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Editor's Introduction

Proponents of the "acculturation" thesis often adopt the perspective of everyday religious life in the parishes of Catholic Europe; but what did the process look like from the vantage of Rome? Peter Burke uses patterns of canonization in Counter-Reformation Europe to weigh the balance of forces in the centuries-long transaction between learned and popular religious cultures. He demonstrates that in the sixteenth century, this balance shifted decisively toward the centers of power: By 1625 or so, Rome had successfully imposed a papal monopoly over canonization. As in matters of "parochial discipline," moreover, the period was one in which the rules became stricter, and the standards of orthodoxy more exacting. Finally, the group characteristics of saints canonized during the Counter-Reformation have much to say about the dominant religious mentalities of the age. In contrast to earlier periods, this cohort included few martyrs and no theologians; nor can "heroic virtue" explain why some were canonized and others not. Instead, the Counter-Reformation church was most likely to honor the founders of new religious orders, missionaries, model bishops, and saints notable for their charitable works. Together, these roles described the church's main priorities; and although Burke does not pursue the point, his examples also suggest the important role that gender played in the construction of new religious identities. Finally, Burke's analysis also describes the church's loss and recovery of "nerve": Canonizations ceased abruptly in 1523; then no saints were canonized until 1588; from then on, canonizations resumed, but at a slow, highly regulated pace.
How to Become a Counter-Reformation Saint

Peter Burke

A volume concerned with the ideas of the sacred and the profane would hardly be complete without some consideration of those holy people, the saints. In any case, saints are well worth the attention of historians because they are cultural indicators. Like other heroes, they reflect the values of the culture which sees them in a heroic light. As western culture has changed over time, so have the kinds of people reverenced as saints: martyrs, ascetics, bishops, and so on. To complicate the story, the way in which saints are created has itself changed over the long term. It has always been the outcome of some sort of interaction between clergy and laity, center and periphery, learned culture and popular culture, but at various times the balance of forces has shifted towards the center. One of the periods in which this happened was the Counter-Reformation.

In the early church, sanctity was essentially an unofficial phenomenon, as it still is in Islam.¹ Some people became the object of cults after their deaths, and some of these cults spread outside their original locations. However, the process of saint-making gradually became more formal and more centralized. At the end of the eleventh century Pope Urban II emphasized the need for witnesses to the virtues and miracles of candidates for sanctity. In the thirteenth century Gregory IX formalized the rules of procedure in cases of canonization. It was the same Gregory IX who set up the tribunal of the Inquisition. This was no coincidence: Like a good lawyer, Gregory was concerned to define both saints and heretics, the opposite ends of the Christian scale. He used similar legal methods in both instances: trials. The trial for sanctity required witnesses; it required judges; and it required the notorious devil’s advocate, the equivalent of counsel for the prosecution.²

However, side by side with the formally canonized saints, defined by the center of religious authority, Rome, there survived informally chosen holy people, whose cult was local not universal and permitted not obligatory. It was a two-tier system, not unlike the dual structure of local and international trade. Holy people are not unique to Christianity. What does appear to be uniquely Christian, though, is the idea that saints are not only extremely virtuous people, but also efficacious mediators with God on behalf of the living; more powerful, more valuable dead than alive. This was, of course, an idea which came under fire at the Reformation. Erasmus, for example, pointed out that the veneration of the saints was “not a great deal different from the superstitions of the ancients,” such as sacrificing to Hercules or Neptune.\(^3\) Specific saints were identified with characters from classical myth: St George with Perseus, for example (since the cult of St George went back to “time immemorial,” he was exempt from the new strict verification procedures).

These criticisms worried the authorities, as can be seen from the discussion of the question of the saints at one of the last sessions at the Council of Trent. The fathers admitted that there had been abuses. However, the decree which emerged from the discussion reaffirmed the desirability of venerating the images and relics of the saints and of going on pilgrimage to their shrines. St George survived the criticisms of humanists and reformers and was not removed from the calendar till our own day. Changes were made, but they were limited ones.

In the first place, an attempt was made to emend the accepted accounts of the lives of the saints and to replace these accounts with something more reliable, judged by the criteria of humanist historical criticism. The most elaborate and systematic attempt at criticism and emendation was of course the work of the Bollandists in the seventeenth century, but the way had been shown by Erasmus himself in the life of St Jerome prefixed to his edition of Jerome’s works.\(^4\)

In the second place, the procedure for admitting new saints was tightened up. The last canonizations under the old regime were those of St Bruno (1514), St Francis de Paul (1519), St Benno and St Antonino of Florence (both 1523). There followed a hiatus of sixty-five years during which no more saints were canonized. It does not seem unreasonable to explain this hiatus in terms of a failure of nerve and to speak of a “crisis of canonization” at a time when, as we have seen, the very idea of a saint was under fire. In Lutheran Saxony, the canonization of St Benno

---

(a local worthy) was mockingly celebrated with a procession in which horses' bones figured as relics. On the other hand, the Protestants developed the cult of their own holy people, notably the martyrs to Catholic persecution. Thus the church authorities were placed in a dilemma. To create saints was to invite mockery, but to refrain from creating them was to yield the initiative in propaganda to the other side. The immediate response of the authorities was to do nothing. It was not until 1588, twenty-five years after the close of the Council of Trent, that saints began to be made again, starting with St Didacus, otherwise known as Diego of Alcala. There were only six formal canonizations in the sixteenth century, but there were twenty-four in the seventeenth century and twenty-nine in the eighteenth.

The revival of saint-making was accompanied by an increase in the central control of the sacred, or of the right to define the sacred. 1588 was not only the year of the elevation of St Didacus but also that of the setting up of the Congregation of Sacred Rites and Ceremonies, a standing committee of cardinals whose responsibilities included canonizations. A treatise of 1610 affirmed that "the authority to canonize saints belongs to the Roman pontiff alone." Saint-making procedures were made increasingly strict and formal by Pope Urban VIII in 1625 and 1634. The distinction between saints and the second-class beati was made sharper than it had been, and formal beatification was instituted. A fifty-year rule was introduced: in other words, proceedings for canonization could not begin until fifty years after the death of the candidate for sanctity. This was a break with tradition. Carlo Borromeo, for example, had been canonized only twenty-six years after his death, and Filippo Neri twenty-seven years after (in Filippo's case, the canonization process began within months of his death). The fifty-year rule was followed by another hiatus; there were no canonizations between 1629 and 1658. The final touches to the new system were added in 1734 by the canon lawyer Prospero Lambertini, later Benedict XIV.

7 I follow the list compiled by G. Löw from the archives of the Congregation of Rites, given in his article "Canonizzazione" in Enciclopedia Cattolica, 12 vols (Rome, 1948–54). Slightly higher figures are given elsewhere, possibly by adding non-formal canonizations.  
8 A. Rocca, De canonizatione sanctorum (Rome, 1610), p. 5.  
According to this system, sanctity was explicitly defined in terms of the Aristotelian-Thomist concept of a "heroic" degree of virtue. As for the procedures by which the possessors of this heroic virtue were recognized, they had become more "bureaucratic," in Max Weber's sense of the term. The distinction between sacred and profane was made sharper than it had been, while recruitment procedures for the saints were made uniform and formal. In the trials for sanctity, the supernatural was defined, graded, and labelled with increasing care. There was also an increase in the central control of the sacred, at the expense of local, unofficial, or "wildcat" devotions. A papal monopoly of saint-making had effectively been declared. At a time of centralizing monarchies, the next world was remade in the image of this one.

These changes still did not mean that unofficial saints disappeared altogether, for the new rules were not made retroactive and the status of some individuals remained ambiguous — that of the plague-saint Roche, for example. His cult had spread widely in the later fifteenth century and popes had authorized confraternities and masses in his name. The Venetians made his cult official at the time of the great plague of 1576, during the hiatus in canonizations already discussed. However, this cult was hardly from time immemorial, since Roche had lived in the fourteenth century. He was an awkward case, as the popes recognized. According to the Venetian ambassador, Sixtus V meant "either to canonise him or to obliterate him" (o di canonizzarlo o di cancellarlo), but in fact the pope died without having made his choice. Urban VIII authorized a special mass of St Roche, but even he, who defined so much, did not clear up the ambiguity of this saint's status.

Local cults not only continued but also sprang up. Some were simply premature honours paid to those whose canonization might reasonably be expected. In Milan, Carlo Borromeo was venerated before his canonization in 1610, and scenes from his life were displayed in the cathedral.


11 For a development of Weber's ideas on religious power and legitimacy which emphasizes the interaction between clergy and laity, see P. Bourdieu, "Une interprétation de la théorie de la religion selon Max Weber," *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, vol. XII (1971), pp. 3–21.

12 *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, 12 vols (Rome, 1961–70), s.v. "Rocco." Perhaps the most useful modern work of reference o the lives of saints.
In similar fashion, at Antwerp, Rubens painted scenes of the miracles of Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier about 1617, although the two men did not become saints officially until 1622. In 1631 the Venetians instituted an official cult of their former patriarch, Lorenzo Giustinian, who was not canonized until 1690.

Other unofficial saints were less conventional. In Castille, Luisa de Carrión, who died in 1636, was treated as a saint and as a miracle worker at court as well as in popular circles, although the Inquisition accused her of imposture and even witchcraft. In Naples, the fisherman turned rebel Masaniello was treated as a saint after his murder in summer 1647. The hair of the corpse was torn out for relics; his name was added to the litany (Sancte Musanalle, ora pro nobis); there were stories of his miracles and it was believed that he would rise again. Even in Rome itself, unofficial cults could still grow up. In 1648, for example, “in the monastery of the Quattro Coronati, a nun called Sister Anna Maria died with the reputation of a saint, and her body was exposed to public view for three days.” The Franciscan Carlo da Sezze, who died in 1670, had lived in Rome with the reputation of a saint and was consulted on occasion by Pope Clement IX.

However, people like this who died in the odor of sanctity could not be tried for fifty years, and if they failed, the cult would be suppressed. Many were examined, but few passed. There have been very few studies of the unsuccessful, despite the potential interest and importance of a historical sociology of failure. The remainder of this paper will, therefore, be concerned with the successful, the happy few, the fifty-five individuals canonized between 1588, when the practice was revived, and 1767, which was followed by another hiatus, this time of forty years.

---

14 A. Nero, “I santi padroni,” in S. Tramontin et al., Culto dei santi a Venezia (Venice, 1965), pp. 77-95.
16 Details and references in Peter Burke, “The Virgin of the Carmine and the Revolt of Masaniello,” Past and Present 99 (1983); 3–21.
19 For a full list from 1594 on, see Löw, “Canonizzazione,” cited n. 7 above.
That the prosopography of the saints might be of value for an understanding of Catholic society is no new idea. A number of historians and sociologists have studied the changing social origins and career patterns of the saints as indicators—or even indices—of social and cultural trends. They have pointed out the rise of martyrs in the sixteenth century and the rise of the middle class into sanctity in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

However, these historians and sociologists have not always been sufficiently conscious of a central problem of method, of the need to decide whether to treat the saints as witnesses to the values of the age in which they lived or the age in which they were canonized. In some cases, like those already mentioned of Carlo Borromeo and Filippo Neri, the problem is not acute, because they were canonized so quickly. On the other hand, several Counter-Reformation figures, now venerated as saints, received this title long after their deaths. John Berchmans, for example, died in 1621 and was canonized in 1888, while Peter Canisius died in 1597 but was not canonized until 1925. It is true that biographies of Canisius were published in 1614 and 1616 and that his beatification process lasted over 250 years, but if he is to be included as a Counter-Reformation saint, so should all those whose processes began in the period. They may, after all, be canonized one day. Conversely, among the saints canonized 1588–1767 were eight who died in the fifteenth century, six who died in the fourteenth century, four who died in the thirteenth century and one who died in the twelfth century.

Most students of the saints have assumed that they are witnesses to the age in which they lived. For a historian of mentalities, however, they have to be treated as witnesses to the age in which they were canonized; there is no other justification for confining oneself to this particular for-


21 These points are made by Sorokin and George.
mally defined group. It might also be worth looking at saints who were, one might say, "reactivated" in the period, but since the criteria for reactivation are not likely to be precise, it may be more useful, in this brief sketch, to concentrate on the newly canonized alone, with the fifty-five saints formally canonized between 1588 and 1767. It might have been worth adding the formally beatified, of which there were forty-three between 1662 and 1767 (twenty-four individuals and the collective beatification of the nineteen martyrs of Gorkum). However, sixteen of the individual beati were canonized later in our period, so the addition of this group would not affect the conclusions very much.

Since the total "population" of the saints is so much less than one hundred, precise statistics will be of little use, let alone percentages. In any case, too much emphasis has been placed on "objective" factors such as social origins and career patterns. As the Belgian sociologist Pierre Deloosz has remarked, the saints have to be studied as part of the social history of perception. The objective factors will, therefore, be discussed only briefly here.

What kind of person had the best chance, during the Counter-Reformation, of achieving this particular form of upward mobility? Men had better chances than women: there were forty-three males to twelve females in the group. Italians (twenty-six saints) and Spaniards (seventeen) had better chances than anyone else (twelve altogether, comprising four French, three Poles, two Portuguese, one German, one Czech and one Peruvian). Nobles had better chances of becoming saints than commoners. At least twenty-six of the fifty-five saints were of noble origin, including some from leading families like the Borjas and the Gonzagas, while Elizabeth of Portugal was of royal blood. There is little or no precise information about the social origins of a number of the saints, but at least five were of peasant stock, while two more worked for a time as shepherds (Pascual Baylón and John of God) and one as a ploughman (Isidore). As for the "middle classes," we know at least that John of the Cross was the son of a silk-weaver, Jean-François Régis the son of a merchant and Filippo Neri the son of a lawyer.

To have a good chance of becoming a saint it was better to be clerical than lay, and much better to be a member of a religious order than one of the secular clergy. Of our fifty-five individuals, only six were members of the laity (Isidore the ploughman, John of God, Francesca Ponziani, Elizabeth (Isabel) of Portugal, Caterina of Genoa and Margherita of Cortona), and of these, Margherita of Cortona was a

22 See Deloosz (or his contribution in Wilson, ch. 6) and Weinstein and Bell, Saints and Society, pt. 2.
23 Enciclopedia Cattolica, s.v. "Beatificazione."
member of the "third order" of Franciscans, while John of God is associated with the Brothers Hospitallers and Francesca Ponziani with the Benedictines. Three of the fifty-five were lay brothers, on the margin between the lay and clerical worlds: Pascual Baylón, Felice of Cantalice and Serafino of Montegranaro. The secular clergy account for another eight of the fifty-five, making seventeen altogether who were not full members of religious orders.

Of the thirty-eight remaining saints, the Franciscans have the largest share, with one nun (Caterina of Bologna) and seven friars (Diego of Alcalá, Pedro of Alcántara, Giovanni Capistrano, Giacomo della Marca, Francisco Solano, Pedro Regalado and Giuseppe of Copertino). Close behind came the Dominicans and the Jesuits. The Dominicans had three nuns (Rose of Lima, Agnese Segni and Caterina de' Ricci), and four friars (Hyacinth [Jacek], Raimondo Peñafort, Luis Bertrán and Michele Ghisleri, better known as Pope Pius V). There were six Jesuits canonized in the period: Ignatius Loyola, Francis Xavier, Francisco Borja, Aloysius (Luigi) Gonzaga, Stanislas Kostka and Jean-François Régis. Then came the Carmelites, with two nuns (Teresa of Avila and Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi) and two friars (Andrea Corsini and John of the Cross). The Servites had three saints: a nun, Giuliana Falconieri, and two friars, Filippo Benizzi and Pellegrino Laziosi. The capuchins had two saints, Fidelis of Sigmaringen and Giuseppe of Leonessa, not counting their two lay brothers, Felice and Serafino. The Theatines had two saints, Gaetano of Thiene and Andrea Avellino. There was one Benedictine (Juan of Sahagún), one Augustinian (Tomaso of Villanueva) and four saints who founded their own orders (Camillo de Lelis, Jeanne de Chantal, José de Calasanz and Girolamo Miani).

It is obvious enough that these fifty-five men and women were not a random sample of the Catholic population at large. However, the question remains, why these particular individuals achieved recognition rather than the many people of similar social background. It is not sufficient to say that they possessed "heroic virtue": it is also necessary to discover who saw them as virtuous. There are two places to look for the answer to this question: at the grass roots, where a particular cult grew up, and at the center, where it was made official.

To begin with the periphery. Delooz was surely right to view the problem of the saints as essentially one of collective representations, or the social history of perception. Some societies are, as he put it, "programmed" to perceive sanctity, while others are not. Italy and Spain were clearly programmed in this way. Saints were also perceived in stereotyped ways: there is a relatively small number of saintly roles, or

24 Delooz, Sociologie et canonisations. p. 179.
routes to sanctity. It may be useful to draw up a typology and distinguish five main routes or roles.

The first is that of the founder of a religious order. No fewer than twelve out of our fifty-five fall into this class. Francesca Ponziani founded the Benedictine Oblates; Teresa of Ávila the strict ("discalced") Carmelite; Ignatius Loyola founded the Jesuits. François de Sales and Jeanne de Chantal between them founded the Visitation nuns. Gaetano of Thiene was one of the founders of the Theatines. Vincent de Paul founded both the Congregation of the Mission and the Daughters of Charity. Camillo de Lelis founded the Camilliani, Girolamo Miani the Somaschi and José de Calasanz the Piarists. Filippo Neri is now regarded as the founder of the Oratorians, although he did not have a formal institution in mind, and, in a similar way, John of God may be described as the "posthumous founder" of the Brothers Hospitallers.

A second important road to sanctity was that of the missionary. Nine of our fifty-five fall into this class, if we include an organizer of missions, Tomaso of Villanueva. Diego of Alcalá was a missionary in the Canaries; Raimondo Peñaforo in North Africa; Francis Xavier in the Far East. Luis Bertrán and Francisco Solano both worked in Spanish America, in modern Colombia and in Peru respectively. Jean-François Régis tried to convert the Huguenots of the Cévennes, while Fidelis of Sigmaringen met his death on a mission to the Swiss. Giuseppe of Leonessa worked in Italy as well as outside Europe.

A third route to sanctity was that of charitable activity. There are seven obvious cases in the fifty-five, three women (Elizabeth of Portugal, Margherita of Cortona, Caterina of Genoa) and four men. Vincent de Paul's work among the galley-slaves is famous, and there was also John of God who worked among the sick in Granada; Camillo de Lelis; and José de Calasanz who set up schools for the poor.

A fourth route was that of the pastor, the good shepherd, with seven cases, of which the most famous is surely that of the model bishop of the Counter-Reformation, Carlo Borromeo, with François de Sales, Bishop of "Geneva" (actually based at Annecy), close behind. The others are Pope Pius V; Turibio, Archbishop of Lima; Patriarch Lorenzo Giustinian; Jan Nepomuk, said to have been murdered for refusing to divulge the secrets of confession; and Tomaso of Villanueva, Archbishop of Valencia, who overlaps with the missionary group.

The fifty and last main route was that of the mystic or ecstatic, subject to trances, levitation, and so on. Again there are seven obvious cases, four women and three men. The women were Teresa of Ávila (another overlap), Rose of Lima, Maria Maddalena de'Pazzi and Caterina de' Ricci, while the men were John of the Cross, Pedro Regalado and Giuseppe of Copertino. There were, of course, saints who did not fit any of these cat-
categories very well. Aloysius Gonzaga and Stanislas Kostka, for example, who were both Jesuit novices who lived ascetic lives and died young. Jan Kanty was a professor at Cracow. However, the five roles which have just been described seem the most important by far, although some omissions may seem surprising. These Counter-Reformation saints include no theologians, no equivalent of Thomas Aquinas (although Nicholas of Cusa was proposed for canonization). Equally surprising is the relative lack of martyr-saints, in a period in which many people (some of whom have been canonized subsequently) did die for the Catholic faith, a period which did also reanimate the cult of the martyrs of the early church (encouraged by the discovery of the Roman catacombs at the end of the sixteenth century). Jan Nepomuk and Fidelis of Sigmaringen fall into the martyr category, while the nineteen martyrs of Gorkum, executed by the Calvinists, were beatified in 1675. That other martyrs were unofficially regarded as saints seems likely. A historian of the mission to Japan remarked that “pour obéir au decret du Pape Urbain VIII, je déclare que s’il m’arrive de qualifier de Saints et de Martyrs ceux qui ont souffert la mort dans le Japon, je ne prétends point prévenir le jugement du Saint Siège: mais j’entends par le nom de Saints, des personnes signalées en vertu . . .”25 Was this a case of reluctant obedience?

The clustering of our fifty-five saints around five roles suggests that a key factor in the imputation of sanctity to an individual is the “fit” between his or her career and the best-known stereotypes of sanctity. The process is, of course, circular or self-confirming. There are few lay saints, for example, because the stereotypes are biased in favour of the clergy and the stereotypes are biased partly because the clergy form the majority of saints. Individuals are matched with roles. They are perceived as similar to individuals who have already been recognized as saints. In some cases, the later saint consciously modelled himself or herself on an earlier figure. Maria Maddalena de’Pazzi and Rose of Lima are both said to have imitated Catherine of Siena, who was canonized in the fifteenth century. Carlo Borromeo is said to have modelled himself on St Ambrose, his great predecessor as Archbishop of Milan.26 One may suspect that Filippo Neri, renowned for his gaiety and humility, was perceived as another St Francis; Francisco Borja, general of the Jesuits, as another St Ignatius; Ignatius himself as another St Dominic (another Spaniard who founded an order); and Aloysius Gonzaga, famed for his heroic degree of chastity, as another St Alexis. There were, of course,

many lesser imitators of the saints. One of the main reasons for having saints, as the church officially saw it, was to provide models with which the faithful could identify.

In the imputation of sanctity, contiguity was important as well as similarity (or as Roman Jakobson would say, metonymy as well as metaphor). The sacred seems to be contagious. At any rate, we find that Francis Xavier, Filippo Neri, Pius V and Felice of Cantalice were all associated with Ignatius Loyola; Felice of Cantalice, Camillo de Lelis, Maria Maddalena de'Pazzi and Caterina de' Ricci with Filippo Neri; Francisco Borja, Pedro of Alcantara and John of the Cross with Teresa of Avila; Andrea Avellino and Aloysius Gonzaga with Carlo Borromeo.

So much for the growth of cults at the periphery. It remains to try to explain how and why certain cults were adopted by the center and made official. The "heroic virtue" of the candidates had to satisfy the examiners. To understand what happened it is not sufficient to study the trials themselves. One needs to remember, for example, that particular popes took a special interest in saint-making – Sixtus V, for example, whose recovery of nerve put the whole process back into motion in 1588; Paul V, who only canonized two saints himself but left five more cases pending, to be completed by Gregory XV; Clement X and Alexander VIII, who canonized five saints apiece; Benedict XIII, who canonized eight in one year; and Benedict XIV, who had written a treatise on the subject. Papal interests also help to explain particular choices. Only one pope, Clement XI, canonized another, Pius V; but regional loyalties were extremely strong. The Roman Paul V canonized the Roman Francesca Ponziani. The Florentine Urban VIII canonized one Florentine, Andrea Corsini, and beatified another, Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi. The Venetian Alexander VIII canonized the Venetian Lorenzo Giustinian. Another Venetian, Clement XIII, canonized one Venetian, Girolamo Miani, and beatified another, Gregorio Barbarigo (who, like the pope, had been Bishop of Padua). In one case a process like the "old school tie" loyalty seems to have been at work: Benedict XIV, an old pupil of the Somaschi, beatified the order's founder, Girolamo Miani. And Alexander VII, in spite of the fifty-year rule, canonized his old friend François de Sales.

The center did not simply select from candidates presented by the periphery, but sometimes yielded to pressure. The religious orders were powerful pressure-groups and the high proportion of saints from their

28 Some of these associations are pointed out by De Maio, "L' ideale eroico," cited n. 10 above.
29 See Pastor, Geschichte der Päpste.
ranks has surely to be explained in these terms, among others. Robert Bellarmine, for example, who was strategically placed at Rome, is said to have been responsible for the beatification of his fellow Jesuit, Ignatius. There were also pressures from rulers. If there was a “Spanish preponderance” in the field of sanctity as in that of international relations, the two phenomena may not be unconnected. The first Counter-Reformation saint, Diego of Alcalà, was canonized following pressure from Philip II. Philip III pressed for Raimondo Peñaforte, Isidore and Carlo Borromeo. The bull canonizing Ignatius refers to requests from both Philip II and Philip III. Sigismund of Poland pressed successfully for the canonization of Hyacinth and Louis XIII for Caterina of Genoa. Henri IV, Ferdinand II and Maximilian of Bavaria were other rulers who tried to exert pressure on behalf of particular candidates. As for Andrea Corsini, his case was urged by an alliance of his order, the Carmelites, the ruler of the region he came from, Tuscany, and his family. For family pressure must not be forgotten: It was to the advantage of Carlo Borromeo that he had his nephew and successor, Federigo, to plead for him. Foreign visitors to Italy, including Burnet and Montesquieu, picked up gossip about Italian noble families paying large sums to have relatives canonized. 100,000 crowns was a figure quoted for Carlo Borromeo and 180,000 crowns for Andrea Corsini.

Such stories do not have to be taken too literally. Suffice it to say, pending further research, that it is impossible to explain the achievement of sanctity entirely in terms of the qualities of the individual, or even by the qualities which the witnesses saw in each individual. The imputation of sainthood, like its converse, the imputation of heresy or witchcraft, should be seen as a process of interaction or “negotiation” between center and periphery, each with its own definition of the situation. This process involved the official management of unofficial cults, which were, like religious visions, sometimes confirmed and sometimes suppressed. It also involved the implantation of official cults in parts of the periphery other than the region where they first sprang up. The cults of Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier, for example, seem to have become part of German Catholic popular culture in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a process which involved their

---

30 Bertelli, Ribelli, p. 118. On orders as pressure groups in the late Middle Ages, Vauchez, La Sainteté en occident, pp. 131ff.
31 F. Contelorus, De canonizatione sanctorum (Lyons, 1634), pp. 789ff.
32 S. di S. Silverio, Vita di S. Andrea Corsini (Florence, 1683), pp. 54ff.
33 G. Burnet, Some Letters (Amsterdam, 1686), p. 106.
“folklorization” or assimilation to earlier local cults. Thus curative properties were now assigned to “Ignatius water.”

This process of negotiation deserves further study. Enough has been said here, perhaps, to suggest that saints are indeed cultural indicators, a sort of historical litmus paper sensitive to connections between religion and society.
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