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The amnesty of 1846, the first political act of Pope Pius IX, created a sensation in its age. Today, however, it receives only perfunctory mention in most histories, and very little attention beyond that. What originally looked like the new beginning of a "Liberal" Pope is now seen as just a false start for a famous conservative.

This sudden change of opinion is no doubt strongly conditioned by the events of the Roman Revolution of 1848. It is fairly well known that some of the most visible leaders of that revolt had also received pardon for their previous offenses a mere 2 years before. It is even better known that the Pope himself, following his restoration, retreated from enlightened political reforms into religious conservatism and bitterness for the rest of his days. His subsequent unwillingness to continue political programs which had only recently made him the toast of the Italian nation appear to be rooted in suspicion and hurt - he acted on the belief that his own subjects had violated his kindness and trust.

There were, to be sure, several recipients of the amnesty who had turned against their erstwhile benefactor. Among the best known were Pietro Sterbini, sincere democrat and arch-promoter of the Roman Republic, Giuseppe Galletti, a gentle Mazzinian, and the young firebrand Felice Orsini, who would later die for his attempt to assassinate Napoleon III. We can identify other names of high-profile plotters who came home in 1846 to continue their former activities: Pietro Beltrami, Raffaele
Pasi, Livio Zambeccari, and several members of the Caldesi and Muratori families. Whatever each of these men intended in his inmost self, loyal or not, Pius certainly could not know. We can easily forgive him for concluding that they had been "poor risks" - that reconciliation for them was probably a bad idea. Thus we are left with the impression that the amnesty was an act of folly and political naivete'.

State of the Question

Until now, those authors who mention the amnesty at all usually do so in some larger context; either of the Revolution of 1848, or of the person and reign of Pius IX. Hence the amnesty is typically treated as an isolated event, and often a mistake at that. What I propose to do in this investigation is to focus on the valuable data generated by the amnesty itself. Two distinct archival fonts contain a rich lode of information on the individuals who first applied for it in 1846, as well as those who were later indicted for violating its conditions. This neglected information will clearly show that the amnesty was not only a just and generous political action, but that it was an act of mutual trust which was generally respected and honored by those who benefited from it. Even in the context of 1848, the amnesty and the Revolution which came after it are unique. Those who led and those who followed were certainly not cast in the mold of 1830.

Those writers tend to follow several variations of a single theme. Pius IX represents an important element of the Old Regime, as he fights frantically to hold back the tide of the modern world, which is variously interpreted in terms of nationalism, liberalism or social justice.
Writing within 20 years of the event, authors like Alphonse Balladier and Giuseppe Spada promoted the rather conservative image of a legitimate and moral government overthrown by mindless democrats, or by anarchists who threatened the very foundations of civilization. Luigi Carlo Farini moderated this vision somewhat: he saw Pius' regime as anachronistic, yet holding the middle ground between clerical reactionaries and doctrinaire nationalists, and still fighting the same lost cause. At the opposite end of the spectrum are authors like Raffaele DeCesare, Giuseppe Leti, and George M. Trevelyan. Writing during the early decades of this century, they interpreted the revolution in terms of heroic patriots fighting to overthrow an outdated rule of superstition, clericalism, and medieval relics so that the New Italy could emerge. Still more recently, works of George F-H. Berkeley (1932-40), E. E. Y. Hales (1954-60), and Frank J. Coppa (1974-85) have presented a less stereotypical portrait of the Pope. Like Farini, they have shown Pius and his advisors as attempting to steer a middle course between extremists. They are drawn as well-meaning individuals who were eventually overcome by forces beyond their understanding and control. In each of these several interpretations, 1848 in Rome is essentially the same as other revolutions since the Restoration.

Three works of Domenico Demarco from the 1940’s present another sort of interpretation. He pointed out in great detail that the 3-month Provisional Government of 1848 gained very broad support among nearly all Roman citizens by responding to bread-and-butter issues more effectively than any papal government ever had. Although doomed from the
start by the international situation and by financial chaos, the interim
government had established a spirit of sympathy and good will which was
passed on to Mazzini. This legacy, in part, helped to explain why so
many people made heroic sacrifices during the siege. For Demarco, the
Roman Revolution is a new thing in Italy because of its social basis and
broad support.

This study will fall somewhere between these interpretations.
Some of the leaders of the revolt against Pius were veterans of the for-
mer troubles: 1831, 1843 and 1845 - traditional "carbonari against mon-
archy" conflicts. But the vast majority of the amnesty recipients did
NOT support the new rebellion. Indeed some of them actively opposed it
and died in the process. The obvious conclusion, with data to back it
up, is that the 1848 revolt resulted from new leadership and issues;
those who supported the Provisional Government and Mazzini's Republic
were not the same as the old veterans pardoned in 1846.

In one of the most recent works on the Risorgimento, the author
states that "something like 2000 (sic) potential revolutionaries were
thus once again walking the streets of Rome, Bologna and the rest of the
state".1 The implication is all too clear that the former exiles and
prisoners anxiously returned to their former plotting. The same theme
resumes only a few pages later: "The coming revolution thus had poten-
tial leaders as a result of the amnesty of 1846."2 This author is typi-
cal of most; a handful of leaders are allowed to represent the entire

1 Harry Header, Italy in the Age of the Risorgimento, 1790-1870

2 Header, Italy p. 112.
group. If this proves to be true, then 1848 is merely a larger replay of the previous revolutions. But if not, then we must conclude that 1848 attracted new people, motivated by newer issues, concerns and circumstances.

So what about all of those others? Over 1000 prisoners and exiles applied for the amnesty, and most of them received it. But apart from the best known among them - those already mentioned - there has never been any systematic attempt to study the entire group. It seems strange for the remaining prisoners and exiles have been neglected for so long. After all, most of them had been courageous enough (at least once) to put their lives and fortunes at risk. Then, as now, overt opposition to one's government is dangerous. Pius' amnesty granted them a chance to return home and attempt a fresh start; most of them were only too happy to accept the opportunity. But did the allure of politics during the exciting 1848 period grow too strong for them? Did the passion for reform and change re-ignite the old fire to sweep away the venerable Papal States in favor of a modern, united Italy? Let us find out.

Objectives

The objective of this study is to complete that investigation. There are three fundamental questions: Exactly who took part in the subsequent Revolution, and who did not? What significant patterns are there, if any, in the background of those individuals (place of origin, social class, and places of exile or imprisonment), and what do the patterns mean? What connection is there, if any, between this background and the type of participation (political or criminal) in the revolution?
Instead of using one statistical sample, the entire group of such prisoners and exiles who benefitted from the amnesty of 1846 will provide the raw material for the study. In this way, the somewhat vague argument over "loyalty" might assume a more factual basis.

Method

The investigation consists of a comparison between two lists of names: a "Long List" of all exiles and prisoners who profited from the amnesty of 1846, and a "Short List" of those who may have violated its terms by what they did in the next three years.

Principal sources for the Long List are the records of the Secretariat of State, preserved today in the Vatican Archives. There were contemporary printed lists of the amnistiati, but they are full of errors and omissions. The "Long List" used here was composed from scratch, using the original correspondance which applied the global amnesty to individual prisoners and exiles.

The Short List will then be drawn from this "sample of the whole" by determining which individuals allegedly violated the promise to behave themselves after 1846. The best sources for this material are found in the State Archives in Rome among the court, police and military records for the restoration years. There is a great abundance of material in these fonts, most of it badly neglected by scholars.

Even allowing for inevitable gaps and deficiencies, the results of this study are truly startling. This unified profile of large numbers of former revolutionaries has an obvious interest for scholar and dilettante alike. The resulting insights not only puncture several myths
about the amnesty itself, but cast a whole new light on Pius IX and his government.
When Pius IX was elected Pope in 1846, his Temporal Dominions, the Papal States, extended from Venetia in the north to Naples in the south. In total area, the state was about 41,400 square kilometers. Its greatest length was about 435 kilometers, and its average width was about 130. Its population numbered almost three million inhabitants, of whom a mere 14 to 17 percent lived in towns of a thousand or more. The remainder (at least 2,400,000 people) lived in isolated houses or tiny rural communities, whether they were farmers or not. Rome, the capital, was the largest city with about 150,000 inhabitants at the time. The second city, Bologna, lay at the far northern end of the country with a population less than half the size of Rome's.

Even though it occupied an important slice of central Italy, the domains of the Pope had the reputation of being one of the worst governed and most backward of all European states. The root causes of this
condition lie deep in history and local customs. But bad policy alone does not explain how an individual might become a political exile or prisoner. In order to fill in necessary background, this chapter will briefly discuss social and economic conditions, then local government structures and the court system, and finally, a history of revolutionary activity, as it applied to the Roman state.

Society in the Papal States

The Papal States exhibited one unique characteristic among European monarchies: the dominant class was not the nobility, but the clergy. In other states, the church was one social element among many; but in Rome, the church was considered to be the very reason for the state. Practically speaking, the existence of a papal state was supposed to enable the Pope to govern the church freely - without owing any special loyalty or favor to another prince. This singular rationale also meant that the Papal States would not conform to neighboring states in several ways. Most states of the time accepted constitutional limits on the sovereign, civic officials drawn from the nobility or educated classes, tax revenue for public good, etc. The government in Rome assumed no such things. The nature of traditional church government made the state, as well as the church, a virtually absolute monarchy. Revenue was not considered public wealth, but benefice: income to be used for charitable purposes or to support clerics engaged in church-related work. By reason of both law and custom, the church often held the best lands, prelatures, prebends, abbeys and monastic property, all of which were also considered benefices. During the middle ages, donations had flowed to Rome freely;
local taxes remained very low, and sometimes were not even collected. But the experience of centuries had taught Rome that free will offerings and donations could be unreliable, especially when other European states restricted money sent abroad. Even before the French Revolution, uninterrupted support of schools, seminaries, hospitals and missions was possible only because benefices in central Italy were able to defray the cost with local money. Churchmen were also assured of the top positions in state government and directed the disbursement of the lion's share of state revenue. Clerics made laws, passed judgement, directed education and controlled the police, always with an eye to the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. They saw themselves, not as civil servants or public trustees, but as lords who exercised sovereignty in the name of the church. In other words, the state did not exist for any reason of its own, but to provide a steady base for the operation of the church. Except for its dominant clerical caste, the society of the Papal States was similar to that of most Italian states in nearly every way. Agriculture was the most important occupation, but there were many other goods and services as well. A simple division of the population by profession would look something like the table on the following page.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy (all levels)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobility and untitled landowners</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (doctors, magistrates, teachers)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial people</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans, tradesmen and skilled workers</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants, unskilled workers and unemployed</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasant-owners, sharecroppers and tenants</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these major categories corresponds to those used in the present study.\(^5\)

The whole concept of a church-state seemed anachronistic to many nineteenth century people. But to most of the clergy of that time, the Papal States promised a freedom of action which they considered both necessary and good. In the person of Pius VII, the Papacy itself was seen as one of the principal conquerors of Napoleon's tyranny. It was living proof that God had not allowed his church to fall under the domination of any one secular prince. The church which emerged after the trials of the French Revolution had certainly lost much of its social influence and privileged position, together with immense property holdings which would never be recovered. But in the process, many of the

\(^5\) This table is the author's own creation, based on statistics quoted by Demarco (Tramonto, pp. 22-4), and intentionally regrouped and simplified to match the statistical tables used later in the paper.
old evils had also been purged. Great wealth had never been wholesome for those who preached such virtues as temperance and justice. Nearly everywhere in Europe, there was a flowering of vocations and a great expansion of religious orders. The church they served was more unified, disciplined, and worthy of gospel values than it had been in centuries. Clerics, frequently poor, were now more ascetic and virtuous. Bishops were now better educated and better motivated than the worldly prelates of a century before. It was generally accepted that they were to be pastors first, and princes afterward.

But what was true of the church at large came more slowly in Rome itself. It is genuinely unfortunate that this newly purified clergy was not as well represented in the Roman government as it was in the countryside. Administrative offices were often filled by so-called "political clerics." These sought advancement through their personal connections and talents, but otherwise showed few of the virtues expected of churchmen. Although not necessarily evil men, they tended to be short sighted and opportunistic, like bureaucrats found elsewhere. Other highly motivated prelates kept themselves close to the seat of papal power, but honestly feared the modern world and were unable to compromise with such ideas as constitutional monarchy and liberty of conscience. For most of the clerics found in the curial offices, scientific progress, economic success and modernity were not the controlling norms. Quite the contrary, they represented everything that had to be opposed.

6 Demarco, Tramonto, p. 28.
The nobles of the Papal States found themselves in a somewhat equivocal position. On one hand, their landholdings and overall wealth steadily increased, and their prestige and social position remained unchallenged. On the other hand, there were few opportunities for them to enter government service because of the clerical monopoly. In Rome and Lazio, noble families were one of three types: feudal (ancient clans such as the Orsini, Colonna and Savelli), financial (self-made dynasties like the Torlonia or Grazioli) and nepotistic (beneficiaries of previous popes, such as the Doria, Corsini, Borghese and Chigi). Most Roman families remained fairly loyal to the Papacy in principle, since any changes in the papal monarchy could threaten their own social standing as well. Yet they had little sense of duty or purpose. Those who might wish to serve the state as urban or provincial governors had to begin by becoming clerics themselves. Some were willing to receive tonsure and promise celibacy, but most were not. Younger sons, especially, had a difficult time, since primogeniture favored the eldest as heirs to both lands and title. Unless they managed to carve out careers for themselves in the army, the church, or the bureaucracy, they frequently withdrew to their villas, mistresses and art collections to pass their time as petty princes within a narrow social circle. Although they continued to exert some influence on government by what they said and did, they were always able to claim that they were not responsible for its mistakes. 7

7 Demarco, Tramonte, pp. 29-34.
Elsewhere, the provincial nobility found themselves in a similar quandary, although their psychological ties to Rome were relatively weak. Especially in the Romagna and the Marches, hard working nobles found themselves frustrated at every turn. Families like the Manfredi, Bentivoglio, Malatesta and Della Rovere possessed education, landed wealth, and a tradition of leadership, but few practical opportunities to lead or contribute to their society. The provincial nobles, even those with feudal roots, had also retained an interest in commerce and local politics which the more ornamental Romans would have scorned. Those who had estates in the Po valley often busied themselves with intensive agriculture, like their Lombard cousins. Others invested their wealth in commercial or manufacturing enterprises, sometimes with disappointing results because of the general commercial stagnation. In desperation, many resorted to political writing or debate, sometimes through secret societies. Such a profile fits many individuals in this study. 8

For the commercial and professional classes, life in the Pope's dominions could be especially frustrating, though certainly not because of any lack of talent or creativity on their part. Especially in the north, life in the towns depended very much on agricultural conditions. The most important exports were hemp, wool and silk, although meat and leather products were also significant. Grain was largely produced for domestic consumption, and was not considered an export. Since most manufacturing and commerce focused on the processing of food and fibers, a

---

bad growing season could have a disastrous impact on the availability of work and trade. But even under the best conditions, foreign trade was not encouraged. The principal interest of the central government seemed to be taxing what was produced, rather than stimulating production. Those who planned to trade or to invest found their efforts blocked by tariffs, monopolies, privileges and a bewildering variety of other regulations designed to prohibit and to protect. Use of modern machinery was actively discouraged (or forbidden outright in state-owned factories) because workers would be displaced. There were no railroads at all, and almost no merchant fleet. Even the roads were in poor repair except near the customs posts. Some merchants did prosper because of hard work and a bit of luck. But most felt their efforts would produce much better results under a more friendly regime.

For those engaged in any form of agriculture, life could be much worse. Throughout Italy, the population growth (about 60% from 1700 to 1840) was mainly rural. Farmers met the greater demand for food by bringing more land under cultivation, rather than increasing their yield with better methods. The various systems of cultivation depended not so much on the crops or the size of the farms, but on the type of labor contract in use. In addition to direct farming by a peasant-owner, several systems of rent and sharecropping were used in central Italy. Smallholders were able to survive if their farms were big enough, but they faced falling prices as the century progressed, due largely to competition from cheap Russian grain. Increasing debt often reduced owners and renters to the level of tenants. The mixed farming used most often

---

by sharecroppers produced wheat, maize and other grains, olives, vines and fruit trees. But while this system took care of the needs of a family, it rarely produced enough of any cash crop for a genuine profit. Creeping debt and close supervision by the landowners with constant demands to produce more were also unpleasant realities of a tenant's life. In far too many cases, agriculture alone could not assure a family's survival. The difference had to be made up by cottage industry or seasonal migration by family members with other skills, like blacksmithing or carpentry.²⁰

Immediately outside the gates of Rome, was an intensively cultivated belt of small farms where the peasants did relatively well, due largely to their specialization and their closeness to the Roman markets. Most of the sharecroppers in Lazio also shared in this good fortune, unless their contracts were for only a year at a time, as they commonly were in the Romagna. Beyond this fertile belt was the Agro Romano, a huge and very productive region. At that time, about 1/3 of the land was owned by only four families (Sforza-Cesarini, Borghese, Fabrizi and Chigi), another 1/3 by other nobles, usually in vast unbroken tracts, and the final 1/3 by religious corporations, chief among whom were the chapters of St. Peter and St. John Lateran, the Santo Spirito Hospital, the Holy Office and the Bishopric of Ostia. Although ideally suited for grain production, 85% of the Agro was devoted to pasture for domestic animals. Grazing was not heavily regulated by the courts, as cereal farming was, making it attractive to those whose main

interest was a steady income. Grazing was also relatively easy work, as it required neither efficient management nor extensive labor costs. As a result, the grain produced in the Agro could only feed 90,000 people - half of what Rome required. Even the meat production fell short, because of the easy going methods of the landowners. Over 6000 cattle per year had to be transported from other provinces to feed the capital.¹¹ Thousands of land-hungry peasants looked on this inefficiency with great disgust.

Although the farms outside of Lazio were usually small and compact, there remained one other group of very large landholdings. These were found along the low-lying coastal plains of Ferrara, Ravenna and the Marches, as well as the district known as the Maremme, west of Rome. Life there was dangerous because of malaria, and whatever farming and herding took place was done with hired labor from nearby hill towns. Hired hands there and elsewhere on the largest estates were among the poorest of the farm workers, not so much because they were badly paid, but simply because they had no claim on more than one day's work at a time. The ones who had other skills or jobs were usually able to make ends meet - those who had no other income could starve, especially in a famine year. Despite all their troubles, most peasants remained solidly loyal to the government, although most would complain that they "paid too much" for their rents or contracts.¹²

¹¹ Demarco, Tramonto, pp. 43-66.
¹² Demarco, Tramonto, pp. 35-45.
But far from being concerned with helping peasants, increasing food production or encouraging trade, the Roman administration had a very different agenda of its own. Understanding this extremely unique philosophy of government helps to explain why the Papal States was nearly impossible to govern by the mid-nineteenth century.

Local Administration

Unlike the systems of government found in textbooks which are simple, rational and unified, the papal administration retained the marks of several different (and sometimes contradictory) attempts to change or reform it. Its most serious flaw was that institutions tended to reflect several different and competing concepts of what the state ought to be or do. Much like the Bourbon state in France before 1789, the eighteenth century concept of the Papal States envisioned a union of several organic communities or entities. These were the Comarca (a 40-mile capital district), together with a duchy (Urbino), and five other historic provinces: the Romagna, the Marches, Umbria, the Patrimony, and the Roman Campagna. Each of these provinces had a network of centuries-old customs and practices which made it a unique social and political organ unlike anything else.

Napoleon's conquest of Italy quickly swept away these institutions. His occupation government was based on systems used in Imperial France, rather than on any precedent in Italian history. Each province was governed by a prefect responsible directly to Paris. In theory, the prefect was a representative of the French Revolution to oppressed peo-

---

ple, who were being prepared for self-government; in practice, he was largely concerned with efficiency in collecting taxes and conscripting troops for Napoleon's war effort against other European monarchs. Yet the prefects often found the need to maintain an image of popularity, and did so by promoting economic development and quick, honest enforcement of justice. For many citizens, especially in the Legations, this was a type of good government they had never known or expected from the former clerical-dominated regime.

Following the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, the restored government of Pius VII adopted some of these features. His Secretary of State, Cardinal Ercole Consalvi, had already assured restoration of the entire state to its pre-revolutionary boundaries. Now in the hopes of preserving that state from revolutionary instability and popular discontent, he issued an edict in 1816 which retained a relatively modern administration. Consalvi had to endure a great deal of criticism from those who wanted to restore all aspects of the old regime, but he was encouraged to persist by the Austrian chancellor Metternich. Although Consalvi believed strongly that the Pope had to remain free of any political or institutional limits, he also felt that the best guarantor of this freedom was efficient and humane government. A Pope could never exercise his spiritual mission in true freedom if he found himself simultaneously at war with his own subjects because the institutions of his state worked so badly.

According to Consalvi's program, most offices would now be open to laymen, although the highest were still reserved for clerics. Consultative advice to local administrators was supposed to moderate the rigid-
ity of absolutism. But in practice, many of the potential benefits of this structure were never realized, due largely to opposition and delaying by a faction of ultra-conservative prelates known as the Rigorists (zelanti) to their political contemporaries. Since Consalvi's plans provoked more hostility than support within the college of cardinals, his only hope was to convince Pius VII to decree reforms from the throne, and gently push his critics aside. He knew, of course, that his reforms might end when the Pope died. Thus he felt driven by a sense of urgency, and attempted to enact sweeping changes in a relatively short time. The very speed of his work provoked a sharp reaction on the part of the zelanti. They were equally determined that nothing Consalvi did would outlast him, and each successive reform, in their minds, was earmarked for revision or elimination at the earliest possible opportunity. Ironically, the plan of Metternich and Consalvi to reform the Papal States would eventually fail, not because it was too conservative, but because it was too advanced. After the death of Pius VII in 1823, these zelanti, succeeded in electing one of their leaders, Cardinal Sermattei della Genga, who took the name Leo XII (1823-9). He promptly dismissed Consalvi and spent much of his reign undoing the effects of his laws. Leo, in turn, was succeeded by the moderate Cardinal Castiglioni who, as Pius VIII, hoped to return to a more enlightened policy. Sadly, he died without doing so after only a year. Before they elected the very conservative Gregory XVI (1831-46), the cardinals were dead-


locked for two months. The resulting power vacuum was one of several factors which helped precipitate the revolt of 1831.\textsuperscript{16}

According to Consalvi's reform edict of 1816, the state was re-divided into a capital district and 17 "delegations," similar to the French "departements." For administrative purposes, each delegation was sub-divided into "districts," then "governments" and "communes." Except for their uniform name, delegations were unequal in nearly every way. Some were poor and barren, with barely 15,000 inhabitants; others were quite prosperous, with well over 300,000 people engaged in a great variety of economic activity.\textsuperscript{17} Each was administered by a governor known as an "apostolic delegate," similar to a French prefect in function. Five of these delegations were classified as "first class": Urbino & Pesaro, together with Bologna, Ferrara, Ravenna and Forli', the four traditional "Legations" of the Romagna region. Seven others were rated "second class": Ancona, Macerata, Fermo, Perugia, Spoleto, Viterbo and Frosinone, and five were "third class": Camerino, Ascoli, Rieti, Civitavecchia and Benevento. Because of their commercial significance, a first class delegation was always administered by a cardinal known as a "legate." All other delegates had to be bishops.\textsuperscript{18}

A delegate, in his capacity as provincial governor, was the chief political, administrative and judicial official in his delegation. Despite the image of a delegate a local representative of the central government, he was often considered (and sometimes saw himself) as more

\textsuperscript{16} Reinerman, "Reform," p.541.

\textsuperscript{17} Demarco, Tramonto p.17.

\textsuperscript{18} E.Lodolini, "Amministrazione," pp.9f.
of a feudal lord, who acted very much on his own. In theory, a bad administrator could always be removed from his duties; but in practice, few ever were, since they formed an important part of the shifting web of political factions. All too frequently, a Pope might not live long enough to discover who his worst administrators were. And even if he knew, he might need today's foe as tomorrow's ally against a newer foe. Pellegrino Rossi, a future prime minister of Pius IX, was quoted as saying that a cardinal is "a prince in Rome, a pasha in his province." 19 Especially in the administration of justice, a delegate retained a semi-feudal function as judge. His charity or integrity might enable him to judge well and fairly, but professional training almost never did; few lawyers or jurists ever reached this rank.

In an effort to broaden a delegate's ability, he was assisted by two judicial aides ("assessori"), one for civil affairs, the other for criminal cases. He also received the consultive advice of a "governor's council," which met three times per week. This council had a deliberative vote on all budgetary matters, and a consultive vote on everything else. 20 At first, the council consisted of a secretary general, with two, three or four members, depending on the class of the delegation. After 1824, membership was simplified to include only a mayor and two aldermen ("gonfaloniere" and "anziani"). In his capacity as sovereign, the Pope named all these officials from lists periodically drawn up by his ministers. 21 To further simplify administration, the same directive

---

19 Demarco, Tramonto, p. 26f.
20 Demarco, Tramonto, p. 18.
of 1824 reduced the number of delegations from 17 to 13 by combining Macerata-Camerino, Fermo-Ascoli, Spoleto-Rieti and Viterbo-Civitavecchia.22 A less fortunate result of this directive was the revival of the ecclesiastical monopoly among top level administrators, with a simultaneous increase in inefficiancy and corruption.23

Following the revolution of 1831, a Memorandum (May 21, 1831) from the five major powers had proposed a much more dramatic reform. This document provides a sharply contrasting view of what should have been happening in Rome, at least in the opinion of some of Europe's leading statesmen. Although never implemented, it became somewhat of a focal point whenever reform was discussed. Because it had its origins in the international forum, Roman liberals were able to point to it as a sort of "charter" for the changes they wanted to see. The chief elements of this Memorandum of 1831 are:

1. an administration based on elected municipal and provincial councils which would control local affairs, and send members to a fiscal giunta in Rome to set financial policy, together with an appointed Council of State.

2. opening all civil posts to laymen.

3. reform of the legal system according to Consalvi's 1816 directive, and

4. an organic law to protect these reforms against tampering by subsequent governments.


23 Woolf, p. 244.
Cardinal Bernetti, the new Secretary of State, accepted the Memorandum politely, but still resented what he considered interference by outsiders in the affairs of his unique state. Bernetti was a clear headed organizer and a competent administrator, at least according to the Roman understanding of that skill. He was passionately dedicated to the clerical regime and its need to remain free of entanglements with any foreign power, including Austria. He was prepared to accept help from anyone, but made it clear that he owed them no favors in return. Metternich often found Bernetti to be a difficult partner, but admitted a certain grudging admiration.24 After the Memorandum, Bernetti submitted his own reform proposal on July 5, 1831. Most recommendations of the Memorandum were quietly pushed aside. Perhaps the only significant exception was a weak attempt to broaden the local administration. Eachlegation (=first class delegation) had its council expanded to four members, one of whom acted as president and pro-legate. Any or all of these members could be laymen, although clerics continued to function in many cases, simply because they were the administrators with more experience.25 When Bernetti was succeeded by Cardinal Lambruschini in 1836, the papal government became more tactful, but remained essentially the same. Metternich gave up his serious hopes of reform in Rome.26

---

24 Luigi Carlo Farini, The Roman State from 1815 to 1850, (London: John Murray, 1851-4) I, 28.


Administration of Justice

The Napoleonic regime had granted the first modern codification of laws in the Papal States. Even after the suppression of the French legal codes, Pius VII named three commissions to revise civil, criminal, and commercial codes so that they were no longer founded on just canon or Roman legal principles.27 Cardinal Giuseppe Antonio Sala had told Pius VII in 1814 that the greatest weakness of the judiciary was a combination of too many tribunals with too much overlapping or doubtful jurisdiction. He proposed that legal forums be limited to two (clerical and lay), that uniform procedures and a single code be used everywhere, that judges replace governors in all courts, and that court officials be fewer, but better educated. Courts of first instance, appeal, and revision should hear all cases except those dealing with agriculture or commerce.28

Nevertheless, after the Restoration, each legate or delegate retained his function as president of the penal (criminal) tribunal.29 The reform edict of 1816 began the rational simplification of the judicial system by revising the existing codes and tribunals. Ecclesiastical tribunals survived, but without any jurisdiction in civil affairs. The edict introduced the principle of equality before the law, and prohibited torture, as well as arbitrary arrest and punishment.30 It also

abolished the special jurisdictions of the barons and the municipalities, and restricted the jurisdiction of the delegates to only minor offenses (those punishable by fines, or by one year of labor). Each province was to have a criminal tribunal with five judges in addition to the delegate. These provincial tribunals would hear appeals from the local courts (the Governo) they in turn could have cases reviewed by the superior courts at Bologna, Macerata, or two in Rome (Governo & Consulta). Trained defenders and procurators were to be nominated by the Pope. As modest as these measures may seem today, and notwithstanding those still to be implemented, this 1816 directive gave the Papal States the best administration and judicial system it had ever had. But welcomed as they were by some, these procedural reforms were frequently watered down or ignored by those closest to the heart of power: the judges and prelates of the zelante faction. 31

The special tribunals still continued to hamper the efficiency of the court system, even after several of them were abolished in the 1816 reform. Most of those which survived did so because of special needs, such as Rome's food supply. From an economic standpoint, the capital was almost exclusively a governmental center and a place of pilgrimage. It had little manufacturing and no industry at all, but still had a huge appetite. Since Rome required a steady and substantial flow of foodstuffs, the ordinary market forces were not considered reliable enough to meet the demand. Tight regulation was considered the only way to be sure farmers would sell their products, even at prices below market

---

31 Montenovesi, p. 289.
value. According to the spirit of the times, special courts and judges seemed to be the best manner to safeguard a stable food supply.

Those institutions which retained special judicial powers included:

1. The Congregazione di Buon Governo, the result of a much earlier reform, was an attempt to provide the communes near Rome with officials who were concerned more with efficient government than with political appointments.

2. The Uditore del Camerlengo, specializing in commercial law, helped fix prices and regulate markets in the Piazza Navona neighborhood.

3. The Presidenza di Grascia existed to ensure the supply of oil and cooking fats by supervising the merchants who sold them.

4. The Prefettura di Annona, concerned with the supply of bread and pasta, held regulatory powers over mills, ovens and some grain stores.

5. The Tribunal for Agriculture settled disputes between consumers and merchants dealing in meats and vegetables.

6. The Tribunal of the Cardinal Vicar, among many other functions, helped regulate supplies of other foodstuffs and their prices.

7. The Giudice del Mercede was charged with supervising salaries for all workers engaged in agriculture.

Needless to say, many people saw the need to consolidate and streamline the judicial system further. But for the time being, these institutions survived because of the degree of upset that might take place if too
many things were reformed at once. In the meanwhile, uncertainty as to who had jurisdiction continued to cripple the efficiency of the court system, to the surprise of no one.\textsuperscript{32}

The administrative reform of 1824 attempted to do two things: streamline the efficiency of the courts, and eliminate the need for administrators to function also as magistrates. As a result, Leo XII suppressed or transferred several tribunals: Urbino to Pesaro, Camerino to Macerata, Ascoli to Fermo, Rieti to Spoleto and Civitavecchia to Viterbo.\textsuperscript{33} By allowing fewer courts to exist, all attempts to make them more efficient could hopefully be implemented more quickly. In the same reform, first steps were taken to remove provincial governors from the courts. The four cardinal legates of the Romagna retained both civil and criminal jurisdiction, but the delegates for the other thirteen provinces lost their authority in criminal cases. Tribunals were reduced to include only four professional judges (not including the legate or delegate), and henceforth there would be only two Courts of Appeal: Bologna and Rome. All local laws or statutes not in harmony with the general code were abolished.\textsuperscript{34} By the time the reform of 1831 was decreed, sufficient judges had been trained to allow a complete separation of political and administrative powers from the judicial. For all practical purposes, the delegate had now lost his function as even a civil judge.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{32} E. Lodolini, "Ordinamento," pp. 52f.
\textsuperscript{33} E. Lodolini, "Ordinamento," p. 66.
\textsuperscript{34} Montenovesi, p. 290.
\textsuperscript{35} E. Lodolini, "Ordinamento," p. 68.
Each ordinary tribunal had one or more processing judges, a public defender, and a public procurator. In addition, the much larger courts in Rome had a Public Procurator General, a Prosecutor Advocate, and an Advocate of the Poor.\textsuperscript{36} At the top of the scale was the Tribunal of the Holy Consulta, which served as criminal court of appeal. The entire Consulta was composed of a Cardinal Prefect, several "presiding prelates" and a prelate secretary, but very rarely functioned as a whole. It was commonly divided into two shifts or sections, known as "turni," which functioned separately and heard different cases, sometimes in different cities. The eldest of the judges (called the dean) presided over the first turno, the secretary over the second. Each turno judged capital cases appealed from the various Roman courts (Governo, Senatorial, Auditor Camerale and Apostolic Palace), as well as all provincial courts, except those in the Marches or the Legations. Each turno could also review sentences imposed by other courts (including the opposite turno), and quite significantly, ALL POLITICAL CASES which came to trial.\textsuperscript{37} For the purposes of the present study, it is important to keep this judicial monopoly in mind. In essence, it means that a study of the Consulta records will yield a relatively complete list of political cases, except those which were so weak that they could be dismissed by even a local tribunal.

\textsuperscript{36} E.Lodolini, "Ordinamento," p.68.

\textsuperscript{37} E.Lodolini, "Ordinamento," p.70.
The Political Opposition

Although relative peace returned to Europe after the Congress of Vienna, partisans of reform or political change continued to press, sometimes violently, for the acceptance of their ideas and the destruction of their rivals. There are two chief forms which liberal political opposition followed. One was open, legal criticism of government ministers and policy by members of the opposition. The other was plotting against a government by members of secret societies. Among the members of this second group, there were two main tendencies, both of which had their roots in the French Revolution and before. The first tendency is best represented by the Marquis de Lafayette and the Philosophes of the Enlightenment. They preached a cosmopolitan ideology of progressive economic development, with an increase in production, markets and jobs, all led by an educated elite. Political reform was emphasized; there was a general assumption that social conditions would improve as a natural result, and need not be considered separately. Organizations formed by people of this mind-set were both hierarchical and secret. They looked on nationalist movements as divisive, and ultimately self-defeating. Though widely different in most other ways, members of this group were collectively known as "moderate liberals" to their contemporaries.

---

38 For the purposes of this study, the term "liberal" will be used in the "classic" nineteenth century political sense. It denotes one who favors individual freedom of thought, religion, speech, and activity, and the removal of any controls not required for the protection of the most basic human rights. Liberals in the Papal States, therefore, would tend to favor elimination of clerical influence in education and in the courts, an end to feudal or clerical privileges, and public control of tax revenues. They should not be confused with "economic liberals," although this latter group may still share some common principles.
By contrast, followers of the other tendency are frequently called "radical or democratic liberals." This other group is best represented by Filippo Buonarroti, still active and incorruptible in his old age. As a living symbol of the Jacobin movement, he retained his faith in the ultimate victory of an egalitarian society, which would flow from a fundamental social, as well as political realignment. Although his followers also constituted a de facto elite, Buonarroti favored incorporation of the lower classes into the revolutionary movement as soon as they could be won over and properly motivated. These Jacobin-democrats certainly intended to act in favor of the working masses, but did not necessarily trust them to know the best path to their own salvation. Until they were enlightened, emotional issues such as nationalism and radical social reform might be useful tools to gain and hold the loyalty of this popolo minuto, the ordinary working people.39

Some of the earliest sects, most of them following the "Lafayette" pattern, had strong links to freemasonry. One of these, the Adelphia, gained a substantial following among officers in the pre-1815 army. Similar and better known was the somewhat shadowy organization known as the Carbonari, who also retained masonic trappings. Their demands focused more on political, rather than social change, but were frequently difficult to pin down. They included such standard liberal reforms as the opening of offices to laymen, laicization of the courts, a written constitution, and possibly the separation of the Marches and the Romagna from Rome.40 Although not well organized, they existed in

39 Woolf, pp. 303f.
40 Woolf, pp. 246-54.
nearly every corner of pre-unification Italy. The Carbonari never had a single political program, but several at once. Their vagueness and respect for freedom of thought meant that all good liberals could join. A typical local cluster might include plenty of opportunists, such as those looking for employment or useful connections, or those who simply joined because of peer pressure. But the very broadness of their program ensured that any specific proposal might be met with indifference. Even so, there was general agreement on a basic minimal platform: the broad ideals of "Italian unity, independence, liberty, and expulsion of foreigners" (widely understood to be the Austrians). As to the most desirable form of constitutional government, they were less unanimous; opinions ranged all the way from constitutional monarchy, through a federal state, to a unitary state, such as a radical republic. Evidence presented in this study proves that each of these sub-factions was active before 1846.41

Although Giuseppe Mazzini's plans for Italy were still largely unknown and untried in 1830, the revolutions of that year drove him to refine his ideas with increasing urgency. Mazzini saw the work of the Carbonari as halfhearted and hopeless. He tended to favor Buonarroti over Lafayette insofar as he saw a need to involve all classes in the movement. But he still felt the entire movement was fatally crippled by timid leadership, complex ritual, and the cult of secrecy. The events of 1831 helped Mazzini develop his own program to achieve "liberty, independence and union." He envisioned an Italian society of the future.

based on natural laws and rights, in which all aristocracy and privileges would be abolished in favor of a simple "organic" state based on association between classes, and human progress attained through cooperation. In practice, this demanded good leadership, largely from the middle class, supported by the masses, the poorest and most numerous working classes. He favored the eighteenth century proposals to place limitations on all wills, mortmain and other institutions which removed land from free circulation. He also wanted to see very broad ownership of farmland, a progressive tax on profits, wage control to protect workers, and many public works to provide jobs. The material benefits of this cooperation were to benefit everyone without exception.42

To promote his vision and bring it about more effectively, Mazzini founded a new society which he called "Young Italy" (Giovine Italia). His followers were to avoid any hint of conflict between classes, since he felt that converting a revolution to a class war would ruin it with a new tyranny. He certainly favored leadership remaining with the lawyers, proprietors and officers, but recruited heavily among the city poor as well. He directed that all propaganda favoring Young Italy be restricted to literate members, but insisted that anyone should recruit new members, and that no formality be required beyond an oath of loyalty.43

In the years that followed, both the earlier sects and Mazzini's Young Italy would exist side by side, sometimes at odds with one another, sometimes combining their efforts. But judged both by numbers

42 Woolf, pp. 305-8.
and by influence exerted, time and circumstances seemed to favor the latter.

The Revolution of 1831

The thirty years following the Congress of Vienna were characterized in all Italian states by an underlying struggle between political opposites. A marriage of strange bedfellows labored to change the institutions of Metternich's Europe: Moderate Liberals, the Carbonari, Young Italy and others. The Papal States remained relatively quiet during the early years of Consalvi's reform, although an Austrian army crossed the frontier in 1821 to defeat Neapolitan rebels near Rieti.44

Most potential rebels recognized that the major powers of Europe supported the Austrian domination of the Italian states. But in 1830, the new French government of Louis Philippe declared that France would no longer tolerate Austrian intervention in Italian affairs. The Carbonaro rising of 1831 could never have occurred without this manifesto. Revolutionary leaders in Lyons, as well as in the Legations, hoped that now they might not have to contend with Austrian troops.45

The slowing of reform, and the two-month long conclave following the death of Pius VIII on November 30, 1830 did contribute to the revolt of 1831, but were certainly not its causes. There was no food shortage, and little popular unrest to speak of. The genuine causes were the lingering ones: economic stagnation, governmental inertia, and loss of hope

44 Berkeley, Italy, I, xvii.

among upper-class leaders. The successful July Revolution in France in 1830 may well have served as an encouragement. But the only immediate occasion for activity at this time may have been the revolt in neighboring Modena, and consequent fear of possible crime and disorder in the Romagna. Local leaders appear to have decided to take matters into their own hands.

The earliest leaders were a relatively conservative combination of "old liberals" together with students and young professionals. The "old" faction were landowners and merchants who hoped to restore the historic liberties of Bologna and free themselves from the hopeless misgovernment of Rome. They remembered the old Jacobin and Italic governments as models for imitation, but were largely anti-democratic. The newer leaders (who are the only ones of real interest here) drew their support almost entirely from provincial nobility, property owners, and leading families in the major cities. Although this second group was almost as conservative as the first, there were two important differences: they were more open to considering a newer society of a "Buonarrotian" type, and they were more strongly nationalistic than their fathers had been. Thinking of themselves as "Italians" rather than mere French clients, they were more willing to experiment with political reforms, as long as no explosive social changes threatened their foundations. It is also significant that they had enough idealism or optimism to risk prison or exile for their cause. These conspirators were able to use the network already built by the carbonari, as well as their plans and foreign connections. 46

46 Woolf, pp. 270-3.
Among these new leaders were several who were to figure prominently in subsequent events. Count Terenzio Mamiani della Rovere of Pesaro would be prime minister for Pius IX, and later for Victor Emmanuel II. Colonel Pier Damiano Armandi had helped lead rebel military forces. Physics professor Francesco Orioli, Count Carlo Pepoli and Marquis Daniele Zappi were significant leaders of the expatriate community in France. Tiberio Borgia of Perugia, Filippo Canuti, Sebastiano Fusconi and Federico Pescantini of Lugo would emerge as strong moderate leaders even after years of exile. Each of these was excluded by name from the amnesty of 1831, which allowed most other exiled rebels to return home.

By timing their revolt to take place during the conclave, the rebels assured that the Cardinal Legates would all be in Rome, and not residing in their provincial capitals. Well planned agitation and threats by respected families successfully convinced the temporary administrators that a general insurrection was about to take place. Most of this pressure focused on Monsignor Nicola Parsciani-Clarelli, substituting for Bernetti as the pro-legate of Bologna. On February 4, he authorized a committee of local leaders to maintain order, and departed the following day. This action ensured both a peaceful transition and a strong semi-legal appearance for the new committee, which


48 ASR, *Periodo Costituzionale (1846-8)*, Busta 1, fascicolo 2. This file is a mixed collection of documents providing background on those named to the Council of Ministers (December 29, 1847). It includes printed sheets listing the 33 men excluded from the amnesty of 1831, as well as the 929 who petitioned for the amnesty of 1846.
quickly became a Provisional Government. These leaders appealed to other communes for support, raised the tricolor flag, and declared their independence as the United Provinces of Italy. 49 The 1831 Provisional Government quickly and peacefully changed the controlling hand of the government without loosening its grip. Their only dramatic act came on February 8, when they declared that the Temporal Power of the Popes was abolished forever in the northern provinces. In spite of their relatively conservative position, most contemporaries saw few differences between these rebels and any others. In Metternich's Europe, even a change in theory or principle could be considered an intolerable threat. 50 The same leaders showed enough tactical skill to control the mob, call a constituent assembly, change the government and decree the fall of the Temporal Power, all without spilling a single drop of blood. 51

The pre-arranged movement was so successful that it spread as far south as Senigallia by February 9, always by legal and peaceful means, except at Forli' where a minor clash took place. There was no sanfedist resistance. Troops and administrators either ran away or joined the rebels, apparently because they felt only a weak attachment to Rome, or because they saw more promise and talent in the Provisional Government. The very weakness of any sentiment in favor of the central government was a potent weapon which the rebels used to their advantage. The


51 Morelli, Stato pp. 128f.
Ancona garrison joined the rebels to a man, even though they had been offered an honorable withdrawal to Rome. It appeared that nearly everywhere, the governors, judges, officers and magistrates were supporting the rebellion, or leading it.\textsuperscript{52} But this was not in any sense a universal rising of the population; it was a very good example of how well a handful of skillful leaders could organize and communicate among themselves and their towns.\textsuperscript{53}

Though artisans and peasants were not active in this initial stage, they tended to go along with the new government in the hopes that a more efficient, local administration might stimulate the economy and bring them more and better jobs. The rest of the Marches and the region of Umbria joined the revolt within 15 days. In addition to good coordination among municipal governments, a key factor in spreading the revolt was the advance of a military column under General Sercognani, who led a mixed force of some 3000 rebel troops and volunteers from Ancona toward Rome. They reached Rieti, on the edge of Lazio, where for the first time a local force fired back at them. Sercognani halted to wait for support before continuing his march on Rome. As none was forthcoming, this advance through Umbria marks the high-water mark of this first stage of the revolt. Sercognani eventually decided to surrender to Archbishop Mastai-Ferretti of Spoleto, the future Pius IX.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52} Farini, I, 38-40.

\textsuperscript{53} Tivaroni, \textit{Austriaco}, II, 185-9.

\textsuperscript{54} Candeloro, II, 176-9.
The Austrians finally intervened when Gregory XVI asked for help. Their army entered Bologna on March 21, and forced Ancona to surrender a week later, despite a delaying action by rebel troops under the leadership of General Zucchi. Resistance was generally light and almost perfunctory. Once the rebellion seemed to be contained, the ambassadors of the major powers issued their Memorandum of 1831. Cardinal Bernetti sensed the fundamental rivalry between French and Austrian policy, and set out to play off one against the other. He promised reform in good time, but insisted that the powers "did not understand" the Church interests which were his own priority. In the meantime, he used French support to help get Austrian troops withdrawn by mid-July. Once the Austrians were gone, the Legations promptly rebelled again.

This second revolt was not as peaceful as the first had been, but the influence of the moderate leaders remained strong. The Austrian intervention and the belated activities of some sanfedist groups supported by Cardinal Albani had radicalized supporters of the Provisional Government. The result was scattered, if savage, factional fighting in the Legations and elsewhere. It is worth noting that nearly all cases of political murders and other crimes, and warfare over social issues, like land seizure, were confined to this second phase of the revolt. Bernetti was now determined to use force, but waited six months before doing so. He made minor adjustments in the command structure of the army, as well as enough administrative and judicial reforms to placate foreign opinion. When the papal army finally advanced in January of
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1832, their march northward was so undisciplined that atrocities and civilian casualties were very high. It required six hours to crush the rebels near Cesena, despite a three-to-one superiority. On January 28, the Austrians again returned to Bologna to restore order; this time they were welcomed as protectors. 57

The second Austrian intervention proved to be too provocative for the new French government, which styled itself as defender of the Rights of Man. A month later, the French navy landed troops at Ancona to counter what they considered Austrian encroachment. (Both foreign contingents would remain until 1838, when they were withdrawn by mutual consent.) The earliest French commanders, Combes and Galloy, were republican in sentiment. They won over local leaders by proclaiming liberty for all and hostility to the papal government. Since their own forces were small and largely symbolic, they decided to enlist local help to keep order. They organized and armed a so-called "mobile column" of former soldiers and others who had fled the Austrians. 58 This "colonna mobile" was a secret organization composed largely of lower-class (sometimes criminal) types, who had little organization or discipline, but a great deal of hatred. They took advantage of the temporary power vacuum to set themselves up as a sort of special revolutionary police force. The result was five months of disorder and terror in Ancona, until the French officers themselves were replaced. 59 Although it was eventually disbanded, the mobile column destroyed the hitherto

58 Farini, I, 69-74 & 134.
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peaceful image of the revolutionary government, and associated revolution with terror in the minds of many conservatives. Among those associated with this violence were Camillo Meloni and Adamo Mancini, as well as Matteo Costantini, who would figure in several murder trials after the restoration of 1849.60 The same period saw the first organization of Young Italy in the Marches, among whose leaders was Lorenzo Lesti, a key person in this study.61

Behind his shield of foreign troops, Bernetti worked to improve the notoriously poor quality of the papal armed forces. He hired two splendid Swiss regiments, recently in the service of Charles X of France. He also enlisted large numbers of native troops, until the regular army numbered 13,500. In an effort to bolster these expensive professionals, Bernetti authorized the formation of a body of auxiliary troops called Pontifical Volunteers. A closer look at the Volunteers is in order, since they became an important counter-revolutionary force.

At the time of the Restoration, there had been several reactionary bodies known collectively as "sanfedists" or "centurions." They quickly made their presence felt by clandestine violence against liberal leaders, and people they considered to be pro-French. Although dangerous to real or perceived enemies immediately after 1815, these groups rapidly lost strength because of their weak organizational structure, the superficiality of their doctrine, and their reliance on spontaneous anger as motivation. Their descendents, the Volunteers, were more disciplined, and far more formidable for that reason. Bernetti knew he was taking a

60 Natalucci, Marche, pp. 113-5.
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political gamble, but allowed Giovanni Battista Bartolazzi to organize
government sympathizers into paramilitary militia units. Large numbers
eventually enlisted to help put down the rebellion and prevent further
outbreaks. The first unit of Volunteers was raised in the province of
Fermo toward the end of 1831 to assist Cardinal Albani's troops in sup-
pressing the second revolt. By some accounts, there were presently
about 50,000 of them under 30 distinct commands. Most recruits were
men from peasant stock or villages known for their loyalty to the Pope.
Some of these tended to blame the slightly more prosperous townsmen for
their own poverty and unemployment, and took out their hostilities on
them accordingly. Volunteers received no pay, but were exempt from cer-
tain municipal taxes and allowed to bear arms. Many of these militiamen
were badly disciplined and widely hated for the murders and other crimes
which took place once they began to view their political opponents as
criminals with no rights. Pitched battles were recorded in places where
most townsmen were liberals and many peasants living nearby were Volun-
teers. Faenza, for example, was strongly liberal, while the Borgo, or
sub-town, of Urbecco was a Volunteer stronghold. There alone, those
killed and wounded in sectarian violence numbered several hundred within
just a few years. The danger of setting one part of the population
against another was obvious to the better administrators. As early as
July of 1832, provincial authorities in the Marches expressed serious

62 Fabrizio Marinelli, Le sette reazionari nello Stato Pontificio
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doubts about the value or desirability of such units. The stern Cardinal Spinola saw value in their use as a sort of rural guard for the Legations, but only if there was no expense to the central government. Sebregondi, the Austrian advisor, did not like the idea of leaving law enforcement in the hands of non-professionals. He eventually prevailed on Bernetti to increase their accountability by forcing them to wear black uniforms and demanding a visible command structure.  

So bitter were feelings against the militia, that Mazzini's directives make special mention of them. In the series of revolts planned for 1833-4, Society members were told to "attack and kill all known centurians and enemies of the Federation," to burn their houses, take government representatives into custody, and disarm military posts.

Before Bernetti tightened their discipline, the Volunteers exhibited characteristics of both secret societies and auxiliaries. Although genuinely secret, they took an oath and had a paramilitary structure. From 1833 until their disbanding in 1847, they were a true auxiliary force, with their uniforms and recognized duties. By the time they were disbanded, they had reached a strength of 75,000 in the Legations and the Marches. In spite of their numbers, the Volunteers received very little help from Rome...and very little control. Both Consalvi and Metternich had opposed the formation of such groups as costly, dangerous, and largely useless. More importantly, they both recognized that to

---


66 Hales, Mazzini, pp. 98f.
link force to policy was to admit the failure of that same policy.\textsuperscript{67} For the purposes of the present study, Pontifical Volunteers were especially significant because of the large amount of violence which was directed against them, or provoked by them.

**Plots of the early 1840's**

After more than a decade of Gregory XVI's inert regime, there were several attempted revolts in short succession. Most of these seemed to be motivated by the same combination of factors seen in 1831, but now with greater participation of Mazzinians. Since these revolts were not broadly based or even widely known among the population at large, the police were somewhat justified in their assumption that the plotters and revolutionary societies themselves were the reasons for the continued unrest. Yet there seemed to be no end to the willingness to challenge the government on the part of citizens, especially in the Legations.

One such plot had been uncovered in the planning stages in 1836; Tomasso Galletti and Camillo Meloni were exiled to Brazil with several other leaders.\textsuperscript{68} Of much greater importance, in the Papal States and elsewhere, were the better planned revolts organized by Mazzini's followers: Calabria (1839), Aquila (1841), Savigno (1843), the Bandiera expedition (1844), and Rimini (1845). Mazzini had added the feature of using a sort of "foreign legion" of exiles to support local revolutionary leadership.\textsuperscript{69} Thus the papal police often arrested conspirators from

\textsuperscript{67} Marinelli, Sette, pp.52f.

\textsuperscript{68} Natalucci, Marche, p.117.

other states during local rebellions, and revolts in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies were followed by charges against papal subjects like Achille Paggi, Nicola Marchetti and Antonio Gianelli (1843), and Carlo Osman (Bandiera group, 1844). Mazzini also made efforts to maintain a liaison with respected moderate leaders, such as Mamiani and Farini, as well as with organizations not under his control, like that of Galletti and Biancoli in Bologna.

The Muratori revolt at Savigno near the Modenese frontier (1843) was only one example of this sort of combined effort. Several uprisings were to take place simultaneously to confuse the police and the Austrians. But efficient work by Cardinal Spinola and the police identified many of the planners before they were ready to act. Spies and agents had little trouble learning the general plan, especially since many conspirators assumed that everyone favored their cause, and talked freely of their plans. Police raids forced the few surviving leaders to commit themselves when their chances of success had dropped to nearly zero. As early as July 31, the humane Legate of Ravenna, Cardinal Amat, contacted three local suspects, Count Francesco Lovatelli, Count Tullo Rasponi, and Luigi Carlo Farini, in an attempt to head off trouble. He offered them passports and protection if they would simply leave the country and forget the coming revolution. Subsequent events would demonstrate that his trust had been well placed. The rebellion which finally took place
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at Savigno, in the Samoggia valley, was led by Pasquale and Saverio Muratori. Their attempt of August 14 was a disaster because their promised support had either been defeated, or exposed and scattered. Within a week's time, the police were circulating notices which promised rewards of 300 scudi to whoever arrested the Muratori brothers or any of their fellow leaders: Gaetano Turri, Pietro Pietramellara, Oreste Biancoli, Sebastiano Tanara or several others, all of whom were young nobles, landowners and professionals. 73

A larger but even more hopeless attempt was made on September 8-9. Vincenzo Caldesi and other local leaders assembled a body of 200 armed rebels at Bologna. They were reviewed in broad daylight by Colonel Ignazio Ribotti and a cadre of officers from the Spanish army who had arrived by way of Livorno. Their objective was to march toward Imola and capture three popular cardinals meeting at a villa at Tarrano nearby, and hold them as hostages until their demands were met. But the movement of so many armed men was too big to keep secret. The cardinals (including Amat and Mastai-Feretti) heard of the attempt and escaped easily. When the rebels learned that they no longer had a reason to march, they broke up and melted back into the countryside. Only 30 were ever captured. 74

These events gave the most reactionary elements in the government an excuse to crack down hard. They resorted to using special commissions of inquiry, with powers to try and condemn political suspects by completely bypassing the regular court system.Whatever rebels could be

73 Zama, Rivolta pp. 40f.
74 Piero Zama, Rivolta pp. 42ff.
identified were tried by an Extraordinary Military Commission which had been given these special powers in May to deal with the rebellion. They handed down three distinct judgements in 1844: one against the Imola group (January 22), another against the Muratori band (March 11) and one as a follow-up to both (June 26). Draconian sentences followed, including 20 condemnations to death. Most of these sentences were commuted to prison terms, but 7 rebels were actually executed.\(^7^5\) The Military Commission's judgements were always harsh, summary, and not subject to appeal, except to the Pope himself. Even within governmental circles, many administrators felt these special commissions were much too severe, insofar as they were turning otherwise harmless people into implacable foes. Cardinal Amat had already helped some of the accused escape; Cardinal Gizzi, Legate of Forlì', refused to accept the jurisdiction of the Commission at all in his province. Still others protested to Rome over unfairly harsh treatment. But very little good seemed to come from any of it. At Easter, 1844, two Volunteers were killed in Rimini. The Commission arrested seventy men for the crime, executed two of them, and sentenced all but one of the others to long terms in prison. Fifty-two of these condemned were artisans, probably just bystanders to the actual murders.\(^7^6\)

Since it was at Rimini that local passions were inflamed, it was also there that a much larger attempt at revolution followed in short order. Simultaneous risings were planned for Cesena, Faenza and Forlì', as well as Rimini. Large numbers of armed citizens would seize the pub-

\(^7^5\) Zama, *Rivolta* p. 46.

\(^7^6\) Tivaroni, II, 242-8.
lic buildings, as well as police and military posts. Great care was taken to co-ordinate the movements at least as well as in 1831. The chief local planner was Pietro Renzi. He had been in contact with the exile community in France, specifically Livio Zambeccari, and such other 1843 veterans as Oreste Biancoli and Gaetano Bottrigari. Renzi was informed that three groups were ready to march to support him once the signal was given: one between Poretta and Vergatto, another at Bagnacavallo, led by Pietro Beltrami, and the third at le Balze, near Faenza, commanded by Count Raffaele Pasi. Each of these columns would advance in the direction of Rimini, gathering strength and disrupting the local police forces along their way.\textsuperscript{77}

At the same time, a carefully worded appeal to the major powers of Europe would be published. This so-called Manifesto of Rimini was largely Farini's work, although he had collaboration from several others, like Giuseppe Montanelli. Farini eloquently listed a program of twelve reforms, largely political, which the rebels considered essential to the good government of their state. Many of these had already been proposed in Consalvi's time (but never implemented), or listed in the Memorandum of 1831: modern legal codes, municipal and provincial councils, opening offices to laymen, a free press, a civic guard, and a general amnesty for all political offenders. The demands and the tone of the Manifesto were extremely moderate, intended to attract broad support both inside and outside the Papal States.\textsuperscript{78} It was similar in many ways to a supporting proposal issued by the Piedmontese noble Massimo D'Azeg-

\textsuperscript{77} Zama, Rivolta, pp.119-22.

\textsuperscript{78} Montale, p. 28.
He suggested a uniform military system throughout Italy, reformed legal codes, liberalized press laws, railroads, a customs league, a common organization of studies, and government based on elected communal and provincial councils.\(^{79}\)

Although it had been carefully planned beforehand, the Rimini incident began prematurely. Once again, the police were aware of the plot because of the large numbers involved. The police jailed two suspected leaders, Giuseppe Galletti in Bologna and Mattia Montecchi in Rome. The Military Commission then deployed large numbers of agents and Volunteers to raid the houses of suspects, in order to provoke an uprising before it had a chance to succeed.\(^{80}\) The actual rebellion grew out of what may have been a spontaneous clash between young people and carabinieri at a football game. It is still uncertain how many people anticipated a fight, but quite a few had brought weapons with them. One reason that feelings were especially strong was that the condemnations of the Military Commission had just been handed down on September 10; most of the 67 men sentenced were from the Rimini area.\(^{81}\)

On September 23, an armed band attacked carabinieri and volunteers at the entrance to the football field in Rimini. Several officers received gunshot or stab wounds, but held their positions. In another clash, a volunteer received a chest wound from which he died the next day. Two Swiss were attacked by a mob which killed one and wounded the other. A force of about eighty rebels, led by Renzi and Celli, attacked

\(^{79}\) Montale, p. 33.

\(^{80}\) Farini, I, 113.
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the San Francisco barracks, where they captured a substantial number of weapons. A large number of the troops joined their ranks - those who did not were locked in the Rocca after the other prisoners were released. Renzi declared himself head of a reform government, but was unable to actually rule the city. His regime collapsed after two days. The other supporting forces were even less successful. The bands at Bagnacavallo and le Balze gained control of local government installations, but were easily disbanded before most ordinary citizens knew there had even been a revolt. For all the high sounding rhetoric of the Manifesto, the actual rebels seemed unable to gain the slightest success against Gregory XVI's government.

Although it seemed that both the Memorandum of 1831 and the Manifesto of Rimini had gone largely unheeded by the government, both would eventually provide the basis for the reforms later attempted by Pius IX. What was quite certain, on the other hand, was that hundreds of men now found themselves exiled from their state or imprisoned within it. Many of these were natural leaders who might profit from another opportunity, but Gregory XVI and his government had to pass from the scene before any such thing would be possible.

---

CHAPTER II

THE AMNESTY OF 1846

The election of Pius IX (Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti) signalled a dramatic change of political course. Unfortunately, the sharpness of the contrast between Gregory and Pius led some contemporaries to assume that the change was even more dramatic than it actually was. Pius began as a humane conservative, and remained such. But he was no "liberal pope," and never had any intention of becoming one. Although his charm, good will, and genuine charity toward his political foes might have obscured this basic truth, they could not change it. It may be impossible to pin down the "political philosophy" of the new Pope. He probably never developed one, except for a few vague ideas or plans prior to 1846. Once elected, he had to learn a hard lesson: that a head of state, engaged in governmental politics and day-to-day decisions, must often put aside his "philosophy" and watch it turn into something else. For Pius IX, perhaps the best description of his political journey would be a series of "attitudes," rather than objectives or goals. He evolved from an attitude of paternal charity, through one of self-doubt and confusion, and into one of discouragement and bitterness.

Our most specific insight to his early ideas and hopes for papal government can be found in a short treatise which he wrote nearly a year before his election. This work, entitled Thoughts on the Public Administration of the State, is a rather disjointed essay written in Septem-
ber of 1845. It probably was not written for publication, and may or may not have been inspired by the Manifesto of Rimini, although it clearly had much in common with that document.\textsuperscript{1} It was simply a list of 58 items, in random order, each of which leads into a brief discussion of what the author would like to change about the administration. He spoke of what means might be used to encourage education, industry, jobs for young people, better officials and policemen, rooting out corruption, and making better use of the nobility in high positions. Throughout the work, he frequently appealed to virtue and good will. Essentially, it is not a true political program or philosophy, but rather a charitable and humane discussion of how to make the existing institutions work better. The changes he envisioned in the mechanism of government were largely cosmetic. He took it for granted that clerical government would continue, that lay participation in the administration would never be allowed to influence church policy, and that the clergy should retain their elite status in both social and political sectors. Far from being the revolutionary leader he would later be considered by some, he was fully committed to keeping the Papal States stable and harmonious. Although he liked the idea of making his state a showcase of good government, he never seriously accepted the thought that his subjects might challenge his sovereign rights. In effect, his entire "political philosophy," as reflected in this essay, boils down to no more than maintaining the status quo, but doing so with a sense of decency.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Giovanni Soranzo, "'Pensieri relativi all'Amministrazione Pubblica dello Stato, 1845' del futuro Pio IX," Aevum (1953), XXVII, 23.
Genesis of the Amnesty

One pivotal suggestion in the future Pope's essay was the need for some dramatic act of clemency. In the Papal States, as elsewhere in Italy, granting an amnesty was solidly embedded in tradition. A new sovereign frequently granted pardons or paroles to the rivals of his predecessor to give a fresh and benevolent look to his own regime. In his Thoughts of September 1845, Pius specifically pointed out the need for "...a generous pardon for political offenders, since the multiplication of exiles also multiplies those who are plotting revolutions." With this objective in view, the new pope appointed a transitional committee of six cardinals to study several issues. Their agenda included railroad construction, the reorganization of the Secretariat of State, and how best to reconcile an amnesty with public order. The six nominees were two former Secretaries of State, Bernetti and Lambruschini, together with Macchi, Mattei, Gizzi and Amat, these last two being popularly considered the leading "liberals" among the sacred college. For the proceedings of this committee, we are indebted to its secretary, the young monsignor Giovanni Corboli-Bussi, a close friend and confidant of the Pope, and one of the few genuine liberal thinkers in the new government circle. A study of Corboli-Bussi's transcript gives us a detailed look at the way in which the amnesty was organized and implemented. More importantly, it explodes some of the myths about the same amnesty. 3

2 Soranzo, Aevum pp.40-6.

3 Giacomo Martina, S.J., Pio IX (1846-1850), (Roma: Editrice Pontificia Universita' Gregoriana, 1974), pp. 95-7. It is curious that Candelo- lori (II, 419) makes Corboli-Bussi and the police chief, Monsignor Mar-
The committee held three sessions before the amnesty was published. Each member was encouraged to state his views freely and defend his recommendations, which would then be used by Pius in reaching his final decision. Although no cardinal is identified by name in the transcript, it is relatively simple to trace the advice favoring a rather "minimal" pardon to Lambruschini, occasionally seconded by Bernetti, but opposed by everyone else in most cases. Nevertheless, the exchange of views was surprisingly frank and open. The cardinals took their task seriously and largely succeeded in reaching a balanced consensus.4

During the first session (July 1), everyone agreed that some act of clemency was in order, especially to reduce the hatred which many people felt toward their government. Huge numbers of citizens had signed petitions to the Pope requesting mercy for condemned prisoners, especially those from the provinces of Ancona and the Romagna. The cardinals found it easy to agree that this might be the ideal moment for a conciliatory gesture.5

There was, however, considerable disagreement about how it might best be done. Lambruschini observed that there was an inherent danger in publishing any sweeping amnesty which might appear to be an official condemnation of the previous government. In addition, he pointed out the disruptive effects of releasing genuinely dangerous people under any

---

circumstances, but especially if the release left the impression that there was really nothing morally wrong with political machinations. He suggested that the pardon should not be sudden but gradual, that it be granted on a strictly case-by-case basis, and then only after consultation with other Italian states. It is easy to understand why Lambruschini felt that those in prison should stay locked up, since most of them had been put there during his tenure as secretary of state. In short, he believed that a general pardon would be counterproductive, since it would do more to undermine public order than to preserve it.  

Another matter raised at this first session was the future behavior of those pardoned. There was general consensus that good conduct in the future was a legitimate condition of the amnesty. A variety of suggestions followed. For example, the former offenders could have their political rights restricted, or local governments might accept responsibility for them, or they could be placed under close supervision by the police, or they should be forced to post cash bonds or mortgages on their property to assure their loyalty. But these conditions were ruled out as too severe. The cardinals came to see that such measures appeared petty rather than generous, while still providing no concrete guarantees in return. They were also realistic enough to know that the inefficient police force could never monitor so many people. The only suggestion left was that prisoners and exiles be required to give their word of honor to be loyal citizens from now on. All of the cardinals appreciated the very large risk they were taking: the security of such an arrangement was minimal since it depended heavily on good will and

---

6 Reinerman, "Reform," p.545.
vague hopes. Yet this alternative had the one great advantage of seeming far more generous and trusting than any of the other conditions.

Several cardinals agreed that distinctions were in order. It was appropriate, for example, that ordinary political offenders not be dealt with in the same way as violent criminals. And since greater loyalty was expected of clerics, soldiers and government employees, these might not be automatically treated as generously as the others. Cardinal Macchi spoke in favor of a more generous amnesty than Lambruschini wanted, excluding only policemen and military. Two others, probably Gizzi and Mattei, also insisted that the pardon should be a general one, and granted all at once, if Pius were to begin his reign with a strongly conciliatory gesture. Lambruschini realized that he had not convinced anyone to favor a gradual amnesty, but was well supported in his contention that the broadness of the act of clemency might be difficult to reconcile with public order. This issue of distinctions was left undecided, however, pending more specific information on individual cases.

Finally, it was suggested as an afterthought that more severe penalties would be in order for any relapses which might occur. But again, nothing was decided. By now, most of the cardinals felt that they were discussing a subject which required more specific information before they could proceed. As a preparation for the next session, they agreed to ask Monsignor Marini, director general of police, to provide them with lists of political offenders already condemned, those still on

8 Martina, I, 98.
trial, and those in exile both by their own will and by reason of a judicial decree. Each of these listings should also provide enough information to distinguish real criminals from the rest and to identify which were ecclesiastics, military and employees of the state. With all these considerations in mind, and nothing firmly decided, the first session came to an end.  

Corboli-Bussi's transcript of this meeting effectively kills the appealing fable of Pius and the black beans, which has even been perpetuated by some of the better historians, like Farini, Spellanzon and Salvatorelli. When asked whether or not an amnesty was prudent - so the story goes - the cardinals voted by placing black or white beans in a dish. Five out of six supposedly voted "no," with only Gizzi in favor. Already knowing what he wanted, Pius then covered the dish with his white skull cap, saying "Brothers, aren't they all white?" Despite its cuteness, the story has no basis in fact. The transcript shows clearly that Pius asked for advice not on "whether" to grant an amnesty, but only "how." Furthermore, each of the cardinals favored some form of mercy, and their advice was distilled from prolonged discussions, with each of them able to speak and react to others. Finally, the device of voting secretly with colored beans was not even used by the curia at that time.  

The cardinals' preparatory commission held its second meeting on July 8. The agenda had been drawn up assuming that the information already requested from the police would be on hand. But instead of com-

---

plete lists of prisoners, exiles and those still on trial, Monsignor Marini sent a letter. He regretted that he was unable to supply such a list, due to insoluble bureaucratic difficulties and confusion over authority. In particular, he had no information whatever about trials in progress, since the courts had never shared this data with him. Of the four processes then under way, the Consulta could supply information on two, but the other two were still in the local courts at Ancona and Fano. The rest of the names were available to the police, but would simply take a while longer to assemble in a format useful to the commission.\textsuperscript{12} In the meanwhile, he proposed a simpler solution to the problem of distinctions, based on suggestions which Metternich had sent to Rome. Austria had granted amnesties in 1838 and 1845, and the proposals were the results of their experience: dismiss all political trials in process, commute life sentences to ten years, free all other prisoners, and examine the conditions of the exiles on an individual basis. The cardinals decided, however, that these criteria were too vague and general; they also recalled that the Austrian pardon had not worked very well. They repeated the request that Marini provided the essential information as soon as possible, and returned to their deliberations as best they could without it.\textsuperscript{13}

They agreed to exclude officers, clerics and government employees, as well as common criminals, and to require a declaration of loyalty instead of an oath. They also decided that the announcement would take the form of an address of the Pope to his subjects, according to a for-

\textsuperscript{12} Pirri, "Amnistia," p. 217.

\textsuperscript{13} Martina, I, 99.
formula to be composed by Corboli-Bussi. In an effort to maintain morale within the ranks of the police and the army, the cardinals accepted Lambri-bruschini's suggestion to announce the amnesty only after rewards were given to those soldiers who put down the revolt of 1845, and the members of the political commissions had received official thanks from the government. Following this disappointingly short discussion, the commission listed a number of items for future sessions, including measures to reform the court system, the bureaucracy, the police and the military. All voiced their agreement that the matter of the amnesty had to be dealt with first, and on that note they adjourned their meeting.\textsuperscript{14}

The third and final session of the cardinals' commission took place on July 15. Most issues relating to the amnesty had already been decided. Only two items remained on the agenda: consideration of Mari-

\textsuperscript{15} Whatever its potential flaws, the amnesty had to be published without further delay if it were to have any value as a good will gesture. And so it was.

The final version of the amnesty was dated July 16 and actually appeared on the evening of July 17. The reaction on the part of ordinary citizens was explosive and immediate. Crowds converged on the Quirinal within hours to cheer the Pope, and hail what many hoped would be the beginning of a new age. Both the conditions set down by the cardinals' commission and Corboli-Bussi's careful phrasing had their effect; the acts of clemency were generous and obviously conciliatory. And far

\textsuperscript{14} Pirri, "Amnistia," pp. 220f.

\textsuperscript{15} Pirri, "Amnistia," p. 221.
beyond the mere words of the proclamation were the overtones and the symbolic value that accompanied it. That very image of lavish generosity and the joyous reaction to it had the effect of making the new pope into a hero larger than life. Simply stated, Pius appeared to turn overnight into a "liberal pope" and savior of Italy merely because so many of his subjects had a need to believe that he was those things.\(^{16}\)

The text of the proclamation includes not only the conditions of the amnesty, but the motives for it. This version was translated by William E. Gladstone.

Pius IX - To his most faithful subjects, Health and Apostolic benediction.

During the days when the public rejoicing on our exaltation to the Pontificate touched Us to the depth of our heart, We could not restrain an emotion of grief, while reflecting that not a few families among our subjects were kept back from sharing the general joy, because, in the loss of their domestic consolations, they were made to bear a great portion of the judgement, which only some one member of the family had deserved, by offences against the order of society, or the lawful rights of the Sovereign. We furthermore turn a pitying eye upon the numbers of inexperienced youths, who, although drawn by alluring flatteries into the vortex of political disorders, yet appeared to us less as seducers than seduced. On which account, from that time forward, We have been considering whether to stretch out our hand, and to tender peace of mind, to those of our erring children who might be disposed to give evidence of their sincere repentance. The affection that our good subjects have shown toward Us, and the incessant tokens of veneration that the Holy See has, in our Person, received from them, have now pursued Us, that We may pardon them without danger to the public at large. We accordingly determine and command, that the opening of our Pontificate be signalised by the following acts of sovereign clemency:

I. To all our subjects now actually in a place of punishment for political offences, We remit the remainder of their sentences, provided they make in writing a solemn declaration that they will never, in any manner, abuse this favor, but that they desire faithfully to fulfill all the duties of good subjects.

II. Upon the same condition, all our subjects who have quit­ted our dominions for political reasons may return to them, provided that they shall make known in a proper decree, and through the

Apostolic Nuncios, their desire to avail themselves of this act of our clemency.

III. We, in like manner, discharge those who, on account of having taken part in any machination against the state, are either bound by precetti politici, or declared incapable of municipal office.

IV. It is our intention that all criminal proceedings for offences purely political, which have not yet been completed by a formal judgement, shall abate and determine; and that the parties under charge be set free, unless any among them should ask for the continuation of the trial, in the hope of making his innocence clear, and recovering his rights accordingly.

V. It is not, however, our intention to comprise within the provisions of the foregoing articles that very small number of ecclesiastics, military officers, and civil servants who have been sentenced, or have fled, or are under process, for political offences. In regard to these, We reserve it to ourselves to take other measures, as the examination of their respective cases may show it to be advisable.

VI. Neither, in like manner, is it our will that in this indulgence should be included ordinary crimes, with which political culprits, refugees, or prisoners on trial may be further charged; as, in regard to these, We intend that the existing laws shall have full effect.

We would willingly trust that those, who shall avail themselves of our mercy, will know at all times how to respect both our rights and their own honor. We moreover hope that, with minds softened by our pardon, they will be ready to lay down those intestine resentments, which are always related, either as cause or as effect, to political passions; so that all the children of a common Father may be truly reunited in that bond of peace, in which it is the will of God that they should be mutually joined. But should our hopes in any degree be frustrated, We shall then, with whatever bitterness of pain to ourselves, constantly recollect, that if mercy be the most pleasurable attribute of sovereignty, justice is its first duty.

Given in Rome, at S. Maria Maggiore, on the 16th of July, 1846, in the first year of our Pontificate. Pius PP IX.

The conditions were presented simply and directly. First of all, the amnesty applied only to political offenses; no one could receive it if he were in prison or exile for some civil crime. For example, if a person had been condemned by a Special Commission for taking up arms against the police, he could benefit from the amnesty. But if a policeman had been shot at the time, and there was a possibility that he might

---

17 Farini, I, 179-81.
have done it, then he could be excluded until the matter was cleared up. A second condition denied the amnesty to clerics, soldiers and government employees, since greater loyalty had been expected of them. But even in this severe circumstance, the door was left ajar for a possible review of individual cases. A third condition demanded that each applicant had to sign a printed declaration of loyalty, promising to abide by the conditions of good citizenship in the future. This formality was a small enough price to pay for a second chance, yet it was considered legally binding by the courts. Later on, it would be used as the basis for more severe charges and sentences against those who violated their word.

Even at the start, a few exiles resented this declaration as a sign of bad faith on the part of Pius, and an indicator of his lack of real trust in them. This question of the declaration provoked concern in some exiles. Luigi Carlo Farini wrote to Bertini (August 2, 1846):

...it seems to me that the condition is honorable enough, since by requiring one to carry out the duties of a good subject, it does not mean that he must renounce his own principles. The good subject of a prince is one who tells him the truth, who advises him to do what is good, and who wants him free of foreign dependence. One of two conditions exists: either the Government intends it this way, and everyone can sign in good conscience; or the Government is making mental restrictions, and thus breaks the agreement and absolves the individual from his word of honor. 18

Farini followed his own advice and signed the declaration on the next day. 19 Most others signed the declaration without much thought, especially the prisoners. Some exiles reflected on whether or not they really wanted to sign such a document. A few, like Count Carlo Pepoli,

19 ASV, SdS (1846), rubrica 86, fascicolo 99, p. 100.
Terenzio Mamiani and Filippo Canuti insisted in composing personal formulas of their own, and were relieved to have them accepted. These three returned home only after some delay. Most other exiles either signed in good faith, or evaded the matter altogether.\textsuperscript{20}

The thought that former rebels against the state were now being asked for their word of honor helped to make an otherwise routine measure look radical and dramatic.\textsuperscript{21} Furthermore, the conciliatory message which accompanied the amnesty implied that those who would benefit from it were "victims" of youth and inexperience. Henceforth, they would be considered as partners of the new government, and not foes. But the conditions and the objectives of that partnership were never spelled out, leaving a great deal to chance, or worse, to conflicting interpretations.\textsuperscript{22}

Even at this early stage, significant numbers of conservatives viewed the amnesty as an affront to justice and a dangerous sign of weakness.\textsuperscript{23} Some said that Pius hoped to disarm potential revolutionaries with kindness because he preferred not to confront them. Such an allegation is difficult to demonstrate. But as things actually turned out, the dealings between Pope and Revolution were never very successful for either party.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{20} Candeloro, II, 420f.
\textsuperscript{21} Ghisalberti, Nuove Ricerche, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{24} Michele Monaco, "I precedenti e il significato dell'allocuzione
One conservative with an obvious interest in Roman stability was Klemens von Metternich. In a letter to the new Pope, he advised him to remember that an amnesty was not, and should not be, a statement of innocence, but a pardon for an actual crime. He also advised Pius to maintain a clear distinction in his own mind between acts of "government" (policy originating with him as sovereign) and acts of "administration" (more routine matters which could be delegated to ministers). Finally, the Austrian chancellor added a caution against dangerous "concessions," which gave up essential sovereign rights; these should not be confused with exercising justice and prudence, which were a ruler's duties, and could not in any way be considered options.25

One contemporary author estimated that at the moment of the amnesty, there were about 1250 individuals who might benefit, including 247 political prisoners already condemned, 303 others whose cases were in process, and about 700 exiles. 224 prisoners were released immediately, including 19 from the Castel Sant' Angelo, 7 from the Carceri Nuovi, 129 from Civita Castellana, 5 from San Leo, and 30 from Civita-vecchia.26 According to a list printed by the government in 1849, 894 persons eventually received the amnesty, but only 564 of these signed the declaration.27 A much more recent work goes so far as to say that perhaps 2000 revolutionary leaders were allowed to live freely in the


26 Ghisalberti, Nuove, p. 24n.

Papal States. This number looks absurdly large, unless he intends to include huge numbers of people never arrested or charged with anything, and thus never pardoned.

One immediate result of the amnesty was increased optimism among liberals, who became bolder in suggesting improvements for state and society. Throughout the remainder of 1846, a seemingly endless series of rallies, torchlight processions and banquets honored Pius IX as the harbinger of a new age. Former prisoners and exiles were feted as the heroes of the day, and lauded for their sufferings for the cause of liberty and steadfastness against the "Gregorian" regime. On the other hand, those who had been partisans of the former regime became discouraged and increasingly pessimistic about the future. The names of Gregory and Pius became symbols for the two factions, something which disturbed the Pope greatly. He had announced the amnesty and the more progressive policy because he wanted an era of reconciliation and harmony, not merely another round of fratricide. But in spite of his best efforts, Lambruschini and the "Gregorians" seemed to be utterly discredited and quite bitter against Pius for upsetting the society which they had so carefully crafted.

---


29 Martina, I, 102.

30 Ballerini, pp. 61f.
The Process of the Amnesty

While the festivities continued in Rome and elsewhere, the cumbersome machinery of Roman government began to process the actual beneficiaries of the amnesty. For obvious reasons, putting the prisoners at liberty was much easier than clearing the exiles to return home. According to the custom of the time, prison officials had most of the significant records for prisoners under their care. Whenever a prisoner was moved, his records went with along with him. So in many cases, a prison warden had not only the authority, but also the information to decide who qualified for release under the terms of the July 16 document. Since no further consultation or permission was required, many wardens released prisoners the same day on their own authority. While this was obviously a great boon to the prisoners in question, it has made documentation of their release more difficult. Little or no paperwork was required for ordinary cases, so little has survived. About a hundred cases were doubtful enough to make some official send an inquiry to the Secretariat of State, asking whether or not the terms applied to specific persons. These special cases, together with their replies, are well documented and present no problems whatever to a researcher. The rest, including some actual mistakes in releasing the wrong people, continue to make study in this area difficult.

For those in exile, there were two different ways to initiate the process. The applicant could write directly to Rome, where the Secretariat of State was charged with overall supervision of the amnesty. Or wherever it was more convenient, he could contact a Papal Nuncio through an embassy or consulate of the Papal States in the country where he
found himself. There were many of these consulates in major cities, especially in the Catholic countries of Europe. Most of the day-to-day paperwork of the amnesty process was done by Nuncios and their secretaries as they wrote back and forth in their regular packets of correspondence with Rome. If an exile found himself in a country with no consulate, he could also contact the consulate of another state friendly to Rome, such as France or Tuscany. These delegations were accustomed to handle papal affairs in states like Great Britain or the Ottoman Empire.

Once the application itself was received by the Secretariat of State, a clerk would contact the central office of police in Rome, or the local police in the applicant's province or home town. This check was made to be certain that the exile was not charged with other crimes which would make him ineligible for the amnesty. As soon as the police had cleared the applicant for readmission (or found prohibitive crimes, if such was the case) the results were communicated to him directly, or to the consulate representing him. Finally, the Secretariat authorized the release of a passport and travel visa to him, and alerted the frontier guards to let him pass. Although most cases were handled quite routinely through normal channels, a few presented special problems which might require a legal judgement. There cases were referred for a final decision to the Consulta, as highest court of appeal in political matters. If the applicant signed the written declaration of loyalty as a part of this process, it was also returned to the Secretariat of State and filed.

Ideally, a complete file on one individual would include four elements: the letter of request, the printed declaration, the police
report, and the final permission to return. Not surprisingly, most files are incomplete. Missing elements may simply have been lost, or never existed in the first place. A large number of printed declarations are missing, not necessarily because someone refused to sign. In some cases, the consul probably never had the chance to place the paper before the applicant for his signature. Sometimes, an overeager exile could complicate things by beginning to travel homeward while his case was still being processed. In a few cases, applicants are traced from one consulate to another; one individual applied in Paris, for example, then moved to Marseilles, Livorno and Florence before finally arriving at Bologna. Long after he was home, secretaries in these various consulates continued writing frantic notes to one another, wondering why he had disappeared. Such confusion could wreak havoc with a bureaucracy which was already inefficient and overworked. There are also more than a few cases of applicants simply turning up at home without benefit of passport or valid authorization; the police and the customs guards were no more efficient than the diplomats.

Profile of the Returnees

This study is based on a list of 989 specific names. Each one of them applied for the amnesty, and most received it. Even among those who were refused at first, many were later granted release from prison or permission to return from exile as a result of a change or clarification of policy. Still others simply returned home without permission, or were released from prison against the wishes of the central government. Most of these cases were processed and completed within a year of the
proclamation of the amnesty, the stated deadline.\textsuperscript{31} In each case, there is reason to believe that the individual did have the opportunity to return to his home and live a normal life. What is more important is that he also had the opportunity to return to political activity for or against the government, if he chose to do so.

The master list includes 550 exiles, 433 prisoners, and 6 others who are special cases. These 6 are people who were physically at liberty within the Papal States, but who had some curtailment of their civil or political rights as a result of earlier political activity on their part. On the occasion of the amnesty, they applied for restoration of their former condition, which usually included a government job or pension. In these cases, lost jobs were not regained automatically, but all other civil and political rights were restored. Although the 6 cases are numerically insignificant, they are still included here for accuracy and honesty, and because they remind us that there were cases which do not automatically fit into larger categories.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{31} A few cases were allowed to continue into early 1848, by way of exception, since they had special features which required legal judgments, or in a few instances because of distance and slow communications from such places as Brazil and Ceylon.

\textsuperscript{32} In the statistical lists which follow, as well as those in the appendices, consistent abbreviations are used. The letter "x" always refers to an exile, "p" to a prisoner, and "o" to one of the 6 special cases. In the appendices, where parallel columns are used, the first group of columns always refers to those included in the original amnesty of 1846, the second group always indicates the sub-group of those who were considered to have violated their pledge of loyalty and good conduct.
Division by Place of Origin

Recipients of the amnesty include men from each of the four regions of the Papal States, but very unevenly distributed. Fortunately for this project, nearly every name mentioned in the archival documents includes a place of origin. It was a common practice of the time to list both the place of birth and the father's first name as a means of more accurate identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division by Place of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>grouping</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forlì'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Others&quot; (= unspecified, unknown or foreign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS (989)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to Appendix A for a more complete breakdown by province or town. 33

33 In several cases, there are multiple places of residence. As a typical example, a man could be born in one area (usually in the countryside), but then move to another (usually a town) to live and work,
To those who read Italian history, it comes as no surprise that a large number of revolutionaries in the Papal States originated in the Legations of the northeast. What may be surprising, however, is just how large the percentage actually is: fully two-thirds of the total. Over half of the remaining third come from those two provinces in the Marches (Urbino-Pesaro and Ancona) which were closest to the Legation of Forli', indicating an unmistakable geographical pattern. Ancona was the more important of the Papal States' two major commercial ports, and was always strongly influenced by whatever happened in the areas to the north. This combined zone represents 85% of all names in this study with a specified place of origin. The differences between the commercial northeast and the lethargic, cleric-dominated capital are obvious.

By way of sharp contrast, mountainous Umbria accounts for only 29 names (3%). While it is true that poverty sometimes stimulates revolution, there is no support here for economic want as a single and determining factor. If poverty alone could explain people's disenchantment with the government, then Umbria might have been the leading region, and not the prosperous Legations.

The relatively low number for Lazio (81) reflected its obvious economic link to Rome's food supply, the proximity of the principal administrative offices, and sentimental ties to the Papacy. Added to these factors was a long standing and systematic policy of favoritism for the capital. Food prices were closely regulated, in most cases even though he may have continued to refer to himself as coming from his old patria. In this sort of situation, the place of residence at the time of the alleged political offense is used for one simple reason: political influences on a potential revolutionary are more likely to come from his immediate environment than his place of birth.
keeping them artificially low. Charitable organizations and institutional help for the poor were always stronger in Rome than in the provinces. It is worth remembering that Gregory XVI was cheered even in the poor Trastevere quarter of Rome at the same time in 1831 that revolt was flaming in the north.

Another distinction should also be made. The typical revolutionary from Lazio was likely to be an intellectual, not an artisan. Within Lazio, over half (49 out of 81) are from the city of Rome itself. Rome accounted for a large percentage of the educated people in Lazio, if not the entire state. A further breakdown of the Roman names shows that, at least in this sample, many came from noble or other prosperous families, rather than artisans or working class people. Thus whatever impetus to revolution there may have been in Lazio, it probably originated as a result of political discussion or study, rather than demographics. It is no surprise that the country areas here, and indeed everywhere except the Adriatic coast, were relatively peaceful.

Within the Legations region, it appears at first glance that the statistics show a fairly even distribution of names among the four legations. But a map of the contemporary boundaries (see Appendix E) shows that the legations interlock at precisely the places where some of the largest concentrations of names are found (e.g. Lugo, Russi, Faenza and Forli'). The more detailed breakdown in Appendix A shows that some of these provinces contributed far more than others. If one looks carefully at the map, an interesting pattern emerges: provinces along the Via Emilia were quite significant. This ancient Roman road was still

34 See the reference to the special courts in Chapter I, pp. 19f.
the principal commercial artery of the area. It ran northwestward from Rimini on the coast through Bologna and beyond. In all, it crossed 10 of the 45 provinces in the Legations: Rimini, Savignano, Cesena, Bertinoro, Forlì, Faenza, Castel Bolognese, Imola, Castel S. Pietro, and Bologna itself. Collectively, these provinces contributed 66% of the revolutionaries in the Legations.

A similar pattern, also comprising ten provinces, can be drawn within a 30 kilometer radius of the town of Mangari in the province of Faenza. Although Mangari itself produced none of the exiles and prisoners in this study, it provides a convenient geographical center for the diagram. In common with the "Via Emilia" pattern, this circle also includes the provinces of Cesena, Bertinoro, Forlì, Faenza, and Castel Bolognese, then adds the provinces of Fusignano, Lugo, Bagnacavallo, Russi and Ravenna. This "Faenza circle" pattern, also representing 10 provinces out of 45, claimed about 47% of the Legations' names.

Most interesting of all is the combination of both patterns, 15 provinces, looking somewhat like a sausage with a bulge in the middle. This relatively small zone produced 584 names, 88.5% of all those from the Legations, and over 60% of those from the entire state. While it would be foolish to attribute such a complex thing as revolutionary motivation solely to geography, the geographical pattern is hard to ignore. The "clustering" effect in these specific areas may very well be due to such things as local leadership, peer pressure, cultural traditions of opposition to Rome, regional economic grievances, or the organizational infrastructure of the Carbonari or Young Italy. Whatever factors were present in these provinces, they must have been local
indeed. Another third of the Legations' provinces, (15 out of 45) produced no names at all in this study.

One final observation is in order. The statistics of this table show that prisoners outnumber exiles in every region except the Legations, and specifically the coastal Legations of Ferrara, Ravenna and Forli'. In these three areas, exiles outnumber prisoners by more than double.\(^\text{35}\) In times of revolutionary turmoil, the question of who is captured by the police and who escapes to fight another day may very well be decided by one's access to boats, or to some other means of escape. There is probably a "maritime" factor at work here, which would explain this lopsided statistic. A glance at Appendix A also reveals that the city of Ancona (a port) shows a similar imbalance of exiles over prisoners, whereas the rest of the Marches region does not. A closer look at these factors in a future study could shed more light on how exiles from the northwest differed from all others.

\(^{35}\) The term "exile" in this study not only describes ex-prisoners released to serve double time outside the country, but voluntary exiles and those who have fled to escape prosecution as well.
Division by Profession or Social Class

The categories already used (see page 4) reflect social divisions as they were conceived at the time: six major socio-economic groupings, and several minor ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division by Profession</th>
<th>--x/--p/--o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nobility</td>
<td>28 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>36 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Commoners</td>
<td>342 123 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeois</td>
<td>69 19 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Bourgeois</td>
<td>87 19 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>157 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>29 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasantry</td>
<td>8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>37 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unspecified</td>
<td>87 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (989)</td>
<td>550 433 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to Appendix B for a more detailed breakdown of each class. These statistics, unlike those for the previous group, are

Lest there be any doubt, the term "gentry" refers to any individual who listed himself a "possidente," but had no noble title, and gave no other profession. The very large number of untitled town-dwellers (called "Urban Commoners" here) covers a vast spectrum of professions and levels of wealth. This category has been subdivided according to
obviously incomplete. The large number of "unspecified" professions (over 1/3 of the total) leaves us with a much smaller base total with which to work: 630. The lion's share of those doubts are the fault of the poor prison records, which will continue to leave many questions unanswered.

To return briefly to a discussion in the previous section, please note the imbalance between exiles and prisoners on this table as well. Prisoners predominate only in the "unspecified" group. However the ratio of exiles to prisoners is highest among the nobility, gentry and uppermost professional circles, while it is almost even among the unskilled workers. We return to the question of who escaped and who was captured after a failed revolt. Among those who were able to flee, the factors of wealth and influence may also be as important as access to boats.

In comparison to their total share of the population, the numbers of titled nobility and untitled gentry are quite high (30 and 52). One possible reason for it is the lack of opportunity in the predominantly clerical administration for these otherwise talented and potentially well-motivated people. Another topic for a future study would be a comparison of the level of disillusionment among aristocrats in the Papal States with those of Piedmont or Tuscany, for example.

the author's own system, which may hopefully reflect a more accurate clustering by attitude. Any policemen or carabinieri who came to light are listed as "military," according to their ranks.

There is one exception: the clergy, whose total is so small that any statistical discussion would be foolish.
Similar in proportion is the total of 44 for members of the military, usually trusted to remain loyal, even in times of trouble. It is interesting that officers outnumber enlisted ranks 27 to 17. The Papal States of the time, as everywhere else, drew its officers largely from the upper classes of society. Whatever motivation was operative among the nobility, gentry and professional classes would probably be significant to the military officers as well.

By way of contrast, the numbers of clergy and peasants are so small as to appear almost non-existent. True, the percentage of clergy is proportional to their numbers of society, but absolute loyalty was expected of them in a clerical regime. Even 8 might seem high. On the other hand, the peasants were the largest single class. Most of them had no easy life, but very few had attempted to redress their grievances by revolutionary means. Whatever else these figures might suggest, they show that the sort of revolts which had taken place before 1846 had little appeal for people in the countryside.

The umbrella category of Urban Commoners provides 470 names, three-quarters of the total known professions. It is therefore easy to demonstrate that the revolts of the 1830's and 1840's were essentially urban phenomena; a concentrated populus certainly facilitates political mobilization. The fairly broad range of professions also provides a highly diversified spectrum of those who put down their tools to take up arms against their sovereign. Although the artisans as a group provide nearly half the names in this subdivision, there does not appear to be any one group which stands out. We might assume that many of the tailors, shoemakers or building tradesmen who are listed may have been
unemployed or underemployed, but there is no reason to point to a crisis in any one sector of the economy. If, indeed, there is an economic reason for their discontent at all, it might be best found in the overall stagnation of trade and production, and nowhere else.
Division by Place of Exile or Imprisonment

Once a former rebel had fled the country, he had to select a place to live. After a captured revolutionary was sentenced, he was assigned to a prison. The places where these men found themselves in mid 1846 provide an interesting mosaic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division by Place of Exile grouping</th>
<th>--x/--p/--o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian States</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Europe</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Americas</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-unspecified</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division by Place of Imprisonment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please consult Appendix C for a detailed subdivision of both categories.38

38 Data for this table was relatively easy to obtain, especially for the exiles...the letters of request had to come from somewhere. On the other hand, most of the data does not tell us much about revolutionary
The most striking feature of the exiles' table is the 68% of all exiles who fled to France. Even if one discounts those who went to Corsica or to Algeria (which may arguably be written off as "non-French" areas) the total remains astoundingly high. Part of the reason for the attraction of France was probably the availability of employment in a thriving country. Some of the exiles were reluctant to leave these jobs after 1846, although most still applied for the amnesty in the hopes of visiting family and friends again. Another practical consideration was the small pension provided by the French government for any and all political refugees. This token help to expatriots was one way in which King Louis Philippe and Francois Guizot gave lip service to the idea that their government was "revolutionary," with a possible eye toward keeping their own potential troublemakers in line. Whatever the reasons, the tolerant attitude which the exiles found in France made large numbers of them comfortable enough to stay.

Other places of exile tend to support the wish of most expatriots to remain close to home. Southern Europe and the Mediterranean were clearly preferred to northern Europe, in spite of the possible lure of jobs in these industrializing zones. There is decent representation among quite a large range of Mediterranean countries. If one takes the statistics for Malta and the other islands, the Italian and Iberian states, the surprisingly high number for Greece and the Ottoman Empire, and adds these to the totals for Algeria, Corsica and the French coastal motivation, since those exiled or jailed had already done their deeds. The one exception is what may come to light as a result of the next revolution (i.e. 1848-9), if those who participate tend to follow leaders or fellows met in their jails or places of exile.
cities, the result is a pan-Mediterranean total of 275, or half the entire exile contingent. Those living under the French crown had the dual advantage of being close to home, and still collecting their pensions...the best of both worlds, so to speak.

One might suppose that other Italian states would receive most of the exiles, but this does not take place. Easy-going Tuscany is well represented with about half the total for all of Italy, but compared to the French groups, this is tiny. All the Italian states together gave shelter to only 75 refugees.

Brief note might be made of the very small numbers of overseas exiles. Many of the police and prison records make mention of prisoners who were released from jail to serve double their remaining sentences in exile. The most commonly stated country of exile is Brazil, and the Papal government would frequently buy a ticket and escort the prisoner to the ship to make sure he arrived there. But apparently many of those banished to the Americas found their way back; several of those who repatriated themselves from France are cases in point. Of course there is the possibility that some of those who were deported to North or South America did stay and adapt to their new surroundings, with no thought of returning to Italy. Obviously, these people would not appear in this survey. There really is no practical way of finding out who and how many there were.

Returning once again to the large numbers of exiles in France, we find an interesting pattern of clustering. One more obvious place of settlement would be Marseilles and the south coast, where many refugees would first have entered France. If we add the total for the large port
to those of Toulon, Avignon, Nimes, Montpellier, Cet. te and Narbonne, we
find that there were 93 exiles in the coastal strip. Paris, too, would
have held some hope for housing and employment, as well as proximity to
the local Italian community in the French capital. Paris, with the
nearby towns of Versailles and Charenton, provides another 75 names.

A third settlement area is more mysterious. A crescent-shaped
pattern of towns in western France, facing the Bay of Biscay, accounts
for more than a few names. The towns in question are Angers, Saumur,
Tours, Loches, Chateauroux, Limoges, Perigueux and Bordeaux. In this
crescent, 104 exiles had been settled (possibly at the behest of the
French government), making it the largest of the three clusterings in
France. Chateauroux (30) and Saumur (22) are particularly large concen-
trations. There is some evidence that Mazzini and other revolutionary
leaders were actively communicating with men in these cities.
CHAPTER III

THE REVOLUTIONARY AND REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENTS OF 1848-9

After the joyous beginning of his reign, Pius continued to enjoy a period of great popularity. For a while, even the most conservative cardinals felt it difficult to oppose the reforms of a man who was idolized by so many. Yet the wild enthusiasm shown for Pius in his early years tells us perhaps more about the needs and hopes of the citizenry than it does about the man's own policy. His willingness to discuss change and the reform of institutions was, in itself, a near revolution. Such flexibility was unknown since the days of Pius VII and Consalvi, despite the speed of change in European society. Yet the new Pope's genuine humanity and decency did not itself constitute a policy. Had he been a stronger person, these virtues might have developed into a successful long-ranged program of development. But such was not the case.

Pius IX as Reformer

Much of his popularity was based on a misunderstanding. People tended to see a liberal political leader first of all, and a priest only afterward. Yet the opposite ranking of priorities was the true one. For those few people who cared to observe him, there was ample evidence of the Pope's timidity and fear of dramatic action. Especially in the early spring of 1848, he complained of excessive pressure to anyone who would listen: close advisers, Civic Guard officers, diplomats, visiting
bishops. He lamented his lack of freedom to act as leader of the Church, and declared that he could only see one way to solve a conflict in his roles of priest and prince - to throw himself on God's providence and accept whatever troubles might follow.\(^1\)

In spite of all appearances, the Pope never passed through a "liberal phase," because true liberals embrace certain optimistic assumptions\(^2\) which Pius found totally alien. For him, human beings were weak and helpless creatures, flawed by original sin, and incapable of good and virtuous conduct without the help of God and the controls of society. The duty of an enlightened ruler was to protect and guide his subjects, like a stern parent, but never allow them so much freedom that they might hurt themselves or destroy those institutions which kept them safe. Pius could never bring himself to believe that human beings are perfectable creatures, or that they are able to make wise and prudent judgements with nothing but natural reason to guide them. Pessimism and religious traditionalism were far more important factors in Pius' thinking than liberalism ever was. He lived largely for the next life, and assumed that most of his subjects did too. Whenever he was faced with hard decisions, for example, he would consult theologians before cabinet ministers. This tendency, while admirable in any religious leader, causes untold complications when it is applied to statecraft. It is interesting to note that both Mazzini and Metternich saw this element of


\(^2\) For example, humans are naturally perfectible beings, with an innate attraction to good and virtuous activity; the individual will advance toward a more perfect state, as long as he is free to act rationally.
pessimism in Pius much earlier than most others. The author of the Syllabus of Errors (1864) was obviously someone who saw little hope for the modern world.3

In his earliest political reforms, Pius IX was strongly motivated by the need to reduce suffering among his subjects, and a hope to remove the widespread hatred for the Papal States as one of the worst governed states in Europe. In one sense, his plan to turn Rome into a "showcase of good government" was doomed from the outset; he was able to correct some abuses and improve certain conditions, but he was never totally free to make sweeping reforms. His unalterable view of State as secondary to Church would not allow him, as Prince/Pope, to act with the same freedom which any other sovereign could exercise. At every turn, his inability to wear two crowns simultaneously seemed to hamper even the best motivated efforts.

Added to the major difficulty of setting harmonious policy for both church and state, we must consider the aspirations of many other proponents of change. Far from suffering from a dearth of followers, Pius had far too many adherents, most of whom offered confusing and contradictory proposals. Some wanted to create a constitutional monarchy with liberal institutions. Others saw Rome as the moral nucleus of a strong federation of Italian states. Still others hoped for a revival of the Italian national spirit which would bring on a fusion of states and the renewal of social harmony. His own ideas were certainly conditioned by the many petitions, pleas and suggestions he received from his

subjects and advisers - but he spoke only rarely of the limits beyond which he would not pass. As one reform edict followed another, Pius felt the growing panic of a man being forced to walk the plank: sooner of later, he would have to stop moving or face disaster. But what if everyone else wanted him to continue? When and how would the parting of the ways occur? He never decided on an answer to that question.

One principal difficulty in his policy was that his proposed reforms would only touch certain segments of the population. During his first year as Pope, he agreed to an independent judiciary, equality before the law, and taxation of moral entities, such as seminaries. These measures were generally applauded, and indeed, long overdue. Yet many of the popular journals complained that such modest decrees did not go far enough to correct the principal cause of the state's trouble, the hopeless plight of the smaller farmers and other working classes. Up to this time, revolutionary influence in Rome (carbonaro or Mazzinian) had largely been confined to artisans, small merchants, some nobles and professionals, and a few priests. Despite the amnesty and the early reforms, the loyalty of the poorest classes remained uncertain, conditioned as it was by the needs of the poor and by their rising hopes and expectations of the new regime.

In Naples, by way of contrast, much of the revolutionary discontent was found among the middle level of the commercial class. Bourgeois critics of the government wanted structural and constitutional

---


reforms to allow them into the political arena. But in the Papal States, with its unique clerical monopoly and huge, tax-exempt estates in the hands of religious entities, the suffering was most acute among sharecroppers, day laborers and unemployed craftsmen. The popular slogan among Roman revolutionaries was "work and bread," signalling the need for social reform. Since economic and financial disorder was rampant, much of the underground rhetoric spoke of gaining control of the financial administration, solving unemployment, abolishing the grist tax, and raising taxes on the estates of the wealthiest landowners, jewelry, lavish carriages, and similar luxuries. It remained unsaid, but vivid in the minds of all, that prelates and cardinals would be among the first to be inconvenienced by such laws, and therefore would be reliably opposed to them. 6

For convenience, we can trace the political activity of Pius IX through four distinct phases. Each of these phases is marked by a different relationship between the Pope (especially as he saw himself) and the liberal or radical popular movements outside his immediate circle.

1. From his election in 1846 until the authorization of the Civic Guard (July, 1847) - Pius enacted many fundamental reforms with the full support of political liberals, and against frantic opposition from the most retrograde conservatives.

2. From July of 1847 until the publication of the new Constitution (March, 1848) - he continued reforms at a slower rate, under the influence of clubs and popular movements; he remained in control, but became increasingly conscious of his

6 Catalano, p. 211.
own popularity, with a consequent loss of good judgement.

3. From March to September, 1848, when he appointed Pellegrino Rossi to the Ministry - the popular press and clubs actually directed policy, and the Pope followed with a growing sense of alarm and apprehension. (The Allocution of April 29 was one of these "second thoughts" but not necessarily a burned bridge.)

4. From Rossi's Ministry until the Pope's own death in 1878 - he resisted all further political innovation and fought unsuccessfully to retain control of his state. This period has been likened to a "30-year Greek Tragedy" in which Pius was forced to go on living among hostile fates, where all remaining choices were bad.

The elements of this division ignore the mythical "liberal phase" and more accurately show the known traits of Pius' personality at work. 7

From his 1850 restoration onward, Pius put away his attempts at being a reforming prince. He reverted to governing the Church as his principal occupation, and the Papal States as a necessary evil, if only because he needed somewhere to stand. His pessimism and religiosity reasserted themselves, and he began to read most contemporary movements as potential assaults on a strong and united papacy. The remainder of his pontificate is marked by strenuous efforts to preserve what he considered to be the necessary tools to govern the Church freely and firmly. From the end of the middle ages until his own time, Pius saw attacks on the power of the papacy as the work of the devil, to be

---

7 Hearder, "Republic," 170f.
opposed at all costs. A contemporary author in 1862 wrote of a consistent trend in the work of Arnaldo di Brescia, Cola di Rienzo, Martin Luther and John Calvin to destroy Papal influence; these earlier attacks were now supported by Cavour, Ricasoli, Garibaldi and Mazzini. 8

Early Reforms

The initial work done by Pius and his collaborators provides an interesting vignette of one man's attempt to modernize his state in a very short time. But since it is only marginally significant to the present study, this period will be dealt with quickly. The main point of interest here is the part which several of the former exiles and prisoners played in the new government, a hallmark of the new policy of reconciliation.

The Press Law of March 15, 1847 allowed relatively free publication of political journals. These journals were not subject to actual censorship, merely the supervision of a review board; the board consisted of 5 nominated members, 4 of them laymen. By early 1848, there were over 100 political publications appearing regularly in all parts of the Papal States. This feature is all the more remarkable for the fact that not a single free paper existed in Milan or Vienna at that time. 9

Almost immediately, these publications began to bring political discussion and debate into broad daylight. Most authors agree that the newspapers themselves, along with the political clubs, were largely responsible for the lively ferment which became the matrix for the

---

8 Pier Giorgio Camaiani, "Il diavolo, Roma e la rivoluzione," Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa (1972) VIII, 489 & 496.

events of 1848. Chief among these active journals was Pietro Sterbini's *Contemporaneo*, which proved to be one of the most widely read papers in Rome. One strong moderate, Luigi Carlo Farini, considered Sterbini (a returned exile, like himself) to be both an opportunist and a demagogue, a man who would say or write absolutely anything to enhance his own political standing. He calls Sterbini a man whose flights of fancy overshadowed his intellect, "an imaginative but inaccurate" writer, and a person ignorant of everything except the history of Rome and the French Revolution. In a more favorable light, Farini cites several other publications: the *Felsino* of Bologna, competently published by Marco Minghetti and Antonio Montinari, the Roman *Bilancia*, work of Professor Orioli (also a returned exile) and Advocate Cattabene, and Bertipichat's excellent Bolognese journal *Italiano*, which he described as bitter against the "Gregorians" but not necessarily hostile to the present government.¹⁰

Farini further pointed out that the liberalized Press Law served to solidify and highlight the two tendencies within the liberal camp. The Moderates (whom he clearly favored) worked for concord between government and people, non-violent evolution toward a representative system, and a League of Italian States to oppose Austrian policy in Italy. On the other hand, the Radicals would settle for nothing less, said Farini, than a unitary republic based on popular passion and war against the Austrians and other crowned heads. This highly vocal minority did favor moderate reforms, but only as stepping stones to their final goal,

¹⁰ Farini, I, 213f.
not as ends in themselves. In Farini's view, four principal villains emerged from this radical camp: editor Sterbini himself, lawyer Giuseppe Galletti of Bologna, the popular leader Angelo Brunetti, called "Cicer­
uacchio" by the Romans, and Carlo Bonaparte, Prince of Canino. Sterbini and Galletti are the most visible of the amnesty recipients who sup­ported the overthrow of Pius IX in 1848.

Following closely after the Press Law, Cardinal Gizzi also enacted two structural reforms for the Papal government during mid-1847. The first, on April 14, instituted the Council of State, an advisory body designed to assist the government in the moderization program. Legates and Delegates were asked to nominate three worthy individuals from their respective provinces; one of these would be chosen by the Pope to serve a 2-year term. The other directive, dated June 14, set up a Council of Ministers or cabinet. Without stopping the process of government, this edict re-named and re-defined the offices of the principal administra­tors. The most important office (that of President) absorbed all of Gizzi's duties as Cardinal Secretary of State, including the Interior Ministry, and both Ecclesiastical and Secular Foreign Affairs. Other ministries included Industry and Commerce, Public Works, War, Finance, and Police. All members of this first cabinet were cardinals or prel­ates, but there was a clear implication that the reorganization had opened the door for laymen in at least some of these offices.

11 Farini, I, 216.
12 Farini, I, 218-2.
The institution of a Civic Guard had long been a pet project of liberal reformers, dating at least from the French Revolution. In the Papal States, where a history of foreign troops and centurian atrocities had embittered relations between subjects and government, the idea of a domestic force of citizens keeping order in their own towns seemed especially attractive. As it was originally conceived under Pius IX, the Civica was seen more as a hedge against food riots and crimes against property by the starving poor during the bad harvests of 1846-7. Only later was it seen as a vehicle of military training and organization for a future nationalistic crusade against Austria. For the moment, it was requested and granted as a domestic police force to support the existing carabinieri and soldiers in maintaining order. Unfortunately, while the project was well funded by the municipalities, it was not always well organized. Local leaders usually took charge of their respective units and recruited heavily among their closest friends, clients and associates. There was little attempt to screen membership or exclude people with questionable backgrounds. Conservatives feared the Civic Guard as the latest step in arming the common mob against the police, the Swiss and the Volunteers. Just as the amnesty had allowed radical leaders to resume their activities, and the Press Law had given them permission to propagandize, so the Civic Guard permitted the arming of those who would carry out the next revolution. The old "Gregorian" faction saw the Pope's program as a slow-acting dose of political suicide.

Giovanni Natali, "Bologna e le Legazioni durante la Rivoluzione del 1848" La Mercanzia, (1959) XIV, 49.
As events turned out, the paramilitary ranks and structure, the handsome uniforms, and the stirring display of band concerts, honor guards and parades all served to convince large numbers of civic guards that they were almost the equals of real soldiers. The events of early 1848 would teach them hard lessons: that good weapons did not automatically bring training in their use, that enthusiasm was no substitute for discipline, that there are few shortcuts to military professionalism.

The tragedy of the Civic troops was that their many examples of individual heroism could not save the units themselves from disintegrating under the pounding they took from the well trained Austrian conscripts.

On March 14, 1848, Pius promulgated a new constitution, the Statuto, which he hoped would become the keystone of his new reformed state. As he saw it, this was the final instalment in the concessions he was prepared to make to admit laymen to the structure of civil government. Although he was aware of the uniqueness of the Papal States, he made strenuous efforts to conform to the appearances of other constitutional monarchies. The Council of State would continue to function as an advisory board on executive matters. There would also be a bicameral legislature for all non-ecclesiastical affairs. The Pope would select members of the High Council from lists of nominees, while voters would elect members of the Council of Deputies according to a restricted franchise. Professors, doctors, lawyers, pastors, ecclesiastical leaders, magistrates, mayors, councillors, and other such "notables," had the right to vote automatically. Any other prospective voters had to show evidence that they had either paid 12 scudi in taxes, or possessed 300

14 Hearder, "Republic," pp. 175f.
scudi in capital. This limited franchise was fairly typical of most contemporary states, based as it was on the twin assumptions that public policy at its best when decided by the well educated or those already engaged in administration, and that tax revenue would be spent most prudently by those who paid most of it.¹⁵

Yet even under the accepted restrictions of the day, the Statuto was hardly a revolutionary concession. Pius was never prepared to place any part of the government of the Church in the hands of laymen. It was taken for granted that clerics would continue to participate in all civic functions, both voting and being eligible for any office. But the opposite was not allowed. Non-clerics would only be free to set policy for clearly secular issues, something which was admittedly hard to define in a society where church and state blended so closely on most issues: foreign policy, education, taxation of property related to religious institutions, and such like. There was a tacit understanding that the title of "Secretary of State" was reserved for the cardinal who controlled the foreign affairs of the Church, as well as functioning as president of the Cabinet. The Interior Ministry was reserved for the highest ranking layman, who was effective "prime minister" in secular affairs. But it was also understood that most of the ministers and functionaries would henceforth be laymen, unless their offices dealt heavily with religious matters. As a final safeguard on the freedom of the Church, all legislation and policy would be submitted to secret review by the College of Cardinals. Although not an official element of the new government, the Cardinals effectively became a parliamentary

¹⁵ Farini, II, 50f.
"third house" with power to veto the work of the other two chambers. But even with its obvious limitations, the Papal Statuto significantly opened government decisions to lay influence for the first time since Consalvi's reforms. Coming as it did on March 15, it was the fourth Italian charter granted in a two-month period. Ferdinand II of the Two Sicilies had conceded his on January 23, principally as a response to the revolt in Sicily. Charles Albert announced the fundamental principles of a Statute for Piedmont-Sardinia on February 9, later finalized in the document of March 5. Grand Duke Leopold II of Tuscany followed suit on February 17. Thus, even before the outbreak of war, the liberals of 1848 successfully achieved adoption of relatively free constitutions for the larger Italian states, with the signal exception of Lombardy-Venetia.

Almost unseen amid the hectic activity of March, 1848, the last of the 1846 amnistiati were quietly released from prison. These were 25 prisoners held in Civita Castellana for crimes of armed violence which were technically not covered by the original terms of the amnesty. Their cases had been appealed and reviewed by the Consulta. Pius decided to pardon them as a gesture of good will, and they were turned loose at last. Five of these prisoners were accused of a murder during the revolt of 1845 in Rimini. All twenty of the others were among the more violent members of the Muratori and Imola groups of 1843. Despite the seriousness of their charges, most of these men lived up to the con-
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16 Hearder, History, LX, 176.
17 Berkeley, III. 65-73.
18 Farini, II, 16f.
ditions of the amnesty following their release, and never turned up in court again. As will be seen, however, four of the same names, Angelo Gori, Domenico Conti, Antonio Nanni and Paolo Scorzoni, are accused of later crimes in 1848-9. Gori's identity in the subsequent case is somewhat doubtful, but the others are confirmed matches.

War against Austria and the Allocution

Many of the Pope's reforms would doubtless have been tested and criticized by his own citizens, even if the outside world had stayed peaceful, and the Papal States had remained calm. But the eruption of a liberal revolution in Vienna (March 17), followed by the nationalistic uprisings in Milan and Venice (March 18-22) guaranteed that turmoil and national passions would further confuse an already uncertain process. Public sentiment nearly everywhere in Italy longed for the day when the Austrians would depart (or be expelled) from northern Italy. The Pope's own words had often supported and encouraged this growing consciousness of Italian nationality. Since he was probably the most popular and admired individual in Italy, there is no realistic way that Pius would NOT be involved in any Italo-Austrian conflict. Especially after the Piedmontese king, Charles Albert, declared war on Austria (March 24), the conflict became more than just an isolated rebellion. Charles Albert called for all patriotic Italians to join him in a crusade to push the Germans back across the Alps. There seemed to be a general expectation that the Pope would strongly endorse, if not actually lead, this popular effort.
Because the war between the Austrian army and the Italian rebels was taking place just across the Po river from the Romagna, there was legitimate concern that the fighting might spill over the frontier. In particular, the city of Ferrara and the small forts in the Comacchio region, where the Austrians claimed the right to maintain garrisons, appeared to be dangerous flash points. The Ministry decided in mid-March to send troops to the northern frontier. They ordered most of the regular army into a state of readiness, and called for volunteers to support them. The Papal army of 1848 was relatively small, and better schooled in maintaining internal order than in fighting against other soldiers. Even so, the troops themselves were considered to be of good quality, and able to defend their State. A Piedmontese general, Giovanni Durando, was given command of the division containing most of the regular units, including 2 excellent Swiss regiments, as well as 4 regiments of native infantry, 2 of cavalry, and smaller formations of artillery, engineers and staff officers. Durando's column, about 7000 strong, was ordered to prepare for departure by the last week of March.19

A second division, comprising most of the Civic Guards and volunteer troops, was placed under the command of General Ferrari, a well respected Neapolitan officer in French service. The Civic Guard, as we have already seen, existed by now as an auxiliary force. It had the appearance of a military formation, but actual training was very weak, and the quality of its weapons and equipment uneven. Nevertheless, the Civica was mobilized to support the regulars by fleshing out the numbers

19 Farini, II, 8f.
of the army, if not its quality. The core of Ferrari's force comprised four civic regiments, proudly called "Roman Legions," each consisting of one or two battalions. A number of ad hoc units also enlisted in the enthusiasm of the hour, comprising 3 volunteer regiments (also with 2 battalions each), and the Roman University battalion, in hopes of bolstering the army still further. Although, Ferrari's division numbered almost 10,000 troops, it never had all of its basic equipment, and remained weak in cavalry, artillery and trained officers of every variety.²⁰

Still other volunteer units from the Romagna (not to be confused with those under Ferrari's command) were raised and led by local notables independently of any real control by the War Ministry. Four of these independent battalions were named for river valleys: Alto Reno, Basso Reno, Idice, and Senio. The Alto Reno battalion, soon to become the most aggressive of these units, was commanded by Count Livio Zambec­cari, a returned exile.²¹ These so called "free corps," together with a handful of civic units, had already marched to the Po long before the regular force had left Rome.

As early as March 20, the Duke of Modena's police had attacked Modenese citizens who were demanding reforms. Since this fighting angered many citizens in nearby Bologna, Cardinal Amat, the Legate, moved immediately to contain the troubles, and prevent involvement by Papal citizens in the politics of another state. He tried to seal the frontier with a force of Swiss, Volunteers and Civic Guards, but Major

²⁰ Berkeley, III, 243.

²¹ Natali, "Rivoluzione," p. 50.
Zambeccari led his irregulars all the way to Modena to support the rebels. He returned after the Duke was deposed but insisted on keeping his force together for action elsewhere. Several other local forces moved against Austrian contingents within the Papal states. Volunteer units from Ravenna and the lower Romagna under Major Montanari forced Austrian troops to yield the Comacchio forts. About a thousand others, including Zambeccari's men, surrounded the citadel of Ferrara, but were unable to capture it without heavy guns. It became increasingly obvious that only Durando's regulars could provide the crucial edge to dislodge Austrian troops from places which they were determined to hold.

Meanwhile, the government in Rome eagerly hoped to conclude negotiations for the League of Italian States. The cabinet saw such an alliance as a neat way to avoid the knotty problem of declaring war against Austria, and might even allow Durando's troops to fight, simply as members of the League, and not as soldiers of Pius IX. Furthermore, it might provide a stronger moral basis for Charles Albert's efforts to forge "Italy," rather than an expanded Piedmont. On April 10, Monsignor Corboli-Bussi was sent to the king as special legate, with orders to expedite co-operation and eliminate all obstacles to the finalization of the League. It is genuinely unfortunate that these efforts did not bear fruit. Although the whole issue is idle speculation today, it remains possible that much bloodshed might have been avoided if Vienna had seen a relatively unified front among the Italian states. Given a willingness to compromise in Vienna, there might have been a negotiated settle-

\[22\] Farini, II, 36f.
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ment for some sort of Italian federation. But while the goals of a customs union and a political federation seemed wonderful before the fighting began, the need to expel Austria militarily replaced all other issues in Charles Albert's mind. The League was never concluded, and Corboli-Bussi returned home. For the Piedmontese, this narrowing of focus meant that they would be all but alone in their struggle. For the Roman cabinet, it meant a far more serious need to clarify the status of their troops, now that they were on the verge of active fighting. 24

Since there still appeared to be some chance of an alliance, War Minister Aldobrandini ordered General Durando to "enter into communication with his majesty (Charles Albert) and act in concert with him." On April 18, he authorized Durando to cross the Po. Even this dramatic step remained short of war, however. The north bank of the river was the "Polesine di Rovigo," formerly Papal territory which was assigned to Austria after 1815, but which Rome still claimed. 25 The government appointed Count Carlo Pepoli as a special commissioner for the army, and traveled along with Durando's headquarters as both adviser and watchdog. When Pepoli was elected to the assembly as deputy for Bologna, he was replaced on June 1 by Filippo Canuti. Both Pepoli and Canuti were former exiles, passionately devoted to the moderate liberal cause. Canuti, a close associate of Farini, spent much of his time trying to restrain Durando from rash action and preserve the army's original mission as peacekeeper and guardian of the frontiers. Although he remained a loyal partisan of the Pope, he never succeeded in his task of preventing the


25 Farini, II, 61-3 & 84.
disaster which would soon follow.\textsuperscript{26}

But before Durando's army had arrived, Zambeccari once again decided to commit his volunteers to action. His Alto Reno battalion crossed the frontier and marched toward the Austrian fortress of Legnano. By April 8th, they had marched 20 kilometers into Austrian territory and occupied Ostiglia, on the north bank of the Po. The following week, two other units crossed the frontier to join them: the Bersaglieri del Po, commanded by Count Raffaele Pasi, another returned exile, and the Lower Romagna Volunteers.\textsuperscript{27}

On April 20, Charles Albert ordered Durando to follow the volunteer columns, and occupy Ostiglia and Governolo, but these orders were soon changed. An Austrian relief column under Marshal Nugent had begun moving to Radetzky's aid, and Durando's men were the only trained formation able to intercept these reinforcements. The Papal contingent marched to Treviso instead, and prepared to block all crossings of the Piave river.\textsuperscript{28} Ferrari's Volunteer column, marching several days behind, received orders to conform to Durando's movements and support him with all possible speed.

At just this crucial moment, Pius and his Cabinet had a falling out. After a meeting on April 25, Cardinal Antonelli, the Secretary of State, sent the Pope a memo on behalf of the rest of the Cabinet requesting a public clarification of policy concerning the war. The

\textsuperscript{26} Michele Rosi (ed.), Dizionario del Risorgimento nazionale, (Milano: Casa editrice Dottor Francesco Vallardi, 1930-7) II, 524ff.

\textsuperscript{27} Farini, II, 82.

\textsuperscript{28} Farini, II, 84f.
memo listed three possible courses of action: a formal declaration of war against Austria, the outright withdrawal of the troops, or a statement that the government did not want war, but could not stop its own citizens if they wanted to fight. The Cabinet recommended the third alternative: allowing the troops to continue fighting without formal support, while declaring that a peaceful settlement would be the ideal solution. But instead of a simple clarification of policy, the Pope reacted more strongly than the cabinet wished. Some German bishops were reported to be considering schism if the Papacy continued to promote Italian nationalism at their expense. Pius himself had shown signs of exasperation with the many demands which had pushed him far beyond his better judgement, and decided to make a sudden end to the whole process. After meeting with a Consistory of the Cardinals, he issued what has subsequently been called the Allocution of April 29. He strongly repudiated the war being waged in his name, and ordered that all military activity stop at once. The shock waves were not slow in spreading.

The Cabinet resigned immediately, since their recommendation had been so firmly rejected. The general public realized suddenly that their army was now in a "limbo" condition: denied belligerent status, but committed to action against a resolute enemy. Rumors circulated in Rome that Austrian troops had lynched a prisoner in a civic guard uniform, saying that he had no rights as a soldier. Crowds gathered in a state of panic and near-revolt. Princes and dukes mingled with the mob, trying to calm their passions, as Orioli and Mamiani attempted to repair

30 Farini, II, 100-12.
the political damage Pius had inflicted on himself.\textsuperscript{31}

Despite previous indications that he would never go to war, even to support neo-guelph efforts, Pius had still shocked public opinion too badly to recover quickly. Whether he knew it or not at the time, Pius squarely faced the question of whether church or state considerations would take priority in his Risorgimento policy: he chose the church. Ultimately, this choice proved to be long-ranged and durable; it probably cost him the Papal States, but actually strengthened the moral and spiritual influence of the Papacy in the long run. However, it did not solve his immediate crisis, or save him from the turmoil which followed it. He clarified the Church's position on national politics once and for all: no active war against Austria, no endorsement of popular revolution, and no sacrifice of the Papal States, if it meant loss of the Pope's freedom to act. Just a few years later, one writer opined that the Roman Republic was only "baptized" on February 9, 1849 - it had been born the day of the Allocution.\textsuperscript{32}

Politically, the Allocution appears to have taken power away from the moderates almost overnight, and set up the subsequent clash between radicals and reactionaries. Despite the substantial progress of several ministries, the moderate liberals seemed discredited in the eyes of the general public, since they had failed to make Pius do the single thing the nationalists really wanted in April of 1848: to drive the Austrians out of Italy.\textsuperscript{33} After May 1, the political clubs took over effective

\textsuperscript{31} Farini, II, 114f.

\textsuperscript{32} Monaco, pp. 186-91.

\textsuperscript{33} Catalano, p. 212.
leadership of the population; through the Civic Guard, they held the keys to the physical control of the capital. The next ministry, that of Terenzio Mamiani, turned out to be one of the most talented and noble-minded in the history of the Papal States. But by this stage, practically no one was paying attention to the official cabinet, seen as an agent of betrayal.  

Despite the thundering shock to his political momentum and personal popularity, Pio Nono tried to carry on as usual. The Pope allowed Mamiani a great deal of latitude in setting policy, including measures to reduce clerical control over temporal affairs. Mamiani's vigorous policy, in harmony with his own most deeply held principles, earned him strong opposition from many of the curial cardinals. Although Pius stood by his minister, the timing of the conflict was quite unfortunate: it alienated the clerical right without slowing the subversive efforts of Sterbini and the political left. On May 30, Pius named his Council of State, hoping desperately that stability might follow. Among its distinguished members were Advocate Sturbinetti and Professor Francesco Orioli, a former exile. Only 4 or the 14 members were clerics. Elections for the Chamber of Deputies followed on May 18. Despite the turmoil, the elections went smoothly and most of the candidates returned by the voters were highly respected. The president of the new chamber was the elderly Cardinal Soglia, the virtuous follower of Pius VII in exile.  

---
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Reverses and Violence

Meanwhile, Durando's army had moved into a position to block the reinforcements intended for Radetzky. On the day of the Allocution, he had reached Treviso with his Swiss Brigade and the other regular troops; he immediately prepared to defend the Piave bridges against Marshal Nugent, who was approaching from the east with an Austrian column twice his size. Since Charles Albert's forces had already been halted before the heavily fortified Quadrilateral, the duel between Durando and Nugent took the spotlight as the crucial campaign to save or destroy the Austrian empire. Without supplies and reinforcements, Radetzky would soon be forced to surrender, despite his strong position. But Durando's force was still relatively small; the volunteer corps had only arrived at Ferrara, and would not be able to support him for at least a week, no matter what.\textsuperscript{36} Even if he were so inclined, Durando was in no condition to act boldly and decisively at just the time when he might have turned the tide in favor of the Italians.

One other variable factor lay in the 40,000 troops promised by Ferdinand of Naples. An advance guard of 14,000 under General Pepe had already entered the Papal States and had reached Bologna; the rest were to follow shortly. The full Neapolitan contingent would assure Durando of almost 50,000 regulars, plus several thousand additional volunteers. Such a force would be nearly impossible for Nugent to pass. But the Neapolitans would never see combat. Shortly after the street fighting of May 15, King Ferdinand recalled all of his troops to keep order at home (and eventually to re-conquer Sicily). Most returned home immedi-

\textsuperscript{36} Berkeley, III, 242-5.
ately, although a few hundred volunteers were allowed to follow Pepe northward to continue the struggle. They made a noble contribution to the defense of Venice, but were of no use to Durando as a mobile force. 37

By the time Papal troops actually met Nugent's force in battle, they were well aware of the Allocution. Although none of them broke off their campaign, most were understandably dispirited at the lack of support from their own revered sovereign. Especially among Ferrari's volunteers (most of whom tended toward republicanism anyway), there was an underlying spirit of anger. More than a few grumbled that this was one more example of Italy's being betrayed by its own princes. 38 These same volunteers took the brunt of Nugent's attack during the battle of Cornuda (May 8 & 9). This misfortune was due largely to the Austrians' skillful movement and good discipline, as well as a few bad judgements by Durando. Ferrari's men gave a good account of themselves during the battle, but took dozens of casualties waiting for support that never came. The "conspiracy" rumor took hold of them again, and discipline collapsed completely during their retreat. Although good numbers of these men would continue to fight, this single battle finished Ferrari's division as an organized force. 39

One month later, Durando defended a strong position at Vicenza against a much more powerful Austrian force. He deployed most of his Swiss and other regulars, together with the best of his volunteers, led

37 Berkeley, III, 240f and 285f.

38 Farini, II, 154.

by former exiles Pietramellara and Pasi, and other ardent patriots. Despite a spirited effort, Austrian numbers and training prevailed. On June 11, Durando was allowed to withdraw from Veneto with arms, baggage and honors of war, but on the condition that he and his men would not fight against Austria for the next 3 months.\(^4\) The disaster at Treviso ensured that other rebel forces in Veneto would quickly be mopped up by Austrian columns: Padua, Treviso, Palmanova. By the end of June, Venice was isolated and would eventually succumb to a lengthy siege. Radetzky now faced no one in the field except Charles Albert's Piedmontese, who presently received the same quick hammer blows which had destroyed their allies. The unqualified Austrian victory at the battle of Custoza hurt the Piedmontese forces so badly that they were unable to continue the campaign. They fell back in disorder. By August 6, the Austrians had retaken Milan; on August 9, they signed the Armistice of Salasco, which required the Piedmontese to withdraw all forces to the old frontier.\(^4\)

For all practical purposes, these events finished the military threat to Radetzky in 1848.

After Vicenza, Durando's army fell back on Bologna in fairly good order. That city had been in an agitated state ever since the recall of the Neapolitan force in mid-March. The arrival of the 4000 armed and frustrated veterans served only to further inflame passions here and elsewhere in the Romagna.\(^4\) Durando and Canuti decided to disband most of the restive volunteer units rather than risk further erosion of

\(^4\) Farini, II, 229-33.

\(^4\) Farini, II, 235f & 288.

\(^4\) Natali, "Rivoluzione," p. 51.
morale. Unhappily, these discharged troops took their rage and frustration back to their native towns, plunging many of them into anarchy. Ravenna, Faenza, Pesaro and Fano experienced an extraordinary number of political assassinations, with few if any arrests. Imola, Senigallia and Ancona suffered similar convulsions, as angry civic guards took out their hostility on anyone perceived to be an enemy. Bologna remained relatively quiet at first, due in part to the presence of the army, but also to Cardinal Amat's wise and honest government, and to the efforts of many leading citizens. Wherever political clubs existed, they served not only as sounding boards for the nationalist and revolutionary rhetoric of the day, but also became de facto provisional governments, especially where papal administrators were either intimidated or ignored. 43

In Rome, Sterbini had gained virtual control of the semi-radical Circolo Popolare, the club which would do so much to topple Pius IX's regime; it opposed the more moderate (and more timid) Circolo Romano. Bologna's political world was dominated by two similar clubs: another Circolo Popolare, which represented the extremists and more violent party, and the moderate but relatively powerful Circolo Nazionale, with a broad and talented membership, many amnesty veterans among them. 44 Ancona was polarized in a similar way, with the Circolo Anconitano representing those who favored the Pope's liberal reforms, and the Circolo Popolare which attracted the anti-papal carbonari and Mazzinian democrats. Many other cities had clubs with similar names and groupings,

43 Farini, II, 290f.

44 Natali, "Rivoluzione," p. 52.
which would eventually function very much like political parties.  

Some of the Austrian commanders, emboldened by their recent success, moved to regain their former strongholds south of the Po. Lichtenstein’s corps temporarily re-occupied Ferrara on July 13, where Count Francesco Lovatelli, a former exile, was pro-Legate. Lovatelli protested the occupation vigorously, and Pius added his own pressure through diplomatic channels to force the Austrians to withdraw.

On August 4, Baron Welden announced his intention to move another column toward Bologna, encouraged and followed by the sanfedist leader Alpi. He took Cento easily, then continued toward Bologna, where the Papal army (still bound by its pledge not to fight until September 11) made preparations to withdraw, leaving the city defenseless. Spontaneous resentment provoked ordinary citizens to initiate a four-hour clash at the city’s gates on August 8, forcing Welden’s troops to fall back. Although Radetzky rebuked Welden for his rashness, he did nothing to restore stability to the largest city of the Legations. Volunteers and civic guards from the district converged on Bologna to defend it against another Austrian foray. When nothing materialized, many of them joined local rowdies in settling old scores with policemen or court officials. A Commission of Public Safety, formed by local property owners, took power from pro-Legate Cesare Bianchetti in a vain attempt to maintain order. By the beginning of September, the city had approached nearly total chaos, with countless violent crimes happening every day.

---
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In Bologna, as elsewhere in Italy, the issues of liberty and inde-
pendence mesmerized the attention of the educated professional classes. But other factors, such as regional contrasts, irreconcilable factional disputes, and the nagging social question, with its economic and moral implications, all combined to reveal that the proposed "nation" was being built over a void. Much of the chaos which was about to wrack Bologna would come from lower class people who saw nothing for themselves in the unification programs of the elite. These weaknesses in the social fabric demonstrated the pernicious effects of a long material and moral poverty, which no short-term or rapid reforms could ever hope to cure.48 Yet Bologna was also a natural communications center, important for the spread of revolutionary information, among other things. News travelled from there to Faenza (mainly through the efforts of former exiles Pasi and Caldesi), and then to Lugo and elsewhere. The Circolo Popolare of Lugo was an essential link in the planning and execution of coordinated political activity, such as organized voting or blocking the movements of Swiss troops. Obviously, any upheaval in Bologna would have a strong ripple effect throughout the entire Legations region.49

Meanwhile in Rome, the government became more and more embarrassed and unstable because of the reverses and violence of the summer months. Mamiani had already strained his relations with Pius over the lack of support for Charles Albert. With a growing sense of helplessness, Mam-

48 Natali, Mercanzia, XIV, 52.

ianì decided to resign when his reform program faltered, especially since the August crime spree in Bologna would be sustained largely by the people he hoped to protect: unskilled and semi-skilled workers, with some help from nearby peasants. By the time that disorder occurred, a new ministry had already been formed, led by Count Odoardo Fabbri, a sick, elderly figurehead who obliged the Pope by accepting the job no one else wanted. Among the other notables who resigned in disgust was a conservative deputy, Professor Francesco Orioli. Scholar, mandarin, and former exile, Orioli had, until now, enthusiastically served the Pope in his attempted reforms, intensely thankful for his pardon in 1846. He retired from public life altogether in late July, and was heard from no more.

After their defeat of Welden's troops, most of the Bolognese laid down their arms, but many of the more violent popolani, supported by the volunteers from nearby towns, did not. Two recipients of the 1846 amnesty, Livio Zambeccari and Angelo Masini, attempted to seize control of the commune on August 15, using their own free corps of volunteers. The result was not revolution, but anarchy. Many leading moderates, including former exile Oreste Biancoli, made strenuous efforts to support the beleaguered pro-Legate Bianchetti. But the rabble and the free corps continued to act with relative freedom: they robbed, broke criminals out of jail, plundered homes of wealthy citizens, levied taxes on those quarters of the city where they were strongest, and systematically

---

50 Catalano, p. 212.
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killed a judge, police officers, magistrates and prison guards.\textsuperscript{52} In these acts of violence, many property owners saw the awakening of the "monster" of popular insurrection and redoubled their cries for aid. Farini sent General Zucchi north with troops to support Cardinal Amat, and by early September, they had temporarily restored order. Zambeccari led his men away to help defend Venice, while the rest of the free corps were broken up and fused into the newly formed Unione regiment, which was soon incorporated into the regular army.\textsuperscript{53}

Count Fabbri, for all his good will, was unequal to the task of government. He asked to resign because of the hopeless financial situation, and was replaced on September 16 with the vigorous Pellegrino Rossi, called "the most talented statesman in Italy" by no less a critic than Camillo Cavour. Rossi was an unlikely choice for minister to the Pope: a cynical free-thinker with a Protestant wife, a doctrinaire liberal who had followed Murat, a brilliant jurist and economist. He had come to Rome as ambassador for France, then stayed after the fall of Louis Philippe as a legal adviser to Pius. Rossi was aware of the urgent need to overhaul finances and public order, and was strongly supported by moderate liberals who favored the rule of law, especially those in Bologna. His program was ambitious from the angle of domestic development (foreign loans, a reformed civil service, railroads, telegraph, and compensation for the war veterans), but offered little to those nationalists who still wanted to fight Austria. Rossi favored the revival of Gioberti's Customs League, and its possible transformation

\textsuperscript{52} Farini, II, 330-3.

\textsuperscript{53} Natali, "Rivoluzione," p. 52.
into a formal Confederation of States. It may stand as a tribute to Rossi's fairness that his program did not favor any one party; on the other hand, he had the misfortune of being suspected by all and strongly supported by relatively few. Farini lists those opposed to Rossi as "all who favored turbulence, corrupt magistrates, Sanfedists, greedy clerics, and whoever wanted to destroy or change the Constitution by violent means."\(^{54}\)

During this period of the September-October armistice, there was a renewed call to summon a Constituent Assembly for Italy. The proposal was made by the Montanelli ministry in Tuscany (which included Guer­razzi) as an alternative to Gioberti's now moribund Congress for Federation. Among all the factions competing for the soul of Italian unification, Mazzini's Young Italy was most passionately devoted to the Constituent proposal. Because of the process involved, Mazzini saw it as having a messianic and mystical function which matched his own views. From a more practical bias, he also knew that his oratory and charisma would play well in such a forum.\(^{55}\) As proposed by the Tuscans, this Cos­tituente would be a single chamber elected by universal suffrage throughout Italy, and would function as paramount sovereign for the Italian people, above all other princes and assemblies. Rossi and Far­ini opposed this suggestion as dangerous and inflammatory. To them, Gioberti's neo-guelph proposals offered a brighter hope of consolidating the progress already made (moderate constitutions, economic co-opera­tion, plans for military fusion, streamlined administration), without

\(^{54}\) Farini, II, 363-85.

\(^{55}\) Hearder, "Republic," p. 172.
the dangers of a relapse into political turmoil in the process.\textsuperscript{56}

Rossi has drawn much criticism for trying a conservative solution to the Italian problem, and a moderate solution to the internal problem. He lost the support of the ultra-clerical faction because he planned to tax Church estates and promote lay administration. Much of the support which he and Pius might have had from the educated and propertied classes had eroded when they refused both the Constituent Assembly and war against Austria. The poorest of the peasants and workers had never seen their grievances addressed, and stayed enthusiastic only as long as Pius was the leading reformer and patriot on the peninsula. The Allocution had effectively cost him that position in the popular mind. The most rabid nationalists felt threatened by Rossi's sheer administrative competence which would not long permit them to preach war and revolution in every town square. The hostility to Rossi from both ends of the political spectrum, coupled with the relative indifference of many others, turned out to be a deadly combination. His lack of popularity left open a window of opportunity for the more extreme faction of Sterbini, Galletti and Canino.\textsuperscript{57}

Rossi knew that his enemies might try to disrupt the opening session of parliament, when he intended to present his program to the legislators. He ordered up extra carabinieri to guard against disorder, but Rome was hardly in a state of agitation. So the political shock was all the greater when Rossi was confronted by a sullen crowd of discharged veterans, and swiftly struck down by an assassin's dagger.

\textsuperscript{56} Farini, II, 385-7.

\textsuperscript{57} Catalano, p. 213.
November 15 was a day when everyone lost nerve but the assassins. Their partisans paraded along the Corso with the tricolor, chanting slogans and brandishing daggers. No one objected. Rossi's ministry dissolved, and no one wanted to form a new one.\(^58\) Pius, already shocked by his minister's murder, now felt very much alone. All Cardinals had abandoned him except four, including Antonelli. The Roman nobility were careful to go about their affairs as though nothing were amiss. Most of those moderate liberals who had promoted his reform measures seemed to be occupied elsewhere. Only the foreign diplomats were in evidence, supporting the Papacy by their words, their presence, and a few personal weapons. Without advice or support, the Pope turned his thoughts to the basic survival of himself and his state, even if it meant asking for foreign assistance. The suggestion to flee the capital came from Antonelli, and was supported by the legates from France, Spain, Portugal, Bavaria, and to a lesser degree, Count Liedekerke of the Netherlands. Both the French and Spanish ministers (d'Harcourt and Martinez de la Rosa) hoped to host the exile, if possible, but the Pope quietly declined.\(^59\)

The following morning, there were rumors of a popular rally to demand Sterbini and other democrats in a popular ministry, with a commitment to the Constituent Assembly. Pius' own preference to form a new cabinet would have Pasolini or Minghetti, but these were quite unacceptable to the people in the streets. He began to see Galletti as the best of a bad lot. Galletti had, after all, functioned reasonably well.

\(^{58}\) Farini, II, 404-14.

as police minister in the last 4 cabinets, and at least had a basic grasp of the political realities of the Roman government. Despite his continuing admiration for Mazzini (reasoned Pius) Galletti might prove to be loyal, if only out of gratitude for his 1846 pardon. By mid-day, the crowd outside the Quirinal palace grew more violent. Some of them fired into the palace, killing one bishop, and wheeled a cannon into the square, aimed at the central gate. The Swiss fired back and prepared to defend the palace at all costs. The only advice the Pope heard was to surrender. He protested formally to the diplomats that he was no longer able to act freely. Only then did Pius ask Galletti to from a government. He also nominated Rosmini and Mamiani to significant ministries, but they declined. Sterbini accepted the portfolio of Commerce and Public Works, and now became virtual ruler of Rome through Galletti and his control of the political clubs. The members of the Assembly were so cowed by those clubs and the mob violence that they almost ceased to function. Bolognese deputies Minghetti, Bevilacqua and Banzi resigned their seats in disgust, and others followed their example. Overcome with despair, Pius decided to flee his capital and trust foreign monarchs to rescue him from his own subjects. He slipped out of Rome the night of November 25, aided by the Bavarian, Spanish and French ambassadors. Once across the Neapolitan frontier, he took refuge at Gaeta under the protection of Ferdinand II, and called for help to restore his reign. 60

60 Farini, II, 415-31.
After the Flight to Gaeta

Once it became clear that Pius had left the Papal States, the remainder of the Government was in somewhat of a quandry. On one hand, Galletti's November 16 cabinet felt compelled to carry on, if only because someone had to do so. On the other hand, the ministry and the councils only existed because the Constitution allowed them to share the Pope's executive and legislative authority. At least in theory, they had no other mandate to act. Until some other basis for their authority could be established, their legitimacy as a governing body was very much in doubt. And unless there was a reconciliation with the Pope, the ability of Galletti and company to continue in power demanded a high degree of popularity with the citizenry. This need to legitimatize themselves served to condition nearly every element of the policy which followed.

Although heavily manipulated by Sterbini and the Circolo Popolare, the violent mob of November 16 really DID represent a genuine popular movement. As a result, their demands became a sort of initial, unwritten charter for Galletti's cabinet: a democratic ministry, social reforms, creation of jobs, war on Austria, the Costituente, and Mamiani's national program of June 5. The first priority of what came to be called the "Roman Parliament," was to create jobs, beginning with the previously authorized rail line from Rome to Ceprano. War minister Campello decided to hire unemployed tailors to make uniforms for the next campaign. Sterbini found artistic jobs for craftsmen to work on mosaics in St. Mary Major, and restoration of paintings in other churches. He spent an existing Fine Arts fund, but saw that more money would be needed. So began a cycle of programs and spending which would mark the
entire history of the Provisional and Republican regimes. The need to create employment was essential, but the money to pay for the programs was hard to come by. This chronic lack of funds was never solved (and never seriously addressed) until Pius was restored to power.  

The Provisional Government also hastened to clear away many of the most annoying statutes and feudal remnants of the old regime: the _fede-commesso_ (a perpetual trust status which prohibited sale of certain sections of land), encumbered noble estates which favored eldest sons as heirs, feudal banalities and rural prohibitions on wood gathering, pasturing and the like, and above all, the hated grist tax. Although most working people applauded the abolition of this last tax, the municipalities had to face the loss of a major source of their revenue.  

The legislative agenda of the Provisional Government included more social reform than any regime since the French Revolution. The circle most concerned with the radical re-organization of society was led by former exile Sterbini and the Prince of Canino. Their closest collaborators (all on record as favoring the working classes) included Carlo Armellini, Fasci, Campello the War Minister, Captain Torre, Martini, Sacripante, Giacomo Manzoni, Rusconi, and a few others. With the significant exception of Sterbini himself, none of these radical partisans were veterans of the 1846 amnesty. These were the "new" revolutionaries. Already under Pius IX, this faction had taken full advantage of the liberalized press and association laws, and the implementation of  

62 Demarco, _Sociale_, pp. 31-44.
the new constitution. They had gained worthwhile support for their programs by skillful use of the press and the political clubs, as well as the election of some of their number to public office. The Prince of Canino was one of a small group who saw the circoli popolari as the ideal means to promote Rome as the site for the Constituent Assembly, which would then come under the sway of Mazzini and his Italian National Society. Mazzini, for his part, was very receptive to that idea; he saw the social legislation of the Provisional Government as a healthy beginning for his populist campaign to set up an Italian republic. Echoes of the same policy came from clubs in Ancona and Forli in appeals for a popularly elected assembly to establish a new political order.63

Meanwhile the Pope, from Gaeta, sought to undermine the Provisional Government. He issued a brief on November 27 which stated that all actions taken since his departure were null and void. He then named a 7-member Governative Commission (December 3) to rule in his name until he returned to the Capital. Although Sturbinetti and the Assembly waved these acts aside as invalid ("issued on foreign soil and not signed by a responsible minister"), they also sent a deputation to Pius to work out a reconciliation. The envoys were turned back at the frontier.64

The other major issue was to decide what was to be done about Italian unification. There were still two possibilities alive. The Tuscan plan for a Constituent Assembly would decide the fate of Italy without compromising the sovereignty of the people, expressed through universal manhood suffrage. The alternate plan was Gioberti's Confederate—

63 Demarco, Sociale, pp. 45-58.
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ation of States, to be implemented by princes without any direct, popular initiative. The issue of the Costituente would not go away. Canino and his partisans were a clear minority in the Assembly, but the moder­ates realized that their status was uncertain. They had, after all, been elected as deputies to support and advise the Pope, who now refused to acknowledge their validity as legislators. Resignations continued to weaken the cabinet, which finally fell on December 23. The new cabinet dissolved parliament, calling for new elections, and hence a new popular mandate. The election was set for January 21 and would choose 200 deput­ies by direct and universal suffrage. Before this balloting took place, however, the cabinet received a strong petition from the "Commit­tee of Italian Clubs," an umbrella organization of many of the more rad­ical societies; it demanded that the 100 most popular candidates be declared the Roman delegation to a Constituent Assembly, "providing a nucleus for a unified Italy, based on universal suffrage and a sovereign mandate." The government agreed on January 17, and the elections took on that added significance.

The Pope issued a condemnation of the election and banned any form of participation or support. But 200,000 to 250,000 votes were cast, perhaps one third of all those eligible, although this data is difficult to determine. Demarco gives a breakdown of those elected according to profession and social class. He points out that there were only 27 nobles among the 200, as opposed to 33 in the previous Assembly of 125, and almost all of the High Council. One of these noblemen was Canino, of course, who was far more radical than most commoners. The vast

65 Demarco, Sociale, pp. 62-5.
majority of the others were upper bourgeoisie and professional men. Only 24 deputies were re-elected from previous councils, the rest were new. Of special interest to this study are the 24 deputies previously exiled or imprisoned under Gregory XVI. Most moderate leaders made it a point not to participate in the election, still holding out for a reconciliation with Pius, but their boycott appears to have attracted little popular support. A few moderates did participate, however, despite the Pope's ban; Mamiani was one who refused to abandon the field to the extremists, and was elected easily. Mazzini, Garibaldi and several other foreigners were also elected, although Mazzini did not arrive in person until March. Because of duplications or renunciations on the part of those elected, there were several follow-up elections before all 200 deputies were chosen.  

The new Constituent Assembly, its ranks still incomplete, formally met for the first time on February 5, 1849. Four days later, the issue of the Pope's temporal power was introduced. After a furious debate, 142 members voted in favor of terminating the Papal State "in theory and in fact." Pius IX was deposed in favor of a Roman Republic, which would function as a pure democracy. Never one to shrink from a fight, Terenzio Mamiani led the debate against the resolution, and voted "no" with 8 others. There were also 12 abstentions, 1 conditional vote and 37 absentees. Mamiani and several others resigned their seats before the end of the month.  

---
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To replace the Pope as executive, the Assembly decided on a Triumvirate. Mattia Montecchi, a former prisoner, was one of the first triumvirs, together with Armellini and Salicetti. The better known triad of Mazzini, Armellini and Saffi did not take power until March 23, after the battle of Novara. Sterbini kept his cabinet seat for Commerce and Public Works, and Galletti retained control of the Police. The new republican legislature would spend most of its efforts on just two items: defending itself, and responding to the petitions and needs of its citizens. Since defense would not become a critical issue until April, the earliest legislation showed a determined effort to redesign the social and economic fabric of the state. First came efforts to rebuild faith in the pitiful economy. The Republic assumed the national debt, then declared Church property and deposits to be property of the state (February 21). Treasury bonds continued to lose value, however, necessitating forced loans at a later time. The Assembly abolished the bishops' authority over the universities and schools (February 25), then dissolved the Holy Office and the other ecclesiastical tribunals (February 29). Demarco considers these actions to be genuinely revolutionary, since the clergy lost control of most remaining phases of public life. He credits the Assembly with the willingness to keep trying economic remedies until something worked, but cautiously adds that the seizure of church property was certainly a convenient shortcut, but a one-time action, which could never be repeated. The price was the almost total hostility of the clergy.68

Finances continued to be a headache for the Triumvirate. Despite the sale of religious assets, monetary instability continued because of inflation, deficit spending, and a general loss of faith in the new paper currency. The "right to work" principle of the early days of the provisional government demanded that jobs be available to anyone in need. Despite the shortness of credit, 1200 workers and artists were put to work on the restoration of St. Paul's basilica. Housing for the poor was provided in the former Holy Office building, and in other houses and convents. The salt tax and monopoly of the Torlonia family was abolished, and unused church land was given to peasants. These measures were intensely popular when they were granted, but the long range result of many social experiments was not good. Local and provincial administrations were in severe trouble because of increasing demands and empty coffers. By May, most commoners complained that the government had put them into the precarious dilemma of abundant jobs (working for the state, if nothing else), but wages paid in nearly worthless money. The combination of severe inflation, bonds without backing, requisitions, and forced loans eventually eroded the support for the government among nearly all but the most ardent republicans. Even without war, the Triumvirate would have reached a financial crisis by summertime.\(^6^9\)

By February 18, Pius IX admitted that there could be no reconciliation; he asked Catholic Europe for help to restore him to power. Along with a Neapolitan force assembled by his host, Ferdinand, substantial numbers of troops from France, Spain and Austria would assemble to

extinguish the upstart Republic. Because the so-called First War of Independence was over before Rome's troubles began, support for the Republic also came from northern diehards who wanted to prolong the struggle wherever possible. In addition to Garibaldi's own Red Shirts, substantial numbers of experienced fighters from the north joined the defenders, including Luciano Manara's battalion of Lombard Bersaglieri. One of the refugees from the abortive revolt in Genoa was Giuseppe Avezzano, who would serve the Republic as a War Minister. Most leaders had no illusions about Rome's ability to defy Europe indefinitely, but the coming struggle began to take on the aura of an apocalyptic clash between the combined forces of Italian nationalism and the might of the old order on the peninsula. ⁷⁰

While the Republic was striving to build its popularity and moral authority among its own citizens, the military forces of Austria, Spain, France, and the Two Sicilies prepared to overthrow it. Mazzini's government was considerably hurt in the eyes of the international community by disorders within the Roman State. Widespread murder and factional fighting in the Legations and Marches, (especially in Ancona during March and April) betrayed his lack of control on provinces outside the walls of Rome. The chaos in Ancona culminated with the murder of an Irish Carmelite friar on April 19, with a subsequent British protest and the dispatch of a warship to Ancona harbor. This sensitive condition eased only when Felice Orsini imposed draconian police measures in late April, and regained control of Rome's largest port. Just as damaging to the prestige of the Republic were several local uprisings among rural

⁷⁰ Demarco, Sociale, pp. 140f.
communities in the provinces of Ascoli and Fermo. Badly needed Republican troops had to be detached from combat duty to regain control of those sectors in April and May of the same year.\textsuperscript{71}

After the battle of Novara, the Austrian army was free to begin a systematic occupation of the Legations and beyond. This process was slow but relentless, and involved relatively few major battles, since the bulk of the Republican troops had been concentrated in the capital. Although Spanish and Neapolitan preparations were proceeding, it was the French army under General Oudinot which was in a position to strike at the heart of the upstart regime. Even when his force of 10,000 troops landed at Civitavecchia, there was a great deal of doubt as to whether the French had come as friends or adversaries. Prince-President Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte had good reason to favor Mazzini's immediate expulsion, since he was eager to enhance his political standing among the French clericals, and also improve his image as an international arbiter and peacekeeper. But there was an equally strong democratic-republican faction in the French National Assembly which saw the Roman regime as a kindred state and a potential ally against despotism. The vagueness of Oudinot's orders reflected the ambivalence of his own government. He was given the impression that the Triumvirate was an unpopular usurpation which could be easily removed. Although he was told to treat the leaders with respect, he should not imply any recognition of their legitimacy as a government.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{71} See chapter IV below.

The only real hope for the Romans, under these circumstances, was French public opinion. If the views of Alexandre Ledru-Rollin, Ferdinand de Lesseps, and other French democrats prevailed, then Oudinot's army might actually shield the capital from the other three forces, and buy enough time for the Triumvirs to establish themselves in power. This hope ebbed away slowly, however, as Bonaparte held out for the use of force. The final chapter came on June 13, when the "Red" faction in Paris, led by Ledru-Rollin, attempted an insurrection over earlier French actions against the Roman Republic. The army quickly suppressed the effort, and the police arrested socialist and democratic leaders, some deputies among them. The last obstacle to a military solution had been removed.\textsuperscript{73}

At first, Oudinot was able to take advantage of the uncertainty of his mission. He persuaded the troops guarding Civitavecchia (commanded by former exile Pietramellara) to permit his landing, then disarmed them to make sure that there would be no resistance to French control of the port. Loudly proclaiming that his forces were a threat to no one, he marched the 40 miles to Rome, only to discover that Garibaldi's legionnaires and Manara's Lombards had arrived mere days ahead of him. In his eagerness to establish a French presence, Oudinot decided to seize control of the city on April 30 by a coup de main. The result was a costly assault against the Pertusa Gate which had long since been walled up, but not shown as such on the French maps. Although surprised at first, the Roman defenders rallied to defend the walls and the Vatican gardens. After 6 bloody hours, the French withdrew, leaving 500 casualties and

\textsuperscript{73} Demarco, \textit{Sociale}, p. 260.
365 prisoners in Roman hands. This abortive assault cost the French whatever elements of surprise or good will which they might otherwise have enjoyed. It also encouraged the defenders to redouble their preparations for a siege, as it proved that even the French army could be defeated on a given day.

Oudinot, for his part, asked for an armistice, and offered to exchange Pietramellara's men for those prisoners taken by the Romans. He also realized that his present force was unequal to a proper siege of the fortified capital and its now aroused defenders. So he struck an agreement to refrain from further attacks, and sat back to await reinforcements and heavy artillery. Garibaldi and the other Roman generals took advantage of this temporary truce to deliver a smashing counterattack against the Neapolitans. Ferdinand II's army had advanced into the Alban hills southeast of Rome while the French were landing at Civitavecchia. Garibaldi countered by advancing rapidly toward him with a striking force of Rome's best troops. Severly jolted at Palestrina (May 9) and Velletri (May 19), the Neapolitans withdrew in great disorder toward their own frontier. They contributed little else of value to the French efforts during the rest of the campaign.

On May 31, the day Garibaldi returned to Rome, the French special envoy Ferdinand de Lesseps signed an agreement with the Triumvirs extending the peaceful truce, and agreeing to protect Rome against the Austrians and Neapolitans. But his home government never ratified the pact. Indeed, the use of force was all but certain, as Oudinot's army
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had now grown to over 20,000 men, including excellent artillery and engineering units, and still more on the way. Only a day after de Lesseps' treaty, Oudinot informed Rome that the truce was at an end, though he carefully specified that he would not attack 'the place' until June 4. He interpreted his own words to mean that he would not attack Rome's fortifications before then. However, he shrewdly planned to seize key outposts in the Corsini and Pamphili villas; these commanded the essential approaches to the walls of the Gianicolo, the weakest defensive sector. Accordingly, strong French columns dashed into these villas in the early hours of June 3, routing the handful of defenders, and gaining positions which might otherwise have cost thousands of casualties to a storming party. Although the outrage of the Roman defenders prompted them to fight like lions to regain this sector, mere zeal could not compensate for the villas' stout walls and good cover, now in French hands. Although Garibaldi's men continued to hold the Vascello, a house well sited to defend the San Pancrazi gate, they never succeeded in improving their position. With uncharacteristic lack of skill, Garibaldi threw hundreds of his own men against the villa walls in such a piece-meal fashion that he gained only heartbreaking casualties and stories of heroic death. Many of the most famous martyrs of 1849 - Angelo Masina, Goffredo Mameli, Gaetano Bonnet, Enrico Dandolo, Francesco Daverio - were killed in just a few hours during this fruitless carnage. As the French methodically moved up their heavy guns to begin a month-long pounding of the ancient walls, the best among the officers of both sides must have seen that the question had already been decided. 76

76 Trevelyan, pp. 161-93.
Although a month of hard fighting still remained, there was little hope left for the Republic. Since Mazzini had made the struggle one of Nationalism versus Reaction anyhow, he was now careful to sell his state's life dearly. The future propaganda value of noble sacrifice and symbolic gestures seemed to be his only remaining advantage. Even after French troops had stormed through breaches in the fortifications, Mazzini was careful to publish a new constitution as his final gesture before handing over the government to others. Although it was never put into effect, it remains to this day an interesting charter for a social republic, founded on national pride. Garibaldi was equally determined to continue the fight as long as he was able. He assembled the most ardent of his followers (including Ciceruacchio and his sons) and made a dramatic breakout through the French lines. His bold escape and march toward the north captured the imagination of many a patriot, although he never actually succeeded in reaching beleaguered Venice with aid. Oudinot's soldiers streamed through the streets of the shattered capital, and captured the remaining strongpoints with relative ease. The French set up their military government, and hoisted the French and Papal flags over the Campidoglio and all public buildings. Thus the Roman Republic of 1849 passed from the political arena to the pages of epic literature.
CHAPTER IV

THE RESTORATION OF PIUS IX

Following the final collapse of all resistance on the part of the Republican forces, the French army set up a military occupation government in conjunction with representatives of Pius IX. Although the Pope himself would not physically return until the middle of 1850, his ministers made strenuous efforts to erase all traces of the Republic and its regime, as though it were a bad dream which could safely be ignored once normal activity was resumed. With the Republic gone, General Oudinot now found himself at odds with the Pope's most conservative advisers, a handful of zealanti who hoped to restore the "Gregorian" regime in its full vigor. After the death and destruction his siege had caused, Oudinot hoped for a generous, conciliatory agreement with the former republicans. But Pius and the court of Gaeta were not about to agree with him.

As early as 1831, Monsignor Corboli-Bussi had described the political condition of the Papal States in terms of a dying man who sought to prolong his life with doses of poison. Now in 1849, after two years of failed reforms and one year of revolt, Pius found himself in the same uncomfortable spot as had Bernetti in 1832. He was no longer inclined to tinker with the machinery of the state, since it had already come crashing down around his ears. Some curial cardinals seemed to favor blind reaction, preserving everything and changing nothing, and hope to
postpone the moment of final collapse. Farini felt that the severity of the restoration was a turning point in relations between Pius IX and his subjects. The Allocution of April 29, 1848 had been traumatic to the hopes of most nationalists, but Farini was convinced that most Italians continued to give him the benefit of the doubt. His government was tolerated, if not loved. But the restoration, occurring as it did, assured nothing but contempt for papal rule on the part of both republicans and moderate constitutionalists alike.

As the French troops entered the battered and defeated city on July 3, a few die-hard republicans made their final gestures of defiance. A mob near Palazzo Chigi attempted to attack ex-deputy Diomede Pantaleoni and his friend Abate Perfetti, who had been strong backers of Mamiani and the moderates; Doctor Pantaleoni managed to defend himself with a sword, but Perfetti was wounded. Later the same afternoon, three priests were stabbed and killed in a demonstration in Piazza Colonna. Nevertheless, the French were able to re-establish order rather swiftly. The only real result of the final disorders may have been to harden the positions of the reactionaries when they restored civilian rule. Oudinot quickly vested administrative power in a military government under General Rostolan, who closed the clubs and political associations. His other emergency measures included a curfew, disarmament and preventive censure, suspension of the press, and a ban on all posters and placards.

---


2 Farini, IV, 239.

3 Spada, III, 672ff.
Prince Odescalchi formed a provisional commission to replace the republican communal administrators and assist Rostolan. Defeated republican troops were confined to barracks, but Oudinot promised that they would not otherwise be mistreated. Soldiers and civilians from outside the Roman State were encouraged to leave as soon as possible, although even Mazzini stayed until July 16 without any trouble from the French. When he did finally leave, it was simply because he decided it was time to go.  

The Triumvirs of the Republic and their closest collaborators left in small groups with British or American passports. These foreign documents were not closely inspected by the French officers at Civitavecchia; most of them were already inclined to let the refugees depart quietly aboard French steamers. Sturbinetti, Galletti and Mariani were allowed to emigrate with French passports and encouragement, largely to avoid conflicts later. By way of exception, officials at Civitavecchia arrested ex-deputy Enrico Cernuschi. Although he had also been the most ardent member of the barricades committee, Cernuschi was only charged with a part in the Piazza Colonna disorders of July 3, after the French military government had been proclaimed. The new French envoy, François de Corcelle, was a liberal Catholic and close friend of Alexis de Tocqueville, who was beginning his short but eventful term as foreign
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4 Martina, I, 377.


6 Ghisalberti, Mazzini, p. 72.

7 Spada, III, 673-5.
minister (June 2 - October 31, 1849). Corcelle saw the restoration as a golden opportunity to streamline and consolidate the Pope's liberal reforms of the 1846-8 period and to ensure the continuation of the "new" Papal State, something Pius himself no longer believed in. This alignment put him at odds with Esterhazy and the Austrian delegation, who favored the "Gregorian" policy of no change whatever. As things turned out, Corcelle and his occupation forces continued to promote a mild and conciliatory regime to replace the defeated Republic. But Pius insisted on biding his time and waiting for greater assurances that Paris would restore total control of his state to him. He considered himself to be the principal injured party and saw no reason to allow others a hand in making his policy. Any trust the French may have had in his benevolence was ill placed.

The Interim period of the Red Triumvirate

General Oudinot, anxious to begin withdrawal of his troops, grew impatient to return control of Rome to the Pope, and stated his wish to do so by the end of July. But Pius refused to be hurried, and sent cardinals instead; he nominated the so-called "Red Triumvirate" to rule in Rome until he returned. The members were three "Gregorian" cardinals, all considered reactionaries of one degree or another: Cardinals Gabriele Della Genga Sermattei, (nephew of Pope Leo XII), Luigi Vannicelli Casoni, and Ludovico Altieri. The Austrians considered the first two to be safely conservative and pro-Austrian, but found Altieri to be

---

8 Friedrich Engel-Janosi, Catholic Historical Review (1950) XXXVI, 152.
9 Farini, IV, 247f.
too "pro-French" and too open to the sort of experimentation that had marked the Pope's early years. In point of fact, Altieri was from a distinguished Roman family with diplomatic experience in Vienna and a strong devotion to Metternich, as well as to Pius. Della Genga is also described as intelligent and proud, but strongly anti-liberal and touched with rumors of scandal while Archbishop of Ferrara. He had strongly opposed the election of Pius IX, the amnesty, and all of his reforms. In his first years, Pius considered Della Genga to be his only true enemy among the Cardinals. Vannicelli, on the other hand, had no evident ability or education whatever; the only reason for his red hat was friendship with Gregory XVI. He had served as pro-Legate of Ravenna, Governor of Rome and Legate of Bologna, and had performed badly in all three positions. He was finally removed from administrative work by Pius IX and hidden in the presidency of the Lands Registry Office.

It is very curious that Pius now appointed this conservative but "balanced" trio (one friend, one enemy and one non-entity) to pave his return to Rome. Austrian Ambassador Esterhazy saw it as a more profound political conversion than he had dared to imagine. Had the Pope of the amnesty and the Innovations disappeared forever in the smoke of the siege guns? If so, then Austrian policy in Italy could once again count on Rome to be an anchor of conservatism.

---

10 Engel-Janosi, pp. 152f.  
11 Farini, IV, 260f.  
12 Engel-Janosi, p. 153.
The Triumvirate's principal task was to bridge the gap between the violent overthrow of the Republic and the peaceful celebration of the pope's return as a healer and conciliator. Although the French military government continued to occupy military strongpoints, Oudinot was only too happy to relinquish control of all but security matters to civilians. Officially known as the Governative Commission of State, the Triumvirate had full powers to act in the Pope's name beginning from August 1, 1849. Their first act, on August 2, was to annul everything which had occurred since November 16, 1848 - the day that Pius consented to the formation of Galletti's cabinet. From that point onward, they went to work resetting the mechanism of government.\(^{13}\)

They began by reversing a French directive concerning the defeated army. Oudinot had always considered the Roman regular troops (about 8000 men) to be his greatest potential allies in restoring order. He had offered conciliatory guarantees to any military men who agreed to enter the Pope's service.\(^{14}\) The cardinals, however, never trusted the army, and insisted that they were not bound by such promises made in the heat of battle. They discharged anyone who had enlisted since November 16; they also voided any promotions which had taken place since then, and began a general investigation of the conduct of everyone else.\(^{15}\)


\(^{14}\) DeCesare, Roma, p. 37.

\(^{15}\) Farini, IV, 272.
Many anti-republicans were released from the prisons. Among these were partisans of Gregory XVI's government, including Colonel Stanislao Freddi, one of the prime movers of the military commissions of 1843-4, Captain Allai, another of the military zelanti, and large numbers of ex-Papal Volunteers and centurioni imprisoned at Faenza. Most of these men had done nothing beyond favoring the Pope, so their release was probably justified. What was harder to excuse was the immediate incorporation of these bitter partisans into police service to track down and punish their foes - a factious and utterly senseless measure.  

The cardinals then appointed a "Council of Censure" to investigate and decide the fate of all government employees who were still at their posts. This measure was not so much aimed at appointees of the Republic (who were simply dismissed out of hand) as it was against those of the former Papal administration who had held onto their offices even after the flight to Gaeta. This vindictive act stirred up much resentment and hostility toward the new regime on the part of those who might otherwise have been friendly.

There were two particular target groups for this Council. The first was made up of state employees in general, such as school teachers, provincial magistrates, postal employees, and even cleaning women. The other group consisted of members of the "Famiglia Palatina," the papal household, and other employees of the Apostolic Palaces: dragoons, coachmen, clerks, kitchen helpers and similar workers. Records indicate meticulous investigation of hundreds of names, but few, if any,
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16 Farini, IV, 253.
17 DeCesare, Roma, p. 17.
charges were ever brought against the vast majority of these perfectly harmless people. Quite the contrary, many of those investigated maintained an almost childlike fidelity to the Holy Father, sometimes at the expense of great personal suffering and abuse. Most suspects were never prosecuted or indicted for disloyalty of any sort. 18 These individuals, like many service and governmental workers elsewhere, were generally loyal to their employer, but relatively lethargic and inert when it came to confronting those who represented an opposing system, like the Republic. This "lack of fervor" was enough to incur the wrath of the Council of Censure. It is uncertain how many of the same people may have walked away in disgust after their grilling, but Doctor Pantaleoni, for one, wrote on August 7 that he felt compelled to leave the country which countenanced such disgusting treatment of its own citizens. 19

The Cardinals also appointed a Council of Ministers to take over the regular administration. This cabinet contained only 5 members, 4 of them laymen; but the single cleric was Monsignor Savelli, who received the portfolio of the Interior, including control of the Police. This was the same Savelli who led rebels against the Republic in Ascoli, a sharp and talented Corsican with a reputation for being violent and avaricious. The Ministry of Grace and Justice went to Avvocato Gian Santo, a man of integrity but little imagination, while Camillo Jaco-
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18 ASR, ASP, busta 303, fascicolo 106. This is a thick file of investigative reports on members of the Pontifical Household. It is only one section amid the many pounds of paper generated by denunciations. Literally hundreds of names of accused traitors were submitted to the police, who dutifully investigated each one. In most cases, the infractions discovered were very minor, and not worthy of prosecution.

19 Ghisalberti Mazzini p. 79.
bini, an honest farmer, took over the combined Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Fine Arts and Public Works. Angelo Galli, the new Minister of Finance, was well known as a fiscal bungler. The War Ministry was held by a nobleman known for his loyalty and little else. Despite the image of this new "laymen's cabinet," it was only the tough-minded Monsignor Savelli who held the lion's share of administrative and punitive power.

Finally, the Triumvirate set up a special Court of Inquiry to investigate all crimes against religion, against the majesty of the sovereign, and against public and private safety. Over the next several years, this special court would zealously prosecute many real and imagined threats to Papal rule. Most of the political cases which reached the Consulta between 1849 and 1854 began as investigations by the Court of Inquiry. Thus the Triumvirate set in motion the legal machinery which generated much of the data used in the present study.

Alarmed by what he considered the harsh mis-government of the Triumvirate, Oudinot petitioned the Pope to return quickly in person. Pius replied that he would, but did not do so. The French President Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was also incensed by the actions of the three cardinals, whose policy was seen as overtly pro-Austrian. Bonaparte was anxious to maintain public support at home for his policy of restoring the Pope to his throne, but knew likewise that he could not survive if it looked like he favored destruction of a sister republic, and the repres-
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20 Farini, IV, 263.

21 DeCesare, Roma, p. 23.

22 Farini, IV, 272.
sion of the wishes of a sovereign people. He told the Chamber of Deputies that France had acted to preserve human rights, and should be respected for doing so. Upset that the cardinals never mentioned the sacrifices of the French soldiers, he now took steps to win a more generous policy from Gaeta. 23

President Bonaparte concisely stated his own program in a letter (dated August 18, 1849) to Colonel Edgar Ney, a trusted aide and envoy. He intended the letter for General Rostolan, who was to replace Oudinot, and would be the cornerstone of French policy during the restoration process. The letter listed four elements designed to restore harmony and reconciliation as soon as possible: a general amnesty, a secularized administration, a liberal ministry, and implementation of the Code Napoleon. Since the French had restored the Temporal Power, he did not feel this was too much to ask. 24

Pius found Ney's policy too threatening to his own independence; he immediately acted to show that he was unwilling to return home as a mere pawn of the French army. On September 4, he left Gaeta with his Court-in-Exile, but not for Rome. In company with his host, King Ferdinand II, he sailed further south to Portici, where he would remain for another seven months, stubbornly insisting that only full sovereignty and independence of the military forces could suffice. 25 This delay is significant because the practical steps to a genuine reconciliation were postponed yet again. The Triumvirate Cardinals freely continued their

23 Farini, IV, 280f.
24 DeCesare, Roma, p. 19.
25 Farini, IV, 287f.
policy of repression and alienation.

With an eye toward establishing a "presence" in Rome without actually being present, Pius issued a Motu Proprio on September 12, in which he set out broad guidelines for the governmental structure to follow. The first four of the six parts traced the outlines of the future Council of State to advise him on major administrative and legislative issues, an Assembly for Finance, Provincial Diets and autonomous Municipal Diets; members of these bodies were to be appointed from lists nominated by the broadest suitable franchise, and all would support a consultive administration. The fifth element vaguely promised reforms of the administration and of the civil and criminal courts. The sixth and final paragraph granted the second (1849) amnesty to "victims of the seduction, hesitation or inactivity of others." This policy statement had the desired effect on both Austrian and French representatives; both declared their satisfaction. Even the most casual analysis of this Portici manifesto shows that the Pope's political principles had not advanced beyond the Memorandum of 1831. Bland and outdated by 1848 standards, he still resurrected that document as the key to restoring the Temporal Regime, just as he had in 1846. By now Pius felt that his earlier reforms had failed, but his personality still forced him to concede something else, without knowing how or what.

Revolution notwithstanding, one thing which had not changed since 1846 was the staunch opposition of most Cardinals to political change of any sort. After the Motu Proprio of Portici, both Antonelli and Pius

26 Engel-Janosi, pp. 155f.

27 Ghisalberti, Mazzini, p. 13.
were again subjected to severe criticism by many Curial prelates and officials for their "liberalism" in not restoring the ultra-stable system of Gregory XVI. It is essential to remember that Antonelli was not considered to be a reactionary by his fellow cardinals, but a reckless innovator and opportunist. The Austrophile faction within the Sacred College increased its influence by insisting that the Pope's return not take place until the French occupation forces had been reduced below 10,000 men. Thus the formal return did not take place until April, 1850.

Before we abandon the subject of Austrian influence, it is important to recall that Austrian forces still occupied the Legations, the Marches, and Umbria, and that Austrian military governors ruled those regions harshly, with or without the consent of the papal representatives. Despite the theoretical alliance between France and Austria to restore the Papal regime, Austro-French relations remained tense. Franz Josef's new ministry in Vienna considered French intervention in Italy to be not only an encroachment on Austrian prerogatives, but a source of destabilization. The Second Republic in Paris, on the other hand, saw Austrian hegemony as a continuing source of trouble, which provoked rebellion instead of repressing it. President Bonaparte knew that he needed a speedy resolution of the Roman occupation, or he would face public opposition at home for overstepping his authority. Most French deputies were willing enough to support a short-term peacekeeping force, but they rebelled at promoting the severe pacification of another state. But the Austrians planned just such an operation, hoping to permanently

---

28 Engel-Janosi, p. 157
cripple liberal movements in the Papal States. The lines of conflict between Vienna and Paris had been drawn.²⁹

Unlike the French occupation zone, the Austrian sector was closely supervised by the military. Pro-legates and other local administrators had seen their power effectively reduced to a largely ceremonial level. For example, the Extraordinary Commissioner for the Legations was Monsignor Bedini, a close friend of the Pope and a native of Sinigallia. In theory, he was to be the supreme civilian authority in the region, yet he conformed so closely to the policy of General Gorzhowski, that he was widely considered to be a mere rubber stamp for the Austrians. Austrian officials considered any anti-government activity to be treason, no matter how trivial, and therefore subject to a possible death sentence. By sharp contrast, there were examples in Lazio of well-disciplined Spanish or French troops protecting civilians from the local police whenever they felt that justice was not being served. Yet Austrian officials continued to comport themselves as conquerors, rather than peacekeepers. They acted as though the overly permissive papal governors had brought the revolt upon themselves, and should be treated with disdain. As if to complete the humiliation of the Pope, the Austrian government insisted on billing Rome for the occupation forces, while the soldiers of the other states served at the expense of their own governments.³⁰


³⁰ Farini, IV, 264-9 and 313.
The Second Amnesty

The Triumvirate published the amnesty in Rome on September 18, 1849, the date associated with it ever since. It is significant that this second pardon was broad enough to encompass nearly all who had supported the Provisional and Republican governments. Although it obviously made good political sense, it also betrayed the hard fact that so many Roman citizens needed a formal reconciliation with their sovereign. Too many of them had supported some or all of the events after November 15, 1848, and it was impossible to punish them all. Yet Antonelli and Pius could afford to be generous; they were firmly and safely in charge, with French bayonets to back them up. They actually had more control over the machinery of government during the occupation than at any time before it, or afterward. According to Farini, the time at Portici marked Antonelli's rise to the peak of his influence. His own fidelity to Pius throughout the exile was still appreciated, and the infighting between French and Austrian partisans had paralyzed many other potential advisers. Cardinals Della Porta and Piccolomini were dismissed as too reform-minded. Other wise and tempurate men, Amat, Orioli, Ciacchi, Bofondo, Marini and Soglia, remained in the Pope's good graces, but outside his inner circle of power. Curiously, Antonelli continued to be criticized as "too liberal" by many of his contemporaries among the cardinals. 31

The amnesty of 1849 specifically excluded several groups, particularly those who were leaders in the Provisional government, the Constituent Assembly, and the Republic; Mazzini and his fellow Triumvirs were

31 Farini, IV, 316.
high on the list of offenders. It also banned members of any Assembly who accepted election and took part in the proceedings. Some of these claimed that they had worked with the Pope's interests in mind, but their arguments were ignored. Pius had already declared from Gaeta that it was a political crime to co-operate with the Provisional Government or, to support the Republic by accepting election to its highest legislative body. Other suspects among the civil administrators included the presidi of the provinces, directors of the police, regional commissars, and presidents of the civil and criminal tribunals, if they were nominated by the Republican government. There were further exclusions for all those who had been leaders of military units, whether regular army, civic legions, or volunteer formations. After a few clarifications, the term "military leaders" came to signify those who held the rank of major or above. Several more inquiries followed to clarify and remove lingering doubts. Finally, the second amnesty excluded all individuals who had received the amnesty of 1846, and all those who had been accused of ordinary crimes.

Farini protested the injustice of what he called this "punishment by class," which lumped together, without distinction, all participants in Provisional Government, Constituent Assembly and Republic. In so doing, the Pope glossed over the very real differences between those who actually planned the revolution (chiefly republicans), and those who
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32 ASR, ASP, busta 308, fascicolo 249. This file contains correspondence relating to the implementation and clarification of the second amnesty, and the exceptions to it. Of special interest is an order from the Interior Ministry, dated September 24, 1849 (register # 3695), to arrest 17 individuals including Ludovico and Vincenzo Caldesi and Pietro Guerrini. It is signed "Benvenuti" (the police chief).
tried to oppose the revolution from a position of strength (mainly constitutionalists). Farini insisted that most moderate deputies acted courageously in speaking out against what they saw as republican excesses, even when they knew they were a minority in the Assembly. Their only real "crime" had been the decision to participate in government rather than abstain. By failing to set off the real revolutionaries from all others, the reactionaries swept everyone outside their own clique into one grand massa damnata, and virtually assured their own isolation instead. Farini sees this tactical error as one of the critical shortcomings of the Restoration, one which called into question the entire future of Papal government.  

A second major criticism of the new amnesty was the vague and uncertain wording of most of the terms and guidelines. This vagueness may actually have been carefully calculated by the more reactionary cardinals to create a broad "gray area" which removed the clear protection of law from their political rivals. Obviously, the motivation of political crimes and disloyal actions is open to broad interpretation. So instead of healing the wounds left by war and revolution, the amnesty became a vehicle for any rigorists bent on breaking the power of their political foes. As things turned out, the Cardinal Triumvirs and some of the judges who followed them interpreted events even before the flight to Gaeta as worthy of prosecution: abusing liberty of the (then free) press, the fighting beyond the Po, taking part in political meetings while they were still legal, and so forth. In a few cases, Cardinal Vannicelli even dipped into the previous pontificate for charges,

---

33 Farini, IV, 296.
even though they had technically been forgiven in 1846 by Pius himself.\textsuperscript{34}

Many high-profascicolo public figures, as we have seen, did not wait to be accused or indicted of real or imagined crimes, but chose voluntary exile rather than fight a hopeless battle. Among them were Farini himself, Mamiani, Federico Torre, Giuseppe Galletti, Carlo Rusconi and others too numerous to mention.\textsuperscript{35} Poor Mamiani was very badly treated by the Papal government he had tried to defend. He had argued convincingly in the Constituent Assembly that the Pope should not be deprived of his Temporal Power, then resigned from that body when it voted against his advice, earning himself much abuse from the most ardent republicans.\textsuperscript{36} Now the Red Triumvirate pressured him to leave the state altogether. As a final insult, the Holy Office seized his personal papers for "evaluation" (including writings on philosophy, literature, politics and history) and never returned them. Pantaleoni had suffered a similar loss of personal papers upon departure. As things turned out, Mamiani was subsequently elected to several Italian Parliaments (third through eighth) from many different districts, and functioned honorably as a deputy. He also served as Minister of Public Instruction in Cavour's cabinet, and as President of the Council under Cavour. He was nominated to the Senate in 1864, and died on May 21, 1885.\textsuperscript{37} Had the Triumvirate followed a more conciliatory policy, these

\textsuperscript{34} Farini, IV, 297-300.
\textsuperscript{35} Leti, Roma, I, 188.
\textsuperscript{36} Farini, IV, 273f.
\textsuperscript{37} Leti, Roma, I, 180f.
and other talented men might have felt welcome enough to continue working for the government of Rome, and not its rival in Turin.

Altogether, those who were proscribed, exiled, dismissed from office, and otherwise excluded from positions of influence were numbered in the "thousands," according to Farini. They included not only convinced republicans, but constitutionalists, moderate reformers and people unconnected with any group. The net result was great disenchantment with Pius IX and his government among the Roman nobility, lower clergy, and others who had been his early friends. 38  

The Political Trials of the Restoration  
Over the next five years, the Consulta, sitting as the court of appeal in all political cases, reviewed a huge number of trials covering everything from printing and spreading seditious literature, to murders and violent robbery with political or partisan motivation. These trials did not include the principal leaders of the Republic who, as we have seen, were allowed by French military forces to emigrate before being arrested. This example of "mercy by neglect" allowed many deputies, administrators and military officers to find their way out of the country without further harassment. But far from being a denial of justice, this "laxity" helped to stabilize the war-torn state and avoided the divisive agony of political trials against popular leaders.

Among these refugees, as among those who decided to remain, there were recipients of the 1846 pardon who now found themselves under suspicion. It is now possible to determine who and how many of this original  

38 Farini, IV, 317.
group were caught up in the later turmoil of 1848-9. Simply stated, those who had received the amnesty of 1846 remained out of the political arena to a very surprising degree. These men were politically sensi-
tized, and had already suffered exile or imprisonment for their prin-
ciples at least once; their initial tendency was to return to the forum to promote those ideals one more time. But they did not. Those who could be considered otherwise by any stretch of the imagination number only 160 of the 989 individuals in this study: about 16%, but no more. One possible reason is that many of the remaining 84% saw no future for themselves in acting against the Pope's government. The slow, deliber-
ate change of 1846-8 had given them enough hope to keep them content. Although it can not be proven by these statistics, it is possible that the alternative of following Sterbini (or Mazzini) appeared to uncer-
tain, or too dangerous. The previous reforms, though modest, looked good enough to them that radical change could bring it down like a house of cards.

If, indeed, this was "silent support" for Pius IX and his moderate program of reform, the quiet 84% would be disappointed. By 1849, Pius and most of the cardinals had given up on reform - the only new opening was to the conservatives, as embodied by the Red Triumvitate. Taken in this light, the choices of the Restoration appear to have been even more crucial. Moderates who felt they had remained loyal to the Pope at great cost to themselves, and now had nothing to show for it, could look to Piedmont or elsewhere for their salvation. At least for them, the Restoration was more tragic than the rigors of the revolution itself.
Even allowing for those individuals who fit more than one category, most fall into four broad groupings:

1. Officials, deputies and administrators of the intervening regimes (Provisional Government, Constituent Assembly and Republic).

2. Military officers and men (regular army, volunteers or civic guard) who fought for the above.

3. Anyone who committed violent or other crimes which might carry some degree of political or partisan motivation.

4. Purely political offenders with no other crimes to their charge; such acts as speaking, writing or disseminating literature which criticized the Church-State or promoted secret societies.

LEGISLATORS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Perhaps the most highly visible group of participants in the political process were elected members of the Constituent Assembly. No more than 25 names from the 1846 amnesty list match the 200 representatives elected, but some are quite familiar. Galletti and Sterbini were elected easily. So were many leaders of the revolts of 1843-5: Beltrami, Pasi and Zambecari, Vincenzo Caldesi and his cousin Ludovico, Mattia Montecchi, and the young zealot Felice Orsini. Some of these deputies, as we will see shortly, would also distinguish themselves as military leaders, and a few as local administrators. But most of the others turned out to be unremarkable - and ultimately harmless - both before and after their election. Geographically, 13 of the 25 were from
the Legations (including most of those just named), while only 7 represented Lazio and 5 from the Marches. These names were automatically excluded by the Pope when they were elected. 39

The second amnesty also excluded all provincial governors (presidi) during the Pope's absence. The central police office sent a circular letter to all provincial administrators on August 25, 1849 requesting names and biographical data on these presidi. The replies include several members of the 1846 amnesty group, including two who were also deputies. In the Legations region, Count Oreste Biancoli was listed as third and final administrator of the province of Bologna, succeeding Carlo Berti-Pichat in April, 1849. Biancoli remained there until the Austrian capture of Bologna, when he resigned his powers to the municipal council. Also listed is Count Francesco Lovatelli, who was preside of Ferrara before November 16, and stayed at his post until resigning in protest at the proclamation of the Constituent Assembly. 40

Lovatelli was, in fact, very devoted to Pius IX and his early reform program. He decided to remain in office after the flight of the Pope simply because he would be of no use as a mediator if he resigned. During the previous year he had almost single handedly saved Imola from anarchy during Durando's march northward. He had asked for extra troops
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39 ASR, RR, busta 1, fascicolo 2. This is an interesting collection of the lists of deputies, both printed and hand written, following the elections of January 21, 1849. There are minor differences in these lists, which represent interim and final election results.

40 ASR, ASP, busta 304, fascicolo 120. The key element here is a circular letter from police headquarters, dated August 25, 1849, asking for names and information on the presidi of all provinces during the provisional and republican periods. Several responses to the circular are also included.
and police to restore order (there had been 20 attempted murders in one month). When these never arrived, he simply used the force of his personality and his reputation as a leading local reformer to re-establish tranquility there in less than two weeks.\textsuperscript{41} Like his friends Farini, Mamiani and Minghetti, Count Lovatelli had hoped for vindication by the Pope for his earlier services. Unlike them, he chose to remain in the Papal States after the restoration. Seven years later, he was assassinated by militant republicans who considered him a traitor. His murderers were never convicted; their trial was suspended in 1860, when Italy annexed the eastern provinces of the Papal States, and never resumed.\textsuperscript{42}

In the Marches, two other recipients of the 1846 amnesty were presidi of important provinces. Giuseppe Camillo Mattioli was in charge at Ancona for the entire period, as was Francesco Bubani at Fermo. Although Mattioli was elected deputy, he never took his seat in Rome, but remained in Ancona. He was largely blamed for the violent disorders not only in the city of Ancona, but in Jesi, Corinaldo and the rest of the province as well. Bubani is described by the police report as very anticlerical, despite good skills as an administrator. He is accused of being the force behind attempts to seize church property in his province, and especially as the one responsible for the arrest of Cardinal DeAngelis, Archbishop of Fermo.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{41} Anna Rustici, "Le drammatiche giornate imolesi della primavera del 1848.,” Studi Romagnoli, (1955) VI, 137-46.


\textsuperscript{43} ASR, ASP, busta 304, fascicolo 120.
In Lazio, Pietro Sterbini is listed as the second preside of Frosinone, his home territory. Even though he was a deputy, he apparently had no difficulty administering the nearby province after the resignation of Francesco Mayr. Since Sterbini was already one of the chief promoters of the revolutionary movement, his seat in Frosinone was the very least of his problems. 44

Another significant administrator was Dr. Tomasso Zauli-Sajani of Forli'. He had been president of the Circolo Popolare in his native city, and was appointed governor of Albano during the Republic. His police dossier describes him as "an inflammatory presence" in Albano, responsible for encouraging other like-minded republicans in their opposition to the Pope, and also accuses him of taking 116 scudi and a gold ring with him as he departed from the city. The police recommendation is that he be excluded from the amnesty because he went back on his earlier word of honor. 45

A lesser administrator worthy of note is a Roman, Luigi Uffreduzzi. During the Republic, he served as police commissioner for the Ripa & Trastevere district of the city. Not only did he allegedly support the Republic, but also possessed literature and organizational material pertaining to secret societies. He is also accused of occupation and requisition of church property, as well as possible implication in the San Calisto murders and the "Cardinals' Carriages" case (treated below). Uffreduzzi was arrested in January, 1850 and brought to trial

44 ASR, ASP, busta 304, fascicolo 120.

45 ASR, ASP, busta 308, fascicolo 250. Here are filed police reports and letters dealing with suspects from the Comarca district. Zauli-Sajani is described in entry # 23 under the city of Albano.
on these charges. The proceedings had to be suspended, however, when he escaped from the Castel Sant' Angelo in December of the same year.46

MILITARY LEADERS

According to the guidelines of the 1849 amnesty, "military leaders with the rank of major and above" were to be excluded from the pardon. This study has identified 14 names which fit this description and were also beneficiaries of the 1846 amnesty.

There is a certain degree of overlap, especially among aristocrats, when we consider the military leadership. Four of the deputies already listed were also officers above the rank of Major: Bartolucci, Pasi, Pescantini and Zambeccari. Each of the four was also a unit commander who figured prominently in the struggles against French and Austrian forces. The story of the siege of Rome would have been quite different without them.

Cavaliere Luigi Bartolucci is probably the most significant officer in the sample under consideration. He helped to organize the First Volunteer Regiment during the earliest days of the spring campaign of 1848, and served in that unit as Lieutenant Colonel. Later, he was promoted to Colonel and transferred to the Second Volunteers as commander.47

---

46 ASR, TSC, busta 219, fascicolo 143. These documents are court transcripts outlining the charges and judgements against Uffreduzzi, even after his escape.

47 ASR, MAV, Rubricella 1. The "Rubricella" is a handwritten register of the officers commissioned in all volunteer units for the campaigns of 1848-49.
Because of his service in Napoleon's army, including the Russian campaign, he had more professional experience than the vast majority of his colleagues. His Second Volunteers fought well in Veneto despite their lack of experience and training, but Bartolucci’s own skill and daring helped General Ferrari far more than his men's zeal. On April 10, 1849, the day after the Republic was proclaimed, he was promoted to General. During the siege of Rome, he commanded the division defending all fortifications to the east of the Tiber. The only walls not under his control were those of the vulnerable Gianicolo & Trastevere sectors. That division was assigned to Ferrari, and later to Garibaldi.48

Upon the elevation of Bartolucci to staff duties, Count Raffaele Pasi took command of the Second Volunteer Regiment. Pasi was already a Colonel and had commanded the volunteers from Faenza the previous year. In the reorganization of units, the Second Volunteers was renamed the Sixth Regiment of the Line, and served honorably throughout the siege. Just before the entry of the French, Pasi fell back to the Castel Sant'Angelo with his regiment and disbanded it before returning to exile.49

The remaining two officer/deputies also commanded volunteer units raised for the campaign against Austria in the spring of 1848. Count Livio Zambeccari raised and commanded the battalion "Cacciatori del Alto Reno," composed mainly of men from the province of Bologna. The Alto Reno battalion fought well in the campaigns north of the Po, then was incorporated into the newly formed Eighth Regiment of the Line for the


49 Rosi, III, 800f.
defense of Rome. Lieutenant Colonel Federico Pescantini was the founding commander of the "Pio IX" battalion of Lugo. Though full of nationalistic zeal in the Veneto campaign, the "Pio IX" battalion was so badly mauled by the Austrian regulars that it could not be rebuilt. Its remnants were incorporated into the "Unione" regiment, a new composite unit which proved to be much more durable, and later provided the nucleus of the Ninth Regiment of the Line in a subsequent reorganization. Both of these line regiments served nobly during the defense of Rome.50

Two other officers, though not deputies, were significant unit commanders in their own right. Marchese Pietro Pietramellara raised and led the "Bersaglieri del Reno," also known as the "Melara" battalion, after the popular shortening of his name. The Bersaglieri had made a name for themselves by their spirited defense of Vicenza during Durando's campaign. With the proclamation of the Republic, Pietramellara's unit was charged with the defense of Civitavecchia. Although surprised and captured by the French, the unit was exchanged for French prisoners taken in the ill-fated assault of April 30, and was able to participate in the principal events of the siege, including the battles of Villa Pamphili, Villa Corsini and Parioli. Lieutenant Colonel "Melara" was seriously wounded on June 5, and died a month later in the hospital set up at the Quirinal Palace.51

50 ASR, MAV, Rubricella 1.
51 Rosi, I, 809. and Trevelyan, p. 176.
Angelo Masini, although only a captain in rank, would certainly have qualified as a "unit commander" if he had survived. He led a small cavalry force called the "Lancieri della Morte," which he raised and equipped at his own expense, originally to aid the besieged Venetians. During the battle for Rome, the Lancieri functioned as the effective cavalry arm of Garibaldi's Italian Legion, despite the fact that he never had more than about 40 mounted men "who knew how to die" at any one time. Although misspelled "Masina," his name is well remembered, due principally to his heroic death on June 3, during an unsuccessful assault on the Villa Corsini.52

The officers' roster also lists Lieutenant Colonel Pietro Landi and Major Rubicondo Barbetti of the "Unione" regiment. Barbetti's younger brother Eusebio had been a cellmate of Felice Orsini before the amnesty but was already dead of a fever he had caught in prison; Rubicondo himself joined the student corps of the First Roman Legion (Civic Guards) before it was incorporated into the "Unione."53 Another Civic officer, Major Antonio Celli, served with the Third Roman Legion. Major Gaetano Colombarini served in the Third Volunteer Regiment as both staff officer and company commander, including command of the bersaglieri company. The Third Volunteers were re-designated Seventh Regiment of the Line during the reorganization before the fight for Rome.54

52 Trevelyan, pp. 78 & 185.
53 Rosi, II, 175.
54 ASR, MAV, Rubricella 1.
There remain three other officers not assigned to specific units: Colonel Domenico Belluzzi and Major Antonio Montanari of the Officers' Depot, and Colonel Ignazio Palazzi of the Mobilized Civic Guards. Colonel Belluzzi was one of the many who went to the aid of Venice in the spring of 1848. He proved so successful as a fortress commander, first at Vicenza, then at Malghera, that he was promoted to General and given command of the fourth brigade in the Venetian army. It appears that he never returned to the Papal States to participate in any of the fighting there. Major Montanari was killed defending Ancona in 1849. Following the restoration, Colonel Palazzi was mentioned in a police report dated July 23, 1849. The report is probably in error, at least insofar as it states that "two ex-Republican Colonels were hiding near Frascati, Melara (=Pietramellara, who was dead by that date) and Palazzi." Palazzi is described only as having been previously condemned to life imprisonment for political crimes, then released by Pius IX in the 1846 amnesty.

VIOLENT CRIMES - GENERAL

Within this category, there are three very large "show trials" designed by the Court of Inquiry to prosecute their most implacable foes. They center upon major events of the rebellion itself, and not the more local and specific cases of crimes committed during the rebellion. These

55 ASR, MAV, Rubricella 1.
56 Rosi, II, 228f.
57 ASR, ASP, Busta 302, fascicolo 50. This is another in the very long series of police investigations, prompted by complaints, tips and denunciations, most of them anonymous.
three cases (the Rossi assassination, the San Calisto murders and the "Cardinals' Carriages" affair) were the best known political trials of the day. The prosecutors and the judges of the Consulta considered these cases to be the cornerstones of their campaign against the rebel leadership, since they were so closely connected with serious and violent action against the Ecclesiastical State. Those rebels most determined to overthrow the Pope - so the argument went - had probably decided to commit themselves to action in one or more of these cases. So it is particularly interesting in the context of the present study, that amnesty recipients are NOT found among the defendants to any significant degree.

The most directly connected case is the assassination of Pellegrino Rossi on November 15, the event which actually started the revolt against Pius IX. There were 16 men finally put on trial for the murder, and one of them, Sante Costantini, was actually executed in 1854. None of these individuals were from the 1846 group. The actual assassin (Ciceruacchio's son Luigi by common consensus) had already been shot by the Austrians. Among the many others who had fled the country and were beyond the reach of the courts, the chief planner from behind the scenes was Pietro Sterbini. He was easily condemned in absentia, since few doubted that he had played a major role in Rossi's murder and most of the other events designed to turn Rome into a revolutionary center. But except for Sterbini, no other individual from the amnesty group was even accused.58

58 ASR, TSC, busta 405, fascicolo 132. This fascicolo is actually a hardcover book of 645 pages, containing transcript material from the Rossi murder trial.
A second famous murder trial prosecutes the so-called San Calisto murders. This case is the only one on record which dealt with a systematic attack on the clergy, despite the heavily anti-clerical spirit of the Republic. The defendants were members of the militarized but badly disciplined customs guards (finanzieri) under the command of Callimachio Zambianchi. Between April 29 and May 4, 1849, Zambianchi and members of his unit executed 8 unarmed priests or clerics, and had arrested 14 others with the same thing in mind. At the time there were 289 members belonging to the corps, and all of them were interrogated. Only 5 names on the entire list could have matched members of the amnesty group, but even these were not consistent with known ages, hometowns, etc. Charges against these 5, as against most of the others, were dropped. No members of the amnesty group were involved in this most famous of the atrocity trials.\textsuperscript{59}

Finally, there is the so-called "Cardinals' Carriages" investigation. The original cause for this case was the requisition of several carriages, sometimes including the horses, to help prepare for the impending siege. Since some of the finest vehicles belonged to cardinals still living in Rome, the scheme degenerated into an attempt to extort money for their safe return. In the final analysis, this case grew into a sort of "umbrella" process for prosecution of Republican officials for any damage to or destruction of private property, especially church property, during the interim period. There were 19 dis-

\textsuperscript{59} ASR, TSC, busta 404, fascicolo 130. Another very extensive collection of transcript material, including printed and handwritten notes, testimony and arguments. One set of corrected galley proofs is also provided.
tinct charges, in all, against various combinations of about 70 persons. Of these, only 6 names from the amnesty list are possible matches, and most of these were based on circumstantial evidence because of their official positions. These include Ludovico Caldesi and Enrico Serpieri among the 6 deputies named. The others were Luigi Uffreduzzi, police commissioner for Trastevere, Mattia Montecchi who was working at the War Ministry, Pio Pio, another civil servant, and Angelo Gori, who was a guard for the garage area under the Cancelleria palace. (Gori's name is not a secure match.) The trial became something of a local joke, because of its pettiness. As the testimony proceeded, it became increasingly evident that the revolutionary governments had actually done a fairly good job of safeguarding life and property. If anything, the end result of this and similar trials was to vindicate the Republic from charges of "anarchy" and wholesale destruction of property, at least insofar as was possible during a siege, when round shot and explosive shells were flying through the air.  

VIOLENT CRIMES - SPECIFIC

This section includes violent crimes against persons or property, frequently with some added element of mob action or conspiracy. Among the most common crimes with political implications, are the numerous murders and attacks against government employees. The most interesting cases tend to "cluster" in just a few cities and provinces, possibly because they were planned and carried out by the same leaders or cadres. Bolo- 

\[60\] ASR, TSC, busta 404, fascicolo 131. Very detailed transcript material, none of it printed. Many of these pages are beautifully written by hand as an obvious final copy.
gna, Lugo, Ancona and Pesaro are the cities most frequently mentioned.

Most of these more violent crimes were committed by artisans and other lower class people. The tendency toward violence may reflect a lack of hope (or a lack of opportunity) to be heard in other ways. It may also simply be a much older way of expressing displeasure with the regime. Isolated acts of violence appear in the records, but they are probably not significant. Short of examining very personal motives, there is probably not much to learn from them. On the other hand, there is much of interest in the cases involving group activity, especially when the group is built around older associations, such as friendships formed in exile or in prison.

**Bologna**

As second city in the Papal States, Bologna might look like an obvious trouble spot simply because of its size. But the Austrian incursion of August, 1848 also aggravated political passions in this sophisticated northern city. When the invading forces attempted to seize the city, they galvanized the patriotism of the Bolognese population into a spirited defense and united the political factions for concerted action in a way that nothing else could. General Welden withdrew his troops after August 8, but many of the Bolognese decided to re-direct their rage toward their political rivals within the city. Anyone who might be considered too "pro-Austrian," too "Gregorian," or "anti-Unity" to whatever degree was suddenly in danger. On August 24, a large number of artisans and unskilled workers met at the Tamburrini tavern to decide on a course of action. They resolved to kill all employees of the police and the
courts, including spys, agents and prison guards, beginning with the most hated. Names were selected and plans finalized. Over the next two weeks, Bologna witnessed a series of vicious attacks on the most visible of the police agents, resulting in at least 20 murders and 16 other attempts. Some of those most closely associated with this series of killings were recipients of the 1846 amnesty.

Significant among these leaders were three working class brothers, Gaetano, Luigi, and Alfonso Costa. The first two of these had been accused of rebellion by the Military Commission of January 22, 1844, and received 15-year sentences. As a result of the amnesty, both were released from Civitavecchia prison in 1846. All three brothers were among the ten men accused of killing police spy Luigi Giorgetti on September 1. Giorgetti, who was greatly hated by the Costas, knew of the August 24 meeting and planned to save himself by leaving town. Before he could do so, he was tracked down by the mob and shot three times, almost certainly by Gaetano. All three brothers were found guilty, with two others, and all were condemned to death. Alfonso's sentence was immediately commuted to life imprisonment, because he was still a minor. Luigi and one other also received a commutation on February 4, 1853, but

---

61 These assassination squads, called "Balle" by many, continued their rampage until September 5, when a vice-brigadier of carabinieri was wounded. Police then arrested many of the leaders and sent them to Civita Castellana. Several of them joined Garibaldi when his column passed by there on his retreat from Rome, and continued their fight. ASR, TSC, busta 413, fascicolo 773.

62 ASR, TSC, busta 413, fascicolo 724. This is the first of 5 consecutive cases concerning the events of August and September in Bologna. Several names occur in more than one of these cases, as well as cases 772 and 773, indicating multiple charges.
Gaetano and Pietro Bonetti were beheaded on July 27 of the same year.  

Gaetano Costa was also chief among 5 defendants in a separate trial for the murder of Pietro Brunori. Only two hours after the Giorgetti murder on September 1, police inspector Brunori was surprised near his home by a group of seven armed men, and shot repeatedly despite the pleas of his 14-year old son. Gaetano was identified as leader of the group, and his conviction for this second murder undoubtedly helped to confirm his death sentence. Two of his companions were also executed for the same crime.  

On the following day, September 2, someone shot at police agent Pietro Zappoli, but failed to hit him. Zappoli identified his attacker as Luigi Sarti, a friend of the Costa brothers. Sarti was a local workman who had returned from exile in Algiers as a result of the amnesty. He had been named as one of several present at the Giorgetti murder, but was not convicted. Sarti was also suspected of still another attempted murder on August 9, along with Luigi and Alfonso Costa. This one involved an attack on police agent Francesco Piraz-

---

63 ASR, TSC, busta 413, fascicolo 724. The fine line between criminal and political violence is hard to pin down, even among professionals. The Consulta chose to return many cases to the local courts, indicating that the charge was not sufficiently political. The ordinary tribunals then proceeded to try them as ordinary criminal cases. In practice, the difference between a political murder and a criminal one hinged on something said by the accused which gave away a political motive, or some degree of planning. Most of the time, conspiracy was interpreted as political.

64 ASR, TSC, busta 413, fascicolo 725.

65 ASR, TSC, busta 251, fascicolo 870. In this fascicolo and subsequent ones, a busta number in the "200" series indicates trial notes, usually hand written, while a "400" number means that some or all of the transcript is printed. Many cases have material in both categories.
zotti. Although another man was sentenced to 12 years in prison for this attempt, all other charges were dropped on March 20, 1852 for lack of evidence, and Sarti was released.⁶⁶⁶

Among the other attacks which took place on September 2 were the murders of Antonio and Giuseppe Ragazzini. Since one of these brothers was a policeman and the other a prison guard, they were well aware of the mortal danger to themselves, and attempted to hide at the home of a lawyer near the Porta Maggiore. A large throng located them there and proceeded to loot the house while the brothers escaped to a nearby rooftop. They were finally cornered and stabbed to death. Among the 30 defendants eventually brought to trial for the killings were two local leaders who had requested the amnesty in 1846. Cesare Brini, a tailor, had been serving a 15-year sentence for mob action when he was released from Civitavecchia. Gaetano Vicinelli had been an exile in Paris, having fled charges of previous violent attacks in 1843. He had returned home in 1847, apparently without authorization.⁶⁷⁸ Brini was condemned to death as one of the five principal killers, and was guillotined on July 25, 1853. Vicinelli was also condemned to death by unanimous vote the following year, not only for his support of the murders, but for his previous crimes and violation of the terms of the amnesty. His sentence was commuted to life in prison on September 12, 1854.⁶⁸⁸

⁶⁶ ASR, TSC, busta 414, fascicolo 854.
⁶⁷ ASR, TSC, busta 413, fascicolo 773.
⁶⁸ ASR, TSC, busta 246, fascicolo 773.
Vicinelli is mentioned briefly in another case which is otherwise unrelated to events in Bologna, but which treats two other cases of unauthorized return, and offers a possible clue to linkage among individuals. The principals are Saverio Muratore and Gaetano Turri, leaders of the 1843 Savigno conspiracy and the resulting killings of Captain Castelvetri and several carabinieri. Both are accused of having returned without authorization, although Pius IX had been inclined to reopen their case in March of 1848. Records of their process had been sent to Rome with that end in view, but the files disappeared during the ensuing confusion and the case could not be brought to a conclusion either way. A decree dated April 30, 1851 (when conciliation was no longer in vogue) orders the two to return to perpetual exile from the state or face five years at hard labor.  

Another in the series of killings in Bologna took place on Sunday, September 3. The victim was a landowner, Antonio Baraldi, who had attempted to maintain order in his quarter of the city with a citizens' patrol. He was identified and followed by 3 men as he walked alone to Mass at the church of S. Donato. Although he tried to send for help, they tracked him into the rectory and killed him there before escaping up a narrow street. The assassins were identified as Domenico Sandoni, Domenico Conti, and Valentino Zani. Conti and Zani had been on trial together in 1843 for rebellion. Conti, who had a history of 17 arrests, had been condemned to death by the Military Commission, then had his sentence commuted to life imprisonment. Technically, the amnesty of 1846 did not cover his charges, but after a series of special petitions,

---

69 ASR, TSC, busta 225, fascicolo 229.
Conti was judged to be harmless and was one of those finally pardoned in March of 1848. Zani received 15 years at the same trial and was routinely released by Pius IX three years later. But there was little doubt as to who had actually killed Baraldi in 1848; accordingly, all three men were found guilty and condemned to death. Conti and Zani were executed on April 9, 1854; Sandoni died in prison.  

Several months later, on April 3, 1849, an unknown person attempted a similar killing. Police inspector Giuseppe Radicchi was on his way home when an assassin surprised him and stabbed him several times. Both Carlo Paccapeli and Francesco Versari were arrested as suspects, but the evidence was too circumstantial to convict either of them. The 1846 amnesty had released both men from Civitavecchia on the same day; both were also accused of subsequent crimes. A note on the transcript speaks of unfavorable public opinion following Paccapeli's release in 1850, since the general population felt that he was actually guilty of the crime. Internal exile was one option under consideration.  

There were two additional cases in Bologna of mob related crimes against property. One was an attack on the offices of the local Criminal Court, following the withdrawal of the Austrians in August, 1848. The court offices, housed in an old convent, contained many objects and exhibits relating to pending cases, such as firearms, knives, clothing, money and other precious objects. The money alone was probably over 200 scudi. These items were stolen when a crowd ransacked the entire build-

---

70 ASR, TSC, busta 416, fascicolo 890.
71 ASR, TSC, busta 234, fascicolo 449.
ing. Although many of the perpetrators remained unknown, three men were eventually identified and brought to trial, including Luigi Rossi. Rossi had been condemned to 15 years for insurrection in 1843, but released from Civitavecchia in 1846. In August 1852, Rossi and his fellow defendants received another 20 years.\textsuperscript{72}

A similar mob threatened the villa and family of Count Ottavio Malvezzi. Scion of one of Bologna's oldest and wealthiest families, Count Ottavio was known to be a devoted supporter of the government. On August 21, 1848, a large band of working class people marched about 8 miles to the Malvezzi villa to requisition arms. The leaders demanded 50,000 scudi from the Count, and threatened to hold his family hostage until it was paid. They eventually settled for only 3000 scudi in cash, and released their captives unharmed.\textsuperscript{73} Among the 15 defendants in the resulting trial were Paolo Scorzoni (whose brother was the principal leader) and Gaetano Marchesi. Both of these men were also veterans of the 1843 rebellion and the subsequent Military Commissions. Marchesi had been condemned to 20 years for his activity. Scorzoni had received a death sentence, later commuted to life in Civita Castellana. Although Marchesi was released immediately by the amnesty, Scorzoni had to wait for a pardon in 1848. The outcome of this trial is not indicated in the transcript, but several other charges were also pending against both men. It is of interest that one of the witnesses who identified Marchesi at the scene was the heroic Captain "Masina" (Angelo Masini) who

\textsuperscript{72} ASR, TSC, busta 417, fascicolo 953.

\textsuperscript{73} The spectacle of the Malvezzi and other distinguished families being threatened by armed crowds vividly illustrates how completely the traditional patterns of deference and authority had broken down.
would shortly die during the siege of Rome.\footnote{\textsc{ASR, TSC, busta 417, fascicolo 982.}}

Seen in combination, these cases include a dozen Bolognese individuals who received the amnesty; though the transcripts make no mention of it, they share an interesting background. At least ten of the twelve were heavily involved with the Muratori sedition of 1843. Vicinelli, Conti and Scorzoni were known to be members of the band which attacked the carabinieri at Savigno; Marchesi, Brini, Zani, Rossi and the Costa brothers were all named as members of the force which marched against Imola. Sarti was described as a messenger for the conspirators. The remaining two (Paccapelli and Versari) may also have been involved with the same group, but nothing of their background has come to light. Other members of the same group are identified elsewhere in this paper, though not accused of ordinary crimes. These facts suggest that the original command structure of the Muratori force had been maintained (or rebuilt) for the next upheaval, and not broken up and dispersed after 1843, as the police had hoped.

Lugo

In the city of Lugo, we find a similar (if less dramatic) pattern. A series of cases were combined into one trial process, since they involved the same 9 defendants, including Antonio Marani and Alessandro Barattoni. Marani was released from Ferrara prison by the amnesty, and Barattoni returned from his exile at Macon in France. The charges are serious ones - three murders and one attempt during the late winter of 1849 - but the prosecution's evidence was probably quite weak, since the
cases never moved ahead. The strongest case involved the murder of Sub-Chancellor Giuseppe Montanari on January 19, 1849. The victim was in the habit of taking an afternoon walk before returning to his office in the Rocca. He was attacked by armed men while he was walking alone, and collapsed at a Civic Guard post, where he died soon afterwards. Marani and his brother, with Barattoni, were the chief suspects. The same men were also charged with the murders of Giuseppe Tamburini and Desiderio Utili (both on January 29), and the wounding of District Governor Filippo Masciali on February 29. The Consulta dropped the charges in the Montanari case without any judgement (May 4, 1853), and the other charges never came to trial.\(^75\)

The same Antonio Marani was accused of being one of two attackers, who caused injuries to Antonio Scalaberni in July of 1848. Since his fellow defendant has fled the country, this is not much of a trial. Marani received one year of detention on July 12, 1851, then was released immediately, since he had already been jailed for that long.\(^76\) Alessandro Barattoni was also accused taking part in a shotgun attack on Erminia Pascoli on February 9, 1849. Marani is mentioned in this case, but not charged. Pascoli, the victim, had done no more than refuse, a year before, to believe that the Austrian army had been beaten at Goito. He escaped wounded, but identified his attackers. This case was also dismissed for insufficient evidence.\(^77\)

\(^75\) ASR, TSC, busta 258, files 964-7. This is a combined process which began as 4 individual cases, but was later united when it became evident that the defendants had cooperated with one another.

\(^76\) ASR, TSC, busta 409, fascicolo 523.

\(^77\) ASR, TSC, busta 416, fascicolo 919.
Alessandro's brother, Alessio Barattoni was also accused of attempted murder. Along with Agostino Morandi, a fellow exile, he was indicted for shooting at Luigi Scalaberni as early as November 6, 1846... mere weeks after his return from France. Scalaberni was only slightly wounded in his thumb, but both his mother and he were attacked again in September and October of 1848, allegedly by Barattoni as principal party, Morandi as instigator, and various degrees of participation by four others. Since Barattoni had again fled the country by the time of the trial, it does not seem to have ever moved to completion. However, the one element common to the defendants was participation in the Bagnacavallo revolt of 1845. Morandi is listed as being active in 1831 as well, and wanted for questioning in two other murders. He is described as espousing "anarchist principles." 78

Returned exile Giovanni Caravita was accused of taking part in two murders and a wounding in two different incidents. Caravita had also been involved in the Bagnacavallo events of 1845, but only insofar as he, a horse dealer, provided horses and vehicles for the other participants. The earlier accusation involved the "Pio IX" battalion of Lugo, which Caravita had joined in July of 1848. The transcript describes the unit as "attracting all those dedicated to the politics of change." The battalion was in the process of marching toward Bologna on Sunday, August 6, when it passed through the town of S. Potito at the time of the last Mass. Caravita and several of his fellow volunteers spotted the Baroni brothers, with whom they had long-standing disputes. The armed men threw themselves into the crowd, and shot both Pietro Baroni,

78 ASR, TSC, busta 407, fascicolo 256.
who recovered, and Lazzaro Delprado, who later died. Caravita received 3 years of hard labor for his part in the shootings, but the murder charge did not hold up; there was probably a legitimate case for self defense.\(^{79}\) The other murder charge involved the stabbing of Luigi Dragoni on April 22, 1849. Dragoni was a known political foe of Caravita and his friends. He was provoked into a fight at a wedding banquet and killed in the process. Caravita and one other defendant were probably the main instigators of the fight, but were released because of weak evidence. Another defendant was condemned for the actual killing, but died in prison in 1854, before he could be executed.\(^{80}\)

Several other cases name participants in the 1831 revolution from Lugo. One of the more prominent individuals was Carlo Polzi, a former actuary of the Podesta' of Lugo. He was accused of rebellion and resistance to the Austrians, as well as collection of funds for the Mazzini-ans. The transcript says that he was wounded in 1831 fighting against papal troops, then emigrated to France (Lesneven in Brittany) where he remained until the amnesty. After he returned home, he became vice president of the Circolo Popolare of Lugo and authored an inflammatory poster of January 19, 1849. (A copy of the poster is included as evidence in case 362) He was promoted to lieutenant in the local civic guard, then switched to the "Pio IX" battalion, finally to the "Bersaglieri del Po." In his military capacity, he fought against the Austrians beyond the Po, as well as defending Bologna and Ancona. In his own defense, Polzi said that he did only what hundreds of others did against

\(^{79}\) ASR, TSC, busta 417, fascicolo 950.

\(^{80}\) ASR, TSC, busta 408, fascicolo 460.
Austria. His claim on the second amnesty hinged on the legal technical-ity that he did not actually need the first one. He insisted that he really did not fight in 1831, but simply got in the way and was wounded. Furthermore, he claimed that his departure for France was voluntary, not forced, and that he signed the declaration of loyalty (also voluntarily) almost a year after publication of the amnesty, June 8, 1847.\textsuperscript{81} The court disagreed with this contention; Polzi was found guilty and sentenced to die (April 27, 1852). The death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment, then to perpetual exile.\textsuperscript{82}

Polzi's modified sentence was used as a precedent in a similar case against Antonio Bedeschi and Facondo Gherardi. Both of these men are listed as being active against the government in 1831, then going to exile in France. Bedeschi returned briefly in 1845 to fight at Bagnacavallo and le Balze. In the present case, both are accused of authorizing and manipulating bloody deeds from behind the scenes, while keeping their own hands clean. One specific crime is the murder of Giuseppe Nostini on February 9, 1849. Gherardi gets credit for trying to keep a low profascicolo at first and stay clear of politics. He was only drawn in after the flight of the Pope. Bedeschi, on the other hand, took up his old activities immediately. As an innkeeper, he made his establishment a center for young hotheads, and quickly became what the transcript describes as a "local Cicenuacchio," as did fellow exile Giovanni Mor-

\textsuperscript{81} Polzi is almost correct. His actual signed declaration, dated June 29, 1847, is filed at ASV, SdS, Rubrica 86 (1847), busta 21, p. 68. He had been cleared to return by the Secretary of State the previous September 19. ASV, SdS, Rubrica 86 (1846), busta 29, p. 30.

\textsuperscript{82} ASR, TSC, busta 408, fascicolo 384.
andi. The charges of ordering murders seem to hold up in court, due in part to Bedeschi's outspoken support of the Republic and his own defense of Ancona as a lieutenant in the Civic Guard. Gherardi died in prison before the conclusion of the trial, but Bedeschi's sentence was commuted to perpetual exile.\(^3\)

A similar situation exists in the case of Giuseppe Budini, a native of Castel Bolognese. He was one of several suspects in a political murder in 1831, but fled to France to avoid prosecution. He did not qualify for the 1846 amnesty because of the seriousness of this charge,\(^4\) but found his way back anyhow in time to join the earliest volunteer units fighting the Austrians in Veneto.\(^5\) He stood accused of violent crimes against Austrian troops during the withdrawal after Vicenza, and of being one of the most avid partisans of the Republic during the defense of Bologna and Castel San Pietro. He also used his cover as a horse trader to travel widely in an attempt to keep the Mazzinian network alive, even since the restoration. Budini received a sentence of 20 years in prison, but this was commuted to perpetual exile in Brazil.\(^6\)

\(^3\) ASR, TSC, busta 402, fascicolo 49.

\(^4\) It is mentioned in the transcript that fellow exile Sante Fanelli, a suspect in the same crime, had petitioned in 1846 for the case to be re-opened so that he could establish his innocence. This favor was granted, and all charges against him were dropped for lack of evidence. Fanelli remained on his good behavior during 1848-9, and never again appeared in court.

\(^5\) Control of the frontiers in the Papal States was notoriously sloppy, as the thriving smugglers' trade demonstrates. Budini and at least eight other men found their way home despite being refused in 1846. No distinction exists in this study between them and those who returned legally.
One minor case remains among those at Lugo. Gaetano Benini, a hemp worker and fishmonger, is accused in taking part in an attack on Luigi Bortolotti on June 13, 1848. Bortolotti was seriously wounded by a large group of men who stabbed him repeatedly. Benini and one other defendant are accused simply because they were known to be associates of others who had already been condemned for the crime. Benini was accused of another murder in 1832, and fled to Corfu rather than face the charges. Neither attack was ever proven successfully and both charges against him were soon dropped.87

Ancona

The crimes of violence in Ancona present the most serious example of anarchy during the time of the Republic. Members of the so-called "Lega Infernale," also known as the "Lega Sanguinaria," instituted a genuine reign of terror lasting several months. Their extralegal activities brought the city government to its knees and left the local police helpless to protect lives and property. For a time, it appeared that even the Triumvirs in Rome were unable to reassert their control of the city, until one crime too many brought the anarchy to the point of an international incident.

Even as early as 1847, a few working class toughs took advantage of the weak and tolerant government, conveniently distracted by its own reform projects. The police reported cases of renewed attacks or killings, as individuals tried to eliminate those whom they perceived as

86 ASR, TSC, busta 410, fascicolo 553.
87 ASR, TSC, busta 251, fascicolo 882.
oppressors. Some of these earlier victims included the Marchese Nembrini-Gonzaga, engineer Michele Baldeschi, judge Carlo Bonelli and carabiniere sub-lieutenant Sante Prioli. At this early stage, the attacks may well have been more criminal than political, although motivation is always difficult to pin down. But after the Pope's flight to Gaeta, the Lega continued and intensified its activity, as the government's control deteriorated outside of Rome itself. Judged by their activity, the overall aims of the Lega became more political, insofar as they selected victims for execution or removal from office entirely because of their support for the papal government, and not for reasons of corruption, inefficiency or similar motives. Unfortunately, it is hard to determine what positive objectives the Lega was promoting, since most of their activity was nihilistic and destructive. There were no obvious policies or candidates for office associated with them, and their principal targets were symbols of authority in general, even the existing Republican regime. Yet the Lega's crimes actually alienated popular support for their faction, and became a considerable embarrassment to the Republic.\footnote{Natalucci, \textit{Marche}, pp. 142f.} The Triumvirs hoped to present the new Rome to the world as a humane, highly principled force opposed to Austrian despotism; the Lega's crimes reminded leaders of other nations that Revolution could also have a more anarchistic and violent element.

Part of the resilience of Lega partisans came from their tactic of paying lip service to liberty and the Republic, but acting on blatant criminal motives in practice. In addition to Ancona, the "Lega Infernale" was also active in Senigallia, Pesaro and Corinaldo, which will be
treated shortly. Despite obvious similarities to the Centurians and the "Colonna Mobile" of 1832, it should be noted that the Lega included some policemen and civil servants among its ranks.\textsuperscript{89}

After the proclamation of the Republic, several of the deputies from the Marches demanded that Mazzini restore order, but he was slow to do so. The deputies wanted someone like an olympian hero: a good administrator who was also a political moderate; sufficiently attractive to appeal to all but the most extreme criminals, and impartial enough to reconcile warring factions. For reasons best known to himself, Mazzini seemed hesitant to entrust such power to anyone outside his own circle. His first two nominees for the task were political commissars whose principal qualification seemed to be loyalty to him. Both failed disastrously. Finally, on April 19, an Irish Carmelite friar referred to as "Luigi Okeller" (probably Aloisius O'Keller or O'Kelleher) was murdered in the streets of Ancona. The British government lodged a formal protest in Rome and dispatched a warship to Ancona harbor to protect British citizens, if the Republic was unable to do so. With the credibility of his government at stake, Mazzini selected Felice Orsini, also a deputy, to take control of the situation as a last resort. Orsini was not one of Mazzini's inner circle, but he was both inflexible and highly motivated. He immediately determined which policemen were most trustworthy, then found out who were the principal leaders of the Lega and where they lived. On April 27, Orsini took a small force of trusted men and staged a brilliant nighttime raid (2:30 A.M.) to arrest 20 of the

\textsuperscript{89} Giuseppe Leti, \textit{La Rivoluzione e la Repubblica Romana 1848-1849} (Milano: F.Vallardi, 1913), p. 219.
worst leaders, and still more the following day. Several days of vigorous police work followed, although he had already paralyzed the Lega from the first hour. His state of siege was called off after only three days.$^{90}$

Although the crime wave in Ancona stopped suddenly after Orsini's decisive action, the prisoners were not actually brought to trial until after the restoration. The main process charged 40 individuals with 14 separate counts of violence (including 5 murders and 9 other attacks) against persons.$^{91}$ Most of the accused were named in several of the charges. They were jailed first at Foligno, then moved to Spoleto for about 20 days. Special Commissioner Caldesi (himself a recipient of the amnesty) took them to Narni, where they were confined to a military prison for another 20 days, but then released by Garibaldi's men during their epic retreat from Rome. Although the police made earnest efforts to round up the prisoners, only 8 defendants of the 29 named on the main indictment were present when their trial opened. The 3 who shot O'Kelleher were among them, and 2 of these were eventually sentenced to death. 11 other names were mentioned as possible conspirators, but none of these were in custody either. NONE of these 40 men were members of the 1846 amnesty group. There were over 60 returnees from the city of Ancona and its province, but none of them saw fit to join this more rad-

$^{90}$ Natalucci, Marche, pp. 144f.

$^{91}$ The police archives (ASR, ASP, busta 308, fascicolo 258) contains another more complete list of Anconans compromised by the events of 1849. The original list of 35 individuals (later increased to 44) duplicates much of what already exists in Consulta fascicolo 22. One of the additional names, however, was Cesare Gemini, who will be discussed shortly. Gemini was only arrested in 1850 in Rome, not Ancona, which may account for his failure to appear in the earlier court records.
ical group. It is significant, however, that several others - Orsini, Caldesi and Mattioli among the most important - were amnesty recipients, and defended Mazzini's republic against Lega members, most of whom had no previous political record. This divergence of opinion supports the theory that much of the turmoil, in Ancona at least, had its root in a "new" faction of conspirators. The earlier rebels (as represented by the 1846 group) may have been largely satisfied by the degree of political progress attained by 1849. Members of the Lega, obviously, were not.

Although the arch-conservatives found few distinctions within the liberal camp, there were certainly several "levels of expectation" among those who hoped for change. The faction led by Farini and Mamiani supported the moderate reforms of 1846-8 and wanted them to continue. The group represented here by Orsini, Caldesi and Mattioli wanted more than Pius IX had provided, but were hardly anarchists. As functionaries of the Republic, they favored its secular administration and social programs, but not murder in the streets. Members of the Lega, by contrast, were not satisfied even with Mazzini's regime. Information from this study does not tell us whether they had a more radical program of their own, or simply took advantage of the moment. Whatever their motives, they created great hardship for the Republic.

Two related cases, labeled "Corinaldo/Ancona," name Mariano Bal­lanti very prominently. Ballanti himself was not present for either trial, since he had fled to Piedmont with a false passport. Yet these legal processes present a spectacular list of charges against this one

92 ASR, TSC, busta 202, fascicolo 22.
individual. He was accused of founding and leading a secret society called "Pasquale and Companions," dedicated to "debasing religion, promoting disorder and killing honest people" in the words of the indictment. He associated this society with another larger one, the "Carbonari Cousins," to help achieve his ends by violent means, as the "Lega Infernale" had been doing in Ancona. He was also wanted for 5 murders (including those of an archpriest, an uncle of his, and one of his own assassins, killed with 22 stab wounds), and 10 violent attacks or attempted murders, some of them against civic officials. He was also accused of defamation, blasphemy, forcing councilors to resign after they had beaten his party in open elections, theft of criminal records (against himself), and promoting riots. Finally, the fascicolo includes a small booklet of 52 other charges which are attributed to him or his group. He was wanted for questioning about all of them, and may have been the motivating force behind more than a few. No defense for Ballanti was presented, since he was safely out of the country, but the trial of his companions proceeded without him.93

Ballanti, a native of Corinaldo, had been a corporal of grenadiers with the Pesaro garrison in September, 1845. He left his post to join Renzi's revolt at Rimini, then fled to Tuscany and France after it failed. He returned home after the amnesty. He joined the Civic Guard during the time of the Republic, and served as an artillery sergeant and instructor. The transcript describes him as "a truly perverse individual, an enemy of religion, and violent by nature." Even his compatriots thought that he was capable of anything. He loved the Republic because

93 ASR, TSC, busta 223, fascicolo 203.
he saw it as an opportunity to promote civil war and place himself in positions of authority. He probably saw no future for himself in peacetime occupations. Leaderless, 23 of his associates were put on trial for over 30 crimes. Most were condemned to prison terms, and 7 were given a death sentence for one of the murders - 4 of these were eventually shot. Ballanti himself never returned to the Papal States, although his arrest was ordered. Other records indicate that he died in 1860 fighting with Garibaldi's men in Sicily during the battle of Milazzo. Ballanti's spectacular record of criminal activity looks entirely personal and well isolated from his fellow amnestiati - no others from the 1846 list were noted among his followers.

Another amnesty recipient, Caterbo Biagetti, was also involved with the events of Orsini's lightning strike against society members in Ancona. Biagetti was a non-commissioned officer in the Civic Guard, which Orsini mobilized to maintain order after he had arrested the most extreme of the anarchist leaders. Members of Biagetti's company sympathized with the Lega, and resolved to seize the citadel where their leaders were being held. Biagetti himself, as one of the sergeants, was chosen to "relieve" the carabinieri on duty with 40 or 50 of his own men. The alert policemen were not fooled, however, and most of the civic guards were arrested instead. Biagetti admitted belonging to the Circolo Popolare and the Civic Guard, but protested that he had done nothing wrong. He claimed to have been drunk during the incident, and pointed out that he was never actually condemned before the 1846 amnesty released him from jail. The court disagreed, adding that he had also

94 ASR, TSC, busta 415, fascicolo 855.
abandoned a wife and 3 children in Urbino in order to live with a girlfriend. Biagetti was one of several leaders condemned to 5 years of labor. The others received lighter sentences.95

One case which may be remotely related to the activities of the Lega includes Costantino Schiavoni, a basketmaker released from Civita Castellana in 1846. He was charged with wounding Giovanni Lanari in February, 1849. Schiavoni had been refused when he asked Lanari's daughter to dance at a Liberty Tree celebration; Lanari, who had been a Centurian and was considered a spy by some, defended his daughter, and was later attacked on his way home. Schiavoni was not formally convicted of the deed, but remained a suspect. He and a fellow defendant were released on probation.96

Pesaro

In the city of Pesaro, several related charges were brought against a relatively small number of men; surprisingly, quite a few of them were amnistiati. Pesaro had been a relatively calm and peaceful city until the reign of Pius IX. The sudden change may very well have resulted, not from spontaneous demonstrations in the streets, but from the efforts of a carefully organized network of activists, following the pattern of 1831.

Evidence in many of the cases indicates that the leaders of the entire movement were Achille Stefani and Ferdinando Ciacci, both released from prison by the amnesty of 1846. Even before the fateful

95 ASR, TSC, busta 409, fascicolo 496.
96 ASR, TSC, busta 407, fascicolo 287.
events of 1848, both men had enlisted in the local Civic Guard as officers, and turned Pesaro into a secure base for their own political advancement. One composite case against 26 defendants includes the murders of several of their factional rivals. In this case alone, 8 of the accused were former prisoners released by the amnesty. In addition to Stefani and Ciacci, three others had found municipal jobs as excise clerks or collectors: former soldier Ludovico Esposto (also spelled "degli Esposti"), Giuseppe Siepi, and Antonio Baroni, who died in prison before the end of the trial. The others were two artisans, Domenico Orazietti and Sisto Mosca (or "Mossa"), and Captain Lorenzo Bucci, of the Second Volunteer Regiment, who had been killed in the fighting near Rome during June, 1849. This case and those related to it, like the cases in Bologna, reveal a concerted effort to paralyze the police, prison and court systems. Pesaro may have had 9 or 10 murder victims, including the 5 considered in the large case. Although not included, mention is also made of a murder by ex-prisoner Camillo Gaj, who subsequently died in the Mondavio jail.97

Two of the victims mentioned in the same case were killed in late 1847. One was Girolamo Terni, a workman who did menial jobs for the local police, and was considered a spy by some. The other was painter Curzio Andreozzi, who had spoken out against the formation of the Civic Guard. Both murders had been carried out by groups of armed men, led by Mosca and Esposto, respectively, according to witnesses. Esposto was also accused of being the principal killer of Giuliano Nicolai, Secretary General of the Delegation of Pesaro, who was stabbed to death on

97 ASR, TSC, busta 406, fascicolo 150.
February 4, 1848 as he returned from his customary after-dinner walk. Esposto may have met Ciacci during his prison term in San Leo, and is described as being totally dependent on him for direction and advice. Baroni and Siepi are described as being helpers in this crime, by assisting Esposto to get away. Ironically, another of the victims, Angelo Lombardi, was himself an exile who returned from Florence after the amnesty. He opened his own tavern on the Via Borgomazzo, where he openly criticized the local liberal leaders and the Civic Guards for putting their own interests ahead of the community at large. After the Veneto campaign of 1848, he attracted many veterans of Vicenza and Treviso as patrons; he jokingly referred to this informal group as his "Lega Lombarda." Although Lombardi considered himself intensely patriotic, he was very firm in backing the government of Pius IX, which he felt his oath of loyalty demanded. On one occasion, he rebuked some of his followers for attempting to steal cattle being shipped to besieged Venice. Resented as a turncoat by some, he was earmarked for death by Stefani and Ciacci, probably because the "Lega Lombarda" was not under their control. On December 14 or 15, unknown persons shot at Lombardi and missed. A week later, he was shot once in the throat and died. Although the actual killers were identified as men of Bucci's Volunteer company, Stefani and Ciacci were generally considered to be the ones who ordered the killing.

The final murder charged in this series took place on January 6, 1849. A shoemaker, Terenzio Seraghi, was killed, and his assistant slightly wounded in what looks like a mistaken encounter with Orazietti.

98 ASR, TSC, busta 406, fascicolo 150.
and the same two men who probably shot Lombardi. The three were seeking (at 3 A.M.) to kill another man who had stated his desire to avenge Lombardi, and fired at the wrong victims in the dark. The combined testimony of both Nicola Conti, a returned exile, and one Isidoro Rossi, was a pivotal element in this case, since both men were witnesses to the planning of these attacks. Conti, especially, proved to be a valuable witness against his former companions, and may never have shared their convictions at all. No final verdict is found in these records. 99

Ludovico Esposto had already been implicated as the principal felon in the murders of Andreozzi and Secretary General Nicolai. In a separate case, he is likewise accused of killing the young Sub-Lieutenant Vincenzo Arnaldi on March 12, less than a week after he stabbed Nicolai. Witnesses claimed that Esposto may have hated Arnaldi for blocking his application to the treasury police (the finanzieri) and because he considered Arnaldi too friendly toward the Jesuits. The Lieutenant was attacked by 3 men as he returned to his barracks and stabbed several times. He died the following morning after naming Esposto as his killer. The next day, the police jailed Esposto, only to see him broken out by a large crowd within hours. 100 The action of this crowd was not random or spontaneous at all. The quick, decisive violence betrays not only careful planning by Stefani and Ciacci but their perception that Esposto was a major asset to them, and worth fighting to liberate.

99 ASR, TSC, busta 406, fascicolo 150.
100 ASR, TSC, busta 412, fascicolo 658.
The throng which quickly assembled in the main piazza was openly led by Stefani and Ciacci. In addition to Domenico Orazietti, already mentioned, the group included Giulio Grilli, Luigi Santinelli, Graziano Palombi, Raffaele Farina and Ferdinando Maccari, all former prisoners released in 1846. The crowd, described in the transcript as "anarchists," demonstrated loudly for Esposto's release in front of the Legate's residence and the police offices, then marched to the jail, where they attempted to tear down the main gate. The warden saw no hope of any assistance from the police, so released the prisoner to prevent further violence. The triumphant rioters then escorted Esposto to the Cafe' d'Ausonia, their favorite meeting place. At the conclusion of this trial (March 2, 1853), Santinelli, Grilli and Maccari all received 10-year sentences for their part in the jail break, and Santinelli got an additional 7 years for distraction of property. Palombi received 8 years for the same charge.

Several of the same people assembled later in the year for a similar attack on the offices of the provincial police and the burning of the criminal archives. This event came as part of the popular demonstration on Sunday, November 19, when Pesaro native Terenzio Mamiani was asked to form a government. The "Unione" regiment of volunteers was passing through the city at that time, and joined the festivities. Stefani and Ciacci, as civic officers, probably saw the joyful turmoil as a golden opportunity to cover the traces of their earlier activity. That evening, civic guards and a substantial throng assembled in front of the police offices, and demanded entry. The carabinieri on duty were

101 ASR, TSC, busta 416, fascicolo 913.
won over, but a small picket of grenadiers remained suspicious. These
gave way only when a cannon was rolled up to the gate they were guard-
ing. The police headquarters was sacked and burned before the employees
could do anything. All available records went into the bonfire, system-
atic destruction of furnishings and offices continued for 2 hours, and
the fire in the building itself burned long into the night. In addition
to Stefani and Ciacci, Raffaele Farina and Graziano Palombi are indicted
as members of the crowd, and Nicola Conti is also mentioned here as a
friendly witness to reduce his own prison time. 102

Later the same evening, a group of young people, most of them
drunk, reportedly broke into a house just inside the Fano gate in the
name of the Civic Guard. As they searched for "spys," they terrorized
the inhabitants, including 3 poor old men who usually slept in the base-
ment of the house. They left after a while to visit a tavern, then
returned to confront Natale Guglielmi, one of the old men. In spite of
his denials that he was a spy, they beat and stoned him to death, then
sacked the house. Chief among the eight men accused of this crime was
Luigi Santinelli, a veteran of the previous mob activities, and the one
who reportedly leveled the accusation of spying. After reviewing this
latter case, the Consulta decided that it should be handled as an ordi-
nary murder, and not a political crime. It was sent back (June 18,
1851) to the local court. 103

---

102 ASR, TSC, busta 416, fascicolo 902.
103 ASR, TSC, busta 408, fascicolo 429.
Still another of the charges against Stefani and Ciacci (with 11 others) is the violent expulsion of Major Lelio Lecce, commander of the Pesaro fortress. Lecce had the reputation of being a tough and uncompromising police official, but in February of 1849, he faced the dilemma of conflicting orders from the Government in Rome, and the Pope in Gaeta; Stefani and Ciacci decided to use the occasion to get rid of him entirely. He received a note on February 21, signed by Ciacci, telling him to resign and leave the city if he wanted to avoid trouble. When he refused to leave his office, he was forced physically into a carriage by a crowd, and escorted to the Fano gate by a Civic Guard force under the command of Lieutenant Stefani. Lecce then continued to Rome when he saw that resistance was pointless. Also named in this case are Eugenio Marroni, himself a former prisoner, and returned exile Nicola Conti. Although both Marroni and Conti were present in the crowd, neither was charged, since both were freely co-operating with the prosecution. In this and other trials, large gaps exist in the information, since both Ciacci and Stefani had fled the country, and therefore neither could be questioned. 104

One final charge was leveled at Stefani and Ciacci in their capacity as lieutenants of the Civic Guard. They commanded a Civic contingent sent to suppress resistance in the countryside west of Pesaro. When the Republic decided to introduce conscription in March of 1849, many rural villages refused to comply. By order of Andrea Catabeni, the preside, a punitive expedition sent against the villages of Ginestretto, Sant'Angelo in Lizzola, Montecchiardo and Mombaroccio. Confident of

104 ASR, TSC, busta 417, fascicolo 985.
their overwhelming numbers and their artillery, the Civic Guards were accused of looting and destruction, and especially the burning of a local leader's house to conceal the theft of about 30 scudi, which reportedly ended up in Stefani's pocket. No verdict in this case is found in the records.¹⁰⁵

There is certainly a pattern or linkage in the Pesaro cases, but it remains difficult to see what it is. Even the single common element - all 15 of the accused were prisoners, not exiles - is considerably weakened because they were released from so many different jails. Six of the fifteen came out of San Leo, but each of the others was locked up in a different place. Granted, prisoners were periodically moved between jails, and both Esposto and Orazietti are described as being prison friends of Stefani and Ciacci. But the connection between these men remains a mystery. The police records give very little of value - 5 of the 15 were known to be condemned for activities in Rimini (1845), but the others have no records provided at all. The single most interesting feature is the frequency of multiple-case defendants. In addition to the planners, Stefani and Ciacci, 5 others figure in more than one case: Esposto, the assassin, Mosca, Santinelli, Maccari, and Siepi. (The first 3 of these were known to be veterans of Rimini.) So we are still left with an unsolved mystery about what brought these men together and kept them active. It may be no more than personal charisma of the leaders. Whatever their original connection, the group certainly stayed together once their activities began. The activities of this band definitely invite more attention from scholars.

¹⁰⁵ ASR, TSC, busta 417, fascicolo 986.
Faenza

Beyond any doubt whatever, bloody Faenza was the most highly polarized town in the Papal States before the amnesty. Since Faenza had contributed the largest number of exiles, it would also welcome home the largest number of returnees. The amnesty, together with the disbanding of the Pontifical Volunteers and the subsequent authorization of the Civic Guard, assured that the local strife would continue, but under modified rules. Even geography had its part to play in the conflict, as the transcript of one of the trials points out. The old town of Faenza within the walls, had been strongly liberal and anti-Papal in outlook. It was an independent minded city-state with medieval roots and a longstanding antipathy to directives from a distant capital. On the other hand, the sub-town (or borgo) of Urbecco just across the river Lamone was a more recent entity. The inhabitants keenly resented the shadow of the more prosperous and better educated municipality, and looked to the central government for protection against discrimination. Borgo residents, some of whom were of recent peasant stock, became rabidly pro-government, and had traditionally supplied large numbers of Volunteers. One of the prosecuting lawyers felt it necessary to explain this polarization for the benefit of judges or officials from other places; he likened it to the medieval wars to the death between rival cities. The Volunteers had doubtless misused their authority greatly, and the Faentini nourished their smoldering resentment for the day when a new opportunity would come. Such a turn of events occurred with the reforms of Pius IX, although his objectives had nothing to do with such local affairs. The net result was to discredit members of one faction, who
had been armed and dangerous, then to first rehabilitate, and later arm, partisans of the other faction against their old rivals. As early as October 11, 1846, disorders were taking place between inhabitants of Faenza and Urbecco, as both factions felt the winds of change. More clashes would not be slow to follow.\textsuperscript{106}

Following the restoration of 1849, several of these partisan crimes were brought to trial. What is most shocking is not that the traditional strife continued (which it did, unabated), but that it had little relative connection with the revolution and the war raging everywhere else in the state. Could it be that the Italian convulsion of 1848 looked so trivial to people in Faenza that it was no more than a new variation to a centuries-old feud? At least some of the evidence says so.

The earliest of these crimes was a murder which took place on the afternoon of February 11, 1847, which was the last Saturday of Carnival for that year. The victim was Filippo Melandri, a papal sympathizer in his 60's (a "Papalone") from the Borgo who was making his way home. He was accosted by a group of 5 or 6 men, who stabbed and shot him several times without a word. Among those accused were 3 returned exiles: Giuseppe Bandini, Gaspare Mammini and Francesco Ballardini, all of Faenza. The Consulta was convinced that Bandini was genuinely one of the killers, but decided to send the case back to the provincial court in Ravenna (April 5, 1853) to be treated as an ordinary murder. Evidence was insufficient to establish a "political" motive for the crime.\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{106} ASR, TSC, busta 419, fascicolo 1071/1091.

\textsuperscript{107} ASR, TSC, busta 264, fascicolo 1071/1091.
Ballardini was not as fortunate in a related charge of murder in the nearby town of Fognano. The victim in this case was a local nobleman, Andrea Albani, a former police chief who was very devoted to the papal government. He was variously called a "Papalone," a Gregorian, and a brigand by many of the defendants, and had nearly been killed in 1842 by some of them. According to the testimony, Albani was killed on the morning of April 5, 1849 (which was Holy Thursday). Three men unknown to anyone in Fognano arrived by carriage along the road from Brisighella and Faenza; two of the strangers left the carriage, killed Albani, and quickly fled town in the direction they had come. Although there are many locals among the 21 defendants in this case, the accused assassins are all from Faenza and all unknown to the victim, lending weight to the argument for a conspiracy. Francesco Ballardini was eventually found guilty and condemned to death, his defense substantially hurt by his violation of the amnesty. Other defendants were cleared, but Ballardini was beheaded on December 19, 1854 as the principal assassin.108

Two other multi-faceted cases describe the continuing strife in Faenza. One case recalls several incidents on July 14 and 15, 1847 in which former Volunteers were beaten up and their homes ransacked for weapons. Part of the same activity was a rather bizarre attack on a peasant selling manure just inside the walls of the city - he was beaten by 5 men who wanted his pitchfork. Among the defendants are 6 returned exiles: Sante Angeletti, Paolo Caroli, Andrea Pozzi, Raffaele Silvestrini, Niccola Versari, and Cristoforo Rustichelli, all of Faenza. No

108 ASR, TSC, busta 415, fascicolo 862.
verdict was given in this case.\textsuperscript{109}

Substantially more serious was the other case: 10 separate counts of murder and other acts of violence, charged against 22 defendants. The obvious leader of the group was Count Raffaele Pasi, who has already been noted as leader of the revolt at le Balze in 1845, was soon elected Deputy for Faenza, and who would command the Second Volunteers during the siege of Rome. Pasi was a natural leader with great personal charisma, a logical choice to become commander of the local Civic Guard, with the rank of major. Among Pasi's followers in this case were fellow exiles who had also enlisted in the Civic Guard: Giuseppe Brisighelli, Pasquale Sangiorgi, Vincenzo Valli, Natale Mazzotti, and Niccola Versari, mentioned in the previous case. The most serious of the violent acts occurred on February 14, 1848 when Pasi led a large Civic Guard patrol into Urbecco without an obvious and valid objective. Most people in the Borgo barred their doors against this armed force. A number of stragglers were beaten up before they could get home, then several homes were broken into in an apparent search for ex-Volunteers. Three victims were found hiding with their families. After attempting to escape, they were surrounded and hacked to death with sabers. Hatred for the Papal government was seen as the principal motive in this case. Brisighelli, Valli and three others were found guilty as principals in these murders, and were condemned to death on September 20, 1853. The sentences were commuted to life under maximum security; Mazzotti also received a life sentence as an accomplice. Pasi had fled the country long before the

\textsuperscript{109} ASR, TSC, busta 418, fascicolo 1033.
Among the Faentini in these cases, a rather obvious pattern can be seen in Pasi's followers. Of the 14 defendants who received the amnesty, at least 11 were veterans of Pasi's expedition to le Balze in 1845. All 14 were exiles in France, most of them in the towns of the "western crescent." (There had been 4 in Limoges, 3 in Saumur, 2 in Loches, 1 in Tours, 1 in Montpelier, plus 1 in Marseilles and 2 in Paris.) With the exception of Count Pasi himself, the rest were all innkeepers or artisans, acting as reliable clients and loyal followers. Evidence shows that Pasi was far more successful than most local leaders in keeping his own political network intact before, during and after exile.

There remains one final case related to this group from Faenza. The nearby town of Brisighella experienced a mob action on February 14, 1849 which resulted in the arson of all local records of the communal government, carabinieri and holy office. One of Pasi's followers, the Natale Mazzotti already mentioned, led a band of men from Faenza and Brisighella to attack the Chancery and Communal Residence. They sacked the buildings and burned all the records they discovered. Then Mazzotti used his position as a police agent in Faenza to demand that the local carabiniere commander to turn over the police records, then moved on to the holy office where he did the same thing. All of these papers ended up in the bonfire. The transcript of this trial contends that Mazzotti and his followers came to town for this specific purpose. Of the 30 individuals indicted in this case, 18 eventually received prison terms.

110 ASR, TSC, busta 418, fascicolo 1041.
including Mazzotti and 4 other principals, who got 15 years. This sentence of June 24, 1854 followed the life sentence he had already received for his part in the murders of exactly one year before.\footnote{111}

**NON-VIOLENT POLITICAL CHARGES**

We have already seen the results of a punitive expedition near Pesaro. Elsewhere in the Marches, there were several other expeditions sent to deal with villages hostile to the Republic, as well as church property and persons. Central to this effort in the province of Fermo was the preside Francesco Bubani. The most clear cut case against him was the violation of ecclesiastical immunity by arresting Cardinal DeAngelis. Although warned of danger by his friends, DeAngelis refused to leave Fermo, and continued to protest the illegitimacy of the Republic. Finally, the Interior Ministry ordered his arrest on March 9, 1849, and Bubani carried out the order with the forces at his disposal. He was one of 7 defendants found guilty, and received an 8-year sentence, later commuted to 5 years.\footnote{112} A similar but less serious charge was also leveled at Bubani in his official capacity. A long-standing feud between one Cassiano Bonanni and a sergeant in the Civic Guard came to a head in late December, 1848. Bonanni's house was raided and looted in the middle of the night, and he was arrested, presumably on Bubani's orders. These charges were apparently considered too weak, and were dropped.\footnote{113}

\footnote{111} ASR, TSC, busta 412, fascicolo 620.  
\footnote{112} ASR, TSC, busta 403, fascicolo 92.  
\footnote{113} ASR, TSC, busta 258, fascicolo 976.
Bubani found himself in far more serious trouble over the seizure of church property. The case in point involved the convent of cloistered nuns of Santa Chiara near the country town of Petritoli. In February, 1849, everyone expected a decree from the central government to seize church land and property. When Bubani received word of frenzied efforts to send valuables away from the convent, he decided to act on his own authority. He ordered a mixed force of carabinieri and civic guards to occupy the convent and arrest anyone there who might be hiding valuable goods. He also authorized payment of all expenses out of what was seized. The resulting expedition did capture the house without difficulty on February 19, then proceeded to sell off the large quantities of the wheat, corn, oil, meat and soap which they had confiscated, as well as linens and vestments from the sacristy. When the Assembly in Rome finally did publish the secularization law on February 25, it allowed the religious orders to continue to administer their own goods, or to be compensated eventually for their loss. Thus Bubani's mistaken judgement to anticipate the decree put him not only in a position of violating ecclesiastical immunity, but the laws of the Republic, as well. Eventually 16 men were brought to trial on these charges, but Bubani was obviously the one who had made the fatal decision. The court sentenced him to an additional 20 years in prison, while releasing most of the others on probation. 114 No other amnesty recipients at all participated in these events.

114 ASR, TSC, busta 409, fascicolo 510.
Finally, Bubani was brought to trial on the generic charge of rebellion and violation of the 1846 amnesty. He had certainly received the amnesty and signed the printed declaration. Bubani defended himself on two points: that he technically did not have to sign the declaration, since the earlier charges against him were unproven; and that he did not accept his post in Fermo until after Pius had fled to Gaeta, and effectively left the state leaderless. The Consulta disagreed. By unanimous decision on August 17, 1853, the 6 judges condemned Francesco Bubani to death. The Pope commuted this sentence to life imprisonment a week later.\footnote{ASR, TSC, busta 417, fascicolo 1003.}

The provinces of Fermo and Ascoli had been a considerable thorn in the side of the Republic. Since both provinces were at the southern end of the Marches, they were less influenced by the busy commercial cities of the Legations. Even the larger towns maintained an essentially rural outlook, and local leadership tended to be strongly conservative. Many of those farming towns in the Appennine foothills opposed Republican policies of taxation and conscription, the secularization of religious property, and the continued occupation of Rome (as they saw it) at the Pope's expense. The aforementioned Cardinal DeAngelis and Monsignor Savelli, the future police chief, were two of the many clerics in the provinces who continued to promote hostility to the Republic, and encourage armed resistance to the local administration. Since Ascoli itself was near the Neapolitan frontier, the nearby peasants could receive direction and possibly weapons from Gaeta, and took courage from the government's inability to surround them with troops. When some of
these peasants attempted (on April 12) to re-establish papal government in the province of Ascoli, Ugo Calindri of Perugia, the preside, ordered a mixed force of Civic Guards and volunteer troops against them in the late spring of 1849. The force, commonly called the "Roselli battalion," was commanded by Colonel Pietro Roselli, of the Second Volunteer Regiment. In addition to the second battalion of his own regiment, Roselli took command of the Civic Battalion of Ascoli, with token contingents of carabinieri and finance troops. His first expedition, in April, was directed against the villages of Balzo, Arquata and Spelonga in the Montegallo region. This operation resulted in charges against Roselli and several of his men, including theft, sacking and destruction of private homes and church property, arson, extortion, and so on. In spite of the large number of men involved, only one individual charged is a recipient of the 1846 amnesty, Count Giovanni Battista Ferri, of Porto San Giorgio. In his capacity as Major of a militia column attached to Roselli's force, Ferri is accused of helping to requisition religious houses and threaten their inhabitants, particularly in the case of one house in Arquata. Ferri was not present for this trial, since he had already fled the country.  

The same Ferri is also accused of participation in a more extensive operation against several towns in the Aquasanta district, southwest of Ascoli. He and the men under his command were charged with theft, arson, and other damage to property of several citizens in the towns of San Gregorio, Arquata, Luco, Santa Maria, Talvacchi, and Torre Santa Lucia. In all of these towns, the houses most frequently selected

116 ASR, TSC, busta 415, fascicolo 861.
for sacking were those of former Pontifical Volunteers or their sympathizers. One charge filed against Ferri alone alleges that he extorted 30 scudi from Francesco Tosi of Torre Santa Lucia. Here, as elsewhere, money was freely taken from perceived enemies to defray costs, since the province had no money to pay its troops. Ferri is described as being a political activist since 1831, as well as a high-ranking member of Young Italy and a friend of Mazzini from his days in England. He had already served as a volunteer officer in 1831, and found a temporary commission in the Piedmontese army during his exile. When Pius authorized formation of the Civic Guard, Ferri joined as a lieutenant and rose through the ranks as fighting against the Austrians and the French presented him opportunities.\(^{117}\) As Mazzinian leader for the southern Marches, he supported the violent expulsion of the Jesuits from Fermo, according to the trial transcript. Still later, he is said to have commanded the column which seized Narni and released the 23 prisoners from Ancona, following the siege of Rome.\(^{118}\)

The transcript collection which contains the evidence against Ferri is a large one: a four-inch stack of paper, with 56 charges against 94 individuals. Yet with the exception of Ferri, the only other amnistiato accused is Felice Orsini, once again acting as special envoy and trouble-shooter for the Republic. Since neither Ferri nor Orsini was present for the trial, no effective defense was presented on their behalf, but even half of the story makes interesting reading. In early

\(^{117}\) The trial transcript describes Ferri as a "self-styled" major of militia. In fact his name is not given in the register of commissioned officers for 1848-49. ASR, MDV, Rubricella 1.

\(^{118}\) ASR, TSC, busta 416, fascicolo 927.
May, Calindri's effort against his local rebels was running out of steam. Orsini moved south with token reinforcements to revive the campaign and maintain the Republic's hold on the entire province. Even after Roselli's troops (presumably with Count Ferri in company) were called back to support Rome's final defense, Orsini insisted that the local forces in Ascoli had to do their utmost to foil the local "brigands," as the rebels were commonly known. Not only did Orsini order another sweep of towns to the north and north-east of Ascoli (Offida, Appignano, Force, Montalto and Castignano), but he was also accused of theft and extortion at the expense of clergy and local leaders in Ascoli itself. As late as June 10, when French guns were pounding the walls of the Gianicolo, Orsini's columns were wringing over 800 scudi from the people of the hill towns, as their contribution to the war effort. At this late stage, very little effort was made to enforce the Republic's conscription laws - raising money for the troops by any possible means took priority. Orsini apparently considered himself worthy of his pay. He completed the spoliation of the town palace of Commendatore Francesco DeAngelis of Ascoli (brother of the Cardinal) by confiscating clothing, furnishings and 2 carriages. When the Austrians made their final approach, according to the accusations, Orsini fled toward the Tuscan frontier in one of these vehicles, wearing one of DeAngelis' suits, and carrying a valise of his filled with still more of his possessions.119

There are also several political cases in Ancona which imply guilt by association or leadership. One of these included Lorenzo Lesti and the aforementioned Cesare Gemini among its defendants. Both were

119 ASR, TSC, busta 416, fascicolo 927.
accused of being leaders of Mazzini's Young Italy, and of recidivism, due to their reception of the amnesty of 1846. Neither was accused of personal crimes, but rather complicity in all of the bloody deeds of their underlings. Lesti was known to be one of the three principal leaders of the Society in Ancona. He had carried on a brisk correspondence with Mazzini, and was a friend of all other major republicans in the city. Lesti admitted belonging to Young Italy since 1832 or 1833, and his flight to Paris at that time. But he claimed that he quit in 1836 because of a policy dispute with Mazzini, and that he had no part in any killings or other crimes since then. He declared his admiration for Marat and Robespierre, but had no use for Gioberti or Mamiani, whom he considered to be halfhearted. The transcript does not give a clear idea of the trial's outcome.\textsuperscript{120} We know from other sources, however, that Lesti was condemned to 20 years in Paliano prison (December 17, 1851), and was not released until August of 1863. Seriously ill, but unbowed, he died after only 9 days of freedom.\textsuperscript{121}

Similarly accused was Domenico Buglioni, formerly a captain and adjutant major of the Civic Guard, First Ancona Battalion. Buglioni freely admitted that he was released from prison in 1846 by the amnesty, and that he retained his friendship with Giuseppe Camillo Mattioli, president of Ancona. He was suspected of association with the Circolo Popolare, and possible complicity in the activity of the assassins which Orsini was sent to eliminate. The prosecution asserted that, as adjutant major, Buglioni always knew what the Civic Guard was doing, and

\textsuperscript{120} ASR, TSC, busta 412, fascicolo 667.
\[121\] Rosi, II, 374.
must have known something of the murders. These charges were too weak, and were soon dismissed.\(^{122}\)

Another friend and adviser of Mattioli, Antonio Giannelli, was likewise accused of promoting rebellion and being a leader in the Circolo Popolare. Giannelli was a customs clerk before his imprisonment (therefore a government employee), then continued in the same job after his release in 1846. As a civil servant, he seems to have been close enough to those protecting the "Lega Sanguinaria" to know their activities, and was of great help to Orsini in suppressing the group.

Although he signed a proclamation calling for a general assembly in November, 1848, Giannelli had always disapproved of the Republic. The opinion was presented during his trial that he had actually gotten close to the assassins in order to save or warn their designated victims. He was presented as a moderate leader who actively blocked formation of carbonari lodges. In so doing, he incurred the enmity of Lesti and Gemini, as well as others inclined to extreme tactics. This latter argument prevailed in the trial, and that he was released on probation. He probably was able to benefit from the second amnesty and retain his job, since his supposed rebellion against the state was never proved.\(^{123}\)

After his acquittal, however, he did continue to maintain ties with Mazzini. The same Antonio Giannelli was arrested again in 1853, as a liaison with 40 Hungarian officers of the Archduke Friedrich Karl regiment of the Austrian army. A Mazzinian plot to have the regiment seize Ancona never took place before it was discovered by the Austrian mili-

\(^{122}\) ASR, TSC, busta 227, fascicolo 269.
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tary governor. Giannelli and 14 of the Hungarians received death sentences, which would have been quickly carried out except for the intervention of a young woman. Emma Gaggiotti, daughter of the military intendant, appealed for mercy directly to General Hoyos. All sentences were commuted to prison terms as a result.\footnote{124}

\textbf{Reflections}

All of the cases described here were based on real or perceived crimes, but their relatively low collective number says a lot. Despite vigorous efforts by the prosecutors, the ex-Volunteers and the zelanti to identify and punish their enemies, most of those designated did not come from the ranks of the veterans. The majority of all political and military leaders described here managed to find themselves on the wrong side of the fence again, but they acted like statesmen and soldiers, not major criminals. Most likely, they concluded that the age of Papal Princes had passed, and they hoped to participate in constructing the next age. Whatever other results flowed from their choices, their crime was essentially a difference of opinion.

A few examples of terrible violence did take place, sometimes involving the returnees. In some instances, political motives were very evident (as in some of the murders in Bologna), in others, fighting hinged on the settling of old disputes (especially evident in Faenza). But even allowing for the most extreme examples, there was no pattern of general violence among exiles and prisoners, certainly no more than in the population at large.

\footnote{124 Natalucci, \textit{Marche}, pp. 166-8.}
All things considered, the amnesty, and the men who received it, should get a clean bill of political health.
CHAPTER V

REBELS OR LOYAL CITIZENS?

Who Participated in the Revolution?

The first of the three original objectives of this study was to discover who actually violated the terms of the amnesty of 1846. The assembled evidence indicates that over 80% of the amnesty recipients stayed clear of all political and revolutionary activity during the events of 1848-49. Only 160 names from the complete list of 989 can be identified as politically active, or were even accused of being such; 90 of these were returned exiles and 70 were released prisoners. As quite a few of the cases from the last chapter demonstrate, many of those who fall within the maximum of 160 accused were either judged to be innocent, or found guilty of lesser charges. Especially allowing for cases of doubtful identity, mistaken matches, or those whose charges were dismissed entirely, the number of those who failed to honor their amnesty agreement is extremely small. This basic conclusion is not based on partisan rhetoric or rationalization, but on data from the Consulta's own transcripts. The highest court in the land was hardly permissive.

So even the most pessimistic tally yields only 16.18% of the total who were prosecuted, even according to the rigorous standards of the Red Triumvirate. When 5 out of every 6 veteran political offenders sit through a revolution, thinking their own thoughts, but doing nothing illegal, one is justified in concluding that they have met all expectations.
Within this group of 160, the most irreconcilable tended to be members of an organization, which probably sustained a sort of activist momentum. Some were members of formal societies like Young Italy, which allowed no possibility of compromise with a clerical government, at least in theory. Others belonged to local or less formal groups, like the Lega Infernale in Ancona, or the followers of Stefani and Ciacci in Pesaro. It is noteworthy that especially in the cases where violent crimes are charged, there is almost always a group behind the violence. It is also curious that, at least in cases involving amnesty recipients, there is only one group per city: Faenza, Lugo, Pesaro, Ascoli, Fermo, Ancona, and even Bologna. There may have been other groups, but the amnestiati did not join them, for whatever reason.

All things considered, most of the 1846 group maintained their political equilibrium to a surprising degree, and with it, their continued freedom. There is no obvious support for the allegation that the former exiles and prisoners betrayed their trust by turning on Pius or the government. Even among the 160 of the Short List, a legitimate doubt remains about "which Pius IX" they were loyal to. At least before the Allocution of April, a zealous nationalist who enlisted to fight the Austrians could legitimately proclaim his undying loyalty to the Pope. Whatever else one believes about the wisdom of the amnesty of 1846, the fantasy of mass defections or betrayal during the Revolution simply does not hold water, and - barring new evidence to the contrary - never will.
What Background Patterns Exist?

Using the general rate of participation as a criterion (16.18%), some sections of the statistical tables appear disproportionately large. For example, out of the original 75 exiles in Paris, 14 appear on the Short List of 160. Since they represent 18.67% of the original group, we may conclude that the Parisian contingent had a slightly higher recidivist rate than the entire sample. Using this simple percentage method, let us compare the breakdown of the sub-group with the divisions of the original Long List.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division by Place of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forli'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (160 of 989)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As already established in chapter II, "x" on the statistical tables stands for exiles, "p" for prisoners, and "o" for others.
Of the four major regions, only the Marches shows a higher percentage (19.4%) than the average. The Legations and Lazio are relatively normal, and Umbria, with no one at all from the original list active in 1848, has 0.0%. Of the Legations, Ferrara shows a sharp rise in activity (25.2%), while Ravenna (19.6%) and Bologna (17.8%) are only moderately ahead of the norm. Forli actually registered a decline. At least where men from the original Long List were active, they seem to be most aggressive in those regions with well organized groups, as we have already established. The geographical pattern supports that theory.

Statistics for the individual cities show that individuals in most municipalities chose not to participate. Only 6 cities show strong increases. Pesaro is the city with the greatest rate of participation (28.1%), nearly all of them from Stefani and Ciacci's band. Together with Ancona's 18.9% (most of these from the Lega), Pesaro's total explains why the percentage for the Marches is so high. In the Legations, there are high participation rates for Lugo (27.9%), Bagnacavallo (27.7%), and Faenza (24.4%), as well as a slightly elevated rate for Bologna (18.5%). Each of these cities had either a well organized local group, or a long history of strife which may transcend 1848 entirely.

Another look at the geographic patterns described in Chapter II is in order. Recall that the combination of the "Via Emilia" pattern with the "Faenza Circle" - 15 provinces in all - represented over 60% of the names on the Long List of 989, and 88.5% of the same men known to be from the Legations region. If we reconstruct the same patterns from the

---

2 For the sake of clarity, cities with fewer than 10 individuals from the Long List are not considered, since the percentage changes would appear overly dramatic.
Short List of 160, the combined configuration is sharply down (48% and 69% respectively), and so is the single "Via Emilia" pattern. However the 10 "Faenza Circle" provinces increase dramatically: a former share of 47% of the Legations' names has grown to 56%. The large remaining totals for Faenza, Bagnacavallo and Lugo account for the increase, made even more dramatic by their geographical proximity to one another. This is NOT part of the general trend, so there must be specific local reasons for the variation. Better organization or communication within groups, and stronger leadership are likely factors in the elevated statistics, but the actual reasons are not evident from this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grouping</th>
<th>--x/--p/--o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nobility</td>
<td>8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Commoners</td>
<td>65 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeois</td>
<td>17 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Bourgeois</td>
<td>19 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>24 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasantry</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-unspecified</td>
<td>4 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (160 of 989)</td>
<td>90 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numbers may tell their most interesting story here, insofar as members of the upper classes were far more attracted to continued political activity than their lower class brothers. Could it be that ideology was a stronger motive than were material conditions? In general terms, the gentry and the nobility showed the greatest tendency to continue their political activity after the 1846 amnesty, with 32.7% and 26.7% respectively. Most of the urban commoners show a moderate rise in the participation rate, but in a clear descending order: bourgeoisie (27.8%), petit bourgeoisie (24.7%), artisans (20%) and unskilled (16.1%). The simplest explanation may also be the most accurate: the more prosperous and the better educated felt more secure and free to act, whereas the less fortunate classes considered themselves more at risk. Among those listed as students, a hefty 45.5% reappear on the Short List, although most of these would no longer be students by 1848; the lion's share of these young people came from, and returned to, the upper classes after their education was suspended or completed. The handful of clergy and peasants on the Long List do not appear at all in the later group, and the participation rate for the military is down.

Among the individual professions, it seems significant that 48% of the lawyers went back to politics; considering what lawyers do for a living, this should surprise no one. Commercial dealers also showed a high return rate of 28.6%. Among the petit bourgeois professions, the highest rates occur for clerks (34.8%), shopkeepers (36.4%), coffeehouse keepers (50%) and innkeepers (46.2%). One possible linkage is the need for those in the given professions to deal with large numbers of customers, and hence be exposed to much conversation and propaganda. However
the same characteristic also applies to others whose rate is much lower. Finally, among the artisans, only bricklayers (44.4%) and blacksmiths (25%) show substantial participation during 1848. No reason for this combination is evident.

Among the suggestions already offered, most are only possible theories; nothing in this study conclusively proves any of them. The one single pattern that appears to stand by itself is the clear tendency of the elite classes to be more active, and the working classes to remain less so. It is hardly a shocking revelation, but it is interesting to see the statistics line up so evenly.
### Division by Place of Exile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grouping</th>
<th>--x/-p/-o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian States</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Europe</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Americas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division by Place of Imprisonment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marches</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-unspecified</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (160 of 983)</td>
<td>90 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the exiles who had been in France, the participation rate was higher than the general percentage (20.4%). What is more striking, however, is that except for Corfu, exiles from all other states were LESS likely to return to politics than their French counterparts. The highest percentages are recorded for Bordeaux (50%) and Limoges (43.8%), with less dramatic increases for Algiers, Loches, Paris, Marseilles and Saumur. Of these 7 cities, 4 belong to the "Western Crescent" described

---

3 Here, as previously, samples of fewer persons are ignored, in the name of statistical simplicity.
in chapter II. Those three patterns of refuge continue to tease the imagination: exiles from the Western Crescent showed a collective relapse rate of 19.2% (although very unevenly distributed). This is lower than the rate for the Marseilles cluster (22.6%) but higher than the Paris group (18.7%). Hard and fast reasons for it are not obvious. Whatever political factors had been operative in France, they clearly made more of an impression on the exiles living there than the same factors in other countries.

It is unfortunate that the statistics on the prisons include 102 men whose prison was unknown. The rest of the numbers will be less precise. Prisons in only 2 of the 4 regions showed increased rates: the Legations (23.4%) and Lazio (17.6%). The reasons are not obvious, but those imprisoned at Ferrara had a 25.6% of participation, far ahead of all others. San Leo (20.9%), Civita Castellana (20.5%) and Civitavecchia (17.7%) show more modest increases. Other significant prisons such as Ancona and the Castel Sant'Angelo had significant drops in the rate of participation, compared to the entire list. It is not conclusively provable, but these figures certainly suggest that leadership among prisoners may have had much to do with fostering or preserving friendships and networks in the jails. Clearly, the same factors were at work among the exiles, who were more free to move around. Once prisoners or exiles were allowed to resume their ordinary lives, these connections probably continued, especially among men from the same town. The existence of these connections seems to be self-evident; the story of who formed them and how they were later used remains to be told by future scholars.
Does Background Explain the Crimes?

Based on interpretation of the preceding tables, several relatively easy conclusions are now possible. Many of the best known members of this group were noble and high-minded patriots whose only crime was disagreement with the theory and practice of the Church-State. However a large percentage of the Short List group (especially among the lower classes) engaged in overtly criminal activity, whether politically motivated or not. Unfortunately, the charges against these individuals differ widely, so it is difficult to detect patterns among such relatively small numbers. One possibility, of course, is that there simply are no consistent trends at all. But a few patterns probably do merit some attention.

Legislators and Administrators

This category and the following one become especially interesting because they are composed almost totally of the elite: nobles, gentry, and upper bourgeois professionals.

There are 24 possible names on the list of deputies who are probably amnesty recipients, and another 5 who were significant administrators during the Republic. Not surprisingly, every single one of these people belonged to one of the elite classes of society: nobility, landed gentry, or upper bourgeoisie. These names represent many of the best known of the original amnesty group. In addition, several of those who were most passionately dedicated to the Revolution as an idea are found here: Sterbini, Galletti, Orsini, Zambeccari and Caldesi. Although these individuals and others certainly differ widely in many of their
ideas, we must remember that collectively they represent the leadership which gave life to the Republic, and that they were also lumped together in the minds of many reactionaries.

Several of these deputies and administrators were also accused of other offenses, but not all charges held up under scrutiny. Two were accused of conspiring to commit murder (Sterbini and Pasi), five others (including Orsini) of crimes against property, and still two others of promoting secret societies. These additional charges were not actively prosecuted, since most of these Deputies and Administrators had fled the state anyhow, knowing that their chances of vindication were nil.

Military Leaders

Among military officers who were not also deputies or accused of crimes, only nine officers were excluded. Pietramellara (a noble) and Masini (landed gentry) were already dead in battle, and beyond the reach of earthly courts. Palazzi (a doctor) was never charged, probably because he also emigrated, and Domenico Belluzzi (a professional soldier) may have never returned home after his spectacular defense of Venice. Although each of these individuals found himself on the opposite side of the fence from the Papal regime, none of them seems to have committed even remotely criminal acts, or indeed anything unbecoming of a good soldier. All eight of those with known professions are either career soldiers or the same upper class types as their colleagues in the previous category.
Murder & other Violence

By way of contrast, lower class people seem to be the exclusive defendants in crimes of violence, whether against people or property. For example, there were 40 defendants charged with actual or attempted murder, multiple in some cases. Among these accused, only 1 was known to be gentry, with no nobles or upper bourgeoisie at all. The rest included 9 petit bourgeois, 17 artisans and 5 unskilled. This very lopsided condition may be one result of the limited political options which working class people saw as open to them. The same imbalance is certainly visible in the severity of their sentences. Although 9 of the defendants were released after dismissal of the charges, several others were convicted with overwhelming evidence. Those who were convicted and actually executed (6) were all lower class people: 1 petit bourgeois, 4 artisans, and 1 unskilled. The 7 who received life sentences were likewise from the same lower classes, as were the 4 others who died in prison.

Under the category of violence against persons (shootings, beatings, and lesser injuries), 13 are so charged. Although 3 are of unknown background, 3 others were petit bourgeois, and 7 were artisans. Charges were dismissed in 4 of the 13 cases.

Damage to Property & Society

There were 10 individuals - petit bourgeois, artisans and unskilled - accused of various crimes against property, both state and private. One of these (Antonio Liverani) was shot by the Austrians while trying to escape, and 3 other cases were dismissed.
Under a more vague charge of other crimes against society or property, there were 5 individuals: one each from the nobility (Count G.B.Ferri), bourgeoisie, petit bourgeoisie, artisans, and one unknown. Unfortunately, the outcome of these cases is not provided in the transcripts.

Finally, there were 8 men, all of them former prisoners, accused of planning or participating in prison breaks. At least one case was dismissed, the rest are unknown.

Non-violent Political Charges
Ironically, the only category of charges which cuts across the entire social spectrum appears to be the political offenses.

One frequent accusation was "Offense to the Dignity of the Sovereign" (Lesa Maesta'). In practice, this frequently meant violation of the amnesty terms, especially with reference to the signed declaration of loyalty. It is worth noting that this title seems to have been used exclusively against amnesty recipients. A very broad spectrum of 29 persons were so charged, including all classes except unskilled. These cases were either dismissed altogether (11 of 29) or given severe sentences - there was no middle ground. Among the known sentences, 5 were given life in prison, 7 perpetual exile and one death in absentia.

A similar but less serious grouping of charges covers all forms of communication or association perceived as hostile to the government: talk, literature or membership in secret societies. There were 16 people so charged; one of these is accused of membership in some unnamed society, and 6 others are specifically listed as being Mazzinians. The
accused also cut across the social spectrum: gentry, upper and lower bourgeoisie, artisans, students and one unskilled worker. Only 4 are known to have received prison terms, 3 of them artisans. Of more than passing interest is the fact that 10 of the 16 accused had their charges dismissed entirely. This high dismissal rate may indicate one of two conditions: the difficulty of making a clear case in such a nebulous field, or the possible use of this heading to cover trumped up charges with little substance.

In general, it appears that the individual's background did condition the crimes he was accused of to a certain degree. Upper class people were more likely to find themselves in leadership roles in the government or the military. So their "disloyalty" would more likely occur because they backed the wrong government, and not because of a murder or a prison break. Lower class people, on the other hand, tended to steer their political zeal into violent crimes, if indeed they did anything at all. Only in the purely political field are the classes relatively equal in their participation, allowing for a slight "bulge" at the middle of the social spectrum.

What Next?

Despite the interesting patterns which emerge from this wealth of data, there are almost as many new questions raised as there are old ones answered.

Beyond any doubt, there is solid evidence which suggests organizations or networks about which we know relatively little. At least some of the revolutionary process in 1848 was far from the traditional con-
spiracies among alienated elites, or bread riots by starving workers. Spontaneous outbursts and generic unrest do not account for the methodical and coordinated attacks on government personnel in Lugo. More work is necessary on Count Pasi's group in Faenza and the Lega Infernale in Ancona. The Pesaro crowds of Stefani and Ciacci are begging for more study. Even the coordination of the small bands in Bologna could use more study. Compared to these clusters of activists, the debates and decrees of members of the government seem far more like a modest reform program than a true revolution.

For further study, one good place to start would be the police intelligence files stored in the Sapienza Archives in Rome, as well as the local police records and day books in Bologna and other provincial archives. The Consulta records may offer a few additional details about the cases reviewed here, but not much more; this present study shows the lion's share of what is there. Transcripts from the local courts might help, but not the Consulta.

In any case, the "voiceless thousand" have now been heard. It is no longer necessary to assume what the amnistiati thought or did after their repatriation; their actions, and in many cases their touching fidelity to a pledge of loyalty, have now been shown in full daylight. More needs to be said about them and their political world, but at least there has been a beginning. Hopefully this study will provide a stimulus to further investigation of these forgotten men. Their desire to improve their state and their world, even at the price of their own suffering, should find common ground among many of us who hope for the same good things. If their efforts serve to inspire and instruct the state builders of tomorrow, then they certainly have not suffered in vain.
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APPENDIX A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Governo</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>x/ p/ o</th>
<th>x/ p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roma &amp; Comarca -same-</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 27</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrimonio Viterbo</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ronciglione</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civitavecchia (= Tarquinia)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corneto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campagna Frosinone</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>Sermoneta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Torrice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trevi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vico</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Libretti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestrina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tivoli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Velletri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevento &amp; Pontecorvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERUGIA</td>
<td>-same-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citta' della Pieve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquapendente</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Lorenzo in Monte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMBRIA</td>
<td>Spoleto</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assisi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foligno</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gualdo Tadino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narni</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rieti</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terni</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petriolo di Terni</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
###破折号

####地区

**市镇**  | **Govern**  | **x/ p/ o**  | **x/ p**  
---|---|---|---
Urbino-Pesaro  | same- | 12  | 1 8  
Pesaro  | 10 22  | 1  
Candelara  | 1  |  
Citta’ di Castello  | 1  |  
Pano  | 7 13  | 3  
Possonbrone  | 1 1  |  
Pratte (Rosa)  | 1  |  
Gubbio  | 2 1  | 1  
Monte Grimano  | 1  |  
Monte Porzio  | 1  |  
Pergola  | 2  |  
S. Angelo di Pesaro  | 1  |  
S. Angelo in Vado  | 1  |  
S. Costanzo  | 1  |  
S. Leo  | 1  |  
Scheggia  | 1  |  
Senigallia  | 2 5  | 1  
Urbania  | 2  |  

**Ancona**  
**same-**  
(city)  | 25 12  | 3 4  
Belvedere  | 1  |  
Corinaldo  | 2 2  | 1 1  
Fabriano  | 2  |  
Jesi  | 2  |  
Loreto  | 1 2  |  
Montignano  | 1  |  
Osimo  | 1  |  
S. Angelo in Pontano  | 1  |  
Serra di Conti  | 1  |  
Serra S. Quirico  | 1  |  

**Macerata**  
**same-**  
(city)  | 2 7  | 2 1  
Domo  | 1  |  
Montolmo (= Corridonia)  | 4  |  
Recanati  | 5  | 1  
S. Elpidio  | 1  |  
S. Severino  | 1  |  
Treja  | 1 1  |  
Camerino  | (city) 1 1  | 1 1  
Monte Cavallo  | 3  | 1  

**Fermo**  
**same-**  
(city)  | 4 5  | 1  
Grottazzolina  | 1  |  
Monte Giorgio  | 1  |  
Porto S. Giorgio  | 1  | 1  
Ascoli  
(city)  | 2 2  | 1  
Folignano  | 1  |  
Ripatransone  | 1  |  

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legation</th>
<th>Governo</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>x/</th>
<th>p/</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>x/</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legations - unspeci-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrara - same-</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>Montalbano</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>Argenta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Biagio di Argenta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bagnacavallo (city)</td>
<td>Traversara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cento (city)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conselice (city)</td>
<td>Lavezzola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fusignano (city)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lugo (city)</td>
<td>Cotignola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massa Lombarda (city)</td>
<td>Sant'Agata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna - same-</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>Amola</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calderino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crespellano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tignano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budrio</td>
<td>Minerbio Garuolaro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castel S. Pietro (city)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicina (city)</td>
<td>Villa Fontana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porretta (city)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Pietro in Casale (city)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vergato (city)</td>
<td>Borgo Panigale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Severo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocca Pitigliano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Savigno</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susano sotto Vergato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna - same-</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>S. Alberto</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brisighella (city)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castel Bolognese (city)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faenza (city)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imola (city)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russi (city)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BREAKDOWN BY PLACE OF ORIGIN

#### REGION OF THE LEGATIONS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legation</th>
<th>Governo</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>x/ p/ o</th>
<th>x/ p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forli'</td>
<td>-same-</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>36 3 3 5 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terra del Sole</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertinoro</td>
<td>Forlimpopoli</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meldola</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesena</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 7 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civitella</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiumara</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coriano</td>
<td>Monte Scudolo</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimini</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td></td>
<td>73 38 1 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spadarolo in Monte</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verucchio</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Arcangelo</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saludecio</td>
<td>Cattolica</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montefiore di Rimini</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montegridalfo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morciano</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Giovanni in Marignano</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savignano</td>
<td>(city)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Mauro</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"Others"**

specific but unknown places:

- Barbarolo 1
- Piernarco 1
- Vetturato 1

places outside Papal States

- Piedmont - unspecified 1
- Castel Monferrato 1
- San Remo 1
- Torino 1
- Parma Piacenza 1
- Tuscany Firenze 1
- Pistoja 1 2
- Two Sicilies Napoli 1

no place of origin specified

7 19

**Grand Totals**

550 433 6 90 70
APPENDIX B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Profession (with translation)</th>
<th>x/</th>
<th>p/</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>x/</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unspecified (nobile)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marquis (marchese)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count (conte)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knight (cavaliere)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNTITLED GENTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man of property (possidente)</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLERGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest &amp; pastor (parroco)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest (sacerdote)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subdeacon (suddeacono)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious (religioso)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN COMMONERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- see next 3 pages for expansion:</td>
<td></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEASANTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peasant (contadino)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farm worker (bracciate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market gardener (ortolano)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shepherd (pastorolo)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILITARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colonel (colonello)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain (capitano)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieutenant (tenente)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unspecified officer (ufficiale)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-coms (sergente, brigatere, maresciallo)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soldier (soldato, militare)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student (studente)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sailor (marinajo)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>football player (giocatore di palone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports official (bigliardiere)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smuggler (contrabandiere)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO PROFESSION SPECIFIED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grand Totals*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Profession (with translation)</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOURGEOIS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professionals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>doctor (medico)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surgeon (chirurgo)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>veterinarian (veterinario)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engineer (ingegnere)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lawyer (avvocato, legale, dottore in leggi)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>notary (notajo)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university teacher (professore)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manufacturer (fabbricante)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shipping agent (spedizioniere)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accountant (contabile, computista)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bookseller (libraio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>money changer (cambiavalute)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dealer (trafficante, commerçiant, sensale)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contractor (appaltatore, impressario)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hotel keeper (albergatore)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PETTY BOURGEOIS</strong></td>
<td><strong>White collar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pharmacist (farmacista)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male nurse (infirmiere, flebotomo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deputy (deputato)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>political leader (capo politico)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clerk, inspector (impiegato)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bailiff (cursore)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legal clerk (attuario)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>calligrapher (calligrafo)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tutor (istitutore)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>copyist (scritturale, copista, emanuense)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tradesmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shopkeeper (negoziante)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>printer (tipografo, stampatore)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medal seller (medagliaio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restaurateur (trattore)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coffeehouse keeper (caffetiere)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>innkeeper (locandiere, oste)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wineseller (spacciatore di vino)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Artistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>painter (pittore)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sculptor (scultore)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>writer (scrittore, uomo di lettere)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>musician (musicante, suonatore)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>singer (artista di canti)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actor (artista drammatico)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Profession (with translation)</td>
<td>x/</td>
<td>p/</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x/</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTISANS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textiles &amp; Clothing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weaver (tessitore, lanino)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ribbon maker (fettuciano)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailor (sarto/sartore)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dyer (tintore)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatter (cappelajo)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bricklayer (muratore, cazionsuole)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpenter (falegname, legnajuolo)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabinetmaker (ebanista)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plasterer (gessino)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house painter (verniciatore)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baker (fornajo)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butcher (macellaro, pizzicagnolo, beccaio)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miller (mugnajo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook (cuoco)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fishmonger (pescivendolo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leather</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoemaker (calzolajo)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanner (conciapelli, concitore)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haltermaker (capestraro)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saddler (sellajo)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Artisans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barber (barbiere)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacksmith/ironworker (fabbro, ferrajo)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppersmith (ramajo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanic (meccanico)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gunsmith (armajolo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glassblower (vetrajo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basketmaker (canestraro)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wickerworker (impagliatore)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upholsterer (tappezziere)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comb maker (pettinajo)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cigar maker (fabbricatore di zigari)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rope maker (cordajo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Profession (with translation)</td>
<td>x/</td>
<td>p/</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x/</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNSKILLED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domestic servant (servitore, domestico)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiter/valet (camariere)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coachman (cocchiere)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carter/cabman (vetturale, birocciaio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postillion (postiglione)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>messenger (corriere)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watchman (sorvegliante)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamplighter (lampionajo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porter (facchino)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second-hand dealer (rigattiere)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hemp-dresser (canapino, gargiolaro)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice husker (pilaricco)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whitewasher (imbiancatore)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laundryman (lavandajo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Places of Exile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>x/ p/ o</th>
<th>x/ p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>- unspecified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algiers (N. Africa)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aurellac</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avignon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bastia (Corsica)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batillon-sur-Loire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bourbon-Vendee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cahors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charenton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chateauroux</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaumont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epinal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesneven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lille</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limoges</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loches</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marseilles</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mende</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montauban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mont-de-Marsan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montpellier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narbonne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neufchateau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nimes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perigueux</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quimper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rennes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Quentin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saumur</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toulon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Versailles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>- unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>City or town</td>
<td>x/ p/o</td>
<td>x/ p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>-unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>Aachen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Italy</td>
<td>Fiume</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villafranca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>Cagliari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Remo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Piacenza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscany</td>
<td>-unspecified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livorno</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pistoja</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viareggio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>-same-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Sicilies</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Valetta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian Islands</td>
<td>-unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cefalonia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corfu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Maura</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Places of Exile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>x/ p/o</th>
<th>x/ p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nostizza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottoman Empire</td>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ioannina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>-unspecified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bahia (=Salvador)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Montevideo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Caracas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified places of exile</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Prison or jail</td>
<td>x/</td>
<td>p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>Castel Sant'Angelo (Roma)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civitavecchia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civita Castellana</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corneto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>Narni</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spoleto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marches</td>
<td>Ancona</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cagli</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cingoli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fano</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fossombrone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gubbio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macerata</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mondolfo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pergola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pesaro</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Leo</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senigallia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urbino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legations</td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rimini</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police request - prison unspecified</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No prison given</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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