Gianmarco Braghi / Davide Dainese (eds.)

War and Peace in the Religious Conflicts of the Long Sixteenth Century

R

Academic Studies 89

V&R

V&R

Refo500 Academic Studies

Edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis

In co-operation with
Christopher B. Brown (Boston), Günter Frank (Bretten),
Barbara Mahlmann-Bauer (Bern), Tarald Rasmussen (Oslo),
Violet Soen (Leuven), Zsombor Tóth (Budapest),
Günther Wassilowsky (Frankfurt), Siegrid Westphal (Osnabrück)

Volume 89

REFORC CONNECTING ACADEMICS

Gianmarco Braghi / Davide Dainese (eds.)

War and Peace in the Religious Conflicts of the Long Sixteenth Century

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Table of Contents

Davide Dainese

Foreword

The relationship between violence and religion is ingrained in the history of humanity. To some degree the relationship can be found in every corner of the earth at any moment in time. Moreover, it presents itself in a multitude of forms – from sacrificial practice to the many faces of strict ascetic discipline and the ways in which it has been imposed or self-imposed. The shelves of historical-anthropological-religious libraries are loaded with studies on sacrifice, self-sacrifice, the concept of discipline, the act of disciplining, and the Dionysian and destructive vocation of the sacred. However, it is evident that this violent core of the religious, or, if you will, the sacred heart of violence, is manifest in the history of the three "great" Abrahamic monotheisms under the guise of war. This is clear to anyone seeking knowledge and understanding of the specificities of that exclusivist character inherent in any monotheism. Still, it is equally evident to those living within the "profane" sphere in our present-day marked by so-called religious global warming, or, more generally, to those raised in the school of post-World War II anti-militarism.

From a scholarly point of view – for centuries – the primary debates on the relationship between war and religion have essentially concerned two issues. These are the nature of war and its justification. Oceans of ink have been spilled exploring the two topics on their own, and recent scholarship has examined these issues and their corollaries at great length. Indeed, contemporary historiography is the product of its time. It is marked by two epochal events: the fall of the Berlin Wall and the territorial conflicts in Ex-Yugoslavia. In particular, the Balkan War was reflected in a historiographic sublimation of the return to war *tout court* in Europe – the continent still recovering from the injuries of the numerous "Gothic Lines" of World War II – and the correlated pain inflicted on age-old political, ethnic, and religious factors. Beginning from the 1990s, it is no coincidence that Western scholars – working off developments in intuitions first had by Natalie Zemon Davis[1] in her reflection on the French wars of religion[2] – gradually and subtly problematised religion's role in defining the nature of European conflicts. Today, we tend to distinguish

---

1 See N. Zemon Davis, "The Rites of Violence: Religious Riot in Sixteenth-Century France", *Past & Present* 59 (1973) 51–91.

2 See M.P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562–1629* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [2]2005), 2 and D. Crouzet, *Les guerriers de Dieu: La violence au temps des troubles de religion (vers 1525–vers 1610)* (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 1990), 507–25.

between holy wars and wars of/for faith. The former are generally understood as the crusades, and among these, we typically seek to separate those pitting Christians against non-Christians and those waged within Christianity itself.

That being said, when we examine holy wars in broader terms, not necessarily Christian, the second term is preferred: wars of/for faith. These are considered different from civil wars based on a confessional nature and, more specifically, from the wars linked to the Reformation. More generally, confessional wars are examined with specific analytical instruments according to whether they are intra- or inter-confessional conflicts. Recently, regarding the technical formulas of the German *Geschichtsschreibung*, some have proposed that *Konfessionsbildungskriege* (Christian confessions that were formed historically through the process of conflict) be distinguished from *Konfessionalisierungskriege* (i. e. conflicts between historically pre-established confessions).[3] In short, without delving into detail, it is clear how thick the lens of wartime violence through which we read the history of Christianity has become.[4] Although the decision to make war is not contemplated in the New Testament,[5] if we examine its historical vicissitudes – especially from the Milvian Bridge onward – Christianity must consider the so-called Islamic lesser *jihād*, the *jihād al sayf* , that is, of the sword, with contrition.

Concerning the relationship between war and justice, however, the main distinction must hold between the motivation for war as an event and the way in which war is conducted or concluded. The first issue is called *ius ad bellum*, while the second is *ius in bello*. *Ius ad bellum*, the right to go to war, is a legacy of Roman law. Like all of the ancient world, this is linked with the religious sphere – in Ancient Rome, there was a priestly *collegium*, the fetials, who were entrusted with this duty. Only during Augustus's time would it be possible to question the conditions of a just war based on its righteousness, thus employing the issue of *ius in bello*. The Thomistic paradigm *(auctoritas superioris – iusta causa – recta intentio)*, its crisis – from Bartolus of Saxoferrato to Balthazar Ayala – and its complicated rebirth with Hugo Grotius (a swan song at the end of the long iron century) complete a survey of which the Latin crusades are but one example among many.

---

3 For all these definitions, see the work of C. Mühling, *Die europäische Debatte über den Religionskrieg (1679–1714): Konfessionelle Memoria und internationale Politik im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV.* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2018), 23–5.

4 Previously, see at least A. von Harnack, *Militia Christi: Die christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1905), R.H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-Evaluation* (New York: Abington, 1960), A. Morisi Guerra, *La guerra nel pensiero cristiano dalle origini alle crociate* (Florence: Sansoni, 1963).

5 In addition, the words of Jesus in Matt 11:12 on the relationship between Christianity and violence are valid admonitions.

The current generation of scholars, who to various degrees have experienced the re-emergence of latent European belligerence, are fully aware of its legacy. It involves not only the violence of the regime of Christendom but, above all, its violent fragmentation, to borrow from the lexicon of the Italian translation of Mark Greengrass's volume *Christendom Destroyed*.[6] This is clear in particular when examining how the last twenty years of historiography on the Thirty Years' War – a conflict of an obviously religious nature – starts. The twenty-sixth Council of Europe Art Exhibition set up in Münster and Osnabrück in 1998 on the theme "1648: Krieg und Frieden in Europa", with the three volume catalogue published alongside under the direction of Heinz Schilling and Klaus Bußmann,[7] inaugurated a twenty-year study that has produced further evidence. I am referring to the inheritance of a common legacy and shared responsibility concerning the past – a past which forged modern political configurations from the flames of Lepanto on the one hand and in the mold of Lützen on the other. After all, recent historiography that focuses both on the wars of the so-called Euro-Western area (the wars of Italy, the French wars of religion, the Eighty Years' War, the Thirty Years' War, the Franco-Spanish conflict) and the hypothesis – more fluid in terms of space and time – of Europe as a melting pot of magmatic belligerent areas has significantly shifted the impression (which was dominant in the nineteenth century and for a large part of the twentieth century) that the Thirty Years' War was solely a religious or civil war in German territories. The historical face of the war today is not exclusively German, French, Swedish, Polish, Bohemian, Spanish, Dutch or even Christian. Instead, it is composed of all men and women in what Alois Dempf called *Reichsbewusstsein*, the conscience of belonging to a *sacrum imperium*.[8] Over and above any sense of citizenship, in the consciousness of the European historian who examines the seventeenth century there is a budding sensation of shared guilt and an imperative for critical thought.

Therefore, it is necessary to reflect on the religious; not only because the events of the last thirty years have unmasked the *naïveté* of each optimistic prophecy of secularisation, but also, more simply, to better understand the events of the age that this volume examines. Returning to the historiography of the Thirty Years' War, the focus on the genesis of the modern state, which puts religious phenomena in dialogue with issues concerning the nature or justification of conflict and then relegates it to the Machiavellianism/anti-Machiavellianism binary, has undoubtedly led to objective results. Specifically, I believe it has been decisive in understanding the multiple phases of the conflict, leading us to quite a clear periodisation. That

---

6 See M. Greengrass, *La cristianità in frantumi: Europa 1517–1648* (Rome/Bari: Laterza, 2017).

7 H. Schilling/K. Bußmann (ed.), *1648: Krieg und Frieden in Europa. Münster/Osnabrück 24.10.1998–17.1.1999* (3 vol.; Munich: Bruckmann, 1998).

8 A. Dempf, *Sacrum imperium: Geschichts- und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters und der politischen Renaissance* (Munich/Wien: Oldenbourg, [4]1973).

being said, one wonders if this suffices to explain its outbreak and conclusion in the face of wide-ranging and discordant alternative proposals found in the critical literature.[9] Historical-political scholars have skilfully employed improvements in the religious sciences to reach their goals. Still, they must not stop at an interpretive paradigm that dates back to the 1920s,[10] even if its source is the authoritative Friedrich Meinecke. And so, we arrive at the main goal of this volume: to shuffle the cards, problematise, provoke, and arouse novel reflection. This is the general framework in which to understand the selection of papers collected within.

Of course, the various contributions published in this volume contain a multitude of elements that cannot be simplified according to the classification proposed here in the introduction. Nevertheless, they will be grouped according to a scheme that focuses on common intent and similarity for purely illustrative purposes.

1. Issues of Lexicon and Method

The essays by Mark Greengrass, Graeme Murdock, and Jakub Koryl draw the reader's attention to issues of varying degrees of specificity – aimed at underlying questions and problems – that, in many respects, help familiarise the reader with at least some of the issues focused on in other contributions. Greengrass and Murdock can be incorporated into the debate on the role of religious fact in the conflicts throughout the overlong iron century. While it is true that every early modern historian has engaged with the actual relationship between religion and violence, it is equally true that, as a consequence of what Murdock states, the choice of wording in the historiographic discourse often ignores their contribution by precluding an understanding of the enduring roots of civil wars and international conflicts. After all, early modern historians have been cautious to engage with the theoretical aspects of such a debate. Religious history in particular – with its categories and instruments – has remained on the margins. Although the essays in this volume were presented at a conference in 2019 and could not foresee the current conflict between Russia and Ukraine, these observations could easily be extended to the dramatic events of recent months. In any case, Murdock's contribution represents a case study with a specific focus on the Geneva-Savoy conflict at the end of the sixteenth century. Furthermore, it draws attention to the complexity with which religious and political dimensions intertwine with a parallel historical issue (and

---

9 See D. Dainese, "Note sulla produzione storiografica recente intorno alla Guerra dei Trent'anni. Parte II: La trattatistica militare e le tendenze recenti", *CNS* 43 (2022) forthcoming.

10 See F. Meinecke, *Die Idee der Staatsräson in der neueren Geschichte* (Munich: Oldenbirug, ²1960).

historiographic, given the ample literature on the topic): the determination of borders.[11]

The work of Greengrass, on the other hand, is broader in scope. It concerns an analysis of the relationship between war and religion within a problem of greater importance: the periodisation of the concept of trust. By concentrating on the context – and historiographic dilemma – of the so-called French wars of religion, and through examination of the works of Montaigne and Brantôme, as well as popular perceptions (through judicial acts, testimonies, and propaganda), Greengrass invites the reader to focus – like Murdock – on the degrees of experience that are "imbricated with religion but not" naïvely "bounded by it" to discern what truly happened, the actual "broader historical changes" that occurred.

Jakub Koryl's essay has a different purpose. His attention focuses on complications of a methodological nature: the various lexical issues on tolerance. Following the scholarly activity catalysed in tandem with the seventeenth centenary celebration of the so-called Edict of Milan,[12] this topic has become of significant interest to historians of Christianity. Koryl convincingly shows that, before the era of John Locke – where Socinian christology played an important role – and later with Voltaire, the lexicon of tolerance did not significantly impact reflections on religious liberty. This was because "tolerance" had to do with a semantic horizon circumscribed by contexts of deviation and forbearance.

---

11 For the specific case of the Savoys, see B.A. Raviola, "Disciplinare la frontiera: L'acquisizione delle province di nuovo acquisto e la ridefinizione del confine orientale", in I. Massabò Ricci/G. Gentile/B.A. Raviola (ed.), *Il teatro delle terre: Cartografia sabauda tra Alpi e pianura* (Savigliano: L'artistica, 2006) 161–82; B.A. Raviola, *Lo spazio sabaudo: Intersezioni, frontiere e confini in età moderna* (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2007); B.A. Raviola, "De l'osmose à la séparation: La construction de la frontière entre la France et le Piémont-Savoie (XVIe–XVIIIe siècles)", *Cahiers de la Méditerranée* 81 (2010) 271–89; the bibliography essay B.A. Raviola, "Frontiere regionali, nazionali e storiografiche: Il caso italiano fra risultati acquisiti e nuove prospettive", in M.Á. Melon Jiménez *et al.* (ed.), *Fronteras e historia: Balance y perspectivas de futuro* (Gehsomp: Badajoz, 2014) 259–77; B.A. Raviola, "Storia di un dialogo in fieri?: Territori, frontiere, spazio regionale nella storiografia sui domini sabaudi", in B.A. Raviola/C. Rosso/F. Varallo (ed.), *Gli spazi sabaudi: Percorsi e prospettive della storiografia* (Rome: Carocci, 2018) 99–111. See also M. Scattola, "Guerra, confini, territorio tra Cinquecento e Seicento: Lo spazio logico dello stato moderno", in A. De Benedictis (ed.), *Teatri di guerra: Rappresentazioni e discorsi tra età moderna ed età contemporanea* (Bologna: Bup, 2010) 77–97.

12 See T. Canella, *Il peso della tolleranza: Cristianesimo antico e alterità* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2017); P. Van Nuffelen, *Penser la tolérance durant l'Antiquité tardive* (Paris: Cerf, 2018); D. Dainese/V. Gheller, *Beyond Intolerance: The Milan Meeting in AD 313 and the Evolution of Imperial Religious Policy from the Age of the Tetrarchs to Julian the Apostate* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018).

2.   The Elaboration of Wartime Memory

The essays by Rebecca Giselbrecht, Thomas Müller and Johannes C. Wolfart shed light on the difficulty of metabolising wartime memory. They do so in different ways and for dissimilar contexts. Giselbrecht and Müller's chronologies are, at the most, relatively close. The issue of the elaboration of the memory of war underlines a type of source long considered unconventional for the reconstruction of historical events, namely, to adapt a term from the study of council history, "reception".[13] The reception of war, in turn, impacts other issues and sources on which recent historiography – at least that related to the Thirty Years' War – has found particularly fertile ground. I refer to the so-called "Ego-dokumente/scritture personali/ego-documents/écriture du for privé". Over several decades, this concept has sought to understand and classify the typology of sources that deal with the voluntary or involuntary self-affirmation of the "ego". But these problems also concern the creation of collective memory and, more generally, due to their involving the execution of violence, require specific procedures – the same that, among others, the late Hayden White cleverly studied and perfected.[14]

Rebecca Giselbrecht's essay fits into a polyphonic attempt – particularly in vogue in the last twenty years – to reinterpret or scale back the myth of Swiss neutrality within its historical context.[15] In particular, Giselbrecht's chapter seeks to fill the

---

13 See A. Grillmeier, "Konzil und Rezeption: Methodische Bemerkungen zu einem Thema der ökumenischen Diskussion der Gegenwart", *Theologie und Philosophie* 45 (1970) 321–52 and above all Y. Congar, "La 'réception' comme réalité ecclésiologique", *Revue de Sciences Philosophique et Théoogiques* 56/3 (1972) 369–403 and Y. Congar, "Reception as an Ecclesiological Reality", in G. Alberigo/A.G. Weiler (ed.), *Election and Consensus in the Church* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1972) 43–68; see also: C. Theobald, *La réception du Concile Vatican II* (2 vol.; Paris: Cerf, 2009); G. Routhier, *La réception d'un concile* (Paris: Cerf, 1993) and G. Routhier, *Vatican II: Herméneutique et réception* (Montreal: Fides, 2006).

14 See H. White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) and the essays in the volumes H. White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987) and H. White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), as well as the Italian series edited by E. Tortarolo, *Forme di storia: Dalla realtà alla narrazione* (Rome: Carocci, 2006).

15 See A. Holenstein, "L'enjeu de la neutralité: Les cantons suisses et la guerre de Trente Ans", in J.-F. Chanet/C. Windler (ed.), *Les resources des faibles: Neutralités, sauvegardes, accomodements en temps de guerre (XVIe-XVIIIe siècle)* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2010) 47–61 and A. Holenstein/G. von Erlach/S. Rindlisbacher (ed.), *Im Auge des Hurrikans: Eidgenössische Machteliten und der Dreissigjährige Krieg* (Baden: Hier und Jetzt, 2015). See also: V. Villiger/J. Steinauer/D. Bitterli, *Les chevauchées du colonel Koenig: Un aventurier dans l'Europe en guerre 1594–1647* (Fribourg: Faim de siècle, 2006); R.C. Head, *Jenatsch's Axe: Social Boundaries, Identity, and Myth in the Era of the Thirty Years' War* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2008); D. Tosato-Rigo (ed.), *La chronique de Jodocus Jost: Miroir du monde d'un paysan bernois au XVIIe siècle* (Lausanne: SHSR, 2009) –

gap concerning the role of women. She argues they were not only passive participants but actively engaged, even in wartime events, during the early modern age, thus contributing to the broader framework of the social history of the Reformation. Ultimately – and this is the most relevant aspect to such an account – Giselbrecht's essay reviews some of the legends and hagiographies of specific key female figures in the history of the Reformation in Switzerland to show how the multi-dimensional mythopoeia of the woman as a "beautiful soul" rests on complex and profoundly contrasting data. This reveals behaviour of an entirely different nature and appearance than previously considered.

As declared in its title, *The German Peasants' War (1524–5): Facts, Reception History and New Approaches*, Thomas Müller's essay focuses on this specific war, its context, its immediate, brief reception as well as its historiographic interpretation (concerning the so-called Bundschuh conspiracy and the uprising of the Armer Konrad) and later occurrences in the German attempts to construct identity between 1945 and Germany's reunification. The Peasants' War, whose fifth centenary is nearing, held great promise from the outset for prolific re-use and multi-form historicisation. This was due to the contemporary development of print media at the time; indeed, it would be the first European uprising to pour fuel on the fire of the media revolution. Müller's essay is a necessary stepping stone within the framework of this volume, which is published almost on the eve of 2025.

Johannes Wolfart's work moves us into the final stages of the Thirty Years' War. Wolfart focuses on the siege of Lindau in 1647, which he examines in the specific light of siege literature. This genre, which has been poorly understood by religious studies and other perspectives that often classify it among eyewitness testimony, actually has much to tell us as a heuristic frame. Wolfart's decisive contribution lies in grasping the transformation of the perception of time – more than space – during sieges, of which the chronicle is a testimony. The usual scansion of time is suspended from the moment a siege begins until its end. The chronicles of the besieged, articulated in several different ways, then act as a surrogate.

3. Law History and Political History

With Ian Campbell's essay, we return to the philosophical and theological problem of justifying war, but from a novel perspective. It starts from two sets of sources that historiography has yet to dedicate sufficient attention to: the legacy of Duns Scotus

---

works that, if compared solely with A. Zurfluh, *Sebastian Peregrin Zwyer von Evebach: Eine sozio-kulturelle Biographie einer innerschweizerischen Kriegsmann im Dienste der Habsburger während des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (Zürich: Thesis Verlag, 1993), from the previous decade, reveal the extent to which the historiographic landscape has changed.

and the doctrines imparted in the Protestant (Lutheran or Reformed) universities. The aim of Campbell's research, of which the essay published here is but a fragment, is to fill a gap found mainly in English-language scholarship on the early modern age, especially in Britain. This gap concerns political science, which, absorbed primarily by the study of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, has long neglected the issue of just war. Despite a few crucial exceptions that have capitalised on the legacy of Frederick Russell[16] or on the history of international relations that has profited from the legacy of Roman Law,[17] the topic of just war has remained in many details neglected. Perhaps the most significant element of Campbell's research, besides the results in the specific field of intellectual history, lies in keeping alive observation on the effective social impact of academic thought on the early modern age. In this way, Campbell succeeds in advancing our understanding of a precise phenomenon: the cautious Christian enthusiasm about warfare, beyond the boundaries of the set of questions and answers provided by the Thomistic paradigm. Many efforts have been made in the last few decades to slow down the process of the secularization of the medieval system of law. Scholars tend to look at the sources of the historiographically mainstream early modern theorists. Campbell, on the contrary, widens the milieu to be considered in order to show that "nature and supernature were not so neatly divided as many historians of political thought have suggested".

The contribution from Volker Arnke continues in the area of law history, in this case with the examination of significant cases in the history of international relations. Although he investigates conflicts that lie slightly at the margins of this volume's chronology (1720), Arnke examines lengthy and entrenched dynamics in the history of the spread of the Reformation within the territories of the empire. His essay aims to show the effectiveness of the juridical, political, and institutional

---

16 See F. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975). I refer in particular to J.T. Johnson, *Ideology, Reason and the Limitation of War: Religious and Secular Concepts, 1200–1740* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975); J.T. Johnson, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War: A Moral and Historical Inquiry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981); J.T. Johnson, *The Quest for Peace: Three Moral Traditions in Western Cultural History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); J. Kelsay/J.T. Johnson (ed.), *Just War and Jihad: Historical and Theoretical Perspectives on War and Peace in Western and Islamic Traditions* (New York: GP, 1991). It is also true that especially after the war in the Balkans during the 90s more thought was dedicated to this theme. I wish to recall the tuning by N. Reinhardt, who edited in 2014 a monographic issue of the *Journal of Early Modern History* on just war: see N. Reinhardt, "Introduction: War, Conscience, and Counsel in Early Modern Catholic Europe", *Journal of Early Modern History* 18/5 (2014) 435–46. I have listed a more recent bibliography in my D. Dainese, "Note sulla produzione storiografica recente intorno alla Guerra dei trent'anni. Parte I. Il 1998 come 'turning point'", *CNS* 43 (2022) 133–87 and Dainese, "Guerra dei trent'anni. Parte II".

17 To give one name among many, B. Straumann, *Roman Law in the State of Nature: The Classical Foundations of Hugo Grotius' Natural Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). Straumann tackles this issue through the lens of Grotius.

instruments implemented in the treaties of Münster and Osnabrück for defusing potential conflicts. Arnke's essay fits within the context of historiographic discussions that, especially in the last two decades, have scaled back the idea of an immediate Westphalian settlement or Westphalian system in which the political and the religious sphere would be separated at some point.[18] On the contrary, the balance of powers after Westphalia still required an empire that was supposed to remain holy – and in a threefold sense: Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist. This is not to say that the Peace of Westphalia does not mark an important milestone of periodisation. Indeed, Arnke's contribution clearly makes this point: previously, situations of conflict led to warlike outcomes; later they led to political solutions.

4.   Historical-Religious Themes

An essay concerning aspects of Bolognese history is a necessary complement to a volume publishing the acts of an international conference held in Bologna. Angela De Benedictis's essay examines four case studies in a time frame opening with uprisings in Bologna (1510–52) and closing at the end of the 1600s (Castiglione delle Stiviere). De Benedictis's research, of which the right to self-defence has been a focal point for decades, has already devoted significant consideration to the political and juridical thought underlying citizen uprisings and revolts, paying particular attention to the Italian context.[19] In this essay, her analysis shows the role that churches (or convents, in the case of Mondovì) played as hubs for insurgents. The essay points to historical-political/historical-juridical issues and examines the impact on areas which are significant in particular for historical/anthropological-religious

---

18 This orientation continued to be seen as late as 1998. In German-language contexts, Johannes Burkhardt was particularly vocal about proposing a rereading of the peace in a "conservative" sense; that is, its purpose was to provide the empire with a kind of constitution, hence the idea of the electors as substantial remnants of a die-hard Christendom. This idea reappeared in two volumes by A. Gotthard, *Säulen des Reiches: Die Kurfürsten im frühneuzeitlichen Reichsverband* (Husum: Matthiesen, 1999) and was then developed in later studies. English-language historiography aligns with this view, mainly from Derek Croxton onward, see. D. Croxton, *Peacemaking in Early Modern Europe: Cardinal Mazarin and the Congress of Westphalia, 1643–1648* (Selingsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1999) and especially with D. Croxton, *Westphalia: The Last Christian Peace* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). For a more updated view on the topic of the Peace of Westphalia, see C. Kampmann/M. Lanzinner/M. Rohrschneider, "Von der Kunst des Friedenschließens", in C. Kampmann *et al.* (ed.), *L'art de la paix: Kongresswesen und Friedensstiftung im Zeitalter des Westfälischen Friedens* (Münster: Achendorff, 2011) 9–28, on p. 16–19 and, more generally, Dainese, "Guerra dei trent'anni. Parte II".

19 See in particular A. De Benedictis, *Neither Disobedients nor Rebels: Lawful Resistance in Early Modern Italy* (Rome: Viella, 2018)

scholarship. Indeed, in recent years we have witnessed countless revisitations of the works of the great masters of religious history and sociology in terms of the relationship between space and the sacred, from a multitude of perspectives, and with contrasting results. This is evidenced in reinterpretations of Émile Durkheim,[20] Mark Bloch,[21] Mircea Eliade,[22] and Jonathan Smith.[23] It is also seen in more elusive intellectual figures such as Max Weber[24] and Henri Lefebvre.[25] By and large, there seems to have been a shift in the concept of sacred space. The approach to the concept of space has re-articulated historical-architectural sensitivities, beginning from the valorisation of space both as a fluid, multidimensional, social construct – reflecting and conditioning its occupants – and as a source for understanding liturgical and ritual dimensions.[26] The value of the church as space, in De Benedictis's essay, if not liturgical, is at least highly symbolic as a space to legitimise claims that, despite being theorised in Giovanni da Legnano's *De Bello*, were anything but taken for granted in the seventeenth century.

The concluding essay in this historical-religious thematic framework is Fabrizio D'Avenia's chapter on the hagiographic text of the Dominican theologian Domenico

---

20 É. Durkheim, *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse: Le système totémique en Australie* (Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1912). This is also the case, if you consider in particular the reception of Durkheim in M. Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1925) and in M. Halbwachs, *La mémoire collective* (Paris: Les presses universitaires de France, 1950); for an introduction, see M. Jaisson, "Temps et espace chez Maurice Halbwachs (1925–1945)", *RHSH* 1 (1999) 163–78 and in the German-speaking world in L. Bauer/K. Hamberger, *Gesellschaft Denken: Eine erkenntnistheoretische Standortbestimmung der Stozialwissenschften* (Wien/New York: Springer, 2002).

21 Consider the legacy of Marc Bloch in G. Le Bras *L'église et le village* (Paris: Flammarion, 1976) – a work that includes and elaborates on Bloch's seminal notions of religious and rural history.

22 M. Eliade, *Das Heilige und das Profane* (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1957). Despite the specificity of Eliade's categories, I believe it is especially relevant to consider the clear-cut distinction between profane space and sacred space as a qualitative difference between Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometries respectively.

23 J.Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

24 I refer to the volume dedicated to the city, here reported in the edition from Max-Weber-Gesamtausgabe: M. Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Die Stadt* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

25 H. Lefebvre, *Production de l'espace* (Paris: Anthropos, 1974). On Lefebvre specifically, see Ł. Stanek, *Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research, and the Production of Theory* (London/Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

26 My perspective owes much to the research of Jörg Rüpke. For a general overview, see J. Rüpke, "Religiöses Handeln: Kommunikation mit göttlichen Mächten", in C. Hattler (ed.), *Imperium der Götter: Isis, Mithras, Christus. Religionen im römischen Reich* (Karlsruhe/Darmstadt: Badisches Landemuseum/Wissenschftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2014) 32–9. For an overall theoretical overview, see J. Rüpke, *Pantheon: A New History of Roman Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018), 1–23.

Maria Curione d'Asso entitled *Il glorioso trionfo della sacrosanta religion militare di S. Giovanni Gierosolimitano* (1619). D'Avenia's contribution fits within a historiographic setting that has garnered much attention in Italy in the last few years thanks to the Research Project of Relevant National Interest coordinated by Vincenzo Lavenia at the University of Bologna which focuses on the issue of sacrifice in the Europe of the religious conflicts and in the early modern world. In Curione's treaty studied by D'Avenia, the Knights of the Order of St John (later of Malta) were portrayed in terms of their religious fidelity and military value, which went as far as to include martyrdom. However, this sacrifice silenced the actual behaviour of men whose religious practice was often inadequate. The narrative strategies of this work are set within the context of the coeval literature on the crusades and the "Christian soldier". They include the hagiographic reconstruction of the origins and development of the Order, the providential interpretation of military victory/defeat, the stereotyped portrayal of the "barbarous" infidel, complaints about internal divisions of Christianity against the Turks, and the urgent call to reconquer the Holy Land.

Mark Greengrass

Wars of Religion in the Sixteenth Century and the Problem of Trust

Trust was a problem central to the Reformation. The history of trust, however, is in the process of being written, and some would argue that it is such an omnipresent social reality, an ahistorical plurivalence of human existence, that it is a "concept too many".[1] That has not prevented it from attracting sustained and sophisticated theoretical attention from sociologists and political scientists.[2] It is seen as the distinguishing mark of modernity and its social complexity. Without it, says Niklas Luhmann, we would not be able to get up in the morning.[3] Money, credit, information and the media, legitimate political authority, our prosperity and sense of wellbeing all depend on "trust systems"[4] embedded in markets and regulatory frameworks, underpinned by a rational belief that others have a stake in our own welfare, and "trust networks"[5] such as family ties, religious groups, trade diasporas, patron-client relationships, and local communities.[6] These reflections remind us that there were merchants in Augsburg, Lisbon, Genoa and elsewhere in the sixteenth century who were busy conducting trade at a distance, sometimes globally, on the basis of mechanisms of trust so far-flung that they must have seemed strange and suspicious to most of their contemporaries.[7] Ordinary people were more exposed to instruments of credit closer to hand, where bankruptcy and usury

---

1 T.W. Guinnane, "Trust: A Concept Too Many", *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeshichte/Economic History Yearbook* 46/1 (2005) 77–92.

2 L. Kontler/M. Somos (ed.), *Trust and Happiness in the History of European Political Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 1–12, esp. 3; H. Ziegler, *Trauen und Glauben: Vertrauen in der politischen Kultur des Alten Reiches im Konfessionellen Zeitalter* (Stuttgart: Didymos-Verlag, 2017), 7–32.

3 N. Luhmann, *Trust and Power* (Chichester: Wiley & Sons, 1979), 4.

4 Luhmann, *Trust and Power*.

5 C. Tilly, *Trust and Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

6 Luhmann, *Trust and Power*; Tilly, *Trust and Rule*; see also F. Fukuyama, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1995); B. Misztal, *Trust in Modern Societies* (Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 1996); R. Hardin, *Trust and Trustworthiness* (New York: Sage, 2002); U. Frevert, V*ertrauensfragen: Eine Obsession der Moderne* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2013).

7 F. Trivellato, *The Familiarity of Strangers: The Sephardic Diaspora, Livorno, and Cross-Cultural Trade in the Early Modern Period* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2009), but the evidence is from the eighteenth century, G. Calafat, "Familles, réseaux et confiance dans l'économie de l'époque modern: Diasporas marchandes et commerce intercultural", *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 66/1 (2011) 513–31.

posed trust as moral and legal issues. There is some evidence that such ordinary fiduciary trust was becoming more problematic in the sixteenth century, and that magistrates were aware of it.[8] The French judge Gabriel Bounyn from Châteauroux, for example, was particularly concerned about the erosion of charity, piety and good neighbourliness through declarations of bankruptcy.[9] He sought to uphold punishments of public shame (such as the wearing of a green cap or being pilloried with one's trousers pulled down) for those found unable to meet their debts.[10] We should certainly bear in mind the emergence of new media – the commercialisation of printing, the marketing of news and information, and the cacophony of conflicting voices from pulpits, pedlars, songsters and street-corners – that sixteenth-century religious divisions energised. That cacophony generated issues of trust since it was not evident how much one could believe of all one heard, saw, and (if literate) read. Ideology fostered the forces of persuasion, propaganda, and misinformation, but it also nurtured the wellsprings of distrust and dissent.[11] Even in the world of learning and scholarship, the humanist emphasis on particularity was not only creating "too much to know" but also weakening the mechanisms for verifying it.[12] Humanist philology undermined the trust one could place in an inherited textual tradition. Reading to oneself rather than aloud weakened the cardinal relationship of trust between what someone said and what they held to be true. And the religious changes of the sixteenth century sit astride Daniel Jütte's "age of secrecy",[13] in which arcane knowledge was believed to be capable of unlocking the hidden powers of God's universe. But could one trust the "professors of secrets", the guardians of alchemical wisdom, of medical arcana, of cryptography, of technological and military inventions, especially when they seemed so often to occupy that perilous space in

---

8 M. Häberlein, "Merchants' Bankruptcies, Economic Development and Social Relations in German Cities During the Long Sixteenth Century", in T.M. Safley (ed.), *The History of Bankruptcy: Economic, Social and Cultural Implications in Early Modern Europe* (London/New York: Routledge, 2013) 19–33; C. Muldrew, "Zur Anthropologie des Kapitalismus: Kredit, Vertrauen, Tausch und die Geschichte des Marktes in England, 1500–1750", *Historische Anthropologie* 6/2 (1998) 167–99.

9 G. Bounyn, *Traité sur les cessions et banqueroutes* (Paris: Chevillot, 1586).

10 J.-L. Thireau, "Le premier ouvrage français sur le droit des affaires: le *Traité sur les cessions et banqueroutes* de Gabriel Bonyn (1586)", *Mémoires de la société pour l'histoire du roit et des institutions des anciens pays bourguignons, comtois et romands* 65 (2008) 195–210.

11 A. Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); U. Rublack (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Protestant Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), part III.

12 A. M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2010); A. Johns, "Identity, Practice, and Trust in Early Modern Natural Philosophy", *The Historical Journal* 42/4 (1999) 1125–45.

13 See D. Jütte, *The Age of Secrecy: Jews, Christians, and the Economy of Secrets, 1400–1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015).

Christendom between Christians and Jews? Old-established practices protecting artisanal secrets may well have been breaking down as a result of a closer proximity between theoretical and practical cultures of knowledge; but secrecy was becoming hard-wired into the information-gathering activities and governing practices of Renaissance states.[14]

Humanist pedagogy had begun to suggest that, although honesty and truthfulness were essential moral virtues, there were occasions in the modern world when self-control and circumspection were the order of the day. Erasmus frequently quoted from Plutarch's treatise *De garrulitate* to support his view that the tongue had recently become infected with a disease: "This deadly sickness of a malicious tongue has infected the whole world with its awful venom, pervading the courts of princes, the homes of commoners, theological schools, monastic brotherhoods, colleges of priests, regiments of soldiers, and the cottages of peasants" he told the chancellor of Poland in one of his less successful books, that on the uses and abuses of the tongue (*De Lingua*) in 1525.[15] In Claude Paradin's emblem book, the tongue is presented with the tail of a viper and the wings of a dragon: "Where are you going?" (*quo tendis*?) is the rhetorical question above the image.[16] Sixteenth-century moralists said that one had to learn not to take at face value what babblers and flatterers said, and to understand that there were occasions when one should keep silent.[17] The "lying tongue"[18] or "the tongue can no man tame; it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison"[19] became commonplaces of ecclesiastical rhetoric in both Protestant and Catholic Europe, to the extent that we might imagine that the Reformation, with its emphasis on credal statements to which one bound oneself by oral testimony reinforced the mistrust of the tongue, a linguaphobia.

In due course, Domingo de Soto and Martín de Azpilcuelta (Dr Navarrus), faced with the knotty issue of whether a confessor was bound to secrecy in what was revealed to him in the confessional, and whether or not he was required to reveal it to the Inquisition, would lay out the case for "mental reservation" and what Azpilcuelta claimed was a "new method" of casuistry. That offered distinctions

---

14 P.O. Long, *Openness, Secrecy, Authorship: Technical Arts and the Culture of Knowledge from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001); I. Iordanou, *Venice's Secret Service: Organizing Intelligence in the Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), ch. 1.

15 Cited in E. Butterworth, *The Unbridled Tongue: Babble and Gossip in Renaissance France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 15.

16 C. Paradin, *Devises heroïques* (Lyon: Jean de Tournes/Guillaume Gazeau, 1557), 109.

17 T. van Houdt, "Word Histories, and Beyond: Towards a Conceptualization of Fraud and Deceit in Early Modern Times", in T. van Houdt *et al.* (ed.), *On the Edge of Truth and Honesty: Principles and Strategies of Fraud and Deceit in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 1–31; see in the same collection, J. Trapman, "Erasmus on Lying and Simulation", 33-46.

18 Proverbs 6:28.

19 St Paul, Epistle to James 3:8.

between verbal and non-verbal strategies of not speaking the truth, the fine line between being a liar (*mendax*) and a deceiver (*fallax*), and the various ways of being economical with the truth (*simulatio*).[20] Such distinctions took on a new relevance and urgency in a polemical, and politically explosive, fashion in the wake of the arrival of the Jesuits Robert Southwell and Henry Garnett in England in 1586, and their advocacy of "mental reservation", a justification for English Catholics not to tell the truth when interrogated about the whereabouts and activities of missionary priests. In the visual register, explored by Stuart Clark, what we could see with our own eyes was becoming something that was not what it seemed. It belonged to the "vanities of the eye". Our eyes deceived us as much as our tongues. In some Protestant eyes, they were the engines of idolatry.[21]

Trust was, therefore, an ambient problem in the sixteenth century. But to view it as a badge of modernity is unhelpful if we want to understand its sixteenth-century Reformation context. We must let go of the notion of a firm dividing line between modern and pre-modern notions of trust that have been reinforced by the modernist agenda implicit in the history of emotions.[22] Trust was not "an invariant entity".[23] How it was conceived and problematised, and the institutional, social and cultural guarantees that were put in place to reinforce it (these two elements – perception and social reality – have to be considered conjointly) varied in time and space. Each age has its own trust lexicon, and its particular attempts to resolve the problems of trust through institutional, social and cultural initiatives. There are grounds for seeing the Reformation as raising a distinctive problem of trust even before the religious tensions which it provoked – the wars of religion – fomented it into an existential dilemma.

---

20 P. Zagorin, *Ways of Lying: Dissimulation, Persecution and Conformity in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), ch. 8; S. Tutino, *Shadows of Doubt: Languages and Truth in Post-Reformation Catholic Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), ch. 1.

21 S. Clark, *Vanities of the Eye: Vision in Early Modern European Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); C.M.N. Eire, *War against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); O. Christin, *Une révolution symbolique: L'iconoclasme huguenot et la reconstruction catholique* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1991).

22 G. Hosking, "Trust and Distrust: A Suitable Theme for Historians?", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 16 (2006) 95–115; G. Hosking, *Trust: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 23.

23 G. Hosking, "The Reformation as a Crisis of Trust", in I. Marková/A. Gillespie (ed.), *Trust and Distrust: Sociocultural Perspectives* (Charlotte, NC: IAP, 2008) 29–47.

1. The Protestant Reformation and Trust

What was distinctive in the problem of trust posed by the Protestant Reformation? The following remarks are no more than a summary of what most of its historians would sign up to. The medieval church claimed to offer a universal truth, and ways of accessing it that were adapted to local communities and orders of society. Its claims were sustained by appeals to verification by tradition, firm roots in rituals linked to the most important points in people's lives, and a reliance on lay "trustworthy men" (*viri fidedigni*) to be its wardens, pledges, and jurors.[24] The church was the treasury for God's grace, the priesthood the mediators of that treasure. And although that treasure was far off, the intermediacy of saints, the pursuits of monastic contemplation, and the attestation of miracles brought it closer. There were critics of abuses, and the church was always being invited to reform, both from within and without, but it was an essential trust-mechanism in salvation. The Protestant Reformers did more than turn up the volume of those criticisms. They recalibrated who and how we should trust. Luther's radical Augustinianism inspired a visceral detestation of human beings who could neither trust nor be trusted.[25] We say what we do not mean to; we do what we promise we will not do. In his notorious 1 May 1515 Gotha sermon on slander, he pours bucket-loads of excrement upon the person who disparages and belittles someone else behind their back. The sermon is notorious for Luther's scatalogy, descending from Latin into German at various points, interwoven with biblical allusions to drive home the point that human beings were fundamentally untrustworthy, "poisonous serpents, traitors, vagabonds, murderers, tyrants, devils, and all that is evil".[26] Against this fundamental human faithlessness, institutions are a fragile rampart. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, and in response to the trust issues raised in the post-Reformation religious tensions, Catholic scholastic theologians would distinguish between "faith" in a religious sense and "faith" in a social (trust between human beings), a moral (good and bad faith) and a contractual (fidelity in keeping promises and agreements) sense. The distinction is explicit in the Jesuit Martin Becanus's treatise on whether one was bound to keep faith with heretics.[27] But Luther –

---

24 I. Forrest, *Trustworthy Men: How Inequality and Faith Made the Medieval Church* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018).

25 St Augustine's view of trust is a potentially rich subject, waiting to be explored. J.E. Dittes, "Augustine: Search for a Fail-Safe God to Trust", *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 25/1 (1986) 57–63 provides some instances, and Augustine's treatises *De mendacio* and *Contra mendacium* were fundamental texts on the subject in the sixteenth century.

26 *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (120 vol.; Weimar: Böhlaus), vol. 55/1, 44–51.

27 M. Becanus, *Disputatio theologica an haereticis servanda sit fides?*, in *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2 (Mainz, 1614).

and the magisterial Protestant Reformers followed him here – did not make those distinctions. Human faithlessness is so overwhelming that, when he comes later on to explain justification by faith, he does so by saying that our trust (*fiducia*) in God is not of our own making but God's divine work in us, a blind trust – like that of a baby in its mother – and (unlike our fellow human beings) we could absolutely trust in God and his promises, contained in the Bible and guaranteed by Christ. This notion of *fiducia* is absolutely central to Luther's thought. One of the classic expositions of it was in his 1531 *Commentary on Galatians* in which he explained that our trust in God is a "kind of cognition or darkness that sees nothing … our formal righteousness is … faith and the cloud of heart, that is, trust in what we do not see – in Christ, who certainly is not seen, but still is present".[28] It is helpful to remind ourselves that this notion of "blind trust" was very difficult for contemporaries to come to terms with, just as was the accompanying rejection of the extra-biblical foundations for what we could take on trust. Those reactions came to be centrally about (in the Catholic context) reinforcing the trust that one could legitimately place in the inherited traditions and institutions and authority of the church. Calvin, accepting human faithlessness as a given, offered a model of the church as a human institution where mutual surveillance was hard-wired into it so that the community was a place where trust (*confiance* – Calvin's use of the word invests it with heightened religious connotations) could be nurtured, morally reinforced (*édifié*) against our inevitable backsliding and untrustworthiness. The failure of attempts to reunify Christendom, most notably at the Council of Trent, were themselves exemplifications of the existence of antagonistic theologies and ecclesiologies of trust and mutually opposing institutions for validating it. The often-polemical debates over the status of miracles, the mediation of saints and divine protectors, confession, the monastic life, the efficacy of various devotional rituals and the role of images – debates which form an *alla prima* background to the wars of religion – had trust as the central point at issue.[29]

The problem of trust thus became an existential dilemma in the post-Reformation. Could a ruler conclude a treaty with a heretic or an infidel? Exodus and Deuteronomy contained unambiguous statements that he could not, and the history of the Israelites in the Old Testament was strewn with disasters that befell kings that made military alliances with infidel rulers. Deuteronomy 7:4 warned that you should "make no covenant" with your neighbours lest they "turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods". In 2 Chronicles 16 and 1 Kings 15, King Asa allied with the king of Syria and God turned against him, whilst in 2 Kings 16 and

---

28 O.-P., Vainio, *Justification and Participation in Christ: The Development of the Lutheran Doctrine of Justification from Luther to the Formula of Concord (1580)* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 29–30.

29 M. Sluhovsky, *Believe not Every Spirit: Possession, Mysticism and Discernment in Early Modern Catholicism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

2 Chronicles 28 Ahaz "provoked to anger the Lord" by allying with another Syrian king. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?" St Paul asked the Corinthians, condemning alliances with heretics: "What communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?".[30] John Calvin was not alone in taking these strictures seriously. In his Commentary on Ezekiel 16:26 he confronted the issue head on. We should not trust ourselves to enter into close relationships with the impious, because it was a slippery slope (a favourite Calvin argument) to becoming ensnared in a labyrinth of infidelity.[31] But the real world made different, and contradictory, demands upon princes – to engage, for political reasons, in cross-confessional alliances and marriages, or to conclude treaties with the infidel Ottomans – that also dislocated the contiguity between faith and trust.[32] These alliances in turn became the focal points for polemical debates about trust. Should one conduct commerce with those of another faith? If one did, were the contracts valid and enforceable? These were pertinent questions, on which there were provisions in the Justinian legal code, legal commentaries in the *ius commune* tradition, and an inherited series of arguments from scholastic theologians to draw on. Wim Decock and Vincenzo Lavenia, specialists in unravelling for us how those traditions were drawn on in the post-Reformation context, have shown us how, gradually, the reality of religious pluralism seeped in.[33] Merchants had to be able to trust (in contractual terms) those of another faith, just as rulers had to be free to make alliances across the faith divide, as best suited their political objectives.

Could someone who dissimulated their beliefs be trusted? That question had a long Christian history behind it, and Calvin's two famous treatises on the subject[34] in the early 1540s served to crystallise the unambiguous response to it, and to give those who fail to be true to their faith a name: "nicodemites" (or rather "pseudo-nicodemites", as Calvin preferred to call them because, unlike their biblical namesake, they did not get to see Christ, even by night). They were "dissemblers"

---

30 2 Corinthians 6.

31 J. Calvin, *Commentary on the first twenty chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, trans. T. Meyer (2 vol.; Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1849), vol. 2, 128–9.

32 R. Tuck, "Alliances with Infidels in European Imperial Expansion", in S. Muthu (ed.), *Empire and Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) 61–83.

33 W. Decock, "Trust Beyond Faith: Re-Thinking Contracts with Heretics and Excommunicates in Times of Religious War", *Rivista Internazionale di Diritto Comune* 27 (2016) 301–28; V. Lavenia, "La *fides* e l'eretico: Una discussione cinquecentesca", in P. Prodi (ed.), *La fiducia secondo i linguaggi del potere* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2008) 201–18; V. Lavenia, "'Mendacium officiosum': Alberico Gentili's Ways of Lying", in M. Eliav-Feldon/T. Herzig (ed.), *Dissimulation and Deceit in Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2015) 27–44.

34 *Petit traicté monstrant que c'est que doit faie un homme fidele cognoissant la verité de l'evangile quand il est entre les papistes* (written 1540; published 1543); and the *Excuse à messieurs les Nicodémites sur la complainte qu'ilz font de sa trop grand rigueur* (1544).