this was a relationship which, almost from the beginning, oscillated between co-operation and conflict: co-operation based on a shared commitment to the principle of reform, conflict as a minority of exiles struggled to come to terms with Protestantism as it had been institutionalised north of the Alps.

I. ZURICH AND THE REFORMATION IN ITALY

The first reference to contacts between the Zurich reformers and evangelical sympathisers in Italy is tantalisingly vague. In the prefatory epistle to his *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione* of 1525, Zwingli describes the work as a response to requests for a concise summary of Christian doctrine from brethren in Italy and France. The French evangelicals referred to can be identified with some degree of certainty, but their Italian counterparts remain anonymous.\(^9\) Soon after the publication of the *Commentarius*, however, Zwingli

\(^8\) J. Staedtke, *Die Theologie des jungen Bullinger* (Zurich 1962), pp.29-34.

\(^9\) See the editors’ comments in Z 3, 591, n.1.
received a letter from an Augustinian monk based in Como, Egidio a Porta, making clear his disaffection from traditional religion and requesting instruction in the Reformed faith.\(^{10}\) Zwingli’s reply has not survived, but one can assume that it was encouraging: in December 1526 Porta again wrote to the Zurich reformer, this time to inform him that he and his colleagues had set to work on a vernacular translation of the New Testament. The monk also requested that Zwingli write to his superiors in the order, to request a relaxation of the rule, and to the duke of Milan, to press the case for religious reform.\(^{11}\) Unfortunately we have no information on Porta’s subsequent fate, but it seems that his enthusiasm for Zwinglian reform was shared by other members of the Augustinian order, which in Italy (as elsewhere) produced numerous converts to Protestantism. The ‘Augustinus Saturninus’ who wrote to Zwingli in August 1529, for example, was none other than Agostino Mainardi, who occupied a string of senior positions within the Lombard province of the Augustinian Hermits before coming under suspicion of heresy towards the end of the 1530s.\(^{12}\) Later we shall encounter him as minister to the Reformed congregation of Chiavenna.

These first, tentative, exchanges were nipped in the bud by Zurich’s disastrous defeat in the Second Kappel War (October 1531). The defeat forced a reassessment of priorities: Zurich’s rulers were no longer prepared to see the state’s security placed at risk for the sake of promoting reform abroad. Under Bullinger’s leadership, the Zurich church embarked on a decade of rebuilding and internal consolidation. There is nothing to indicate that Bullinger and his colleagues followed the progress of the Reformation in Italy with any great interest during these years. Salvatore Caponetto has suggested that the

\(^{10}\) Z 8, no.421.


\(^{12}\) Z 10, no.884. See also P. Ricca, ‘Zwingli tra i Valdesi’, Zwa 16:3 (1984/1), 247-62 (254-6); and Köhler, 33. On Mainardi, see A. Armand Hugon, Agostino Mainardo: Contributo alla storia della Riforma in Italia (Torre Pellice n.d.).
circumstances of Zwingli's death may, in addition, have alienated many Italian Erasmians who might otherwise have found his theology attractive. The absence of vernacular translations of the Zurich reformer's works — in contradistinction to those of Luther, of which fourteen sixteenth-century Italian editions have been identified — placed practical limitations on the appeal of Zwinglianism in any case.\(^\text{13}\)

Against this, however, one must set the evidence for the ready availability in Latin editions of works by Zwingli, Bullinger and other Zurich Protestant writers. In April 1533, the Chur reformer Johannes Comander informed Joachim Vadian that he had responded to requests for Protestant literature from evangelical sympathisers in Italy with copies of works by Zwingli, Oecolampadius and Bucer (although not by Luther, for fear of stirring up controversy over the interpretation of the Eucharist).\(^\text{14}\) Various Italian evangelical exiles are recorded as having read works by the Zurich reformers prior to their conversions. Girolamo Zanchi, for example, claimed to have bought and annotated a copy of Bullinger's *De origine erroris*, after the work was recommended to him by a certain Montalcinus;\(^\text{15}\) similarly, Zwingli's *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione* and *De providentia* are said to have been among the Protestant works which Peter Martyr Vermigli read while abbot of San Pietro ad Aram in Naples.\(^\text{16}\) The *Commentarius* was also

---


\(^{14}\) E. Arbenz and H. Wartmann (eds), *Der Vadaniemische Briefwechsel der Stadtbibliothek St. Gallen*, 7 vols (St Gallen 1890-1913), 5, no.732; compare no.798. In July 1554 Comander's colleague Philip Gallicius reported that he was sending a copy of Bullinger’s *Decades* to the Rhaetian magnate Anton Travers to be bound and presented to ‘viro cuidam bono’ in Italy (Schiess, 1, no.265).

\(^{15}\) Zanchi to Bullinger, 24 June 1568 (Epistolatarum libri duo, 128-9, in *Clarissimi viri D. Hieronymi Zanchii omnium operum theologicorum tomi octo* (Geneva 1619); StAZ E II 356a, 833-5).

\(^{16}\) J. Simler, *Oratio de vita et obitu Petri Martyris Vermilii, Sacrarum literarum in Schola Tigurina Professoris* (Zurich 1563), fol.7; P. McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy* (Oxford 1967), p.149. Vermigli later praised the *De providentia*, but J.P. Donnelly doubts whether the Florentine's understanding of predestination was influenced by his reading of this work (*Calvinism and Scholasticism in
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circulating among the Waldenses of Piedmont from around 1535.17

Zurich-based writers also featured prominently on the Indices of prohibited books which began to be issued by the Italian states from the mid-1540s.18 Of the forty-seven authors whose *opera omnia* were proscribed in the 1549 Venetian Index, four were or had been based in Zurich (Zwingli, Bullinger, Pellikan and Theodor Bibliander).19 Titles deemed worthy of specific censure included Zwingli’s *Commentarius* and *Religionis antiquae capita* (in an edition published under the pseudonym of Charieus Cogelius), Rudolf Gwalther’s *Antichristus*, and Bibliander’s *Ad omnium ordinum reipublicae Christianae principes viros populumque Christianum relatio*.20 The 1554 Index added Gwalther, Konrad Gesner, Leo Jud, Johannes Fries and Otto Werdmüller to the list of condemned authors.21 New to appear among the proscribed works were Zwingli’s *Supplicatio ad Hugonem Episcopum Constantiensem* and *Ad Matheaeum Albaeum epistola*, the Zurich Latin Bible of 1539, Leo Jud’s greater and lesser catechisms, Gwalther’s *Apologia pro Zuinglio*, Bullinger’s *Utriusque in Christo naturae assertio orthodoxa*, and an unspecified *Confessio ecclesiae Tigurinae de coena domini*. The Indices do not in themselves provide an accurate guide to what Italian evangelicals were actually reading,22 but inventories of books seized from suspected heretics by the

---

17 Ricca, 249-50. Ricca suggests that the Waldenses were introduced to Zwingli’s doctrine of the Eucharist by Guillaume Farel (ibid., 251).
20 For details, see De Bujanda.
21 The total number of banned authors soared to 290 (Grendler, p.95).
22 Bibliander, for instance, was one of fourteen authors incorporated into the 1549 Venetian Index en bloc
Inquisition confirm that theological works by Zurich churchmen were being disseminated in Italian philo-Protestant circles. Among the texts seized from the Augustinian preacher Giulio da Milano at the time of his arrest in late 1540, for instance, were Bullinger’s commentaries on the Pauline epistles and Acts, and Pellikan’s *Repertorium Bibliae*. The Venetian lawyer Francesco Stella, meanwhile, owned biblical commentaries by Bullinger and Bibliander.

Assessing the theological impact of these works on their readers is no easy task. The Italian evangelical movement lacked a precise confessional identity, and its adherents did not obviously discriminate between ‘Reformed’ and ‘Lutheran’ writers in their choice of reading. According to Ugo Rozzo and Silvana Seidel Menchi, the movement was characterised by a ‘tendance au syncrétisme évangélique’, by an eirenical outlook which emphasised fundamental areas of doctrinal agreement over divisions. The popularity in Italy of works by the Augsburg reformer Urbanus Rhegius has been attributed to the fact that his theology spanned the Lutheran-Reformed divide.

In one area, however, one is tempted to discern the influence of views derived directly or indirectly from Zurich: the doctrine of the Eucharist. By the early 1540s, it is clear that Zwingli’s alleged ‘sacramentarianism’ had become a subject of debate (and a source of disagreement) within the north Italian conventicles. In the aftermath of the colloquy of Regensburg, Martin Bucer was forced to address the issue in a series of letters to certain ‘Italian brethren’, first in Bologna and Modena, and subsequently also in Venice.

---

23 Rozzo and Seidel Menchi, p.348.


and Ferrara. In these letters, Bucer warned his correspondents against emulating
the example of Germany’s Protestants, now hopelessly divided over the sacrament. The
Strasbourg reformer argued that the incompatibility of the Lutheran and Zwinglian
positions was more apparent than real, although both sides were guilty of using
inappropriate language (with opposing results) when discussing the mode of Christ’s
presence in the Eucharist. In place of the ‘extremes’ of Wittenberg and Zurich, he
offered his own mediating interpretation of the sacrament: any suggestion of a fleshly
presence or of the *manducatio impiorum* was refuted (against Luther), but the true
communion of believers with the body and blood of Christ, dispensed with the elements,
was firmly upheld.

Bucer’s appeal to his Italian co-religionists to avoid a ‘spiritum curiositatis et
contentionis’ appears to have fallen on deaf ears. The following year, the Venetian
evangelical Baldassare Altieri informed Luther that the German Eucharistic schism had
now infected the Italian philo-Protestant movement. Under Altieri’s leadership, the
Venetian evangelicals appear to have conformed to Luther’s understanding of the

---

27 For the first two letters, dated 17 August and 10 September 1541, see Martini Buceri Scripta Anglicana
sive omnia [...] (Basel 1577), pp.685-9. The complete text of the third letter, dated 23 December, is
28 *Scripta Anglicana*, p.687.
29 Thus Luther, for example, ‘cum diceret panem esse corpus Christi, aut corpus Christi in pane realiter,
corporaliter recte visus est etiam mihi, si non sentire tamen id his loquendi formis ait aitingerere corpus
Domini pani crassioe aliqiae ratione vel uniri vel includi’. Zwingli, by contrast, while correctly teaching a
form of spiritual presence in the sacrament, ‘saepa ita dilute de praesentia Domini locutus est, [...] ut multis
visus sit tantum absentis in Coena Domini symbolum agnoscere’ (Simoncelli, p.111).
30 *Scripta Anglicana*, p.687: ‘Panem [...] quem frangimus, non panis tantum: sed etiam corporis sui esse
communicationem, et calicem gratiarum actionis sanguinis sui, non vini tantum’.
31 Evangelicals of Venice, Vicenza and Treviso to Luther, 26 November 1542 (*D. Martin Luther's
Briefwechsel*, 11 vols (Weimar 1930-48), 10, p.204 [no.3817]): ‘Quaestio illa de Coena Domini, in
Germania primum orta, deinde ad nos quoque delata, proh dolor! quot turbas excitavit! quotSSIDIA
peperit! quantum recenticulum dedit infirmis! quantum iacturae ecclesiae Dei! quantum impedimenti
gloriae Christi propagandae!’
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Elsewhere in northern Italy, however, a vulgarised Zwinglian line came to prevail. In Lucca, for example, the Lateran canon Ottaviano da Verona described the Eucharist as simply a ‘commemoratione della passione et morte di Hiesù Christo’.33 Federico Chabod cites an attack on the host by a certain Filippo Nicola in November 1537 as evidence for the spread of Zwinglian sacramental views in Cremona.34 Not long afterwards Domenico Morando, formerly chaplain to cardinal Giovanni Morone and now a parish priest near Cremona, reported that Girolamo di Serafino Teggia, his predecessor in the post, had testified to having preached that the Eucharist was ‘una memoria de li benefici che da Iesu Christo havemo receuti’.35 In a letter to Konrad Pellikan of 28 January 1545, meanwhile, the Polish student Samuel Micanus noted the popularity of Zwingli’s works and Eucharistic theology among the evangelicals of Bologna:

Ab omnibus fere, ab omnibus Italis fratribus probantur ipsius [Zwingli’s] scripta et libenter omnes ipsi assentiuntur. In epciónautem plures fere omnes cum Zuingleio et nobiscum sentiunt. Opera tua habentur apud nos et in maximo (ecce, coram Deo loquor, non mentior) sunt pretio. Sed si fás est verum fateri, omnibus recentioribus praeferunt divinissime et syncerissime scribentem Huldricum Zuinglium.36

Micanus’s letter was one of several that the Zurichers received during the 1540s from foreign visitors to Italy commenting on the emergence of an evangelical movement in the Italian cities. In a letter to Bullinger of 1543, for example, the Züricher Hans

---

33 See idem, 30 August 1543 (ibid., p.381 [no.3907]): ‘Cum his, qui vobiscum recte sentiunt, junti sumus et nos in cœdern spirîna, eosque diligentius et observamus, cum caeteris vero, verbi Dei prophanatoribus, coire nullo modo possumus’.

34 F. Chabod, Per la storia religiosa dello stato di Milano durante il dominio di Carlo V: Note e documenti (Rome 1962), pp.115-16.

35 Firpo and Marcatto, Morone, 2:2, pp.904-8. See also the letter from Giovanni Domenico Sigibaldi to Morone of 4 April 1541: ‘El nostro don Domenico Morando ha rivotavo de la setta zuinglina circa la santissima eucharistia, et quello bravo, nepote de messer Baptista, lo perseguita e li guarda per obliquo: anchor lui ha la sua croce’ (ibid., p.971).

36 The full text of the letter is published in A. Rotondo, ‘Anticristo e Chiesa romana: Diffusione e metamorfosi d’un libello antiromano del Cinquecento’, in idem, Aspetti della propaganda religiosa del Cinquecento (Florence 1991), pp.19-164 (161-3). Thomas Erastus reported that a Dominican preacher in Bologna had also taken up Zwingli’s doctrine of predestination (ibid., pp.72-4).
Ratgeb – who refers to himself as a bodyguard (‘trabant’) to the duke of Ferrara – described the difficulties faced by local Protestants. In the current climate, Ratgeb observed, anyone who dared speak of Christ, Paul or Scripture risked being branded a ‘luterano’. Nevertheless, many continued to profess the Gospel ‘hie und zu bolognia und zu vinedig und ym gantzen lombardia, aber haimlich vor vorcht des anticrists’. The Englishman Thomas Knight, writing to Bullinger from Venice four years later, offered a more optimistic assessment of the Reformation’s prospects there:

Evangelium in dies multo sincerius hic quam alibi in Italia praedicatur, Senatusque consulto decretum est conccionem habere cotidie in palatio maiore futura quadragesima: quae nunquam ab urbe condita visum est. Crescat numerus fidelium magis ac magis. Tua commentaria indies plures fiunt apud italos et nisi essent tam magna et chara nulla essent magis vendibilia.

In a letter to Rudolf Gwalther of 7 June 1551, meanwhile, Georg Keller, a Züricher studying medicine at Padua, commended a Neapolitan evangelical who planned to visit Switzerland to collect Protestant works for distribution among his compatriots. Some leading figures in the Zurich church were able to see for themselves the progress that the Reformation was making south of the Alps. Konrad Gesner, for instance, visited Venice during the summer of 1543 in order to collect information for his Bibliotheca universalis. Two years later the Zurich schoolmaster Johannes Fries made the same trip, with a view to purchasing books for his father-in-law, Konrad Pellikan, and for Gesner; a brief account of his itinerary survives. It is likely that both would have been in

37 StAZ E II 355, 104-5.
38 StAZ E II 343, 358.
41 Ibid., pp.194-6.
communication with local evangelicals during their stays. Epistolary contacts between the Zurich churchmen and Italian Protestant sympathisers were also resumed around this time. The evangelical secretary to the imperial chancery in Milan, Pietro Merbelio, was in correspondence with both Bullinger and Pellikan, while in a letter to Joachim Vadian of September 1550, Bullinger provides a detailed account of the persecution to which Italian Protestants were subject, noting as the source of his information 'N. Itali ex Italia'. More specifically, the Zurich church is known to have had links with the important Reformed conventicle in Cremona: it was from there that in February 1550 a certain Giacomo Susio sent Gwalther a manuscript translation into Italian of the latter's Antichristus, with the request that he arrange for its publication. Zurich’s contacts with evangelical sympathisers in Venice are also documented. Although their spokesman, Baldassare Altieri, initially leaned towards Lutheranism, he was nevertheless anxious to establish good relations with the Zurichers. Thus in August 1543 Altieri wrote to Bullinger to describe the difficulties faced by the local faithful, who lacked affordable Protestant literature and suitable pastors, and to request copies of the Zurich Latin Bible, Calvin’s Institutes, and other works by the Genevan reformer. Later he informed Bullinger of his plans for an alliance between

---

42 After his return to Zurich, for example, Gesner assumed responsibility for supplying Venice’s evangelicals with Protestant literature (see Baklassare Altieri to Bullinger, 6 December 1543 [StAZ E II 369, 2]).

43 Merbelio to Bullinger, 18 May 1544 (StAZ E II 365, 36-7). On these contacts, see C. Zürcher, Konrad Pellikan’s Wirken in Zurich 1526-1556 (Zurich 1975), p.74.

44 Vadian BW, 7, no.98.

45 On this community, see Chabod, pp.172-8.

46 The work appeared from the presses of Oporinus in Basel later that year as L’Antichristo di M. Ridolfo Gualtero, ministro della Chiesa Tigurina. Appended to the text is a ‘Discorso brevissimo, per conoscer l’Antichristo’ that appears in neither the German nor the Latin version. Susio’s letter is published in Rotondo, ‘Anticristo’, pp.19-164 (163-4). In October 1553, the Cremonese exile Paolo Gaddi thanked Bullinger for sending a letter of consolation to the beleaguered evangelicals of his native city (Schiess, 1, no.231).

47 11 August 1543 (StAZ E II 369, 3).
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Venice and the Schmalkaldic League that would, he hoped, pave the way for the triumph of the Gospel in Italy. When the defeat of the German princes prompted the Venetian authorities to take steps to suppress Protestant proselytising in the city, Altieri’s position as secretary to the English ambassador became untenable: it was again to Bullinger that he turned in a vain attempt to secure an alternative post that would leave him free to continue with his activity on behalf of the Reformation.

The Zurich church did not mount anything approaching a sustained missionary campaign in Italy. However, it did offer modest assistance, notably in the form of books, to the peninsula’s emerging evangelical communities. The spread of ‘memorialist’ views of the Lord’s Supper would suggest that it also helped, albeit indirectly, to shape their theology. To obtain a more complete picture of the extent of the Zurich reformers’ influence in Italy one would need to undertake an examination of Inquisition trials, of the sort that has recently been conducted for Erasmus by Silvana Seidel Menchi; even then, the difficulties of disentangling ‘Zwinglian’ from other evangelical currents of thought in the confessionally fluid Italian context would be formidable. Nevertheless, from the evidence already cited it seems reasonable to assume that the high international profile of Bullinger and his colleagues made Zurich a natural pole of attraction for Italian evangelicals, alongside Geneva, Basel and Strasbourg. That was clearly true for those who came to constitute the public face of the Italian evangelical movement: the exiles.

---

48 Altieri to Bullinger, 13 November 1546 and 29 January 1547 (StAZ E II 365, 447, 449-50). On this scheme, see A. Stella, ‘Utopie e velleità insurrezionali dei filoprotestanti italiani (1545-1547)’, BHR 27 (1965), 133-82.

49 Altieri visited Switzerland in summer 1549 in the hope of persuading the Swiss Confederation to appoint him its official representative in Venice. After failing in this endeavour he returned to Italy, where he was received by the evangelical sympathiser Giovanni Andrea degli Ugoni on his estates near Bergamo. From there Altieri continued to correspond with Bullinger; he died in August 1550 (see DBI 2, p.559).

II. THE FIRST GENERATION OF ITALIAN EXILES

Contacts between the Zurich church and Italian evangelical refugees are attested as far back as the late 1520s. Francesco Negri, a former Benedictine from Bassano and one of the first Italians to commit himself openly to the Reformation, is said to have met Zwingli at the time of the Marburg colloquy. When, in June 1531, Negri decided to leave Strasbourg for the Italian-speaking subject territories of Graubünden (where he hoped to make a living as a schoolmaster) Wolfgang Capito asked Zwingli to commend him to the senior minister in Chur, Johannes Comander, and to the Rhaetian magnate Anton Travers.  

There is only sporadic evidence of such encounters during the 1530s: in the absence of concerted repression at home, most Italian evangelicals did not feel impelled to contemplate emigration. The few who did found a haven in Bucer’s Strasbourg. They included the Venetian Bartolomeo Fonzio, who in early 1533 accompanied Bucer to Zurich on one of his ill-fated missions to heal the Eucharistic schism with the Lutherans. Three years later the Zurichers received another exile, Giovanni Angelo Odoni, who had been studying in Strasbourg and came with a letter of introduction from Capito.

Traditionally, the year 1542 has been taken to mark a watershed in the history of the Reformation in Italy. Although recent historiography has moved to play down the significance of this date – it has been pointed out that the reform-minded ‘spirituali’ continued to exercise influence at the highest levels of the Italian church long after the bull *Licet ab initio* had been promulgated, and that the 1540s saw the beginnings of a genuinely popular Protestant movement in cities like Siena, Modena and Venice – in one

---

51 Z 11, no.1220.
53 Capito to Bullinger, Pellikan and Bibliander, 18 April 1536 (HBBW 6, no.797).
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respect its importance remains undiminished. 1542 was a year of spectacular public defections from Catholicism: by Bernardino Ochino, Peter Martyr Vermigli and Celio Secundo Curione, to name the most prominent. Like their French equivalents, the first Italian religious refugees acted as a magnet for others. Although some of exiles were uneasy about the implications of mass flight for the cause of the Gospel in Italy – in his *Esortatione al martirio*, Giulio da Milano argued that flight was only praiseworthy when undertaken at God’s direct command and for the benefit of other believers – the reformers’ almost unanimous opposition to the practice of dissimulation (Nicodemism) made exile the only practical option for the truly committed believer faced with persecution. An Italian exile community – or more accurately, a series of communities with strong mutual ties – slowly took shape.

1542 also marks the beginning of intensive contacts between the Zurich church and the Italian exiles. As we have seen, the latter were in many instances already familiar with the works of Zwingli, Bullinger and other Zurich writers. For those travelling north from Italy via the Bündner passes and Chur, Zurich was the first major port of call and Bullinger the first Reformed church leader of any significance whom they encountered. That was certainly the case with the apostates of 1542, who passed through Zurich in rapid succession during the late summer and autumn of that year. In a letter to Joachim Vadian of 19 December, Bullinger describes these encounters at some length. In August, he notes, he received a Capuchin named Hieronymus, who claimed to have read his works

---
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in Naples. Shortly afterwards he was visited by Curione, whom he commended to the authorities in Bern. Next to arrive was Ochino, whose reputation as Vicar-General of the Capuchin order and the most acclaimed preacher of his day had, one assumes, gone before him: Bullinger was certainly impressed by the Sienese exile's demeanour. No sooner had Ochino departed to take up a preaching post in Geneva than Curione returned, with the intention of collecting his wife and children from Lucca. For the journey, Bullinger presented him with a copy of his commentary on Matthew's Gospel and a letter of recommendation to the crypto-Protestant duchess of Ferrara, Renée de France.® Finally, the Zurichers received the former prior of San Frediano in Lucca, Peter Martyr Vermigli, along with his companion Paolo Lacizi. The procession of famous figures clearly raised Bullinger’s hopes for the breakthrough of the Reformation in Italy: ‘Meretrix illa Babylonis iudicabitur et iudicatur, deo laus et gloria’.®

Some of the exiles chose to prolong their stay in Zurich: a certain Laurentius of Cremona spent several months as a house-guest of Rudolf Gwalther in 1554, for example.® Others enjoyed the hospitality of Konrad Pellikan, whose close relations with Italian evangelicals have already been remarked on. They included Girolamo Mariano — perhaps the same Hieronymus referred to in Bullinger’s letter of December 1542 — and, more famously, the young Sienese exile Lelio Sozzini, who lodged with Pellikan in 1548-9 before returning to take up permanent residence in Zurich in 1554.® Those were exceptional cases, however. The Zurich churchmen could offer the Italian exiles little in

---

® On his return to Zurich from Italy, Curione was supplied with a letter of introduction to the Hofmeister of the former monastery of Königsfelden describing his straitened circumstances and requesting help to cover his travel expenses to Bern (M. Kutter, Celio Secundo Curione: Sein Leben und sein Werk (1503-1569) (Basel 1955), p.55).

® Vadian BW, 6, no.1271.

® See the letters of Pier Paolo Vergerio to Bullinger, 13/14 January, 15 and ? June 1554 (StAZ E II 356a, 583-90, 622-3, 599-602).

® Bonorand, Vadian, pp.155-6; Zürcher, p.74. Curione commended Mariano to Bullinger in a letter of 29 July 1544 (StAZ E II 366, 87°).
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the way of long-term employment, and were not anxious to detain them: in a letter to Bonifacius Amerbach of 11 September 1542, for instance, Pellikan reports that he and his colleagues had advised some of the new arrivals to travel on to Geneva. Basel, too, with its printing-houses and university, offered a more alluring prospect than the city on the Limmat. However, despite the fact that few exiles settled in Zurich, most continued to look to its churchmen for spiritual leadership. Fleeting personal encounters developed into solid humanist friendships, articulated through and cemented by correspondence.

Probably the best known of the Zurichers' new Italian correspondents was Peter Martyr Vermigli. Few letters survive from Vermigli's first spell at the Strasbourg academy (1542-7), but after the Florentine moved to Oxford his missives became more frequent. In letters to Bullinger and Gwalther, Vermigli described his pedagogical activities at the university, and his confrontations with Catholic opponents. He was also able to offer the Zurichers an outsider's perspective on the faltering progress of the Edwardian Reformation. The relationship was strengthened by the presence in Oxford of two Zurich students, Johannes ab Ulmis and Rudolf Stumpf, who formed part of Vermigli's inner circle in the mainly hostile university environment: Stumpf spoke highly of the Florentine exile in his letters home. Doctrinally, and especially in the contentious matter of the Eucharist, Vermigli was also edging closer to the position of the Zurich church around this time, after initially aligning himself with Bucer. in 1551, he had Gwalther arrange for the Zurich printer Christoph Froschauer to publish his commentary on 1 Corinthians. For their part, the Zurichers came to see in Peter Martyr a valuable

---

60 F. Hartmann (ed.), Die Amerbachkorespondenz (Basel 1942- ), 5, no.2495.

61 See, for example, his letter to Gwalther of 1 June 1550, complaining of the shortage of preachers outside London (ET, no.CCXXX). 

62 Ibid., no.CXCIV.

63 S. Corda, Veritas Sacramenti: A Study in Vermigli's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper (Zurich 1975), pp.64-78.

64 ET, nos CCXXX, CXXXXII, CXXXXIII, CXXXXV.
Chapter 1: Zurich and the Italian Reformers to 1555

theological ally. When, following his return to Strasbourg in 1553, Vermigli found himself the target of local Lutherans’ antipathy, Bullinger took the opportunity to offer him the chair of Old Testament theology at the Zurich Lectorium.65

Of equal significance was Bullinger’s relationship with the Piedmontese humanist Celio Secundo Curione, who had been appointed to a lecturing post at the academy of Lausanne: more than twenty of his letters to the Zurich Antistes survive from the 1540s alone.66 The association between the two men was underpinned by a shared devotion to the memory of Zwingli. According to his sixteenth-century biographer, Nicholas Stupanus, the Commentarius de vera et falsa religione was among the first Protestant works which Curione encountered in his youth.67 Recently Luca d’Ascia has suggested that Zwingli’s interpretation of Christ’s words in the Eucharist as metaphor may have provided Curione with a hermeneutical model when, in his De amplitudine beati regni Dei, the Piedmontese exile came to grapple with those passages of scripture which suggested that the number of the elect was exceeded by that of the damned.68 D’Ascia also describes Curione’s early Araneus seu de providentia Dei as an Erasmian reworking of Zwingli’s own De providentia: one passage in the Araneus defending Pythagoras from the charge of teaching the transmigration of souls is clearly derived from the earlier treatise.69 In January 1545, on hearing that the Zurichers were planning to

65 Bullinger to Vermigli, 1 May 1556 (StAZ E II 342, 323). See Vermigli’s inaugural oration, with its praise for the Eucharistic teaching of the Zurich church, in Loci communes D. Petri Martyris Vermillii, Florentini, Sacrarum literarum in Schola Tigurina Professotis (London 1583), 1062-5.

66 The existing register of Curione’s correspondence in Kutter, pp.295-303, is in need of some correction. For a partial overview of the surviving letters, see S. Calvani, ‘Note sul carteggio di Celio Secundo Curione dal 1535 al 1553’, BSSV 159 (1986), 35-40.

67 Kutter, p.13.


69 Ibid., p.216, n.31.
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publish a complete edition of Zwingli’s works, Curione asked Bullinger to supply him with a copy.70 A subsequent letter made his admiration for Zwingli’s achievement plain: ‘Nulli hodie extant libri theologici, quos tantopere desiderem, et concupiscam, propter excellentem (quae in eis est) doctrinam’.71 Curione also adhered to an overtly Zwinglian doctrine of the Eucharist. In his catechism for children, the *Institutione della religione christiana*, he offers a memorialist reading of the sacrament and describes the relationship between the elements and the spiritual realities they signify in terms of analogy, much as Bullinger does in his *Decades*.72 Curione’s Zwinglianism may have led to friction with Pierre Viret and the Calvinist-dominated classis of Lausanne: certainly, after moving to Basel in January 1547 he was quick to condemn Viret for his ‘Bucerian’ stance on the sacrament.73 In later years Curione also opposed the lutheranising policies of the Basel church leadership.74

Although only one of Bullinger’s letters to Curione from the 1540s survives, he

70 Curione to Bullinger, 18 January 1545 (StAZ E II 346, 148-9). Interestingly, Curione notes that Zwingli’s writings were impossible to come by in Lausanne or Geneva.
71 Idem, 19 October 1545 (StAZ E II 366, 85').
72 *Una familiare et paterna institutione della Christiana religione* (Basel n.d. [1550]), sigs Dv-f*: This was an amplified version of the Latin edition published the previous year (Kutter, p.285).
73 Curione to Bullinger, 6 May 1548 (StAZ E II 346, 234; CO 12, no.1016). On hearing that his *Pro vera et antiqua Ecclesiae Christi autoritate ad Antonium Florebellum Mutinensem oratio* (Basel n.d.) had attracted criticism from Bucer for its statements on the sacrament, Curione remarked: ‘Quid Bucerus de meis scriptis sentiat, modo sanioribus vere probentui’, non valde moror. Neque enim me cum Calvino et Vireto volo coniungere in ea quaestione: quos audio Argentorati, Bucero subscripsisse, etiamsi domi aliter sapere videantur. Nam domi apud Lutheranos exagitant, quod apud Bucerum probant’ (StAZ E II 346, 211). Curione offers a figurative interpretation of the words of institution on pp.181-3 of the *Oration*.
74 Curione to Bullinger, 22 August 1569 (StAZ E II 377, 2461): ‘Disceretur cum video, quosdam homines eoque primas in ecclesia tenentes id unum studere, ut Zwiglii [sic] atque Oecolampadi sanctam memoriam, oblivio ne obruant sempernara’. Curione acted as Bullinger’s informant on the growing tensions between Lutherans and Zwinglians in Basel, although he was anxious to conceal his role from the Basel authorities. See his letters of 23 and 27 July 1569 (StAZ E II 377, 2463, 2462), and the discussion in Kutter, pp.214-5. By this stage Bullinger and the Basel *Antistes* Simon Sulzer were at loggerheads over the latter’s pursuit of Lutheran-style reforms: see H.R. Guggisberg, ‘Das lutheranisierende Basel: ein Diskussionsbeitrag’, in H.-C. Rublack, *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland* (Gütersloh 1992), pp.199-201, and A. Nelson Burnett, ‘Simon Sulzer and the Consequences of the 1563 Strasbourg Consensus in Switzerland’, *ARG* 83 (1992), 154-79.
clearly had a high opinion of his correspondent’s abilities. If Curione is to be believed, it was Bullinger who first persuaded him to take up his pen on behalf of the Gospel; the selection of correspondence which Curione published in 1553 included a letter from the Antistes praising his Oration against Antonio Fiordibello.\(^{75}\) The two men frequently exchanged books as well as letters. In March 1543, for instance, Curione requested a copy of the new edition of the Zurich Latin Bible, along with some works by Konrad Gesner,\(^{76}\) later he received the Zurich confession of 1545, portions of the Decades, and a ‘sermon on the Lord’s Supper’ (perhaps Bullinger’s Apologetica expositio of 1556).\(^{77}\) In return, Bullinger and his sons were presented with several of Curione’s own works.\(^{78}\) The Piedmontese exile also took a special interest in the welfare of Zurich students in Basel, particularly the younger Huldrych Zwingli.\(^{79}\)

During the course of the 1540s and early 1550s, many more Italian exiles were drawn into Bullinger’s ever-expanding international network of correspondents. They included Girolamo Zanchi, Vermigli’s co-worker first in Lucca, and latterly in Strasbourg,\(^{80}\) his fellow Bergamasc Guglielmo Grataroli, an exile in Basel;\(^{81}\) Francesco

\(^{75}\) Curione to Bullinger, 29 July 1544 (StAZ E II 366, 87); Caeli Secundi Curionis selectarum epistolarum Libri duo (Basel 1553), pp.34-6.

\(^{76}\) StAZ E II 366, 88”. The request for the Bible ‘minore forma’ was repeated in a letter of 30 November 1543 (ibid., 66’). Curione acknowledged receipt of the volume in May the following year (ibid., 62’).

\(^{77}\) Curione to Bullinger, 19 October 1545, 11 May 1549, 4 December 1550 (StAZ E II 366, 85, 74, 71). See also idem, 21 March 1548, 15 April 1556, 18 May 1558 (StAZ E II 366, 79, 58, 54).

\(^{78}\) Curione, Epistolae, p.35; Curione to Bullinger, 30 November 1543, 18 January 1545, 24 August 1547, 20 January 1549, 11 May 1549, 25 November 1552, 15 October 1554 (StAZ E II 366, 66, StAZ E II 346, 148, StAZ E II 366, 211, 76, 74, 69, 61).

\(^{79}\) Curione to Bullinger, 2 May 1547, 31 January 1548, 21 March 1548, 20 January 1549, 2 May 1550, 4 December 1550, 8 January 1551 (StAZ E II 366, 81, 77, 79, 76, 72, 71, 70).

\(^{80}\) Zanchi apostatised in October 1551. He was in correspondence with Bullinger from October 1553.

\(^{81}\) Grataroli left Italy towards the end of 1548, and began to correspond with Bullinger at the time of the Servetus affair (see StAZ E II 336, 54-89). His De memoria was published by the Zurich printers Andreas Gesner and Rudolf Wyssenbach in 1553 (M. Vischer, Bibliographie der Zürcher Druckschriften des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts (Baden-Baden 1991), p.422 [I 47]), and he contributed to Konrad Gesner’s De
Stancaro of Mantua and Girolamo Massario of Vicenza, both commended to Bullinger by Cuiione; Galeazzo Caracciolo, the founder of Geneva’s Italian church; and Lelio Sozzini (during his frequent absences from Zurich). Zurich was also a frequent port of call for the Basel-based Lucchese printer Pietro Perna, a close associate of Cuiione’s.

Exceptionally strong links were forged with those exiles who had settled in the Italian-speaking areas of the Rhaetian Freestate (Graubünden, the Grisons). It was they who were responsible for introducing the Reformation to Italian Graubünden: prior to the exiles’ arrival in the 1540s, Protestantism had remained confined principally to the German-speaking League of the Ten Jurisdictions and to the area around Chur, even

---

Stanzo, published in Venice by Tomaso Giunta the same year (Bonorand, Vadian, pp.36, 64; M. Bundi, Frühbeziehungen zwischen Graubünden und Venedig (15./16. Jahrhundert) (Chur 1988), pp.86-7).

See Cuiione to Bullinger, 8 February 1546 (StAZ E II 366, 82), and 29 December 1552 (ibid., 68). Stancaro singled out the anti-Anabaptist works of Bullinger and Leo Jud for special praise in his Opera nuova della Riformazione (Basel 1547), p.549. His Ispositione de la Epistola canonica di S. Giacobo Vescovo di Gierusaleme (Basel 1547) incorporates material from Bullinger’s commentary on the same text. Compare the ‘Epistolae argumentum’ which prefaces both works, and see the comments of Josias Simler in his revised edition of Gesner’s Bibliotheca universalis (Bibliotheca instituta et collecta primum a Conrado Gesnero, deinde in Epitomen redacta et novorum librorum accessione locupletata [...] per Iostiam Simlerum Tigurinum (Zurich 1574), p.207).

StAZ E II 368, 509.


On Perna, see Perini, ‘Ancora’, and ‘Note e documenti su Pietro Perna libraio-tipografo a Basilea’, NRS 50 (1966), 145-200. Perna was behind the publication, in 1551, of an Italian translation of the New Testament by the Benedictine Massimo Teofilo. This was based on the Zurich Latin Bible and incorporated part of Bullinger’s preface to the text, De omnibus sanctae scripturae libris exposito: compare Il Nuovo ed eterno Testamento di Giesu Christo [...] per Massimo Teofilo Fiorentino (Lyon 1551), fols *7v*-*8r*, and Biblia sacra utraque Testamento (Zurich 1539), sigs B'-B1'; see Perini, ‘Ancora’, 379-82, for further details.

By Italian Graubünden I understand the Valbregaglia, Poschiavo and Mesolcina, all member-communes of the Rhaetian Freestate with representation in the Diet, along with the so-called ‘subject lands’ (Untertanenländer, paesi sudditi) of Chiavenna, the Valtellina and Bormio. The subject lands were administered by seven Rhaetian magistrates, appointed by the ruling communes for a period of two years each. The most powerful of these officials were the commissario of Chiavenna and the podestà of Sondrio, who also served as governor (Landeshauptmann) for the Valtellina as a whole. For further details of these arrangements, see A. Wendland, Der Nutzen der Pässe und die Gefährdung der Seelen: Spanien, Mailand und der Kampf ums Veltlin (1620-1641) (Zurich 1995), pp.37-46. On the constitution and government of the Freestate more generally, see R. Head, Early Modern Democracy in the Grisons: Social Order and Political Language in a Swiss Mountain Canton, 1470-1620 (Cambridge 1995), pp.36-117.
though the Second Ilanz Articles of 1526 had invested individual Rhaetian communes with the ius reformandi. Because the Rhaetian Reformed church was heavily dependent on Zurich, both for its theology and for its personnel, it was logical for the exiles to attempt to initiate contacts with Bullinger and his fellow ministers, either directly or via the mediation of the ecclesiastical leadership in Chur. The ensuing correspondence allowed the Zurichers to keep abreast of the Reformation's progress in the region and, to some extent, to assist the work of evangelisation there.

Graubünden's first Italian Reformed community was established in Chiavenna during the late 1530s, under the leadership first of Francesco Negri, and then of Agostino Mainardi. The cause of Protestantism in the region received an significant boost when, in 1544, the Rhaetian Diet ruled that residents of the 'subject lands' (Chiavenna, the Valtellina and Bormio) might maintain evangelical preachers and ministers at their own expense; three years later Giulio da Milano organised a Protestant congregation in Poschiavo. However, the crucial turning-point for Reformed fortunes was the arrival in Graubünden of Pier Paolo Vergerio, the former bishop of Capodistria. During a ministry of less than four years (1550-3) Vergerio achieved the conversion of the entire Valbregaglia and large parts of the neighbouring Ladin-speaking Lower Engadine, and established a foothold for the new faith around Sondrio in the Valtellina. He was also responsible for a vast outpouring of anti-Catholic propaganda, most of it destined for circulation in northern Italy. Inspired by the example of Geneva, Vergerio hoped to convert Italian-speaking Rhaetia into a vast centre for proselytising activity south of the

---

87 The standard account of the Reformation in the Italian-speaking areas of Rhaetia is E. Camenisch, Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation in den italienischen Südtälern Graubündens und den ehemaligen Untertanenlanden Chiavenna, Veltlin und Bormio (Chur 1950). A new study by Conradin Bonorand is to be published imminently.
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Alps.

During his time in Graubünden Vergerio kept up an intensive correspondence with the Zurichers. Traugott Schiess has published seventy of his letters to Bullinger from this period, and to those must be added seventeen addressed to Gwalther. Vergerio also visited Zurich on several occasions (February 1550, August 1550, September 1551 and February 1552). Among the subjects discussed in Vergerio's correspondence are the persecution of evangelicals in Italy, the moves to reconvene the council of Trent, and his own reforming activities. In one letter to Bullinger, dated 7 May 1551, he recounts the destruction of the relics of St Gaudentius at Casaccia in the Valbregaglia, which was apparently carried out in response to his preaching. Other missives describe opposition to Vergerio's preaching in his home parish of Vicosoprano, and the emergence of a Reformed community in Sondrio.

Like Curione, Vergerio offered the Zurichers copies of his publications (especially his polemics against Trent) in exchange for their own works. The Istrian exile's intention was to deploy the latter as part of his ambitious evangelising campaign. In August 1551, for example, he asked Bullinger to send him copies of the Decades and other works for distribution in Italy, while in September the following year he informed...

---

96 Another eighty or so letters survive from the period 1553-64, but relations between Vergerio and the Zurichers became noticeably cooler after his move to Lutheran Tübingen.

97 E. Walder, 'Pier Paolo Vergerio und das Veltlin 1550', Schweizer Beiträge zur allgemeinen Geschichte 3 (1945), 229-46 (241); Vadian BW, 6, no.1705; Amerbachkorrespondenz, 8, nos 3460, 3463, 3495.

98 See, for example, Vergerio to Bullinger, 7 January 1551 (Schiess, 1, no.142).

99 Schiess, 1, no.152(2). Writing to Gwalther shortly afterwards, Vergerio disclaimed responsibility for the iconoclastic excesses of his supporters (ZB Ms. F 40, 557).

100 Vergerio to Bullinger, 8 October 1551 (Schiess, 1, no.163); 23 January 1553 (ibid., no.201).

101 Schiess, 1, nos 145, 158, 161, 191; ZB Ms. F 40, 553-4, 559, 568-9, 574, 561.

102 Schiess, 1, no.158.
Chapter 1: Zurich and the Italian Reformers to 1555

the Zurich Antistes that his books were selling well south of the Alps. Vergerio also
sought to make Bullinger's works accessible to a wider Italian readership by translating
them into the vernacular. In a letter of December 1550 he reported that he had already
translated two of the Antistes' writings; later he produced manuscript translations of
Bullinger's Perfectio christianorum, Fundamental demonstration that the evangelical
churches are neither heretical nor schismatic, and De sacrosancto coena (none of which
survive). In addition, Vergerio's free rendering of a Bullingerian oration against the
council of Trent was published by his collaborator in Poschiavo, the printer Dolfin
Landolfi. The Istrian exile had originally planned to make extensive use of Zurich's
presses for the publication of his writings, but in the absence of anyone qualified to edit
Italian-language texts he was forced to turn elsewhere: only the Operetta nuova [...] in
nella quale si dimostrano le vere ragioni, che hanno mosso i Romani Pontefici ad instituir
le belle ceromorie della Settimana santa appeared in Zurich under his own name,
published by Andreas Gesner and Rudolf Wyssenbach in 1552. However, it should be
noted that the Gesner-Wyssenbach partnership gave further, indirect support to Vergerio's

---

97 Ibid., no.191.
98 Ibid., no.138.
99 Ibid., nos 189, 224, 229.
100 Vergerio to Gwalther, 8 March 1551 (ZB Ms. F 40, 568); H. Bullinger, Diarium (Annales vitae) der
Jahre 1504-1574, edited by E. Egli (Basel 1904), pp.39-40. Josias Simler summarises the work's contents
in Narratio de ortu, vita, et obitu reverendi viri, D. Henrici Bullingeri [...] (Zurich 1575), fols 25"-6".
101 Vergerio to Bullinger, 13 December (?) 1550 (Schiess, I, no.138). This may also explain why Perna
dropped plans to publish Teofilo's New Testament in Zurich (Perini, 'Note', 151, 158).
102 Vischer, Bibliographie, p.419 (I 39). In a recent article Robert Pierce has argued for Vergerio's
authorship of the Annotomia della messa, traditionally ascribed to Agostino Mainardi. This work, too, was
probably published by Gesner and Wyssenbach ('Agostino Mainardi, Pier Paolo Vergerio, and the
Anatomia missae', BHR 55 (1993), 25-42). Zurich's overall contribution to Italian-language publishing in
the sixteenth century was modest: in his dissertation Pierce lists only six editions for the period 1533-1609
(Pierce, 'Vergerio', appendix 1; but it should be noted that Pierce's list is not comprehensive).
publishing ventures, by supplying type and other equipment to Landolfi.\textsuperscript{103}

Vergerio was not the Zurichers' only Italian contact in Graubünden during this period. Francesco Negri, for example, corresponded with Bullinger (to whom he presented a copy of his verse epic, \textit{Rhetio}), Fries and Johannes Wolf, minister at the Fraumünster;\textsuperscript{104} his son also attended school in Zurich.\textsuperscript{105} Two of Negri's Latin works, \textit{Ovidianae metamorphoseos epitome} (1542), and \textit{In dominicam precatio\textsuperscript{em} Meditatiuncula} (1560), were published by Christoph Froschauer. In the same way, Agostino Mainardi, whose early letter to Zwingli has already been referred to, re-established contacts with Zurich shortly after going into exile in 1541. Early the following year, for instance, Mainardi procured an edition of Bullinger's commentary on the New Testament epistles from the \textit{Antistes} via Johannes Comander;\textsuperscript{106} three years later Bullinger presented him with a copy of the newly published Zurich \textit{Confession} on the Lord's Supper.\textsuperscript{107} By the early 1550s, the Zurichers' Italian correspondents in the Rhaetian Freestate also included Paolo Gaddi, minister in Teglio; Pietro Parisotto, minister at Samaden in the Engadine;\textsuperscript{108} Giovanni Beccaria, who introduced Protestantism first to Locarno and then to the Mesolcina;\textsuperscript{109} and Giulio da Milano.

\textsuperscript{103} R. Bornatico, \textit{L'arte tipografica nelle Tre Leghe} (1549-1803), p.43; C. Bonorand, 'Dolfin Landolfi von Poschiavo: Der erste Bündner Drucker der Reformationszeit', in M. Haas and R. Hauswirth (eds), \textit{Festgabe Leonhard von Muralt} (Zurich 1970), pp.228-44 (233); Pierce, 'Vergerio', p.120.

\textsuperscript{104} See the verses dedicated to Fries and Wolf in ZB Ms. D 75, fols 120', 266'. Fries, Wolf and several other members of the Zurich church establishment (Gwalther, Simler, Gesner) were competent in Italian. See Vergerio to Gwalther, 13 September 1550 (ZB Ms. F 40, 563'-4'); and Curione to Bullinger, 22 June 1550 (ZB Ms. F 62, 182'). This ability was not shared by Bullinger: see Vergerio to Bullinger, 20 February 1551 (Schiess, 1, no.145), and Bullinger to Calvin, 21 April 1551 (CO 14, no.1489).

\textsuperscript{105} Schiess, 1, no.68.

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., nos 31-2.

\textsuperscript{107} Mainardi to Bullinger, 3 November 1545 (ibid., no.64).

\textsuperscript{108} On Parisotto, see Bundi, p.151.

\textsuperscript{109} See chapter 2:1 below.
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The relationship between the Zurichers and the exiles had its basis in shared humanist interests – particularly striking in the cases of Curione and Negri – and a common commitment to the struggle against the papacy. However, this was not the whole picture: by the end of the 1540s disagreements over doctrine, both within the Italian exile communities, and between the more radical exiles and their Zurich correspondents, were threatening to sour relations. A significant number of the new arrivals brought with them expectations of reform which the Zurich church was unable or unwilling to meet. It is to those differences that I now wish to turn.

III. THE SEEDS OF CONFLICT: EARLY ENCOUNTERS WITH ITALIAN ‘HERESY’

In order to understand why doctrinal controversy came to occupy such a central place in relations between the Zurichers and their Italian contacts, some consideration of the religious context from which the latter emerged is required. The Italian evangelical movement was shaped by an extraordinary mix of influences: Erasmianism (often understood as a form of ‘Lutheranism’), northern Protestantism (of all complexions), and autochthonous reformist currents, such as the Cassinese Benedictine tradition explored by Carlo Ginzburg, Adriano Prosperi and Barry Collett. The spiritual climate in Italy during the first half of the sixteenth century resembled the state of ‘magnificent religious anarchy’ which, according to Lucien Febvre, existed in France prior to the advent of Calvinism, or the _Wildwuchs_ of the early German Reformation.

What set the Italian evangelical movement apart was its inability to move

---


111 L. Febvre, 'Une question mal posée: Les origines de la réforme française et le problème des causes de la réforme', in idem, _Au coeur religieux du XVIe siècle_ (Paris 1957), pp.3-70 (66).
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beyond this 'Gärungsphase' (Seidel Menchi), to make the transition from conventicles to 'gathered' churches of the sort which took shape in France during the years immediately prior to the wars of religion.\textsuperscript{112} Giulio da Milano drew attention to that fact in his Esortatione al martirio, observing: 'Gli christiani d'Italia son come membri dispersi, e morti, senza guida, e senza capo, non essendo le chiese Italiane congregate, ne regolate secondo la parola di Dio.'\textsuperscript{113} The organisational weakness of Italy's evangelical communities made it impossible to establish mechanisms for the promotion and enforcement of doctrinal uniformity such as developed elsewhere.\textsuperscript{114} To quote Silvana Seidel Menchi:

Da in Italien nicht die historische Situation eintrat, bei der aus der Reformation des Zweifels, die Reformation der Gewißheiten wurde und sich deshalb der Konflikt zwischen diesen beiden niemals herausbilden konnte, blieben der Habitus des Zweifels und das Thema Toleranz charakteristische Bestandteile der Reformationsbewegung.\textsuperscript{115}

Ideas considered both 'orthodox' and 'heretical' from the perspective of northern Protestantism found adherents within the same communities, and even co-existed within the thought of a single individual.

In the absence of institutional restraints on belief, or of a normative authority (besides scripture) to replace that of the old church, there was little to prevent individuals slipping over into strikingly heterodox positions, once the initial breach with Catholicism had been made. 'Fantasia,' according to Silvana Seidel Menchi, was a leitmotif of the Italian evangelical movement. Italy's evangelicals did not assimilate the ideas of the northern reformers uncritically, but selectively and as aids to their own, more or less


\textsuperscript{114} Exceptions to this pattern include Cremona (see Chabod, cited above) and Vicenza, where Alessandro Trissino attempted to impose a distinctively Calvinist brand of reform (see Olivieri, \textit{Riforma ed eresia} (Rome 1992), pp.324-46).

\textsuperscript{115} Seidel Menchi, \textit{Erasmus}, p.269.
independent, scrutiny of traditional religion. In Italy, ‘Das Paradoxon des Erasmus, nach
dem “jedem zusteht, Theologe zu sein”, wurde wörtlich genommen’.116 The fate of the
Valdesian circle after its founder’s death illustrates just how far the process of theological
experimentation could lead. Under the influence of another Spaniard, Juan de Villafranca,
a number of Valdés’s former disciples came to question the doctrines of the Trinity and
the divinity of Christ.117 Radicalised Valdesians like Girolamo Busale were subsequently
responsible for transforming Venetian Anabaptism into an antitrinitarian movement with
strong judaizing tendencies: some ended by rejecting the New Testament and revealed
religion altogether.118 Few Italian evangelicals adopted positions as extreme as that, but
indifference towards the niceties of Protestant dogma, even a tendency towards
universalism, was widespread: around 1572, for example, the silk-weaver Pietro Antonio
Ungari and his associates were arguing that Muslims and Jews could be saved in their
own faith.119

Such sentiments were unlikely to find favour with the representatives of the
emerging Protestant orthodoxies which the Italian exiles would encounter north of the
Alps.120 False perceptions of Protestant Europe current in Italy provided another potential
source of friction. As Seidel Menchi has again shown, in Italian evangelical circles the
‘Lutheran’ states of Germany and Switzerland had the reputation of havens of religious

116 Ibid., p.100.

117 A. Stella, Anabattismo e antitrinitarismo in Italia nel XVI secolo: Nuove ricerche storiche (Padua 1969),
pp.25-6; M. Firpo, ‘<<Ioanne Valdessio è stato hereticus pestissimus>>: forme, esiti e metamorfosi
dell’<<heresia>> valdesiana’, in Tra alunbradores e <<spirituali>>: Studi su Juan de Valdés e il
valdesianismo nella crisi religiosa del ‘500 italiano (Florence 1990), pp.9-125 (92).

118 On Venetian Anabaptism, see Stella, Antitrinitarismo; idem, Dall’anabattismo al socinianesimo nel
cinquecento Veneto: Ricerche storiche (Padua 1967); Martín, pp.99-112. The testimony of Pietro Manelfi,
formerly our principal source of information on the movement (C. Ginzburg (ed.), I costituti di don Pietro
Manelfi [Florence 1970]), has now been shown to be unreliable (see Stella, Antitrinitarismo, pp.64-72; U.
Gastaldi, Storia dell’anabattismo, 2 vols (Turin 1972/81), 2, pp.554-8).

119 Seidel Menchi, p.179.

120 Ibid., p.101.
Chapter 1: Zurich and the Italian Reformers to 1555

liberty, where each was permitted to live and worship 'a suo modo'. Many Italians suffered bitter disillusionment when, as exiles, they came face to face with the reality of the magisterial Reformation. The experience of Pietro di Casalmaggiore, a Lombard evangelical who spent time in Chiavenna during the late 1540s and early 1550s before returning to the Catholic church, is instructive. Pietro told the Milanese inquisitors that he had gone into exile 'pensandomi di trovar un paradiso de costumi et fede', but had been forced to leave Graubünden after daring to criticise the doctrines and lifestyles of the local Reformed. Having repudiated the spiritual ‘tyranny’ of the papacy, many exiles were impatient of alternative, Protestant, attempts to constrain consciences. In his *De amplitudine*, for instance, Curione denounces the use of force to that end:

Evangelium [...] IESU CHRISTI Domini nostri, non vi aut armis propagandum est, sed praedicatione, spiritus energia, et evidentia, moribus, patientia, charitate, placabilitate, iustitia, temperantia, constantia, bonitate, fide, lenitate, quibus illa sacri spiritus sese exercit, et ostendit. [...] Nihil est tam voluntarium, nihil tam liberum quam religionis sententia. Idcirco illa instituendo ac persuadendo, non minis aut metu traditur: quam non occidendo, sed moriendo, non saevitia sed patientia, non fraudae sed fide defendimus. Si enim imperis, ac vi religionem tueri velis, iam non defenditur, sed polluetur ac violabitur potius.

A readiness to resort to coercion was not the only similarity which dissenting exiles noted between the papacy and the leaderships of the various Protestant churches. Some accused the Reformed establishment of seeking to dilute the scripture principle in the interests of upholding a conservatively defined orthodoxy, so perpetuating many of Rome’s most fundamental errors.

Evidence has already been adduced to show that the theology of the Zurich

121 Ibid., p.135. This impression was encouraged by works like Vergerio’s *Epistola [...] nella quale sono descritti molte cose della Città, e della Chiesa di Geneva* (Geneva 1550), and *Del battesimo et de fiumi che nascono ne paesi de signori Grisoni* ([Poschiavo 1550]). See the analysis of the *Epistola* in Pierce, ‘Vergerio’, pp.267-73.
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curch found at least some echo among Italy's evangelicals. However, it should not be assumed that Zwinglianism à l'italienne was a faithful reproduction of its Zurich prototype. Significantly, where Zwingli's name was mentioned in the Italian context, it was usually in connection with the most radical aspect of his theological programme, the doctrine of the sacraments. Zwingli the gradualist reformer, the fierce opponent of Anabaptist sectarianism, hardly featured. The Zurich reformer's iconoclastic reputation, put about by his Lutheran and Catholic opponents, may well have left many Italian evangelicals with a one-sided view of the man and of the reforms for which he was responsible. The emphasis of Zwingli's Reformation was, in fact, on continuity with existing practice wherever possible; the legacy of medieval Christendom was not rejected out of hand. As has been demonstrated recently, the institutions of the remodelled Zurich church were firmly grounded in the reforming traditions of the fifteenth-century diocese of Constance.  

They were similarly cautious in their handling of sensitive doctrinal questions, in particular the fundamentals of Triadology and Christology. Zwingli had no wish to see the church's traditional stance on those matters altered. In the first Bern sermon of 1528, for instance, he drew on Augustine's analogy with the faculties of the human soul to illustrate the interrelationship of the three persons of the Godhead. Similarly, in the Fidei ratio the Zurich reformer affirmed his belief in the Trinity as set out in the Nicene and Athanasian creeds. On numerous occasions he endorsed the Chalcedonian

124 See Gordon, especially pp.23-72.
127 Z 6:2, 792.
understanding of Christ's person, against those who accused him of teaching Nestorianism. In his final works Zwingli even sought to tone down the radicalism of his Eucharistic views, reappropriating much of the language traditionally applied to the sacraments. Where he had earlier insisted on the radical duality of matter and spirit, and the corresponding ontological separateness of the sacraments and grace, he now began to explore ways in which the two might be linked, through analogy, or through the operation of the Holy Spirit as the mediator of Christ's presence (contemplatio fidei).

The process of re-evaluation continued under his successors, who were keen to rebut the charge of sacramentarianism commonly levelled against the Zurich church. From the mid-1530s onwards, Heinrich Bullinger presided over a concerted campaign to rehabilitate Zwingli's memory. That involved, among other things, bringing his more 'positive' late theology of the Eucharist to the attention of the reading public, notably through the publication of the Fidei expositio in 1536. In the Zurich Confession of 1545, Bullinger cites this last work as evidence for his predecessor's recognition of the benefits conferred by the sacrament on those who receive it with faith. The same point is made in Rudolf Gwalther's Apology for Huldrych Zwingli, published together with the first complete Latin edition of Zwingli's works, which also attempted more generally to underline the reformer's orthodoxy and in so doing, to put distance between Zwingli and those 'enthusiasts' (Schwärmer) with whom he had been associated by Luther.

---

128 See, for example, Z 6:2, 792-4; Z 6:5, 66-8.


130 Warhaffte Behauntnuß der dieneren der idlichen zu Zuryc / was sy uß Gottes wort / mit der heyligen allgemeinen Christlichen Kilchen gloubind und leerind [...] (Zurich 1545), fols 10'-16'.

131 Rudolphi Gualtheri Tigurini ad Catholicam Ecclesiam omnemque posteritatem, pro D. Huld. Zuinglio et Operum eius aeditione Apologia (Zurich 1545), fol.49*: 'Licet enim signa et tesseras Sacramenta
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The very fact that Zwinglianism was historically ‘tainted’ with heresy (although Bullinger strove to locate the origins of Anabaptism elsewhere, the prominence of Zwingli’s early followers in the first sectarian community at Zollikon remained a source of embarrassment) lent added urgency to the Zurich theologians’ efforts to demonstrate their orthodox credentials. The ‘catholicity’ of Reformed teaching, as opposed to that of the radicals, is a recurring theme of Bullinger’s works. In particular, he was anxious to show that the teachings of the Reformed church did not constitute heresy as defined by imperial law.\textsuperscript{132} To that end, the Decades (first published in 1549) were prefaced by a litany of confessional statements: the creeds of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and the first and fourth councils of Toledo; the declaration of faith of Irenaeus; Tertullian’s rule of faith; the creeds of Athanasius and pope Damasus; and, crucially, the anti-heresy edict of the emperor Gratian (380).\textsuperscript{133} Bullinger’s reasons for including this material in his most important theological work were not simply tactical: the ancient creeds embodied for him the eternal truths of the Christian faith.\textsuperscript{134} Although the Antistes stressed simplicity of exposition, this ought not to be confused with the desire of some Italian exiles for a simplified Christianity. When Bullinger chose not to probe the more abstruse articles of doctrine, it was because such speculation was unlikely to contribute to the edification of ordinary believers, rather than because he had ceased to

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{132} H. Bullinger, \textit{Das die Evangelischen Kilchen weder katzerische noch abtrünnige / sunder gantz rechtgülige und allgemeine Jesu Christi kilchen syend / gründliche erwysung} (Zuich 1552), fols 18\textsuperscript{r}-19\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Sermonum decades quinque, de potissimis Christianae fidei religionis capitibus, in tres tomos digestae, authore Heinrycho Bullingero, ecclesiae Tigurinae ministro} (Zurich 1577), sigs \textsuperscript{3r}-\textsuperscript{3v}.
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regard those tenets as fundamental: Bullinger’s preferred option was simply to take the doctrinal formularies of the early church as read. In the *Summa Christenlicher Religion* of 1556, for example, he warned his readers against pondering the doctrine of the Trinity too deeply, pointing out that for a thousand years Christian princes had forbidden such questioning “by verlierung lybs und labens”.

From Bullinger’s point of view, the execution of Michael Servetus – of which many Italian exiles were critical – was entirely justifiable on the basis of imperial law.

Bullinger’s traditionalism is further manifested in his attitude towards the early church councils and the Fathers. The Fathers had played a key role in Bullinger’s initial conversion to Protestantism, and in shaping his early theology: the *Antistes*’ emphasis on the linkage between the full divinity and the saving work of Christ, for example, was derived from Athanasius. Bullinger also identified closely with the orthodox heroes in the early church in their struggles against doctrinal opponents, consciously modelling his massive history and refutation of Anabaptism, *Der Widertöfferen Ursprung*, on Irenaeus’s *Against the heresies*.

Like other Protestant writers, Bullinger refused to accord the councils or Fathers any authority independent of scripture, and accepted that they had frequently erred. However, this formal adherence to the scripture principle concealed a subtle retention of tradition, as an interpretative filter through which the biblical text was to be received. For Bullinger, only those readings of scripture which conform to the ‘regel des gloubens’ – the church’s ‘allgemeine gewässe unnd bestimpte

---

135 *Summa christenlicher Religion* (Zurich 1556), fol.26.

136 Staeck, Bullinger, p.44.

137 *Der Widertöfferen Ursprung / forgang / Secten / wäsken / füremen und gemeine jre leer Artickel / auch fre gründ und warumm sy sich abständernd / unnd ein eigne kirche anrichtend / [...] (Zurich 1561), fol.1.

138 In his *De concillis* of 1561, Bullinger cites disapprovingly Gregory the Great’s assertion that the rulings of the four ecumenical councils should be accorded equal authority with the four Gospels (fol.103*).
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*ußlegung der geschrifft* — are to be credited.¹³⁹ *Die artickel des Gloubens* are not to be rejected along with false traditions, as they are by certain radical heretics.¹⁴⁰ So far as the doctrines of God and Christ are concerned, the rulings of the early church councils and statements of the Fathers remain binding on Christians, because they faithfully articulate the position of scripture.¹⁴¹ Of course, the circularity of the argument led to a blurring, in practice, of the distinction between biblical and conciliar / patristic authority. It was over precisely that point that the Zurichers were to clash with some of the more radical Italian exiles.

Many of the exiles with whom Bullinger had dealings were, it must stressed, perfectly content with his conservative vision of reform; some, like Agostino Mainardi, Giulio da Milano and Guglielmo Grataroli, pursued it even more zealously than he himself did. Others found it difficult to accept the restrictions on doctrinal speculation that Bullinger’s approach entailed. In strictly doctrinal terms, the *Antistes*’ Italian critics were a diverse group, as one might expect given the eclecticism of the Italian evangelical movement which had produced them; certainly they did not offer anything so coherent as an alternative reformist programme. What they shared was an uneasiness with the increasing confessionalism of official Reformed theology, and with the determination of the Reformed leadership to punish deviation from an orthodoxy defined with reference to catholic tradition as well as scripture: both characteristics of the papacy which the exiles had so publicly repudiated.

The fundamental differences of outlook between the Zurich church and this section of the Italian exile community, termed by Cantimori ‘heretics’, came to the surface on several occasions during the 1540s and early 1550s. The best-known of these

¹³⁹ *Gründliche erwysung*, fol.9′.
¹⁴⁰ Ibid., fol.27′.
¹⁴¹ Decades, fol.10′ (1:3).
early confrontations involved Bullinger and the Sicilian exile Paolo Ricci / Lisia Fileno, who after fleeing Italy for Graubünden in summer 1542 assumed the name by which he is best known, Camillo Renato. In Italy, Camillo appears to have been a leading proponent of the ‘Zwinglian’ view of the Eucharist: Paolo Simoncelli has made a compelling case for linking the spread of such ideas in Modena, Bologna, Venice and Ferrara to his preaching itinerary. In a lengthy statement to the Inquisition in Ferrara, Camillo attacked those (Catholics) who interpreted the Mass as a sacrifice in its own right, rather than simply the recollection of Christ’s once-for-all self-offering; his language suggests a degree of sympathy, cautiously expressed, with the primary Zwinglian understanding of the Eucharist as memorial. Following his departure from Italy, Renato wasted no time before establishing direct contact with the Zurichers. Towards the end of 1542, he wrote to Bullinger to describe his experiences at the hands of the Inquisition and to urge the Antistes to assist the evangelical cause in Italy. Another two letters survive from 1544, suggesting the beginnings of a regular correspondence with Zurich. Throughout this time Renato was busy organising an evangelical congregation at Caspano in the Valtellina, where he was employed as a tutor by a local branch of the Paravicini family.

However, Renato’s ‘Zwinglianism’ was not all it appeared. The records of his trial in Ferrara give evidence of heterodox tendencies with regard to such doctrines as the

142 A bibliography of the literature concerning Renato has been compiled by S. Calvani in A. Séguenny (ed.), Bibliotheca Dissidentium: Répertoire des non-conformistes religieux des seizième et dix-septième siècles, 4 (Baden-Baden 1984), pp.155-90. The most important studies to date are G. Williams, ‘Camillo Renato (c.1500-?1570)’, in J. Tedeschi (ed.), Italian Reformation Studies in Honor of Laelius Socinus (Florence 1965), pp.105-83; and C. Renato, Opere, documenti e testimonianze, edited by A. Rotondó (Florence 1968).

143 Simoncelli, p.39.

144 Renato, Opere, p.72.

145 Ibid., pp.135-7; Schiess, 1, no.37.

146 Renato, Opere, pp.138-9; Schiess, 1, nos 54-5.
immortality of the soul, which remained a central tenet of Reformed belief.\textsuperscript{147} In exile, Renato showed a reluctance to defer to the authority of established Reformed leaders like Bullinger, or to be confined by the doctrinal parameters which they had set; rather he insisted on offering independent contributions to what he saw as an ongoing process of purging Christ's church of abuses, especially with regard to the sacraments. It has even been suggested that his assumption of the name Camillus was designed to be connotative of this role: just as the classical Camillus had restored the \textit{signa} captured by the Gauls to Rome, so his modern equivalent was to claim that he had rediscovered the true meaning of the evangelical 'signs', baptism and the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{148}

Renato's independent stance first became apparent in May 1545, when Bullinger sent him a copy of the Zurich church's \textit{Confession} on the Lord's Supper. In his reply, Renato began by emphasising his basic agreement with Bullinger's formulation of the doctrine of the Eucharist. However, he also insisted on the right of the Caspano congregation to work out its own position on the basis of scripture, rather than in response to confessional statements drawn up by others. In a statement that must have worried Bullinger - who was concerned, as we have seen, to rebut the charge that Zwingli's followers had reduced the Eucharist to a ceremony devoid of spiritual benefit - Renato declared that the evangelicals of Caspano acknowledged nothing in the Lord's Supper 'praeter memoriam mortis Christi'.\textsuperscript{149}

When pressed to respond to the \textit{Confession} in more detail, he delivered a searching critique of the Bullingerian doctrine of the sacrament, in particular the notion of 'spiritual eating' (the notion that, in the Eucharist, the elect feed on Christ by faith). Like the Zurichers, Renato interprets the 'eating' (manducatio) of Christ's flesh described in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{147} Renato, \textit{Opere}, pp.64-5
  \item \textsuperscript{148} Williams, 'Renato', p.140.
  \item \textsuperscript{149} Renato to Bullinger, 15 May 1545 (Renato, \textit{Opere}, pp.140-1; Schiess, 1, no.58).
\end{itemize}
John 6 as a metaphor for faith. But unlike the Zurich theologians, he understands this act as temporally limited to the moment of conversion, to the first reception of faith by God, and therefore as extraneous to the Supper, which merely commemorates the event which made salvation possible (Christ’s death). Renato sets up a series of antitheses to demonstrate the utter separateness of spiritual and physical eating: spiritual eating is a single event, which takes place in the heart of individual believers and in the absence of outward signs, whereas the Eucharist is a repeatable, public rite, which requires the presence of material elements; in spiritual eating, the faithful receive the grace of God and forgiveness of sins, but in the Lord’s Supper they merely testify, by their participation, to a spiritual transformation which has already taken place within them. According to Renato, the Eucharist was instituted not so that believers might thereby experience communion with Christ, but so that they might make outward profession of their membership of his mystical body. It is not even a re-enactment of the Last Supper: there Christ’s intention was to strengthen the faith of his disciples, whereas the Eucharist is an act of thanksgiving by those who already believe. There can be no question – and this sets Renato in clear opposition to Bullinger – of the sacrament confirming, let alone bestowing faith. In a further twist to his argument, Renato maintains that the Protestant Eucharist as presently constituted is no more than partially reformed. For full conformity to biblical practice to be established, the love-feasts of the New Testament and sub-apostolic church must be restored as a prelude to the consecration of the bread and wine.150

Renato’s suggestion that the process of recovering and reinstating true doctrine and worship had not been carried forward to completion by the first generation of reformers was one which Bullinger was to come across repeatedly in the course of his dealings with Italian radical thinkers. Initially his response to the Sicilian’s criticisms was conciliatory. In a letter of 18 September 1545 he was careful to note areas of agreement.

150 Idem, 10 August 1545 (Renato, Opere, pp.141-6; Schiess, 1, no.59).
such as a shared opposition to any suggestion of a corporal presence in the Eucharist. If he
examined Bullinger's explanations carefully, the Antistes maintained, Renato would find
that the position of the Zurich church was broadly compatible with his own. However, the
detailed arguments contained in the letter revealed the extent of the gulf separating the
two theologians. Against Renato, Bullinger emphasised the links between 'spiritual' and
'sacramental' eating. He defended the claim made in the Zurich Confession that the
sacraments act as auxiliaries to faith, and criticised Renato's attempt to posit a complete
temporal disjunction between faith and sacrament: there was no contradiction, Bullinger
argued, between the simultaneous 'recollection' and 'perception' of Christ's sacrifice.
Similarly, there was no qualitative difference between the church's Eucharist and the Last
Supper: both served the same dual function, to proclaim Christ's death and to build up
faith in the elect. As for Renato's call for the restoration of love-feasts, that was dismissed
on the grounds that such rites would serve as an occasion for profanity and excess, as they
had in the early church.151

Renato refused to be moved by Bullinger's arguments. In his reply, dated 2
November, he reiterated most of the points he had made previously, insisting once again
that his stance was consistent with scripture.152 In a subsequent letter he cautioned
Bullinger against attempting to enforce adherence to an interpretation of the Eucharist
which lacked biblical foundation: the Zuricher should avoid emulating the bad example
set by the church Fathers, 'qui vel mortui nos vexant'.153 That negative judgement on the
Fathers - and, by extension, all non-scriptural authority - is symptomatic of the extreme
biblicism which underpins Renato's theology. Similar sentiments are expressed in his
later Trattato del Battesmo e della Santa Cena, written near the beginning of an long-

151 Renato, Opere, pp.146-50; Schiess, 1, no.61.
152 Renato, Opere, pp.151-4; Schiess, 1, no.63.
153 Renato, Opere, pp.156-7; Schiess, 1, no.73.
running dispute with the Chiavenna minister Agostino Mainardi, who shared Bullinger’s understanding of baptism and the Eucharist as testimonies to God’s promises. Repudiating Mainardi’s ‘conjectures’, Renato proposes here that all terms foreign to scripture (including ‘sacrament’ itself) be abolished: ‘la novità delle parole’, he claims, is at the root of all disagreement over doctrine; it is the product of a ‘carnal prudenza’ fundamentally opposed to the ‘spirito cristiano’. Mainardi’s conception of the sacraments, reliant as it is on the continued use of such terms, can only be described as ‘profana e scolastica e papale e non conveniente a essere ricevuta né da’ dotti della proprietà del nome né molto manco da’ cristiani’.

Bullinger’s exchange with Renato illustrated a basic difference of opinion between the Zurichers and the more radical Italian exiles concerning the interpretation of the scripture principle, and its implications for the discourse and practice of Reformed theology. Whereas many exiles favoured an exclusive biblicism, Bullinger and his colleagues insisted, as we have seen, on the compatibility of scripture and the church’s catholic tradition. These antithetical approaches led to friction on several occasions during the late 1540s and early 1550s. In a letter to Bullinger of 15 August 1549, for example, Celio Secundo Curione expressed reservations about the use of extra-biblical terminology

154 Renato, Opere, p.95. The Trattato was written in response to a sermon on the Eucharist by Mainardi, possibly the ‘Sermone del sacramento della Eucaristia’ which appears as an appendix to the Annotomia della Messa of 1552 (Annotomia, fols 103r-41r). Mainardi answered Renato’s tract with a lengthy refutation, the last part of which survives in manuscript form (Burgerbibliothek Bern A 93, 4; see A. Rotondö, ‘Esuli italiani in Valtellina nel Cinquecento’, RSI 88 (1976), 756-91 [787-8]). In this text Mainardi attacks Renato for his contempt for ecclesiastical tradition, and confronts the Sicilian’s objections to his use of non-scriptural language: ‘Quando voi dite che la scrittura di nuove voci, ne nuovi discorsi, ne deduzioni, ne altri curiosità parturiscono contenzioni e scissure, dico che l’intendete male, come di sopra haviam mostrato. E vero certo che la scrittura non ha bisogno di nuove voci, ne nuovo discorsi, essa in se, ma nohaviam bisogno noi ben esplicarla e dechiararla. Haviam bisogno di nuove voci, di nuovi parlari, pur che esponiamo del senso de quella, ne tal novita e biasmavole, anzi laudabile, alli predicatori e utile alli populi qual meglio intendano con parole usato il senso della scrittura e non fanno con quelle di essa scrittura e, come e chiaro e manifesto massimamente quando tal voci sono usate da tutta la chiesa di christo, come e questa voce sacramento e simili. Se li discorsi e le deduzioni non tanto sono utile ma necessari a collui che vuol bene dechiarare le sacre lettere, quell sanza discorsi non s’intenderanno mai bene, ma bisogna che tal discorsi e deduzioni siano cavati dalla scrittura e non se lo proprio senso, e non haviam fatto noi che haviam cavato dalla scrittura per necessaria deduzione che li sacramenti confermano le promission divine, certificano li credenti dalla gratia di dio, corroborano la fede non gia per virtu delloopera operata ma per virtu dello spirito’ (fol.7r).
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in the Consensus Tigurinus to describe the status and function of the sacraments:

Animadverti [...] ad vestrae sinceritatis consuetudinem, aliquid externi et peregrini fermenti admistum, non sine magno quodam artificio fuisse. Appendices vocantur Evangelii, sigilla, organa. Dicuntur confirmare, continuare, ac reparare communioonem Christi ipsius. Conferri per ea dicuntur, bona quaedam, augeri quodam modo Christus in nobis, dum illa usurpamus. Fructum demique, qui fortassis in ipsa sacramentarum usurpatione non extitit, nescio in quae tempora disseri, dilatumque proferri. Quae omnia, etsi, ut dixi, excusari aliqua ratione queant, sunt tamen ab illa simplici divinorum consuetudine (ni fallor) aliena. Et talia, ac si quis tueri velit, in magnas incidit ambages, et non modo inutiles, verum etiam ecclesiae dei periculosas contentiones.155

Bullinger, for his part, criticised Curione for suggesting in the manuscript version of his De amplitudine beati regni Dei that the question of the relative number of the saved and the damned had not been adequately treated by earlier theologians:

Mihi certe persuasum est omnia ea quae verae salutis sunt, iam dei gratia esse revelata, et quantum satis est exposita, cum a veteribus tum a neoteris scripturae divinae tractatoribus. Neque enim nihil certi aut absoluti nos adhuc habere ac in singulos fere annos nova quaedam expectare oportere arbitror.156

Even more illuminating in this respect are the Zurich theologians’ replies to the questions and criticisms of Lelio Sozzini. Between 1552 and 1555, Sozzini bombarded Bullinger and his colleagues with letters and short treatises on problems ranging from the exposition of Matthew 16:20 to the personality of the Holy Spirit. Like Renato and Curione, Lelio was hostile to the use of extra-biblical authorities and terminology: in his De Sacramentis Dissertatio ad Tigurinos et Genevenses, presented to Johannes Wolf in early 1555, he challenged the authors of the Consensus Tigurinus to produce scriptural support for their claims that the sacraments nourished and strengthened faith, that they enabled the believer to feed on Christ, and that they served as ‘organa’ and ‘adminiicula’ of grace.157 True to their catholic self-understanding, however, the Zueichers refused to

---

155 Curione to Bullinger, 15 August 1549 (CO 13, no.1243).
156 Bullinger to Curione, 20 September 1553 (Basel UB G I 66, 71).
157 Sozzini, Opere, pp.81-92. Lelio’s understanding of the Eucharist closely resembled that of Renato. Like the Sicilian, he describes the sacraments as acts of thanksgiving for benefits received, and testimonies to an already present faith in Christ. He also makes the same distinction between the Last Supper and the church’s
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detach scriptural from patristic authority in their responses. When Sozzini questioned the
Reformed doctrine of the sacraments, Wolf replied with quotations from Augustine and
Chrysostom, as well as the Bible; when he asked for clarification on the doctrine of the
Trinity, Wolf cited the Fathers (Tertullian, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Augustine) along
with some pagan authors (Hermes Trismegistus, Plato, Proclus) in support of the church’s
traditional line.  

Exchanges of this sort were bound to have some negative impact on relations
between the Italian exiles and the Zurich church. By the end of the 1540s, the Italians in
Switzerland and Rhaetia were fast acquiring a reputation for contentiousness, ill-
discipline and heresy. Renato’s dispute with Mainardi had split the evangelical
congregation of Chiavenna, forcing an intervention first by the Chur-based leadership of
the Rhaetian Reformed church, and then by the Zurichers themselves (June 1548).  

In their frequent letters to Bullinger, the Chur ministers complained ceaselessly about the
unreliability, ignorance and disputatiousness of the Italian exiles.  

By 1553 well-
substantiated rumours of support for the ideas of Michael Servetus from within the Italian
exile community had begun to reach Bullinger’s ears; as a result, Bullinger suspected

Eucharist. Antonio Rotondo is sceptical of the likelihood of direct contacts between Renato and Sozzini
(ibid., pp.337-9; Renato, Opere, pp.328-9), but has uncovered evidence which suggests that Lelio was
familiar with Renato’s works prior to his exile (‘Per la storia dell’eresia a Bologna nel secolo XVI’,
Rinascimento 13 (1962), 107-54 (145-52); Renato, Opere, pp.224-7).

Sozzini, Opere, pp.218-30.

Ibid., pp.248-59.

Their statement on the Chiavenna Eucharistic controversy is published in Renato, Opere, pp.208-19. It is
divided into two sections: first, the views of Mainardi, Renato and Francesco Stancaro, who had moved to
Chiavenna from Basel and taught that grace was bestowed via the sacraments, are analysed and compared;
next, the Zurich church’s own interpretation of the sacraments is expounded. While plainly regarding
Mainardi’s position as the most satisfactory of the three considered, the Zurichers go out of their way to
accommodate Stancaro’s more conservative opinions, which resembled those of Calvin. In its concessions
to instrumentalist language (conferre, exhibere) where understood ‘improprie et sacramentaliter’, the
judgement anticipates the Consensus Tigurinus.

In April 1552 Johannes Comander wrote: ‘Contentiosi sunt [Itali] et inquieti; ex quacmique re levissima
rixam movent nec doceri a quoquam sustinent nec a sua pertinacia remittunt’ (Schiess, 1, p.247 [no.181]).
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that Castellio’s *De haereticis an sint persequendi*, the best-known of the many protests that greeted the Spaniard’s execution, was of Italian provenance.\(^{163}\)

On the whole, however, the Zürichers showed themselves remarkably resistant to the prevailing negative characterisation of the Italian exile community. When Curione’s *De amplitudine* was denounced as heretical by his fellow exile Vergerio, Bullinger assured the Basel professor of his continued friendship, despite the fact that Curione had ignored his advice not to publish the work.\(^{164}\) Bullinger’s willingness to seek out common ground with Renato in the face of their disagreements over the Eucharist has already been noted; it was evident again in the Zurich church’s judgement on the Chiavenna sacramentarian dispute, which condemned Renato’s Eucharistic views, but in relatively restrained language.\(^{165}\) In the course of their early dealings with the Italian radicals, Bullinger and his colleagues chose to opt, wherever possible, for dialogue over confrontation. With Lelio Sozzini, for example, they saw it as their task to offer guidance to an erring but talented younger colleague, to persuade him to divert his energies away from unprofitable doctrinal speculation back to what Bullinger describes as ‘practical theology’: acceptance of the church’s historic teachings, and leading a Christian life.\(^{166}\) It was in the role of pastor, as much as that of theologian, that the Zurich divines responded to Sozzini: the tone of their admonitions was always kindly, if occasionally firm.

Given what has been said about the doctrinal conservatism of Bullinger and his

---

\(^{163}\) Guglielmo Grataroli, one of the few Basel Italians to condone Servetus’s execution, denounced his compatriot Girolamo Massario to Bullinger on this score in a letter of 5 January 1554 (StAZ E II 336, 60; CO 15, no.1893). Elsewhere Grataroli claimed that Massario had offered him copies of the Spaniard’s *De trinitate erroribus* and *Dialogi de trinitate* (Perini, ‘Note’, 162).


\(^{165}\) Bullinger to Curione, 22 August 1555 (Basel UB G I 66, 74).

\(^{166}\) Sozzini, *Opere*, p.189. Similar advice was dispensed to Sozzini by Gwaldter (ibid., p.208), and Wolf (ibid., p.259).
colleagues, this readiness to countenance the questioning of fundamental Reformed teachings may seem puzzling. It is to be explained, at least in part, with reference to the distinction Bullinger drew between ‘private’ and ‘public’ heresy. In his commentary on Titus (3:10), for example, the Antistes argues that while the authorities in church and state are right to insist on outward conformity, consciences cannot be forced: ‘private’ unbelief remains a matter for God alone.\(^{167}\) Similarly, in *Der Widertöufener Ursprung* he differentiates between heresy that remains concealed in the heart (and is not punishable by the magistrate) and that which ‘ußbricht / unnd umb sich frißt wie der kräbs / daß vil frommer lüt nit nur dardurch vergifft und verderbt werdent / sondern Gott und sin wort darzu gelesteret und öffentlich zerrissen wirt’.\(^{168}\) So long, therefore, as Lelio Sozzini showed no signs of openly dissenting from the teachings of the Zurich church, Bullinger was prepared to treat him as one of the faithful, regardless of his private doubts.

In addition, Bullinger’s personal attachment to many of the exiles made him reluctant to lend credence to the accusations to which they were subject. This is again best illustrated by the case of Lelio Sozzini. In November 1554 the minister of the Italian church in Geneva, Celso Martinengo, informed Bullinger that he and other office-holders within the congregation had received letters from Sozzini accusing them of false teaching. Martinengo also alleged that Lelio was responsible for converting a young member of his flock, who was currently in Zurich, to antitrinitarian views.\(^{169}\) Similar charges were made against Sozzini by Giulio da Milano early the following year.

After receiving Giulio’s letter, Bullinger confronted Sozzini with the charges that it contained. Sozzini rejected the suggestion that he sympathised with Seivetus’s

\(^{167}\) *In omnes apostolicas epistolatas, divi videleicet Pauli XIII. et VII canonicas commentarii [...] (Zurich 1549)*, p.633: ‘Fides et incredulitas cordium sunt, fateor, ea nemo hominum iudicare potest. Ex dictis vero et factis, isque manifestis debent fieri hominum iudicia’.

\(^{168}\) *Widertöuffer*, fol.166’.

\(^{169}\) *CO* 15, no.2045.
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doctrine of the Trinity or that he opposed the punishment of heretics by the Christian
magistrate; his only reservation about Servetus’s execution, he claimed, concerned the
haste with which the death sentence had been carried out. Lelio then reaffirmed his
acceptance of the teaching of scripture and the Apostles’ creed. When pressed by
Bullinger to endorse the more explicitly trinitarian Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds,
and to denounce the early church heresies and Anabaptism, Sozzini refused to commit
himself, preferring to emphasise his commitment to the Zurich church:

Consentio doctrinae, quae semper in catholica ecclesia orthodoxa fuit et hodie
simpliciter et concorditer docetur in ecclesia Tigurina. Ideo enim communico
vobiscum in mystica Christi domini coena; ideo vobiscum habito, nusquam
diverticula quaero aut ullos in ullis erroribus instituo, sed quiete vivo.170

Remarkably, Bullinger professed himself satisfied with this cagey response, and
with the confession which was later submitted to him by Sozzini. In his reply to Giulio, he
conceded that Lelio had a ‘curious mind’, but insisted that that was no proof of underlying
heresy.171 The Antistes accepted that Sozzini would continue to raise awkward questions,
but believed that those could be dealt with adequately in the context of discussions with
himself and other senior Zurich colleagues. The distinction between public and private
dissent was upheld: Lelio was free to pursue his theological enquiries, provided that he
did not seek to communicate his doubts to others.172

170 The interview is described by Bullinger in a letter to Giulio da Milano of July 1555 (Schiess, 1, no.290).
171 Ibid. Edward Hulme argues that Sozzini’s confession (for the text of which see Sozzini, Opere, pp.93-
100) is a typical piece of ‘academic’ discourse, shot through with ambiguities and obfuscations (‘Lelio
Sozzini’s Confession of Faith’, in Persecution and Liberty: Essays in Honor of George Lincoln Burr (New
York 1931), pp.211-25). Bullinger was aware that his protégé had not expressed himself as clearly on the
issues at stake as might have been hoped. In a letter of 10 July 1555 he noted with regard to Lelio’s first
draft of the confession: ‘Agnoscis voces trinitatis, unitatis, consubstantialitatis, unionis et distinctionis
usurpatas esse ab annis mille trecentis; sed addis magis te probatum, «si adhuc verbis Christi et
apostolorum fides mea explicaretur». Ex quibus quidem verbis quis poterat colligere voces istas te non
agnoscere pro evangelicis et apostolicis’ (Sozzini, Opere, p.240).
172 See Rotondo’s comments in Sozzini, Opere, p.67. This compromise was suggested to Lelio by Bullinger
in the letter cited above: ‘Nemo vero erit tibi libertatem modeste quaerendi discendique; nemo rumus
probat aut probare potest, si tu vel alius cogitationes aut tentationes patius suas et pravas et offensione
plenas effert ut ubiis temere, non observato delectu temporis, locorum et personarum, immo haas tueatur
usque ad clamores et rixas. [...] Melius esse existimo haummodi cogitationes et aestus animi sauci apud eos
duntaxat proferre, qui mederi quant, deinde et his, iunctis simul precibus ad Deum piis, obsequi bene
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Not all contemporaries shared Bullinger's belief that the public and private spheres could be so easily closed off from each other. Giulio da Milano, for one, was sceptical of the Zurichers' chosen strategy of containment. His experience of dealing with the followers of Camillo Renato in the Valtellina had taught him that the word of heretics was simply not to be taken at face value: 'Vix enim credi potest, quam flexibilis sit haeretici vafricies et quam obliqua et volubili flexu iste anguis effugiat, nisi fortiter prematur. [...] Nam omnes anabaptistae ea sunt perfida, ut non vereantur efflare modo calidum et modo frigidum'. It was the duty of Reformed ministers, Giulio argued, to 'tear off the mask of heresy by demanding that those under suspicion make clear their acceptance of the fundamental teachings of the church'. That was certainly Calvin's preferred approach: when confronted with evidence for the emergence of antitrinitarianism in the city's Italian church in early 1558, he and the hardline Italian minister Lattanzio Ragnone insisted that its entire membership subscribe to a confession of faith which set out the doctrines of the Trinity and two natures of Christ in uncompromising terms. Bullinger's more flexible stance allowed him to retain the esteem of heterodox exiles for longer, but also exposed him to greater disappointment when the degree of their alienation from Zurich-style reform became apparent. And with such divergent visions of the future of the Reformation at stake, open confrontation could not be postponed indefinitely.

173 Giulio da Milano to Bullinger, 4 November 1555 (Schiess, 1, no.296). Giulio had an established track record of opposition to Italian religious radicalism, about which he was well-informed. See the two letters against the Venetian Anabaptists appended to the second edition of his *Esorrtazione al martirio*, pp.118-47.

174 CO 17, no.2870. For the text of the confession, see CO 9, 385-6. It stresses the inadequacy of the Apostles' creed as a statement of orthodox belief.
Almost from its inception, the relationship between Zurich and the Italian exiles was characterised by two contradictory impulses. The first was towards cooperation, on the basis of shared intellectual interests and a common platform of anti-papalism. Through their contacts with those exiles who had settled in the Rhaetian Freestate, the Zurichers were able to contribute to the partial reformation of an Italian-speaking region; they also supported Vergerio's propagandising activities in northern Italy. Meanwhile, exiles like Vermigli and Curione established themselves as trusted and valued associates of Heinrich Bullinger. In the case of Curione, however, a second, more problematic, aspect of the relationship presented itself. The Italian exiles were products of an evangelical movement in the early stages of its formation, with underdeveloped organisation and no defined confessional stance. Understandably, many found it difficult to make the transition from this climate of free and easy religious experimentation to one of increasing doctrinal uniformity, such as that which they encountered in Zurich and other Swiss Reformed states. Some exiles, like Renato, felt that their aspirations for continuing reform were blocked by the conservatism of the Zurich church establishment, and gave vent to their frustration. For their part, Bullinger and his colleagues were faced with a dilemma: how to square their commitment to solidarity with the exiles – on whose shoulders, after all, hopes for a possible Protestant breakthrough in Italy rested – with the need to defend the doctrinal integrity of their church and of the wider Reformation. It was one that was to confront them repeatedly over the next two decades.
By the mid-1550s, Heinrich Bullinger could count most of the leading Italian evangelical exiles among his associates. However, this was a relationship conducted primarily at arm’s length, through correspondence of varying regularity. Unlike Basel or Geneva, Zurich did not in the first instance become home to a substantial Italian exile population, for reasons that have already been mentioned. The few individuals (like Lelio Sozzini) who chose to make the city their permanent base did not constitute a recognisable Italian ‘community’.

That situation was transformed by the arrival in Zurich of around 130 Protestant refugees from Locarno in spring 1555. Although the scale of the influx does not bear comparison with the better-known migrations of religious exiles to London, Geneva or Emden, in the context of a city like Zurich – whose population has been estimated at between 4,600 and 5,500 in 1529 – it was nevertheless significant. With the Locarnesi, Zurich acquired its own Italian-speaking church, which quickly forged links with other Italian ‘diaspora’ communities in Geneva, Basel and Graubünden.

In this chapter I shall examine the structure and organisation of this
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congregation, as well as its relations with the authorities and citizens of Zurich. Welcomed
initially in the name of international evangelical solidarity, the Locarnesi soon became the
target of popular resentment, focused on their economic activities and articulated through
Zurich's powerful guilds. Faced with such opposition, the long-term survival of the city's
Italian church was, as we shall see, always in doubt.

I. ZURICH AND THE ECCLESIA LOCARNENSIS REFORMATA

During the second half of the fifteenth century, the Swiss Confederation entered a phase of
rapid territorial expansion. Perhaps its most dramatic success was the acquisition, between
1495 and 1513, of the Italian-speaking areas which make up the modern canton of Ticino.
The drive southwards was spearheaded by the states of inner Switzerland, whose aim was
to strengthen their grip on the vital trading corridor with Lombardy. In June 1503, Uri,
Schwyz and Unterwalden were able to secure French recognition of their sovereignty over
Bellinzona and Blenio. Nine years later the Swiss, as part of the grand coalition assembled
by pope Julius II for the purpose of expelling the French from Italy, seized Locarno and
Lugano, on the shores of the Lago Maggiore. Their possession of those territories was
confirmed by the Eternal Peace signed with France in November 1516.3

From this point onwards Locarno, formerly part of the duchy of Milan, was
subject to the joint rule of the twelve Swiss states that had participated in the campaign
against Louis XII. Like the Confederation's other Gemeine Herrschaften (common
lordships), Locarno was administered by a governor or Landvogt, appointed for a period of
two years on a rotating basis from among the ruling states.4 The Landvogt's authority was

3 G. Wielich, Das Locarnese im Altertum und Mittelalter: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kantons Tessin

4 For what follows, see F. Meyer, Die evangelische Gemeinde von Locarno, 2 vols (Zurich 1836), 1, pp.93-7,
and R. Pfister, Um des Glaubens willen: Die evangelische Gemeinde von Locarno und ihre Aufnahme in
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restricted, with policy decisions concerning the running of the territory reserved to the
ruling states themselves at meetings of the Swiss Diet or at the annual Jahrrechnung. A
good deal of power also remained in the hands of local elites, especially the noble
corporation of the capitanei. 5 Many of the day-to-day functions of government were
exercised by a territorial council of twenty-one, consisting of twelve representatives from
the town of Locarno, three from Ascona, and six from the remaining communes. 6 In
practice, the most powerful official in the territory was probably the secretary or
Landschreiber, whose task was to liaise between the Landvogt and the native inhabitants.
Whereas the Landvogt was an outsider, ignorant of the local language and legal system –
deficiencies that could hardly be remedied during his brief term of office – the
Landschreiber had the advantage of being a permanent appointee, with long-standing and
intimate knowledge of the area. Significantly, from 1540 to 1556 – the period with which
we are principally concerned – Locarno’s Landschreiber was a staunch Catholic, Walter
Roll of Uri. 7

Unlike the German-speaking Gemeine Herrschaften of eastern Switzerland,
Locarno and its associated territories were substantially unaffected by the first wave of
Zwinglian reform, prior to the Second Kappel War. The only direct evidence we possess
for the spread of Protestantism in the area at this time are two letters from 1530-1. In the

5 The capitanei were divided into two ‘parentele’ or kinship groups, the Muralti (who included the Duni of
Ascona) and the Orelli. The Magoria, a subgroup of the Orelli, were treated as a separate entity for some
purposes (K. Meyer, Die Capitanei von Locarno im Mittelalter [Zurich 1916]).

6 The council was originally elected by the ‘consilium generale dominorum capitaneorum’, which met in
December and January of each year. During the 1530s, the capitanei were required to surrender two to three
seats on the council to non-noble ‘terrieri’, but that did not substantially undermine their dominant status in
Locarno (Meyer, Capitanei, pp.130-1, 265-6).

7 On Roll, see E. Walder, Der Condottiere Walter Roll von Uri und die Beziehungen zwischen der
Innerschweiz und Italien in der Wende zur Gegenreformation 1551-1561 (Bern 1948), especially pp.129-81.
first of these, the Züricher Jakob Werdmüller, who had recently been appointed Landvogt, informed Zwingli that he had lent a copy of ‘üwer letinisch büchle’ (perhaps the Fidei ratio) to a local priest ‘der der geschrift bericht ist’. That priest has been identified as Baldassare Fontana, a Carmelite, who wrote to the Swiss Reformed churches on 1 March 1531 requesting that they send him a selection of works by Protestant writers, specifically Zwingli, Luther, Melanchthon, Brenz, Bucer and Jud.

Fontana’s evangelical sympathies had no lasting impact on the population of Locarno. The same could not be said of the activities of another philo-Protestant cleric, Giovanni Beccaria, who began work as a schoolmaster in the town around 1535. In his De persequutione adversus Locarnenses, Beccaria’s former pupil, Taddeo Duno, described the schoolmaster as having laid the foundations for religious reform in Locarno; among Beccaria’s early converts Duno listed, besides himself, Ludovico Ronco and the lawyer Martino Muralto.

Between 1542 and 1544 the progress of the Reformation in the area was further assisted by the presence of a Protestant Landvogt, Joachim Baldi of Glarus. Baldi seems to have acted as a conduit for the supply of evangelical literature to Locarno: in January 1545, for example, Fridolin Brunner of Glarus noted that he had recently dispatched works

---

8 Werdmüller to Zwingli, 20 August 1530 (Z 11, no.1081).


10 The De persequutione was written towards the end of Duno’s life; the autograph manuscript in StAZ W 20.72 (Vertreibung aus Locarno, no.2) is dated 1602. A copy is held in ZB Ms. S 197, 8°-10°, 13°4°, 19°-24°. A. Chenou, ‘Taddeo Duno et la Réforme à Locarno’ (unpublished thesis, University of Geneva n.d.), contains an edited transcript of Duno’s manuscript. The text published by F. Ernst, ‘Taddeo Dunos Bericht über die Auswanderung der protestantischen Locaner nach Zürich’, Zwa 9:2 (1949/2), 89-104, is a seventeenth-century German translation of the De persequutione.

11 See Duno’s In laudem ornatissimi praestult, viri praetorii doctissimi, Ioachym Beldi Glaronensis, Thaddaei Duni Locarnensis [sic] ἀναγραφή (Basel 1545), especially sig.A2v.
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by Bullinger and Erasmus to the Landvogt for the use of a Minorite preacher from Locarno.\(^{12}\)

From an early stage, the group of Reformed sympathisers in Locarno enjoyed friendly relations with the Zurich church. A number of letters survive from Beccaria to Konrad Pelliikan, describing the steady progress of the Reformation locally. In one such missive, dated 12 April 1546, the schoolmaster informed his correspondent that a reform-minded preacher – possibly the Franciscan Cornelio of Sicily – was active in Locarno, ‘qui non pauc... manipulo in Domini horrea refert’.\(^{13}\) On another occasion he discussed the prospects for the Reformation in Italy as a whole, observing that the evangelical sermons of a local Minorite, Benedetto Locarno, had been positively received in Genoa and Sicily (not least by the Spanish viceroy).\(^{14}\) Several of Beccaria’s followers also had links with Zurich. In the case of the physician Taddeo Duno, those may have been established in the course of studies in Basel during the second half of the 1540s: in the preface to his later *Muliebrium morborum remedia*, Duno recalled that it was Konrad Gesner who had first encouraged him to pursue the study of medicine.\(^{15}\) Guamerio Castiglione, a Lombard nobleman who

---

\(^{12}\) Brunner to Bullinger, 19 January 1545 (StAZ E II 335, 2079). The preacher referred to by Brunner was probably Benedetto Locarno (Meyer, *Locarnergemeinde*, 1, p.168; see n.14 below).

\(^{13}\) ZB Ms. F 47, 140. Cornelio was subsequently convicted of eleven doctrinal errors by the Milanese Inquisition. Those included teaching predestination, denying free will, and attacking the invocation of the saints, auricular confession and monastic vows. Documents relevant to the case, including Cornelio’s abjuration, are published in Meyer, *Locarnergemeinde*, 1, pp.479-84.

\(^{14}\) Beccaria to Pellikan, 12 April and 12 July 1546 (ZB Ms. F 47, 140, 120-1). The little that is known about Benedetto’s activities is summarised in S. Caponetto, ‘Una sconosciuta predica fiorentina del minoretta Benedetto Locarno’, in idem., *Studi sulla Riforma in Italia* (Florence 1987), pp.205-18. During the late 1530s Benedetto was part of an Erasmian circle at the convent of San Francesco di Brescia; later he became professor of metaphysics in Bologna and provincial head of the local Franciscan Conventuals (1541-3). Caponetto claims that he subsequently returned to Locarno, although there is no evidence that he played a part in the emergence of a Reformed community there. A copy of part of one of his sermons (probably from the Bologna period) has survived. Scholastic rather than popular in style, the sermon is described by Caponetto as ‘un tentativo d’innestare la giustificazione per fede nella teologia di Niccolò Cusano’ (ibid., p.212).

\(^{15}\) T. Duno, *Muliebium morborum omnis generis remedia* (Strasbourg 1565), sig.A1f. While in Basel, Duno translated Francesco Stancaro’s commentary on the letter of James into Latin. He went on to complete his
settled in Locarno around 1542, had probably studied with Pellikan in Zurich: in a letter of 23 June that year he addresses the Hebraist as his ‘praeceptor’. Another Lombard immigrant, Antonio Mario Besozzi, visited Zurich as tutor to Rodomonte, son of Count Filiberto of Masserano, in 1544, before taking up residence in Locarno and marrying a local woman, Chiara Orelli. For their part, the leaders of the Zurich church showed an active interest in the emerging Locarnese Reformed community, responding positively to requests for books and other assistance; Pellikan even agreed to act as tutor to a local boy (a nephew of Benedetto Locarno) at Beccaria’s request. The relationship resembled that which was growing up around the same time between Zurich and the fledgling Italian churches of Graubünden.

The support of the Zurichers was needed to counteract growing opposition from other quarters to the evangelical presence in Locarno. By the late 1540s, news of the spread of Protestantism in Locarno had come to the attention of the Catholic states, always alert to possible breaches of the terms of the Second Kappel Peace. At the Jahrrechnung of July 1548, the outgoing Landvogt, Jakob Feer of Lucerne, warned his masters that the new faith was making significant advances in Locarno, and advised the banishment of Beccaria.

---

16 ZB Ms. F 47, 54; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.155-6. On Castiglione, see DBI 22, pp.94-6.

17 Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.173-5; DBI 9, pp.672-5. In his letter to Pellikan of 12 April 1546, Beccaria sends greetings to ‘Dominum Antonium Mariam et filium suum mihi charissimum’ (ZB Ms. F 47, 140).


19 Beccaria to Pellikan, 12 April and 12 July 1546 (ZB Ms. F 47, 140, 120-1).

20 The treaty ruled out any change of religion for those common lordships that were still Catholic in 1531.

21 EA 4:1d, p.969.
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Matters came to a head the following year, when a visiting Dominican preacher from Lugano proposed a disputation with the Locarnese evangelicals, led by Beccaria. Fifteen theses, covering papal supremacy, good works, justification, auricular confession, purgatory and (as Taddeo Duno puts it) 'aliis similibus vanis, absurdis et ridiculis Romanae ecclesiae dogmatis' were offered for debate. However, the disputation, fixed for 5 August, ended in fiasco. Duno, who was present as a spokesman for the Protestant side, put the blame for this outcome on the unhelpful intervention of the Landvogt, Nikolaus Wirz of Unterwalden, who sought to cut through the complicated doctrinal issues under discussion by demanding that Beccaria simply state whether or not he accepted the teachings of the Roman church. When the schoolmaster failed to give a satisfactory answer, Wirz terminated the disputation and placed Beccaria under arrest. A popular protest led to his rapid release, but only at the price of permanent exile from Locarno.

Further repressive measures followed. In October 1550 a delegation representing the inhabitants of Locarno submitted a statement to the Swiss Diet reaffirming their determination to remain 'zu allen zyten by dem Alten waaren unnd ungezwyfelten Christenlichen glouben unnd Religion wie die heylig Cristenlich unnd Römisch kilchen bißhar gehallten unnd gegloupf', and calling for the dissidents to be brought into line. At the same meeting the punishment of several Locarnesi who had eaten meat during Lent was

22 Duno provides an account of this disputation in a letter to Bullinger of 9 August 1549 (StAZ E II 365, 67-70; transcribed in Chenou, 'Locarno', pp.64-7), and in his De persequutione, fol. 2r-4r. See also Beccaria's subsequent representation to the Swiss Diet in EA 4:1e, pp.163-4; Pfister, 'Locarno', 170-3, and Um des Glaubens willen, pp.33-8.

23 For the text of the articles, see EA 4:1e, pp.167-8.

24 For Wirz's version of what occurred, see ibid., pp.137-8.

25 The Diet later ordered an enquiry into the circumstances surrounding Beccaria's release (ibid., p.206). For the resulting testimonies, see ibid., pp.256-9.
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noted. In the early part of 1553, Castiglione, Besozzi and Gianantonio Viscardi, an apostate priest from Domodossola who had sought refuge in Locarno, were expelled from the territory; shortly afterwards their wives and children suffered the same fate. In the absence of a Catholic Landvogt — the Basler Hans Jeuchdenhammer succeeded Wirz in July 1550, and he was followed by Kaspar Stierli of Schaffhausen and Esaias Röichli of Zurich — Walter Roll co-ordinated the campaign against the Locarnese Reformed, urging the Catholic states to take steps 'um diese eingewurzelte Sekte auszurotten'. In February 1553 he proposed that all inhabitants of Locarno be ordered to attend confession and receive the sacrament over the coming Easter season as a way of putting pressure on evangelical sympathisers. That suggestion was taken up the following year, with the additional provision that any who died having failed to communicate should be excluded from burial in consecrated ground.

The Locarnese evangelicals responded to these attempts to re impose religious uniformity by seeking to enlist the support of the Swiss Reformed states. Their well-established ties with the Zurich church were of key importance in this regard. As early as September 1549, the community (reputedly 200 strong) had written to Bullinger and his colleagues to assure the Zurichers of its constancy in the face of persecution and to request

27 EA 4:1e, p.438.
28 Ibid., pp.743, 807; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, p.488.
29 EA 4:1e, pp.807-8. The Reformed states subsequently registered a formal protest against these measures, on the grounds that they had been implemented by the Catholics without consultation (see ibid., pp.837, 873, 922-3).
30 Ibid., p.154.
31 Ibid., p.154.
32 The Italian text of the mandate is published in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.492-3, from the copy in Daniel Orelli von Gemsberg’s Locarnische Verfolgung (ZB Ms. B 31, pp.10-11). Another, contemporary, copy is located in FA Orelli 8.7. A Latin translation is to be found in StAZ A 350.1: Locarner Acten 1554, and StAZ E II 371, 634". See also Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.284-5, and EA 4:1e, pp.884-5.
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backing for its campaign to be allowed to organise publicly. Throughout the crisis year of 1554, Bullinger was in regular correspondence with Taddeo Duno, who had assumed effective leadership of the community in Beccaria’s absence, and with Antonio Mario Besozzi, who had settled in Chiavenna following his expulsion from Locarno and acted as an intermediary between the Locarnesi and the Zurich ministers. When the Catholic states began to allege that the Locarnese evangelicals were not, as they claimed, Reformed Protestants, but Anabaptists and sectarians, Bullinger assisted the community in its efforts to rebut these potentially damaging charges. He may even have prompted the Zurich council’s decision to order an investigation into the orthodoxy of the Locarnesi, which fully vindicated them. In a letter dated 13 July 1554, Besozzi paid tribute to Bullinger for his support to date and urged him to continue to plead the cause of Locarno’s Protestants.

33 ZB Ms. F 60, 311-12. In August Beccaria appeared before the Zurich council to describe the plight of Locarno’s evangelicals and to present their petition ‘das jaen zugelassen, ein kilch zehan, das gotzwort zehoren und zepredigen wie in anderen gemeinen herschafften der Eidgnoschaft’. The council instructed Bullinger to write back assuring the Locarnesi that Zurich would do its best to help them realise this goal (StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1549-53).

34 Duno had settled in Asso, near Como, after receiving his doctorate in 1550. Three years later he returned to Locarno, following a brush with the Milanese Inquisition (De persequutione, fol.4v).

35 At the beginning of June 1554 Besozzi visited Zurich with letters from the church of Locarno to Bullinger and the Zurich council countering the accusations of Anabaptism (StAZ E II 365a, 560-1; StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1554). On 8 June Bullinger commended Besozzi to Zurich’s delegates in Baden, Burgermeister Johannes Haab and Stadtschreiber Johannes Escher, noting that he brought letters from ministers in Graubünden and the Valtellina supporting the Locarnesi evangelicals’ protestations of orthodoxy.

36 StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1554 (EA 4:1e, pp.950, 959). The investigation was carried out by Zurich’s delegate to the Jahrrechnung, Johannes Wegmann, in collaboration with Esias Rüchli. Rüchli submitted his findings on 9 July, along with a list of Locarnese evangelicals and an orthodox Reformed confession of faith drawn up by the community (StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1554; StAZ E II 371, 642v-3; published in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.499-500). On the authorship of and possible sources for the confession, see J. Staedtke, ‘Das Glaubensbekenntnis der christlichen Gemeinde zu Locarno vom 9. Juli 1554’, Zwei 10:3 (1855/1), 181-93. Suspicions were not totally allayed by Rüchli’s assurances: on 13 October, Besozzi urged the Zurichers to send a new commission of enquiry to Locarno in order to satisfy the remaining doubters (StAZ E II 365a, 544-6). Later that month, thirty evangelicals appeared before the Landvogt to deny the accusations of Anabaptism once again (Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.327-8; compare Duno to Bullinger, 5 November 1554 (StAZ E II 365a, 562-3), and the church of Locarno to the four Swiss Reformed cities, 15 November 1554 [StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1554]).
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before the Zurich magistracy. If the Antistes had had any doubts about the community’s Reformed credentials, it is unlikely he would have continued to lobby the Zurich authorities so hard on their behalf.

Support from the other Swiss Reformed states was rather less solid. At a meeting in Aarau on 22 August, the four Protestant Orte called for the consciences of the evangelical minority in Locarno to be respected, arguing that the inhabitants’ declaration of October 1550 - to which the Catholic states habitually referred in support of their actions - had been issued without their approval and was therefore invalid. As a solution to the dispute, they suggested allowing the territory’s inhabitants to hold a plebiscite on the religious question, as was the practice in other Gemeine Herrschaften. However, this apparent common front concealed fundamental differences between the two major Protestant states, Zurich and Bern. Bern had little strategic interest in the Ticinese common lordships and had, during the negotiations which produced the Eternal Peace of 1516, expressed a willingness to surrender them to France in exchange for financial compensation. Whereas in Zurich Bullinger was able to ensure that international evangelical solidarity continued to count for something, in Bern such considerations had never been allowed to take precedence over a hard-headed awareness of the priorities of the Bernese state. Bern’s rulers were especially mindful of the possible impact of any conflict on their power-base in western Switzerland. The Locarno crisis came at a sensitive time for the state, as it was in the process of acquiring part of the Catholic county of Greyerz. For the transaction to proceed smoothly, Bern required the support of France, which was

---

37 Besozzi to Bullinger, 13 July 1554 (StAZ E II 365a, 542-3).
38 EA 4:1e, pp.984-5.
39 Wielich, pp.477-83.
40 V. Jacobi, Bern und Zürich und die Vertreibung der Evangelischen aus Locarno (Zurich 1967), p.94.
committed to a peaceful resolution of the Locarno dispute. More generally, Bern feared that instability within the Confederation might allow Savoy to threaten its control of the Pays de Vaud. The other two Reformed states, Basel and Schaffhausen, were in no position, either militarily or constitutionally, to risk an armed confrontation with the Catholic Swiss.

Zurich’s isolation first became apparent at a meeting of the Reformed cities on 25 October. There the representatives of Bern, Basel and Schaffhausen declared themselves ready to allow the will of the Confederation’s Catholic majority to prevail in Locarno, so long as no attempt was made to proceed on similar lines in the other Gemeine Herrschaften. They also conceded that the presence of a Protestant community in Locarno could not be justified on the basis of the Second Kappel Peace, as the Catholic states had long maintained. Zurich, by contrast, continued to contest this interpretation of the Landfrieden, arguing that forcible recatholisation was only applicable to those territories specifically excluded from its terms, such as the Freie Ämter and Bremgarten.

By the time the Swiss Diet met to consider a compromise solution to the dispute, brokered by Glarus and Appenzell, the Reformed states were hopelessly divided over the issue of Locarno. The compromise proposed amounted to a surrender to the Catholic states’ key demands. In future only Catholic worship would be recognised in Locarno. All inhabitants of Locarno who had embraced the new faith were to return to Catholicism forthwith, and those who refused were to quit the territory by 3 March 1555. The concessions made to the Reformed side related to fairly peripheral matters: the exiled Locarnese Protestants could continue to hold property in Locarno, while those states which

---

41 L. von Murali, 'Zum Gedächtnis an die Übersiedlung evangelischer Locamener nach Zürich 1555', Zwa 10:3 (1955/1), 145-60 (151-2). For the attitude of France, see Ed 4:1e, p.1073.

42 Jacobi, p.101.

43 Ed 4:1e, pp.1050-2.
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chose not to assist in the implementation of the measures retained their rights of jurisdiction in the territory.\textsuperscript{44}

Bern, Basel and Schaffhausen immediately accepted the proposals, but Zurich's representatives protested that they had no authority from their magistrate to do so. One of them was permitted to return to Zurich to obtain the council's verdict on the articles.\textsuperscript{45} With the other Protestant states now ranged against it, Zurich could do little in practical terms to prevent the expulsion of the Locarnese evangelicals. However, the council remained anxious not to be seen to collude in the punishment of fellow evangelicals. Zurich would not intervene if the other Swiss states insisted on the implementation of the \textit{Schiedsmittel}, but neither would it assist or approve their actions in any way. The city also refused to accept the Catholic interpretation of the principle at issue: namely, that the introduction of Reformed worship in Locarno contravened the terms of the \textit{Landfrieden}.\textsuperscript{46} A subsequent attempt by envoys from Bern, Basel, Schaffhausen, Glarus, Appenzell and the Rhaetian Freestate to persuade Zurich to soften its stance met with no success.\textsuperscript{47} Shortly afterwards the council's decision received the endorsement of Zurich's rural subjects, expressed in a plebiscite.\textsuperscript{48}

There was never any real prospect that the Protestant states, or Zurich alone, would take up arms in order to secure toleration for Locarno's Protestant minority; the Locarnese themselves stated repeatedly that they would rather undergo the rigours of

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., pp.1074-6.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., pp.1063-4.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p.1064.
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{EA} 4:1e, 1096-8. See also the council's letter to Röschli of 26 December (copy in ZB Ms A 70, fols 425'-7).
\textsuperscript{48} K. Dändiker, 'Zürcher Volksanfragen von 1521 bis 1798', \textit{Jahrbuch für Schweizerische Geschichte} 23 (1898), 149-225 (190-4); Bullinger to Calvin, 18 January 1555 (CO 15, no.2090).
persecution and exile than permit such an outcome to the dispute. Zurich, did, however, make the strongest possible protest against the expulsion of its co-religionists, short of provoking a third religious war within the Confederation. The city’s determination not to shift from its position, even in the face of pressure from its Reformed allies, may be attributed in no small measure to Bullinger’s powers of persuasion. The importance he attached to the Locarno dispute is evident from a Ratschlag prepared for the use of the Zurich clergy on 5 January 1555. In this document, Bullinger argues that the measures agreed at Baden are irreconcilable with the duty of the state, as well as of individual Christians, to act in defence of the Gospel. It would be hypocritical of the Zurich council, he continues, to demand that its own subjects adhere to the Reformed faith, while aiding the suppression of Protestantism in a territory over which it holds partial jurisdiction. Bullinger contends that support for such measures would adversely affect the status of Protestantism not only in Locarno, but in the Confederation as a whole. It would strengthen Zurich’s adversaries in their ‘falschen glauben’, and present them with a massive propaganda victory: ‘Das allergrößte in der sach ist, so mächtends [the Catholics] sagen: könet ihr den glauben an anderlüthen straffen, so straffent in an etich selbs’. Bullinger goes so far as to assert that it would be better for Zurich to withdraw entirely from the government of the Gemeine Herrschaften than to punish those ‘die unsers glaubens sind’. He is also critical of the stance adopted by the other Protestant states: the unity of the Confederation cannot be maintained in the long term ‘wam man dinge firnimmt, die wider

49 The church of Locarno to the four Reformed cities, 7 November 1554 (StAZ E II 371, 635; StAZ A 350.1: Locarner Acten 1554; EA 4:1e, pp.1052-3). Compare Duno to Bullinger, 5 November 1554 (StAZ E II 365a, 562-3).


51 Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, p.506.

52 Ibid., p.508.
II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ZURICH’S ITALIAN CONGREGATION

Envoys of the seven Catholic states and Glarus arrived in Locarno on 12 January 1555 to oversee the implementation of the Baden Schiedsmittel. Three days later they summoned representatives of the rural communes of Locarno, together with the entire population of the town, to inform them of what the Diet had decided with regard to the religious question. The inhabitants of the countryside, which had remained solidly Catholic throughout the period with which we are concerned, immediately reaffirmed their commitment to the traditional faith. The town-dwellers, by contrast, requested time to formulate their answer. On 16 January the evangelicals among them, 211 in total, informed the commissioners that they had no intention of returning to Catholicism. Over the course of the next two months, however, a significant proportion of that number did choose to conform. According to the Landvogt of Lugano, Jost Pfyffer, only ninety-eight adult evangelicals had left Locarno for Roveredo, in the Mesolcina, by the prescribed deadline of 3 March (although others followed later).

The exiles’ ultimate destination was not immediately clear. In a letter of 14 December 1554, Besozzi had asked Bullinger whether they might be permitted to settle in

---


54 EA 4:1, pp.1107-8. See also Rouchli’s letter to the Zurich council of 25 January describing the commissioners’ activities (ZB Ms. E 15, fols 151v-6r; EA 4:1, pp.1110-13).

55 See the evangelicals’ declaration in StAZ A 350.1: Locarner Acten 1555; summarised in EA 4:1e, p.1113.

56 EA 4:1e, p.1150; Pfister, Um des Glaubens willen, p.99.
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either Zurich or Bern. The following month a two-man delegation to Zurich, which included Taddeo Duno, informed the council that eighty heads of family were contemplating emigration; now, however, their intention was to settle in Graubünden. The Zurich council itself appears to have favoured this option, which would have relieved it of the burden of accommodating the exiles. Two prominent Zurichers, Hans Edlibach and Bernhard von Cham, were instructed to accompany Duno and his companion to the forthcoming meeting of the Rhaetian Diet with the aim of securing the Leagues’ consent to the Locarnese evangelicals’ request. In letter to the Rhaetian authorities of 9 February, the council expressed the wish that ‘ji wellen nach uwer selbs erbieten, den gutenn veiwysten Armen Cristen, imder uch schutz, schirm, underschlof, und wonung geben’, although it committed itself to receiving the exiles in Zurich should that prove necessary.

Rhaetia’s Reformed majority responded favourably to this proposition: several communes voted to take in the Locarnese evangelicals, while Philip Gallicius in Chur made repeated representations to the Diet on their behalf. However, the Catholic Upper League, and in particular the Mesolcina, home to Beccaria and Gianantonio Viscardi since their expulsions and the preferred destination of the Locarnesi, was bitterly opposed to any such move. Pressure was also brought to bear on the Freestate by the papal nuncio Ottaviano

---

57 StAZ E II 365a, 552; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, p.398.
58 Bullinger to Calvin, 18 January 1555 (CO 15, no.2090); Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, p.429.
59 Instruction dated 12 January (StAZ A 350.1: Locarner Acten 1555; summarised in EA 4:1e, p.1105).
60 StAZ A 350.1: Locarner Acten 1555. In a subsequent letter, dated 23 February, Zurich asked that the Locarnese evangelicals be permitted to settle ‘in uweren landen, oder andern gemaynen herrschafften, Veitlin ahd [sic] anderschwo, uvern verleiten und bewilligen nach’ (ibid); Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.443-4.
61 See the letter from the council of Chur to Zurich, 13 February 1555, in StAZ A 350.1: Locarner Acten 1555; and Schiess, 1, nos 281, 282, 283.
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Raverta, bishop of Terracina. The exact course of events is unclear, but an initial decision allowing the Locarnesi to settle anywhere in Graubünden appears to have been amended subsequently to make their reception dependent on the consent of the relevant commune. In an address to the Zurich council of 23 February, Bullinger reported that the attempts of the Locarnesi to secure a permanent haven in the Mesolcina had been blocked and that they now hoped to settle in either Zurich or the Valtellina. Yet for many exiles the Mesolcina remained a desirable alternative to Zurich for some time to come: as late as March 1556, Gianantonio Viscardi informed the elders of the community that many Locarnesi had expressed an interest in moving to the Mesolcina, and suggested that they send a delegate to the forthcoming Rhaetian Diet in order to have the ban on settlement in the valley overturned. Gallicius, too, remained active on the exiles' behalf in this matter, though with little success.

With the Mesolcina closed to the Locarnese evangelicals, and few of them showing any inclination to take up the offer to settle elsewhere in Graubünden, Zurich was bound to honour its promise to receive the exiles. On 18 March the first group of Locarnesi, including the weaver Pariso Appiano and the fisherman Stefano Pebbia, arrived in the city and were given leave to remain. Twelve days later a delegation made up of '2 Doktor, 2

63 Pfister, Um des Glaubens willen, p.117.
64 'Es schirbynd die Luggamer die sich von wägen unser waren religion uß irem vatterland ze ziehen begliben / und begärend üwer wylheyt radt und hilff. Zygend an wie sy wol erfröwt uß der gegäbnen antwort uff dem pundsting ze Chur: so bald aber die 8 ort verytten / und sy gen Roffle und in das mosaxer taal botten geschickt / sye inen geantwort etc. Hieruff habind sy sich entschlossen in das Veltlin / oder allher gen Zirych ze ziehen' (StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1555); Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, p.438.
65 FA Orelli 8.7, no.28.
66 Gallicius to the Locarnese church in Zurich, 30 March 1556 (FA Orelli 8.7, no.30); Gallicius to Bullinger, 29 April 1556 (Schiess, 1, no.312). In May the Catholic states wrote to the Rhaetian Leagues insisting that they block such moves (EA 4:2, p.8).
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Edelman, 2 kaufman und 2 von handswerchen von Luggarus' formally requested permission for the community to settle in Zurich; their petition was granted "bis uff witeren bescheid". By the end of May, Zurich was host to well over one hundred exiles.

During the course of these transactions, the Locarnesi were again able to rely on the active support of Heinrich Bullinger, who acted throughout as their advocate with the secular authorities. In the speech of 23 February already cited, for instance, he put forward three requests on the exiles’ behalf: first, that they be permitted to reside in Zurich; secondly, that they be allowed to continue practising their current professions; and finally, that they be free to trade with Milan. A petition presented to the council by the Locarnesi in early June was also drafted by Bullinger.

More importantly, Bullinger seems to have played a key role in persuading the Zurich magistrates – perhaps against their better judgement – to support the introduction of an Italian-language church service. The right to worship and organise publicly was a long-cherished ambition of the Locarnese evangelicals. In a letter to Bullinger of May 1554, the community’s leaders asked the Zurichers to do all they could ‘ut Ecclesia nostra sub aliquo tandem Pastore uniri possit, et cibum spiritualem accipere, ut relictis erroribus, et vitiiis humanae carnis, spiritui pareat’; it was the church’s very lack of a public face that had

---

68 STAZ B II 90, 11; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.4.


70 ‘Supplication der vertribnen Luggarnem beträffend die Bussen und Meyland’ (STAZ A 350.1: Locarn Acten 1555); Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.10-12. The petition requested Zurich’s help on two counts: securing commercial access to Milan, and overturning convictions for blasphemy issued against three Locarnese women (Barbara Muralto, Lucia Belo and Catarina Appiano) by the Catholic states. Muralto had been charged by the papal nuncio Raverta with speaking ill of the Virgin Mary and her property declared forfeit; her companions had received fines of 50 kronen (EA 4:1e, pp.1108-9). See Muralto’s later account of her conversation with the nuncio, published in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.516-8.

71 STAZ B II 365a, 560. Compare the letter cited in n.33 above.
first given rise, they suspected, to charges of Anabaptism. Exile was seen as an opportunity to realise aspirations which had, in Locarno, been thwarted by the opposition of local Catholics and the ruling Swiss states: in his address to the council of 23 February, Bullinger reported 'daß sy [the Locamesi] by einandem blyben möchtend [...] und daß sy ein kylichen und wälchen predicanten gehaben möchtend'.

To begin with it seemed unlikely that Zurich would respond favourably to this demand. While the exiles were in Roveredo, Beccaria advised them against settling in the Swiss cities for precisely this reason. 'Dovete saper di certo,' he warned, 'che in niuna delle Citä de nostri signori Illustriessimi vi sera concesso haver particolar predicante: ma vi bisognerà legger in casa, o andar ad udire lingua non intesa'. However, on 30 March 1555 the Zurich council instructed Bullinger to look into how the exiles' desire for their own minister might be satisfied, and on 22 May, the Rechenrat and the clergy were asked to put forward proposals for the establishment of an Italian church in the city. The commission presented its findings the following day. It recommended that nominees for the post of Italian preacher be required to submit to an examination by 'die gelerten und

72 The church of Locarno to the Zurich council, 31 March 1554 (StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1554):
'Infantes nostros Christiano rite baptizare non possimus iuxta voluntatem Domini, et conscientiam nostram nisi maximo cum periculo, neque sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Christi, administrare, quae omnia non minore dolore et angustia, animas nostras afficiunt [...]. Imo vix scimus quo nos vertamus, nam si clam baptizamus, Catabaptistas nos vocitant, sin palam nobis et ministriis insidiantur, ac Haereticos et Lutheranos appellant, quia neque sal, neque oleum, neque sputem, neque exorcismos admittimus'.

73 StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1555.

74 FA Orelli 8.7, no.11. The letter, though anonymous, is in Beccaria's hand. It is undersigned 'manum nosti', a formulation which appears in other letters from Beccaria to Taddeo Duno.

75 StAZ B II 90, 11.


77 StAZ B II 90, 28.
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verordneten' prior to appointment. The new incumbent would receive appropriate accommodation, a state salary of 50 gulden, and a fixed annual amount of corn and wine. Italian services were to be held in the church of St Peter on Sundays and at other times stipulated by the clergy (on condition that the times of existing services were not affected). The church was never intended to become a permanent fixture of Zurich's religious life: once the Locarnesi had acquired an adequate knowledge of German, it was hoped, the maintenance of an Italian preacher would cease to be necessary. That needs to be borne in mind when considering its subsequent fate.

The commission’s recommendations were ratified by the council on 29 May. Attention now shifted to the question of who should be appointed to the new post. Beccaria, who in spite of his reservations had accompanied the exiles to Zurich, seemed the most obvious candidate. Following his banishment in 1549, Beccaria had remained in close contact with Locarno’s evangelical community. At the Jahrrechnung of July 1553, for instance, it was reported that he ran a Protestant school in Mesocco attended by the children of Locarnese Protestants. This is confirmed by a letter from Beccaria to Duno of 23 November 1554, in which the schoolmaster reports on the progress of two boys in his care whose fathers, Aloisio Orelli and Gianambrosio Rosalino, were to be exiled from Locarno the following year. The authors of the Ratschlag of 23 May noted that Beccaria was 'den vertribnen anmutig und bekant' and proposed his election as preacher, subject to

78 This stipulation was not as exceptional as it seems: all candidates for the ministry in Zurich had to appear before an examiners committee consisting of ministers, professors and council members (Gordon, pp.93-4).

79 StAZ A 350.1: Locarner Acten 1555; published in Meyer, 2, pp.359-61. The same recommendations are contained in the Latin 'Constitutio facta in Senatu Tigurino Ecclesiastico de Locarnensibus', also dated 23 May and published in Meyer, 2, pp.301-3 (copies in FA Orelli 8.3; ZB Ms E 15, fols 157’-8’; ZB Ms. S 197, fols 18’, 6’; Orelli, Verfolgung, pp.107-9).

80  EA 4:1e, p.808.

81  FA Orelli 8.2, fol.7a”; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, p.249, n.236.
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examination.\textsuperscript{82}

However, Beccaria’s was not the only name mentioned in connection with the new post. Writing to Bullinger on 3 June, Philip Gallicius endorsed the choice of Beccaria – the ‘apostle’ of Locarno – over another, unnamed, but more illustrious candidate.\textsuperscript{83} Two of the best-known Italian exiles, Bernardino Ochino and Giulio da Milano, were being considered for the position from an early stage.\textsuperscript{84} The search for an alternative to Beccaria became urgent after he turned down the council’s offer, pleading a lack of qualifications. The reasons for this decision are unclear, but Beccaria may have been deterred by the prospect of a searching doctrinal examination at the hands of Zurich’s ministers and professors: certainly he showed no such qualms when the evangelicals of Mesocco asked him to serve as their minister four years later. Alternatively, Beccaria may have felt that the new church had the potential, given the publicity which the expulsion of the Locarnesi had attracted, to become a focus of the Italian exile community. As such, it would require more prestigious leadership than he could provide. That was certainly the view of Pier Paolo Vergerio, who made no attempt to conceal his disappointment from Bullinger on learning that Beccaria was likely to be appointed.\textsuperscript{85}

Bullinger appeared before the Zurich council on 11 June to report that Beccaria

\begin{footnotes}
\item[82] Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.360.
\item[83] 'Hic eum apostolus fuit et propter eos unaque cum ipsi passus est multa ac diu, ut ipsi pro eo rogare deberent et gratulari ei aliquam propiciorem fortunam. Alter, de quo scribis, clarior quidem est nomine; sed probatus inventus est per extremam paupertatem, ille non ita. Si hic satis idoneus esset ad praedicandum Christum, hunc retinerem magis quam illum; neutrum tamen audivi concionantem' (Schiess, 1, no.286; cited in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.7-8, n.18).
\item[84] Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.362.
\item[85] Vergerio to Bullinger, 12 June 1555 (StAZ E II 365a, 661). Vergerio had established close ties with the Locarnesi while minister in Vicosoprano. In July 1553 he asked Josias Simler to send six copies of a work against the Mass – perhaps the Annotomia della messa – to Ludovico Ronco in Locarno (StAZ E II 356, 527; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, p.266; Prüfer, Um des Glaubens willen, p.53), while some months later he presented Bullinger with a manuscript copy of the preface to his Italian version of the Antistes’ De sacrosancto coena, translated into Latin by Besozzi (Vergerio to Bullinger, 25 September 1553 [Schiess, 1, no.229]). For this preface, see StAZ E II 365, 173-4.
\end{footnotes}
Chapter 2: The Locarnese Exiles

had declined the position of Italian minister. In his stead, the Antistes proposed Bernardino Ochino, pointing out that the Sienese exile was presently without employment in Basel, and had demonstrated his abilities as a preacher in Augsburg and England. Bullinger noted that the Locarnesi themselves had expressed a preference for Ochino as Beccaria’s replacement. That is not surprising, given his prominence within the Italian evangelical movement. There is also evidence for direct contacts between Ochino and the Locarnese Protestant community prior to its exile. In the summer of 1554 he visited Chiavenna and met Antonio Mario Besozzi, who passed on his greetings to Bullinger in a letter of 13 July. On 9 August that year Walter Roll informed his masters in Uri that Ochino was said to be planning to visit Locarno at the invitation of local evangelicals, and requested instructions on how to deal with this threat. Again, in early February 1555 Vincenzo Maggi, an Italian exile based in Chur, wrote to Besozzi’s wife Chiara Orelli to urge the Reformed church of Chiavenna to show hospitality to the persecuted Locarnesi (‘questi buoni cristiani profughi’) as they passed through the town en route to Zurich, adding intriguingly: ‘Desiderarei bene che al passare di questi santi Confessori per Chiavena, se ritrovassi l’occhino, accio gli spezassi con quel suo bel modo il pane, ch’ha per costume’.

86 Ochino was not among Bullinger’s regular Italian correspondents (only one of his letters to the Antistes survives) but he did pass through Zurich following his expulsion from Augsburg in early 1547, and might have settled there permanently had he not been offered alternative employment in England (see F. de Enzinans, Epistolario, edited by L. Garcia Pineda (Geneva 1995), nos 21, 25, 26, 27). Bullinger’s colleague Johannes Wolf was responsible for a Latin translation of Ochino’s Imagine di Antichristo (Rotondò, ‘Anticristo’, p.151).

87 For the text of Bullinger’s speech, see Appendix below.

88 StAZ E II 365a, 543; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 1, pp.296-7, n.79.


90 FA Orelli 8.7, no.8. In the event, most of the exiles bypassed Chiavenna, proceeding directly from Roveredo to Chur via the San Bernardino pass.
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Bullinger’s nomination of Ochino encountered no obvious opposition from the Zurich council, which immediately dispatched a letter to its counterpart in Basel asking that it use its good offices with the Sienese exile to persuade him to take up the appointment. It also wrote to Ochino himself, setting out his conditions of employment. On 17 June the Baslers replied with the news that Ochino had accepted Zurich’s offer on their instructions; the new minister arrived in Zurich three days later, to deliver his first sermon on 23 June.

III. THE LOCARNESE COMMUNITY: COMPOSITION, ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES AND ORGANISATION

Exile populations are not always easy to quantify, but in the case of Zurich Locamesi we are relatively well-served so far as the community’s early development is concerned. During the late 1550s, the Zurich council commissioned several surveys of the new arrivals, focusing on their economic status and activities (September 1556, August 1557 and April 1558). At the time of the first survey, the number of Locarnesi currently resident in Zurich stood at 125. This total included some recent arrivals from Locarno, such as the cobblers Filippo di Campo and Francesco Albertino, whose wives had taken part in the initial emigration without them. Another twenty or so persons, including the

---

91 StAZ A 350.1: Locarn Acten 1555.
92 Ibid.
93 Bullinger, Verzeichnis, fol.188°. Compare FA Orelli 8.2, fol.9°; ZB Ms. B 251, fol.45°.
95 The figure is derived from a list (in Taddeo Duno’s hand) submitted with the survey (StAZ A 350.1: Locarn Acten undatiert; published in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.372-5).
96 Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.374.
families of Bartolomeo Cataneo, Giacomo Zareto, Stefano Pebbia, Gianambrosio Rosalino and Giovanni Muralto, were expected to follow shortly. They were later joined by Besozzi and his family, boosting the total Locarnese population of Zurich to over 130 by April 1558.

The reports contain quite detailed information on the occupations and economic activities of community members during these years. The survey of 1556 noted a significant disparity in wealth within the community. Around one-third of households were described as well-off, but another seven were deemed ‘arm’ or even ‘gar arm’. Many exiles seem to have arrived in Zurich virtually destitute; the minutes of the Zurich council for 12 December 1555 state:

Mine herren ist angelamgt das der vischer [Stefano Pebbia] unnd andere von luggarus grossen hunger unnd mangel lyden missind, deshalben jr bevelch dass die herren pfleger jm all muss den selben hilff thun unnd daryn gwald haben sollind. Unnd sollind Seckelmyster Edlibach, Melcher Wirz, J. Hans Cunrat Escher und M. Bernhart Sprüngli by den luggarneren nachfrag haben / wahn jr gelt so jnen geschemckt worden komen sige, unnd daran sin das dasselbige unnder die armen ubtheylt, unnd nit nun den rychen jn jren hemiden belybe.

As we shall see, poverty was to remain a problem for some members of the community for years to come.

Most of the more prosperous exiles were at this stage still reliant on income from property they retained in Locarno: in the September 1556 survey, eleven households are described as subsisting on rents. However, that did not remain the case for long. In February 1555, as has been noted, the Locarnesi had pressed the Zurich council to support their demands for freedom of trade with Lombardy. Some months later, representatives of

---

97 Some indication of the ultimate wealth of individual exiles can be obtained from surviving wills and wardship records of a later date. In November 1582, for instance, Chiara Verzasca, widow of Battista de’ Baddi, left 212 fl. to her female relatives, 32 fl. to the Zurich Spital, plus an unspecified amount to her brothers Gianantonio and Bartolomeo (StAZ B VI 320, fols 63r-4; B VI 321, fols 390r-1). When she married Francesco Muralto in January 1568, Catarina Orelli brought a dowry of 800 fl. (FA Orelli 4.300).

98 StAZ B II 93, 59; cited in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.31, n.102.
the duchy of Milan agreed to Zurich’s request to allow the exiles to operate on their territory, on the condition that they confined their activities strictly to trade.\(^9^9\) In September 1556, only five Locarnesi (Martino Muralto, Gianantonio Rosalino, Pariso Appiano, Giacomo Zareto and Filippo Appiano) had begun to take advantage of this concession, but by August the following year the picture had changed dramatically. Now fourteen heads of household were engaged in mercantile ventures. Ludovico Ronco, for example, had formed a trading company with Besozzi, Guanerio Castiglione\(^1^0^0\) and Andrea Cevio which imported spices and textiles from Milan and Venice.\(^1^0^1\) Similarly, the Verzasca brothers, Gianantonio and Bartolomeo, were trading with Milan in linen (‘zwilch’), woollen cloth (‘paret’) and rice.\(^1^0^2\) By the time of the third survey, the number of heads of household deriving their income in whole or in part from trade had risen to sixteen, that is to say almost half of the community’s adult males. Most scholars attribute this development to the rigidity of the Zurich guild system, which made it difficult for the Locarnesi to practise their original professions, and that undoubtedly helps explain the speed of the transformation.\(^1^0^3\) However, a similar phenomenon has been observed in other refugee communities of the time: exiles were ideally placed, by virtue of their continuing links with their former homelands, to carve out new livelihoods in long-distance trade.\(^1^0^4\)

\(^9^9\) StAZ B II 92, 7 (17 July 1555); cited in Meyer, *Locarnergemeinde*, 2, p.24, n.76.

\(^1^0^0\) Castiglione had rejoined the Locarnese evangelicals in Zurich following their exile.

\(^1^0^1\) Meyer, *Locarnergemeinde*, 2, p.377.

\(^1^0^2\) Ibid., p.378.
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The survey of April 1558 revealed that members of the community were extending their activity from trade to manufacture, specifically of textiles. The lead in this regard was taken by Pariso Appiano, one of the first to begin trading with Milan and a trained silkweaver. By April 1558 his business, financed with the help of another exile, Gianantonio Rosalino, was employing four apprentices and was about to take on another two, including a Catholic from Locarno. Appiano was also underwriting the operations of a French Protestant immigrant from Geneva, who himself employed two apprentices. A second, smaller enterprise on the same lines was run by Evangelista Zanino, Andrea Cevio’s son-in-law, in conjunction with his brother Paolo and another Locarnese youth, Giannaria Toma. Zanino later became the first to attempt to produce silk on a large scale in Zurich, with the assistance of imported Italian labour.

Clues as to the internal dynamics of the community during the late 1550s and early 1560s are provided by its own records, which survive in the form of minutes of meetings, and accounts; they are currently in the hands of the Orelli family. Unfortunately these records are deficient in a number of respects. In the first place, they have suffered significant physical damage. Daniel Orelli von Gemsberg, who rediscovered them in 1684, noted that the volume in which they were contained was rotting away in

103 Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.382-3.

104 Ibid., p.382. Zanino also sold imported cloth in Zurich, while exporting tallow, linen, leather and other commodities to Italy.
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parts, forcing him to cut out substantial sections to save what remained. Thus, for example, records of donations made to members of the community from its funds survive, while records of loans do not. Secondly, there is no reference in the accounts to income from the collection which the church instituted in November 1556, and which may eventually have become its primary source of revenue; Ferdinand Meyer suggests that this was entered in a separate volume, now lost. Lastly, the minutes themselves are of only limited value, as no entries survive for the period March 1561 to June 1565, during which Zurich’s Italian-speaking community experienced its most severe crisis. Whether this gap in the records reflects a real decay in the institutional fabric of the church, or merely scribal negligence, is difficult to ascertain.

The minutes for the years 1555-8 do, however, provide a useful guide to the community’s very early development. At an initial meeting held on 12 June 1555, the Locarnese heads of household elected four elders: Giovanni Beccaria, Ludovico Ronco, Alberto Trevano and Martino Muralto. Taddeo Duno and Guamerio Castiglione were subsequently added to that number. The election of Beccaria, Duno and Ronco comes as no surprise, when one recalls the leadership that they had shown during the community’s travails in Locarno. Castiglione and the lawyer Muralto were also natural choices, given their wealth and aristocratic backgrounds. Least is known about Trevano and about Francesco Verzasca, who became an elder in March 1559, but they, too, were among the

109 FA Orelli 8.7, fol.1'.
110 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.14'.
112 FA Orelli, fol.9'; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.364.
114 Muralto belonged, of course, to a capitanei family, and had served as podestà in Vigevano in 1548-9 (Meyer, Capitanei, pp.343-5).
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community’s more prosperous members. Following his appointment as professor of Old Testament in Zurich in August 1556, Peter Martyr Vermigli was also elected to the college of elders, at Ochino’s recommendation. Wealth, education, or a combination of the two would therefore seem to have been the criteria for office-holding in Zurich’s Italian church.

The powers and duties of the elders were defined at the meeting of 12 June as: first, to ‘sopraslar all’i costumi, correttioni et politia della nostra congregazione’; secondly, to administer the church’s funds and record its revenue; and thirdly, to distribute sums of up to 2 scudi to the needy. Those functions were confirmed at a second meeting on 23 June. However, there is no evidence that the Locarnese elders exercised discipline in the manner that their equivalents in other ‘Calvinist’ exile churches did: such an arrangement would have been highly irregular in the context of Zurich, where the magistracy retained the power of excommunication and where the leading churchmen were fundamentally opposed to the introduction of ecclesiastical discipline on Genevan lines. From the surviving minutes, it would appear that in practice the elders’ duties were confined to financial matters. Some of those elected were assigned particular responsibilities in this regard: Martino Muralto, for instance, was placed in charge of the church’s common chest.

115 For Trevano, see the survey of September 1556: ‘Albertus Trevanus tribit kein gwerb hatt daß er und sin frauw wol mögend uffkommen’ (Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.376). On his death in 1573 Trevano left property in Locarno and Zurich, including 145 kronen to his niece Maddalena Muralto (StAZ B VI 316, fols 212r-13v; B VI 317, fol.41v”). In the September 1556 report Francesco Verzasca is described as ‘zimlich wohlhabend’ (Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.376).

116 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.13”. For the background to Vermigli’s appointment, see p.28 above.

117 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.9”; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.364.


119 See Chapter 5:111 below.
while Ronco, who had acted as scribe to the community in Locarno, was appointed 'Canceller', with the task of keeping the accounts and minutes up to date. That function seems to have passed to Duno in 1558 (which may explain why the minutes of the community begin to peter out around this time).

The establishment of an effective system for administering the church's finances was of pressing concern for two reasons. First, as has been noted, many exiles arrived in Zurich with few or no resources of their own. Secondly, during its early months in Zurich the church came into possession of a substantial capital: one of the community's first decisions was to send representatives to the Swiss Protestant cities to request financial assistance for the refugees. Bern was by far the biggest donor, but Lausanne, Biel and Basel also contributed. At a meeting of the elders on 5 November 1555, the church's total assets were recorded at around 1200 scudi.

The community was divided over the use of those resources. That is not surprising, when one considers the economic disparities which existed among its members. Many of the wealthier and more enterprising Locarnesi saw in the common chest a potential source of funding for their private or co-operative business ventures; poorer exiles

120 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.9"; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.364.

121 Duno and Ronco were sent to Bern, and Beccaria to Schaffhausen. Martino Muralt and Lelio Sozzini, who conveyed Zurich's offer of a preaching post to Ochino, were instructed at the same time to request financial aid from the Basel council (FA Orelli 8.2, fol.9"; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.364). Their petition had the support of the Zurich authorities (see the letter of the Burgermeister and Rat of Zurich to Basel, dated 12 June [StA Z A 350.1: Locarner Acten 1555]).

122 For Bern, see the letter to the Locarnesi of 19 June 1555 (FA Orelli, 8.7, no.15; copy in Bullinger, Verzeichnis, fol.189") and the latter's reply, dated 22 June (FA Orelli 8.7, no.16); for Lausanne, Viret's letter of 17 April 1555 and the Locarnese reply of 21 June (ibid., nos 12 and 13); for Biel, the letter of the Locarnese elders to Ambrosius Blarer dated 8 October (ibid., no.22); for Basel, their letter to Sulzer of 22 April 1556 (ibid., no.31). The amounts received were entered in the community's accounts for 1555 (FA Orelli 8.2, fols 88"-89"). These also record a further small donation of 5 scudi from Bern in September 1561 (ibid., fol.90"). On the collections, see Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.14-18. Such collections were to become a standard Reformed response to refugee crises (for a later example, see Chapter 6:111 below).

123 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.12"
were understandably concerned that their needs should not be overlooked as a result. On 18 August 1555 a first attempt to resolve this conflict of interests was made. It was proposed that the funds in the common chest be divided up as follows: most was to be invested as loans, either with community members or with Zurich citizens; another 5% was to be dispensed to the poor of the church for the relief of their immediate needs; and the remainder was to be set aside for the provision of future assistance. This solution quickly proved unworkable. At a meeting on 2 September, the elders complained that they were besieged by requests for loans of 25, 30 and even 100 scudi, and warned that if the situation continued ‘li denari presto hariano fine’. Henceforth, they decided, the maximum amount available as a single loan should be limited 10 scudi, and then only with ‘idonea segurta per restituirli’. The elders’ control over community finances was strengthened at a full meeting of the church two weeks later, where the upper limit of 2 scudi which they were permitted to dispense on their own authority was abolished. The same meeting revealed that some members of the community were dissatisfied with the elders’ management of the fund. In order to restore confidence, and to allay any suspicion of financial irregularities, it was decided that the church’s money should be deposited in a chest to which Ochino, Muralto and Duno each had access. Money was only to be removed from this chest when all three of the above were present.

Despite those measures, tensions over the use of the fund continued to surface. In order to resolve them, Ochino proposed a further reform of the church’s finances on 27 September 1556, which was accepted unanimously. Once again, this sought to strike a balance between retaining funds adequate to meet the needs of the community’s poor, and

\[124\] Ibid., fol.117.

\[125\] FA Orelli 8.2, fols 115-125; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.366-7.
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providing capital for the use of its entrepreneurs. The majority of the money was therefore set aside for commercial loans at an interest rate of 5%, with the profits to be used for relief of the needy. In addition, interest-free loans of up to 50 scudi were made available to those with no visible means of support. These rather more generous terms may have satisfied the clamour for increased access to the church’s resources, but problems of administration remained: at a review of accounts conducted in September the following year the three auditors (Francesco Verzasca, Aloisio Orelli and Francesco Michele Appiano) advised the minister and elders to be less generous in future when responding to requests for loans.\(^\text{127}\) In March 1561, the elders were forced to defend themselves against charges of maladministration of the fund from a minority within the congregation. Only an appeal to the city council, which found in the elders’ favour, succeeded in silencing these protests.\(^\text{128}\)

For all the competing demands on the church’s resources, the elders were able to use the common chest as the basis for an autonomous welfare system which served to underpin the community’s distinct identity.\(^\text{129}\) First Beccaria, and then Castiglione, assumed the office of deacon, administering the collection money – of which, as has been mentioned, we unfortunately have no record – and purchasing food, clothing and other items on behalf of the poor.\(^\text{130}\) Trevano, Francesco Verzasca and Francesco Michele

\(^{127}\) FA Orelli 8.2, fol. 15v-16r. The church’s total assets had fallen to below 950 scudi by this time.

\(^{128}\) Copy of the minutes in FA Orelli 8.7, pp.17-18; Meyer, Locarngemeinde, 2, p.164. The investigation reported a further reduction of the funds in the common chest to 777 scudi. The elders responded by attempting to recall loans from wealthier church members.


\(^{130}\) In January 1556, for instance, Castiglione received more than 3 scudi from the common chest ‘per panno qual lui compro per commissione nostro per Battista Roggiolo cioe per suo vestire avanti a Nadale’ (FA Orelli 8.2, fol.96v). Compare the entries for 15 October 1556 (fol.97r) and 19 March 1558 (fol.99v).
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Appiano also made occasional contributions in that area.\(^{121}\)

Understandably, the common chest was under greatest pressure during the months following the arrival of the Locarnesi in Zurich: in July 1555 alone, a total of 53 scudi was dispensed in poor relief.\(^{122}\) In subsequent years, most grants went to a small number of individuals and families, who remained excluded from the growing prosperity of the community as a whole.\(^{123}\) Prominent among these were, as one might expect, the young, widows and the infirm. Battista Roggiolo, for instance, an invalid resident in the Zurich Spital from his arrival with the first group of Locarnesi in March 1555 until his death around 1570, received an average of four grants a year between 1555 and 1563. In Roggiolo's case, the sums dispensed never exceeded 2 scudi, and were often designated for a specific purpose, such as the purchase of shoes. Other regular recipients of poor relief were the cobblers Francesco Albertino and Filippo di Campo, who according to the surveys of September 1556 and April 1558 made a living from polishing shoes; both were described in the first of these reports as extremely poor. Albertino and di Campo were able to claim larger amounts – up to 4 scudi – from the common chest in order to help them cover their rent; the fisherman Stefano Pebbia and the widow Lucia Belò also regularly received grants for that purpose.\(^{124}\)

\(^{121}\) For Trevano, see the entries for 12 November 1555 (ibid., fol.95'); 6 February 1556 (fol.96'); 12 September 1557 (fol.99'); 12 February 1558 (fol.99'); 15 June 1559 (fol.100'). Appiano was reimbursed for expenses on behalf of Battista Roggiolo on 11 January 1558 (fol.99'), while in March 1561 Verzasca reclaimed 1 scudo that he had issued to Stefano Pebbia 'a nome della chiesa' (fol.102').

\(^{122}\) Ibid., fol.94'. Money also had to be found at this time to reimburse those who had lent money to the community in Locarno and during the course of the move to Zurich, as well as to cover the expenses of the delegations sent to request aid from the Reformed cities (fols 93'-4').

\(^{123}\) The number of recipients fluctuated between seven and twelve annually from 1555 to 1561, but had fallen to four by 1563. By this stage money was being disbursed from the fund much less frequently, partly, one assumes, as a result of the ongoing deterioration of the community's finances, and partly because fewer exiles now required such support.

\(^{124}\) The accounts for the period 1555-63 contain forty-two entries for Roggiolo, fifteen for Albertino and his wife Angelina Pebbia, twenty for Filippo di Campo and his wife Elisabetta Robasciotto, thirteen for
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The common chest was used not only as a safety net for those unable to support themselves, but as a means of subsidising the economic activities of poorer church members. On 3 October 1555, for instance, Stefano Pebbia and his brother-in-law Francesco Albertino received around 10 scudi with which to purchase fishing-nets. Similarly, on 25 November 1556 3 scudi were granted to Bernardino Roggiolo, son of Battista, ‘qual ha domandato alla chiesa questo sussidio, per comprar Instrumenti per poter da sua posta essercitar l’arte de ligar libri accio che per questa si potesse mantenere et sostenere, promettendo poi alla Chiesa nel avenir di non esserli piu grave in modo alcuno’, while in April the following year Filippo di Campo requested 2 scudi ‘per compra [sic] corio per poter lavorare’. The apprenticeship in Basel of Bartolomeo Orelli was also financed from community resources.

Community solidarity found expression through the fund in other ways. In April 1556, for example, the church set aside 150 scudi to redeem the property of Barbara Muralto, Lucia Belò and Catarina Appiano, who had been convicted by the Catholic states of blasphemy against the Virgin (see n.70 above). On several occasions, assistance from Lorenzo Pebbia and his family and eight for Lucia Belò.

135 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.95⁰.
136 Ibid., fol.98⁰.
137 Ibid., fol.98⁰.
139 Ibid., fol.13⁰. After making representations to the Landschreiber Roll, the Locarnesi eventually succeeded in having these penalties commuted (ibid., fols 13⁰, 97⁰). On the whole affair, see Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.26-8.
the church enabled exiles to arrange for members of their families to join them in Zurich. The common chest also provided the resources for regular payments to Rudolf Gwalther, minister at the church of St Peter used by the Locarnesi, to their own pastor, and to others who served the exiles in an official capacity. Duno, who had agreed to act as physician to the community, received a quarterly salary of 20 scudi for his services, while Beccaria was paid half that amount in return for providing the children of the community with instruction in the catechism. The elders also drew on the common chest to purchase pews and books for the use of the church and its minister – the Loci communes of Wolfgang Musculus and a 1557 Latin edition of the Genevan Bible are mentioned – and to pay for copies of Ochino’s Dialogo del Purgatorio and Syncerae et verae doctrinae in coena Domini defensio to be bound and presented to those churches which had contributed to the fund in the first instance.

Overall, the extant minutes and accounts delineate a remarkably cohesive congregation during the late 1550s and early 1560s. The Italian church service and the common chest served as focal points for the community, bringing together wealthier and poorer exiles despite ongoing tensions over the use of shared resources. Conversely, that unity acted as a barrier to the refugees’ integration into wider Zurich society.

---

140 Bartolomeo Cataneo, 8 April 1556 (FA Orelli 8.2, fol.97'); Stefano Pebbia, 16 August 1556 (fol.97') and 15 April 1557 (fol.98'); Francesco Albertino, 31 July 1557 (fol.98').

141 See the references in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.29-30.


143 Ibid., fol.15' (cited in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.30, n.98); fol.96', 99', 99', 101'.

144 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.96'. Duno and Beccaria also took out a loan from the church to pay for the publication of these works, for which security was put up by Bartolomeo Verzasca and Ludovico Ronco (see ibid., fol.19').
IV. THE LOCARNESE AND OTHER ITALIAN EXILE COMMUNITIES

Earlier studies of the Zurich Locarnesi have tended to examine the community in isolation, rather than in the context of a wider Italian Protestant ‘diaspora’. To some extent this neglect is understandable, as the sources for the Locarnesi’s relations with Italian-speaking Reformed communities elsewhere are patchy, to say the least. However, there is clear evidence that such ties did exist, and that the Locarnesi considered themselves – and were considered by others – part of the Italian ‘nation’ in exile. In Taddeo Duno’s De persequutione, the experience of the Locarnesi is linked to the fate of the Reformation in Italy as a whole: Duno includes in his account a list of prominent Italian converts to Protestantism, most of whom he claims to have known personally.¹⁴⁵ Prior even to its enforced departure from Locarno the community had, as we have seen, played host to refugees from the neighbouring duchy of Milan, some of whom (Besozzi, Castiglione) assumed positions of leadership in the Zurich Italian church.

One interesting feature of the April 1558 survey is the addition of a ‘Beschrybung des Anndern welschen volks das hie ist’.¹⁴⁶ The existence of this group, comprising persons ‘so nit von Luggarus sonnder annern orthen har sind, unnd aber zu jnen jn jre Predigen gonnd unnd deßhalb für Luggarnen gehalten unnd verschryven werden’, suggests that the Locarnesi were not as ‘closed’ a community as is sometimes implied. The compilers of the list distinguished between foreigners resident in Zurich on a more or less continual basis, and occasional visitors to the city. The latter comprised for the most part merchants, such as the Tridi and Ciseri of Como, and their servants. The former were an extremely varied group, in terms of both nationality and occupation. They included

¹⁴⁵ De persequutione, fols 1r-2r. Those named are Vermigli, Ochino, Aonio Paleario, Vergerio, Galeazzo Caracciolo, Ulisse Martinengo, Girolamo Zanchi, Curione, Scipione Lentolo, Scipione Calandrini, Francesco Betti, Francesco Stancaro, Ludovico Castelvetro, Giacomo Aconcio and Giulio Cesare Paschale. For further evidence of Duno’s Italian patriotism, see the preface to his translation of Stancaro’s commentary on the letter of James (Explanatio Epistolae divi Iacobi (Basel 1547), pp.6-7).

¹⁴⁶ Published in Meyer, Locarnergemenginde, 2, pp.387-90.
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four Poles, six Frenchmen (three of them students), the English exile John Parkhurst and his wife, \(^{147}\) six boys from Locarno and two others from Milan and Mesocco respectively, \(^{148}\) a maid from Rhaetia, and three sons of the Milanese secretary Ascanio Marso, who were in Zurich with Martino Muralto in order to learn German. A recent arrival in Zurich was Isabella Bresegna Manrique, the widow of the Spanish governor of Piacenza and a former associate of Juan de Valdés in Naples, who brought with her a large entourage of servants. Ochino received a number of exiles in his own home: the Roman evangelical Francesco Betti, a ‘Ludwig’ and a ‘Cesar’ from Bologna, and another ‘Ludwig’ from Parma, with his wife and sister. Peter Martyr, meanwhile, played host to a brother and nephew of Lelio Sozzini, possibly Camillo and Fausto; \(^{149}\) Lelio himself lodged with the Zürcher Hans Wyss. Omitted from the list are Vermigli (who was made a citizen of Zurich on his arrival) and his amanuensis Giulio Santerenziano, who later worked as a corrector for Froschauer. \(^{150}\)

It is reasonable to assume that the growth in Zurich’s foreign population since 1555 had much to do with the establishment of Italian-language worship in the city, under the charismatic leadership of Ochino and Vermigli: when questioned by those responsible for compiling the survey of September 1556, Battista de’ Baddi, a member of the Locarno community who had initially settled in Chiavenna, gave that as his reason for moving to

\(^{147}\) On the English exiles, see P. Boesch, ‘Die englischen Fluchtlinge in Zürich unter Königin Elisabeth I’, Zwa 9:9 (1953/1), 531-5. In October 1559 the Locarnesi received a bequest of 10 scudi from an unnamed English exile, probably Edward Frensham (FA Orelli 8.2, fol.17\(^{*}\); Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.33-4; ZL, nos XXIX and XXX).

\(^{148}\) Two of the Locarnese boys were staying with Trevano. The others lodged with Martino Muralto, Battista de’ Baddi, Giovanni Beccaria and Francesco Verzasca.

\(^{149}\) V. Marchetti, ‘Sull’origine e la dispersione del gruppo eretica dei Sozzini a Siena (1557-1560)’, RSF 81 (1969), 133-73 (140).
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Zurich. Some of the Locarnese evangelicals who had chosen abjuration over exile in March 1555 later sent their sons to be educated in Zurich (probably by Beccaria), if the survey of April 1558 is to be believed. The Zurich Locamesi remained mindful of their obligations to such persons: in August 1558, for instance, they agreed to arrange for the son of Caterina Greco – whose husband Niccolò had been executed in January 1555 for uttering blasphemies against the Virgin – to learn a trade in Zurich. The Greco family also received alms from the common chest on two occasions.

Charitable giving was not restricted to present or former members of the community. As a congregation with first-hand experience of persecution, the Locamesi felt themselves under an obligation to assist others in similar straits. Support was targeted at fellow exiles, many of them Italians passing through Zurich en route to the larger refugee centre of Geneva. On 3 February 1556, for instance, the Locarnese elders asked the church of Aarau to arrange for a group of Sicilian evangelicals who were travelling to Geneva to be conducted as far as Bern. In March that year the church made a payment to a certain ‘Magistro Battista Milanese qual ha dimandato soccorso alla chiesa per andar a Tubinga’. Similarly, on 25 July 1557 ‘doi poveri cristiani l’uno Romano et l’altro Tarentino’, who

151 Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.386: ‘Baptista Badius antwurt, Das er mit andem Luggarnern Daselbs abgetreten, und sich etwas Zyts zu Clava enthalten. Als er aber verstanden, das man hie in jer Sprach predige, ware er alliar kommen, und jmme von uch minen Herren vergunt worden hie zu wonen’. On similar grounds Vincenzo Maggi requested permission to settle in Zurich in August 1555 (StAZ B II 92, 15).

152 On the residual Protestant presence in Locarno, see Pfister, Un des Glaubens willen, pp.103-8.

153 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.16; cited in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.32, n.111.

154 See the entries in the accounts for September 1555 (FA Orelli 8.2, fol.95°) and 8 August 1556 (fol.97°).

155 FA Orelli 8.7, no.25; published in K. Bentath, Bernardino Ochino von Siena (Braunschweig 1892), pp.305-6. See also the letter commanding the exiles to the church of Bern (FA Orelli 8.7, no.26) and the entries in the accounts for 21 December 1555 (FA Orelli 8.2, fol.96°) and 10 February (ibid., fol.96°: ‘spese fatte si per il viver per giorni xi si per farli condurre certi fratelli et sorelle Napolitani al numero de novi per il viaggio di Geneva’).

156 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.96°.
had arrived with letters of recommendation from the churches of Chiavenna and Caspano, received a grant from the common chest after a collection had been taken up on their behalf.\footnote{FA Orelli 8.2, fol.98º. The two were almost certainly Francesco Betti and Giacomo Aconcio, both commended to Bullinger by Curione in a letter of 1 July (StAZ E II 366, 55; published in G. Aconcio, De metodo e opuscoli religiosi e filosofici, edited by G. Radetti (Florence 1944), p.398).} Four years later, the Locarnesi contributed around 2 scudi from the community funds to a collection organised by the Zurich church on behalf of the Waldenses of Angrogna;\footnote{FA Orelli 8.2, fol.103º.} in September 1558 a certain Galeazzo Tegio was instructed to make a bed, at the church’s expense, ‘per beneficio de Poveri fratelli viandanti’.\footnote{Ibid., fol.100º; cited in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.33-4, n.119. Around twenty grants of this kind were made during the period 1555-63.}

Zurich was situated almost midway between Geneva and the Rhaetian subject lands, which were home to the largest of the Italian exile congregations. Its Locarnesi had links with Italian-speaking communities in both centres. On 29 May 1555, Celso Martinengo, minister to the Italian church in Geneva, wrote to the Locarnesi to commiserate with them on their exile. Their obedient suffering, he declared, should serve as a reproach to those Nicodemites who ‘facendo professione de christiani, amano piu le sue commodità che la gloria di Dio’. Martinengo proposed that the two communities cooperate closely in future:

Poi chel Signore ci ha congiunti in tanti modi, et spirituali et politici, et specialmente per la vicinità del luogo, et per l’essilio commune, abbracciamoci con indissolubile vincolo et legame, et dove noi haveremo bisogno di voi, con fiducia vi richiederemo, ricerchandovi che facciate il simile con esso noi, et con lettere vi preghiamo che spesso ci visitiate, avvisandoci mutualmente, essortandoci et consolandoci di quanto averterà alla giornata sicome vi promettiamo noi di fare il medesimo del canto nostro.\footnote{Original in FA Orelli 8.7, no.14; copy in Orelli, Verfolgung, pp.119-25.}

That suggestion was reiterated in a letter of 1 August from the elders of Geneva’s Italian church, which explicitly acknowledged the Locarnesi as fellow members of the Italian church.
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‘nation’ in exile. As these letters are all we possess in the way of formal contacts between the two churches, it is difficult to establish just how far Martinengo’s hopes were realised. However, other sources, notably the surviving business records of Ludovico Ronco, suggest a thriving commercial relationship between certain Locarnesi and Italian exile merchants in Geneva throughout the second half of the sixteenth century: in November 1575, for instance, Ronco’s Genevan business associate Franco Taruffo organised a weaver’s apprenticeship for the former’s son Gianbattista. The records also bear witness to a brisk trade in textiles between Ronco and Taruffo.

Relations with the churches of Chiavenna and the Valtellina during this period were equally cordial. Evidence for such links predates the exile of the Locarnese evangelicals. The Reformed pastor of Chiavenna, Agostino Mainardi, was among the community’s most enthusiastic defenders. When Besozzi visited Zurich in June 1554, he came armed with a letter to Bullinger from Mainardi refuting the charges of Anabaptism which had been levelled against the Locarnese Reformed. Locarno’s evangelicals also received a certain amount of pastoral care from their co-religionists in the Rhaetian Freestate: in the same letter, Mainardi reports that Guido Zonca (‘sane doctrine vir et fidelis Christi minister, qui ne latum quidem unguem a vestra fidei confessione discedit’) had recently visited Locarno to baptise an infant and to preach. During the months leading up

---

161 FA Orelli 8.7, no.19; copy in Orelli, Verfolgung, pp.140-5: ‘Ci parebbe mancare assai del nostro debito, carissimi et honorissimi fratelli nel Signor Jesu Christo, se noi non vi visitassimo almeno con questa nostra: si per rallegrarci e congratularci con esso dei de la commune gratia che il Signor n’ha fatte, si ancora per far con la vostra santa Chiesa quel medesimo afatto che habbiam gia fatto con le altre de la nostra natione [my italics], che sono in Chiavenna e in tutta la Valtellina’.

162 FA Orelli 8.4, fol.4’. Taruffo was present as a witness when another Locarnese, Francesco Orelli, was received as a resident of Geneva on 23 October 1572 (P.-F. Gilsendorf, Livre des habitants de Genève, 2 vols (Geneva 1957/63), 2, p.45).

163 Ibid., fols 46-7’. For a fuller description of these records, see Peyer, Handel und Bank, pp.62-5.

164 Schiess, 1, no.260.

165 The accounts for September 1555 record a grant of 3 scudi to Guido Zonca for ‘consolationi spirituali
to their exile, Mainardi wrote two letters of consolation to the Locarnesi, describing their tribulations as evidence of election.\textsuperscript{166}

Those links were reinforced by the settlement of exiled Locarnesi in Chiavenna (Besozzi, Battista de’ Baddi, Cristoforo Pastacolona) and Tirano (Leonardo Bodetto, originally from Cremona, but married to Catarina Appiano of Locarno).\textsuperscript{167} When, in October 1555, Bodetto was informed by the church of Tirano that it could no longer afford to employ him as a schoolmaster alongside Francesco Negri, the Cremonese exile turned to Zurich’s Italian community for assistance,\textsuperscript{168} and duly received several grants from the common chest.\textsuperscript{169} The presence in Zurich of an Italian-speaking congregation may well have served to strengthen further the ties between the Zurich church as a whole and the Italian Reformed communities of Rhaetia: the Locarnese exiles were ideally placed to add extra weight to the Valtellina churches’ occasional requests for assistance from the Zurich authorities. In a letter of June 1556, for example, the Teglio schoolmaster Pietro Guicciardi asked the Locarnesi to commend his church, which was currently experiencing difficulties, to Bullinger and Gwalther, ‘de’quali forsi saremo sforzati al tempo suo di loro servirci, per sostentamento dello Evangelio in questa Valle per lo favore de’ suoi Magnifici, et potenti signori’. Significantly, Guicciardi thanked Ochino ‘degli officii fatti col Bulinger’ in this matter.\textsuperscript{170}
Although Basel had no Italian church it, too, was home to a significant, if somewhat disparate, group of Italian evangelical exiles, notably Celio Secundo Curione and Pietro Perna. Both were in contact with the Zurich Locarnesi. On 5 July 1555, Curione wrote to welcome the Locarnesi to Zurich and to offer them his support. The Piedmontese humanist was probably instrumental in securing Basel’s donation to the common chest: in the letter he assures the exiles that as soon as the Antistes, Simon Sulzer, returns to Basel ‘farò colui et con gli altri ministri l’officio del qual mi scrivete: il quale havea deliberato di fare, se ben non mi haveste avisato’.

Further direct evidence of Curione’s links with the Locarnesi is lacking, but he did visit Zurich in 1564, following the death of his three daughters from the plague, in the hope that his wife might derive comfort from ‘italiarum mulierum colloquis’; that suggests an ongoing relationship with the city’s Italian-speaking community. The same would appear to be true of Perna, who was married first to Giovanna, a sister of the Locarnese Francesco Verzasca, and then to Aurelia, daughter of Martino Muralto. The Lucchese printer was a frequent visitor to Zurich during the late 1550s: in June 1557, for instance, Curione informed Bullinger that either Lelio Sozzini or Perna would shortly supply him with a copy of Curione’s defence of his De amplitudine to the Rhaetian Diet’s decision to authorise Protestant worship in the Valtellina (November 1552), possibly in alliance with religious radicals (“tanto più lo scandalò con gli infermi è pericoloso, perche il Diavolo usa hipocriti che fanno professione di intendere la verità, et che del Papato non participano ne della chiesa cristiana”). The aim of the church’s opponents was to have the local Reformed minister, Paolo Gaddi, removed. This is confirmed by a letter from Guicciardì to the Rhaetian magnate Friedrich von Salis of 2 September 1556, in which the schoolmaster warns his correspondent of an attempt ‘di voler far persuader alli Magnifici signori che sarebbe bene per maggior pace di questa terra che le loro signorie facessero terre di Teglio il nostro Ministro, et che facessero poi venirlo un altro chi a loro piacesse, che di questo non si curano, ne voglion contradir a le loro ordinazioni’ (StAG D II b 3). Compare the letter from Paolo Gazo (Gaddi?) to Tomaso della Chiesa, September 1556 (ibid.); and P.D.R. de Porta, Historia Reformationis ecclesiarum Rhaeticarum, 2 vols. (Chur 1771), 2:3, p.93.

171 FA Orelli 8.7, no.17; copies in Orelli, Verfolgung, pp.137-9. See also the church’s reply of 9 July (FA Orelli 8.7, no.18).

172 Curione to Bullinger, 22 August 1564 (StAZ E II 366, 52).

beati regni Dei, which (in one of those internecine squabbles that plagued the Italian exile community) Vergerio had denounced as heretical. Perna also had long-standing ties with Ochino, whose preaching may even have played a part in his conversion to Protestantism in the late 1530s; Leandro Perini argues that the Lucchese wrote the anonymous preface to part two of the Basel edition of Ochino’s Prediche while employed as an apprentice to the work’s publisher, Michael Isingrin. Perna himself later published most of the works written by Ochino while in Zurich, including the infamous Dialogi XXX.

Those ties were cemented, as in the case of Geneva, by commercial contacts. Antonio Sonzini, an evangelical from Bellinzona resident in Basel from 1555, had links with the Ronco company, for instance. In 1570, Ronco set up a new company for the import of rice from Italy with his relative Geronimo Orelli of Locarno and the Genoese exile Francesco d’Isola, who operated out of Basel; later he exported cloth to Geneva and Lyon via the same city. From as early as 1555, Locarnese exiles were also choosing to relocate from Zurich to Basel. The first to do so was Bartolomeo Orelli, whose apprenticeship was sponsored, as we have seen, by Zurich’s Italian church and who became a citizen of Basel in 1559; Orelli enjoyed close relations with such prominent members of the city’s academic establishment as Basilius Amerbach and Theodor Zwinger. Another

---

174 StAZ E II 366, 56: ‘Petrus Perna, iam civis Basiliensis, aut Socinus, nostram primam ad Vergerii calumnias responsonem, ostendet […]’.


176 Ibid., p.185.

177 See Chapter 3 below.

178 See StAZ B V 13, fol.319v; Weisz, ‘Tessiner’, p.381.

179 FA Orelli 8.4, fol.21v. The company was wound up in November 1573 (ibid., fol.35v). On d’Isola, see T. Geering, Handel und Industrie der Stadt Basel: Zunftwesen und Wirtschaftsgeschichte bis zum Ende des XVI Jahrhunderts (Basel 1886), pp.452-3.

180 Orelli was the channel for correspondence between the Tuscan evangelical Aonio Paleario and the Basel
migrant was Olinorio Rosalino, who witnessed the baptism of Perna’s twins Lelio and Laura on 30 August 1563; Olinorio was probably the eldest son of Gianambrosio Rosalino, described as an apprentice to a Basel printer in the survey of April 1558. Many more Locarnesi were to tread this path over the coming years, as relations between the exiles and their Zurich hosts deteriorated.

V. THE LOCARNESI AND ZURICH SOCIETY

The success of the Locarnesi in forging ties with other Italian exile communities contrasts starkly with their inability to establish similarly amicable relations with the native population of Zurich. The most important Locarnese mercantile enterprises, the Ronco company and Appiano’s silk-weaving business, have the appearance of exclusively exile concerns: the four apprentices employed by Appiano in April 1558, for example, were all Locarnesi (Giacomo Duno, Giangiacomo and Giacomo Rosalino, and a son of Lucia Belò). Wealthier members of the community, such as Castiglione, tended to employ other exiles, rather than Zurichers, as domestic servants. The exiles’ closest Zurich associates, besides the clergy, appear to have been the Ziegler family: at the time of the 1558 survey, for instance, one of Aloisio Orelli’s sons was in the service of Hans Ziegler the Younger, probably the same ‘Giovanni Zieglero’ whose generosity towards a member of Zurich’s Locarnese community is acknowledged in the accounts for December the following year. Those links can be explained by the fact that the Zieglers, like the Locarnesi themselves, were involved in transalpine trade.

Later generations of Zurich Locarnesi were inclined to gloss over any hostility
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their forebears had encountered on first arriving in Zurich, stressing rather the munificence of the city authorities and populace. In a poem commissioned by the descendants of the original exiles in 1592, Zurich appears as 'das gelobte land', offering deliverance from the tyranny of Egypt-Locarno. Duno, in his De persequutione, suggests that many exiles found it difficult to come to terms with the alien customs and language of their new home, but does not refer explicitly to tensions with Zurich's native population. Bullinger, meanwhile, is keen to stress the generosity with which ordinary Zurich citizens responded to the plight of the Locarnesi.

The minutes of the Zurich council, however, present a rather different picture: one of widespread opposition to the newcomers almost from the moment of their arrival. The commission charged with bringing forward proposals for the establishment of an Italian church in May 1555 had, as one its tasks, to investigate 'wie der unwillen so by etlich Zünfften der vertribnen Luggarnern halb, abzuleiten syg'. Hostility towards the exiles was such that the commissioners felt it necessary to recommend steps to prevent disruption of the Italian service by the 'gmeyn volk': a guard was to be put in place around the church of St Peter during sermons, and Zurichers were to be warned against subjecting the exiles to physical or verbal abuse. That some Zurichers should have reacted in this way comes as no surprise: the Zurich populace was

---

184 'Urbem incolentes Locarnenses lingua peregrina, vivendi et vestiendi modus, populi mores a patris plurimum differentes initio terrorbant non parum, quod mitandum non erat pauperum praecipue respectu, quanquam tempore illo rerum omnium vititam erat magna ut parvo vivere liceret: constanter tam etque fortiter perseverantes et in domino (qui eos quasi ex Ur Chaldæorum, vel ex Aegypto in promissam terram eduxerat) sperantes, paulatim vivendi et vestiendi rationi assuefeci urbis leges et instituta servarunt, linguam autem didicerunt' (De persequutione, fol.8r).
185 'Vil burger zu Zürich thatend rycher hilff den armen Luggarnen mit kernen, wein, geligen, herberig und hausplunder' (Verzeichnis, fol.186f). Compare Bullinger to Calvin, 14 June 1555 (CO 15, no.2228).
186 StAZ B II 90, 28; cited in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.359.
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notoriously xenophobic, and had laid the blame for the city’s defeat in the Second Kappel War at the door of meddling foreign preachers (meaning Zwingli and his circle).

The most vociferous opposition to the Locarnesi came from the guilds. In that respect Zurich was no different from other cities where religious exiles had settled. However, according to Heinz Schilling the potential for conflict was always greater where, as in Zurich, the guilds played an important role in government.\(^{188}\) The strength of the Zurich guilds should not be exaggerated — although 144 out of the 212 members of the Large Council were guildsmen, most power resided with a relatively small number of officials — but they were still able to put considerable pressure on the magistrates to ensure that their privileges were safeguarded. In London, by contrast, guild-led protests against economic competition from Netherlandish migrants tended to fall on deaf ears.

The Zurich council’s attitude towards the exiles strikes one as ambivalent. On the one hand, it recognised its responsibility to them as fellow evangelicals and as residents of Zurich. As has been mentioned, it intervened at their request to secure the lifting of the trade ban with Milan in July 1555. The following year, Zurich made representations to the Swiss Diet on behalf of the three Locarnese women fined for blasphemy by the Catholic states.\(^{189}\) Again, when Gianantonio Pairano was murdered while travelling through Zug in 1558, Zurich insisted that its Catholic neighbour take action against the perpetrators;\(^{190}\) the exiles also benefited from the council’s support in a series of property disputes with relatives in Locarno.\(^{191}\)

At the same time, the authorities continued to draw a clear distinction between

\(^{188}\) Schilling, pp.28-9.

\(^{189}\) Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.25.

\(^{190}\) StAZ B IV 21, fol.42, 164°.

\(^{191}\) StAZ B IV 21, fol.64°, StAZ B II 95, 55, StAZ A 350.1: Locamer Acten 1555 (Martino Muralto); StAZ B IV 21, fol.152° (Lucia Belo).
native Zürichers and the Locarnesi, whose presence in Zürich was never intended to become permanent. Zürich’s citizenship policy, already more rigid than that of Geneva or Basel, was further tightened in response to the arrival of the Locarnesi. In December 1556, the council confirmed the existing prohibition on the creation of new citizens from outside the Confederation and extended it to immigrants from the Gemeine Herrschaften and Zugewandte Orte, on the grounds that ‘das gmeine Statt mit vil frömbden lüthen beladen, die hüser und geden gesteigeret, unnd die gwerb unnd hanndtwerck übersetzt werdent’. Zurich’s rulers also seem to have been anxious to restrict the autonomy of their recently established Italian church: on 5 August 1555 they decreed that the two Seckelmeister, Hans Edlibach and Bernhard Springli, were to be consulted on the use of community assets.

From the end of 1555, the guilds began to put pressure on the council to intervene to regulate the economic activities of the Locarnesi. Guild-members were suspicious of the exiles’ innovative business practices, and sensed a threat to their control of Zürich’s commercial life; insecurities were heightened by a downturn in the city’s economy around this time, which produced a marked increase in poverty. The first sign that the council was taking heed of the guilds’ concerns came in August 1555, when an attempt was made to prevent the exiles profiting from the re-sale, in Locarno, of grain purchased cheaply in Zürich. All three official surveys of the community were initiated in response to complaints of this sort. In September 1556, the Locarnesi were accused of showing contempt for the guilds, while a year later several Zürichers, led by the cobbler

---

192 StAZ A 71.1, no. 51 (9 December 1556).
193 StAZ B II 93, 17; cited in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.22, n.72.
194 Büchold, Bullinger, pp.236-41.
196 StAZ B II 96, 12 (9 September).
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Heini Ulrich, informed the council ‘das jnen von den Luggarnern an jren hanndtwerck unnd gewerben jngriff beschäche’.

The rapid expansion, over subsequent months, of such new enterprises as Appiano’s silk-weaving business merely added fuel to the flames.

On 2 March 1558, the council instructed the Rechenherren to carry out a fresh review of the situation. The decision may have been influenced by recent moves on the part of some wealthier exiles to purchase property in Zurich, which did not sit well with the the council’s policy of treating the Locarnesi as temporary residents.

The commissioners’ proposals, which were issued as a council mandate on 18 March, amounted to a delicate balancing-act. The magistrates sought to honour Zurich’s existing commitments to the Locarnesi, while going some way to meet the guilds’ demands for regulation of their commercial activities.

The mandate stated that the Locarnesi were free to remain in Zurich, and to support themselves ‘mit jren gwün und gwerben’, but they continued to be barred from citizenship. Secondly, the exiles were forbidden to purchase property or to introduce ‘nüw gwerb und läden, die biihar nit gehalten sygen’, although exemption was extended to those businesses already in existence. Thirdly, the Locarnesi were made subject to the regulatory system operated by the guilds. No exile was to practise more than a single trade, and all were to pay an annual fee to the relevant guild and to observe its ‘gwerbsordnungen und satzungen’. Those exiles not engaged in a recognised

197 StAZ B II 101, 3 (7 July).

198 It should be noted, however, that the council had permitted Appiano to place the arms of Zurich on his products in August 1557 (StAZ A 350.1).

199 See StAZ B VI 337, fol.299, where the purchase of the house ‘Zum Mohrenkopf’ by Martino Muralto is noted. According to the survey of April 1558, Guanerio Castiglione and Gianambrosio Rosalino had also acquired property in Zurich. Opposition to exiles maintaining independent households was not confined to Zurich: the London strangers faced criticism on this score during the 1590s (O. Grell, Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London: The Dutch Church in Austin Friars 1603-1642 (Leiden 1989), p.21).

trade were instructed to join Zurich’s noble corporation, the Constaffel. At the same time, the Locarnesi were excluded from the benefits of guild membership, such as eligibility for public office.

The authors of the mandate also expressed alarm at the recent influx of foreigners into Zurich, who ‘under dem schyn der Luggarnern sich on erloubtnus harjnn gelaßen haben’. Henceforth no citizen or resident was to receive a foreigner in their house without the council’s written consent. In order to ensure that this regulation was observed, Hans Konrad Escher and Hans Göldli were instructed to examine the Locarnesi and other foreigners every six months, ‘oder so offt sy notwendig bedunckt’, in order to ascertain whether any aliens had entered Zurich illegally; only students were exempted from this provision.\(^{201}\) The mandate also contained the strongest sign yet of the council’s determination not to allow Zurich to develop into an exile centre along the lines of Geneva or London. It stated that Zurich, which could barely support its own citizens, was becoming overburdened by the Locarnesi and their increasing numbers of offspring. For this reason the exiles should be urged ‘uff mitel und weg zu trachten, ob mitler zyt sy, oder jre sün by andern Evangelischen Stetten und orten underkommen möchten, und nit also der laßt allein uff einer gmeynen burgerschaft alhie lege [my italics]’\(^{202}\).

The mandate of March 1558 exposed the precariousness of the exiles’ situation in Zurich. As we have seen, some Locarnesi had already migrated from Zurich to Basel; the survey of 1558 mentions others resident in Geneva, Neuchâtel and Constance. The Zurich

\(^{201}\) The third survey, which was carried out the following month and included other foreigners resident in Zurich as well as the Locarnesi, was probably an attempt to obtain reliable information on the scope of this problem. The number of foreigners in Zurich may well have been exaggerated in the popular imagination. That was certainly the case in other centres with large immigrant populations, such as London. There the authorities, less hostile to the exile presence than their Zurich counterparts, compiled registers of aliens as a way of counteracting speculation about the size of the city’s foreign community (Grell, Dutch Calvinists, p.22).

\(^{202}\) Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, p.392.
magistrates had now given a clear indication that this was their preferred solution to the Locarnese ‘problem’: many exiles were quick to take the hint. The years 1558-63 saw the departures of Pariso Appiano, Filippo Orelli (brother of Bartolomeo),203 Gianantonio and Bartolomeo Rosalino, and the Verzasca brothers, all of whom settled in Basel. On the surface there was plenty of opposition towards the ‘Welschen’ in Basel, as in Zurich: in April 1550, for instance, an edict was passed forbidding the publication of any works in languages apart from Latin, Greek, Hebrew and German, following the appearance of Giacomo Susio’s Italian translation of Gwalther’s controversial Antichristus.204 The Basel authorities also refused repeatedly to sanction the establishment of a French or Italian church service in the city.205 However, unlike their counterparts in Zurich, they operated a flexible – if selective – citizenship policy, with the aim of attracting new capital and skills.206 On average, thirty-five new citizens were created annually between 1565 and 1601.207 As mere ‘residents’ (Hintersassen) of Zurich, the Locarnesi did not enjoy the trading privileges and immunities open to full citizens: those disadvantages could be overcome by moving to Basel.

In Zurich, meanwhile, the exiles remained the target of popular and guild hostility. In June 1558 Besozzi was excluded from membership of the grocers guild, Saffran;208 shortly afterwards certain Locarnesi were accused of hoarding supplies of tallow.

203 See the testimonial issued to Filippo by Zurich council on 14 August 1559 (ZB Ms. S 95, 118).
207 Geering, p.448. Of around 1,500 new citizens created between 1550 and 1599, thirty-four were Italian-speaking (Denis, p.242).
208 StAZ B II, 102, 31. Besozzi’s business practices encountered opposition from within the Italian community itself. Several years later Bartolomeo Verzasca testified that Besozzi had at one point been ordered to appear before Ochino and the Locarnese elders ‘seins handels und wechsells halb’ (StAZ A 350.1;
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for export, thereby inflating the price of that commodity.\textsuperscript{209} In August 1560 the council again received complaints from some citizens, this time about competition for places in recognised trades from the growing number of younger Locarnesi in Zurich.\textsuperscript{210} In this hostile climate, the continued existence of the Italian church was bound to come into question. Giovanni Beccaria and Isabella Bresegna left Zurich for the Rhaetia Freestate in February 1559, depriving the community of its founding father and of a potential patron.\textsuperscript{211} Bullinger himself doubted that the church could be sustained over the longer term: in a letter to the Chur minister Johannes Fabricius of 30 March 1562 he commented, ‘Sollte by uns sterben ochinus ich acht nitt das man einiche Italicam ecclesiam me pflanzen wurde, sundern die biderben Luggaraner in andere unserer pfarren wysen’.\textsuperscript{212}

Throughout these difficulties the Zurich church remained the exiles’ staunchest ally. Several examples of Bullinger’s continued support for the community can be adduced. In June 1556, he drafted a petition addressed to the Landammann and council of Glarus by Lucia Belò, Barbaro Muralto and Catarina Appiano,\textsuperscript{213} while the following year he presented the Italian church with a copy of his newly published Sermons on the

\textsuperscript{209} ‘Es ist angezogen, wie etlich Luggaraner, so allhie wonend, das unschlitt zu huffen ufkouffind, hinweg ftirind und damit trefflich verthiirind’ (StAZ B V 15, fols 274", 306”).

\textsuperscript{210} StAZ B II 113, 13 (7 August 1560): ‘Demnach ob etlich von den Luggarneren wegen gredt wurden, das sy jre kind die erwachsen allhie verschinen och jnn die gwerb furden wolten, damit man noch mer von jnen beschwert wurde. Ist erken das die Rechenherren deshalb ein Ratschlag stellen wie disen sol zubegagnen sin’; Bodmer, p.27.

\textsuperscript{211} StAZ B II 106, 7 (23 February); FA Orelli 8.2, fol.17”.

\textsuperscript{212} StAZ B II 373, 309 (Schiess, 2, no.426).

\textsuperscript{213} ZB Ms. F 154, fol.40”; Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.28-9, n.87.
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Apocalypse.\textsuperscript{214} Bullinger’s history of the Locarnese community (written some time after April 1558) commemorates the sufferings and steadfastness of the exiles; it includes a lengthy account of the ‘martyrdom’ of Niccolò Greco that shows every sign of being based on eye-witness descriptions of the incident.\textsuperscript{215} Further evidence of the close relations between the Locarnesi and the Zurich clergy may be found in Konrad Gesner’s \textit{liber amicorum}, which features several prominent members of the community (Beccaria, Duno, Castiglione and Martino Muralto).\textsuperscript{216}

So long as the Locarnesi showed no signs of harbouring heterodox opinions, they could continue to rely on the support of the Zurich divines. Up until his death in November 1562, Peter Martyr Vermigli may have acted as a guarantor of the community’s orthodoxy, in his dual role of Locarnese elder and professor at the \textit{Carolinum}. Bernardino Ochino, too, enjoyed the confidence of the Zurich church establishment, at least in public. However, that confidence was sorely tested by the publication of Ochino’s \textit{Dialogi XXX} in the spring of 1563. For the first time, the Zurich churchmen were confronted with what they took to be clear evidence for the spread of heresy in the city’s Italian community. That discovery was to have momentous consequences both for the Locarnesi, and for the future attitude of Bullinger and his colleagues towards the Italian exiles as a whole.

\textsuperscript{214} StAZ E II 346, 142\textdegree{}; FA Orelli 8.2, fol.99\textdegree{}; Meyer, \textit{Locarnergemeinde}, 2, p.30, n.98.

\textsuperscript{215} Verzeichnis, fols 182\textdegree{}-5\textdegree{}. Compare Duno, \textit{De persequitione}, fols 6\textdegree{}-7\textdegree{}.

\textsuperscript{216} A. Serrai, \textit{Conrad Gesner} (Rome 1990), pp.363-6.
In a letter of 5 June 1563, Theodore Beza drew Bullinger’s attention to some alarming news. Many good and learned persons, he reported, had taken offence at the recently published *Dialogi XXX* by the Zurich’s Italian colleague Bernardino Ochino. Beza had been told that in this work ‘maximarum haereseon argumenta clare et perspicue explicari, quae nullis aut certe infirmissimis rationibus diluantur’. The author was accused of indulging in ‘curiosis et vanis speculationibus’, and of distorting passages from scripture. Beza himself had not had an opportunity to examine the suspect volumes, but expected that his Zurich counterparts would take appropriate action to deal with the situation.¹

Bullinger was initially dismissive of the Genevan churchman’s fears. He was, of course, aware of the Italian exiles’ reputation for doctrinal unreliability and, in particular, for antitrinitarianism. Precautions had been taken to ensure that the Locarnese church was not ‘contaminated’ by such ideas. At the time of its foundation, the Zurich council and ministers stipulated that whoever was appointed to the position of Italian preacher in Zurich was not to believe, teach or dispute contrary to the doctrines or rituals of the church ‘privatim vel publice’; he was also to use the Zurich liturgy in translation and to submit to

¹ Correspondance, 4, p.154 (no.271).
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the discipline of the synod. Bullinger had no reason to believe that Ochino had contravened those terms. In his reply of 12 June, the Antistes assured Beza that Ochino had nothing in common with the heretical followers of Servetus, Matteo Gribaldi and Giorgio Biandrata, whom he had openly condemned, and whose ideas he had promised to refute in writing.

Yet by the end of the year Bullinger had radically revised his judgement. With the approval of the Antistes and other senior Zurich churchmen, Ochino had been convicted of teaching false doctrine, removed from his post and banished from Zurich. In this chapter I shall argue that the Ochino affair highlighted (and set the seal on) an important shift in the Zurich church’s attitude towards the Italian exiles. But it is first necessary to place the work at the centre of the controversy, the Dialogi XXX, in the context of Ochino’s overall theological development.

I. ORTHODOXY AND DISSENT IN OCHINO’S ZURICH WORKS

Scholars’ interpretations of Ochino’s later works have inevitably been coloured by the circumstances of his departure from Zurich, and by his subsequent vilification by the Reformed establishment and corresponding canonisation by their radical opponents. Cantimori, for instance, did not hesitate to include Ochino among his ‘eretici’, although he qualified this with the statement that Ochino’s heresy consisted more in indifference than in

---

3 Correspondance, 4, p.158 (no.273).
4 For the opposing ‘orthodox’ and ‘radical’ views of Ochino, see the exchange between Beza and Andreas Dudith-Sbardellati in Correspondance, 11, nos 796 and 780. Ochino was among those singled out by Giorgio Biandrata in the antitrinitarian manifesto De falsa et vera unius Dei [...] cognitione as having helped ‘reclaim’ the scriptural doctrine of a unipersonal God (A. Pimanát (ed.), De falsa et vera unius Dei Patris, Filli et Spiritus Sancti cognitione libri duo (Budapest 1988), pp.32-44). On Ochino’s place in Socinian historiography, see C. Madonia, ‘Bernardino Ochino e il radicalismo religioso europeo’, Bollettino senese di storia patria 98 (1991), 110-29.
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outright opposition to such doctrines as the Trinity.\(^5\) Roland Bainton, Ochino's most recent biographer, doubts whether the Sienese exile ought to be regarded as an antitrinitarian, but argues nevertheless that his understanding of justification directly influenced Socinianism.\(^6\) Conversely, there have been attempts to restore Ochino's reputation as a (relatively) orthodox Reformed theologian, notably by Erich Hassinger. While acknowledging the existence of 'spiritualist' elements in Ochino's theology (which he attributes to the influence of Juan de Valdés) Hassinger insists that Ochino remained faithful to the core teachings of the Helvetic reformers in all of his Protestant works, up to and including the Dialogi XXX.\(^7\)

Here I do not hope to settle the question of Ochino's orthodoxy or otherwise. As Emidio Campi points out, attempting to classify individuals as 'orthodox' and 'heretical' at a time of considerable doctrinal fluidity is a misguided enterprise.\(^8\) Many Protestant thinkers from at least the first half of the sixteenth century do not fit neatly into either category: Ochino is certainly one of them. That being said, from the early 1550s - Servetus's execution marks a watershed - the leaderships of the various Swiss Reformed churches were becoming less willing to tolerate diversity among their followers. A unified Reformed 'confession', derived from the convergence of existing doctrinal positions (the Consensus Tigurinus represents an early move in this direction), and defined in opposition to Catholicism, Lutheranism, and the multifarious brands of religious radicalism, was beginning to take shape. It is my belief that Ochino was out of sympathy with this trend, which ran counter to his own, increasingly anti-dogmatic, approach. Any apparent change

\(^5\) Cantimori, Erretici, p.258.
\(^6\) R. Bainton, Bernardino Ochino, esule e riformatore senese del Cinquecento (Florence 1940), p.156.
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in Ochino’s position during his time in Zurich was as much one of perception as of substance: what was acceptable in a Reformed theologian in the early 1550s had often come to be regarded with suspicion a decade later. That is not to say that all the movement was on the side of the Reformed establishment: there is much to suggest that Ochino was attracted by heterodox solutions to some critical theological, especially soteriological, problems. Instead of following his compatriots Peter Martyr Vermigli and Girolamo Zanchi into Reformed orthodoxy, Ochino kept open the channels of communication with thinkers whose position was more unambiguously radical than his own. Under their influence, he came to question, if not to reject, certain aspects of received Protestant teaching.

For Ochino, as for most early Italian evangelicals, the initial appeal of the Reformation lay in its core teaching of justification by faith alone. In the Epistola ai signori di Balia della città di Siena, published in the wake of his flight from Italy in August 1542, Ochino declared that it was for the sake of this doctrine that he had finally broken with the Roman church.9 Repudiating the ‘works righteousness’ of Catholicism, he argued that only Christ’s vicarious sacrifice could make satisfaction for sin:

Io credo et confessò con Paolo che, essendo li homini (per el peccato del primo parente) figlioli de l’ira et della damnatione, morti et impotenti a relevarsi et a reconciliarsi con dio, Christo iustitia nostra mandato dal suo eterno padre, con attribuirsi li peccati dellaui suoi electi et offerirsi in croce per epsi, ha satisfacto plenisamente et in tutto placato l’ira di dio, imo adoptati per figli del suo eterno padre et facti suoi heredi, richi di tutti li divini tesori et gratie.10

The same point is made forcefully in his Galatians commentary of 1546:

Doppo’l peccato de primi parenti non potiamo andare alla vita per la via della osservantia di tutti li divini precetti, per le nostre repugnant conjupisceneti, tal che sol Christo l’ha osserrata tutta; ne è stato alcun santo, ilquale habbia osserrato, non dire tutta la legge, ma ne il minimo suo precetto, non dire per sempre, ma ne per un batter d’occhio, impero che non fu mai santo nella presente vita, che facesse un sol bene, con quella somma fede, spirito, amore, zelo, humilita, retta intentione, et in quel modo che era obrigato secondo la

---

9 This text is republished in Benrath, pp.294-302; B. Ochino, I <<dialogi sette>> e altri scritti del tempo della fuga, edited by U. Rozzo (Turin 1985), pp.136-45; and Marchetti, Gruppi ereticali senesi, pp.247-54. All references are to this last edition.

10 Epistola, pp.247-8.
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sommamente perfetta legge di Dio; et si come si conveniva alla infinita divina bonta.\footnote{Espositione di Messer Bernardino Ochino sopra la Epistola di Paulo à i Galati (n.p. 1546), fol.78v.}

The function of the Law is not to save, but to bring humanity to an awareness of its own sinfulness and of its need for God’s mercy, manifest in Christ.\footnote{Ibid., fol.53v. Compare Bernhardini Ochini Senensis expostio Epistolaro divi Pauli ad Romanos (Augsburg 1545), fols 33r-4v.} Good works are the consequence, rather than the cause, of justification: just as only a good tree can yield good fruits, so only a person already justified can perform good works.\footnote{Galati, fol.38r. The image is a favourite of Protestant writers from Luther onwards.} Even the regenerate remain subject to ‘le prave, et immoderate concupiscentie’, the effects of original sin, as a perpetual reminder of their dependence on God.\footnote{Ibid., fol.85v. Compare La seconda parte delle Prediche di Mess. Bernardino Ochino Senese (n.p. [Basel] n.d.), sigs xxx4r-xxx5v.}

At this stage in his career, Ochino seems to have understood justification as a transaction involving the imputation of the sins of the elect to Christ and the corresponding ascription of his merits to them. In his commentary on Romans, for instance, he writes:

Quamvis in renatis per Christum restent pravae cupiditates ad virtutis exercitacionem, a quibus ita retardentur, atque impeduntur, ut deum summa observantia colere nequeant, ut velint: tamen quia in eis non regnat peccatum, sed Dei spiritus, tantum abesse, ut corporis affectibus assentiantur, et ab eis, tanquam pecati mancipia, ad vitia traducantur, ut etiam eis resistant eosque superent. Itaque in eis, quandi sunt viva fide cum Christo coniuncti, nihil quod damnandum sit inest, non quia li non a perfecta legis functione absint: sed hac in re, quod a suo officio absunt, id eis a deo non datur, non quia per se, semoto Christo, peccatum non sit, sed quia eorum peccata propter eam, qua cum Christo cohaerunt, coniunctionem, transseunt in Christum, cui deus ea imputat: Christus ea sibi vendicavit, et luit.\footnote{Expositio Epistolaro ad Romanos, fol.58v.}

There is little in Ochino’s doctrine of justification, as set out above, to which Bullinger or his Zurich colleagues could have taken exception. A clear distinction is made between justification, an extrinsic process accomplished on behalf of the elect by Christ, and sanctification, which reaches its conclusion only in the next life. That distinction
formed the basis for Luther’s understanding of the regenerate person as *semper peccator semper iustus*, which was also, needless to say, axiomatic for the Reformed. From Ochino’s *Catechismo* of 1561, it would appear that his position on this issue changed little during his time in Zurich. The ‘Illuminato’ who replies to the questions of ‘Ministro’ in the catechism declares at one point, ‘Nella presente vita, non è chi perfettamente adempia la legge di Dio, per la repugnante carne, et imperfetto lume che habbiamo di Dio’. That view is reiterated during the discussion of the tenth commandment: ‘mentre che siamo nella presente vita, [triste concupiscentie] sono non solamente ne gl’huomini carnali, ma et anco ne regenerati et spirituali’. It is impossible for the elect to free themselves from the effects of original sin, although they may control their inclination to evil with the help of God’s Spirit. Illuminato compares human appetites to serpents curled up in the shade, which sometimes appear dead, but always reawaken to spew forth their venom. We may not even legitimately ask God to eradicate our tendency to sin, because it is his will ‘che in fin a morte sieno in noi le sfrenate concupiscentie, a esercitio di virtù’.

But elsewhere in Ochino’s Zurich works there are signs of a growing tension in his thought between the doctrine of imputed righteousness and theories of ‘essential’ justification, as championed both by Catholic writers and by Protestant dissidents like Servetus, Osiander and Sebastian Castellio (on whom see below). This tension is most

---


17 Ibid., p.129.

18 Ibid., pp.130-2. See also pp.143, 147.

19 Ibid., p.209.

20 Ochino was not the only Italian evangelical attracted by the notion of essential justification. The Cassinese Benedictine tradition that helped shape the *Beneficio di Cristo* was characterised by an emphasis on the sinlessness of the regenerate (Ginzburg and Prosperi, *Giochi di pazienza*, pp.55-6). Curione, similarly, understands the infusion of virtue into the soul of the Christian as an integral part, rather than a secondary consequence, of justification (E. Balmas, *Il pensiero religioso di C.S. Curione* (Rome 1935), p.27).
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evident in the fifth volume of the *Prediche*, published in 1562. In sermon 8 of this collection, entitled ‘Perche venne Christo, et perche fu mandato dal Padre’, Ochino proclaims that Christ did not die in order that we might remain in sin, but so that we might be free of it (‘non mori, accio stessemo ne peccati, ma per liberarcene’). He continues, ‘non volse anco essere crocifisso, per farci liberi al male, ma al bene: ne anco ci lavò di peccati, accio c’imbrattassemo in essi, ma perche fussimo innocenti e virtuosi’.

Similarly, in his *Laberinti del libero arbitrio*, which appeared around the same time, Ochino argues that the regenerate person has regained the liberty proper to Adam and Eve. ‘Veramente libero’, he or she is no longer a slave of sin, but capable of performing spiritual works. In both the *Prediche* and the *Laberinti* Ochino stops short of asserting the sinlessness of the regenerate: even those who have received the light of faith can fall, as the examples of David and Peter demonstrate. With that qualification added, none of the statements cited above are, strictly speaking, incompatible with Reformed orthodoxy: Zwinglian theologians had always argued for the close intertwining of faith and works. However, they did not intend to blur the fundamental distinction between justification and sanctification. With Ochino, on the other hand, one senses an increasing disinclination to view the two as discrete processes.

That was coupled with an important shift in his understanding of Christ’s role within the economy of salvation. In his sermons and commentaries of the 1540s, Ochino speaks of Jesus taking on and satisfying for the sins of humanity by his death: Christ, through his expiatory sacrifice, is the operative agent in salvation. Yet in some of his Zurich works Ochino offers a rather different reading of the atonement. In the *Dialogo del Purgatorio* of 1556, for example, he denies that Christ was capable, by his own merits, of reconciling God with humanity; the efficacy of his death lies solely in the fact that God has

---

21 La quinta parte dell’prediche di M. Bernardino Ochino, non mai prima stampate (Basel 1562), p.58.
chosen to accept it as satisfaction for sin. Salvation, for Ochino, was the product of God’s freely given grace expressed in election, and he appears to have had difficulty integrating the doctrine of Christ’s merits into this scheme. Thus in sermon 9 of the *Prediche*, volume 5, he describes Christ as neither the cause nor the means (‘mezzo’) of salvation, but as one charged merely with implementing the divine decree. At this point the notion of the substitutionary atonement retreats entirely into the background. Christ’s death, Ochino argues, is not a form of expiation, but a demonstration of God’s love for humanity: ‘Dio vuole che il suo figliuolo morisse in croce, accioche l’uomo vedesse che Dio non era irato, ma che l’amava eccessivamente, et così andasse a lui’.

Here we may relate Ochino’s changing understanding of the atonement to his statements on justification in the *Prediche* and the *Laberinti*. Christ’s function is to effect a transformation of humanity’s attitude to God, rather than vice versa:

> Dio non haveva bisogno della morte di Christo per amarci, ma è ben vero, che noi havevamo bisogno della morte di Christo per amare Dio: però se bene Christo è stato quello, per mezzo del quale habbiamo havuti tutti gli effetti dell’amore di Dio, non però per mezzo suo ci ha Dio amati; imperoche egli ci ha amati per pura gratia, et senza mezzo alcuno. Anzi sicome Dio ci ha donato il

---

23 *Dialogo del purgatorio di Messer Bernardino Occhino di Siena, Pastore della Chiesa de Locarnesi, in Zuricho* ([Zurich] 1556), pp.41-2: ‘Se Dio havesse volute entrar in giudicio per pagarci, secondo che di giustitia ci era debitore, senza farci una minima gratia: et havesse pesato le opere di Christo, con le quali meritò, habebbe trovato che per se stesse, et per lor propria natura, semota ogni divina gratia de accetatione, non era tali ch’havessero di giustitia obligato Dio à perdonarci li nostri peccati. L’obligomo adunque solamente per gratia, se come anco per gratia et non per lor propria natura, furo satisfattorie per li nostri peccati’. This statement did not pass unnoticed; in June 1558, Ochino wrote to the Rhaetian magnate Friedrich von Salis to defend himself against the charge ‘che Christo habbia meritato o soddisfatto è una bestemmia’ (letter published in Benrath, pp.306-7).

24 For Calvin there is no such contradiction between the doctrines of Christ’s merit and God’s grace. See J.T. McNeill (ed.), *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols (Philadelphia 1960), 1, p.529 (2:17): ‘It is absurd to set Christ’s merit against God’s mercy. For it is a common rule that a thing subordinate to another is not in conflict with it. For this reason nothing hinders us from asserting that men are freely justified by God’s mercy alone, and at the same time that Christ’s merit, subordinate to God’s mercy, also intervenes on our behalf. Both God’s free favour and Christ’s obedience, each in its degree, are fitly opposed to our works. Apart from God’s good pleasure Christ could not merit anything; but did so because he had been appointed to appease God’s wrath with his sacrifice, and to blot out our transgressions with his obedience’. These remarks flowed from an earlier discussion of the atonement between Calvin and Lelio Sozzini (for whose views see the article cited in n.94 below).
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suo amore, senza mezzo, benché gli effetti dell’amore ce gli habbia donati per mezzo di Christo, così anco ci ha donato Christo senza alcun mezzo, atteso che Christo non poteva esser mezzo tra se et Dio, ma si ben tra noi et Dio.26

Again, this represents a subtle change of emphasis rather than a clear break with orthodox Reformed teaching. In sermon 8 of the Prediche Ochino still speaks of Christ’s death in terms of reparation (‘Fu dal Padre mandato a cio, che ponendo in esso le nostre iniquità, sicome Isaia predisse, et esso accettandole, et portendole sopra il legno della croce, ce ne liberasse, tollendo i peccati del mondo, et salvandoci da essi’), although he is clearly more concerned with its transformative effect on humanity (‘Venne per tor da noi il cuor di pietia et dancel di carne, [...] per rigenerarci, et di carnali farci spirituali, di terreni celesti, di humani angelici, et di diabolicì divini’).27 Ochino’s discussion of the atonement in the Prediche must also be set against what he says on the question in the Catechismo. There he offers a much more traditional formulation of the doctrine: Christ offered himself up for the elect on the cross ‘et piacque tanto a Dio, quel divin sacrificio, che placè l’ira sua’.28

In the Catechismo Ochino also articulates a clear doctrine of double predestination:

Quelli i quali nella divina mente, sono eletti, son sempre eletti, et quelli che son reprovati, son per ogni tempo reprovati. Quelli a quali Dio non imputa i peccati, sicome sono gli eletti, non glieli imputa mai, et quelli a quali gli imputa, sicome sono i reprovati, gli imputa sempre. Christo morì per liberare gli eletti da tutti i lor peccati, et non morì per liberare i reprovati pur da un solo.29

This is consistent with the position Ochino had set out in his works of the 1540s, notably the series of sermons on predestination which appear in the second volume of the Prediche. There he describes election as the surest proof of the ‘eccessiva bontà di Dio’, grounding

26 Ibid., p.17. This passage appears in sermon 2, ‘Nella quale si mostra quanto sia grande et magnifica la liberalità di Dio’.

27 Ibid., pp.61-2.

28 Catechismo, p.155.

29 Ibid., p.282.
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this teaching in the immutability of the divine nature: 'che [Dio] l'eletto [...] possi dannare, è cosa falsa, heretica, et impossibile, non si puo verificare in senso composto, ne anco in diviso, poi che in Dio, non puo essere mutatione, ne successione'. Even Christ, the mediator of salvation, cannot reverse the effects of these eternal decrees. In this group of sermons Ochino resists any attempt to link election to divine foreknowledge of good works; rather, it is an unmediated act of God's will. He also specifically defends the doctrine of reprobation against the charge that it offends against God's justice, alluding to a favourite predestinarian text, Romans 9:19-21:

Puo disporre di noi a modo suo, farne quello gli piace, piu ch'el figolo de vasi, et tutto giustamente. Et che oblighi ha Dio con noi? Di poi, per il peccato d'Adamo siamo tutti persi, et potrebbe tutti giustamente dannarci, et lui ne salva tanti, et ci lamentaremo, dove non siamo degni, che col punirci illustri la sua gloria? Imo debba predicarsi, che Dio alcuni ha eletti et alcuni no, per sbattere per terra la sapientia dell'huomo, et renderlo tutto humile et soggetto a Dio.

Ochino refuses to question the reasons for God's choice. It is enough to accept that God is just in whatever he wills, and therefore that his decision in this matter is also righteous, however incomprehensible it may seem to us.

Ochino's statements on predestination in the years immediately subsequent to his conversion in fact place him closer to Calvin than to Bullinger, who was alarmed by the implications of the Genevan reformer's doctrine of reprobation. In the second volume of the Prediche, for instance, Ochino's interpretation of the text most commonly adduced in support of universal salvation, 1 Timothy 2:3-4, is identical to that of Calvin: both argue,

---

30 Prediche, 2, sig.rro'

31 Ibid, sig.ono".

32 'Non si ha [...] a cercare causa alcuna della nostra eletzione, fuor della divina volonta. De reprobati, non intendo disputare, per che Dio gli reproba, per non esserci necessario, ne utile il superlo' (ibid., sig.ss0').

with Augustine, that Paul's statement 'God wills all people to be saved' is to be understood
as meaning that no class of persons is excluded from election. In his commentary on this
passage, by contrast, Bullinger prefers to emphasise the availability of salvation to all who
believe in Christ.

By the beginning of the 1560s, Calvin's explicit double predestinarianism had
begun in most places to prevail over Bullinger's more moderate line. Ochino's affirmation
of the double decree in the Catechismo would seem to align him with this emerging
Reformed consensus. However, the Catechismo, as an example of a 'public' genre, is
perhaps to be read more as a statement of the Zurich church's views on a particular issue
than of Ochino's private opinions. The Zurich church's position on predestination had been
clarified in January 1560 by the dismissal from his post at the Carolinum of Theodor
Bibliander, who had taught a doctrine of predestination by classes (believers and
unbelievers) against the double predestinarianism favoured by Peter Martyr Vermigli.
Unsurprisingly it is Vermigli's position - now, in effect, the official stance of the Zurich
church - which is endorsed in the Catechismo. For Ochino's personal response to the
debate between Vermigli and Bibliander one must turn to the Laberinti del libero arbitrio.

14 Prediche 2, sig.uug: 'Et se bene è scritto, che Dio ha cura di tutti, chiama tutti, vuol salvare tutti, è morto
per tutti, illumina tutti, et similii sentencc, dico che s'intende, che ha cura di tutti generale, ma degli eletti
spetiale, et cosi chiama tutti con vocatione universale, ma gli eletti con interna et singolare. Quando anco
Paulo disse, che vuol salvare tutti, intese, ciò è d'ogni sorte di persone'. Compare Institutes, 2, pp.983-4
(3:24).

15 Bullinger, Commentarii, pp.564-6.

are summarised in E. Egli, 'Bibliander's Leben und Schriften', in Analecta Reformatoriana II: Biographien
(Zurich 1991), pp.1-144, especially pp.71-9. Vermigli interprets both reprobation and election as products of
God's will, but seeks to counter the charge that this makes God the author of sin by arguing that the actual
commission of evil acts leading to damnation is dependent on a secondary cause, the corruption of the human
will (In Samuelis prophetae libros duos D.D. Petri Martyris Vermilii Florentini, et Theologiae in Schola
Tigurina professoris, Commentarii doctissimi (Zurich 1595), fol.275'). For a fuller discussion, see Donnelly,
Calvinism and Scholasticism, pp.116-40, and F. James, 'Praedestinatio Dei: The Intellectual Origins of Peter
1993).
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The Laberinti signal a retreat from Ochino’s earlier double predestinarianism, as articulated in the second volume of the Prediche. There is no evidence in the work of support for the disgraced Bibliander’s opinions: Ochino continues to teach the election of individuals, rather than of classes, and to argue that the performance of good works is entirely dependent on the operation of grace within the believer. However, he appears to have modified his conception of predestination in response to the persistent criticism (voiced by Catholics and radical reformers alike) that the doctrine rendered God ultimately responsible for sin. In the Laberinti Ochino distinguishes sharply between election, an act of the divine will, and reprobation, which belongs rather to the realm of God’s foreknowledge. God knew, for instance, that Peter would be saved as he had already so determined. In the case of Judas, by contrast, ‘non vedde che peccherebbe, perché havesse cosi determinato, ma perché il suo peccato gl’era presente’. Ochino illustrates the link between damnation and foreknowledge by comparing God to a man who sees another fall from high tower, but does nothing to prevent it. He concludes, ‘il veder di Dio non è causa di nostri peccati; ne perché gli vede pecchiamo, ma perché pecchiamo gli vede’. (Vermigli, it should be noted, had explicitly rejected the notion that reprobation was consequent upon foreseen sin.)

See, for instance, Laberinti, pp.103, 233. However, in a letter of 16 August 1560 Bibliander (now in enforced retirement) informed Thomas Platter that the publication of ‘Labyrinthum quendam Italicum de providentia, de praedestinatione, electione et eiusmodi’ had come to his attention and requested a copy of ‘tam sublime opus’ as soon as a Latin edition was available. Bibliander does not indicate whether he was aware of the identity of the work’s author (Pollet, 2, pp.333-4).

Ibid., p.163.

Ibid., p.163.
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Timothy 2:3-4. In sermon 8 he dismisses the interpretation of this text offered by Calvin and Augustine (which, as we have seen, he had earlier shared). 41 Neither is he prepared to countenance the existence of competing ‘revealed’ and ‘hidden’ aspects of the divine will, as postulated by Vermigli to explain God’s simultaneous tolerance and condemnation of human sin. 42

In the Laberinti Ochino appears, on one level, to be calling for a return to the moderate single predestinarianism professed by the Zurich church prior to the Bibliander affair. If this had been the total extent of Ochino’s differences with Reformed orthodoxy, it is likely that he would have been permitted to live out his days in Zurich undisturbed: in an address of 1536, Bullinger himself had argued that reprobation was the product of God’s foreknowledge, rather than his will. 43 But as we have seen, Ochino’s understanding of soteriology in general was taking on an increasingly heterodox hue. In addition, like many Italian exiles he was unsympathetic to the growing ‘confessionalism’ of the Reformed leadership, above all its preoccupation with precise doctrinal definition. In the Laberinti Ochino suggests that this quest for certainty is both destructive of Christian unity and, ultimately, futile. In formal terms, the work anticipates the Dialogi XXX: problems are raised, alternative opinions are considered, but the reader is rarely presented with a firm conclusion. In the final sermon Ochino proposes ‘dotta ignoranza’ as the ‘via per uscire di tutti i sopra detti laberinti’. 44 He compares salvation to a meal prepared for humanity by God, which we ought to enjoy instead of speculating about the manner in which it was

---

41 Laberinti, p.87: ‘Ne anco appruovo la opinione di quelli, li quali disseno, che la mente di Paulo fu di dire, che vuole salvare d’ogni sorte persone, [...] imperocché questo è dubbio, ne consta per la parola di Dio’.

42 Ibid., p.88. Contrast Vermigli, Samuel, fol.21’.

43 Walser, pp.163-7.

44 Laberinti, p.246.
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prepared: ‘Possiamo salvarci, non solo senza sapere, ma et senza pensare, se siam liberi, o no’. The same anti-dogmatic tendency is apparent in Ochino’s *Disputa della Cena* (1561): there he suggests that the controversy over the sacrament may be resolved ‘con lassare a ciascuna delle parti la sua opinione’, since the mode of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist is not among the articles necessary for salvation, as set out in scripture and the Apostles’ creed.

Nothing in the works published by Ochino prior to 1563 could be said to have placed him in open opposition to the Reformed establishment. The *Catechismo*, for instance, is in most respects a model of Reformed orthodoxy. However, from the *Laberinti* and the final volume of the *Prediche* it would appear that Ochino was beginning to consider different approaches to the key problems of soteriology: justification, the atonement and predestination. In these works one finds a mix of views, some consistent with traditional Protestant teaching, others reminiscent of dissident figures like Sebastian Castellio and Lelio Sozzini. Ochino also hints at his growing dissatisfaction with the leadership of the Reformed churches. In the *Prediche* he attacks those who claim to be Reformed Christians, but whose chief concerns are ‘d’esser additati, nominati, et famosi: et se qualchun si scopre illustre con qualche virtù, come quelli che temano che non offuschino la lor gloria, gli perseguittano senza fine’.

Elsewhere in the same work he suggests that Protestant divisions cast doubt on their claim to represent the true church of Christ:

---


46 *Disputa di M. Bernardino Ochino da Siena intorno alla presenza del corpo di Gesu Cristo nel Sacramento della Cena* (Basel 1561), p.169: ‘I sacramenti et le cerimonie sono accidental!, e non essentiali alla osservanza di precetti morali, così et alla viva fede’. See the recent analysis of this work by E. Campi, ‘<<Conciliazione de dispareri>>: Bernardino Ochino e la seconda disputa sacramentale’, in *Das Reformierte Erbe*, 1, pp.77-92. Like some of his compatriots (see chapter I:III above), Ochino clung to a strongly Zwinglian view of the Eucharist that diverged in some respects from the *Consensus Tigurinus*. See, for instance, his comments on the use of the term ‘exhibere’ in his *Syncerae et verae doctrinae de Coena Domini defensio* (Zurich 1556), pp.126-7.

47 *Prediche*, 5, p.305. Compare his later criticisms of Bullinger, cited in section II below.
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‘L’unione spirituale mostra gl’uomini essere evangelici et divini: così le disunioni mostrano che sieno Antichristiani et diabolic: però bisogna dire, che le Chiese così partiali non siano veramente cristiani’.48

Similarly, when discussing the appropriate response to persecution in the Disputa della Cena Ochino warns his compatriots that exile is no easy alternative to laying down one’s life for the faith: often it is only the start of a longer and more bitter martyrdom among ‘falsi fratelli’. Again he criticises the fissiparous tendency within Protestantism:

Devi sapere, che da circa quarant’anni in quasi son molte chiese riformate, et tutti pensano d’esser sommamente perfette, speczialmente nella dottrina, nella quale son si diverse et varie, che ciascuna danna per heretiche tutte le altre, che non accettano le sua. Et perche non è senon un solo Evangelio, et una sola vera dottrina, se non errano in dannar le altre, bisogna, o che tutte sien in errore, o vero che una sola sia in verità.49

Even if the exile should find sanctuary in a church that holds all that is necessary for salvation, ‘forse vorrebbero obligati di più, a credere di necessità quello, che non è necessario che creda per salvarti’.50 Here, one suspects, is an implied criticism of the increasing obsession with doctrinal minutiae on the part of Reformed theologians. Certainly the Zurich churchmen seem to have regarded Ochino’s statement in that light: a manuscript copy of the passage is preserved in the Zurich Staatsarchiv among the documents relating to Ochino’s banishment in November 1563.51

II. THE CRITIQUE OF REFORMED ORTHODOXY IN THE DIALOGI XXX

Ochino’s last and most controversial publication, the Dialogi XXX, has proved resistant to interpretation by contemporaries and modern scholars alike. Josias Simler, who was

48 Ibid., pp.166-7.
49 Disputa, pp.258-9.
50 Ibid., p.260.
51 STA Z E II 367, 375-7.
charged with examining dialogues 19 and 20 following Ochino’s dismissal, remarked on
the difficulty of gauging the author’s true intentions. Simler’s sentiments are echoed by
Erich Hassinger, who observes:

Es ist sehr oft nicht auszumachen, bei welchem der beiden Colloque
ten in den
“XXX Dialogi” [...] er selbst seiner tiefsten Überzeugung nach steht, und selbst
wenn sich beide einig werden, so ist die Formulierung ihres Schlusses bisweilen
so schillernd und zweideutig, daß man fast an eine bewuβte
Verschleierungsabsicht zu glauben geneigt ist.®

In rhetorical terms the Dialogi XXX are quite unlike, say, the evangelical dialogues of the
ey early 1520s, or even Ochino’s own earlier, anti-Catholic dialogues. The latter exploit the
propagandistic potential of the dialogue, as a medium which allows for the demonstration
of the clear supremacy of one viewpoint over another. The structural principle of the
Dialogi XXX, by contrast, is indeterminacy. Although in most of the dialogues an
‘Ochius’ puts forward views consistent with the official teaching of the Zurich church, the
opinions of his fictional interlocutors are given an equal, if not greater, airing. Dialogue
becomes not simply a pedagogical or polemical device, but a means of exploring the
contradictions of received theology and, more generally, of questioning the claims of the
Reformed leadership to religious authority.

The first volume of the Dialogi is devoted to an area of doctrine that looms large
in Ochino’s earlier Zurich works: soteriology. In dialogues 1 to 17 Ochius’s interlocutor is
one Jacobus Judaeus, whose critique of the Reformed understanding of justification and
Christ’s role in the economy of salvation recalls to some extent the Ochino of the Prediche
and the Laberinti. In dialogue 3, for instance, Jacobus argues that one cannot logically
designate both election and Christ’s merits as the cause of salvation: the Messiah’s mission
was redemptive not in the sense of providing satisfaction for sin, but of liberating the elect

© STAZ 367, 304: ‘De Bernardini Ochiiii dialogis duobus de Trinitate mihi iudicare est difficile, quod res
aliqui ardua ita lubrice et obscure tractatur ut vix videre queas quid sibi velit’.

from it and rendering them perfect. In dialogue 6 – on how sins are forgiven by Christ’s works – Jacobus makes clear his opposition to the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement:

Dici non potest eum pro nobis satisfecisse, praesertim cum eius supplicium atque mors non fuerit per sese idonea satisfactio pro iniuria et probro quo Deum affecerant electi: sed eo tantum fuerit satisfactio quod eam Deus pro sua benignitate satisfactionis loco haberi dignatus est: id quod non vere satisfacere est [my italics].

Dialogues 11-13, meanwhile, contain a trenchant attack by Jacobus on the doctrine of justification by the imputation of Christ’s merits. For Jacobus, it is the office of the Messiah to redeem the elect from both actual and original sin. The failure of the Reformed to recognise that justification involves the radical transformation of the interior life of the believer, rather than merely the non-imputation of sin, is a sign that they, like the papists, have only dead faith. Subsequently Jacobus takes issue with Ochinus over the interpretation of Romans 7:14-25, which Calvin and other Reformed commentators took to refer to the incomplete sanctification of the elect in this life. Jacobus, by contrast (following

54 Bernardini Ochini Senensis Dialogi XXX. In duo libros divisi, quorum primus est de Messia, continetque dialogos xviii. Secundus est, cum de rebus variis, tum potissimum de Trinitate (Basel 1563), pp.88-9: ‘Nullius opera nos ad aeternam vitam amavit [Deus]. Sed cum peccata nostra videret, et nos servare immutabiliter decrevisset, non mutavit aliquum immutabile decretum suum, sed in aeterno et stabili suo in nos amore perseverans, cum videret nos sic impios, caecos, miseror non posse ad summam illam felicitatem perfectionemque cui ipse nos destinaverat, pervenire, statuit mittere Messiam, quo non liberaret a peccatis omnibusque in quibus ob illa eramns miseriis, et perfectos beatosque reddere. Misit igitur cum ut esset in eius conspectu sancti et intemerati, non ut nos eius opera amaret. Ita fiet ut sit Christus cusa [sic] non praecipua, sed instrumentalis, quippe eius opera executorius sit et ipsa praestituras Deus, quicquid in seipso nullius adhibita opera facere irrevocabiliter decrevit’.

55 Ibid., pp.163-4.

56 ‘Non fuisset Christus vindex optimus, si nos tantum a poena liberasset debita peccatis, ac non a culpa. Non veniet Christus ut nos reddet hishionem, foris bonus, intus malos: quin noquidem intus mali esse possimus, quin et foris sinimus, cum nesses sit ut si intus mala est arbor, fructus quoque malus sit. Quin veniet ut nos vere intus forisque lavet, ut mundet, ut peccata a nobis auferat, noaque intimatos, puros, mundos reddat, sicuti passim traditur in sacris literis. […] Non est is bonus medicus, qui mali radicem non tolle: sic et Christus non fuisset bonus medicus spiritualis nisi a nobis origina peccatum abstulisset si modo, ut vos docetis, peccatum est, et aliorum omnium origo’ (ibid., pp.288-9).

57 ‘Ita fit ut verear ne falso Evangelicorum nomine, vereque fide mortua insigniti, caeteroquin peccatorum pleni, ac tales quales olim papani fruisti, et forsae aliquanto deteriores, sic a mortem tendentes, ita dicentes: Hoc sat is est quo nobis peccata nostra non imputentur’ (ibid., p.290).
the younger Augustine), argues that Paul is here describing not the justified person's continuing battle with sin, but the state of the unregenerate prior to grace. At according to Jacobus, the believer with 'living faith' will also possess the Christian virtues, above all charity. Justification is not by imputation, but by participation, through the indwelling of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit. In support of this view Jacobus cites the words of John the Baptist in John 1:29-30:

Ecce, inquit, agnus dei qui tollit peccatum mundi, tollit inquit, non facit ut non imputetur. [...] Dicit Johannes Christum lavisse nos suo sanguine, et alibi eius sanguinem mundare nos ab omni peccato: mundare inquam, non efficiere, ut quamvis adhuc pollutis nobis peccata non imputentur.

Jacobus Judaeus's criticisms are ostensibly those of one hostile not merely to Reformed orthodoxy, but to Christianity in general. The objections he raises to the Messiahship of Jesus in dialogue 1 – for instance, that Jesus failed to realise the Old Testament prophecies of an earthly Messianic kingdom – are the traditional stuff of Jewish anti-Christian polemic. However, there may well be other sources for the critique of Reformed soteriology outlined above, and for the broader attack on orthodox teaching (concerning matters as diverse as the Trinity, marriage and the punishment of heretics) that appears in the second volume of the Dialogi. Bullinger, in a letter to the Chur minister Johannes Fabricius of 20 April 1565, voiced the suspicion that the work had been written 'conspirantibus Laelio [Sozzini] Castellione et reliquis monstris'. I would contend that

58 Ibid., pp.290-6. In his earlier Romans commentary Ochino had suggested that Paul was speaking here 'in hominis non renati personae' (Expositio Epistolae ad Romanos, fol.55). On the treatment of this text by sixteenth-century exegetes, including Ochino, see D. Steinmetz, 'Calvin and the Divided Self of Romans 7', in idem, Calvin in Context (Oxford 1995), pp.110-21.

59 'Itaque et iustus et sanctus est, postquam in eo deus et Christus et spiritus sanctus habitat, idque non imputatione, sed participatione' (Dialogi XXX, I, p.330).

60 Ibid., p.336.

61 Ibid., pp.7-58. It is unclear what (if any) Jewish sources Ochino had at his disposal.

62 StAZ E II 373, 593; Schiess, 2, no.690; Bainton, p.203. Compare ZB Ms. F 15, 445, where Bullinger suggests that others were involved in the genesis of the Dialogi ('diewyl er h. Bernhardin, als zu besorgen sich von anderen, unruwigen, verireten lüthen laßen anstiften').
there are indeed striking similarities between some of the ideas put forward by the participants in the Dialogi and the views of the two thinkers mentioned here by Bullinger.

Castellio’s relationship with Ochino dated back to at least 1545, when he translated the Sienese exile’s commentary on Romans into Latin. In his Contra libellum Calvini, Castellio listed Ochino among those who, like himself, had criticised the execution of Servetus. As is well known, the Savoyard was also responsible for the Latin translation of the Dialogi XXX eventually published by Pietro Perna (whose links with Ochino and the Zurich Locarnesi have already been noted). Apart from this, there is little evidence of direct contacts between the two men after 1555, though Castellio may well have visited Zurich during Ochino’s time there. An undated letter from Ochino to Castellio also survives. This would appear to form part of an exchange concerning the definition of faith, as either an act of the intellect or of the will; certainly, Castellio takes up specific points raised by Ochino in the letter in his unpublished De arte dubitandi.

---

64 Contra libellum Calvini (n.p. 1612), sig.Af.
65 See pp.104-5 above. Simler claims that Castellio also produced the Latin editions of the Laberinti and the Disputa (Bibliotheca, p.97).
66 See the entry in Gesner’s ‘liber amicorum’ for 10 November 1561 (Serrai, p.367).
67 Published in Buisson, 1, p.228-9, n.1; and Bennatth, pp.307-8.
68 De arte dubitandi et confideundi ignorandi et sciendi (Leiden 1981), edited by E. Feist Hirsch, part 2:IV. At times Castellio appears to quote directly from Ochino’s letter:

[Ochino]: Fides est actio intellectus. Intellectus autem nullas habet actiones nisi cogitare: ergo fides est cognitio [...].
[De arte, p.91, II.12-14]: Addunt haec. Intellectus est facultas naturalis idque necessario assentitur aut dissentit aut dubitat, propter non habuisse rem, quam ei obiciuntur. Proinde sine evidentia non assentitur et porro neque credit.
See also ibid., p.93, II.1-3; p.94, II.46-8.
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Many of the arguments deployed by Jacobus Judaeus in the Dialogi XXX recall statements by Castellio in part 2 of De arte dubitandi, which dates from 1563, and in the Dialogi quatuor, written before 1558 and revised in March 1562.\(^{60}\) In dialogue 4, for instance, Jacobus attacks the Reformed for making God the author of sin by their doctrine of double predestination,\(^{70}\) while in dialogue 6 he adopts a universalist stance: all are comprehended within the God’s decree of election, ‘quandoquidem omnibus ea dedit quibus opus est, et quae sunt ipsis ad salutem necessaria’. Election is to be understood as conditional, with each individual free to accept or reject the offer of salvation.\(^{71}\) Castellio, too, repudiates the orthodox Reformed concept of the perseverance of the elect: rather, Christians are to work out their salvation in fear and trembling.\(^{72}\) Jacobus’s violent antipathy to the notion of imputed righteousness has already been noted. Similarly, in the tract ‘An possit homo per spiritum sanctum perfecte obediere lege Dei’, dated 11 February 1562, Castellio argues that it is not merely possible to overcome sin in this life, but that doing so is a precondition for salvation.\(^{73}\) In part 2 of De arte dubitandi, meanwhile, he pours scorn on the Reformed doctrine of extrinsic justification: just as during his earthly mission Christ truly healed the physical ailments of the sick, Castellio contends, so he now truly purges believers of sin, the malady of the soul.\(^{74}\) Reformed orthodoxy has fallen into

---

\(^{60}\) I have used the 1613 Gouda edition of the Dialogi quatuor, which includes material additional to that published in the original Basel edition of 1578. On the dating of this work, see C. Gilly, ‘Die Zensur von Castellios Dialogi quatuor durch die Basler Theologen (1578)’, in M. Erbe et al., Querdenken: Dissens und Toleranz im Wandel der Geschichte (Mannheim 1996), pp.169-92 (169). According to Fausto Sozzini, the Dialogi quatuor were Castellio’s riposte to the predestinarian propositions of the Basel professor of Old Testament, Martin Bohnhaus (Dialogi quatuor, fol.4’

\(^{70}\) Dialogi XXX, 1, p.114.

\(^{71}\) Ibid, p.175.

\(^{72}\) Dialogi quatuor, pp.71-3. Compare De arte, p.163.

\(^{73}\) Dialogi quatuor, p.239.

\(^{74}\) De arte, p.99; see also Dialogi quatuor, pp.232-3: ‘Vides frater in quae monstra, et se, et alios coniciant, qui sic docent, et qualem medicum Christum faciant, qui morbos non sanet, sed quasi emplastro tegat, et
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the trap of confusing justification with Christ's other 'beneficium', the forgiveness of sins. Both Castellio and Jacobus Judaeus cite John the Baptist's parents Elizabeth and Zacharias as scriptural examples of such 'true' righteousness. Their interpretation of Romans 7 is also identical.

Agreement between Castellio and Ochino was by no means total. In the section of De arte dubitandi entitled 'De Christi beneficio', for instance, Castellio takes issue with those who, like Ochino in the Prediche, 'putant [...] non deum homini a Christo fuisse pacatum aut reconciliatum, sed contra hominem, qui deum sibi iratum esse falso putaret ideoque ab eo aversus esset, ad deum fuisse Christi doctrina convertum eique reconciliatum'. Castellio's universalist understanding of election would also seem to be at odds with that of Ochino, who in the Laberinti continues to posit the election to salvation of individuals from eternity, without reference to foreseen good works. Overriding these differences, however, was the two theologians' shared concern about the implications of double predestination for human behaviour and God's justice. In the final sermon of the Laberinti, Ochino argues that the doctrine of the servitude of the will discourages the performance of good works, just as the doctrine of free will can lead to excessive pride in one's own abilities. Elsewhere in the work he insists that the punishment of sinners must be related to actual faults committed: 'Non niego che Dio non potesse punirci senza colpa,

postea sanasse dicat'. Compare the statement by Jacobus Judaeus cited in n.56 above.

75 De arte, pp.100-2, 104.
76 Ibid., pp.120-1; Dialogi XXX, 1, pp.318, 339.
77 S. Castellio, Defensio suarum translationum Bibliorum, et maxime Novi foederis (Basel 1562), pp.192-8. Castellio makes an approving reference to Ochino's understanding of this text on p.197.
78 De arte, p.157.
79 Laberinti, pp.251-3. The potentially destructive consequences of belief in reprobation had been illustrated for Italian evangelicals by the well-publicised case of Francesco Spiera: the drama is replayed in Dialogue 18 of the Dialogi XXX -- on the sin against the Holy Spirit -- where 'Paracletus' attempts to soothe the fears of a certain 'Philautus' who, like Spiera, is convinced that his damnation has been foreordained.
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et così anco determinare che stessimo nel fuoco eterno, senza prevedere in noi peccato alcuno; ma dico bene, che Dio questo non l'ha fatto mai, ne anco lo farà. Similarly, Castellio maintains that the doctrine of reprobation cannot be reconciled with the biblical teaching of a merciful God: to say that God created some for damnation is to make him worse than wolves or tigers, who do not devour their own offspring, as well as to undermine religion and the 'praxis pietatis', encouraging a fatalism that leads to licentious living.

The parallels between Ochino’s later theology and Castellio’s thought are not limited to technical points of doctrine. Ochino shares the Savoyard’s well-known reservations about the secular punishment of heresy, and the use of force by Christians. More broadly, both Castellio and Ochino distinguish between the fundamentals of Christianity, spelled out clearly in scripture and comprehensible to all, and other, non-essential, dogmas; Castellio places questions such as baptism, the Lord’s Supper, justification, predestination and the Trinity in this second category. In the same way ‘Spiritus’, Ochinnus’s interlocutor in dialogues 19 and 20, argues that only those doctrines explicitly taught in scripture and the Apostles’ creed are necessary for salvation, this is

---

80 Ibid., p.119.
81 Dialogi quatuor, pp.59-63.
82 See dialogues 26 and 28. In the first of these, a Christophorus criticises the French Huguenot for taking up arms in defence of the faith; his arguments anticipate Castellio’s Conseil à la France désolée, published some months after the Savoyard had received Ochino’s manuscript of the Dialogi (on the Conseil, see H. Guggisberg, ‘Castellio und der Ausbruch der Religionskriege in Frankreich: Einige Betrachtungen zum Conseil à la France désolée’, ARG 68 (1971), 253-67). Dialogue 28, meanwhile, consists of an exchange between pope Pius IV and cardinal Giovanni Morone who, like Castellio, disputes the application of the Mosaic penalties for blasphemy and idolatry to contemporary heresy (including antitrinitarianism). ‘Morone’ cites some of Castellio’s favourite proof texts, including the parable of the wheat and the tares, and Gamaliel’s counsel in Acts 5:34-9. Ochino’s choice of Morone to front this dialogue is interesting; it may have been linked to the publication, by Vergerio in 1558, of the Inquisition’s ‘Articuli contra Moronum’, which highlighted the cardinal’s opposition in principle to the punishment of heretics (Firpo and Marcatto, Morone, 5, pp.366-79).
83 De arte, pp.57-9.
84 ‘Credo ego Deum non frustra, sed ad hominum utilitatem dedisse mundo thesaurum sacrarum literarum, ut
demonstrated by the fact that the good thief, the Samaritan woman and other New Testament figures were redeemed despite lacking any knowledge of the Trinity. In dialogue 25, Ochino himself makes much the same point:

Si [...] statuit Deus ut humanarum scientiarum (quae ad salutem nostram non pertinent) prima principia sint per sese ita clara, expressa, manifesta, ut nihil egeant aliis antecedentibus, quae clariora sint ipsis, facile est cuivis cogitare eum multo magis statuisse ut Christianae fidei capita, quae prima sunt verae theologiae capita, et homini ad salutem necessaria, sint per sese clara, expressa, manifesta, nullis adhibitis humanis consequentiis.

Ochino’s biblicism links him with other Italian critics of Reformed orthodoxy, not least Lelio Sozzini, whom Bullinger suspected of having inspired the Dialogi XXX along with Castellio. The relationship between Ochino and Sozzini is not particularly well-documented, but Antonio Rotondò has uncovered evidence for contacts dating back to 1547. In a letter to Bullinger of 18 July 1549, Curione noted that Sozzini and Ochino were in regular correspondence, and it seems likely that Lelio accompanied Ochino on his visit to Rhaetia of summer 1554. It was Sozzini, along with Martino Muralto, who conveyed the Zurich council’s offer of the position of minister to the Locarnesi to Ochino in Basel the following year. In addition, Rotondò has gone some way towards establishing that Ochino was familiar with Lelio’s advanced critique of the doctrines of the Trinity and the pre-

---


86 Dialogi XXX, 2, p.292.

87 Sozzini, Opere, p.33.

88 ZB Ms. F 62, 185’.

89 Sozzini, Opere, p.213, n.6.
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existence of Christ.90 Some of the statements of ‘Spiritus’ in dialogue 19 of the Dialogi XXX have close parallels in Lelio’s at that time unpublished commentary on the prologue to John’s Gospel,91 while more generally, Spiritus’s insistence on the invalidity of credal formulations which depart from the letter of scripture recalls Sozzini’s rejection of extrabiblical terminology.92 Ochino’s increasing difficulties with the classic Anselmian doctrine of the atonement may also owe something to Sozzini who, like Jacobus Judaeus in volume 1 of the Dialogi, questioned whether the teaching of salvation by grace alone was compatible with the doctrine of Christ’s merits.93

As we shall see, the Zurich churchmen came to regard the Dialogi as an elaborate subterfuge in which Ochino, under cover of orthodoxy, offered the critics of the Reformed establishment a platform for their views. Some modern scholars have more or less endorsed that reading, while others have found it unconvincing.94 A rather more subtle interpretation of the Dialogi has been proposed by Antonio Rotondò, who notes the similarities between Ochino’s mode of argument here (and, one might add, in the Laberinti) and the stance adopted by Lelio Sozzini, Giorgio Biandrata and other Italian exiles when putting forward matters of doctrine for discussion with the Reformed

---

90 A. Rotondò, ‘Calvino e gli antitrinitari italiani’, RSI 80 (1968), 759-84 (766); ‘Sulla diffusione clandestina delle dottrine di Lelio Sozzini 1560-1568 (Risposta a Jerome Friedman)’, in idem, Studi e ricerche di storia eretica italiana del Cinquecento 1 (Turin 1974), pp.87-116 (98-100); and especially Sozzini, Opere, p.344, n.82.

91 Compare Spiritus’s comments on John 1:3, ‘through him all things came to be’, in Dialogi XXX, 2, pp.75-6, with Sozzini, Opere, p.112.

92 See chapter 1:III above.
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leadership. This ‘modo accademico’ (Rotondo) was characterised by questioning rather than direct statement; the aim of its proponents was to identify inconsistencies in the current position of the church on a particular issue, rather than to propound a fully worked-out alternative. It was an approach fundamentally at odds with the theology of the Zurich ministers, which stressed clarity and simplicity of exposition, and conformity to the historical position of the church catholic.

The Dialogi XXX represent, in my view, Ochino’s attempt to confront Reformed orthodoxy with the criticisms made of it by Castellio, Sozzini and other radicals. It is unlikely that Ochino identified as yet with all aspects of the radical programme (if one can use such a term with reference to a group of dissenters united only in its opposition to Reformed doctrine and discipline as currently constituted). In dialogue 19, for instance, both Ochino and Spiritus condemn the ‘tritheism’ of Biandrata, Matteo Gribaldi and Valentino Gentile; Ochino also denounces in unequivocal terms Lelio Sozzini’s interpretation of the prologue to John’s Gospel, while Spiritus gradually drops his objections to the pre-existence of the Logos in favour of a more conservative Arianism.

---

53 Sozzini, Opere, p.71.

56 Silvana Seidel Menchi suggests that the method was born out of the medieval scholastic disputation, and that it became established among evangelical sympathisers in Italy as a means of self-defence against the Inquisition. When the Dominican Damiano of Brescia was accused of ‘Lutheranism’ in 1546, for example, he replied that he had put forward heretical texts ‘non assertive neque dogmatizando, sed disputative vel quaestiones proponendo’ (Seidel Menchi, p.250). Seidel Menchi argues that the ‘modo accademico’ evolved from a practical stratagem for the covert communication of heterodoxy into a habitus mentis among the Italian evangelicals (ibid., p.241).

97 Dialogi XXX, 2, pp.46-7.

98 After his death Ochino came to be regarded as a pioneer of antitrinitarianism. This was a judgement made very much in the light of his dismissal by the Zurich authorities, however. Ochino’s published works prior to the Dialogi XXX contain few references to the Trinity, but that does not mean he was a closet antitrinitarian: Reformed theologians in general fought shy of the question until forced to address it by the Servetus affair. Furthermore, Ochino was examined by Calvin shortly after leaving Italy and found to be orthodox so far as the Trinity was concerned (CO 11, no.462). On the other hand, during the early 1560s the anti-Nicene faction among the Polish Reformed claimed to have Ochino’s support for their views (see Stanislas Sarnicki to Christopher Threlius, 24 April 1563 [CO 20, no.3938]). In his introduction to dialogues 19 and 20 Ochino attempts to scotch such rumours: ‘Nonnulli nulla a me data occasione, incipiebant non solum suspectum habere me, verum etiam a me eam non credi dictitare, quae me ves coegit eorum errorem ostendere’ (Dialogi
Ochino’s defence of orthodox soteriology is a good deal less robust, however. At several points in volume 1 of the Dialogi, Ochino actually concedes ground in this area to Jacobus Judaeus – something which did not escape the notice of the Zurich divines. In dialogue 6, for example, he appears to modify his language on the atonement in order to take account of some of the telling points made by his adversary:

Non venit [...] Christus ut eum [Deum] mutaret, sed ut efficeret ut divina decreta reipsa sortirentur eventum, tollenda peccata, quae nos saluti prohibebant, nobisve divinam bonitatem aperiendo, ut Dei amore captus eum offendisse. Venit igitur Iesus ut nos mutaret, quibus id opus erat: non Deum, qui nos ad aeternam vitam amare nunquam intermisit. Quinimo non adeo venit Christus, ut morte sua Deum ad tribuendum nobis misericordiam commoveret: quandoquidem cum sit Deus ipsa clementia, misericordia, charitas, nihil opus erat ut commoveretur. Sed ideo venit ut nos ipsos ad capiendam nostri misericordiam commoveret.99

On occasion Ochino also slips over into open criticism of the Reformed churches, and in particular of the Reformed clergy. In the preface to dialogue 25 he warns magistrates to be on their guard lest a ‘new papacy’ arise in Reformed lands from the ruins of the old,100 while in the dialogue itself Ochino condemns those who, while ostensibly teaching the all-sufficiency of scripture, insist that it still requires explanation and commentary: ‘Hac falsa veri specie introduxerunt in ecclesiam Dei suam falsam doctrinam,

---


XXX, 2, p.6. Rotondo would therefore seem to be right to advise caution about ascribing antitrinitarian views to Ochino prior to his expulsion from Zurich (see ‘Atteggiamenti’, 1006; ‘Sulla diffusione’, 100; Sozzini, Opere, p.152, n.13). At the same time, it is clear that Ochino had taken note of the criticisms directed against Nicene orthodoxy by some of his fellow-exiles. Bitterness at his treatment by the Reformed establishment may then have pushed him into a closer association with the nascent antitrinitarian movement during the final months of his life: see the letter from Girolamo Zanchi to Bullinger of 7 October 1566, with its reference to Ochino’s ‘Servetianism’ based on information received from the former minister to the Italian conventicle in Pińczów, Giorgio Negri (StAZ E II 356, 814; Schiess, 3, no.1). As is well known, Ochino died at the Moravian home of the antitrinitarian Anabaptist Niccolò Paruta in early 1565 (D. Caccamo, Eretici italiani in Moravia, Polonia, Transilvania (1558-1611) (Florence 1970), p.213).
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perinde ac si ipsorum verba esse debeant summa authoritatis'. Similarly, in the preface to dialogue 26 ('on the way to build up the kingdom of Christ, and to destroy that of Antichrist') Ochino voices the fear that the Reformed churches, like the papacy before them, may succumb to the blandishments of Satan. He accuses some of his colleagues in the Reformed clergy of conspiring to usurp Christ's dominion and urges the remainder to resist their ambitions, 'scientes nos omnes esse homines terrenos, non deos caelestes: nostraque verba, ut nostra sunt, esse non oracula, sed mendacia'. The implication of Ochino's comments is clear: the Reformed have begun to reproduce within their churches the structures of authority which, in Catholicism, have led to the most grotesque distortions of biblical teaching. Elsewhere in the Dialogi XXX, Ochinos's interlocutors redirect charges that were the staple fare of anti-Catholic polemic - the abandonment of scripture for tradition, and the exclusion of the laity from effective participation in the life of the church - against the Reformed themselves. In dialogue 22, for example, Meschinus accuses the Reformed of acting in direct contradiction to the teaching of Paul, who in 1 Corinthians 14 recommends that contentious issues be settled in 'spiritual colloquies' where all members of the church have an opportunity to have their say. Instead religious authority has been concentrated in the hands of a learned, clerical elite, with dire consequences:

Quod minister verum esse iudicat, docetque, id censet omnibus aliis credendum esse tanquam caput fidei. Quod si quis contradicit, neque illa citra ullam conditionem fidem adhibet, is haereticus est. Denique quod noctu somniarunt, id cartis mandant, excudique curant, suaque scripta et verba pro oraculis haberi volunt. Neque est quod eos speres unquam recantaturos, aut sese ecclesiae suae subjecturos. Volunt ut ecclesia, ipsorum, non ipsi ecclesiae arbitrio credant: id quod non est nihil aliud quam se quosdam Papas terrenosque deos esse velle, et in hominum conscientias tyrannidem exercere, ac dominos esse fidei eorum qui sunt in ecclesia, vellicque ut ipsorum arbitratu credant, contra Pauli sententiam.

101 Ibid., p.287.

102 Ibid., p.316.
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Those who dare to question the clergy’s decisions are likely to find themselves the targets of slander, invective or worse.104

These criticisms are reiterated, with specific reference to the Zurich church, in Ochino’s last known work, the Dialogo della prudenza humana, written in Nuremberg in early 1564.105 Here Ochino denounces Bullinger as the ‘pope’ of Zurich, accusing the Antistes (‘poco amico de forestieri et specialmente degl’ italiani’) of engineering his dismissal.106 According to Ochino, his treatment at the hands of his former colleagues belies their claim to represent the true church and identifies them rather with the ‘synagogues of Satan’ which, ‘come quelle che sommo piene di errori, non voglian esser agitate, acio non sien scuperte’.107 Ochino denies that the ‘academic’ method is subversive of true doctrine: ‘la verita per se stessa si sostenta, si difende, resiste, supera et trionfa’.108


105 A copy of this text, dated 1572, was published by J.G. Schelhorn in Ergötzlichkeiten aus der Kirchenhistorie und Literatur, 3 vols (Ulm 1764), 3, pp.2009-35. Philip McNair claims to have identified an autograph manuscript of the Dialogo in British Library Additional Ms. 28568, fols 13r-22v; there is also a Latin translation of the work (in the hand of Samuel, son of Konrad Pellikan) in StAZ E II 367, 333-48. After examining these two contemporary manuscripts I no longer accept that the textual differences between the British Library copy and the version published by Schelhorn are as significant as McNair would have us believe (‘Apology’, 370-2).

106 BL Additional Ms. 28568, fol.20v.

107 Ibid., fol.16v. Ochino’s language here is reminiscent of his earlier anti-papal works. Compare Galati, fol.21v: ‘Si come Maumeth non vuol che la sua dottrina sia disputata, accio non sieno scoperti li suoi inganni; cosi Antichristo non vuol che si predichi la verita dello evangelio accio non sieno scoperti li suoi tradimenti’.

108 BL. Additional Ms.28568, fol.16v. Compare La terza parte delle prediche di M. Bernardino Ochino (n.p n.d.), sig.Cccc, where Ochino argues that even those who are secure in the true faith should seek to ‘chiarirsi et di crescere sempre in lume, certezza et chiarezza’. This path presents no dangers ‘perche la verita quanto è
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His opponents wish to silence him because they fear that his criticisms, though expressed ‘destamente’, are likely to ‘turbare la lor pace mondana’. On a doctrinal level, Ochino appears to confirm his rejection of both double predestination and justification by imputation, and to endorse the views articulated by Jacobus Judaeus in the Dialogi XXX.

In hindsight, he even seems ready to accept his opponents’ interpretation of the Dialogi XXX, as a covert attack on orthodox teaching:

E ben vero, che qualcun potrebbe dire, che io non dovevo in modo alcuno favorir le lor false opinioni, ma liberamente alla scuperta dannarle. Ma Dio ha voluto così, acio che ognun veda, che son si superbi, che non possan tollerar di esser ripresi de lor errori: etiam che'l si usi somma desterita, artificio, rispetto et gentilezza si che ciascun considerar, quel che harebbon fatto, se rigidamente alla scuperta, io havessse dannata la lor falsa et heretica dottrina. Non possan anco dannarmi, perche ho impugnate le lor opinioni, imperocché se le son vere, per impugnarle non ho lor nocita ma giovato, et se le son false, dovrebbon ringratiarmi, se amassen la verita, poi che ho scuperti i lor errori. Ma essi in luogo della verita, aman le lor commodita, et in luogo del cercar l'honor d'iddio, cercan la gloria del mondo. Et se le ragioni che io adduco, contra le lor opinioni, son potenti, et le risposte invalide, questo non e per mio defetto, imperocché le ragioni sono insolubili, ma tutto e per lor colpa poiche vogliam che li errori sien defesi per verita.

Ochino now claims that his expulsion from Zurich is a work of God, which has allowed

\[\textit{piu discussa, tanto piu resplende} \] [my italics].

\[109\] BL Additional Ms. 28568, fol.20'.

\[110\] He envisages his opponents deliberating as follows: ‘[Ochino] dice anco che Dio non ha determinato di dannar i reprovati, senz'a preveder i lor errori: etiam che'l si usi somma desterita, etiam quando fa delle opere buone: et mostra cio con ragioni si efficaci, che noi per aiutarci non haviam altro rimedio, se non dir mal di lui. Dice, che noi faciamo li huomini peggio che bestie, etiam quando fa delle opere buone; et mostra cio con ragioni si efficaci, che noi per aiutarci non haviam altro rimedio, se non dir mal di lui. Dice, che noi faciamo li huomini peggio che bestie, perche dove le bestie per non haver liberta non peccano, noi voliamo, che g'huomini sien senza liberta, et con tutto questo pecchio. Mostra et con ragioni potentiissime, che noi faciamo Dio autor di tutti peccati che si son fatti, si fanno et faranno, se ben ci vergogniamo di dir apertamente si enorme bestemmia. Non vuol consentir alla nostra santissima chiesa, la qual si professone di creder che li huomini pechino senza lor colpa. Dice, che'l dir, si come diciam noi, che Christo sia venuto, morto in croc e, et risuscitato, non per farci in verita giusti, ma lasciandoci nelle nostre ingiustitie, per far che le non ci sieno imputate, ma ci sia imputata la sua giustitia, e un altra horrenda bestemmia. Dice anco esser pessima heresia, e dir quel che diciam, cioe che'l peccato originale accompagni li eletti infin a morte’ (ibid., fol.21').

\[111\] Ibid., fols 16'-17'.
him to make public his disillusionment in a way that would have been impossible had he remained in his post.\textsuperscript{112}

Statements of this sort have led one scholar to describe the \textit{Dialogo della prudenza humana} as an ‘interpretative key’ to Ochino’s Zurich works.\textsuperscript{113} That is perhaps to overstate the case: it is likely that Ochino was, to some extent, rationalising his earlier conduct in the light of his present situation, as he had done following his apostasy from Catholicism.\textsuperscript{114} That said, Ochino’s remarks in his final work would appear to rule out any interpretation of the \textit{Dialogi XXX} as merely a well-intentioned, if at times poorly-executed, defence of Reformed orthodoxy. Rather, the work suggests a theologian ill at ease with many aspects of orthodox teaching and with what he perceived to be the autocratic style of the Reformed leadership. At the same time, Ochino remained a member of the Zurich clerical establishment, with both the privileges and the responsibilities that that status carried with it. The ambiguity of his position – as both official defender and private critic of Reformed orthodoxy – is reflected in the structure and content of the \textit{Dialogi XXX}. It was the Zurich authorities’ response to the work that determined which of those roles he would ultimately adopt.

\textbf{III. THE WIDER CONTEXT OF ‘HERESY’ IN ZURICH’S ITALIAN COMMUNITY}

Ochino’s case acquired special importance in the eyes of Bullinger and his colleagues because it was seen not in isolation, but against the backdrop of growing unease about the spread of heterodox ideas in Zurich’s Italian-speaking community as a whole. The presence

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{112} Ibid., fols 21*-22*.
\item \textsuperscript{113} B. Nicolini, \textit{Il pensiero di Bernardino Ochino}, in \textit{Atti della Reale Accademia Pontaniana di scienze morale e politiche} 95 (1938), 171-268 (207). Contrast Hassinger, pp. 100, 109.
\item \textsuperscript{114} See his \textit{Responsio ad Mutium Justinopolitanum}, published in Benzath, pp. 289-94, and Ochino, \textit{Dialogi sette}, pp. 130-6. Here Ochino claims that he refrained from preaching openly against the papacy in Italy in order to protect himself and to avoid giving offence to his hearers. In private, however, ‘esplicai el vero a molti’ (\textit{Dialogi sette}, p. 132).
\end{itemize}
of Lelio Sozzini in Zurich gave rise to fears that the Locarnesi – whom Bullinger had defended so vigorously from the charge of Anabaptism – might be exposed to views at variance with Reformed orthodoxy, especially antitrinitarianism. Such fears may explain the timing of Giulio da Milano’s denunciation of Sozzini to Bullinger in spring 1555: certainly, in his letter to the *Antistes* of 4 November that year Giulio urged Bullinger to take steps to protect Zurich’s newly established Italian church from Lello’s harmful influence.115

Less than three months earlier, the elders of the Italian church of Geneva had written to their Locarnese counterparts to enjoin them to follow the example of the other churches ‘de la natione’ in repelling heresy; the Genevans suggested that the two congregations form ‘una salda confederatione e collegamento, per opporci unitamente a la forza d’un tale e tanto nemico, che come ruggente leone va continuamente à torno, cercando di devorare il gregge di Cristo, e spogliarlo del vero e sommo bene, e de la celeste eterna heredita’.116

Replying on 1 September 1555, the Locarnese elders expressed the pious hope that membership of the Zurich church would protect them from exposure to evil and scandalous doctrines, adding that if problems should arise ‘confidentemente haremo refugio a voi come a maggiori et sinceri fratelli et membra d’un istesso corpo’.117 However, of the Italian exiles who were attracted to Zurich over the coming years, a significant number are known to have held views at variance with Zwinglian orthodoxy. Some of the new arrivals were closely linked to Lelio Sozzini. They included his brother Camillo, who was obliged to leave Zurich in the aftermath of Ochino’s expulsion,118 and his nephew Fausto, who may have visited the city in 1558 and again following Lelio’s death in May 1562.119 Ochino was

---

115 Schiess, 1, no.296.
116 FA Orelli 8.7, no.19.
117 Ibid., no.20.
118 See section IV below.
probably familiar with Fausto's *Expositio primae partis pri"imis capitis Ioannis*,120 and may in turn have influenced the latter's understanding of the atonement.121 Another exile with close links to the Sozzini family was the Sienese merchant Dario Scala. His presence in Zurich is attested as early as September 1555, when he stood godfather to the son of Junghans Ziegler.122 Scala's heterodoxy is beyond dispute: around 1560 he made an antitrinitarian confession of faith before the church of Chiavenna which, according to Rotondo, bears the clear imprint of Lelio Sozzini's ideas.123 Word of his radical leanings had reached even Bullinger, who in a letter to Johannes Fabricius of 27 September 1560 asked his Rhaetian colleague to confirm whether (as was rumoured) Scala had been expelled from Chiavenna the previous year as a follower of Servetus.124 Fabricius's reply suggests a further intriguing connection: the Chur minister denied any knowledge of Scala's antitrinitarianism, but noted that a certain Ludovicus, long resident in Zurich, was

120 Sozzini, *Opere*, p.344, n.82.

121 See Fausto's letter to Martin Vadovita of 14 June 1598: 'Certe in dialogis illis [the *Dialogi XXVI*], quorum non panta exempla iam diu in ipsa Polonia mihi viderer contigit, est sententia ista aperta expressa et inculcata: quae breviter est, Christum quidem sanguine suo delevisse atque expiasse peccata nostrar, sed alia tamen ratione, quam ea quae vulgo recepta est, ut scilicet divinae iustitiae sanguinis sui fusione id persolvent; quod ei propter nostra peccata debebamus, seu pro nobis peccatisque nostris satisfecerit; quippe cum nec id ullo modo opus esset, nec nostrorum peccatorum poenas Deus a quoquam repetere, seu (ut sic loquar) debita cum ipso nostra exigere voluerit, sed ea tamen liberaliter remittere ac condonare, quomodum universae Sacrae Literae a"pertissime testantur' (Fausti Socini Senensis opera omnia in Duos Tomos distincta (Amsterdam 1656), 1, p.475). Compare Fausto's comments on the atonement in *De Jesu Christi servatore* (1578) with the analysis of Ochino's views in sections I and II above: "Tantum abesse ut in reconciliatione hanc peragendam Christus nobis Deum placaverit; ut potius sum iam particularum ostenderit, et ab eo iam placato ad nos, qui a"dhuc illius mimici cramus, sibi reconciliandos missus fuerit" (*Opere*, 1, p.137).


123 Sozzini, *Opere*, pp.364-70 (with the text of Scala's confession). See the analysis of the confession in 'Sulla diffusione', 95-8. Scala was the bearer of letters from Lelio Sozzini in Tübingen to Bullinger on 10 and 17 July 1558 (Sozzini, *Opere*, nos 44 and 45).

124 StAZ E II 373, 203 (Schiess, 2, no.276).
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an ardent Servetian. The Ludovicus mentioned was probably one of the two Italians of that name listed in the 1558 survey of Zurich’s foreign population, perhaps the notorious radical Ludovico Fieri of Bologna, who is known to have had ties with the Sozzini family and was censured by the Rhaetian synod in June 1561 for criticizing the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Fieri certainly visited Zurich in March 1562, in an apparently successful attempt to convince Bullinger of his return to orthodoxy. Any such change of heart proved short-lived: during the remainder of the 1560s the Bolognese exile was active promoting the spread of antitrinitarianism in Moravia and Transylvania.

Among the Italian visitors to Zurich during the late 1550s and early 1560s were several other figures of dubious orthodoxy. They included Filippo Valentini, who later fell foul of the church of Chiavenna, and Isabella Bresegna, to whom Ochino dedicated his Disputa della Cena in 1561. Although described by Benedetto Nicolini as a ‘Calvinist’, prior to her exile Bresegna had been linked with the radical Valdesian Juan de Villafranca, and with the antitrinitarian Anabaptists Girolamo Busale and Giovanni Laureto.

The same ambiguity surrounds the Roman exile Francesco Betti, who was

125 Fabricius to Bullinger, 30 September 1560 (StAZ E II 376, 22; Schiess, 2, no.277).

126 Fieri was among the witnesses to the division of Mariano Sozzini’s estate in Siena on 19 December 1556 (Zucchini, Celso, pp.11, 20). On his difficulties with the Reformed church of Graubünden, see F. Trechsel, Die Protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socin, 2 vols (Heidelberg 1939/44), 2, p.429; and Cantimori, Eretici, pp.282-3.

127 StAZ E II 375, 707; StAZ E II 378, 1767 (Schiess, 2, nos 422 and 430).


129 Serrai, p.366. In September 1561 the papal nuncio in Switzerland, Giovanni Antonio Volpe, noted that Valentini had been staying with Muratto in Zurich for the past eight months (Karl Fry (ed.), Giovanni Antonio Volpe Nuntius in der Schweiz: Dokumente. Band 1: Die erste Nuntiatur 1560-1565 (Florence 1935), p.145 [no.286]). On Valentini’s troubled relations with the church of Chiavenna, see Scipione Lentolo’s Commentarii conventus synodalis convocati mensce Iulii 1571 [sic] in oppido Chiavenne de excommunicatione Hieronymi Turriani, Plurientis ministri, Nicolai Camulli et Camilli Sozzini (Stadtbibliothek Bern A.93, 7), fol.25°.

periodically resident in Zurich during the late 1550s and early 1560s.\textsuperscript{131} Betti’s published works are impeccably orthodox in tone, as even Cantimori acknowledges.\textsuperscript{132} In his \textit{Lettera al marchese di Pescara}, written in defence of his recent apostasy from Catholicism, Betti praises the discipline of the Zurich church and presents an entirely conventional account of justification by faith and the atonement.\textsuperscript{133} Recently, however, it has been shown that he had strong ties with the Sozzini family: Betti took charge of Lelio Sozzini’s papers following his nephew Fausto’s return to Italy towards the end of 1563, and was later in correspondence with both Fausto and Camillo Sozzini.\textsuperscript{134} During the 1570s he worked as a corrector for Perna in Basel, assisting with the publication of Castellio’s \textit{Dialogi quatuor}.\textsuperscript{135}

Betti was accompanied to Zurich in July 1557 by the Tridentine exile Giacomo Aconcio. Like Betti’s \textit{Lettera}, Aconcio’s \textit{Somma brevissima della dottrina christiana} of 1558 diverges little from Reformed orthodoxy. Aconcio endorses the doctrine of imputed justification, for instance, repudiating any suggestion of perfectionism: ‘Cosa certa è, che quella rigeneratione che prediccan i papisti, nella quale l’huomo ricuperi tante forze che possa perfettamente adempi la legge d’Iddio et meritar la vita etema, non si trovò mai in huom del mondo’.\textsuperscript{136} After moving to England in 1559, however, he defended the dissident

\textsuperscript{131} Betti appears in the April 1558 survey of foreigners in Zurich as Ochino’s house-guest (see Chapter 2:IV above). He seems to have left Zurich later that year, returning some time in 1563 (\textit{DBI} 9, 717-8).

\textsuperscript{132} Cantimori, \textit{Eretici}, pp.287-91.

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Lettera di Francesco Betti Romano, all’Illustrissimo et Eccellentissimo S. Marchese di Pescara suo padrone, ne la quale da conte à sua Eccellenza de la cagione perche licentiato si sia dal suo servigio} (n.p. 1557), p.31.

\textsuperscript{134} See the letter from Betti to Camillo Sozzini of 30 June 1570 (V. Marchetti and G. Zucchini (eds), \textit{Aggiunte all’Epistolario di Fausto Sozzini 1561-1568} (Warsaw 1982), pp.150-2).


\textsuperscript{136} Aconcio, \textit{De methodo}, p.244. Compare his comments on Romans 7, pp.227-8, 245-6.
Dutch minister Adrian van Haemstede for pursuing a policy of conciliation with Mennonite Anabaptists, a stance which led to Aconcio’s excommunication by the London French church. The exile reflected on those experiences in his celebrated *Stratagematum Satanae*, published in Basel by Perna in 1564. There (like Ochino) he criticises the Reformed leadership for its obsession with doctrinal minutiae, which he identifies as the root cause of the divisions within Protestantism, and proposes that church members be required to assent only to those articles which scripture *clearly* teaches are necessary for salvation; he also argues for strict fidelity to the word of scripture as the only safeguard against error and a return to the corruptions of the papacy, rebuking Protestant writers for their reliance on the Fathers and other non-biblical authorities. Again like Ochino, Aconcio condemns the Reformed clerical establishment for its high-handedness, intolerance and pride, and proposes that its will to dominate be offset by transferring control over doctrine, hitherto in the hands of the clergy, to the Christian community as a whole.

It is usually assumed that the radical theological opinions of men like Lelio Sozzini, and even the more moderate criticisms of Ochino or Aconcio, remained confined to a limited circle, with the bulk of Zurich’s Italian-speaking community – the Locarnesi – unaffected. That would accord with what is known of the proselytising methods of Sozzini and other Italian radicals, who were accustomed to concealing their adherence to advanced

---

137 Hassinger, pp.12-14.

138 Aconcio identifies these as: 1. the oneness of God, and the distinction between Christ and the Father; 2. the last judgement; 3. the salvific mission of Christ; 4. salvation by faith in Christ; 5. the denial of salvation by another mediator or by good works; 6. the oneness of baptism (*Stratagematum Satanae libri VIII* (Florence 1946), edited by G. Radetti, pp.522-6).

139 Ibid., pp.256, 432-4.

140 Ibid., pp.292-300; compare section II above. Contact between Aconcio and Ochino did not end with the former’s departure from Zurich in early 1558: in England, Aconcio supported Ochino’s efforts to recover the income from his former English benefices (see Ochino to Cecil, 25 August 1561 (*Calendar of State Papers, Foreign*, 23 vols (London 1862-1950), 1561/2, no.454; ZL, 1, nos 16, 24 and 33; Hassinger, pp.7-8, 58-9).
doctrinal positions in order to avoid both confrontation with the orthodox authorities and
giving offence to 'weaker brethren':
certainly, after Ochino's dismissal, Taddeo Duno
and Martino Muralto disclaimed any prior knowledge of their pastor's intention to publish
the Dialogi XXX and insisted that his preaching had been along entirely orthodox lines.

On the other hand, all the indications are that Ochino and the exile community to
which he ministered had formed a very close bond. It was to 'his' Locarnesi that Ochino
dedicated the Catechismo in 1561, while in the Dialogo della prudenza humana he claimed
that members of the congregation had rallied around him during the difficult days
following his condemnation. Despite the circumstances of Ochino's departure from
Zurich, the Locarnesi continued to hold him in high esteem: as late as January 1566,
Ochino is referred to as 'Ms. Bernardino di buona memoria' in the congregation's
minutes. In addition, two prominent members of the community, albeit originally
foreigners - Guamerio Castiglione and Antonio Mario Besozzi - have been identified as
likely radical sympathisers. Castiglione, like Betti, had close links with the Sozzini family,
and took charge of Camillo's papers after the latter's flight from Zurich towards the end of
1563. Besozzi, meanwhile, was ordered to leave Zurich in December 1564 following an
investigation into alleged heretical remarks he had made at the fair of Zurzach earlier that
year. In the course of a conversation with a Florentine exile, Michele Pulliano, and a
Genevan, Nicolas Denis (known as Le Fex), Besozzi was said to have denied the existence

---

141 Rotondò, 'Atteggiamenti', 1010-11; Sozzini, Opere, pp.67-8.
142 StAZ B II 125, 65; StAZ B VI 259, fol.122v.
143 BL Additional Ms. 28568, foL18r.
145 Most of the documentation relevant to the case is in StAZ A 350.1; see also StAZ B II 129, 26 (9
September 1564; StAZ B VI 259 (16 December 1564 / 15 January 1565), fols 165v-7r. It is examined in detail
in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.184-97; and Cantimori, Eretici, pp.272-9. According to Socinian
tradition, after Lelio Sozzini's death Besozzi held his papers in safe-keeping until Fausto was able to collect
them (F. Sozzini, Opera, fol.**1v).
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of original sin and to have claimed that it was possible to fulfil the demands of the Mosaic Law; significantly, Pulliano claimed that Besozzi had cited John the Baptist’s father Zacharias as a scriptural example of righteousness before the Law, just as Ochino (in the person of Jacobus Judaeus) and Castellio had done.¹⁴⁶

Of particular interest are a series of statements taken up in the course of Besozzi’s trial from Locarnesi who had been present at the conversation in Zurzach (Lorenzo Pebbia, Evangelista Zanino, Bartolomeo Orelli and Bartolomeo Verzasca). Their testimonies are characterised by a marked reluctance to divulge any evidence that might serve to incriminate Besozzi. According to Pebbia, for example, Besozzi would not concede that Christ died for all men but only for ‘die gloubigen’, in line with orthodox teaching. Similarly, in the accounts of Orelli and Zanino it is the Genevan Le Fex who puts forward the heterodox universalist view, and Besozzi who takes issue with it from an orthodox standpoint.¹⁴⁷ Zanino also puts a positive gloss on Besozzi’s supposed Pelagianism.¹⁴⁸ He, Orelli and Pebbia all deny that Besozzi had ever spoken out in favour of the Dutch Anabaptist David Joris, as was alleged.¹⁴⁹ Verzasca acknowledges that Besozzi might have discussed religion with him in the past, but claims (rather implausibly) not to recall what was said.¹⁵⁰

From these testimonies, it would seem that most Locarnesi were prepared at

¹⁴⁶ Cantimori, Eretici, pp.275-6, n.10.
¹⁴⁷ ‘Als der von Genff gsagt, Christus syge für jedermann gstorben, Anthwurt Marius, Es ist waar, er ist für alle gstorben, aber syn tod nützt allein die, so jnn jm glouben’ (StAZ A 350.1).
¹⁴⁸ ‘Evangelist Zanin von Luggarnuß und allhie soßhaftt seit [sic], das under anderem Marius zu dem von Genff gsagt, Was wir menschen böbes thund, das mochtend wir wol unterlaßen, dann das böß von unns kompt, und heiße Gott uns nüdt bößes thun’ (ibid.).
¹⁴⁹ ‘Hienebent sy all dryg einmitig, uff befragen bin der geordneten herren, gsagt, Das Jeorg Daviden halb, so zu Basel verbrennt worden, inn sollich reden nie gedacht worden. Und jnen nit witer, dann wie eins jedeß sag hievor stadt, hierumb zwüffen syge’ (ibid.).
¹⁵⁰ Cantimori, Eretici, p.276, n.11. Verzasca only agreed to testify in the case ‘also, daß er zich aller verdachtichey crledigt’.
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least to turn a blind eye to the presence of heterodox ideas on the fringes the community. Giorgio Biandrata, who had sought refuge in Zurich following his flight from Geneva in May 1558, only to be rebuffed by Bullinger and Peter Martyr, later claimed that some Locarnesi had objected to the Zurich authorities’ handling of his case.\(^{151}\) Even the staunchly orthodox Vermigli seems to have been prepared to offer dissenters attached to Zurich’s Italian-speaking community a certain amount of leeway; as late as May 1558, he commended Lelio Sozzini to Calvin in glowing terms.\(^{152}\) Prior to 1563, Zurich remained a relatively congenial environment for Italian dissidents, so long as they refrained from publicising their opinions outside the exile community. Membership of the Zurich church was defined by outward conformity, not intellectual assent to its doctrines; as we have seen in the case of Lelio Sozzini, Bullinger was prepared to go to some lengths to ensure that tender consciences were accommodated. It took a public scandal, of the sort that accompanied the publication of the Dialogi XXX, to force him to rethink his approach.

IV. THE ZURICH CHURCH’S VERDICT ON THE DIALOGI XXX

As has been observed, Bullinger found it difficult to accept at first that Ochino could be guilty of the ‘errors’ attributed to him by critics of the Dialogi XXX: that should come as no surprise, given his close relations with the Locarnesi. In the Dialogo della prudenza humana, Ochino claimed that Bullinger had consistently opposed his presence in Zurich, and had sought to block his appointment as the city’s Italian minister; the second

\(^{151}\) When Bullinger and Wolf confronted Ochino regarding these allegations, he informed them that the Locarnese church had received no correspondence from Biandrata and had not, to his knowledge, met to discuss the matter (Bullinger to Radziwill, 30 September 1561 [CO 18, no.3539]).

\(^{152}\) Published in Sozzini, Opere, pp.68-71. In a statement of 1590, the judaizing antitrinitarian Matthias Vehe recalled hearing from Girolamo Zanchi that Lelio Sozzini had once criticised Vermigli’s Dialogus de specie in Christo nature in his presence, asserting that Christ possessed a single, human, nature. In Vehe’s account, Zanchi claimed that Vermigli had overheard their conversation, but had failed to reprimand the Sienese exile for his remarks (‘Matthias Vehe Glirius’ Apology’, published in R. Dan, Matthias Vehe-Glirius: Life and Work of a radical antitrinitarian with his collected writings (Budapest 1982), pp.284-5).
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accusation, in particular, flies in the face of what is known from other sources (see p.77 above and Appendix).\textsuperscript{153} Ochino's relations with his Zurich colleagues are poorly documented, but the few surviving references suggest that he was an esteemed and active member of the pastorate: his \textit{Syncerae et verae doctrinae de Coena Domini defensio} of 1556 carried the full authority of the Zurich church, and his name appears alongside that of Bullinger and Vermigli on the judgement which Zurich issued in the divorce case of Galeazzo Caracciolo three years later.\textsuperscript{154} When the \textit{Defensio} attracted adverse comment from Farel, Viret and Johannes Haller, Bullinger made no effort, publicly at least, to distance himself from the work.\textsuperscript{155} Following Ochino's dismissal, it emerged that Bullinger had received complaints from outside Zurich about statements contained in the \textit{Laberinti}, \textit{Disputa} and \textit{Catechismo}. His reaction to those was, again, restrained: Ochino was simply warned not to publish any further works, either in Zurich or elsewhere, without the approval of the Zurich censor.\textsuperscript{156} In later years the Zurich divines insisted that, prior to the publication of the \textit{Dialogi}, they had been given no cause to suspect that Ochino was anything other than a loyal servant of their church.

In Chapter 1, I highlighted the patient manner in which the Zurichers responded to the problems put to them by the more radical Italian exiles, and related it to their inclusive vision of the church. It was that approach to dealing with dissent which enabled

\textsuperscript{153} BL Additional Ms. 28568, fol.20'.

\textsuperscript{154} The statement, dated 18 May 1559, is published in G. Zanchi, \textit{De divorcio} (Opera, 8, 333).

\textsuperscript{155} For their criticisms of the \textit{Defensio}, see CO 16, nos 2427, 2450, 2468. Around the same time Ochino's \textit{Dialogo del purgatorio} was subject to an investigation by the Zurich council. However, concern had been aroused not by the work's doctrinal content, but by an unauthorised German translation published by Huldrych Zwingli the Younger, which the council feared might be interpreted as defamatory by Swiss Catholics. See Bächttold, \textit{Bullinger}, pp.108-9, for references; also ZB Ms. J 287, fols 193'-5'.

\textsuperscript{156} 'Spongia adversus aspergimes Bernardini Ochini, qua verae causae expunturntur, ob quas ille ab Urbe Tigurina est relegatus', published in Hottinger, 9, pp.475-510 (410) and Schelhorn, 3, pp.2157-2194. A manuscript copy of the 'Spongia' is also to be found in StAZ E II 367, 349-74. All references are to Hottinger's text.
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Bullinger and his colleagues to maintain good relations with Lelio Sozzini and other Zurich Italians with heterodox leanings into the late 1550s and early 1560s. For evidence of those continuing links, one need look no further than the letter of consolation which Konrad Gesner addressed to Lelio’s relatives Dario, Cornelio and Celso Sozzini, who were under investigation by the Inquisition in Tuscany,\(^{157}\) or the ongoing contacts between Aconcio, Betti and Johannes Wolf (who was noted for his command of Italian), following the two exiles’ departure from Zurich.\(^{158}\)

At the same time, there were some signs of a hardening of attitudes, brought on by the spate of doctrinal disputes involving Italian exiles during the mid to late 1550s. Bullinger was disturbed, for instance, by the furore surrounding the unauthorised publication of Curtione’s *De amplitudine beati regni Dei*, although he did not sever relations with the work’s author.\(^{159}\) Hard on the heels of that controversy came Matteo Gribaldi’s flight from Tübingen (following the revelation of his continuing antitrinitarian sympathies), the confrontation between Calvin and dissidents in Geneva’s Italian church, and the public abjuration of the ‘tritheist’ Valentino Gentile.\(^{160}\) Even more disturbing, so far as Bullinger was concerned, were events in eastern Europe, where first Francesco Stancaro, and then Giorgio Biandrata, threatened to split the Polish Reformed church with their criticisms of orthodox Christology and Triadology. In their letters to the Polish Reformed from 1561 (discussed in Chapter 4:II below), both Bullinger and Johannes Wolf stress the

---

\(^{157}\) Published most recently in Zucchi and Marchetti, *Aggiunte*, pp.106-10. Compare the letter of the same date from Bullinger ‘to the faithful suffering persecution in Italy’ in StAZ E II 342, 398-401.

\(^{158}\) Aconcio, *De metodo*, 406-9. The copy of Betti’s *Lettera al marchese di Pescara* in the Zurich Zentralbibliothek contains the following handwritten dedication: ‘A M. Rodolpho Gualthero suo carissimo fratello Giovan Violphio d.’ Wolf was also friendly with Fausto Sozzini (Wotschke, p.432).

\(^{159}\) See Bullinger to Curtione, 16 July 1557 (StAZ E II 342, 349): ‘Odi lites et concoatianes huismodi ex animo’.
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value of explicit confessional statements as weapons in the fight against heresy; like Giulio da Milano earlier, they argue that clarity is the only defence against Satan’s wiles.\(^{161}\) Whereas, in the case of Lelio Sozzini, Bullinger was inclined to overlook ambiguity and equivocation, by the early 1560s he had come to regard it as part of a conscious strategy to insinuate heretical teachings into the church and to neutralise its mechanisms of self-defence.

In this climate it was natural that the orthodoxy of Italians living in Zurich itself should come under increasing scrutiny. We know, for example, that from 1562 at the latest all new residents of the city were required to subscribe to a detailed confession of faith that included articles on the unity and distinction of the three persons of the Godhead, the dual procession of the Holy Spirit, and the eternal generation of the Son.\(^{162}\) Bullinger’s assessment of Lelio Sozzini had also changed radically by the time of the latter’s death in May 1562: in his Totenbuch Bullinger described his former protegé as an Arian and a ‘versipellis horribilis’.\(^{163}\) The choice of language is significant: the ‘academic method’ of dissecting theological problems had been exposed in Bullinger’s eyes as mere trickery, as an attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the Reformed establishment while subverting the faith of others. This new-found insight surely informed his reading of the *Dialogi XXX* when he finally came to examine the text.

For several months following Beza’s denunciation of Ochino, however, Bullinger refrained from initiating proceedings against his elderly colleague. The *Antistes*

---

\(^{161}\) See p.55 above.

\(^{162}\) This confession is first mentioned, as far as I am aware, in a letter of October 1562 from the Polish minister Stanislas Sarnicki to his compatriot Christopher Thetius. Sarnicki notes that it had been adopted (on Bullinger’s recommendation) by the orthodox faction of the Polish Reformed church at a recent meeting of its synod in Cracow (CO 19, 572-80 [no.3875]). For the text of the confession, see the copy in ZB Ms S 130, 14.

\(^{163}\) *Laelius Soccinus Senensis ist gestorben aber nitt verkündt worden / dass er in die Luggarny kylichken gehört, und verergehmt Arianismi. Versipellis Horribilis erat [?]* (Stadtarchiv VIII, C.48 (18 May 1562); cited in Rotondè, ‘*Calvino*’, 767, n.18).
was not yet prepared to bracket Ochino alongside the ‘heretics’ he had become used to dealing with in Poland and Graubünden. He may also have believed that the controversy surrounding the publication of the *Dialogi* would quickly blow over and that any official enquiry by the Zurich church was only likely to prolong the scandal. Beza saw matters very differently: in his view, it was vital that the Zurichers distance themselves from Ochino’s work ‘ut omnes Ecclesiae intelligant ista vobis non probati’.

Any hopes Bullinger might have had of restricting the scope of the controversy were ended by an incident in early November 1563. At the annual fair of Basel a group of Zurich merchants, led by Johannes Wegmann, became involved in a dispute with a nobleman from Röteln in the Margravate of Baden, Gorius Kraft, who pointed to the *Dialogi* as an example of the failure of the Zurich authorities to ensure the teaching of correct doctrine. Because Ochino held an official position within the Zurich church, and could therefore be seen as speaking on its behalf, the city council was duty-bound to treat these allegations with extreme seriousness once they had been brought to its attention.

With Zurich’s good name at stake, there was no question of the issue being handled in the same low-key manner as the case of Lelio Sozzini, a private citizen, eight years earlier. By publishing the *Dialogi XXX* without the knowledge of the Zurich censors, Ochino was also seen to have challenged magisterial control of religion in the city, and to have breached his oath of loyalty to the council and synod.

---

164 Beza to Bullinger, 1 July 1563 (*Correspondance*, 4, p.162 [no.274]).

165 The encounter is described in Meyer, *Locarnergemeinde*, 2, pp.168-70.

166 ‘Spongia’, p.478. The city ministers acted as informants in this regard.

167 The unauthorised publication of religious works was an extremely sensitive issue in Zurich, because of its implications for relations with the Catholic states. The appearance of Gwaltner’s *Endchrist* in 1546, for example, was met with vocal opposition from the *Fünf Orte*, who described the work as a ‘Schändbüchlein’ (Bächold, *Bullinger*, pp.95-103). A censorship committee had been established by the Zurich council in 1523; its powers over printers in the city were progressively extended during the course of the 1550s (ibid., p.108).
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Initially the Zurich council’s concerns related to dialogue 21, ‘on polygamy’. Following the Mühlster affair and the bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse, polygamy had become a question of extreme sensitivity to the Reformed, and indeed to Protestants in general. Any suggestion that Zurich condoned deviation from the Christian standard of monogamous marriage would lend support to the long-standing Catholic charge that the Reformation undermined traditional behavioural norms, with evangelical liberty taken to mean moral, especially sexual, licence. Both Zwingli and Bullinger flatly opposed the plurality of wives, which Luther and Bucer had been prepared to countenance in some circumstances on the basis of Old Testament precedent. In his commentary on Matthew’s Gospel of 1542, for instance, Bullinger denies that there was any ‘general’ dispensation for polygamy under the old covenant, only ‘permissiones’ granted by God to individual figures, like the patriarchs Abraham and Jacob, in exceptional circumstances. In dialogue 21, by contrast, Ochinus’s antagonist Telipolygamus, who has expressed a desire to take a second wife, maintains that polygamy was both sanctioned by Mosaic Law, and permitted by Christ and the apostles; the legitimation of polygamy, Telipolygamus implies, is the logical consequence of the Protestant emphasis on the dignity of the married state. (Many of Telipolygamus’s arguments seem to have been derived from Johannes Lening’s notorious Dialogus Neobuti, written in support of the bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse.) Ochinus, as usual, defends the orthodox position, but fails to dissuade

---

168 Dialogi XXX, 2, pp.186-227.
170 For a detailed analysis of the dialogue, see Taplin, ‘Polygamy Controversy’, chapter 2:II.
171 Dialogi XXX, 2, pp.226-7. In the Dialogo della prudenza humana, Ochino comes close to equating the relaxation of the prohibition on plural marriage with the abolition of obligatory clerical celibacy (BL Additional Ms. 28368, fol.15v).
172 The first to note the similarities in structure and content between the two texts was Johannes Schelhorn.
Telipolyganmus from his resolution. In his final statement he actually undermines the Reformed churches’ absolute prohibition of polygamy by appearing to allow an exception for those men who are convinced that they have been called by God to take a second wife.173

After receiving word of the incident in Basel, the Zurich council ordered Bullinger and his colleagues to examine the dialogue on polygamy. A German translation was produced and presented to a meeting of ministers and professors on 21 November, which condemned the work and referred the matter back to the council.174 The following day Bullinger, Gwalther and Wolf appeared before the magistrate to deliver their judgement on the dialogue. In their address, drafted by Bullinger, the ministers attacked Ochino on three counts: first, for ignoring the previous warning he had received not to publish anything without prior authorisation; secondly, for raising such a contentious issue as polygamy at all; and thirdly, for failing to offer a cogent defence of the Zurich church’s stance on the question.175 They did not call directly for Ochino’s dismissal, but advised that appropriate measures be taken to protect the reputation of Zurich and its church: ‘[Wir] bittend [...] uwer Wyßheit sy wolle dise sachen Christlich und wol beradtschlagen und verhälffen, das diser kylichen kein verwysen darus entstande, sunderen ir guten namen


173 ‘Si id feceris ad quod te Deus impellit, dummodo divinum esse instinctum exploratum habeas, non peccabis. Si quidem in obediendo Deo errari non potest’ (Dialogi XXX, 2, pp.225-6). Various explanations have been offered for Ochino’s interest in the question of polygamy: Bainton, for example, suggests that the dialogue was written in response to the plight of Sigismund II of Poland, who was having difficulty obtaining an annulment of his third marriage (Bainton, pp.133-4). As pastor to the Locarnese community, Ochino would also have been aware of the problem of ‘unbelieving’ spouses faced by many exiles; as has been noted, he was party to the discussions surrounding the case of Galeazzo Caracciolo, which centred on precisely this issue.

174 ‘Spongina’, p.478. The translation referred to may be the extended summary of dialogue 21, in Bullinger’s hand, located in StAZ E II 367, 281-8.

175 StAZ E II 367, 261-4. Published in Bemuth, pp.308-10.
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...behalte, einigkeit sampt gesunder einfalten und eerbarer leer aller zyt erhaltten werde'.

The council’s response was swift and decisive: Ochino was removed from his position and instructed to leave Zurich, while a letter was sent to Basel requesting that the authorities there take steps to recall existing copies and stop further distribution of the Dialogi XXX.

Bullinger had moved a long way from the stance he had adopted when first advised by Beza of the threat to orthodoxy posed by the Dialogi XXX. His change of attitude can be accounted for as follows. First, the increasingly public nature of the controversy over the work made it necessary for Zurich, as the senior Swiss Reformed state, to be seen to dissociate itself from Ochino’s actions. Next, even the suggestion that Ochino had advocated polygamy, forever linked in the Protestant mind with the social and moral disorder of the Münster episode, was always likely to cause Bullinger to view his case in an unfavourable light: in their pronouncements on dialogue 21 both Bullinger and the council stress the work’s potentially destabilising effects on the ‘gemeinen Mann’.

Finally, Bullinger would have been mindful of the controversy’s implications not just for Ochino, but for the position of the Zurich clergy as a whole. Memories of the anticlerical backlash that had followed Zurich’s defeat in the Second Kappel War were still fresh, and

176 Benrath, p.310.

177 STZ B II 123, 57-8: ‘Als mine herren von jren predicanten berichtet, das Gorius Crafft uß der Marggrafschaft Rotteln burger zu Basel, unsren koufflichten Hamms Wegman unnd andere Als sy jnu nechet verschinner Mß zu Basel zum Ochsen gwenen, ugehept, unnd geag, das uß Zürich secten aufgangen die scheimisch unnd klitzersch zigen, unnd namlich Bernhardin Ochin ein slieblich buch ußgen laßen, unnd sy daru als unsser burger angetzeigt, gheffen werden disen buch nachfragen, habind sy funden das er Ochin der Ehe unnd anderer such haß ein buch geschrieben das zu Basel durch Petrum Bemam getruckt, das mer zu Ehgiumuß unser Religion, dann zu uffnung derselben reiche, unnd das sy von slieblich buch nit gewiß. Darum habent min herren darab ein trefflichen beden empfangen unnd deshalb jne Ochin angentz geurloubet unnd uß jr Statt unnd Land verweisen. Unnd darneben hern Burgermeister Müller, J. Andares Schneider Pannerher, J. Hamms Cunrath Ascher, unnd J. Hamms Göldi bevelch jne Ochino des antzeugen. Darneben sölle stieblich angentz gen Basel geschriben, Unnd sy dahj peten werden stiebliche bitter alle by dem Trucker, unnd jren burgern so die kouff, zu jren handen zebringen und demaß zu behalten, das die nit mer uffangind noch under den gemeinen man komind’. Compare STZ B VI 259 (22 November 1563), fols 121r-12. For the letter to Basel, see STZ E I 4.1 (22 November); ZB Ms. F 15, 442r-43r; published in Benrath, pp.310-12. The Dialogi had already been denounced to the Basel council by Andreas von Bodenstein (letter published in Buissou, 2, pp.483-93). After he had been informed of the judgement Ochino asked for, and received, a formal letter of dismissal from the council. His request to be allowed to remain in Zurich over the winter months was turned down, however (STZ E I 4.1 (24 November); Benrath, pp.212-3).
relations between church and state in Zurich remained on a knife-edge throughout Bullinger’s period as Autistes. The clergy, understandably, were perceived as the chief protectors of Zurich’s Italian community, and with the controversy over the Dialogi escalating daily they risked incurring guilt by association. In a letter to Johannes Fabricius of 20 November, Bullinger observed that responsibility for the affair was likely to be laid at the door of himself and his colleagues by the Zurich populace: ‘Nunc multi clamabant; Ir nämend üch immerdar frömber lüthen an / die gäbend üch den ildon’. As a result, in their address to the council two days later Bullinger, Gwalther and Wolf went out of their way to point out that Ochino had acted entirely without the knowledge or assistance of other members of the Zurich pastorate. By endorsing the harsh measures resolved on by the magistracy, Bullinger was able to deflect any further criticism away from the clergy as a whole and to make Ochino the sole focus of investigation.

The decision to expel Ochino from Zurich was made, it would seem, on the basis of an examination of dialogue 21 alone. Only after the initial sentence had been passed were Bullinger and the other senior Zurich churchmen instructed to undertake an examination of the remaining dialogues, which was submitted to the council between 26 and 28 November. Portions of this text were later incorporated into the Zurich church’s

---

178 StAZ E II 373, 387 (Schiess, 2, no.556; Bainton, p.181).
179 ‘Und wie uns sin handlung leyd von seinem wegen, also ist auch sy uns noch vil leyder von der kylchen wegen, die hiemit beleydiget und verergeret. Des wir doch nit vermögend und doran weder gemeinschaft noch gefallen habend und so wir darumb gewässet, und es erweren mögen, hiend wirs erwert’ (Bennuth, p.310). Compare the account in ‘Spongia’, p.479: ‘Testabantur [the three city ministers] apud amplissimum Senatum, ipsis quidem insciis, has a Bernardino esse edita, neque antea a quocunque ipsores lecta, tantum abesse, ut lice in causa ipsum suis inverint conciliis. Provindic omne ne quis ministri lac in re suspiciari velit de ministris qui sancte sentiant, docentique de sancto coniugio’.
180 See StAZ E II 367, 264; ‘Spongia’, p.482; Bullinger to Fabricius, 26 November 1563 (StAZ E II 373, 383; Schiess, 2, no.557; Bainton, p.182); Bullinger to Beza, 28 November 1563 (Correspondance, 4, p.228 [no.297]): ‘Bernardini Ochini Dialogos illos 30 inspeximus, capita quaedam perversarum doctrinarum (tutus liber nil alii est quam impias perversiones) annotatimus, ad Senatum retulimus, qui vehementer ista commotus hominis audacia et impurrutate ipsum officio dejecit, denique urbe et agro ejiciit’. In his reply of 4 December, Beza remarked that he was surprised so much was being made of the dialogue on polygamy when the entire work was riddled with ‘foedibus erroribus’ (ibid., p.231 [no.298]). Never one to shirk a confrontation, however, Beza later undertook a detailed refutation of the arguments for polygamy contained in dialogue 21.
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official account of the affair, the *Spongia adversus aspergines Bernhardini Ochini* of March 1564. Both the completed report, and the preliminary notes of those theologians assigned the task of examining the *Dialogi XXX*, have survived.\(^1\)\(^1\) In the course of this investigation Bullinger and his colleagues came to believe that in the *Dialogi XXX* they were being confronted not with minor, isolated instances of dissent, but with an attack on the very foundations of Reformed doctrine. Thus when Martino Muralto visited Bullinger on 30 November in a final effort to have the sentence against Ochino rescinded he was told that the Italian pastor would be best advised to leave Zurich before the three weeks allotted to him by the council had passed, ‘dann sin sach ye lenger ye böser sich finde’.*\(^2\)\(^\text{1}\)

In their comments on the *Dialogi XXX*, the Zurich divines reiterated their earlier criticisms of Ochino’s mode of argument. The author’s inability or unwillingness to present a clear case in favour of orthodoxy testified, they argued, to his underlying malign intent. Thus in dialogue 27 (‘on how we may know whether a church is truly of Christ and whether or not it is pure and sincere’) they noted Ochino’s failure to offer a satisfactory response to the charges levelled against the Reformed by his adversary Eusebius, concluding from this ‘das menschlich sählen und mercken muss / das er sin unbegrüntt leer under eines andern namen in die kylchen listiklich usspreitet’.*\(^2\)\(^3\) The Zurichers were

\(^{1}\) For the report, see StAZ E II 367, 271-9, published in Bainton, pp.183-8; copy in StAZ E II 445a, 967-74. For the notes, see StAZ E II 367, 298-332. The work appears to have been shared out as follows: dialogues 7, 10, 12, 13, 22, 27 (Bullinger); dialogues 2-6 (Gwaltier); dialogues 7-9 (unidentified); dialogues 18, 26 and 28 (Wolf); dialogues 19-20 (Simler).

\(^{2}\) For the notes, see StAZ E II 367, 298-332. The work appears to have been shared out as follows: dialogues 7, 10, 12, 13, 22, 27 (Bullinger); dialogues 2-6 (Gwaltier); dialogues 7-9 (unidentified); dialogues 18, 26 and 28 (Wolf); dialogues 19-20 (Simler).

\(^{3}\) For the notes, see StAZ E II 367, 298-332. The work appears to have been shared out as follows: dialogues 7, 10, 12, 13, 22, 27 (Bullinger); dialogues 2-6 (Gwaltier); dialogues 7-9 (unidentified); dialogues 18, 26 and 28 (Wolf); dialogues 19-20 (Simler).

Bainton, p.183. The dialogue is a summation of the criticisms of the Reformed churches made throughout the work. Eusebius accuses the mainstream Protestant churches of failing to complete the work of Reformation, and of retaining or reverting to ‘superstitious’ papal practices and doctrines (infant baptism, bowing on entering church and at the name of Jesus, the clerical-lay distinction). At one point he even compares them unfavourably with the Muslims and Jews, who do at least clearly repudiate idolatry.
sceptical of Ochino’s formal defence of monogamy in dialogue 21:

Wenn man [...] das gespräch eigentlich und imm grund besicht / wirt es sich heyter finden
das er der widerparth grund vil trüwlicher / geflassner / anstücktiger / silfaltiger und stercker
herfür stellt und ziert / dann den handel der einigen rächten Christlichen Ee. Er
verantwortet mitt mitt trüwen und geschicklich die gägenwürff / wie es aber die notturff
erforderet. Und da er schon underwylen understatt ettwas zu verantworten / gadt es imm so
law und kalt ab / das man schynbar keinen ernst spiht. Ja mitt sinem antworten gibt er
immerdar anlass der widerparth / ires mutwillens und unreinen geschwätztes vil me herfür
tu bringen und uusszustossen.184

The ‘academic’ rhetoric of the Dialogi could not be reconciled with the
Zurichers’ pastorally orientated approach to theology, exemplified by Bullinger’s own
Summa Christenlicher Religion. There the Autistes expresses his distaste for ‘seltzamen
fragen’, which serve only to sow confusion and to undermine faith. The theologian’s task is
rather to steer his reader away from such matters, back to the simple and enduring truths of
Christ’s teaching.185 In their comments on the Dialogi, Bullinger and his colleagues suggest
that Ochino’s work was likely to have the diametrically opposite effect: ‘Ein ieder
gottsförchtiger mensch kan wol gedancken was somlichs by gloubigen und ungloubigen
unwillens und verwysens bringe’.186 In the later ‘Spongia’, they argue that if Ochino had
wanted to use the medium of the dialogue for the purpose of refuting heresy he ought to
have modelled himself on the orthodox writers of the early church, Athanasius, Jerome and
Theodoret: ‘Nam hos adversariorum vel Haereticorum argumenta fideliter exposuisse, sed
strictim: at longe copiosius et fidelius validiusque illa confutasse. Contraria vero omnia
apparere et reperire in Bernhardini Dialogo’.187 In support of their claim that Ochino’s

184 Ibid., p.187. Simler argues that Ochimus’s function in dialogue 19 is essentially that of a foil for his
interlocutor Spiritus: ‘Verum primum se suspectum facit quod ipse testimonia multa ad probandam trinitatem
adducit’ contra quae Spiritus novas scripturarum explicationes, instantias et argumenta profert, quae Ochimus
neque replicat neque confutat, ita ut videatur ideo tamen nostra argumenta praefeceret contra ea Spiritus ille
virus suum posset effundere’ (StAZ E II 367, 304).

185 Bullinger, Summa, sigs aii‘iii’.

186 Bainton, p.185.

187 ‘Spongia’, p.488. The Zurichers are referring specifically to dialogue 21.
intention in the *Dialogi* was to subvert orthodoxy by covert means, they cite several
passages where Ochino himself is guilty of doctrinal errors otherwise attributed to his
fictional antagonists.\(^{188}\)

Turning to the theological content of the *Dialogi*, the Zurich divines identify
several areas where Ochino departs from official teaching. In dialogue 27 he is accused of
failing to offer a cogent defence of infant baptism, of advocating ‘Geistlichen gesprächen /
da ouch den ungelerten platz gäben wirt zu reden’, and of defending the Anabaptist
doctrine of the community of goods. Dialogues 26 and 28, with their denunciation of the
use of force in the defence of religion against the twin enemies of persecution and heresy,
are also heavily censured.\(^{189}\)

However, the Zurichers reserve their most potent criticisms for Ochino’s
teaching on justification and the atonement, the questions which dominate the first volume
of the *Dialogi* and an area where his difficulties with Reformed orthodoxy were, as we
have seen, most evident.\(^{190}\) Their completed report includes a strong statement of the
doctrines of justification by the imputation of Christ’s merits, ‘die rächt hauptleer der
heiligen Christlichen kylchen’, and of the dual status of the elect in this life, in whom
remains ‘ein sömliche blödikeit und neigung zur stind’.\(^{191}\) Against those teachings, they

---

\(^{188}\) Bullinger notes that in dialogue 27 Ochinos concurs with views expressed by Jacobus Judaeus in dialogue
13 (Jacobus had argued that the love of God above all creatures amounted to full obedience to the Law). See
StAZ E II 367, 313-4, 319, 321; Bainton, pp.184-5; ‘Spongla’, p.484. Compare Gwalther’s negative
assessment of Ochinas views on original sin in *Dialogi XXX*, 1, p.259: ‘Ochinos ipse: Si quis puer ante
adultatem mortus regnum coeleste non adipiscitur, id ideo fit, quia ea natura dignus non est, non quia in eo
insit umnum peccatum’ (StAZ E II 367, 308). Simler claims that both Spiritus and Ochinius describe Christ as
God by participation rather than by nature in dialogue 19 (ibid., 305).

\(^{189}\) Bainton, pp.187-8; StAZ E II 367, 314, 329-30; ‘Spongla’, p.489. Such criticisms touched a raw nerve
with the Zurich divines because of the violent circumstances of Zwingli’s death.

\(^{190}\) In the *Dialogo della prudenza humana* Ochino insisted that his criticisms of Reformed soteriology were
the real reason for his dismissal (BL Additional Ms. 28568, fol.20’). But as has been noted, the preliminary
investigation which prompted the sentence of 22 November was confined to dialogue 21, although
the ministers were aware that unspecified allegations had been made against other parts of the *Dialogi XXX*.

\(^{191}\) Bainton, p.183. Their position is restated in the ‘Spongla’, written in response to the *Dialogo della
prudenza humana* with its savage criticisms of the Reformed understanding of predestination, justification
argue, Ochino posits a ‘Jewish’ doctrine of works righteousness, failing to distinguish adequately between the extrinsic process of justification and its attendant consequence, sanctification; he also plays down unacceptably the significance of Christ’s vicarious sacrifice. In his notes on dialogue 13, for example, Bullinger underlines Jacobus Judaeus’s assertion that the elect are justified ‘non imputatione, sed participatione’.

Gwalther, meanwhile, claims that, by questioning the Anselmian doctrine of the substitutionary atonement, ‘[Ochinus] principuam consolationem tollit, quae est, quod salus nostra non minus Dei iustitia quam misericordia nititur’.

According to Gwalther, the Sienese exile also sets up an artificial contradiction between election by mere grace and the mediatorial office of Christ, effectively reducing the latter to a bit-player in the drama of salvation.

The Ochino affair forced the Zurichers to re-evaluate their attitude towards the Italian exiles. Previously, as we have seen, Bullinger had been less inclined than some other Reformed leaders (notably Calvin and Beza) to assume the worst of those Italians suspected of heresy, and been prepared to accept public conformity as a sufficient demonstration of an individual’s orthodox credentials. After 1563, his attitude seems to have become a good deal less trusting. In a letter to the Nuremberg jurist Christoph Herdesian of September 1571, for instance, Bullinger excepted only Peter Martyr Vermigli from a blanket condemnation of the Italian exiles:

192 StAZ E II 367, 319. Bullinger had already polemicised against the Anabaptists on the question of ‘essential’ righteousness (Widertouffer, fol. 23r-4v); see M. Burrows, "'Christus inter nos vivens": The peculiar genius of Bullinger’s doctrine of sanctification', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 98 (1987), 48-69.

In the Summa Christenlicher Religion he writes: ‘Alle die zu gnaden von Gott in Christo durch den glauben und durch die widergeburt angenommen sind / legend das fleisch nit so gantz und gar dahin / das sy keiner anflichungen mee empfindend oder sich schwærer fälen nit mee zu besorgen habind. Dann die sündig art blbyter in uns / biß in unser grab’ (Summa, fol.116). Compare Commentarii, pp.57, 65-7, 395, 466-7; Decades, fol.174v.

193 The statement is reminiscent of Zwingli in the Fidei exposito (Z 6:5, 64).

194 StAZ E II 367, 308.
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Some years earlier, Bullinger had given vent to his bitterness at Ochino’s ‘betrayal’ (for it was without doubt in those terms that he came to view the publication of the Dialogi XXX) in his preface to Josias Simler’s De aeterno Dei filio domino et servatore nostro Iesu Christi, et de Spiritu sancto, adversus veteres et novos Antitrinitarios, id est Arianos, Trithelitans, Samosatenians, et Pneumatomachos, libri quatuor (Zurich 1568), sigs α',-α2'. In the ‘Spongia’ the Zurichers note, with a combination of mockery and outrage, the contrast between Ochino’s unquestioning public support for the teachings of the Zurich church prior to his expulsion and his subsequent self-portrayal as an aspiring reformer of that church (‘Spongia’, pp.503-5).

193 Bullinger to Beza, 4 December 1563: ‘Quid futurum sit cum Locarnensi ecclesia vehementer dubio. Dissipavit hanc vereor, infelix ille senex’ (Correspondance, 4, p.229 [no.297]).

Judaeus) in the *Dialogi XXX*, Besozzi had cited Zacharias as an example of justification via the law; he also ascribed Besozzi’s alleged antitrinitarianism to the influence of his former pastor. Moreover, Bullinger indicated that he was no longer prepared to assume the good faith of those charged with heresy, or to make any distinction, in practice, between the public and private profession of unorthodox views. The members of the Zurich council could choose to accept Besozzi’s protestations of innocence, but

so wellend wir iennen nit verhalten, daß die Servetaner, Davidianer und andere ird. glichen Säcter, so zu unseren ziten in vilen kichen hin und här grosse verwirung und Argemuss anrichtend, under andern artikel auch den habend und lehrend, daß man den glauben vor mengklichem zu bekennen nit schuldig eye, sonder es möge ein jeder denselbigen nach deren will und meynung richten, under deren Schirm er wonett, giessend aber hiebene ir giffi heimlich ûß, und machend jnen selbs ein anhang [...].

Bullinger had ceased to believe that it was possible to confine or channel heresy in such a way as to prevent it from causing harm to the wider community. Doctrinal error was by its nature contagious, and must be eradicated at source.

In Chapter 2, I argued that Zurich acquired increasing importance as a centre of the Italian exile diaspora during the late 1550s. That can be put down primarily to the establishment there of Italian-language worship in the wake of the decision to receive the Locarnese evangelicals, and the subsequent appointment of the highly respected Ochino as Zurich’s Italian minister. Ochino’s expulsion, and the Zurich council’s refusal to consider installing a successor, made it far less likely that Zurich would continue to attract Italian exiles from elsewhere. Without an obvious focus like the Italian church service, the core

---

199 ‘zu unsern ziten bätt ein Hispanier Michael Servetus disen jrrtümnum ernüweret / und sind jezdug etliche Italianer in Poland / die mit glichem jrrtümnum grosse unruw und iamer anrichtend. H. Bernardin disputiert auch in einem verwornnen 18 Gespräch das Christus wol eye und gempert werde ein Sun Gottes / er eye aber nit Gott / sunder ein creatur / der erstgeboren aller creatures / aber nit von eweikheit. Darin verdünklet und verkeert er alle ZügnuBen im allten mid nüwen testament die da heyeter kundschaft gäbend der eewigen waren Gottheit unsers herren Christi’. In their report on the *Dialogi*, the Zurich theologians drew back from openly accusing Ochino of antitrinitarianism. Privately, Bullinger was less restrained. Writing to Fabricius on 3 December 1563 he remarked, ‘Dialogos duos de Trinitate sunt pestilentissimi et penitus proculcandi’ (SIAZ E II 373, 391; Schiess, 2, no.559; Bainton, p.190).
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Locarnese community itself began to decline in numbers. A survey carried out in the wake of Besozzi’s banishment listed 149 exiles resident in Zurich, divided among twenty-seven households; by 1576 the number had fallen to 104, in twenty-four households, despite a significant rate of natural increase and the arrival of more evangelicals from Locarno (Ambrosio Portio and Francesco Riva). The economic activities of the remaining exiles continued to meet with opposition from the guilds: a mandate of April 1568 restricted their involvement in silk-manufacturing, for instance. More galling still was the continued exclusion of most Locarnese residents of Zurich from citizenship. Although the physician Giovanni Muralto was made a citizen in January 1566 in recognition of his services during an outbreak of the plague, it was twenty-five years before this honour was extended to any of his compatriots (Francesco and Giannmelchiore Orelli, and Giangiacomo and Giorgio Pebbia). Even then the exiles and their descendants did not enjoy the privileges of full citizens, but were excluded from government office.

Ironically, the hostility that it faced from the host population may have helped the community hold together under difficult circumstances. During the years subsequent to Ochino’s expulsion, its institutions seemed in disarray: the common chest was rapidly becoming exhausted, and minutes for the meetings of the elders and congregation were no longer kept after January 1567. However, from the early 1570s there are signs of a revival, with the common chest again being used for the benefit of both poorer Locarnesi.

---

200 STA Z A 350.1; published in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.393-4. This total included twenty-one servants who may or may not have been Locarnesi.

201 Published in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.414-5. The total excludes the family of Giovanni Muralto, which had acquired citizenship by this time.

202 This Samtweerordung is published in Meyer, Locarnergemeinde, 2, pp.411-13; and Schnyder, Quellen, 1, pp.329-31.

203 As late as the 1590s, feeling against the Locarnesi continued to run high in some quarters, if the bitter criticisms of the decision to admit the Pobbia and Orelli to citizenship, contained in ZB Ms. B 251, fos 44-5, are anything to go by.

204 Total assets declined from 835 scudi in 1561 to just over 668 scudi in 1567 (FA Orelli 8.2, fols 90°-11°).
and visiting foreigners; a new weekly collection was even instituted in 1595. Much of the credit for this must go to Taddeo Duno, who appears to have succeeded in rebuilding relations between the community and its erstwhile protectors in the Zurich church. Duno was on excellent terms with both Bullinger and his younger colleague Josias Simler, to whose celebrated *De Helvetiorum republica* he contributed a description of Locarno. His abilities were also held in high regard by a later generation of Zurich churchmen, notably Johann Wilhelm Stucki. Under Duno’s tutelage, the Locarnesi remained a cohesive community, its identity reinforced by family and business ties. By the end of the sixteenth century there were signs that the exiles were becoming more integrated into Zurich society - intermarriage was now common, and the Locarnesi had forged strong links with the Ziegler and Werdmüller families in particular - but only with Duno’s death in 1613 can one begin to speak of the community’s disappearance as a distinct entity.

The consequences of Ochino’s dismissal for those heterodox thinkers who had attached themselves to the Locarnese community were more immediate. The 1560s saw the

---


206 J. Simler, *De Helvetiorum republica* (Paris 1577), fol.189'. When Duno submitted a Latin petition to the Zurich council in October 1567 requesting citizenship and an official salary, Bullinger translated it into German (StAZ B II 378, 1925'–6'; Meyer, *Locarnergemeinde*, 2, pp.324-5). Simler’s life of Bullinger contains a tribute to the dead Antistes from Duno on behalf of the Locarnesi (Narratio, fol.84').

207 With his *De peregrinatione filiorum Israelitarum in Aegypto tractatus chronologicus* (Zurich 1595) Duno published letters from several Zurich professors endorsing his solution to this obscure exegetical problem (*De peregrinatione*, fols 2'–3'). Duno’s will was drawn up and witnessed by the Zurich Antistes Johann Jakob Breitinger (StAZ B VI 325, fol.163').

208 Of Martino Muralto’s three daughters, for instance, two married fellow Locarnesi and one another Italian-speaking immigrant from Chiavenna, Gianantonio Pestalozzi. Ludovico Ronco’s business records contain ample evidence of continuing economic co-operation between the refugees: in 1576, for instance, Ronco set up a trading company with his compatriot Francesco Michele Appiano (*FA Orelli 8.2*, fol.11').

209 Werdmüllers stood as godparents to Locarnese children on at least eleven occasions, and Ziegler on at least fifteen occasions, between 1565 and 1600 (these figures are derived from an examination of the baptismal records of the three Zurich city churches [Stadarchiv Zürich VIII C.2, C.15, C.19]).
departure from Zurich of Francesco Betti (in 1565), Guamerio Castiglione (in 1567), Dario Scala and Camillo Sozzini (both around the time of the Ochino affair). Zurich was no longer perceived as a secure location for their activities, or as sympathetic to their aspirations. Niccolò Camogli, a Genoese exile who received Ochino in Basel in early December 1563 and hoped to find a refuge for him in Graubünden, spoke of Ochino’s oppressors as ‘novi Pharisaei’: similar language had been used of Calvin by Castellio, Matteo Gribaldi and others critical of Servetus’s execution.

The Ochino affair had, in fact, brought home to Bullinger and his colleagues how far some Italian exiles had drifted from the conservative and ‘catholic’ vision of the Reformation that they espoused. Their previous encounters with ‘heresy’ — in Poland and Rhaetia — had been more or less indirect; Ochino, by contrast, was a trusted colleague, a servant and representative of the Zurich church. His disgrace placed a question-mark against the Zurichers’ own orthodoxy: the point could be made (and was) that Zurich had nurtured, and abetted the development of, a notorious heretic. The increasing involvement of the Zurich divines in the anti-heretical campaign being waged by Europe’s Reformed churches during the 1560s was in part an attempt to lay those suspicions to rest.

210 Weisz claims that Castiglione left Zurich as early as 1563 (‘Tessiner’, 392), but he was in fact present at the last documented meeting of the Locarnese heads of household on 1 January 1567 (FA Orelli 8.2, fol.20). Castiglione also received the sum of 6 scudi from the common chest on 1 October that year (ibid., fol.105).

211 The circumstances of Camillo’s departure are described in Cantimori, Eretici, p.306. Cantimori’s source is a letter from Gwaltier to Scipione Lentolo of 9 March 1571, cited in Lentolo’s Commentarii, fols 247-55. The letter describes how, after the Zurichers got wind of Camillo’s antitrinitarianism, they instructed the Locarnese elders ‘ne eum foverent, sed et dimitterent neque invidia ipsis conflaretur’. Camillo then left Zurich before Bullinger and Gwaltier could denounce him to the city authorities.

212 Lentolo, Commentarii, fols 478-84; Bainton, pp.189-90.
The middle decades of the sixteenth century saw the consolidation of Reformed Protestantism as a mature theological system. Bullinger’s *Decades*, the Heidelberg catechism, and the Second Helvetic confession all appeared during this period, and testify to the growing preoccupation of the ‘second generation’ of Reformed churchmen with precise doctrinal definition. This process did not take place in isolation, but in the context of polemical debate with theological opponents. The evolution of Reformed Christology, as is well known, proceeded against the backdrop of the ongoing Eucharistic schism with the Lutherans. In the same way, from the late 1550s confrontation with various Italian radical thinkers over the doctrines of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ forced the Zurich divines to undertake a reconsideration of those questions. In the course of that, Bullinger and his colleagues reiterated their commitment to Nicene orthodoxy, along with their conviction that the Reformation entailed not a radical break with Christian tradition, but the resumption of the church’s natural development, interrupted by the rise of the papacy. It was to the early church creeds, the ecumenical councils and the orthodox Fathers that the Zurichers invariably turned when detailed responses to the radicals’ arguments were
required. Just as previous polemical exchanges with Catholics and Lutherans had helped define where the Reformed churches stood in relation to more conservative opponents, so the conflict with the Italian ‘heretics’ and their followers in eastern Europe set the limits to Zwinglian radicalism. The episode clarified what Bullinger and his colleagues understood by reform: an attack on ‘a limited spectrum of doctrinal and practical abuses with the intention of reaffirming the values of the historical church catholic’. It reaffirmed their sense of solidarity with the Constantinian and post-Constantinian church — Reformed polemicists identified closely with the Fathers in their conflicts with ancient antitrinitarians — and buttressed their claim to catholicity and consequent exemption from the penalties for heretics prescribed by the Theodosian code.

I. THE STANCARIST CONTROVERSY AND THE REFORMED DOCTRINE OF THE MEDIATOR

Events in eastern Europe explain the Zurich church’s growing preoccupation with issues of Christology and Triadology from the late 1550s onwards. During this period the activities of a number of Italian exiles were responsible for the appearance of doctrinal divisions within the nascent Reformed church of Little Poland, culminating in a schism between orthodox Nicenes (henceforth known as the ecclesia maior) and antitrinitarian radicals (who formed the ecclesia minor or Polish Brethren). The Zurich church was at the forefront of efforts to check the spread of heterodox ideas among Polish Protestants and thereby to safeguard the prospects for the Reformation in the kingdom. In the process, Bullinger, Wolf and their colleagues were obliged to make explicit Zurich’s position on the complex doctrinal questions under discussion in a way they had not done previously.

1 R. Muller, Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: Volume I, Prolegomena to Theology (Grand Rapids 1987), p.63.

2 See Chapter 1:II above.
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Under the Jagiellon king Sigismund II Augustus the Reformation began to make a significant impact on the vast Polish-Lithuanian state. In 1553 it achieved its most notable success to date, with the conversion of the powerful Lithuanian magnate Mikolaj Radziwill. Outside the German-speaking areas of Prussia and Great Poland, Reformed Protestantism of the Swiss type predominated. Ties with the Swiss churches and Geneva were strengthened following the return of Jan Laski to the land of his birth in December 1556. Bullinger was quick to take advantage of these encouraging developments. In November 1555 he wrote to Sigismund Augustus and urged him to reform his realm after the example of that archetypal godly magistrate, the Old Testament king Josiah. In subsequent years the Zurich church’s relations with its Polish counterpart were mediated largely through Francesco Lismanini, a Greco-Italian from Corfu and former confessor to Sigismund’s wife Bona Sforza. Although long an advocate of religious reform, Lismanini converted to Protestantism only after a visit to Zurich in autumn 1554, during which he established close links with Bullinger, Wolf and the leaders of Zurich’s Italian community. After his return to Poland in March 1566 Lismanini became an influential figure within the


7 Ibid., p. 37. Lismanini and Ochino were on especially good terms. The Sienese exile dedicated his *Dialogo del Purgatorio* to Lismanini, who in turn arranged for the publication of two of Ochino’s works in Polish (see B. Nicolini, ‘Bernardino Ochino e la Polonia’, in idem, *Ideali e passioni nell’Italia del Cinquecento* (Bologna 1962), pp. 117-26). Lismanini was also in correspondence with Lelio Sozzini and Guarnerio Castiglione (Wotschke, nos 83, 96). In a letter to Johannes Wolf of 16 August 1562, he sent greetings to Martino Muralto and ‘li signori locarnesi’ (ibid., no. 252).
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...kingdom’s emerging Reformed church. His regular letters were the Zurich divines’ principal source of information on the progress of the Reformation in Poland.

Until the very end of the 1550s the Reformed of Little Poland were more or less united over doctrine. Peter Gonesius, an antitrinitarian who had studied under Matteo Gribaldi in Padua, caused a minor stir when he appeared before the synod to deny the full divinity of Christ in 1556, but remained a peripheral figure. The principal concerns of the church’s leadership were to create a viable organisational framework for the rapidly expanding network of Reformed congregations, and to achieve unity with the Bohemian Brethren, who had settled in Great Poland in large numbers. Those priorities were altered drastically by the arrival in Poland of Francesco Stancaro in May 1559. Stancaro was already a familiar figure on the eastern European Protestant scene. Ten years earlier he had been among the participants at the first Polish Reformed synod, composing a statement on doctrine and discipline for the new church, the Canones reformationis ecclesiarum polonicarum. Shortly afterwards Stancaro was invited to take up the chair of Hebrew in Königsberg. It was at this point that he began to put forward his distinctive ideas on the mediatorial office of Christ, in opposition first to Osiander, and then to Andreas Musculus (after moving to Frankfurt in August 1551). Stancaro returned briefly to Little Poland in the late summer of 1553, but his presence there was made impossible by his insistence that the Poles accept his idiosyncratic Christology, already condemned by Melanchthon. Moving on to Hungary, where he spent the next six years, Stancaro continued to court controversy, this time clashing with the Lutheran superintendent Francis Dávid.

---

8 For Gonesius’s condemnation, see M. Sipay, Acta synodalit ecclesiarum Poloniae reformatorum, 3 vols (Warsaw 1966-83), 1, p.47.

9 On Stancaro, see Hein, Italienische Protestanten, pp.66-118, and F. Ruffini, ‘Francesco Stancaro: contributo alla storia della Riforma in Italia’, in idem, I riformatori italiani (Turin 1955), pp.165-406. For his earlier contacts with the Zurichers, see pp.31-2 above.

10 Hein, Italienische Protestanten, pp.70-2. This was the basis for Stancaro’s later claim to have founded the Polish Reformed church, made in the preface to his De Trinitate et Mediatore nostro Iesu Christo (Cracow 1562), sigs Aii*-Bvii*.
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Stancaro’s theology of the mediator, which served as the catalyst for debate about the doctrine of the Trinity among the Polish Reformed, may be briefly summarised.11 Taking his cue from Peter Lombard, the Mantuan exile argued that the mediatorial office of Christ was restricted to his human nature. A mediator, he pointed out, is inferior to the one with whom he intercedes: any attempt to involve Christ’s divinity in the work of mediation therefore entails his subordination to the Father. The orthodox doctrine of co-equality between the persons of the Godhead can only be safeguarded by the rigorous exclusion of the Son’s divine nature from the mediatorial office: failure to do so would incur the charge of Arianism.

But Stancaro’s critics feared that his doctrine of the mediator would lend credence to the charge of Nestorianism commonly levelled against the Reformed by Lutherans. Even more seriously, his assertion that the man Christ mediated not with the Father, but with the Godhead as a whole, appeared to compromise the distinction of persons within the Trinity, leaving God an undifferentiated monad, a ‘Deus trinitas’ alien to scripture. The problem was compounded by the Mantuan’s use (and vigorous defence) of scholastic terminology.

Stancaro’s insistence on making a shibboleth of what many considered an arcane doctrine, and his habit of denouncing opponents in the most extreme terms imaginable, soon brought him into conflict with the hierarchy of the Polish Reformed church. Shortly after his return to the kingdom, Stancaro published a provocative work comparing statements by the Hungarian Lutherans Dávid, Caspar Heltai and Matthias Hebler, as well as Melanchthon, with the teachings of the arch-heretic Arius.12 The Polish Reformed reacted by condemning the book at the synod of Wlodislaw in June 1559; at a subsequent meeting at Pińczów in August Stancaro was convicted of Nestorianism and

11 For a more detailed discussion of Stancaro’s views, see Hein, Italienische Protestanten, pp.89-97.

12 Collatio doctrinae Arii et Philippi Melanchthonis et sequacious (Pińczów 1559).
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excommunicated. The same assembly issued its own confession on the mediator, a copy of which was sent to Zurich with an accompanying letter from Lismanini and a copy of Stancaro’s work. Despite his excommunication, Stancaro continued to hurl anathemas at the leaders of the Polish Reformed from Dubiecko, where he had established a rival church under the protection of the local magnate Stanislas Stadnicki. To combat this, the Reformed superintendent Felix Cruciger solicited the public approval of the Zurichers (and of their colleagues in Geneva, Basel and Strasbourg) for the confession issued by the synod of Pińczów. The united condemnation of Europe’s leading Reformed churches would, it was hoped, bring Stancaro to heel.

The Stancaro affair raised particular difficulties for the Zurich church, in their defence of the Reformed doctrine of the Eucharist against the Lutherans, Zwinglian churchmen had developed a Christology which, while formally consistent with the position laid down by the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, emphasised the distinction of Christ’s two natures within the unity of his person. As a result, they had frequently been obliged to fend off accusations of Nestorianism, most recently from Johannes Brenz. In Stancaro, Bullinger and his colleagues were confronted with the extreme logic of their own anti-ubiquitarian position. That did not prevent them coming out firmly in favour of the Polish Reformed leadership. One of the principal authors of the Zurichers’ response, Peter Martyr Vermigli, had already made his objections to Stancaro’s doctrine of the mediator clear in a letter to the Polish church of 14 February 1556. Replying to one of four questions put to him by Lismanini, Vermigli insisted that the efficacy of Christ’s mission depended

14 Lismanini to the Zurich ministers, 1 September 1559 (Wotschke, no.174). For the Pińczów confession, see ibid., no.172.
15 Cruciger to the Zurich ministers, 17 March 1560 (Wotschke, no.184). Lismanini had already asked the Zurichers to clarify their position in his letter of 1 September 1559.
16 Curiously, Stancaro’s position on the sacraments (especially as regards their relationship to grace) was closer to that of the Lutherans than to that of the Reformed. See his *Opera nuova della Riformazione*, pp.596-9, and p.51, n.160 above.
on the participation of both natures in the work of mediation. If salvation could be accomplished by the human nature alone, he argued, there would have been no reason for the Incarnation to take place, as a man like Moses could have interceded with God on behalf of humanity. Similarly, in their joint missive of 27 May 1560, the Zurichers, while continuing to stress the distinction of natures within the Incarnate Christ, resisted the consequences Stancaro sought to draw from this. Mediation, they argued, has several aspects, some of which (suffering, dying etc.) are proper to the human nature, others of which (the sanctification of believers, for example) can only be attributed to Christ’s divinity. The text repeatedly cited by Stancaro, 1 Timothy 2:5 (‘There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ’) does not exclude Christ’s divine nature from the office of mediator: ‘Dum hominem Paulus appellavit Christum, eundem simul Deum esse non negavit. Neque apposuit TANTUM, particularam exclusivam’. 

But the relatively brief letter of 27 May left many of the questions raised by Stancaro unanswered; in particular, it did not provide a satisfactory explanation of how the involvement of Christ’s divine nature in the process of mediation could be squared with the orthodox doctrine of the co-equality and co-essentiality of the three divine persons. On a practical level, too, the letter failed to silence the Stancarists, who argued that it and the statements received from the other Reformed churches were forgeries. At the synod of Książ in September 1560, Stancaro’s supporters, led by Stanislas Ossolinski, forced the Reformed leadership to submit his case to Calvin, Beza, Bullinger and Vermigli for further consideration. Once again, Lismanini turned to Bullinger for support. By this time, the
Zurichers were fully aware of the seriousness of the challenge that Stancaro posed to the unity and (just as important in the long run) the reputation of the Reformed church in Poland. Stancaro’s tendency to condemn those who disagreed with him as ‘Arians’ and ‘tritheists’ was of particular concern to them: Bullinger and his colleagues understood that any association with Arianism, the archetypal heresy, could deter otherwise sympathetic magistrates from embracing the Reformed cause, as well as providing ammunition for Catholic polemicists.

The Zurichers’ second letter to the Poles — published in March 1561, together with their earlier statement, as the *Epistolae duae ad ecclesias polonicas* — is dominated by that concern. First the charge of tritheism is repudiated:

Nos enim ut sentimus, ita praedicamus, docemus et scribimus, tres esse divinas personas, Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum sanctum, consubstantiales, aequales, et eiusdem essentiae, utque sunt eiusdem naturae, ita etiam unam voluntatem habent, et operationem, quod tamen accipit volumus incoluntur personarum proprietate: non enim Filius generat, ut Pater, neque Pater mittit ut Filius, neque Pater et Spiritus sanctus, instar Filii carnis humanam sumpserunt.

Next the Zurichers set out their Christology, placing themselves firmly within the Chalcedonian mainstream and rejecting the opposing alternatives of Nestorianism and Eutychianism, together with the related Monothelite heresy. Their priority throughout is to demonstrate that the Reformed doctrine of the mediator conforms fully to the historic teaching of the church catholic. To that end, they affirm the authority of the first six ecumenical councils and quote at length from a whole litany of early church writers:

---

22 *Epistolae duae*, p.12.


24 ‘Recipimus item conciliium Nicenum, Constantinopolitanum, Ephesinum prius, et Chalcedonense, nec non quintam et sextam Synodum, quatenus de beatissimi Trinitate, incarnatione Filii dei, ac redemptione humani
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Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Cyril, John Damascene and Augustine.26

Elsewhere in the letter, the Zurichers take issue with Stancaro’s central premise: that the doctrine of consubstantiality depends on restricting the office of mediator to Christ’s human nature. The assumption of this function by the Logos, they argue, is an example of the diversitas proprietarum which exists between the persons of the Trinity within the divine economy and is most clearly manifested in the Incarnation (which, of course, pertained to the Son alone). ‘Non […] illa perpetuo separantur ab eadem essentia’, the Zurichers insist, ‘quaer variis actionibus ornantur’.27 Like Vermigli in his earlier letter to the Poles, they also draw attention to the negative soteriological implications of Stancaro’s views. According to the Zurich divines, Christ’s created human nature – for all its perfection – was incapable of bringing about a reconciliation between sinful humankind and God; the efficacy of the atonement depends on the participation of the Son’s divinity in the work of mediation.28 Stancaro, the Zurichers imply, is depriving the Incarnation of its rationale and thus opening the way to those who would deny Christ’s divinity altogether.

The publication of the Epistolae duae pleased Stancaro’s Polish adversaries, but

generis per ipsum parta decreverunt, quod nobis compertum sit, nihil ibi vel definitum vel constitutum, quod a scripturis divinitus revelatis non doceatur’ (ibid., pp.15-16).

26 Most of the authorities cited in fact argue for the full divinity and humanity of Christ (which was not in dispute) rather than for the involvement of Christ’s divine nature in the office of mediator. Stancaro noted this in his reply to the work: ‘Praemissae falsae sunt, quia illae Sacrorum Patrum authoritates, quas pro se allegunt, excludunt naturam Divinam ab officio Mediatoris, sed non a persona Mediatoris. Falsa erga est conclusion, quod Christus sit Mediator secundum Divinam naturam’ (De Trinitate et Mediatore, sig.Kiii). The Zurichers themselves seem to have been aware that they were on shaky patristic ground (see their rather unconvincing attempt to explain away those passages in the Fathers which appeared to support Stancaro’s position in Epistolae duae, pp.46-7).

27 Epistolae duae, p.29.
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it did not put an end to the controversy over the mediator. The following year Stancaro issued his *De Trinitate et Mediatore Domino nostro Jesu Christi*, which included a typically forthright attack on the Zurichers. The Zurich church’s public support for his ‘Arian’ and ‘Eutychian’ opponents, Stancaro argued, belied its claims to catholicity. As if to underline this, he repeatedly accused the Zurichers of defending positions anathematised by the third council of Constantinople (notably the characterisation of the mediatorial office as ‘theandric’) and of compromising the unity of the Godhead by their teaching.30 He turned the charge of Nestorianism back on his opponents, maintaining that, in effect, they taught two Sons, ‘unum Filium nudum cum Patre et Spiritu sancto, alterum dissidentium seu offensum, et alium carne indutum Mediatorem, et conciliatorem non offensum’.31 Stancaro also accused the Reformed of inconsistency, arguing that until recently they had expressed themselves in full agreement with his doctrine of the mediator. In support of this claim he cited Christological statements contained in earlier published works by Bullinger and Vermigli, among others.32

By the time the Zurichers received a copy of this work (late 1562), the Stancarist controversy was no longer the burning issue it had once been. However, the gravity of the allegations contained in *De Trinitate et Mediatore* was sufficient to demand a public response from Bullinger and his colleagues.33 The task was undertaken by Josias Simler, who had succeeded to Vermigli’s chair of Old Testament following the latter’s death in November 1562. Simler’s *Responsio ad Franciscum Stancarum Mantuanum* (published in

---

30 *De Trinitate et Mediatore*, sigs IIIii-iii.

31 ‘Faciunt [...] unum Deum incarnatum, orantem, supplicantem, et ad pedes patris alterius Dei prostratum intercedentem, gementem, lachrimantium’ (*ibid.*, sigs Aiiii-iiii).

32 *ibid.*, sigs Dviiiii-iiii; also IIIii.

33 See *ibid.*, sigs Aiiii: ‘Tigurini et Genevensiae, Arriana, Eutychianam, Apollinaristanum, Timotheianum, Accephalorum, Theodosianorum, Galainorum et Macarianorum, haereses, pro fide catholica ad vos miserunt, ut demonstrativa in hoc libro videbitis et manibus vestris contractibus’.
March 1563 is divided into four sections, corresponding to those parts of De Trinitate et Mediatore that were directed against the Zurichers. In the first of these, he replies to Stancaro’s main charges, in particular his claim that the doctrine of the *diversitas proprietarum* proposed in the Zurichers’ second letter to the Poles compromised the unity of substance within the Godhead. Like Stancaro’s Polish critics, Simler retorts that the Mantuan’s own position is reminiscent of ancient Sabellianism, with its negation of any real distinction between the persons of the Trinity. Simler also objects to the suggestion that the Zurichers constitute two Christs, one the incarnate mediator, the other the God with whom he intercedes. On the contrary, it is the Mantuan who has sought to divide Christ’s person:

Potius dicendum esset, eos facere duos Filios qui naturam divinam prorsus a Mediatione removent, ut sit secundum illos unus Filius homo Mediator, et alius Filius Deus, apud quem fiat mediation: sed nos cum haec aliter mitigari possint, nolimus adversarios imitari et omnia detorquere calumniose.\(^{34}\)

Neither can the Zurichers be accused of Eutychianism, as they carefully preserve the distinction of natures *within* the office of mediator.\(^{35}\)

Elsewhere in the *Responsio ad Stancarum*, Simler defends Bullinger and his late predecessor, Peter Martyr, against the charge of doctrinal innovation; he even cites article 19 of Zwingli’s *Uflegen der schlußreden* in order to demonstrate the consistency of the Zurich church’s position on the question of the mediator.\(^{36}\) The Zurichers’ interpretation of the patristic passages cited in the second of the *Epistolae duae* – which Stancaro claimed had been misapplied to the office, as opposed to the person, of the mediator – is also upheld:

---

\(^{34}\) *Responsio ad maledicem Francisci Stancari Mantuani librum adversus Tigurinae ecclesiae ministros, de Trinitate et Mediatore Domino nostro Iesu Christo, auctore Iosia Simlero Tigurino* (Zurich 1563), fol.14r.

\(^{35}\) Ibid., fola 14”-15”.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., fol.24”*; compare Z 2, 158-62.
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Cum de Mediatoris persona Patres disputant, non tantum docent Mediatorum nostrum esse Deum et hominem, sed ostendunt neminem posse fungi hoc officio nisi sit Deus et homo: quod si humanitas omnia efficit, et nulla hic sunt partes divinae naturae, nescio qua recte hoc ab illis statuatur.\(^{37}\)

However, Simler’s principal objection to Stancaro, like that of the authors of the *Epistolae duae*, is soteriological: he, too, insists that the efficacy of Christ’s mission depends on the participation of Christ’s divine nature in the mediatorial office. What had been implied in the earlier work – namely, that Stancaro’s position makes the Incarnation superfluous – is here made explicit: ‘Quid enim hac coniunctione opus erat, si deitas non aliter per carnem assumptam operatur quam per Mosem et Aaronem, aut quemvis alium sanctum hominem’.\(^{38}\)

In his *Responsio ad Stancarum*, Simler provided the Zurich church with a precise and closely argued statement of its position on the relationship between the two natures of Christ in the context of salvation. For all the turmoil that it created, the Stancarist controversy could in one sense be regarded as beneficial, as it presented the Zurich Reformed with an opportunity to clear themselves of the accusation of Nestorianism.

Whereas in dialogue with the Lutherans they were continually obliged to emphasise the

---

\(^{37}\) Ibid., fol.33v. Simler sought to iron out any apparent discrepancies between the positions of Bullinger and Vermigli on the one hand, and Calvin on the other. In his first reply to Stancaro of June 1560, Calvin had argued that Christ exercised the office of mediator ‘ab initio creationis’ (CO 9, 337-42). That assertion was repeated in his statement of March the following year (CO 9, 349-58). The Zurichers, by contrast, preferred to designate the pre-incarnate Logos as mediator only by anticipation i.e. in the sense that he was predestined to take flesh and die for humanity’s sins (*Epistolae duae*, p.19). In *De Trinitate et Mediatore*, Stancaro cited this as evidence of his opponents’ disunity. In his response, Simler explained the apparent disagreement as simply a difference of emphasis. The Zurichers, he insisted, do not exclude Christ absolutely from the office of mediator prior to the Incarnation. Neither, conversely, does Calvin designate the pre-existent Christ as mediator without qualification, ‘sed dispensationis ordine’ (*Responsio ad Stancarum*, fol.226v). Simler’s argument is not entirely convincing in doctrinal terms, as the Genevans do attribute a ‘cosmological’ as well as a soteriological role to the mediator, but he did at least succeed in establishing a formal equivalence between the positions of the two churches. On Calvin’s doctrine of the mediator, see G. Williams, ‘Strains in the Christology of the Emerging Polish Brethren’, in S. Fiszman (ed.), *The Polish Reformation in its European Context* (Bloomington 1984), pp.61-95; J. Tylenda, ‘Christ the Mediator: Calvin versus Stancaro’, *CTJ* 8 (1973), 5-16; idem, ‘The Controversy on Christ the Mediator: Calvin’s second reply to Stancaro’, *CTJ* 8 (1973), 131-57.

\(^{38}\) Ibid., fol.28v. Here Simler reproduces the argument first set out by Vermigli in his letter to the Poles of February 1556.
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distinction between Christ’s two natures, against Stancaro they were able to make plain their acceptance of the other side of the Chalcedonian formula, the unity of the Saviour’s person. The exchange was also in many ways a conventional one, relating as it did to the correct interpretation of traditional doctrinal formulas: at no point was the continued relevance of such doctrines as the Trinity and the two natures of Christ called into question. If anything, Stancaro may be regarded as more conservative than the Zurichers, because of his reliance on scholastic (Peter Lombard’s) as well as patristic authority.

The controversy did, however, force the Zurichers to give detailed consideration to some technical aspects of doctrine which they had in the past preferred to gloss over: for example, the distinction between Christ considered as incarnate mediator and as God, and the relationship between the persons of the Trinity within the economy of salvation. It deepened their knowledge of patristic Christology, already quite extensive as a result of the ubiquitous controversy, and impressed on them further the importance of catholicity as a defining characteristic of the Reformation. Stancaro, by raising the spectre of Arianism, threatened the future progress of reform in eastern Europe. Unfortunately for the Zurichers, the increasingly heterodox positions adopted by Polish Protestants in reaction to the Mantuan’s views lent credence to his claim that the Reformed doctrine of the mediator was at variance with Nicene orthodoxy. Over the next decade, Zurich’s churchmen were repeatedly obliged to fend off the allegation that their teachings were responsible for the emergence of organised antitrinitarianism.

II. THE ZURICH DIVINES AND THE ITALIAN ANTITRINITARIANS IN POLAND

By the end of 1561, Bullinger and his colleagues no longer regarded Stancaro as the principal threat to the unity and orthodoxy of the Polish Reformed church. That dubious dignity had passed to Giorgio Biandrata, the Piedmontese physician whose criticisms of Calvin’s doctrine of the Trinity had led to the imposition of a rigidly orthodox confession
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of faith on Geneva’s Italian church.\(^{39}\)

Biandrata arrived in Poland in November 1558 and quickly entered into contact with his fellow countryman Lismanini in Pińczów. With the latter’s help, Biandrata was able to allay initial concerns regarding his orthodoxy; he also secured a powerful patron in the palatine of Vilna, Mikolaj Radziwill. When Calvin denounced Biandrata as a follower of Servetus – ‘Stancaro deterior’ – in the revised preface to the second edition of his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles,\(^{40}\) Lismanini, Cruciger and the other leaders of the Polish Reformed, who valued Biandrata’s contribution to the ongoing struggle with Stancaro and his followers, did all in their power to convince the Genevan reformer of his error.\(^{41}\) At the synod of Cracow in December 1561 Biandrata was declared innocent of the charge of Servetianism;\(^{42}\) a confession he had drawn up was approved by the Polish ministers at Pińczów the following April.

A complete reconstruction of Biandrata’s activities during his stay in Poland is beyond the scope of this study; the conflicting statements of contemporaries make it difficult, in any case, to unravel precisely what was happening behind the scenes. It appears, however, that Biandrata took advantage of the turmoil created by the controversy over the mediator to propose a radical reassessment of the received doctrine of the Trinity and, in particular, of the *homoousion*, on the basis of scripture and the Apostles’ creed. Some leading figures within the Polish Reformed church, frustrated by Stancaro’s intransigence and by their own inability to match his formidable mastery of the relevant patristic and scholastic arguments, seized on this as a way of changing the terms of debate

\(^{39}\) For a summary of Biandrata’s career, see the article by A. Rotondo in *DBI* 10, 257-64.

\(^{40}\) *CO* 18, no.3232 (1 August 1560). The work was dedicated to Radziwill.

\(^{41}\) At the synod of Pińczów in late January 1561 those present expressed themselves satisfied of Biandrata’s orthodoxy. In a concession to Calvin, they delayed a final pronouncement on the issue to a subsequent meeting, but a letter was sent to Radziwill affirming their continued confidence in his client. See Sipayño, 2, pp.84-6; and Cruciger to Radziwill, 13 March 1561 (*CO* 18, no.3359).

\(^{42}\) The Polish synod to Calvin, 13 December 1561 (*CO* 19, no.3648).
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and thereby neutralising the troublesome Mantuan. At the synod of December 1561, Biandrata suggested that the Polish church should in future confine itself to the language of scripture when discussing the Trinity; in spring 1562 he succeeded in convincing the Poles to adopt this proposal. It seems as if Biandrata’s call for a return to the plain word of scripture struck a powerful chord with by many Reformed ministers in Poland, where the influence of Erasmian humanism was strong. Stancaro’s penchant for scholastic and non-scriptural formulations had repelled many, Lismanini among them, for whom it smacked of ‘popery’; it was to this constituency that Biandrata was able to address his appeal.

Bullinger, recalling his earlier encounter with Biandrata in July 1558, was quick to express reservations about the welcome that had been afforded the fugitive by the Polish Reformed. In a letter to the reform-minded Catholic bishop, Jacob Uchanski, of 27 May 1560 he warned:

Cavebitis vobis in istis partibus non tantum a Stancaro sed ab omnibus illis, qui cum Ario et Serveto negant divinitatem Christi servatoris. Audio Blandratam quendam medicinam exercentem in istis apud vos partibus inficere Servetano veneno non paucos. Certe si est, qui Genevae fuit, inde discessit, quod Calvinus, pastor eius ecclesiae vigilantissimus, ursit ipsum et ad confitendam sinceram et veram fidem adducere voluit, et hic Tiguri apud nos de iis disputare coepit, quae modis omnibus improbavimus.

Stancaro himself, who until the publication of the Epistolae duae had not given up hope of regaining the Zurichers’ support, skilfully played on those fears. In a letter of 4 December 1560, Stancaro informed the Swiss that his opponents in Poland were misusing their

---


44 Hein notes Laski’s aversion to non-scriptural language and precise doctrinal definition in the negotiations with the Polish Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren over the Eucharist and adds, ‘Das Pochen auf das “satis est” in der Theologie Laskis hat später die antitrinitarischen Umtriebe in Polen ungewollt gefördert’ (ibid., p.60).

45 See p.144 above.

46 Wotschke, p.109 (no.189).
authority in order to propagate a form of tritheism. In fact, prompted by Biandrata, a number of Polish ministers were coming to accept what Stancaro had long been saying were the logical consequences of involving Christ's divine nature in the office of the mediator: the subordination of the Son to the Father and the effective abandonment of the doctrine of consubstantiality. Increasingly the *homoousion* was taken to signify commonality rather than identity of essence.

Bullinger and his colleagues were alarmed by the unexpectedly radical turn that the anti-Stancarist reaction in Poland was taking. Those concerns are evident from the second of the *Epistolae duae*, in which the Zurchers instructed their Polish counterparts to be on their guard against those — meaning Biandrata and his proselytes — who were using the controversy over the mediator to lead the church into heresy:

*Li, ut sunt astuti homines, cum fratibus nostris recte sentientibus facere se assimulant, iactando se ambabus ulnis amplecti Christum quod utranque naturam esse mediatorem, sed ex altera parte cum Stancaro sentiant, inde concluendi Filium esse minorem Patre, quod etsi publice non dicunt, suis tamen consciaturibus, et simplicioribus quos corrumpere student, id perpetuo ingerunt, quasi vicerint.*

Johannes Wolf also voiced reservations about the strategy of the Polish church leadership, in a letter to Lismanini of 5 March 1561. Take care, he warned, ‘ne qui vos haereticos appellant, haereses in vestris opinionibus deprehendant’: Stancaro’s comments had clearly hit home. In his reply, dated 15 May, Lismanini not only defended Biandrata’s orthodoxy, but came close to reproaching the Zurchers for their earlier treatment of his compatriot. Meanwhile, some Polish ministers were growing perturbed by the drift towards heterodoxy. Writing to Bullinger on 28 September 1561, Stanislas Sarnicki, a Reformed

---

47 *CO* 18, no.3288.
48 *Epistolae duae*, pp.51-2.
49 *Wotschke*, p.124 (no.217).
50 Ibid., p.127 (no.221a); ‘Si duole non poco de qualch’uno di vostr, per non haverlo uddito quando passo per Tifuro’.
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pastor in Cracow, expressed doubts about the orthodoxy of a confession of faith Lismanini had submitted to the recent synod of Wlodislaw, in which he detected the influence of the 'tritheist' Valentino Gentile.\(^{31}\) Shortly afterwards, Bullinger cautioned Cruciger and the leaders of the Polish Reformed against allowing themselves to be deceived by those 'qui pietatem quidem simulat, sed impiissimis dogmatibus referri nihil aliud spirant quam verae religionis perniciem'.\(^ {32}\)

In a letter to Lismanini of 29 September, Wolf adopted a rather more conciliatory line. Unlike Calvin, and even Bullinger, he was prepared to accept the possibility that Biandrata might have retracted his earlier heterodox views. However, he also made it clear that Biandrata's rehabilitation was conditional on his accepting the doctrine of consubstantiality, the Athanasian and Nicene creeds, and the writings of the orthodox Fathers on the Trinity.\(^ {33}\) But by this stage many Polish ministers had become convinced that the doctrine of the Trinity had not escaped the corruptions of the papacy and was in need of reform. Lismanini himself seems to have been among them: in a letter to Wolf of 28 December 1561, he admitted that the Stancarist controversy had forced him to reconsider his attitude to the Trinity, and described how he had embarked on an ambitious programme of reading, including works by Erasmus and most of the major Greek and Latin Fathers, in order to help him clarify his views.\(^ {34}\) By the time the Little Polish synod met at Pińczów in August 1562, the belief that some revision of Nicene orthodoxy was called for was widely shared. The confession produced by the assembly endorsed the Nicene creed and repudiated Arianism, but voiced only qualified acceptance of the more elaborate

\(^{31}\) Ibid., no.228. Compare Sipayło, 2, pp.119-23.

\(^{32}\) Bullinger to Cruciger, 30 September 1561 (CO 18, 758 [no.3540]).

\(^{33}\) Wotschke, no.229.

\(^{34}\) Ibid., no.246; the fruits of that reading are apparent in Lismanini's letter to the Polish nobleman Ivan Karniński of 10 September 1561, in which, following Biandrata, he argues for the supremacy of the Father within the Godhead (Lubienicki, pp.177-83).
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Athanasian creed. Some of Biandrata’s supporters were prepared to go further. In a letter to the Zurich church of November 1562, the Polish ministers Paclesius, Krowicki and Zitinius denounced the Athanasian creed as an invention of the ‘scholae papanae’ and as the source for later errors concerning justification, the mediation of Christ and the intercession of saints. In sum, they argued that the Reformed establishment’s fidelity to the received doctrine of the Trinity was inconsistent with the founding principles of the Reformation:

Vana [...] est illa de papatu persuasio, unum hunc articulum integrum de trinitate manisse, cum ex reliqua eius structura facile conici potest, quam firmo nixi sint fundamento, qui tam tetra superstruxerint, quamvis singulari deus bonitate propter electos integram formam, sub faecibus, baptismi reliquerit.  

By this stage a formal schism within the Polish church was imminent. On 14 November a group of doctrinal conservatives, led by Samicki, held a synod in Cracow at which they affirmed their adherence to the conciliar creeds and to a series of Reformed confessional statements on the Trinity. Shortly afterwards Gregory Paul, Biandrata’s closest ally and Samicki’s arch-rival, published his Tabula de Trinitate, in which he rejected the doctrine of consubstantiality as traditionally understood. Although this work does not survive, a subsequent letter from Paul to the Zurichers provides some indication of its contents. Here Paul argues that the persons of the Trinity are distinct beings whose unity consists merely in sharing a single divine nature. The ‘one God’ of scripture is not some incomprehensible ‘Deus essentia’, but the Father, from whose substance the Son is generated. Paul purports to uphold the Nicene creed – its description of the Son as ‘God
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from God' is cited at several points in the letter — but rejects the intrinsic authority of the church Fathers and councils.° The ideas put forward in Paul's letter are substantially the same as those associated with Valentino Gentile, who was present at the August synod of Pińczów. The close ties between Paul and Gentile — who, unlike Biandrata, made no secret of his differences with the Reformed establishment — alarmed even Lismanini, who sought to distance himself from Paul's views and to re-establish his orthodox credentials with the Zurichers.° However, by now the radicals were in the ascendant. Although Biandrata left Poland for Transylvania during the summer of 1563, Paul continued to lead the majority of the Polish Reformed in an antitrinitarian direction. His victory (and the break-up of the Polish church) was sealed in September that year, when another synodal gathering in Pińczów adopted a confession condemning the orthodox doctrine of consubstantiality as Sabellian. The same confession boldly asserted the sole authority of scripture in matters of faith: 'Solius [...] verbi divini ea est apud omnes electos reverentia [...] ut illi nec addere, nec quicquam imminuere fas esse credant'.°

The programme of doctrinal reform devised by Biandrata and his supporters represented a much more fundamental challenge to Reformed orthodoxy than Stancaro's doctrine of the mediator. The tritheists' demand for a return to the simple language of scripture and the Apostles' creed — a persistent refrain, as we have seen, of Italian dissenters from Renato onwards — placed a question-mark against the traditional formulations which enshrined the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity. The onus was now on the Zurich divines to demonstrate that their retention of extra-biblical terminology was consistent with the principle of sola scriptura.


°°° See Lismanini's letters to Wolf of 28 April and 24 May 1563 (Wotschke, nos 277 and 292).
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This was a problem to which Bullinger had given some consideration even prior to the Polish trinitarian controversy. In his *Assertio utriusque in Christo naturae* of 1534, for instance, the *Antistes* explained the introduction of such terms as *homoousios* as an attempt to preserve the true meaning of scripture against the ‘curiositas prophanorum quorumdam hominum’. When challenged by the Catholic polemicist Johannes Cochlaeus as to how the Reformed were able to reconcile their continued faith in the Trinity, as defined by the doctors of the early church, with their belief in the all-sufficiency of the Bible, Bullinger again insisted on the primacy of the sense over the letter of scripture.

The same points are developed at greater length in the Zurich divines’ responses to Biandrata and their other antitrinitarian opponents. In his letter to Lismanini of 29 September 1561, for instance, Wolf argued that Biandrata’s protestations of orthodoxy did not ring true, as in the same breath he rejected the creeds and the Fathers:

Qui de Jesu Christi unigena dei filio nostro domino hoc sentiunt hocque sibi persuasum habent, quod sacrae literae si non iisdem, quibus patres usi, saltem eandem sententiam referentibus verbis tradiderunt, hi ipsi nec Athanasii nec Niceni concilii symbola nec doctorum de sacrosancta trinitate scripta repudiabunt.

Wolf could not resist drawing a parallel between Biandrata’s stance and that of the fourth-century heresiarch Arius. The career of Arius, who had concealed the full extent of his

---

61 CO 20, 350 (no.4125).
62 *Utriusque in Christo naturae tam divinae quam humanae, contra varias haereses, pro confessione Christi catholica, Assertio orthodoxa, per Heinrichum Bullingerum* (Zurich 1534), fols 15'-18'.
63 *Ad Ioannis Cochlei de canonicae scripturae et Catholicae ecclesiae auctoritate libellum, pro solida Scripturae canonicae auctoritate, tam et absoluta eius perfectione, veraque Catholicae ecclesiae dignitate, Heinrichi Bullingeri orthodoxa Responsio* (Zurich 1544), fol.14: ‘Intelligo [...] omnia esse in scripturis comprehensa, ut ex ipsa ece thesauro inexhausto peti quaeque卿que pietatis sunt, comprehensam autem, id est collecta, conclusa, contenta, sic ut possint omnia illa in ipsis et ex ipsis disserata et plana expositione vel significacione posta, ostendi, vel necessaria consequentia deducti’.
64 Wotschke, p.134 (no.229).
65 The tendency to equate Biandrata with Arius was fostered by a theological mindset and an accompanying polemical vocabulary that had the effect of erasing the distinctions between contemporary ‘heresy’ and its ancient prototype. Whether accurate or not, the parallel was constantly in the Zurichers’ minds when they considered developments in Poland.
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heresy in order to be able to disseminate it more effectively, should serve as a warning to
those who were prepared to take Biandrata's protestations of orthodoxy at face value,\(^{66}\) the
history of the early church generally testified to the need for precise statements of doctrine
which the heretics, for all their cunning, would be unable to circumvent.\(^ {67} \)

The defence of non-scriptural language, both as a practical tool for safeguarding
the church against heresy and as a legitimate exegetical device, is a central feature of the
'Responsio ministrorum Tigurinae ecclesiae ad argumenta Antitrinitariorum
Italopolonorum', written in early 1563 at the request of Sarnicki and his orthodox
supporters.\(^ {68}\) Here the Zurichers attack the 'tritheism' and subordinationism of Biandrata,
Gentile and Paul, arguing for the co-essentiality of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and
insisting that, wherever scripture refers to God without qualification, all three persons are to
be understood, rather than the Father alone, as the radicals claim. They also repudiate the
suggestion that the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity actually amounts to a quaternity of
three persons and one essence.\(^ {69}\) The doctrine of consubstantiality, they argue, is no papal

\(^{66}\) Wotschke, pp.133-4: 'Manet alta profecto mente mihi repositum, quod ecclesiasticae historiae de Arri
moribus et ingenio referunt, qui potuero et consueverit pro eo, ac res tempusque ferrent, simulare ac
dissimulare'. See also Wolf to Calvin, 28 September 1561 (CO 18, 749-50 [no.3537]): 'Vereor [...] ne
quid ille vocum ab ecclesia priscarum receperam horror et praetextus alienarum a sacris litteris argutiarum, et quae in
cognoscere hominum alia vident, aliquid non malis magistris tantum, quam in praesentia scire velit. Laudat [Biandrata]
symbolum apostolicum: Athanasiano et Niceno minime esse opus existimavit. Hic suspicor latere anguem in
herba et verum ne quia istas blandia rati [an obvious play on the Latin form 'Biandrata'] se pateretur excipi,
ultra pontum Euxinum vel in Aegyptiam illum Alexandriam venderetur. Neque enim nescio quam calldem et
versatum fuerat ipsum Arrii ingenium quomque facile sit Satanae artes cum dogmate simul omnes posterorum
animis inserere'.

\(^{67}\) See the letter from the Zurich church to Radziwill of early 1565 (Wotschke, p.234 [no.332]): 'Ut in veteri
crassia, cum ariani, macedoniani, nestoriani et reliqua pastorum symbolorum apostolorum verbo profiterentur, re
ipsa autem suis dogmatibus illud violarent, pii doctores necessitate adacti alias etiam confessiones fidei saeae
cediderunt, in nos quoque hoc tempore faciendum existimabantus'.

\(^{68}\) StAZ E II 371, 931-5. The title and marginal notes are in Bullinger's hand. Sarnicki had asked Bullinger for
a statement condemning the radicals in his letter of 23 January 1563 (Wotschke, no.268). Sarnicki's ally
Christopher Thretius brought the 'Responsio' with him when he returned to Poland from Switzerland in June
that year (T. Wotschke, 'Christoph Thretius: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kampfes der reformierten Kirche
genegen den Antitrinitarismus in Polen', Altpreussische Monatsschrift NF 44 (1907), 1-42, 151-210 [21-3]).

\(^{69}\) This charge was central to Valentin Gentile's critique of Reformed triadology. See his Genevan confession
of June 1558, published in Beza's Valentini Gentilis impietatis [...] brevis explicatio (Geneva 1567), pp.3-14,

182
invention, but a faithful exposition of the facts of scripture: namely, that God is one, and that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are each truly divine. The extra-biblical terms Trinity, essence, person and relation are neither sophistic nor pagan in origin, but sanctified by time-honoured usage within the church. Here Bullinger and his colleagues articulate their essentially conservative understanding of the scope and nature of religious reform. Whereas the radicals maintain that whatever is not specifically taught in scripture ought to be repudiated, the Zurichers turn this argument on its head: whatever cannot be shown to contradict scripture is to be retained by the church, even if the Bible does not explicitly prescribe it. The burden of proof is thus shifted from the Reformed establishment to its challengers.

The same conservatism informs Bullinger's unpublished 'Trinitas Dei, et patris filiique in substantia coaequalitas'. In a section of the work entitled 'Confessiones fidei', Bullinger argues that the Apostles' creed alone cannot protect the church against infiltration by heretics, who have learnt to twist its meaning to support their errors. He continues:


---

70 StAZ E II 371, fol.93r: 'Quod se dicant ea tantum reiicienda esse, quae sub Papatu conventa et conficta fuerunt, facilis nobis est responsio: doctrina enim de trinitate personarum, et unitate essentiae divinae non est in Papatu conficta et excogitata, sed est sacris litteris desumpa, quae et unum Deum praedicant et patrem Deum et filium Deum et spiritum sanctum Deum nobis tradunt'.

71 Ibid., fols 131-2: 'Aut [...] ostendat vitium et errorem in his confessionibus et cas confutent, aut si nihil tale ostendere possunt, fateantur se contentiosos et arrogantes esse, qui quae tamen reprehendere et confutare non possunt'.

72 ZB Ms Car XV 20, pp.109-174. It is difficult to date this work with any certainty. However, the terminus a quo is the promulgation of the edict of Parczów (August 1564) expelling foreign heretics from Poland, as Bullinger refers to Valentino Gentile's later activities in Transylvania. The treatise also presumably predates Gentile's execution (September 1566), of which there is no mention. The 'tritheistic' opinions refuted in the Trinitas Dei are those of Gentile and the early Balandra, which makes me inclined to view the work as Bullinger's response to Gentile's reappearance in Switzerland in July 1566.

73 Ibid., p.117.
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In a by-now familiar refrain, the Antistes defends the non-scriptural terms Trinity, person, essence and consubstantial as compatible with the scripture principle, on the grounds that the Word of God contains "quod istis vocibus exprimitur". In focusing so exclusively on the letter (verbum) of scripture, Bullinger implies, the antitrinitarians have lost sight of its import (res). The doctrinal statements of the early church, on the other hand, exemplify the principle articulated in his own Second Helvetic Confession: 'praedicatio verbi Dei est verbum Dei'.

III. 'MALLEUS HAERETICORUM': THE ANTI-HERETICAL WRITINGS OF JOSIAS SIMLER

During the early 1560s, Zurich’s theologians were drawn irresistibly into the complex doctrinal debates raging within the Polish Reformed church. Although deeply averse to the metaphysical speculation that discussion of the Trinity tended to involve, the Zurichers were aware that failure to mount a cogent defence of this core doctrine would seriously undermine their claim to be an authentically ‘catholic’ church. The rapid evolution of eastern European antitrinitarianism under the intellectual leadership of Biandrata and other Italian exiles during the later 1560s and 1570s only emphasised the urgency of this task, the greater part of which was assigned to Bullinger’s talented younger colleague Josias Simler. In his anti-heretical works – *De aeterno Dei filio* (1568), the *Scripta veterum latina de una persona et duabus naturis Christi* (1571), and the *Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae de duabus naturis Christi* (1575) – Simler sought to provide a historically and

---

74 Ibid., p.125.

75 See Wolf to Lismanini, 15 March 1563: ‘Censeo, sacrosanctam hoc de trinitate mysterium potius adorandum quam curiose excutiendum [...]’ (Wotschke, no.270).

76 In the absence of a full-length modern study of Simler’s career, see J.W. Stucki, *Vita clarissimi viri D. Josiae Simleri Tigurini sanctae theologiae in Schola Tigurina Professoris fidelissimi* (Zurich 1577); G. von Wyss, ‘Josias Simler’, *XVII Neujahrsblatt zum Besten des Waisenhauses in Zürich für 1855*, 1-24.
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theologically convincing explanation for the (re)-emergence of antitrinitarianism in recent times, and to draw together the arguments for the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, both patristic and contemporary, in a single comprehensive synthesis.

Throughout his career Simler had extensive contact with Italian religious exiles. While studying in Basel during the late 1540s, he attended Curione’s lectures on rhetoric, and in 1553 he accompanied Vergerio on his journey to Württemberg to take up the post of counsellor to Duke Christoph.\(^7\) In later years he corresponded with Italian exiles of widely differing religious persuasions, among them Scipione Lentolo, Simone Simoni and Girolamo Zanchi. More important still was Simler’s friendship with Peter Martyr Vermigli, his colleague at the Lectorium since 1556 and predecessor as professor of Old Testament.\(^8\)

After Vermigli’s death, Simler wrote a popular biography of the Florentine, the Oratio de vita et obitu Petri Martyris Vermilii (1563), and co-ordinated plans for an edition of his complete works, many of which were still unpublished. Simler himself edited Vermigli’s In Samuelis prophetae libros duos commentarii and Preces sacrae de Psalmis Davidis desumptae, both of which first appeared in 1564. Later he planned to publish Vermigli’s correspondence and to produce an expanded edition of the Loci communes first compiled by Robert Masson.\(^9\) Vermigli’s thought influenced many aspects of Simler’s theology, notably his views on predestination; Simler planned, for instance, to include in the projected new edition of the Loci the oration on free will which Martyr had delivered at the

\(^{7}\) ZB Ms. F 40, 441.

\(^{8}\) Bullinger, in a letter to Zanchi of 16 December 1562, observed that Simler ‘mirum in modum Martyr noster amavit, et cum [eo] in summa concordia vixit’ (Zanchi, Epistolae, 1, 126).

\(^{9}\) See C. Schmidt, Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften (Elberfeld 1858), pp.293-6; Correspondance, 16, p.61, n.6; ibid., 17, pp.111-12, n.6. Work on the new edition of the Loci, which incorporated what could be assembled of Vermigli’s correspondence, was completed by Rudolf Gwalther after Simler’s death in July 1576. See Gwalther’s preface, addressed to candidates for the ministry in Zurich and extolling the benefits of the ‘locri’ method of scriptural exposition, in Loci communes, sigs aii-ii’. 
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time of his dispute with Theodor Bibliander. More generally, Simler was impressed by Vermiglì's unimpeachable orthodoxy, which could be offered as an alternative, positive, model to the radicalism of so many of his compatriots. In his preface to the Commentary on 1 and 2 Samuel – dedicated, significantly, to the Lithuanian and future antitrinitarian John Kiszka – Simler emphasised Martyr's doctrinal rectitude:

Nihil enim in his scriptis occurreret quod cum sacra religione pugnet: fuit enim Martyr in dogmatibus non modo purus, sed etiam simplex et perspicuus, et plurimum a contentionibus et argutis nonnullorum sophismatibus abhorruit: cui si multi similes essent in Ecclesia doctores, multae forte controversiae componi possent, quibus nunc aliqua misere ecclesia Christi laceretur, ita ut adversariis nostris infirmis quidem offensioni, aliis vero ludibrio simus [my italics].

Zurich's other senior Italian churchman, Bernardino Ochino, left a very different impression on Simler, who, as we have seen, a member of the team of theologians that examined the Dialogi XXX in November 1563. Without doubt, the 'revelation' of Ochino's heterodoxy influenced Simler's subsequent approach to the problem of heresy. It brought home to him the link between dissent and dissimulation, and the corresponding need for the churches to guard against subversion by radicals within their ranks. In the preface to his Scripta veterum latina Simler reflected bitterly on the Ochino affair:

De Ochino quid dicam? quem ipse vidi et novi, et in cibus amicorum numero aliquando fuit, vocatus hic fuit Tigurum ab amplissimo magistratu, ut Ecclesiam Italiam quae nuper illuc venerat, doceret. Hic in frequenti ministerum Ecclesiae conventi interrogatus, an doctrinae quae apud nos recepta esset, et legibus disciplinae Ecclesiasticae subscriberet? sibi haec admodum probari respondit, et de quibusdam capitibus ut se ab Anabaptistarum deliriis alienum esse ostenderet, copiose disseruit: postea pro consuetudine Ecclesiae nostrae fidem et iusiurandum dedit se nullum novum dogma ab Ecclesiae nostrae doctrina dissentiens publice privatimve propitium esse, sed si quid tale habeat prius ad publicam synodum relaturum, quae quotannis bis convocari

80 Simler to Beza, 10 May 1576 (Correspondance, 17, no.1199). As we saw in chapter 3:1, Vermiglì was able to overcome the Zurichers' traditional resistance to the 'Calvinist' doctrine of double predestination. The culmination of this process was the endorsement by the Zurich church of the strongly predestinarian theses of the Bern theologian Abraham Musculus in 1588 (G. Adam, Der Streit um die Pradestination im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert: Eine Untersuchung zu den Entwirfen von Samuel Huber und Aegidius Humius (Neukirchen 1970), pp.74-5). For Simler's views on predestination, see Exodus. In Exodus vel secundum librum Mosis [...] commentarii (Zürich 1584), foL130v.

solet. Quanta vero fide et constantia iusiurandum servari et promissis steterit, testantur Labyrinthe, et Academici eius Dialogi, et alia scripta ab ipso in publicum aedita, quorum cum postea ratio ab ipso exigeretur, non potuit ab eo impetrari, ut publica disputattones defendenda susciperet, quae a se scripta erant, aut scripto publico sententiam suam explicaret. Et scilicet iuria huic facta est homini periuo, qui contra iusiurandum et fidem datam, ea deliria et blasphemias in vulgus sparsi, quorum patrocinium ne ipse quidem postea suscipere ausus est.82

Simler’s involvement in the Stancarist controversy has already been noted. However, from the preface to the Responsio ad Stancarum it is evident that by the time the work was published Simler, in common with his Zurich colleagues, was most concerned by the activities of Biandrata and his fellow ‘tritheists’. This shift in priorities manifested itself in a shift in historical perspective. In Simler’s account of the dispute over the mediator, the order of events as they are known to have occurred is reversed. Stancaro ceases to be characterised as the instigator of the dispute; instead, his Nestorianism comes to be seen as an extreme reaction to the subordinationism of other Italian exiles:

Ut olim Dionysius Alexandri episcopus nimio ardeore disputandi contra Sabellium, quaedam scriptis ex quibus deinde sumn eirorem Arians hausit, ita Stancarum dum novos Ariamnos, ut ait, impugnant, aliquando ea scribit et docet ex quibus plerique existimant ipsum veteres Sabellii et Nestorii errores fovere.83

Simler goes on to attack the arguments contained in Paul’s Tabula, a copy of which the Zurichers had received from Sarnicki.84 On the one hand, he seeks to demonstrate the incompatibility of Paul’s position with biblical monotheism. On the other, he argues that by making Christ’s divinity dependent on that of the Father – who alone is described by Paul, following Gentile, as autotheos – the radicals effectively reduce him to the status of a

82 Scripta veterum, fol.45; also cited in Firpo, Antitrinitari, pp.7-8, n.22.

83 Responsio ad Stancarum, fol.5. Interestingly, where this image of the two extremes – and specifically, the comparison with Dionysius of Alexandria – is used elsewhere by the Zurichers, the priority of the ‘Sabellian’ Stancaro is maintained, in an exact reflection of the ancient paradigm. Compare StAZ E II 371, 931, and Wolf’s warning to Lismanini in his letter of 15 March 1563: ‘Verebamur enim, ne quid iam aggressos esse accepimus, ea via adversus Stancarum procedendum indicarent, qua in Arii Servertique diverticula simplices et incautos sedecerent. At Sabellium ut fugere, ut divertas ad Arium, quid est alius, quam dum Charybdis vitae studes, in Scyllam incidere?’ (Wotschke, p.169 [no.270]).

84 CO 19, 636.
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creature. In Simler’s view, ‘tritheism’ is nothing more than a revival of the ancient Arian heresy, albeit in a concealed form.

The schism within the Polish church continued to preoccupy Simler and his colleagues throughout the mid-1560s. In March 1565, an attempt to reunify the orthodox Reformed with Paul’s anti-Nicene party at the synod of Piotrków merely exposed the widening doctrinal gulf between the two sides. Just as worrying was the spread of antitrinitarianism in neighbouring Transylvania, where the Reformed superintendent Francis Dávid was being wooed by Biandrata. A compromise formula committing the radicals and their orthodox opponent, Peter Melius, to renounce non-biblical language broke down towards the end of 1566, and the slide towards schism quickly became irreversible. The ensuing polemical exchange between Dávid and Melius revealed an important theological shift within antitrinitarianism, away from Gentile’s ‘tritheism’ and towards a more radical unitarianism and denial of Christ’s pre-existence derived from Lelio Sozzini’s commentary on the prologue to John’s Gospel. News of this development was swiftly passed on to Europe’s leading Reformed theologians by their correspondents in Poland and Transylvania. In the preface to his Valentini Gentilis [...] brevis explicatio of August 1567, for instance, Beza condemned the increasing diversity of antitrinitarian opinions, and in particular the views of the ‘new Samosatenes’ who had embraced Sozzini’s Christology.

The publication of the Gentile anthology, which included texts by Beza, Calvin, Andreas Hyperius and Alexander Alesius as well as Simler’s preface to the Responsio ad

---

85 Responsio ad Stancarum, fol.*6*.
86 Ibid., fol.*7*.
87 See M. Baláz, Early Transylvanian Antitrinitarianism (1566-1571): From Servet to Palaeologus (Baden-Baden 1996).
88 Antonio Rotondò summarises the evidence for Lelio’s authorship of this text in Sozzini, Opere, pp.344-71.
Stancarum, was the first move in a sustained and co-ordinated polemical campaign against the antitrinitarians, bridging even the Lutheran-Reformed divide. The work did not, however, address the specific problems raised by the more radical forms of antitrinitarianism that were gaining ground in Poland and Transylvania. Simler’s De aeterno Dei filio was designed to make good this deficiency. Like the Zurichers’ earlier interventions in the trinitarian controversy, the tract was written in response to an appeal for assistance against their radical opponents from the orthodox Polish Reformed. During the summer of 1567, Christopher Thretius, now rector of the Reformed college in Cracow, visited Zurich, Bern and Geneva with instructions to recruit a senior Swiss theologian to write against the Samosatenes. In his preface to De aeterno Dei filio, Simler reports that he was initially reluctant to accept the charge, as Beza, Zanchi and Zacharias Ursinus were all said to be planning works against the antitrinitarians. However, the persistence of Thretius and his Polish colleagues Lasicki, Samicki and Paul Gilowski eventually persuaded the Zurich professor that his contribution was necessary. On 7 June 1568 Bullinger informed Beza that the work, in four parts, was intended to be ready for sale at the forthcoming Frankfurt book fair; before the end of August Simler was able to send the

90 Geneva and the Swiss churches had co-operated closely during the lead-up to Gentile’s trial in Bern the previous year. On receiving news of the Italian’s arrest, for example, Beza urged Bullinger to use his influence with the Bernese authorities to ensure that Gentile did not escape the death sentence as he had done previously in Geneva (Correspondance, 7, no.476). Bullinger replied to say that he had written to his colleagues in Bern to that effect (‘hortans ut faciant quod in re tanta decet’ [ibid., no.481]). Johannes Haller kept the Zurich Antistes informed of developments in the case until Gentile’s execution on 10 September, which Bullinger greeted with satisfaction (see his letter to Zanchi of 6 January 1567 [Zanchi, Epistolae, 2, 131]).


92 De aeterno, sig.5r. Beza, too, encouraged Simler to accede to the Poles’ request (see Beza to Bullinger, 6 July 1567 (Correspondance, 8, no.560); idem., 13 April 1568 [ibid., 9, no.600]). His own promised response to the antitrinitarians failed in the end to materialise, though see the preface to his edition of the dialogues of Athanasius in ibid., 11, pp.319-30.

93 Ibid., 9, p.79 (no.610).
Genevan churchman a copy of the finished text. 

In De aeterno Dei filio, Simler’s primary objective was to offer an authoritative Reformed response to the arguments of the Italian and eastern European ‘Samosatenes’: a good deal of book 1, therefore, is taken up with refuting Lelio Sozzini’s commentary on the Johannine prologue. But that was only part of a much grander project. In scale and conception, De aeterno Dei filio may be compared to Bullinger’s Von der Widertüfferen Ursprung (which, incidentally, Simler had translated into Latin). Of course Simler’s focus was narrower: whereas Bullinger had ranged over the entire spectrum of Anabaptist views, his younger colleague confined himself to the single issue of the Trinity. Within those limits, however, he strove to achieve the same degree of comprehensiveness in his coverage of heretical opinion. Simler was also the first Reformed theologian to attempt a

---

94 Simler to Beza, August 1568 (ibid., no.629).

95 I have not been able to identify all of Simler’s sources, but among the texts cited are: Valentino Gentile, Protheses (fols 104r, 105v, 277r, 277v, 278r); the now-lost Antidota (on which, see T.R. Castiglione, ‘La <<impietas Valentini Gentilis>> e il corruccio di Calvino’, in Ginevra e l’Italia, pp.149-76 [164-5]), with its dedication to Sigismund II of Poland (fols 220v, 251r, 260r, 277v, 281r, 281v); Annotationes in Calvinist Institutiones (fols 277r, 278v); and, possibly, the Confessio of 1561 (fols 175v, 177r, 182r). Matteo Gribaldi, Epistola de Deo et Dei Filio (fols 265v-6v). Jan Kazanowski, unpublished reply to Calvin’s letters to the Poles (fols 197v-8v, 199v-200v, 201r, 203v-4v, 267v). The Zurichers received a copy of this work from Mikolaj Radziwill in October 1564 (Wotschke, no.330) and responded to it early the following year (ibid., no.332). On Kazanowski, see Correspondance, 11, p.326, n.5. Bernardino Ochino, Dialogi XXX (fols 78r, 79v, 81v, 85r-6v, 86v, 94v, 116v, 117v, 117v, 121v, 122v, 131v, 139v, 140v, 304v, 305v, 209v, 313v). Gregory Paul, Tabula de Trinitate (fol.251r). Radziwill to Calvin, 6 July 1564 (fols 248v, 271r-2v). Michael Servetus, De Trinitatis erroribus (fols 76v-7r). Lelio Sozzini, Brevis explicatio in primum Ioannis caput (for references, see Sozzini, Opere, p.348, n.95). Besides these texts, at the time De aeterno Dei filio was published Simler possessed a copy of the Brevis enarratio disputationis Albanae de Deo trino et Christo duplici, the antitrinitarian account of the second disputation of Alba Julia in March 1568 (see Simler to Beza, August 1568 [Correspondance, 9, no.629]). He also refers to Stephan Czasmay’s De horrendis simulachris Deum trinum et unum adumbrantium, which Bullinger had received in a Hungarian edition from Matthias Thury (De aeterno, sig.6r, Miscellanea Tigurina, 3 vols (Zurich 1722-4), 2, pp.207-13). While the De aeterno was in press, Simler received a further batch of antitrinitarian writings from Thretius, including Francis Dávid’s Refutatio scripti Petri Meli et an ‘interpretationem anonymum primi capitatis Ioannis Evangelistae, cuius partem ante manu descriptam vir bonus ad me miserat’ (De aeterno, sig.6v; Thretius to Bullinger, 15 July 1568 [Wotschke, no.386]). The latter reference is probably to the Explicatio praeae partis primum capitatis Ioannis, published in late 1568 and usually attributed to Fausto Sozzini (the case for and against Fausto’s authorship is summarised in Balázs, pp.78-94).
systematic classification of the antitrinitarian movement, hence the division of *De aeterno Dei filio* into four books dealing in turn with the Samosatenes, Arians, tritheists and 'Pneumatomachi'.

This scheme is, of course, to some extent merely a convenient polemical device. Book 4, for example, brings together several contrasting heresies relating to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and includes a defence of the *filioque* clause in the western Nicene creed against the Greek church. Similarly, the 'Arians' whose views are refuted in Book 2 were not a real contemporary grouping, but a sect constructed by Simler on the basis of statements by Ochino's fictional interlocutor in the *Dialogi XXX*, Spiritus. The distinction between 'Arians' and 'tritheists' is also rather loosely observed: for example, some of the *Protheses* of Valentino Gentile, designated elsewhere as the founder of the tritheist sect, are refuted in the course of Book 2. The subordinationist aspect of tritheism, in particular the refusal of Gentile and his followers to identify the Son with the 'one God' of scripture, was seen by Simler as tantamount to Arianism in any case.

The individual sections of *De aeterno Dei filio* are arranged to support a carefully constructed historical account of the origins and development of contemporary antitrinitarianism. According to Simler, all of the sects described in his work may be traced back to Servetus, the second Simon Magus. Simler identifies the ideas of the Spanish heresiarch as the point of departure for both the later Arians and Samosatenes. The transformation of antitrinitarianism into an organised movement, however, is seen as the

---

96 *De aeterno*, fols 104v-5v.
97 Ibid., fol.188v.
98 *De aeterno*, fol.1v.
99 For the Arians, see fols 76v-7v. For the Samosatenes, see fols 3v, 43v. Most antitrinitarians – with the significant exception of Fausto Sozzini – continued to number Servetus among the founding fathers of their movement, even after they themselves had gravitated to more radical positions (see Pimat, *De falsa et vera*, p.43).
achievement of Servetus's Italian disciples. In his preface to De aeterno Dei filio, Simler reflects on earlier events in Poland, identifying Biandrata, Gentile and (to a lesser extent) Lismanini as those responsible for the schism within the Polish Reformed church. Following what had by now become the standard Reformed account of these developments, he describes how the Italians succeeded in popularising their tritheistic views under the guise of combating Stancaro. The fragmentation and doctrinal radicalisation of eastern European antitrinitarianism after 1563 was, again, the work of Italian exiles. Simler identifies the arrival of Ochino in Poland, following his expulsion from Zurich, as a key moment in this process. It was under Ochino's influence, Simler claims, that many Polish radicals eventually rejected adult baptism and the deity of the Holy Spirit: the Dialogi XXX became the founding text of a neo-Arian sect which openly asserted the creatureliness of the Logos and confirmed the antitrinitarians' repudiation of Christian orthodoxy. Around the same time another fundamental split was taking place, between tritheists loyal to the ideas of Valentino Gentile and others who, like the third-century heretic Paul of Samosata, had come to doubt the pre-existence of Christ; this new

---

100 De aeterno, sig.B1: 'Hi primum simulabant se nihil aliud agere quam ut Stancari delirium una nobiscum refellerent, interea tamen sensim et clam animis multorum instillabant, Christum qua Deus et Patre minorem esse, ideoque secundum eam naturam pro nobis intercedere, neque Patrem, et Filium, atque Spiritum Sanctum esse unum Deum, sed esse horum perpetuum quasi divisionem, et tres prorsus spiritus esse, e quibus solus Pater sit [...] unum Deus, Filium vero et Spiritum Sanctum duos esse Spiritus a summo illo uno Deo Patre essentiaes, et ab eo dependentes'.

101 Ibid., fols 3v, 73v. Compare Simler, Narratio, fol.40v. Others shared Simler's assessment of Ochino's importance for Polish antitrinitarianism. In a letter to Beza of 21 May 1565, for example, the Pole Jan Lasicki observed with regard to the radicals, 'Habent ingenio pollentem Ochinum, qui eis novas opiniones et excogitabit et suppeditabit, cuius Dialogos a nostris studiose legi audio, adeo quidam smit natura rerum novanun studiosi, post ubi impetrit se esse peritos in animum inducerunt suam, infinitos errores parere solent, fit enim ut error errorum secum trahat' (Correspondance, 6, p.90 [no.396]).

102 Like Beza in his preface to the Gentile collection, Simler identified the Brevis explicatio as the source for this error. Unlike the Genevan reformer, however, he repeatedly sought to dissociate Lelio Sozzi from the movement to which his ideas were said to have given rise. See De aeterno, sig.B1; Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae, fol.4v; Bibliotheca, p.443: 'De singulis fere dogmatibus religionis semper disputavit, et scriptis, nihil tamen ipse in publicum edidit: at Samosateniani nostrae aetatis eum inter principes suae haereseos nominant, ac dicitur illus esse, impia interpretatio in primum caput Ioannis absque nomine authoris ab illis edita'. Rotondo suggests that Simler was reluctant to acknowledge Sozzi's authorship of the Brevis explicatio as to do so would raise questions about the Zurich church's failure to take action against him while he was still alive (see Rotondo, 'Sulla diffusione', p.108; and Sozzi, Opere, pp.352-3). It is also possible
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Samosatene party was led by Gregory Paul in Poland, and by Giorgio Bandrata and Francis Dávid in Transylvania. In his final anti-heretical work, the Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae de duabus naturis Christi, Simler summarised these three phases in the development of antitrinitarianism as follows:

Qui primum Papatu relicto nostris ecclesiis se coniunxerunt, postea in summo capite doctrinae, in cognitione Dei a vobis dissentientes, primum Christum ante carnem extitisse fassi sunt, sed eum Deum quendam essentiatum fecerunt, aeternum quidem, verum et persona sic essentia quoque a Patre distinctum et illo inferiori [tritheism]: mox spiritum quendam creatum ante omnes alias creaturas confinxerunt, qui carnem ex virgine assumptae creatus ante omnes alios [Arianism]: tandem cum ante nativitatem ex virgine reipsa prorsus non extitisse affirmarent [teaching of the Samosatene].

Nor, he argued, was the evolution of heresy likely to stop there. Simler characterised the antitrinitarian movement as in a state of continual flux, the consequence of its departure from the sure and constant teaching of the church. Ultimately, he predicted, the radicals would abandon even those trappings of Christianity which they had thus far retained.

Simler, like Wolf earlier, explains such ‘gradualism’ as a deliberate tactic of the antitrinitarian leadership, designed to facilitate the transition of potential converts from orthodoxy to heresy and to divert suspicion from themselves. In the preface to his Responsio ad Stancarum, for instance, he warns: ‘Huius erroris patroni suam impietatem non statim produnt, sed initio in paucis ab usitata doctiina recedunt, donee se in amos hominum penitus insinuarint: tum enim demum libere suam impietatem effundunt’.

that Simler was misled by the existence of another commentary on the Johannine prologue – that of Fausto – which could not be ascribed to Lelio on stylistic grounds.

103 De aeterno, sig.δ4v.

104 Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae, fol.4r. The Assertio was Simler’s response to a work by the Lithuanian radical Symon Budny, in which the latter set out to refute the arguments for Christ’s divinity contained in the first chapter of De aeterno Dei filio. Budny’s tract, which Simler received from Thietius in April 1575 (Woitschke, no.470), is published in Firdo, Antitrinitari, pp.289-328.

105 See De aeterno, sig.e2: ‘Ut Astrologi singulis anniuis quasdam praedicationes edunt, et novas Ephemerides sydernum edunt, ita nostri illi adversarii quotannis novas quasdam et prioribus contrariis fidei confessiones edunt’.

106 Responsio ad Stancarum, fol.98r.
Chapter 4: Defining and Defending Orthodoxy

In the course of their dealings with Lelio Sozzini, Ochino and Biandrata, Simler and his colleagues had become convinced of the link between heresy and dissimulation. The subtle 'academic' mode of proceeding, exemplified by Ochino's *Dialogi XXX*, would, they believed, give way to the open profession of heresy as soon as circumstances permitted. To illustrate this point Simler cites the example of Gentile:


Earlier in the chapter, I noted how the Zurichers seized on the practice of dissimulation as evidence for the similarity between contemporary radicals and the heretics of the early church. That dual perspective is deeply embedded in the structure of Simler's anti-heretical works. It is perhaps most apparent in his *Scripta veterum latina* of 1571, which includes a detailed account of Christological debates within the early church from Nestorius to Mohammed, followed by a brief description of the revival of ancient errors in recent times. The history of the early church also provided Simler and other Reformed polemicists with an explanation for the reappearance of heresy in their own times. In the *Assertio*, Simler – following Gregory of Nyssa – argues that the overthrow of 'crassa idololatria', first by the apostles and their successors, and now by the Reformation, has prompted Satan to revise his strategy for undermining the church and to raise up heretics bent on introducing a more subtle brand of idolatry, the worship of a unipersonal God.

---

107 Ibid.

108 For the circumstances of this work's composition, see chapter 5:111 below. In the *Scripta veterum latina* Simler's principal target was the 'Eutychianism' of the Anabaptists, Caspar Schwenzfeld and Johannes Brenz. However, the patristic texts edited there were also intended for use against the Samosatenses (Scripta veterum, fol. *+2*).
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According to Simler, the development of ancient heresy from the Arian controversy onwards offers a clear pointer to the ultimate destiny of its modern counterpart, if allowed to proceed unchecked. In both De aeterno Dei filio and the Scripta veterum latina, the Zurich professor describes Islam as the summation of the various Christological and Triadological heresies which plagued the early church, and predicts the same fate for contemporary antitrinitarianism.\(^{10}\) Thus he observes that it was precisely those areas of eastern Christendom most affected by the Arian, Nestorian and Eutychian controversies which later succumbed to the armies of Mohammed; in the same way, failure to deal with antitrinitarian activity in Poland and Transylvania is likely to facilitate the Ottoman advance into eastern Europe. The new sect of Samosatenes, with its emphasis on the humanity of Christ, poses a particularly sinister threat from that point of view: ‘Qui vero Christum tantum hominum credit cum Samosatelianis, is non existimabit se a Christo defuere si audiat Mahometum tam praecclare de Christo scribere ut plus ille ipsis Samosatelianis tribuat’.\(^{11}\) The discovery in Heidelberg, in spring 1570, of a group of antitrinitarian sympathisers that was allegedly seeking to make contact with both Biandrata and the Turkish sultan tended to support that assertion; it was borne out further by the eventual conversion to the Muslim faith of one of the group’s members, Adam Neuser.

\(^{10}\) Scripta veterum, fol.206*. The association between antitrinitarianism, Judaism and Islam was something of a Reformed commonplace. In a letter to Radziwill of 30 September 1561, Bullinger argued that the Christian faith stands or falls on the question of Christ’s full divinity: if the Messiah is not truly God ‘vicerunt [..] Judaei et Turcae et praestat fides eorum, Christiana fides inanis erit’ (CO 18, 756 [no.3539]).

\(^{11}\) De aeterno, fol.283*. In his preface to the same work Simler notes the proximity of Transylvania to the Ottoman empire and warns his readers there to beware ‘ne Samosatelianis doctrina Mahumetanae aditus paretur, cum tanta sit utriusque affinitas’ (ibid., sig. e*). According to Simler that ‘affinitas’ is explained by the fact that Mohammed derived his teachings from the monk Sergius, who combined the heresies of Nestorius and Paul of Samosata. See Scripta veterum, fol.179; De aeterno, fol.283*: ‘Credendum est complures huiusmodi errorum contagis infectos, apud quos Christi deitas ante in dubium vocata erat, avidius Mahomet deliria arripuisse: praesertim cum Sergii monachi et Judaeorum quorundam consilio, ea delecta essent, et Alcorano a Mahometo comprehensa, quae in tanta opinionum varietate maxime videbantur popularia’. In his characterisation of Islam as a Christian heresy, Simler follows a well-established medieval tradition previously affirmed by his fellow Zurichers Bullinger and Bibliander. Both reproduce the legend of the monk Sergius, propounded in its classic form by the ninth-century writer Theophanes (V. Segesvary, L’Islam et la Réforme: Étude sur l’attitude des reformateurs zurichois envers l’Islam (1510-1550) (Lausanne 1978), p.108).
Simler was therefore able, in the *Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae de duabus naturis Christi*, to describe Islam as the ‘finis [...] novae huius doctrinae’.

Conflicting interpretations of the scripture principle were at the heart of the debate between the orthodox Reformed and Italian religious radicals. The radicalisation of antitrinitarianism during the mid to late 1560s led to an even sharper polarisation of opinion over this issue. For all their biblicist rhetoric, the Italian and Polish ‘tritheists’ of the early 1560s were selective in their rejection of traditional doctrinal authority. Although they tended to repudiate the later Fathers (Augustine, the Cappadocians), they continued to cite works by earlier writers (especially Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*, Tertullian’s *Adversus Praxeum* and Hilary’s *De synodos*) which offered support for their views. Initially they also retained the Nicene creed, in the belief that it enshrined the distinction between the divinity of the Father (ingenate) and that of the Son (generate). Reformed polemicists lost no time in pointing out this inconsistency. Gentile, in particular, was frequently pilloried for employing terms alien to scripture, such as the designation of the Father as *essentiator*; in his preface to the *Responsio ad Stancarum* Simler remarks: ‘Miror esse aliquos ex his qui nobis obiiciant nomina a nobis usurpaii quae in scripturis non habeantur, cum illis subinde in ore sint nomina Dei essentiatoris et essentiati, quae certe non a prophetis aut apostolis acceperunt’.

---

112 *Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae*, fol.59*. Simler notes the defection of some antitrinitarians to Islam and Judaism elsewhere in the work (fols 5"", 53*). Compare *Scripta veterum*, fol.*5*. On the trinitarian controversy in Heidelberg, see C. Burchill, *The Heidelberg Antitrinitarians* (Baden-Baden 1989). The radicals sought to turn such accusations to their advantage, arguing that their simplification of Christian doctrine would encourage the conversion to Christianity of Jews and Turks, ‘qui portentosus istis opinionibus, quae Christianae fidei axiomata esse creduntur, ab eo amplectanda semper sunt deterriti’ (F. Sozzini, *Explicatio primae partis primi capitatis Iohannis*, in *Opera*, 1, p.75; compare *De falsa et vera*, pp.37-8).

113 See pp.179-80 above.

114 *Responsio ad Stancarum*, fol.*3*. Compare *De aeterno*, fol.249*: ‘Postremo reprehendendi nobis sunt adversarii qui illas voces quas ecclesia publico consensu receptit, et max ab Apostolorum aetate in usu habitut, repudiant ut alienas a scriptura, et interim suas locutiones novas et peregrinas sacris literis obstruchunt, Deum essentiorem et Deum essentiatum, άνωφορος, Deus Apostolicus, Solidus ille unus Deus et Pater, Deus emphaticus et articulatus, Deus author et Deus executor et alias huius generis phrases complures’. 
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The later Samosatenes, by contrast, were far more consistent in their opposition to extra-biblical authority and terminology. Thus the author of the preface to the antitrinitarian anthology *De falsa et vera Dei unius Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti cognizione* (probably Biandrata) argued, 'ubi de fundamento controvertitur, et de uno Deo agnosendo disputatur, dicimus summopere cavendum esse, ne exoti cis utamur vocibus, vel aliquo pacto a sacrosanctis Dei phrasibus discedamus, cum praesertim de Deo vera etiam dicere extra verbum, periculosum sit, et quicquid extra quae rustit, anathema'. An unidentified Samosatene work cited in *De aeterno Dei filio* denounces even the ante-Nicene writers Irenaeus, Justin and Ignatius for failing to acknowledge the true humanity of Christ. Simler observes that on this score the Samosatenes have outdone even their master Servetus, 'qui etiam ementitis et male detortis Patrum testimoniiis sua stabilire conatus est'.

The radicals’ appeal to the scripture principle represented nothing less than a challenge to the hermeneutical basis of Reformed theology. Against Catholic opponents, Bullinger and other Reformed writers insisted on the all-sufficiency of scripture and decried the Roman church for its reliance on tradition. Now, in a sense, their own weapons were being turned against them. Worse still, Catholic and Lutheran polemicists were able to point to antitrinitarianism as the logical outcome of the Reformed rejection of extra-biblical authority. This argument was made most forcefully in an anonymous *Indicium et censura ministrorum Tigurinorum et Heidelbergensium de dogmata contra adorandam Trinitatem in Polonia nuper sparso*, published in Cologne in 1565. Citing the work most

---


116 *De falsa et vera*, pp.5-6. For the evidence of Biandrata’s authorship of the preface, see ibid., pp.liii-liii.

117 *De aeterno*, fol.68v.

118 Ibid., fol.69v.
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likely to cause the Zurichers embarrassment, Ochino’s *Dialogi XXX*, the author of the *Judicium* asserted that the charges levelled against the Reformed leadership by the radicals were the same as those which mainstream Protestants had historically directed against the papacy.\(^{119}\)

At the request of Thretius, Bullinger composed a lengthy refutation of this work, which appeared as a preface to *De aeterno Dei filio*.\(^{120}\) Here the *Antistes* again draws a sharp distinction between the principle of *sola scriptura* as understood by the Reformed and the biblical literalism of the radicals. Quoting at times word for word from his earlier reply to Cochlaeus, Bullinger argues that the limits to theological enquiry and exposition ought to be set by the content, but not the language, of scripture. All doctrinal statements, regardless of the vocabulary used, are legitimate provided that they substantially express what is contained in God’s word. For example the Bible describes Christ as a true man free from sin: from this we may deduce that he possesses human flesh and a rational soul, even though neither of those terms appear there.\(^{121}\) In the same way, the traditional trinitarian formulations clearly articulate the biblical understanding of God’s nature.\(^{122}\)

Simler’s treatment of the problem of extra-biblical language proceeds along much the same lines. The Zurich professor recognised the superficial attractiveness of the

\(^{119}\) *Judicium et censura*, pp.43-5, 68, 75-7.

\(^{120}\) See Thretius to Bullinger, 3 October 1565 (Wotschke, no.344 [p.253]). Thretius identifies cardinal Stanislas Hosius as the author of the *Judicium et censura*.

\(^{121}\) *De aeterno*, sigs α\(_r\)-f. ‘The same point is made in almost identical form in the *De canonicae scripturae et Catholicae ecclesiae autoritate libellum* (fol.14c).’

\(^{122}\) Ibid., sig.α\(_r\): ‘Cum scriptura Deum hunc verum et unum, discerte nuncupet Patrem, Filium et Spiritum sanctum, singulisque suam tribuat proprietatem, nec inter se confundat, ut cum manifeste angelus Dei ad virginem Mariam dicit, Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te, et virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi: et quod nascetur sanctum, vocabitur fillius Dei: sicuti et in baptismo Christi, auditur vox patris delata super Filium, et cernitur specie columbae Spiritus sanctus: ut et alias Dominus ipse baptismare iubet in nomen Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti: cuncta aperissent ispe Dominus Jesus aliibi etiam dicit, Ego et Pater unum sumus, quem postiacis vocabulum vel Trinitatis vel Personae? Quibus nihil aliud significatur quam quod de ipsis rebus manifestissime commemoratis docetur testimonio, unum videlicet esse Deum, tribus distinctum personis, ut haec tamen unitatem non discindant aut lacerent’.
radicals' biblicism. In his preface to the *Responsio ad Stancarum*, he even declared himself willing to dispense with certain technical terms, provided that the substance of doctrine remained intact. Almost immediately, however, Simler withdrew this concession, arguing that the traditional language ought to be retained in situations where orthodoxy was under threat.\footnote{Simler declared in his preface to the *Responsio ad Stancarum* that he was willing to dispense with certain technical terms, provided that the substance of doctrine remained intact. However, he later withdrew this concession, arguing that the traditional language ought to be retained in situations where orthodoxy was under threat.} Similarly, in *De aeterno Dei filio* he suggested that those who professed themselves to be orthodox but rejected such formulations were either naive or – more probably – secret heretics.\footnote{In *De aeterno Dei filio*, Simler suggested that those who professed themselves to be orthodox but rejected such formulations were either naive or secret heretics.} Like Bullinger, Simler stresses the distinction between the word and substance of scripture: the principle of *sola scriptura* applies only to the latter.

For Simler, this is closely bound up with the Zwinglian notion of the pastor as prophet, which inspired the exegetical endeavours of the Zurich *Lectorium* and of Reformed biblical scholarship in general. Such an understanding of the office of minister is at odds with the radicals' insistence on the letter of scripture:

\begin{quote}
Dedit enim Deus ecclesiae donum prophetiae seu interpretandi scripturas, quod hac regula prorsus abolveretur: id enim est interpretum munus ut ea quae captui nostro perplexa impeditaque sunt, explicent alis et plioribus verbis, quae tamen religiose et fideliter ipsius scripturae veritati serviant.\footnote{In *De aeterno Dei filio*, Simler stated: 'Dedit enim Deus ecclesiae donum prophetiae seu interpretandi scripturas, quod hac regula prorsus abolveretur: id enim est interpretum munus ut ea quae captui nostro perplexa impeditaque sunt, explicent alis et plioribus verbis, quae tamen religiose et fideliter ipsius scripturae veritati serviant.'}
\end{quote}

Following Bullinger and Calvin, Simler defends the received ways of speaking about the Godhead as fully consistent with the meaning of scripture.\footnote{Following Bullinger and Calvin, Simler defends the received ways of speaking about the Godhead as fully consistent with the meaning of scripture.} In an attempt to steal the heretics' clothes, he asserts that his opponents' much-vaunted fidelity to the *verbum* disguises a lack of regard for the plain and logical sense of biblical texts. As an example of
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that tendency, Simler cites Lelio Sozzini’s reinterpretation of the ‘in principio’, which in the *Assertio orthodoxa* he attributes to Biandrata. The radicals’ misuse of scripture in order to defend their doctrinal innovations is, he argues, comparable to that of the papists.

The dispute over non-scriptural language was symptomatic of a more fundamental difference of opinion between the Reformed and their antitrinitarian critics concerning the authority and value of church tradition. That was already apparent from the exchanges of the early 1560s, in which the Zurichers took issue with the radical assertion that all doctrine inherited from the papacy ought to be jettisoned as corrupt. Continuing in the same vein, Simler accuses the heretics of failing to grasp that vestiges of true Christianity (scripture, the Apostles’ and Nicene creeds, the essentials of baptism) remained even amid the errors of the medieval church: ‘Abhorrent a Papistica doctrina, sed non discernunt quid Papisticum sit ab ipsis Papis extra Dei verbum excogitatum et ecclesiae traditum, et quid Christianum sit et verbo Deo consentaneum’.

In *De falsa et vera unius Dei cognitione*, Biandrata and David argued that the antichristian captivity of the church was to be attributed first and foremost to its abandonment of the Christian fundamentum, biblical monotheism; the rise of the papacy was merely a corollary of that initial lapse. The orthodox Reformed, by contrast, preferred to see the fall of the church as a direct consequence of the papal ‘usurpation’. On

---

127 "Non tantum a veterum sententia, verum etiam a perspicuo simplici et genuino verborum sensu recedat" (*Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae*, fol.9; see also ibid., fols 16', 39', 41').

128 Ibid., fol.11'

129 Ibid., fol.5'. Compare *De aeterno*, fols 67'*, 250''-251'.

130 See the genealogy of the papacy given in *De falsa et vera*, pp.20-1: 'Fictus ille Christus est regni Antichristi vita, et omnium eius blasphemiarum caput. Fictus enim iste aeternus Deus Christus alium et secundum Deum introduxit (cum tantus sit unus Deus pater): Pluralitas vero Deorum unus Essentiam peperit: Essentia autem una plurae personas, vel Trinitatem genuit: Persona genuit naturas: Natura incarnationem, et hypostaticam unionem: haec autem sibi opposita Idiomatum communicacionem peperunt, sequuta tandem hanc meretricem Babylonicam alia scortae, ut Missa, Monstrantia, Monstrosam enim matrem monstras filias ecce oportuit, ut sit conformis partus suae genericiai'. The Italian radicals had a tendency to link reform of the ‘sophistic’ and ‘idolatrous’ doctrines of the Trinity and the Mass: see, for instance, the remarks of Ochino’s interlocutor Spiritus in *Dialogi XXX*, 2, p.49.
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the basis of that very different interpretation of Christian history, Simler was able to steer a middle course between the radicals’ outright rejection of tradition and the ‘second source’ approach of the post-Tridentine Catholic church.

This is most evident from his statements concerning the Fathers. The trinitarian controversies of the 1560s and 1570s, like the earlier conflict with Stancaro, acted as a powerful stimulus to patristic study in Zurich. In the ‘Responsio ad argumenta Antitrinitariorum Italopolonorum’, for example, the Zurichers sought to refute the ‘tritheist’ interpretation which their radical opponents placed on certain passages from Irenaeus, Justin, Tertullian, Athanasius and Hilary, while in his ‘Trinitas Dei’ Bullinger replied to the arguments of Gentile and others by quoting from Augustine’s anti-Arian works. Similarly, in De aeterno Dei filio Simler’s responses to the ‘objectiones’ of his heretical adversaries are peppered with lengthy citations from the Fathers. Simler is also known to have been working on an edition of Hilary – whose anti-Sabellian stance made him a favourite of the ‘tritheists’ – in the months prior to his death. The Scripta veterum latina, meanwhile, consisted in the main of Christological statements by the fifth- and sixth-century orthodox writers John Cassian, Maxentius Johannes, Leo the Great, Gelasius, Vigilius, Fulgentius and Rusticus. In his introduction to this work, Simler stakes out the Reformed ‘middle position’ on the correct use of the Fathers, in opposition to the extremes of both Tridentine Catholicism and religious radicalism:

Nos enim Patrum scripta non ideo edemus, quod illis eam tribuamus authoritatem, quam Canonicis scripturis, memores illius quod a D. Augustino scriptum est, neque quorumlibet disputationes, quamvis Canonicorum et laudatorum hominum, velut Canonicas scripturas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat salva honorificentia quae illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum scripturis improbare, si forte invenerimus quod aliter senserint quam veritas

131 The De aeterno was later attacked by the radicals for its reliance on extra-biblical authority. The Heidelberg antitrinitarian Matthias Vehe claimed that Simler’s work had proved ineffective against the heretics ‘aus ursach, das er ire argumenta allein aus gottlichem wort genomen, nit hat umbgestoßen und kein andere argumenta wider sie hat bringen, dan der patrum consilia und erklärung, die nit gegründet sein in gottlichem wort in ursprünglicher sprachen’ (Dän, p.280).

132 Correspondance, 16, no.1152. Simler defends Hilary’s orthodoxy in De aeterno, fols 186*-8*, 272*-7*.
habet divino adiutorio vel ab aliis intellecta vel a nobis. Rursus Anabaptistarum et Samosatenianorum sententiam improbamus, qui veterum lectionem prorsus aspernantur, et non verentur omnes qui ab Apostolorum usque aetate fuerunt sanctos Patres, Graecos simul atque Latinos damnare, et Antichristi satellites et tripersonati Dei defensores vocare, cunque neque Patres probant, et eos etiam contra quos illi scripsere Samosatenum, Sabellianum, Photinum, Arium se probare negent, nulla iuxta illos prorsus fuerunt Ecclesia, scilicet ut ipsi soli verae Ecclesiae nomine gaudere possint. At vero nobis sufficit quidem Apostolorum doctrina, et ex ea abunde haurimus quicquid ad tuendam pietatem et errores confutandos necessarium est, tamen nihilominus lectis veterum coniuncta scripturum cognitioni, magnam affert confirmationem, cum animadvertimus eomm fidem et dexteritatem in citandis et exponendis scripturis, et perpetuum quendam consensus in praecipuis fidei dogmatibus. Simler concedes that the opinions of the Fathers are only to be considered authoritative insofar as they conform to God’s word. On the other hand, they serve as important witnesses to the consistency of the catholic church’s teaching with regard to the Trinity and Christology through the centuries, to that consensus ecclesiae with which Simler was seeking to align the Zurich Reformation.

The confrontation with the Italian antitrinitarians and their eastern European followers did not trigger any fundamental changes in the doctrinal position of the Zurich church. The doctrines of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ had been affirmed in all of the principal Zwinglian statements of faith, from the Commentarius in vera et falsa religione through to the Second Helvetic Confession. However, the trinitarian controversies of the 1560s and 1570s forced the Zurichers to give more detailed consideration to those questions than they had done previously. The result was an increased emphasis on the conservative aspects of the Reformed programme. Catholic and Lutheran polemicists had long argued that Helvetic Protestantism was merely the respectable face of religious radicalism, a charge which the emergence of antitrinitarianism from within the Reformed

---

133 Scripta veterum, fol. "2".

134 Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae, fols 8'-9": 'Lectionem veternm non ita commendamus quod corun auitoritate velimus confirmare dogmata fidei, ut falsa nos calumiantur Adversarii, sed cum judicio corum scripta legi volumus, et ad normam sacrarum litterarum examinari, neque enim alter sua scripsereit, et dogmata non muda praperent, sed scripturis singula confirmant'. Compare Bullinger in De aeterno, sigs a_{4}-a_{7}.
churches of Switzerland and eastern Europe appeared to support. Bullinger, Simler and other Reformed theologians reacted by seeking to place the catholicity of the Swiss churches beyond dispute. The ‘excesses’ of the antitrinitarians exemplified for them the dangers of a wholesale rejection of catholic tradition; their anti-heretical works were intended to make clear to conservative as well as radical opponents the Reformed churches’ continued acceptance of the core elements of that tradition. The redefinition of the scripture principle to permit the use of extra-biblical vocabulary was an important element in this process of harmonising the central tenets of the Reformation with the historical teachings of the western church. The ‘open’ model of a Reformed church, by which many Italian exiles were attracted, was rapidly giving way to a confessional, conformist model. In Chapter 5, I shall examine how that transition affected the Italian Protestant communities of the Rhaetian Freestate.
During the 1540s and 1550s, the Zurich church helped to create the conditions for the establishment of Protestant congregations throughout the Italian-speaking southern communes of Graubünden and the Rhaetian subject lands. At first, the possibility seemed open that Rhaetia’s Italian churches might become for Italy what Geneva was becoming for France: a refuge for the persecuted faithful and the springboard for a sustained Protestant missionary assault. Very soon, however, it became apparent to Bullinger and his colleagues that the hoped-for Reformation of Italy was unlikely to materialise. Although the Zurich divines retained a lively interest in the affairs of the embryonic Italian congregations of Rhaetia, increasingly their concerns centred on the activities of dissident elements within those communities. Already Bullinger’s intervention in the Chiavenna sacramentarian controversy of the late 1540s, whose main protagonists were Camillo Renato and Agostino Mainardi, has been noted. I now wish to turn to further disputes of this type from the 1560s and early 1570s, which pitted conservative reformers in the mould of Mainardi against opponents of confessionally defined Reformed orthodoxy. Both sides looked to the Zurich church to authenticate their understanding of the Reformation, competing actively on occasion for the support of Bullinger and his colleagues. However, following the Ochino affair and the series of dramatic schisms in the Reformed churches of Poland and
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Transylvania, the distinction between 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' had become much more clear-cut in the minds of Zurich's theologians. The Zurichers offered firm backing to the Rhaetian Reformed leadership in its campaign against the radicals, thereby helping to ensure that Reformed orthodoxy prevailed in Protestant Graubünden. In the process, they demonstrated their new-found determination to root out dissent from within the Italian exile community.

I. FROM MAINARDI TO LENTOLO: CONFLICTS WITHIN THE ITALIAN CHURCHES OF GRAUBÜNDEN, 1561-7

Between 1547 and 1551, the theological and personal differences between Agostino Mainardi and Camillo Renato threatened to split the Reformed church of Chiavenna, the largest of the Italian congregations in the Rhaetian subject lands. In August 1549, a commission made up of four senior Rhaetian ministers managed to persuade the two sides to accept an agreement based on twenty-one articles drawn up by Philip Gallicius,¹ but that failed to hold for long; on 6 July 1550 Renato was excommunicated by the church of Chiavenna for persistently defying its minister.² Under pressure from Vergerio, Renato recanted his errors early the following year,³ but again the settlement proved only temporary: the Sicilian left Chiavenna towards the end of 1551.

Mainardi was now in a position to re-impose his authority on the town's Reformed congregation; in Italian Graubünden as a whole, however, the ascendancy of the orthodox faction was by no means assured. Renato himself returned to his old haven, Caspano, where he remained until the early 1570s under the protection of the Paravicini.

¹ Renato, Opere, pp.270-1.
² Mainardi to Bullinger, 4 August 1550 (Schiess, 1, no.130).
³ Renato, Opere, pp.235-41.
Chapter 5: The Italian ‘Heretics’ of Rhaetia

family. The Reformed pastorate of Italian-speaking Rhaetia and the subject lands, which was drawn overwhelmingly from the ranks of evangelical exiles like Renato, included a number of known radical sympathisers; it was to combat their errors (denial of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, ‘libertinism’, and rejection of the Reformed doctrine of baptism) that the Rhaetic Confession was introduced in 1553. The leadership of the Rhaetian Reformed church was profoundly mistrustful of the exile ministers. In November 1557, for instance, Johannes Fabricius, the Zurich-educated Alsatian who had recently succeeded Johannes Comander as senior minister in Chur, counselled Bullinger against responding to some doctrinal questions put to him by a certain Ludovicus Arcadius of Mantua, who purported to be a pastor serving in Graubünden: ‘Homines eiusmodi curiosos et novarum rerum apprime cupidos plures apud nos est reperire, et fere, quo indoctiores quidam sunt, eo confidentius nova moluntur’.

It was only a matter of time before a new confrontation between the conservative and radical factions in the Italian churches erupted. In January 1560, Mainardi persuaded the church of Chiavenna to make admission to its ranks conditional on subscription to an elaborate confession of faith that he had drawn up to combat the errors of Renato (on the sacraments, the atonement, and the fate of the soul after death). The measure soon attracted criticism from Mainardi’s less orthodox colleagues. Opposition to subscription was led by Michelangelo Florio, formerly minister to the Italian congregation in London under

---


5 Comander and Gallicius to Bullinger, 22 April 1553 (Schiess, 1, no.209).

6 STAZ E II 373, 507; Schiess, 2, p.35 (no.39). Fabricius was replying to Bullinger’s letter of 29 October (STAZ E II 373, 19; Schiess, 2, no.37[2]). Arcadius had asked Bullinger: first, whether ministers should be obliged to affirm the Athanasian creed (often a stumbling-block, as we have seen, for Italian radicals); secondly, whether communion should be dispensed privately to the sick (this was advocated by exiles such as Ochino in opposition to Reformed practice); thirdly, whether the synod should hear accusations against ministers in their absence.
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Edward VI and now pastor at Soglio in the Valbregaglia. Early in 1561, Florio and four other ministers (Girolamo Turriano of Piuro and Hieronymus Tryphernas of Mese in the Valchiavenna; Francesco Cellario of Morbegno and Augustinus a Crema of Tirano in the Valtellina; and Giorgio Stefano of Casaccia in the Valbregaglia) put their names to a list of 25 *quaestiones* that implicitly condemned Mainardi's approach to dealing with 'heresy'.

The dissenting pastors objected in particular to the suggestion that all church members should be required to make an explicit declaration of faith in the Trinity, as defined by the Nicene and Athanasian creeds and the creed of pope Damasus. In question 20, for example, they asked

> an quis tanquam pertinax, atque convictus haereticus ob simplicem errorem in articulo Trinitatis, cuius arcum sacramissimum vix ab angelis comprehendi potest excommunicari debeat, quomodocunque in caeteris omnibus in doctrina atque vita sit inculpabilis, imo laudatissimis moribus, et summa erga pauperes charitate sit praeditus?

Florio and his supporters suggested that verbal acceptance of the church's doctrines ought to be regarded as sufficient proof of orthodoxy, and voiced doubts as to whether 'idiotae' and 'simplices' could justly be compelled to assent to propositions which they were unable to understand and which were, moreover, framed in non-scriptural language.

In May 1561, shortly before a meeting of the Rhaetian synod that was due to discuss the dispute, Florio presented Bullinger with a copy of the *quaestiones*: in effect, the Zurich church was being asked to act as an arbiter in the conflict, as it had done during the Renato controversy a decade earlier. But if Florio hoped that Bullinger would intervene to moderate Mainardi's demands, he misjudged the situation badly. The *Antistes* had

---


8 For the original text of the *quaestiones*, see StAZ A 248.1. A copy (in which the questions number 26 rather than 25) is held in Bern and published in Trechsel, 2, pp.417-9. The *quaestiones* are discussed in Rotorzò, 'Esuli', 784-5; and Cantimori, *Eretici*, pp.282-3.

9 Trechsel, 2, p.419.
maintained his links with Mainardi throughout the 1550s: two of the Chiavenna minister's works, the *Trattato dell'unica, et perfetta satisfattione di Christo* and the *Pia et utile sermonethe gratia di Dio* were published in Zurich in 1552, while Mainardi's correspondence with Bullinger at the time of the Locarno crisis has already been noted. More importantly, Bullinger approached the *quaestiones* in the light of his cumulative experience of Italian religious radicalism, most recently in eastern Europe. In Florio's opposition to subscription, he probably saw an echo of Biandrata's demands for a return to 'scriptural simplicity' — code for the abandonment of Nicene orthodoxy. In a letter to Mainardi of 11 May, Bullinger brushed aside the reservations that had been expressed by the Chiavenna minister's opponents about demanding adherence to anything more than the Apostles' creed, as a well-tried tactic of heretics bent on escaping detection: ' Qui vero recipiunt symbolum apostolicum vere, illi non abhorrent a symbolo Nicaeno, Constantinopolitano et Athanasiano, ut quae cum illo congruant; qui renuunt agnoscre, prodigiosas habent opiniones'. After inspecting the *quaestiones*, Bullinger told Johannes Fabricius that they would leave the church helpless against antitrinitarianism, and warned his Rhaetian counterpart to be vigilant: 'Italica illa ingenia irrequieta sunt ingenia'.

In his official response to Florio's queries, dated 17 May, Bullinger mounts a vigorous defence of the use of credal language in the service of the church, using arguments he had already rehearsed in the *Assertio utriusque in Christo natura*, De

---

10 The *Trattato* has been read as a defence of the orthodox Reformed doctrine of Christ's merits against radical criticisms of the Protestant teaching on satisfaction, of the sort made by Ochino, Lelio Sozzini and, apparently, Renato (Armand Hugon, p. 94). However, the work's main target is clearly the Catholic understanding of redemption, in particular the distinction between the 'guilt' and the 'penalty' for sin.

11 Schiess, 2, p. 295 (no. 340). Bullinger clearly made the connection between concurrent developments in Poland and Rhaetia: with the letter he sent Mainardi a copy of the *Epistolae duae ad ecclesias polonicas* in order to clarify the Zurich church's teaching on the Trinity.

12 Bullinger to Fabricius, 16 May 1561 (StAZ E II 373, 267; Schiess, 2, no. 343). Bullinger also wrote to friends in Basel (which Florio intended to visit next) to advise them against giving succour to the dissidents. Again he criticised the 'ingenium Italicum' which had prompted Florio to attempt to bypass the Rhaetian Reformed authorities by seeking support from outside Graubünden (StAZ E II 373, 279; Schiess, 2, no. 345).
canonicae Scripturae et catholicae ecclesiae authoritate and the Decades, and was shortly to deploy again in the context of the Polish trinitarian controversies.13 There is no harm, Bullinger maintains, in ministers resorting to extra-biblical terminology, 'res tamen in scriptura traditas nihil mutantibus, sed magis illustrantibus et a dolo hominum malo simplicitatem veritatis asserentibus'.14 He illustrates this point with an example from the history of the early church:

Quaerabantur olim sectarii et Arriani inprimis, voces Trinitas, persona, consubstantialis et similes non inveniri in scripturis sanctis expressas, et proinde iniquum existimabant, illas requiri a fidelibus confitentibus alias, unum esse Deum Patrem, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. Caeterum vigilantes Ecclesiarum pastores, sentientes in hac herba haereticum latitare anguem, voces illas requirebant rigide, quo significantus exprimeretur orthodoxa veritas excludereturque haeretica pravitas.15

On the authority of Athanasius, Bullinger claims that the church has the right to react to changing situations – and the emergence of new forms of heresy – by formulating doctrinal statements suited to dealing with them. Again he sets up an implicit comparison between the problems facing the contemporary church and those which had confronted its ancient forerunner: in the early church, too, misuse of the Apostles’ creed by heretics had necessitated the introduction of more elaborate confessions of faith. Bullinger concludes that the Nicene, Constantinopolitan and Athanasian creeds do not add to, but merely make explicit, what is taught in scripture concerning the Trinity. Refusal to accept them therefore equates to a rejection of scripture itself.16

---

11 ‘Tigurinum consilium ad synodum Curiae’ (StAZ A 248.1; published in Trechsel, 2, pp.419-28).
14 Trechsel, 2, p.421.
15 Ibid., p.422.
16 Trechsel, 2, p.424: ‘Qui amplectitur ea, quae tradita sunt in scripturis sanctis de Trinitate deque incarnationis Filii mysterio et de Spiritu Sancto non potest non eadem ratione eadem extra scripturas in Symbolis illis comprehensione atque tradita. Ergo qui Symbola haec respunt, non viderint, quomodo sincere credant et sensu incorrupto retineant aut custodiant, quae in scripturis sanctis de illisipsis capitibus sunt exposita aut comprehensa’. Bullinger mounts a spirited defence of the creed of pope Damasus, which Mainardi’s critics found especially objectionable, not least because of its authorship (ibid., pp.423-4). Significantly, the creed of Damasus, with its precise definitions of orthodox teaching on the Trinity and the two natures of Christ, was later prefaced to the Second Helvetic Confession.
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The Zurichers' comments on the *quaestiones* were addressed to the Rhaetian synod, which duly gave its backing to Mainardi when it met in June 1561. As proof of its orthodox credentials, the synod reissued Philip Gallicius's Rhaetic Confession and upheld the sentences of excommunication passed by the consistory of Chiavenna against two dissident members of the congregation, Ludovico Fieri and Pietro Leone; an attack on Mainardi which Leone had published in collaboration with Michelangelo Florio was also formally condemned. Nevertheless, the 1561 synod failed to provide a permanent solution to the 'problem' of heresy in the Italian churches. Subscription was not made a general precondition of church membership, although it was encouraged. Individual congregations and ministers, rather than the Rhaetian church as a whole, remained responsible for ensuring that doctrinal uniformity was maintained. That meant that the practice of church discipline continued to vary considerably across the Valbrrega and the subject lands during the 1560s, with the strict regime put in place by Mainardi in Chiavenna only one of several possible models.

For proof of this, one need only turn to the neighbouring congregation of Piuro, headed by Girolamo Turriani. Turriani, as we have seen, was one of the signatories to Florio's *quaestiones*; the association between the two men dated back some years, as Florio's *Apologia* of 1557 includes a prefatory epistle by his fellow exile, at that time minister in Bondo. Turriani was judged theologically unreliable by the Rhaetian church.

---

17 This work no longer survives. On Leone, see Lentolo, *Commentarii*, fols 3'-4'.

18 See the 'Acta synodi' published in Trechsel, 2, pp.429-30, which state: 'Ne tamen quis in posterum earn, quae totius est ecclesiae, confessionem possit Clavennensem aut Maynardicam appeare, nos unanimi consensu earn confessionem confecimus, quae a vestra nihil discreptat; quod ad religionis capita attinet, quae posthac tamen non Clavennensis sed Rhaetica dicetur, ad cuius subscriptionem neminem cogendum quidem censemus ad tollendas occasiones rizarem, sed coeterus tamen a ministris et senioribus sunt examinandi, quoutquot ecclesiae accenseri et inscribi cupiunt. Si quis tamen volens minime coactus subscribere velit, id neutiquam improbamus. *Quod autem ad examen attinet, singulis ecclesiis suam ius permitimus integrum et ponimus in potestate ministrorum et totius ecclesiae, qui sufficientem aut minus sufficientem edant confessionem*. The italics are my own.

19 *Apologia di M. Michelagnolo Fiorentino, ne la quale si tratta de la ver e false chiesa [...]* (Camogas.
leadership at an early stage: in December 1564 Johannes Fabricius spoke of him as a
‘homo perversi cerebri et ingenii’.20

Turriani and his ally Florio were in contact with other Italian radicals resident in
Basel and Zurich. The Genoese merchant Niccolò Camogli (whom we encountered briefly
in Chapter 3) wrote to the two ministers from Basel on 20 September 1563 to urge them to
continue to resist the introduction of the death penalty for heresy in Rhaetia. In the same
letter he praised Ochino’s recently published Dialogi XXX, promising to send Florio and
Turriani a copy of the work via Camillo Sozzini, whom he commended as a ‘probus
iuvenes’ much persecuted by the ‘novi Pharisaei’. With the Zurich authorities increasingly
on their guard against heretical activity, it would seem that the group of Italian exiles
associated with Ochino and Lelio Sozzini had begun to look for an alternative haven:
Camogli went on to explain that Camillo would soon be visiting Piuro with a view to
settling there permanently, possibly with his nephew Fausto.21 There were also plans for
Dario Scala to move to Graubünden.22 Had news of Camogli’s efforts to arrange for
Ochino’s reception in either Soglio or Piuro following his expulsion from Zurich not
reached the ears of Bullinger, who raised the alarm with Fabricius in Chur, the ‘secta
senensis’ might have been able to relocate to Rhaetia in its entirety.23 In the event Camillo
and Camogli took up residence in Piuro during the course of 1564; the latter was also
appointed an elder in the town’s Reformed church.

1557), sigs A4-B2.

20 Fabricius to Bullinger, 4 September 1564 (StAZ E II 375, 747; Schiess, 2, p.531 [no.634]).

21 Lentolo, Commentarii, fols 48°-9; part-published in Bainton, p.180. Fausto Sozzini advised his uncle
Camillo to leave Zurich in a letter of 3 November 1563: ‘Lo star dove eravate non fa per la sanità né della
persona né della borsa’ (Marchetti and Zucchi, Aggiunte, p.91).

22 Camogli to Florio and Turriani, 29 December 1563 (Commentarii, fols 50°-51°). Camogli dispatched a
copy of Scala’s confession of faith to the two ministers for their approval. A good deal of subterfuge seems to
have been involved in this transaction: Camogli writes, ‘ut tutiora sit omnia, rogo alterum ex vobis ut in mei
gratiam eius exemplar exscribat sine Duri nomine, et cui opus est, eam ostendat’.

23 See Bullinger to Fabricius, 27 December 1563 (StAZ E II 373, 479; Schiess, 2, no.566; Bainton, p.194).
Recent work on the Archiv Salis-Planta, much of which is now held at the Staatsarchiv Graubünden in Chur, has added considerably to our knowledge of the Piuro radicals' activities during the 1560s. In particular, a number of letters addressed to Camillo Sozzini have been rediscovered and published. Those letters reveal that, from Piuro, Camillo remained in communication with other, possibly 'heretical', Italians currently or formerly resident in Zurich, among them Guarnerio Castiglione and Francesco Betti, whose radical links have already been noted. Camogli and Turiani participated indirectly in this network of contacts: writing to Camillo on 14 April 1565, Castiglione asked the latter to pass on his greetings to Camogli, 'il quale amo nel Signore', and 'al nostro reverendo Torriano, le cui saliuti mi sono state gratissime et delle cui prediche ve ne ho invidia'. Camillo was also in correspondence with his nephew Fausto, who had returned to Siena from Switzerland in late 1563 after depositing Lelio's papers with Betti. While in Basel, Fausto had made the acquaintance of Camogli, whom he describes in one letter as 'vero brudder mio'.

In Piuro at least, it would seem that the radicals' activities encountered little interference, although Fausto Sozzini was still keen to restrain his uncle Camillo from embarking on too open a proselytising campaign. With only a few miles separating Piuro and Chiavenna, the hawkish Reformed leadership in the latter town was left fighting an uphill battle to prevent radical influence spilling over into its own community: in June 1563, Fabricius informed Bullinger that Pietro Leone had returned to Chiavenna to

---

24 Marchetti and Zucchini, *Aggiunte, passim*; Zucchini, *Celso e Camillo Sozzini, passim*.
25 See the letters from Betti to Camillo Sozzini of 30 March 1565 (*Aggiunte*, pp.117-8), April / May 1565 (ibid., pp.120-1), 21 February 1568 (ibid., p.136), 26 June 1569 (ibid., pp.145-6), 30 June 1570 (ibid., pp.150-2); and Castiglione's letter to Camillo Sozzini of 14 April 1565 (ibid., pp.118-20).
26 *Aggiunte*, p.119.
27 Ibid., p.98.
28 One historian has described 1560s Piuro as a 'Bollwerk der <<Heresie>> gegen das orthodoxe Chiavenna' (Welti, *Kleine Geschichte*, p.94).
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disseminate his heresies, and had been sentenced to death by the Diet. Mainardi’s death on 31 July that year was a serious blow to efforts to combat such dissidents. On hearing the news, Bullinger expressed the hope that a successor of like mind could be found, so that Chiavenna did not become a haven for sectarians.

From Bullinger’s perspective, the congregation’s choice of Girolamo Zanchi, a long-time correspondent of his and a disciple of Peter Martyr, could not have been more apposite. The Zurich church had been conspicuous in its support for Zanchi’s attempts to resist the imposition of Lutheranism in Strasbourg, before inviting him to succeed Vermigli as professor of Old Testament in Zurich (the plan seems to have foundered on resistance from the Zurich council to the appointment of another foreigner to its academy). In a letter of 22 October 1563, to the Rhaetian magnate Friedrich von Salis, Bullinger indicated that he held Zanchi’s talents in high regard.

The Antistes was in regular correspondence with Zanchi throughout the latter’s time in Chiavenna and never questioned his commitment to Reformed orthodoxy. Neither have most modern scholars: the Thomist Zanchi is best known as a formative influence on Reformed ‘scholasticism’, and as the author of De tribus Elohim, an impressive defence of the doctrine of the Trinity. From Strasbourg, Zanchi had urged the leaders of the Polish

---

29 StAZ E II 376, 90-1; Schiess, 2, no.519. Fabricius writes that banishment might have been a more appropriate sentence, but adds that Leone’s execution may at least serve as an example to those inclined to emulate him: ‘Malum aliquid durius in Stancarum primo in Polonia constitutum quam nunc tot ecclesias inter se commissas’. It is unclear whether the death sentence was ever carried out.

30 Bullinger to Fabricius, 13 August 1563 (StAZ E II 373, 395; Schiess, 2, no.530).

31 On the struggle between Zanchi and the Strasbourg Lutherans, see J. Kittelson, ‘Marbach vs. Zanchi: The Resolution of Controversy in Late Reformation Strasbourg’, SCJ 8 (1977), 31-44. See also the Zurich judgement on Zanchi’s theses, published in Hottinger, 8, pp.39-58, and analysed in Walser, pp.181-93.

32 See Gesner to Zanchi, 15 December 1562 (Zanchi, Epistolae, 2, 132); Bullinger to Zanchi, 16 December 1562 (ibid., 126); Wolfgang Haller to Zanchi (ibid., 131-2).

33 Schiess, 2, no.549.
Reformed to resist the drift away from Nicene orthodoxy, and there is no suggestion that he underwent a change of heart in Chiavenna. In August 1565, for instance, Zanchi informed Bullinger that a local cobbler, Antonio of Padua, had been excommunicated for denying the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Bewailing the spread of Servetus’s errors among his compatriots, Zanchi endorsed the prevalent conception of Italians as untrustworthy in theological matters: Bullinger was advised not to provide ‘Italis nostris’ with testimonies of sound doctrine nisi bene perspectam habeas illorum fidel de Deo et peccato originali, de baptismo parvulorum etc.

Zanchi could hardly be accused, then, of turning a blind eye to heresy. Nevertheless, some of the Piuro radicals took encouragement from his appointment. Zanchi was linked by marriage to Basel’s heterodox Italian community, through his first wife Violanthis Curione. When he passed through Basel en route to Chiavenna in late November 1563, Zanchi lodged with Camogli, his visit coinciding with the latter’s attempts to arrange a safe haven for Ochino in Graubünden. In letters to Florio and Turriani, Camogli noted that Zanchi had expressed sympathy for Ochino’s plight, and claimed that the Bergamasco had pledged himself to a policy of conciliation vis à vis Chiavenna’s own ‘heretics’; Camogli apparently believed that Zanchi might act as a counterweight to Mainardi’s assistant Simone Fiorillo, who had recently blocked a move to readmit Camillo Renato to Reformed worship. Zanchi’s association with Camogli, and the fact that his second wife was a member of the powerful Lumaga merchant family, based in Piuro, prevented him

---

34 For Zanchi’s involvement in the doctrinal controversies affecting the Polish church, see the letters in Zanchi, Epistolae, 1, pp.36-41.

35 Zanchi to Bullinger, 19 August 1565 (StAZ E II 356, 805'; Schiess, 2, p.627 [no.715]).

36 The ‘D. Hieronymus’ denounced by the church of Chiavenna in September 1571 for failing to heed repeated warnings to break off contact with heretics is not Zanchi, as Giampaolo Zucchini suggests, but Turriani (Lentolo, Commentarii, fols 1r-2'; G. Zucchini, Riforma e società nei Grigioni: G. Zanchi, S. Fiorillo, S. Lentulo e i conflitti dottrinari e socio-politici a Chiavenna (1563-1567) (Chur 1989), pp.20-1).

37 See Camogli’s letters of 20 September, 1 and 3 December 1563 (Lentolo, Commentarii, fols 48r-9'; 46r-7'; 47r-8').
from taking a hard line in his dealings with the Piuro radicals: in fact, Zanchi and Turriani appear to have been on good terms. When Turriani deserted his post during an outbreak of the plague in 1564, for example, Zanchi rallied to the Piuro minister’s support, to the annoyance of Johannes Fabricius in Chur.\(^38\) Although events such as Ochino’s expulsion from Zurich had brought the theological differences between radical and orthodox thinkers in the Italian exile community into sharper relief, there was as yet no permanent rift: Zanchi later confessed to having had an amicable relationship with Lelio Sozzini, which ended only when Sozzini, abandoning his customary discretion, sought to win Zanchi over to his radical version of antitrinitarianism.\(^39\)

In any case, Zanchi’s attention was fully occupied by a challenge to his authority from within the church of Chiavenna, orchestrated by his deputy Fiorillo. The conflict between Zanchi and Fiorillo has been examined in detail by Giampaolo Zucchini. Fiorillo, it would seem, exploited tensions between native Chiavennaschi and Italian exiles who had settled in the town in order to destabilise Zanchi’s position. In February 1567, prompted by Fiorillo, the church decided that henceforth only natives (terrieri) should be eligible for election as elders: the move was directed principally against Zanchi’s close ally Francesco Bellinchietti, also of Bergamo.\(^40\) When Zanchi refused to recognise the decision, accusing its supporters of fomenting schism, the congregation suspended him from preaching; among the offences with which he was charged by his opponents was (significantly) conspiracy with the church of Piuro to bring about Fiorillo’s dismissal.\(^41\) Zanchi responded by attempting to drum up support for his case in the Valbregaglia, Zurich and Geneva, and

---

\(^38\) Fabricius to Bullinger, 27 November 1564 (Schiess, 2, no.643). The Chur minister was moved to remark on this occasion, ‘Italia non nisi habuit unum Martyrem’. Zanchi’s support for Turriani was not entirely altruistic: he himself had fled to the mountains around Piuro to escape infection (Zanchi, Opera, 7, 36-7).


\(^40\) Zucchini, Riforma, p.42.

\(^41\) Zucchini, Riforma, p.65.
from Italian pastors in the Engadine, but that was not enough to prevent the church of Chiavenna from voting to dismiss him on 18 May. After failing to have the decision overturned by the church authorities in Chur, Zanchi accepted the offer of a professorship in Heidelberg.  

Many of Zanchi's difficulties in Chiavenna can be put down to his lack of pastoral experience and consequent inability to manage the inevitable conflicts of interest which arose in the congregation. As an established theologian with ties to Europe's leading Reformed churchmen, he may also have found it difficult to adapt to a much smaller stage: certainly Zanchi's opponents in Chiavenna believed that he was guilty of high-handedness, and accused him 'di volersi usurpare il grado di superintendente a tutti gli altri' and of failing to act in consultation with the college of elders or his colleague Fiorillo. Zanchi's period as minister in Chiavenna stands out as one during which theological divisions took second place to personal or social rivalries: between the minister and his assistant, and between exiles and natives. The radicals themselves were noticeably divided in their opinion of Zanchi: while it is likely that he enjoyed the support of Camogli and Turriani, his accusers in the church of Chiavenna included some who later came under suspicion of heresy, such as Gianbattista Bovio of Bologna. In a letter of 30 March 1565, Francesco Betti informed Camillo Sozzini that he would be unable to visit Chiavenna 'se prima non m'è levata di dosso la calunnia datami dalla carità di messer Girolamo Zanco appo alcuni gentilhuomini di cesternia chiesa': Zanchi had, apparently, referred to Betti as a liar, slanderer and evil spirit ('maligno').

Bullinger was saddened to learn of Zanchi's dismissal. Writing to Fabricius's

---

42 Ibid., pp.50-6.
43 Ibid., pp.63-4.
44 Ibid., p.66.
45 Ibid., p.117.
successor as senior minister in Chur, Tobias Egli, he observed regretfully, 'Rhaetia non habet multos Zanchos'. That could not obscure the fact that Zanchi had failed to tackle what was, from the point of view of the Reformed leadership, the most urgent problem facing the Italian congregations of Rhaetia: heresy. That task was left to his successor, the Neapolitan Scipione Lentolo.

II. SCIPIONE LENTOLO AND THE ANTI-HERESY EDICT OF JUNE 1570

Unlike Zanchi, Lentolo came to the post of minister in the troubled church of Chiavenna with considerable pastoral experience. A former Franciscan, he had fled to Geneva in 1558 after a lengthy period of imprisonment by the Inquisition. Prior to his appointment in Chiavenna, Lentolo had spent five years as minister to the Waldenses (at Angroina, Ciabàs and Prali); this was followed by a brief spell at Monte di Sondrio in the Valtellina. Lentolo’s uncompromising disciplinarianism had not endeared him to congregations in

---

46 Schiess, 3, no.22. Following his move to Heidelberg, Zanchi remained in close contact with the Zurichers. The relationship was not without its difficulties: during the Heidelberg discipline controversy of the late 1560s, for instance, Zanchi was one of the leading advocates of the introduction of Calvinist-style church government, while the Zurichers favoured the anti-disciplinarian stance of Thomas Erastus (see Zanchi to Wolf, n.d. [Epistolae, 1, 63-4]). However, the Bergamasco made common cause with Bullinger and Simler in the polemical struggle against antitrinitarianism. In a letter to Bullinger of 24 August 1568, he welcomed the imminent publication of Simler’s De aeterno Dei filio, noting that the work was likely to prove especially useful to his fellow Italians, of whom many had succumbed to antitrinitarianism (StAZ E II 356a, 833-5; Epistolae, 2, 128-9). Simler assisted Zanchi’s own efforts to combat the radicals, sending him a copy of the Brevis enarratio dispositionis Albanae de Deo trino et Christo duplici after he had completed work on the De aeterno (Correspondance, 9, no.629; Zanchi, Opera, 1, fol."iii"i). When De tribus Elohim appeared, Simler described the work as ‘ad retundendum adversariorum nefarios conatus utilissimum’ (Ludwig Lavater to Zanchi, 19 December 1572 [Epistolae, 186); compare Simler, Bibliotheca, p.300).

either area,\(^\text{48}\) but it proved the key to tackling the problem of heresy in Chiavenna. Whereas Zanchi had managed to alienate the elders and deacons of the church of Chiavenna, Lentolo worked in harnass with them in order to marginalise and exclude his theological opponents. He also managed to engineer the dismissal of Simone Fiorillo, who had proved such a thorn in Zanchi’s side.\(^\text{49}\) Finally, he was able to enlist orthodox colleagues from across the Valbregaglia and the subject lands in support of his campaign against heresy. They included Guido Zonca of Mese, Giulio da Milano of Tirano, Paolo Gaddi of Teglio and Arminio Guliotta of Bondo.

From Lentolo’s account of his dealings with the heretics, the Commentarii conventus synodalis de excommunicatione Hieronymi Turriani, Nicolai Camulii et Camilli Sozzini, it is possible to gauge the impact of the Neapolitan’s arrival on the radicals of Chiavenna, whose activities seem to have gone largely unmonitored as the struggle between Zanchi and Fiorillo escalated. In fact, Lentolo gives the impression that much of Mainardi’s earlier work had been undone during Zanchi’s time as minister. In a letter to Johannes Wolf of October 1569, he emphasised the size of the challenge that he faced:

Mihi vero, ut aliquid de rebus huius Ecclesiae, cui servio, tibi communicem, mihi inquam fere quotidiem quasi confligendum cum hominibus Italicis, quod tamen et ipse Italus quem sim, minime me pudet dicere, quibus nulla religio placet, quando Papistica eis incipit displicere: sed Dei beneficio sunt ha pi et cordati viri qui una mecum fortiter resistant, neque ullo modo permittant Satanum praevaleare.\(^\text{50}\)

Following his appointment, Lentolo marshalled the Chiavenna college of elders in a concerted campaign to rid the community of radicals. The best-documented case is that of Giovanni da Modena, whom Antonio Rotondò has identified with Giovanni


\(^49\) Lentolo informs Bullinger of Fiorillo’s dismissal in a letter of 31 October 1568, but does not provide any explanation of the circumstances which had led to it (StAZ E II 365, 318; Schiess, 3, no.127).

\(^50\) Lentolo to Wolf, 12 October 1569 (ZB Ms. F 66, 309\textsuperscript{a}).
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Bergomozzi. On 21 May 1568, Bergomozzi was summoned before the college of elders to answer the charge that he had taught the sinlessness of the regenerate. He was asked to provide a written statement of his position in reply to twenty doctrinal questions drawn up by Lentolo, but failed to do so. Further attempts to secure Bergomozzi’s abjuration were also unsuccessful, resulting in his temporary suspension from the Lord’s Supper on 10 December. In February the following year, the college instructed church members to avoid the offender’s company, as he had been seen in conversation with known heretics; formal excommunication followed on 18 March.

During the course of 1569, proceedings were initiated against several other suspected heretics. On 4 March, for instance, the college instructed Lentolo and the elder Gianandrea Pellizari to follow up reports that Francesco Vacca of Bagnacavallo had questioned the doctrine of the Trinity. Under examination the accused openly denied the true divinity of Christ and refused to receive correction; that resulted in his excommunication on 20 March. The same fate befell Gianbattista Bovio, who (like Bergomozzi) proclaimed the sinlessness of the regenerate, while dismissing the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation as ‘puerorum catechismum ac lac procerum’.

Another local radical to come under investigation was Solomon of Piuro. Lentolo reports that Solomon had been excommunicated by Mainardi in August 1560 for denying the divinity of Christ, but had remained in Chiavenna unrepentant. After his arrival, Lentolo reopened proceedings against the heretic, who was given a solemn warning to renounce his errors. Solomon eventually agreed to sign the Rhaetic confession, but only as an act of obedience to the magistrate. When, in April 1569, the college of elders

---

81 DBI 9, pp.96-8.

82 Lentolo, Commentarii, fols 5v-9v.

83 Ibid., fols 22v-4v.

84 Ibid., fols 25v-31v.
demanded that he acknowledge the confession as pious, Christian and in accordance with
the word of God, Solomon refused, with the result that he remained excluded from the
sacraments. Following this, according to Lentolo, he continued to associate with other
dissidents and to question the divinity of Christ.\(^{55}\)

Lentolo’s Commentarii are our main source for the doctrinal views of the
Chiavenna radicals, although given their provenance they obviously need to be approached
with caution.\(^{56}\) Opposition to the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity was cited in most, though
not all, cases (Francesco Vacca, Gianbattista Bovio, Solomon of Piuro). That opposition
does not appear to have been particularly coherent: while Vacca, influenced perhaps by the
advanced antitrinitarianism of Lelio Sozzini, denied the divinity of Christ, a certain
Giacomo da Venezia was accused of reviving the ancient Sabellian heresy. A clearer
picture emerges in respect of the radicals’ soteriology. Several of them – including
Giovanni Bergomozzi, Gianbattista Bovio and Solomon of Piuro – rejected the orthodox
Protestant distinction between imputed and essential righteousness, arguing for the
perfection of the regenerate. Ochino, whose works are known to have circulated in Rhaetia,
is one possible source for such views.\(^{57}\) Lentolo himself detected Ochino’s influence in the

\(^{55}\) Ibid., fols 39v-43r.

\(^{56}\) See also Lentolo, Responsio orthodoxa, pp.187-8.

\(^{57}\) Following Ochino’s expulsion from Zurich, copies of the Dialogo della prudenza humana were
disseminated in the Valtellina (Fabricius to Bullinger, 20 March 1564 [8AZ E II 376, 112; Schiess, 2,
no.598; Sainston, p.196]). On 22 August 1568, Camillo Carrara was summoned before the presbytery of
Chiavenna and charged with reading Ochino’s works (Commentarii, fol. 35r). Giovanni Cortese, pastor at Sils
in the Engadine, was later investigated by the Rhaetian synod for possessing works by the Sienese preacher
(Zucchinì, ‘Lentulo’, 120). In his Trattato delle origini delle herezie of 1572, Scipione Calandrimi suggests
that Ochino had attracted a following in Rhaetia: ‘Io lascio passar per brevità molti altri heretici hereiarchi, et
huomini seditiosi, per non esser tediosi, e in speciali alcuni della natione nostra italiana, tra quali uno è stato
Bernardino Occhino, che prima essendo stato instrumento assai giovevole all’Evangelio, nondimeno poi per
isdegno conceputo contro la chiesa di Geneva, et per ambizione comincio a macchinarne una sette a parte et a
meter immensi cose nuove sotto una certa forma accademica, onde i cervelli de semplici, o d’altri inclinati per
natura pur troppo al male, son messi a partito, o indotti, o confermati nel male, si come ha ben dato a
conoscere in questi stessi paese uno che era stato suo discepolo, il quale havendo una moglie in Italia che era
donna nobile et honesta, et veramente christiana, non lasciò perciò di tener un’altra in questo paese, senza la
licenza del magistrato, et senza causa legittima di poter così fare, e nondimeno la memoria e del maestro e del
discepolo è anchora pretiosa appresso di molti, che vogliono esser tenuti buoni cristiani’ (Trattato, pp.56-7).
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radicals' conception of the mediatorial office of Christ. Noting Bovio’s refusal to accept that Christ had made satisfaction for sin by his death, Lentolo observed:

Qua [...] in re haud obscure ostendebat, se cum Ochino impuro illo nebulone sentire: qui negat Christum esse servatorem nostrum, quatenus pro nobis Patri satisfecerit, sed quatenus ut Propheta nobis divinam voluntatem explicaverit, ac, ut fideliter praestaret, ne morum quidem subire recusaverit: alioquin salus noster non esse gratuatum Dei donum. Quasi vero Christi meruit cum divina gratia pugnaret ac non potius illam extolleret, et commendaret: quum Deus sic mundum dilexit, ut non sit veritus unigenitum dare, quo credentes vitam consequerentur aeternam. 

Similar views were professed by Camillo Sozzini, who is reported to have said that Christ’s death was of no more benefit to humanity than that of the martyr Cyprian. The criticisms directed against the traditional understanding of the atonement by Ochino and Lelio Sozzini had, it would appear, been appropriated and elaborated by the radicals of Piuro and Chiaverma during the 1560s.

Within months of his appointment, Lentolo had placed his opponents on the back foot. In a letter to Camillo Sozzini of 21 February 1568, Francesco Betti lamented the demise of ‘Christian liberty’ in Rhaetia:

Si come io sono amatore della vera libertà cristiana et la desidero, et per me et per altri sopra le cose di questa vita, così et mi rallegra quando la veggo non pure sepolire, ma entrare in suo luogo la tirannia per opera di coloro che pur vorrebbero esser tenuti colonne del christianesimo. Ma che? queste non sono cose nuove. Quello, che mio giudizio ci ha di peggiore, è che così fatti mali ci vengono per li nostri peccati, laonde è da ricorrere a dio et, humiliandoci nel cospetto suo, addimandargli merce et aiuto per poterlo servire in ogni luogo et in ogni tempo sinceramente non pur noi, ma tutti que’ che lo temono et che desiderano di seguir le sue vie.

Some radicals, such as Gianbattista Bovio and Francesco Vacca, thought it advisable to leave Graubünden for the safer climes of Poland and Transylvania. Most, however,
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38 Lentolo, Commentarii, fol.28v.
39 Ibid., fol.25r.
60 Aggiunte, p.136.
61 The accounts of the Locarnese community in Zurich record the payment of a subvention on 25 September 1569 to ‘Ms. Gio. Batta di Bovi Bolognese che venendo da Chiavenna era per andare in Eidelberga per speciale ordine della Chiesa computa la spesa del’hosteria et la condutta de la carretta fin’Basilea’ (FA Orelli
remained, aware that Lentolo's writ did not run beyond Chiavenna. In the *Commentarii*, Lentolo complains that the sanctions imposed by the church of Chiavenna were rendered ineffective by the fact that the 'heretics' could always turn to Turriani in the expectation of support: he notes, for instance, that those accused of heresy by the Chiavenna college of elders habitually requested time to reply in writing to the charges levelled against them, during which they visited Piuro to receive instructions from their 'magistrum sive magistros'.

Lentolo goes so far as to ascribe the resurgence of religious radicalism in Chiavenna to the influence of Turriani and his associates; Francesco Vacca's errors are said to have been the product of a stay of several months with Camogli in Piuro, prior to which his views had been orthodox. Obviously one has to be wary when considering such claims given the nature of the source: the *Commentarii* were written as a vindication of Lentolo's role in the subsequent proceedings against Turriani and his associates. Radical ideas were current in the Modena 'comunità di fratelli' with which several of those investigated by the church of Chiavenna, including Vacca, had had links prior to their exile. On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt Lentolo's assertion that Turriani was prepared to receive excommunicates from Chiavenna into his church. In the 25 *quaestiones* of 1561, to which Turriani was a signatory, it was suggested that ministers might disregard sentences of

---

8.2, fol. 105'). On Bovio's subsequent activities in Poland, see V. Marchetti, 'Una polemica di Scipione Lentulo con l'antitrinitario Fabrizio Pestalozzi (1581)', *Il pensiero politico* 5 (1972), 284-301 (291). In a letter of November 1569, Francesco Vacca chided Camillo Sozzini for his reluctance to abandon Piuro: 'Sciebam te non esse relicturn dulcia tuguria pluriensia ut co venires ubi multo melius et animo et corpore esses' (*Aggiunite*, p.146).

62 Lentolo, *Commentarii*, fol.5°.

63 Ibid., fol. 22°, 24°.

64 See C. Bianco, 'La comunità di <<fratelli>> nel movimento ereticale modenese del '500', *RSI* 92 (1980), 621-79.

65 See Lentolo, *Commentarii*, fols 1°, 2°, 25° (Camillo Sozzini); fol.30° (Gianbattista Bovio); fols 32°, 34° (Giovanni Fratino); fol.35° (Giacomo da Venezia); fol.35° (Camillo Carrara); fols 36°, 38° (Pietro Romano).
By late 1569, it had become apparent to Lentolo that heresy could only be effectively tackled in Chiavenna as part of a general assault on the problem throughout the Italian Reformed churches of Graubünden. Campaigns centred on a single church had proved ineffective, as 'heretics' expelled from one congregation could always find refuge elsewhere so long as no common approach to discipline existed across the region. Already Lentolo had established close ties with several other local ministers who shared his opposition to the radicals: in May 1570, for instance, the Chiavenna college of elders proceeded to the formal excommunication of Giovanni Fratino after consultation with Guido Zonca and Scipione Calandrini, preachers in Mese and Morbegno respectively. Together Lentolo and his orthodox allies in the Italian-speaking pastorate now began to put pressure on the Rhaetian magistracy to intervene on their behalf. On 7 November 1569, the church of Chiavenna asked the Reformed leadership in Chur to petition the Diet for the expulsion of all religious dissidents from Graubünden. In May the following year the Chiavennaschi wrote again, to point out that the churches of the Valtellina, too, were infested with Arians and Anabaptists. What Lentolo was seeking, in effect, was universal subscription for those professing membership of the Rhaetian Reformed church, the goal that had eluded Mainardi in 1561.

Lentolo's timing was fortunate, in that his demand for magisterial action against
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66 Question 24: 'An aliquis Ecclesiae minister videns aliquem pium fratrem inique, et violenter ab alio quopiam ministro excommunicatum, ecclesiaeque prorsus explosum, illum recipere possit, eique sacram Dei coenam exhibere?' (Trechsel, 2, p.419).

67 Lentolo, Commentarii, fol.34'.

68 Responsio orthodoxa, pp.38-46.

69 Ibid., pp.47-9. The churches of the Valtellina had become involved in Lentolo's campaign against the Chiavenna radicals as a result of the activities of Pietro Romano, said to be a disciple of the executed Benedictine Giorgio Siculo, whose 'Pelagianism' had attracted Calvin's ire. In November 1570, the Chiavenna college of elders opened proceedings against Romano on the basis of information received from Giulio da Milano. See Lentolo, Commentarii, fols 35'-6'; Cantimori, Eretici, pp.308-9.
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the heretics coincided with the outbreak of a conflict between orthodox and dissenting ministers in Chur itself. There the pastor of St Regula, Johannes Gantner, had denounced the sentence of banishment issued by the city council against a local bookseller, Georg Frell, for disseminating Schwenckfeldian and Anabaptist literature; the ensuing controversy left Tobias Egli, who was already alarmed by reports of heretical activity in Chiavena, inclined to support the measure put forward by Lentolo. At Egli’s request, on 27 June 1570 the Diet promulgated an edict instructing all inhabitants of the Freestate to adhere, on pain of banishment, to one of Graubünden’s two recognised faiths: Catholicism, or Reformed Protestantism as defined by the Rhaetic and Second Helvetic Confessions.

Lentolo was quick to take advantage of the new statute’s provisions. On 15 September, Solomon of Piuro was denounced to the commissario of Chiavena, Christian Hartmann, as a heretic under the terms of the edict. Two months later Giacomo da Venezia suffered the same fate. However, it quickly became apparent that the Rhaetian magistracy was in no hurry to enforce the new measures. Solomon of Piuro, for instance, was still at liberty six months after his denunciation; in April 1571, the Chiavena college of elders was forced to request that Hartmann attend a meeting at which the accused was due to answer the charges against him, in order to witness that he received a fair hearing.

Many otherwise orthodox members of the church seem to have been uncomfortable with Lentolo’s hardline stance: the death of Giovanni Bergomozzi in early 1571 provided a
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70 Egli, like his predecessor Fabricius, was a protegé of Bullinger. Originally from the Thurgau but educated in Zurich, he served as minister in Weinsach, Frauenfeld, Davos and Russikon before taking over as preacher at St Martin’s in Chur (Schiess, 3, pp.ix-xix). On the clash between Egli and Gantner, see E. Wenneker, ‘Heinrich Bullinger und der Gantnerhandel in Chur (1570-1574)’, Zwa 24 (1997), 95-115; S. Rageth and O. Vasella, ‘Die Autobiographie des Taufers Georg Frell von Chur’, Zwa 7:7 (1942/1), 444-69. Egli’s awareness of the threat represented by the Italian heretics is evident from his letter to Bullinger of 5 June 1570. There he argues that by means of the proposed edict ‘via praeceditur Haereticis et Arriauismo, qui Chavennae suppulare videbatur’ (StAZ E II 377, 2477; Schiess, 3, no.204).

71 Text in Lentolo, Responsio orthodoxa, pp.52-4.

72 Lentolo, Commentarii, fol.41v.

73 Ibid., fol.42v.
focus for their discontent. Lentolo was determined that the excommunicate should be interred without religious rites, but another Modenese exile, Giulio Sadoleto, arranged for Turriani to conduct the funeral, which was attended by several members of the church of Chiavenna in defiance of their pastor’s interdict. When admonished, these latter refused to accept that they were at fault and absented themselves from the Lord’s Supper for almost a year in protest. Lentolo was forced to seek the support of Zonca, Guliotta, Gaddi and Giulio da Milano in order to bring the situation under control.

Outside Chiavenna, too, the edict encountered considerable opposition. Even Scipione Calandrini, who had earlier approved Lentolo’s excommunication of Giovanni Fratino, appears to have had reservations about the measure. The edict’s most vocal critic was Bartolomeo Silvio, an exile from Cremona who, after spells as minister at Pontresina, in the Engadine, and Casaccia, in the Valbregaglia, had taken charge of Lentolo’s former congregation of Monte di Sondrio. Shortly after the promulgation of the edict, Silvio

---

74 On Giulio Sadoleto and, especially, his links with Camogli, see A. Pastore, *Nella Valtellina del tardo Cinquecento: fede, cultura, società* (Milan 1975), pp. 114-5; and Rotondi, ‘Esuli’, 776-82. Sadoleto and Bergomozzi were both prominent figures in Modena’s ‘comunità di fratelli’.

75 Lentolo, *Commentarii*, fol. 11r-21v.

76 See Egli’s letter to Josias Simler of 28 May 1571 (ZB Ms F 59, 410-12): ‘Scipio ille Calandrinius multis antequam hinc disceleret eadem de re mecum egit, sed in faciem meam non omnino male de isto decreto sentire voluit: imo D. Commissariorum (inter quos fuit D. Willius noster) sedulam et diligentem operam in decreto eiusmodi explicando, ac declarando, mire praedicavit, quam declarationem grato animo omnis susceperint, ac mentes, denique Legislatorum exacte cognoverint. Non hoc decretum sicuti Itali conquirent, itifirmis quicquam incomodat, neminem etiam vi quidam sive ad pontificiam sive Evangelicum professionem rapit. Sed praefractis pacis publicae turbatoribus modum ac temporum statuit, qui cum neque nostrae ecclesiae se adiungunt, neque etiam sordibus Pontificis detec tori videri volunt, nescio quid tertium ac singularre penes se fovent, ecclesias turbant, exota apud promismum vulgus evomunt, Confessioni piae ac orthodoxae nostrae, eiusque assertoribus ministris, sese opponunt, nihilque non speciatim et clanculum facientur, modo separatione ac alienatione ab ecclesia, cures membra tamen esse vultunt, magni et caeteris scientiis esse videantur. Quae autem haec de impudentia, ne quid durius dicam, istius Calandrini, qui post decetri illius sensum explicatum et approbationi a dominis et ministris, ino ab illo ipso, nihilominus praeestim ad se impugnati? Any letter that Calandrini may have sent to Zurich protesting about the edict does not appear to have survived.
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wrote a short tract fiercely criticising the new anti-heresy measures. Like Florio before him, Silvio had grave reservations about both the wisdom and the propriety of requiring subscription of church members. By demanding that prospective members assent to a series of complex doctrinal formulas, he argued, the Reformed churches were likely to drive potential converts back into the arms of the Catholic church; given the evangelicals' minority status in the Valtellina in particular, this was a luxury they could ill afford. Silvio maintained that Rome, rather than internal dissidents, ought to be the principal target of the Reformed leadership. (In this respect his position recalls that of Ochino and Aconcio, who had also sought to make antipapalism the basis of Protestant unity.)

In his tract Silvio echoes the concern expressed by Florio in his earlier *quaestiones* for those persons 'weak in faith' who are as yet unable to embrace the full theological package of Swiss Reform. Again like Florio, he argues that all who accept the Apostles’ creed are to be considered brethren in Christ, and dismisses subscription as an unbiblical practice, with its roots in the papacy:

> Omnes adversus papaturn ad ravim clamavimus pro sanctarum scripturarum simplicitate, cum Paulo dicentes: Sacras literas posse nos (etiam ministros), ad salutem instruere per fidem in Christo et ut perfecto sit homo Dei ad omne opus bonum formatum. Nunc autem veluti immemores symbola multiplicari volumus, leges et ordinationes. Quid papari adversum nos non possunt ista nec legentes et
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78 ZB Ms. F 61, 343-8'. Silvio's text also appears, with some significant textual variations, in Lentolo’s *Responsio orthodoxa*.

79 ZB Ms. F 61, 344'.

80 ‘Volunt itidem, ut si quis sese simpliciter religione, ordini et statutis Curienis Synodi subscribere noluerit, is pro haereticus per magistratum plectitur exilio perpetuo et severius per ipsius magistratus arbitrio, quod si fiat, ubi erit in ecclesia membrorum differentia, infirmorum scilicet et fortorum? Ubi imbecillium tolerantia? Aliubi apostolorum aetate mixtue erant ecclesiae ex iudaeis et gentibus. Ex iudaeis infirmi plerique modum adducti ut omnino ceremonias valedicerent, diu in illis assueti. Gentes noverant se ad illas non tenevi, sed ad illorum corpus et veritatem. Aliqui doctores ea in diversitate rixas movebant, et infirmos contenabant et judicabant qu asi Deus in scientia illos potentiores fecisset ut infirmos fatigaret, opprimerent et perderent, ad renunciationem religionem vel ad factendum contra prorsa sui conscientia adductos. Euismodi mandat Paulus infirmum in fide suscipere, non ad contendendum in questionibus non contemnere, nec servum judicare non suum, sed alium: qui quoque non ad illorum arbitrium vivere teneatur, sed Christi domini sui, cui et quaeque nostrum vivere et mori debet’ (ibid., 345°; *Responsio orthodoxa*, pp.179-80).
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audientes?®

Subscription, for Silvio, represents an attack on evangelical liberty and a violation of Christian charity: he warns his fellow ministers, ‘Caveamus ne in papanam phrenesim cadamus, volentes non posse quenquam nos arguere, etiam si animas turmatim ad inferna trahamus’.® It is also contrary to the established practice of the Rhaetian church: in the past, Silvio notes, those who refused to put their names to the Athanasian creed continued to be regarded as ‘fratres’ by the synod, even though they were excluded from the ministry.® Silvio accepts that the Christian magistrate has a duty to maintain order within the church and to punish those who offend outwardly against God’s law. That power does not, however, extend to policing private consciences, where the individual is answerable to God alone.®

According to Lentolo, Silvio’s tract was disseminated and discussed in Chiavenna, ‘primum in angulis, denique palam in triviis et tabernis’.®® That would imply widespread support for his views, not only from religious radicals but also from moderates (like those who had attended Bergomozzi’s funeral), for whom the edict represented an affront to Rhaetia’s traditions of religious liberty. Faced with such opposition, the orthodox pastorate had no choice but to issue a defence of its position on the treatment of heretics. At the request of Giulio da Milano and Paolo Gaddi, Lentolo produced a lengthy response to

81 ZB Ms. F 61, 344®; Responsio orthodoxa, p.105.

82 ZB Ms. F 61, 345®; Responsio orthodoxa, pp.170-1. Silvio’s language here is reminiscent of Ochino in his preface to dialogue 26 of the Dialogi XXX (see pp.133 above).

83 ZB Ms. F 61, 344®; Responsio orthodoxa, p.100.

84 Magistratus autem domino serviens, et ecclesiae nutritus index eit in iram ei qui male agit, non autem inquit qui male credit. Nam externorum index est, non cordium et mentium. Adulteria externa, non cordium concupiscientias, punire deberet; et homicidia, non iram et odia cordium: sic seductorem et ecclesiarum turbatorem, ac dissecatorum, saecrorum externorum contemptorem, ac verbi ac veritatis blasphemum, etc., non cume disciplihum docilium se exhibitent, qui mecum evangelica mysteria doctus est, vel percipere valuit, consentire et cum conscientia confitteri, profitteri, et sese illis subscribere’ (ZB Ms. F 61, 346®; Responsio orthodoxa, pp.262-3).

85 Responsio orthodoxa, p.51.
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Silvio’s work, the *Responsio orthodoxa pro edicto illustissimorum D.D. trium foederum Rhaetiae*.

In its final version, Lentolo’s *Responsio orthodoxa* consists of two prefaces – the first addressed to the Rhaetian Diet, the second to the Christian reader – followed by a section-by-section rebuttal of Silvio’s work. There is nothing original about the arguments that Lentolo deploys in support of the magistrate’s right to punish deviation from orthodoxy: most of them had been well-rehearsed in such works as Beza’s *De haereticis a civil magistratu puniendis libellus* and Bullinger’s *Decades*. Like Beza, Lentolo equates support for the toleration of heretics with support for their errors, arguing that Silvio’s real aim is to create space within the church for those who are intent on its destruction: thus Silvio and his followers oppose the use of force against dissidents

> non quod haereticos negetis puniendos, verum quia in quos hodie Magistratus vere Christianus animadvertit, nempe Arianos, Anabaptistas, Georgianos, aliosque id genus fanaticos, non credetis esse haereticos, sed potius bonos viros, et qui sint ut simplices et rudes ferendi, immo fovendi: vel potius quod multo quam nos rerum divinarum cognitione sint instructores.®

Silvio is simply being disingenuous when he accuses the edict of targeting the ‘weak in faith’: in reality, it is aimed at incorrigible heretics, who despise the most basic tenets of Christianity.

Lentolo also dismisses his opponent’s appeal to charity: ministers, he insists, have a sacred duty to protect their flock against false prophets, to combine the simplicity of doves with the cunning of serpents. Charity does not entail standing by while enemies devastate Christ’s sheepfold. If Silvio’s prescription were followed, Lentolo argues, the church would be powerless to act against sinners.® Discipline must be exercised with especial rigour in the case of heresy, because it is not a private matter, but rather a

---

® Ibid., p.178.
®® Ibid., p.240.
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contagion which, left unchecked, will spread inexorably through the body of the Christian community. ‘Quid enim ab huiusmodi homine expectandum erit’, he asks, ‘nisi ut alios corrumpat?’® Neither is Lentolo impressed by Silvio’s suggestion that efforts to impose conformity on Reformed believers will detract from the ongoing struggle with the Roman church: doctrinal unity among Protestants must, the Neapolitan implies, precede any challenge to Catholic supremacy.® It is more difficult for Lentolo to brush aside his adversary’s claim that by endorsing the edict, which confirms the legal parity of Catholicism and Reformed Protestantism in the Rhaetian Freestate, the Reformed leadership has recognised idolatry as a legitimate form of worship. He resolves this problem by, in effect, replacing the traditional polarity of Catholics and evangelicals with one of ‘orthodox’ (both Catholic and Protestant) and ‘heretics’: Catholicism, Lentolo implies, is to be preferred to the heterodox Protestantism of his opponents because it at least pays lip-service to the historical witness of the church, as set out in the ancient creeds.® Although the edict is not without its flaws – Lentolo acknowledges with regret that he and his colleagues have hitherto failed to convince the Rhaetian magistrates of their duty to promote a single, biblically based form of worship – it is to be commended for its positive features: namely, the recognition of the Reformed faith on an equal footing with Catholicism, and the proscription of heresy.®
III. THE ZURICHERS’ INTERVENTION AND THE TRIUMPH OF REFORMED ORTHODOXY IN RHAETIA

Although Lentolo’s formative years as a Protestant had been spent either in or in close contact with Geneva, he was also well acquainted with the Zurich divines. On a visit to Zurich in 1566, the Neapolitan had met Bullinger and Wolf, with whom he subsequently remained in correspondence, while in a letter to the Zurich Autistes of 8 September 1567 he passed on greetings to Gwalther and Simler.

Yet it was Lentolo’s adversary Silvio who first drew Zurich into the controversy that had greeted the anti-heresy edict. In September 1570, Silvio wrote to Bullinger to make known his concerns about the new decree, enclosing a Latin translation of the tract analysed above. It is worth pausing for a moment to consider why Silvio should have wanted to involve Bullinger in his dispute with the Rhaetian Reformed leadership. There are parallels with Florio’s mission to Zurich almost a decade earlier: both were Italian ministers uncomfortable with the sort of confessional orthodoxy that was being promoted by the church of Chiavenna, and both perceived in Bullinger a readiness to respond positively to their criticisms. Memories of Zurich’s relatively conciliatory stance towards the Italian radicals prior to the early 1560s may well have played some part in that. In his tract Silvio warns his fellow ministers against excessive suspicion of others’ orthodoxy, which, the Apostle teaches, constitutes an offence against charity (‘charitas [...] non cogitat malum, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia suffert, et potius multitudinem peccatorum

---

92 In a letter to Wolf of 15 March 1568, Lentolo praises the Zurich minister as a ‘chiara stella’ of the church and asks to be accepted by his correspondent as ‘vostro familiare, et cosi interno, che non lasciamo passare nessuna occasione di scriverci, e farci l’un l’altro scritto’ (ZB Ms. F 39, 601).

93 StAZ E II 365, 326-7; Schiess, 3, no.31.

94 ZB Ms. F 61, 343; Schiess, 3, no.220. There is some confusion about whether the work was originally written in Latin or Italian. The Zurich manuscript cited above contains the marginal note, ‘Ex italico in latum versa’, whereas Lentolo refers to the tract as having been translated into the vernacular by radicals in Chiavenna (Responsio orthoda, p.51).
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operit, quam videre cogitatur’); Bullinger had offered Giulio da Milano similar advice with respect to Lelio Sozzini in July 1555.

It is likely that Silvio was also attracted by Zurich’s approach to the question of discipline, which differed in several crucial respects from that of Geneva. Both Bullinger and Gwalther were opposed to the use of excommunication as a disciplinary sanction: in their view, it contradicted the purpose of the Lord’s Supper as a sign of the inclusiveness of God’s kingdom and the unity of believers. More generally, they were suspicious of attempts to separate out ecclesiastical from magisterial discipline, which they feared could lead to a revival of the sort of clerical tyranny for which Protestants had traditionally condemned the papacy. Similar fears had been expressed by Italian dissidents like Aconcio and Ochino, as we have seen; they were also in evidence in the 25 quaestiones of 1561, in which Florio and his colleagues questioned the Calvinist practice of examining communicants before admitting them to the Eucharist.

At issue in the controversy over the edict of June 1570 was not simply the question of the magistrate’s right to punish heretics, but how and by whom discipline should be exercised in Graubünden’s Italian churches. In Silvio’s work the main target of criticism was not in fact the Rhaetian magistracy, but the local Reformed clergy, whose desire to impose absolute conformity to their views was identified as the inspiration for the

---

95 ZB Ms. F 61, 346; Responsio orthodoxa, p.228. The reference is to 1 Corinthians 13:6-7.

96 Schiess, 1, p.412 (no.290): ‘Frates enim sumus, qui mutuaem invicem charitatem debemus; susplicationes autem numerat Paulus inter opera carnis’.

97 J. Wayne Baker, 'In defense of magisterial discipline: Bullinger’s "Tractatus de excommunicatione" of 1568', in Gäller and Herkenrath, 1, pp.141-59.

98 Trechsel, 2, p.419. Gwalther criticised this practice in the context of the Heidelberg controversy over church discipline. See his letter to Beza of 1570: ‘Ista certe, quae infinitis exemplis tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti probari poterant, nos movent ut privatim illud examen, quod quisque se ipsum probat, secundum Pauli praeceptum sufficiere putemus ii qui ad Domini mensam volunt accedere’ (Correspondance, 11, pp.255-6 [no.798]). In the Palatinate, as in Rhaetia, religious radicals and antitrinitarians were prominent among those opposed to the introduction of Calvinist-style discipline (see Burchill, passim).
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recent crackdown. Some of the Chiavenna radicals explicitly voiced a preference for magisterial over ecclesiastical discipline. Giovanni Fratino, for example, insisted that he was not subject to the jurisdiction of the Chiavenna college of elders, but only to that of the ‘Rhaetian lords’; others summoned before the college criticised it as a ‘papal’ or ‘Spanish’ inquisition. In an anonymous letter of 1571 to the pastor of Geneva’s Italian church, Niccolò Balbani, a supporter of Turriani compared the Genevan system of church government unfavourably with the statist model that had evolved in the Swiss churches.

The Sienese exile Mino Celsi took this argument a stage further in his response to the controversy surrounding the edict, In haereticis coërcendis. There, quoting selectively from Zwingli and Bullinger, Celsi asserted that the Zurich church had consistently opposed the punishment of heresy.

But the Zurichers did not approach the Rhaetian dispute as a battle between rival ‘Swiss’ and ‘Genevan’ forms of church discipline, of the kind that was currently underway in Heidelberg. To do so would be to ignore the fact that the immediate object of contention was not an ecclesiastical, but a magisterial measure, the edict of June 1570. ‘Calvinists’ – like Lentolo – and ‘Zwinglians’ – like Bullinger and Gwalther – were in total agreement on

---

99 ZB Ms. F 61, 343: ‘En in quadem ditione Illustriissimorum Dominorum Rhetorum, ubi satis numerosa evangelicorum ecclesia, papanorum tamen aliquanto numerosior, haec proclamatio prodiit: quam non veluti magistratus mentem, sed tantum evangelicæ ecclesiæ seu eius ministrorum voluntatem examinatam mihi displicuisse non diffiteor, et ardore quodam [...] impulsus reprehendi scripto censuræ tamen et judicio cuiusdam illustrissimi et excellentissimi II. doctoris illius ecclesiae præcipui membri submissio’.

100 Lentolo, Commentarii, fol.33. Compare ibid., fol.5.


102 In haereticis, pp.50-1, 120-1, 218, 228-39. On Celsi, see P. Bietenholz, ‘Questioni su Mino Celsi da Siena’, BSSV 132 (1972), 69-76; and ‘Mino Celsi and the Toleration Controversy of the Sixteenth Century’, BHR 34 (1972), 31-47. Writing to Beza on 13 October 1569, another Italian exile, Simone Simoni, also invoked the Zurichers when contesting the legitimacy of consistorial discipline (Correspondance, 10, no.713). In subsequent letters to Josias Simler, Simoni distinguished sharply between the Zurich church and ‘sanguinarii illi Lemnici’ (11 October 1573 and 12 May 1574 [ZB Ms. F 61, 317-22]). In response, Simler emphasised Geneva’s positive services to the Protestant cause: its hospitality towards exiles, the many excellent books published there, and the ministers that it had supplied to France (17 March 1574 [ZB Ms. S 129, 134]).
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this issue. Silvio’s call for the church to refrain from the use of force and his indifference to the finer points of doctrine, on the other hand, were positions that Bullinger and his colleagues had come to associate with religious radicalism, and especially with the so-called ‘academicici’: Castellio, Ochino and their followers. Silvio, the Zurichers believed, was questioning the magistrate’s cura religionis, as Castellio had done in the wake of Servetus’s execution. That, and the conviction that behind Silvio’s protest lurked the familiar spectre of Italian heresy, explains the vigour with which they took up the cudgels on Lentolo’s behalf.

The opening salvo in this campaign was fired by Rudolf Gwalther. In early 1571 he published his Six sermons on the Incarnation of the Son of God, dedicated to the Bürgermeister of Chur, Stefan Willy. In his preface to the work, dated 1 December 1570, Gwalther argues that the dual nature of Christ, divine and human, is the central teaching of the Christian faith, the foundation of all others. This doctrine has come under attack from two fronts: first, from those who deny Christ’s godhead; and second, from those who compromise his humanity through monophysitism. Both groups, it may be inferred, are to be found in Rhaetia, in the form of the Italian radicals and the Schwenckfeldian bookseller Frell respectively. Next Gwalther addresses Silvio’s criticisms of the June edict. He accuses the statute’s opponents of seeking to turn the church into

\[ \text{einem stabulo Circaeo} [...] / \text{darinnen glych wie in einem Thiergarten} / \text{allerley sectische verworrene kopff} \]

\[ \text{durchein anderen lauffind} / \text{die auch allerley widerwueriger umd strynger leeren oder meinungen ynfurind} / \text{und in summa} \]

\[ \text{einem yeden gestattet werde sin gesang oder geschrey ulzelassen} / \text{umd taglich nach sinem kopff etwas nieuws umd das den anderen zu wider sye} / \]

---

103 The term ‘academicus’ was coined by Theodore Beza to describe those opposed to the treatment of heresy as a civil crime (principally Sebastian Castellio). It was applied to Ochino by Josias Simler (see the passage quoted on pp.186-7 above).

104 Die Menschwerdung deß ewigen und eingebornen Suns Gottes unsers Herren Jesu Christi erklärt und ußgelegt in sechs predigen / dieser zyt allerley Secten nitzlich zulassen: durch Rudolffen Walther diener der kirchen Zürich (Zurich 1571). A Latin version of the text was published the following year. Of the six sermons, three had been published previously in Gwalther’s Die Geburt und Menschwerdung unsers Herrn Jesu Christi (Zurich 1553) and three were new.
Gwalther, like Bullinger and Zwingli before him, concedes that only God can bring the individual to an acceptance of the truth, but insists that that does not absolve the magistrate of the responsibility for ensuring that orthodoxy is publicly upheld:

\[
\text{Wirdt nieman lüugnen können / daß man die lüt wol umb so vil dämmen und in saun halten kan / daß sie mit dem das sy in jren hertzen gefäss und fürgenommen habend / mit ußbrächind / oder wider Gottes wort falsche und irrige meinungen öffentlichen ynfürind. Es kann zwar ein Oberkeit dem kein anders hertz gäben / der von natur zornmütig oder rauchgirig / oder von ardt diebisch und raubisch ist: sy kan aber mit strengen Mandaten und gebührlicher straaf wol weeren / daß disse nit nach jren anfluchtungen etwas thetlich handlin / ist auch schuldig die selbigen / so sy etwas wider das gemein rîcht unnd alle billickeit thund / nach jrem verdienen zedraffen / damitt fromme lüt vor jnen sicher syend / umd nit auch andere durch jr bysypil verbôseret werdind.}
\]

Gwalther ridicules the suggestion that magistrates have no business in the cure of souls:

\[
\text{Wer ist [...] so grob und unverstendig / daß er nit könne die rechnnung machen / Diewyl die fürgesetzten und Regenten einen yeden lyb und gut schîrmen sôllend / sy vil mer schuldig syend so vil jnen möglichen zuverhüten / daß nieman sîner seel halben verfürt werde / und an der selben schaden empfahe?}
\]

Following Beza and Bullinger, Gwalther defends the application of the Mosaic laws against blasphemy and false prophecy in Leviticus 24:14-16 and Deuteronomy 13:1-11 to contemporary heresy. During the time of the apostles, he argues, the secular authorities were hostile to Christianity, but with Constantine’s conversion the responsibility of maintaining ‘einigkeit in der leer und im glauben’ reverted to the magistrate. Gwalther repudiates Sebastian Castellio’s interpretation of the parable of the wheat and the weeds, a
key text for all sixteenth-century advocates of religious toleration. The parable, he argues, is simply a warning against excessive zeal in the pursuit of wrongdoing, which may lead to the conviction of the innocent: where the weeds may be safely destroyed without harming the wheat, that should be carried out. Gwalther continues:

Noch vil mer aber sol man dem unkrut weeren / wenn es dem guten samen schaden thut / also / dass der selbig darvor nit mag ufwachsen / das ist / wenn der waar glaub durch die verfûrisch leer und angerichte secten verhinderet / dar zu die gantze kirch betribet unnd zerissen wirdt.\(^{110}\)

The magistrate has a duty to be especially vigilant when the church is threatened, as now, by heretics who cast doubt on ‘die rechten gründ der Christenlichen Religion / die doch die Papistischen leerer unverrucht habend lassen blyben’, that is to say the orthodox doctrines of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ.\(^{111}\)

Gwalther’s contribution to the debate was warmly welcomed by Lentolo. In a letter of 12 February 1571, he lavished praise on Bullinger’s deputy:

Tua cohortatio fratribus Curiensibus adeo opportune se obtulit, ut nihil unquam opportunius, nihilque magis in tempore videatur esse factum. Non quod ipsi diligentiissimi non sint atque strenui ad resistendum Christi hostibus sed vel fortissimi, quum congregiendum est indigent cohortedone aliqua praeertim, eorum, qui et virtute et autoritate præ caeteris valent. Exercuit enim eos his diebus Satan, sed nec exercere desinet, quanvis nunc indutias concedere videatur. Verum is est praecipuus illius tuae cohortationis fructus, quod ea inducis optimos illos commiliones, ut, dum ipsi, non ita praemuntur, nos respiciant, nobisque suppetias ferant, qui properiiodum semper sub ar mis et in excubiiis, esse cogimur, imo quibus in singula prope momenta cum hostibus manus conserror necesse est.\(^{112}\)

\(^{110}\) Ibid., fols 8"-9". For Bullinger, the parable expresses the reality of the church as a *corpus permixtum*, and indicates the futility of attempts to construct a church of the elect prior to Christ’s return (*Widerâûffer, fols 166"-7*). Beza, in keeping with his greater emphasis on ecclesiastical discipline, interprets the field in the parable not as the church, but the world, and the weeds as all evildoers, rather than simply heretics (*De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis libellus, adversus Martini Belli farraginem, et novorum Academicorum sectam* (Geneva 1554), pp.139-55).

\(^{111}\) Ibid., fol.10".

\(^{112}\) StAZ E II 377, 2469". Although the letter is dated 1570, that is clearly an error since Lentolo refers to the edict as already in force, and assumes familiarity on Gwalther’s part with Bartolomeo Silvio’s polemic, which the Zurichers did not receive until September that year. Gwalther continued to follow developments in Rhaetia with interest. In June 1571 he was informed by Ulisse Martinengo that Giorgio Biandrata had acquired citizenship in Mesocco and was expected in Rhaetia shortly (Gwalther to Bullinger, 19 June 1571 [StAZ E II 340, 356; cited in Rotondo, ‘Atteggiamenti’, 1009-10, n.67]). The Latin translation of the *Six Sermons* was designed to assist the Rhaetian Reformed leadership in combating that new menace (idem, 26
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In the same letter, Lentolo informed his correspondent that he had sent a copy of the *Responsio orthodoxa* to Chur to be corrected by Egli, his fellow pastor Ulrich Campell, and Johannes Pontisella, the rector of the Chur Latin school; they were under instructions to forward the work to Zurich so that it might be judged against Silvio's text. Lentolo implied that the orthodox cause in the Italian churches would receive a much-needed boost if the Zurichers gave their public seal of approval to his riposte. As if to underline the need for outside support, he reported that the radicals congregated around Turriani in Piuro were continuing to defy the edict. Camillo Sozzini, for example, had refused to subscribe to either of the two recognised faiths, publicly declaring himself to be (as Lentolo puts it) a follower of the 'novi academici'. Camillo's disruptive influence was not confined to Piuro: Lentolo describes him as 'huc illuc semper excurrens, ac se incautis insinuans lenocinio nescio cuius simulatae honestatis et probitatis, ut non ita facile possim meos ab eis consuetudine amovere'.

From the end of 1570, Bullinger, too, began to take an active interest in the conflict that was unfolding in Graubünden. In November, he sent Egli a copy of Beza's *De haereticis* so that the latter might be in a better position to refute the arguments against the punishment of heretics put forward by his rival, Johannes Gantner. In March 1571, Egli's deputy Ulrich Campell went so far as to suggest that one of the senior Zurich churchmen – either Bullinger himself, Gwalther, Wolf or Ludwig Lavater – should attend...
the forthcoming meeting of the Rhaetian Reformed synod (scheduled for June), at which
the cases of Gantner, Silvio and the Piuro radicals were due to be discussed. In the event,
Bullinger declined this invitation, for fear of being seen to undermine the independent
authority of the Rhaetian church leadership. However, he did advise Egli on how to
proceed against the 'heretics' at the synod, emphasising that they should be prevented from
turning the assembly into a platform for their heterodox views. In particular, Egli was to
avoid allowing himself to be drawn into debating the Trinity or the divinity of Christ:
'indignum est, ut ponamus in dubium, quae sunt compertissima'. Typically, Bullinger
refers back to one of the defining moments in the history of the early church, the Arian
controversy, to illustrate the dangers of parleying with heretics: 'Magnus ille Constantinus
indignissime ferebat, ut eius ad hoc epistolae apud Eusebium testantur, quod Alexander et
Arius in hanc descendissent arenam, et arcti endos fidei contentionibus miscissent'.

After the synod had met, Egli sent Bullinger an extended account of its
proceedings. According to Egli, the first two days of the meeting were taken up with an
exchange of views between himself and Gantner, which eventually resulted in the latter's
condemnation by the ministers present. Then attention switched to the question of the

---

116 Campell to Bullinger, 24 April 1571 (StAZ E II 375, 859; Schiess, 3, no.246).

117 Bullinger to Egli, 1 June 1571: 'Prodesse et vobis ministris et ecclesiae vestae videtur, quod nulli ex
nostris ad vos evocantur, ne forte domini vestri et populus vester suspicetur vos non esse instructos satis etc.
sicque vestae decedat autlioritate' (StAZ E II 342a, 630; Schiess, 3, no.251).

118 Idem, 27 April 1571 (StAZ E II 342a, 628; Schiess, 3, no.248).

119 Idem, 25 May 1571 (StAZ E II 342a, 629; Schiess, 3, p.248 [no.249]). In his letter of 1 June Bullinger
writes; 'Sitis autem constantes et simplices, in omnibus nostrae confessioni inhaerentes nec alio sinentes vos
ad aliena abstrahi'.

120 'Acta Synodi Curienis Mense Junio 1571' (StAZ E II 381, 1270'-82'), published in P.D. Rosius de Porta,
Historia Reformationis ecclesiarum Raeticarum, 2 vols (Chur 1771/77), 1:2, pp.517-53. See also Schiess, 3,
no.252. Ulrich Campell's account of the synod focuses on the dispute between Gantner and Egli, leaving
aside the proceedings against Turiani and his associates (Historia Rhaetica, edited by P. Plattner, 2 vols
(1887/9), 2, pp.474-90).

121 During the course of this debate Gantner produced a book (probably Castellio's De haeretis an sint
persequendi) containing passages from ancient and contemporary authors arguing against the use of force to
Italian dissidents. Turriani was accused of receiving heretics excommunicated by the church of Chiavenna and of defending ‘dogma istud academicum’ (religious toleration). Camogli, for his part, was charged with offering asylum to convicted heretics. Egli implies that the synod was initially reluctant to take punitive action; a key moment was the intervention by Lentolo’s ally Giulio da Milano, who urged his fellow ministers to give a clear sign of their determination to protect the Italian churches against the ‘emissaries’ of Antichrist. Giulio also produced the orthodox faction’s trump card: Camogli’s letters to Florio and Turriani of late 1563, in which the possibility of settling Ochino in Rhaetia was mooted. His evidence was supplemented by Lentolo’s own testimony, ‘ex quibus’, Egli reports, ‘satis constabat illum [Turriani] non pastorem, ministrum, sed luporum protectorem esse’. Camogli did not help his case by remarking, under examination, that ‘er wüste als vil von der Heiligen Trinitet, als sin Schuch’. The synod eventually suspended Turriani and Silvio from the ministry, pending further investigation, and excommunicated Camogli and Camillo Sozzini.

Bullinger was pleased by the outcome of the meeting, and urged Egli now to press for the comprehensive implementation of the edict: ‘Camulius et eius similes indigni sunt quos terra ferat, non iam dico Rheti tolerent. Ad corvos!’ Achieving that was less straightforward than one might imagine. The Piuro radicals, especially Camogli, had suppress heresy. Egli responded by citing Beza’s rejoinder to Castellio’s work.

122 StAZ E II 381, 1275; Porta, 1:2, p.545.

123 The letters seem to have been intercepted by the ever-watchful Giulio; Lentolo had translated them into Latin.

124 StAZ E II 381, 1275; Porta, 1:2, p.544.

125 AERSGB 3, p.292.

126 Bullinger to Egli, 27 July 1571 (StAZ E II 342a, 626; Schiess, 3, p.258 [no.256]). Compare the Antistes’ letter of 9 December 1571 (Schiess, 3, p.276 [no.267]): ‘Dominum oro, ut magistratus spiritum excitet, quo semel bene statuta tueatur et non seducatur nebulonem fabulis atque ita conduplicentur novae vobis molestiae’.
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powerful allies within the Rhaetian aristocracy. Soon Egli was reporting magisterial indifference, even hostility, to his calls for better enforcement of the anti-heresy measures. In a letter to Josias Simler of 20 August 1571, the Chur minister complained:

Principes viri quidam [of this republic], qui se prae caeteris religiosos ac evangelicos profitentur, de nobis nunc conquerantur ceu rigidioribus, in fanaticis istis revincendis ac deturbandis. Approbarunt Rheti Domini uno ore omnes nostras actiones: sed privatim nunc quidam repperiuntur, qui a seipsis dissidentes, id in nobis culpant, quod antea benevol confirmanunt.127

Many of Graubünden's Reformed were apparently reluctant to endorse a crackdown on the radicals that might adversely affect the position of Protestantism as a whole in the Freestate, with the Catholic minority taking the opportunity to call for the general expulsion of all Italian exiles from Rhaetia, orthodox as well as 'heretics'.128 The knowledge that some leading Rhaetian magnates shared their doubts about the approach adopted by Egli and Lentolo seems to have given encouragement to the edict's Italian opponents: in October, Egli informed Bullinger that the church of Piuro, backed by several ministers from the Valbregaglia, had refused to elect a replacement for Turriani and was threatening to ask the Diet to overturn the sentence of suspension imposed by the synod.129

Aware of the difficulties faced by the Rhaetian church leadership, Zurich continued to offer what it could in the way of support. The most concrete demonstration of this came with the publication of Simler's *Scripta veterum Latina* in August 1571. The work was dedicated, at the suggestion of Tobias Egli, to the three Rhaetian Leagues.130 Like

---

127 ZB Ms F 59, 413. For example, Peter Guler, the *Ammann* of Davos, criticised the suspension of Silvio, whom he knew from his time as *podestà* in Traona (Egli to Bullinger, 1 October 1571 [ZB Ms. S 125, 27]).

128 Egli to Simler, 28 May 1571 (ZB Ms. F 59, 410').

129 ZB Ms. S 125, 27. Compare Egli to Simler, 11 September 1571 (ZB Ms. F 59, 415'-7').

130 See Egli to Simler, 28 May 1571 (ZB Ms. F 59, 410'). For Simler's involvement in the campaign against religious radicalism in Rhaetia, see also his letter to Bullinger of 22 June (1571?), in which he records that one of his students, the Bregaglottio Johann Baptist Müller, has been offered the position of minister in Morbegno. Simler points out that it would be useful to have a pastor of proven orthodoxy in the town who could prevent misuse of the local printing-press by heretical elements (ZB Ms. F 40, 442; T. Schiess, *Josias Simler und sein Schüler Johann Baptist Müller von Vicosoprano*, Zürcher Taschenbuch (1903), 223-53 [231-2]). In the *Commentarii conventus synodalis* Lentolo refers to a letter that he received from Simler, dated 3
Gwalther in his *Sermons*, Simler addresses the specific situation in which the Reformed church of Graubünden found itself. First he emphasises the peculiarity (and perilousness) of Rhaetia's geographical position: interposed between Germany and Italy, the Freestate is vulnerable to the spread of heresy from both quarters – in the one case Anabaptism and Schwenckfeldianism, in the other 'Samosatene' antitrinitarianism. This is a clear reference to the twin dangers posed by the 'Eutychians' Gantner and Frell, and the Italian radicals. Simler then embarks on an extended defence of the Rhaetian anti-heresy edict, reiterating many of the points made by Lentolo and Gwalther in their works on the same subject. The control of heresy, Simler insists, is one aspect of the magistrate's *cura religionis*, and the edict has precedents in the actions of the Old Testament kings of Israel and Judah and the early Christian emperors. Like Gwalther, Simler argues that the intention behind such measures is not the coercion of consciences, but the maintenance of 'doctrinae et morum externam politiam'. The Zurich professor has no time for Silvio's objections to the 'dogmatism' of the confessional orthodoxy demanded by Lentolo of Reformed believers: all that is being called for, he maintains, is acceptance of the basic tenets of the Christian faith.

The advocates of religious toleration – to whom Simler applies the by-now familiar epithet 'academici' – would strip Christianity of all that is distinctive and essential to it, leaving believers with only 'generalem quandam Christi notitiam, cum... 

October 1571, informing him that Pietro Romano had visited Zurich and spoken critically of the church of Chiavenna (*Commentarii*, fols 38-9).

131 There is a fine analysis of Simler's preface to the *Scripta veterum* in Firpo, *Anti-trinitari*, pp.1-8.

132 *Scripta veterum*, fol.*2*.

133 Ibid., fol.*3*.

134 It is likely that Simler had read Silvio's tract by this time: in a letter of 23 October 1572, Lentolo asked Bullinger to have his colleague return the manuscript of the *Responsio orthodoxa*, in which, of course, Silvio's work was reproduced (StAZ E II 365, 332-4; Schiess, 3, no.336; Zucchini, 'Lentolo', p.122; 'In coëncendis', 538). In his *Bibliotheca*, Simler mentions the *Responsio orthodoxa* (then still unpublished) under the entry for Lentolo (*Bibliotheca*, p.618).
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Machometanismo communem'. This last reference is significant: in Simler’s heresiology, as we have seen, Islam represents the final destination of those who abandon the path of Nicene-Chalcedonian orthodoxy.

Simler’s defence of the edict earned him a letter of thanks from the council of Chur. He was also awarded a goblet worth 60 gulden by the Rhaetian Diet in recognition of his services to the cause of orthodoxy. The Graubünden church leadership was equally appreciative: Egli described the *Scripta veterum* to Bullinger as a true ‘hammer of heretics’, and asked Simler to have the Zurich printers Froschauer and Gesner dispatch copies of the work to Chur for sale, ‘quo mature in Italiam quoque devensant, ubi hoc remedio valde indigent’.

It is likely that Egli would have preferred to see Silvio and the Piuro radicals permanently excluded from the Rhaetian Reformed church. Camogli’s wealth, combined with the notorious venality of the Rhaetian ruling elite, made that an unrealistic proposition. Having secured Zurich’s backing in such a public manner, however, the orthodox party within the Rhaetian church was able to exact a heavy price from the dissidents for their eventual rehabilitation. At a meeting in Davos in February 1572, the synod agreed to lift the sentences on Camogli and Turriani, provided that each formally abjured his errors. The conditions attached to Turriani’s rehabilitation left little room for calculated ambiguity of the sort which the Rhaetian church leadership and its allies in

---

135 *Scripta veterum*, fol. *37*.

136 *Bürgermeister* and council of Chur to Simler, 31 August 1571 (ZB Ms. F 57, 44); Schiess, 3, p.271, n.1.

137 Egli to Bullinger, 3 September 1571 (StAZ E II 376, 195; Schiess, 3, p.260 [no.259]). The same phrase is used by Johannes Pontisella in a letter to Simler, also of 3 September (ZB Ms. F 61, 7).

138 Egli to Simler, 11 September 1571 (ZB Ms. F 59, 415*).

Zurich now associated with the Italian exiles. The Piuro minister was to subscribe to the Second Helvetic Confession and to promise to have no further contact with heretics, either verbally or in writing. Furthermore, he was to demonstrate the sincerity of abjuration by preaching on the doctrinal issues in dispute – the unity and Trinity of the Godhead, the two natures of Christ, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the judgement of the soul immediately after death, infant baptism and the magistrate’s *cura religionis* – before a four-man commission that included his arch-rival Lentolo. The following year Silvio was readmitted to the synod after he agreed to abjure his errors, both in writing and before the church of Sondrio.

Since Cantimori, scholars of the Italian Reformation have tended to regard the events of 1570-2 as marking a decisive turning-point in the history of the Italian churches of Graubünden. In his study of the sixteenth-century Valtellina, Alessandro Pastore observes:

Dopo queste misure rigorose i fermenti ereticali in Valtellina non avranno più un peso consistente e solo alcune anabattisti più irrequieti e coraggiosi prendranno nuovamente la via dell’esilio verso la Polonia e la Transilvania. Ma i più, stanchi e afflitti dalle patite traversie, si accosteranno alle pratiche nicodemitiche mascherando la loro vera fede, oppure entreranno sinceramente a far parte delle comunità di fedeli seguaci dell’ortodossia riformata svizzera.

Those comments do not quite do justice to the complexity of the situation in the Italian churches after 1572. The ‘victory’ of Lentolo and his allies was not in the first instance complete: Silvio, Turriani and Camogli did, after all, eventually secure their readmission to the Reformed fold. Their ‘abjurations’ might well be viewed with scepticism: outward

---

140 One of Gantner’s followers, Johannes Möhr, had been excluded from the synod on the grounds of Helvidianism.


142 AERSG B 3, p.5. Camillo Sossini was less fortunate: the last we hear, he had fled Piuro after being accused of sodomising a local youth (Egli to Simler, 20 August 1571 (ZB Ms. F 59, 414); Campell, *Descriptio*, pp.412-13).

conformity was widely condoned by Italian radicals as a legitimate response to persecution, as Lentolo and his colleagues knew. As late as 1577, Silvio was admonished by the synod ‘quod non satis pro officio suo auditores suos ad subscribendum synodali confessioni exhortatus sit, imo subscribere renuentibus Coenam Domini administravit’.

Turriani, like certain other Italian exiles who shared his difficulties with Reformed orthodoxy (Simone Simoni and Francesco Pucci, for instance), eventually returned to Catholicism.

There is also some evidence of continuing radical activity in the Italian-speaking areas of Graubünden during the 1570s and 1580s. At a meeting of the synod in 1575, Scipione Calandrini complained that Pietro Romano – who had been excommunicated by the church of Chiavenna two years earlier – was continuing to disseminate his errors; the same assembly excluded the minister of Vicosoprano, Francesco Thrana, for remaining stubbornly opposed to the edict. For its disciplinary sanctions to take effect, the synod was dependent, as before, on the co-operation of local congregations and magistrates: such support was not always forthcoming. The case of Lorenzo Sonzini, pastor in Mello, who was suspended from the ministry in 1575 because of his association with Pietro Romano, illustrates the problem. Five years on, the synod was still appealing to the evangelicals of Mello to find themselves a new pastor. Eventually it conceded defeat and readmitted Sonzini, only to suspend him again in 1582. This sentence was finally lifted by the synod in 1585; one imagines that the saga might have continued in similar vein had Sonzini not been abducted shortly afterwards, to suffer a martyr’s death in Rome.

144 AERSG B 3, p.20. The last direct testimony that we have for Silvio is a letter to Johannes von Salis of February 1577 (see Zuccheri, ‘Silvio’, 69).

145 Lentolo to Stucki, 10 April 1598 (StAZ E I 380, 385).

146 AERSG B 3, p.6.

147 AERSG B 3, pp.46, 55, 76, 84.
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That being said, the edict and the disciplinary measures subsequently taken by the synod did send out an important signal to the Italian radicals. The lines between Reformed orthodoxy and heresy had been clearly demarcated, and the principle of subscription conceded. The coalition of moderate and radical dissidents that had been assembled to resist the edict quickly dissolved. Lentolo’s opponents in the Italian pastorate (Silvio and Turriani) grudgingly came to terms with the new religious dispensation; prominent laypersons either did the same (Camogli, Giulio Sadoleto) or sought out a more secure base for their activities (Mino Celsi, Marcello Squarcialupi). In a letter to Johann Wilhelm Stucki of 21 April 1596, Lentolo felt able to pronounce the final demise of heresy in Italian Graubünden.¹⁴⁸

The controversy over the edict was also significant in terms of its effect on how the Zurich church was perceived by the more radical Italian exiles. The notion of Zurich as a moderate counter-weight to Genevan severity was difficult to perpetuate after Bullinger, Gwalther and Simler had identified themselves so closely with the suppression of dissent. The Zurich church’s treatment of Ochino had already made it the target of criticism in some quarters;¹⁴⁹ its support for the Rhaetian edict only intensified this. In his letter to the Antistes of 1 October 1571, Egli reports that the minister of Vicosoprano (Francesco Thrana) had attacked Zwingli as a ‘virum [...] sanguinarium’ who had engineered the deaths of Anabaptists without just cause.¹⁵⁰

Conversely, the affair strengthened relations between the orthodox Reformed

¹⁴⁸ StAZ E II 380, 345; cited by Rotondo in Renato, Opere, p.331 (where the archival reference is given inaccurately as StAZ E II 325, 345). The last known case of heresy dealt with by the church of Chiavenna concerned Fabrizio Pestalozzi, a local merchant who had come under the influence of Gianbattista Bovio while resident in Poland (see Marchetti, ‘Una polemica’, passim).

¹⁴⁹ This is suggested by the fact that at the synod of June 1571 Egli felt it necessary to defend the punishment meted out to Ochino by the Zurich authorities: ‘Historiam ac causas Ochiniani exilii ex praefatione tua, quam libro Domino Simleri [De aeterno Dei filio] praefixisti, fratribus vere exposui, ne quid aliorum maledicentia in sinistris de quoquam indicarent’ (StAZ E II 381, 1276; Porta, 1:2, p.549).

¹⁵⁰ ZB Ms. S 125, 27.
pastorate of Italian-speaking Rhaetia and the Zurich church. Lentolo had earned the Zurichers' approbation by his tireless and ultimately successful pursuit of heresy;[51] over subsequent decades he established himself as their most important Italian correspondent in the region. Lentolo’s success in combating religious radicalism meant that Zurich’s relationship with the Italian Reformed congregations of Rhaetia ceased to be dominated by the question of heresy: the emphasis now shifted to supporting their efforts to consolidate and sustain a Protestant presence in this important frontier region.

[51] Zucchini (‘In coërcendis’, p.538) suggests that Lentolo’s eventual failure to have his Responsio published in Zurich as originally planned testifies to a lack of enthusiasm for the project on (in particular) Bullinger’s part. Against this, see Lentolo to Egli, 22 January 1574 (StAZ E II 365, 363-4). When the Responsio did finally appear in Geneva in 1592, it included a warm letter of commendation from Bullinger, dated January 1574, along with some verses by Gwalther praising Lentolo for having purged the ‘Augiae stabulum’ of heresy (Responsio, pp.348, 2).
‘Una sacra Ancora, è sicura ritratta’: that was how Vincenzo Paravicini described Zurich in the preface to his translation of Johann Jakob Breitinger’s *Fundamental instruction as to whether a sect may endure more or less than 100 years* of 1622. Paravicini, as minister to the congregation of Valtellinese exiles established in Zurich following the infamous ‘sacro macello’ of July 1620 – in which up to 600 Protestants perished at the hands of their Catholic neighbours – had more reason than most to be aware of the benefits that the Italian-speaking Reformed of the Valtellina and other parts of Rhaetia had derived from their association with the Swiss city. During the early decades of those communities’ existence, their relationship with Zurich was dogged by controversy over doctrine, as orthodox ministers like Mainardi and Lentolo struggled (with the assistance of the Zurichers) to subdue ‘heretical’ and other dissenting elements within the Italian churches. After 1572, religious radicalism was more or less a spent force in Graubünden: Lentolo and his allies in the Rhaetian pastorate would henceforth set the theological tenor for the Reformed churches of Chiavenna, the Valtellina and the Valbregaglia. Those communities

---

remained in close contact with the Zurich church, but with the latter now functioning more
as a provider of practical assistance (in the form of education, books and advice) than as an
arbiter in intra-community disputes. The relationship was, it must be stressed, one of
mutual benefit: for their part, Rhaetia's Italian-speaking congregations offered the Zurich
church a means of continued access to the world of Italian culture and scholarship at a time
of hardening intellectual divisions between Catholic and Protestant Europe.

I. 'IN HIS ANTICHRISTI FAUCIBUS': THE SITUATION OF RHAETIA'S ITALIAN
REFORMED CHURCHES PRIOR TO THE 'SACRO MACELLO'

In order to appreciate why links with Zurich came to assume such importance in the life of
Graubünden's Italian-speaking churches during the late sixteenth century, one needs to be
aware of the context within which those congregations were operating. With the
submission or emigration of the radicals, the internal threat to the unity and cohesiveness of
Rhaetia's Italian Reformed churches had receded. Nevertheless, their situation remained
precocious. The Valbregaglia had been fully protestantised, but in Poschiavo and the
subject lands Reformed believers were very much in the minority. Andreas Wendland has
recently argued, on the basis of a report drawn up for the governor of Milan by the marquis
of Meregnano during the final quarter of the sixteenth century, that the total population of
the subject lands exceeded that of Rhaetia proper, standing at somewhere in the region of
90-95,000; around 10,000 of those lived in the county of Chiavenna, 6,000 or so in Bormio
and the remainder in the Valtellina.² Sixteenth and early seventeenth-century estimates of
the size of the Protestant presence vary. Broccardo Borone, an evangelical exile from
Padua who subsequently returned to the Catholic church, claimed in his Relazio della Rezia
of 1601 that there were no more than 800 Protestants in the Valchiavenna and 2,500 in the

² The expression appears in a letter from the church of Sondrio to Gwaller, 5 September 1583 (ZB Ms. A 49,
218-9).

³ Wendland, Pässe, pp.45-6.
The Italian-speaking churches of the Rhaetian Freestate and its subject lands around 1600

1. Casaccia
2. Vicosoprano
3. Stampa
4. Bondo
5. Soglio
6. Castasegna
7. Ponteggia
8. Piuro
9. Chiavenna
10. Prata
11. Mese
12. Dubino
13. Traona
14. Mello
15. Casano
16. Morbegno
17. Berbenno
18. Chiesa (Malenco)
19. Mossini (Monte di Sondrio)
20. Sondrio
21. Teglio
22. Tirano
23. Grosotto
24. Brusio
25. Poschiavo
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Valtellina; however, he also offers a much lower figure than is generally accepted for the total population of the subject lands. An anonymous report from 1619, on the other hand, places the Reformed population of the Valchiavenna at 2,000 and that of the Valtellina at 5,000. Wendland prefers the figure for the Valtellina given by Meregnano - just under 2,000 - and suggests a total for the subject lands of approximately 4,000 Reformed. Whatever the precise figure, it is unlikely that Protestants constituted much more than 5% of the population of the subject lands.

Some distinction should be made between the position of Protestantism in the Valchiavenna and in the much larger Valtellina. The evangelical communities of Chiavenna and Piuro were large and wealthy, and included among their number most of the leading citizens and merchant families of both towns. In the Valtellina, by contrast, scores of parishes had been left virtually untouched by the Reformation. The Venetian envoy to Graubünden, Gianbattista Padavino, reported early in the seventeenth century that 'nessun luogo assolutamente è tenuto da heretici, anzi non vi sarà di questi ne anco la centesima parte'. Some Reformed communities (Cermeledo, Grania, Boalzo) were too small to support their own preacher.

---

4 Porta, 2:3, pp.179-81. Borromeo was confident that the forcible recatholicisation of these lands could be easily achieved.

5 A. Wendland, ‘Republik und Untertanenlande’ vor dem Veltlinerufstand (1620), BM (1990), 182-213 (210).

6 Wendland, Passo, p.61.

7 Filippo Archinto, bishop of Como, noted during his visitation of 1614-15 that one-third of the population of Chiavenna was Reformed, and that the town’s Protestants were offering financial inducements to local Catholics to convert (U. Mazzone, ‘<Consolare quei poveri cattolici>': Visitatori ecclesiastici in Valtellina tra ‘500 e ‘600’, in Pastore, Riforma e società, pp.129-57 (148); G.B. Crollolanza, Storia del contado di Chiavenna (Milan 1870), p.238). For evidence of the strength of Protestantism in the Valchiavenna from an early date, see the letter from the syndics of the Catholic church of San Lorenzo in Mese to Giovanni Antonio Volpe of 12 May 1568 (K. Fry (ed.), Giovanni Antonio Volpe Nunzius in der Schweiz: Band II: Die zweite und dritte Nunziatur 1565, 1573 (1588) (Stans 1946), no.842).

8 A. Guissani (ed.), ‘Relazione del segretario Padavino ritornato dal paese de’ Signori Grisoni’, Periodico della società storica per la Provincia e antica Diocesi di Como 15 (1903), 161-212 (190).
Chapter 6: From Heretics to Martyrs

Even in those places where formally constituted Reformed churches did exist, Protestants tended to be heavily outnumbered by their Catholic neighbours. According to the Catholic bishop of Como, Feliciano Ninguaida, who carried out a visitation in the Valtellina during the late 1580s with the specific intention of gathering information on the extent of the Protestant presence there, in Dubino only four out of forty and in Caspano only fifteen out of 200 households were Reformed. The sole exception to this pattern was in the area around Sondrio, which had been a focus of Vergerio’s missionary work back in the early 1550s; there Ninguaida reports that some villages were almost exclusively Protestant. Otherwise the largest concentrations of Protestants were to be found in the urban centres of the Valtellina, especially Teglio, Tirano and Sondrio: some authorities put the Protestant population of the last-mentioned town at as high as 700-800.

Evidence for the state of relations between the Catholic and Protestant communities is rather mixed. In the Valchiavenna they seem to have been surprisingly good. An anonymous account of the area written some time between 1584 and 1618 paints a harmonious picture of religious co-existence:

Questa terra se come ancho in parte del Contado e diviso in queste due Religione, ne de alter se vi ne permette, e pero vivano cosi pacificamente che gia mai per interesse di Religione so vi e presentito una minima Contosa, anc non sia riguardo contratar matrimonio li uni con gli altr.

Mixed marriages were also a feature of life in the Valtellina, if Ninguaida’s visitation

---


12 ZB Ms. A 12, fol.327v.
records are anything to go by. In many places (Dubino, Caspano, Chiesa and Lanzada in the Valmalenco) Protestants and Catholics were forced to have dealings with one another on a regular basis, if only because they worshipped in the same church building.

Increasingly, however, it seems that such arrangements were beginning to break down as the two religious communities became more polarised. In 1609, for example, the Reformed community of Chiesa petitioned the Rhaetian Diet to be allowed their own church and cemetery; their request was supported by local Catholics anxious to 'liberate' the parish church of Sts James and Philip from their religious rivals. There was also conflict over ecclesiastical revenue, a proportion of which had been assigned to the Reformed by the Rhaetian Diet in 1558. In 1602, for instance, the evangelicals of the church of San Pietro in Chiavenna complained that they had been forced to supplement their minister's salary out of their own pockets because the rival Catholic foundation of San Lorenzo was withholding the portion of church income due to them.

For the Catholics of the Valtellina, the Rhaetian Diet's insistence that they share church revenue and buildings with the Reformed was evidence not of Bündner evenhandedness, but of a systematic campaign to weaken their attachment to the old faith. For

---

13 In Mello, for example, a Protestant named Elisabetta, the daughter of a certain Giovanni Angelo, was married to a Catholic, and the children were being brought up Reformed. However, the children of another Protestant woman in the same village, who was married to the Catholic Vincenzo Paravicini, were being raised in the old faith (Ninguarda, pp.251-2). A common solution to the dilemmas posed by mixed marriages was for fathers to take charge of the religious education of their sons, while mothers did the same for their daughters (Mazzone, 'Visitatori', p.154).

14 Church-sharing (the so-called simultaneum) was a feature of other bi-confessional areas, such as the Thurgau (H. Meyer, Der zweite Kappeler Krieg: Die Krise der Schweizerischen Reformation (Zurich 1976), pp.239-40).

15 Di Filippo Bareggi, 136-7. For an example of the tensions that could arise over the use of church buildings, see ibid., 123-4 and n.80.

16 P. Jecklin (ed.), Materialien zur Standes- und Landesgeschichte Gem. III Bünde (Graubünden), 1464-1803, 2 vols (Basel 1907/9), 2, no.285; Schiess, 2, no.125; Camenisch, Reformation und Gegenreformation, p.44.

17 StAG D II b 3, 2.

18 The Rhaetian Diet intervened repeatedly to frustrate attempts by the Catholic hierarchy to improve pastoral
their part, the Bündner magistrates suspected the Catholics of the Valtellina (not without reason) of conspiring with neighbouring Catholic states, especially Milan, to undermine Rhaetian control of the subject lands. That pushed them into closer co-operation with the local Protestant minority, whose security and freedom to worship were in any case dependent on the support of the magistracy; it was no coincidence that the largest Protestant communities were to be found in those towns where Rhaetian governing officials were based. Some Reformed churches, notably that of Chiavenna, owed their establishment to the patronage of Rhaetian magnates who had taken up residence in the subject lands, while leading Reformed families from the area, such as the Vertamate of Piuro and Pestalozzi of Chiavenna, demonstrated their loyalty to the Rhaetian state by acquiring citizenship in member communes of Graubünden proper. Prominent Valtellinese Protestants also sought to forge direct links with the Rhaetian aristocracy: for example, Hortensia, sister of the exiled count Ulisse Martinengo di Barco, married into the powerful Salis clan.

Such evidence of collusion with the hated Rhaetian overlords had the effect of intensifying the hostility felt by Valtellinese Catholics towards the Protestants dwelling in their midst. The Reformed of the Valtellina came to be regarded as a foreign body, the
cutting edge of Rhaetian rule. The 'foreignness' of the Valtellinese Reformed was underlined by the prominence of exiles within the community, both as ministers and as lay spokespersons. Economic and social disparities between the two religious communities fuelled Catholic resentment still further: most native converts to Protestantism were, it seems, drawn from aristocratic families (such as the Paravicini, Marlianici and Guicciardi) or the mercantile elite (the Lunaga of Chiavenna and Piuro, for example). The economic dominance of the Reformed was such that, while attempting to conduct a visitation of the Valtellina in 1578, bishop Gianfrancesco Buonhomini of Como was forced to accept lodgings in Chiuro because all of the best inns in nearby Sondrio were owned by Protestants.

The closing decades of the sixteenth century saw an upsurge in religious violence and intimidation throughout the Valtellina. Protestants played their part in this with some highly provocative gestures. In February 1592, for example, a certain Andreino Ferrari broke into the parish church of Sondrio, seized the host from the tabernacle, and ground it underfoot; three years later an attempt was made to set fire to the town’s Catholic presbytery. Most violent acts emanated from the Catholic community, however, and follow a pattern familiar from other parts of Europe, such as France. Church feast-days, for instance, became the focus for attempts to force local Protestants to acknowledge the

---

22 Wendland, Pässe, pp.71-2.

21 On the 'elitist' character of Protestantism in the subject lands, see Di Filippo Bareggi, 125, and L. Musselli, 'La riforma protestante in Valmalenco e il diritto ecclesiastico dei Grigioni', Bollettino della società storica valltellinese 32 (1979), 45-63 (48).


Catholic identity of the community as a whole. In May 1600, the Rhaetian synod complained that the Reformed minority in Morbegno (a notable flashpoint for such conflicts) was coming under pressure to observe Catholic holy days, while in June 1608 it noted that Protestants in Sondrio had been targeted for failing to hang out banners to commemorate Corpus Christi. Another favoured tactic was desecration of the Protestants’ sacred space: thus Reformed services were disrupted by the ringing of church bells, and Protestant churches were smeared with excrement. In Trauna Catholics insisted on burying an infant which had died prior to baptism in the Reformed church of Santa Trinità.

Reformed ministers, as the most energetic defenders of Protestantism and the perceived source of the heretical ‘contamination’, were singled out for special attention. In a letter to Tobias Egli of 13 February 1572, Scipione Calandrini provides a graphic account of a failed assassination attempt on his colleague in Mello, Lorenzo Sonzini. Pastors were also at constant risk of abduction by local Catholics. In the most celebrated incident, Calandrini’s predecessor as minister in Morbegno, Francesco Cellario, was seized while returning from a meeting of the synod in June 1568; despite frantic attempts by the

---

27 AERSG B 3, p.159: ‘Frates singuli memores sint ut admonent suos legatos ad proima comitia profecturos ut commendatam habeant causam fratrum ecclesiae Morbenniensis, quod contra decreta et libertatem Christianam volunt cogere ad observationem feriarum Papisticam, nec sicut hactenus volunt nostris locare aedes, quo haec ratione discedere cogantur’.


29 Unusually, on this occasion a (Catholic) Rhaetian official was implicated. See AERSG B 3, p.198: ‘In specie conquesti sunt de Balphasae a Monte Praetore Trahonensi, qui infantem recens natum, quem Papaei propter baptismi privationem in suis sepulchris terrae mandare nolebant, vi praefractis templi Evangelicorum portis, in ipsorum sepulchris illum sepeliri curaveri’.

30 ZB Ms. F 182, 162°-3°; copy in Ms. S 125, 139. In the same letter Calandrini draws attention to the opposition he faced as minister in Morbegno, close to the Milanese border and home to a Dominican monastery that was at the centre of most anti-Protestant intrigues: ‘Non dico quas contumelias in die sepulcris viri, mulieres ac puero evomerint, ut lapides in me iecerint, imo etiam in templum ipsum inter concionandum Morbenii, servum quoque ianuae templi lapillus septius obstrucies ne obsederi posset. Taceo in me iactatum esse non annum me duraturum Morbenii, ac talia eiusmodi’. In the same year the Rhaetian synod expressed a desire to see the Dominican house dissolved (AERSG B 3, p.1).

31 The Rhaetian synod brought the problem of abductions to the attention of the Diet in 1588 (AERSG B 3, p.96).
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Rhaetian Diet to secure his release, Cellario was eventually executed in Rome;\(^{32}\) the same fate later befell Lorenzo Sonzini (as we have seen).\(^{33}\) Some Catholics were intent on purging their region not only of the troublemaking Reformed clergy, but of the Protestant presence as a whole. In 1584, Sondrio was abuzz with talk of an imminent ‘Sicilian vespers’, which would culminate in the slaughter of the heretics.\(^{34}\)

Reformed ministers were fully conscious of the dangers to which they and the congregations they served were exposed. In a letter to the Rhaetian magnate Johannes von Salis of October 1605, Niklaus Kesel, pastor in Monte di Sondrio, referred to his community as ‘tante pecore destinate al macello’.\(^{35}\) Kesel’s colleague Antonius Andreoscha, minister in Tirano, described the predicament of the Valtellinese Reformed in almost identical terms: ‘restariono come pecore nel mezo dei lupi’.\(^{36}\) The pastors’ response to this threat to their congregations’ survival was not, however, to seek an accommodation with local Catholics, but to attempt to shore up Protestantism in the subject lands by drawing closer to the Rhaetian magistracy and to more established foreign Reformed churches, principally Zurich. In that way they hoped both to compensate for the minority status of the Reformed in the subject lands, and to reinforce their communities’ distinct confessional identity.

\(^{32}\) DBI 23, 430-3.

\(^{33}\) See p.260 above. Scipione Calandrini, too, narrowly survived an kidnap attempt in July 1594. It was for his alleged involvement in this attack that Niccolo Rusca, the former archpriest of Sondrio, was tried and put to death by militant Rhaetian Protestants at the infamous Strafgericht of Thusis in 1618.

\(^{34}\) See section III below.

\(^{35}\) StAG D II a 3 c.

\(^{36}\) Ibid.
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II. ZURICH AND ITALIAN GRAUBÜNDEN: THE CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION

The continuing relationship between the Zurich church and the Italian Reformed communities of Graubünden during the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is amply documented in correspondence held at the Zurich Staatsarchiv and Zentralbibliothek. Until his death in 1599, Scipione Lentolo was a key figure in that relationship: he, more than anyone else, was responsible for rehabilitating the scandal-prone churches of the Valbregaglia, Chiavenna and the Valtellina in the eyes of Reformed Europe. In Zurich, Lentolo’s correspondents during the first half of the 1570s comprised Bullinger, Gwalther, Simler and Johannes Wolf. At times the Neapolitan appears almost reverential in his devotion to the Zurich divines: in August 1574, for instance, he asked Tobias Egli to send him portraits of Bullinger and, if possible, other Zurich ministers, ‘non tantum ad meam bibliothecam ornandum, quantum ad ipsum, qui illos amo et colo, eorum prospecto oblectendum’.

During the years immediately following the deaths of his established correspondents Wolf (1572), Bullinger (1575), and Simler (1576), Lentolo seems to have been in less frequent communication with Zurich; that coincided with a general loosening of ties between the Reformed churches of Zurich and Graubünden during Gwalther’s period as Antistes (1575-85). From the early 1580s, however, contacts were resumed on a more intensive basis than before. Almost all of Lentolo’s surviving letters from this period are addressed to Johann Wilhelm Stucki, a former pupil of Peter Martyr Vermigli and from 1571 professor of Old Testament at the Zurich Lectorium. Like many of his predecessors

37 STAZ E II 365, 381.


in Zurich, Stucki was to some extent a product of Italian humanism: not only did he know Italian,40 but he had studied Hebrew in Padua during the late 1560s.41 Stucki’s thought, with its combination of humanist learning and a rigid adherence to Reformed orthodoxy, could not fail to appeal to the similarly minded Lentolo. More than forty letters from the Neapolitan exile to Stucki survive from the thirteen years of their acquaintance.

Among Stucki’s correspondents were other figures prominent in the Italian Reformed churches. The most important of them, after Lentolo, was Scipione Calandrini, a former pupil of Antonio Paleario and a member of a Lucchese patrician family that contributed many distinguished converts to Protestantism.42 For around a decade, Calandrini was based in Geneva, where he assisted the city’s Italian pastor, Niccolò Balbani, and taught rhetoric and dialectics at the academy. In 1568 he moved to the Valtellina, where he was elected Francesco Cellario’s successor as minister in Morbegno. Calandrini seems to have wavered temporarily in his support for the anti-heresy edict of June 1570,43 but any doubts about his orthodoxy were dispelled following the publication of his Trattato delle origine delle heresie by the Landolfi press in Poschiavo in February 1572, in which he defended both excommunication and the magistrate’s cura religionis.44

40 See especially Ulisse Martinengo’s letter to Stucki of 5 March 1600 (StAZ E II 380, 434): ‘Prendo ardire di scrivere a VS. in lingua Italiana, poiche ho vedeute [sic] due lettere da lei in Italiano bene, et politamente scritte, al signor Horatio Paravicino’; also idem, 17 February 1601 (ibid., 490-1), and 11 October 1604 (ibid., 508-9).

41 See Stucki to Gwaltlier, 18 December 1567 (StAZ E II 380, 4), and StAZ E I 13 , 104'-5. I am grateful to Dr Karin Maag for this last reference.

42 Calandrini’s biographical details are summarised by M. Luzzati in DBI 16, pp.458-63.

43 See p.225 above.

44 For the background to the publication of the Trattato, see the letter from Calandrini to Tobias Egli of 13 February 1572 (Ms. F 182, fol.163r): ‘Haec raptim ad te scribo Posclavium contendens hortatu D. Iulii Medicilamensis et D. Pauli Gaddii, quo typis tradam opusculum quoddam, quod ante paucos menses adversus haereses exaravi’. Luzzati regards this work as a highly significant contribution to the process of restoring the tarnished image of the Italian Reformed: ‘Lo scritto di un italiano, in lingua italiana, contro eretici in massa parte italiani, doveva in certo modo fornire la prova dell’ortodossia di quella nazione italiana che i padri della Riforma svizzera sospettavano in blocco d’esser la pecora nera del gregge evangelico’ (DBI 16, p.462). In the Trattato Calandrini argues that the aim of those who oppose the exercise of discipline in doctrinal matters is...
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Around 1577, the Lucchese took charge of the church of Sondrio, the largest in the Valtellina, where his combative style - in evidence at two set-piece disputation held with the Catholic clergy of the subject lands in Tirano and Piuro during the 1590s - was particularly resented by local Catholics. Broccardo Borrono, for example, describes Calandrini as a 'homo perniciiosissimus', and accuses him of translating Reformed works from French and Latin for dissemination by friends in Italy. In one of those works, his Italian translation of Philippe du Plessis-Mornay's Traité de l'Église, the Lucchese confirmed that he did not see his mission-field as confined to the Valtellina, calling in a lengthy prefatory epistle on the rulers of Italy to follow the examples of magistrates elsewhere - including Poland, Transylvania, Rhaetia and the Swiss Confederation - in extending toleration to orthodox Protestantism.

Calandrini's links with the Zurichers were of long standing. Passing through Zurich in December 1558, after fleeing Lucca, the exile entered his name in Gesner's liber amicorum. Just over three years later he was again in Zurich, this time to plead the cause of Geneva's Lucchese community, which was seeking to persuade the government of Lucca to rescind a punitive decree that it had issued against Protestant citizens living to acquire for themselves 'una sfrenata licentia di spargere il lor veleno, e di mettere sempre a campo cose nuove' (Trattato, p.3). The 'charity' which they invoke would leave the Church defenceless against its enemies: 'Qual charità sarebbe del pastore il lasciare distruggere il gregge dal lupo, o rubbarlo dal ladro? o il lasciare infettare tutto il gregge da una pecora marcia et appesata? Qual charità et amore sarà del padre che lascia vivere in casa sua uno scelerato, il quale seduca la moglie et le figliuole inducendole a fomicare?' (ibid., p.151).

45 Porta, 2:3, p.188.

46 See the recent discussion of this text in S. Adomi-Braccesi, 'Religious Refugees from Lucca in the Sixteenth Century: Political Strategies and Religious Proselytism', ARG 88 (1997), 338-79 (375-8). In Calandrini's last known published work, the Confatutone delle calunnie et delle maledicentie (Geneva 1596), he seeks to counter Catholic attempts to associate the Reformed with those genuine 'heretics' (Anabaptists and 'Trinitarii') whom he had denounced in his earlier Trattato (see pp.7-8, 12-15). I am grateful to Emanuele Fiume for allowing me to consult his copy of this extremely rare text.

47 Serrai, p.363.
abroad. Apart from Stucki, Calandrini’s Zurich correspondents included Gwaltther, Heinrich Wolf and Heinrich Bullinger, grandson of the Antistes.

Closely associated with Calandrini in Sondrio was a figure whom I have already mentioned in passing, Ulisse Martinengo of Brescia. Martinengo’s importance within the Italian Reformed community of the Valtellina is well attested. In March 1584 the Barnabite Domenico Boveri said of him, ‘fa peggio di tutti gli altri contro la religion catholica’. There was some substance to this charge: six years earlier, Martinengo had used his influence with the Rhaetian authorities to have Gianfrancesco Buonhomini’s visitation of the Valtellina curtailed. In a letter to Gwaltther of 16 May 1584, Raphael, son of Tobias Egli, praised the itinerant count’s services to Protestantism in the subject lands, which had made him the principal target of local Catholics’ antipathy: ‘Qui [...] fratries ob Evangelium exules illo arctius et maiore caritate complectatur nemo est, nec qui plus

---

48 Letter from the Italian church in Geneva to the Zurich council, 11 March 1562 (StAZ A 241.1; copy in ZB Ms. S 103, 166): ‘Cum his litteris mittimus ad vos D. Scipionem Calandrinum gentilem nostrum, his mandatis, ut Dominationibus vestris nonnulla exponat, atque ab illis exorat, quae ad Christi Reditus causam, nostrum fratrumque commodum pertinere arbitraretur. Rogamus igitur vos cimi omni (ut decet) humilitate, ut ei fratem indubium habeatis in omnibus, quae nostro nomine narraverit, aut petierit; votisque nostris pro Dei gloria, quam vohtis ante omnes acerbas propositi pro vestri Imperii dignitate, generis nobilitate, pietateque ac solita erga omnes oppressos atque afflictos humanitate, amiuere dignemini’. The letter is signed by Balbani and several other prominent Lucchese exiles (Filippo Rustici, Lorenzo Venturini, Francesco Cattani, Paolo Arnolfini and Vincenzo Mei). On the edict of January 1562, see S. Adom-Baccesi, ‘Le <<Nazioni>> lucchesi nell’Europa della Riforma’, Critica storica 28 (1991), 363-426 (369-73, 381-83). Calandrini’s petition was strongly backed by Bullinger, who commended him to Fabricius in Chur (Schliess, 2, no.421).

49 Heinrich, son of Johannes Wolf, was twice professor of New Testament at the Carolinum (U. Ernst, Geschichte des Zürcherischen Schulwesens bis gegen das Ende des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts (Winterthur 1879), p.112). From 1592 until his death in 1594 he served as preacher at the Fraumünster (E. Dejung and W. Wuhurn (eds), Zürcher Pfarrerbuch 1519-1952 (Zurich 1953), p.633). On Heinrich Bullinger, see ibid., pp.229-30. Lentolo was also in contact with the younger Bullinger (see Lentolo to Stucki, 21 September 1587 [StAZ E II 380, 67]).


51 Cited in Pastore, Valtellina, p.110.

52 Mazzone, p.139.
consilio et re ipsa his Ecclesiis profuerit, ac prodesse possit, quam ipse’. Like Calandrini, Martinengo was in regular correspondence with Johann Wilhelm Stucki. We possess around thirty of his letters to the Zurich professor, beginning in 1594 and continuing up until shortly before Stucki’s death in 1607.

Besides Stucki, the Italians’ most important Zurich contact during the period with which we are concerned was Kaspar Waser, successively professor of Hebrew, Greek and theology at the Zurich academy. Waser, who according to his biographer Jodocus Kvosen knew eleven languages including Italian, probably ranks as Zurich’s foremost intellectual during the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Like Stucki, he had a strong affinity for Italian culture. In 1592-3, before his ordination, Waser had accompanied Johann Peter, younger brother of the Augsburg nobleman J.H. Heinzel von Degerstein, on an extended tour of Italy, during which he made Lentolo’s acquaintance. From 1597 we find him in correspondence with Lentolo, and later with the Neapolitan’s successor in Chiavenna, Ottaviano Mei, who as pastor in Teglio had already forged links with Zurich through Stucki. During the years immediately prior to the ‘sacro macello’, Waser also corresponded with the Engadiners Johann Peter Danz and Caspar Alexius, ministers in Teglio and Sondrio respectively.

The network of contacts linking Zurich and the Italian churches was probably

53 ZB Ms. S 142, 16.

54 J. Kvosen, De vita et obitu reverendi et clarissimi viri, Domini Caspari Waseri (Basel [1626]). In a letter of 1597, Lentolo specifically refers to Waser’s (and Stucki’s) knowledge of Italian (ZB Ms. S 152, 93.1).

55 Lentolo to Stucki, 26 June 1593 (StAZ E II 380, 272). See also Paolo Lentolo to Jakob Zwinger, 15 July 1593 (Basel UB Fr. Gr. Ms. II 4, 152).

56 Mei, who served as minister in Teglio from 1581, and in Chiavenna from 1599 until his death in 1619, was another product of Geneva’s Lucchese community (biographical details are given in G. Giorgetta, ‘Un codicillo di Ottaviano Mei’, Clavenna 17 (1978), 24-8). He was a vocal defender of Reformed doctrine against the Catholic clergy of the subject lands: among Stucki’s papers is a copy of six theses by Mei, dated 19 April 1593, condemning the Mass, purgatory, auricular confession, papal primacy and a string of Catholic devotional practices as without scriptural foundation (StAZ E II 358a, 571f). Like Calandrini, Mei figured prominently at the disputation of Tirano.
even more extensive than the surviving records document. At various points, Lentolo indicates that he was also in correspondence with Felix Trüb, one-time professor of New Testament and Hebrew at the Zurich academy;\(^\text{57}\) with Gabriel Gerber, a former Catholic canon from Lucerne who converted to Protestantism in 1589 and was subsequently appointed minister in the Zurich town of Bülach;\(^\text{58}\) with Huldrych Zwingli, grandson of the reformer and professor of New Testament at the Lectorium from 1585 to 1591;\(^\text{59}\) and with Raphael Egli, son of Tobias and a former pupil of Lentolo’s in Chiavenna.\(^\text{60}\)

Rather more obscure, but perhaps no less significant, are the continuing ties between the Italian Reformed communities of Rhaetia and the Zurich Locarnesi, ties that survived the dissolution of Zurich’s Italian church in December 1563.\(^\text{61}\) Thus the accounts of the Locarnese community for the later sixteenth century record grants to a son of the minister of Stampa in the Valbregaglia (21 March 1585);\(^\text{62}\) to Daniele, son of Bartolomeo Chiesa, minister in Malenco (10 February 1589);\(^\text{63}\) to Salvatore Madera, a Portuguese exile and former schoolmaster in Sondrio (20 March and 5 August 1595);\(^\text{64}\) and to ‘un povero

\(^{57}\) See Lentolo to Stucki, 7 July 1589 (StAZ E II 380, 93).


\(^{59}\) Lentolo to Stucki, 26 June 1593 (StAZ E II 380, 273).

\(^{60}\) Idem, 3 November 1588 (StAZ E II 380, 75). On Egli, see most recently J. Gerber, ‘Giordano Bruno und Raphael Egli: Begegnungen im Zwiieicht von Alchimie und Theologie’, Sudhoffs Archiv 76 (1992), 133-63. Relations between Egli and Lentolo appear to have become strained by the time of the latter’s death (see Lentolo to Stucki, 13 September 1598 [StAZ E II 380, 392-5]).

\(^{61}\) These contacts are noted briefly in Bonorand, Bildungswesen, p.73.

\(^{62}\) FA Orelli 8.2, fol.108v.

\(^{63}\) Ibid., fol.109v.

\(^{64}\) Ibid., fol.115v. Madera caused a scandal while in Sondrio by entering a Catholic church naked and profaning the host (supposedly during a bout of insanity). Local Catholics demanded the schoolmaster’s execution, but at the request of the Rhaetian synod he was released and handed over to the Zurichers (AERSG B 3, pp.126, 129-31). Calandrini provided Stucki with a detailed account of the episode in his letter of 15 July 1595 (StAZ E II 358a, 607). Taddeo Duno’s De peregrinatione filiorum Israel in Aegypto, published in August that year, was prefaced by some laudatory verses from Madera’s pen (De peregrinatione, fol.4r).
garzone di Chiavenna’ (12 March 1599). There is some evidence of contacts between Lentolo and Taddeo Duno, the *eminence grise* of the Locarnese community. During Bullinger’s final illness, Duno provided Lentolo with reports on the Antistes’ deteriorating condition, which were subsequently relayed to Paolo Gaddi and Giulio da Milano in the Valtellina. Duno may even have acted as an intermediary between Lentolo and the Zurich churchmen, who had considerable respect for his abilities. During the early 1590s, for instance, Lentolo’s reputation came under fire from a newly converted Italian exile, Niccolò Manini (also known as Niccolò da Eremo). After a brief period of service as minister in Casaccia in early 1590, Manini left Graubünden for London, where he complained of mistreatment by Lentolo and the church of Chiavenna. Lentolo composed an extended refutation of this charge, a copy of which was sent to Duno to be read and then passed on to Stucki. The favour was repaid shortly afterwards, when Lentolo helped to ensure that the will of a local evangelical, Paolo Beccaria, who had left part of his fortune to Zurich’s Locarnese community, was upheld despite a challenge mounted by Catholics

---

65 FA Orelli 8.2, fol.116*.  
66 Lentolo to Bullinger, 6 April 1575 (StAZ E II 365, 404; Schiess, 3, no.450).  
67 See p.160 above.  
68 On 16 February 1591, the *coetus* of the London stranger churches wrote to the Rhetian synod to request confirmation of Manini’s credentials (StAZ E II 380, 158-9 [copy in Lentolo’s hand]; AERSG B 3, 109-11). The synod replied on 12 June that Manini’s conduct during his tenure of the ministry in Casaccia had been satisfactory, but censured him for his ingratitude towards Lentolo and the church of Chiavenna. It also repeated the charge (first made by Lentolo) that Manini was unsound on the question of predestination (StAZ E II 380, 168-9 [copy in Lentolo’s hand]). See also J.H. Hessels, *Ecclesiæ Londino-Batavæ Archivium: Epistulæ et Tractatus cum Reformationis tum Ecclesiæ Londino-Batavæ Illustrantes*, 4 vols in 3 pts (Cambridge 1887-97), 3:1, nos 1063, 1096, 1121, 1150, 1176, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1212, 1216. Lentolo wrote personally to the Italian minister in London, Gianbattista Aureli, to warn him against Manini, who quickly came into conflict with both Aureli and the *coetus*. See Boersma and Jelsma, *Unity in Multiformity*, pp.89-105, 202-3; Boersma, *Vluchtig Voorbeeld*, p.99.  
69 Lentolo to Stucki, 29 June 1591 (StAZ E II 380, 170-3). Another copy of Lentolo’s defence (for which see StAZ E II 380, 162-7) was sent to Jacques Couet, minister of the French church in Basel, to be forwarded to England.
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from the Mesolcina. Again, when Duno’s *De peregrinatione filiorum Israel in Aegypto* of 1595 attracted sharp criticism from the Leipzig theologian Matthias Dresser, Lentolo was among those to whom its author appealed for support. Whereas senior Reformed figures like Beza cautiously withheld their approval (while not condemning the work outright), Lentolo wholeheartedly concurred with Duno’s proposed solution to the chronological difficulties presented by the Old Testament texts under consideration. Replying to Duno on 15 October 1596, he enthused:

_Crede quaeso mihi, loquor quod plane sentio, et prorsus omni amota adulatione, me hactenus nequaquam meminisse legere in eo argumento quod visum mihi sit verius, eruditius, acutius excogitatum, atque probatum solidius. Legi, relegi librum, ac quo magius lego, eo magis delectat, docet, persuadet._

Lentolo was sufficiently impressed to ask Duno to send him copies of other works he had published.

Ulisse Martinengo, a frequent visitor to Zurich, also had dealings with the Locarnesi. During the late 1590s, for instance, Martinengo was involved in a financial dispute with the Augsburg exile J.H. Heinzel von Degerstein, now resident in Zurich. In Martinengo’s absence, Duno kept him informed of the progress of the case. He may even have contributed to its resolution: in a letter to Stucki of 31 March 1596, Martinengo writes, ‘Excellens Doctor D. Thadens Dumus, et D. Roncus quid in hac causa egerint adhuc ignoror, scripsi tamen ad illos ut tibi communicarent quid hactenus factum sit’. Scipione

---

70 StAZ E II 380, 172-3. See also Lentolo to Stucki, 6 October 1591 (StAZ E II 380, 3). The legal expenses incurred by the Zurich Locarnesi in the course of this dispute are recorded in the community’s accounts (FA Orelli 8.2, fol.109r).

71 ZB Car. C. 40, fol.64r. For Duno’s reply to Lentolo, dated 29 November 1596, see ibid., fol.64v. This manuscript volume contains a revised and expanded version of the original work together with an appendix of letters engendered by the controversy and copied out in Duno’s hand with a view to subsequent publication (see Duno to J.J. Grynaeus, 24 January 1597, 1, 14 and 23 August 1600 (Basel UB G II 4, fols 100-3); Duno to Jakob Zwinger, 18 February 1603 [Basel UB Fr. Gr. Ms. II 23, no.176]). Much earlier, Duno appears to have sought Lentolo’s approval for his ‘In ecclesiastica disciplina tractatus duo’ (now lost) (see the summary of the work’s contents in ZB Ms. S 125, 88).

72 StAZ E II 380, 357. See also Martinengo’s letter of 1 May 1598, in which he refers to the successful outcome of the case: ‘Ex epistola Excellentissimi Domini Doctoris Duni cognovi ab integerrimus Tigurinus judicibus decretam mihi fuisse solutionem ex bonis Domini Enzelli pro summa mihi debita’ (StAZ E II 380, 262).
Calandrini’s links with the Locarnesi are less well documented, but we know that he made use of passing Locarnese merchants as couriers for his letters to Stucki.

The emergence of Bergamo as a focus of transalpine trade during the final decades of the sixteenth century may well have brought the Zurich Locarnesi, whose mercantile activities had hitherto been concentrated more on Lombardy, into closer contact with the Reformed communities of the Valtellina and Valchiavenna: a natural port of call for those travelling from Chur to the Veneto via the Splügen pass. Thus, among the trading partners of Ludovico Ronco during the 1570s and 1580s were the Lumaga and Scandoleri families of Piuro. Contacts of this sort can be shown to have continued right up until the eve of the ‘sacro macello’. For example, a letter dated 21 October 1610 from the Chiavenna merchant Giacomo Curtabate to his nephew Azzo Guicciardi of Teglio, who was studying in Zurich, includes the note ‘per ricapito al Signor Giorgio Pebbia’: Pebbia was a second-generation Locarnese merchant engaged in trade with Lyon, Milan and Bergamo. Similarly, in a letter to Kaspar Waser of 10 March 1611, written from Sondrio, Gianbattista Calandrini advised the Zurich professor to entrust his reply to Pebbia, who

402). I have found no reference to this judgement in either the Zurich Richtbücher or the council records. However, for evidence of Heinzel’s financial difficulties see StAZ B II 263, 46 (14 June 1598); Gerber, 140.

73 On 10 October 1599 Calandrini informed Stucki that he had received his letter, ‘quibus magna responsione non est opus, cum per D. Ludovicum Orellum non ita pridem pluribus tecum egerim’ (ZB Ms. F 80, 337). Ludwig Orelli (1576-1632) inherited the cloth export company founded by his father Gianmelchiero. See Weisz, ‘Tessiner’, 437-8; H. Schulthess, Die von Orelli von Locarno und Zürich: Ihre Geschichte und Genealogie (Zurich 1941), pp.82-3.

74 D. Fretz, Die Frühbeziehungen zwischen Zürich und Bergamo 1568-1618 (Zurich 1940).

75 On 5 October 1578 Ronco received a bale of ‘stami di strusi di Verona’ from Bartolomeo Scandoleri to be woven in Zurich (FA Orelli 8.4, fol.16ª). His business records also include a copy of a note from Lorenzo Lumaga, dated 23 February 1579, acknowledging a debt to Ronco’s company of 800 scudi to be paid ‘per li pagamenti di Fiera di Francoforte in Zuricco a Ms. Francesco Michele [Appiano]’ (ibid., fol.18ª).

76 StAZ E II 383, 709. Initially Pebbia worked in concert with his brother Giangiacomo, but their company had to be wound up after it ran into difficulties in the late 1590s (Weisz, ‘Tessiner’, 433-5).

77 Probably identical with the Gianbattista Calandrini who served as minister in Dubino from 1606 (see J.R Truog, Die Pfarrer der evangelischen Gemeinden in Graubünden und seinen ehemaligen Untertanenlanden (Chur 1934-5), p.264; AERSG B 3, 177, 182). He was apparently a son of Scipione Calandrini: in a letter to
would ensure that it was safely delivered via Giacomo Curtabate in Chiavenna. In the light of those ties, it comes as no surprise to discover that the Locarnese brothers Martin, Ludwig and Johann Jakob Orelli were among the main contributors to the relief fund established for those survivors of the 'sacro macello' who sought refuge in Zurich.

III. AREAS OF CO-OPERATION

During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the Italian Reformed communities of Graubünden saw themselves as an integral part of that 'Calvinist international' which some historians have postulated for this period. Although they were not exile congregations in the formal sense — the bulk of their membership consisted of local converts — the role of exiles in defining their sense of identity was crucial. Men like Lentolo and Martinengo came to Rhaetia as deracinated figures, having by their conversions renounced traditional allegiances to home, family and Catholic society. The main focus of their loyalties was now the wider fellowship of Reformed believers with which they had chosen to align themselves. Some of this clearly rubbed off on the Protestant communities of Rhaetia, in which the exiles tended to assume leadership roles: Graubünden's Italian-speaking Reformed became intensely cosmopolitan in outlook. During the later sixteenth century, for example, they followed eagerly the twists and turns of religious conflict in France, doubtless aware of the parallels with their own situation.

Great hopes were invested in the accession to the French throne of Henri IV: Mei composed verses in praise of the Bourbon prince, while Lentolo clung to the conviction

---

78 ZB Ms. S 162, 154.1.
79 StAZ II 279, 5.
80 See the anti-Nicodemite 'Lettera pastorale alli Protestanti di Francia caduti per forza de tormenti', presumably a response to the wave of abjurations that followed the massacres of September 1572, in StAG D II b 3.
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that his return to the Catholic fold in 1593 would prove a temporary lapse. In purely numerical terms, the Italian Reformed of Graubünden may have been insignificant players on the European stage, but they made up for that with fervent commitment to the international 'Protestant cause': the churches of Brusio, Poschiavo, Tirano, Teglio, Sondrio, Berbenno, Chiavenna, Piuro and the Valbregaglia all contributed to the relief fund for Geneva set up following the Escalade of 1602, for instance. As the sole representatives of Protestantism in Italian-speaking lands – the Italian identity of the Waldenses was a much later development – they were in a position, one might say, to punch above their weight.

Yet there were barriers to the full participation of Rhaetia’s Italian churches in the cultural and intellectual life of Reformed Europe. The most formidable of those was geography: southern Graubünden and the Rhaetian subject lands were very much at the periphery of the Protestant world. Even Chur, the nearest Reformed centre of any significance, was several days’ journey from Chiavenna. Because of the Italian churches’ physical isolation, their links with Zurich acquired a special importance. The Zurich church assumed the role of mediator between these communities and the rest of Reformed Europe, facilitating the passage of individuals, books and correspondence across the Alpine barrier. It also assisted local pastors in their efforts to consolidate the gains which the Reformation had made in Italian Graubünden since the 1540s.

Before 1572, the major obstacle to such co-operation had been the Zurichers’ misgivings about the Italian churches’ commitment to orthodoxy. Older Zurich churchmen’s perception of those congregations continued for some years afterwards to be informed by their experience of dealing with Italian ‘heresy’. In February 1576, for

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item StAZ E II 358a, 531; Lentolo to Stucki, 6 June 1595 (StAZ E II 380, 325-6).
\item RCP 8, p.234, n.60. The security of Geneva was a matter of obvious concern for the Italian Reformed at this time; shortly before his death Lentolo told Stucki that he feared for the city’s future at the hands of the Savoyards (StAZ E II 380, 420-1).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
example, the church of Chiavenna wrote to Rudolf Gwalther urging him to support its campaign for the relaxation of the prohibited degrees in the subject lands, on the basis that consanguineous marriages were preferable to unions with 'unbelievers'. In an accompanying submission, Lentolo argued that mixed marriages were leading members of his church into idolatry. However, the new Zurich Antistes was not impressed: in his reply, he urged the Chiavennaschi to continue to observe the prohibited degrees lest their conduct give rise to scandal. Gwalther appears to have made a connection between this issue and the earlier heresies to which the Italian Reformed community had proved so susceptible:

Quod maxime dolendum inter Evangelii professores exorti sunt, qui dum novos Christos fingunt, coelos item novos fabricant, deoque alilis articulis disputationes eruditae vetustati plane incognitas instiutunt, Ecclesiam in partes distrahunt, et periculoosum seismatum sunt authores.

In a letter to Beza, whose opinion had also been solicited, Gwalther made his fears more explicit: 'Suspecta sunt mihi non immerito in eiusmodi causis Italorum ingenia, ne sub Evangelii libertate licentiam quaerant'. Such sentiments do not, however, seem to have been shared by younger Zurich divines, who had no direct experience of the campaign against the radicals. On the rare occasions when Italian ministers felt that their orthodoxy had been impugned, they were able to turn to the Zurchers in the knowledge that they were likely to receive support. When Lentolo and his son Paolo were accused of sponsoring the publication of Thomas Erastus's anti-disciplinarian Explicatio gravissimae quaestionis in 1590, for example, the Neapolitan exile instructed Johann Wilhelm Stucki to write to the

---

83 StAZ E II 377, 2656, published in RCP 4, 231-3.
84 StAZ E II 365a, 681-5.
85 StAZ E II 381, 1407. Lentolo reports that the church of Chiavenna had accepted Gwalther's judgement in a letter of 12 September 1576 (StAZ E II 377, 2657). For Gwalther's conservatism on the question of the prohibited degrees, see also his letter to Kaspar Hubenschmid of 27 November 1579 (StAZ E II 382, 968).
86 Correspondance 17, p.35 (no.1185).
churches of Geneva and Basel to set the record straight. Stucki also gave Lentolo his complete backing against the charges of Niccolò da Eremo, unlike some of Lentolo's own colleagues in the Rhaetian Reformed synod.

Zurich's enhanced commitment to the Italian churches after 1572 was perhaps most evident in the area of education. Most of the major population centres in the subject lands – Chiavenna, Sondrio, Teglio, Tirano – were able to offer a certain level of Reformed education, provided either by the minister himself or by schoolmasters employed by the Protestant community. For more advanced study, however, the Italian Reformed were obliged to look further afield. As early as the 1530s there are indications that boys from the Valbregaglia, Poschiavo and the subject lands were attending Zurich's Latin schools and the Lectorium; however, their numbers rose appreciably from the end of the 1570s. Italian-

---

87 Lentolo to Stucki, 1 December 1590 (StAZ E II 380, 121). The Explicatio was in fact published in London under the false imprint of Poschiavo – on the initiative of Giacomo Castelvetro (see Bromatico, pp.44-5; A.W. Pollard, G.R. Redgrave et al. (eds), A Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books printed abroad 1475-1640, 3 vols (London 1976-91), no.10511). Interestingly, Lentolo argues that Erastus' teaching would turn the church into a 'stable of Circe': Gwalther had used the same image when condemning the opponents of the 1570 anti-heresy edict in the preface to his Six Sermons on the Incarnation of Christ (see chapter 5:111 above). He also assumes that Geneva and Zurich were united in their condemnation of Erastus and support for Calvinist-style discipline ('Semper, dei summo beneficio, ego et filius tota pectore ahberraeceamus ab ea doctrina, quae diversa sit ab ea quae fideliter et pura iuxta praescriptum Divini verbi praecipue docetur, et istic, et Genevae [my italics]'). Lentolo may have been aware that the Zurich divines' opposition to the use of excommunication as a disciplinary sanction had softened; Burkhardt Leemann was to propose its introduction in Zurich some years later (G. Zimmermann, Die Zürcher Kirche von der Reformation bis zum dritten Reformationsjubiläum (1519-1819) nach der Reihenfolge der Zürcherischen Autisten (Zürich 1878), p.133).

88 Lentolo to Stucki, 30 August 1591 (StAZ E I I 380, 174-7). Lentolo appears to have been unhappy with the Rhaetian synod's response to the enquiries of the London stranger churches regarding Manini: 'De illo vno [...] qui non ea praedentia et constantia se gessit in illo suo responso ad prudentes et cordatos Ministros exterrarum, quae Londini sunt, Ecclesiarum, sicut tu vere et scite eos vocas: doleo mirum in modum cum eius causa, tum Synodhi ipsius, cu prae est. Quod vel pueri, nemum viri sapientes, cognoscere possunt, parum sibi in re praesertim gravi, vel minime, ut decreter, constare. Sinit bonus vir se velut abiripi ab auctoritate quorumcumque, qui nebuloni illi [Manini] faverunt, decepti cum illius pollicitationibus tum sua ipsorum levitate, ac etiam cupiditate diviendi, ac suae cuticulae consulendi, eum dicam ventri, quippe cui, ut multis argumentis apparat, longe magis servivert, pro dolor et pudor, quam Deo' (ibid., 174). Martino Ponchieri, minister in Casaccia, was one of those who endorsed Manini's version of events (Hessels, 3, no.1176). At a meeting of the synod in 1590 he also censured Lentolo for refusing to baptise a child without its father's consent (AERSG B 3, pp.107, 111-2).

89 See Bonorand, Bildungswesen, pp.40-50.
speakers came to form a high proportion of the Rhaetian contingent of students in Zurich, which constituted the largest single foreign element: according to Conradin Bonorand, of the eighteen Bündner whose names appear in the Zurich 'Album' of students for the years 1578-9, eleven were from the Italian-speaking communes of southern Rhaetia or from the subject lands. Zurich remained the most popular centre of higher education for boys from those areas up until the 'sacro macello': more than fifty Italian-speaking Bündner are known to have studied in the city between 1590 and 1620. Unsurprisingly, many of the students were relatives of the Zurichers’ Italian correspondents. They included Lentolo’s son Paolo, along with several members of the Marlianici family, to which Scipione Calandrini was related by marriage. In some cases, scholarships were offered to Italian-speaking students. In June 1612, for example, Josua Resta, minister in Caspano and himself formerly a student in Zurich, wrote to Kaspar Waser on behalf of a certain Bartolomeo, who was returning to the Swiss city to resume his studies at the Carolinum. Could Waser do his best, Resta asked, to ensure that the boy continued to receive financial support?

The Zurich ministers and professors were also responsible for the Italian students’ welfare during their stay in the city. Azzo Guicciardi, from Teglio, spent the years 1610-11 as a house-guest of Kaspar Waser, for instance. While in Zurich the boy improved his command of Latin and learnt German; in a letter to Azzo’s mother of 12 July 1611,

---

90 Ibid., p.72.

91 See the list in C. Bonorand, 'Bündner Studierende an böhmischen Schulen der Schweiz und des Auslandes im Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation', *JHGG* (1949), 91-174 (100-30).

92 Lentolo to Bullinger, 3 June 1575 (StAZ E II 365, 409; Schiess, 3, no.454). Paolo went on to study in Geneva and Basel, where he obtained a doctorate in medicine. After spending several years at the court of Elizabeth I, he was appointed city doctor in Bern (J. Picot, ‘La famiglia di Scipione Lentolo’, *BSSV* 100 (1956), 66-7; G. Busiño, ‘Italiani all’università di Basilea dal 1460 al 1601’, *BHR* 20 (1958), 497-526 [516]). On the Marlianici, see Bonorand, ‘Bündner Studierende’, 111-12; StAZ E II 358a, 642’.

93 ZB Ms. S 162, 139. In June 1606 the Rhaetian synod sent Paolo Gaffuri, son of the former minister of Poschiavo, to Zurich with the request that he be offered a scholarship (AERSG B 3, 186). His brother Cesare followed three years later (see J.B. Paravicini to the Zurich professors, 16 August 1609 [StAZ E II 459, 365]). In 1609 a ‘Gafforo’ (presumably Cesare) received 16 s from the Grossmünsterstift’s Studentenamt (StAZ G II 39.12).
Waser described him as a model pupil. Guicciardi’s experience illustrates how the tradition of sending Valtellinese youths to study in Zurich could become self-perpetuating: the boy’s schoolmaster in Teglio, Pietro de’ Pozzi, was himself a former pupil of Waser’s. Of course, such arrangements did not always turn out to the satisfaction of both parties. Massimiliano Piatti, a companion of Guicciardi’s who also lodged with Waser, fell in with bad company and ended up storming out of the professor’s house after a row with one of his sons. Waser was unable to persuade him to return or to accept alternative lodgings with another minister; the situation deteriorated further when Piatti ceased to attend school and was accused of seducing a local girl. Eventually Waser decided that the only solution was to send his errant pupil home.

As is well known, the single most important function of the Zurich academy was to provide trained pastors for service in the state’s rural subject territories. As the output of graduates increased, Zurich was also able to supply ministers to other parts of eastern Switzerland which suffered from a shortage of adequately trained clergy. The German-speaking Reformed churches of Graubünden (including Chur) were among those which benefited from the arrangement.

Zurich was less well equipped to offer such assistance to Italian-speaking (or, for that matter, Romantsch-speaking) congregations in the Freestate, because of the difference in language. That left churches in the region reliant, for the most part, on the services of Italian evangelical exiles. But the protracted theological controversies of the 1540s, 1550s and 1560s had shown that the doctrinal probity of ministers with this background could not

---

94 StaAZ E II 383, 721.

95 Waser to Pietro de’ Pozzi, 1 December 1610 (ibid., 705); Waser to Niccolò Guicciardi, 10 December 1610 (ibid., 707).

96 See Waser to Cecilia Piatti, 19 January and 10 March 1611 (ibid., 715, 718). Massimiliano subsequently wrote to Waser from Teglio to apologise for his misdemeanours (ibid., 789).

97 Bonorand, Bildungswesen, p.35.
be guaranteed. Although heresy was less of a problem in subsequent years, the records of the Rhaetian synod show that many exile pastors continued to fall short of the Reformed ideal. Most were repeatedly fined for failing to attend the annual meetings of the synod. Others were accused of favouring Catholic doctrines or being too intimate with Catholic clergy: several ministers are known to have reverted to the old faith. But given the shortage of candidates for such posts, the synod could not afford to be choosy. The situation became more urgent as the flow of exiles out of Italy began to dry up around 1600. In March 1606, Niklaus Kesel declined an invitation to exchange his position as minister in Monte di Sondrio for one in German-speaking Graubünden because four Valtellina churches were already without pastors. Service as a minister in the Italian lands was not an attractive option: it was both fraught with personal danger (as the fates of Cellario and Sonzini demonstrated) and poorly remunerated. In May 1597 the synod appealed to the Rhaetian Diet to increase the salaries of ministers in the Valtellina, who were hardly able to support their families on their current stipends. Complaints of this sort continued to be heard throughout the period with which we are dealing. In a letter to

---

98 See, for example, AERSG B 3, 13, 88, 104. Eventually the synod was forced to allow the Chiavennaschi, Bregagliotti and Valtellinesi to transact business in separate ‘colloquies’ (ibid., 141, 153).

99 In 1608 the Neapolitan Ferdinandus Carresius, minister in Bondo, was suspended on suspicion of apostasy: ‘Ferdinandus minister ecclesiae Bondiensis (quoniam compertum est ipsum Mediolani fuisse apud Cardinalem) indignus nostro consortio indiciatur, et a synodo excluditur, idque ministrator Dominico Ministro, ut ecclesiam de exclusione haec moneat, et ad ipsum dimittendum exhortetur’ (AERSG B 3, 194-5). See also the cases of Giovanni Battista Thei (ibid., 95), Martino Ponchieri (ibid., 114, 116-7) and Michael Capuanus (ibid., 145).

100 Kesel to J. von Salis, 21 March 1606 (StAG D II a 3 c). The situation had been aggravated by the recent death of Scipione Calandrini.

101 Lentolo describes his poverty in a letter to Stucki of 13 September 1598 (StAZ E II 380, 392-5). On another occasion he grumbled, ‘Italica natio vix alet suos ministros, nequum diet’ (ibid., 420).

102 ‘Proposuit fuit V. Synodo, plerosque Valturiae fratres propter exigua salaria sese cum familiaribus alere non posse. Ideoque in proximis comitibus proponendum esse a Dominis supplicandum indicat, ut sua autem salaria statantur homo a Comitatibus solvenda, quo fratres pauperes Ecclesiarum minus graventur, et Ecclesiae pauperes Ministros sustinare [?] possint’ (AERSG B 3, 141). Two years later the Valtellinese ministers informed the synod that their salaries were still not being paid on time (ibid., 150).
Breitinger of July 1620, the Neapolitan Michele Terenzio, minister in Soglio, bewailed the poverty of his situation, which he was keen to exchange for a teaching position at the Zurich academy. In his desperation, Terenzio claimed, he had considered a return to Catholicism (‘ad vomitum Paternae meae domus’).

One solution to the staffing crisis was to appoint Romansh-speaking Rhaetians to Italian parishes: by the time of the ‘sacro macello’, five of the seventeen Reformed congregations in the subject lands, both churches in Poschiavo, and Bondo and Casaccia in the Valbregaglia were in the care of ministers from the Engadine. A more satisfactory approach was to make good the shortfall with Italian-speakers native to Graubünden. When Pietro Menghino of Poschiavo came to Zurich on Lentolo’s recommendation in June 1593, he was singled out by the latter as a potential future minister: ‘Speramus namque eum futurum huius regionis Italicis Ecclesiis aliquando utilem: quippe quae maxima laborant penuria bonorum Pastorum’. In the event, Menghino returned to Rhaetia as a schoolmaster rather than as a minister, but among the Italian Bündner who studied in Zurich were several who later underwent ordination: Josua Resta (Caspano), Bartolomeo Paravicini (Dubino, Soglio), Vincenzo Paravicini (Bondo, Casaccia), Gianbattista Calandrini (Dubino), and Simone Pellizari (Piuro). Most of the Engadiners who served as ministers in the Italian lands were also Zurich-trained.

103 StAZ E II 390, 457.
104 Statement based on information in Truog, Pfarrer.
105 The appointment of Romansh-speakers to Italian parishes appears to have been regarded as less than ideal by the synod. See G. Baserga, ‘Il movimento per la Riforma in Valtellina e le sue relazioni con Ginevra’, Periodico della Società storica della Provincia e antica Diocesi di Como 21 (1914), 97-128; 22 (1915), 31-35 (20): ‘In illis locis desunt nobis candelabra, desunt φως φωτος, desunt pastores; alii enim propter lingam, alii propter aetatem, alii propter nationem alii propter alia minus idonei’.
106 Lentolo to Stucki, 23 August 1594 [StAZ E II 380, 314]).
107 For example, Caspar Alexius (Sondrio), Antonius Andreoscha (Brusio), Samuel Andreoscha (Mello), Johann Peter Danz (Teglio), Jörg Jenatsch (Berbenno) and Gaudensius Tack (Brusio, Malenco). Information derived from Truog, Pfarrer; idem, ‘Die Pfarrer der evangelischen Gemeinden in Graubünden und seinen ehemaligen Untertanenlanden (Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen)’, JHG C 75 (1945), 113-47; and Bonorand,
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The Zurich church’s interest in improving educational opportunities for the Italian Reformed was most clearly demonstrated by its support for attempts to set up a Latin school for the subject lands in Sondrio.\footnote{Bündner Studierende, passim.} This had long been a cherished project of the Rhaetian Reformed leadership: Zanchi mentions it in a letter to Pierre Viret as early as October 1563.\footnote{The standard account of this episode is C. Camenisch, Carlo Borromeo und die Gegenreformation im Veltlin mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Landesschule von Sondrio (Chur 1901), pp.140-233.} Proposals for the establishment of a school were finally put to the Diet by Johannes Contius Bisaz, the president of the Rhaetian synod, in May 1581, and later that year the measure was approved by the communes.\footnote{Zanchi, Epistolae, 2, 174.} It was, inevitably, to Zurich that the Rhaetians turned in search of someone qualified to head the new institution, which was to be funded from the proceeds of the dissolved priory of Teglio. Lentolo suggested his former pupil Raphael Egli, who had recently been ordained in Zurich, and wrote to Gwalther to request his release in October 1582.\footnote{Camenisch, Borromeo, p.143.} On 6 November Gwalther put Lentolo’s petition to the council, observing ‘daB vilgedachter Raphael Egli zu solchem Stand geschiickt und tugendlich, wir aber diser Zyt in unser Schul siner wol mangeln mögend’.\footnote{Letter published in Camenisch, Borromeo, pp.250-1.} As a further testimony of Zurich’s support, Egli was offered an annual grant from the Grossmünsterstift to supplement the salary of 60 kronen assigned him by the Bündner.\footnote{Text in ibid., pp.147-8.} After his arrival in the Valtellina, the new rector published a school order setting out his vision for the college. There were to be three classes, each with its own schoolmaster. The school was to provide a humanistic education, with the emphasis on the acquisition of

\footnote{StAZ G II 39.7, entries for 17 November 1582, 28 September 1583 and 6 July 1584. See also Calandriini’s letter to Gwalther of 12 February 1583 requesting that Egli be supported over the coming year (ZB Ms. A 49, 222-3).}
correct Latin, both spoken and written; in the third class, students were also to be taught the rudiments of Greek from the New Testament. In most respects, the school was modelled on its existing equivalents in Zurich.\footnote{Via ac ratio scholae illustrium dominorum D.D Rhaetorum qui nomine Trium Foederum nuncuparur, a Raphaele Eglino Tigurino descripta, published in Camenisch, \textit{Borromeo}, pp.253-61. Compare Bullinger's \textit{Schulordnung} of 1532, summarised in Ernst, pp.88-93.}

However, by the time Egli’s school order appeared (April 1584) the project had run into serious difficulties. Local Catholics were inclined to regard the school as little more than an instrument for the dissemination of Protestantism in the subject lands, even though religious instruction was specifically excluded from the curriculum. It therefore quickly became a focus of anti-Protestant feeling: one visiting Franciscan preacher urged his listeners to massacre the ‘Lutherans’ and instructed Catholic women to withhold sex from their Protestant husbands.\footnote{Calandrini and the church of Sondrio to Gwalther, 5 April 1584 (StAZ E II 382, 1049; part-published in Camenisch, \textit{Borromeo}, pp.269-70): ‘Quia [...] res in proximo Synodo Ministrorum Rhaetiae circa tempus Comitiorum tractabitur, non dubitamus pastores omnes rem corde habituros. Gravium vero virorum exhortatio, quales tu, vir praestantissime, cum Collegis tuis estis, non inutilis cias futura asset’.
\footnote{Camenisch, \textit{Borromeo}, pp.177-81.}} Matters came to a head in March 1584, when the archpriest of Sondrio, Giangiacomo Pusterla, led a Catholic mob through the streets of the town attacking Protestants and demanding the abolition of the school.

Calandrini, at the centre of the storm, urged Gwalther in Zurich to intervene to stiffen the resolve of the Rhaetian magistracy,\footnote{Camenisch, \textit{Borromeo}, pp.167-8.} and for a time the school’s prospects did indeed seem to be improving. At the end of June, the Diet appointed a fifteen-strong commission to investigate the Sondrio disturbances and punish those responsible. While in Sondrio, the commission also decided to purchase a building to house the school, to increase Egli’s salary to 80 kronen, and to provide him with the resources to recruit the other two teachers envisaged in the original plan.\footnote{Camenisch, \textit{Borromeo}, pp.177-81.} This proved to be only a temporary respite, however. Graubünden was coming under increasing pressure from foreign Catholic
powers to abandon the project; in August the Swiss Catholic states threatened to abrogate their alliance with the Freestate if that was not done.\textsuperscript{118} The following month Calandrini informed Gwalther that finance for the school was inadequate and that it still lacked suitable premises; again he emphasised the need for the Zurchers to intervene to shore up support for the project.\textsuperscript{119} But although the Zurich church was firmly behind Egli and Calandrini, the council was apparently wavering in its support: in a further letter of 28 November, Calandrini expressed dismay at hearing that Zurich and the other Swiss Protestant states had warned the Rhaetian Diet against continuing with the plan in the face of Catholic opposition.\textsuperscript{120} With rumours circulating that the school was to be transferred to Chur, Egli decided to ask the Zurich council to secure his release.\textsuperscript{121} The Rhaetian Diet agreed to this request when it met in January 1585,\textsuperscript{122} and the Sondrio school was eventually amalgamated with Chur's existing Nikolaischule.\textsuperscript{123}

Hopes of establishing a public school in the subject lands had not been extinguished completely, however. In an undated letter which appears to have been written shortly after Egli's return to Zurich, Gwalther pledged his continuing support for that objective,\textsuperscript{124} although it was not until 1616 that the Rhaetian synod revived the school project, again with the backing of the Diet.\textsuperscript{125} The proposal was that the Genevan company

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., pp.182-3.

\textsuperscript{119} ZB Ms. A 49, 218-9.

\textsuperscript{120} STAZ II 382, 1050.

\textsuperscript{121} R. Egli to Gwalther, 20 November 1584 (ZB Ms. S 142, 51). Gwalther passed on Egli's request on 12 December (STAZ A 248.3).

\textsuperscript{122} See the letter of the Diet to Zurich dated 18 January (STAZ A 248.3).

\textsuperscript{123} Bonorand, Bildungswesen, pp.59-70.

\textsuperscript{124} ZB Ms. F 41, 141-2. Egli, too, remained in close contact with the Italian churches: at one point he seriously considered taking up an offer to serve as minister in Brusio (R. Egli to J. von Salis, n.d. but c.1591 [STAG D II a 3 b]).

of pastors should release Caspar Alexius, a Bündner who had been teaching at the city’s academy for around a decade, to serve as rector of the new institution. With their academy under severe staffing pressure, the Genevans were reluctant to accede to this request. Once again, the Zurich church rallied to the support of its Italian co-religionists; in a letter to the Genevan scholarchs of 13 February 1618, Breitinger, Waser and Rudolf Hospinian argued that Alexius’s presence would benefit the churches of the Valtellina, and that the school would assist the progress of the Reformation in Rhaetia more generally. That intervention, supported by a similarly worded request from Bern, was enough to persuade the Genevans to let Alexius go. Although his efforts to overcome Catholic opposition to the school do not seem to have been much more successful than those of Egli three decades earlier, the episode is of interest if only because it turns accepted wisdom about the respective roles of Geneva and Zurich in the later Reformation on its head: here we see supposedly outward-looking Geneva putting parochial concerns first, while ‘introspective’ Zurich pushes the claims of fellow believers in a vulnerable but strategically important part of Europe.

The Zurichers had, it must be said, reasons of their own for wanting to see the school project come to fruition. For years, young men from the city had been taking advantage of the links that existed between Zurich and the Italian churches to spend extended periods in Graubünden’s subject lands studying with local ministers and

---

126 RCP 12, pp.411-13, 430-3; Baserga, passim.
128 StAZ E I 384, 421-2; Baserga, 21-3.
129 In a letter of 10 June 1620, Johann Peter Danz informed Johann Heinrich Waser that the school was now to be set up in Teglio under his supervision (ZB Ms. B 65, 244-5). Such plans were cut short by the ‘sacro macello’, in which Danz was among the victims.
130 In a letter to the company of pastors of 28 September 1616, the Rhaetian synod dared to reproach the Genevans for their neglect of the Italian churches: ‘Dedistis Galliae doctores innumeris, cur non etiam Italiam?’ (RCP 12, p.431).
schoolmasters, many of whom had impeccable humanist credentials. Gradually what amounted to an informal ‘exchange scheme’ took shape. As early as August 1570, Lentolo sought to interest Johannes Wolf in such an exchange, which would have seen one of Wolf’s sons travel to Chiavenna to receive tuition while Paolo Lentolo studied in Zurich.\footnote{ZB Ms. F 39, 605.}

During the late 1590s, Stucki’s son Johannes was tutored by Pietro Menghino (himself, as has been noted, a product of the Zurich academy) in Sondrio; Johannes lodged with a certain Orazio Paravicini, while Stucki took charge of the latter’s son Francesco.\footnote{Calandrini seems to have brokered the arrangement. See his letter to Stucki of 28 November 1595 (StAZ E II 358a, 642): ‘Nobilis quidam Ecclesiae nostrae Horatius Paravicinus nomine, homo dives, et perhumanus, cupit filium suum primogenium amorum tredecim istuc mittere, et nobillem aliquem adolescentem vostratem eiusdem aetatis vel circiter eius loco in aedes suas recipere, qui munde, et liberaliter tractaretur, quem etiam in studiis litterarum a Menghino nostro instituti suis ipsius sumptibus curaret. Quare me rogavit ut de ea re tecum per literas agerem, teque rogarem ut pro tua singulari humanitate eius desyderio satisfieri curares’.}

Stucki’s correspondent Ulisse Martinengo provided him with regular updates on Johannes’ progress. In a letter of December 1598, Martinengo observed admiringly, ‘Italice ita loqui ut non amplius pro Germano ex pronuntiatione dignosci posset’;\footnote{Martinengo to Stucki, 27 December 1598 (StAZ E II 380, 418).} the following February he reported that the boy had come as far as was possible in the study of Greek with Menghino and that ‘Italici vero sermonis est iam ita penitus, ut si isthoc aliquando stilum exerceat ad conservationem eius quod didicit, satis et ample in hoc idiomate nobis profecisse videatur’.\footnote{Idem, 15 February 1599 (StAZ E II 380, 422).} Such arrangements seem to have been popular with both parties: in October 1600, for instance, one finds Stucki attempting to persuade Orazio Paravicini to send his younger son Cesare to Zurich in order that another of Stucki’s own boys might have the opportunity to study in the Valtellina.\footnote{O. Paravicini to Stucki, 28 October 1600 (StAZ E II 380, 22). Paravicini turned down the offer on this occasion as he did not believe Cesare was ready to leave home. However, the exchange may have occurred at a later date: in a letter to Stucki of 20 March 1605, Martinengo discusses arrangements for the return to Zurich of one of his correspondent’s sons, who had been staying with a ‘dominus Paravicinus’ (StAZ E II}
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Heinrich (a future Bürgermeister of Zurich) and Johann Caspar, spent time in Teglio and Sondrio respectively. The fact that Waser had earlier provided Valtellinese youths with accommodation and tuition meant that his sons could expect a warm reception from the Italian Reformed: in one letter home, Johann Heinrich mentions that in the course of the journey he was able to call in on his former schoolfriend from Zurich days, Azzo Guicciardi. Enduring ties were forged between individual families as a result of such exchanges. When he visited Sondrio in 1615, for instance, the Zurich student Johannes Brähm was given lodgings with a certain Cesare Paravicini (probably Martinengo’s nephew) whose father had played host to his own many years earlier.

It is easy to grasp the attraction for the Zürchers of the exchange scheme, which provided some of the city’s most promising young men with an opportunity to round off their education by learning Italian in a Reformed setting. In a letter to Waser of 20 June 1616, Ottaviano Mei spoke encouragingly of the progress made in this regard by a group of Zurich students, now returning home, during their time in Chiavenna: ‘Eos non arbitror inutilis omnino operam vernaculae linguæ nostræ impendisse: satis enim expendite vernaculo huius regionis idioma videntur fabulari.’ From the Zürcher’s perspective, Rhaetia’s Italian churches performed a function equivalent (albeit on a smaller scale) to that of the Genevan academy, which Zurich youths attended primarily in order to learn French. Many of the Italian ministers and schoolmasters were accomplished teachers of

380, 518).

156 Johann Heinrich Waser to Kaspar Waser, 14 March 1616 (ZB Ms. B 42, 94°-5°). Passing through Chiavenna, Johann Heinrich also met Ottaviano Mei, who advised him on how best to go about learning Italian (see Mei to Waser, 21 March 1616 [ZB Ms. S 166, 9]). His brother Johann Caspar appears to have had a less happy time in the Valtellina. In a letter to his father of 13 May 1616, he complained of neglect by his host, Niccolò Martinici, and asked to be allowed to move to Chiavenna (ZB Ms. F 172 d, 384°-5°).

157 Brähm to Stucki, 11 [?] January 1615 (StAZ E II 387, 100).

158 ZB Ms. S 166, 19.

their native tongue: Lentolo was the author of a highly regarded Italian grammar which went through nearly twenty editions between 1567 and 1650, and was translated into French, English and German.\textsuperscript{140} For the Zurichers who took part in the scheme, time spent learning Italian in Chiavenna or the Valtellina could serve as valuable preparation for study at an Italian institution of higher education. One well-documented case is that of Johann Ulrich Grebel, who spent just under a year in Teglio during the early 1580s, receiving instruction in Italian and Justinian’s \textit{Institutes} from the local schoolmaster, Annibale Guicciardi, before going on to Padua to read law.\textsuperscript{141} Johann Heinrich Waser also studied at the university of Padua during a tour of Italy undertaken in 1617.\textsuperscript{142} By making it easier for Zurichers to attend Italian universities, the frontier churches of Italian Graubünden helped bridge the divide between the cultures of Catholic and Reformed Europe.

A two-way traffic was also established in books. The surviving correspondence details numerous instances of Zurich ministers supplying their Italian contacts with theological literature, especially their own works. In a letter to Simler of 12 May 1574, for instance, Lentolo thanked the Zurich theologian for sending him his latest polemic against the ubiquitarians.\textsuperscript{143} Later Stucki presented Lentolo with a copy of his \textit{Helvetica gratulatio ad Galliam de Henrico huius nominis in Galliarum et Navarrae rege Christianissimo;}

Calandrini received the same author’s \textit{De angelis angelicoque hominum praesidio atque custodia meditatio}, which he read ‘maxima cum animi voluptate, atque aviditate’ and

\textsuperscript{140} P. Buzzoni, \textit{I praecepta di Scipione Lentulo e l’adattamento inglese di Henry Grantham} (Florence 1979), pp.105-6.

\textsuperscript{141} See StAZ E II 380, 36-65. In a letter to Stucki of 18 August 1582, Grebel reported that he had received a copy of Lentolo’s grammar from the author (ibid., 37). Annibale Guicciardi was a former pupil of Josias Simler (see ZB Ms. F 61, 19).

\textsuperscript{142} 

\textsuperscript{143} ZB Ms. F 60, 306. Lentolo is referring to Simler’s \textit{De vera Iesu Christi [...] secundam humanam naturam in his terris praesentia, orthodoxe [...] expositio} (Zurich 1574). See also Bullinger to Egli, 2 April 1574 (Schiess, 3, no.416); and Egli to Bullinger, 18 May 1574 (ibid, no.423).
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described as a source of consolation in troubled times. At times the Zürichers’ Italian correspondents sought their help in acquiring specific works. Lentolo, for example, was keen to lay hands on Simler’s life of Peter Martyr, as well as the Latin original of Ludwig Lavater’s De spectris, lemuribus atque insolidis fragoribus, which he hoped to translate into Italian. Similarly, on 30 January 1589 Calandrini wrote to the younger Heinrich Bullinger (a former pupil of his in Sondrio) on behalf of a certain ‘Signor Marc’antonio’, whose attempts to acquire a copy of ‘il [...] libro della Tragedia’ (probably Francesco Negri’s Tragedia del libero arbitrio) had thus far come to nothing ‘perche in queste parte non se trovano per danari’. On another occasion Orazio Paravinici asked Stucki to procure some volumes for the minister of Berbenno in the Valtellina.

In return, the Reformed of the subject lands provided the Zürichers with books, verses and other publications circulating in Italy. In his letter of January 1589, for instance, Calandrini thanked the younger Bullinger for sending him a recent work by Rudolf

---

144 Lentolo to Stucki, 8 December 1591 (StAZ E II 380, 187); Calandrini to Stucki, 15 July 1595 (StAZ E II 358a, 607). Lentolo also read the De angelis – see his letter to Stucki of 30 March 1596 (StAZ E II 380, 342) – along with two works by Stucki’s colleague Rudolf Hospian, De origine, progressu, usu et abusu templorum ac rerum omnium ad templo pertinentium, libri v (Zurich 1587), and De origine et progressu monachatus libri v (Zurich 1588) (Lentolo to Stucki, 29 May 1590 [StAZ E II 380, 129]). In a letter of 18 January 1613, Ottaviano Mei thanked Kaspar Waser for sending him a copy of his Commentary on Psalm 90 (ZB Ms. S 164, 10).

145 ZB Ms. F 60, 306. Simler replied that his oration was no longer available in the original separate printing, so Lentolo instead requested a copy of the work – presumably the 1569 Zurich edition of Vermigli’s Commentary on Genesis – to which it was prefaced (see Lentolo to Simler, 15 September 1574 [ZB Ms. F 60, 307]).

146 Lentolo to Simler, 13 September 1575 (ZB Ms. F 60, 295). Lentolo had already received a copy of the existing French translation from Johann Baptist Müller. It is unclear whether he ever carried out his intention to translate Lavater’s work: the Italian manuscript translation of De spectris in the Zentralbibliothek Zürich (Ms. D 12) appears to date from the early seventeenth century.

147 See the testimonial by Calandrini and the church of Sondrio, dated November 1589, in StAZ E II 358a, 505. The two letters from Calandrini to Bullinger which survive are written, it should be noted, in Italian.

148 StAZ E II 365a, 789. The ‘Signor Marc’antonio’ referred to may be Marc’antonio d’Alba, later minister in Mello and Monte di Sondrio.

149 Letter of 15 January 1600 (StAZ E II 385, 1a).
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Hospinian and promised to match this gift ‘con qualche altro bel libro che mi venga ille
mani, qualche io giudichi doverai esser grato’. On another occasion Lentolo asked Stucki
to have Gabriel Gerber supply him with a list of books he wished to have purchased in
Venice, while later Waser received books from Lentolo and Gianbattista Calandrini.

The Zurichers’ Italian correspondents also occupied an important niche in their
information-gathering network. During the early 1570s, Lentolo sent regular ‘schedulae’ or
news-bulletins to Tobias Egli in Chur, which were then passed on to Bullinger. After Egli’s
death in 1575, Lentolo expressed the hope that the arrangement might continue under his
successor as senior minister in Chur, Kaspar Hubenschmid. Whether it did so for long is
unclear, but by the late 1580s Lentolo was again sending such reports to Stucki on a
weekly basis, via a merchant in Chur; later Calandrini appears to have assumed the same
responsibility for the Valtellina. In return the Zurichers dispatched news of developments
elsewhere in Europe, which Lentolo and Calandrini then forwarded to their fellow
ministers. Stucki and his colleagues also facilitated communication between Rhaetia’s
Italian communities and other Reformed churches, on one occasion passing on books from
Lentolo to Antoine Sadeel and Antoine de La Faye in Geneva. Many of the Italian-

---

150 StaAZ E II 365a, 788.
151 Letter of 19 March 1593 (StAZ E II 380, 268).
152 Lentolo to Waser, 1 February 1598 (ZB Ms. S 152, 93.3); 15 March 1598 (ZB Ms. S 153, 14b); 11 April
1598 (ibid., 14a). On 17 June 1612 Calandrini sent Waser a manuscript copy of Tommaso Campanella’s
Monarchia di Spagna (ZB Ms. S 162, 140).
153 Lentolo to Bullinger, 11 February 1575 (StAZ E II 365, 401; Schiess, 3, no.448). See also Lentolo to
Simler, 13 September 1575 (ZB Ms. F 60, 295).
154 Lentolo to Stucki, 20 June 1589 (StAZ E II 380, 92); Martinengo to Stucki, 11 August 1598 (StAZ E II
380, 412). ‘Schedulae’ addressed to Stucki are preserved in StAZ E II 380, 472-89.
155 See Martinengo to Stucki, 29 January 1593 (StAZ E II 380, 294): ‘De bello Argentinensi quae scrisisti
statim communicavi Reverendo D. Calandrino nostro, qui sibi iam diu hoc munus suscepit, et scribendi, et
accipiendi ceterisque communicandi novas res quae afferuntur, maxime euniusmodi hae sunt ad communem
pietatis causam pertinentes’.
156 See Lentolo to Stucki, 1 December 1590 (StAZ E II 380, 119). Lentolo’s theology was Genevan in
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speakers who attended the Zurich academy used it as a stepping-stone to study at other, more internationally prestigious, Reformed centres of higher education (Basel, Geneva, Marburg and Heidelberg).157

Throughout the period under consideration, the Italian churches and their ministers were able to call on Zurich for assistance in all sorts of matters of practical concern. In December 1568, for example, Lentolo asked Bullinger to mediate in a family quarrel involving one of the deacons of his church, whose son was refusing to return home from Zurich after the failure of a business venture in Germany.158 On another occasion he asked the Antistes to put in a word with the Zurich council on behalf of the Rhaetian magnate Hercules von Salis, who was hoping to acquire Zurich citizenship.159 Lentolo was not above using his Zurich contacts to benefit members of his own family: in a letter to Stucki of 5 February 1589, he outlined the predicament of a relative who had been recruited as a textile-worker by the Werdmüller family but given insufficient work to support his dependents, hinting that Stucki’s intervention on the man’s behalf would be appreciated.160

The Zurich professors Stucki, Felix Tülb and Raphael Egli may also have had a hand in

---


158 StAZ E II 365, 332-3; Schiess, 3, no.137.

159 Idem, 23 October 1572 (StAZ E II 365, 332-3; Schiess, 3, no.336).

160 StAZ E II 380, 82.
Paolo Lentolo’s appointment as city doctor in Bern four years later. Commendations of other Italian religious exiles (usually converted Catholic clergymen who were passing through Chiavenna and Zurich en route to Geneva) are another regular feature of Lentolo’s correspondence. Writing to Bullinger in June 1573, for example, Lentolo praised the Apulian Alessandro Marantha as a ‘vir doctus, multumque ac diu in scholasticis litteris, in nostris christianis, et in docendo concionandoque in celebrioribus Italiae locis versatus’. Similarly, in a letter to Stucki of 3 February 1597, Lentolo asked the Zurich church to contribute to the expenses of the bearer, Niccolò Calvo, a Milanese exile and the son of a distinguished professor of medicine at the university of Padua, who was planning to study in Geneva. The financial records of the Grossmünsterstift’s Studentenamt indicate that the Zurichers responded positively to requests of this sort: they contain numerous entries for donations made to Italian exiles carrying letters of recommendation from the churches of Chiavenna, Sondrio and Tirano.

During the final quarter of the sixteenth century, Rhaetia’s Italian Reformed pastorate was faced with a major new challenge: fending off the assaults of an increasingly militant Catholic church and population. Some of the literature requested from Zurich was clearly intended for use in polemical exchanges with the local Catholic clergy, which had

---

161 See Lentolo to Stucki, 3 June 1593 (StAZ E II 380, 270-1). Lentolo later asked Stucki to help him arrange transfer of a loan that he had procured for his son (see his letters of 3 September 1593 (ibid., 278); and 3 October 1593 [ibid., 284]). Correspondence between Paolo and Scipione was also channelled through Stucki (see Lentolo’s letters of 30 July 1594 (ibid., 312); and 8 August 1598 [ibid., 388]).

162 Letter of 4 June 1573 (StAZ E II 365, 339; Schiess, 3, no.373). On this occasion Lentolo’s judgement appears to have been rather wide of the mark: see Bullinger to Egli, 18 December 1573 (Schiess, 3, no.404): RCP 3, pp.110, 118.

163 StAZ E II 380, 369-70. For a similar request, see Lentolo to R. Egli, 27 June 1596 (ZB Ms. F 81, 119). Calvo was received into the Rhaetian synod in 1598 and later served alongside Mei in Chiavenna (Busino, ‘Borrone’, 147).

164 Marantha was given 4 lb on the basis of Lentolo’s commendation (StAZ G II 39.5). On 15 June 1599 the Spanish exile Juan Herrera, commended to the Zurichers by the church of Sondrio, received 8 lb 16 s from the Studentenamt along with a smaller sum from the Locarnese common chest (StAZ G II 39.10; FA Orelli 8.2, fol.117).
begun to be reinforced by graduates of Borromeo’s *Collegium Helveticum* in Milan. In September 1587, for instance, Lentolo asked Stucki to send him several copies of a recent work by Heinrich Wolf attacking the papal reforms of the calendar (probably the *Chronologia of 1585*), which the Protestant majority in the Rhaetian Diet had rejected despite demands from the Catholics of the Valtellina that it implement them. Calandrini also received a copy of Wolf’s book, which he promised to circulate among his colleagues throughout the Valtellina.

The 1590s saw two set-piece disputations between Catholic and Protestant clergymen, in Tirano and Piumo. For the first of these there is some evidence of indirect Zurich involvement on the side of the Reformed delegation, made up of Scipione Calandrini, Ottaviano Mei, Niklaus Kesel, Cesare Gaffuri and Antonius Andreoscha. The disputation had been triggered off by the curate of Tirano, Simone Cabasso, who attempted to equate Calvin’s doctrine of the mediator with subordinationism; at issue was whether Christ mediated with God in both natures (as the Reformed maintained) or in his human nature alone (as the Catholics present, following Robert Bellarmine, contended). In a letter to Stucki of 28 November 1595, Calandrini reported that he and his colleagues had managed to hold their own at the first colloquy, but emphasised the urgent need for reinforcement in the form of Protestant works controverting the views of Bellarmine. It is

---

165 Lentolo to Stucki, 21 September 1587 (StAZ E II 380, 67). On the Rhaetian Diet’s decision to retain the Julian calendar, see Porta, 2:3, p.75; and F. Maissen, ‘Der Kalenderstreit in Graubünden (1582-1812)’, *BM* (1960), 253-72. The issue acquired symbolic importance in the light of the growing confessional tensions in the subject lands: one of the first acts of the rebel Catholic administration that seized power after the ‘sacro macello’ was to introduce the Gregorian calendar (*Vera relatione della vittoria et libertà ottenuta da Cattolici, contro gli Heretici, nella Valtellina* (Pavia 1620), sig.A2).

166 Calandrini to H. Wolf, 12 November 1588 (ZB Ms. F 38, 221).

167 The position of the Catholic disputants was close to that of Francesco Stancaro (see Chapter 4:1 above). Their Reformed adversaries were not slow to make this connection (see *Disputationis tiranensis inter pontificios et ministros verbi Dei in Rhaetia, anno 1595 et 1596 habitu partes IV* (Basel 1602), pp.37, 168-70).

168 StAZ E II 358a, 611. Calandrini was interested specifically in Antoine de La Faye’s *Theses de verbo Dei*. In the letter he acknowledges having already received a work by David Pareus defending Calvin against the
unclear whether such works were ever sent, but later Calandrini wrote to thank Stucki for endorsing the position of the Valtellinese ministers in letters to the Rhaetian synod and Diet.\textsuperscript{169} When the official Protestant account of the disputation was eventually published in 1602, a copy of the work was presented to Stucki by Calandrini on behalf of the Italian ministers.\textsuperscript{170}

As religious conflict in the subject lands intensified, ministers from the area turned increasingly to Zurich for moral and political support. In October 1590 Calandrini informed Stucki that at a forthcoming meeting of the Rhaetian Diet the mainly Catholic Upper League intended to propose that the majoritarian principle which determined confessional allegiance in the communes of the Freestate proper should be extended to the subject lands, as a way of preventing further Protestant expansion in the area; Calandrini wanted Stucki to persuade the Zurich council to use its influence with the Rhaetian Diet to block this measure.\textsuperscript{171} Similarly, in April 1607 Antonius Andreoscha appealed to the Zurich divines, in the name of their common faith, to come to the aid of the embattled Valtellinese churches:


\textsuperscript{169} Letter of 18 July 1597 (StAZ E II 358a, 642). The Zurichers had been sent a work entitled ‘Sacrificularum vulturenerum liber adversus Pastores Rhaetiae Evangelicos’ together with the responses of Mei, Calandrini and Gaffuri (StAZ E II 382, 1120-1273). See also StAZ E II 365, 207-61, for another copy of Calandrini’s contribution. Further material generated by the Tirano disputation is to be found in StAZ E II 449.

\textsuperscript{170} See Mei to Stucki, 3 March 1603 (StAZ E II 385, 75).

\textsuperscript{171} ZB Ms S 147, 84. Calandrini would have preferred to seen the religion of the subject lands determined by the (Protestant) majority of the ruling Bünder communes, following the precedent set by the Swiss Confederation in its dealings with its own subject territories. Earlier Ulrich Campell had expressed similar views on behalf of the Rhaetian synod (see AERSG B 3, 27-35; R. Head, ‘Rhaetian Ministers, from Shepherds to Citizens: Calvinism and Democracy in the Republic of the Three Leagues 1550-1620’, in W.F. Graham, \textit{Later Calvinism: International Perspectives} (Kirksville, Mo. 1994), 55-69 [62-3]).
vestrum Magistratum admoineatis ut nobis in omnibus et auxilio, et consilio esse velit, cum sinus omnes membra corporis Christi, et in eadem navi.  

Andeoscha's reference to 'hispanizantes' is significant: the Protestant cause in the Rhaetian subject lands was bound up with the broader factional struggle in Graubünden between proponents of an alliance with Spain and those whose loyalties lay with either France or, more especially, Venice. Reform ministers based in the subject lands were among the most uncompromising opponents of a Spanish alliance, which they regarded as a Trojan horse for the recatholicisation of Graubünden. That concern is reflected in their correspondence with the Zurich churchmen. In a letter to Stucki of 30 March 1596, for example, Lentolo reported that although many of the leading men of the republic inclined towards accepting Spain's overtures out of greed (the corruptibility of the Rhaetian aristocracy was notorious), others were prepared to resist them for the sake of piety and freedom; Lentolo expressed himself confident that the patriotic faction would carry the day. In November 1600, meanwhile, Martinengo informed Stucki that Spain was attempting to secure the Rhaetian Leagues' consent to an alliance by underhand means: 'non la dimanda apertamente alle Comunità, credo per timore di ripulsa, ma solamente la praticca con li principali, et primati'. With the letter he enclosed two drafts of the terms proposed by the Spanish. Later Martinengo provided Stucki with reports on the construction of a fortress at the approaches to the Valtellina by the count of Fuentes, governor of Milan. Relations with Spain were an equally pressing concern for Ottaviano

172 StAZ E II 381, 1791. In a letter to the Zurich ministers and professors of 15 June, the churches of the Ten Jurisdictions lent their support to Andeoscha's analysis, arguing that Protestantism in Graubünden, 'sonderlich der welischen kirchen in den grenzen Italiens', was under severe threat (StAZ A 248.6).

173 On the unstable political situation in the Freestate during this period, see Head, Grisons, pp.168-98; Pfister, Jenatsch, pp.36-52.

174 StAZ E II 380, 341-2.

175 Ibid., 438-9.

176 See his letters of 11 October 1604 (ibid., 508-9) and 28 February 1605 (ibid., 516)
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Mei, who in 1604 sent Stucki a copy of an oration he had delivered to an assembly of Rhaetian officials the previous year, advising them to reject a new offer of a treaty from Fuentes. It was with some regret that, in January 1613, Mei informed Waser of the Diet’s decision not to renew the alliance that it had concluded with Venice ten years earlier.

From around 1615, Reformed ministers assumed an increasingly prominent role within the anti-Spanish faction. Many of those most active in that regard (Jörg Jenatsch, Caspar Alexius, Blasius Alexander and Marc’antonio d’Alba) were attached to churches in the subject lands, where they hoped to spearhead a renewed proselytising offensive: it is in this context that one must see the decision to revive the Sondrio school project in 1616. The long-delayed protestantisation of the Valtellina may not have been the limit of their ambitions. In a letter to the Genevan company of pastors of June 1617, the church of Sondrio reiterated its request for Caspar Alexius’s release, arguing that the proposed school would act as a magnet for Protestant converts in Italy as a whole:

[Non] dubitiamo punto che l’assistentia d’un tal personaggio in queste frontiere non sparga con suoi scritti et prediche il seme della dottrina del figliuolo di Dio anch’ora nell’Italia dove Gesù Christo con l’Idolatria vien profanato, dando un refugio spirituale a quelli che continuamente escano della tenebre del Papato.

The anti-Spanish fervour of the Valtellina pastors was shared by Kaspar Waser, who had worked behind the scenes to bring about an alliance between Zurich, Bern and Venice in 1615 in the teeth of opposition from the more cautious Antistes Breitinger. In a letter to Johann Peter Danz of 20 May 1617, Waser urged the Rhaetian ministers not to waver in their opposition to the intrigues of the ‘hispanizantes’.

---

177 STA II 385, 71.
178 ZB Ms. S 164, 10. Waser was kept informed of the negotiations surrounding the possible renewal of this alliance by Gianbattista Calandrini (ZB Ms. S 162, 154.7, 11).
179 Baserga, 124. That was certainly the fear of the Spanish administration in Milan (see Wendland, Pässe, pp. 90-6).
180 H. Gmür, Das Bündnis zwischen Zürich / Bern und Venedig 1615/18 (Zurich 1945), pp. 116, 121.
181 Waser to Danz, 20 May 1617 (ZB Ms. S 162, 57).
In the end, however, the politicisation of the Rhaetian Reformed clergy proved counter-productive, at least so far as the cause of Protestantism in the subject lands was concerned. The militancy of Alexius and his fellow ministers only succeeded in eliciting a massive reaction from the Catholics of the Valtellina, culminating in the massacres of July 1620 that brought Protestant life in the region to a permanent end. Reformed worship was also suppressed in Chiavenna when it was occupied by the Spanish the following year, and later came under severe pressure in the Valbregaglia and Poschiavo. When the ‘Bündner Wirren’ had run their course, the Zurichers resumed their correspondence with ministers serving those Italian-speaking Reformed communities which had survived (largely in the Valbregaglia); however, with the disappearance of so many congregations, the relationship was never able to recapture its former importance and intensity. The most lasting testimony to that relationship was, in fact, the Zurich church’s role in co-ordinating assistance for the hundreds displaced by the violence. Zurich received around 250 refugees from the Valtellina, many of them commended directly to Kaspar Waser by Rhaetian ministers.182

Two collections were taken up in the city’s churches on their behalf, and a relief fund was set up which continued to operate for years to come.183 As well as administering the fund and liaising with the exile community, Waser wrote a detailed and emotive account of the recent massacre, the victims of which included his former student Azzo Guicciardi: by doing so, he ensured a place for the ‘sacro macello’ in the annals of Calvinist martyrology.184 When Waser died in September 1625 his funeral was attended, according to

182 See StAZ A 248.11.

183 The first collection (on 20 August 1620) raised 1620 lb 21 s 4 li; the second (on 1 January 1621) raised 2225 lb 20 s (StAZ E II 279, 133-4). Money was also contributed by Bern (StAZ A 248.11), Schaffhausen (ibid.), the Dutch and Italian stranger churches in London (ibid.), and the churches of Middelburg, Amsterdam and Emden (StAZ E II 279, 2').

184 Aufsichtliche und unberührliche Beschreibung des grausam und unmenschlichen Mordes / so in dem land Veltlyn / gemeinen drei Phiniden gehörig / anno M.DC.XX den IX. Jul. und folgende tag / allen Calenders / an den Evangelischen einwohneren daselbst / durch etliche verzweifelte Böswichte / Rebellen und Banditen / ganz barbarischer weise ist geübt worden [...] (Zurich 1620). Waser’s biographer Kvozen names him as the author of this anonymous work, which was translated into Italian by Vincenzo Paravicini.
his biographer, by a considerable number of exiles ‘qui se patrono, imo patre orbatos esse’. A sonnet was also composed in his memory by Vincenzo Paravicini, who, with the assistance of the Zurich clergy, had persuaded the city authorities to reinstitute Italian-language worship in Zurich, almost sixty years after the abolition of the previous Locarnese service.

During the half-century between the Rhaetian anti-heresy edict of June 1570 and the ‘sacro macello’, the relationship between the Zurich church and the Italian Reformed entered a new phase. The doctrinal conflicts of earlier years receded into the background, to be replaced by close co-operation between the Zurich divines and an Italian pastorate eager to affirm its orthodox credentials. The Italian churches of Graubünden were less directly under Zurich’s sway than, say, those of the Thurgau or Appenzell Ausserrhoden, and the Zurich church was unable to prevent the majority of them falling victim to the confessional politics of the Thirty Years War. Up to 1620, however, it was Zurich – rather than Basel or even Geneva – that represented those congregations’ principal point of contact with the culture of Reformed Europe. A relationship which began as an amicable correspondence between ministers gradually took on a wider significance, as the ‘exchanges’ between well-to-do families in Zurich and the subject lands testify. In the light of this, it is worth considering whether Zurich after Bullinger has been too easily dismissed as a second-rank Reformed centre, contributing little either theologically or politically to the Protestant

(Kvosen, p.19).


186 See the exiles’ petition in StAZ E II 384, 572. As in the case of the Locarnesi, the arrangement only lasted a few years. In July 1625 the council ordered all able-bodied refugees to return home; most eventually settled in southern Germany (K. Schulthess, ‘Glaubensflüchtlinge aus Chiavenna und dem Veltlin in Zürcher Kirchenbüchern 1620-1700’, Der Schweizer Familienforscher 36 (1969), 1-38 [3]). For Paravicini’s sonnet, see Kvosen, p.58.

187 However, Zurich did contribute forces to a failed attempt by the Rhaetian Freestate to reconquer the Valtellina in August-September 1620 (Pfister, Jenatsch, pp.98-9).
world at large. The Italian correspondents of Stucki, Waser and the like would certainly not have recognised in that picture the Zurich church they knew.
Conclusion

When the first Italian evangelical exiles arrived in Switzerland around 1540, a new area of international involvement opened up for the Zurich church. Hopes of a mutually beneficial relationship were swiftly compromised, however, by theological differences – differences that became more apparent as moves by the Reformed leadership to consolidate and systematise Reformed doctrine on an essentially conservative basis gained momentum. A series of controversies ensued, during which the Zurich church was forced to revise its estimation of the Italian evangelicals, and to spell out its understanding of orthodoxy with an unprecedented clarity. Throughout this difficult period, however, the Zurichers maintained their association with the Italian Reformed, forming alliances with exiles who shared their opposition to ‘heresy’: those alliances became the basis for improved relations between the two groups in the decades after 1570. Although circumscribed by a city council suspicious of foreign entanglements, the Zurich church remained an active player on the European Reformed stage. Its relationship with the Italian exiles, both ‘orthodox’ and ‘heretical’, and with other Italian-speaking converts to reform, bears testimony to that international engagement.

The middle decades of the sixteenth century witnessed a steady exodus of evangelical sympathisers from the Italian cities to Geneva, the Rhaetian Freestate and parts of the Swiss Confederation. Although this emigration was on a far smaller scale than the
Conclusion

mass movements of religious refugees from France and the Netherlands that also took place during this period, its impact was considerable. The Italian exiles and their descendants brought with them new skills – in trade, in finance and in manufacture – and an intellectual vigour born out of the late Italian Renaissance: they played a key role in transmitting the works of Machiavelli, Guicciardini, Pietro Bembo and others to a northern European readership.¹

Because of its position of leadership among the Swiss Reformed, its strong traditions of biblical and humanist scholarship (centred on the Lectorium) and, above all, the personality of Heinrich Bullinger, the Zurich church held a special attraction for the Italian exiles. During the 1540s and early 1550s, their most prominent representatives came to feature among the correspondents of Bullinger and other senior Zurich churchmen (Rudolf Gwalther, Konrad Pelikan and Konrad Gesner). The welfare of the exiles – and, by extension, the cause of the Gospel in Italy – became part of the international remit of the Zurich church.

Compared with the missionary efforts sponsored by Geneva in France and the Waldensian valleys, Zurich's support for its Italian co-religionists might seem modest: distance, the linguistic barrier, and the experience of the Second Kappel War, which had left Zurich's rulers deeply suspicious of foreign entanglements, prevented Bullinger from actively promoting the spread of the Reformation in the Italian-speaking regions on the fringes of the Swiss Confederation. But through its contacts with evangelical sympathisers in those territories, and with exiles who had settled there (such as Vergerio, Negri and Mainardi), the Zurich church was able to ensure that the Reformed faith gained a foothold in Italian Graubünden and in Locarno. Although the support of Bullinger and his colleagues proved insufficient to protect the Reformed minority in Locarno against the determination of the Catholic Swiss states to ensure that the terms of the Second Kappel
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Peace were upheld, it was enough to ensure that the Zurich council resisted pressure from the *Fünf Orte* to co-operate in the suppression of that community and agreed to the Locarnese exiles forming a semi-autonomous Italian-speaking congregation in Zurich.

Even with the backing of the Zurich church leadership, the Italian exiles experienced difficulties in adapting to their new circumstances. In Zurich, the Locarnesi had to confront not only initial poverty and culturally unfamiliar surroundings, but a conservative guild establishment jealous of its monopoly control of the city’s economic life; a xenophobic population; and a council keen to see them move on elsewhere as soon as possible. The Italian exiles as a whole had to adjust their (often highly idealised) perceptions of the Reformed churches to match the reality they encountered north of the Alps. Differences between the leaderships of the host churches and a minority of more radical exiles (Cantimori’s ‘heretics’) quickly manifested themselves. Disputes over specific questions of doctrine – the interpretation of the sacraments, the Trinity, the relationship between justification and sanctification – were symptomatic of a more basic disagreement about the scope, nature and objectives of religious reform. Such dissent was not a phenomenon unique to the Italian exiles: the French and, especially, the Dutch stranger churches of London also contained a heterodox element. But ‘heresy’ was proportionately more common among the Italian exiles because of the peculiarly ill-defined and doctrinally eclectic character of the Italian evangelical movement, through which most of them had first encountered Protestantism. It is hardly surprising that when the products of that movement came face to face with the confessional systems that were evolving north of the Alps, conflict was the result.

Bullinger was a leading representative of one such system. Besides the Protestant shibboleths of *sola fide* and *sola scriptura*, his theology was predicated on the notion of catholicity: a commitment to the historical tradition of the western church, as embodied in the writings of the Fathers and the credal statements of the earliest councils.
Conclusion

Bullinger’s emphasis on catholicity was a crucial plank in the Zurich church’s campaign to distance itself from sectarian Anabaptism and to legitimise the Reformation — often in a literal sense, because by affirming kinship with the Constantinian church the Zurichers were excluding themselves from the definition of heresy enshrined in imperial law. The priorities of the Italian radicals were very different: seeking a radical break with the papist past, they devised an uncompromising, literalist interpretation of the scripture principle which led them to question doctrines that the Reformed establishment continued to hold sacrosanct: above all, the Trinity and the full divinity of Christ. They thereby threatened to undermine the efforts of Bullinger and others to demonstrate the basic orthodoxy and respectability of the Reformed creed.

Unlike Calvin and Beza, who were quick to grasp the seriousness of the challenge embodied in such views and to take steps to suppress them, Bullinger preferred to proceed through dialogue. This difference in approach may be accounted for in part by a difference in temperament between the two reformers, but also by differences between the intellectual and theological traditions of the Genevan and Zurich churches. The Zurich church continued to draw inspiration from Erasmus, as well as Zwingli: the emphasis of its theology was pastoral, rather than dogmatic. By the standards of Geneva, Zurich was slow to develop a systematic theology in some areas. As late as the 1550s, the doctrinal consensus within the church was broad enough to accommodate differences of opinion about some quite significant theological matters; for evidence, one need look no further than Bibliander’s idiosyncratic views on predestination. Initially at least, Bullinger appears to have felt that room could also be found for the views of Italian dissidents such as Lelio Sozzini: as ‘bishop’ of Zurich, his duty was to keep the church as inclusive as possible.

The heretics, for their part, saw in the Zurichers potential allies against the ‘rigidity’ and ‘intolerance’ of Geneva: Bullinger’s and Gwalther’s opposition to the use of excommunication as a disciplinary sanction was repeatedly invoked by anti-Calvinist
Conclusion

The radicals were also able to cite Zwingli’s rejection of the real presence as a precedent for (and the precursor to) their own criticisms of traditional doctrine: as they were aware, the Zwinglian tradition was open to both radical and conservative readings.

During the 1540s, 1550s and 1560s that putative alliance unravelled, as a series of doctrinal controversies revealed to Bullinger the extent of his differences with the radicals, and the misguidedness of his attempts to reach an accommodation with them. Like Calvin and such theologically conservative exiles as Giulio da Milano, Bullinger came to believe that the radicals’ activities represented a genuine threat to the integrity of the Reformed churches. He also became convinced that that threat could only be effectively countered by insisting on subscription to detailed and explicit confessions of faith, which even the heretics’ notorious rhetorical ingenuity would be unable to circumvent. The danger of settling for anything less was illustrated for Bullinger by Bernardino Ochino’s *Dialogi XXX*, which he interpreted as a covert but systematic attack on the fundamentals of Reformed teaching. By the early 1560s, the Zurich church was fully engaged in the defence of orthodoxy (especially trinitarian orthodoxy) against the attempts of dissident exiles to subvert it, and in efforts to impose doctrinal conformity on the region with the largest concentration of Italian Reformed churches: Graubünden and its subject lands.

Bullinger’s changing relationship with the Italian radicals offers insights into the evolution of Reformed orthodoxy more generally during this crucial period. In the early 1540s, when the first wave of Italian exiles arrived in Switzerland, Reformed doctrine was still comparatively unsystematised; no single theological tendency had yet achieved

---

2 See Chapter 5:111 above.

3 As late as 1590, Fausto Sozzini was able to argue that his, purely memorialist, interpretation of the Eucharist was authentically representative of Zwingli’s position, which the Zurich church had abandoned under the influence of Bucer and Calvin (*Opera*, I, pp.423, 433, 701, 770). In the *Disputatio scholastica* of Jacobus Paleologus, which pits Catholic and orthodox Protestant theologians against the representatives of Italian and eastern European antitrinitarianism, ‘Zwingli’ is one of the first to be persuaded of the veracity of the radicals’ arguments (*Firpo, Antitrinitari*, p.243).
dominance, as the struggles between 'Zwinglians' and 'Calvinists' in the Pays de Vaud around this time demonstrate.\(^4\) By 1570, that diversity had become less pronounced, as an agreed Reformed line emerged on the main doctrinal issues that had once divided Geneva and the Swiss; Bullinger's Second Helvetic Confession can be seen as the culmination of that process. The Italian radicals, who had earlier benefited from the lack of an agreed definition of orthodoxy, found themselves squeezed to the margins and, finally, excluded from the Reformed fold altogether. Advocates of an inclusive, loosely defined Protestantism, such as Aconcio, Ochino and Bartolomeo Silvio, lost out to proponents of a new Reformed confessionalism, epitomised by the Rhaetian anti-heresy edict of June 1570.

In a perceptive recent study, Ben Kaplan has charted the unfolding of a similar process in the Protestant northern Netherlands.\(^5\) In Utrecht, a powerful local faction, derided by their Calvinist opponents as libertines, preached a broad-based evangelical settlement. Like the Italian radicals, the libertines were averse to the imposition of confessions of faith, the concentration of power in the hands of the clergy, and the application of ecclesiastical discipline, in which they detected the seeds of a 'new papacy'.\(^6\) On a doctrinal level, they had reservations about the doctrines of double predestination and imputed justification (like Ochino and some of the Chiavenna radicals who fell foul of Lentolo).\(^7\) In the Reformed churches of both the Netherlands and the Swiss states, confessionalism prevailed after a protracted struggle; however, whereas in Switzerland the upshot of its triumph was religious uniformity, in the Netherlands the Reformed church failed to project its vision of orthodoxy on to society at large, leaving the libertines and their successors free to opt out of formal church membership altogether.

---


\(^6\) Ibid., p.27.

\(^7\) Ibid., pp.88-9.
Conclusion

The gradual disappearance of radical elements from within the Italian exile community allowed for the emergence of a new relationship – or perhaps more accurately, of the sort of relationship that had originally been envisaged – between the Zurich church and the Italian Reformed. Before 1570, Zurich’s commitment to the fragile Italian-speaking Reformed congregations it had helped establish in the Rhaetian Freestate had been undermined by fears that those churches were becoming breeding-grounds for the most pernicious kind of heresy. Once that threat had receded, the Zurichers were able to give more wholehearted support to the efforts of local pastors to consolidate the Protestant presence in the region. The rebuilding of relations may have been facilitated by the emergence of a new generation of Zurich churchmen, such as Johann Wilhelm Stucki and Kaspar Waser, who associated the Italian reformers not with religious radicalism or antitrinitarianism, but with the impeccable orthodoxy of Scipione Lentolo and Scipione Calandrini.

In that context, the Zurich church was able, in the years leading up to the ‘sacro macello’ of 1620, to act as a bridge between the Italian-speaking congregations of Graubünden and the international community of Reformed believers of which they were anxious to be part. Waser’s hagiographic account of that massacre, with its litanies of the slaughtered and tributes to individual acts of heroism, confirms the rehabilitation in the eyes of Protestant Europe of the Italian Reformed. From Reformed orthodoxy’s most persistent critics, they had undergone a remarkable transformation: into some of the faith’s most exemplary confessors.
Heinrich Bullinger, address to the Zurich council, 11 June 1555
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kylchen der vertriebnnen versähen möchte / und mitt dem die guth lüt versähen werind. Da so
zeigend wir an / das ein doctor und gelerter man h. Bernhardin Ochin von Senen / ietzund
zu Basel whonhaft ist / der kein ampt noch stand hat / vorhin aber zu Augspurg und auch
in Engolland geprediget / darzu in Italischer sprach vil geschrieben hat / ein allter und
verrümpten man / zu dem die Luggarnern ein besonderbare anmutung habend / und hoffend
so der uwer wyßheit / gefallen möchte / were er zu bewegen dass er zu inen zuge. Sölchqs
alles habend wir uwer wyßheit uff das kürzist berichten wollen / mitt unthäniger pitt
uwer wyßheit wolle die vilgedacht der Luggarnern kylch in gnad bevollen haben / und
fürderlich verhälffen das sy mitt einem gottsfürchtigen trüwen diener oder prediger
versähen werdint. Daran Gott ein gfallen haben / und uwer wyßheit lob und eer erlangen
wirt. Acte des 11 tags Junii Anno domini 1555 uwer wyßheit / unthänige gehorsame
pfarrer predger und læser diener der kylchen zu Zürych.
I. PRIMARY SOURCES

i. Manuscript sources

Staatsarchiv Zürich

A 71.1 Burgerrecht 1342-1670
A 248.1-11 Valtellina
A 350.1 Locarno
A 369.1 Fremde Personen ca.1445-1565
A 369.3 Handbuch der Gebrüder Peppia von Zürich 1595-8
B II Ratsmanuale
B II 1080 Ratsschläge 1553-60
B IV Ratsmissiven
B V Ratsurkunden
B VI 259 Rats- und Richtbücher 1561-8
B VI 312-30 Gemächtsbücher 1532-1675
B VI 337-43 Schirmbücher 1553-1615
E I 4 letters of 22 and 24 November 1563
E II 279-449 Antistitalarchiv (correspondence, manuscript tracts etc.)
G II 39.3-13 Grossmünsterstift Studentenamtsrechnungen 1552-1622
W 20.72 Familienarchiv von Muralt
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 12</td>
<td>Kopienband zur Graubündner und Veltliner Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 52</td>
<td>Briefband, Kaspar Waser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 70, no.48</td>
<td>Schriftstücke betreffend die Vertreibung der evangelischen Locaner 1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 132</td>
<td>Johannes Heinrich Waser, <em>De vita sua</em>, vol. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 157</td>
<td><em>Descritione d'un viaggio da Zurigho a Napoli</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 31</td>
<td>Daniel Orell von Gemsberg, <em>Locarnische Verfolgung</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 42</td>
<td>Briefband, Johann Heinrich Waser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 65</td>
<td>Kopienband, Kaspar und Josias Waser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 80</td>
<td>Kopienband zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 251</td>
<td>Sammelband zur Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 50a</td>
<td>Sammelband (Briefe von und an Konrad Gesner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 75</td>
<td>Sammelband (Fest- und Trauergedichte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 157</td>
<td>Miscellaneenband theologischen Inhaltes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 236</td>
<td>Sammelband theologischen Inhaltes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 15</td>
<td>Sammlung allerhand Geschichten, Begebenheiten und Merkwürdigkeiten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 12-35</td>
<td>Johann Jakob Wick, Sammlung von Nachrichten zur Zeitgeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 36-87</td>
<td>Thesaurus Hottingerianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 154</td>
<td>Sammelband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 172d</td>
<td>Epistolae virorum clarorum ad Dominum Casparum Waserum theolgiem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 182</td>
<td>Sammelband (Bündner Unruhen der Jahre 1571-73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 21</td>
<td>Sammelband zur Zürcher Geschichte des 14.-17. Jahrhunderts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography

J 255  Miscellanea Helvetiae, 1525-1741
J 287  Bernhard Sprünghli, Annalen über zürcherische und eidgenössische Begebenheiten der Jahre 1538-1567
S 1-266 Simlersche Briefsammlung, Kirchengeschichte des 16.-18. Jahrhunderts
Car C.40  Taddeo Duno, De quadraginta Israelitarum peregrinatione in Aegypto tractatus
Car XV 20  Sammelband (Theologische Schriften)

Stadtarchiv Zürich

III.A.2  Bürgerbuch B der Stadt Zürich 1545-1723
VIII.C.2  Tauf- und Ehenbuch der Kirchgemeinde Grossmünster 1546-1600
VIII.C.15  Tauf-, Ehen- und Totenbuch Fraumünster 1528 bis 1730
VIII.C.19  Taufbuch St Peter 1553-1690
VIII.C.24a  Ehenbuch St Peter 1554-1802
VIII.C.48  Bullingers Totenbuch 1549 bis 1574

Familienarchiv Orelli (Zürich)

4.300  Akten betr. Bürgerrecht der Familien von Muralt und Pestalozzi 1566-1673
7.3  Briefe, Briefentwürfe, Schuldscchein, Testamente aus dem Besitz verschiedener Glieder der Familie von Orelli 1563-1830
8.2  Protokolle, Briefe, Rechnungen der Kirche der Locarner in Zürich 1555-1600
8.4  Geschäftsbuch des Ludovico Ronco 1571-84
8.7  Sammelband mit Dokumenten zur Geschichte der Locarnischen Verfolgung 1554-1680

Staatsarchiv Graubünden

AB IV 8 a 3  Veltlin: Akten, Urkunden und Missiven 1380-1599
Bibliography

B 721  Acta synodalia rhetorum evangelicorum concionatorum 1572-1608
Breve Ragguaglio dello Stato delle Chiese Evangeliche nel Contado di Chiavenna

D II a 1  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II a 3 a  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II a 3 b  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II a 3 c  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II a 5  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II a 6  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II a 7  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II a 111  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II b 3  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden
D II c  Archiv Salis-Planta Samaden

Archiv der Evangelisch-Rhätischen Synode Graubündens

B3  Synodal-Protokoll, 1572-1608
B4  Acta synodi 1608-41

Universitätsbibliothek Basel

C VI a 35  correspondence
Fr. Gr. Ms. I, 12  correspondence
Fr. Gr. Ms. I, 13  correspondence
Fr. Gr. Ms. II, 1  correspondence
Fr. Gr. Ms. II, 4  correspondence
Fr. Gr. Ms. II, 5  correspondence
Fr. Gr. Ms. II, 5a  correspondence
Fr. Gr. Ms. II, 18  correspondence
Bibliography

Fr. Gr. Ms. II, 23 correspondence
G I, 3 correspondence
G I, 5 correspondence
G I, 20b correspondence
G I, 66 correspondence
G II, 4 correspondence
G II, 31 correspondence

Bürgerbibliothek Bern

A 93, 4 Disputatio inter Camillo Sorrino [sic] et Augustino del battismo et cena sancta
A 93, 7 Commentarii conventus synodalis convocati mense Iulii 1571 [sic] in oppido Chiavenna de excommunicatione Hieronimi Turriani, ecclesiae Pluriensis ministri, Nicolai Camulii et Camilli Sozzini

British Library

Add. MS 28568 Bernardino Ochino, dialogues

ii. Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Printed Works

Adamo, Antonio di, Annotomia della Messa, la qual scuopre gli enormi errori, et gli infiniti abusi, dal volgo non conosciuti, si della Messa, quanto del Messale [...] Con un Sermone della Eucharistia nel fine, il qual dimostra se Christo e corporalmente nel Sacramento, ò non. (n.p. [Zurich: A. Gesner and R. Wyssenbach] 1552)

Aretius, Benedikt, Valentini Gentilis iusto capitis supplicio Bernae affecti brevis historia: et contra eiusdem blasphemias orthodoxa defensio articuli de sancta Trinitate (Geneva: F. Perrinus 1567)

Betti, Francesco, Lettera di Francesco Betti Romano, all'Illustrissimo et Eccelentissimo S. Marchese di Pescara suo padrone, ne la quale da conta à sua Eccellenza de la cagione perche licentiatò si sia dal suo servigio (n.p. 1557)

Beza, Theodore, De haereticis a civili Magistratu puniendis Libellus, adversus Martini Bellii farraginem, et novorum Academicorum sectam, Theodore Beza Vezelio auctore (Geneva: R. Etienne 1554)
Bibliography

Beza, Theodore, *Valentini Gentilis teterrimi haeretici impietatem ac triplicis perfidiae et perjuriae, brevis explicatio, ex actis publicis Senatus Genevensis optima fide descripta* (Geneva: F. Peninus 1567)


Breitinger, Johann Jakob, *Instruttione fondamentale se una setta duri più o meno di cent'Anni. Similmente, qual sia l'antica è nuova fede, è dove avanti la Reformatione essa sia stata [...], translated by Vincenzo Paravicini (n.p. [Zurich] 1622)

Bucer, Martin, *Martini Buceri Scripta Anglicana fere omnia [...] a Conrado Huberto ad explicandas sedendasque religionis cum alias, tum praesertim Eucharistias controversias, singulari fide collecta* (Basel: P. Perna 1577)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *Utriusque in Christo naturae tam divinae quam humanae, contra varias haereses, pro confessione Christi catholica, Assertio orthodoxa [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1533)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *In sacrosanctum Jesu Christi Domini nostri Evangelium secundum Matthaeum, Commentariorum libri XII [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1542)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *De scripturae sanctae authoritate, certitudine, firmitate et absoluta perfectione, deque Episcoporum, qui verbi dei ministri sunt, institutione et functione [...]. Accessit authoris Responsio ad Ioannis Cochlaei de Canonicae scripturae et catholicae ecclesiae authoritate libellum [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1544)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *Warhaffte Bekanntnuß der dieneren der klichen zu Zürych / was sy uß Gottes wort / mit der heyligen allgemeinen Christlichen Klichen gloubind und leerind / in sonderheit aber von dem Nachtmal unsers herren Jesu Christi [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1545)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *In omnes apostolicas epistolas, divi videlicet Pauli xiii. et vili. canonicas, commentarii [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1549)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *Das die Evangelischen Klichen weder kätzerische noch abtrünnige / sunder gantz rechtglübige und allgemeine Jesu Christi klichen syend / gruntliche erwysung [...]* (Zurich: A. Gesner and R. Wyssenbach 1552)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *Summa Christenlicher Religion. Darinn uß dem wort Gottes / one alles zancken und schüllen / richtig und kurz / anzeigt wirt / was einem yetlichen Christen notwendig sye zu wissen / zu glouben / zu thun / und zu lassen / och zu lyden / und sællichk abzusterben [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1556)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *Catechesis pro adulterioribus scripta [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1559)
Bibliography

Bullinger, Heinrich, *Der Widertoujferen ursprung / fürgang / Secten / wäsen / fürnemen und gemeine jrer leer Artikel / och jre gründ / und warumm sy sich absündierend / und ein eigne kirchen anrichtend / mit widerlegung und antwort uff alle und yede jre gründ und artikel [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1561)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *De conciliis [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1561)

Bullinger, Heinrich, *Sermomum Decades quinque, de potissimis Christianae religionis capitibus, in tres tomos digestae [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1577)

Calandriini, Scipione, *Trattato dell’origine delle heresie et delle schisme, che sono nate, o che possono nascere nella chiesa di Dio, et de rimedii che si devono usare contra di quelle, cio è, della scommunica, et della potestà del magistrato civile* (Poschiavo: C. Landolfi 1572)


Castellio, Sebastian, *Contra Libellum Calvini in quo ostendere conatur Haereticos jure gladij coercendos esse [...]*. (n.p. [Amsterdam(?)] 1612)

Castellio, Sebastian, *Sebastiani Castellionis Dialogi IV* (Gouda: C. Tournaeus 1613)

*Castellio, Sebastian, Sebastiani Castellionis Dialogi IV* (Gouda: C. Tournaeus 1613)

Catholici cuiusdam et orthodoxi iudicium et censura, de iudicio et censura ministrorum Tygurinorum et Heydeburgensium, de dogmate contra adorandam Trinitatem in Polonia nuper sparso* (Cologne: Apud Maternum Cholinimi 1565)

Curione, Celio Secundo, *Coelii Secundi Curionis Araneus, seu de Providentia Dei libellus vere aureus, cum alis nonnullis eiusdem Opusculis [...]* (Basel: J. Oporinus 1544)

Curione, Celio Secundo, *Caelii Secundi Curionis, pro vera et antiqua Ecclesiae Christi autoritate, in Antonium Florebellum Mutinensem, Oratio [...]* (Basel n.d.[1547?])

Curione, Celio Secundo, *Una familiare et paterna institutione della Christiana religione, di M. Celio Secundo Curione, piu copiosa, et piu chiara che la latina del medesimo [...]* (Basel n.d.[1551])

Curione, Celio Secundo, *Caelii Secundi Curionis selectarum epistolarum Libri duo* (Basel: J. Oporinus 1553)
Curione, Celio Secundo, *Coelii Secundi Curionis de amplitudine beati regni Dei, dialogi sive libri duo* [... (n.p. [Poschiavo: D. Landolfi] 1554))


Duno, Taddeo, *In laudem ornatissimi praesulis, viri praetorii doctissimi, Ioachym Beldi Glaronensis* (Basel 1555)

Duno, Taddeo, *Muliebrium morborum omnis generis Remedia* (Strasbourg: J. Rihelius 1555)

Duno, Taddeo, *Thaddaei Duni Locarnensis medici, epistolae medicinales locis multis auctae [...] (Zurich: J. Wolf 1592)

Duno, Taddeo, *Thaddaei Duni Locarnensis, medicinae doctoris et Christi exulis: de peregrinatione filiorum Israel in Aegypto, Tractatus chronologicus [...] (Zurich: J. Wolf 1595)

Duno, Taddeo, *Thaddaei Duni Locarnensis medicinae doctoris et Christi exulis: Ad graves calumnias et sophisticas disceptationes, Danielis Angelocratoris Corbinas, de tempore peregrinationis Israëltarum in Aegypto, Responsum Apologeticum* (Zurich 1603)

Epistolae duae, ad ecclesias Polonicas, Jesu Christi Evangelium amplexas, scriptae a Tigurinae ecclesiae ministris, de negotio Stancariano, et mediatore dei et hominum Iesu Christo, an hic secundum humanam naturam duntaxat, an secundum utranque mediator sit (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1561)

Florio, Michelangelo, *Apologia di M. Michelagnolo Fiorentino ne la quale si tratta de la vera e falsa chiesa* (Camogask: G. Catani 1557)

Francisci Spierae, qui quod susceptam semel Evangelicae veritatis professionem abnegasset, damnassetque, in horrendam incidit desperationem, historia [...] (Basel: n. pub [J. Oporinus?] 1550)

Gaffori, Cesare, Scipione Calandrini and Ottaviano Mei, *Disputationis Tiranensis inter pontificios et ministris verbi Dei in Rhaetia, anno 1595, et 1596 habitu partes IV* (Basel: K. Waldkirch 1602)


Gwalther, Rudolf, *Die Menschwerdung des waaren ewigen und eingebornen Suns Gottes / unsers Herren Jesu Christi erklärt und ufiggelegt in sechs predigen / diser zyt wider*
allerley Secten nutzlich zu lasen: durch Rudolfen Walther diener der kirchen Zürych (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1571)

Hottinger, Johannes Heinrich, *Historiae ecclesiasticae novi Testamenti*, 9 vols (Zurich: Schaufenberg 1667)

Kvosen, Jodocus, *De vita et obitu reverendi et clarissimi viri, domini Caspari Waseri [...]* (Basel: J. Schroeder 1626)

Lavater, Ludwig, *Historia de origine et progressu Controversiae Sacramentariae de Coena Domini, ab anno nativitatis Christi M.D. XXII usque ad annum M.D. LXIII deducta [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1563)

Lavater, Ludwig, *Vom leben und tod des Eet^irdigen und Hochgeleerten Herrn / Heinrychen Bullingers / dieners der Kyrchen zu Zürych / kurze einfalte und warhaffte erzeltung [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1576)

Lening, Johannes, *Dialogue / das ist ein freundtlich Gesprech zu zweyer personen / Da von / Ob es Gôttlichem / Naturlichem / Keyserlichem und Geystlichem Rechte gemesse oder entgegen sei / mehr dann eyn Eeweib zugleich zuhaben. Unnd wo yemann zu diser zeit solchs fûrnehme ob er als eyn unchrist zuverwerffen unnd zuverdammen sei oder nit* (n.p. 1541)


Mainardi, Agostino, *Trattato dell’unica, et perfetta satsiattione di Christo, nel qual si dichiara, et manifestamente per la parola di Dio si pruova, che sol Christo ha satsatto per gli peccati del mondo, ne quanto à Dio cè altra satsiattione che la sua, o sia per la colpa, o sia per la pena, composto per M. Agostino Mainardo Piamontese* (n.p. [Zurich: A. Gesner and R. Wyssenbach] 1551)

Mainardi, Agostino, *Una pia et utile sermone della gratia di Dio, contra li meriti humani* (published with the above text)

Negri, Francesco, *In dominicam precationem Meditatiuncula, per Franciscum Nigrum Bassianatem [...]* (Zurich: C. Froschauer n.d.)


Negri, Francesco, *De Fanini Paventini, ac Dominici Bassanensis morte, Qui nuper ob Christium in Italia Rom. Pon. iussu impie occisi sunt, Brevis Historia [...]* (n.p. 1550)

Ochino, Bernardino, Bernhardini Ochini Senensis expositio Epistolae divi Pauli ad Romanos, de Italic in latinum translata (Augsburg: P. Ulhart 1545)

Ochino, Bernardino, Esposizione di Messer Bernardino Ochino sopra la Epistola di Paolo à i Galati (n.p. 1546)


Ochino, Bernardino, La terza parte delle Prediche di M. Bernardino Occhino, non mai più stampate, nella quale si tratta, della Fede, Speranza et Carità [...] (n.p. [Basel] n.d.)


Ochino, Bernardino, Bernardini Ochini senensis viri doctissimi, De Purgatorio dialogus (Zurich: [A. Gesner and H.J. Gesner] n.d [1556])

Ochino, Bernardino, Syncerae et verae doctrinae de Coena Domini defensio, per Bernardinum Ochinum Locarnensium Ecclesiae Pastorem: contra Libros tres Joachim Westphali, Hamburgensis Ecclesiae praedicatoris (Zurich: [A. Gesner and H.J. Gesner] 1556)

Ochino, Bernardino, Prediche di M. Bernardino Ochino Senese, nomate Laberinti del libero, o ver servo Arbitrio, Prescienza, Predestinatione, et Libertà divina, et del modo per uscirne [...]. (Basel: P. Perna n.d. [1560])

Ochino, Bernardino, II catechismo, o vero institutione Christiana di M. Bernardino Ochino da Siena, in forma di Dialogo. Interlocutori, il Ministro, et Illuminato [...] (Basel: P. Perna 1561)


Ochino, Bernardino, La quinta parte delle Prediche di M. Bernardino Ochino, non mai prima stampate [...] (Basel: n. pub 1562)

Ochino, Bernardino, Bernardini Ochini Senensis Dialogi XXX. In duos libros divisi, quorum primus est de Messia, continetque dialogos xvii. Secundus est, cum de rebus variis, tum potissimum de Trinitate [...] (Basel: P. Perna 1563)

[Paravicini, Vincenzo], Vera narratione del massacro degli evangelici fatto da' papisti
Bibliography

rebelli nella maggior parte della Valtellina, nell'anno M.DC.XX addì ix. Luglio, e giorni seguenti, stilo vecchio (n.p. [Zurich?] 1621)

Servetus, Michael, De trinitatis erroribus libri septem (n.p. [Hagenau: J. Secerius] 1531)

Silvio, Bartolomeo, De eucharistia tractatus et Barptolomaei [sic] Sylvii Cremonensis, Verbi Dei apud D. Rhaetos concionatoris (n.p. 1551)

Simler, Josias, Responsio ad maledicam Francisci Stancari Mantuani librum adversus Tigurinae ecclesiae ministro, de Trinitate et Mediatore nostro Iesu Christo [...] (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1563)

Simler, Josias, Oratio de vita et obitu viri optimi, praestantissimi Theologi D. Petri Martyris Vermilii, Sacrarum literarum in Schola Tigurina Professoris (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1563)

Simler, Josias, De aeterno Dei filio domino et servatore nostro Iesu Christo, et de Spiritu sancto, adversus veteres et novos Antitrinitarios, id est Arianos, Trithumas, Samosatenses, et Pneumatopathos, libri quatuor (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1568)

Simler, Josias, Scripta veterum latina, de una persona et duabus naturis Domini et Servatoris nostri Iesu Christi, adversus Nestoria, Eutychen et Accephalus olim aedita (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1571)

Simler, Josias, Bibliotheca instituta et collecta primum a Conrado Gesnero. Deinde in Epitomen redacta et novorum librorum accessione locupletata, imo vero postremo recognita, et in duplicem post priores editiones aucta, per Iosiam Simlerum Tigurinum (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1574)

Simler, Josias, Narratio de ortu, vita, et obitu reverendi viri D. Henrici Bullingeri, Tigurinae Ecclesiae pastoris [...] (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1575)

Simler, Josias, Assertio orthodoxae doctrinae de duabus naturis Christi Servatoris nostri, opposita blasphemiis et sophismatis Simonis Budnaei nuper ab ipso in Lituania evulatis [...] (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1575)

Simler, Josias, Iosiae Simleri Tigurini de Helvetiorum Republica, Pagis, Foederatis, Stipendiariis, Oppidis, Praefecturis, Foederibus tum domesticis, eorumque origine ac legibus, tum externis, Pagorumque singularum privatae Reipublicae ratione, libri duo (Paris: J. du Puys 1577)

Simler, Josias, Exodus. In Exodum vel secundum librum Mosis, Iosiae Simleri Professoris Divinarum literarum in Schola Tigurina Commentarii [...] (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1584)

Sozzini, Fausto, Fausti Socini Senensis opera omnia in Duos Tomos distincta (Amsterdam: n. pub 1656)

Stancaro, Francesco, Ispositione de la Epistola canonica di S. Giacobo Vescovo di
Gierusaleme, pia, dotta et diligente: ornata de molti luoghi comuni a utilita grande de la chiesa catholica, et massime de presenti tempi [...] (Basel 1547)

Stancaro, Francesco, Francisci Stancari Mantuani in epistolam canonicam D. Iacobi episcopi Hierolysamitani expositio pia, docta, et accurata [...]\textsuperscript{1}, translated by Taddeo Duno (Basel: J. Parcus 1547)

Stancaro, Francesco, Opera nuova di Francesco Stancaro Mantoano della Riformazione, si della dottrina Christiana, come della vera intelligentia de i sacramenti [...] (Basel 1547)


Stucki, Johann Wilhelm, Vita clarissimi viri D. Iosiae Simleri Tigurini, S. Theologiae in schola Tigurina Professoris fidelissimi [...] (Zurich: C. Froschauer 1577)

Vera relatione della vittoria et libertà ottenuta da Cattolici, contro gli Heretici, nella Valtellina. [...] (Pavia, Cremona and Bologna: Moscatelli 1620)

Vergerio, Pier Paolo, Del battesmo et de fiumi che nascono ne paesi de signori Grisoni (n.p. n.d.)

Vergerio, Pier Paolo, Epistola del Vergerio, nella quale sono descritti molte cose della Città, e della Chiesa di Geneva (Geneva: C. Badius 1550)


Waser, Kaspar, De vita et obitu Reverendi, nobilis et clarissimi Viri Domini Joh. Guilielmi Stuckii, sacrarum litterarum professoris in Schola Tigurina, Oratio historica, habita publice et edita a Casparo Wasero, Tigurino (Zurich: J. Wolf 1608)

[Waser, Kaspar], \textit{Ausführliche / umbständliche und warhaffte Beschreibung deß grausamen und unmenschlichen Mordes / so in dem land Veltlyn gemeinen dreyen Pünnten gehörig / Anno M. DC. XX den IX. Jul. unnd folgende tag / alten Calenders / an den Evangelischen einwohneren daselbst / durch etlich verzweifelte Bößwicht / Rebellen und Banditen / gantz barbarischer weise ist geübt worden} (Zurich: J.R. Wolf 1620)

Zanchi, Girolamo, Clarissimi viri D. Hie. Zanchii omnium operum theologiorum Tomi octo (Geneva: S. Crespin 1619)
iii. Post-1700 published Sources


Aconcio, Giacomo, *De Methodo et opuscoli religiosi e filosofici*, edited by Giorgio Radetti (Florence: Vallecchi Editore 1944)

Beza, Theodore, *Correspondence de Théodore de Bèze*, edited by Fernand Aubert et al. (Geneva: Librairie E. Droz 1960- )


Campell, Ulrich, *Ulrici Campelli Raetiae alpestris topographica descriptio*, edited by C.J. Kind (Basel: Verlag von Felix Schneider 1884)


Castellio, Sebastian, *De l'impunité des hérétiques / De haereticis non puniendis*, edited by
Bibliography

Bruno Becker and Marius Valkhoff (Geneva: Librairie E. Droz 1971)

Castellio, Sebastian, De arte dubitandi et confidendi ignorant et sciendi, edited with an introduction and notes by Elisabeth Feist Hirsch (Leiden: E.J. Brill 1981)


De falsa et vera unius Dei Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti cognitio libri duo (Alba Julia 1568), facsimile edition with an introduction by Antal Pirnát (Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó 1988)


Epistolae Tigurinae de rebus potissimum ad Ecclesiae Anglicanae Reformationem pertinentibus conscriptae 1531-1558 (Cambridge: Parker Society 1848)

Firpo, Massimo, and Dario Marcatto (eds), Il processo inquisitoriale del cardinal Giovanni Morone, 6 vols (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea 1981-95)


Guissani, A. (ed.), 'Relazione del Segretario Padavino ritornato dal paese de' Signori Grisoni presentata nell’Ecc.矍 Collegio a’ 20 Agosto 1605', Periodico della società storica per la Provincia e antica Diocesi di Como 15 (1903), 161-212

Hartmann, Alfred (ed.), Die Amerbachkorrespondenz (Basel: Universität Basel 1942-)

Bibliography

Jecklin, Fritz, Materialien zur Standes- und Landesgeschichte Gem. III Bände (Graubünden), 1464-1803, 2 vols (Basel: Basler Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung 1907/9)


Lubienicki, Stanislas, History of the Polish Reformation and Nine Related Documents, translated and interpreted by George Huntston Williams (Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1995)

Luther, Martin, D. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel, 11 vols (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger 1930-48)

Marchetti, Valerio, and Giampaolo Zucchini (eds), Aggiunte all’Epsistolario di Fausto Sozzini 1561-1568 (Warzaw and Lodz: PWN 1982)

Miscellanea Tigurina, 3 vols (Zurich: Bodmer 1722-4)

Ochino, Bernardino, I dialogi sette e altri scritti del tempo della fuga, edited by Ugo Rozzo (Turin: Claudiana 1985)

Renato, Camillo, Opere, documenti e testimonianze, edited by Antonio Rotondò (Florence and Chicago: Sansoni and the Newberry Library 1968)


Schnyder, Werner (ed.), Quellen zur Zürcher Wirtschaftsgeschichte, 2 vols (Zurich and Leipzig: Rascher Verlag 1937)

Sipayho, Maria (ed.), Acta synodorum ecclesiarum Poloniae reformatorum / Akta synodów różnowierczych w Polsce, 3 vols (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Universytetu Warszawskiego 1966-83)


Sozzini, Lelio, Opere, edited by Antonio Rotondò (Florence: Olschki 1986)

Valdés, Juan de, Alphabete cristiano, edited with an introduction by Massimo Firpo (Turin: Einaudi 1994)

Von Kausler, Eduard, and Theodor Schott (eds), Briefwechsel zwischen Christoph Herzog von Württemberg und Petrus Paulus Vergerius (Tübingen: H. Laupp 1875)

Von Segesser, Anton Philipp, et al, Amtliche Sammlung der ältern eidgenössischen Abschiede, 1245-1798, 8 pts (Lucerne and Bern 1839-78)

Wotschke, Theodor (ed.), Der Briefwechsel der Schweizer mit den Polen (Leipzig: M. Heinsius 1908)

The Zurich Letters, edited for the Parker Society by Hastings Robinson, 2 vols (Cambridge: Parker Society 1842/5)

Zwingli, Huldrych, Huldreich Zwinglis samtliche Werke, edited by Walther Köhler et al. (Corpus Reformatorum vols 88- ) (Leipzig: M. Heinsius 1905- )

II. SECONDARY SOURCES


Adorni-Braccesi, Simonetta, <<Una città infetta>>: La repubblica di Lucca nella crisi religiosa del Cinquecento (Florence: Olschki 1994)


Anderson, Marvin Walter, ‘Vista Tigurina: Peter Martyr and European Reform (1556-1562)’, Harvard Theological Review 83 (1990), 181-206


Armand Hugon, Augusto, Agostino Mainardo: Contributo alla storia della Riforma in Italia (Torre Pellice: Società di Studi Valdesi n.d.)

Aureggi, Olimpia, ‘I Lumaga di Piuro e di Chiavenna’, Archivio storico lombardo 89 (1962), 222-89


Bibliography


Bainton, Roland H., *Bernardino Ochino, esule e riformatore senese del Cinquecento*, translated by E. Giammarco (Florence: Sansoni 1940)


Balmas, Enea, ‘Un inedito di Scipione Lentolo’, *BSSV* 152 (1983), 31-56

Baserga, Giovanni, ‘Il movimento per la Riforma in Valtellina e le sue relazioni con Ginevra’, *Periodico della società storica della Provincia e antica Diocesi di Como* 21 (1914), 97-128; 22 (1915), 5-36

Bassetti, Aldo, ‘I riformati locarnesi in Zurigo alla luce di nuovi documenti’, *Bollettino storico della Svizzera italiana* (1941/3), 1-10

Becker, Bruno (ed.), *Autour de Michel Servet et de Sébastien Castellion* (Haarlem: H.D. Tjeenk, Willink & Zoon N.V. 1953)


Bibliography

Bertrand-Barraud, Daniel, Les idées philosophiques de Bernardin Ochin, de Sienne (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin 1924)

Beeta, Enrico, Storia della Valtellina e della Val Chiavenna, 2 vols (Milan: Dott. A. Giuffrè editore 1955/64)

Bianco, Cesare, 'La comunità di <fratelli> nel movimento eretico modenese del '500', RSI 92 (1980), 621-79

Biel, Pamela, Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness: Heinrich Bullinger and the Zurich Clergy 1535-1575 (Bern: Peter Lang 1991)


Bietenholz, Peter G., Basle and France in the Sixteenth Century: The Basle Humanists and Printers in their Contacts with Francophone Culture (Geneva: E. Droz 1971)

Bietenholz, Peter G., ‘Questioni su Mino Celsi da Siena’, BSSV 132 (1972), 69-74

Bietenholz, Peter G., ‘Mino Celsi and the Toleration Controversy of the Sixteenth Century’, BHR 34 (1972), 31-47


Boesch, Paul, ‘Die englischen Flüchtlinge in Zürich unter Königin Elisabeth I’, Zwa 9:9 (1953/1), 531-5

Bonorand, Conradin, Die Entwicklung des reformierten Bildungswesens in Graubünden zur Zeit der Reformation und Gegenreformation (Thusis: Buchdruckerei Rott & Co. 1949)

Bonorand, Conradin, ‘Bündner Studierende an höheren Schulen der Schweiz und des Auslandes im Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation’, JHGG (1949), 91-174

Bonorand, Conradin, ‘Le relazioni culturali tra i protestanti di Valtellina e i protestanti della Svizzera tedesca’ Archivio storico lombardo, serie 9, 5/6 (1966-7), 1-9
Bibliography


Bonorand, Conradin, ‘Mitteleuropäische Studenten in Pavia zur Zeit der Kriege in Italien (ca.1500 bis ca.1550)’, Pluteus 4-5 (1986-7), 295-357


Bornatico, Remo, L’arte tipografica nelle Tre Leghe (1549-1803) (Chur: Gasser & Eggerling AG 1971)

Bouvier, André, Henri Bullinger, réformateur et conseiller oecuménique, le successeur de Zwingli, d’après sa correspondance avec les réformés et les humanistes de langue française (Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé S.A. and Droz 1940)

Brassel, Thomas, ‘Drei umstrittene Traktate Peter Martyr Vermigli’, Zwa 11:7 (1962/1), 476


Büsser, Fritz, ‘Josias Simmlers Gedenkrede auf Petrus Martyr 1563: Vermigli in Zürich’,
Bibliography

in Alfred Cattani, Michael Kotrba, and Agnes Rutz (eds), Zentralbibliothek Zürich: Alte
und neue Schätze (Zurich: Verlag NZZ 1993), pp.74-7

Buisson, Ferdinand, Sébastien Castellion: Sa vie et son œuvre: Étude sur les origines du
Protestantisme libéral français, 2 vols (Paris: Hachette 1892)

Bundi, Martin, Frühe Beziehungen zwischen Graubünden und Venedig (15./16.
Jahrhundert) (Chur: Gasser AG Druck und Verlag 1988)

Burchill, Christopher J., The Heidelberg Antitrinitarians (Baden-Baden and Bouxwiller:
Éditions Valentin Koerner 1989)

Burchill, Christopher J., ‘Girolamo Zanchi: Portrait of a Reformed Theologian and His
Work’, SCJ 15 (1984), 185-207

Burnett, Amy Nelson, ‘Simon Sulzer and the Consequences of the 1563 Strasbourg
Consensus in Switzerland’, ARG 83 (1992), 154-79

Burrows, Mark S., “Christus inter nos Vivens”: The Peculiar Genius of Bullinger’s
Doctrine of Sanctification, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 98 (1987), 48-69

Busino, Giovanni, ‘Italiani all’università di Basilea dal 1460 al 1601’, BHR 20 (1958), 497-
526


Busino, Giovanni, ‘Di Broccardo Borrone e del suo <<Ritratto della Rezia>>, Bollettino
della società storica valtellinese 16 (1962), 25-60

Buzzoni, Paola, I Praecepta di Scipione Lentulo e l’adattamento inglese di Henry
Grantham (Florence: Valmartina Editore 1979)

Caccamo, Domenico, Eretici italiani in Moravia, Polonia, Transilvania (1558-1611): Studi
e documenti (Florence: Sansoni 1970)

Calvani, Simona, ‘Camillo Renato’, in André Séguenny (éd.), Bibliotheca Dissidentium:
Répertoire des non-conformistes religieux des seizième et dix-septième siècles, 4 (Baden-

Calvani, Simona, ‘Note sul carteggio di Celio Secundo Curione dal 1535 al 1553’, BSSV
159 (1986), 35-40

Camenisch, Carl, Carlo Borromeo und die Gegenreformation im Veltlin mit besonderer
Berücksichtigung der Landesschule von Sondrio (Chur: Kommissionsverlag der Hitz’schen
Buchhandlung 1901)

Camenisch, Emil, ‘Die Confessio Raetica: Ein Beitrag zur bündnerischen
Reformationsgeschichte’, JHGG (1913), 223-60

318
Bibliography

Camenisch, Emil, *Bündnerische Reformationsgeschichte* (Chur: Bischofberger & Hotzenkocherie 1920)


Cameron, James, ‘The British Itinerary of Johann Peter Hainzel von Degerstein by Caspar Waser’, *Zwa* 15:3/4 (1980/1-2), 259-95

Campi, Emidio, ‘<<Conciliatone de dispareri>>: Bernardino Ochino e la seconda disputa sacramentale’, in *Das reformierte Erbe*, 1, pp.77-92


Campi, Emidio, ‘Remarques sur l’histoire de la Réforme en Italie’, *BHR* 56 (1994), 495-507


Cantimori, Delio, *Umanesimo e religione nel Rinascimento* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi Editore 1975)

Cantimori, Delio, and Elisabeth Feist, *Per la storia degli eretici italiani del secolo XVI in Europa* (Rome: G. Bardi 1937)


Caponetto, Salvatore, *Studi sulla Riforma in Italia* (Florence: Università degli Studi di Firenze 1987)

Caponetto, Salvatore, *La Riforma protestante nell’Italia del Cinquecento* (Turin: Claudiana
Bibliography

Editrice 1992)


Chabod, Federico, Per la storia religiosa dello stato di Milano durante il dominio di Carlo V: Note e documenti, edited by Ernesto Sestan (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per l’età moderna et contemporanea 1962)

Chenou, Albert, ‘Taddeo Duno (1523-1613)’, BSSV 120 (1966), 55-61

Church, Frederic C., The Italian Reformers 1534-1564 (New York: Columbia University Press 1932)


Corda, Salvatore, Veritas Sacramenti: A Study of Vermigli’s Doctrine of the Lord’s Supper (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag 1975)

Crolloloanza, G.B., Storia del contado di Chiavenna (Milan: Presse Serafino Muggiani e comp. Librai editori 1870)

Dändlik, Karl, ‘Zürcher Volksanfragen von 1521 bis 1718’, Jahrbuch für Schweizerische Geschichte 23 (1898), 149-225

Dalbert, Peter, Die Reformation in den italienischen Talschaften Graubündens nach dem Briefwechsel Bullingers: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reformation in der Schweiz (Zurich: Dissertationsdruckerei Leemann AG 1948)

Dán, Robert, Matthias Vehe-Glirius: Life and Work of a radical antitrinitarian with his collected writings (Budapest and Leiden: Akadémiai Kiadó and E.J. Brill 1982)


Denzler, Alice, Geschichte des Armenwesens im Kanton Zürich im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert (Zurich: Buchdruckerei J. Rüegg 1920)


Ernst, Ulrich, Geschichte des Zürcherischen Schulwesens bis gegen das Ende des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts (Winterthur: Druck und Verlag von Bleuler-Hausheer & Cie 1879)

Fast, Heinold, Heinrich Bullinger und die Täufer: Ein Beitrag zur Historiographie und Theologie im 16. Jahrhundert (Weierhof: Mennonitischer Geschichtsverein e.V. 1959)


Firpo, Luigi, Scritti sulla Riforma in Italia (Naples: Prisini 1996)
Bibliography


Firpo, Massimo, *Tra Alumbrados e <<Spirituali>>: Studi su Juan de Valdés e il Valdesianismo nella crisi religiosa del ’500 italiano* (Florence: Olschki 1990)


Fragnito, Gigliola, ‘Gli <<spirituali>> e la fuga di Bernardino Ochino’, *RSI* 84 (1972), 777-813

Fretz, Diethehn, *Die Frühbeziehungen zwischen Zürich und Bergamo 1568-1618* (Zurich: Seeverlag Zollikon 1940)


Gay, Teofilo, ‘Scipione Lentolo’, *Bulletin de la société d’histoire vaudoise* 23 (1906), 104-7


Gilly, Carlos, ‘Das Sprichwort <<Die Gelehrten die Verkehrten>> oder der Verrat der Intellektuellen im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung’, in Antonio Rotondô (ed.), *Forme e destinazione del messaggio religioso: Aspetti della propaganda religiosa nel Cinquecento*

Gilmont, Jean-François, ‘L’Historia delle grande e crudeli persecutioni’ di Scipione Lentulo’, BSSV 151 (1982), 51-68


Ginzburg, Carlo, and Adriano Prosperi, Giochi di pazienza: Un seminario sul <<Beneficio di Cristo>> (Turin: Giulio Einaudi Editore 1975)

Giorgetta, Giovanni, ‘Dissidi tra cattolici ed evangelici in Villa di Chiavenna’, Clavenna 3 (1964), 75-120


Giorgetta, Giovanni, ‘Un codicillo di Ottaviano Mei’, Clavenna 17 (1978), 24-8


Giovanoli, Gaudenzio, ‘Erinnerungen an hervorragende Pfarrer in Soglio’, BM (1932), 51-6

Gmür, Helen, Das Bündnis zwischen Zürich / Bern und Venedig 1615/18 (Zurich: Verlag AG Gebr. Leemann & Co. 1945)

Gordon, Bruce, Clerical Discipline and the Reformation: The Synod in Zürich, 1532-1580 (Bern: Peter Lang 1992)


Greil, Ole Peter, Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London: The Dutch Church in Austin Friars 1603-1642 (Leiden: E.J. Brill 1989)


Grendler, Paul, The Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Press, 1540-1605 (Princeton:
Bibliography

Princeton University Press 1977)


Guggisberg, Hans R., Basel in the Sixteenth Century: Aspects of the City Republic before, during and after the Reformation (St. Louis, Mo.: Center for Reformation Research 1982)


Guissani, Antonio, La rivoluzione valtellinese del 19 luglio 1620 (Milan: Dott. A. Giuffrè Editore 1940)

Hassinger, Erich, Studien zu Jacobus Acontius (Berlin Grinnewald: Verlag für Staatswissenschaften und Geschichte 1934)


Bibliography


Hubert, Friedrich, *Vergertios publizistische Thätigkeit nebst einer bibliographischen Übersicht* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1893)


Jacobi, Verena, *Bern und Zürich und die Vertreibung der Evangelischen aus Locarno* (Zurich: Leemann AG 1967)


Bibliography

Kind, Christian Immanuel, *Die Reformation in den Bistümern Chur und Como* (Chur: Verlag der Grubenmann'schen Buchhandlung 1858)

Kittel, James M., ‘Marbach vs. Zanchi: The Resolution of Controversy in Late Reformation Strasbourg’, *SCJ* 8 (1977), 31-44


Leemann-van Elck, Paul, *Druck, Verlag, Buchhandel im Kanton Zürich von den Anfängen bis um 1850* (Zurich: Druck Leemann AG 1950)


McNair, Philip, ‘Ochino’s Apology: Three Gods or Three Wives?’, *History* 60 (1975), 353-73

326
McNair, Philip, ‘Bernardino Ochino in Inghilterra’, RSI 103 (1991), 231-42

McNair, Philip, and John Tedeschi, ‘New Light on Ochino’, BHR 35 (1973), 289-301


Madonia, Claudio, ‘Bernardino Ochino e il radicalismo religioso europeo’, Bollettino senese di storia patria 98 (1991), 110-29

Maissen, Felix, ‘Der Kalenderstreit in Graubünden (1582-1812)’, BM (1960), 253-73

Maliniak, J., Die Entstehung der Exportindustrie und des Unternehmerstandes in Zürich im XVI. und XVII. Jahrhundert (Zurich and Leipzig: Rascher & Cie. 1913)

Marchetti, Valerio, ‘Sull’origine e la dispersione del gruppo eretico dei Sozzini a Siena (1557-1560), RSI 81 (1969), 131-73

Marchetti, Valerio, ‘Una polemica di Scipione Lentulo con l’antitrinitario Fabrizio Pestalozzi (1581)’, Il pensiero politico 5 (1972), 284-301

Marchetti, Valerio, Gruppi ereticali senesi del Cinquecento (Florence: ‘La Nuova Italia’ Editrice 1975)


Martin, John, Venice’s Hidden Enemies: Italian Heretics in a Renaissance City (Berkeley: University of California Press 1993)

Mazzali, Ettore, and Giulio Spinri, Storia della Valtellina e della Valchiavenna, 2 vols (Sondrio: Editore Bissoni 1968/9)

Meyer, Ferdinand, Die evangelische Gemeinde in Locarno, ihre Auswanderung und ihre weiteren Schicksale: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Schweiz im sechsziitnten Jahrhundert, 2 vols (Zurich: S. Höhr 1836)

Meyer, Karl, Die Capitanei von Locarno im Mittelalter (Zurich: Druck der Buchdruckerei Berichts AH1916)

Meylan, Henri, ‘Bèze et les italiens de Lyon (1566)’, BHR 14 (1952), 235-49

Mikat, Paul, Die Polygamiefrage in der frühen Neuzeit (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag 1988)

Mörlikofer, J.C., J.J. Breitinger und Zürich: Ein Kulturbild aus der Zeit des dreißigjährigen Krieges (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel 1874)

Mörlikofer, J.C., Geschichte der evangelischen Flüchtlinge in der Schweiz (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel 1876)


Musselli, Luciano, ‘La riforma protestante in Valmalenco e il diritto ecclesiastico dei Gugioni’, Bollettino della società storica valtellinese 32 (1979), 45-63

Nabholz, Hans, ‘Zürichs Höhere Schulen von der Reformation bis zur Gründung der Universität, 1525-1833’, in Ernst Gagliardi, Hans Nabholz, and Jean Strohl, Die Universität Zürich 1833-1933 und ihre Vorläufer, pp.1-164 (Zurich: Verlag der Erziehungsdirektion 1938)

Neuser, Wilhelm Heinrich, ‘Calvins Kritik an den Basler, Berner und Zürcher Prädikanten in der Schrift <<De praedestinatione>> 1552’, in Das Reformierte Erbe, 2, pp.237-43

Nicolini, Benedetto, ‘Il pensiero di Bernardino Ochino’, Atti della Reale Accademia Pontaniana di scienze morale e politiche 95 (1938), 171-268

Nicolini, Benedetto, Ideali e passioni nell’Italia religiosa del Cinquecento (Bologna: Libreria Antiquaria Palmaverde 1962)

Nicolini, Benedetto, Aspetti della vita religiosa, politica e letteraria del Cinquecento (Bologna: Tamari Editori 1963)


Olivieri, Achille, ‘Il <<Catechismo>> e la <<Fidei et doctrinae ... ratio>> di Bartolomeo Fonzio, eretico veneziano del Cinquecento’, Studi veneziani 9 (1967), 339-452

Olivieri, Achille, Riforma ed eresia a Vicenza nel Cinquecento (Rome: Herder Editrice e libreria 1992)
Bibliography

O’Malley, Charles Donald, Jacopo Aconcio (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura 1955)


Palazzi Trivelli, Francesco, ‘Riformati, cattolici, reti, valtellini: baruffe in Sondrio a cavallo tra Cinque e Seicento’, Bollettino della società storica valtellinase 44 (1991), 133-58


Pastore, Alessandro, Nella Valtellina del tardo Cinquecento: fede, cultura, società (Milan: SugarCo Edizioni 1975)


Peer, Florian, L’église de Rhétie au XVIIe et XVIIme siècles (Geneva: Imprimerie Rivera et Dubois 1888)

Perini, Leandro, ‘Note e documenti su Pietro Perna libraio-tipografo a Basilea’, NRS 50 (1966), 145-200


Pestalozzi Keyser, Hans, Geschichte der Familie Pestalozzi (Zurich: NZZ 1958)


Peyer, Hans Conrad, Vom Handel und Bank im alten Zürich (Zurich: Verlag Berichthaus
Peyronel Rambaldi, Susanna, Speranze e crisi nel Cinquecento modenese: Tensioni religiose e vita cittadina ai tempi di Giovanni Morone (Milan: FrancoAngeli 1979)


Pfister, Rudolf, Die Seligkeit erwählter Heiden bei Zwingli: Eine Untersuchung zu seiner Theologie (Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag 1952)

Pfister, Rudolf, Um des Glaubens Willen: Die evangelischen Flüchtlinge von Locarno und ihre Aufnahme zu Zurich im Jahre 1555 (Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag AG. 1955)

Pfister, Rudolf, 'Die Reformationsgemeinde Locarno, 1540-1555', Zwa 10:3 (1955/1), 161-81

Pfister, Rudolf, 'Reformation, Türken und Islam', Zwa 10:6 (1956/2), 345-75


Picot, Jacques, 'La famiglia di Scipione Lentolo', BSSV 100 (1956), 66-7


Pirnat, Antal, Die Ideologie der Siebenbürger Antitrinitarier in den 1570er Jahren (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1961)


Pirnat, Antal, 'Per una nuova interpretazione dell'attività di Giorgio Biandrata', in Klaniczay, Rapporti veneto-ungheresi, pp.361-71

Plath, Uwe, Calvin und Basel in den Jahren 1552-1556 (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag 1974)

Plath, Uwe, 'Der Streit um C.S. Curiones <<De amplitudine beati regni Dei>> im Jahre 1554 in Basel', in Erésia e Reforma, pp.271-81

Plath, Uwe, 'Sebastiani Castellionis annotationes ad Johannis Calvini Institutiones Christianae Religionis anno 1553 excusas', BHR 37 (1975), 87-98
Bibliography


‘Predicanti italiani in Valtellina e nei Grigioni’, *Archivio storico lombardo* 29 (1902), 469-70

Prosperi, Adriano, ‘Preghiere di eretici: Stancaro, Curione e il Pater noster’, in *Querdenken*, pp.203-221

Prosperi, Adriano, ‘Un gruppo-eretico italo-spagnolo: La setta di Giorgio Siculo (secondo nuovi documenti)’, *Critica Storica* 19 (1982), 355-51

Rageth, Simon, and Oskar Vasella, ‘Die Autobiographie des Täufers Georg Frell von Chur’, *Zwa* 7:7 (1942/1), 444-69

Ricca, Paolo, ‘Zwingli tra i Valdesi’, *Zwa* 16:3 (1984/1), 247-63

Rosius de Porta, Petrus Domenicus, *Dissertatio Historico Ecclesiastica qua ecclesiarum colloquio vallis Praegalliae et comitatus Clavennae olim comprehensarum reformatio et status, ex documentis authenticis maximum partem anecdotis exponitur* (Chm: Jakob Otto 1787)

Rosius de Porta, Petrus Domenicus, *Historia Reformationis ecclesiarum Raeticarum*, 2 vols in 4 pts (Chm / Chur and Lindau 1771/77)

Rossi, Paolo, *Giacomo Aconcio* (Milan: Fratelli Bocca Editori 1952)

Rotondò, Antonio, ‘Per la storia dell’eresia a Bologna nel secolo XVI’, *Rinascimento* 13 (1962), 107-54


Rotondò, Antonio, ‘Calvino e gli antitrinitari italiani’, *RSI* 80 (1968), 759-84, republished in *Studi e ricerche*, pp.57-86

Rotondò, Antonio, ‘Sulla diffusione clandestina delle dottrine di Lelio Sozini 1560-1568 (Risposta a Jerome Friedman)’, in *Studi e ricerche*, pp.87-116

Rotondò, Antonio, ‘Pietro Perna e la vita culturale e religiosa di Basilea fra il 1570 e il 1580’, in *Studi e ricerche*, pp.273-391


Rotondò, Antonio, ‘Anticristo e Chiesa romana: Diffusione e metamorfosi d’un libello
antiromano del Cinquecento’, in idem, Forme e destinazione, pp.19-164


Rozzo, Ugo, ‘Nuovi contributi su Bernardino Ochino’, BSSV 146 (1979), 51-83


Ruffini, Francesco, Studi sui riformatori italiani (Turin: Edizioni Ramella 1955)

Sanders, Paul, ‘Heinrich Bullinger et le <<zungliansime tardif>> aux lendemains du <<Consensus Tigurinus>>, in Das Reformierte Erbe, 1, pp.307-23

Schelhorn, Johann Georg, Ergöstlichkeiten aus der Kirchenhistorie und Literatur, 3 vols (Ulm and Leipzig: Bartholomäische Handlung 1764)


Schiess, Traugott, ‘Die Beziehungen Graubündens zur Eidgenossenschaft, besonders zu Zürich, im XVI. Jahrhundert’, Jahrbuch für Schweizerische Geschichte 27 (1902), 29-183


Schiess, Traugott, ‘Briefe aus der Fremde von einem Zürcher Studenten der Medezin (Dr. Georg Keller)’, Neujahrsblatt herausgegeben von der Stadtbibliothek Zürich 262 (1906), 1-38


Schmidt, C., Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften (Elberfeld: Verlag von R.L. Friderichs 1858)

Schnyder, Werner, Aus der Geschichte des Zürcher Seidenhandels (Zurich: Buchdruckerei
Bibliography

a.d. Sihl AG 1944)

Schnyder, Werner, Handel und Verkehr über die Bündner Pässe im Mittelalter zwischen Deutschland, der Schweiz und Oberitalien, 2 vols (Zurich: Schulthess Polygraphischer Verlag 1973/5)

Schucan, Luzi, 'Der Brief Antonio Besozzis an Theodor Zwinger I: Ein Nachtrag', Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde 72 (1972), 319-22

Schulthess, Hans, Die von Orelli von Locarno und Zürich: Ihre Geschichte und Genealogie (Zurich: Schulthess & Co. 1941)

Schulthess, Hans, Bilder aus der Vergangenheit der Familie von Muralt in Zürich (Zurich: Buchdruckerei Schulthess & Co. AG 1944)


Schwarz, Brigitte, 'Ferdinand Meyer e la Riforma a Locarno', BSSV 178 (1995), 172-81


Seidel Menchi, Silvana, 'Le traduzioni italiane di Lutero nella prima metà del Cinquecento', Rinascimento 17 (1977), 31-108


Simoncelli, Paolo, 'Inquisizione romana e Riforma in Italia', RSI 100 (1988), 5-125


Staedtke, Joachim, 'Der Zürcher Prädestinationsstreit von 1560', Zwa 9:10 (1953/2), 536-46


333
Staedtke, Joachim, *Die Theologie des jungen Bullinger* (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag 1962)

Staedtke, Joachim, ‘Drei umstrittene Traktate Peter Martyr Vermiglis’, *Zwa* 11:8 (1962/2), 553-4


Stella, Aldo, ‘Utopie e velleità insurrezionali dei filoprotestanti italiani (1545-1547)’, *BHR* 27 (1965), 133-82


Tedeschi, John (ed.), *Italian Reformation Studies in Honor of Laelius Socinus* (Florence: Le Monnier 1965)

Tedeschi, John, ‘The Cultural Contributions of Italian Protestant Reformers in the Late Renaissance’, *Schifanoia* 1 (1986), 127-51


Bibliography

Trechsel, F., *Die Protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socin*, 2 vols (Heidelberg: Universitätsbuchhandlung von Karl Winter 1839/44)


Truog, Jakob Rudolf, *Die Pfarrer der evangelischen Gemeinden in Graubünden und seinen ehemaligen Untertanenlanden* (Chur: Druck von Sprecher, Eggerling & Co. [1935])

Truog, Jakob Rudolf, ‘Die Pfarrer der evangelischen Gemeinden in Graubünden und seinen ehemaligen Untertanenlanden (Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen)’, *JHGG* 75 (1945), 113-47


Tylenda, Joseph N., ‘Christ the Mediator: Calvin versus Stancaro’, *CTJ* 8 (1973), 5-16

Tylenda, Joseph N., ‘The controversy on Christ the Mediator: Calvin’s second reply to Stancaro’, *CTJ* 8 (1973), 131-57

Tylenda, Joseph N., ‘Girolamo Zanchi and John Calvin: A Study in Discipleship as Seen Through Their Correspondence’, *CTJ* 10 (1975), 101-41


Venema, Cornelis P., ‘Heinrich Bullinger’s Correspondence on Calvin’s Doctrine of Predestination 1551-1553’, *SCJ* 17 (1986), 435-50

Vischer, Lukas, ‘Girolamo Zanchi, reformierter Prediger in Chiavenna’, *BM* (1951), 289-301

Vischer, Lukas, ‘Friedrich von Salis’, *BM* (1952), 329-57


335
Vischer, Lukas, ‘Die Abendmahlschwierigkeiten in Chiavenna’, *BM* (1956), 268-78


Von Liebenau, T., ‘Della chiamata a Locarno di Bernardino Ochino’, *Bollettino storico della Svizzera italiana* 12 (1890), 30


Von Wyss, G., ‘Josias Simler’, *XVII Neujahrsblatt zum Besten des Waisenhauses in Zürich* (1855), 1-24

Walder, Ernst, ‘Pier Paolo Vergerio und das Veltlin 1550’, *Schweizer Beiträge zur allgemeinen Geschichte* 3 (1945), 229-46

Walder, Ernst, *Der Condottiere Walter Roll von Uri und die Beziehungen zwischen der Innenschweiz und Italien in der Wende zur Gegenreformation 1551-1561* (Bern: Buchdruckerei H. Möschler 1948)

Walser, Peter, *Die Prädestination bei Heinrich Bullinger im Zusammenhang mit seiner Gotteslehre* (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag 1957)

Weisz, Leo, ‘Johann von Muralt, der siebenbürgische Hofarzt’, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (14, 15 and 16 August 1929)

Weisz, Leo, ‘Bernardino Ochino in Zürich’, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (14 and 15 March 1935)


Welti, Manfred E., *Kleine Geschichte der italienischen Reformation* (Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn 1985)


Wendland, Andreas, ‘Republik und <<Untertanenlande>> vor dem Veltlineraufstand (1620)’, *BM* (1990), 182-213

Wendland, Andreas, *Der Nutzen der Pässe und die Gefährdung der Seelen: Spanien, Mailand und der Kampf ums Veltlin (1620-1641)* (Zurich: Chronos-Verlag 1995)

Wenneker, Erich, ‘Heinrich Bullinger und der Gantnerhandel in Chur (1570-1574)’, *Zwa* 24 (1997), 95-115


Williams, George Huntston, ‘Camillo Renato (c.1500-1575)’, in *Italian Reformation Studies*, pp.103-83


Willis, David, ‘The Influence of Laelius Socinus on Calvin’s Doctrines of the Merits of Christ and the Assurance of Faith’, in *Italian Reformation Studies*, pp.231-41

Wotschke, Theodor, ‘Christoph Thretius: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kampfes der reformierten Kirche gegen den Antitrinitarismus in Polen’, *Altpreußische Monatsschrift* NF 44 (1907), 1-42, 151-210

Wotschke, Theodor, *Geschichte der Reformation in Polen* (Leipzig: Verein für Reformationsgeschichte durch Rudolf Haupt 1911)

Zimmermann, Georg Rudolf, *Die Zürcher Kirche von der Reformation bis zum dritten Reformationsjubiläum (1519-1819) nach der Reihenfolge der Zürcherischen Antistes* (Zurich: S. Höhr 1878)

Zucchi, Giampaolo, ‘Contributi agli studi sulla giovinezza di Fausto Sozzini’, *BSSV* 130 (1971), 35-41

Zucchi, Giampaolo, ‘Di una lettera inedita di Nicolò Camogli (1581)’, *BSSV* 137 (1975), 15-20


Zucchi, Giampaolo, ‘Francesco Negri a Chiavenna e in Polonia’, *Clavenna* 17 (1978), 16-23

Zucchi, Giampaolo, ‘Notizie zu Bartolomeo Silvio nei Grigioni’, *Clavenna* 19 (1980), 61-9


Zucchi, Giampaolo, ‘*In coercendis haereticis*: L’esilio di Scipione Lentolo in Svizzera e il suo inedito epistolario (1567-1599)’, in *Studi politici in onore di Luigi Firpo*, 1, pp.525-42

Zürcher, Christopher, *Konrad Pelliikan's Wirken in Zürich 1526-1556* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag 1975)

III. WORKS OF REFERENCE


Dejung, Emanuel, and Willy Wuhrmann (eds), *Zürcher Pfarrerbuch 1519-1952* (Zurich: Kommissionsverlag Schulthess & Co. AG 1953)

*Dizionario biografico degli italiani* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana 1960-

Bibliography

Dünki, Robert, Pfarrbücher, Bürgerbücher und Genealogische Verzeichnisse im Stadtarchiv Zürich (Zurich: Stadtarchiv Zürich 1995)

Gagliardi, Ernst, and Ludwig Förrer, Katalog der Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Zürich II: Neuere Handschriften seit 1500, 5 vols (Zurich: Buchdruckerei Berichthaus 1931-82)

Geisendorf, Paul-F., Livre des habitants de Genève, 2 vols (Geneva: Droz 1957/63)

Historisch-biographisches Lexikon der Schweiz, 7 vols (Neuchâtel: Administration des historisch-biographischen Lexikons der Schweiz 1921-34)


Jenny, Rudolf, Handschriften aus Privatbesitz im Staatsarchiv Graubünden: Repertorium mit Regesten (Chur: Calven-Verlag 1974)

Len, Hans Jacob, Allgemeines Helvetisches / Eydgnôfisches / Oder Schweizerisches Lexikon, 20 vols (Zurich: Hans Ulrich Denzler 1747-65)


Staedtke, Joachim, Heinrich Bullinger Bibliographie: Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der gedruckten Werke von Heinrich Bullinger (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag 1972)


Theologische Realenzyklopädie (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter 1977-)

Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts, 24 vols (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann 1983-97)


Wackernagel, Hans Georg, Marc Sieber and Hans Sutter (eds), Die Matrikel der Universität Basel, 3 vols (Basel: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek 1956)
IV. DISSERTATIONS


Dalbert, Peter, ‘Bullinger und die Romanen italienischer Zunge’, (unpublished thesis, University of Zurich 1943)


