The Order of St John and the Holy See

The Order of St John and the Holy See: A study in diplomacy through the career of Ambassador Fra Marcello Sacchetti, 1682-1720.

Adrian Scerri

PhD History 2021

To my parents

Abstract

This dissertation examines the role of the ambassador of the Order of St John to the Holy See through the career of Ambassador Fra Marcello Sacchetti. Divided in ten chapters, it probes into the various aspects that this role demanded. The first chapter serves to present the methodology adopted and to put the rest of the dissertation in a historical and historiographic foundation. Chapter 2 analyses the evolution of diplomacy and examines the perspective of various theorists in their pursuit for the qualities that an ambassador should have. Chapter 3 then narrows the discourse down to the diplomacy of the Order of St John and explores the roles of receiver and procurator-general, two roles that directly or indirectly, were also a means for the Order of St John for maintaining a presence outside the convent in Malta. This is followed by an in-depth study of the nature of the issues that the ambassador faced daily, and how he used his wiles, contacts, friends and relations in trying to obtain a favourable outcome for the Order. Thus, areas covering financial issues, challenges of the Order's jurisdiction by church authorities, wars, both against the Ottoman Empire and inter-Christian wars, corsairing and slavery are covered by appealing to case-studies and supported by secondary sources. On a different tack, Chapter 8 dealt more with the manner rather than the matter of early modern diplomacy, thus it examines patronage and the Order of St John, which was both a giver and receiver of patronage. Patronage was also linked with the arts, so Chapter 9 follows with the ambassador's role as a procurer of art for the Order of St John. This phenomenon did neither start nor stop with Fra Marcello Sacchetti, showing that by his time it was integrated with his role. Coming from a family with notable patrons of the arts, Fra Marcello Sacchetti might have had some advantage in this area over his predecessors. This chapter deals also with religious issues, showing the ambassador as representing the Grand Master as head of a religious institution rather than a prince of a realm. The last chapter strives to paint a picture of the man behind the role. It therefore concentrates more on the material aspect by focusing on Fra Marcello Sacchetti's possessions, using his personal inventory and that drawn up by his family. Conclusions are then drawn, showing how aspects of the history of the Order are revealed through the study of its diplomacy.

Preface

This dissertation was spawned by a line from an article by David F. Allen and a discussion with Professor Victor Mallia-Milanes.[1] The project back then was the dissertation for the Masters in Hospitaller Studies. At the time I had a vague notion of wanting to write about the diplomacy of the Order of St John. Professor Mallia-Milanes suggested that the best way to go about it was to select an ambassador and build a picture through his outgoing correspondence. I chose Fra Marcello Sacchetti for various reasons. His longevity in office, the period itself (1682-1720), familiarity with language, accessibility and completeness of his correspondence, were all factors that contributed to my choice. That work was completed successfully, but somehow I felt I had only scratched the surface. It dealt mostly with the matter of Fra Marcello Sacchetti's letters, but diplomacy does not consist solely of what is being negotiated, but how.

And so I set about this project, first by complete immersion in the correspondence between Fra Marcello Sacchetti and various Grand Masters, because I wanted to absorb the issues that the Order's ambassador in Rome dealt with. But primary sources have a way of leading you to others. The second part of the preliminary research was to appeal to secondary sources because the discourse had to be framed within a historical and historiographical background. The first two chapters elaborate on these areas, providing a wide foundation upon which to build the rest of the work. So from the general it narrows down to the particular. From the history and historiography of diplomacy discussed in the first two chapters it moves to chapter 3, where the diplomacy of the Order is the focus. This chapter also elaborates on the important distinction between procurator general and receiver, as Fra Marcello Sacchetti had both roles, in addition to being an ambassador, and the Order was quite practical when it came to foreign representation.

---

[1] David F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors' in Counter Reformation Europe', in *The Military Orders: Welfare and Warfare*, Helen Nicholson (ed.) (Aldershot: Ashgate 1998), 363.

Work on the first three chapters helped me look again at the primary sources with a more trained eye. I could see the issues that eventually built my chapters 4 to chapter 9 in a much better light. Chapter 4 deals mostly with financial issues, chapter 5 focuses on matters of jurisdiction, chapter 6 is about war, both the 'glorious' one against the common enemy and the 'disgraceful' war between Christian states, and chapter 7 explores corsairing and slavery. Chapter 9 is concerned with two other aspects found in the ambassador's portfolio: the procuring of art and representing the Order in matters related to religion. For a while I toyed with the idea of exchanging Chapter 8: Patronage and Ceremonials with Chapter 9: Art, Cult and Confessors. The reason was that Chapter 8 is more about how diplomacy was conducted but on the other hand I did not want to leave it to the penultimate end as it is such an integral part of the whole role. Conversely, it could not come too early in the work as I believe it was more amenable to the reader after having seen several case studies that the previous chapters present.

In the study of an ambassador of a prince, a realm and a religious institution, some arbitrariness in the division and sequence of chapters cannot be avoided. The divisions do not in any way mean that topics do not blur into each other. Financial matters obviously touch upon all the other subjects. The Order's fierce adherence to its independence meant it saw any interference as an affront, so problems in jurisdiction surfaced continuously. The protection of this was vital. The ambassador's role was varied and complex, but the purpose was very simple: to protect the Order's relevance and identity, for the loss of either could mean extinction or becoming a parody of her former glorious self. This delicate job was entrusted to one man for thirty-eight years. So apart from his role, I had to try to find as much as I could about him. Though there was never the intention of gleaning a biography on Fra Marcello Sacchetti, it was interesting and relevant to catch a glimpse of the man. This constitutes chapter 10, a chapter that deals with material culture. It completes the picture by discussing the people and objects that surrounded Fra Marcello Sacchetti. Though far from complete, a sketch emerges of an educated, younger member of a newly ennobled banking family, equally proud of the family's ancient Tuscan roots and of his status as one of the most prominent families in Rome, not only a knight of an Order devoted to the caring of the sick and the defence of Christendom, but the ambassador of her Grand Master, to whom, as his letters ended, he bowed profoundly.

And similarly I wish to metaphorically bow in gratitude towards a number of people who made this possible. Thanks goes to my supervisor, Dr Mark Aloisio and external co-supervisor Dr Diana Carrió-Invernizzi for insights, corrections and discussions. I would like to include here Professor Victor Mallia-Milanes not only for help with the original subject matter but also for the possibility that the M.A. in Hospitaller Studies gave me. In such a project, the list would be endless, and in trying to be complete I fear I would omit more than I would remember. I therefore limit myself to those directly involved. Gratitude due to Dr Emanuel Buttigieg for his good advice and to Ms Fleur Brincat for suggestions and practical help. Thanks also to Dr Daniel K. Gullo and Dr Valeria Vanesio for help with archival matters especially in Rome. The last bow is to those, my society of friends, who were silent at my impatience, and patient with my silence. In the words of John Milton, 'They also serve who only stand and wait.'

Contents

List of Abbreviations

AOM: National Library of Malta, Archives of the Order of Malta

AIM: Cathedral Archives, Archivum Inquisitionis Melitensis

ASMOM: Archivio Sovrano Militare Ordine di Malta (Rome)

ASC: Archivio Storico Capitolino

BSMOM: Biblioteca Sovrano Militare Ordine di Malta

Chapter 1: Framework of a study

1.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to lay a historical and historiographic foundation to the rest of the dissertation. It commences by tracing the main approaches to the history of diplomacy, describing the different methodologies adopted and concluding with a rationale for the eclectic approach implemented for this work. An analysis of the primary sources perused follows. This section opens a window on the nature of the main documents that will accompany the reader throughout the entire dissertation. The last section of this chapter paints a picture of the world that Fra Marcello Sacchetti inhabited, the forces at play and the main issues that dominated the political scene.

1.2 Approaches to the study of the history of diplomacy

The purpose of this section is to present in a coherent manner the approach adopted for this dissertation. Since the approach favoured was an eclectic one, borrowing from previous strategies, it was necessary to outline the three main approaches adopted by historians of diplomacy since the nineteenth century. The first of these was political in outlook, using diplomatic studies in order to better understand foreign policies. In this view, diplomatic history remained a means to an end. The antithesis of this was an attempt by historians to turn their gaze upon the actors rather than the script; to study the men that executed the policies rather than the policies themselves. This approach attempts to draw a faithful picture of the diplomatic corpus by studying groups of similar individuals. As if obeying a Marxist's pendulum metaphor of history, the third approach adopted by historians of diplomacy was a synthesis of the previous two. It assumed a dual perspective: looking at diplomatic history both from the standpoint of the birth of strong nation states and the crystallization of a diplomatic culture, complete with its own literature. In presenting these three approaches, a criticism of each will also be rendered, thereby justifying the heterogeneous option that is drawn at the conclusion of this section.

Diplomatic history has been considered by modern historians as the branch of history most resistant to innovation, the mule seemingly too obstinate to accept the spurs of other disciplines. The heirloom of Herodotus and Thucydides, diplomatic history was standardised by Leopold Von Ranke in the nineteenth century but 'was

concerned with international politics of the state and furthermore tackled this from the point of view of national histories.'[1] This tendency lingered on and its salient point could still be found well into the twentieth century. A number of authors embraced the main element of this approach; that is the consideration of diplomacy as an aspect of foreign policy and international relations.[2] As in other branches of history, diplomatic history was intimately linked with the policies and the politicians that generated it. The onus was on the study of foreign policy as the endeavour of governments and diplomats were perceived as mediators of those policies. Historians therefore tended to concentrate on significant peace conferences and the influence these had on the relations between nations. Historians adhering to this approach also ventured into the origins and development of diplomacy itself with particular emphasis on when diplomacy became 'modern'. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) and the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659) were two such instances, considered by some historians as landmarks in the history of diplomacy and as heralding 'modern' diplomacy.[3] There was therefore a tendency to observe modern day diplomacy and work backwards, seeking points of comparison and contrast, tracing, as it were, an evolution towards a modern model, as if diplomacy was an organism obeying Darwin's law of natural selection. This whiggish tendency had however a practical offshoot. It shed light on how diplomacy changed according to the historical reality that bred it. This aspect was adopted in this project to give an overarching view of the theme and place the core of the discourse within a historical framework. However, it could not be adopted as the main methodology for the whole dissertation. Its vision of the diplomat as mediating foreign policies for his prince is not concomitant with how the Order of St John used its ambassador in Rome. Moreover, this approach tends to concentrate on the more powerful of the European states, which description could not be attributed to a military order ruling a set of small islands. Lastly this approach fails to explore how the

[1] Diana Carrio-Invernizzi, 'A New Diplomatic History and the Networks of Spanish Diplomacy in the Baroque Era', *The International History Review*, 36:4 (2013), 603-618.
[2] Marie-Hélène Côté, 'What Did It Mean to be a French Diplomat in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries?', *Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d'histoire*, 45 (2010), 237. A more detailed study of the individual authors and their works will be given in Section 2.2 Treatises and Theorists.
[3] Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (New York: Dover Publications, 1955), 178. The discussion on the Peace of Westphalia is taken up in more detail in Section 2.1 Evolution of Diplomacy.

diplomat actually performed his tasks since the study of diplomacy remained a means to better understand the relations of states.

Somewhat on the other end of the scale, the adaptation of the prosopographic approach attempted to remedy this shortcoming and 'better grasp the men behind the titles' in order to 'understand better professional diplomacy.[4] The term prosopography is derived from two Greek terms: *prosopon* – originally meaning face or mask worn by actors in order to reveal emotions, and *graphia* – writing, description. As an approach, it is 'a collective biography, describing the external features of a population group that the researcher has determined has something in common.'[5] Thus in the study of the history of diplomacy, the common denominator is the profession. This approach tries to achieve a comprehensive and faithful understanding of the set under scrutiny by appealing to as wide a sample as possible.[6] This approach would therefore seek to discover the ambassadors and their world by studying a large sample and drawing conclusions accordingly. The large sample would serve to avoid the pitfall of leaping from the particular to the general on scanty sources. Initially this approach seemed enticing enough to be adopted for the entire project. However, early probing into primary sources showed that the way the Order made use of its ambassador was very particular. Further evidence revealed that the role of the ambassador in Rome was different from the ones the Order had in France, Spain and the Empire and that the resident ambassador in Rome was a point of reference for the others. For instance, Fra Villavincentio the Order's ambassador in Madrid, consulted Fra Sacchetti on certain claims made by the Archbishop of Toledo.[7] Moreover, the ambassador in Rome doubled up as the procurator general. Sacchetti also served as the receiver in Rome from 1682 to 1715. These roles will be explored in Chapter 3. The prosopographic approach was therefore not valid as a complete strategy to study an ambassador whose position was unique, so much so that 'finding the appropriate knight of St John to represent their Order at Rome was always a headache for Grand Masters and their

[4] Marie-Hélène Côté, 237.
[5] Koenraad Verboven, Myriam Carlier, Jan Dumolyn, 'A Short Manual to the Art of Prosopography', 39, retrieved on 19 April 2016 from http://prosopography.history.ox.ac.uk/course_syllabuses.htm
[6] K. Verboven, M. Carlier, J. Dumolyn, 'A Short Manual to the Art of Prosopography', 39.
[7] See AOM 1297, f.105r, 8 August 1682. The case is treated in detail in Chapter 5.

councils'[8]. On the other hand, the Order's ambassador shared common traits with his contemporaries, not as much in function as in the external trappings that were an equally essential characteristic of the profession. So, although not valid for the matter of diplomacy, it proved to be valid for analysing the manner in which diplomats worked. Inherited traditions became conventions and fixed modes of behaviour. The question that naturally springs up is to what extent did the ambassador of the Order in Rome follow these modes of behaviour. The prosopographic approach was therefore adopted to answer certain questions concerning protocol and ceremonials. Another field of exploration where this approach was deemed suitable concerned the office of the ambassador. Areas such as the personnel available, the use of informal meetings and the manner in which the house of the ambassador was furnished for such gatherings are all aspects that need to be studied in order to give as complete a picture as possible. The prosopographic approach distances itself from the policies brokered by diplomats and concentrates on the brokers themselves. It focuses on the study of a professional diplomatic class but fails to venture into the study of a diplomatic culture.

An attempted solution to this failing was the viewing of diplomacy from 'the dual perspectives of the rise of great powers in Europe and the early developments of a public sphere and diplomatic culture.'[9] The presupposition here is that the emergence of strong states gave rise to two related concepts: a diplomatic class with 'its own characteristics, attitudes, and types of education' and a genre of literature intended as manuals for this new diplomatic class.[10] This approach therefore blends the history of facts with the history of ideas.[11] It compares and contrasts theory and practice by asking questions on whether manuals on the 'perfect ambassador' actually influenced a prince in choosing his ambassadors. Previous historians looked at such treatises as important in reflecting the existing diplomatic world but did not consider them as having practical influence on it. The dual perspective approach offers a fresh look at old sources, asking the important question whether these theorists were merely

[8] David F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors' in Counter Reformation Europe', in *The Military Orders: Welfare and Warfare,* Helen Nicholson (ed.) (Aldershot: Ashgate 1998), 368.
[9] Marie-Hélène Côté, 238.
[10] Marie-Hélène Côté, 238.
[11] See this work, Chapter 2.

describing the existing state of affairs or actually proposing an ideal alternative. [12] This it strives to do by studying a set of diplomats in the manner of the prosopographic approach, comparing and contrasting the results to the guidelines set out by contemporary theorists. It studies diplomatic theory and reality with the same lens, showing that, though idealistic, the treatises were not however mere utopian dreaming. It takes into account the evolution of theories hand in hand with the evolution of practice, observing an increasing concern not only with the figure of the ambassador, but also how best to execute his mission. This approach is ideal to study the evolution of the diplomatic world in parallel with the evolution of its theories.

The dual perspectives approach was perused for this project to relate Fra Marcello Sacchetti to contemporary theories. It could not however suit the whole project. Firstly this approach retains a leaning towards the emergence of great powers. Secondly one of the aims of this project is to uncover more of the history of the Order of St John through the study of its diplomacy. The dual perspectives approach barely delves into matters that occupied the diplomats. There were certain points that had to be kept clearly in mind in adopting an approach for this project. Ambassadors of monarchs represented their respective ruler. Fra Marcello Sacchetti was representing his prince but also his Order in its religious capacity. Moreover, he was doing so not merely to another ruler but to the pope, a ruler who was also the ultimate authority of the Order of St John.

The peculiar position that the ambassador of the Order of St John in Rome enjoyed dictated a peculiar approach. From the outset, it was evident that a single approach would not suit the various facets of this project. Fra Marcello Sacchetti was endowed with the widest possible sense of 'diplomatic function', that is 'to act as a permanent channel of communication between the sending state and the receiving state'.[13] Although the Order provided instructions, it did not bestow its ambassador with a clear-cut portfolio. The ambassador dealt with a wide range of situations that strictly speaking, were not always related to the political issues conventionally associated with the work of the diplomat. Some samples of occurrences that required

---

[12] For instance, Lucien Bély's *Espions et ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV* follows this approach. See John C. Rule, 'Gathering Intelligence in the Age of Louis XIV. Review of Lucien Bély's *Espions et ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV.*', *The International History Review*, 14:4 (1992), 732-752.
[13] G.R. Berridge and Lorna Lloyd (eds), *Dictionary of Diplomacy* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 104.

the ambassador's intervention will suffice to uphold this. In 1683, the ambassador wrote to recommend to his Grand Master a certain Bartolomeo de Rossi for a job well done in a wood-cutting operation in Terracina.[14] Exactly a month later he was frantically appealing to the Pope to prevent Emperor Leopold from taxing the Order's property in the Empire.[15] As procurator general, the religious life of the brethren fell under his jurisdiction. So again in 1683 he proudly informed the Grand Master that he had secured the right for all the churches of the Religion to celebrate the feasts of St John and St Paul under double rite.[16] On a completely different tack, in 1714 he was carrying negotiations with the ambassador of the Serenissima over galleys flying the colours of the Religion allegedly seen sailing in Venetian waters.[17] These are mere random samples. The wide range of issues handled by the Order's ambassador in Rome pointed already towards an eclectic approach as being more appropriate in answering the questions that sparked off this project.

The nature of this project therefore, dictated a composite approach since it explores five related areas: the Order as a political entity; the customs; mores and traditions of the diplomatic world; the office of the diplomat; the contemporary discourse on the 'ideal' ambassador and lastly the ambassador himself who unites all these in his person. Having its headquarters or convent on an island did not mean that the Order was not affected by what was happening on mainland Europe. Its possessions and links with the various monarchs meant that the Order was concerned with all the complexities on the continent. Though its principality was an island, it was far from isolated. The political arena of post-Thirty Years War Europe was also the political reality of the Order and the world within which its ambassador functioned. 'So much of the Order's history remains wrapped up in its diplomacy' so the political approach had to be enlisted to unwrap it.[18] Elements of the prosopographic approach had to be adopted to take this a step further in revealing how Sacchetti worked. This had to be taken into consideration especially in the eventuality of gaps and dead ends since primary sources tended to discuss matters at hand but hardly ever the manner of

[14] AOM 1298, f.77r, 3 June 1683.
[15] AOM 1298, f.91rv-92r, 3 July 1683.
[16] AOM 1298, f.154r, 11 December 1683.
[17] AOM 1326, f.178r, 17 February 1714.
[18] D. F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors' in Counter-Reformation Europe', 363.

handling them. Comparison with his contemporaries could thus prove beneficial in building a composite picture of the diplomatic arena in which Sacchetti performed. Finally, the realm of ideas could not be divorced from the realm of acts. Ideas either describe reality or propose a better one. Either way they mirror the spirit of the times. Hence elements of the dual perspectives approach were incorporated. The goal of this dissertation is to draw as complete a picture as possible of the Order's diplomacy in Rome. The strategies chosen were not a matter of taste. They were dictated by the subject.

1.3 Sources

Research for this dissertation began with the letters of Fra Marcello Sacchetti to Grand Masters Fra Gregorio Carafa (r.1680-1690), Fra Adrien de Wignacourt (r.1690-1697), Fra Ramon Perellos (r.1697-1720) and the final months of his career with Fra Marc'Antonio Zondadari (r.1720-1722) found in the Archives of the Order of Malta at the National Library of Malta under Section 9 – Correspondence. These constitute the tangible evidence of Sacchetti's diplomatic career. The diplomatic letter had become standardised in Italy by 1500, which format was later adopted throughout Europe.[19] Official despatches began with a salutation, followed by acknowledgment of recent correspondence identified by dates. The main body of the letter came next, after which the date and place of the letter were written. The hour was sometimes noted as well, though this was rare. The letter was then formally concluded and signed at the bottom of the sheet.[20] Sacchetti's letters varied slightly in format. The salutation, in this case *Eminent[issi]mo P[r]in[ci]pe* (most eminent Prince) was written at the very top of the sheet, and more than half of the first page was left blank, which seems to show that the letter was folded in such a way that the salutation served also as the addressee. Then the Grand Master's recent letters were acknowledged by their dates. When no letters had been received, as was often the case during the winter months, the ambassador would politely say so, blaming the weather. The body of the letter dealt with pending cases, outcomes, and the course of action taken or planned. Within the body of the letter occasional details were included, usually given by way of explanation. For instance the eye infection of Monsignor Altoviti, the Secretary of the Congregation of Ecclesiastical Immunity, was mentioned to explain delay in a case.[21] Similarly Cardinal Colonna, the Prefect of the same Congregation, was 'out of Rome to enjoy the countryside.'[22] Monsignor Altoviti then decided to rest at Cardinal Barberino's vineyard till Cardinal Colonna returned.[23] Such little details give a human touch to Sacchetti's missives and also show the early modern tendency to spare no

[19] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 97.
[20] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 97.
[21] AOM 1298, f.68v, 22 May 1683.
[22] AOM 1298, f.83r, 12 June 1683: '*fuori di Roma a godere la campagna.*'
[23] AOM 1298, f.83r, 12 June 1683: '*Seg[retario] Altoviti se ne sta a una vigna del S[ignor] Card[inale] Barberino fino al ritorno di Card[inale] Colonna*.' For a brief biographical note of Monsignor Giacomo Altoviti and Cardinal Colonna, see Appendix 1, 236, 238.

details, as Mattingly put it 'no information, however trivial, was ignored.'[24] The letter was then formally concluded, with the place and date written immediately after. The signature remained at the very bottom of the sheet, the only words written in Sacchetti's own hand unless he had included some note in the margin. When the need arose, an ambassador would also enclose a *relatione* or *avviso* with his despatch. Sacchetti did on occasion follow this practice as in this example:

A *relatione* [pamphlet] printed in Genoa and Milan is attached. It concerns the capture of three Turkish vessels by the Squadron: the said news along with specific letters was written from Livorno and from Venice: I am told that it is going to be reprinted in Rome. However I do not have any letters either from the Venerable General or from the *Riveditore*. I will await the confirmation of the *avviso* [notice] from Your Eminence. According to the letters and the *relatione*, the *Capitana* was lost except for the crew and the cannon. If this is true it is hoped that this loss is abundantly compensated by the wealth of the said vessels.[25]

In this letter Sacchetti mentions two sources of information which were sought after in the early modern world: the *relatione* and *avviso*. Evolving from merchants' letters, the *avvisi* were hand-written newsletters dealing with political and military news.[26] They were particularly well developed in Venice and Rome by the middle of the sixteenth century.[27] The *relatione* was a printed description of ceremonies, festivities and pageants besides military exploits. Such publications not only reflected 'the growing commodification of news' but also mirrored the receptiveness of rulers and religious orders to the power of propaganda that printing potentially had.[28] In the Italian peninsula, there were one hundred and sixty printing presses by the mid-seventeenth century.[29] On 11 December 1683 Sacchetti wrote to the Grand Master

---

[24] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 96.

[25] AOM 1298, f.88r, 26 June 1683: '*Viene annessa una relatione stampata in Genoa, et in Milano concernente un impresa fatta da cotesta squadra contro tre vascelli Turcheschi: la med[esima] nuova viene scritta da Livorno e da Venetia con med[esima] lettere particolari: mi dicono di piu che sia stata ristampata uno in Roma, io pero non ho lettera ne da quell V[enerabile] Generale ne dal Riveditore. Aspettaro di sentire dall E[minenza] V[ostra] la conferma dell'avviso e se bene dicono in detta relatione e in detta lettera essenti persa la Capitana salvo l'equippaggio et il cannone, quando che nelle altra parti la relatione forse vera, ne vorrebbe la perdita abbondente recompensata dalla ricchezza delli detti vascalli*.'

[26] Mario Infelise, 'From merchants' letters to handwritten political avvisi', Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe', vol 3, *Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400-1700*, Francisco Bethencourt and Florike Egmond (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 33-52.

[27] Mario Infelise, 'Roman Avvisi: Information and Politics in the Seventeenth Century', in *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*', Gianvittorio Signoretto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 212.

[28] Laurie Nussdorfer, 'Print and Pageantry in Baroque Rome', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 29:2 (1998), 439.

[29] Brendan Dooley, 'Political Publishing and its Critics in Seventeenth Century Italy', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 41 (1996), 176.

saying that he would print four hundred copies of a decree issued by the Congregation of Rites permitting the Order to celebrate the feast of St John and St Paul under double rite in all its churches.[30] However, such documents do not occur often in Sacchetti's letters to the Grand Master. Judging from his reaction to the *relatione* narrating the capture of Muslim ships, he seemed to have been wary of the veracity of such reports, preferring solid evidence from the Venerable General or from the *riveditore* (the official in charge of managing goods and expenses on the galleys), and even awaited confirmation from the Grand Master himself.[31] The way the terms '*relatione*' and '*avvisi*' are used in Sacchetti's letters vary. In the piece cited above Sacchetti seemed to have used the terms '*relatione'* and '*avviso'* interchangeably. Sacchetti's most common use of the term *relatione* was to refer to official reports by courts in Rome.[32] The word '*avviso*' usually means simply notice or piece of news, as when Sacchetti on hearing of the death of the Prior of Siena wrote that he had 'checked the truth of this news [*certezza dell'avviso*].'[33] Some of these letters have aged remarkably well but others unfortunately have not taken the passage of time kindly, which is not surprising. Firstly the letters are the originals, meaning that they had to undergo the sea voyage and the preventive disinfection procedures. Such letters were subjected to dipping in white acid then put over a fire which had been sprinkled with ginger and aromatic herbs.[34] Fortunately, missing information due to letters being unreadable could be gleaned from the corresponding copies of missives sent by Grand Masters.[35]

---

[30] AOM 1298, f.154r, 11 December 1683: '*Mi restringo di mandarle annessa una copia del decreto di questa cong[regazio]ne de Riti con il quale si concede tanto a tutte le Chiese della Relig[io]ne e di Convente, e fuori, come a tutta cotesta Diocesi, di potessi celebrare il giorno delli gloriosi Martiri S[an] Giovanni e Paolo sub ritu duplici: Io non mando all E[minenza] V[ostra] l'Originale di esso decreto, perche ho considerato che non essendovi costa stampa, e dovendosi participare la notitia della sud[dett]a concessione per tutta la Christianita dove vi sono Chiese della Rel[igio]ne esser meglio, che io ne faccia stamapre quattrocento ad effetto che V[ostra] E[minenza] possa farle sparger p[er] tutto, dove bisognera e nello stesso tempo che io mandero le stampe all' E[minenza] V[ostra] le mandero il decr[et]o orign[a]le senza del q[ua]le lo stampatore qua non puo stamparle*.' See also this work, Chapter 9.

[31] For *riveditore*, see *Codice del Sacro Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano riordinato per comandamento Del Sacro Generale Capitolo* (Malta 1782), 432-434.

[32] See for instance: AOM 1298, f.123r, 11 September 1683 (litigation between the Venerable Prior of Barletta and Baron Don Marco Quarti and AOM 1298, f.101r, 24 July 1683 (*relatione* presented by Monsignor Cantelmi to the Congregation of Immunites).

[33] AOM 1297, f.149r, 31 October 1682: '*mi sono prima assicurato qua dalla certezza dell' avviso*'.

[34] Alfred Bonnici, 'The Postal System of the Order of St John' (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 2011), 111.

[35] AOM 1448-1481.

Also forming part of Section 9, these copies are in very good state, having been filed and stored immediately after being written.

Between them, these two sections paint quite an accurate picture of the Order's concerns during the early modern period thereby revealing the role the ambassador in Rome had to play. Most of the cases occupying the stylishly written letters dealt with three areas: financial aspects, questions about jurisdiction and matters dealing with warfare and corsairing. Financial aspects could vary from a monarch's attempt at challenging the Order's exempt status to the kin of a deceased knight demanding a right to inheritance. Other themes occur, which although less frequent, still serve to throw light on the role of the ambassador. Subjects such as patronage, the acquisition of works of art and relics, occasional meetings with other ambassadors, or the celebration of feasts in the Order's churches were also matters which preoccupied the ambassador. The general tone of the letters is one of great respect towards his Prince. Besides the use of the polite form of address, Sacchetti also alludes to the compassion, virtue, justice and wisdom of his prince. Even when respect was showered upon Sacchetti, he attributes it wholly to the Grand Master as in the reception given to him by Cardinal de Medici:

> Yesterday I was escorted for the visit to Signor Cardinal de Medici, who received me with such kindness and excessive goodness, that I cannot withhold from Your Eminence: not only did they toll the bell, something which the Medici Cardinals never do, but in my retinue I was accorded more of his gentlemen than even his own person. He did more than ever was done to my predecessors, he overflowed with infinite goodness, so much so that I felt bewildered, yet extremely happy to see such honour bestowed upon Your Eminence and His Religion in the person of His Ambassador.[36]

The only form of praise the ambassador allowed himself was his diligence in executing the Grand Master's commands. It is in this vein that Sacchetti described his methods and his persistence in petitioning cardinals in trying to obtain favourable results.

To gain a sense of which issues may or may not have been recurring and possible similarity in how they were tackled, a select sample of letters pertaining to Sacchetti's

---

[36] AOM 1302, f.97r, 21 June 1687: '*Hieri mi portai con Corteggio alla visita di questo Sig[nor] Card[inale] de Medici, il quale mi riceve con tanta benignita, et eccesso di bonta, che io non devo tacerlo all' E[minenza] V[ostra]: poiche non solo mi sono la Campanella, cossa non mai pratticata dall Cardinali de Medici, ma nell' accompagnamento: tanto de suoi Gentilhuomini, quanta della sua persona fece molto piu di quello che vi sia stato fatto alli miei Predecessori, ma eccede con Bonta infinita; onde io ne restai confuso per me stesso, e consolatissimo per vedere onorata li E[minenza] V[ostra] e Sua Rel[igione] nella persona del Suo Amb[asciatore]*.' This was Francesco Maria de Medici (1660-1711), second son of Ferdinando II (1621-1670).

predecessor were consulted. Fra Giovanni Caravita had handed over to Sacchetti by 2 May 1682 as attested by Sacchetti's first letter.[37] Reading through Fra Caravita's letters proved that both the content and the way of conducting affairs were very similar. The formal style of writing was also retained, showing a certain continuity that pointed towards the Order having a long tradition of representation at the Holy See, as attested by Riley-Smith – 'Permanent representation at the Holy See dated from 1231 when the Master appointed a brother called Marquisius his full time representative at the curia with plenary powers in legal actions.'[38] This logically led the search to the Rhodian period in order to see the evolution of the Order's diplomatic office in Rome. The absence of correspondence from this period was made up for by the meticulous *Istoria* by Giacomo Bosio.[39] Bosio provided information on the development of the Order's representation in the roles of procurator general, the agent and the resident ambassador which superseded the latter.[40] More information was gleaned from the Statutes of the Order, which offered a glimpse into the Order's legislation on the duties and remuneration of its representatives abroad.[41] Supplementary information was also found in Fra Caravita's treatise on the role of receivers and procurators, particularly the section dealing with those brothers serving the Order abroad.[42] Bosio also offered clues as to the Order's links with European monarchs through its priors and commanders, a situation which eventually changed to the sending of ambassadors for specific missions and the establishing of resident ambassadors at the major courts of Europe. For the latter, Bartolomeo Dal Pozzo proved to be an invaluable source of information. Dal Pozzo's first volume picked up where Bosio had left.[43] Scouring through these two authorities, a picture of the development of the Order's diplomacy emerged, from priors acting as ambassadors to

---

[37] AOM 1297, f.64r, 2 May 1682.
[38] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c. 1070-1309* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 281. See also Helen Nicholson, *Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights. Images of the Military Orders, 1128-1291* (Leicester-London-New York: Leicester University Press, 1993), 104-105.
[39] Giacomo Bosio, *Dell'istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Ill.ma Militia Di S. Gio. Gierosol.no*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1629).
[40] See this work, Chapter 3.
[41] Giacomo Bosio, *Gli Statuti Della Sacra Religione Di S.Giovanni Gierosolimitano* (Rome, 1589).
[42] Giovanni Caravita, *Trattato dell'Offizio Del Ricevitore E De' Procuratori Del Comun Tesoro, Fuor di Convento e Straordinarj* (Malta, 1763).
[43] Bartolomeo Dal Pozzo, *Historia Della Sacra Religione Militare Di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano Detta di Malta*, vol I (Venice, 1715), title page.

sporadic, mission-based ambassadors and finally to permanent representation. This development followed the European pattern.[44]

A permanent presence in European courts was important for the Order as its survival depended on the goodwill of Christian rulers. It was partly for this reason that the Order embraced a policy of strict neutrality (the other reason being that the brethren hailed from different nations), to remain equidistant from European powers, a policy which sometimes turned into a precarious balancing act. This was the case during the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1713). Grain was withheld from Sicily on suspicion that the Religion was helping the British whilst French influence in Malta was looked upon with deep mistrust by the Spanish, the British and the Dutch, with the result that all parties freely attacked Maltese shipping.[45] The political programme of the Order revolved around the same themes: protection of its property and privileges, the steady supply of necessities especially grain and guarantee of help in case of attack, because the fear of Ottoman reprisal always loomed on the horizon. The records of the Order's political dealings with various states make up Section 3, the *Liber Conciliorum Status*.

This section was originally tapped to see what the Order's approach during the Peace of Westphalia (1648) was. Indeed help came from an unlikely source during the negotiations held in Münster. It was the Serene Republic of Venice which had instructed its ambassador 'that in the treaties for universal peace he was to protect the interests of our Religion'.[46] The *Liber Conciliarum Status* proved useful to shed light on particular aspects covered in this dissertation, such as ceremonials. Thus, the entry dated 14 August 1648 contained instructions on how the Order's ambassador in Rome was to conduct himself with the ambassador of the Grand Duke of Tuscany.[47] On a similar note, a *relazione* filed in Section 17 *Miscellanea Generale* contained a detailed account of the reception accorded to the Bali Fra Teodoro Ermanno, extraordinary

---

[44] For instance, see Matthew Smith Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450-1919* (London: Routledge, 1993), 1-11 and Jeremy Black, *A History of Diplomacy* (London: Reaktion Books, 2010), 43-50.

[45] Helen Nicholson, *The Knights Hospitaller* (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2001), 112.

[46] AOM 258, f.148r, 26 November 1648: '*che nelli trattati della pace universale protegga l'interessi di n[ost]ra Religione*'. For the relations between Hospitaller Malta and Venice see Victor Mallia-Milanes, *Venice and Hospitaller Malta, 1530-1798. Aspects of a Relationship* (Marsa: PEG, 1992).

[47] AOM 258, f.139v, 14 August 1648: '*Come si debba deportare lo Ambas[ciato]re della Relig[io]ne in Roma con quello del Gran Duca di Toscana*'.

ambassador of the Order in Rome on 5 March 1731.[48] The description goes into great detail with 'the staff bearers in scarlet and blue livery' down to the colour and design of their socks.[49] Parallel descriptions can be found in various accounts of similar occasions during the period. For instance, the account of the visit of the Earl of Castlemaine, ambassador for James II, to Pope Innocent XI in 1682 describes how 'the other 52 Liveries were of fine Scarlet lin`ed with silk brocard' and how the pages had 'silk marble-coloured stockings and gilt Swords.'[50]

During the initial stages of research, documents were scoured more for material directly connected with diplomatic matters. However, it soon became clear that ceremonials, patronage and other aspects considered today as on the fringe of diplomacy were treated as an essential part of it. Thus the correspondence section of the *Archivum Inquisitionis Melitensis* (AIM) was originally looked into for the purpose of learning more about the internal political scene of the island, but the search yielded alternative results. For example, a letter addressed to the pope by inquisitor Giacomo Caracciolo (1706-1711) dated 31 July 1706, a mere month after his appointment, dealt with the grievances of two Greek Catholics, for whose sake the inquisitor appealed to the Pope.[51] Less than a week later the inquisitor was recommending the knight Fra Casimoro Adolfo Antonio, Baron of Waltot to the Pope.[52]

The other sources perused were documents at the Magistral Archives in Rome (*Gli Archivi Magistrali*) where there are ten volumes of letters addressed to Sacchetti from various senders and two more volumes of letters by Grand Masters. The Sacchetti family Archives (now held at the *Archivio Capitolino* in Rome) were also examined. The findings from these archives and other sources will keep informing this discussion and the wider direction of this dissertation. The process and the result of research are formed by the relationship between what is sought and what is found.

---

[48] AOM 217, f.34. The term 'Bali' was a high ranking official within the Order. It is often translated as bailiff and written as Balio, bailli and bailly. 'Bali' will be retained throughout this work.
[49] AOM 217, f.34, '*staffieri in vaga Livrea di scarlatto, turchino, con mostre, camisciole, e calzoni rossi*'.
[50] Michael Wright, *An Account of His Excellence Roger Earl of Castlemaine's Embassy from His Majesty James II[d] King of England Scotland France and Ireland &c to His Holiness Innocent II* (London, 1688), 31.
[51] AIM 92, f.3rv, 31 July 1706.
[52] AIM 92, f.3v, 6 August 1706.

1.4 Sacchetti's World (1682-1720)

Despite the Peace of Westphalia, Europe remained a turbulent continent during the thirty-eight years that Sacchetti was in office. The differences between France, Spain and the Empire had not been ironed out. The French diplomatic and military systems were quickly adopted by the other European powers and French ambitions lost what had been gained by French diplomacy. The Netherlands turned to England, their erstwhile rival, whilst German states became friendlier with the Emperor rather than the Sun King. Alliances shifted according to need and a pattern emerged which was to be repeated even in the twentieth century: when a state became too great, 'it created against itself a coalition that matched the threat it represented.'[53] This is particularly evident in The Nine Years' War, known also as the War of the League of Augsburg (1688-1697) and again repeated in the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-1715).[54] Apart from the constant 'internal' struggle there remained the Ottoman threat, particularly against the Habsburgs. In fact, Ottoman policy especially during the sixteenth and seventeenth century was to seek 'friendly relations with rulers perceived as actual or potential allies in the struggle against the Habsburgs.'[55] France had been on friendly terms with the Porte since Francis I (1497-1547). No French help was offered during the lifting of the siege of Vienna (1683), nor did France participate in the subsequent War of the Morea (1684-1699), earning Louis XIV the title 'the most Christian Turk'.[56] The Ottomans were still supposedly the enemy of Christendom and the sole reason for the Order of St John to retain its military function. Having one of its key patrons on friendly terms with its major enemy and at loggerheads with His

---

[53] F. Braudel, *History of Civilizations* (New York: Penguin Books, 1995), 419.
[54] For the War of the league of Augsburg see Thomas Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598-1700* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 401-403. For the War of the Spanish Succession, see M. A. Thomson, 'Louis XIV and the Origins of the War of the Spanish Succession', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4 (1954), 111-134.
[55] Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around it* (London, I.B.: Tauris, 2007), 144.
[56] William James Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Cambridge MA: Shenkman Publishing, 1976), 10. This unflattering title was also the long and highly descriptive title of a book. See H. Rhodes, *The Most Christian Turk: Or, A View of the Life and Bloody Reign of Lewis XIV: Present King of France. Containing an Account of His Monstrous Birth, the Transactions that Happened During His Minority Under Cardinal Mazarine, Afterwards His Own Unjust Enterprizes in War and Peace as breach of leagues, oaths, &c. the blasphemous titles given him, his love-intrigues, his confederacy with the Turk to invade Christendom, the cruel persecution of his Protestant subjects, his conniving with pirates, his unjustly invading the empire, &c. laying all waste before him with fire and sword, his quarrels with the Pope and Genoieze, his treachery against England, Scotland, and Ireland, the engagements of the confederate princes against him; with all the battles, sieges, and sea fights, that have happened of consequence to this time*.' (London, 1690).

Catholic Majesty and the Holy Roman Emperor must have been a constant problem for Grand Masters and a strain on their ambassadors. Apart from the anxiety of conflicting relations among its patrons, there was also a material aspect due to the Order being a landowner in various European countries. There was thus the threat of taxation and the physical devastation of war.

Continuous conflict was also a constant strain on the finances of all European countries. Governments had to survive on loans obtained from tax farmers which led to further indirect taxation, especially in France and Spain.[57] Due to the way society was structured, the burden was particularly felt by the lower classes as the nobility and the Church paid much less in comparison to their wealth.[58] The picture that emerges from contemporary seventeenth century writers is of a static and hierarchical society. Though mankind was considered as the head of a divinely ordained creation, it was itself further divided into classes or estates. The first estate comprised the clergy and the second consisted of the nobility. The third estate was made up of everybody else. Within each estate were further ranks and subdivisions. Even the nobility had further internal class distinctions between the *noblesse d'épée* and the *noblesse de robe* (the 'old' and the 'new' nobility), though intermingling was not uncommon.[59] Royal policy towards the aristocracy was directed at curtailing its power. The new nobility had risen up the social ladder through service and loyalty to the king so they were easier to tame but the old nobility 'did not surrender its notions of honour and independence readily.'[60] Holding an office was no substitute for an august lineage. The old nobility's view of itself is best exemplified in the following question, one of twenty-two that constituted the proofs of nobility demanded for entry into the Italian langue of the Order of St John:

Has he ever worked in any sort of merchandise, wool, silk, or anything else, or in a bank counting money, or writing, or has exercised any form of trade baser than these, or mechanical or practised some trade in any form? [61]

---

[57] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 37.
[58] Max Beloff, *The Age of Absolutism: 1660-1815* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2014), 75.
[59] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 160.
[60] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 159.
[61] AOM 4754, f.5r, 4 September 1645. '*Se ha esercitato manualmente qualche sorte di Mercanzia, o di Lana, o di Seta, o di qualsivoglia altra cosa, se e' stato al Banco a contar danari, o vero a servire, o ha esercitato altra arte piu vile, e meccanica, & insomma che professione ha fatto, e con che sorte di persone ha praticato*'.

The questions were addressed to four witnesses. Alessandro Venturi, a lawyer who had exercised his profession for the Order and a friend of the Sacchetti family had answered in the negative, adding the comment that even considering his age this would be impossible. Marcello was born to Marchese Don Matteo (1593-1658/1659?) and Cassandra Ricasoli-Rucellai in 1644, six years after Louis XIV. His proofs of nobility are dated 4 September 1645. His career had been sealed at the tender age of one. Noble families sought to enhance their prestige by initiating their younger sons into one of the military orders.

The questions set out to prove nobility show the obsession that early modern society had with prestige. This question was extended for the men on Marcello's paternal and maternal side. The Order had retained the view that nobility was not merely a question of riches and privileges. There was lineage (at least two hundred years of noble ancestry for the Italian langue) and revenue that did not come from labour of any sort. In truth, an exception was made for the Sacchetti. Although a leading Florentine family since the middle ages, they only acquired the title of *marquisat* in 1633.[62] Another question which throws light on the self-perception of contemporary nobility is whether the Sacchetti and Ricasoli families claimed nobility by associating themselves with aristocratic families, to which the answer was that they were original nobles and not by association.[63] This was particularly important in view of the tendency of selling office positions for which accepted noble lineage had been a criterion, a tendency which gathered momentum in the seventeenth century especially in the courts of Vienna, Paris and Rome.[64] The contemporary writer Charles Loyseau (1564-1627) lamented the fact that distinctions were no longer clear: 'Knights have their spurs and gilt harness, at least that was of old their particular badge, but nowadays he has it who will buy it.'[65] The implication of this is that the nobility was not a heterogeneous class as the neat division of three estates implies. This trend eroded to some extent the power of the old nobility based on patronage and

---

[62] See this work, Chapter 10.
[63] AOM 4754, f.8v, 4 September 1645: '*Se nella Citta di firenze si aggregano familgie popolari alla nobilta, e se le dette sono aggregate, e da quanto tempo in qua. The answer being, Le famiglie soprad[ett]e sono nobili origin[a]li e non aggregati, e cosi tenerle e essere tenuti universalm[en]te*.'
[64] T. Munck, Seventeenth-Century Europe, 150.
[65] Charles Loyeaux, *A Treatise of Orders and Plain Dignities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 13.

local autonomy, a trend which facilitated the rise of absolute monarchy.[66] The latter decades of the seventeenth century are characterised by the absolute system of government albeit in various forms.[67] Patrimonial absolutism of the French monarchy had become a model of greatness which some rulers sought to imitate. Spain, Portugal, Tuscany, Naples, Savoy and the Papal States would fall under this category.[68] The defining trait of an absolute government was that the ruler united both executive and legislative powers in his person. Absolutism does not imply that monarchs were all powerful in every aspect of government but that rulers attempted, mostly successfully, to ignore representative institutions within their territories.[69] Even in Malta the chapter-general, which was the Order's legislative authority, was not called again after 1631 until 1776.[70]

The dominant position that France had successfully established waned as the century drew to a close. Financial disorganisation took its toll on both Spain and France, whereas fiscally efficient Britain and the Netherlands proved themselves to be much more resilient. The Empire regained new vigour partly due to renewed support from the German states especially after the lifting of the Siege of Vienna in 1683. This was not to be the last Ottoman attack on Christian territory. Venice in particular had to tread carefully due to its territorial and commercial proximity to the Ottoman Empire which policy often brought it in conflict with the Order. The Order's ambassadors, meanwhile, tried to maintain a balancing act in Madrid, Vienna, Paris and Rome.

---

[66] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 160.
[67] Thomas Ertman, *Birth of the Leviathan. Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 35-89.
[68] T. Ertman, *Birth of the Leviathan*, 10.
[69] On Absolutism see Wolfgang Weber, 'What a Good Ruler Should Not Do: Theoretical Limits of Royal Power in European Theories of Absolutism, 1500-1700', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 26:4 (1995), 897-915.
[70] Ann Williams, 'Constitutional Development of the Order of St John', *Hospitaller Malta. Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem*, V.Mallia-Milanes (ed) (Msida: Mireva Publications, 1993), 287. See also H.J.A. Sire, *The Knights of Malta* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 77.

1.5 Conclusion

This chapter serves as a foundation upon which the rest of the work is built. An analysis of the methodology adopted enables a better understanding of the arguments that will follow and justify the choice of sources. The section concerning sources, though far from exhaustive, enables a better comprehension of the theme. Lastly, a brief overview of Europe serves to frame Sacchetti's career within a historical context by giving a general outline of the early modern political world in which he lived.

Chapter 2 Diplomacy in perspective

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the development of diplomacy, from the early beginnings in ancient Egypt down to the establishing of resident ambassadors in the early modern period. The Peace of Westphalia is discussed in some detail since it has been considered a turning point in the history of diplomacy. From the evolution of diplomacy, the chapter then turns its focus to what theorists of diplomacy had to say about the person of the ambassador, going through the qualities that the 'ideal' ambassador should possess. The aim of this chapter is therefore to present an overarching view of diplomacy, showing the links of continuity and setting the tone for the chapters which will follow.

2.2 Evolution of diplomacy

'Diplomacy is as old as the world and will not die before the world does' wrote Maulde-La-Clavière in 1893.[1] While it is not within the scope of this dissertation to delve into ancient history, yet it is pertinent to give an overview of the development of diplomacy. The earlier dichotomies between 'old' and 'new' diplomacy drawn by historians have proved artificial and are too blurred to be useful tools in understanding the emergence of Early Modern Diplomacy. As Jeremy Black said:

> Although there is often reference to turning points, no period in history can be discussed without reference to what had come earlier, and this is also the case with supposed turning points which only take on meaning in the context of change.[2]

Documents from antiquity support this fact. A set of three hundred and fifty clay tablets produced in Egypt, known collectively as the Amarna letters, serve to show how relations between states were conducted in mid-fourteenth century BC.[3] The Amarna letters can be grouped under three headings: international correspondence, administrative correspondence and documents for instruction.[4] International correspondence consists of about fifty documents mostly sent by Pharaoh to the rulers

---

[1] René de Maulde-La Clavière, *La Diplomatie au Temps de Machiavel*, 3 volumes, vol 1 (Paris, 1892), 1.
[2] Jeremy Black, *European International Relations 1648-1815* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 70.
[3] Jeremy Black, *A History of Diplomacy* (London: Reaktion Books, 2010), 19.
[4] Raymond Cohen and Raymond Westbrook (eds), *Amarna Diplomacy: The Beginnings of International Relations* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 1, 2.

of other independent states. They dealt with dynastic matters such as marriage, trade and legal queries, exchanging of gifts, and alliance and strategic issues; the whole paraphernalia of state relations or 'the mechanics of diplomacy.'[5] The second group of letters labelled administrative correspondence are letters sent to Egypt from its Canaanite vassals. They deal mostly with problems faced by the dependent states such as internal strife and security, trade, and tribute.[6] The third group are intended for instruction purposes in schools.[7] The Amarna letters demonstrate the relationship between the powers of the time. They also bear testimony to a diplomacy which was wide-ranging and sophisticated. The concern with 'status, ranking and prestige' bears uncanny resemblance to that which was typical of the Early Modern Period.[8] Another factor worthy of note is the fact that the Amarna letters were written in Akkadian which means that although Egypt was a great power, it still made use of the lingua franca of international relations of the time.[9]

It is possible to draw parellisms between the ancient and the early modern world because similar political contexts breed similar political exigencies. Thus the political context of ancient Sumer (circa 2400 B.C.) and that of Greece before and after Macedonian domination bear resemblance to what was happening in Italy in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century A.D., when the concept of permanent representation was taking hold.[10] The common factor in these instances was the large number of states within a relatively small area with larger neighbours showing unwarranted interest in them. French interest in a fragmented Italy in the late fifteenth century particularly mirrored that of Persia in Greece in the fourth century B.C.[11] On a larger scale, ancient Greece threatened by aggressive Persia served as a paradigm for a disunited Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe threatened by the Muslim 'ogre'. Such stereotypical metaphors fostered especially (but not exclusively) during the Renaissance lent high esteem to diplomatic attempts at European cooperation against

---

[5] R. Cohen and R. Westbrook (eds), *Amarna Diplomacy*, 1, 2.
[6] R. Cohen and R. Westbrook (eds), *Amarna Diplomacy*, 1, 2.
[7] R. Cohen and R. Westbrook (eds), *Amarna Diplomacy*, 1, 2.
[8] J. Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, 19.
[9] J. Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, 9-10.
[10] J. Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, 17.
[11] D.J. Mosley, 'Diplomacy and Disunion in Ancient Greece', *Phoenix* 25: 4 (1971), 319. See also, David Abulafia, 'Introduction: From Ferrante I to Charles VIII', *The French Descent into Renaissance Italy 1494-95. Antecedents and Effects*, David Abulafia (ed.) (Variorum Ashgate: Hampshire, 1995), 1-25.

the encroaching 'barbarian'. However, in spite of the flirtation of the Renaissance with the Greek classical world, Western diplomacy had to look to Imperial Rome and Byzantium for its direct ancestors. Fresh approaches to Byzantine history since the 1980s have shed new light on the influence it has exerted on the West.[12] Widely different fields such as 'music, art, thought, political symbolism and language of the early medieval West' owe much more to Byzantium than had hitherto been thought.[13] Byzantine diplomacy is considered 'of great importance in the origins of post Renaissance European diplomacy' due partly to the fact that Byzantium was one of the first states to organise a special government department that dealt with foreign affairs.[14] The concern of Byzantine diplomacy was more about the practicalities of unity and contention rather than the classical Greek legacy.[15] Unity and contention were a preoccupation in the Christian West as much as in the Christian East. Both societies harked back to their Roman legacy and both were being beleagured by an alien force. Though the similarities drawn between classical and Medieval Europe did not engender the concept of Christian cooperation yet it encouraged it.[16]

According to Mattingly this sentiment had its origin in medieval self-perception which is the point of departure in forming his theory of diplomacy, stating that 'a belief in the actual unity of Christendom, however variously felt and expressed, was a fundamental condition of all medieval political thought and activity' and that; 'Besides thinking of themselves as Christians, the people of Latin Christendom also thought of themselves, more or less consciously, as Romans.'[17] Mattingly posits the theory that the roots of Christian cooperation lay not merely in the Catholic Church, but in the memory of what it had replaced, namely the Roman Empire. The eventual predominance of Christianity in most of Europe during the Middle Ages gave again a common denominator which had not been known since Roman hegemony.[18] Politically, medieval society still vaguely viewed itself as Roman.[19] There was therefore a sense of cohesion but this did not prevent bitter internal strife. What it did

---

[12] Michael McCormick, 'Byzantium's Role in the Formation of Early Medieval Civilization: Approaches and Problems', *Illinois Classical Studies*, 12:2 (1987), 208.
[13] M. McCormick, 'Byzantium's Role', 208.
[14] *Dictionary of Diplomacy*, 38.
[15] *Dictionary of Diplomacy*, 20.
[16] J. Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, 18.
[17] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 16, 17.
[18] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 16.
[19] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 17.

was to give some concept of political and religious unity: 'the unity of the Church echoed the unity of the Roman Empire.'[20] Mattingly describes this unity as extremely complex and a comprehensive definition of it eluded even Medieval thinkers.[21] It found expression in the phrase *res publica Christiana*, a phrase which seemed to imply the baptism of the Imperial past.[22]

The importance of this ideal of the *res publica Christiana* cannot be over emphasised for the military-religious orders. Being supra national and a product of the Crusades made the concept of a unified Christendom crucial. The underlying philosophy was to bring European monarchs under the same thinking cap thus having the capture of the Holy Land and the defence of the Papacy before all dynastic or state interests. With the papacy as their official head and the recapture and defence of the Holy Land as their official aim, the military orders were staunch upholders of this ideal. It ensured their popularity and guaranteed material help. A common Christian front, sharing a common aim and having a common alien enemy was an elixir for military orders; it guaranteed eternal life. A truly united Christendom would have spared them the dilemma of fratricide, of having brethren serving conflicting princes, and of having to declare strict neutrality with the danger it incurred, namely being hated by all parties involved.

This idea that 'Latin Christendom still knew itself to be one' has come under criticism lately.[23] Watkins levies the criticism that 'Like other accounts of the unifying medieval experience of faith, Mattingly's ignores the historical contingency of his sources', and that Mattingly's views follow Burckhardt's romantic ideal of the Renaissance too closely, in that within the former's treatment of diplomacy lies the latter's stereotype of a medieval world 'woven of faith, childlike prejudices, and illusion'.[24] This calls for some qualification. Firstly, it is important to distinguish between faith and religion. Faith is an internal emotion which is very hard to gauge. Religion is the external manifestation of a faith. That medieval society was permeated by religion is hard to deny. From birth till death, life was punctuated by religion. The day was marked by the tolling of bells, the year interspersed by religious feasts. There

---

[20] Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 4.
[21] G. Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy, 16.
[22] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 18.
[23] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 16.
[24] Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1981), 81.

were rites from birth till death which staggered people's lives and Canon law, governed society. It was possible for a Scotsman to go to pilgrimage to Spain and still recognise both language and form of worship. Religion was therefore a common denominator with which Western medieval society identified.

Watkins argued that 'the discourse of the *res publica Christiana* arose during specific historical circumstances' namely 'as a rallying cry urging Christians to stop fighting among themselves and to take up common arms against the Muslim Infidel.'[25] According to Watkins, by basing his (Mattingly's) theory of medieval diplomacy on Du Rosier's 'the grand object of all diplomacy is peace', Mattingly ignored the fact that papal interest in peace in the West was merely an attempt at redirecting violence towards Muslims and enemies of the papacy, a policy which was repeated by 'several sixteenth-century popes in their campaigns against Protestantism'.[26] The conclusion that Watkins reached is that Mattingly's history of Renaissance diplomacy is based on 'unstable dichotomies.'[27]

Watkins' conclusion, however, does not take into account a fundamental aspect which is perfectly outlined in Weiler's article, which he cited. The discourse on the *res publica Christiana* certainly arose during a specific time when Christendom was under threat. But the papal appeal was not a papal invention. It was heeded to and took root and lasted well into the early modern period because it was present in the medieval mind in the first place:

> The role played by successive popes in disseminating and enforcing the idea could not have been played successfully had they devised it themselves; only by responding to and elaborating on contemporary sensitivities, beliefs, and attitudes. To legitimize political actions by reference to the needs of the Holy Land was only possible if the idea was already accepted as a precept.[28]

The Church was therefore appealing to sentiments already present in the society of its time. More than sowing new ideas, the Pope was harvesting the fruits of established conceptions. War with Islam had been going on for over three hundred years, with the first Christian victory in the West attributed to Charles Martel in Poitiers in 732. The term *res publica Christiana* was not coined as early as the first Crusade. It was first

---

[25] John Watkins, 'Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 39:1 (2008), 2, 3.
[26] J. Watkins, 'Toward a New Diplomatic History', 3.
[27] J. Watkins, 'Toward a New Diplomatic History', 3.
[28] Björn Weiler, 'The "Negotium Terrae Sanctae" in the Political Discourse of Latin Christendom, 1215-1311.', *The International History Review*, 25:1 (2003), 35.

used by the adviser of the French King Philippe IV (1268-1314), the jurist Pierre Dubois (1250-1320) in the treatise *De recuperatione Terrae Sanctae* (1305 -1307).[29] The original phrase read '*unita tota respublica christicolarum ecclesie romane obedientium*' translated as 'The whole commonwealth of Christian believers owing allegiance to the Roman Church.'[30] The threat to this Catholic commonwealth was present and real as long as its enemy was felt to be present and real. As Braudel says:

> Islam was a powerful neighbour, and Christianity had to undertake a difficult and dramatic campaign against it, inventing its own Holy War, the Crusade. Crusading became interminable. The First Crusade – not, obviously, the first war with Islam but the first that was collective, self-conscious and spectacular.[31]

Although these Christian campaigns came to an end in 1291 when Acre fell, yet the ideal of *res publica Christiana* with its military arm in the shape of the Crusade became an 'obsessive mystique' which kept resurfacing in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth century.'[32]

The Order of St John was established when fiery discourse on the liberation of the Holy Land was rife and its diplomacy was forged by the same fire. Appeals to the concept of the *res publica Christiana* kept recurring in the Early Modern Period when the Order felt that its privileges were under threat. For instance, when in 1682 Pope Innocent XI had granted permission to the King of Portugal to levy taxes on property of the Orders of the Church, the ambassador Fra Marcello Sacchetti appealed to the pope, citing both legal means and the time hallowed argument of defending the Christian Republic:

> Humbly we supplicate Your Holiness to declare that it was not nor is it his intention to include the aforementioned [Military] Orders since these privileges were given to them *Titolo Oneroso*, that is not only utilise their possessions, but also shed their blood in defence of the Christian Republic fighting against the Turk, as the Rota confirms in Decision 72 number 6.[33]

---

[29] Pierre Dubois, *De recuperatione Terrae Sanctae*, Alphonse Picard (ed) (Chartres, 1891), 7. It was dedicated to King Edward I of England.

[30] Pierre Dubois, *The Recovery of the Holy Land*, translated with an introduction and notes by Walther I. Brandt (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), 69. Dubois's book was dedicated to King Edward I of England.

[31] Fernand Braudel, *A History of Civilizations* (New York: Penguin Books, 1995), 309.

[32] F. Braudel, *A History of Civilizations*, 309.

[33] AOM 1297, f.140r, 10 October 1682: '*Humilmente supplicano la Sant[ita] Vostra dichiarare non fuisse nec esse suo intentionij di comprendere li detti ordini atteso che detti privileggi li sono stati concessi Titulo Oneroso cioe per consumare non solo li loro beni, ma anco spargere il sangue in difesa della Rep[ubblica] Christiana militando contra Turcas come lo ferma la Rota nella Decis[ion]e 72 n[umer]o 6.*' The legal term *titolo oneroso* is translated as 'for valuable consideration', that is 'consideration sufficient to sustain an enforcable agreement'. Note also that '*unita tota respublica christicolarum ecclesie romane obedientium*' had become '*res publica Christiana*'.

The defence of Christendom was not merely the self perception of the Order. This same definition and the noble aim of Christian unification is found in Mazarin's instruction to his godson; the seventeen year old Louis XIV:

> In 1655, Cardinal Mazarin put into the mouth of his master, the young Louis XIV, this definition of the Order of St John: it was an army whose function was to fight the enemies of Christendom, 'and to work for the unification of Christian princes.'[34]

The Order of St John might have claimed some success in fighting the enemies of Christendom but the seventeenth century revealed that 'the unification of Christian princes' was mere utopian dreaming. The pages of Europe's early modern history bristle with blades and are riddled with musket balls. The first half of the seventeenth century was marked by a period of hostilities known as the Thirty Years' War, although this term, implying a definable coherent war, has been challenged by historians.[35] The conflicts, lasting from 1618 to 1648, were widespread and their reasons complex. Clashes between the Habsburg emperors and their rebellious subjects soon embroiled other European powers. The French dynasty, in its search for secure frontiers, found itself at war with both branches of the Habsburg family. Spain took up arms to safeguard its possessions in Northern Italy. The United Provinces renewed their struggle for independence from their Spanish overlords. Denmark, Sweden, Poland and Muscovy brought in their ancient rivalry into the melee. Underlining all this was the religious aspect as princes attempted to consolidate their choice Christian denomination or eradicate its threat, pitting against each other Counter-Reformation Catholicism, Calvinism and Lutheranism. Lastly, commercial and strategic interests between sea-faring powers extended the conflict from the Baltic to the Spanish Empire in the New World. Thus, although fought largely on German soil, 'few parts of Europe remained unscathed.'[36]

Such an unprecedented scale of conflict fostered diplomatic activity. Attempts at peace negotiations continued throughout the war, often parallel with military manoeuvres. This paradoxical state of affairs brought to the forefront the importance of 'intelligence', defined as 'information, whether foreign or defence, political or

---

[34] David F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors' in Counter Reformation Europe', *The Military Orders: Welfare and Warfare*, Helen Nicholson (ed.) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 363. He quotes AOM 1200, ff.449-450; AOM 1776, ff.309-311.

[35] Thomas Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598-1700* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 1. See also, G. Mortimer, 'Did Contemporaries Recognize a 'Thirty Years War'?', *The English Historical Review*, 116: 465 (2001), 124-136.

[36] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 1-2.

economic, secret or openly available.'[37] News of the efforts of diplomacy, whether fact or fantasy, influenced the efforts of the military.[38] The quest for allies spurred on further diplomatic endeavours. The Peace of Prague (1635), brokered by the Empire, alarmed the United Provinces and Sweden.[39] The latter, having the military expertise but not the financial means, joined forces with France, which was militarily backward but could muster more resources.[40] The Swedish chancellor Oxenstierna (1612-1654) had urged the senate to discuss the matter of preparing personnel for state roles.[41] The Spanish invasion of Trier in 1635 goaded France into an alliance with Savoy, Parma and Mantua.[42] Denmark replaced its sporadic missions with permanent diplomats in foreign courts, setting up resident embassies in Stockholm, Paris and The Hague by the 1630s and consulates in Vienna, Madrid and Brussels a decade later.[43] Frantic fighting had generated feverish diplomacy.

Bringing such a widespread and disjointed conflict to an acceptable end had to be a diplomatic feat. The congress which hosted the negotiations to resolve the Thirty Years War was held in the Westphalian towns of Catholic Münster and Protestant Osnabrück between 1644 and 1648.[44] Historians have magnified the importance of Westphalia, to the extent that it lent its name to the political reality that emerged after it, hence:

> The term 'Westphalian system' is sometimes 'used to describe the post-1648 system of international relations that is, that in which states – secular, sovereign, independent, and equal - are the members, and stability is preserved by the balance of power, diplomacy and international law.'[45]

Westphalia came to be considered the birthplace of diplomacy proper and 1648 as the birth year of diplomacy as a recognisable institution. A staunch advocate of this belief,

---

[37] *Dictionary of Diplomacy*, 199.
[38] Derek Croxton, '"The Prosperity of Arms is Never Continual": Military Intelligence, Surprise, and Diplomacy in 1640s Germany', *Journal of Military History*, 64 (2000), 981-1004.
[39] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 22.
[40] Peter H.Wilson, *The Thirty Years War. Europe's Tragedy* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 464-465.
[41] Heidrun R.I. Kugeler, '"Le Parfait Ambassadeur". The Theory and Practice of Diplomacy in the Century following the Peace of Westphalia.' (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Magdalen college, University of Oxford, 2006), 168-169. For details of Oxenstiernia's political career, see T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 63-64.
[42] Daniela Frigo, '"Small States" and Diplomacy: Mantua and Modena', *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy. The Structure of Diplomatic Practice, 1450-1800*, Daniela Frigo (ed) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 170.
[43] J. Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, 63.
[44] *Dictionary of Diplomacy*, 389-390.
[45] *Dictionary of Diplomacy*, 389-390.

Leon van der Essen considered the embassy to have been elevated to the dignity of an official institution after Westphalia and that 'from that moment (1648), the institution (diplomacy) crystallised: everything became regularised and ordered in a rigid and definitive manner.'[46] Garrett Mattingly was not immune to this sentiment, declaring perhaps with more enthusiasm than accuracy, 'After the Treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees the period of modern diplomacy really begins.'[47] Such an approach is overly simplistic and has to be treated with caution. It ignores the evolutionary nature of the states-system, exaggerating the contribution of Westphalia in giving states the four characteristics of secularity, sovereignty, independence, and equality.[48]

At first glance, the treaty of Westphalia might seem to have ended the papal claim of universal authority and confirmed the diplomatic independence of secular princes. However, Protestantism within the Empire had been recognised prior to 1648, in the Treaty of Nuremberg of 1532 for instance.[49] The Peace of Augsburg in 1555 also acknowledged Protestantism, albeit reluctantly. The official position of the papacy at Westphalia was one of condemnation.[50] Urban VIII, although one of the organizers of the congress, was aware of the limited authority that the papacy bore and rather than try to impose the Catholic badge on the proceedings avoided the role of arbitrator and instead, 'in order to spare the sensitivity of the warring powers and not to endanger the peace process, fearfully avoided any appearance of influencing the parties.'[51] He even instructed the papal nunzio to make no proposals himself.[52] The attitude of the papacy towards the terms of Westphalia was one of reticence. It would not be seemly to condone heretics but it could not exert pressure on the Emperor to adopt a more radical attitude towards its Protestant subjects for the simple reason that it could not risk antagonising its major protector within the Empire.[53] The Church chose to bide its time, 'until a universal council could be summoned to reunite the various branches of Christianity'.[54] Westphalia was only one of a series of congresses

---

[46] Leon Van der Essen, 'Le rôle d'un ambassadeur au XVIIe siècle. Contribution à l'histoire de la diplomatie', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*. 2:2 (1923), 307-308. '*Dès ce moment, l'institution se cristallise: tout se réglemente et s'ordonne d'une manière rigide et définitive*.'
[47] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 178.
[48] Dictionary of Diplomacy, 389-390.
[49] D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia', 572.
[50] D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia', 572.
[51] D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia', 572.
[52] D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia', 572.
[53] D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia', 572.
[54] D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia', 572.

and no more binding than its predecessors. The mediaeval conception of a uniform Catholic Europe had not died down.

Linked with the notion that Westphalia had ushered in the secular state is that it also established the concept of sovereignty. The word 'sovereignty' has no exact translation in Latin, the original language of the documents of the Treaty. The closest was *Supremum Dominium*.[55] In the French translation, the term 'sovereignty' appears only five times, three of which acknowledge the handing over of territories previously held by the Empire to France.[56] Another made similar grants to the Duke of Savoy and his vassal.[57] The last mention of the term sovereignty is in article 107, which concerns towns that had exchanged hands. It confirmed the rights, benefits and privileges 'which they enjoyed before these troubles … save, nevertheless, the Rights of Sovereignty.'[58] An overemphasis on the changes brought about by Westphalia has prompted for instance, the claim that 'After 1648, national sovereignty, characterized by autonomy and interstate competition, became the primary governing system among European states.'[59] This idea hinges on the hyperbolic belief that 1648 spelt the demise of the Holy Roman Empire. The Holy Roman Empire survived as a title until 1806.[60] The Confederation of the Rhine created by Napoleon was the only form of union of German territories for some time.[61] Thereafter the Austrian Emperor retained some control over the German states until the Prussian victory at Königgrätz in 1866.[62] The Emperor had long lost complete control of those Imperial territories to which Article VIII had supposedly granted a degree of sovereignty. The States attained the right to vote in all considerations on the affairs of the Empire and the right to make alliances, even with foreign powers, provided these alliances were not directed against the

---

[55] G. Braun, 'Les traductions francaises des traits de Westphalie: de 1648 à la fin de l'ancien régime', *XVIIe siècle*, 48 (1996), 190, 131-155.
[56] Yale Law School, *The Avalon Project*. *Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy*, retrieved on 25 July 2015 from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/westphal.asp, Articles LXXI, LXXIII and LXXVI.
[57] Yale Law School, *The Avalon Project*, Article CI.
[58] Yale Law School, *The Avalon Project*, Article CXVII.
[59] Jason Farr, 'The Westphalia Legacy and the Modern Nation-State', *International Social Science Review*, 80:3/4 (2005), 156.
[60] Joachim Whaley, *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire, vol II, From the Peace of Westphalia to the Dissolution of the Reich 1648-1806* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 644.
[61] J. Whaley, *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire*, 638.
[62] Robert William Seton-Watson, 'The Austro-Hungarian Ausgleich of 1867', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 19:53/54, The Slavonic Year-Book (1939 - 1940), 123.

Empire.[63] These grants however, underlined the curbing of sovereignty rather than celebrated its achievement. Sending representatives to the Imperial Diet acknowledged the superiority of the Emperor, not diminished it. Moreover, the States had had the right to make alliances long before 1648.[64] This was actually an amendment to the Peace of Passau in 1552, when the nobles had been granted the right to join foreign armies as mercenaries, even armies directed against the Empire.[65] In fact, the Electors of Bavaria and Cologne, both allies of France during the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714) 'were placed under the Imperial ban in 1706, depriving them of their rights and privileges, and they did not regain these until the war came to a close with the Treaty of Rastatt in 1714.'[66] The States still recognised the Emperor as their nominal overlord, still paid common taxes and raised a joint army.[67] As Jeremy Black succinctly put it:

> First, effective autonomy had long existed within the Empire, second, the process of Imperial disunity and the effective sovereignty of individual princes had been greatly advanced as a result of the Reformation, and, third the changes should be seen as an adaptation of a weak federal system, rather than as a turning point.[68]

The United Provinces fared even less better in matters of sovereignty and independence, although some historians still claim otherwise. Ronald Asch, for instance, argues that Westphalia granted both sovereignty and independence to the Circle of Burgundy, of which the United Provinces formed part.[69] Article IV of the Treaty underlines the opposite:

> That the Circle of Burgundy shall be and continue a Member of the Empire, after the Disputes between France and Spain (comprehended in this Treaty) shall be terminated. That nevertheless, neither the Emperor, nor any of the States of the Empire, shall meddle with the Wars which are now on foot between them. That if for the future any Dispute arises between these two Kingdoms, the above said reciprocal Obligation of not aiding each others Enemys, shall always continue firm between the Empire and the Kingdom of France, but yet so as that it shall be free for the States to succour; without the bounds of the Empire, such or such Kingdoms, but still according to the Constitutions of the Empire.[70]

---

[63] Wyndham A. Bewes, 'Gathered Notes on the Peace of Westphalia of 1648', *Transactions of the Grotius Society*, 19 (1933), 68.
[64] D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia of 1648', 573.
[65] D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia of 1648', 573.
[66] J. Black, *History of Diplomacy*, 64-65.
[67] J. Black, *History of Diplomacy*, 574.
[68] J. Black, *European International Relations*, 74.
[69] Ronald Asch, *The Thirty Years War: The Holy Roman Empire and Europe, 1618-48* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), 144.
[70] Yale Law School, *The Avalon Project*, Article IV.

This clause was inserted so that France could make a separate peace with the Empire and continue its war with Spain. Through this clause France also obtained a guarantee of neutrality from the Empire and its States. Hardly a triumph of independence and sovereignty, this was more a French diplomatic coup.[71] The Franco-Spanish struggle wore on till the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659), 'which was more of a compromise than is usually appreciated…'.[72] France gained Artois and Roussillon, Louis XIV gained a bride; Maria Theresa, the daughter of Philip IV (1621-1640) but Spain retained its presence in the Low-Lands and Italy.[73]

Neither Westphalia nor the Pyrenees brought lasting peace in Europe. The theatre of war shifted from one region to another. The Baltic remained a bone of contention between Sweden and Denmark. The English and the Dutch both had commercial interests and thus sought to maintain stability in that area with neither Sweden nor Denmark gaining monopoly of the sea.[74] France in the last four decades of the seventeenth century emerged as particularly belligerent, a befitting epithet considering the foreign policy of Louis XIV: 'Most of the European conflicts of the last four decades of the century… hinged on dynastic or treaty claims pursued more or less on the King's personal initiative.'[75]

Louis XIV took great interest in diplomacy as much as he did in war, both being useful tools for pursuing French policy of curbing Habsburg power as much as for personal aggrandizement.[76] With its financial resources and the web of diplomatic missions, France was therefore in a position to exert great influence on European relations of the period.[77] 'In diplomacy, as in government and in culture, seventeenth-century France led the way.'[78] The trend of establishing resident embassies was soon picked up by other states, both major and minor. For the former, it was a means to thwart French domination in international affairs.[79] For the smaller states, diplomacy was an even greater necessity. Ruling families of minor states needed to procure

---

[71] See D. Croxton, 'The Peace of Westphalia', 575.
[72] J. Black, *European International Relations*, 75.
[73] J. Black, *European International Relations*, 74-75.
[74] J. Black, *European International Relations*, 76.
[75] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 397.
[76] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 397, 399. For French anti-Habsburg policy, see Friedrich Heer, *The Holy Roman Empire* (London: Orion Books, 1996), 216.
[77] T. Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe*, 399.
[78] Derek McKay, Hamish Marshall Scott, *The Rise of the Great Powers 1648-1815* (London-New York: Longman, 1983), 202.
[79] D. McKay, H. M. Scott, *The Rise of the Great Powers 1648-1815*, 201.

suitable alliances primarily for their own security both at home and abroad.[80] Secondly, having the right allies was a guarantee against political oblivion which would have undermined the prestige of these dynasties.[81] What could not be achieved by expensive armies on European battlefields could be achieved by expedient ambassadors in European courts.

This, however, was no novelty in European affairs. The concept of resident embassies did not materialise merely after Westphalia. For instance by 1547 France had ten resident ambassadors abroad.[82] On the Italian peninsula, the princedoms and republics had established permanent embassies in each other's capitals by the 1540s.[83] The concept of resident embassies had thus already taken hold by the first decades of the sixteenth century, only to be checked by the gathering momentum of the Counter-Reformation.[84] Similarly, the Thirty Years War disrupted the further evolution of permanent representation. The Peace of Westphalia did not usher a new period in diplomacy.[85] Rather, Europe resumed the ties that had been so brutally severed. Changing circumstances gave the diplomacy of the last decades of the seventeenth century its own flavour, its own characteristics but did not create the concept. Diplomacy after Westphalia was not an invention, but an inheritance.

2.3 Treatises and theorists

By the middle of the fifteenth century diplomacy had gained the mark of an institution and its exponents came to be considered as an integral part of the machinery of state. This elevated the status of the ambassador to a trusted official of the ruler, not merely his messenger. This was the logical outcome of permanent representation. Sporadic diplomacy could not have attained this status because by its very nature it was aimed at executing a mission not of maintaining an office representing one's prince in a foreign country. Hand in hand with the gradual development towards permanent diplomacy there grew a body of literature on the profession of ambassador. There had been medieval works which had included the subject, treated from a legal point of view. These medieval legal treatises were given 'a new lease of life through their

[80] D. Frigo, 'Introduction', in *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy*, 18-19.
[81] D. Frigo, 'Introduction', in *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy*, 18-19.
[82] M. S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450-1919* (London: Longman, 1993), 9.
[83] M. S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 9.
[84] M. S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 10.
[85] J. Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, 65.

incorporation in the larger collection of treatises printed in the sixteenth century.'[86] There are eight extant works on the ambassador dated between 1436 and 1548, and another two dealing with papal legates.[87] However in the short span between 1625 and 1700 there appeared no less than one hundred and fifty three treatises dealing with the ambassador, a hundred and fourteen of these being new titles.[88] Other works were published after 1700, notably François de Callières' *De la manière de négocier avec les souverains : De l'utilité des négociations, du choix des ambassadeurs et des envoyés et des qualités nécessaires pour réussir dans ces emplois* which appeared in 1716, and Antoine Pecquet *Discours sur L'Art de Negocier* (1717). Callieres' work has been much praised, the highest accolade being 'it is almost impossible to speak too highly of his work'.[89]

A number of these works remained tied to the past. Thus for instance, Conrad Braun's *De Legationibus* (1548) retained a legalistic outlook, adopting a scholastic style with *quaestiones* concerning legal matters and the corresponding answer propped up by a host of conventional authorities such as Scripture, canon and civil law and the arguments of philosophers.[90] Most of their content was also distant from actual practice. Thus Giovanni Bertacchini in his *Repertorium* (1481) argues whether an ambassador should be fully compensated for his journey if he does not proceed directly to his destination.[91] Similarly Martin Garratus in *Tractatus de Legatis maxime Principum* discusses whether an ambassador should be paid when sick or on Sundays.[92] Concerned with the increasing importance of the ambassador's office, these authors turned their gaze to the past to see what the approved authorities had to say about the matter. Their works therefore, do not always mirror the practices of their present but the inherited concepts of their past. For instance, the medieval definition

---

[86] Alain Wiffels, 'Early Modern Scholarship on International Law', *Research Handbooks in International Law*, Alexander Orakhelashvili (ed) (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2011), 38.
[87] B. Behrens, 'Treatises on the Ambassador written in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries', *The English Historical Review*, 51:204 (1936), 617.
[88] Maurice Keens-Soper, 'Francois de Callieres and Diplomatic Theory', *The Historical Journal*, 26:3 (1973), 487.
[89] Eustace Clare Grenville Murray, *Embassies and Foreign Courts. A History of Diplomacy* (London: Routledge, 1855), 30.
[90] Paolo Margaroli, *Diplomazia e Stati Rinascimentali. Le ambascerie sforzesche fino alle conclusione della Lega italica (1450-1455)* (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1992), 9.
[91] B. Behrens, 'Treatises', 617.
[92] Martinus Garratus, *Tractatus de Legatis maxime Principum*, Tractatus Universi Juris, xiii, pt. 2, 1584, 36. (Cited in B. Behrens, 'Treatises', 617.)

of an ambassador being 'anyone sent from another' lingered on in a number of treatises even when agents not backed by a state had long been denied the right of embassy.[93] Another factor that harked back to a previous era was that an ambassador served the entire 'Christian Republic' not merely his prince, an ideal to which 'many seventeenth-century theoreticians still gave lip service.'[94] The Renaissance revival of classical scholarship ironically made theorists even more backward looking by considering contemporary practices as paling next to the glory of antiquity and thus unworthy of observation.[95]

However some of these works began to shake off the shackles dictated by previous methodology and became more empirical in tone, appealing not only to the great works of antiquity but also to observation and experience. This innovation is first evident in Bernard de Rosier's *Ambaxiator Brevilogus* (1436). In this work Rosier made use of his experience in Rome rather than rely merely on *a priori* reasoning to render a depiction of the purpose of the function of the ambassador. Astute remarks for the need of dexterity and prudence in handling situations also reflect his drawing from personal experience of existing diplomatic practice.[96] Rosier's contribution seemed to be a medium between the scholastic approach such as Braun, Bertacchino and Martin Garratus and the treatises written by humanist thinkers. Of the latter, the first two to appear after Rosier were Ermoloa Barbaro's *De Officio Legati* published in 1489 and Etienne Dolet's essay with the same title published in 1541. Both authors had had experience in the diplomatic field and both departed from the previous formula of appealing to antiquity and were concerned more with what their present had to teach. In fact, Barbaro was already envisaging the function of diplomacy on a 'national level' as De Lamar states:

> By the end of the sixteenth century diplomatic practice had tested and proved the validity of Ermolao Barbaro's appraisal of it a hundred years before, that its function was the preservation and aggrandizement of the state.[97]

---

[93] J. L. Holzgrefe, 'The Origins of Modern International Relations Theory', *Review of International Studies*, 15:1 (1989), 17.
[94] Willima J. Roosen, 'The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV', *French Historical Studies*, 16:3 (1970), 312.
[95] B. Behrens, '*Treatises*', 619.
[96] B. Behrens, '*Treatises*', 619.
[97] Jensen De Lamar, 'French Diplomacy and the Wars of Religion', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 5:2 (1974), 43.

The next work was by Ottaviano Maggi. Published in 1566, the work entitled *De Legato libri Duo*, makes use of both ancient references and contemporary examples. The next decade saw four important treatises written by two French and two Italians: Felix de La Mothe Le Vayer's *Legatus, seu De legatorum privilegiis, officio et munere libellus* (1579) and Pierre Ayrault's *De Legationibus* (1588). Torquato Tasso's *Il Messagero* (1582) and Alberico Gentili's *De Legationibus. Libri Tres* (1585) were the Italian contribution. Ayrault was the first to declare that the ambassador is both present and absent in his country although the credit is very often erraneously given to Grotius.[98] A body of literature on diplomacy was thus forming as the sixteenth century came to a close. Most of these works remained in print well into the seventeenth century, thus subsequent authors had access to their predecessors. This ensured an amount of influence on later authors. From their works, it is evident that all theorists borrowed liberally from each other.[99]

The first two decades of the seventeenth century saw twenty new titles on the ambassador. Four authors in particular stand out: Jean Hotman de Villiers, Herman Kirchner, Frederick van Marselaer and Juan Antonio De Vera, the latter being considered as 'one of the most famous treatises on the ambassador of the modern era.'[100] Or as Mattingly put it: ''when the seventeenth century spoke of 'The Perfect Ambassador' it meant De Vera's book.'[101] The treatise was orginally called simply *El Enbaxador* (*El Embajador*) – The Ambassador, when it was first published in Seville in 1620. The adjective '*Parfait*' – Perfect, crept in with the first French translation in 1635. Subsequent translations, two more in French in 1642 and 1709 and three in Italian (1649, 1654 and 1674) retained the adjective. The popularity of this work is attested by the number of translations, as Conchi Gutierrez says:

> He [De Vera] managed to influence the European political discourse of the seventeenth century through his treatise on the ambassador, called El Enbaxador (El Embajador), later translated as The Perfect Ambassador, published in Seville in 1620. This influence is credited by the six European editions of the book: three in French, in 1635, 1642 and 1709, and three in Italian, in 1649, 1654 and 1674. Also, in less than a century, the book was eligible as a representative of the Republic of Letters, as shown by the review of the 1709 edition published in Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres.

---

[98] J. Craig Barker, The Protection of Diplomatic Personnel (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 43. '*Il y sera tenu pour absent et pour present en son pays*.'
[99] Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (New York: Dover Publications, 1955), 182.
[100] Dante Fedele, 'Naissance de la Diplomatie Moderne. L'ambassadeur au croisement du droit, de l'éthique et de la politique' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Lyon, 2014), 51.
[101] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 181.

Nouvelles was one of the first European journals of literary criticism; Pierre Bayle, the French exile and scholar, was its editor.[102]

De Vera's importance comes not from his originality as much as the wide range of his sources. In fact, few if any of the theorists mentioned were completely original. They borrowed freely and unabashadely from each other so that the picture each painted was loosely based on the same model.[103] Moreover, writers adhered to the format established by de Rosier in 1436 and each one dealt with the following themes: the origins and functions of diplomacy, who bears the right to send ambassadors, the qualities and virtues of the ambassador, his knowledge and education, his relationship with his own prince and the one to whom he is assigned, his behaviour at court, and his privileges and immunity. Thus a synoptic analysis would render a more faithful picture of the ideal of the Early Modern Ambassador than individual dissection of each treatise.

The nobility of the art is underlined by tracing its family tree to mythical or biblical origins. So both de Vera and La Mothe-Le-Vayer held that the birth of diplomacy became essential after the opening of Pandora's box.[104] Gentili glorified the origins of diplomacy even further by appealing to scripture: 'the first ones [ambassadors] were the angels of God'. Indeed, some authors seemed to retain this angelic image in the way they insisted on the purity of the person. All treatises agree that morality should be the lodestone of the ambassador. Thus Bernard du Rosier listed a number of virtues, amongst which he mentions veracity, uprightness, modesty, temperateness, discreetness, kindness, honesty and sobriety.[105] Ermolao Barbaro wrote that the ambassador must have 'hands and eyes as pure as those of the priest officiating at the altar.'[106] Dolet states that the morals of the ambassador are to be so strict that none can find fault in him.[107] He even extends this uprightness to the

---

[102] Conchi Gutierrez, 'Ambassadors on duty, promoters of their own books: the case of de Vera's Enbaxador', Lecture presented for the Renaissance Society of America, Berlin, 2015. See also Conchi Guiterrez, 'The diplomacy of letters of the Count of La Roca in Venice (1632-1642)', *Embajadores culturales. Transferencias y lealtades de la diplomacia espanola de la Edad Moderna*, Diana Carrió-Invernizzi (ed), Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (Madrid, 2016), 187-204.
[103] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 184.
[104] J.J. Jusserand, 'The School for Ambassadors', *The American Historical Review*, 26:3 (1922), 427-428.
[105] Bernard du Rosier, *Ambaxiator Brevilogus*, 5.
[106] Ermolao Barbaro, *De Offici Legati*, 70.
[107] Etienne Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate, commonly called ambassador', *The American Journal of International Law*, 27:1 (1933), 87.

ambassador's servants because as he says, 'the estimate of our characters will be largely based upon the lives of our servants'.[108] Thus the servants chosen are to be continent, sober and self-controlled and not arrogant nor impudent nor inclined to do anyone harm, nor given to any form of wickedness, to lust or to gluttony'.[109] Jean Hotman agrees to the moral uprightness described in other works and adds being charitable to the poor, honesty and trustworthiness.[110] Bragaccia states that first and foremost an ambassador is to place his trust in God as the source of all good.[111] This does not imply that these writers were not shrewd observers of human nature. They were describing the ideal not the actual reality, as Gentili qualifies: 'I know very well how much I depart from the current code, but I paint ambassadors not as they are, but as they ought to be.'[112]

The moral virtues of the ambassador is the section that occupies most space in the treatises. Mattingly drew the conclusion that the 'moral qualities an ambassador should possess occurs in these late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers in a kind of vacuum' and 'not related at all to the ends a diplomat should seek.'[113] This is debatable. Bragaccia for instance, recommended charitable acts not only as service to God but also for the practical reason that such acts help gain the trust of the host prince and his court.[114] Moreover, he added the shrewd advice that charitable acts of extreme generosity should be reserved for times of crises, such as war or during a plague outbreak, as otherwise such acts would seem suspicious.[115] Hotman wrote of two main concerns of the ambassador. Firstly he is to 'represent the grandeur of his Prince.'[116] Secondly the ambassador's aim is to preserve good relations with the host country.[117] Hotman stated that it is impossible to underline minutely all the affairs that an ambassador has to deal with as they are so many and so diverse.[118] This sentiment is found in most of the other treatises, which is why they dwell so much on the virtues

---

[108] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 86.
[109] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 86.
[110] J. Jusserand, 'The School for Ambassadors', 438.
[111] Gasparo Bragaccia, *L'Ambasciatore* (Padova, 1627), 79.
[112] A. Gentili, *De Legationibus Libri Tres*, as cited by G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 189.
[113] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 187.
[114] G. Bragaccia, *L'Ambasciatore*, 95.
[115] G. Bragaccia, *L'Ambasciatore*, 95.
[116] Jean Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore del Signor Di Ville* (Venice, 1659), 21. (Jean Hotman was Marquis de Villers-St-Paul, hence 'Di Ville').
[117] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 8, 42.
[118] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 8.

that an ambassador should embrace, prudence in particular, because whatever the business at hand, the actions of the ambassador were to be governed by moral principles. Thus all theorists stressed the importance of prudence. For instance, the term prudence and its derivatives (not counting antonyms derived from the same root) occur a hundred and forty-six times in Bragaccia, fifty-eight times in De Vera and sixty-seven times in Hotman. Prudence, it must be emphasised, is not just one of many virtues, but controls all virtues and guides human actions. It is the practical virtue, defined by Aquinas as 'wisdom concerning human affairs' or 'right reason with respect to action'.[119] Mothe le Vayer described it as that virtue which guides actions, a middle path between the moral and the intellectual virtues.[120] Far from being divorced from the duties of the ambassador, the moral virtues emphasised in the treatises are to guide him in all affairs. Moreover, these virtues must be evident so that the prince is praised in the person of his ambassador and he also gains the trust of the host prince, thereby maintaining good relations and facilitating smooth negotiations. Prudence was also the guide when faced with a moral dilemma such as a conflict between telling the truth or dissembling for the good of one's country. Hotman distinguishes between lying to hurt (*fraude*) and lying to help (*buon inganno*).[121] Prudence also dictates the defence of the honour of one's country, even if that would mean hiding the truth.[122] It is true that the theorists set high standards on the ambassador's morality, but it is also true that their reason for doing so is not set in a vacuum but, in their way of reasoning, intimately entwined with the ambassador's performance of his role.

The rest of the discourse found in these treatises hinges upon this moral uprightness as all writers underlined the importance of the cardinal virtues in some form or other. Indeed, the term 'cardinal' is derived from the Latin word *carda*, meaning 'hinge'.[123] The ambassador is to be guided by a sense of higher good. Even the ambassador's precious immunity is derived from this rule of honour as De Vera

---

[119] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (*ST* IIaIIae 47.2 ad and ST IIaIIae 47.4), Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. http://www.iep.utm.edu/aq-moral/#SH3a

[120] François Mothe Le Vayer, *Scuola de Prencipi e de Cavalieri* (Bologna, 1677), 271. Le Vayer dedicated a whole chapter to prudence (chapter XIII, *Della Prudenza*, 271-275).

[121] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 55.

[122] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 43.

[123] Walter W. Skeat, *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 76.

stated: 'only when governed by this rule do ambassadors justly merit the privileges and immunity'.[124] With an example from antiquity he even added that 'Those who did not act in this manner deserved the name of spies rather than ambassadors.'[125] Thus even such a sensitive issue as diplomatic immunity was linked with the moral life of the ambassador. Hotman extended this immunity to the ambassador's household. As for the ambassador's own person:

> Everybody know that, by divine and human reason, even amongst the most barbaric of nations, amidst the weapons and armies of his enemies, the ambassador has always been throughout the centuries considered to be holy, sacred, and inviolable.[126]

Hotman and Gentili were actually consulted by the English Government upon such an issue in 1584. The Spanish ambassador, Bernardino de Mendoza (1540-1604), had been found to have plotted against the host sovereign. Both urged the government to send Mendoza back to Spain rather than execute justice upon him. Their advice is today common practice:

> How sound the advice of the two doctors was, the lapse of more than three centuries of time has abundantly proven. And the opinion that they then gave to Elizabeth and her counsellors is to-day an established rule of the law of nations against which no responsible Power would dare protest, much less act.[127]

This case justifies the emphasis that the writers made on the moral uprightness of the ambassador. He has the immense privilege of being untouchable. It is therefore expected of him to work hard to deserve it.

Such high standards were not merely restricted to the ambassador's morality. The qualities that an ambassador had were also demanding. Good looks, wealth and lineage for instance scored high on most lists. Thus Dolet advises that 'special care must be taken that the ambassador be a man suitable to his office in figure, face and stature' because 'a handsome figure moves most persons to admiration.'[128] This sentiment is echoed in others, for instance Gentili cites Aristotle that good looks are the best letter of introduction and De Vera underlines the importance of having a comely face.[129] Birth and wealth were also aspects that a prince should take into

---

[124] Juan Antonio De Vera De Cuniga, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore. Dialoghi Historici, e Politici* (Venice, 1654), 41.
[125] J. De Vera, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore*, 43.
[126] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 87, 88.
[127] Thomas Willing Balch, 'Albericus Gentilis', *The American Journal of International Law*, 5:3 (1911), 665-679.
[128] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 84.
[129] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 185.

account when choosing an ambassador. Of the latter, there was general agreement that an ambassador has to afford a certain lifestyle which came hand in hand with the profession.[130] Dolet made the curious suggestion that if the chosen man lacks the necessary funds, then the prince should compensate his ambassador according to which court he is to be sent; the greater the splendour of the court the more money to be allotted.[131] The ambassador was after all representing his prince amongst the upper echelons of a foreign country and was therefore expected to be unstinting especially at table.[132] Most authors mention birth and wealth in the same verse. Indeed, most ambassadors of the seventeenth century were chosen from the nobility. For instance, out of fifty French ambassadors sent to England, Rome and Vienna between 1648 and 1715, forty-six were of noble birth.[133] Nonetheless, the emphasis on nobility is rather ambivalent in the treatises. Dolet is categorical and well before his time: 'I can scarcely approve giving consideration to ancestry, in the case of an ambassador, for neither nobility nor obscurity of origin produces ability or worth in a man, but ability and worth produces nobility.'[134] Even so, Dolet still considers nobility as an added bonus if married to talent. Thus although 'high birth has not a bit of weight in my [Dolet's] estimation', he still believes that if the ambassador happens to be 'born to high station, this circumstance will constitute no small addition to the completeness of his qualifications.'[135] This sentiment is modified even further by Abraham van Wicquefort and later by François de Callières. Wicquefort, writing one hundred and forty years after Dolet, states that nobility is not a necessity, yet an ambassador should not be chosen from the lower classes and that a man's 'education and experience cannot compensate for a non-prestigious name.'[136] Callières, writing in 1716 maintained a similar position and considered high birth desirable especially if employed at a prominent court.[137] Considering that birth, wealth and a certain level of education very often went together, the sentiment expressed in the treatises seems to

---

[130] J. De Vera, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore*, 13, 14.
[131] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 84.
[132] Catherine Fletcher, 'Furnished with Gentlemen: the Ambassador's House in Sixteenth–Century Italy', *The Society for Renaissance Studies*, 24 (2010), 518-520.
[133] Marie-Hélène Côté, 'What Did It Mean to be a French Diplomat in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries?', *Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d'histoire*, 45 (2010), 242.
[134] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 83.
[135] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 83.
[136] Marie-Hélène Côté, 242.
[137] Marie-Hélène Côté, 242.

be that it was easier to find the necessary requirements from the nobility more than any other class.

One group which gradually lost popularity as ambassadors with the advent of the seventeenth century was the ecclesiastical class. The Church had provided a number of ambassadors in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. De Vera is not too much in favour although he does not deny it outright. Certain dealings, he maintains, might be too impure for a priest's hands, which would render his embassy as 'imperfect'.[138] Hotman does not recommend priests for a different reason: the ecclesiast's ultimate loyalty is to the Pope not to his prince.[139] Dolet explains the former popularity of choosing priests as ambassadors because they were the only educated section of society. But since the lay, especially the nobility, were 'gradually coming to their senses' and were becoming attracted to learning instead of 'act the brute and swaggering about in their armour', choosing priests was no longer a necessity.[140]

The emphasis on an almost all-encompassing education is typical of the age. In a work written for the instruction of Louis XIV, Mothe le Vayer embraced a wide range of subjects. The first part dealt with geography (which included a brief history) of the world with a focus on European countries but including also far-flung reigns such as Abyssinia and the Congo. Rhetoric and moral philosophy came also in the first section. The second part dealt with economy, politics, logic and what is termed '*fisica*' but which is more akin to general science.[141] The book embodies the definition of the 'Renaissance man', and shows the intense love for learning of the age. Most of the writers ranked education high in the list of requirements, though there was some disagreement on the subjects. Languages ranged from Latin and Greek to the modern languages. De Vera was the least exigent and recommended that an ambassador should use his native tongue as much as possible for a man is most eloquent in his mother tongue.[142] Oratory and eloquence were the most highly praised qualities. Maggi was the most demanding:

---

[138] J. De Vera, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore*, 38.
[139] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 10.
[140] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 83.
[141] François de La Mothe Le Vayer, *Scuola de' Prencipi e de' Cavalieri*.
[142] J. De Vera, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore*, 278.

An ambassador should be a trained theologian, should be well versed in Aristotle and Plato, and should be able at a moment's notice to solve the most abstruse problems in correct dialectical form; he should also be expert in mathematics, architecture, music, physics, and civil and canon law. He should speak and write Latin fluently and must be proficient in Greek, Spanish, French, German and Turkish. While being a trained classical scholar, a historian, a geographer, and an expert in military science, he must also have a cultured taste for poetry.[143]

Hotman criticises Tasso, Maggi and Gentili and 'other noble writers' of painting too perfect a portrait forgetting Plato's teaching that perfection can only exist in the realm of ideals and cannot be found in this world.[144] 'They want', says Hotman, 'their ambassador to be a theologian, an astrologer, a dialetician, orator, scientist, an Aristotle and wise as Solomon.'[145] Hotman brought an interesting concept to the discussion. He maintained that the qualities have to be such as can be obtained by nature and experience. Hotman's ambassador had to have a certain '*universalita*' due to the different affairs he would have had to deal with. This '*universalita'* can be translated as worldly sagacity, which quality, Hotman added, comes with being widely travelled, having some knowledge of letters but above all be particular knowledgable in history.[146] Bragaccia followed suit and dedicated a whole chapter of his treatise on the importance of history.[147] Taken collectively, the treatises set a high standard of education as imperative, albeit not all stress equally the various fields of study.

The preferable age of the ambassador was also a point of discussion, with a general tendency towards middle age. The dilemma the authors had to face was very real: should one opt for the vigour of youth or the wisdom of old-age. De Vera admits that his predeccesors were in favour of an ambassador to be over thirty, and mentions that some hold that should two be sent, then an elder and a younger would be best to complement each other.[148] This is erraneously cited by Jusserand as being De Vera's suggestion: 'Vera wonders whether it would not be appropriate to send in some cases two ambassadors, an older one who would shine by his wisdom and a younger one by

---

[143] Ottaviano Maggi, cited in Charles W.Freeman, *The Diplomat's Dictionary* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1994), 28.
[144] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 13.
[145] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 13, 14.
[146] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 14.
[147] G. Bragaccia, *L'Ambasciatore*, 146-150.
[148] J. De Vera, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore*, 208. In fact, De Vera allows for more than one ambassador only for ceremonial purposes to show esteem to the host prince. He compares having more than one ambassador to summoning more than one medic who would lose themselves in discussion whilst the patient loses the last precious moments of his life. Ibid., 51-52.

his sprightliness.'[149] De Vera questioned this rather than agreed, stating that a young man can be wise just as an old one can be rash. He cited Aristotle's criticism of the Lacedaemonians' senate for being filled solely with older men and mentions that Guiccardini was an ambassador when barely twenty eight. He also added the crushing argument that a man can be king of Spain at a young age and face momentous decisions.[150] Strangely enough, Mattingly mentioned Dolet as the only one besides De Vera who preferred youth rather than old age: 'Only Dolet, also young, would have agreed.'[151] Actually Dolet did not:

> Young men possess no experience in affairs, no prudence, nor any sagacity, no restraint and no self-control; but unbridled passions, arrogance, audacity - in short, every kind of rash and headlong impulse rules them.[152]

Dolet opts for middle-age, but in the absence of the right candidate he stressed:

> It is better, however, to overtax somewhat the powers of old men than to have such unwarranted confidence in rash youths as to impose a difficult task of any kind upon them.[153]

Again it is evident that the thread that runs continuously in all these works is prudence. Old age is to be preferred because the young are 'rash' and have 'no prudence'.

Prudence is the recurrent theme, the one which ought to govern the ambassador's actions in all circumstances. Hotman considered it prudent for an ambassador to 'nourish' himself from his predecessor's despatches and to make use of his contacts.[154] Bragaccia agreed with this sentiment; the ambassador must do his best to uphold the good reputation of his predeccesor or, in the case of his antecedent leaving a bad name, he is to build a good one by exhibiting his virtue and valour.[155] The letters themselves are to be an opportunity to display his virtues to his distant sovereign and his council.[156] Even the ambassador's table is to be governed by prudence. It should be sufficient enough to show magnamity and liberality, but not too much to earn one the reputation for 'extravagance and folly'.[157] Entertainment should also be consistent, maintaining the standard originally set lest it would be thought of

---

[149] J. J. Jusserand, 'The School for Ambassadors', 434.
[150] J. De Vera, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore*, 208-209.
[151] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 185.
[152] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 82.
[153] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 82.
[154] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 35.
[155] G. Bragaccia, *L'Ambasciatore*, 106.
[156] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 81-82.
[157] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 87. See also J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 27.

the ambassador that he had not calculated wisely the expenses incurred and thus earn him the reputation of being 'rash and imprudent.'[158] Acceptance of gifts is another topic wherein prudence has to be meticulously exercised. De Vera held that the acceptance of a gift by an ambassador should be licensed by his prince. Should an affair go not according to plan, the prince would suspect his ambassador's integrity. De Vera recommended the Venetian practice of making it illegal for a public figure to accept gifts, hammering his point home with 'he who wants to preserve his liberty, receives gifts from nobody.'[159] Modern practice has not changed much in this regard. De Vera's words written in 1620 are echoed in this 2012 communication to the European Commission: 'Acceptance of gifts… may, exceptionally be authorised… when it is clear that this will not compromise or reasonably be perceived to compromise the staff member's objectivity and independence…'[160] Dolet did not mince words: siding with the enemy 'if won over by gifts or suborned by the promise of wealth and honours' is 'deserving of capital punishment.'[161]

The sanctity of the person of the ambassador is a theme upon which all the theorists agreed. It was also their point of departure. According to Dolet, the word 'sacred' is derived from the '*sagmina'*, the plant that Roman ambassadors carried to mark them as inviolate.[162] Moral uprightness emerges from this. The ambassador has to merit this esteem. Immunity had also a practical offshoot to it, as did morality. The former, as Hotman explained, is a necessity, as no one would willingly leave hearth and home and risk perilous voyages only to be at the whim of some foreign sovereign. And without ambassadors, he added, the world would revert to chaos.[163] The practical side of moral uprightness was to gain the trust of the host court and to allow one's prince to shine through the person of his ambassador. As Walter Bagehot (1826-1877) wrote years later: 'An ambassador is not simply an agent; he is also a spectacle.'[164] All of the qualities have to shine forth:

---

[158] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 87.
[159] J. De Vera, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore*, 225-226.
[160] Communication from Vice-President Šefčovič to the Commission on Guidelines on Gifts and Hospitality for the staff members, Brussels, 7.3.2012 SEC(2012) 167 final, retrieved from ec.europa.eu/.../docs/sec_2012_0167_f_en_communication_to_commission_en.pdf, on 8 August 2016.
[161] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 89. See also G. Bragaccia, *L'Ambasciatore*, 426 and 569.
[162] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 91.
[163] J. Hotman, *Lo Ambasciatore*, 87-88.
[164] Walter Bagehot, *The English Constitution* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1867), 153.

> And what is the value of your good character, your ability your prudence, your magnamity, your humanity, your kindliness, unless every one knows that these qualities have been generously and abundantly bestowed upon you, and praises you to the heavens for them?[165]

In all of his endeavours, whether in the display of magnamity or in negotiating the most delicate of affairs, the ambassador was to be guided by prudence. At first, these treatises seem idealistic and far removed from reality. Out of the context of their age they sound like ghosts from a remote past. But when read against the vibrant background in which they were written, they reveal 'how close to reality these authors came.'[166]

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter narrowed down the discourse began in chapter 1. From the early examples of the Amarna letters it then gave a brief overview of the evolution of diplomacy to the crystallisation of the concept of *res publica Christiana*. The importance of this term for the self-perception of military orders called for deeper discussion, especially due to the challenge to this concept presented by the Thirty Years War. A criticism of the Peace of Westphalia flowed naturally from this particularly because it was traditionally held to be the birth of diplomacy proper. The spate of treatises written before and after the hostilities that characterised the first half of the seventeenth century were then analysed. These writers served not only to provide a contemporary contribution to the history of diplomacy but also to allow a glimpse into the early modern mind. This chapter puts what is to follow within a larger framework, as the focus will shift to the diplomacy of the Order of St John, from its *ad hoc* beginnings in the Latin East and which, reflecting the trend of European courts, gradually matured into a system of permanent representation.

---

[165] E. Dolet, 'On the Office of Legate', 87.
[166] Marie-Hélène Côté, 255.

Chapter 3 The Ambassador as Receiver and Procurator General

3.1 Introduction

Choosing the right man to represent the Order in Rome was a delicate matter. There were three areas for which the Order needed a permanent presence in Rome. Formally, the ambassador had to represent the Grand Master as a ruler of a principality, the receiver to protect its financial claims and the procurator general dealt with matters related to the Order as a religious institution, but these areas often overlapped. This chapter will trace the evolution of Hospitaller diplomacy from its use of priors to establishing a diplomatic corp. Since Sacchetti was also receiver and procurator general in Rome this chapter will examine these roles and show how the bureaucratic system of the Order was not rigid when assigning roles, and the ultimate aim of representation was protecting its status as an exempt order of the Church. Many of the Order's practices can be considered as organic rather than planned, in the sense that decisions were taken, roles assigned, and offices created according to needs that arose. Permanent embassies took over from the priories in Vienna, Paris and Madrid but at the same time, receivers acted as ambassadors in places where there were no permanent embassies. In Rome, these three roles became even more blurred as they were concentrated in one man. From an overview of the Order's evolving representation, this chapter will define the roles through official designations and by examining case studies. This will help understand better the cases that Sacchetti had to deal with which will be discussed in the coming chapters.

3.2 Evolution of Hospitaller Representation

All medieval religious orders found dealings with secular courts unavoidable, in spite of their primary aim of standing aloof from the world. The idea of 'apartness' in Christianity has a long history. Originally it replaced martyrdom. When Christianity became the religion of the state individuals or communities sought spiritual salvation in remote places as a substitute mortification for being persecuted.[1] But as the original

[1] Henri Daniel-Rops, *The Church of Apostles and Martyrs* vol II (New York: Image Books, 1962), 273-274.

fervour became institutionalised, links between the religious orders and the secular world were inevitable. As Helen Nicholson states: 'They depended upon the secular authorities for gifts of property, exemptions from taxes and other dues, and for protection.'[2] Secular benevolence did not come without a price. Religious orders 'were expected to perform various services, which in turn gave them enormous political impact on society but which deflected them from their religious vocation and aroused criticism.'[3] Military-religious orders had an even more pressing need for funds. 'These [military-religious] orders … all grew from the same root, that of monasticism, onto which was grafted the military life.'[4] Waging war was, and still is, expensive. Moreover, all military orders emerging from the Holy Land apart from the Templars embraced hospitality as their primary calling.[5] Being both martial and medical made huge demands on the orders' finances. In the estimation of Riley-Smith, the Order of St John was 'spending almost as much on acts of mercy as they were on warfare', at least up to 1270.[6] Throughout its three phases, that is the Holy Land and Cyprus (1113-1306?), Rhodes (1310?-1522) and Malta (1530-1798), the Order of St John retained this dual vocation.[7] Although the Order did generate some income from its subsequent bases, yet it relied heavily on its European properties.[8] Close links with princes and popes were therefore crucial. Thus enmeshed in the political world, the Order exploited both official and unofficial channels to uphold its privileges and guarantee its own security.

---

[2] Helen Nicholson, *The Knights Hospitaller* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), 98.
[3] H. Nicholson, *The Knights Hospitaller*, 98.
[4] James W. Brodman, 'Rule and Identity: The Case of the Military Orders', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 87: 3 (2001), 383.
[5] Enrique Rodríguez-Picavea, 'The Military Orders and Hospitaller Activity on the Iberian Peninsula during the Middle Ages', *Mediterranean Studies*, 18 (2009), 24-43.
[6] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c.1070–1309* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 80.
[7] The years 1291-1306 are the accepted dates when the Order was based on Cyprus. The four-year gap between Cyprus and Rhodes is due to the Rhodian period being considered to start on the Order's final capture of the main town and not to be construed as parallel to the eight-year peregrinations of 1522-1530, that is between the loss of Rhodes and settlement in Malta. See Anthony Luttrell, 'Studies on the Hospitallers after 1306. Rhodes and the West, The Island of Rhodes and the Hospitallers of Catalunya in the fourteenth century', *Variorum Collected Study Series* (Ashgate: Aldershot 2007), XVIII, 156.
[8] Anthony Luttrell, 'From Jerusalem to Malta: the Hospital's character and evolution'. *Peregrinationes, Accademia Internazionale Melitense*, 3. Retrieved from https://www.orderofmalta.int/wp-content/uploads/archive/pubblicazioni/FromJerusalemtoMalta.pdf on 6 November 2016.

There were various unofficial channels through which the Hospital represented itself with monarchs and popes, whose support was vital. The Order maintained its headquarters, the 'Convent', in the East for four hundred and nine years, during which time there was a constant active presence in the West to recruit and procure supplies and money to sustain both its martial and medical vocations. Hospitallers were thus 'familiar figures in the West and they acted as a constant reminder of the struggle in the Holy Land.'[9] This latter fact added to their already high prestige of being both knights and religious. This combination had marked out members of military orders as ideal candidates for 'prominent positions in royal government since the twelfth century', because 'As warriors who were also religious, they were regarded as being particularly trustworthy.'[10] Thus for instance, Fra Guerin of Glapion rose to be Chancellor of France. Similarly Fra Joseph of Chauncy served Edward I (1272-1307) as royal treasurer. Appointing brother knights to administrative posts rather than members of the local nobility was preferred by monarchs as local nobles could easily acquire too much power and pose a threat to royal authority.[11] Brother knights holding high positions in European courts could have indirectly served to further the interests of the Order albeit unofficially, although, with the conquest of Rhodes, this became an occasion for conflict rather than cooperation. As Helen Nicholson says: 'The royal minister who served his king or pope before his Order was an increasing problem of the Order by the fourteenth century.'[12] The grand priors of each European priory might have served as a counterbalance to this, by acting as semi-official regional diplomats for the Hospital with local rulers.[13] For instance the Prior of Navarre 'being a person of confidence both of the King and of the Queen, his position and experience were placed in the diplomatic service of the Crown'.[14] In France, the Prior of Auvergne Fra Guy di Blanchefort (1446-1513) was sent to the Pope by the Grand Master as

---

[9] Jonathan Phillips, *The Crusades, 1095-1197* (Harlow U.K.: Pearson Education, 2002), 61.
[10] H. Nicholson, *The Knights Hospitaller*, 107.
[11] H. Nicholson, *The Knights Hospitaller*, 108.
[12] H. Nicholson, *The Knights Hospitaller*, 107.
[13] Simon Phillips, *The Prior of the Knights Hospitaller in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 59-96.
[14] Anna Katarzyna Dulska, 'Malitia temporis. Priorato navarro de la Orden de San Juan de Jerusalén bajo fray Martín Martínez de Olloqui (1383-1435)' (Unpublished Phd. dissertation, University of Navarre, 2016), 272: '*Siendo el prior de San Juan persona de confianza tanto del rey, como de la reina, su posición y experiencia fueron puestas al servicio diplomático de la Corona, especialmente durante la ausencia de Carlos III en Francia y la consiguiente lugartenencia del reino por parte de Leonor entre 1403 y 1406.*'

ambassador and ordinary procurator general and again in the same year (1492) by Charles XIII of France to discuss with the Pope his (the king's) desire of renewing hostilities with the Turk.[15] In 1494 Fra Blanchefort was sent to Rhodes by the French king to invite the Grand Master to Rome to discuss the matter.[16] The Prior of Germany Fra Ridolfo di Verdemberch was sent by the Holy Roman Emperor to Rhodes on this issue of war.[17] Priors therefore acted as double ambassadors, representing both their Grand Master with their respective monarch and vice versa.

Priors were also sent on diplomatic missions to rulers beyond their priory. For instance, Fra Raimondo di Lestura, Prior of Toulouse, was sent to the Sultan of Egypt as ambassador of the Grand Master to conclude a treaty in 1403.[18] When the need arose, representation was increased and extraordinary ambassadors were sent, usually high-ranking knights. For instance, fear of an impending Turkish invasion in 1389 spurred the Council of the Order to send two Grand Crosses as ambassadors to appeal for help 'to the Anti-pope, the college of cardinals, the king of France and other Christian princes and the Grand Master who was in Avignon'.[19] Relations with Muslim powers ranged from treaties and truces to threats and hostilities. Certainly negotiations with Muslim rulers were not a Rhodian phenomenon. In the Latin kingdom, the permanence of military-religious orders (when contrasted with the fleeting nature of crusading warriors) had given them reason to negotiate with Muslim neighbours. Indeed, they [the military-religious orders] acquired a name for conducting negotiations and forming alliances, a name which eventually turned to notoriety and suspicion in the Western mind.[20] The Hospital was still practising such dealings during the Rhodian period. Certain Hospitallers felt confident enough in offering the service of mediator:

In January 1413 Giorgio, the Hospitaller ambassador from Rhodes, appeared before the *podesta* in Chios and offered, in return for payment and the covering of any costs

---

[15] Giacomo Bosio, *Dell'Istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Ill.ma Militia Di S. Gio. Gierosolno*, vol 2 (Rome, 1629), 510.
[16] G. Bosio (1629), 517.
[17] G. Bosio (1629), 420.
[18] G. Bosio (1629), 164.
[19] G. Bosio (1629), 138. '*…di mandar due signori della Gran Croce in Ponente, Ambasciatori all'Antipapa, al Collegio de Cardinali, al Re di Francia, à gli altri Principi Christiani & al Gran Maestro, che tuttavia si trovava in Avignone, à domandar aiuto, rimedio, e soccorso.*'
[20] Nicholas Morton, 'Templar and Hospitaller attitudes towards Islam in the Holy Land during the 12th and 13th centuries: some historiographical reflections', *Levant*, 47: 3 (2015), 319.

he incurred, to intercede with Paşa Turco in the war between the Genoese of Chios and Cüneyd.[21]

The diplomacy of the Order during the Rhodian period was marked by this fluctuation between treaties, hostilities and fear of Muslim attacks in the East and steering a neutral course between the rivalry of Christian princes in the West. Rhodes put the Grand Master on a higher authoritative plane, as he was now a ruler of a set of islands not just the head of a religious institution. As Carlos Barquero Goñi says, 'By the fourteenth century, the Master of the Hospital had attained a level of authority such that he maintained diplomatic relations with the European monarchs of the era'.[22] Luttrell states: 'The Master granted lands, raised taxes, sent ambassadors, coined money, governed the Greek church and generally acted like a prince on his own island.'[23] Such a state of affairs had tremendous impact on the way the diplomacy of the Order developed after 1306. For instance, in 1312 the Order, acting independently of the Pope's wishes, 'sought to attract the sympathies of the Aragonese king, Jaume II' by not aiding his rival Philippe of Anjou, Prince of Taranto (12278-1331/2).[24] The Pope had instructed the Order to help Prince Philippe against the Catalan conquerors of Athens. This was completely ignored, a fact which was repeated in 1314 when the Pope ordered the Religion 'to prepare three or four galleys and some troops with which it should, if so requested, defend certain Angevin places in Greece, probably in the Argolid, against attack from the Catalans of Athens.'[25]

This seeming attempt at independence from the papal circles should not be over-emphasized. The papal court, both when in Avignon and in Rome, remained a fulcrum for Hospitaller diplomacy. Throughout Bosio's *Istoria*, there is a continuous stream of ambassadors being sent to the papal court. Unfortunately there is no evidence of their diplomatic correspondence as most of the Rhodian documents have been lost or more optimistically have not yet come to light.[26] Pierredon lists a certain

---

[21] Kate Fleet, 'Law and Trade in the Early Fifteenth-Century: The Case of Cagi Sati Oglu', *Oriente Moderno, Nuova serie*, Anno 25 (86), Nr. 1, The Ottomans and Trade (2006), 189.
[22] Carlos Barquero Goñi, 'The Military Orders. On land and by sea', *The Military Orders*, vol 4, Judi Upton-Ward (ed) (Ashgate: Aldershot 2008), 208. The quotation acknowledges Luttrell in footnote 7 on same page.
[23] A. Luttrell, 'From Jerusalem to Malta: the Hospital's character and evolution', 5.
[24] Anthony Luttrell, 'The Island of Rhodes and the Hospitallers of Catalunya in the fourteenth century', *Studies on the Hospitallers after 1306* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2007), xviii, 156.
[25] A. Luttrell, 156.
[26] Valeria Vanesio, *Il Valore inestimabile delle Carte*, Collectanea Bibliothecae Magistralis II (Roma: 2014), 47.

Fra Iacomo degli Opici as the first permanent ambassador at the Holy See, starting from 1405, although Gazzoni considers official diplomatic recognition to have started in 1466. Bosio mentions Giacomo degli Opici in his *Istoria* (volume 2) in the capacity of procurator general, although agreeing with Pierredon on the date.[27] The entry in question mentions Fra Iacomo degli Opici as procurator general and executor of the will of Fra Bartolomeo Caraffa, Prior of Rome and Hungary who died in 1405. The implication is that he was already a procurator general at the time. There is no previous mention of him being appointed. The entry in Bonazzi's *Elenco dei Cavalieri* reads: '*degli Opici di – Giacomo Comm[endatore] del Santo Sepolcro di Firenze ed Ambasciatore a Roma, 1405*.'[28] The Order considered the procurator general at the papal court automatically as ambassador as attested in this extract from Bosio referring to the year 1433:

> And since the said Commander of Fieffes, Somereux and Ceresiers, Fra Pietro Lamandi, who as we have mentioned is Procurator General in the Court of Rome, has no more than four hundred ducats for the upkeep of the said Office of Procurator General, so in order to better meet the expenses of that *Embassy* [author's emphasis], the Chapter assigns a ducat a day apart from the afore mentioned four hundred:[29]

Moreover, at least some of the roles of ambassador and procurator general in Rome overlapped. The statutes during the magistracy of Fra Jaques de Milly specify that the elected brother will reside in Rome and 'shall defend the privileges, graces, and liberties of the Order, the concessions, grants, and provisions of the master and council.'[30] A good number of cases that Fra Marcello Sacchetti had to tackle as ambassador dealt exactly with defending privileges and liberties of the Order.[31] It was usual practice for the ambassador in Rome to be also the procurator general. Thus Fra Henrico d'Estampes Vallancay in 1638, Fra Giralamo Altieri in 1645, and, as late as

---

[27] Pierredon and Gazzoni cited in V. Vanesio, 47. See also G. Bosio (1629), 167.

[28] Francesco Bonazzi di Sannicandro, *Elenco dei Cavalieri di S.M. Ordine di S. Giovanni di Gerusalemme Ricevuti nella Veneranda Lingua D'Italia Dalla Fondazione Dell'Ordine Ai Nostri Giorni, Parte Prima* (Napoli: Detken & Rocholl, 1897), 101.

[29] G. Bosio (1629), 203: '*E perche il detto Comendator di Fieffes, di Somereux, e di Ceresiers Frà Pietro Lamandi, il qua era (come detto habbiamo) Procurator Generale della Religione nella Corte di Roma, no haveva piu di quattrocento ducati di provisione per il detto Officio di Procurator Generale, accioche meglio alle spese di quell'Ambasciata supplir potesse, gli assegno' il Capitolo un ducato al giorno, oltra i quattrocento sopradetti*'.

[30] Giacomo Bosio, *Gli Statuti Della Sacra Religione Di S.Giovanni Gierosolimitano* (Roma: 1589), 195. '*E difenda i privilegij , le gratie, e le libertà dell'ordine nostro. Sostenga, e difenda parimete le concessioni, le donationi, e le provisioni del Maestro, e del Consiglio*.'

[31] Adrian Scerri, 'Of Briefs and Privileges: the role of the ambassador to the Holy See, Fra Marcello Sacchetti in safeguarding the Order of St John's position in the 1680s', *Proceedings of History Week 2011*, J.Abela-E. Buttigieg-K. Farrugia (eds) (Malta: Midsea Books, 2011), 95-104.

1660 Fra Gilberto del Bene, were all ambassadors and procurators general at the papal court.[32] For some time, the Order had also kept an agent in Rome, an office which, according to Dal Pozzo, was rendered superfluous in October 1636. Fra Lorenzo Rosa was apparently the last agent, taking over from Fra Antonio Bosio. Incidentally, his uncle Fra Giacomo Bosio had also been agent in 1598.[33] Instead of the agent, a secretary of the Embassy was appointed, chosen from a professed religious of the Order. The appointment was for three years and the secretary fell directly under the Ambassador.[34]

During its presence in Malta, it seemed to have become customary for the Order to officially appoint ambassadors to deal with particular cases rather than make use of its priors as had been previously the practice. The custom of appointing resident ambassadors in major countries in Europe was definitely established by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Thus Dal Pozzo mentions Fra Girolamo de Acugna as 'Procurator general and resident ambassador in Portugal' in 1581.[35] Ten years before Fra Francesco Salviati Fiorentino had been sent to the court of France as the Order's resident ambassador.[36] The Religion definitely had a resident ambassador in Madrid by 1629, when Fra Raffael Ortiz de Sottomaior was appointed.[37] However, Dal Pozzo mentions Fra D. Gonzalo de Porras as 'Ambassador of the Religion in Madrid' in 1607, which seems to imply a resident ambassador.[38] Concerning Vienna, there is mention of 'the Ambassadors of the said Order residents in our Imperial Court' in a letter dated 1598 sent by Emperor Rudolph II to the Grand Master.[39] This letter was delivered by hand by the Order's extraordinary ambassador Fra D. Girolamo di Guevara in Vienna who had stayed in the Emperor's court for three years to discuss matters concerning the Priory and commanderies of Bohemia. As if to distinguish Fra Guevara from the resident ambassadors, Emperor Rudolph II referred to him in his letter as '*Oratore*', though this might have been simply a case of Latin influence.[40]

---

[32] Bartolomeo Dal Pozzo, *Historia Della Sacra Religione Militare Di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano Detta di Malta*, vol. 2 (Venice: 1715), 28, 126 and 285.
[33] Dal Pozzo, vol 1 (Verona: 1703), 402.
[34] Dal Pozzo (1715), 13.
[35] Dal Pozzo (1703), 174.
[36] Dal Pozzo (1703), 36.
[37] Dal Pozzo (1703), 778.
[38] Dal Pozzo (1703), 534.
[39] Dal Pozzo (1703), 412, 413. Curiously, the letter bears three dates, all in June 1598: 9 from Prague, 23 from 'Our Empire' as well as from Bohemia, and lastly 26 from The Kingdom of Hungary.
[40] Dal Pozzo (1703), 412, 413.

This list contradicts a belief that 'it was under Pinto's magistracy that the embassies to the King of France, the King of Spain and the Emperor (other than the Roman Pontiff), became permanent.'[41] The Order seemed to have followed the general European trend in its diplomatic practice, that is, of moving from mission-based envoys to permanent representation. Immersed as it was in the world, any religious aloofness the Order might have harboured had to give way to necessity. The evolution of the diplomacy of the Order of St John reflects its attitude to the vicissitudes of time: adapting enough to remain relevant in a changing world but not making relevance its master. The Religion seemed to have a formidable ability at self-preservation and those who sharpened their tongues in the courts of kings and popes have to be credited as much as those who sharpened their swords.

3.3 The Receiver

According to Riley-Smith, the first mention of the term 'receiver' can be traced to 1255. At this early stage, the receiver seemed to have been a treasury assistant, since the Order was in the habit of appointing two brethren per office to lessen the opportunity for misappropriation.[42] Gradually this post evolved into a fully-fledged office with the responsibility of collecting the responsions, as the Order's priors, who had hitherto collected this revenue, were relieved of this duty.[43] Master Fra Roger de Pins (r. 1355-1365) ordered that a receiver was to be appointed in every Priory and the Castellany of Amposta to facilitate funds reaching the Common Treasury.[44] This was a ratification of what was already being practised.[45] Even so, Bosio considered it important enough to explain why this turn of affairs came about: Master De Pins held a Chapter General wherein several useful and important statutes for the good government of the Religion were instituted. One of these was the appointment of a

---

[41]Antonio Rapisardi, 'Sacra Hierosolymitana Religio. Profili Storico-Giuridici E Relazioni Internazionali' (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Università Degli Studi Di Macerata, 2011), 28. '*E' sotto il magistero di Pinto che le ambascerie presso il Re di Francia, il Re di Spagna, l'Imperatore (oltre che il Romano Pontefice) diventano permanenti*.' Rapisardi cites Francesco Gazzoni, *Ordine di Malta* (Milano: 1979), 75.

[42] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c.1070–1309* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 144.

[43] Simon Mercieca, 'Aspects of the Office of the Receiver of the Hospitaller Order of St John' (Unpublished B.A. (Hons) dissertation, University of Malta, 1991), 10.

[44] *Statuti della Sac. Religione di S. Gio. Gerosolimitano con le Ordinationi dell'Ultimo Capitolo Generale celebrato nell'anno 1631* (Borgo Nuovo: 1674), Titolo Quinto, Item 36, De' Ricevitori, 65.

[45] S. Mercieca, 'Aspects of the Office of the Receiver', 10.

receiver in every priory. This official was to have the necessary authority to collect from priories and commanderies all 'responsions, impositions and all the other rights appertaining to the Treasury.' Responsions were a part of the revenues generated in a commandery, which the commander was bound to send to the Convent every year. These were normally equivalent to one third of the money generated by the commandery.[46] Any income accumulating from a commandery from the death of its commander till the end of the Order's fiscal year was called the mortuary (Italian *mortuorio*) and belonged to the Treasury.[47] In such a case, or where the commander has been promoted to a higher dignity, that commandery would be deemed as vacant. A vacancy (Italian *vacante*) meant that the revenue accruing during the first full fiscal year was also due to the Treasury.[48] Impositions were *ad hoc* taxes, created when the convent felt the need to raise money to face an impending emergency or to meet with any other financial difficulty.[49] Another source of income was the right of passage (Italian *passaggio*), which was the entrance fee for an applicant who had been deemed eligible to join the Order.[50] The fee was symbolic of what once had been the actual expenses incurred for the new brother to leave Europe for the Holy Land.[51]

The common practice before authority was granted to the receivers was that the priors collected the monies from their priories and commanderies. Grand Master De Pins felt the need to install the office of receiver in every priory because according to Bosio, 'more often than not, the Religion had to struggle to secure the funds from the hands of those who had collected them.'.[52] The fact that Bosio includes all dues, and not only the responsions as the prerogative of the receiver shows that the latter was taking on other financial responsibilities that concerned the Treasury. Mercieca argues that these other dues implied mortuaries and vacancies, although the procurator

---

[46] Stefan Cachia, 'The Treasury, Debts, and Deaths' (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta, 2004), 266.
[47] S. Cachia, 'The Treasury, Debts, and Deaths', 264.
[48] S. Cachia, 'The Treasury, Debts, and Deaths', 268.
[49] S. Cachia, 'The Treasury, Debts, and Deaths', 72. See also S. Mercieca, 'Aspects of the Office of the Receiver', 9.
[50] S. Mercieca, Aspects of the Office of the Receiver, 29.
[51] Francesco Russo, *Un Ordine, Una Citta, una Diocesi, La giurisdizione ecclesiastica nel principato monastico di Malta in età moderna (1523–1722)* (Roma: Aracne, 2017), 493.
[52] Giacomo Bosio, *Dell'Istoria della Sacra Religione*, vol. 2 (Rome: 1629), 102: '*In quei tempi, i Priori riscuotevano da Commendatori, a Priorati loro sottoposti, le Risponsioni, & impositioni, e gli altri Diritti spettatanti al comun Tesoro, con molta autorita; & il piu delle volte, stentava poi la Religione a cavargli dale mani il danaio, che ricevuto havevano; dal che gran danno glie ne risultava*.'

general could also have been tasked with these functions.[53] Bosio mentions that the receivers of Venice, France and Lombardy were admitted in the Chapter General of 1459, describing them as 'Receivers of Responsions'.[54] Mercieca argues that this indicates that the responsions were their main task and any other duties were secondary. By the seventeenth century, the system was fairly well established. The Order installed one or more receivers in each priory. The number of receivers depended on the extent of properties it possessed in that particular area.[55] The duty of a receiver was quite clear by this time: 'to collect responsions, impositions, the rights of passage, rights on the spoils, mortuaries and vacancies, oversee the goods, and ensure the rights of the Treasury.'[56] The territory under a receiver's jurisdiction was called '*ricetta*', a collection of administrative and financial units. It has been said that the term was originally '*precettoria*', that is a preceptory or commandery and corrupted to '*recettoria*' and eventually '*ricetta*'. It seems more likely that etymologically it comes from '*recepta*', past participle feminine of the Latin verb *recipere*, meaning take back, regain.[57]

Apart from the main financial duties, the receiver could also serve as an acting diplomat. In the absence of an ambassador, agent or other minister of the Order, the receiver served as the only bridge between that territory and the Order.[58] Genoa was such a case, where the receiver was both the political and financial representative of

---

[53] S. Mercieca, 'Aspects of the Office of the Receiver', 11. The two terms are defined by Cachia as follows: The mortuary (Italian *Mortuorio*) 'denoted the phase in the administration of a commandery that immediately followed the death of its commander, until the end of the Hospitaller fiscal year. Revenue accruing from a commandery during this period went to the Treasury and was generally itself called *mortuorio*.' The vacancy (Italian *Vacante*) 'referred to the period when a commandery was without commander. Statutorily, it denoted the first full fiscal year after the commander vacated a commandery either by being promoted or by death. The revenues accruing from a commandery during this period went to the Treasury.' (Cachia, 264 and 268.) For a more detailed description, see *Compendio delle Materie contenute nel Codice del Sacro Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano* (Malta: 1783), 97-98.

[54] G. Bosio (1629), 259: '*Ricevitori delle Risponsioni di Venetia, di Francia, e di Lombardia*'.

[55] BSMOM, ms. 63. Carlo Micallef, *Summa Iurium Ierosolymitanum Equitum*, [17th century], vol. 2, 330. (The date of publication is uncertain).

[56] BSMOM, ms. 63. Micallef, '*Ad exigenda Communis Aerarii Iura, in omnibus Provinciis et certis quibusdam Civitatibus (ubi de facili Bona ad Aerarium soectantia pervenire possunt) suoi Receptores Hierosolymitanorum Ordo constitutit*', 330.

[57] *Dizionario Etimologico Online*, retrieved on 20 April 2019 from https://www.etimo.it/?term=ricetta&find=Cerca

[58] Ivan Grech, 'Il Prezzo dell'Onore nel Mediterraneo. Rapporti e Dissidi Diplomatici tra Genova e l'Ordine di Malta nel Seicento', *Cavalieri di San Giovanni in Liguria e nell'Italia Settentrionale. Quadri regionali, uomini e documenti*, Atti del Convegno, Istituto Internazionale di Studi Liguri (Genoa: 2004), 596.

the Order.[59] This was also true for Venice, as Mallia-Milanes states: 'Whenever the need arose, the receiver in Venice acted also as the resident minister accredited by the Grand Master and his Venerable Council to the Serenissima.'[60] The position of receiver was therefore not merely one of collecting revenue and transferring it to the convent. Even the collection of money was not always straightforward and the receiver had to be prepared to go to court when it was felt that the privileges of the Religion were under threat. Of course the obstacle in question would have to be financially feasible as lawsuits were an expensive affair especially since lawyers were employed by the Order and rarely home-grown. Throughout their history, orders of the Church, military or not, had to keep up with 'the mounting legalism of ecclesiastical administration' that had kept increasing from at least the twelfth century.[61] Due to the sheer number of legal issues, military orders tended to employ lawyers in a permanent manner rather than sporadically.[62] This had several advantages. The institution could rely on some form of loyalty as the lawyers were not defending the Order one day and its opponent the next. It also ensured that any experience gleaned by the lawyers would eventually be at the Order's disposal, not aiding its adversaries. Another advantage of maintaining a team of advocates was that in the course of their career, these men would have established important contacts in the legal environment. As Brundage points out such contacts could 'help to contain litigation costs or, even better, might sometimes make litigation unnecessary.'[63] Of the three great military orders, only the Teutonic Order was self-sufficient in legal matters and could rely on its own members.[64] The Hospitallers still fared better than the Templars in the world of litigation and had managed to have members within its ranks that had trained in law.[65] As Luttrell maintains, 'during the fourteenth century the brethren, especially the *fratres presbiteri*, had improved considerably' and 'after 1356 the Hospital regularly trained some of its chaplains in Canon Law at Paris and other universities.'[66] The Temple seemed to have

---

[59] I. Grech, 'Il Prezzo dell'Onore', 596.
[60] Victor Mallia-Milanes, *Venice and Hospitaller Malta, 1530-1798. Aspects of a Relationship* (Marsa: PEG, 1992).
[61] James Brundage, 'The Lawyers of the Military Orders', *The Military Orders: Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick*, Malcolm Barber (ed.), I (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994), 346.
[62] J. Brundage, 'Lawyers of the Military Orders', 350.
[63] J. Brundage, 'Lawyers of the Military Order's. 349.
[64] J. Brundage, 'Lawyers of the Military Orders', 355.
[65] J. Brundage, 'Lawyers of the Military Orders', 351-352.
[66] Anthony Luttrell, 'The Hospitallers' Historical Activities: 1400-1530', *Latin Greece, the Hospitallers and the Crusades 1291-1440* (London: Variorum, 1982), 145.

stood aloof from increasing legalism which eventually hastened its demise. On the other hand, the Order of St John was quicker to adapt and, though the number of lawyer brethren was never enough for its needs, yet lay lawyers were drawn towards its patronage and thus it could rely on them for constant legal assistance.[67] Receivers all over Europe would have had constant dealings with lawyers as, from the twelfth century onwards, 'local and regional courts became increasingly sophisticated' and Church authorities 'were beginning to appoint full-time judges with formal legal training to preside over them.'[68] Rome of course was a special case as many disputes had to be settled there, and ultimately, it is where religious orders had to do constant battle to retain the privileges that they had accumulated over time and in general protect their way of life as stipulated by their rule and statutes. The souring of relations between religious orders and local communities from the fourteenth century onwards may have forced these orders to face more lawsuits. According to Guida, one factor that contributed to the Hospital's loss of popularity was due to the way commanderies were being managed for the benefit of the commander rather than the Order.[69] Kleinhenz argued that this pattern was in fact true for the main monastic orders during the late medieval period.[70] As for the military-religious orders, their relevance was questioned once there was no longer a Christian force present in the Holy Land. Military orders had greatly benefited from gifts and endowments while there was a strong Christian foothold in the Levant. But when the tide turned 'the military orders became increasingly criticised for their inadequacies as defenders of Christendom.'[71] The original fervour that had enriched them with donations died down as their popularity diminished, and what had once been graciously given was now coveted back. The military orders had to fight constant legal battles to retain their privileges and their properties.[72] The receiver was the main protector of the Hospital's financial interests and had to have constant dealings with the Order's lawyers.

---

[67] J. Brundage, 'Lawyers of the Military Orders', 352-353.
[68] J. Brundage, 'Lawyers of the Military Orders', 348.
[69] L. M. Guida, *L'Ordine di San Giovanni di Gerusalemme. Le Sue Commende e i Suoi Conventi*. (Taranto: Centro Studi Melitensi, 2007), 210.
[70] Christopher Kleinhenz, *Medieval Italy: an Encyclopedia* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 731.
[71] Alan Forey, 'The military orders in the crusading proposals of the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries', *Military Orders and Crusades*, VIII (Ashgate: Routledge, 2001), 317.
[72] J. Brundage, 'Lawyers of the Military Orders', 348.

All litigants had access to lawyers, and the common ruse for those with the weaker case was to prolong the dispute as much as possible in the hope that the adversary ran out of patience and resources and opted for a settlement out of court. The Order both practised this with instructions to the receiver to prolong the case or, if the case was promising, commanded to avoid the case getting bogged down with infinite deferments.[73] It seems also that the verbosity of certain lawyers was so notorious that Grand Master Carafa stipulated a provision for this very purpose when lawyers presented a case at the Council:

> Regarding lawyers disputing a case at the council, who indulge in superfluous words, tiring out the Councillors unnecessarily, [who] used to be abreast and informed of the cases. Therefore, it is decreed that [the lawyers] can only speak for half an hour at the opening and a quarter of an hour when summing up; to this effect the Vice Chancellor shall keep time with a sand clock.[74]

The Grand Master could only impose a limit on lawyers' duration for speeches for his Council and could not legislate for the courts in Rome. The only way to exert any form of influence that would push a lawsuit towards a speedy and favourable end in Rome was through having influential patrons presiding, or at least present, in that particular court. This usually took the form of a cardinal protector. Religious orders found it expedient to have one or more high-ranking church officials that protected that Order's interests. In the system of patronage, the protector would in turn be compensated. For instance, Dal Pozzo mentions Cardinal Chigi as appointed to be protector of the Religion in 1658.[75] During the first eighteen years of Sacchetti's tenure, the cardinal protector seems to have been Cardinal Alderano Cibo (1613-1700) although no official mention of this was found in Dal Pozzo.[76] The Order of St John had several cardinals on whose favour it could rely. Many of its members were drawn from the nobility which ensured good connections. A glance at the Sacchetti family quickly shows the number of connections a noble family had. By marriage, the Sacchetti were connected to the Altoviti, the Falconieri, the Ricasoli-Rucellai, the Acciaioli, the

---

[73] S. Mercieca, 'Office of the Receiver', 74.
[74] Dal Pozzo (1715), 703, '*Circa le dispute de gli Avocati nelle cause, che trattavano in Consiglio, i quali diffondendosi in superfluita di parole, defaticavano senza necessita I Consiglieri, che sogliono prima esser istrutti, & informati nelle Case. Persio fu decretato ch'in avvenire non potessero parlare piu di mez'hora per cadauno nella prima attione, & un quarto d'hora nella replica; al qual effetto il Vicecancelliero tenesse pronto per misurar il tempo l'horologio da polvere*.'
[75] Dal Pozzo (1715), 271.
[76] For a brief biographical note of Cardinal Cibo, see Appendix 1, 235.

Marchesi di San Vito and the Nerli.[77] This does not include friendships and alliances, such as the Barberini. Three of these families had high-ranking members in the Roman Curia: Monsignor Giacomo Altoviti (1604-1693), Cardinal Niccolo Acciaioli (1630-1719, the surname is sometimes spelt Acciaiuoli) and Cardinal Francesco Nerli (1636-1708). Such an army of friends in high places would seemingly ensure favourable outcomes in all disputes, but the litigants would have their own connections and alliances. In his role as receiver, Sacchetti would often appeal to cardinals who were favourable to the Order. Sacchetti was appointed receiver on 3 November 1681[78] until 1715, when Fra Carlo Benedetto Giustiniani took over.[79] By that time he was 71 years old.

Apart from these important patrons, Sacchetti had his own team to consult, namely the Order's lawyers in Rome and the procurator of the common treasury. Little so far could be gleaned on these, as only their surnames are mentioned in Sacchetti's despatches; lawyers Bottini and Cerretani and the procurator Torrenti. The latter was very probably a chaplain of the Order as he is not mentioned in Bonazzi's *Elenco dei Cavalieri* but his role implied that he had to be a member of the Order. As Caravita states, the Religion needed other ministers apart from the receivers to protect its interests abroad, so procurators of the treasury were appointed in every priory, the numbers depending on the size of the particular priory.[80] That Torrenti was not a knight would be an exception, as Caravita stipulated that to be eligible for procurator outside the convent, one should have completed five *caravane*,[81] but exceptions for any office were neither unknown nor uncommon. Judging from Sacchetti's frequent consultations and the nature of the cases, it is safe to assume that Torrenti was procurator of the common treasury outside the convent. As receiver, Sacchetti had to oversee that the Order was not defrauded of *spogli* of deceased knights within his *ricetta*. The death of Fra Carlo Chigi in 1683 shows the work involved. Fra Chigi had been commander of Montalboddo, Fano and Sinigalia in the Marche, then part of the pontifical states. Fra Cesare Nappi informed Sacchetti of his death and also that the late Fra Chigi had been granted a dispensation by Pope Alexander VII (r.1655-1667)

[77] For Patronage, see this work Chapter 8. For the Sacchetti family see Chapter 10.
[78] AOM 127, f.56v.
[79] AOM 1327, ff.143r-144v, 11 May 1715.
[80] Giovanni Maria Caravita, *Trattato*, 181-182.
[81] G.M. Caravita, *Trattato*, 181-182.

to bequeath 6,000 ducats as he pleased, other than the *quinto* usually allowed by the Order, and also other permissions given by previous Grand Masters.[82] The procedure Sacchetti followed was thus: Fra Nappi was to send all permits and faculties of the deceased to the procurators of the common treasury. He then consulted Procurator Torrenti and Angelo Paolini, the solicitor in charge of the *spoglio*, 'the better to have a grip on the affair and keep it within sight until it ends.'[83] More information on the faculties were needed, which according to Sacchetti, could only be obtained from a certain Giovanni Vincenzo Morettini, who was well versed in such cases. The problem was that Morettini charged dearly for his services:

> Had his fee been a mere trifle, I would have taken him on immediately, but he expects over 100 *scudi*, [so] I will write to the Procurators of the Treasury this evening for advice.[84]

Meanwhile, Sacchetti had to see that the relatives of the deceased commander had not initiated proceedings on the strength of the faculties of their deceased kin. This information had to be obtained from the receiver in Florence where the family lived. The case ended favourably for the Order, as in actual fact Fra Chigi had not after all taken advantage of the faculties he had obtained, nor did the family initiate any proceedings against the Order.[85] Sacchetti frequently encountered similar cases. The system the Order had established reflected its efforts to protect its interests from every angle. The receiver largely took care of the financial side. This position also enabled him to keep a check on priors. A procurator of the common treasury helped him in executing his work but could also monitor the receiver himself. This system of checks and counterchecks was typical of the Order which knew the fragility of man and the vulnerability of the Order should the life support system of its priories fail. Its ministers outside the convent were the Western equivalent of its naval squadron in the East: constantly protecting the Religion and justifying its existence.

---

[82] AOM 1298, f.138r, 30 October 1683.
[83] AOM 1298, f.138r, 30 October 1683: '*ad effetto di poter quanto prima metter le mani in questo affare senza perderlo di vista fino alla totale terminatione*.'
[84] AOM 1298, 138r, 30 October 1683: '*se la sua pretensione fosse stata di qualche bagattilla io facil[mente] averei pigliato l'arbitrio, ma perche lui domanda sopra cento scudi, io scrivo questa sera ai V[enerabili] proc[uratori] del Tesoro per consiglio*.'
[85] AOM 1299, f.33v, 19 February 1684.

3.4 The Procurator General

All orders of the Church maintained a representative in Rome to deal with various affairs concerning the order and its members in the various congregations and ecclesiastical tribunals. It was a prestigious and demanding role, usually given to an experienced brother who enjoyed the trust of his brethren and was known to be 'diligent and prudent' and have 'the necessary abilities to deal with such affairs.' The appointment was for three years, after which he could either be confirmed for another three years or recalled.[86] As orders of the Church, military orders followed this precept. The Order of St John was a special case in that its Master, along with his Council, ruled a group of islands. The Order's political position in Malta was peculiar. Nominally under the viceroy of Sicily, the Grand Master behaved as absolute ruler. So representation in Rome had to be political as well as religious. Like other realms, the Grand Master as prince of a territory wanted a functioning embassy in Rome, as he had in Paris and Madrid so in Rome, thus the Procurator General doubled up as an ambassador: 'The Order had a resident ambassador in the Roman Curia, who was also called Procurator General.'[87] However, the Church regulations that governed the office of the Procurator General held for the Order as well. Like other religious orders, his mandate ended after three years or automatically when a Chapter General was held. The position could be confirmed and there were no restrictions as to how many times this could be extended. The duties of the Procurator General were to:

> defend the privileges, benefices and liberty of the Order, sustain and defend equally the concessions, the donations and the provisions of the Master and the Council. Resist and oppose rebellious and disobedient brethren who are to be rigorously prosecuted and favour and aid graciously (refusing all manner of gifts), defend the obedient and keep the Master and the Convent informed of all affairs.[88]

The Order itself does not seem to have distinguished between the ambassador and the procurator general as regards duties. Being the same person, the statutes address both offices in the same line and do not distinguish between nature of functions assigned. For instance, as the statutes state:

---

[86] See Gaetano Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica* (1852), vol. 55, 278-279, sub vocem 'Procuratori degli Ordini Religiosi'.
[87] BSMOM, Ms. 62. Carlo Micallef, *Summa Iurium Ierosolymitanum Equitum*, [17th century], vol. 1, 596-599, sub vocem 'Legatus vulgo Ambasciatore'.
[88] BSMOM, Ms. 62. Carlo Micallef, Summa Iurium Ierosolymitanum Equitum, [17th century], vol. 1, 596-599, sub vocem 'Legatus vulgo Ambasciatore'.

It is commanded that, the Ambassador, and Procurator general of our Order in the court of Rome diligently supplicate his Holiness in the name of all the Religion in the Beatification of Our Saints and that their office can be said in our Churches, and masses. We further charge M[onsignor] Rev[erend] Prior of the Church to send the necessary information and other instructions needed for the progress of this pious affair.[89]

The task is purely religious and no distinction is made between the roles since both offices are included. In fact it was actually ordained that:

In the new compilation of the statutes, for statute twelve, that concerns the Procurator general in the Court of Rome the words below have to be added, that is, Ambassador to His Holiness, and Procurator general in the Court of Rome.[90]

The statutes then, underlined the dual nature of the main minister of the Order in Rome, but neither specified between the two roles nor attempted to separate the functions of the two offices. Indeed, given its nature of a religious Order and an Order state, the representation in Rome was naturally blurred. The following case study shows the lack of clarity in the two roles.

The case centres around the *smutitione* of the Grand Priory of Germany. The word *smutitione* was the term used by the Order when there was a vacancy to fill in a priory or commandery. The death of the Grand Prior Landgrave Cardinal Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt on 19 February 1682 gave the Order the opportunity to try and appoint someone without interference from the papacy. Cardinal von Hessen came from a protestant family but after a short stay in Malta he was impressed by the ethos of the Order and converted to Catholicism to be able to join its ranks.[91] He did so in 1636 and a year later was decorated with the Grand Cross *ad honores*, recommended by a brief from Pope Urban VIII Barberini (r.1623-1644).[92] The papacy saw in his conversion a means of propaganda for promoting Catholicism in Germany and he was

---

[89] Statuti 1674, Titolo Terzo, Della Chiesa, 14. '*Item, hanno ordinato, che l'Ambasciatore, e Procuratore generale dell'Ordine nostro nella Corte Romana a nome di tutta la Religione supplichi la Santita di Nost[ro] Signore, e facia le diligenze necessarie per la Beatificatione d'alcuni nostril Santi, e che nelle nostre Chiese se ne possi dire l'officio, e messe. Comettendo al M[onsignor] Rev[erendo] Prior della Chiesa a mandargli le scritture, che bisogneranno per l'informationi, & ogni altra instruttione per la buona, e pia direttionedi questo negotio necessaria.*', 38.

[90] Statuti 1674, Titolo Duodecimo, Dell' Elettioni, 4. '*Item, hanno ordinato, che nella nuova compilatione de'statuti allo statuto dodeci, che tratta del Procurator generale in Corte Romana siano poste l'infrascritte parole, cioe, ambasciator appresso la Santita di Nostro Signore, e Procuratore generale nella Corte di Roma.*', 110.

[91] Fredrick, Landgrave of Hesse, retrieved from https://www.omnia.ie/index.php?navigation_function=2&navigation_item=%2F08533%2Fartifact_aspx_id_537&repid=1

[92] Dal Pozzo (1715), 19.

showered with dignities throughout his career. Apart from being made Grand Prior in 1647, he was Commander in Chief of the Spanish Fleet and Governor of Majorca and made Cardinal by Innocent X in 1652. He was also Protector of the German Nation in the Eternal City (apart from Spain, Aragon and Sardinia), appointed Dean of the Cathedral Church of Breslau in 1668, Bishop of Breslau in 1671 and made provincial governor of Silesia in 1675.[93] When he died, Sacchetti had not yet taken over as ambassador as his appointment was for 1 May 1682 as declared in his election in the minutes of 6 November 1681.[94] It was thus ambassador Fra Caravita who started to handle the case. In his first letter as ambassador, Sacchetti informed the Grand Master of the result of this case, and that Fra Franz von Sonnenberg (1608-1682) was appointed as Grand Prior to the 'satisfaction of His Holiness and that of Cardinal Cibo'.[95] However, by August, Sacchetti learnt from the captain of the Swiss Guards that his [the captain's] cousin Fra Sonnenberg was gravely ill, which meant that Sacchetti had again to seek the intervention of Cardinal Cibo to ensure that the Order retained the right over the appointment of Grand Prior.[96] Sacchetti doubled his pleas by sending his secretary to seek the protection of Cardinal Cibo in case there was another vacancy in the Priory of Germany. He obtained the promise from the Cardinal that he would do his utmost to favour the Order. The same Captain informed Sacchetti that Fra Sonnenberg was better.[97] Unfortunately Fra Sonnenberg's health deteriorated and Sacchetti learnt of his death with the arrival of mail from Milan on the evening of Wednesday 28 October. Sacchetti considered the matter as urgent: 'So Thursday morning I sent immediately to Cardinal Cibo, informing him and supplicating to present to His Holiness to allow the Order a free hand in the devolution of the Priory.'[98] Cardinal Cibo replied:

I have spoken to the Pope past weeks when you gave me notice of his illness. I will inform him of his death and since these Princes of Nuremberg did not make any claim

---

[93] Fredrick, Landgrave of Hesse, retrieved from https://www.omnia.ie/index.php?navigation_function=2&navigation_item=%2F08533%2Fartifact_aspx_id_537&repid=1

[94] AOM 1297, f.57r, 3 November 1681.

[95] AOM 1297, f.64r, 2 May 1682: '*Con sodisffatione di Sua Santita e del Sig[nor] Card[inale] Cibo*'.

[96] AOM 1297, f.123rv, 29 August 1682.

[97] AOM 1297, f.125r, 5 September 1682.

[98] AOM 1297, f.152v, 31 October 1682: '*Onde io subito il giovedi a mattina mandai dal Sig[nor] Card[inale] Cibo a Darlene parte et a supplicando di rappresentare a nostro Sig[nore] di voler laschiare la libbera smutitione del Priorato*'.

last time I am sure they will not make claims now, so the Pope will leave it in the hands of the Religion.[99]

Cardinal Cibo eventually obtained confirmation from the Pope and the Grand Master was duly informed. The Bali Fra Gottfriede Droste zu Vischering (1614-1683, year of birth uncertain) was chosen.[100] Unfortunately Fra Droste died barely a month later, but the Pope confirmed that the Grand Master 'can enjoy the continuation of the original favour and that when the Venerable Langue proceeds towards the devolution, there will be no obstacle'.[101]

This case has various themes that were typical problems that the Order faced regularly. Central to the question is papal interference. The relationship between the Order and the papacy was paradoxical. The existence of the Order, its functions, its revenues, its claims over territories were all justified by it being a religious order and as such thrived in the immunity granted to all religious orders. Due to the military aspect, further privileges were bestowed along the years. But retaining all this came at a price as various popes very often used Hospitaller lands for their own ends, dealing them out to favourites or championing their own candidate when there was a vacancy for a commandery or priory.[102] Once a commandery or priory was 'lost' to the papacy, it was very hard for the Order to regain it, as subsequent popes would uphold the decisions of predecessors especially since they would have their own favourites and their own obligations. The knights were not exactly thrilled by these proceedings. Commanderies were a knight's insurance policy as Dal Pozzo accurately and rather emotionally put it:

Not only are they obliged by the vows; but [they] have renounced most of their Birth right, have spent what little remained of their resources in the service of the Order, consumed their youth in voyages and caravans, shed their blood and imperilled their lives in a thousand tribulations; then, at the end of their career, after acquiring the right

---

[99] AOM 1297, f.152v-153r, 31 October 1682: '*Io ne parlerai le settimane passate al Papa quando lei mi diede notitia della sua malatia hoggi gli partecipero l'avviso della morte e gia che qeuti Sig[nor] Pr[incipi] di Neuburgo non ne fecero nesuna istantia le altra volta tengo per cert oche non la faranno adesso, con che il Papa lo laciera correre alla Rel[igione].*'

[100] Dal Pozzo (1715), 493.

[101] AOM 1298, f.5v, 2 January 1683: '*si poteria godere della contunuatione della prima gratia, con che quando costa la Ven[erabile] Lingua venna all'atto della smutitione, non vi sara nesun ostaclo per queste parte.*'

[102] See, Emanuel Buttigieg, 'The Pope wants to be the Ruin of this Religion', The Papacy, France, and the Order of St John in the Seventeenth Century', *Symposia Melitensia*, 5 (2009), 73-84.

to commanderies and dignities, they find themselves cheated out of everything, and what remains as their prize for so many trials is a poor and scanty old age.[103]

The ambassador and procurator-general, as the defender of 'the privileges, benefices and liberty of the Order' would have to contend such papal decisions which infringed these pillars upon which the whole edifice of the Order rested. This could only be done through intense lobbying with the hope of thwarting the papal mind in favour of the Religion. This was a very delicate process as applying too much pressure could easily have the opposite effect to the one desired and taxed every inch of the minister's diplomatic prowess. This was an ongoing process. The incidence of two deaths in one year brings to the forefront the fact that when the Pope granted the Grand Master a free hand in the choice of a prior once did not mean that that priory would remain free from papal interference for ever. This is immediately evident with the first sign of illness of Prior Fra Sonnenberg. Sacchetti's prompt action earned him an accolade from the Grand Master, praising him for his diligence in keeping Cardinal Cibo aware of the situation and imploring his protection so that 'the Religion is not discriminated against.'[104]

The main role of any ambassador remained the interest of his prince which was equal to interest of the country as the prince equated himself with his realm. In strictly legalistic terms, the ambassador of the Order represented the Grand Master, whilst the Order as a religious body was represented by the procurator general. But in truth this would be a legal fiction, as the Grand Master in a sense embodied the Religion and would only wish to promote its interest and curb whatever was to its detriment, and his ambassador acted in his stead. Even the cases that the ambassador dealt with in Rome would not suffice to distinguish between the roles as even issues which would seem to be strictly religious such as the commemoration of a particular saint or inviting priests to listen to confessions would still be related to the Order's privileges.[105] But ultimately, no matter how far removed from worldly concerns, a case always boiled down to the Order enjoying its 'liberty', which often translated into being exempted

---

[103] Dal Pozzo (1715), 344: '*s'eran non solo obligati con voti; ma rinunciato la maggior parte il proprio Patrimonio, havevano speso il poco residuo delle loro sostanze in servitio dell'Ordine, consumata la gioventu in viaggi, e caravane, sparso il sangue, & esposta a mille cimenti la vita; E pure trovandos al fine della cariera, dopo acquistatao il Jus delle Comende, e delle Dignita, vedersi in ultimo defraudati d'ogni cosa, ne restarsi con altro premio di tante fatiche, che con una povera, e stentata vecchiaia*.'

[104] AOM 1449, f.162r, 26 September 1682: '*Affinche non venisse pregiudicata la Relig[io]ne*'

[105] This work, Chapter 3.

from ecclesiastical interference. This exemption could only be sustained by the papacy, so the roles of the ambassador and procurator general not only blurred, but were very often identical.

3.5 Conclusion

Changing circumstances breed either adaptation or extinction. The change of fortunes saw the Order constantly carving a new future for itself. After the catastrophe of the loss of Acre and the uncertainty of Cyprus, Rhodes offered stability without the fear of being too comfortable and too far from the common foe. In a sense, the Malta experience can be seen as a continuation of this. This chapter outlined how changes of fortune affected the Order's diplomatic endeavours. By the seventeenth century, the system of permanent representation in the four major cities of Europe had been established. Apart from the ambassador, the Order also had other ministers outside the convent, that unofficially could represent the Order, such as procurators of the common treasury and receivers. In Rome, a religious order had to maintain a procurator general as well as an ambassador. Ambassador Sacchetti was also receiver and procurator general. Although he executed these roles, he was never addressed as such. The addressee in the outgoing correspondence of the Grand Masters Sacchetti was listed as ambassador, being the highest dignity of the three. On rare occasions, his title of Prior is put down on the copy stored in chancery, as in the letter dated 11 February 1700, To the 'Prior of Lombardy Sacchetti [in] Rome', although on the same day another note was sent and put down as 'Further to Ambassador Prior Sacchetti'.[106]

The procurators of the common treasury in the Convent used the respectful title of '*Ill[ustrissi]mo Sig[nor]e E[ccellenti]ssmo*' at the head of the letter.[107] As a receiver, Sacchetti kept a steady correspondence with the procurators of the common treasury based in Malta. Apart from information on responsions from his *ricetta*, other matters are mentioned which show that roles were very fluid and that attempting to separate them according to tasks would be a disservice to the study of the administrative processes of the Order.

---

[106] AOM 1461, f.19v, 11 Feb 1700: '*Al Prior di Lombardia Sacchetti Roma*' and '*Aggionta all'Amb[asciator]e Sacchetti*'.
[107] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP6, 16 October 1697.

For instance, in a letter addressed to Sacchetti dated 4 October 1696 (or 97, date not clear) the procurators of the common treasury asked Sacchetti to intercede on behalf of a curate imprisoned on the behest of Cardinal Archbishop of Bologna Giacomo Boncompagni (r.1690-1731). Since the curate belonged to a church within the confines of a commandery in this city, the procurators felt that this 'jeopardised the privileges of the Order.'[108]

The Commander, Fra Luigi Sampieri had written to the secretary of the common treasury Commander Fra Giulio Bovio regarding this incident, and a copy of this letter was sent to Sacchetti so that he could 'substantiate his defence'.[109] The letter then proceeds with financial concerns regarding Sacchetti's *ricetta*. Therefore, although the responsibilities of the procurators of the common treasury and the receivers of the Order were primarily concerned with the overseeing of financial affairs, this letter points at a certain flexibility in the responsibilities of the ministers of the Order. Fra Bovio could have written directly to Sacchetti, to the Grand Master or to his Grand Prior. It is possible that he did. Be that as it may, he definitely wrote to those ministers least responsible for such affairs, and they in turn took it upon themselves to inform the ambassador, although strictly speaking it would have been more the responsibility of the Procurator General.

The result would have been the same. The case would end up at in the hands of the ambassador in Rome, even though the victim was not a knight and the Order had not been defrauded of any money. The procurators appealed to Sacchetti to 'give orders' so that the case be concluded 'in a way that there is no prejudice to our rights.'[110] And that was the crux of the matter. All ministers had to defend the 'privileges, benefices and liberty of the Order.' Each minister had to be jealous of these three pillars without which the Religion could not function and which each knight felt had been earned with blood.

---

[108] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP6, f.13r, 4 October 1696: '*E come che il negozio riguarda l'indennita de nostri Privileggi*'.
[109] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP6, f.13r, 4 October 1696: '*Cosi conviene sostenerne la difesa'* 4 October 1696.
[110] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP6, f.13r, 4 October 1696: '*Si compiacca di dar ordine che sia [unclear] detta affare in maniera; che non ne risulti pregiudizio a nostri diritti*.'

Titles apart, on letters, the Grand Master addressed Sacchetti as '*Relig[io]se in Chr[ist]o nobis chiaris[si]me sal[utissi]me*' (Religious in Christ), and the main concern was the survival of the Order:

We hope, that the blood, that is shed every year by Knights and Religious for the glory of the Holy Catholic Faith, and for the service of the Holy See, germinates and bears pious fruit, which is not merely praise that His Holiness gives us. We feel it is an opportune moment to ask His Holiness to confirm and renew the privileges conferred upon our Religion by the gratitude of so many Pontiffs who in the past respected and appreciated the great utility of our service to Christianity.[111]

[111] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP3f.114r 15 Oct 1687: '*Sperando noi, che il sangue, che si va spargendo ogn anno de nostri Cavalieri, e Religiosi per l'ampliatione della S[an]ta Fe[de] Cat[toli]ca e per servitio della S[an]ta Sede, habbia da germogliare, e produrre frutto piei, che non sono le semplice lodi, che ci vengono date da Sua San[ti]ta. Habbiamo stimato tempo opportune di dimandare all S[anti]ta Sua la confermatione, e rinnovat[io]ne de I privilege della Religone n[os]tra conceduti dalla gratitudine di tanti sommi Pontefici, che ne tempi socorsi consideravano, e riconoscevano l'utile grande, che apportava al Christianesimo il servitio de nostri*.'

Chapter 4: In the interest of the *Comun Tesoro*

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with economic issues which the ambassador had to tackle as part of his role. These were cases where special permissions were being sought or had been obtained from the papacy, on the strength of which, the rules of the Order could be bypassed or its privileges suspended. Briefs, as these permits were called, diverted monies and goods of a defunct brother from reaching the *Comun Tesoro*. The Common Treasury was the Order's ministry for finance, handling all the Order's assets, revenue and expenditure. This included the substantial income from commanderies as well as the effects of individual knights on their demise.[1] Briefs could range from an individual knight seeking to bequeath personal effects to his kin rather than the Order, to monarchs attempting to augment their revenue by taxing Church institutions. The ambassador used his contacts to obtain early information on any applications for such briefs in order to prevent them being issued. Once obtained, they would be hard to recall. In his dealings, Sacchetti would still have to be exceedingly prudent to prevent alienating the Order from powerful families or indeed, even monarchs.

4.2 On Briefs: Two Examples

Though the Order followed the practice and trends of European princes in its diplomatic corps, nevertheless its special position demanded that its diplomacy would also be peculiar to it. The Order's diplomacy was guided mainly by the need to safeguard its interests and maintain a strict neutrality between princes who were often at loggerheads with each other. As Allen said: 'Diplomacy was the Order's forte both for preserving its own privileges and for interacting with the respective foreign policies of its principal protectors, namely the papacy, and the Spanish and French monarchies.'[2] Moreover, it was not merely a question of retaining the favour of kings and popes. Within each court circled powerful individuals that had to be taken into

[1] Stefan Cachia, 'The treasury, debts and deaths. A study of the Common Treasury of the Order of St John and its relationship with the individual Hospitaller in matters of debts and deaths based on Giovanni Caravita's 'Trattato del Comun Tesoro'' (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta, 2004), 40.

[2] David F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors' in Counter-Reformation Europe', in *The Military Orders: Welfare and Warfare* (Helen Nicholson ed.) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 363.

account, courtiers and cardinals with whom bishops and families of brother knights had special affinity. The Order's privileges were very often challenged from within as well as from without.

Sacchetti's official letters teem with a variety of cases that threatened such privileges. A particularly sensitive area was the question of *spoglie*, defined as:

> All the goods, whether monies, moveables, immovables, as well as credits which the knight left on his death. In common usage it referred to those goods that devolved to the Treasury after deducting the *quinto*, any debts that the knight might have had, and any other expense incurred.[3]

The *quinto* refers to one-fifth of the possessions of Hospitallers which they were legally allowed to dispose of as they wished, after having obtained permission from the Grand Master. Cachia adds that 'They could also will away, on obtaining due permission patrimonial properties, and any immovable in Malta.'[4] That the issue of *spoglie* was a delicate matter is attested by the fact that the statutes contain fifteen entries to govern all aspects related to bequeathing.[5] As religious, the brethren embraced the vows of chastity, obedience and poverty. The latter did not prevent religious institutions from amassing wealth, but it did prevent individual members from disposing of goods at will as if they were personal possessions. Brethren were obliged to list the goods, including money owed and owing, at their disposal in a form of inventory called the *dispropriamento*. According to a statute enacted under Grand Master La Sengle this was supposed to be done yearly.[6] This was quite a sensible statute, because it distinguished between goods that belonged to the Order from what respective families of knights gave to their kin to make use of during their lifetime. It left nothing to chance and the annual update ensured that neither party, that is neither the Order nor the family of the brother knight, would trespass on each other's rights when a knight died. For instance, Sacchetti clearly identified in his *dispropriamento* those items that belonged to his familial house, underlining the fact with: 'I have merely enjoyed simply the use of…'[7]

---

[3] S. Cachia, 'The Treasury, Debts and Deaths', 267.
[4] S. Cachia, 'The Treasury, Debts and Deaths', 266.
[5] Giacomo Bosio, *Statuti della Sacra Religione di San Giovanni Gerosolimitano* (Rome, 1718), 114.
[6] G. Bosio, Statuti (1718), 183, '*Statuimo, che i Priori, Bagliui, Commendatori, e fratelli, siano tenuti di fare ogn'anno dispropriamento*'.
[7] AOM 931/35, 15, f.106r-107v: '*Item dichiaro che tanto il letto dove io dormo, quanto tutti gli altri mobili, cioè Arazzi, parati, quadri, Tavolini, studioli, sedie, libri et ign"altro cosa esistente si nell'Appartamento di sopra dove io dormo, che in quello da basso, dove ricevo le visite, sono e*

There was, however, a loophole through which a well-connected family could attempt in order to lay claim for more than the allotted *quinto*.[8] Members of religious orders did not have the right to make a will because it would be a flagrant breach of the vow of poverty.[9] But a papal brief allowing a knight to testate could override the Order's statutes. This the ambassador in Rome would have had to try to prevent or strive to overcome in lengthy and expensive legal battles. Sacchetti encountered two such cases early in his career as ambassador.

Barely a month from his investiture as ambassador, Sacchetti had to deal with the case of the Prior of Bagnara Fra Fabrizio Ruffo (1619-1692). Sacchetti learnt from the receiver of Naples that the Prior had obtained a brief permitting him to draw up a will. The procurator of the treasury Torrenti promised to do his utmost to get this brief withdrawn.[10] Legal proceedings were duly initiated, with some optimism as to a favourable outcome as the Prior of Bagnara was still alive. Sacchetti later approached Cardinal Giovanni Battista de Luca (1614–1683) both to consult him in his capacity as a jurist, and to gain support for the Order's case. A lawyer of note, de Luca was very close to Pope Innocent XI who had first made him *referandarij Utriusque Signaturae* (the Referendary of both signatures) and later auditor of the Sacred Palace.[11] A year before, in 1681, Innocent XI had elevated him to the cardinalate. The outcome of the Bagnara case depended on the *Sacra Rota* and there was not much hope of a speedy decision as all tribunals closed from July till October.[12] The case resurfaced again two years later, when the receiver of Naples Fra de Cordova wrote to

---

spettano alla mia casa, avendone io solamento goduto il semplice uso; e similmente dichiaro, che tutti l'argenti di qualsivoglia sorte, de i quali mi sono fin ora piu servito, sono proprij della mia casa, et alla medesima spettano'.

[8] S. Cachia, 'The Treasury, Debts and Deaths', 183.

[9] S. Cachia, 'The Treasury, Debts and Deaths', 211.

[10] AOM 1297, f.82r, 6 June 1682; '*la citatione autentica contro il Ven[erabl]e P[rio]re della Bagnara per l'affari del suo breve colla facolta di testare Io l'ho consegnata a questi Ministri accio intentino il giuditio contro di esso et ne ho parlato hieri mattina ca[l]dam[ente] al Proc[uratore] Torrenti il quale mi ha promesso di fare ogni possibile diligenza per la revocatione di questo Breve*.'

[11] H. Lee Cowan, 'Cardinal Giovanni Battista De Luca: Nepotism in the Seventeenth Century Catholic Church and De Luca's Efforts to Prohibit the Practice' (Published online Ph.D. dissertation. University of North Texas 2012), 60. Retrieved on 24 May 2019 from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Cardinal-Giovanni-Battista-De-Luca%3A-Nepotism-in-the-Cowan/3a733423ffcd6353a5cde5005da4e82c0e6da2c7. The *Referandarij Utriusque Signaturae* were officers entrusted with all preparatory arrangements for papal decisions for documents awaiting the papal signature.

[12] AOM 1297, f.84r, 13 June 1682. The *Sacra Rota* was one of the highest Church tribunals, in the words of Pius IV, where 'the more serious cases of all the Christian faithful may be known and decided.' H. L. Cowan, 'Cardinal De Luca', 322. For a brief biography of Cardinal De Luca, see Appendix 1, 235.

Sacchetti with the alarming news that the Prior was gravely ill and his briefs were still valid. The ambassador called for lawyers Bottini and Cerretani along with Procurator Torrenti. Evidently the *Sacra Rota* had not revoked the brief. The last resort was to obtain a monition from the *Auditore della Camera superiore observatione privilegiorum* and despatch it hastily to the receiver in Naples.[13] Further probing proved to no avail. Sacchetti had asked the Grand Master to give orders to Procurator Fra Mignanelli (possibly Giacomo, who joined the Order in 1642) to provide details on the contents of the brief.[14] Copies were eventually sent by the receiver, which Sacchetti then passed on to the Procurator.[15] Nothing had been retracted. The briefs held, and the ambassador's assiduousness proved to no avail.

The ambassador came across a very similar case a few months later. News of the death of the Venerable Prior Fra Fortunato de Vecchi reached him from Tuscany on 30 October 1682. Since no previous news of illness had been received in Rome, the news of the Prior's death had to be confirmed, as Sacchetti wrote to Grand Master Carafa on 31 October: 'and since I had had no previous news, neither from the receiver [Fra Andrea Minerbetti] nor from any other Sienese knight, I had to confirm this news.'[16] It can be deduced from Sacchetti's tone and from similar cases that sickness was usually diligently reported to the ambassador in Rome. In the same letter he explained his strategy. After confirmation of the news he contacted the next of kin, in this case, the lay brother of the late Prior informing him of 'the obligations that every religious has in such cases regarding the interests of the common Treasury'.[17]

However, Prior Fra De Vecchi had been in possession of two important documents that absolved him from such obligations. Pope Clement X (r.1670-1676)

---

[13] AOM 1299, f.28r, 5 February 1684: '*Il Ricev[itore] di Napoli Cav[aliere] de Cordova mi scrisse con sua lettera delli 29 dal cadente, che ritrovandosi il V[enerable] Prior della Bagnara ammalato con qualche pericolo di vita, dubitava che in evento di Morte in virtu delli suoi Brevi non incontrasse cola disturbo per causa del di lui spoglio con gl'Eredi. A tal avviso senza perdita di tempo feci unire avanti di me li Avvocati Bottini, e Cerretani con il Pro[curato]re Torrenti, quali conclusero di dovessi pigliare un Monit[orio] di Mons[ignore] Aud[itore] della Camera sup[per] observatione privilegioru[m] e trasmetterlo con ogni prontezza al sud[detto] Ric[evitore] come feci hier sera per via della staffetta, che ogni settimana parte in tal giorno da q[ues]ta Corte p[er] Napoli*.'

[14] AOM 1297, f.164rv, 7 November 1682.

[15] AOM 1298, f.7r, 9 January 1683.

[16] AOM 1297, f.149r, 31 October 1682: '*et se bene io non havevo di cio ricevuto nesun avviso ne del R[icevitor]e ne da altro Cav[aliere] Senese, mi sono prima assicurato qua dalla certezza dell' avviso'.*

[17] AOM 1297, f.149r, 31 October 1682: *'e poi ho mandato da questo Com[endator] de Vecchi suo fratello, notificaandogli lo obbligo che ha ogni Riligioso in simili casi per quelli che riguarda l'interesse di cotesto commun Tesoro*'.

had granted him a brief allowing the Prior to testate, whilst his successor, Pope Innocent XI (1611-1689) had further consolidated this by a *motu proprio*.[18] This was a papal rescript which derives its name from the fact that the provisions contained were decided by the pope personally, for reasons deemed sufficient by himself not on the advice of cardinals or other Church dignitaries. The lay brother knew that legally the position was unassailable, almost boasting that 'on the strength of these two writs, the Religion was not entitled to anything even had his brother died intestate.'[19] The Procurator of the Common Treasury in Siena, Fra Mignanelli (possibly Fra Francesco Mignanelli who entered the Order in 1642), had ordered for the will to be opened so he could verify the presence of the brief and rescript.[20] Sacchetti had to await information from the receiver or the procurator of the common treasury in order to 'perform due diligence in this court for anything the Prior could have had in the interest of the said Common Treasury'.[21]

Within a week Sacchetti met the brother of the late Prior who not only held to his original demands but added that he had a right to the pension his brother had on the Baliaggio of Saint Euphemia up to 25 October.[22] Eventually the receiver sent the brief and rescript which Sacchetti forwarded to the Procurator. It transpired that Prior Fra De Vecchi had been a conclavist twice. A conclavist was a personal aide to a cardinal present in a papal conclave. The Prior had helped Emilio Bonaventura Altieri become Pope Clement X and Benedetto Odescalchi become Pope Innocent XI, as conclavists played an important role in the negotiations of papal elections.[23]

These two cases within months of each other serve to show various aspects on the role of the Order's ambassador in Rome. Briefs could only emanate from the Court

---

[18] AOM 1297, f.149rv, 31 October 1682.
[19] AOM 1297, f.149rv, 31 October 1682.
[20] AOM 1297, f.149v, 31 October 1682.
[21] AOM 1297, f.149v–150r, 31 October 1682. '*Dall' avviso che io havero dal R[icevitor]e o dal suddetto Pro[curato]re del Tesoro da Siena mi regolaro per fare qua le diligenze dovute per quello che possa havere in questa corte il Defonto Priore, se ne sara luogo per l'interesse di cotesto comun Tesoro*'.
[22] AOM 1297, f.164r, 7 November 1682. The term Bailiaggio is often translated as bailiwick, referring to an area under the jurisdiction of a Bali. In this case, Saint Euphemia fell under the jurisdiction of Prior Fra del Vecchi.
[23] Renata Ago, 'Hegemony over the Social Scene and Zealous Popes', *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492–1700*, Gianvittorio Signorotto, Maria Antonietta Visceglia (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)**,** 117. For role of Prior De Vecchi, see Giovanni Nicolao, *Conclave Per la morte di Clemente X, Nel quale fu creato Papa il Signor Cardinale, Benedetto Odescalchi da Como, Innocent XI* (Colonia, 1677), 24.

of Rome, therefore Sacchetti's contemporaries in Paris, Madrid and Vienna would not have had to deal with similar cases. Contesting briefs that endangered the Order's income was peculiar to the ambassador in the court of Rome. It also put the ambassador in a very delicate position. Obtaining the right to make a will went directly against the Statutes of the Order, therefore the knight who could obtain it had to have powerful patrons in the right places. European noble families continuously sought connections to further strengthen their position and guarantee the future of their 'house', in particular by trying to be as close as possible to the ruling family. Rome was a singular case. In the case of Rome, the sovereign was elected, the chosen one being usually elderly and therefore the reign was often short. Like other early modern monarchs, the pontiff was supreme, but his family could wallow in this light only for a short while. The death of a pope spelt also the downgrading of his kin from members of a ruling house to mere nobles. The antidote to this was, as Renata Ago says:

> to marry into the families of other important cardinals. From the Borghese to the Barberini to the Chigi, there was not one house of foreign origin which did not adhere to this strategy, preferably choosing a Roman family or a family with a solid Roman heritage.[24]

A glimpse at the career of Camillo Francesco Maria Pamphili (1622-1666) provides an example of Ago's point. Great nephew of Giovanni Battista Pamphili, who became Pope Innocent X in 1644, he was destined by his family to marry Lucrezia Barberini, to mend the rift between the two families. Expressing an interest in the Church, he was created Cardinal Deacon in 1644, and Prior of Capua (Order of St John) in 1645.[25] Losing interest in his ecclesiastical career, in 1646 he married Olimpia Aldobrandini, the young widow of Paolo Borghese, grand-niece and later sole heir of Pope Clement VIII.

4.3 A Balancing Act

The relevance to the Order's ambassador in Rome is that this helps to reveal the delicate position he occupied. Just as the Sacchetti family had its own patrons, so did other knights, and very often the families could easily be rivals. Behind the cardinals

---

[24] R. Ago, 'Court and Politics in Papal Rome', 230.

[25] Francesco Bonazzi di Sannicandro, *Elenco dei Cavalieri di S.M. Ordine di S. Giovanni di Gerusalemme Ricevuti nella Veneranda Lingua D'Italia Dalla Fondazione Dell'Ordine Ai Nostri Giorni, Parte Prima* (Napoli: Detken & Rocholl), 189, 238. Entry reads: '*Panfilo, Panfilio, o Panfiglio di Roma – Camillo pronipote d'Innocezio X, Priore di Capua, Cardinale, e quindi ammogliatosi con Donna Olimpia Aldobrandini, 1645*.'

and Church officials, hovered the two equally antagonistic courts of France and Spain. That Spain was hostile to the Sacchetti family was evident in the conclaves of 1644 and 1655, when Cardinal Giulio Cesare Sacchetti (1586-1663), included in the French Court's list of acceptable candidates, was twice vetoed by the Spanish faction.[26] Thus, all diligence exerted had to be done with extreme sensitivity or risk jeopardizing his career or worse, the Order's avowed neutrality. If, as ambassador of the Order, he was seen to be blatantly siding with the faction of the reigning Pontiff, an ambassador would soon find himself on the wrong side of the court in the volatile Roman political scene.

Even the Grand Master had to be cautious when endeavouring to thwart the intentions of knights petitioning the Pope for a brief, as is evident in this four-line note written by Fra Giovanni Domenico Manso to Sacchetti:

His Eminence has commanded me to write on his behalf to Your Excellency, that you speak to Signor Cardinal Slutio, or whoever is the Secretary of Briefs, that you petition him in the name of His Eminence not to concede any brief to Knight Fra Don Diego Velez de Guevara Castilian; and that this remains secret.[27]

The desire for secrecy on the part of the Grand Master showed that he did not want Fra de Guevara to know that the Grand Master was undermining his desires. This was not uncommon, even when rulers were the supposed recommenders. In his paper on Renaissance Patronage, Vincent Ilardi states that rulers or persons of high status often wrote letters praising their client in the most glowing terms but sent separate letters to the recipient to ignore the acclamatory ones. Or, as in this case, 'More commonly, rulers instructed their ambassadors on the degree of support, if any, to be extended to their recommended clients at the courts of other rulers.'[28]

Similar sentiments were expressed in another letter from Fra Manso on behalf of the Grand Master regarding the intentions of Fra Leonor de Bealieu Bethomas to apply for a brief which would enable him to acquire commanderies of grace not only within his actual Priory of France but also beyond, in the other [Priory] of Aquitaine.

---

[26] R. Ago, 'Court and Politics in Papal Rome', 184.

[27] ASMOM, Archivio dell'Ambasciata presso la Santa Sede, Sacchetti, DP3, 5AB, fascicolo 13, f.126r, 30 October 1686: '*Sua Em[inenz]a mi ha comandato di scrivere da par[te] sua a V[ostra] Ecc[ellenz]a che parli con il Sig[nor] Card[ina]le Slusio, o chi sara Seg[retar]io de brevi, e lo preghi a nome di Sua Em[inenz]a di non concedere alcun breve al Cavalier Frà don Diego Velez de Guevara Castigliano; e che la cosa resti secreta*.'

[28] Vincent Ilardi, 'Crosses and Carets: Renaissance Patronage and Coded Letters of Recommendation', *The American Historical Review,* 92: 5 (1987), 1127.

This would render futile the concept of merit based on service to the Religion.[29] Sacchetti had to appeal to the Secretary of Briefs and ask that this application be rejected and also to supplicate the Pope to act quickly and give precise orders to this Monsignor in his (the Pope's) own name. But it was again the Grand Master's desire that this opposition to the Commander's suit remain secret:

> His Eminence says, however, that in this business you must act with all due caution and avoid clamour and public outcry but still with the most ardent efficiency that your zeal knows full well how to apply in such grave matters.[30]

Fra Bethomas basked in the favour of the Sun King due to his family ties to Alexandre Bontemps, first *valet de chambre* and trusted man of Louis XIV. He had been appointed captain of the galleys of the king in 1664 and squadron commander in 1680. In 1684 he had managed to obtain a pension of 4000 livres on the bishopric of Marseilles. He became Commander of the Commandery of Slype in 1687. Notwithstanding the desires of the Grand Master and Sacchetti's efforts, Fra Bethomas acquired the commandery of la Feuillé in 1691 on the request of Louis XIV even though the Prior of Aquitaine had already decided to assign the commandery to another knight. For this reason, Fra Bethomas had to provide the latter with a pension of 3000 livres to obtain the said commandery.[31]

It is evident that such pleas for briefs that enabled a knight to avoid the strict statutes of the Order were not isolated cases or restricted to the papal court. The samples provided hail from Spain and France as well as Italy. Such privileges once given to individual knights threatened the Order on various levels. In the case of permitting a knight to bequeath, there was the immediate consequence of diverting funds from the coffers of the Common Treasury. On the other hand, the obtaining of commanderies through briefs seemingly should not have had adverse effects on the Order's revenue. The running of a commandery by one knight instead of another need

---

[29] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP3, f.109r, 25 September 1687: '*per esser capace di Comm[en]da di gratia non solam[ent]e dentro il proprio Priorato di Francia, ma anche fuori nell altro d'Aquitania p[er] impegnare p[er] l'autorita Regia, o de supremi ser[vizz]i , e sconcertare via del favore il servitio della Relig[io]ne che come sa V[ostra] E[ccellenza] non puo non patire detrim[ent]o quando le cose non caminavo con li ordine suo e del merito, e del dovere*'.

[30] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP3, f.109r 25 September 1687: '*In questo negotio pero dice V[ostra] Em[inenz]a ch'ella si porti con ogni circuspettione operando senza strepito, et impegno pubblico, ma si bene con la piu viva efficacia che sappia pratticare il suo zelo nelle cose di magg[io]r premura*'

[31] Retrieved on 3 July 2018 from http://www.palacret.com/histoire-d-une-commanderie/2c--les-commandeurs-batisseurs/30---leonor-de-beaulieu-de-bethomas#_ftn6

not have affected the Order's revenue as long as the responsions kept flowing. Yet in a letter sent by Fra Manso, the Grand Master had complained that such briefs were 'the total ruin of the commanderies which in all the langues are mostly to be found in a state of deterioration.'[32] This seems to imply that knights who acquired commanderies through briefs were not then putting much effort in their upkeep, a state of affairs which would lead to a decrease in the annual turnover.

Apart from the direct consequences of diminished revenue, there was also the negative impact that such briefs were having on the brother knights. Governing a commandery was something which a knight aspired to after the trials and tribulations of the *caravane*. The problem had had a long history. In fact, in 1588 Italian Hospitallers had petitioned the Pope to ask for more sensitivity when granting commanderies and that it was 'unjust… that senior Hospitallers were being by-passed by junior ones in the allocation of commanderies.'[33] Knights could easily reach the conclusion that if well-placed friends and relations were to become stronger arguments than merit and seniority, then a knight would fare better in seeking to serve a sovereign or a high Church dignitary than the Religion. And in the late seventeenth century the number of knights applying for such briefs had become concern enough for the Grand Master to express his apprehension that 'many are pleading in Rome in order to obtain briefs that puts a burden on the pensions of commanderies'.'[34]

The Grand Master had asked his ambassador to try to pull the reins on this practice, and 'appeal to Monsignor Albani, the new Secretary of Briefs, so that he refuses all these requests as a prejudice to the Religion.'[35] Fra Manso added a rather cryptic note:

In this diligence do not show that your orders emanate from here [Malta], but like previous petitions found in the notes of the Secretarial Office during the time of Signor Cardinal Slusio, because such are their means, to flatter His Eminence, either to allow

---

[32] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP3, f.132r, 24 October 1687: 'della totale rovina delle Commende che in tutte le lingue si trovano al mag[gior] segno deteriorate'.
[33] Emanuel Buttigieg, *Nobility, Faith and Masculinity. The Hospitaller Knights of Malta, c.1580-1700* (London - New York: Continuum, 2011), 80-81.
[34] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP3, f.132r, 24 October 1687: '*molti facciano diligenza in Roma per ottenere brevi facoltativi con dispensa di poter gravare li pen[sio]ni le commende*'
[35] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP3, f.132r, 24 October 1687: 'vuole sua Em[inenza] ch'ella faccia una buona, et efficace preven[tion]e a Mons[ignor] Albani nuovo Seg[retar]io di Brevi, accio che ributti queste richieste come di proegiudizio alla Relig[io]ne'.

the briefs, or to remove the obstacle to the petition in his name, that ultimately he cannot do anything but stoop to the other impertinences.[36]

Thus, although nominally the Grand Master could forbid such petitions, he still exercised a degree of caution and obliged his ambassador to do so. It is interesting to note that the method employed by the ambassador in opposing the petition for briefs was identical to the one employed by the petitioners themselves, that is to seek well-disposed officials in high places and try to use their influence to thwart the desires of the petitioners. Diplomacy in the early modern world was fuelled by patronage. For an Order State that had to sail equidistant amidst far greater powers, diplomacy was not a means of aggrandizement, but a lifeline. It was through its ambassadors that the Religion could cling to its properties and privileges, the retention of which 'depended on the continued support of popes, princes, and public opinion in general.'[37]

4.4 Of Briefs and Princes

Briefs applied for by individual knights posed a threat to the Order they embraced. But threats to the Order's privileges could come from an even higher source. Kings could, and did, petition Popes to obtain briefs that would allow them to tax ecclesial institutions, including the Order's properties, within their realms. By default, the Church enjoyed 'real immunity' which is described as 'the right whereby it is claimed that the property of the Church and the clergy are exempted from secular jurisdiction and from all fiscal and other burdens imposed by secular authority.'[38] This covered all orders of the Church, whether military or not. The Order had also been granted superior privileges between 1135 and 1154, when the Order began to enjoy a relatively new privilege, that is, exemption from the authority of bishops. Popes had deemed this necessary for any internationally organised institution, so as to free them from local intervention. Bishops naturally saw this as an affront to their authority, and by 1179,

---

[36] ASMOM, Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP3, f.132r, 24 October 1687: '*In questa diligenza n[on] si mostri, che si faccia per ord[in]e di qui, ma come per istanz[a] trovatane ne tempi passati nelle note della Segetaria in tempo del S[ignor] Cardinale Slusio, perches ono tali li mezzi; che p[uo]i prendeno per apprettare Sua Em[inenza] o a passare li brevi; o a rimmover l'ostacolo dell'istanz[a] in suo nome, che per lo piu n[on] si puo far di meno a andescender all'altri impertinenze*.'

[37] A. Luttrell, 'Malta and Rhodes: Hospitallers and Islanders', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798*, Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva,1993), 270.

[38] William E. Addis and Thomas Arnold (eds.), *A Catholic Dictionary* (London: Virtue and Co. Ltd, 1955), 428.

enough confrontations had arisen to warrant clarification during the Third Lateran Council (Canon 9):

> Now we have learnt from the strongly worded complaints of our brethren and fellow bishops that the Templars and Hospitallers, and other professed religious, exceeding the privileges granted them by the apostolic see have often disregarded Episcopal authority.[39]

The privilege of real immunity was therefore the norm for all institutions of the Church and secular powers needed papal dispensation to override it. Circumstances did arise when Popes suspended this privilege but generally the military orders were exempted. For instance the Council of Vienne (1311-1312) saw this privilege waived off for all orders except military ones and specifically the Order of St John: 'only the priors, preceptors, masters, persons and places of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem and of the said military orders are to be excepted' (Session 1).[40] This was the same Council that saw the suppression of the Order of the Temple. The exception, protecting the military orders from financial ruin reads almost as if the Church wanted to assure the military orders that they were not to share the same fate as the Temple. The Hospital thus continued to thrive under papal protection, to the extent that a generally worded brief was not enough to qualify it for taxation. Such case occurred during the Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome (1431-1445), wherein the Hospital was mentioned by name: 'This holy synod therefore imposes on each and every ecclesiastical person, both exempt and non-exempt under whatever form or words, even the order of St John of Jerusalem' (Section 25).[41]

Although this guarantee still held and had been further strengthened by Pope Pius IV (1559-1565), the Order kept vigilant guard over any hint of encroachment upon its privileges. Petitions for briefs and dispensations were frequent. Regal petitions were quite seldom but nonetheless worrying when they occurred. Such a threat came in 1683, motivated by a Royal wedding. King Pedro II of Portugal (1648-1706) was seeking the hand of the Duke of Savoy for his daughter, the Infanta Isabel Luísa (1669 –1690). News had reached the Grand Master that the King wanted to raise one million *cruciati* as dowry for the Princess. The news was that the Pope had conceded a brief allowing the taxation of all Church property save that of the Jesuits.

---

[39] Norman P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol I (London: Sheed and Ward, 1990), 216.
[40] N. P. Tanner, *Decrees*, 353.
[41] N. P. Tanner, *Decrees*, 511.

From the information gleaned, it seemed that the Hospital had not been specifically mentioned, which somehow allayed the Grand Master's fears. This fact alone, he wrote to Sacchetti, 'should not include our Order in such hateful practices, as these impositions are, in conformity with our many privileges and especially according to the Bull of Pius IV.'[42] In the Grand Master's letter, the priorities can be clearly deduced. Primarily, the veracity of the news had to be ascertained. If a brief had been indeed given, the actual wording of it had to be known by the ambassador in order to prepare a counter-petition and present suitable arguments. The Grand Master on this occasion did provide Sacchetti with detailed instructions in the second part of his letter. Whatever the wording, the Grand Master insisted that Sacchetti pleaded with the Pope to specifically exclude the Hospital 'as has been done on various similar occasions, in particular when such a concession was granted to the King of Poland for the war he had with the Turk.'[43] And there was also the age-old argument: 'the income of our Religion goes primarily towards the service of Christianity, namely to defend it from the Ottoman power, and for the caring of the sick.'[44] This, after all, was why real immunity had been granted in the first place, and the reason why military orders were particularly even more protected than the other orders of the Church. Taxing the orders of the Church would impede them from exercising their mission. Taxing military orders would leave the *Res Publica Christiana* vulnerable to attack.

Thus armed, Sacchetti's first port of call was Monsignor Slutio, the Secretary of Briefs. Johan Walter Sluse (1628-1687) was originally from Liege and had been raised to the purple along with De Luca.[45] Up to 1679, Roman society spoke of the triumvirate of De Luca, Cibo and Slusius, yet was surprised that Slusius was never given any benefice throughout his career. Slusius was known for his brusque manners but also for his 'uprightness, his wide scholarship, his untiring industry and his prodigious memory.'[46] As a Roman and deeply immersed in political affairs, Sacchetti

---

[42] AOM 1449, f.120r, 2 July 1682: '*e benche col non obbligare espressam[en]te l'ordine n[ost]ro, questo non vien compreso nelle cose odiose, come sono simili imposit[io]ni, in conformita di molti privileggi, che habb[iam]o, e special[ment]te secondo la bolla di Pio 4o*'.
[43] AOM 1449, f.120r, 2 July 1682: '*come si fece in varie occas[io]ne e special[men]te quando fu concesso una imposit[io]ne al Re di Polonia p[er] la guearra che haves[se] col Turco*.'
[44] AOM 1449, f.120r, 2 July 1682: '*che le rendite della n[ost]ra Relig[io]ne sono destinate p[er] il p[rimari]o serv[it]io della Christianita e particolarm[en]te p[er] difenderia dalla potenza Ottomana, e p[er] l'essercizio dell'Hospitalita*.'
[45] For a brief biography of Cardinal Slusius, see Appendix 1, this work, 235.
[46] Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, *The History of the Popes. From the close of the Middle Ages*, xxxii (London: Trubner and Co, 1940), 20.

must have been aware of Slusius' formidable character. The wily Monsignor assured the ambassador that no such brief had been given, nor had he heard anyone mention such a petition, adding that if it were granted, it would be illegal:

since the Princess is not going to a husband outside her realm, she need not take with her more dowry, apart from the promise of her kingdom to which she has been sworn heiress.[47]

This Sacchetti faithfully communicated to his Prince. However, there seems to have been a hint in Monsignor Slutio's words that perhaps Sacchetti had not failed to notice, and which showed that the Monsignor knew more than he was prepared to reveal. There was a legal impediment to Princess Isabella's wedding: Portuguese law, namely The Law of the Cortes of Lamego. Originally enacted in 1143 with the foundation of the monarchy, it was strengthened and widened in scope by the Cortes of 1641. It was on the strength of this that the King of Spain was declared a usurper and the House of Braganza raised to the throne.[48] So Monsignor Slutio's words were rather cryptic. If the marriage proceeded, the Princess would have had to forfeit the throne, and the dowry would have become a necessity. Putting the terms 'illegal', 'going to a husband outside her realm' and 'the promise of her kingdom' in the same verse was Slutio's devious method of slithering away from giving a direct answer.

It seems that Sacchetti was still not absolutely sure with Monsignor Slutio's assurance. Since the matter of such a brief concerned the immunity of religious orders, Sacchetti sought more information from the Congregation of Ecclesiastical Immunity.[49] Founded in 1626 by Pope Urban VIII (1623-1644), it was officially called *Congregatio pro executione et interpretatione concilii Tridentini*. As the name implies, its original purpose was to provide correct interpretations of the canons of the Council of Trent (1545-1563).[50] With time, it took the role of investigating claims of violation of religious immunity since disagreements over jurisdiction often arose between secular and ecclesiastical authorities. The Secretary of the Congregation of the Council, or simply the Council as it had become known, was a certain Monsignor Patriarch Antonio Altoviti.[51] The Altoviti, like the Sacchetti, were originally a

---

[47] AOM 1297, f.94r, 25 July 1682: '*atteso che la Principessa per non andar a Marito fuor di stato non deve portasi altra dote, che la speranza del Regno, del quale e' stata giurata herede*'.
[48] James Mackintosh, *The Miscellaneous Works of the Right Honourable Sir James Mackintosh* (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846), 30.
[49] AOM 1297, f.94v, 25 July 1682.
[50] Retrieved on 20 March 2018 from http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07690a.htm
[51] http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07690a.htm

Florentine family a branch of whom had moved to Rome. The two families were related by marriage, and the mother of Cardinal Giulio Cesare Sacchetti (1587-1663) was one Francesca Altoviti.[52] Politically, they were allied to the Barberini amongst others, putting the Altoviti solidly within the French faction.[53] From Monsignor Altoviti Ambassador Sacchetti learnt that King Pedro's petition had indeed been lodged with the Council. Sacchetti then probed the matter at the Congregation of Bishops. The official name was *Congregazione per l'erezione delle Chiese e le Provviste concistoriali*, it was instituted by Pope Sixtus V in 1588.[54]

From this Congregation, Sacchetti was assured that no such brief had been granted and if it were to be, the privileges of the Hospital would remain inviolable.[55] Although Sacchetti had had guarantees from three different Church bodies, there was as yet nothing formal and only word of mouth to go on. By the end of August, no official reply had reached the ambassador and it seemed that there was not much hope of halting it as Sacchetti complained: 'It would distress me greatly should this brief be issued, for if sent, I see little hope that the Religion would be exempted from paying up once it has been included.'[56] More gloom was in store. Cardinal Cibo, the Secretary of State had spoken to Mancini, Sacchetti's secretary, and had revealed that the brief had been extended by five years, although it was for half a million cruciati. Due to problems encountered when an attempt was made to enforce it, it was changed and some of the burden of taxation was put on foodstuffs.[57]

Sacchetti's correspondence with the Grand Master on the 10 October seemed more optimistic. Sachetti had written to Cardinal Cibo, petitioning for the exemption of the Hospital from the brief. A copy was sent to the Grand Master.[58] A plea was also

---

[52] See this work, Chapter 10.
[53] Elisa Goudriaan, *Florentine Patricians and their Networks. Structures Behind the Cultural Success and the Political Representation of the Medici Court (1600-1660)* (Leiden and Boston: Brill Academic, 2017), 270.
[54] Retrieved on 12 February 2018 from http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cbishops/documents/rc_con_cbishops_pro_20011127_profile_it.html
[55] AOM 1297, f.94v, 25 July 1682.
[56] AOM 1297, f.123r, 29 August 1682: '*mi dispiacerebbe grande che il detto Breve fosse stato concesso, perche essendo stato mandato cola, poca speranza vi vedo di far escludere La Rel[igione] dal pagamento quando vi fosse stata inclusa*.'
[57] AOM 1297, f.125v, 5 September 1682: '*il Sig[nor] Card[inale] gli rispose che mesi sono fu concessa una proroga di altri cinque Anni p[er] un Breve di 500 m[ila] cruciati, ma che quando poi fu cola p[er} imposti sopra li detti beni insorsero tali difficolta che fu permutato, e messa qualche gravezza sopra le robbe commestibili*.'
[58] AOM 1297, f.137r, 10 October 1682.

sent to the Pope. Worded politely yet firmly, it cited the Bull by Pius IV and the endorsement it had from Popes Innocent X (1644-1655) and Clement X. More than the supplication it professed to be, the address to the Pope was more of a reminder that including the Order was a breach of ancient privileges:[59]

> Humbly we supplicate Your Holiness to declare that it was not nor is it his intention to include the aforementioned [Military] Orders considering that these privileges were given to them *Titolo Oneroso*, that is not only utilise their possessions, but also shed their blood in defence of the Christian Republic fighting against the Turk, as the Rota confirms in Decision 72 number 6.[60]

The strategy worked. The Pope's nunzio was duly informed: 'it had never been his intention to include in the said brief the possessions of the Religion and charged his nunzio to express these sentiments to that Prince.'[61] This information reached Sacchetti via Cardinal Cibo, to whom Secretary Mancini was duly sent in order to personally see the document. A summary of it was made as well, which though not exact, at least captured the gist of it.[62] The ambassador still desired to obtain an official copy of the letter from the Secretary of State. According to Sacchetti, such letters were only grudgingly given, 'as the Secretariat only concedes copies of letters somewhat reluctantly.' So the ambassador went directly to Cardinal Cibo to acquire an official copy. This was not a question of mistrust, but it was hoped that such a letter would prove useful for similar cases in the future. Like previous Bulls and official papers that protected the Order from encroachment, this could also be cited if the need arose. The Order sought to harbour an arsenal of such rulings, weapons of paper that were to be brought out when the danger was not the steel of the distant foe, but the varied needs of those closer to home.

It was a combination of external hostilities and the needs of a Catholic monarch that gave rise to a very similar case which the ambassador had to face. In 1683, Vienna found itself besieged by Ottoman forces. The Order was willing to cooperate with the Emporer by encouraging individual brethren to take up arms but could not do much

---

[59] AOM 1297, f.140r, 10 October 1682.
[60] AOM 1297, f.140r, 10 October 1682: '*Humilmente supplicano la Sant[ita] Vostra dichiarare non fuisse nec esse suo intentionij di comprendere li detti ordini atteso che detti privileggi li sono stati concessi Titulo Oneroso cioe per consumare non solo li loro beni, ma anco spargere il sangue in difesa della Rep[ubblica] Christiana militando contra Turcas come lo ferma la Rota nella Decis[ion]e 72 n[umer]o 6*.'
[61] AOM 1297, f.152r, 31st October 1682. '*che egli non haveva mai inteso di comprendere in ditto breve li beni della Religione et la incaricava di far noti questi sentimenti a quell Principe*.'
[62] AOM 1297, f.152r, 31 October 1682. For copy of letter see AOM 1297 f.154r.

financially.[63] But Emperor Leopold I (1658-1705) was in need of financial as well as martial aid. Thus the Pope had granted him a brief allowing him to tax religious orders, including 'military, Hospitaller and Commanderies.'[64] Sacchetti had been informed by the Prior of Bohemia Fra Ferdinand Ludvík, Count Liebsteinský of Kolowrat[65], who had also attached a copy of the brief that allowed the Emperor to raise money 'for the present needs', as Sacchetti euphemistically put it.[66] The wording of the brief was ambiguous. On one hand, the Order was not mentioned by name, on the other it comprised military and Hospitaller orders. Sacchetti's first move was to stall the brief from being applied. He informed Prior Fra Kolowrat accordingly:

To this I told him [Prior Fra Kolowrat] that, as in the past so today, the inclusion of the possessions of the Order requires a special declaration that retracts its privileges, adding that with respect he must represent the above to his Eminence the Nunzio Bonvisi, pleading the suspension of the said collection of obligations until he gets an answer from Rome.[67]

The predicament that Sacchetti faced now was how to obtain a definite answer from Rome. A visit to Monsignor Slutio did not add much, as the Monsignor merely repeated that since the Order had not been mentioned by name, then it was automatically excluded. If he were to petition for a clear exclusion of the Order from the brief, he feared it would have the reverse effect: 'I do not want to put in doubt that, as these ministers are telling me, which is already clear.'[68] Rather than going directly to the Pope, Sacchetti opted for addressing his plea to Cardinal Cibo. As Secretary of State, Sacchetti was sure that Nunzio Bonvisi would communicate with him, in which case the Cardinal would 'find there everything prepared'.[69]

The subject was brought up again in Sacchetti's letter to the Grand Master dated 6 November 1683. Visits to Monsignor Slutio did not add any more favourable arguments beyond the fact that the Order should be satisfied that it had not been

---

[63] See this work, Chapter 6.
[64] AOM 1298, f.136r, 16 October 1683: '*militares, Hospitalla, et Commendas*'.
[65] Prior from 1676 to1701. Full name and dates retrieved on 23 April 2018 from http://en.maltezskyrad.cz/history-of-the-grand-priory-of-bohemia/grand_priors_of_bohemia/
[66] AOM 1298, f.136r, 16 October 1683: '*per li presenti bisogni*'.
[67] AOM 1298, f.136rv, 16 October 1683: '*Alche io ho risposto tanto p[er] il passato come fo hoggi, che ad effetto che la Rel[igione] sia compresa, e li beni dell'Ordine indigent speciali declaratione cum derogatoria derogatoriarum, soggiungendogli, che debba con ogni riverenza far rappresantare quanto di sopra all' E[minente] Nunzio Bonvisi, pregandolo che vogila soprasedere nella resoccione delli detti carichi fin che ne habbia la risposta da Roma*.'
[68] AOM 1298, f.136v, 16 October 1683: '*Et io non vorrei mettere in dubbio una cosa che p[er] altro mi dicono questi ministri, esser chiara.*'
[69] AOM 1298, f.136r, 16r, 16 October 1683.

mentioned by name. Meanwhile, Prior Fra Kolowrat had requested Sacchetti to provide him with written proof that the Order's property was indeed excluded 'that I manage to obtain an exemption for the possessions of those Priories from the said impositions.'[70] The Prior was seeking a clearly worded declaration, especially since he had obtained a letter that the Nunzio had sent to the Archbishop of Prague which advised the latter to:

> Procure the sum of 50 thousand tallers for the immediate aid of the Emperor and that he will soon send the declaration of the Brief, in which are included all the priviliged, naming the Jesuits and the Jerusalemitan Knights.[71]

This put the matter in a darker light. The Prior sent copies of this letter and of the brief as published in Bohemia. The brief was duly pored over, and no specific mention of the Order of St John was found, though it included the words 'Commanderies, and any Religions and Military.'[72] The ambassador finally approached the Pope himself in the hope of obtaining a definite response. He was affably received but still offered the elusive answer that 'it had been his intention not to burden the Religion if it had not been burdened by his predecessors in similar cases, and that in this last concession to the Emperor he had made use of the same wording that Alexander VII, of Sacred Memory, had used in the year 1664.'[73] Practically the Pope had repeated what Monsignor Slutio had told Sacchetti. The Priory and Commanderies of Bohemia were still in an ambiguous position, and did not give Sacchetti what he wanted; namely a letter that unmistakebly informed Nunzio Bonvisi that it had never been the Pope's intention to include the Order in the brief accorded to the Emperor.[74]

---

[70] AOM 1298, f.142r, 6 November 1683: '*che io procurassi di far esimere da detta impositione li beni di quelle Priorati.*'
[71] AOM 1298, f.142v, 6 November 1683: '*Tutto questo non ostante mi replico il sud[detto] V[enerabble] P[riore] con altra lettera, che l'E[minente] Nuntio Bonvisi aveva scritto a Mons[ignor] Arcivescovo di Praga, che procurasse di trovare una somma o da Mercanti o da altro di 50m[ila] tallari per soccorrer prontamente l'Imp[eratore] che susseguentement gl'averebbe mand[ato] la dichiaratione del Breve, nella quale vi erano compresi tutti li privilegiati et nominatim li PP Giesuiti, e li Caval[ieri] Gierosalemitani.*'
[72] AOM 1298, f.142v, 6 November 1683: '*quale avendola ben considerata non vi trovai mai che vi fosse nominata la Rel[igione], benche vi fossero li termini di Commendas, et quascumq Religiones et Militares.*'
[73] AOM 1298, f.142r, 6 November 1683: '*che aveva inteso di non aggravar la Rel[igione] se questa non era stata aggravate dalli suoi antecessori in casi simili, e che pero in quest' ultima concessione fatta all' Imp[eratore] si era servito dell' istesse parole delle quali si era prevaluto la S[acra] M[emoria] di Alessandro VII l'anno 1664.*'
[74] AOM 1298, f.142v, 6 November 1683.

Sacchetti raised the subject on several occasions with Cardinal Cibo, in his own words 'to know the mind of His Holiness about this matter.'[75] And it was from Cardinal Cibo that security was obtained. Having visited Cardinal Cibo to discuss another matter, the Cardinal raised the subject and informed Sacchetti that the Pope had never meant to include the Order. It was with a certain pride and joy that the ambassador informed his Prince:

Then yesterday, I went to Cardinal Cibo regarding another case, which Your Eminence will see from another letter of mine. He told me that he had written on behalf of the Pope to His Eminence the Nunzio that the Pope had never intended to include the Religion in these impositions. Having expressed my humble gratitude, I requested a copy of the said letter which he kindly promised to give. I sent for it to obtain it from the Secretary of State, and if I have it in time, I will send your Eminence a copy attached, which you can register in the Chancellery as it can come very useful in similar cases. For instance other Pontificates would see that in this situation, the Pope, who had given considerable financial aid to the Emperor to which almost everyone contributed, expressly excluded the Religion with a declaration. I take the opportunity to congratulate Your Eminence since with this it seems that the Religion is covered for all time.[76]

The ambassador's persistence worked in this case. The Grand Master expressed his gratitude to which Sacchetti alluded to in his letter dated 19 February 1684, with which this case was officially sealed.[77]

4.5 Conclusion

The case studies chosen hail from different parts of Christendom. This helps to demonstrate that the role of the ambassador in Rome spanned wider than the Papal States or indeed the Italian peninsula. Sacchetti's position in Rome meant that he also had to deal with cases arising in other parts of Europe. Though papal influence in the early modern world may not have been as strong as it had been in the Medieval period,

---

[75] AOM 1298, f.142v, 6 November 1683: '*sapere sopra di cio la mente di Sua Santita*'.
[76] AOM 1298, f.143r, 6 November 1683: '*Essendo poi ieri andato dal S[ignor] Card[inale] Cibo per la causa che V[ostra] E[minenza] vedera da un altra mia scrittura, mi disse che egli per parte del Papa aveva scritto all E[minente] Nuntio che la mente del Papa era, che la Rel[igione] non fosse compresa in questa impositione avendogli io qui rrese umilissime gratie, gli feci instanza di darmi una copia della sud[detta] lettera et egli me la promise benignamente. Io ho mandato a pigliarla alla segretario di Stato, e se l'avero in tempo, ne mandaro copia qui annessa all E[mminenza]V[ostra], la quale potra farla registrare in cotesta Cancelleria potendo molto servire in simili casi, e per essempio a gl'altri Pontefici li quali vederanno che in questa congiontura, nella quali il Papa ha dato tanti aiuti di somma considerabilissima di denaro all Imp[eratore] e nella quale vi sono concorsi quasi tutti, habbia voluto con una dichiaratione espressa escluderne la Rel[igione]. Di qua prendo motivo di congratularmi con l'E[mmineza] V[ostra] gia che con questo pare, che la Rel[igione] si messa a coperto per ogni tempo*.'
[77] AOM 1299, f.33v, 19 February 1684.

it was still a force that monarchs had to consider. As head of the Church, the Grand Master was answerable to him. The Grand Master was also aware of the fact that, like himself and his ambassador, many of his brother knights also hailed from families with influential connections. The ambassador in Rome had to constantly perform a tight-rope act, maintaining a precarious balance between the powers of the day and the Religion. As such, in his person he embodied what the Order strived to do: retain its financial and political independence without losing the favour of its main patrons.

Chapter 5 Of Church and State

5.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on questions of jurisdiction, examining the ambassador's role in finding solutions for problems arising between the authorities of the Church and the Order. In Malta, disagreements often arose between the Grand Master, the Bishop and the Inquisitor. Such disagreements were mirrored in the Order's priories in Europe. Disputes arose especially over the visitation of churches by local bishops and the unbridled race for monopolising subjects. In both instances it was more a competition of dominance, of expanding one's authority at the expense of the other. Ultimately, apart from any financial benefits, this rivalry between Church and State was a matter of prestige. In the absence of a Code of Canon Law, there was far too much leeway for interpretation. The ambassador's task was to uphold his Order's status by trying to weave around the tangled web of decrees adopted as guidelines in such disputes.

5.2 Exemption and Interpretation

The Council of Trent had established that 'Honorary titles, or particular privileges, shall not derogate in any way from the right of bishops' but members of religious orders were officially exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop as long as they were: actively serving the order, reside within their confines and buildings, living under their obedience, or who have legally made profession according to the rule of these military orders, a fact of which the ordinary must have proof. And this is notwithstanding any privileges, even those of the order of St John of Jerusalem and other military orders.[1]

In its effort to organise itself, the Church of the counter-reformation sought to introduce some form of guidelines. Canon law had not yet been codified, and so the *Corpus Juris Canonici* served in its stead.[2] Although religious orders were exempt

[1] Norman P. Tanner (ed.), 'Council of Trent – 1545-1563 session 24, canon 11', *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* vol II,) (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 765.

[2] Canon Law was first codified in 1917. *Catholic Dictionary*, 102. There had been attempts at organizing the body of laws that had accrued over time. The first was an unofficial attempt by the monk Gratian (c.1101-1159), commonly known as the *Decretum Gratiani*. In 1234 Pope Gregory IX published what came to be known as the *Decretales Gregorii IX* (also called the *Liber Extra*). Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303) issued the *Liber Sextus* in 1298, named thus as it continued on the five books of the *Decretales Gregorii*. Pope Clement V (1305-1314) added another authoritative edition, a task finished by his successor Pope John XXII (1316-1334) in 1317. It was named the *Clementinae*, but this codification did not have the force of the Decretals or the *Liber Sextus*, as decrees issued after the *Liber Sextus* and excluded from the *Clementinae* still held. Pope Gregory XIII (r.1572-1585) then sanctioned

from the authority of bishops, yet in purely religious matters, this authority had to be acknowledged.

The religio-political organisation in Malta under the Order was quite a peculiar arrangement. As in Rhodes, the Grand Master was head of the islands, behaving very much like an independent prince, striking coins in his image, administering justice, exchanging ambassadors with other sovereigns, conceding lands and other attributes associated with sovereignty.[3] This power was often challenged by the two other authorities on the island; the bishop and the inquisitor. The three main authorities were therefore all full members of the Church, although knights were lay brethren.

As in the rest of the Catholic world, the Church in Malta was made up of the secular (or diocesan) clergy and the regular clergy. The latter belonged to one of the various religious orders, and thus not linked with a territorial base. They had their own provincial superior in Sicily and ultimately responsible to the Pope. The secular clergy were organised within the country they were based and fell under the Bishop's jurisdiction. The Hospital meanwhile, was subject to the Pope like any other religious order, as this definition by Jonathan Riley-Smith clearly puts it:

> Military orders are orders of the Roman Catholic Church, the brothers (and occasionally sisters) of which are professed religious, subject to the usual obligations of, and constraints in, canon law, except one: some of them had the right and duty to bear arms. Since priests are forbidden by canon law to use force, these orders were – and one of them still is – unusual in that they were run by their lay brothers, the knights.[4]

The Order had its own clergy, governed by the Grand Prior and owed no obedience to the Bishop and the diocesan Church. The Hospital resisted any form of interference from that sector and tried to impose its own candidate as Bishop. The Bishop had to be a member of the Order. Three religious members were chosen and presented to the Pope and the Viceroy of Sicily, one of whom had to be subject of the Spanish Crown. The Bishop was chosen from one of these. This effectively meant that the Grand Master could merely present candidates, but ultimately it was the Viceroy who

---

the *Corpus Juris Canonici* in 1580. See A. Keogh, 'The Codification of the Canon Law', *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, 10: 1 (1928), 14-32.

[3] A. Luttrell, 'Malta and Rhodes: Hospitallers and Islanders', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem*, Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993), 275.

[4] Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Towards a History of Military-Religious Orders', *The Hospitallers, The Mediterranean and Europe. Festschrift for Anthony Luttrell*, K.Borchardt, N.Jaspert and H.J.Nicholson (eds) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 269.

nominated his preference.[5] Up to 1574, the bishop had also the role of inquisitor, but this changed with the arrival of Monsignor Duzina and lasted till 1798. As from 1574 onwards, the inquisitor was also apostolic delegate.[6] The inquisitor was head in all matters of faith.[7] Over his employees, termed patentees or familiars, he had full jurisdiction. They were his subjects, not the Grand Master's, something which the latter begrudged bitterly.[8]

There were thus three jurisdictions, each with their own court, their own subjects and supposedly their own sphere of influence, but the spheres were not always clear and distinct. The Grand Master had to compete with both bishop and inquisitor, the latter considered as 'the symbol of foreign interference in Malta.'[9] As Ann Williams says, 'the existence of two rival jurisdictions undoubtedly restricted the Order in its administration.'[10] The situation in Malta was all the more singular because the Grand Master wore 'two hats' as it were. He was the superior of a religious order, and he was also the ruler of a realm. Moreover, the seventeenth century was a period when princes were flexing their arms in an effort to cast off the outmoded shackles of Church and nobility that had hemmed royalty for so long. Disputes often flared up and led to a tripartite tug-o-war that ended up in one of the courts of Rome, and the Grand Master's letter explaining the situation on Sacchetti's desk. And it would not be the only dispute between the Order and the Church clamouring for the ambassador's attention. The Order was supra-national, and its commanderies in Catholic lands were subject to the same hankering for authority and the same shades of grey in jurisdiction.

5.3 Bishops and Priors

A typical case of such alleged usurpation was one instigated by the ambitions of the Bishop of Tortosa, Fra Josep Fageda (1608-1685) of the Order of St Jerome. Sacchetti,

---

[5] A. Koster, 'The Knights State (1530 - 1798): A Regular Regime', *Melita Historica*, 8: 4 (1983), 302.
[6] Alexander Bonnici, 'Maltese Society under the Hospitallers in the light of Inquisition Documents', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993), 314.
[7] A. Bonnici, 'Maltese Society under the Hospitallers', 311.
[8] A. Bonnici, 'Maltese Society under the Hospitallers', 314.
[9] Frans Ciappara, 'Gio. Niccolo Muscat: Church-State Relations in Hospitaller Malta during the Enlightenment, 1786-1793', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993), 613.
[10] Ann Williams, 'Constitutional Development of the Order of St John 1530-1798', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993), 290.

had been informed by the Castellan of Amposta (The Castellany of Amposta was the Order's name for the Priory of Aragon).[11] The Bishop was claiming the right to visit churches that fell within the bounds of the Castellany.[12] This constituted an infringement of the decree of the Council of Trent which forbade bishops from exercising pontifical functions outside their diocese.[13] According to Sacchetti, the Bishop had already been forbidden to do so by the Sacred Congregation yet he was threatening a lawsuit. Sacchetti informed the Grand Master that he was going to send a monitory 'where the Religion is mentioned' and send it to the Castellan with the next courier.[14] He also asked Procurator Torrenti to speak to Monsignor Altoviti after which he (Sacchetti) would consult Lawyer Cerretani 'for the last helping hand' and communicate all proceedings to the Grand Master.[15]

The Grand Master had been briefed separately from Spain. Evidently, Grand Master Carafa had not yet received anything on the matter from Sacchetti. The Grand Master's letter adds certain details. The church in question was the vacant rectory of the Commandery of Valdecona.[16] The Commander was Fra Romualdo Simon de Pallares, who was also filing a lawsuit in Rome against Bishop Fageda. The seriousness of the matter is evident in the words the Grand Master used: 'a case which could have the most dire consequences to the detriment of the Religion, should the ill-founded pretensions of the bishop materialise'.[17] The recurring motive for the Grand Master's anxiety was not that an odd visit from a bishop would destabilise the Order. What made each case to be treated with utmost urgency was the fear that if ignored, the exception would become the norm: 'with this example, it [the Order] would soon be stripped of every jurisdiction, usurped by all the other bishops'.[18] He therefore urged his ambassador to:

---

[11] A. Williams, 'Constitutional Development', 286.
[12] AOM 1297, f.95v, 25 July 1682.
[13] J. Waterworth (ed.), *The Council of Trent. The canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent* (London: Dolman, 1848), Decree on Reformation, Chapter 5, 53.
[14] AOM 1297, f.95v, 25 July 1682, '*qua citata la Relig[ion]e*'.
[15] AOM 1297, f.96r, 25 July 1682, '*et poi l'Avv[ocato] Cerretani li dara l'ultimo mano e di tutto ne daro distinto raguaglio all'E[minenza] V[ostra]*'.
[16] AOM 1449, f.135r, 7 August 1682. Valdecona, modern day Ulldecona, is roughly 20km away from Amposta. It still bears the cross of the Order on its flag and coat of arms.
[17] AOM 1449, f.135r, 7 August 1682: '*questa causa porta seco perniciosiss[im]e conseguenze in danno della Relig[io]ne quante volte la mal fondata pretensione del Vesc[ov]o havesse luogo*'.
[18] AOM 1449, f.135r, 7 August 1682, '*con questo esempio in poco tempo restarebbe spogliata con usurpat[ion]e de gli altri Vescovi d'ogni sua giurisd[itio]ne*'.

use your authority to help the procurators of Fra Pallares in anything they need and employ your office with the ardour that the importance that the matter demands, thus you would not only be rendering considerable service to the Religion, but, with immense gratitude, we will hold you as distinguished amongst the others of your station.[19]

By 1 August, Sacchetti had obtained a monitory from the Auditor of the Camera (chamber) 'which would serve the Castellan of Amposta in all occurrences of any pretensions that the Bishop of Tortosa has of wanting to visit any churches situated in that Castellany.'[20]

The Tortosa case turned out to be quite easy to settle when compared to a parallel litigation concerning jurisdiction between the Grand Prior of Castille and the Archbishop of Toledo, Cardinal Luis Manuel Fernández de Portocarrero y de Guzman (1635-1709). The case had already been dragging on for some time when Sacchetti inherited it from his predecessor, Fra Giovanni Caravita. On 29 May 1681, the Sacra Rota had ruled in favour of the Archbishop and granted executorial letters.[21] Neither the Grand Prior nor the Ambassador in Madrid were ready to accept these rulings. In fact, on 8 August Sacchetti reported to the Grand Master that the Grand Prior had petitioned the King of Spain. Ambassador Villavincentio also asked for his help in the Papal court. Sacchetti held a pessimistic view of the case, even considering meeting lawyers as an unnecessary expense.[22] He communicated directly with the Grand Prior and Ambassador Villavincentio, sending them a letter of advice formulated by Procurator Torrenti on how to present the case in the Royal Court.[23] The advice did not reach Spain in time. Within the week, Sacchetti received 'a long-printed writ that the Venerable Grand Prior had presented to His Majesty against the executorials [letters] despatched by the Rota' and imploring Sacchetti's aid in the Papal Court.'[24] Sacchetti insisted that there was not much he could do to thwart decisions that had

---

[19] AOM 1449, f.135r, 7 August 1682, '*dovete voi dunque assisterle con l'aut[orit]a v[ost]ra, et ad ogni richiesta de Proc[urato]ri del Com[mandant]e sud[et]to impiegare i v[ost]ri uffici con quellardore che convene all' importanza della materia, che oltre di rendere alla relig[io]ne un serv[iti]o considerabiliss[im]o, saremo noi p[er] distinguerlo tra gli altri del v[ost]ro carico con sensi di vera gratitude[i]ne*'.
[20] AOM 1297, f.101v-102r, 1 August 1682, '*per servirsene in tutte le occurrenze di alcune pretensioni che ha il Vescovo di Tortosa di voler visitare alcune chiese soggette a quella Castellania*.'
[21] AOM 1297, f.82r, 6 June 1682.
[22] AOM 1297, f.95v, 25 July 1682.
[23] AOM 1297, f.102r, 1 August 1682, '*per il buon regolamento cola della sua lite' and to Fra Villacentio 'accio anche egli, che si trova alla Corte sappia quello che deve operari nelle occorenze*.'
[24] AOM 1297, f.105r, 8 August 1682, '*Et mi manda un lungo mem[oria]le stampato, che il V[enerabile] Priore di Castiglia ha fatto presentare a Sua Maesta contro le esecutori spedite dalla Rota*'.

already been taken, seeing that there were already three sentences in favour of the Archbishop.[25] The only hope that Sacchetti could see was in the intervention of the King of Spain 'who, for the peace of his subjects, has on several occasions forbidden the execution of [the decisions of] the Rota.'[26]

This rather defeatist attitude was addressed by the Grand Master: 'we do not want to let our hopes sink in this almost desperate case' he wrote on 15 September.[27] He advised Sacchetti to consult the Order's lawyers to open the case again and go over all the writs related to the case. More than just conveying information, the Grand Master also sought to tacitly fire his newly appointed ambassador with the tenacity that was to characterise his conduct later in his career. He also warned him not to trust, or more accurately 'hold under suspicion', the Dean of Toledo, who was Auditor of the Rota and also Procurator of the Archbishop of Toledo.[28] Having a high official of the court acting as procurator to one of the concerned parties did not augur well, which the Grand Master sought to counterbalance by appealing to six cardinals.[29]

The Grand Master's letter summarises the case, highlighting certain salient facts. There had been omissions from various Priors who had administered the Priory, omissions that had jeopardised the Order's privileges in matters of jurisdiction. The Archbishop took advantage of the situation and considered those residing within the confines of the Priory as his subjects, to the extent of exacting tithes from them, when they should only acknowledge the Prior as their only superior who is only answerable to the Pope. The Order had not been given a fair hearing and therefore the case should be re-opened. The letter concludes with the usual appeal: the Religion gained its privileges at the price of blood and unstinted expenditure in the service of the Holy See.[30]

The case resurfaces in December 1682 when Sacchetti was informed both by the Prior Don Irigo de Elendia (Allende?) and by the ambassador Fra Villavicencio that the King of Spain had been presented with two scripts explaining the case, and

---

[25] AOM 1297, f.105r, 8 August 1682.
[26] AOM 1297, f.105r, 8 August 1682: '*che per quieta delli suoi sudditi piu volte ha impedito l'esecutione della Rota*'.
[27] AOM 1449, f.151v, 15 September 1682: '*Non vogliamo cadere affatto d'animo nella quasi disperata Causa*'.
[28] AOM 1449, f.151v, 15 August 1682: '*di dare per sospetto il decano di Toledo Aud[ito]re della Rota, che fa il Proc[urato]re in Causa dell'Arciv[esco]o*'.
[29] AOM 1449, f.152r, 15 August 1682.
[30] AOM 1449, f.152r, 15 August 1682.

that the King was going to intercede with the Pope on the Order's behalf, desiring no less than that the decrees of the Rota be revoked.[31] Sacchetti promised to plead further with the Pope and added that 'the crucial part must be done there [in Spain] by His Majesty, as he has done in similar incidents in the Bishopric of Vique, and Girona in Catalunya, and the Church of Pilar, and in Arezzo in Saragosa in Aragon'.[32] The examples mentioned may easily have been an innocent remark. On the other hand, they can be taken as hints. Sacchetti could not write directly to the King of Spain and mention them, nor could he tell the ambassador in Spain to do so, as they would be out of line. Such a mention in a petition could only be done by a Prince to a Prince. In saying that 'the crucial part must be done by His Majesty', Sacchetti seemed to be absolving himself should the case go against the Order, but also hinting that if the Order was in the right in the previous cases, there is nothing to stop the King from exerting his regal power again in an identical case.

The weather arrested the exchange of mail, and the Grand Master's letters sent on 31 January, 11 and 15 February and 11 March arrived in Rome in April. Apparently, the Grand Master's remark of giving up so soon still smarted.[33] On 24 April 1683, as the case dragged on, Sacchetti was to meet up with the lawyers yet again to devise a new strategy. Again he stressed:

> I beg you to believe that on my side, I will not shirk any entreaty, any most exact diligence, and any glimmer of hope that presents itself to me, but the business in this Court is in a bad state.[34]

The case worsened with the Archbishop of Toledo excommunicating a number of priests that were subjects of the Priory for which Sacchetti promised to appeal to the Rota for the absolution of these priests.[35] Taking advantage of this excessive act, Sacchetti raised the question again with the Pope, audaciously stating that the decrees of the Rota had created so much confusion, with the Bishop's ministers extending authority well beyond the rights accorded to them by the decrees of the Rota. His

---

[31] AOM 1297, f.184v, 19 December 1682.
[32] AOM 1298, f.10r, 23 January 1683, '*il piu importante deve farsi da Sua Maesta cola, come ha fatto in simili accidenti nel Vescovato di Vique, e Girona in Catalogna, e nelle Chiese del Pilare, e d'Arezzo in Saragoza d'Aragona.*'.
[33] AOM 1449, f.151v, 15 August 1682.
[34] AOM 1298, f.46r, 24 April 1683, '*La supplico di credere, che io non mancaro dal canto mio di appostarvi ogni sollecitudine, et ogni piu esatta diligenza, et ogni picciola aperture, che mi si presenti… Ma il negotio in questa Corte e' in cattivo stato.*'
[35] AOM 1298, f.58r, 1 May 1683.

audacity did not go unnoticed, and the Pope curtly answered that if the Venerable Prior did not like the decisions of the Rota, then he could have appealed and be guaranteed that justice will be served. However, regarding the ministers exceeding the faculty granted unto them, the Pope professed that he was not aware and promised to write to his Nunzio in Spain on the matter.[36] Effectively this meant that the Pope was unwilling to revoke any decisions taken. Still, it was a partial victory, confirmed by Cardinal Cibo who told Sacchetti that as soon as he had left, the Pope had asked him to write to his Nunzio to curb further attempts by the ministers of the Bishop.[37] Letters received from Prior de Elendia and Ambassador Villavicencio confirmed that the Nunzio had indeed been informed.[38]

But the matter escalated. Cardinal Cibo informed Secretary Mancini that some brethren had set upon the Bishop's ministers with 'staves and firearms' when these ministers went to exercise the faculty conceded to them by the Rota, and that Villavicencio had fomented the disorder by writing an abrasive note to the Nunzio's Auditor.[39] Cardinal Cibo added that the Pope was furious, had asked the Nunzio to initiate legal proceedings and that if Villavicenzio did not desist from such excesses, he would be stripped of his commandery and any privileges he enjoys within the Order.[40] Mancini promised to inform Sacchetti and at the same time pleaded with the Cardinal to suspend all decisions until Villavicenzio's and the concerned brethren's version of the matter had been heard. Mancini added that the ministers were instigating excesses by going beyond the faculty granted to them. The Cardinal remained unmoved, stressing that the Religion should go to the Nunzio and the Rota to air its grievances not resort to violence against ministers of the Church.[41] Sacchetti consulted Torrenti on this turn of events. Diplomatically, Sacchetti suggested that the Grand Master should tell Villavicenzio to avoid further excesses. He then went to Cardinal Cibo and 'pleaded to mollify the Pope, intimating to retain ears open to the reasons of the Religion, and not give credit to news coming from biased and avid adversaries.'[42]

---

[36] AOM 1298, f.58v, 8 May 1683.
[37] AOM 1298, f.59r, 8 May 1683.
[38] AOM 1298, f.68r, 22 May 1683.
[39] AOM 1298, f.89r, 3 July 1683: '*con bastoni et armi da fuoco*'.
[40] AOM 1298, f.89rv, 3 July 1683.
[41] AOM 1298, f.89v, 3 July 1683.
[42] AOM 1298, f.90r, 3 July 1683: '*lo pregai di voler addolcire lo spirito del Papa, con insinuargli di tenere anco un orecchia aperta alle ragioni della Rel e non dar credito alle relationi interessate, et appossionate degl' Avversarij*'.

Sacchetti again outlined the argument, that the Rota had given permission to the Bishop to visit Parochial Churches in this Priory yet his demands were going beyond these bounds.[43] Ever well-disposed towards the Order, Cardinal Cibo promised his protection with the Pope.

Sacchetti took his plea to the Rota, making an official plaint to suspend the censures, underlining that the disorders had been provoked by the ministers of the bishop who had acted beyond the faculty granted to them by excommunicating several Chaplain brothers and the knight Abengorar. The antagonism of the Rota is evident. It ruled that the case should be treated *Ad mentem*, meaning that the onus of proof lay with the Order. The Order had to prove that the ministers had acted beyond the bounds of the original executorial. Once proven, the censures would be abolished.[44]

The case approached some form of favourable closure in 1685. The Venerable Prior retained the right to nominate priests on Churches within the bounds of the Priory, the original right that the Archbishop of Toledo had been contesting. It was with unfeigned jubilation that Sacchetti wrote to the Grand Master:

> There remains nothing for me to do in this matter except assure Your Eminence that as I have done all this time that I have assisted in this business, I have always had my eyes fixed on this moment. Now that it presents itself I will not spare any effort or diligence to see the end of this case that has been the cause so much confusion in Spain, so much anxiety for Your Eminence and finally so much prejudice against the Religion.[45]

5.4 Fort and Chapel

Closer to home, though perhaps on a smaller scale, was the case concerning jurisdiction over the chapel within the walls of Fort Ricasoli. The name of this fort was chosen by Grand Master Cotoner to honour Fra Giovanni Francesco Ricasoli, who had donated thirty thousand scudi to the Common Treasury for the general upkeep of so many fortifications. The Grand Master and counsellors had decided to concentrate this sum on the new fort, and to name it after him and etch his coat of arms in a prominent place as a sign of gratitude.[46] Designed by Antonio Maurizio Valperga, construction on this fort had begun in 1670. Its purpose was to defend the Rinella

---

[43] AOM 1298, f.90r, 3 July 1683.
[44] AOM 1298, f.93r, 10 July 1683.
[45] AOM 1300, f5v, 29 March 1685.
[46] Dal Pozzo, *Historia*, vol. 2 (Venice, 1715), 390.

peninsula which the Ottoman forces had used to batter Fort St Elmo in 1565. The threat was less serious with the construction of Valletta, but the site remained vulnerable.[47] Grand Master Carafa wished to erect a chapel for the spiritual needs of the garrison, who would live within the walls of the fort along with their families. Sacchetti had to be involved due to matters of jurisdiction. Since some of the inhabitants of the fort would be civilians, the Bishop of Malta might lay claim that as religious head of the island, they were bound to him for all religious matters. Sacchetti had therefore to obtain from the Pope the 'total exemption from this Bishop.'[48] The opinion of the Order's lawyers was to entreaty the Pope directly, perhaps considering the Grand Master's desire as reasonable as much as it was pious. Should any difficulties be encountered, Sacchetti was to petition Cardinal de Luca or any other cardinal that might aid his case.[49] Communications were duly sent, including the lawyers' advice and the document that Sacchetti had drawn up to present to the Pope at his first audience.[50] Audience was granted almost a month later:

> Yesterday morning the Pope gave the ordinary audience to the ambassadors. I went to His Holiness at the hour assigned to me, to whom, after the kissing of the feet, I petitioned for the certification of the Church to be built in fort Ricasoli, and the desire of Your Eminence to provide a chaplain with the necessary faculty to administer all the sacraments not only to the captain and his Lieutenant, and soldiers in the said fort, but also the women and wives of the soldiers that live in the same fort. This chaplain is to be completely and wholly dependent on this Prior of the Church and not on the Bishop nor on the Parish priest of Saint Lawrence of Vittoriosa.[51]

Of course Sacchetti did not just present the document, but embellished it with his own appeals, mentioning also the generous donations of the late Grand Master Cotoner in building and bequeathing funds.[52] The implication here was the Order's usual argument: that it has always been at the forefront in defending Christendom and spared

---

[47] Stephen C. Spiteri, The Knights' Fortifications. An Illustrated Guide of the Fortifications built by the Knights of St John in Malta (Valletta, PSL, 1990), 127.
[48] AOM 1298, f.7v, 9 January 1683: '*per la totale essentione da cotesto Vescovo nella fondatione da farsi nel Forte Recasoli*.'
[49] AOM 1298, f.9r, 16 January 1683.
[50] AOM 1298, f.40r, 3 April 1683.
[51] AOM 1298, f.58r, 8 May 1683: '*Hieri mattina il Papa diede l'udienza ordinaria a gli Amb[asciato]ri. Io mi portai all ora assegnatami dalla Santita Sua, alla quale, doppo il bacio del piede, feci instanza per la certificatione della Chiesa da farsi nel forte Ricasoli, et il desiderio di V[ostra] E[minenza] di provi un cappellano con la facolta necessaria per amministrare tutti li sacramenti non solo al capitano e suo Luog[otenen]te, e soldati di detto forte, ma anche alle donne e moglie de soldati che habitavanno in detto forte. Quale cappellano sia in tutto e per tutto dipendente de cotesto Priore della Chiesa e non gia del Vescovo ne dal Paroco di S[an] Lorenzo della Vittoriosa*'.
[52] AOM 1298, f.58r, 8 May 1683.

no expenditure in its mission. Sacchetti also explained the reason for the Grand Master's desire to exclude the Bishop and the Vittoriosa parish priest. The garrison and their wives and children were vassals of the Grand Master, making them subject to the Order's Prior. Having some people subject to the Prior and others subject to to the Bishop would cause confusion and inconvenience.[53] Ever a prudent politician, Pope Innocent XI graciously received Sacchetti's petition but refrained from committing himself before consultations with his ministers.[54] On Cardinal Cibo's advice, Secretary Mancini was despatched to Monsignor Liberati, secretary responsible for such petitions, and update him on the case. Cardinal Cibo had also promised Sacchetti his support in this matter.[55] Sacchetti was hoping on obtaining early information of the Pope's rescript to his plea.[56] The case was to be referred to the Congregation of the Council, which spelt good news for the Order. The secretary was Monsignor Altoviti, whose support Sacchetti could rely on.[57] Having the support of two key figures: the Secretary of the Council and the Secretary of State (Cardinal Cibo), Sacchetti could be quite optimistic on the outcome. Furthermore, Sacchetti had also lobbied more cardinals, including Cardinal Colonna, the Prefect of the Congregation of the Council.[58]

But a variety of incidents kept delaying the hearing. Monsignor Altoviti was taken ill with an eye inflammation.[59] On his recovery, he had to defer the case due to work having accumulated on his desk whilst he was sick, and the Order's case could not be rushed as it 'merited mature reflection'.[60] When the Secretary was again available, the Congregation of the Council missed its Prefect, Cardinal Colonna, who decided to take a break from the bustle of Rome and 'enjoy the countryside.'[61] Apparently not being too anxious about the backlog of work, Monsignor Altoviti took Cardinal Colonna's example and found time for a short stay at Cardinal Barberino's

---

[53] AOM 1298, f.58rv, 8 May 1683.
[54] AOM 1298, f.58v, 8 May 1683.
[55] AOM 1298, f.59r, 8 May 1683.
[56] AOM 1298, f.58v, 8 May 1683: '*hieri dopo pranzo mandai il Seg[retario] Mancini da Mons[ignor] Liberati, seg[retario] de Mem[oria]le, ad informarlo sopra questa materiale, e spero ben presto di sapere che rescritto sia uscito al ditto mem[oria]le, quale io communicaro subbito all'E[minenza] V[ostra]*'.
[57] AOM 1298, f.62r, 11 May 1683.
[58] AOM 1298, f.93v, 10 July 1683.
[59] AOM 1298, f.68v, 22 May 1683.
[60] AOM 1298, f.71v, 29 May 1683: '*meritava matura riflessione.*'
[61] AOM 1298, f.83r, 12 June 1683: '*fuori di Roma a godere la campagna.*'

vineyard.[62] Sacchetti's lobbying continued tirelessly, and feeling confident that most Cardinals were on the Order's side, Sacchetti suggested sounding the Vittoriosa Parish Priest:

> And if I am right, that is, we have the support of the Cardinals in this business, I think that we must see if they would write to this Parish Priest of St Lawrence to learn whether this new population would cause a prejudice to his Parish.[63]

The letter was in fact sent to the Parish Priest although by 4 September the Council had not yet received a reply.[64] Structural works on Fort Ricasoli continued. The Governor's house was completed in 1686. However work on the church itself seems to have stalled for some time and recommenced again in 1696. It was dedicated in 1698, the same year that the fort was armed with guns, as if stressing the Religion's claim that the anger of the guns was there to defend the faith from the anger of its foes.[65]

But not all of the Order's rivals could be fought with guns. Rivalry between institutions of the Church could insiduously undermine the Order. Throughout its long history, the Hospital had tasted the sweetness of victory and the bitterness of defeat. The loss of the Holy Land and the subsequent demise of the Templars spurred it to continuously justify its existence. The loss of Rhodes could easily have spelt an ignominous end in a Europe for whom Christendom was a memory not an ideal. But the Order had survived all these setbacks because its lifeline, in the shape of ancient privileges, held. By the seventeenth century, the Order's position seemed secure. It had resident ambassadors in every major court in Europe. Its priors and other officials acted as ambassadors in lesser princedoms. Bastions and towers guarded its convent from without, and Bulls by various Popes ensured it from within. But this state of affairs cannot be perceived as an accomplished fact but as a continuous struggle. No sooner had one challenge been overcome in the Papal Courts than another cropped up.

---

[62] AOM 1298, f.83r, 12 June 1683: '*Seg[retario] Altoviti se ne sta a una vigna del S[ignor] Card[inale] Barberino fino al ritorno di Card[inale] Colonna*.'
[63] AOM 1298, f.100r, 24 July 1683. '*E se bene vedo, che li Sig[nori] Cardinali desiderano favoririci in questo negotio, mi pare pero di scorgere, che potrebbero far scrivere a cotesto Paroco di S[an] Lorenzo della Vittoriosa piu informatione per sapere se questa nuova Populatione sia di pregiuditio alla sua Parocchia*'.
[64] AOM 1298, f.123r, 4 September 1683.
[65] Alison Hoppen, *The Fortification of Malta by the Order of St John 1530-1798* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1979), 93. Regarding guns, see S. C. Spiteri, *Fortifications*, 129.

A recurring test for various grand masters was the race for monopolising subjects. The two contending authorities on the islands, namely bishop and inquisitor, had always sought to increase their influence by acquiring more and more subjects. This unbridled flourishing of clerics was not peculiar to Malta. The archbishop of Naples, Innico Caracciolo, who incidentally had been uncle to an inquisitor of Malta (Innico Caracciolo the younger) had complained: 'I know that in a poor diocese near Naples one of the canonries is called the canonry of ordinations. Anyone, even a total stranger, who wanted to be ordained simply applied to receive it'.[66] Various Grand Masters had voiced their concern on this issue. For instance, in 1638 Grand Master Lascaris complained to the Pope that Bishop Balaguer was ordaining an excessive number of minor clerics to the extent that it was becoming hard to find enough subjects to man the coastal guard and that the bishop's law courts were hearing more cases than the Grand Master's Castellany. All clerics, however minor, were being included in the Ecclesiastical Forum. These clerics included even married men.[67] Basically, anyone connected with the Church was being granted ecclesiastical immunity from secular authority. Ignored in Rome, Lascaris wrote to the King of Spain, saying that the islands were being usurped by the bishop, contrary to the wishes of his (the King's) predecessor.[68] The allegation was extremely serious. The Prince of the Islands was claiming that he was fast being robbed of people to govern to a point where the bishop was going to end up ruling over more subjects than he did. The king did address the Bishop, but the intervention of the Order's ambassador in Rome was still needed to plead with the Pope. Urban VIII was at last moved to issue a Motu Proprio in 1638, corroborating it with another in 1644 to remedy the situation, which documents curtailed the automatic inclusion of all clerics within the Ecclesiastical Forum.[69]

Notwithstanding the Motu Proprio by the Pope to control such proliferation of clerics, the problem resurfaced. Bishop Cocco Palmieri had adopted Balaguer's policy and had ordained clerics 'without or with false dimissorials'.[70] By 1699, the issue

---

[66] Domenico Sella, *Italy in the Seventeenth Century* (London and New York: Longman, 1997), 113, 114.
[67] Dal Pozzo, vol. 2 (1715), 24.
[68] Dal Pozzo, vol. 2 (1715), 24-25.
[69] Dal Pozzo, vol. 2 (1715), 25.
[70] AOM 1311, f.192r, 2 January 1700: '*chierici ordinati senza, o con false dimissorie'. For Dimissorials, see Can. 1015 - § 1: 'Ogni promovendo sia ordinato al presbiterato e al diaconato dal Vescovo proprio o con le sue legittime lettere dimissorie*.'

had again been taken up to Rome. Sacchetti reported that he was going to an extraordinary audience with the Pope, which he [Marcello] had requested:

to present, orally and in writing, the confusion that would ensue with the Bishop's desire to dredge up afresh the affair of the suspension of the privilege of Ecclesiastical Forum for clerics ordained without dimissorials.[71]

During the private audience, Sacchetti shrewdly appealed to decisions taken in 1638 and 1644, which decisions he claimed, surely came 'after mature reflection'. All he was pleading for was simply the confirmation of these decisions.[72] Finding the Pope favourable to his pleas he took the opportunity of this meeting to 'exaggerate the grave detriment that results to the temporal rule of Your Eminence, not only due to the multiplicity of clerics, but also the excessive number of patentees of the Holy Office.'[73]

The Inquisitor was, like the Bishop, swelling the ranks of dependants in the form of patentees. Like clerics, persons who were attached to the Inquisition were answerable to the Inquisitor and not to the Grand Master.[74] Considering that the Grand Master was simply asking for a confirmation of a previous papal decision and not its revocation, the matter should have been closed fairly quickly. But matters of jurisdiction dragged on interminably. Verbally, Sacchetti seemed to have been assured that a favourable decision was imminent. Almost a year later, the Grand Master was hoping that a Motu Proprio would be put in motion before Auditor Balsani returned to Malta.[75] The matter dragged on. Despite audiences and assurances and a change in both bishop (Joaquin Canaqves 1713-21) and two grand masters (Fra Adrien de Wignacourt (r.1690-97) and Fra Ramon Perellos y Roccaful (r.1697-1720), in 1717 the case was still pending: 'The case concerning the excessive number of clerics and patentees did not convene as I had written in my last letter'.[76] Grand Master Carafa

---

[71] AOM 1311, f.69r, 25 April 1699: '*stavo per portarmi ad un' Udienza straordinaria di N[ost]ro Sig[nor]e richiestagli da me ad effetto di rappresentargli in voce, ed in scritto tutte gl' Inconvenienti, che potevano nascere dale pretenzioni di cod[est]o Vesc[ov]o di volere rivangare ex Integro l'affare della sospensione del privilegio del foro, ed il Canone di quei Chierici ordinati senza Dimissorie*'.
[72] AOM 1311, f.69v, 25 April 1699, '*con mature discussione*'.
[73] AOM 1311, f.69v, 25 April 1699: '*mi prevalsi di cosi propizia congiuntura per esagerargli il discapito gravissimo, che risultava al Dominio temporale di V[ostra] E[minenza]; non meno dalla moltiplicita di detti Chierici, che dall'eccessivo numero di Patentati del Sant' Off[ici]o*'.
[74] AOM 1311, f.69v, 25 April 1699.
[75] AOM 1461, f.36r, 29 March 1700: '*Non lasciamo pero di replicare la premura che habbiamo di che so ponga in essecutione il decreto moderatorio de Patentati del S. Offitio prima che si parta di cotesta Corte il nostro Aud[itor]e Balsani*'.
[76] AOM 1329, f.134v, 22 May 1717: '*La causa sopra il numero eccessivo de Chierici, e Patentati, non si riproporra come ho avvisato l'ordin[ar]io scorso*'.

had already experienced this incessant procrastination: 'We waste more time and resources in defending our rights in Tribunals due to infinite trials then we do in our mission as a Hospital and in fighting the common enemy.'[77]

The sample cases cited show that legal battles between the Order and Church authorities occupied a considerable part of the ambassador's time. There was constant friction between bishops and grand masters with jurisdiction being very often the bone of contention. Dal Pozzo mentions how Cardinal Chigi, newly elected Protector of the Religion, wrote to the Bishop of Malta to observe the directives of the Council of Trent regarding minor and married clerics 'over which new contentions were always arising between Grand Master and Bishop.'[78] What also stands out in these cases is the seeming reluctance of the various tribunals to come to a conclusion, and one which was definite and could be referred to when similar disputes arose. To account for this, various factors must be considered.

It was a period during which the move towards jurisdictionalism and regalism was met with the equally determined move towards the consolidation of ecclesiastical rights by the Church. The post-Tridentine Church was determined to retrieve the authority it had lost to the state.[79] The time was ripe for the clash of the 'two absolutisms.'[80] The throne-altar contest can be typified by the Bull *In Coena Domini*. This document had been read to congregations on Maundy Thursday since the late Middle Ages. It listed a series of possible transgressions on ecclesiastical liberties, each one carrying the penalty of excommunication. Pope Pius V (1566-1572) had revised and expanded it and subsequent popes confirmed it.[81] Traditionally, one of the main goals of the Papacy was to free the Church from the interference and intrusion of the secular state. In this aspect, Trent was the latest of an ongoing struggle. But during the sixteenth century and after, the situation became more complex.[82] Church-State relations had been a continuous jousting tournament since the Church had

---

[77] AOM 1450, f.136v, 9 August 1683: '*siamo ridotti p[er] obligo di giunta defens[io]ne a consumare il tempo, e le sostanze pui ne Tribunali p[er] l'eternita delle Riti, che p[er] il n[ost]ro Instituto dell Hospitalita, e Militia contro il Commun Nemico*.'
[78] Dal Pozzo, vol. 2 (1715), 271: '*per i quali insorgevano sempre tra il G. Maestro, & il Vescovo nuove contese*.'
[79] John A. Marino, 'Early Modern Italy 1550-1796', *The Short Oxford History of Italy*, John A. Davis (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 140.
[80] Jean Delumeau, *L'Italie de Boticelli a Bonaparte* (Paris: A. Colin, 1974), 205.
[81] D. Sella, *Italy in the Seventeenth Century*, 161.
[82] David Knowles, 'Church and State in Christian History', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 2: 4 (1967), 12.

become an established institution: 'The dialogue, which has often become a controversy and a conflict, between church and state constitutes one of the great themes that run throughout European history.'[83] On the other hand, the state was equally determined to assert greater control on all forms of institutions, even ecclesiastical ones.[84] The seed for separation of Church and State was sown in the fertile ground of the power struggle between throne and altar that had predated Luther and Trent. Machiavelli had suspended all morality for reasons of state by 1532. Botero's *Della ragione di Stato* had been published in 1589.[85] Paolo Sarpi was already clamouring for the separation of Church and State. What begins in the realm of ideas soon starts to take hold in the physical world. In 1727 in Piedmont, a concordat was reached which limited the clergy's fiscal immunity and the jurisdiction of the Church's courts.[86] This encroachment of the state would have been evident to the cardinals presiding over the numerous Congregations in Rome, and therefore cases where Church and state were contesting jurisdictional rights were bound to be treated with caution. This could arise out of genuine religious fervour or the more mundane reason of safeguarding potential sources of income. If Rome put down its guard on the question of real immunity, it would stand to lose much needed revenue. Immunity meant that the ordained were free from secular taxation. But the Church could and did tax various dioceses. For instance, twenty-five per cent of the income of Neapolitan Church property was directed to Rome.[87] And this was official taxation. Cardinals, notwithstanding the precepts set down by Trent, were still immersed in nepotism and familial ties, resulting in extensive plundering from episcopates.[88] Thus erosion of episcopal powers was not only due to state encroachment.

A genuine spirit of reform seems to have driven Pope Innocent XI, and 'a new perception of the dignity and tasks of the episcopate' was actually 'the most significant element' he had introduced.[89] Episcopal status was one of the casualties of the Thirty Years War. Already on the defensive after the interdiction of Venice (1606-1607), the

---

[83] David Knowles, 'Church and State in Christian History', 3.
[84] D. Sella, *Italy in the Seventeenth Century*, 162.
[85] Stéphane Bonnet, 'Botero Machiavélien ou l'invention de la Raison d'État', *Les Études philosophiques.* Philosophie politique Classique, 3 (2003), 315-329.
[86] J. A. Marino, 'Early Modern Italy', 110.
[87] D. Sella, *Italy in the Seventeenth Century*, 171.
[88] Gianvittorio Signorotto, 'The Squadrone Volante', *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 206.
[89] G. Signorotto, 'The Squadrone Volante', 206.

papacy further tried to retain ancient rights of jurisdiction by instituting the Congregation of Immunity in 1626, during the pontificate of Pope Urban VIII Barberini.[90] The heavy toll of a long war spurred the French and Spanish kings to turn upon local ecclesiastical authorities to tax Church property, and Rome had not done much to defend them.[91] In 1671 Don Antonio Gaeta published a book in defence of bishops who had been abandoned by Rome.[92] Don Alfonso Litta, archbishop of Milan, joined in the fray, stating that when princes do not follow the law they are behaving just like the pope does as a secular monarch.[93] During Sacchetti's tenure, relations between governments, local churches and Rome were a major concern, evident in 'the increase in jurisdictional conflicts that took place following the seventeenth-century wars.'[94]

Trent had especially marked out bishops as a vehicle of reform. One area which the Council of Trent was set upon improving was the educational level of the priesthood, which bishops were to oversee.[95] In the post-Tridentine era 'bishops' governance of their dioceses was a high-profile, high-priority matter' and 'episcopal visitations became much more frequent.'[96] Bishops were thus enjoined to care for their diocese, and an overzealous one, even if driven by good intentions, might well go beyond his remit in the name of reform. There were thus two opposing forces contesting the same point. Bishops were seeking to exercise what to them were Tridentine demands whilst Princes strove to extend their power by appealing to other Tridentine precepts. Trent had neither fully catered for Church-State relations nor for affairs involving bishops and religious houses. The Order of St John was both a religious order and a state. Conflicts over power were bound to happen and, as Bizzocchi stated, 'In a culture imbued with law, power struggles immediately assume juridical form.'[97]

But although the culture was extremely legalistic, the laws themselves were open to much interpretation. Rather than clearly define clerical and lay status, the

---

[90] G. Signoretto, 'The Squadrone Volante', 207.
[91] G. Signoretto, 'The Squadrone Volante', 207.
[92] G. Signoretto, 'The Squadrone Volante', 208
[93] G. Signoretto, 'The Squadrone Volante', 208
[94] G. Signorotto, 'The Squadrone Volante', 206.
[95] J. A. Marino, 'Early Modern Italy', 136.
[96] J. A. Marino, 'Early Modern Italy', 135-136.
[97] Roberto Bizzocchi, 'Church, Religion, and State in the Early Modern Period', *The Journal of Modern History,* 67, Supplement: *The Origins of the State in Italy, 1300-1600* (1995), 159.

jurists considered 'the very idea of immunity as a matter of interpretation.'[98] Although Sacchetti could pit previous decisions in the melee of contemporary issues, previous rulings were no guarantee of similar decisions. It would have been futile to expect that the decision by the Rota on the Tortosa case would be mirrored in the litigation with the Bishop of Toledo. Each situation was treated afresh, as if it had had no predecessors. The laws did not lend themselves easily to neat conclusions. Moreover, there was a host of congregations and tribunals to interpret them, adding to the confusion.

These institutions had been established over time to facilitate the administration of the Papal states. They were the main cogs in the complicated machinery of papal government. Their roles often overlapped and it was common for cases to be treated by more than one congregation simultaneously. As Hanns Gross states, 'These congregations present an almost impenetrable maze to the uninitiated.'[99] Sacchetti weaved around this maze with considerable ease, very often relying on family contacts and high officials who equally offered and received patronage from the Hospital. The way these congregations operated made familiarity with a great number of officials a necessity. Since cardinals exchanged offices regularly, the more officials an ambassador knew, the more influence he could exert. However, this regular shifting of personnel was another inherent weakness in the system. Cardinals 'performed so many and such different functions in turn that they were never long enough in one office to master its technique and routine.'[100]

Multiplicity of courts was not only peculiar to Rome but was common practice in Catholic Europe. Apart from the inquisitor and bishop, the state also had three courts: the Castellania in Valletta, responsible for religious crimes for residents in Valletta, the harbour area and surroundings whilst Mdina, Rabat and the neighbouring hamlets were catered for by the court of the Captain of the Rod. Gozo had yet another seat chaired by the governor of the island aided by an assessor.[101] The nature of the case (be it civil or criminal) and also who the litigants or defendants were, that is

---

[98] R. Bizzocchi, 'Church, Religion, and State', 159.
[99] Hanns Gross, *Rome in the Age of Enlightenment. The post-Tridentine syndrome and the ancient regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 45.
[100] H. Gross, *Rome in the Age of Enlightenment*, 44.
[101] Simon Mercieca, 'How Was Judicial Power Balanced in Malta in Early Modern Times? A Cursory Look at the Maltese Legal System through a Historical Perspective', *Journal of Civil Law Studies*, 2: 4 (2011), 456.

whether they were subjects of the Church or of the state, were all factors which determined which court would hear the case. A civil case which started in Malta but ended up in Rome may throw light on this.

The litigants were Paolo Antonio Saliba who was representing his wife and Giacinto Macedonia. Saliba was a patentee of the Inquisition whilst Macedonia had been Captain of the Rod up to 1676 and therefore the subject of the Grand Master.[102] Sentence had been passed at the Tribunal of the Seneschal, but Macedonia was not satisfied with the ruling and wanted to appeal. The Grand Master considered the case important enough to champion his vassal's cause and write to the ambassador in Rome. On the advice of his lawyers, Sacchetti hoped to present the appeal at the Congregation of Immunity. The problem was that the Tribunal of the Seneschal was a lay institution, and therefore appealing to an ecclesiastical court was illegitimate. Such was Cardinal de Luca's opinion, and Sacchetti had to find a way round it.[103] Moreover, with one of the litigants being a familiar of the Inquistion, the case might end up in front of the Tribunal of the Holy Office, something which Sacchetti wanted to avoid at all costs because 'it would be presented to the Council of the Cardinals, and God knows how long they would deliberate and what decision they would reach.'[104] Cardinal de Luca's refusal was duly objected to and it seems the objection was accepted, as Sacchetti wrote:

I received the reply to the writ sent by lawyer Carlo Conti in favour of Giacinto Macedonia against the wife of Paolo Saliba, familiar of the Holy Office, so that I will not fail to aid the said Giacinto's procurators in this affair that concerns the jurisdiction of Your Eminence.[105]

In Malta, this contest over jurisdiction was perhaps even more keenly felt as the secular government held the islands in fiefdom from the King of Spain and itself acknowledged the Pope as ultimate head. The need to assert its authority was thus

---

[102] AOM 1297, f.104v, 8 August 1682. This letter mentions Saliba as patentee and Macedonia as subject of the Grand Master. He is listed as '*Capitan di Verga*'. See Vincenzo Azzopardi, *Raccolta di varie cose antiche e moderni utili ed interessanti riguardanti Malta e Gozo* (Malta: Giuseppe Camilleri e Co, 1843), 78.

[103] AOM 1298, f.10v, 23 January 1683.

[104] AOM 1297, f.104v, 8 August 1682: '*dove si saria proposto nella Coll[egio] di Signor Card[inali] et Dio sa qual risolutione havessero presa et con quanto lunghezza di tempo*.'

[105] AOM 1299, f.6v, 1 January 1684: '*Ricevuta la replica alla sc[rittur]a mandata dall'avv[oca]to Carlo Conti a favore di Giacinto Macedonia contro la moglie di Paolo Saliba patentato del S[anto] Officio ond'io non mancaro di assistere ai Pro[curato]ri del Giacinto in questo affare che riguarda la giurisditt[ion]e dell'E[minenza] V[ostra]*'.

heightened and jurisdiction over subjects and issues was the way this authority was asserted.

Even in matters of security, the Grand Master's authority was sometimes challenged. Thus for instance, the issue of the nocturnal confinement of slaves was challenged by the Inquisitor, who was claiming complete jurisdiction of the slaves of the Holy Office. It was deemed necessary by grand masters that for the safety of the island, all slaves, whether belonging to the Order or not, were to be locked up for the night. A 1581 law had been further confirmed in 1681.[106] The Inquisitor objected to this as shown by correspondence between Grand Master Carafa and Sacchetti. Sacchetti passed this case to Procurator Torrenti to consult the Order's lawyers.[107] In this case, Rome upheld the Grand Master's claims and a writ was duly issued, stressing the fact that the Grand Master had jurisdiction over all slaves since it was a question of the security of the islands.[108] The ratio of slaves to subjects was quite high, thus this was not a mere case of demonstrating supremacy but also a matter of safety for the general public as well as preventing potential riots or even rebellion.[109] Connection between slaves and petty crime was also a concern, as subsequent letters show.[110]

But when criminal behaviour was exhibited by priests it could prove harder for the lay power to serve justice and necessitated the intervention of the ambassador. Ecclesiastical immunity demanded that those falling under the mantle of the Ecclesiastical Forum could only be tried by an ecclesiastical court, with the further right of appealing to the Congregation of Immunity. The curious case of Don Maruzzo Salvatore was such an instance. According to the Grand Master the scandalous life this priest led was worthy of exile, and thus was Sacchetti instructed, to request the Congregation of Immunity for the 'perpetual exile from this our dominion'.[111] Knowing that Salvatore would present his own petition, Sacchetti sought to present the Grand Master's petition simultaneously and so sent his secretary Mancini to encounter the secretary of Cardinal Girolamo Casanate. This Cardinal was Secretary

---

[106] NLM, LIB. 151, f.72rv.
[107] AOM 1298, f.34r, 20 March 1683.
[108] AOM 1298, f.40r, 3 April 1683.
[109] Godfrey Wettinger, *Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo ca. 1000 – 1812* (Marsa: PEG, 2002), 536.
[110] AOM 1453, f.28v, 29rv, 16 January 1686.
[111] AOM 1449, f.127v, 20 July 1682: '*perpetua relegate[io]ne da questo n[ost]tro dominio*'.

of the Congregation of Immunity and had been Inquisitor in Malta (1658-1663).[112] Things went as planned:

I have arranged for Secretary Mancini to encounter Cardinal Casanatte's secretary at the Palace, which he did as I had planned and this same Secretary said to Secretary Mancini that this said priest had written to him on this case and he showed him the letter which had been conceived on the same lines as the aforementioned writ by Your Eminence[113].

The next step was to consult Monsignor Altoviti which both secretaries duly did, showing him both letters. Monsignor Altoviti suggested to wait for Salvatore's official petition.[114] All the necessary documents were in Rome by 5 September 1682.[115] Sacchetti conducted further consultations but the case was fast approaching a stalemate. Salvatore could not claim ecclesiastical immunity because his extradition from the Church had not been the result of a particular crime but out of the necessity of his own correction. On the other hand, the Congregation of Immunity could not demand his exile as this would be a blatant contradiction, with the Congregation initiating proceedings against itself.[116] There was however another way out suggested by Monsignor Altoviti. Sacchetti could take up the matter with the Inquisitor:

He [Monsignor Altoviti] however put me on the path I had to take, that is to give a document to the Pope in which I petition to put this affair in front of Monsignor Inquisitor and manifest to him the incorrigibility of the said priest so that he can exile him.[117]

Sacchetti managed to obtain a letter from Cardinal Cibo, the Secretary of State, addressed to the Inquisitor recommending the exile of Salvatore.[118] But this proved to be futile, as the order for exile should have been issued from the Congregation of the Council and not from the Secretary of State.[119] Altoviti was unavailable for further

---

[112] Alexander Bonnici, *Medieval and Roman Inquisition in Malta* (Malta: Reliġjon u Hajja, 1998), 304.

[113] AOM 1297, f.119r, 22 August 1682: '*ho fatto, che il Seg[retario] Mancini s'incontrassi a Palazzo col Seg[reta]rio del Card[inal]e Casanatte, il che a punto segui come Io havero proiettato et il sudd[ett]o segretario disse al Seg[retario] Mancini che cotesto Vic[ari]o li scriveva sopra queto partic[olar]e e li fece veder la lett[er]a quale e' concepita nell'istessi termini a punto che la sud[dett]a scrittura di V[ostra] E[minenza]*'.

[114] AOM 1297, f.119rv, 22 August 1682.

[115] AOM 1297, f.126r, 5 September 1682.

[116] AOM 1297, f.130r, 19 September 1682: '*che esso Salvatore era stato estratto dalla Chiesa ad correcttionem e non gia per qualche eccesso p[er] il quale non godesse l'Immunita e che pero la Cong[regatio]ne non proceva [missing piece. Probably contr]a se stessa ordinare l'esilio.*'

[117] AOM 1297, f.130v, 19 September 1682: '*Mise pero p[er] la strada di quello che dovevo fare cioe di dare un memoriale al Papa nel quale lo supplicassi che rimattasse l'affare a cotesto Mons[ignore]e Inquisitore e che costandogli l'incorrigibilita del d[ett]o sacerdote potesse esiliarlo*'.

[118] AOM 1297, f.166r, 4 November 1682.

[119] AOM 1297, f.184v, 19 December 1682.

consultations,[120] and the Congregation of the Council would only meet after the festive season.[121] The matter dragged on but eventually the Inquisitor was officially informed by the Council to order the exile of the dissolute priest.[122] Salvatore however, turned up in Rome but the ambassador shadowed his every move:

I have my eyes on his movements, as since he has been exiled from there [Malta] on the strength of the said letter, he has no options left but to appeal to the aforementioned Congregation. I have no fear there, considering the justice of our case and Altoviti's good disposition.[123]

The priest however spoilt his own chances of appeal and sealed his own fate. The case came to an appropriate conclusion, proving further the original accusations:

From what I have heard he is not to be found any longer in this City as he stayed only for a few days and I have been told that on the trip he was making with Monsignor Cantelmi, he stripped him of some antique silver medals and thus on Monsignor Cantelmi's arrival in Rome, he made good his escape. I must say that the Monsignor was utterly disgusted, having obtained these medals at great cost and with so much trouble.[124]

Monsignor Giacomo Cantelmi or Cantelmo was Inquisitor in Malta from 1678 to 1683. As it were, Father Salvatore dug his own grave by ruining his chance of appeal. But notwithstanding the Grand Master's desire and the Council's decision, he had still the right of appeal had he been prudent enough to use it. This could have dragged the matter further, yet, even without appeal, the Grand Master had to wait for almost a year to obtain satisfaction.

5.5 Conclusion

Church-state relations in Malta were heavily marked by constant wrangling. Disputes ended up in Rome, where the proliferation of courts and constant changing of personnel prolonged the cases. The ambassador would then seek audiences with relevant and influential clerics, using whatever leverage he could. Family ties and the

---

[120] AOM 1297, f.176r, 5 December 1682. '*il che non ho potuto fare per la scarsezza del tempo*'.
[121] AOM 1297, f.180v, 12 December 1682.
[122] AOM 1298, f.44v, 10 April 1683.
[123] AOM1298, f.91v, 3 July 1683: '*io invigilo sopra li suoi andamenti, se bene essendo egli stato cacciato di costa in vigore della sud[ett]a lett[er]a non potra far altro che ricorrerrere alla med[esim]a Cong[regazio]ne nella quale io ho poco timore che egli possa avvanzare cosa alcuna atteso la giustitia della nostra causa e la buona dispositione di Mons[ignore] Patriarca Altoviti segr[etrari]o di essa.'*
[124] *AOM1298, f.120r, 28 August 1683: 'Non si trova piu in questa Citta dove a qualche ho Saputo poi, si e' trattenuto pochi giorni, e mi e' stato riferto che nel viaggio che fece con Mons[ignore] Cantelmi, gli habbia pigliato alcune medaglie antiche d'argento e percio all'arrivo, che fece in Roma Mons[ignore] Cantelmi egli prese la fuga, et intendo anco che Mons[ignore] ne stia disgustatissimo, havendo egli procurato dette medaglie con molto fastidio e spesa*.'

patronage of his illustrious Order were employed lavishly, which was typical of the period. However, the ambassador had to exercise constant judiciousness. People fell in and out of favour regularly in Rome. He also had to be aware that in serving his Prince, he might be making a number of powerful enemies, whose aims he was thwarting or who were championing his opponent's cause. For instance, it was quite likely that the Inquisitor in Malta might end up sitting in one of the Congregations. In establishing and strengthening contacts, the ambassador had to be extremely careful that he was not making eternal enemies in the bargain. Another point that comes out is the sheer number of court cases that Sacchetti had to deal with. The length of time congregations took to reach a decision ensured that cases accumalated faster than they were being solved. Since there was no shortage of squabbles, Sacchetti and his aides, notably Secretary Mancini and Procurator Torrenti, had ample lawsuits to occupy their time. These litigations in the late seventeenth century escalated with time, as Grand Masters espoused absolutism and would eventually assert that 'if former Inquisitors had exercised such a right [jurisdiction over laymen] it was only an abuse which would no longer be tolerated,' and even extend its jurisdiction over clerics and familiars, to the point of resisting intereference from foreign powers in underlining their sovereignty.[125]

[125] F. Ciappara, 'Church-State Relations', 614, 621.

Chapter 6: 'The upheavals are universal': War, diplomacy and the Order

6.1 Introduction

'The times are universally disastrous, the upheavals are universal, and our Religion has to undergo its own trial, because God wills it.'[1] Thus lamented Perellos with his ambassador in the opening line of a letter that strayed slightly from the usual formal manner. Indeed war, though part of the *raison d'etre* of a military Order, could bring disruption, especially if its main European patrons were on opposite sides. This chapter looks at the ambassador's role where it concerned hostilities between states. Sacchetti's term in office coincided with a series of wars in Europe. The Order was involved in two of these: The Great Turkish War (1683-1699), encompassing the second Ottoman siege of Vienna and the War of the Morea, and the Ottoman-Venetian War (1714-1718), in which the Ottoman Empire sought to regain the losses it had incurred in the previous conflict. When at war with the Ottomans, Sacchetti's letters concerning hostilities go into certain detail on developments, but are strangely reticent about inter-Christian conflicts, of which there were three during his career as ambassador: The Nine Years War (1688-1697), the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714) and the War of the Quadruple Alliance (1718-1720). This chapter will take the Great Turkish War and the War of the Spanish Succession as illustrative examples in order to discover the involvement of the ambassador in Rome. These two wars were chosen for various reasons. The choice was guided primarily by the need to present contrasting wars, one with 'the common enemy' and the other between Christian states. The Great Turkish War was chosen over the Ottoman-Venetian war as the latter was a consequence of the former. Moreover, the second phase of the Great Turkish War, the War of the Morea, was partly the initiative of Pope Innocent XI and therefore involved more interaction between the Order and Rome. Concerning the War of the Spanish Succession, this was preferred as a case example especially because it best challenged the Order's fragile neutrality. Moreover, the next inter-Christian war, the War of the Quadruple Alliance, was the result of dissatisfaction on the part of

[1] AOM 1473, f.126r, 10 June 1712: '*I tempi sono universal[en]te calamitosi, li sconvolgimenti sono universali, e la n[os]tra Religione ne deve provar la sua parte, perche Dio cosi vuole.*'

Spain with the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht, thus a consequence of the War of the Spanish Succession.

6.2 The Great Turkish War (1683-1699)

For the Order, inter-Christian wars were more troubling and taxed its diplomatic corps, especially in Paris, Madrid and Vienna, much more than hostilities with the Ottoman Empire, unless it was feared that Malta was the Sultan's target. A Christian alliance against the common enemy involved the Hospital in its military capacity but did not embroil it in disastrous political complications. It could embrace its crusading tradition, add fire power to the Christian coalition, cover itself in glory and earn the gratitude of Pope and monarchs alike. It could rekindle the propaganda coup of 1565, the bulwark of the Christian Republic, publicizing how it neither spared coins from its coffers nor the blood of its brethren in the defence of Christendom. But when Christian princes were at each other's throats, the Order suffered the consequences. Inter-Christian wars in Europe during this period were largely due to Bourbon-Habsburg rivalry or consequences of it.[2] This dragged in other states as alliances formed and shifted. As soon as one war ended, preparations for another followed, as the defeated party would attempt to redress the unfavourable terms of previous treaties. And to the East lay the permanent threat of the Ottoman Empire, keen to expand and seemingly with endless resources to fund its ambitions.

The Porte's decision to attack Vienna was taken as early as August 1682. Sultan Mehmet IV (reigned 1648-1687) had decided to take advantage of the European situation and succeed where Suleiman the Magnificent had failed.[3] Emperor Leopold I was already preoccupied with various complications: a rebellion in Hungary supported by the Ottomans, French ambitions in Flanders, Germany and Italy, and all royal eyes on the potentially vacant throne of Spain if Charles II died without issue.[4] Such adversity seemed to threaten the very existence of the Empire, and, 'the whole Habsburg structure was thrown into a panic by the major Ottoman attack under Kara

[2] Neil Briscoe White, 'Aspects of the International Relations of the Order of St John, 1683-1722' (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 2011), 33.
[3] John Stoye, *The Siege of Vienna. The Last Great Trial between Cross and Crescent* (London: Collins, 1964), 226.
[4] J. Stoye, *The Siege of Vienna*, 226.

Mustafa which led to the lengthy siege of Vienna itself.'[5] The Ottoman onslaught, wrote Dal Pozzo, 'frightened the Emperor, who sought to save his person, escaped from Vienna' and 'the city was filled with terror, and now that Caesar has left, it seemed no one else would stay.'[6] Ottoman intentions were well known in Malta. News that 'armies and immense war machines were being transported from Asia' was discussed by the Grand Master and his Council. The decision was taken to send the galley squadron to the Levant with orders to destroy all shipping 'of any nation' if used to transport 'the infidel army'.[7] According to Dal Pozzo, the squadron was joined by 'six French ships flying the Portuguese flag, sent corsairing in the vicinity'.[8] This seems to have been the personal initiative of Colbert, Louis XIV's prime minister, not, according to Dal Pozzo, for booty but because the Order's squadron was commanded by his godson.[9] Offering help to the Emperor on land was a more difficult enterprise. The Order was not in a financial or logistic position to muster regiments and transport them to a landlocked battlefield. The Grand Master's response to this was to encourage individual knights to join the Emperor's ranks through a decree. Sacchetti's first letter concerning the Ottoman assault mentions this decree.[10]

The decree was not an innovation but a tradition. It was reissued when a Catholic state was at war with the Ottoman Empire.[11] Privileges awaited those knights and religious of the Order who went to serve the Holy Roman Emperor. For instance, six months service was equivalent to a *carovana*, financing a hundred soldiers for a year corresponded to having captained a galley for the same amount of time. The decree was sent to all the receivers with orders to publish it in its entirety. The Emperor had sent a letter in appreciation of this gesture.[12]

---

[5] Thomas Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598-1700* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 392.
[6] Dal Pozzo, vol. 2 (1715), 501. '*A si fatte novella spaventato l'Imperatore, cerco di ripor in sicuro la sua persona… si riempe la Citta di tanto terrore, che partendo Cesare, non pareva che fosse per restarvi persona alcuna*.'
[7] Dal Pozzo (1715), 495.
[8] Dal Pozzo (1715), 495.
[9] Dal Pozzo (1715), 495-496.
[10] AOM 1298, f.91r, 3 July 1683.
[11] Dal Pozzo (1715), 496: '*rinovarono il Decreto altre volte preso in simili occasioni*'; (renewed the Decree issued before on similar occasions).
[12] Dal Pozzo (1715), 496.

Sacchetti received the decree and mentioned it first on 3 July 1683, promising the Grand Master to inform all knights.[13] He also used it to boost the Order's standing with the Pope. The time coincided with two cases that Sacchetti was struggling with to obtain a favourable result. The Pope was particularly incensed with the Order due to the Toledo case, in which Grand Prior de Elendia and Ambassador Villavincentio were being held to blame for the violence exhibited towards churchmen.[14] The other case was related to the present war because the Emperor had asked for permission to tax Church institutions, including military and hospitaller.[15] After informing brother knights as he was duty bound, Sacchetti brought up the subject of the Grand Master's decree with Cardinal Cibo, after discussing the previous affairs. The Cardinal had been aware of it, having been informed by Monsignor Cantelmi. Of course such news would be spreading fast, with all receivers and ambassadors notified and commanded to inform all knights. It was Cardinal Cibo himself who suggested that Sacchetti should inform the Pope in person. This is what Sacchetti wanted. Obtaining an extraordinary audience with the Pope was not easy, but since Cardinal Cibo had suggested it, Sacchetti achieved a tacit guarantee that the Cardinal Secretary of State would exert some influence for the audience to materialise. At the proposed audience, Sacchetti hoped to placate the Pope on the Toledo case, using the age-old formula of knights willing to shed their blood for Christendom. As for the brief granted to the Emperor, he could argue that the Hospital cannot help Caesar in the manner it was born to do, namely sword in hand, if it was going to be deprived of revenue from all its lands in the Empire. And the Grand Master's decree was proof of the willingness of knights to be where the fighting was thickest. Such news would have been in line with Pope Innocent XI's policy of rallying a Christian front against Ottoman forces, a policy he had held dear even before his election in 1676.[16]

The siege of Vienna was lifted by 12 September 1683. The Ottoman army had been routed, with Jan Sobieski claiming that the enemy abandoned 'his whole encampment stretching over a mile.'[17] Sobieski had despatched Priest Donhoff as his

---

[13] AOM 1298, f.91r, 3 July 1683.
[14] This work, Chapter 5.
[15] This work, Chapter 4.
[16] Maurice Ashley, *The Golden Century. Europe 1598-1715* (London: Phoenix, 2002), 168.
[17] Jan Sobieski, *Sobieski's Letter to Pope Innocent XI*, translated by Ludwik Kzyżanowski. Retrieved on 20 September 2018 from https://www.jstor.org/stable/25777983

envoy with a captured Ottoman banner as a gift to the Pope. He arrived on the 25 September. Ever eager to promote the glory of a united Christendom, the Pope held mass at the Quirinale four days later, with all the ambassadors present. There he received the trophy, tacitly sending the message to all sovereigns that the real enemy was the crescent and not fellow Christians.[18]

Taking advantage of the enthusiasm fostered by the Christian victory, the Pope formed the Holy League, which Venice joined in 19 January 1684 as the war of the defence of Vienna morphed into the War of the Morea (1684-1699). In joining the Holy League, Venice renewed its diplomatic ties with Rome, which had been severed in 1678, when the Serenissima had fallen out with the Papacy over the extraterritorial and diplomatic rights of the quarters of its ambassador to Rome, Girolamo Zeno, who was subsequently recalled.[19] To heal this rift and establish again diplomatic ties, Giovanni Lando or Landi (1648-1707) was sent as extraordinary ambassador to the Holy See.[20] Lando is described as one of 'the foremost orators of the Republic', and credited with helping to avoid a war between Spain and the Holy See, for which the Pope publicly declared '*homo missus a Deo cui nomen erat Ioannes*', citing the Gospel of John 1, 16.[21] Lando had evidently managed to secure the Pope's trust, although their relationship eventually cooled down due to Venetian support of France in questions on jurisdiction over ecclesiastical properties.[22] However, while the war raged on, Venice was not in a position to completely sour its relations with the papacy. During his tenure in Rome it is claimed that 'ambassadors of other princes, that is those of the King of France, the King of Spain, the Duke of Tuscany, the Order of Malta often consulted him.'[23] Lando was probably in Rome at the beginning of 1684, having been

---

[18] Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, *The History of the Popes. From the close of the Middle Ages*, xxxii (London: Trubner and Co, 1940), 182-183.
[19] Sherrod Brandon Marshall, 'A Mediterranean Connection: French Ambassadors, the Republic of Venice, and the Construction of the Louisquatorzien State, 1662-1702.' (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Syracuse, 2016), 197. Retrieved from http://surface.syr.edu/etd/586
[20] S. B. Marshall, 'A Mediterranean Connection', 197. It was found that this Venetian ambassador is sometimes called Giovanni and sometimes Girolamo. S. B. Marshall uses the latter. For this work Giovanni was chosen since it seemed more prevalent and Girolamo Lando, was another Venetian ambassador, sent to England from 18 December 1619 to 24 June 1622. Giovanni's surname was found to be written both as Lando and Landi.
[21] *Delle Inscrizioni Veneziane*. Raccolte ed Illustrate da Emmanuele Antonio Cigogna (Venice: 1824), 179.
[22] S. B. Marshall, 'A Mediterranean Connection', 199.
[23] *Inscrizioni Veneziane*, 179.

given fifteen days to leave Venice, a thousand ducats and a monthly subsidy of 200 more, on 8 December 1683.[24]

On New Year's Day, 1684, Sacchetti was busy writing or passing on letters of congratulations on the victory of the Christian forces, while feasts were held in Malta.[25] The wave that had scattered the Ottoman army had now the galleys of the Serenissima upon its crest. The Grand Master soon informed Sacchetti of his intentions to arm the Order's galleys and push the victory home.[26] At this stage, the Order's galley squadron was at its zenith. with its galleys 'now equipped with a landing military corps of a thousand men,' and the war of the Morea offered new prospects of contributing to the commitment of the Holy League.[27] Readiness was crucial for galley warfare, as by October at the latest the weather became too treacherous for low draught vessels. This alacrity is felt in Monsignor Tese's message to Sacchetti, straight after the Monsignor had had an audience with the Pope: 'he [the Pope] has ordered to make all possible haste so that the Galley squadron departs with all rapidity, since His Holiness is informed that the Venetian Navy will be at the ready on the 22 of this month'.[28]

Sacchetti kept the Grand Master abreast of all military movements. The Papal Squadron lay at Civitavecchia, taking in more recruits as companies of soldiers marched towards the harbour.[29] At Syracuse, the Papal galleys joined with the Order's squadron and the combined fleet headed towards Corfu 'on the day of St John the Baptist.'[30] The campaign was therefore launched, by accident or design, on a very significant day for the Religion. This combined fleet was to join with the Venetian navy. The Republic was still smarting from the loss of Candia and sought to wrest

---

[24] Retrieved from http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-lando_(Dizionario-Biografico)/ on 25 May 2019.
[25] AOM 1299, f.5rv, 1 January 1684.
[26] AOM 1299, f.49r, 15 April 1684: '*sopra li preparamenti del nuovo armamenti contro il Turco*'.
[27] Salvatore Bono, 'Naval Exploits and Privateering', in *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993), 368.
[28] AOM 1299, f.63v, 20 May 1684: '*In questo punto Mons[ignor] Tese mi ha mandato a dire che essendo stato questa mattina all'udienza del Papa dal medesimo gli e' stato ordinato di fare ogni diligenza possible perche la squadra di queste Galere parta con ogni celerita, giache la Santita Sua ha avviso che l'Armata Veneta sara all' ordine alli 22 del corrente*'.
[29] AOM 1299, f.64v, 27 May 1684: '*attesa che hieri marcio verso quell Porto una Comp[ani]a di soldati p[er] imbarcare, et hoggi sono partite le alter due Comp[ani]e e tanto piu credo che la partenza delle med[esim]e Galere succedera nelli d[etti] giorni*.'
[30] AOM 1299, f.87r, 15 July 1684: '*il giorno di S[an] Giovan[ni] Bat[is]ta*.'

Ottoman territories that were too close to her navigation routes.[31] The fleet of the Holy League under the Venetian General Morosini soon regained most of the Dalmatian territories but the success abroad was not enough to stop mistrust brewing in Rome. The Hospital and the Republic had fought side by side, but throughout their long relationship their divergent interests had often led to clashes, and both sides had learnt by bitter experience to be wary of each other.[32] Sacchetti's initial encounters with Lando were thus not very amicable, although their rapport improved. Sacchetti's next letter concerning the War somewhat doused the jubilation of initial victories:

> Yesterday evening at a nightly hour Cardinal Cibo sent for Secretary Mancini, and told him that the Pope had ordered him to send a despatch with all haste by boat to Monsignor Inquisitor to present to Your Eminence the doubt that the Venetians have, namely that the Squadron of Your Eminence wants to return to Malta towards the middle of this month and abandon the main body of the Armada, adding that His Holiness imposed upon him [Cardinal Cibo] to write that the Pope has found this supposed retreat of the Squadron of Your Eminence revolting, a retreat which would waste the expenses involved and dash the high hopes the present campaign had of winning some considerable prize to the detriment of the common enemy and to the advantage of Christendom. The Cardinal concluded by saying that he had informed me so that I would be able to inform Your Eminence on the sentiments of His Holiness.[33]

Sacchetti realised that this letter was damaging both for the Order and for his prowess as ambassador. Such sentiments in the mind of the Pope jeapordised the pending cases that the Order had and the future ones as well. The Pope was doubting the Order's commitment to the Holy League, and that made the Order look like a band of legalised pirates rather than a military order of the Church. Personally, he would lose face with his Prince. Should this letter reach the Grand Master without the ambassador's forewarning, it would reflect badly on his ability to gauge the rumours that echoed in

---

[31] David Abulafia, *The Great Sea. A Human History of the Mediterranean* (London: Penguin Books, 2012), 489.

[32] For the history of the relations between Venice and the Order, see Victor Mallia-Milanes, *Venice and Hospitaller Malta, 1530-1798. Aspects of a Relationship* (Marsa: PEG, 1992).

[33] AOM 1299, f.99r, 4 August 1684: '*Hieri sera ad un ora di notte il S Card[a[l]e Cibo mando a chiamare il Seg[retari]o Mancini, e gli disse che N[ost]ro Sig[nor]e gl' aveva ordinato di spedire con tutta diligenza una stafetta a feluca a cotesto Mons[ignor] Inquis[itor]e p[er] rappresentare all'E[minenza] V[ostra] il dubbio che avevano li Sig[nor]i Venetiani, che la squadra di V[ostra] E[minenza] verso la meta del Corr[en]te mese se ne volesse ritornare in Malta et abbandonare il corpo dell'Armata, sogguingendogli che S[ua] B[eatitudine] glaveva imposto di scrivere che questa supposta ritirata della squadra di V[ostra] E[minenza] averebbe dato gran disgusto al Papa che si sarebbero perse e la spesa e la buone speranze che vi erano di potere nella presente campagna fare qualche impresa considerabile contra il comun nemico et, a favore della Cristianita conncludendo il Sig[nor] Card[ina]le che me lo faccia sapere ad effetto che io potessi scrivere all'E[minenza] V[ostra] li sentimenti di Sua S[ant]ita*.'

Rome, and on his supposedly good relations with the Pope and various cardinals. Failure to forestall the Pope's letter by one of his own would be a terrible blow. To his credit, Secretary Mancini was not overawed by the Secretary of State and did reply:

To this preposterous accusation Secretary Mancini answered that he would not fail to present to me all that the Cardinal was pleased to command of him, but if he [Cardinal Cibo] would not think of him as being too impertinent, he would like to say what he thinks of this affair, he would assure the said Signor Cardinal that this doubt of these Venetians is empty air and based on the vainest of suspicions, because Your Eminence, and the Religion, that so generously has found the strength from its very weakness (considering the present exhausted state of the Religion) to spend huge sums to meet with the exactions of His Holiness, and to make it known the World over, that the Religion has never shied from its laudable custom to be the first to disembowel itself when it came to go against the Turk, and that after having gone for a trip with the Galleys and ships, wishing to turn back without having seen the face of the prize, this suggestion is utterly alien to the Religion, when it has occasion in the present event to shower itself with glory in the face of all the Christian world. It would make the Order despicable were it to entertain the thought, even momentarily, to leave the Levant before the month of October, as in fact it has done for so many years during the siege of Candia.[34]

Mancini's answer is pregnant with subtle jibes and undertones. The switch to the subjunctive mood (*congiuntivo*) ensured no rebuke from the Cardinal. As this mood implies expressing opinion rather than fact, and thus used with verbs such as 'think', 'seem', 'suppose', it is a polite form of addressing a superior due to its deferential tone. Mancini then juxtaposed the Venetians and their vain suspicions with the Order and its tangible efforts, citing as proof the Order's long history of bravery in warfare, with a subtle taunt at the Republic's long history of appeasement. Mancini's parting shot is the siege of Candia, the latest adventure which the Religion had shared with Venice.[35]

---

[34] AOM 1299, f.99rv, 4 August 1684: '*A questa strana proposta gli rispose il Seg[retari]o Mancini, che egli non averebbe mancato di rappresentarmi quanto si compiacuto comandargli ma che se egli non avesse dubitato di passare temerario, di voler dire il suo parere in questo affare, averebbe assicurato d[ett]o Sig[nor] Card[ina]le che questo dubbio delli Sig[nor]i Venetiani era aereo e fondato sopra un sospetto vanissimo, poiche V[ostra] E[minenza], e la Religione , che cosi generosamente aveva cavato forze dall' istessa debolezza (atteso lo stato presente esausto della Relig[ion]e) e p[er] fare spese cosi grandi p[er] far conoscere al Mondo tutto, che la Religione non ha punto declinato dal suo lodevole costume di esser sempre la prima a sviscerarsi quando si tratta di andar contro il Turco, e che poi doppo aver fatta una passeggiata con le Galere e Vascelli, se ne volesse ritornar in Porto senza aver veduto la faccia del premio questo era un procedere cosi strano che dove essa Relig[ion]e aveva preteso col presente avvenimento di rendersi gloriosa appresso il Mondo Cristiano, si sarebbe resa disprezzabile se aveva se mai solamente prensato di partirsi prima da Levante che il mese di Ottobre, come appunto ha fatto p[er] tanti anni durante l'assedio di Candia*.'

[35] For relations between Venice and the Order during the War of Candia, see Peter Fava, 'Malta and Venice: The War of Candia 1645-1669' (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 1976).

However poignant Mancini's reply was, Sacchetti still had to find a way round this diplomatic tangle. Cardinal Cibo's forewarning gave him twenty-four hours and proof, if proof was needed, that the ambassador had the trust of the Secretary of State. The whole incident owed much to Pope Innocent's character traits. Extremely upright and spiritual rather than worldly, nevertheless, he had never travelled outside Italy, had never been a nuncio and had therefore no experience of the guile of diplomats.[36] He was thus prone to manipulation by more worldly and less scrupulous men. His scrupulosity occasionally made him mistrust even his ministers. Landi would have known the Pope's weaknesses just as much as he knew his crusading zeal.[37] And it was on these that Landi worked his oratory. Though Pope Innocent XI was usually slow in reaching decisions, yet once his mind was set he was intractable and at times he was prone to leaping to conclusions without listening to the version of the maligned party as he had done in the Toledo case.[38] A last minute desperate audience with the Pope was futile, and the Cardinal told Sacchetti so.[39] Sacchetti knew who hovered behind these manifestations. Two days earlier, the Venetian ambassador had called at Sacchetti's house and told him that the word in Venice was that the Order was going to repeal its squadron and abandon the campaign.

Sacchetti had assured him that there were no such plans so early in the season, but only that the squadron would follow usual procedure and winter in Malta as it was considered the best place to refit the vessels.[40] The success of the campaign of the following year depended much on the state of the vessels. Notwithstanding Sacchetti's guarantees, Signor Landi still considered himself duty bound to inform the Pope. Infuriated, the Pope took the decision to bypass the Order's ambassador and vented his ire by writing directly to his nuncio in Malta, Inquisitor Caracciolo (1683-1686). The only avenue left for Sacchetti was to anticipate the Pope's letter with one of his own so that when the Inquisitor solemnly sought audience with the Grand Master, brandishing the Pope's letter, the Prince would have been informed of all the Pope's sentiments and his answer despatched.

---

[36] Pastor, xxxii, 17-18.
[37] For Pope Innocent XI and crusading spirit see Pastor xxxii, 14, 18 and 40.
[38] This work, Chapter 5.
[39] AOM 1299, f.99v, 4 August 1684.
[40] AOM 1299, f.100r, 4 August 1684: '*in nesun luogo si poteva far meglio che in cotest' Isola*'.

Sacchetti's plan was to send his own letter to the Grand Master with the same boat as Cardinal Cibo's, for which reason he needed to meet him on Friday morning, before the boat sailed, with the promise of a more detailed despatch on Saturday 5 August.[41] Judging from the Grand Master's reply, Sacchetti's audience was succesful. The Grand Master wrote that no sooner had the boat arrived when the Inquisitor appeared to present the Pope's letter, and in so doing presented the one sent by Sacchetti. As Grand Master Carafa put it, 'with wise prudence' Sacchetti had convinced Cardinal Cibo to despatch his own letter 'envoloped beneath the Cardinal's'.[42]

In his reply to the Cardinal Secretary of State, Grand Master Carafa gave his assurance that the squadron would remain with the Venetian navy till the end of September, 'according to the practice in Candia'.[43] Though the letter was diplomatically worded, the message was very close to Secretary Mancini's reply. He mentioned that it was always his intention that the squadron remained as long as the season permitted, that the Pope's orders had been carried out to the letter and that in fact, further provisions had been sent to the squadron.[44] Sacchetti was given a copy of this letter, 'for your information and so as not to repeat the same.'[45]

Sacchetti's next encounter with the Venetian ambassador was less fraught with suspicion. The contribution of the Order's squadron in the campaign had quelled Venetian doubts. Signor Landi had nothing but praise for the Order's galleys and troops:

He also rendered a Eulogy in favour of the Galleys and the Battalions of Your Eminence, saying that in this enterprise they bore themselves with great valour, and that the Captain-General was fully satisfied with the Venerable General and the other officials of Your Eminence.[46]

---

[41] AOM 1299, f.100r, 4 August 1684.
[42] AOM 1451, f.166v, 29 August 1684: '*con avveduta prudenza*' and, '*sotto piego del Sig[nor] Card[ina]le*'.
[43] AOM 1451, f.167v, 29 August 1684. Grand Master Carafa to Cardinal Cibo: '*seconda il pratticato ne viaggi di Candia*'.
[44] AOM 1451, f.167v, 29 August 1684.
[45] AOM 1451, f.167r, 29 August 1684: '*p[er] v[ost]ra informat[io]ne e per non replicarvi l'istesso*.'
[46] AOM 1299, f.105r, 26 August 1684: '*Hieri questo Ministro della Republica Veneta sig Giovanni Lando mi porto una lett[er]a Ducale p[er] V[ostra] E[minenza], quale mando questa sera costa, e mi diede parte della presa di Santa Maura, come V[ostra] E[minenza] avera di gia saputo p[er] via di Napoli, e mi fece un Elogio delle Galere, e Battaglione di V[ostra] E[minenza], dicendo che in d[ett]a impresa si erano portati con molto valore, e' che quel Generalissimo restava a pieno sodisfatto del V[enerabile] G[e]n[era]le, e degli altri Offitiali di V[ostra] E[minenza]*.'

With that hurdle cleared, Sacchetti sought an extraordinary audience with the Pope which was granted two weeks later. The Pope was particularly pleased with the Grand Master's decision to extend the squadron's presence till October if necessity so dictated and that proof of this was the fact that provisions had already been sent.

The Pope's flight of anger and the subsequent joy must be seen in the light of his stubborn clinging to the dream of a united Christendom. This vision fitted with the Order's self-perception but no European monarch expressely made it his main policy. The ideal of a *res publica christiana* was paid lipservice by Christian monarchs and only brought up when it suited them.[47] Not so for Pope Innocent XI. A united Christendom was one of Odescalchi's articles of reform, a programme which had to be signed and sworn by all the Cardinals as a condition for his acceptance of the triple tiara of the papacy.[48] A united Christendom and the obliteration of the Ottoman Empire was for Pope Innocent XI not just a dream but a tangible aim. His hopes at the outset of the War of the Morea were so high that he even formulated how the eventually defunct Ottoman Empire was to be carved between the Christian powers: Hungary to the Empire, Moldavia and Wallachia to Poland, Venice would acquire Slavonia, Croatia, Bosnia, Dalmatia, Albania and Epirus and France would take Thrace, Constantinople, Adrianople, Bulgaria, Serbia, Macedonia, Morea, Achaia and the Archipelago. Knowing the antagonism between the houses of France and Austria, the Pope planned to reserve Transylvania and Banat as buffer states between the two. France could venture into Syria and Egypt when the Duke of Anjou would be crowned Emperor of the East.[49] Considering that the Order was the eternal enemy of the 'Turk', the Pope viewed any half-heartedness in its war effort as total betrayal. The suspicion did not arise again for the rest of the war, which dragged on as successive popes and grand masters inherited the conflict. The War of the Morea came to a conclusion with the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699. Venice gained the Peloponnese and much of Dalmatia

---

See also AOM1759 f.260, 18 Sept. 1684: '*coll' impiego anco delle militie di sbarco, e coll' azzardo generoso di tanti Cavalieri, ne rende eminenza dovuta la partecipatione, egli e la portiamo colle punti insieme co gli applausi ben meritati dal valore, et esperienza de suoi, e co gli attestati del piu grato, e sincere sentimento de gli animi nostri a si felice principio sperar dobbiamo conseguitino altri maggiori piu fortunati eventi, da quali sempre piu depressa la Tiranide dell Inimico comune, si renda ampliato il culto della vera religione, e con degni gloriosi sacrifici di sudori e di sangue*.'

[47] This work, Chapter 2. See also, Noel Malcolm, *Useful Enemies. Islam and the Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought 1450-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 114.

[48] Pastor, xxxii, 10.

[49] Pastor, xxxii, 186.

and Austria recovered most of Hungary and Transylvania. The Ottomans would soon rekindle the struggle to reverse the losses incurred by this treaty in 1714, with the conflict ending in 1718 with the Treaty of Passarowitz. It was the last conflict between the Serenissima and the Sublime Porte.

6.3 The War of the Spanish Succession

On the Western front, war was a pervading pestilence. In 1697, the belligerent powers of the Nine-Years War met in Ryswick to conclude a peace. However, the negotiations were overshadowed by the ghost of the undead Charles II of Spain (1661-1700). The Peace of Ryswick turned out to be a pause for the combatants to lick their wounds rather than herald a spell of cooperation between European powers. The optimism that had probably reigned in official circles in Malta was short-lived. The news that had arrived in late June was full of promise. The powers had agreed to concede Naples and Sicily to France and the throne of Spain was to go to the Archduke Karl von Habsburg. It seemed war had been averted. But before he died, Charles II had altered the will, 'made in a spirit of resentment that heretical Dutch and English should plan the dismemberment of his empire'.[50] The altered will, allegedly incorporating the suggestions of Cardinal Portocarrero and the advice of Pope Innocent XII and Cardinals Albani, Spada and Spinola was aimed at preventing the dismemberment of the Spanish Empire.[51] It sang a different tune, a tune that was soon to be accompanied by martial drums and belching cannons as Europe was once again plunged into war.

The failing health of Charles II of Spain had been the concern of most of the crowned heads of Europe for quite a while, more as heirs rather than as doctors. Charles II had suffered from ill health throughout his life and died childless. The Spanish Habsburgs had inbred themselves out of the map. His death prompted Louis XIV and Leopold I (1640-1705) to push forward their candidates, plunging European powers and their colonies into yet another war. England (which over the course of this conflict would evolve into the United Kingdom of Great Britain)[52] and the Dutch

---

[50] Geoffrey Treasure, *The Making of Modern Europe 1648-1780* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 275.
[51] Pastor xxxii, 687: It is 'allegedly' so because 'The original text of Charles II's enquiry and Innocent XII's answer have not been found, either in Rome or in Madrid.' For a brief biographical note of the three cardinals mentioned, see Appendix 1, 236-237.
[52] The kingdom of England joined with that of Scotland by The Acts of Union in 1707. See http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aosp/1707/7/section/I

republic declared war on France and later Spain, although they had previously recognised Philip of Anjou as king. The Emperor had not recognised the French claim in spite of Charles II's will and declared war on France and on Philip and his adherents.[53] The war had been foreseen and attempts at a peaceful solution had been made as early as 1698 with the Partition Treaty and again in 1700.[54] Similarly, the cardinals and ambassadors in Rome were not only aware of the frailty of the king of Spain, but also of the advanced age of Pope Innocent XII and the illness that started to ravage him in November 1699.[55] Succumbing to his ailment on 27 September 1700, the Pope was outlived by the frail Charles by barely a month. Both men had opted that the answer to the Spanish question was a Bourbon king of Spain.[56] Mindful of the turmoil that a vacant throne of Peter would trigger, the cardinals knew that the chosen one had to be equal to the troubles that were brewing. The cardinals were divided in three factions, the pro-French, the Imperialists and the Zelanti.[57] The latter had voluntarily opted to iron out all worldly differences between them and work towards the good of the Church, setting aside deliberations of nationalities, familial ties, ancient feuds and political tendencies. Added to this, a number of cardinals did not adhere to any party, such as Ottoboni, Panciatici, Cantelmi, Adda, Rubini, Costaguti, Bichi, Imperiali, Omodei, Barberini and Albani.[58] These divisions would ensure a long and difficult conclave. On the 23 November 1700, Cardinal Giovanni Francesco Albani (1649-1721) accepted the tiara and took the name of Clement XI. Although not pertaining to any faction, Cardinal Albani was strongly supported by the Zelanti.[59] As a cardinal, Albani had been highly influential, considered as having 'the Pope's ear at all times.'[60] He had replaced Cardinal Slusio as Secretary of Briefs on the latter's death in 1687.[61]

The new Pope's approach to the Spanish question was dictated by his religious and secular role. As head of the Church, he sought first and foremost peace between

---

[53] M. A. Thomson, 'Louis XIV and the Origins of the War of the Spanish Succession', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4 (1954), 111.
[54] M. A. Thomson, 'Origins of the War of the Spanish Succession', 114-115.
[55] Pastor, xxxiii, 1.
[56] Pastor, xxxii, 688.
[57] Pastor, xxxiii, 2.
[58] Pastor, xxxiii, 4.
[59] Pastor, xxxiii, 6.
[60] Pastor, xxxiii, 9, citing *Relazione di Roma of N. Erizzo* (1702), State Archives, Venice.
[61] Pastor, xxxiii, 8.

the Christian monarchs. As a prince of an Italian state, he wanted to avoid Italy from becoming a battlefield. Politically, Pope Clement XI was considered as pro-French although not at the expense of 'his strict ecclesiastical principles'.[62] He sought to remain equidistant from Paris and Vienna but this policy only antagonised them both. He was in disagreement over Louis XIV's Gallican church policy. With Leopold I, the Pope had censured the Emperor's recognition of the Elector Frederick of Brandenburg as king of Prussia, a territory which had been wrested from the Order of St Mary of the Germans (the Teutonic Order) and therefore a military order of the Church.[63] The Pope's attempt at trying to mediate between Bourbon and Habsburg failed, because a mediator has to be seen as neutral by both parties, but both considered him as siding with the other. Lamberg, the Emperor's envoy, described the Cardinal Secretary of State as 'stinkingly French' and demonstrated unreasonable hatred towards the Italians in general.[64] On the French side, Marshal Vendome accused the Pope of being 'intimidated by the Emperor's threats' and even accused him of failing to uphold Italy's neutrality.[65] Roman-Viennese relations soured even more when French and Imperial troops faced each other on papal territory.[66] Nor did things improve with the death of Leopold I and the accession of Joseph I in 1705.[67]

Grand Master Perellos found himself in a position similar to the Pope. The Order's neutrality was immediately put into question since Perellos was considered as pro-French.[68] As with any Christian disagreement, the Order immediately felt the tension amongst its brethren. For instance, the priories falling under the Crown of Aragon were attached to the anti-Bourbon party and thus expected to lend their human and economic resources to Charles VI, the archduke of Austria, in his bid to become Charles III of Spain.[69] On the other hand, French knights, especially those serving the King of France, championed the cause of Philip Duke of Anjou.[70] When Philip of

---

[62] Pastor, xxxiii, 9.
[63] For a more detailed account of the Pope's difficulties with France and the Empire, see Pastor, xxxiii, 18-20.
[64] Pastor xxxiii, 32.
[65] Pastor, xxxiii, 33.
[66] Pastor, xxxiii, 33.
[67] Pastor, xxxiii, 34.
[68] Francesc Amorós i Gonell, 'Malta i els cavallers hospitalers de l'orde militar de Sant Joan de Jerusalem durant la Guerra de Successió (1702-1714). Notícies extretes de la correspondència Diplomàtica', *Pedralbes: revista d'historia moderna*, 26 (2006), 265-266.
[69] F. Amoros, 'La Guerra de Successió', 266.
[70] F. Amoros, 'La Guerra de Successió', 105.

Anjou entered Madrid in 1701 as Philip V, festivities were held in Malta, as in Rome, as befitted any Christian king.[71] Two extraordinary ambassadors were also sent, one to Palermo and the other to Madrid, in order to pay homage to the new king and his representative in Sicily.[72] In reality, the Order could not avoid manifesting celebrations and sending ambassadors, having to adhere to traditions. This did not go down well with the pro-Habsburg allies and the Order's reputation for neutrality was tarnished throughout the war.

The war in general was wreaking havoc on the Order's income. Not only did it disrupt the flow of *responsiones*, but agricultural land within the commanderies was being wasted by marauding armies. Already in 1702, commanderies in the Netherlands, to the west of Germany, Switzerland, Bavaria and North Italy were suffering the ravages of war.[73] The Order was not unfamiliar with similar mishaps in the past, but localised wars meant that revenue disrupted from one area was compensated from another.[74] But the scale of warfare had grown and in the case of the War of the Spanish Succession, more widespread. Moreover, the feuding monarchs were in need of more and more money to fund their war effort. For instance, Hospitaller estates, officially immune from taxation, were too tempting and were thus forced to pay taxes regardless.[75] By 1706, the allies deemed it fit to confiscate property and income of the Order in Flanders, in Milan and Catalunya in 1706.[76] This was replicated by the Duke of Savoy (Victor Amadeus II, 1666-1732), who suspended the immunity on the Order's lands in Piedmont, as Perellos informed Sacchetti in 1707.[77]

The only avenue left for the Religion was diplomacy. Trusting that the Order still enjoyed a certain prestige with Catholic kings, Perellos tried to mitigate the misfortunes of war that the Order was suffering by appealing to the belligerent rulers to respect the property of the Religion. The war gave rise to a steady flow of correspondence between the Grand Master and his representatives, be they

---

[71] Rodereick Cavaliero, *The Last of the Crusaders: The Knights of St John and Malta in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Tauris Parke, 1960), 107. See also AOM 265, f.37v-39v. For the Emperor's protest with the Pope, see Pastor, xxxiii, 15.
[72] Francesco Russo, *Un Ordine, Una Citta, una Diocesi. La giurisdizione ecclesiastica nel principato monastico di Malta in età moderna (1523–1722)* (Rome: Aracne, 2017), 399.
[73] AOM 1463, f.42r, 10 February 1702. Perellos to receiver Crivelli in Milan.
[74] N. Briscoe-White, 'Aspects of the International Relations of the Order of St John', 44.
[75] AOM 1463, 139v, 30 July 1702.
[76] AOM 1651, 6 March 1706. The folio number could not be retrieved as the volume is now in restoration.
[77] AOM 1468, f.101rv, 27 July 1707.

ambassadors, priors or receivers wherever the Order had vested interest. Only France responded positively and guaranteed the rights and privileges of the Order and its property within the French dominions.[78] The Emperor appropriated the right to nominate the Prior of Bohemia. Perellos sent the Grand Bailiff of Germany, Count d'Herbestein to plead the Order's case with the Emperor. Count d'Herbestein was in Rome in 1709, where he met Sacchetti and passed on Perellos's letter for the Pope regarding this case. Sacchetti promised to seek an extraordinary audience with the Pope to present the letter, and on his part add further solicitations so that the Pope would instruct his Nunzio in Vienna to assist the Order's deputation to the Emperor.[79]

The audience was given on 25 May. Sacchetti raised the issues concerning the Priory of Bohemia and the commanderies being held by Dutch forces, adding his own supplications. The Pope promised his full support and that he would also send the necessary documents proving the rights of the Order to his Nuncio Monsignor Piazza.[80] Meanwhile, the Nuncio in Paris had also been charged to promote the Order's interest in the question of the Order's estates held by the Dutch. In his letter, addressed to the Grand Master but sent to Sacchetti to forward, the Nuncio explained that since the peace congress had broken down he had deemed it prudent not to exert pressure on the topic. He had however broached the subject with Louis XIV's Minister in readiness for when peace talks continued. The Nuncio learnt that Ambassador Sacchetti had already pleaded with the Pope and the Minister would do his utmost for the restitution of the Order's estates although the Minister had underlined that it would not be easy. The Nuncio had had occasion to discuss the matter with Sacchetti, considering that when the peace talks started, they should be attended by as many knights as there would be ministers, 'each one from the same nation as the Ministers themselves, so every knight could solicit his own case.'[81] Perellos wrote to Sacchetti

---

[78] AOM 265, f.91v-92r, August 1702: '*Mais comme cette conduite est directement contraire à l'intention de sa Maiesté, et a celle de sa Predecesseur Rois, qui se sont si souvent expliquez par leurs declarations et par celle du nous de Juin 1641, les Chevaliers du même Ordre sont exempts de cette recherche: que par le contrat passé par sa Maiesté, et le clergé de France le 11 Septembre 1675, ils sont déchargez du huitième denier, que par l'arrest du Conseil d'État du 15 Janvier 1678, ils sont exceptez da cette imposition.*'

[79] AOM 1321, f.82r, 11 May 1709: '*domandare a N[ost]ro S[ignore]e udienza straord[inari]a per presentare la letter ache sopra tal materia li E[minenza] V[ostra] scrivi a Sua San[tit]a, e d'uniro le mie suppliche e premure, perche si degni d'ordinare al suo Mons[ignore]e Nun[tio] di assistere a Deputati dell'Ordine coll'efficacia de suoi ufficij appresso S[ua] M[aesta] Ces[are]a*'.

[80] AOM 1321, f.103r, 25 May 1709.

[81] AOM 1321, f.161r, 20 July 1709: '*ciasche d'uno della med[esi]ma Natione de Ministri stessi, onde servissero presso di lor a' sollecitar la propria causa*.'

that this was not possible as the knight Baron de Meruelt had already been given this commission and the Order could not afford sending so many knights. 'We can only wait,' he wrote somewhat dejectedly, 'and see what fruits we can reap from the favours of ministers of Princes, who will be solicited by our Baron de Meruelt once the Peace Congress opens again.'[82]

But the peace talks did not reach any conclusion and the only fruit reaped was even more bitter. In 1712, the Viceroy of Sicily, the Marquis de Los Balbases, suspended the *tratte*, that is the usual grain provisions, to Malta because the Order had allowed two Dutch corsair ships to enter the harbour considering this as a breach of fealty of the Act of Donation of 1530.[83] Perellos aired his grievance with Sacchetti in a lengthy letter. In this case, Perellos does not instruct or ask for Sacchetti's intervention. In fact he does not even explain why the *tratte* provisions had been suspended, simply saying that the Viceroy had taken offence due to 'various reasons' which Perellos 'did not deem necessary to express.'[84] At first, the Grand Master asked Fra Carlo Riggio, the Order's receiver in Palermo, to appeal with friends and intervene with the Viceroy. This did not have the required result, so Perellos sent the Knight Da Laval Montmorency but the Viceroy refused to see him on the grounds that he was not an ambassador. After deliberation with his Council, it was decided to send the Venerable Bailiff de Tincourt as extraordinary ambassador, accompanied by two galleys, which, according to Perellos, 'will divide the squadron and undermine the usual campaign, but considering the calamitous times we have to be patient.'[85] Patience was rewarded with the accession of Victor Amadeus II to the throne of Sicily in 1713 and the *tratte* renewed. Peace was sealed in 1713-1714 with the Treaties of Utrecht, Rastatt and Baden.

The Order did not come out unscathed. It had to recover all the lands that had been lost and reinstate those lands that had been ravaged during the war to their original condition. Apart from the material disruption there was also the need to heal

---

[82] AOM 1470, f.117r, 18 August 1709: '*Onde non si puo far altro, che aspettare qual frutto potra produrre il favore e l'assistenza de ministri de Prencipi, che saranno sollecitati dal Baron de Meruelt, quando s'apra il congress della Pace Generale*.'
[83] AOM 266, f.45r-47r, 6 June 1712.
[84] AOM 1473, f.126r, 10 June 1712: '*il Sig[nor] Vicire di Sicilia piglia motivo da diverse cause, che non stimiamo necessarii d'esprimere, di dichiararsi mal sodisfatto, e passa a proibire l'estrattione di tutte le provisioni*.'
[85] AOM 1473, f.126r 10 June 1712: '*quali divise dal resto della squadra, debilitano l'operationi della campagna, ma richiedendo cosi la fatalita de tempi bisogna aver pazienza*.'

the division of brother knights. Finally, and perhaps most vital for its existence, the Religion had to remove the blemish on its reputation for neutrality. In a long letter to Queen Anne of England, Perellos had to justify decisions taken during the war as well as reminding the Queen that when her fleet was waging war on Tripoli, they had found safety and provisions in Maltese harbours.[86] The Order's ability to embrace neutrality was severely challenged during the War of the Spanish Succession. Rome was all but impotent during the war. As Montesquieu aptly put it: 'He (The Pope) was formerly formidable to the princes themselves… but none fear him anymore.'[87] Clement XI had managed to alienate both Bourbons and Habsburgs. Initially he acknowledged Philip d'Orleans as Philip V of Spain but procrastinated in deciding whom to invest in Naples and Sicily. His indecision pleased neither party and far from becoming the mediator, he ended up with 'the Papal States themselves a theatre of military conflict.'[88] This may partially explain Perellos' seeming reluctance to involve Sacchetti too much during this war. Sacchetti's contacts were mostly cardinals and asking for their intervention would have been futile, if not actually detrimental to the Order. Like the Pope, the Order's claim to being neutral was at best severely challenged, at worst outrightly disbelieved. Oratory was claimed to be the ambassador's best weapon, but in this case, it seemed best to be punctuated by a prudent silence.

6.4 Conclusion

The two case studies chosen serve to show the contrast between inter-Christian feuds and war against the Ottoman Empire. The latter presented fewer obstacles for the Order and offered opportunities to demonstrate to its Christian patrons that the original zeal of its spiritual ancestors was far from dead. Needless to say, complications still arose but prowess in battle and wily diplomacy could be employed to overcome the hurdles of mistrust. But when the warring states were Christian and included the Order's patrons, the hurdles seemed insurmountable. The responsions failed to reach

---

[86] AOM 1561, f.600, 6 March 1706.
[87] Charles de Montesquieu: *Oeuvres completes. Les Lettres Persanes, Lettre XXIX*, 89: '*Le pape est le chef des chrétiens. C'est une vieille idole, qu'on encense par habitude. Il était autrefois redoutable aux princes même; car il les déposait aussi facilement que nos magnifiques sultans déposent les rois d'Irimette et de Géorgie. Mais on ne le craint plus*.' Retrieved from https://www.arvensa.com/wp-content/Telechargements/Extraits_gratuits/Extrait%20Montesquieu.pdf
[88] Hanns Gross, *Rome in the Age of Enlightenment. The post-Tridentine syndrome and the ancient regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 43.

the coffers of the Common Treasury. The Order's estates suffered the side-effects of war, or were taxed to line the exhausted coffers of belligerent kings. Furthermore, a supranational institution found it harder to instil the spirit of neutrality in its members, who officially acknowledged the Grand Master as their only head yet could not ignore their innate loyalty to their king. Inter-Christian warfare tended to divide brethren according to political leanings. The Sacchetti family was evidently pro-French. The head of the Sacchetti family, Marcello's nephew, the Marquis Matteo Sacchetti (1675-1743) exchanged correspondence both with Louis XIV and with Philippe D'Orleans (1674-1723) when he was Regent of France.[89] The Sun king's letters exhibit no formality and are simply signed 'Your affectionate friend, Louis.'[90] For instance, in congratulating the Marquis on the birth of the youngest son, Louis XIV wrote 'because you know that I am interested in everything that concerns you and your house' and is signed 'Your good friend'.[91]

However, as ambassador of the Order, Sacchetti showed no evidence of political leanings in his letters. His role in both wars discussed was quite similar, though he seemed to be more involved in the Turkish war. Primarily he served as a vehicle of information, acting as the mouthpiece for the Grand Master in Rome and reporting back any news. In his reports, he would also give details on how certain information was received. Although the Grand Master did occasionally correspond directly with the Pope, most communication was done through the ambassador. This was the case even with the Nuncio in Paris whose letter for the Grand Master was sent to Sacchetti. In his audiences with the Pope or encounters with cardinals, Sacchetti sought to protect the privileges of the Order when threatened and defend the Order's good name when this was jeopardised. The contrasting effects on the health of the Order is evident in the two wars discussed. War against the common enemy unified the brother knights and justified the very existence of a military Order of the Church. War amidst Christian nations brought disruption both material and psychological. The War of the Spanish Succession revealed a world preferring pragmatic politics to principles. In such a world, neutrality was suspicious and crusading ideals anachronistic. That the Order of St John successfully rode this storm and ruled the

---

[89] ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Busta 9, n.4: Letter sent from Paris dated 10 March 1718.
[90] ASC, Busta 9, n.4: '*V[ot]re aff[ectio]ne amy*'. Letter sent from Versailles dated 20 January 1707.
[91] ASC, Busta 9, n.4: '*car vous savez, que je m'interesse a tout ce qui vous regarde et vostre maison*.' Letter from Versailles dated 10 February 1708, signed '*V[ot]re bon ami Louis*'.

Maltese islands almost into the nineteenth century is a feat of its tenacity, its adaptability and the shrewdness of its diplomats.

Chapter 7 Corsairs and Consequences

7.1 Introduction

In an interview with a French journalist in March 2011, Muammar Ghaddafi, then still leader of Libya, sought to justify his regime as being crucial for peace in the Mediterranean by resurrecting an image of its turbulent past:

> There will be an Islamic jihad in front of you in the Mediterranean. They will attack the 6th American fleet, there will be acts of piracy here at your doors, 50 km from your borders. The people of Bin Laden will come to impose ransoms on land and sea. We will return to the time of Barbarossa, pirates, Ottomans who imposed ransoms on the boats.[1]

Ghaddafi's ominous comment to a French journalist recalls a history of sea-faring violence in the Mediterranean, violence which was sponsored by the states whose shores formed the sea their corsairs sailed. His use of the term 'Islamic jihad' immediately placed European history as the heir of the crusades, and the corsairs as the unholy sons of the Holy War. The depiction of fearsome, lawless corsairs marauding the seas appealed to the legacy of violent encounters between cross and crescent. Fearsome they well might have been, but 'lawless' is a term that needs qualification. Corsairing was governed by rules and alleged misconduct judged in courts with rights of appeal. In cases perpetrated by ships flying the Order's flag, the victim could appeal as high up as Rome itself. This chapter will first discuss the legal framework that governed the Order's corsairing activities. This will serve to better understand Sacchetti's role in cases where victims of plunder brought up their grievance to Rome in the hope of recovering their lost merchandise. The second section will look at the other victims of corsairing – the slaves. Corsairing was the easiest way to procure slaves and with the galleys of both cross and crescent ploughing the Mediterranean, slaves were always in demand.[2] Slavery was institutionalised in the Early Modern World and therefore was also subject to certain rules and

---

[1] '*I'l y aura un djihad islamique en face de vous, en Méditerranée. Ils attaqueront la 6e flotte américaine, il y a aura des actes de piraterie ici, à vos portes, à 50 km de vos frontières. Les gens de Ben Laden viendront imposer des rançons sur terre, et sur mer. On reviendra au temps de Barberousse, des pirates, des Ottomans qui imposaient des rançons sur les bateaux*.' Retrieved from https://www.lejdd.fr/International/Afrique/Exclusif-L-interview-integrale-accordee-par-Mouammar-Kadhafi-au-JDD-278745-3236552 on 15 August 2019.

[2] Peter Earle, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1970). See also Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, vol.2 (London: Fontana Press, 1987).

regulations. For instance, Maltese slaves in North Africa could communicate with their families and to practise their religion.[3] Muslim slaves in Malta had the similar rights, and even a law was enacted to ensure respect during a slave's burial, forbidding insults and pelting with stones on pain of rowing on the galleys for men, a beating of fifty strokes tied to a column in the square for children and the punishment for women left to judge's discretion.[4] Thus, although slaves were the property of their owner, there still was semblance of retaining human dignity. Moreover, since slaves could communicate with families and authorities back home, their treatment could have consequences on how their co-religious slaves in other countries. The notion that once in bondage in another country, a slave was all but dead back home has been shown to be untenable.[5] Like the pleas of those who lost their ship, so the entreaties of those who lost their freedom could be heard in Rome. The Order's ambassador, with the help of the Order's lawyers, would seek to navigate the sea of appeals for the honour of his Grand Master and the benefit of the Religion.

7.2 Legal Framework

The terms 'corsairing', 'privateering' and 'piracy' are often loosely used as synonyms in casual conversation. Though the method is the same, there is a difference in legal status. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) defined piracy in 1605 as 'individuals who despoil others through privately exercised force and without urgent reasons to do so'[6] Indeed the word 'piracy' is still fraught with ambiguity even after the definition of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the High Seas.[7] Essentially, pirates sailed beyond the laws of

---

[3] Frans Ciappara, 'Christendom and Islam: A Fluid Frontier', *Mediterranean Studies*, 13 (2004), 171.
[4] Jonathan Muscat, 'The Administration of Hospitaller Malta Bandi and Prammatiche 1530 – 1798' (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta, 2011), 124, citing AOM 740, f.94r, 16 November 1668.
[5] F. Ciappara, 'Christendom and Islam', 170.
[6] Grotius, *De Jure Pradae*, 325–326.
[7] United Nations, Treaty Series, Convention of the High Seas of 1958, Article 15 (United Nations, 2005): 'Piracy consists of any of the following acts: (1) Any illegal acts of violence, detention or any act of depredation, committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or a private aircraft, and directed: (a) On the high seas, against another ship or aircraft, or against persons or property on board such ship or aircraft; (b) Against a ship, aircraft, persons or property in a place outside the jurisdiction of any State; (2) Any act of voluntary participation in the operation of a ship or of an aircraft with knowledge of facts making it a pirate ship or aircraft; (3) Any act of inciting or of intentionally facilitating an act described in subparagraph 1 or subparagraph 2 of this article. illegal acts of violence, detention or any act of depredation, committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or a private aircraft, and directed: (a) On the high seas, against another ship or aircraft, or against persons or property on board such ship or aircraft; (b) Against a ship, aircraft, persons or property in a place outside the jurisdiction of any State'.

any country whereas privateers and/or corsairs operated under licence and their conduct was answerable to the prince who had issued it. The acknowledged difference between corsair and privateer is the area of activity. Namely 'corsairs' is the term used for privateers operating in the Mediterranean.[8] 'Corsair' and 'privateer' carry the same meaning, namely private individuals commissioned by a ruling power to plunder by proxy from those whom the government granting the licence considered as enemies of the state and therefore legitimate prey.[9] The licence distinguished the corsair from the pirate. In granting corsairing licences, the Order was acknowledging the prevailing characteristic of the period, that of perpetual warfare between Christian and Muslim. On the practical side, corsairing provided informal naval training, helped to police the seas and added fire-power to the Order's squadron at no extra cost.

Both the Order and Malta had had a history of corsairing before 1530. In a short pamphlet on the siege of Rhodes of 1480, Lionel Butler maintains that Maltese corsairs had come to aid the besieged knights.[10] Corsairing had been practiced in Malta well before 1530, and subject to the same regulations as corsairs operating from the Kingdom of Sicily, of which Malta was part at least since 1127.[11] With Aragonese ascendancy in the Mediterranean, corsair captains 'were assigned to defend territories, which the Aragonese rulers lacked the financial and material resources to protect, especially small, relatively isolated islands, such as Malta' creating, as it were, 'a small military aristocracy' on the island, which soon became involved in the local political and economic scene.[12] The Order did not introduce the *corso* to Malta, but it did help to organise and strengthen what was already a thriving industry. Meanwhile, on Rhodes, the Order had also encouraged corsairing as a means of patrolling shipping routes, protecting Christian shipping and in general prolonging the war against Islam

---

[8] Liam Gauci, *In the Name of the Prince: Maltese Corsairs 1760-1798* (Malta: Heritage Malta, 2016), 13. This acknowledged distinction will be adhered to throughout this work.
[9] The English King Henry III (1207-1272) issued the earliest known privateering commissions in 1243. The directive was to 'annoy our enemies by sea or by land'; see Theodore M. Cooperstein, 'Letters of Marque and Reprisal: The Constitutional Law and Practice of Privateering', *Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce*, xl (2009), 221, 223.
[10] Lionel Butler, 'The Siege of Rhodes 1480', *Historical Pamphlets*, 11 (London), 6.
[11] Carmel Cassar, 'Between Africa and Europe: Corsairing Activities and the Order of St John in Malta', Corsari, schiavi, riscatti tra Liguria e Nord Africa nei secoli XVI e XVII. *Atti del Convegno Storico Internazionale Ceriale* (2004),16.
[12] Mark Aloisio, 'The Maltese Corso in the Fifteenth Century', *Medieval Encounters*, 9: 2 (2003), 194.

by attacking enemy craft.[13] The Rhodian experience in the *corso* was imported to Malta after 1530.[14] The Order's presence encouraged more adventurers, Maltese and foreigners alike, to arm ships and sail for booty. Although strictly speaking, private corsairing was not an official operation of the Order, yet it facilitated corsairing ventures by founding administrative and legal bodies.[15] Apart from the necessity of a licence, the concerned authoritative body inspected the ship to make sure it was sea-worthy, examined the adequacy of the crew and armament and assessed the captain's capabilities.[16] Once granted, the licence was not a free pass to attack anything that floated, but stipulated where the theatre of operations had to be conducted and what constituted legal prey.[17]

The *corso* operating from Malta was conducted either as a public enterprise by the galleys of the Order or by private individuals. The term 'public' refers to the fact that the Order was also the governing body of a set of islands. In a state of constant warfare against Islam, the Order sent yearly *caravane* in the Levant or against the Barbary corsairs.[18] This structure of having both public and private corso was unique to Malta.[19] For instance, the Order of St Stephen organised similar operations, but it was solely a military Order and unlike the Order of St John, did not rule over a country. In the public corso, the Order's galley squadron would sail with clear details as to its theatre of operations and the knowledge that anything captured belonged to the Common Treasury.[20] The only material benefit the knights gained from these excursions was the benefit of 'seniority' (*anzianita*), wherein three *caravane* lasting not less than six months each could eventually translate into a commandery.[21] Knights and lay individuals could also apply for a corsairing licence privately and arm various

---

[13] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *Hospitallers: The History of the Order of St John (*London and Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1999), 96-100.
[14] Anthony T. Luttrell, 'The Hospitaller State on Rhodes and its Western Provinces, 1306-1462' (Hampshire: Routledge, Variorum Collected Study Series, 1999), 186. See also Riley-Smith, *Hospitallers: The History of the Order of St John*, 98.
[15] Salvatore Bono, *Corsari nel Mediterraneo. Cristiani e Musulmani fra Guerra, Schiavitu e Commercio*, Arnoldo Mondadori (ed) (Milan: Mondadori, 1993), 56.
[16] S. Bono, *Corsari nel Mediterraneo*, 56.
[17] S. Bono, *Corsari nel Mediterraneo*, 56.
[18] Joseph Muscat, 'Rules and Regulations for Maltese Corsairs', *Melitensium Amor. Festschrift in honour of Dun Gwann Azzopardi*, Toni Cortis, Thomas Freller and Lino Bugeja (eds) (Malta: The Contributors, 2002), 185.
[19] Molly Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants. A Maritime History of the Mediterranean* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2010), 95.
[20] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 95.
[21] *Istruzioni sopra gli Obblighi piu principali De' Cavalieri di Malta* (Rome: 1713), 271.

crafts to sail for plunder.[22] In such cases, knights had the right to keep one fourth of the booty, the rest going to the Common Treasury.[23] The first official body intended to regulate the *corso* was set up on 17 June 1605 during the magistracy of Grand Master Alof de Wignacourt (r.1601-1622).[24] Called the *Tribunale degli Armamenti* or *Magistrato degli Armamenti* (henceforth the *Magistrato*), its purpose was to 'regulate the relations between the *armateurs* of the vessels, their captains, and their crews.'[25] There was a fee in granting the licence to arm and sail bearing the Order's flag and the condition that Christian shipping or bearers of passports by Christian rulers were not to be molested.[26] The Order reaped a number of benefits from corsairing. Firstly there was the obvious financial gain. Plundered goods generated commerce. Moreover, corsairs often helped to provision the island as captured merchandise could include comestibles, especially grain, of which there was never enough on the Maltese islands. But perhaps the most expensive commodity that corsairs could acquire were slaves. It is calculated that 'over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, at least thirty-five thousand to forty thousand slaves passed through Malta.'[27] There was the added benefit of providing the right environment to bolster the art of seafaring. The Order sought to promote the name it had acquired as an '*école de guerre navale*' and prided itself in providing top ranking naval officers for Catholic powers. For instance, after 1680 'nearly all of the captains who rose to the rank of squadron commander in the French navy were knights.'[28] Grand Master Zondadari even argued that without corsairing, Christians would lose the edge in seamanship to the Mulims.[29] Corsairing also rendered added security to the islands, with its shores being policed by armed ships and the notoriety of their crew. As White states: 'The reputations of the Maltese preceded them; every Muslim traveller knew of and feared the fate that awaited those who survived the initial onslaught.'[30] But the fact that the Order had felt the need to set up a legal body that governed the *corso* shows that this activity, however lucrative,

---

[22] J. Muscat, 'Rules and Regulations for Maltese Corsairs', 185.
[23] S. Bono, *Corsari nel Mediterraneo*, 54.
[24] AOM 152, f.681.
[25] J. Muscat, 'Rules and Regulations for Maltese Corsairs', 186.
[26] J. Muscat, 'Rules and Regulations for Maltese Corsairs', 186.
[27] Joshua M. White, *Piracy and Law in the Ottoman Mediterranean* (California: Stanford University Press, 2018), 65.
[28] Paul Walden Bamford, 'The Knights of Malta and the King of France', *French Historical Studies*, 3: 4 (1964), 430-431.
[29] AOM 1481, 4 October 1720. Zondadari to Cardinal Paulucci, Secretary of State.
[30] J. M. White, *Piracy and Law*, 199.

did not come without its own complications. It also shows that the number of persons applying for patents was significant enough to warrant a code of behaviour. Suffice it to say that 'between 1605 and 1635 nearly four hundred patents were issued.'[31] In the introduction to the Statutes and Ordinances of the *Magistrato*, it was underlined that the increasing number of corsairs was actually depleting the island from provisions and martial items in supplying their ships, the purchasing of which was also being done clandestinely.[32] The purpose of the *Magistrato*, it was stressed in the introductory paragraph of the Ordinances and Statutes of this tribunal, was not to curb corsairing, but to curb the abuse of going beyond the privileges that the licence to sail under the Order's colours allowed.[33]

In 1697, Grand Master Perellos founded the *Consolato del Mare*, a mercantile tribunal composed of a lawyer and three merchants. There was a crucial distinction in the jurisdiction of the two legal institutions. Whereas the *Magistrato* dealt with cases of corsairs sailing under the Order's flag, the *Consolato* was concerned with ships flying the Grand Master's flag, the quartered banner of a Prince and head of state, not of a religious order subject to the pope.[34] Thus it precluded any appeal to Rome. This obviously did not go down well, neither with Rome nor with the Roman Inquisitor based on Malta. The setting up of this court became yet another cause of friction between the Grand Master and the Inquisitor. The latter, following papal policy, was against the depredation of Greeks and even 'demanded a general recall of all Maltese ships in the Levant.'[35] In 1704, the Inquisitor proceeded to further champion the Greek cause by appointing a certain Canon Muscat 'to receive Greek cases against corsairs.'[36] This was a direct lunge at the Grand Master but the latter could not parry it by further defiance and keep issuing corsairing patents under his own flag. Although a secular court, the Order was not a secular institution, and the Pope would still exert pressure in favour of the Greeks. There was a limit to the extent the Grand Master could ignore papal pressure, especially since Rome was even backed by France in this cause. In order to save face, the Grand Master retained the right to provide patents

[31] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 96.
[32] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 97.
[33] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 97-98.
[34] L. Gauci, *In the Name of the Prince*, 17.
[35] AOM 1463, f.184rv, 11 November 1702.
[36] AOM 1467, f.70v, 24 May 1706.

under his own flag, but did not do so to avoid clashes with Rome.[37] By the turn of the eighteenth century it became Greek common practice to appeal to Rome with every unfavourable decision, where, as Grand Master Perellos complained to Sacchetti, dubious cases were ruled against the Order and no decision reached where there were no doubts at all.[38] Actually, in allowing the Grand Master's flag to be used by corsairs, Grand Master Perellos was not enacting a new policy but reviving an ancient tradition, as he informed Sacchetti on 20 February 1702.[39]

The fact that he mentioned 'suits of Greeks' underlines the legal issues that arose because of the identity of victims of corsairing activity. What exactly constituted fair prey was fraught with ambiguity. Much depended on the religious identity of the victim and the goods, not only on nationhood or ethnicity. The Order had also appropriated the right to search ships of whatever nation, as the ship may well be Christian, but the goods could belong to Muslims or Jews.[40] By the seventeenth and eighteenth century, the majority of Greeks were subjects of the Ottoman Empire, a citizenship which they could hardly advertise when their ships were boarded, as Molly Greene states, 'in their confrontation with the corsairs their [the Greeks'] Ottoman identity had to be hidden rather than displayed.'[41] Note, for instance, the term 'Christians' used in Giacomo Capello's 1716 depiction of plaintiffs seeking redress:

> The poor, despoiled Christians proceed to Malta, they bring the action to court, but lose everything, either because of the invulnerability corsairs enjoy [on the island], or else because they are judged by the same ruffians. Thereupon they appeal to Rome from whence judgments emanate against the corsairs, but having squandered so much on the proceedings, they [none the less] spend the rest of their lives in misery.[42]

Christian Ottoman subjects wisely chose to stress their Christianity. But it was precisely this identity which was put into question in the innumerable court hearings. Christian but not Western, Eastern but not Muslim, the Greek communities seemed to be the unwilling victims in the jarring of two hemispheres. In the long period of confrontation between Christianity and Islam, the Greeks had always found

---

[37] AOM 1477, f.65v, 11 March 1716.
[38] AOM 1468, f.61v-64r, 28 April 1707.
[39] AOM 1465, 28v, 20 February 1704.
[40] J. M. White, *Piracy and Law*, 133.
[41] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 19.
[42] Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.), *Descrittione di Malta* (Malta: Bugelli Publications, 1988): '*Li poveri Cristiani spogliati vanno a Malta; fanno liti, ma le perdono tutte, o per le prottettioni alli corsair, o perche vengono giudicati da stessi carattadori. Si appellano pero a Roma, e di la escono le sentenze contro li corsari, che havendo molto disperse restano miserabili*.', 54-55.

themselves in the middle. The first crusade was launched on the plea for help by Byzantine Emperor Alexius I Comnenus in March 1095 'to encourage Westerners to help defend the Eastern Church against the Turks.'[43] Yet this did not stop Western powers from carving bits of the crumbling Byzantine Empire for their own. The Order of St John itself had wrested Rhodes not from Muslims, but from fellow Christians, as officially Rhodes still appertained to the Byzantine Empire, though the latter was at this time too weak to exercise any form of control.[44] But during the seventeenth and eighteenth century, Rome, still fanning the flames of the Counter-Reformation, increasingly began to act upon its traditional policy of rapprochement towards the Orthodox Church and sought to curb corsairing activity in the Levant.[45] There was also the added pressure from France, who had a 'long history of cooperation' with the Ottoman Empire.[46] France had also championed Rome's religious zeal in the Levant and acquired the patronage and protection of Ottoman Catholic communities.[47] Venice, on the other hand, remained jealous of its autonomy and shied away from any papal interference. Furthermore, in view of Ottoman expansion, Venice wanted to appease its Greek Orthodox population by steering clear of any attempt at conversion.

In the eyes of the *Serenissima*, such Catholic interest might stir its Greek subjects to rebellion and drive them into Ottoman arms and his promise of religious freedom. As Braudel states, 'the Orthodox clergy has regularly been one of the most determined adversaries of Venice and westerners in general' and sought to dampen any rebellious plans against Ottoman rule, intervening to 'cool tempers and to explain that the survival of the Greek people depended on their continuing to cause no trouble.'[48] Thus, for different reasons from Rome and France, Venice was also not too keen on corsairs sailing under the Order's flag. Apart from the obvious disruption of trade, there were other consequences. If its own subjects were attacked, then it showed

---

[43] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *What were the Crusades?* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 12-13.
[44] Helen Nicholson, *The Knights Hospitaller* (3rd edition) (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), 46-47.
[45] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 100. See also L. Gauci, *In the Name of the Prince*, 19. The Catholic Church's policy of rapprochement was not an innovation of the seventeenth century. For a history of the debate between the Latin and Greek Churches, see for instance Edward Siecienski, *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).
[46] Noel Malcolm, *Useful Enemies. Islam and The Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought, 1450-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019)
[47] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 101.
[48] F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean World*, vol 2, 769.

her as weak and unable to protect her own people. If the victims were Ottoman subjects, the Republic feared that such hostility would provoke the Sultan to take reprisals on Venetian shipping and indeed, on Venetian possessions, as had happened with the loss of Crete in the War of Candia (1645-1669).[49] Venice had steadily lost territory to the Ottoman Empire and this brought a change of subjecthood to the inhabitants of these territories. Greeks who had erstwhile been Venetian subjects found themselves appertaining to a Muslim power. As Veneto-Greeks, they had had access to diplomatic channels in cases of depredation by Catholic corsairs. As Ottoman Greeks they could only turn to the *Magistrato* with the hope of an appeal to Rome, or simply a direct appeal to Rome.[50] It is with cases that ended up in Rome that Sacchetti was involved.

7.3 Victims in Rome

The legal channels for those seeking repossession of goods or compensation was thus through the *Magistrato* with right of appeal to Rome. There were also cases of Greeks presenting their case directly in Rome and bypassing the *Magistrato*.[51] Much depended on the contacts one had. Undoubtedly, the Greeks knew through their Orthodox clergy that Rome was sympathetic towards their cause just as they knew that the Order was not. The lack of esteem that the Order had for the Greeks can be deduced from various grand masters' letters. Though usually restrained and diplomatically worded, occasionally a certain amount of sentiment crept in. Grand Master Zondadari called the Greeks as people of 'bad faith' and elaborated how Greeks hovered around Maltese quays, taking note of worthwhile goods and informing their compatriots who would then lay false claims upon it.[52] According to Grand Master Zondadari, Turks were fast becoming aware that sentences emanating from Rome leaned towards the Greeks so they 'began to put all their cargoes under Greek names.'[53] Grand Master Vilhena 'cited a Latin priest… who reported hearing a Greek boast at Patmos that he

[49] Alexander H. de Groot, 'The Ottoman Threat to Europe', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993), 225.
[50] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 99.
[51] M. Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 215.
[52] AOM 1482, f.288v, 22 September 1721: '*I Greci sono generalmente di mala fede*'.
[53] AOM 1481, f. 419r, 31 December 1720.

had made a profit of 100 percent on claims against Maltese corsairs settled in Rome.'[54] Thus whether one looked at Greeks as 'poor, despoiled Christians' spending 'the rest of their lives in misery' as Capello maintained, or as 'people of bad faith' who played the victims whilst churning a profit by claiming goods that were not theirs or inflating the prices of goods lost, ultimately depended on one's bias.

The first case of corsairing that Sacchetti was involved mentions the inflation of prices. The appeal to Rome had been launched by one Davide Armeno before 1 September 1674, as by that date the inventory of pillaged goods had been drawn up and Armeno had sworn that it was correct, which was again confirmed on 6 September 1678.[55] Sacchetti was made ambassador in 1682 so his predeecessor Fra Giovanni Caravita handed over all pending cases.[56] Cardinal Giovanni Francesco Ginetti (1626-1691), then Treasurer General of the Apostolic Chamber, had passed sentence in favour of Davide Armeno, giving him the right for '*restitutione ad integrum*' by the Religion.[57] Sacchetti specified the merchandise by quantity, weight and the equivalent price, even to details such as 'a porcelain case worth fifty scudi'.[58] But there had been another sentence prior to this one which had also specified that the Order had to compensate Armeno.[59] The case had been heard in front of Cardinal Girolamo Casanate (1620-1700), who incidentally had been inquisitor in Malta from 1658 to 1663, and a similar sentence had been passed.[60] There was no further right of appeal. The Church was aware of the abuse of the right of appeal, a ruse which had been used by clerics in order to avoid correction by the Church. The formula used when waiving off this right was '*appellatione remota*', and had been adopted since the middle of the twelfth century.[61] Since the same court had already accorded a second hearing and reached the same conclusion, namely full restitution, the right of appeal had been

---

[54] Roderick Cavaliero, 'The Decline of the Maltese Corso in the 18th Century: A Study in Maritime History', *Melita Historica*, 2 (1959), 236.
[55] AOM 1297, f.68rv, 9 May 1682.
[56] AOM 1297, f.68rv, 9 May 1682: '*questo affare seguito nel tempo del mio predeccessore*'.
[57] AOM 1297, f.68rv, 9 May 1682. *Restitutione ad integrum* means that the plaintiff is to be placed in the same position as he was before the depredation. The term is still used by insurance companies today.
[58] AOM 1297, f.68rv, 9 May 1682.
[59] AOM 1297, f.79v, 30 May 1682.
[60] For a brief biographical note of Cardinal Casanate, see Appendix 1, 237.
[61] I.S. Robinson, 'The institutions of the church, 1073-1216', *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 385.

denied.[62] It was evident that more revisions and appeals were considered as needless procrastination. However, Sacchetti found a way round this legal web. Sacchetti took advantage of discrepancies between the figures that the Order allegedly owed to Davide Armeno as stipulated by two different sentences. On the grounds that the latest sum due exceeded the figure stipulated by Cardinal Casanate, Sacchetti obtained a right for appeal at the same court, which was the only way to attain it.[63] The logic behind Sacchetti's reasoning centres around the concept of *restitutione ad integrum*. Since the goods had been sold and thus impossible to be returned, the Order had to pay the equivalent sum, but the same court had stipulated two different sums. What Sacchetti was driving at was to wear down the 'enemy', in this case the plaintiff. In fact Davide Armeno had left Rome, presumably for his homeland and was being represented by his procurator.[64] Eventually, it was hoped that the plaintiff would give up and have to settle for an accord outside court, which would be much less than his original claim as Sacchetti wrote to Grand Master Perellos: 'If I get the decree in favour of the Signature [of justice], I will see if I can come to some sort of agreement.'[65]

However, the settlement out of court did not materialise. Sacchetti met Armeno's procurator but no agreement was reached on the liquidation prices of the goods.[66] The ambassador was claiming that the plaintiff had inflated his amounts.[67] The only way was to go back to yet another hearing at the Signature of Justice. Since there was disagreement on the price of the booty, Sacchetti needed the inventory as calculated by the Common Treasury for which he wrote both to the Procurators of the Common Treasury and to Grand Master Perellos.[68] This piece of evidence was obviously necessary to compare prices being claimed by both parties. Sacchetti also needed this list to discuss with a cardinal friend of his who had promised help in the Davide Armeno case.[69] This cardinal strangely remains unnamed. Sacchetti simply

---

[62] AOM 1297, f.79v, 30 May 1682.
[63] AOM 1297, f.79v, 30 May 1682.
[64] Davide Armeno's procurator is mentioned as being summoned by Sacchetti in AOM 1297, f.84r, 13 June 1682.
[65] AOM 1297, f.79v, 30 May 1682, '*Io pero se havero il decreto in favore dalla sign[atu]ra vedero se mi riesce di fara qualche accordo*.'
[66] AOM 1297, f.86r, 20 June 1682.
[67] AOM 1297, f.86r, 20 June 1682.
[68] AOM 1297, f.88r, 27June 1682.
[69] AOM 1297, f.88r, 27June 1682.

stated that he was a friend, whereas in subsequent letters he is quite frank with names of clerics who were well-disposed towards the Order. On 25 July Sacchetti confirmed that the Armeno case was to be heard again at the Signature of Justice but the Procurators of the Common Treasury had not yet sent the inventory, which he sorely needed, as he stated, 'to follow up what I have started.'[70] He confirmed receipt of it on 22 August which he gave to the Order's lawyers 'to reach a suitable adjustment' and proceed with the litigation.[71] A meeting was held in which the Order's lawyers, Sacchetti, Davide Armeno and his procurator were present. Sacchetti does not specify the date but it would probably be between 28 September and 2 October, as this meeting was mentioned in a letter dated 3 October. Armeno's procurator was satisfied with the lawyers' suggested amendments but Davide Armeno apparently was not.[72] In fact, the ambassador wrote to the Grand Master of a new claim Davide Armeno had made and the advice Sacchetti had received from the Procurators of the Common Treasury on how to act on it. Again Sacchetti consulted his cardinal contact and was awaiting his reply to close the case.[73]

After eight years of litigation, in and out of court, no agreement had been reached. Various conclusions can be drawn from this case study. The prolongation of the case is evident. When the outcome was unfavourable to the Order, the next best strategy was to stretch the case on any legal pretext. The Order had the legal structure in place. It had permanent representation in Rome in the persons of the ambassador and the Procurator of the Religion, who represented the Order as a religious institution, whereas the ambassador represented his Grand Master as Prince of a realm. Aiding these two was a team of lawyers. The plaintiff hailed from another country and therefore had to appoint a procurator in his stead, incurring even more expenses. However, in this case the plaintiff did not give up easily and was ready to continue the litigation rather than settle for an amount which he deemed inadequate. Notwithstanding the Order's organised team in such cases, the plaintiffs could also have strong patrons, which could be a very forceful argument. For instance, when Giacomo Caracciolo had just been appointed Inquisitor in Malta (r. 1706-1710), a letter was sent to him by Cardinal Paolucci, strongly recommending two Catholic-

[70] AOM 1297, f.96r, 25 July 1682: '*perche Io posso proseguire quello che ho principiato*.'
[71] AOM 1297, f.120r, 22 August 1682: '*per poter venire ad un buono aggiustamento*'.
[72] AOM 1297, f.134r, 3 October 1682.
[73] AOM 1297, f.167r, 14 November 1682.

Greeks, Demetrio di Larissa and Teodoro Atanasio. According to the same letter, Caracciolo had not even left Rome.[74]

With the highest Church authorities offering ready ears to Greek complaints, Greek clergy in Rome sought to help their fellow countrymen by making use of their contacts. Thus an unnamed Greek priest called upon Sacchetti many times in order to plead on behalf of a merchant, a certain Giorgio Carachsi, who claimed that he had been robbed by Captain Giuseppe Magro and Captain Antonio Curro.[75] The priest alleged he had a letter from Cardinal Cibo addressed to the Grand Master explaining his reasons and claimed that he had been in the service of Cardinal Pignatelli.[76]

Antonio Pignatelli had had an illustrious career within the Church, serving as vice-legate in Urbino in 1646, Inquisitor of Malta (1646-1649), Governor of Viterbo (1649-1652), Archbishop of Larissa and Nunzio of Florence (1652-1660), Nunzio of Poland (1660-1668) and Nunzio of Vienna (1668-1671) which was considered as the last stepping-stone to the dignity of cardinal.[77] He then somewhat lost favour with the new pope Clement X (r. 1670-1676) when his predecessor, Clement IX (r. 1667-1669), died, but was reinstated in 1673 as Secretary of the Congregation of Bishops and the even more prestigious office of Maestro di Camera. Pope Innocent XI retained him for his merits and lavished more appointments, as Archbishop of Faenza in 1682 and Naples in 1686. Pignatelli eventually succeeded to the throne of Peter as Pope Innocent XII (r. 1691-1700) after Pope Alexander VIII (r. 1689-1691).[78] In 1683, when the Greek priest was knocking on Sacchetti's door, Pignatelli was thus in Faenza, but seemingly had managed to intercede on the priest's behalf with Cardinal Cibo.

Sacchetti had resisted the Greek priest's pleas for a while, as he mentioned, and resisted forwarding the letter to the Grand Master, saying that His Eminence hands out 'quick and strict justice', but the priest kept insisting so Sacchetti had to concede to write about the case to the Grand Master and forward the one by Cardinal Cibo.[79]

---

[74] AIM Corr. 92, f.3rv, 31 July 1706: '*Ancorche prima della sua partenza da questa Corte siano stati raccomandati in genere al favour di V[ostra] S[antita] gl'interessi de poveri Greci Cattolici costi, e che percio sia ella per prestare la sua assistenza a Demetrio di Larissa, e a Teodoro Atanasio*'.
[75] AOM 1298, f.75r, 1 June 1683.
[76] AOM 1298, f.75r, 1 June 1683. For brief biographical note of Cardinal Pignatelli, see Appendix 1, 236.
[77] Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, *The History of the Popes. From the close of the Middle Ages*, xxxii (London, Trubner and Co, 1940), 571-572.
[78] Pastor, xxxii, 572-573.
[79] AOM 1298, f.76r, 1 June 1683: '*che l'E[minenza Vostra] faceva rendere a tutti pronta, e retta giustitia*'.

During the same week, the plaintiff Carachsi himself called upon Sacchetti, along with a certain Paneiotto. In defence of the Order, Sacchetti had insisted that there was no need to tell the Grand Master to spur his ministers to attend to their functions as justice would be served. But the plaintiffs did not seem assured, and Sacchetti therefore wrote to the Grand Master mentioning their pleas.[80]

On occasion, Sacchetti was approached not after the alleged crime had happened, but in order to obtain a magisterial passport that would guarantee safe passage. In 1704, a certain Father Giuseppe Maria di Gierusalemme, of the Order of the Reformed Minors of St Francis and Apostolic Prefect of the Ethiopian mission, called upon Sacchetti to forward his letter to the Grand Master. In this letter, Father Giuseppe, explained how he had accompanied six Ethiopian Christians to Cyprus for the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (*Propaganda Fidei*). He owed his safety and that of the Ethiopian 'sons', to Captain Solomon Medley, described as a Jewish-Marionite and a good Catholic from Tripoli di Sona (which is close to Verona in Italy): 'without whose help it would have been impossible to ferry the said Ethiopians out of Egypt, due to the great tyranny and persecutions of the Turks.'[81] He was thus asking for a passport from the Grand Master, so that Medley's ship would be 'safe and respected by Maltese Corsairs, from whom he had often suffered depredations'.[82]

Such pleas were not uncommon and cannot be seen as being too detrimental to the corsairing industry. But there was mounting pressure, in particular emanating from Rome and Venice, aimed at restricting operations in the Levant. The Venetian attitude to corsairing was one of deep disapproval, seeing in it a continuous threat that would destabilize its relations with the Porte and its relationship with the Order was heavily marked by its corsairing activities. Indeed, the spells of collaboration occurred when Venice was at war with the Ottoman Empire and, as Mallia-Milanes puts it these could 'hardly be defined as the solemnization of a close friendship.'[83] The Order could ill afford completely severing ties with Venice when the Republic wielded the powerful

---

[80] AOM 1298, f.76r, 1 June 1683: '*ad ogni modo non sono restate quieti, onde mi sono indotto di farli la presente*'.
[81] AOM 1316, f.13r, 26 January 1704.
[82] AOM 1316, f.13r, 26 January 1704, '*un efficace passaporto p[er] esser sicuro e' rispettato il suo bastimento di Corsari Maltese, da quale spesse volte ha ricavuto ostaggi e robbamenti*'.
[83] V. Mallia-Milanes (ed.), *Descrittione di Malta*, Introduction, 1.

lever of the *sequestro*, that is, withholding the Order's *responsiones*. Neither could it withstand pressure from Rome and shy away from aiding a Christian force when facing the 'common enemy'. Similar to Venice in seeking to appease the Porte, the Order had to follow the same policy and appease both Rome and the Serene Republic. But in doing so, the Levant was gradually becoming more and more restricted for Maltese corsairs and that was where the best prizes lay.

But Rome was strongly discouraging attacks on Greek merchants or Muslim pilgrims. In 1699 Perellos wrote to Sacchetti insisting that licences granted to corsairs explicitly forbade sailing within 50 miles of pilgrim routes and those who had strayed beyond the limit of their licence would be severely punished.[84] Sacchetti duly informed Cardinal Spada of the Grand Master's behests.[85] Venice had also prohibited corsairs from plying their violent trade in the gulf. In 1712 the Venetian ambassador in Rome had sought Sacchetti's secretary specifically to remind him of this prohibition, as there had been rumours of ships flying the Order's flag sailing in these waters. The secretary had assured the ambassador that the Grand Master had always sought to satisfy the desires of the Serene Republic, and that there was no truth in these rumours. The ambassador had seemed satisfied with this answer according to the secretary, but notwithstanding, Sacchetti deemed it prudent to inform the Grand Master of these suspicions.[86] Two years later, in 1714, Grand Master Perellos had to again declare that 'the Adriatic, north of the Otranto-Capo Santa Maria line, and its approaches, out of bounds to the Order's squadrons as well as to all *armateurs*, Maltese and foreign, flying the Hospitaller cross.'[87] These prohibitions extended to seas in the Levant where Venice claimed jurisdiction.[88] The ambassador in Rome thus had the delicate task of maintaining good relationships without compromising his Prince's dignity. Corsairing was certainly one aspect which caused the greatest friction, particularly with Rome, France and Venice. But for the Order, curtailing corsairing was economically suicidal. No wonder that Giacomo Capello, albeit rather

[84] AOM 1461, f.8v, 9 February 1699.
[85] AOM 1311, f.53r, 7 March 1699.
[86] AOM 1324, f.151r, 2 July 1712.
[87] V. Mallia-Milanes, *Venice and Hospitaller Malta*, 167.
[88] V. Mallia-Milanes (ed.), *Descrittione di Malta*, Introduction, 7.

hyperbolically, exclaimed that 'everyone on the island was involved in the *corso* one way or the other.'[89]

7.4 Slavery

Another aspect which employed Sacchetti's time was the treatment of slaves. In the Early Modern World, slaves were a common feature in both Christian and Muslim lands. Suffice it to say that 300 000 and 400 000 Moroccans and North African Ottoman subjects passed through Portugal and Spain between 1450 and 1750; about 500 000 Muslims were enslaved in Italy between the beginning of the sixteenth century and the end of the eighteenth' and 'more than a million Christians were enslaved in the Maghrib between 1530 and 1780.'[90] Unlike the African slaves in the New World, who were treated no better than beasts of burden, slaves inhabiting the Mediterranean could claim some minimal rights and live on the hope of redemption. Some historians have argued that North African Muslim slaves had less hope of being redeemed as Algiers, Tunis and Morocco had not set up charitable institutions for the redemption of slaves. However, the lack of institutions did not deter Muslim relatives from negotiating the release of those dear to them, but this implied that much depended on the financial means a particular family had.[91] During their incarceration, there were rules which governed the conduct of their owners, whether the slaves belonged to the Order or to private individuals although it was more difficult to control the conduct of the latter.

In general, the plight of both Christian and Muslim slaves seems to have been tolerable. After the indignities and humiliation of being shaved, then auctioned like cattle, if one did not find himself on a galley bench or other hard labour, the slave would be put to work but tales of constant beatings seem to be inflated and excessive cruelty more the exception than the rule.[92] A slave was an investment. Extremely harsh treatment would either make the slave outwardly convert to the master's religion to avoid the beatings, or worse, adversely affect his health or even lead to death. A convert or a dead slave had to be replaced. However, beatings were administered in

---

[89] V. Mallia-Milanes, *Venice and Hospitaller Malta*, 168-169.
[90] Daniel Hershenzon, 'Para que me saque cabesea por cabesa: Exchanging Muslim and Christian Slaves across the Western Mediterranean', *African Economic History*, 42: 1 (2014), 11-12.
[91] D. Hershenzon, 'Exchanging Muslim and Christian Slaves', 12-13.
[92] F. Ciappara, 'Christendom and Islam', 168.

case of any disobedience.[93] Slaves in Malta had their own Cadi, who acting as a sort of representative, could write to respective Muslim rulers and air the slaves' grievances. This would foster a spirit of revenge and Muslim masters would in turn pay back and badly treat Missionary priests and Christian slaves. Such complaints had repercussions and could go as high up as Rome, involving cardinals, the Pope, and of course, the ambassador.

Thus in 1685 Missionary priests in Tripoli wrote to the Inquisitor in Malta (who was also the Pope's nunzio) and to Grand Master Carafa that they were being badly treated due to reports of ill-treatment of slaves belonging to the Order.[94] Grand Master Carafa wrote to Sacchetti, vehemently denying these reports, adding that they must have originated due to the chaining law. The practice was that slaves walking about in towns had to be chained together so as to make it difficult for them to commit petty crime usually associated with slaves. In fact, Grand Master Carafa did raise the subject of petty crime committed by slaves with Sacchetti again in January 1686.[95] Prior to that, in answer to the alleged ill treatment, the Grand Master underlined that:

> There was no other place in the world where the slaves, including those from Barbary, were treated with the humanity and charity shown them in Malta, in the hope – rarely realized – that it would lead to the similar treatment of the Christian slaves in Muslim countries. In spite of all this, the GM did not consider it wise to take any retaliatory measures against the slaves in Malta, in order not to infuriate any further the authorities in Tripoli, but the slaves in Malta were warned that they would suffer if the Christians in Muslim countries were not better treated in future, and the same warning was sent to Tripoli.[96]

The number of *bandi* issued concerning slaves show the restrictions imposed on them, yet also reveal an amount of freedom that slaves in Malta had, albeit within strict limits and accompanied by harsh punishments if these limits were ignored.[97] In the Early Modern World, retributive justice was severe for malefactors of any status, but harsher

---

[93] For maltreatment of Christian slaves see Robert C. Davis, *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters. White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast, and Italy, 1500-1800* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 92. For maltreatment of Muslim slaves, see Emanuel Buttigieg, 'Corpi e anime in schiavitù: schiavi musulmani nella Malta dei Cavalieri di San Giovanni (1530-1798)', *Schiavitù del corpo e schiavitù dell'anima. Chiesa, potere politico e schiavitù tra Atlantico e Mediterraneo (sec.XVI-XVIII)*, E. Colombo, M. Massimi, A. Rocca and C. Zeron (eds.) (Milan, 2018), 292-293.
[94] G. Wettinger, *Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo ca. 1000 – 1812* (Marsa: PEG, 2002), 54.
[95] AOM 1453, f.28v, 29rv, 16 January 1686.
[96] AOM 1452, 67r-70v, 30 April 1685.
[97] For regulations concerning slaves, see Jonathan Muscat, 'The Administration of Hospitaller Malta. *Bandi* and *Prammatiche*, 1530 – 1798' (Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Malta, 2011), 118-126.

still for slaves. But according to Grand Master Carafa, slaves in Malta were treated better than their counterparts anywhere else, particularly in North Africa, as he stated to the Pope:

> The Grand Master assured the Pope himself that the slaves in Malta were more to be envied than pitied. Those who were privately owned were frequently entrusted with the management of their master's house, like Christian servants if not better, and those belonging to the government who were employed on the galleys were treated better than similar slaves in any other country. They were maintained and dressed with all Christian charity – a thing unknown in Turkish lands, particularly in North Africa.[98]

Sacchetti thus informed the Pope of the Grand Master's sentiments, convincing him that no ill-treatment was taking place and that any reprisals on the religious and Christian slaves by Muslims was based on false pretexts. Judging from the Pope's reply, Sacchetti must have been convincing. In March 1685, Sacchetti informed the Grand Master that the Pope desired him to demand the Cadi in Malta to inform the Pasha of Tripoli asking him to desist from mistreating the missionary priests.[99] Though it might have stalled the abuse of Christians for a while, yet the problem seemed to have been a recurrent one.

In 1703 a strongly worded letter to Sacchetti, Grand Master Perellos showed that misconduct towards priests and Christians had resurfaced:

> We know that the Turks of Barbary willingly jump on any pretext to maltreat the Christian slaves, and also, and with utmost rigour, the Missionary priests and other Religious. We have striven at all times to remove any motive, however unfounded, bearing in mind that our good treatment of Turks, whether they belong to the Order or privately owned, would oblige them to refrain from such maltreatment.[100]

He goes on to explain how lenient the Order was with slaves who were set free due to age or infirmity without ever having paid a ransom but merely a nominal fee of 25 Scudi, in spite of the fact that they could have been put to some use. Grand Master Perellos maintained that these good gestures were not enough due to the 'Inquisitor's improper procedures'.[101] Unfortunately the Grand Master did not elaborate on these procedures, but apparently they infuriated 'the Berbers who quickly forget the Order's

---

[98] G. Wettinger, *Slavery*, 54, 55. AOM 1453, f.26rv, 16 January 1686.
[99] AOM 1300, f.40r, 17 March 1685.
[100] AOM 1464, f.20r, 13 January 1703: '*Sapendo noi che I Turchi di Barberia si appigliano volentieri a pretesti per strapazzare I Schiavi Christiani non solo, ma anche e con maggior rigore I P[ret]I Missionarij ed I Relig[ios]I; habbiamo procurator in ogni tempo di toglier loro I motive, anche apparanti, ed applicazzime sempre il pensiero ad obbligarli a cessare dai consueti rigori col far qui trattar bene I Turchi si della Relig[io]ne che de Particolari*.'
[101] AOM 1464, f.20r, 13 January 1703: '*le improprie procedure dell'Inquis[itor]e*'.

diligence and abuse Christians in most vile ways.'[102] Grand Master Perellos was quoting a letter sent by the Consul of Algiers to the Consul of Tripoli, which letters he attached. Sacchetti had to present all this to the Pope in the hope that, while the Grand Master was seeking some form of relief for the Christians, His Holiness could come up with some solution to save the poor wretches from such barbaric treatment.[103]

7.5 Conclusion

This chapter explored the role of the ambassador in matters concerning the victims of corsairing. The victims could be ship owners who felt that their identity as Christians ought to render them immune to marauding corsairs. However, for the Order's tribunals governing corsairing, the religious identity of the ship owners did not necessarily cover the goods in transport, since many Christians, particularly Greeks, were Ottoman subjects. Three of the Order's patrons, namely France, Rome and Venice, were keen to discourage corsairing activities for different reasons. For the Order, corsairing was a lucrative business, in line with their *raison d'etre* of Holy War, protecting the seas from Muslim corsairs and of course procuring slaves. Due to the fluid world between cross and crescent, ill-treatment of slaves could have dire repercussions. The ambassador in Rome would thus seek solutions in the many lawsuits brought up by plaintiffs seeking redress for lost goods and to appease the Venetian ambassador when tension between the two states mounted. He sought to quell rumours of alleged ill-treatment of Muslim slaves to safeguard the plight of Christians shackled in foreign lands. The method was identical for both the ambassador and his rivals: to seek patronage of those in power and go through the established procedures with the hope that the influence of one's patrons would be greater than that of his rivals. Ultimately, Sacchetti sought the greater good of the Religion, trying to maintain a balance between conciliating contenders without compromising the prestige of His Eminence.

---

[102] AOM 1464, f.20rv, 13 January 1703: '*mentre le improprie procedure dell'Inquis[itor]e fanno irritar maggiormente i Barbari che scordandosi delle agevolezze predette, pratticano con i Christiani tirannie non ordinarie*'.

[103] AOM 1464, f.20v, 13 January 1703: '*l'acclusa copia di lettera scritta dal Console di Algeri a quello di Tripoli e da questo mandataci vi rendera persuaso di questa verita; Ne portarete dunque la notitia a nome nostro a S[ue] S[antissi]mi piedi di N[ost]ro Sig[nor]e accio simcome noi applichiamo tutto lo studio al Sollievo di que[st]I poveri Christiani, pensi ancora egli al modo di liberali almeno da cosi barbaro trattamento.*'

Chapter 8 Patronage and Ceremonials

'Connection was the cement of the governing class'[1]

8.1 Introduction

This chapter explores two aspects of diplomacy that were an integral part of the politics of the early modern world. The first section deals with political patronage (*clientelismo*), as distinct from cultural patronage (*mecenatismo*).[2] There are various models on how to view patronage, but ultimately all stress the vertical paradigm, based on the idea of 'a benevolent superior' giving to a 'worthy inferior'.[3] Whilse focusing on the role of the Hospitaller ambassador in questions of patronage, this chapter will also present the other model of patronage, a horizontal perspective where giver and receiver freely exchange roles. In horizontal patronage, the social status of both is, if not equal, fairly close. A number of works have covered the topic of patronage among the nobility, but it seems that the point of departure tends to be hierarchical.[4] Indeed, such structure of patronage pervades the Mediterranean way of thinking.[5] This is evident even in relgious practice, wherein an individual is in need of some benefice (for instance a cure from a malady) and seeks the intercession of a patron saint in his/her prayers, promising some votive offering as part of the bargain. As will be seen, the Grand Master, as ruler of a set of islands, dealt in the superior/inferior type of patronage. But the special status of a Military Order of the Church bore its own implications, namely that of promoting its own breed of patronage, one based on reciprocity of favours. Considering the seeming aristocratic aversion of anything transactional, the idea of reciprocal favours was tacitly admitted but hardly mentioned, as the 'language of patronage contained numerous terms for the voluntary,

---

[1] Barbaraa W. Tuchman, *The March of Folly: From Troy to Vietnam* (1985).
[2] Sharon Kettering, 'Patronage in Early Modern France', *French Historical Studies*, 17: 4 (1992), 843.
[3] S. Kettering, 'Patronage in Early Modern France', 844.
[4] See the studies by Lucien Romier, *Les Origines Politiques des Guerres de Religion*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1914); also, *Le Royaume de Catherine de Medicis*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1922); and *Catholiques et Huguenots a la cour de Charles IX* (Paris, 1924); J. Russell Major, 'The Crown and the Aristocracy in Renaissance France', *American Historical Review*, 69 (1964): 631-45; Robert Harding, *Anatomy of a Power Elite: The Provincial Governors of Early Modern France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978); Richard Bonney, *Political Change in France under Richelieu and Mazarin, 1624-1661* (Oxford, 1978), 90-111, and Sharon Kettering, 'Brokerage at the Court of Louis XIV', *The Historical Journal*, 1993.
[5] David D. Gilmore, 'Anthropology of the Mediterranean Area', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 11 (1982), 175-205.

spontaneous, and disinterested bestowal of patronage as a gift'.[6] This linguistic camouflage requires a brief analysis of the language used. Being related to the manner of conducting affairs, this discussion will lead to the second section, where ceremonials and rituals, an integral part of Early Modern politics, will be examined. Ceremonials were the medium through which status and prestige were communicated. This chapter looks at ceremonials both as the formal rituals established in courts and the less formal rites that a person of some station would have considered as equally important.

8.2 Patronage

Patronage in the sense of political clientelism tends to elude an all encompassing definition due perhaps to its characteristic of reflecting the existing structures of a particular society, and thus, when these structures change, so does the nature of patronage.[7] Although changing circumstances do influence the nature of patronage, yet certain characteristics have to remain the same, otherwise patronage would not remain recognisable. The main characteristics that social scientists seem to agree upon are:

- In the interaction that occurs between patron and client, the latter is inferior to the former in power and status
- The interaction is a reciprocal one, with both participants expecting some form of return, not necessarily of a material nature
- That since the interaction regulates itself on the basis of return, then the relationship between client and patron ceases to be if the reward fails to materialise.
- The interaction is a private affair even when public officials are involved, its only status before the law being the fact that it is entrenched in the norms of the community.[8]

---

[6] S. Kettering, 'Patronage in Early Modern France', 844.
[7] Sharon Kettering, 'The Historical Development of Political Clientelism', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18: 3 (1988), 419.
[8] Domonic A. Bearfield, 'What Is Patronage? A Critical Reexamination', *Public Administration Review*, 69: 1 (2009), 68.

These characteristics should thus fit patronage in the Early Modern era as much as a contemporary democracy. For instance, they would fit an ambitious seventeenth century merchant seeking royal commercial ties through a member of the noblity. And they would also fit an unemployed person using the vote as leverage when meeting a candidate standing for the next election.[9] In both instances, the characteristics of patronage hold. However, there is a tendency to address the phenomenon of patronage purely from a vertical perspective, with the point of departure being the first characteristic, that is, a patron-client relationship wherein the client is always markedly inferior in status to the patron. However, a 'horizontal' type of patronage existed as well, one whose distinctive mark was that the patron and client could exchange roles in a variety of transactions. This is linked with the third characteristic, which points at patronage being tied to a specific transaction on which the patron-client relationship depends and one which spells the end of this relationship if not honoured. Yet horizontal patronage was not necessarily tied to a specific favour, but was more of a continuous investment. In a sense, the relationship was more one of patronage amongst peers rather than that of one party being permanently the inferior of the other. For example, barely four months into his career, Sacchetti eagerly commended Monsignor Altoviti to the Grand Master. The Altoviti family was related to the Sacchetti, a fact which Marcello Sacchetti did mention. But the ambassador felt he had to show that his recommendation did not rest solely on ties of kin. His interest, and that of the Monsignor's, lay not with aiding the family but the Religion. Thus he added that 'concerning these familial ties, Your Eminence can rest assured that the said Prelate [Altoviti] only desires whole-heartedly to serve Your Eminence'.[10] Grand Master Carafa did not hesitate in expressing his gratitude to the said Monsignor, informing his ambassador of the correspondence. Monsignor Altoviti seems to have been pleased with this as he had spoken to Sacchetti about the Grand Master's letter and 'shown signs of extreme satisfaction for the said letter.'[11] Evidently there is no specific task or favour being asked, no singular transaction, but a general appreciation

---

[9] Isabel Kusche, 'Political clientelism and democracy: Clientelistic power and the internal differentiation of the political system', *Acta Sociologica*, 58: 3 (2014), 207-221.
[10] AOM 1297, f.10v, 1 August 1682: '*riguardo della Parentela devi restar persuasa l'E[minenza] V[ostra] che il med[esim]o Prelato desidera sommam[ent]e di server V[ostra] E[minenza]*.'
[11] AOM 1297, f.136r, 10 October 1682: '*havendomi dimostrato segni di estremo gradimento per la sud[detta] lettera*'.

that could come to good use for future reference for both parties. In this manner, patronage on equal terms was similar to that sought through kinship. Kinship refers to the practice by noble houses of seeking patronage within the extended families on both sides.[12]

Since the Order of St John drew its members from the younger sons of the nobility, it could be sought by noble families through their relatives within the Order, particularly those houses that had a long tradition of providing knights. For instance the Aquaviva family of Naples had seven of its members join the Order between 1373 and 1691.[13] The Afflitto, also from Naples, had provided ten knights between 1563 and 1700.[14] The Genovese branch of the Spinola family had fourteen members between 1509 and 1707.[15] One has also to bear in mind that many noble families, and therefore many knights, would have been related through the maternal side and therefore bore a different surname. For instance, Sacchetti's mother was Cassandra Ricasoli, a family described as 'not inferior in nobility, splendour and honour [to the Sacchetti family], being also one of the oldest families in Florence.'[16] As Kettering says, 'Large, multi-headed noble families offered greater opportunities for finding patronage than small, single-headed families.'[17] Thus the Order, with its own system of internal patronage, could be seen as a means to extend the original family, especially those whose kin had risen through the ranks and now occupied some prestigious position that opened doors to yet more contacts. In this sense, not only would the Order be itself 'a quarry of patronage', as David Allen aptly put it, but also act as a broker for further patronage in the complex web that characterised power relations in the

---

[12] Sharon Kettering, 'Patronage and Kinship in Early Modern France', *French Historical Studies*, 16: 2 (1989), 409.
[13] Francesco Bonazzi di Sannicandro, *Elenco dei Cavalieri di S.M. Ordine di S. Giovanni di Gerusalemme Ricevuti nella Veneranda Lingua D'Italia Dalla Fondazione Dell'Ordine Ai Nostri Giorni, Parte Prima* (Napoli: Detken & Rocholl, 1897), 11.
[14] F. Bonazzi, *Elenco*, 12.
[15] F. Bonazzi, *Elenco*, 313-314.
[16] Proofs of Nobility, AOM 4754, 4 September 1645: '*Se la Signora Virginia del Signor Oratio del Signor Luigi Rucellai Ava Materna del detto Signor Rucellai sia nata, e discesa nobilmente dal canto del detto suo Padre, Avo et altri antenati di casa, e famiglia de Rucellai e se sono nobili di nome, et armi almeno da dugento anni in qua, Rispose: Ancora dico alle Signorie Vostre che questa famiglia de Rucellai è nobilissima et antichissima quanto le sopradette come lo dimostrano le fabbriche di detta Casa e publiche e private, e l'Attioni delli Huomini illustri di tutte e quattro le sopraddette Casate celebrate da tutti i nostri scritto*.'
[17] S. Kettering, 'Patronage and Kinship', 409.

Early Modern World, a world wherein the Order's 'greater value to contemporary popes, cardinals, monarchs and princes' was as a repository of patronage.[18]

Since influential positions were entrusted in the hands of nobility, such families weaved webs of contacts wherever they could. Patronage thus permeated the politics of the Early Modern World, or as Helmut Koenigsberger described it; 'the fuel which kept the wheels of sixteenth-century political society turning', a fuel which burned well until the demise of the *ancien regime*. Patronage was intimately interwoven with courtly life, as Kettering said for the French Court: 'influence peddling and the search for patronage were major court activities that helped set the tone of life at Versailles.'[19] Rome was not immune to this 'tone of life'. Cardinals whom Sacchetti had sought for support in the numerous squabbles that the Hospital faced daily in many of the Congregations would then seek him out to acquire some benifice for themselves or for some relative. A case in point would be a short note in one of Sacchetti's letters mentioning Cardinal Spada and his brother. Cardinal Fabrizio Spada (1643-1717) had had an impressive career in the Church, rising from Archbishop of Patrae (1672) to Apostolic Nunzio to Savoy (1672-1674) and France (1675), obtaining the purple in 1675. He was appointed Secretary of State (1691), a position he kept till he resigned in 1700 when he became Prefect of the Apostolic Signatura, a position (amongst other honours) he kept till he died in 1717.[20] His brother was Fra Alviano Spada, who had joined the Order in 1653, captained a galley in 1672 and became Grand Prior of Venice in 1706.[21] In 1700 Cardinal Spada asked Sacchetti to plead with the Grand Master on behalf of his brother so that he (the brother) could exchange his present commandery with the one of Scaperrano, which had been recently vacated. This request had been granted as can be seen by Sacchetti's letter:

> Having spoken with Cardinal Spada, he expressed his abundant obligations towards the kindness of Your Eminence, when he has deigned to confer on his brother the Commenda of Scaperrano, recently vacant on the death of Commendatore Fra Giuseppe Requesens, in place of the one he (the brother) had.[22]

---

[18] D. F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors', 379.
[19] Sharon Kettering, 'Brokerage at the Court of Louis XIV', *The Historical Journal*, 36: 1 (1993), 69-87.
[20] Retrieved on 17 December 2019 from http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bspadafa.html
[21] *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, Tomo IV (Venezia: 1892), 157. Retrieved from http://digitale.bnc.roma.sbn.it/tecadigitale/giornale/LO10016952/1892/V.4/00000163
[22] AOM 1311, f.238r, 24 April 1700: '*In occasione del mio abboccamento questa matina col Sig[nor]e Card[ina]le Spada, egli mi ha' esaggerato l'obbligat[io]ni verso la bonta di V[ostra] E[minenza] quando si compiacesse di conferire al di lui fr[at]ello la Commenda di Scaperrano*

Another Cardinal, Cardinal Imperiali (Cardinal Giuseppe Renato Imperiali 1651-1737) had also approached Sacchetti on behalf of a relative.[23] A nephew of his had been accepted as a knight, but apparently being still of a tender age was supposed to have the role of a page. The Cardinal had managed to obtain a brief so that the nephew would be exempt from doing service in the convent in Malta in order to continue his studies in Pisa. The brief had to be signed by the Grand Master to take effect. In his letter, Sacchetti is almost apologetic in tone:

Since the person making the request bears the purple and is a Protector of the Religion, and that since we have benefited to the utmost from the efficacacious effects of his patronage in all occurrences, I thought that I should not oppose him in any way, again with the hope that in this occurrence I have acted to the utmost satisfaction of Your Eminence.[24]

The above examples serve to show how horizontal patronage worked. Officially, the status of the Grand Master as the head of a military-religious Order was equal to that of a Cardinal, hence the same mode of address – Your Eminence.[25] The power cardinals wielded varied according to how much they had the Pope's ear and how close they were to the crowns they favoured, whether Bourbon or Habsburg. The Grand Master, through his ambassador in Rome sought the friendly hand of such cardinals, especially those who were members or presided over the various Congregations that tackled the many lawsuits and issues that the Religion faced. In turn, the purple-robed prelates would seek the same ambassador to win favours for their relatives. The ambassador was therefore a point of reference for such transactions. The Hospital enticed those who wielded influence, offering in return access to its prestige, exemptions and exceptions within its hierarchy and of course the

---

ultimam[en]te vacate p[er] morte del Comm[endatore] fra Giuseppe Requesens in permute di quella, che presentemente possiede, lo partecipo con la presente all'E[minenza V[ostra] perche resti inteso del desiderio che ha il sud[dett]o Sig[nore]e Cardinale di ricevere simil[e] grazzie da V[ostra] E[minenza] e profondamente m'inchino.'

[23] For a brief biographical note of Cardinal Imperiali, see Appendix 1, 237.

[24] AOM 1329, f.36r, 17 February 1717: '*Da questo Sig[nor]e Cardinale Imperiale e stata fatta istanza a N[ost]ro Sig[nor]e per la concessione d'un Breve, facolatativo puo a VE, et a favore d'un suo nipote ricevuto Cavaliere della di Lei Religione in qualita di Piaggio, ad effetto d'essere esente dall'obligo di portarsi personalmente a prestare il Servizio di Paggio e non abondane I Studij, a quali applica di presente nel Collegio di Pisa, E perche si tratta nel caso presente d'una grazia, che viene richiesta, e domandata da un Porporato Protettore della Religione, e che del di lui patrocinio ne fa godere alla med[esim]a efficaci effetti in tutte le sue occorrenze, ho creduto di non dovergli fare opposizione, con Speranza ancora d'incontarare in questa maniera la piena sodisfazione dell Em[inen]za V[ost]ra.*'

[25] Pope Urban VIII (r. 1623-1644), had declared in 1630 that the three German electors and the grand master of the Order of St John could also use the title of eminetissimus. See Mario Bosi, 'Quando ai Cardinali fu dato il titolo dei eminenza', *Strenna dei Romanisti*, 41 (1980), 107-114, 112.

lure of the much desirable commanderies. Horizontal patronage was thus a way of retaining the privileges the Order enjoyed, safeguarding it from internal incursions that would undermine its position, and thus its prestige.

The Hospital was of course a source for vertical patronage wherein persons of lesser status, who did not wield power, sought for some benefit to better their position. The Grand Master would reward loyalty or aid individuals in whom a certain potential was evident. Sacchetti for instance did not hesitate to recommend a certain Bartolomeo de Rossi, who had been commissioned by the Order to oversee woodcutting operations in Terracina, for executing his duties with loyalty and diligence.[26] A certain Maltese youth, who unfortunately was not named, was not only recommended by the Grand Master but hosted by Sacchetti himself for some time and then resided with Procurator Torrenti. The young man was in Rome to further his studies and was described by Procurator Torrenti as a young man of great talent who will surely succeed.[27] There was a difference in the manner of how the recommendation was expressed. When the ambassador recommended someone to the Grand Master, the tone was deferential, apologising with phrases such as 'taking the liberty' in commending an individual.[28] On the other hand, the Grand Master would command as much as commend. Recommendations by the Grand Master followed a certain pattern. The suitor, having obtained a letter from the Grand Master, would seek the ambassador. The Grand Master would have written beforehand to his ambassador informing him to expect a visitor. For instance, on 13 June 1682 a priest arrived at the ambassador's palace, bearing a letter from Grand Master Carafa:

The priest Father Lorenzo Miguel, yesterday gave me a letter from Your Eminence dated 9 March, in which Your Eminence commands me to help him in his pretensions in this Court for any benefice in any vacancy that may occur.[29]

Where the Grand Master 'commands' the ambassador would rather 'plead' as can be seen in the last verse of the following letter, which describes Lorenzo Gafa in glowing terms:

Your Eminence will be minutely updated from Lorenzo Gafa, who after leaving the necessary orders for the completion of the whole work for the Niche of the main altar

---

[26] AOM1298, f.77r, 3 June 1683.
[27] AOM1297, f.176v, 5 December 1682.
[28] AOM1298, f.77r, 3 June 1683: '*prendo l'ardire*'.
[29] AOM 1297, f.84v, 13 June 1682: '*Il Sacerdote D[on] Lorenzo Miguel, hieri mi rese una benignissima di E[minenza] V[ostra] delli 9 Marzo, colla quale l' E[minenza] V[ostra] mi comanda che io l'aiuti nelle sue pretensioni in questa Corte in occasione di vacanza di qualche beneficio*.'

of the Conventual Church of Your Eminence which should be fine at this stage, and trusting his report, I would merely like to express to Your Eminence that the aforementioned has shown singular proof of his virtue and talent in previous projects, and that during his stay here he has shown such predisposition for the good service of Your Eminence that he merits the grace of your protection as I humbly plead and profoundly bow.[30]

Lorenzo Gafa (1638-1703) was sixty years of age by this time, and a renowned architect who had already executed several commissions in Malta. Lorenzo was thus not a struggling artist seeking a patron that would launch his career. Keith Sciberras puts forth the proposition that various Hospitallers had supported the Gafa family, and strongly suggests Fra Giovanni Bichi as the patron of Lorenzo, who had built the palace that gave its name to the headland in Kalkara, now known as Ta' Bighi.[31] However, the style of patronage in this letter is not indentical with that of art patronage, but simply a recommendation based on Lorenzo's 'virtue' and his manifest desire to serve the Order.

The ambassador's house was a port of call for those seeking to obtain some favour from the Grand Master. It was thus that the two Greek victims of corsairing increased their chances of retribution.[32] In fact they did obtain satisfaction, as on 11 September 1683 Sacchetti wrote to the Grand Master, thanking him profusely 'for the kind fulfillment of justice that will benefit Giorgio Carachsi and Panaiotto, the Greeks I had recommended.'[33] In actual fact, the recommendation had not come originally from the ambassador, but from Cardinal Cibo, who in turn was helping a priest who had worked with Cardinal Pignatelli.[34] It was the way patronage worked. The efforts of both the Cardinal and the ambassador were not in fact for the sake of the Greeks themselves, but because of their recommender. But Sacchetti had espoused the Greek cause, thus indirectly becoming their recommender as much as Cardinal Cibo. Once a

---

[30] AOM 1311, f.310r, 21 September 1700: '*Da Lorenzo Gafa, che doppo lasciati gli ordini necessarij per l'ultimatione dell'opera intiera della Nicchia dell'Altare mag[gior]e della Chiesa Conv[entua]le di V[ostra] E[minenza] se ne passa a codesta volta, restera ella minutam[en]te in voce raguagliata dello Stato, in cui presentam[en]te si ritrova il Lavoro, e rimettendomi Io alla di lui relatione, rappresento solam[ent]e all E[minenza] V[ostra] che il med[esi]mo in simil[e] commissione ha dato prove molto singolari della sua virtu, e talento, e che nel suo soggiorno si sia impiegato con propensione tale verso il buon Servito di V[ostra] E[minenza] che merita di essere aggraziato della di Lei prottett[io]ne, come umilm[en]te ne la supplico e profondam[ent]e m'Inchino*.'

[31] Keith Sciberras, Roman Baroque Sculpture for the Knights of Malta (Malta: Midsea Books, 2012), 36-37.

[32] This work, Chapter 7.

[33] AOM 1298, f.123r, 11 September 1683, '*per il benignissimo compimento di giustitia che fara conseguire a cotesto Giorgio Carachsi e Panaiotto Grece raccomandati da me*'.

[34] This work, Chapter 7.

cause was adopted, the person doing the recommendation would wish a successful outcome, and this for two reasons. Firstly, there was the question of honour, of saving face. If the Grand Master refused his recommendation, Sacchetti would have to admit with Cardinal Cibo that the plea had been refused as if his word, the word of an ambassador and Prior of Lombardy, did not carry weight with the Grand Master. Secondly, there was the practical side of patronage, that is, of returning favours and the possibility of asking for others. Cardinal Cibo, then still Secretary of State, was constant in his support for the Hospital. A refusal could taint the good relations the ambassador and the Secretary of State had and would close a door which thus far had proved to be so convenient. Kings and princes were part of this system. The Grand Master was far from being beyond all this, knowing that the survival of the Hospital depended on the goodwill of popes and monarchs and the prestige of its patronage. On occasion, the Grand Master would have to seek help for specific cases from one of the Order's protectors in Madrid, Rome or Paris. It was thus that the King of Spain became involved in the troubles between the Order and the Archbishop of Toledo.[35] In 1687, Grand Master Perellos asked Sacchetti to obtain the intercession of the French ambassador in Constantinople for the liberation of a certain knight, Fra Santini, who had fallen into slavery. Sacchetti spoke with the French Cardinal D'Estrees in order to contact Louis XIV's ambassador and hopefully the knight would be set free.[36]

Since, as Allen says, the Order was 'a quarry of patronage', ambassadors in Madrid, Paris, Vienna and Rome would have had to deal with a variety of such pleas, and they in turn would use the prestige the Religion offered in order to preserve its existence. Rome was a special case. Not only did the Order have to face a number of lawsuits there, but the Order's existence was due to it being an order of the Church, functioning in its military and hospitaller mission purely because of the ecclesiastical umbrella that covered it, as Buttigieg says, 'the papacy extended its ecclesiastical and diplomatic immunity to the Order.'[37] The price to pay was constant interference that often led to a general disgruntlement within the langues, especially when the papacy appropriated commanderies and distributed them without consideration for veteran knights who expected the compensation of a commandery after years of risking their

[35] This work, Chapter 5.
[36] AOM 1302, f.119r, 26 August 1687.
[37] Emanuel Buttigieg, 'The Pope wants to be the Ruin of this Religion', The Papacy, France, and the Order of St John in the Seventeenth Century', *Symposia Melitensia*, 5 (2009), 75.

lifes for the Religion.[38] Appealing to the Order's next biggest patron, France, did not always produce the required result, as Louis XIV could exert pressure just as much as the Pope.

Such was the case with the awarding of one of the Order's highest decorations, that of Grand Cross. Sacchetti had been informed by the Grand Master that he should deny outright pleas for this award, but when a knight has the patronage of the ambassador of France, an absolute denial was impossible:

Yesterday the Duke de Chaulne, Ambassador to the King, sent his gentleman to me to assert that, *Commendatore* Sesmaisons, having procured to obtain a Brief for Grand Cross *ad honoris* from the previous Pope before his demise was told that my consent is required. Your Eminence's repeated desires have been that no similar Briefs are given without my participaton, but he implored that he would not want me to oppose the new Pontiff, since the Ambassador is interested in the advancement of the said *Commendatore*, to which I replied that I have precise orders from Your Eminence to oppose similar benefices in general, and I cannot go against such orders. To this he begged me to write to Your Eminence, which I have done to obey the said Ambassador, to whom I will convey what Your Eminence deigns to command of me.[39]

This sample case offers a representative example of patronage. The knight in question was Jean-Baptiste de Sesmaison (1636-1719). The Sesmaisons were a noble family, originally from Brittany. His widowed mother had enrolled him with the Order of St John when he was eighteen. He became Bali of the Order and *Commendatore* of Coudrie and Bias in 1669. He was awarded the commandery of la Feuillee in 1703 as well as Coudrie /Puy-Raveaux, Villejes, Les Habittes, Lande-Blanche, Bourganeuf-en-Mauges, and Blizon. He ended his carrier as Pilier of the langue of France, meaning he had the prestigious responsibility of the hospital from 29 December 1718 till 23 June 1719. He died on 6 July 1719.[40] His patron in this matter, the Duc de Chaulne,

---

[38] E. Buttigieg, 'The Papacy, France and the Order of St John in the seventeenth century', 81. See also B. dal Pozzo, *Historia*, vol 2, 343.

[39] AOM 1305, f.36rv, 3 March 1692: '*Hieri quest Sig[nor]e Duca de Chaulne Ambass[ciator]e del Re mi mando un suo Gentilhuomo a farmi istanza che havendo egli procurato p[ri]ma della morte del Papa d'ottenere un Breve facoltativo di Gran Croce ad honoris p[er] il Comm[endator]e de Sesmaisons, gli havevano detto, conveniva haverno il mio Consenso, V[ost]ra Em[inenz]a replicate istanze non si volevano concedere simili Brevi senza la mia partecipat[io]ne, e che pero mi pregava di non volermi opporre al nuovo Ponteficio st[a]nte che il sud[dett]o S[ignor]e Amb[assciato]re s'interessava ne gli avantaggi del med[esim]o Comm[endator]e, al che io risposo, ch'io havevo Ordini cosi precisi da V[ost]ra Em[inenz]a d'opporm*i *generalm[ent]e a simili gratie, che non potevo in questa parte trasgredirli, A questo mi fece istanza di volerne scrivere a V[ost]ra Em[inenz]a, Il che io faccio p[er] ubedire il sudd[ett]o Sig[nor]e Amb[assciato]re, al quale poi rappresentero quanto in questa parte V[ost]ra Em[inenz]a si degnera ordinarmi*.'

[40] Retrieved on 28 December 2019 from http://www.palacret.com/histoire-d-une-commanderie/2c--les-commandeurs-batisseurs/31---jean-baptiste-de-sesmaisons

had already been sent to Rome in 1667 for the conclave that elected Pope Clement IX. He was then made governor of Brittany in 1670, going again to Rome for the election of Pope Clement X during the same year. He was made the King's commander-in-chief of Brittany in 1675 and ambassador to Rome for the third time in 1689. Both families thus had Breton connections and were quite equal in status, as can be seen by the Sesmaisons' proofs of nobility.[41] The Duc was however in a better bargaining position, being an ambassador and a favourite of King Louis XIV, as is evident by the Duc's various appointments. The protocol was observed, thus the French ambassador sought to promote his protégé through the intercession of Sacchetti, and not address the Grand Master himself. The language is also indicative of the strict code of honour that governed patronage. Indeed, this can be seen in the other case studies.

An important hidden rule of the language of patronage seems to have been the total avoidance of obvious promises, threats or anything which might reduce the plea to a transaction. The only record of the actual conversation between Sacchetti and the Duc's man is of course Sacchetti's version, but the tone is evident: it is thinly veiled in language of friendship and disinteredness except for the Duc's avowed interest in Sesmaisons' career. Thus Sacchetti wrote '*m*i *pregava'* – 'supplicated me' and seemingly showed interest in Sacchetti's welfare by saying that he would not like Sacchetti to start on the wrong foot with the new pope (Innocent XII who reigned from 1691 to 1700). But the language of patronage cannot be taken at face value because a simple expression could be pregnant with implicit meaning. The election of Pignatelli as Pope Innocent XII had initially been opposed by the French party, but eventually he got their support.[42] The implication is that this pope had the blessing of the French monarch. There was another tacit message in this. The Pope had been crowned by Cardinal Urbano Sacchetti.[43] Not taking no for an answer, yet refraining from imposing or breaking the rules by challenging Sacchetti's honour, the messenger of the Duc implored (*mi fece istanza*) Sacchetti to consult the Grand Master. In this way, the language of patronage borrows from 'friendship, chivalry, and noble courtesy and

[41] AOM 3406, f.1r-38v. Two knights were appointed by the Provincial Chapter of the Priory of Aquitaine to establish the proofs of nobility on 4 May 1654. He was admitted on 29 September 1654.
[42] Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, *The History of the Popes. From the close of the Middle Ages*, xxxii (London, Trubner and Co, 1940), 570.
[43] The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church. Biographical Dictionary, retrieved on 30 December 2019 from https://webdept.fiu.edu/~mirandas/bios1681.htm

honour.'[44] Of course this is Sacchetti's brief version of what was an oral exchange. In analysing patronage language, one must bear in mind two drawbacks: that there is no evidence of the mannerisms that would accompany certain words and phrases and the actual exchange might be one-sided, having been reported by only one of the interlocuters.

For instance, there is no record of the Cardinal Imperiale's words. Sacchetti mentioned how much the Religion had benefited from his help, but it would go against all forms of decorum had the said Cardinal mentioned the fact himself. At face value, patronage had to be offered freely, the sole interest being of offering a service. Thus Monsignor Altoviti is reported as having the only desire to 'whole-heartedly serve' the Grand Master. Similarly, Cardinal Spada expressed his 'abundant obligations' for the favour the Grand Master had granted, but that was purely the expected way of showing gratitude. When Cardinal Spada had sought Sacchetti on behalf of his brother, he was the Secretary of State. It was understood that Sacchetti would approach him should the need arise, but though implicitly understood, reciprocity was never mentioned.

Although it would be an impossible task to find one paradigm of patronage that fits all,[45] certain characteristics can be drawn. Firstly the model of patron/client as a permanent fixture does not fit the patronage practised by the Order, not even for its two supreme protectors France and Rome. In vertical patronage, the client is bound by loyalty to constantly serve his protector. The Order sought and offered patronage due to its peculiar position. Meanwhile, the house of its ambassador in Rome was constantly visited by messengers sent by influential people seeking some favour that the Grand Master could grant. But equally, Sacchetti's gentlemen would sally forth, reaping the silent harvest of implicit obligations.

---

[44] S. Kettering, 'Patronage in Early Modern France', 859.
[45] See S. Kettering, 'Patronage in Early Modern France', 862. See also J. Russell Major, 'Vertical Ties through Time', *French Historical Studies*, 17: 4 (1992), 863-871.

8.3 Ceremonials and Ostentation

'The sauce to meat is ceremony; Meeting were bare without it.'
William Shakespeare, Macbeth.

In 1980, in his important seminal work on ceremonials, William Roosen observed the ambivalent attitude of scholars, those who considered ceremonials as 'ridiculous practices' and those who minutely described the ceremonies but ignored their meaning and implications.[46] In a way, these attitudes reflected those of contemporaries who had to follow early modern protocol but at times described them as 'bagatelles', 'vanities' and 'futilities'.[47] Roosen argues that ceremonials are worth studying because they give 'insights into diplomacy and early modern politics in general.'[48] What Roosen also underlined was that ceremonials were (as they still are), an integral part of diplomacy, not something which is added on. In a sense, ceremonials were not merely the manner of conducting diplomatic negotiations, but occasionally diplomacy itself. This holds even for the present, as Rana states: 'In diplomacy, appearance is inseparable from function. The public face and image are among the tools the ambassador uses to reach his objectives.'[49] Though the rituals may have been toned down, diplomacy still retains ceremonials, nowadays known as protocol, as a fundamental part of its practice. Considering this staying power of rites, the study of diplomacy cannot be divorced from its outward manifestations because 'spectacles and pageantry' are 'an integral part of power and politics themselves'.[50] Ceremonials can be understood on two levels. There were the official, established rites especially of precedence amongst ambassadors of princes. But apart from the formal and official ceremonies, there was the equally important need to manifest one's status beyond the negotiation table.

It was the Peace of Westphalia where acceptable solutions were set in stone, as it were. It would be a fundamental mistake to consider the quarrels over precedence as 'baroque vanities', for 'determining these symbolic codes also determined some of

---

[46] W. Roosen, 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial: A Systems Approach', *The Journal of Modern History*, 52: 3 (1980), 452-453.
[47] W. Roosen, 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial', 452.
[48] W. Roosen, 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial', 452.
[49] Kishan S. Rana, *The 21st Century Ambassador. Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive* (Malta and Geneva, DiploFoundation, 2004), 39.
[50] D. Cannadine and S. Price (eds.), 'Introduction: divine rights of kings', *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 6.

the political content of the negotiation.'[51] Before starting to speak about exchange of territories, withdrawal of troops and spoils of war, the parties had to establish the 'language'. The elaboration of the ceremonies is a reflection of a process that started in the seventeenth century and culminated in the eighteenth, namely that the diplomatic corps came to be 'dominated by noblemen from long-established families to an unprecedented extent,' and that any commoners left in this role were 'quickly ennobled.'[52] This is not to say that Renaissance diplomacy had not included aristocratic figures. Nobles had been sent on diplomatic missions, but these were usually more of an ostentatious nature and purely temporary, such as finalising a truce or an alliance, orchestrating a political marriage, conclude a peace and similar quests.[53] But the Early Modern era saw the rise of nobles as resident ambassadors. The theorists followed this pattern. Thus, for Wicquefort (1606-1682), nobles should be used for 'purely ceremonial missions' because nobles tended to be belligerent and too brimming with self-importance to be of good service to their prince.[54] But by the time that Callieres (1645-1717) and Pecquet (1704-1762) were writing, the idea that a commoner could be sent to represent a prince had become impossible, because only a noble had the necessary training and the social sagacity that courts demanded.[55] And so, as the seventeenth century merged into the eighteenth, diplomacy became a complicated web of ceremonies and rituals mostly based on precedence, which mirrored the glory of the prince the ambassador represented.

In Rome, precedence was fiercely sought due to the perpetual enmity between the pontifical nobility and the old Roman feudal families.[56] The list below, drawn by Renata Ago from the Ottoboni Archive shows the order of precedence in the papal court:[57]

---

[51] Niels F. May, 'Staged Sovereignty or Aristocratic Values? Diplomatic ceremonial at the Westphalian peace negotiations (1643-1648)', *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410-1800*, Tracey A. Sowerby and Jan Hennings (eds) (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), 81.
[52] Hamish Scott. 'Diplomatic culture in old regime Europe', *Cultures of Power in Europe during the Long Eighteeenth Century*', Hamish Scott and Brendan Simms (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 74.
[53] H. Scott, 'Diplomatic culture in old regime Europe', 72.
[54] Wicquefort, 'L'ambassadeur et ses fonctions' (Cologne) Premiere Partie, 73-74, retrieved from https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k93844c/f77.image on 9 January 2020.
[55] H. Scott, 'Diplomatic culture in old regime Europe', 73.
[56] Renata Ago, 'Hegemony over the Social Scene and Zealous Popes (1676–1700)', *Court and Politics in Papal Rome* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004), 236.
[57] R. Ago, 'Hegemony', 236.

Senator of Rome

Ambassadors of France and Spain

Auditor camerae

General Treasurer

Six Patriarchs

Head of the Orsini family / Head of the Colonna family

Participating protonotaries

Barons of the Colonna, Orsini, Savelli and Conti families

Heads of the pontifical houses

Ambassadors of Bologna, Ferrara and Malta

Judges of the *Rota*

Dignitaries of the Apostolic Chamber

Other barons

Presidents and agents of the serene princes

Chancery officers and non-participating protonotaries

So, in the papal court the ambassador of the Order ranked tenth, along with the ambassadors of Bologna and Ferrara. The term 'court' when referring to Rome is more of a concept than a physical building, as there was no one particular residence where the Pontiff enacted his sovereign status around which the cardinal-courtiers orbited. Rather it was the reigning pope and people who had access to him that formed the Roman court.[58] Popes, like kings, sought to show their dominant position through exhibition in any form. Thus the control of artistic and cultural life, social events and the elaborate use of rituals were eagerly practised by most popes as much as by kings. Sacchetti's tenure coincided with the reigns of four popes: Innocent XI (1676-1689), Alexander VIII (r. 1689-1691), Innocent XII (r. 1691-1700) and Clement XI (r. 1700-1721).[59] Pope Innocent XI was perhaps an exception to his predecessors when it came to ceremonials and displays of pre-eminence. From the outset of his pontificate, he showed an austere tone that was to dominate public life. For instance, he 'forbade the

[58] 'The real criterion for membership of the court was access to the ruler.': Ronald G. Asch, 'Introduction: Court and Household from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries', *Princes, Patronage and Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age*, Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (eds.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 8.

[59] For a chronological list of popes, grand masters, inquisitors and bishops during Sacchetti's tenure, see Appendix 2, this work, 242.

erection of the customary triumphal arches' when taking possession of the Lateran, abolished feasts on the anniversary of his coronation and henceforth appeared very little in public.[60] He also avoided the customary appointment of a Cardinal-nephew and discouraged his family from living in Rome.[61] However, this did not have the effect desired by the Pope. All he managed to do was create a vacuum in public life which was quickly filled by the nobility of Rome.[62] Innocent XI's decision to abolish the position of Cardinal-nephew and forbid members of his family from having important positions only served to bring to the forefront the aristocratic families of Rome, especially the Orsini and the Colonna. These were the most preeminent of all Roman families, second only to the relatives of the reigning pontiff. The absence of the latter encouraged them all the more to take the lead.[63] His successor, Pope Alexander VIII, on the other hand, would have erased all the previous austerity had his reign not been so short lived. The next pontiff, Innocent XII, adopted not only the name but also the manners of Innocent XI. The last pope during Sacchetti's term in office was more concerned with spiritual upheavals although he had to face the worldly ones, thus the end of the seventeenth and the ushering of the eighteenth centuries saw attempts at religious reawakening.[64] But the Roman populace loved splendour and the measures of austerity were largely ignored. Thus for instance, Innocent XI's prohibitions of the French fashion, games and carnival had little effect on the Roman nobility, the foreign ambassadors or indeed, the populace in general.[65]

Ambassadors in particular had a very practical need for displaying splendour, for behind the manifestations of grandeur lay the grandeur of their prince. Certain rules were established during the negotiations of the Peace of Westphalia. Indeed, negotiating the actual terms of peace could not even start before the nightmare of precedence was established as Niels F. May puts it: 'The divergent opinions regarding title, precedence, and other symbols of rank considerably decelerated the peace negotiations.'[66] Certain practices were adopted during the conferences at Münster and Osnabrück which became the norm for diplomatic ceremonial and retained today, such

---

[60] Pastor, xxxii, 15.
[61] Pastor, xxxii, 24-25.
[62] R. Ago, 'Hegemony', 238.
[63] R. Ago, 'Hegemony', 240.
[64] Pastor, xxxiii, 335-338.
[65] Peter Tusor, *The Baroque Papacy (1600-1700)* (Viterbo: Sette Citta, 2016), 157.
[66] Niels F. May, 'Diplomatic ceremonial at the Westphalian peace negotiations', 81.

as the title 'Excellency', distinguishing ambassadors from lesser diplomats and is still the mode of address of an ambassador.[67] This mode of address at least smoothed the squabbles concerning titles of nobility during negotiations within closed doors, but exhibitions of splendour were not merely relegated to internal spaces. Commuting to courts or visiting persons of dignity was in itself a demonstration of pomp and power.

Then, as today, one of the chosen methods of ostentation was the means of transport. The early modern equivalent of the car was the carriage, which appeared in Rome in the middle of the sixteenth century and quickly caught on amongst the upper classes.[68] Although introduced to Rome by the Archbishop of Esztergom Ippolito d'Este (1509-1572), who later became cardinal, it had been vehemently lambasted by Pope Pius IV (r.1559-64) as effeminate and that clergy should ride with majesty on horseback.[69] But the carriage became firmly entrenched in the Roman streetscape, accepted even by the stern Pope Sixtus V (r.1585-1590) as an essential part of 'the splendour of the papal court.'[70] As Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592) wrote about Rome: 'The people of rank go only in coaches'.[71] By the last decade of the seventeenth century, Pope Innocent XII Pignatelli (r.1691-1700) had 'ordered the construction of a new carriage road to the Capitol' and even named it *Via delle tre pile*, alluding to the Pignatelli coat of arms.[72]

Ambassadors quickly adopted the carriage, or rather, the train of carriages, as a means of showing the magnificence of their prince and underlining his power and authority, as Hunt states: 'No members of Rome's disparate elite claimed more spatial dominance in the city than the resident ambassadors of the great crowned heads of Catholic Europe and of the constellation of minor powers that dotted the Italian peninsula.'[73] In the book (published 1688) celebrating the visit of the extraordinary ambassador of James II to Pope Innocent XI in 1686, Michael Wright devoted twelve pages to describe the first four coaches, along with drawings of them, no detail

---

[67] Niels F. May, 'Diplomatic ceremonial at the Westphalian peace Negotiations', 81.
[68] Patricia Waddy, 'Cardinals' Palaces: Architecture and Decoration', *A Companion to the Early Modern Cardinal*, Mary Hollingsworth, Miles Pattenden, Arnold Witte (eds) (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 357.
[69] G. Gozzadini, *Delle antiche carrozze e segnatamente di due Veronesi* (Bologna: 1862), 228.
[70] J. M. Hunt, 'Ambassadors and their Carriages', 71.
[71] M. de Montaigne, *The Complete Works: Essays, Travel Journals, Letters*, trans. D. M. Frame (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003), 1168.
[72] Pastor, xxxii, 58.
[73] John M. Hunt, 'The Ceremonial Possession of a City: Ambassadors and their Carriages in Early Modern Rome', *Royal Studies Journal*, 3: 2 (2016), 70.

considered too futile to leave out.[74] Added to the English coaches, the 'Great men of Rome, by their Relations, and Gentlemen, that brought their several Coaches to wait on him, to the Pope's Palace' making 'the whole train, amounting to the number of three hundred and thirty Coaches.'[75] Of course such level of magnificence was not exhibited by the resident ambassadors in their daily trajectories to the Vatican or on other excursions, but the carriage was the adopted method of showing off the glory of one's sovereign, because, as Hunt called it, the carriage was 'a highly mobile extension of the palace'.[76] Imposing one's presence on the streets of Rome often led to aggressive and violent behaviour, because the reputation of the represented monarch depended heavily on precedence.

It was thus how one of Sacchetti's predecessors, the Order's ambassador in 1635, quarrelled with the governor of Rome. The governor, the highest authority in Rome over criminal matters, was visiting the Pope at the Quirinal palace and his carriage encountered that of the Order's ambassador. The latter did not give precedence as protocol demanded, and his coachman instead belayed his horses to cross the street before the governor's coach. Not to be outdone, the governor took a different route in order to meet the Order's carriage again and demanded satisfaction. Eventually the Pope coerced the Order's ambassador to send a letter of apology and the coachman was conveniently blamed and punished by public torture, being given the *strappado*, of course in layman's clothes not in the Order's livery.[77] Due to the frequency of such incidents, Cardinal Bevilacqua wrote to Cardinal Cibo as Secretary of State in a bid to adopt some form of protocol: 'When two carriages meet in the narrow streets that one must always turn aside which can do so most conveniently, though without prejudice to any precedence.'[78] Whether this was ever put into practice is not known, but it did not curb the importance of carriages for the elite.

When Fra Marcantonio Zondadari was sent to Rome as extraordinary ambassador, the resident ambassador Fra Caravita wrote to the Grand Master: 'the aforementioned Ambassador having his first audience last Wednesday, made a

---

[74] Michael Wright, *An Account of His Excellence Roger Earl of Castlemaine's Embassy* (London: 1688), 34-47.
[75] M.Wright, *Castlemaine's Embassy*, 50.
[76] J. M. Hunt, 'Ambassadors and their Carriages in Early Modern Rome', 70.
[77] John M. Hunt, 'Violence, and Masculinity in Early Modern Rome', *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 17: 1 (2014), 186.
[78] Pastor, xxxii, 64.

grandiose entry with livery, carriages and procession, worthy of a Minister of Your Eminence and a Nephew of Cardinal Chigi.'[79] As a knight, an ambassador of a most prestigious military order and also a member of an important aristocratic family, Sacchetti made use of carriages. In his *dispropriamento* he mentions 'five carriages with their trappings, that make up my train as Ambassador.'[80] Five carriages compared favourably with other ambassadors. The diarist Giglio Gigli, narrates that in 1647 the French ambassador had met the pope with five carriages, followed by a cortege of around two hundred and ten.[81] This was done to eclipse the similar entry of the ambassador of the Holy Roman Emperor in 1638.[82] The ambassador of the Order was thus not outshone by the most powerful of peers. The carriage spoke loudly of wealth and with it, power.

The expense was not limited to buying the carriages and their horses. One had to employ grooms and coachmen as well as maintain servants and pages in livery. Since the heavily sculpted woodwork was gilded, carriages were in constant need of maintenance to keep their golden lustre. Woodcarvers and gilders were hired to maintain the carriages in pristine condition. Thus the woodcarver Giovanni de Sebastiani was paid 23.50 scudi in 1685 for works on frames and carriages.[83] His services were required quite often for frames and furniture beside carriages. Sebastiani and his associate Giovanni Maria Giorgetti must have been a craftsman of some note, having worked for the Barberini and the Rospigliosi, apart from the Sacchetti and other families.[84] He was again paid 11.30 scudi for unspecified works at Palazzo Sacchetti in 1688. In 1693 a carriage must have suffered some accident, or at least needed major works, as Sebastiani was paid 112.45 scudi.[85] His name keeps cropping up in

---

[79] AOM 1296, f.13v, 25 January 1681: '*Et in al proposito sono a rappresentare all'Em[inenza] V[ost]ra che l'Ambasc[iator]e sud[dett]o havendo havuto la sua p[ri]ma audienza Mercordi della cad[ent]te sett[ima]na fece una comparsa assai pomposa di Livree, carrozze e corteggio quali si convegno ad un Ministro di V[ostra] Em[inenza] et Nipote del Sig'nor] Card[ina]le Chigi.*'
[80]AOM 931/35, 15, f.107r: '*le cinque carrozze con suoi fornimenti, che compongono il mio treno di Amb[asciato]re*'.
[81] G. Gigli, *Diario di Roma*, vol. 2 (Rome: Colombo, 1994), 504-505.
[82] J. M. Hunt, 'Ambassadors and their Carriages', 72.
[83] Archivio Sacchetti, Busta 62. Giovanni de Sebastiani formed a partnership with Giovanni Maria Giorgetti in 1670, hence he is also known as Giorgetti. See A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, 'Roman Documents and Inventories', 5-6. The authors quote the Sacchetti family archive, once preserved by the family, before being donated to the Archivio Storico Capitolino in 2014.
[84] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, 'Roman Documents and Inventories', 19. See the following footnotes for the primary sources quoted by the authors.
[85] Archivio Sacchetti, Busta 66, c.267.

connection with frames, furniture and carriages in the Sacchetti ledgers, along with that of one Angelo Clementi, gilder. For instance, in 1686 Clementi was paid 12 scudi for work on a carriage.[86] His services were required again in 1696, when he was paid the sum of 59.10 scudi.[87] His last work was on a carriage in 1697, when he gilded carvings executed by Sebastiani.[88] In 1698, Cesare Clemente, possibly his son, took over.[89] Carriages were therefore not a onetime expense but were maintenance-hungry. Evidently the intricate woodcarvings and gilding were prone to chip and scratch, and the amount of heavy traffic on the streets of Rome guaranteed a steady flow of work for woodcarvers and gilders. Carriages had to be kept in pristine condition, as a shabby means of transport would reflect badly on its owner.

Apart from the need of ostentation, early modern ceremonial served another, more practical purpose. It mirrored the relationship between princes.[90] Downgrading in ceremonial between ambassadors could mean either that one's prince was less friendly than he had been, or that the receiving country was being considered as less important. Inversely, honouring an ambassador more than was usual meant the opposite.[91] Thus Sacchetti reassured the Grand Master that relations between the Order and the King of France were all serene:

I would like to say to Your Eminence that I am carrying on with my visits at the *Sacro Collegio*, and yesterday, 10 of the present, I visited the Ambassador for France the Duke d'Estrées, from whom I receive so much honour and courtesy: I wanted to send this note for the consolation of Your Eminence. I send this by way of Livorno, and next Saturday, with my usual despatch I will give more news, and with that I bow profoundly.[92]

The ambassadors themselves seldom described in any form of detail neither the formal ceremonies nor the usual behaviour in informal or semiformal occasions. Roosen stressed this fact that 'little is known about the working methods' from 'the

---

[86] Archivio Sacchetti, Busta 63, c.131
[87] Archivio Sacchetti, Busta 67, c.126.
[88] Archivio Sacchetti, Busta 70, c. 156 Angelo earned scudi 30 for work on a carriage whilst Sebastiani was paid scudi 85. In c.105, Sebastiani again earns the same sum for working on a carriage.
[89] Archivio Sacchetti, Busta 71, c.68.
[90] W. Roosen, 'The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV', 330.
[91] W. Roosen, 'The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV', 330.
[92] AOM 1298, f.61r, 11 May 1683: '*Partecipo all'E[minenza] V[ostra], che io sto seguitando le visite del S[acro] Collegio, et hieri, 10 del corrente visitai questo S[ignore] Amb[asciatore] di Francia Duca d'Estrees, dal quale ricever ogni atto di onorevolezza, e di benignissima cortesia: ne ho voluto portare questo cenno per consolatione di V[ostra] E[minenza] per via di Livorno e Sabato prossimo con il solito dispaccio mi diffondero d'avantaggio, e con tal fine le faccio prof[ondissimo] inchino*.'

perspective of the diplomats themselves.'[93] Perhaps, since ceremonies were well known, ambassadors rarely felt the need to describe them. In a rare, if not singular, example, Sacchetti described his visit to Cardinal Medici in some detail.[94] Occasionally Sacchetti did mention some aspect of usual practice in the court of Rome. For instance, the pope gave audience to all the ambassadors on a Friday, although it is not clear whether this was a weekly occurrence or less often and regular. The day can be deduced from the fact that Sacchetti wrote to the Grand Master every Saturday and a number of his letters bear the words: 'Yesterday, at the ordinary audience'.[95] Ambassadors were given an audience together with the cardinals at an allotted time and issues presented after the ceremony of the kissing of the feet, as the following letter attests:

Yesterday morning, the Pope gave the ordinary audience to the ambassadors. I went to His Holiness at the assigned time, to whom, after the kissing of the feet, I presented my plea.[96]

For more urgent matters, Sacchetti asked for an extraordinary audience with the Pope, particularly if a case seemed to be dragging unnecessarily or when Sacchetti received a letter from the Grand Master addressed to the Pope. Thus in 1699 Sacchetti complained of procrastination in the various congregations, especially the Holy Office, and asked for an extraordinary audience: 'Seeing the procrastination in the execution of pending cases, especially in those appertaining to the Tribunal of the Holy Office, I have asked for an extraordinary audience with His Holiness'.[97] As Visceglia states 'Whenever controversies became particularly bitter, the pope himself preferred to speak directly to the diplomatic representatives of the powers concerned, assisted by a few trusted advisers.'[98]

---

[93] W. Roosen, 'The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV', 311.
[94] This work Chapter 1.
[95] For instance: AOM 1298, f.54v, 29 April 1684: '*Nella mia udienza ordinaria di hieri presentai a Nostro Signore*'. AOM 1303, 419r, 31 December 1689: '*Presentai nell'udienza d'hieri a' Sua Santita un memoriale sopra l'Indulgenze*'.
[96] AOM 1298, f.58r, 8 May 1683: '*Hieri mattina il Papa diede l'udienza ordinaria a gli Amb[asciato]ri. Io mi portai all ora assegnatami dalla Santita Sua, alla quale, doppo il bacio del piede, feci instanza*'.
[97] AOM 1311, f.53v, 7 March 1699: '*Vedendo che la prosecuzione de negotij pendent si va procrastinando, particolarm[ent]e quelli, che sono nel Tribunale del Sant'Off[ic]o, ho domandata un udienza straordinaria a N[ost]ro S[ignore]*'.
[98] Marco Pellegrini, 'Pope and Cardinals in the Age of Alexander VI', *Court and Politics in Papal Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 27-28.

The other occasion where Sacchetti pleaded for an extraordinary audience was when a case was too pressing to follow the usual channels. For instance, in 1709 Grand Master Perellos was troubled with two particular cases: the loss of property in the Spanish Netherlands due to the War of the Spanish Succession and the Emperor wanting to nominate the next Prior of Bohemia. The Grand Master asked Sacchetti on 13 April to plead for an audience with the Pope in order to implore the His Holiness' protection.[99] Due to various church functions, the private audience was long in coming, but it did materialise on 15 May.[100] When dealing directly with the Pope, as with any other sovereign, diplomacy happened within formal and official meetings. However, most of the work of the diplomat, whether with courtiers in secular courts or their equivalent in the shape of cardinals and monsignors in the religious one, was done 'outside the official context of ceremonial encounters.'[101]

This however needs some qualification. Though there is good reason to believe that diplomacy was as active, if not more, during unofficial visits and encounters, it does not follow that these visits, no matter how unofficial they were, were not themselves ruled by unspoken rules of etiquette that in themselves were part of the ceremonial that governed political life in the early modern period. Although these semi-official visits are seldom described by the diplomats themselves, the words used imply an undercurrent of established manners. For instance, on 29 May 1700, the ambassador for Venice visited Sacchetti to speak about the procurement of wood that the Order needed for its galleys. Sacchetti describes the encounter thus:

> On occasion that last Tuesday Signor Ambassador of Venice came to render me a visit, he told me that Receiver Marini had solicited the Serene Republic for wood to be used for the Squadron of Your Eminence, the said [Republic] promptly accommodated him without taking any payment of any sort.[102]

The term '*congiuntura'*, translated as 'occasion', could easily mean chance meeting as much as a planned encounter. The visit was not a formal one, otherwise, the ambassador of Venice would have first sent one of his gentlemen, 'according to the

---

[99] AOM 1321, f.83v, 18 May 1709.
[100] AOM 1321, f.103r, 25 May 1709.
[101] Nathalie Rivère de Carles, *Early Modern Diplomacy, Theatre and Soft Power. The Making of Peace, Early Modern Literature in History* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 17.
[102] AOM 1311, f.262r, 29 May 1700: '*In cong[iuntur]a che Martedi passato il S[ignor] Amb[asciatore]di Venezia venn[e] a rendermi la visita, mi disse che havendo il Ricev[ito]re Marini fatta istanza alla Ser[enissima] Rep[ublica] di legname per sevizio della Squadra di V[ostra] E[minenza], la medisima gli l'haveva prontam[ent]e accordata senza pagamento di sorte alcuna.*'

usage of this court', as Sacchetti had said on other occasions.[103] Two examples should suffice here, with the first one being the exception that proves the rule. In a litigation between the Bishop of Albenga and the Commendatore Fra Francesco Grimaldi over the nomination of the curate of the commandery church, Sacchetti sought the help of Cardinal Colonna. In his own words: 'And I did not send my *gentilhuomo*, according to the usage of this Court, but went to him in person.'[104] On another occasion, more of a formality than for the purpose of conducting negotiations, Sacchetti did send one of his valets:

With the arrival of the Count of Castlemaine, Ambassador of the King of England, in this Court, I have sent my *gentilhuomo* to welcome him, as the Sacred College and all the other ministers of Princes have done. He greatly appreciated it and sent a *gentilhuomo* of his. Once he makes his public entrance and has his first audience with the Pope, since he has only privately met Signor Cardinal Howard, and when visits to the Sacred College begin, I will not refrain from sending my services in conformity with the usage of this Court, and in his good time, I will visit him.[105]

Established rules of protocol thus ensured the smooth running of affairs. Once a rule was established, the actors would not be forced to struggle for precedence for the sake of saving face. Protocol thus acted as lubricant for the cogs in the diplomatic machinery. The drawback was that unawareness or wilful ignoring of even one of the minute rules could easily result in stalling communications.

Sacchetti had to deal with such a situation that arose between the Order's ambassador and the Papal Nunzio in Paris. Sacchetti recounts the case to the Grand Master:

Some months ago, Signor Cardinal Cibo asked me to write to the Venerable Bali d'Hauteville to visit Monsignor Nuncio Ranucci, adding that he [the Bali] had avoided it due to some reason of precedence. I wrote on this question to the Venerable Bali, who replied with a letter dated 20 June. This I believed was the end of the matter. Some days ago, the Secretary of Signor Cardinal Cibo sent for Secretary Mancini [Sacchetti's secretary] and told him that the Venerable Bali refused to make the said

---

[103] AOM 1298, f.84r, 19 June 1683.
[104] AOM 1298, f.84r, 19 June 1683: '*Et non ho mandato il mio Gentilhuomo, secondo l'usanza di questa Corte, ma son[o] andato in persona*.'
105 ASMOM, Archivio dell'Ambasciata presso la Santa Sede , Sacchetti, DP3, 5AB, fasciclo 13 1686: '*Essendo arrivato in q[ue]sta Corte il Conte di Castelmene Amb[asciato]re p[er] il Re d'Inghilterra, io come anche hanno fatto il Sag[r]o Colleg[i]o; e questi altri ministrij de Prinicipi ho mandato un mio gentilh[uom]o a dargli il ben venuto, il che e' stato da egli benegnamente gradito, e me ne ha mandato a' ringratia p[er] un suo Gentilhuomo, doppo che, egli haveva fatto il suo ingresso pubblico e sara ammesso all p[ri]ma udienza pub[li]ca dal Papa, gia che fin'ora non vi e' stato che privatemente con il Sig[nor]e Card[ina]le Houvart, e che principera' le visite al Sac[r]o Collegio io non tralasciero di mandarsi a' servile con conforme l'uso di q[ue]sta Corte, et a' suo tempo vi faro' visita.*'

visit as he did not want to take the left hand of the aforementioned Prelate. However, according to [the Nuncio's] instructions, you will find that his predecessors had never offered their right hand when in their own residence to the ambassadors of Your Eminence. On this matter, Signor Cardinal Cibo consulted Monsignor Bargellini, who had served for a long time in that Nunciature. This Prelate referred to when, during his time, the Grand Prior de Souvre had visited, and he had taken his left hand. Upon this, Signor Cardinal Cibo asked me to write to Your Eminence, if it would be Your pleasure to command the said Venerable Bali to visit His Holiness' Nuncio as he should do without any more needless procrastination.[106]

It is unclear whether the Bali was aware that the Nunzio was bound by official protocol to offer his left hand or not. Several aspects stand out however, that reveal much of the early diplomatic world. Throughout, the official channels were followed. The Nunzio complained to the Secretary of State and the latter consulted with the Order's ambassador, not directly with the Grand Master. Sacchetti meanwhile, having already communicated with the Bali on the matter, thought it prudent to revert to the Grand Master rather than risk another altercation on precedence with the Bali himself, who would have undoubtedly taken umbrage at being commanded by a fellow ambassador and inferior to him within the Order's hierarchy, since Sacchetti was not a Bali. As regards the matter of precedence, the importance given to detail is evident. The Bali was willing to sour relations with the Holy See rather than suffer what he considered to be the humiliation of taking the Nunzio's left hand.

Thus, although two sides of the same coin, protocol and precedence could give rise to conflicts. The establishment of rules had served to curb constant bickering over primacy, but a certain sense of grandeur still reigned within the nobility. As ambassadors, they sought to depict the honour of their sovereign, but as nobles the

---

[106] AOM 1300, f.47rv, 31 March 1685: '*Molti mesi vi sono mi parlo il S[ignor] Card[ina]le Cybo incaricandomi di scrivere al V[eneran]do Balio d'Hautefeuille di voler fare la visita a quell Monsig[nor]e Nuntio Ranucci, soggiungendomi che quello sfuggiva di farla per Causa di qualche precedenza, Io scrissi sopra di cio al sudo V[eneran]do Balio, quale mi rispose con sua lettera della 20 Giugno prossimo passato, copia della quale mando annessa all' E[minenza] V[ostra], con che io credevo, che questo fosse un affare terminato. Dal giorni sono il Segretario del S[ignor] Card[ina]le Cybo mando a chiamare il segretario Mancini, et gli disse, che il sudo V[eneran]do Balio ripugnava di far la detta visita p[er] non prendersi la mano manca in casa del sud[ett]o Prelato, quale trovava nelle sue Instruttioni, che li suoi Predecessori non avevano dato p[er] il passato la mano destra in propria Casa alli Ambasciatori di V[ostra] Eminenza], sopra di che il mede[si]mo S[ignor] Card[ina]le ne ha fatto domandare le notitie a questo Monsig[nor]e Bargellini, il quale ha essercitato p[er] un longo tempo quella Nunciatura, e questo Prelato ha riferito che in suo tempo fu' visitato dal fu' Gran Priore de Souvre, e che si era preso la mano manca. Su la quale relatione il S[ignor] Card[ina]le mi ha fatto far istanza, ch'io scriva a' V[ostra] E[mineza], accio si compiaccia ordinare al sud[ett]o V[eneran]do Balio di visitare il Nontio di Sua Santita' come deve senza piu' lungo indugio.*'

glory of their Houses still ranked high. Ceremonials, whether perceived as foolish foppishness or necessary ritual, are a window on early modern diplomacy. The intrinsic interest in ceremonials lies in the fact that present day diplomatic protocol was forged during this time. Their implicatons goes further than that. Ceremonials are a window not only on the manner of enacting diplomacy but also on the mindset of its actors.

8.4 Conclusion

This chapter brought together two aspects of early modern diplomacy; patronage and ceremonials. Both were integral aspects on the matter and manner of diplomacy. In a sense, patronage and ceremonials are intimately linked because they were the medium through which diplomacy was conducted. It was through patrons that an ambassador sought to achieve what his sovereign demanded of him. Ceremonials could seem like an extra burden on the ambassador, but in fact they served to make his life easier by offering a set of rules to follow, allowing him to bear himself with dignity without fear of losing face and denigrating the prince he represented. Even today, 'public occasions present the most testing times', which is where ceremonial is best appreciated.[107] Like all capital cities, Rome had its own structures to deal with ambassadors and placate their rivalries. They did not always work and squabbles did ensue. When rifts occurred, connections could be appealed to to cement them. Without the cement of connections and the sauce of ceremonials, the early modern diplomatic world would have sank into a bleak landscape of aristocratic anarchy.

[107] Dictionary of Diplomacy, 303.

Chapter 9 Art, Cult and Confessors

'The more the Protestants preached against outward show in the churches, the more eager did the Roman Church become to enlist the power of the artist.'[1]

9.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to explore Sacchetti's role in procuring works of art and permissions for religious devotions to accommodate his Grand Master's desires. To achieve this, a background to religion and the impact of the Protestant Reformation on the Church is first given. This brief overview serves to give a framework that helps to understand better the manner in which the Hospital tried to maintain its religious obligations as an Order of the Church. This then leads to the link between art and cultic devotions, such as veneration of saints and relics, in post-Tridentine Catholicism. Trent had sought to cleanse the Church from abuses and accretions in this sector and had instituted the Congregation of Rites to do this, whose functions will be seen in this chapter. Sacchetti had to deal with this Congregation whenever he received a request linked with worship from his Grand Master. There were several throughout his career treated elsewhere in this dissertation, as for instance, the case of the chapel at Ricasoli.[2] The case studies that will be discussed were chosen specifically because they deal with aspects that the Council of Trent had legislated upon and they best show the ambassador's role in such matters.

9.2 Background

Although the seventeenth century is hailed as the century of the intellectual and scientific revolution, it does not follow that religion had lost its hold over society. The scientific way of thinking had its roots embedded in the Renaissance if not before, but its progress was slow and evolutionary rather than rapid and revolutionary, in the latter's strict definition of a radical overturning. As Munck aptly states 'Religion provided a universal mode of thinking and of expression which pervaded all aspects of life in seventeenth-century Europe.'[3] Four religious views rubbed shoulders, and very often clashed swords, during the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth

---

[1] E.H. Gombrich, *The Story of Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951), 326.
[2] This work, Chapter 5.
[3] Thomas Munck, *Seventeenth-Century Europe. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598-1700* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 287.

century. Predominantly there was the Christian-Muslim divide, with both religions having their own internal divisions. Christianity had experienced its first schism in 1054, dividing Western and Eastern Christianity into Latin and Orthodox. The Church's attitude towards its Orthodox brethren during the sixteenth and early seventeenth century has been treated elsewhere in this dissertation.[4] There was then the upheaval from the North when Martin Luther's critique sparked the Reformation and the reaction from the Latin Church, which reaction became descriptive of the Church's efforts towards spiritual reform – the Counter-Reformation of the Roman Catholic Church. Luther's criticism had rung too true and too deep to ignore.[5] This does not mean that the Church had been in total oblivion before Luther hammered home his criticism, as even Lutheran historians 'conceded that Catholic renewal predated the first stirrings of Protestantism.'[6] For instance, Erasmus, though not an iconoclast, had rebuked in harsher terms than Trent 'all pictorial deviations from Scripture'.[7]

One of the aims of the post-Tridentine Church was to 'eradicate superstition, to police the boundaries between sacred and secular more tightly, and to intensify the interior faith and moral fervour of the laity.'[8] The Church's aim was to cleanse genuine devotion from all profane accretions with which ignorance and misdirected zeal had cluttered Catholicism throughout history. This reforming project tried to tackle all levels of the faith, from the religious education of priests and faithful to their manifestations of it. The Council of Trent sought to legislate on various themes such as prayer, the celebration of feast days, works of sacred art and the veneration of relics, even for religious orders and their churches that hitherto had been exempt from the bishops' authority:

Moreover, in the invocation of saints, the veneration of relics, and the sacred use of images, every superstition shall be removed, all filthy lucre be abolished; finally, all lasciviousness be avoided; in such wise that figures shall not be painted or adorned with a beauty exciting to lust; nor the celebration of the saints, and the visitation of

---

[4] This work, Chapter 7.
[5] Luther was not completely against the use of images to educate the illiterate. See Peter Burke, 'Popular Religion', *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Reformation*, Hans S. Hillebrand (ed.), vol. 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 297.
[6] Mary Laven, 'Encountering the Counter-Reformation', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 59: 3 (2006), 707.
[7] Erwin Panofsky, 'Erasmus and the Visual Arts', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 32 (1969), 211.
[8] Alexandra Walsham, 'The Reformation and "The Disenchantment of the World' Reassessed", *The Historical Journal*, 51: 2 (2008), 501. See also, John O'Malley, *Trent and all That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (London: Harvard University Press, 2000), 18.

relics be by any perverted into revellings and drunkenness; as if festivals are celebrated to the honour of the saints by luxury and wantonness.[9]

The policing and the enforcement of this edict was to be done by the bishops. Trent invested more power in the bishops, something which religious orders begrudged. After Trent, placing a new image for veneration, revering a new relic and acknowledging new miracles had to be authorised by the bishop, after consultation with theologians, and with the Pope himself when there was room for doubt.[10] Luther's sharp criticism, which had sparked off the Council of Trent, had made the Church seek to establish uniformity not only in the tenets of belief but also in how these tenets were to be expressed. A particularly sensitive area was the cult of saints. Luther had brushed off the invocation of saints as 'one of the abuses of the Antichrist' adding that 'the Mass itself and anything that proceeds from it' could not be accepted as it contaminated the holy sacrament.[11]

Of course, such a lunge at what the Church held so sacred – the cult of saints and the mass as its highest form of worship had to be parried. But there was an element of truth in many of Luther's accusations. It was for this reason that in his bull *Immensa Aeterni Dei* (1588) Pope Sixtus V (r. 1585-1590) instituted fifteen Congregations in order to organise better the administration of Church affairs.[12] The Congregation of Rites was one such department. The main function of this Congregation was to encourage uniformity of worship, especially concerning the cult of saints and the use of images and relics. Rome tightened the restrictions and created a body to deal with queries. Basically, anything linked to liturgy, worship and sacred imagery had to be approved. This held for churches and chapels belonging to Orders of the Church as well. Military-religious Orders were no exception. The Grand Master had to make use of his ambassador in Rome when such business arose. It was the jurisdiction of yet another Congregation and had to be treated as such. What Sacchetti could offer, more perhaps than his predecessors, was that he moved equally comfortably in Cardinals'

---

[9] J. Waterworth (ed.), 'The Council of Trent', 'The Twenty-Fifth Session', *The canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent* (London: Dolman, 1848), 232-89.
[10] J. Waterworth (ed.), 'The Council of Trent', 'The Twenty-Fifth Session', 232-89.
[11] Martin Luther, *The Smalcald Articles*. Article II, Of the Mass, 1537.
[12] Peter Guilday, 'The Sacred Congregation De Propaganda Fide (1622-1922)', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 6: 4 (1921), 479.

courts as much as in artists' studios. The Sacchetti family had already made a name as art patrons and was not without political influence.

9.3 Art

The Sacchetti family was well connected with the artistic world so the younger Marcello was born into an established reputation. Marquis Marcello Sacchetti senior, the ambassador's uncle, was 'the family's most knowledgeable member in matters of art' who was committed to art patronage not only due to his position as Depositary General and Secret Treasurer of the Apostolic Chamber but also out of a genuine love for art.[13] In fact, he did not seek to patronize already established masters, as favoured by the other Roman nobility. Marcello senior looked out for artists with great potential and helped them build fame through his recommendations.[14] An artist he fervently promoted was Pietro da Cortona (1596/97-1669). There are different versions of how the two met but it is certain that by 1624 Cortona had become a favourite of the Sacchetti family.[15] The art patronage of the elder Marcello and other family members has been well researched, notably by Lilian H. Zirpolo and Sergio Guarino. However, Fra Marcello Sacchetti had largely been ignored by art historians, as Keith Sciberras points out, 'the Ambassador Marcello Sacchetti' should be seen 'as an important Roman patron of the Late Baroque'.[16]

Sacchetti was neither the first nor the only ambassador to serve the Order as art procurer. Indeed, diplomats acting as procurers of art and luxury goods were not peculiar to the Order. Jeremy Black highlights Paris and Rome as 'cultural centres', where ambassadors could furnish their monarchs with 'opulent and high quality goods', much desired by rulers in their bid for personal 'prestige linked to the conspicuous display of cultural patronage.'[17] Italy had long been a happy hunting ground for ambassadors seeking to obtain works of art for their sovereigns. Spanish ambassadors to Charles V and Philip II had 'negotiated commissions and prices with

---

[13] Lilian H. Zirpolo, *Ave Papa Ave Papabile: The Sacchetti Family, Their Art Patronage, and Political Aspirations* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2005), 1, 55.
[14] L. Zirpolo, *Ave Papa Ave Papabile*, 55.
[15] L. Zirpolo, *Ave Papa Ave Papabile*, 56.
[16] Keith Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture for the Knights of Malta* (Malta: Midsea Books, 2012), 80.
[17] Jeremy Black, *A History of Diplomacy* (London: Reaktion Books, 2010), 69-70.

the master [Titian] for over thirty years'.[18] Grand Masters seem to have started emulating this trend, at least in Rome, during the Cotoner magistracy with ambassadors Fra Francisque de Seytres-Caumons and continued with Fra Marc' Antonio Verospi.[19] The list of invaluable works of art in which Sacchetti was involved is impressive. Sciberras highlights the following:

> the monumental *Baptism of Christ*, the great reliquary of St John the Baptist, the high altar of St John's and that of the Oratory, and the monuments to Nicolas Cotoner, Gregorio Carafa and Ramon Perellos.[20]

Equally impressive is the list of artists he managed to engage; Domenico Guidi, Giovanni Battista Contini, Girolamo Lucenti, Ciro Ferri, Giuseppe Mazzuoli and Giovanni Giardini.[21]

The ambassador's role, however, was not only a matter of finding the right artist. He had to seek and obtain the necessary permits from the Congregation of Rites. For instance, an extraordinary audience with Pope Innocent XII was requested so that Sacchetti could present the Grand Master's desire to place a bust of the said Pope on the façade of the church of Our Lady of Victory in Valletta:

> I will ask His Holiness for another audience to present to him, and plead in the said meeting on behalf of the latest profusion of sentiments of Your Eminence, full of esteem, reverence and gratitude, presenting him with the decision taken by Your Eminence and his Venerable Council to prolong the memory of the obligations that the Religion bears, to place an effigy of His Holiness in the church of Our Lady of Victory, in a bronze bust *al naturale*, for which work I put forward, as requested by Your Eminence, the most excellent *virtuoso* of artists.[22]

By careful comparison of style and other creations, notably a similar bust of the same pope in Santa Cecilia in Trastevere, Rome, the work in question is convincingly attributed to Giuseppe Mazzuoli (1644-1725) by Keith Sciberras.[23] But whereas Sacchetti mentions the plea for the bronze bust, he is strangely taciturn as regards

---

[18] Michael J. Levin, *Agents of Empire: Spanish Ambassadors in Sixteenth-Century Italy* (London, Cornell University Press, 2005) 183-184.
[19] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 78.
[20] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 78.
[21] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 78-79.
[22] AOM 1311, f.29v-30r, 31 January 1699: '*domandero a N[ost]ro S[ignore]e un' altra Udienza per rendergliele, e suppplico in tal cong[iuntur]a ad una nuova esaggerat[io]ne de sentimenti di V[ostra E[minenz]a pieni di stima, riverenza, e gratitudini dandogli li parte della deliberat[io]ne presa da V[ostra E[minenz]a; e dal d[ett]o suo Ven[erabil]e Consiglio per eternare la memoria degli obblighi, che tutta la Religione gli conserva, far collocare nella chiesa della Madonna Sant[issi]ma della Vittoria l'Effigie della San[ti]ta Sua in un Busto di bronzo al naturale, alla qual'opera o ordinato che secondo il prescrittoni dal V[ostra E[minenz]a si ponga mano dal piu Ecc[ellen]te; e virtuoso di q[ue]sti Artefici*.'
[23] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 79.

permissions in the case of the monumental Baptism of Christ that adorns the high altar of the conventual church.

The case of the Baptism of Christ is a curious one. Considering the fact that Sacchetti had monitored the whole process, from the arrival of Lorenzo Gafa in Rome to the packaging and shipping of the work, his letters do not mention any pleas taken up with the Congregation of Rites. Pascoli mentions that when the work was in progress, Pope Clement XI paid an official visit 'with several cardinals, the marquis [sic] Sacchetti then ambassador of Malta, and other knights, and prelates in train.'[24] Such a visit proves that the work had papal approval, but whether a papal visit could replace an official declaration by the Congregation of Rites is not known. It also creates another problem. In his correspondence with Grand Master Perellos, Sacchetti strangely failed to mention the papal visit, a fact noted by Sciberras as well, since this would have been 'an occasion which was surely of prestige and which somewhat crowned Sacchetti's handling of the commission.'[25] Paradoxically, the rest of the chequered story of the Baptism of Christ is well documented. The project was first entrusted to Melchiorre Gafa (1635-1667) in 1666, 'to provide designs for the high altar niche of the conventual church.'[26] Fra Francisque de Seytres-Caumons, then ambassador of the Order in Rome, commissioned Melchiorre in the Order's name and paid him fifty *doppie*. Pisani interprets Seytres-Caumons' words as boasting of having made a bargain: 'The Ambassador boasted that he had paid him fifty *doppie* for work which was worth a hundred'.[27] However it seems more plausible to consider this as a part payment to alleviate the expenses that Melchiorre had already incurred:

I have caused the said architect to be paid fifty *doppie* in acknowledgment of his efforts and expenses, since he told me that he had already spent around a hundred *doppie*. So I believe that I have not erred in my honourable servitude to Your Eminence and His Holy Religion.[28]

---

[24] Lione Pascoli, *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori, ed Architetti Moderni*, vol II (Rome, 1736), 485.
[25] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque* Sculpture', 146.
[26] Moira Pisani, 'Melchiorre Gafa's *Discorso* about the Designs and Models for the Main Altar of St John's Co-Cathedral, Valletta', 11. Retrieved from https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/handle/123456789/40118 on 29 June 2020.
[27] M. Pisani, 'Melchiorre Gafa's *Discorso*', 11.
[28] AOM 1284, f.143r, 22 August 1665: '*Al med[esi]mo Architetto ho fatto pagare dopp[i]e cinquanta p[er] recognit[io]ne di fatighe e spese giache me ha detto haver spesi circa cento d[opp]I, onde credero non haver fatto errore p[er] il hon[or] servi[ti]o di v[ostra] em[inenz]a e Sua S[acra] Rel[igio]ne.*'

The original plan was to have full scale models in clay from which a mould would be produced and the figures cast in bronze.[29] The tragic death of the artist spelt the shelving of the project until 1693 when a design which included silver statues were chosen. Not much enthusiasm was shown though, and the project was again suspended, to be picked up again three years later. It was only in 1699 that Perellos fired up the Council and formed a new Commission that was to manage the project.[30] The artist was now Lorenzo, Melchiorre's younger brother.[31] Lorenzo met Sacchetti on Wednesday 17 June, the artist arriving 'with the post-chaise from Naples', bearing the Grand Master's letter to Sacchetti.[32] The project for the main altar was to restart in earnest. Sacchetti replied that once the designs, measurements and other instructions arrived from Naples, he would have 'one of the most famous sculptors of this city'.[33]

It is of particular interest that there was no interference in the choice of the artist from the Grand Master and the Council, nor from the Commission appointed on purpose to supervise the project. Sciberras underlines this but interprets Sacchetti as stating that Gafa would help him in choosing the artist: 'the choice of the sculptor, in this case Mazzuoli, was left entirely in the hands of Sacchetti and Gafa.'[34] It seems more probable that Sacchetti had already made his choice and that Gafa would assist the chosen artist in the execution of the work, not help Sacchetti in choosing the artist: 'and start the work and perfection of the ornaments with the assistance of the said Caffa, by one of the most famous sculptors of the city'.[35] The fact that Sacchetti does not mention Mazzuoli by name does not imply that he had not yet chosen the artist. Mazzuoli is not mentioned in Sacchetti's subsequent letters when the work was well underway. Nor is he mentioned in connection with the bronze bust. Which raises another important question. If, as Sciberras claims, the bronze bust of Pope Innocent XII is the work of Mazzuoli, then Sacchetti would have already been familiar with the

---

[29] M. Pisani, 'Melchiorre Gafa's *Discorso*', 11.
[30] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 140.
[31] M. Pisani, 'Melchiorre Gafa's *Discorso*', 11.
[32] AOM 1311, f.95v, 20 June 1699, '*Mercoledi della cadente settimana arrive qua col Procaccio di Napoli l'Architetto Lorenzo Caffa e mirese la benigniss[im]a di V[ostra] Emininza]'*
[33] *AOM 1311, f.95v, 20 June 1699, 'e subito che i Disegni, misure, ed altre Istruttioni, che il med[esim]o Caffa ha imbarcate in Napoli dentro alcune casse, saranno pervenute, non manchero di secondasi la premura di V[ostra] Emininza] con farle Immediatam[ent]e dar principio all'opera, e perfezione degli ornamenti coll'assistenza del presato Caffa, da uno de piu famosi scultori questa Citta*'.
[34] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 143.
[35] AOM 1311, f.95v, 20 June 1699. '*e dar principio all'opera, e perfezione degli ornamenti coll'assistenza del presato Caffa, da uno de piu famosi scultori di questa Citta*'.

artist since the bust was ready to be packed and sent to Malta around 6 July 1699.[36]

Meanwhile, the preliminary work on the *Baptism* proceeded. By 18 July, the place where the models in actual size were to be made, had been found.[37] Sciberras interprets this as Sacchetti had 'secured a sculptor to execute the work within a couple of days', that is, considering the term '*luogo'* – place, as referring to an artist's studio. Yet this can possibly just be taken literally. If, as argued, Sacchetti had already made his choice, then the word could simply refer to the actual premises where the artist could work on the large-scale models: 'a place has been acquired where to shape the models in large scale'.[38] Sacchetti also uses the verb '*preso*' – acquired, rather than '*trovato*' – found. There is no information on where Mazzuoli worked or the size of his workshop. The sheer magnitude of the *Baptism* would require considerable space and apertures large enough to facilitate access of large stones and the exit of finished statues. Once a space had been secured, the stones were quickly procured as Sacchetti wrote on 25 July: 'Your Eminence can rest assured that everything is proceeding with due diligence and attention'.[39] The concerned parties agreed on the price of the marble by 8 August.[40] There followed a steady flow of correspondence between Grand Master and ambassador, evidence of the enthusiasm Perellos had for the project and Sacchetti's diligence in monitoring the work every step of the way.[41] No updates are mentioned until Gafa is ready to return to Malta. Sacchetti's letter preceded the artist, praising him for his diligence and loyalty.[42] Perellos did not disdain this recommendation and promised to support Gafa.[43] Interestingly, it is not solely for the artist's sake that this promise is made, but 'to show you the esteem [in which] we hold your recommendations.'[44] The ambassador's task did not end with the execution of

---

[36] AOM 1311, f.101r, 4 July 1699: '*Essendo perfezionato il Busto di bronzo al naturale di N[ost]ro Sig[nor]e li o fatto incassare ed il primo giorno dell' entrante settimana si fara imballare per incaminarlo immediatam[en]te a cod[est]a volta per via di Napoli*'.
[37] AOM 1311, f.108v, 18 July 1699.
[38] AOM 1311, f.108v, 18 July 1699: '*e' stato preso il luogo per formare I Modelli in grande.'*
[39] *AOM 1311, f.116v, 25 July 1699: 'essendosi fatta la scelta delle Pietre necessarie e pero l' E[mminenza V[ostra] resta persuasa che si proseguira con tutto diligenza*'.
[40] AOM 1311, f.123r, 8 August 1699: '*L'opera commessa dell'ornamento di cod[est]o Altare Magg[iore] si tira con ogni attenzione avanti essendosi stabilita il prezzo delle pietre*'.
[41] AOM 1461, f.59v, 14 May 1700, where Perellos insisted on 'working incessantly' (*fate che si travagli incessantamente*), AOM 1461, f.62v, 23 May 1700, and AOM 1311, f.137r, 3 October 1699.
[42] AOM 1311, f.310r, 21 September 1700. This work, Chapter 8.
[43] AOM 1461, f.167r, 17 November 1700.
[44] AOM 1461, f.167r, 17 November 1700: '*di darvi a conoscere la stima che facciamo delle vostre intercessioni*.'

the work though. He had to oversee the financial side once instructions from the Procurators of the Common Treasury arrived.[45] There was also the business of obtaining the licence allowing the statues to be exported.[46] This document, dated 23 April 1703, still exists and is housed in the State Archives in Rome, as cited by Sciberras.[47] Sacchetti had also seen to the secure packing and loading of the marble statues, a task which seemed to have been fraught with difficulties. Sacchetti was of the opinion of hiring a *tartana* that would sail down the river to Civitavecchia and hence to Malta.[48] This avoided dangerous loading and unloading from the *tartana* onto the galleys and took advantage of the *tartana*'s wider deck. Perellos seems to have insisted on the galleys which were, not only unsuitable for the purpose due to their sleek built, but also arrived late and delayed the transport to Malta by a month.[49] In fact, it was the *tartana* that did the carrying, with the nimble galleys providing security as guards. The small convoy finally reached Malta on 1 July 1703.[50] The ambassador had played a crucial role from beginning to end.

Another object of both devotion and art in which the ambassador in Rome was involved in was the reliquary built to house the right hand of the Order's patron. The crown of the Order's collection of relics, this was considered as the hand that had baptised Christ. Sultan Bayezid II had given the relic to the Order in 1484. According to Bosio, in 1482 the Sultan was desirous of showing his good will to Grand Master D'Aubusson. He had been assured by his Basha that 'the most precious, the most gratifying thing he could send, was the right hand of St John the Baptist, which had been worthy of baptising the Saviour of the World.'[51] Bosio lavishly describes the reliquary as made of 'ivory, gold and jewels, with various figures and ornate work, and the clearest of crystals in such a way that the holiest Hand could well be seen.'[52] Two centuries later, Grand Master Carafa felt the need to boost devotion towards this important relic. Perhaps inspired by 'the Baroque transformation of the Oratory'[53], an expense borne by Fra Stefano Maria Lomellini, Carafa revealed to the Council his

[45] AOM 1461, f.169v, 17 November 1700.
[46] AOM 1312, f. 40v, 26 February 1701.
[47] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 149.
[48] AOM 1312, f.30r, 12 February 1701.
[49] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 148.
[50] AOM 1464, f.80r, 4 July 1703.
[51] Bosio, Libro Decimoterzo (1629), 479-482.
[52] Bosio, Libro Decimoterzo (1629), 479-482.
[53] K. Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*, 153.

desire to commission a reliquary worthy of such a priceless relic to be placed on the altar of the Oratory.[54]

Sacchetti's involvement in this project was not confined to the procurement of the artifact, and this section will focus on the religious side. The Grand Master's desire for a reliquary was linked with several religious initiatives which his ambassador had to strive to obtain. These initiatives, aimed at spurring religious devotion, surface quite frequently in the correspondence between Grand Master and ambassador. Sacchetti seemed to have been rather vague at his audience with the pope where he first expressed his Prince's desire to celebrate the Translation of the relic with 'all the pomp possible'.[55] The Congregation of Rites conferred the permission of liturgically celebrating the office of St John the Baptist every Wednesday.[56] But Grand Master Carafa wanted to 'enrich the cult of the relic' even more with the 'celestial grace' of indulgences, as wrote Sacchetti on Christmas eve 1689.[57] On 30 December, during the audience with the Pope, Sacchetti presented a writ concerning the indulgences, to which the Pope replied that 'he would willingly concede, but the Grand Master had to tell him on which days he desired them'.[58] During the same audience, Sacchetti presented another document, asking for the celebration of the feast of St John on 5 December with double rites.[59] This time the Pope replied that this was the prerogative of the Congregation of Rites. Sacchetti seemed to have wished to press the matter further but promised to do so when the holiday season was over.[60]

---

[54] AOM 262, *Liber Conciliorum Status*, 1672-1686, f.242v.
[55] AOM 1303, f.158v, 17 July 1688.
[56] AOM 1303, f.183v, 11 September 1688.
[57] AOM 1303, f.418r, 24 December 1689: '*Mercoledi della cadente settimana con un piegheto di staffetta ricevei una benignissima dell' E[minenza] V[ostra] in data delli 2: corr[en]te, e con essa un foglio dettato dalla Pieta dell' E[minenza] V[ostra] desiderosa di arrichire di gratie celestie il Culto della Reliquia del n[ost]ro P[at]rone S. Gio[vanni] Batt[ista]. Communicaro il tutto con il S[ignore] Cardinale Carafa e con le dal lui direttioni ne supllicaro il Papa ad effetto che concorra nel pio desiderio di V[ostra] E[minenza] si concedere le desiderate Indulgenze*.'
[58] AOM 1303, f.419r, 31 December 1689: '*et il Papa mi rispose che l'haverebbe concesso benignam[en]te ma che era necessario, che antecedentem[en]te V[ostra] E[minenza] di dichiaresse li giorni nelli quali le voleva*'.
[59] AOM 1303, 419r, 31 December 1689: '*Gli presentai doppo un altro memorial domandogli l'ufficio sub ritu duplici per il giorno 5 Xmbre da poterli celebrare ogn'anno della Nativita' del Glorioso S. Gio[vanni] Batt[ista] e il Papa mi disse che cio spettava all S[acra] Congregat[io]ne de Riti*'.
[60] AOM 1303, 419r, 31 December 1689: '[unreadable part] *Io haverei pottuto fare le mie instanze, come io faro subito passata li p[rese]nti feriati*'.

9.4 Cult and Confessors

The paradox of how to 'best marry the temporal arms with the spiritual' was omnipresent in the Hospitaller world.[61] Theological debate had not been exhausted during the Middle Ages, when the ideal of physically fighting for Christ emerged. Christianity had always viewed itself as in a continuous spiritual battle against evil but the circumstances of the crusades had taken the battle to a physical plane. The work of St Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153), *In laude novae militiae*, justifying the military order of the Templars had 'sealed the link between warfare and piety', but the debate was far from over.[62] In early modern times, 'the climate of opinion across Europe was far from being unanimously favourable to an institution of religious knights.'[63] The Order continuously sought to emphasize the idea of martyrdom in warfare and in being the image of Christ the healer in their hospitaller mission.[64] In the spirit of the counter-reformation individual knights of a pious disposition sought to assert its religious dimension. Fra Sabba da Castiglione (1480-1554), in his *Ricordi*, presented what amounts to almost a manual for the religious knight. His second entry, after an exhortation on the fear and love of God is in fact that when the apparel of knighthood is not accompanied with good deeds it is a dead religion.[65] Of course, as in any other institution, a number of members strayed from the ideal as can be seen by trials of knights appearing before the Inquisition for a variety of crimes.[66] Grand Masters constantly sought to curb excesses and to promote the religious dimension of the Order. This section presents three case studies , two concerning the promotion of the cult of saints and one dealing with confessors for French knights. The choice of the saints is in itself telling and although in sharp contrast, both somehow are linked to the Order. One achieved sainthood through her life of charity and self-denial within the Order. The others, two early Christian martyrs, were soldiers.

---

[61] AOM1298 f.87r, 15 July 1684: '*ha saputo cosi bene accoppiare le Armi temporali con le spirituali*.'
[62] Emanuel Buttigieg, *Nobility, faith and masculinity the Hospitaller knights of Malta, c.1580-c.1700* (London: Continuum, 2011), 92.
[63] E. Buttigieg, *Nobility, faith and masculinity*, 99.
[64] E. Buttigieg, *Nobility, faith and masculinity*, 96-97.
[65] Sabba da Castiglione, *Ricordi overo Ammaestramenti* (Venice, 1613), Ricordo II, 4: '*L'habito senza l'opere e' una religion morta*.'
[66] E. Buttigieg, *Nobility, faith and masculinity*, 114.

Grand Master Carafa had expressed the desire to obtain permission to celebrate the feasts of the martyrs Saint John and Saint Paul under double rite, in Latin *sub ritu duplici*. In the Catholic tradition, saints' days are ranked according to the importance of the person celebrated. Up to the 1950s, it was a rather complicated affair but it has since been simplified.[67] Orders of the Church could celebrate specific anniversaries of saints who were relevant to the charism of that particular order. The Counter-Reformation had seen 'a revival in saint-making', but due to the Council's insistence on curbing abuses, this revival had to be 'accompanied by increased regulation of the cults of saints.'[68] For instance, in 1696 the Congregation of Rites discussed the 'insertion of saints and blessed in the new Franciscan breviary.'[69] Such observance was allowed after permission from Rome had been granted. In its bid towards uniformity, the Church had published the revised Roman Breviary in 1568 and again a revision of the Roman Ritual in 1614.[70] Deviations from these needed special permission, as the Church sought a balance between uniformity and the diversity of localities and traditions of particular orders.[71] So many saints had accrued in the breviary that what was supposed to be the ferial (daily) office made up of the psalter and biblical readings had become an exception amidst a plethora of hagiographical readings.[72] The saints in this instance, John and Paul were brothers, soldiers in the Roman army who had served under Constantine. When Julian the Apostate (361-3) claimed the throne, the two brothers refused to recant their Christianity and suffered martyrdom by decapitation.[73] The Grand Master's choice here bears a certain parellelism to the image of the valiant Christian knight willing to suffer death for the faith. The feast of the martyrs John and Paul is held on the 26 June. This happpened to be the anniversary of a 'naval victory by the fleets of the Republic of Venice and the Order over the Turks in the Dardanelles.'[74] Gregorio Carafa had been acclaimed

---

[67] http://www.rosarychurch.net/answers/qa101999c.html
[68] Simon Ditchfield, 'Tridentine Worship and the Cult of Saints', *The Cambridge History of Christianity - Reform and Expansion 1500-1660*, R. Po-Chia Hsia (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 6, 206.
[69] Wiktor Gramatowski, 'Il Fondo Liturgico piu antico dell'Archivio della S. Congregazione dei Riti (1588-1700).' *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 13 (1975), 413.
[70] S. Ditchfield, 'Tridentine Worship', 201.
[71] S. Ditchfield, 'Tridentine Worship', 204.
[72] S. Ditchfield, 'Tridentine Worship', 202.
[73] Retrieved on 14 June 2020 from http://www.30giorni.it/articoli_supplemento_id_22131_l3.htm
[74] Giovanni Scarabelli, *Catalogue of the Records of the Order of St John of Jerusalem in the National Library of Malta*, vol 13, Archives 1952-1953 (The *Coeremoniale* and the *Kalendarium*), Culto e Devozione dei Cavalieri a Malta (Rome: 2004), 103-104: '*in ricordo della vittoria navale riportata*

as the hero of this expedition hence its importance for him personally.[75] The Grand Master was thereby commemorating a victory over the 'common enemy', attributing the victory to divine intervention, and glorifying with the crown of martyrdom those who fell in battle. This would serve as propoganda for the Order, stressing the Order's relgious commitment, and also as an inspiration for those engaged in combat in the War of the Holy League (1683-1699) then raging.

The Congregation of Rites did eventually accede to the Grand Master's wishes, but not without some help. In his jubilant letter informing the Grand Master that his request had been granted, Sacchetti praised Monsignor Casale for his support in proposing the request to the Pope:

I have to express to Your Eminence that the secretary of the said Congregation, Monsignor Casale, has favoured us in this business, not only with due diligence and promptness in recommending it to the Pope but also in having brought to me this decree by his own hand, which bears such glorious terms for Your Eminence praising the action and the piety of Your Eminence.[76]

The Congregation of Rites had granted the decree on 4 December.[77] Monsigor Casale had personally taken it to the ambassador. Sacchetti sent a copy to the Grand Master, having planned to make several copies from the original:

I restrict myself in sending only a copy attached of the decree by the Congregation of Rites which it confers to all the Churches of the Religion, whether within the Convent or without, as in all the said diocese, the authorisation to celebrate the day of the glorious Martyrs St John and Paul under double rite: I am not sending the original of this decree to Your Eminence because I thought that, there being no printing press, and having to distribute the news of this concession all over Christendom where there are Churches of the Religion, it is better that I have four hundred copies printed so that Your Eminence can send them anywhere where needed and in the meantime, I will send the original decree to Your Eminence when I send the prints, as without original the printer here cannot make the copies.[78]

---

dalla flotta della Repubblica di Venezia e dell'Ordine stesso contro i Turchi in questa stessa data nel 1656 presso i Dardanelli.'

[75] Biagio Aldimari, *Historia genealogica della famiglia Carafa* (Napoli: 1691), 420-421.

[76] AOM 1298, f.154v, 11 December 1683: '*Non devo tralasciare di rappresentare a V[ostra] E[minenza] che Mons[ignore] Casale segr[etari]o della d[ett]a Cong[regazio]ne ci ha favoriti in questo negotio, non solo con premura e puntualita in proporlo al Papa ma in oltre mi ha portato egli stesso di persona il med[esim]o decr[et]o quale e' concepito con termini gloriosi p[er] V[ostra] E[minenza] esaltando l'attione e la pieta di V[ostra] E[minenza]*.'

[77] G. Scarabelli, *Catalogue*, 103.

[78] AOM 1298 f.154r, 11 December 1683: '*Mi restringo di mandarle annessa una copia del decreto di questa cong[regazio]ne de Riti con il quale si concede tanto a tutte le Chiese della Relig[io]ne e di Convente, e fuori, come a tutta cotesta Diocesi, di potessi celebrare il giorno delli gloriosi Martiri S[an] Giovanni e Paolo sub ritu duplici: Io non mando all E[minenza] V[ostra] l'Originale di esso decreto, perche ho considerato che non essendovi costa stampa, e dovendosi participare la notitia della sud[dett]a concessione per tutta la Christianita dove vi sono Chiese della Rel[igio]ne esser*

According to Scarabelli's catalogue, the decree allowed the Order to celebrate 26 June as a liturgical feast in all the churches in Malta and Gozo and all other churches belonging to the Order. Moreover, mass at the conventual church could be celebrated in the pontifical manner.[79] Grand Master Carafa's efforts at promoting the spiritual aspect of the Order show a rather obsessive concern, perhaps reflecting the spirit of the Counter-Reformation. The manner of exhibiting religious fervour seems also to underline this. The spiritual pleas in Rome are linked to images, indulgences and relics, three aspects that had come under the fire of the Protestant upheaval. The next case deals with another relic, this time of an obscure saint when compared to St John the Baptist, but quite prestigious for the Order.

In a letter to his ambassador in Rome dated 28 August 1683, Grand Master Carafa wrote:

> It seems to us unbecoming that here in the Convent, in our Major Conventual Church of St John, the Saints of our Order are not particularly venerated. We have Saints in various Churches in our commanderies, who are still solicited by the devotion of our Religious.'[80]

To propogate more devotion towards a saint belonging to the Order, the Grand Master and Council decided to acquire a relic and the choice fell on an arm-bone of Santa Toscana. Toscana was born in Zevio, near Verona in Italy around 1280 and married Alberto Canoculi, also from Verona. He seems to have been like minded in matters of spirituality and dedicated their married life to charity. When Alberto died, Toscana sold all her possessions and joined the Hospitaller Order as a nun. She adopted a life of austerity, prayer and caring for the sick poor. Her feast is on 14 July, although the year of her death is uncertain, being either 1343 or 1344.[81] She was interred in the church in the Order's commandery of San Vitale in Verona. The commander at the time of request was General Fra Bernardino della Ciaia, who had been informed of the Grand Master's desire. Vaguely aware that some form of permit was necessary and

---

meglio, che io ne faccia stamapre quattrocento ad effetto che V[ostra] E[minenza] possa farle sparger p[er] tutto, dove bisognera e nello stesso tempo che io mandero le stampe all' E[minenza] V[ostra] le mandero il decr[et]o orign[a]le senza del q[ua]le lo stampatore qua non puo stamparle.'

[79] G. Scarabelli, Catalogue, 104, '*Nella Chiesa Conventuale Maggiore la celebrazione e' in pontificale per Fondazione del Gran Maestro Fra Gregorio Caraffa*.'

[80] AOM 1450, f.147v, 148r, 28 August 1683. '*Parendoci troppo disdicevole, che qua in Conv[en]to nella n[ost]ra Mag[gior]e Chiesa Conv[entua]le di S[an] Gio[vanni]: non siano specialm[en]te venerati i Santi dell' ord[i]ne n[ost]ro, che habb[iam]o in varie Chiese delle n[ost]re Com[men]de e sollecitati ancora dalla devot[io]ne de n[ost]ri Relig[io]si*'.

[81] Retrieved on 13 March 2015 from http://www.smom-za.org/saints/toscana.htm

not wishing to ignore religious obligations, the Grand Master ordered Sacchetti to refer the matter to the relevant Church officials. Carafa was under the impression that a papal brief was required to exhume the body of a saint and transfer a relic to the Order's Conventual church, so he asked the ambassador to plead with the Pope 'in our name'.[82] He had also expressed the desire 'to celebrate on the day the translation of the Saint's relic apart from the celebration of her day of birth with plenary indulgences.'[83] The term 'transfer' ('*translatione*') refers to the removal of a part or the whole object worthy of veneration from one locality to another. In the case of primary relics, such as body parts of saints, the translation was done with all formalities, whereas secondary relics, such as clothing or earthly possessions of the saint demanded less ceremony. It is not clear whether the Grand Master meant to commemorate the translation once or hold an annual celebration on the anniversary of the day when the relic reached Malta. Certainly the relic would have been carried with all the pomp and devotion from the harbour to the conventual church. But an annual celebration would have meant another feast besides the anniversary of her death, which for saints is referred to as 'birth in heaven'. The fact that the Grand Master was also requesting plenary indulgences points more to the celebration being a one off affair. After Trent, the Church was exceptionally cautious about granting indulgences. The Council of Trent had admitted that abuses had crept in and were the cause of much criticism by 'heretics'.[84] Nevertheless, the Grand Master had made his requests. It was up to the ambassador to fire up the bureacratic machinery that throbbed in Papal Rome.

The Grand Master's request was in fact threefold. Firstly there was the actual obtaining of the relic, secondly the celebration of the Saint's feast and thirdly the holding of a second feast on the day of the translation of the relic, complete with plenary indulgences. Sacchetti's strategy led him first to Monsignor Slutio, the Secretary of Briefs. In his elusive way, Monsignor Slutio told the ambassador that there was no need to obtain a papal brief as long as the local bishop granted a licence.[85] Sacchetti informed the Grand Master and also promised to keep the commander

---

[82] AOM 1450, f.147v, 148r, 28 August 1683.
[83] AOM 1298, f.129v 25 September 1683: '*celebrando l'Ufficio della translatione della Santa in quel giorno che cadera oltre del Natalitio con l'Indulgenzi Plenari*'.
[84] Jordan J. Ballor, 'The Council and the Catechism', *Journal of Markets and Morality*, 16: 1 (2013), 400.
[85] AOM 1298 f.129v, 25 September 1683.

concerned informed of any developments.[86] Considering the Order's track record in relations with local bishops, this was not exactly good news.[87] Meanwhile, Sacchetti had another task in hand: the celebration of the translation of the relic with plenary indulgences. The body governing this was the Congregation of Rites and Sacchetti believed that obtaining plenary indulgences for the transfer of the relic was harder than obtaining the relic itself.

Since the post-Tridentine Church had strengthened bishops' status, the Order found itself having to make separate requests; to the Bishop of Verona, Sebastiano Pisani (r.1668-1690) for the transfer of the relic, and to the Congregation of Rites for the celebration of the feast. Regarding the transfer, neither the Bishop nor the city's Proveditors (local district governors) were too keen on it, as Commander della Ciaia informed Sacchetti. The Commander was quite sure that some sort of accord could be reached with the Proveditors, but the Bishop offered harder oppostion. He wanted to lead the ritual of extraction and proffer the licence with his seal.[88] The Commander wanted to foil the Bishop's desire by obtaining a papal brief that would render the Bishop's presence unnecessary, and possibly allow him to lead the ceremony himself. The traditional jealousy resurfaced between bishop and knight each time jurisdiction over a church within the Order's territory arose. Sacchetti did actually enquire about the possibility of such a brief in favour of the commander but was assured that it would be almost impossible to obtain, because the Bishop's claims fell within the bounds of the Tridentine precepts. The commander was told as much, with the promise by the ambassador that he would still attempt to obtain it.[89] The issue came to a standstill as Bishop Pisani, by accident or design, had some buisiness to attend to outside Verona. The commander was quite sure that all hurdles would be removed when the Bishop returned. The ambassador reported this on 1 January 1684, keeping the Grand Master updated on this business.[90] But the absence of the Bishop prolonged the matter. No progress was made, and on 19 February 1684 Sacchetti wrote to the Grand Master

[86] AOM 1298 f.129v, 25 September 1683.
[87] See Francesco Russo, *Un Ordine, una città, una diocesi. La giurisdizione ecclesiastica nel principato monastico di Malta in età moderna (1523-1722)* (Rome: Aracne, 2017).
[88] AOM 1298, f.137r, 23 October 1683.
[89] AOM 1298, f.137v, 23 October 1683.
[90] AOM 1299, f.6v, 1 January 1684.

after informing Commander della Ciaia regarding the brief and enquiries as to the return of Bishop Pisani:

> I wrote again to the Commander della Ciaia, who replied that he is still waiting for the return of Monsignor Bishop to end this case, who I suppose will not find any difficulty after Your Eminence wrote to the Proveditors of the city, so I do not think it necessary to procure an Apostolic Brief which is not easy to obtain, considering that only such a Brief can give authentication to the Relic, which in principle has to be given by the Bishop.[91]

Finally, on 12 August Sacchetti could boast that 'a small box bearing the relic of Saint Toscana addressed to Your Eminence was sent from Verona by Fra Bernardino della Ciaia'.[92] In 1685, the relic was 'placed in a silver arm reliquary emblazoned with the armorial shield of the Grand Master'[93] who had striven so hard to remedy the 'unbecoming' fact that the Religion had led so many to sainthood but no relics of Hospitaller saints graced the conventual church.

This case presents a number of revealing points. The religious dimension immediately stands out. The relic of a Hospitaller saint obviously spelt prestige for the Order and for the Grand Master who obtained it. It could also help boost religious fervour, reminding the brother knights that they were first and foremost religious militants who had chosen to tread the Christian path through the charism of the Order, which they shared with their religious brethren who did not bear arms. Another salient point is that the Church was striving to retain its Tridentine commitment towards the empowerment of bishops. Although the Hospital enjoyed the status endowed to a military order of the Church, the authority of the Bishop of Verona could not be overridden. The bureacratic procedures set up had to be followed, regardless of who was making the request. The Order's privileges were not enough to bypass the officialdom of the Congregation of Rites. The Hospital could not just claim jurisdiction over the body of the saint, in spite of Toscana being a Hospitaller saint

---

[91] AOM 1299, f.33v, 19 February 1684: '*io ne scrisse di nuovo al Com[mendatore] della Ciaia, quale mi rispose, che aspettava il ritorno di quel Mons[ignor] Vescovo per terminare questo affare, il quale suppongo che non trovera difficolta doppo aver scritto l'E[minenza] V[ostra] ai Proveditori della detta citta, con che non stimo necessario di procurare il Brevetto Apostolico quale non e' facile di ottenere, atteso che simil Breve si suol dare piu tosto autentica della Reliqua, che per precetto al Vescovo di darla.*'

[92] AOM 1298, f.102r, 12 August 1684: '*una Cascettina diretta all'E[minenza] V[ostra] con la Reliquia di S[anta] Toscana mandatagli da Verona dal Com[endatore] f[ra] Bernardino della Ciaia*'.

[93] Mario Buhagiar, 'The Treasure of Relics and Reliquaries of the Knights Hospitaller in Malta', *Melitensium Amor. Festschrift in honour of Dun Gwann Azzorpardi*, Toni Cortis, Thomas Freller and Lino Bugeja (eds) (Malta: The Contributors, 2002), 128.

buried in a Hospitaller church on Hospitaller ground. The ambassador had to work through the official channels. When the Grand Master expressed this request Vienna was still under siege by the Ottoman forces. In the same summer, Grand Master Carafa had offered 'prizes and privileges to all the Religious who go to war in Hungary.'[94] Sacchetti's rather baroque compliment on how His Eminence was able to 'marry the temporal arms with the spiritual' did have an element of truth, in the sense that the Grand Master took initiatives to promote the faith.[95] On his part, Sacchetti's strategy in this 'spiritual' request was the same as in any 'temporal' case. His first move was to speak to his contacts, cardinals and monsignors who occupied posts of authority and were friendly towards the Order. He kept a steady correspondence with all parties concerned whilst appealing in person to officials relevant to the case. As in many other cases, the ambassador in Rome remained the fulcrum of all correspondence. In this case, the Grand Master and the commander in Verona corresponded frequently, but the ambassador was made privy of all exchanges. In the end his tenacity paid off and he managed to obtain an outcome favourable for his Order. 'it was hoped of you' wrote the Grand Master in conclusion, 'that we would soon see the end [of the matter], and from having experience of your zeal and solicitude.'[96] The word 'soon' – (*brevemente*), in this case is rather relative. It took a year from the Grand Master's request to his final say on the case when he thanked the ambassador for his diligence. Cases such as this dragged on mainly due to two main factors: the slow rate at which correspondence exchanged hands and a lack of clarity in jurisdiction.

The case of the two Capuchin priests is another instance where the Order's religious interest comes in conflict with different jurisdictions. It surfaces first in Sacchetti's correspondence on 24 October 1682. Two French priests had arrived in Malta some time before to hear the confessions of the knights and novices in the three French *langues*. The Fifth Lateran Council (1512-1517) had tried to deal with the matter of jurisdiction, considering it as the cause of all dissension between the different authorities of the Church:

---

[94] AOM 1298, f.91r, 3 July 1683: '*premij e prerogative a tutti li Religiosi che andaranno guerraggiare in Ungheria*.'
[95] AOM 1298, f.87r, 15 July 1684: '*che ha saputo cosi bene accoppiare le Armi temporali con le spirituali*.'
[96] AOM 1451, f.179v, 3 September 1684: '*si sperava da voi di vederne si brevemente il fine, et l'istessa esperienza noi habb[iam]o p[er] esserci noto v[ost]ro zelo e sollecitud[in]e*.'

We wish to preserve charity and mutual goodwill among bishops, their superiors, prelates and friars, as well as to promote divine worship and the peace and tranquillity of the universal church. We know this can be done only if each preserves as far as possible his own jurisdiction.[97]

But the precepts of the Council were not clear enough to prevent discord. On the matter of confession it stipulated that 'The friars' superiors are bound to specify and present in person to the same prelates the friars whom they have chosen to hear for a time the confessions of the prelate's subjects'[98]. The term prelate refers to 'a dignitary having jurisdiction in external forum by right of his office' and that 'abbots, although not bishops, have had the jurisdiction of a prelate'[99]. But although head of an Order of the Church, it is not clear whether a Grand Master could qualify as 'prelate' since he was not theologically prepared to judge 'the sufficiency of their learning and their other skills relative to this sacrament.'[100] However, according to Sacchetti, the Hospital had obtained permission from the Sacred Congregation of Bishops.[101] But the Inquisitor in Malta had taken offence at this and raised the issue with Cardinal Cibo, then Secretary of State. Since the Inquisition had jurisdiction over the spiritual side even of knights, the Inquisitor expected to have a say in the matter of their confessors. The French Langues would not accept inquisitorial interference and so Sacchetti's orders were to petition Cardinal Cibo in order to obtain confirmation for the grant given by the Sacred Congregation of Regular Bishops. He had prepared a writ to present to Cardinal Cibo. But before doing so, Sacchetti had to heed French claims. He had received letters from the Grand Hospitaller and the Prior of Toulouse, advising him to consult the French ambassador, the Duc d'Estress, in Rome. Advice from such high dignitaries had to be considered. A prior, appointed by the Chapter-General but more often by the Grand Master, governed a cluster of commanderies. They received brethren into the Order and were responsible for sending *responsions* to the Convent.[102] The Grand Hospitaller was 'the over-all head of the hospital organisation'

---

[97] N. P. Tanner (ed.), Fifth Lateran Council – 1512 – 1517, On religious and their privileges, in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* vol I, Norman P. Tanner (ed) (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 644-645.
[98] N. P. Tanner (ed.), Decrees, 645.
[99] Retrieved on 7 September 2020 from https://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/dictionary/index.cfm?id=35737
[100] Retrieved on 7 September 2020 from https://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/dictionary/index.cfm?id=35737
[101] AOM 1297, f.148rv, 24 October 1682.
[102] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *Hospitallers: The History of the Order of St John* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 77.

and was 'one of the highest officials of the Order'.[103] This role was traditionally held by the Pilier (Head) of the Langue of France.[104] Sacchetti figured that before presenting the writ, he would communicate with the French ambassador. The advice Sacchetti was seeking was whether to speak to Cardinal Cibo on the matter or go directly to the Pope. Secretary Mancini was duly sent to the French ambassador. The latter had expected the call as the Grand Hospitaller and the Prior of Toulouse had written to him: 'Those gentlemen have written to me, saying that the Grand Master had commanded his ambassador to petition me'.[105] Sacchetti does not mention meeting the French ambassador in person, but on Monday 26 October he sent the writ to Cardinal Cibo. A copy of this was sent with his regular Saturday letter to the Grand Master. The Secretary of State promised to help but needed time to find certain letters that would help in the case. On being pressed by Secretary Mancini, the Cardinal insisted that he had not yet had time to see the said letters.[106] Some positive feedback from Cardinal Cibo was given by the 14 November, after two more visits by Secretary Mancini, although the Cardinal had not yet written to the Inquisitor about the matter.[107] By 9 January some correspondence must have reached the Inquisitor as Sacchetti wrote that he was glad that the Inquisitor was following the Cardinal's orders.[108] It was not however, the end of the matter. The Grand Master wrote again, insisting on repeating petitions with Cardinal Cibo, for which Secretary Mancini was duly sent.[109] Typical of Sacchetti's insistence, Mancini was again sent to see if the Cardinal had sent the letter. Elusively, the Cardinal answered that he had written the letter the previous Saturday, but refrained from stating whether it had been sent or not.[110] Meanwhile, Sacchetti kept the Grand Hospitaller and the Grand Prior of Toulouse informed, in answer to their queries.[111] Curiously he added that Cardinal Cibo had been very helpful.[112] Although friendly towards the Order, surely in this case there

---

[103] Paul Cassar, *Medical History of Malta* (London: Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 1964), 40.
[104] Alain Blondy, 'Malta and France 1789-1798: The Art of Communicating a Crisis', in *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem*, Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed) (Msida: Mireva, 1993), 660.
[105] AOM 1297, f.148r, 24 October 1682: '*Quelli signori mi hanno scritto, che il sig[nor] Gran Maestro ha dato ordine al suo Amb[asciatore] di farme l'istanza: la quale non riuscendogli*'.
[106] AOM 1297, f.152r, 31 October 1682.
[107] AOM 1297, f.168r, 14 November 1682.
[108] AOM1298, f.8r, 9 January 1683.
[109] AOM1298, f.11r, 30 January 1683.
[110] AOM1298, f.12r, 6 February 1683.
[111] AOM1298, f.12r, 6 February 1683.
[112] AOM1298, f.12v, 6 February 1683.

seemed to have been an element of procrastination. Cardinal Cibo did in fact address the Inquisitor on this, and thus Sacchetti considered it expedient to show the Secretary of State in good light. Well disposed towards the Order, Sacchetti knew that Cardinal Cibo had access to the Pope's ear and would be crucial in ironing out rough spots between Church and Order. The weather must have hindered the exchange of letters. It was on 1 May that Sacchetti received three letters from the Grand Master, with a postscript on the last one dated 7 April by which Sacchetti learnt that the case had come to a satisfactory conclusion: 'at last these Capuchin priests are freely listening to the confessions of these French knights for which I was very concerned considering the time it took'.[113]

9.5 Conclusion

The variegated cases discussed reveal various aspects of the Order's concerns related to art and religion and the part played by the ambassador in Rome in achieving the desired outcome. Art had always been employed by religion, but mostly it had served to instruct those who could not read. But the Reformation, with its vicious attack on images had sparked a reaction and the Catholic Church discovered that art could not only instruct the illiterate, but fill with awe those 'who, perhaps, read too much' and so 'architects, painters and sculptors were called upon to transform churches into grand show-pieces whose splendour and vision nearly swept you off your feet.'[114] The nobility of Europe were also easily seduced by this desire to inspire awe, to show themselves as above the common man. The Order was made up of a nobility professed to be religious, and its need for exhibiting grandeur and spiritual fervour was evident. From reliquaries and altar pieces to indulgences and confessors, subsequent Grand Masters did their best to show the Order as deserving to be called an Order of the Church. It was a post-Reformation world, with Catholicism rebutting the Protestant scorn with theology, internal reform and lavish art. Sacchetti inhabited such a world. Judging from the family's inventory, he had grown up in a palace surrounded by art, where walls were small gaps between paintings. Suffice it to say that one page of the family's inventory listing portraits (excluding portrait of popes) has over eighty-one

---

[113] AOM1298, f.55r, 1 May 1683: '*in fine cotesti Preti Capuccini essercitino in udire le confessioni di cotesti Cav[alieri] Francesi per il che ne stavo molto inquito, attesa la tardanza dell' arrivo*.'
[114] E. H. Gombrich, *The Story of Art*, 326.

entries, including portraits of Sultan Bayazid and the prophet Muhammed.[115] In his apartment within the palace, the inventory boasted no less than seventy four paintings.[116] The majority of the paintings depicted religious subjects, interspersed with occasional classical themes. Mary with the child Jesus and John the Baptist featured prominently. Possessions can help reveal a lot on what a person holds important. The inventory of the Sacchetti family and the ambassador's *dispropriamento* will help in building a profile of Fra Marcello Sacchetti as a religious knight hailing from one of the oldest noble families in Italy.

[115] ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Libri Mastri -Serie II, n. 214, f. 41r, Inventario dei mobili, argenteria e oro esistenti nell'appartamento dell'Ecc.ma Casa Sacchetti (1688), Appartamento del Signor Ambasciatore sopra li Mezzanini.
[116] ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Libri Mastri -Serie II, n. 214, f. 41v-44v, Inventario dei mobili, argenteria e oro esistenti nell'appartamento dell'Ecc.ma Casa Sacchetti (1688), Appartamento del Signor Ambasciatore sopra li Mezzanini.

Chapter 10 People and Possessions

'Objects themselves are not simply props of history, but are tools through which people shape their lives.'[1]

10.1 Introduction

This chapter attempts to extract a profile of Fra Marcello Sacchetti as a person not merely as the Grand Master's ambassador. It will strive to discover the influence that both the people and the objects surrounding him exerted on his life. The backbone of this chapter will be the 1688 inventory of the family and Sacchetti's *dispropriamento* of 1720, but excursions will be made into other sources to supplant information that the primary sources lack. The focus will be on two interwoven aspects of any person's life: the immediate family and the material world that surrounded him. Possessions mirror 'consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, the beliefs of individuals who made, commissioned, purchased or used them, and by extension the beliefs of the larger society to which they belong'.[2] The tangible world of things is the medium through which the intangible one of beliefs, self-perception and self-projection are expressed. It is people who bestow status unto objects, but the objects then bestow status unto people. This chapter will thus explore both objects and people, not divorced from each other but intertwined, because what is being sought is not what Fra Marcello Sacchetti had, but who Fra Marcello Sacchetti was.

10.2 Material Culture

Jules David Prown defines material culture as 'the study through artifacts of the beliefs – values, ideas, attitudes, and assumptions – of a particular community or society at a given time.'[3] The point of departure is that since people have spent time, energy and very often money on raw materials, then the scrutiny of the finished product will offer at least a glimpse as to why this was done and what was hoped to be achieved by this effort. The study of the object is not only intrinsic, as in the history of art, but serves to reveal mindsets of a particular group. It is a tool made use of particularly by all the

---

[1] Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello, 'Introduction: Writing Material Culture History', *Writing Material Culture History*, Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello (eds.) (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 2.
[2] Henry H. Glassie, *Material Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 41-42.
[3] Jules David Prown, 'Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 17: 1 (1982), 1.

branches of history and anthropology and not a field of study in its own right. This is so because the range of artefacts is too wide to be treated as a specific area of study. It includes the finest sculpted marbles to the roughest pierced shell.

Such scale of variety dictates the need to classify the objects under study. The accepted method among followers of this discipline is to categorize artefacts according to functionality.[4] This varies slightly, depending on what element is stressed by the particular scholar. Thus Prown seems to embrace an unadulterated functionality when presenting the following list:

1. Art (paintings, drawings, prints, sculpture, photography).

2. Diversions (books, toys, games, meals, theatrical performances).

3. Adornment (jewellery, cosmetics, tattooing, other alterations of the body).

4. Modifications of the landscape (architecture, town planning, agriculture, mining).

5. Applied arts (furniture, furnishings, receptacles).

6. Devices (machines, vehicles, scientific instruments, musical instruments, implements).[5]

Other scholars focus more on human interaction through the medium of objects rather than their intrinsic function. In her joint work with Baron Isherwood, Mary Douglas criticises Thorstein Veblen's sweeping answer of 'material welfare, psychic welfare, and display' to the question of why people buy objects.[6] The obtaining of goods has to be firmly grounded within the social process according to Mary Douglas, and this implies the need to relate to others. Once the basic needs of food, warmth and shelter are met, the next human step is interaction. Douglas' perspective is that:

> Objects are an integral part of the human need to relate to others: Forget that commodities are good for eating, clothing, and shelter; forget their usefulness and try instead the idea that commodities are good for thinking; treat them as a nonverbal medium for the human creative faculty.[7]

Renata Ago agrees that 'the nature of goods varies according to their function' as well as having a relational value but stresses the fact that very often goods can have an

---

[4] J. D. Prown, 'Mind in Matter', 2-3.
[5] J. D. Prown, 'Mind in Matter', 3.
[6] Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood, *The World of Goods. Towards an Anthropology of Consumption* (London and New York, Routledge, 1996), vii.
[7] Douglas and Isherwood, *The World of Goods*, 40-41.

exchange value as well as serve an intermediary purpose. Her addition to previous classifications is thus underlined by the power of exchange or lack of it:

1. As objects of exchange, merely used to obtain other goods, having a purely economic value.
2. This exchange can occur for services not only for other goods. Thereby the objects in question still remain within the economic realm, though not as strictly as in the previous classification as in this case there is a relational element in the exchange.
3. Objects can be ends in themselves. Obtaining them infers removing them completely from the market, with the intention of permanence or at least for a long period of time. The key element here is possession, endowing the things with a symbolic value.
4. Such objects may eventually return to the market but very often retain their 'preceding status' and do not obey the existing market rules.[8]

Ago's addition leaves out a whole gamut of objects. For instance, an item of furniture would elude all the above list. This lack of classification is hardly addressed throughout the book but explained in the conclusion. Rather than get hemmed with classification, Ago's stance on material culture is one aimed at comprehending the relationship between humans and objects, how individuals within their community 'objectified themselves in the culture of their material world, and how objects in turn affected culture.'[9] Her conclusion also raises a point most relevant in examining the inventory of the Sacchetti family, and Fra Marcello's earthly possessions. This family was obviously upper class, one of the noble families that had to be emulated if one wanted to show 'class'. The prominent families of Rome set the tone of the city. They established fashions, trends, manners and customs. But money on its own draws no attention. It can only speak through what it can buy. It was through the material that the noble families sought to announce their status, their fine tastes, indeed the essence of what being noble meant in early modern Rome. The Sacchetti were not immune to the necessity of ostentation, as Zirpolo says 'the Sacchetti were image-conscious and would utilize any possible venue to promote their social, political and financial

[8] Renata Ago, *Gusto for Things. A History of Objects in Seventeenth-Century Rome* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 15.
[9] R. Ago, *Gusto for Things*, 215.

status.'[10] The Sacchetti were originally from Tuscany, where they had played an important role since 1197.[11] They are mentioned in Dante's *Paradiso*, a fact acknowledged in Fra Marcello's Proofs of Nobility.[12] The Roman branch of the family was started by the entrepreneur Giovanni Battista Sacchetti (1540-1620), Fra Marcello's grandfather, who was married to Francesca Altoviti (c.1558-1597). They had ten children, but it was the fifth born, the ambassador's uncle Marcello (1586-1629) who became head of the family as the elder males died at a young age and the other two were females. Although relatively newcomers to Rome, the Sacchetti managed to secure close alliances with the powerful Barberini.[13] Giovanni Battista Sacchetti had helped the Barberini financially when they started to make inroads in the curia, an investment which ultimately paid off for both families when Maffeo Barberini became Pope Urban VIII (r.1623-1644).[14] Marcello senior (1586-1629) became the famous patron of the arts and intimate confidant of Maffeo Barberini. Both were avid disciples of knowledge and their interest in art and poetry seems to have been genuine as it was this love of learning that brought them together.[15] The friendship served the Sacchetti well, with key positions awarded to the male members of the family and eventually the monopoly of the lucrative alum mines in Tolfa.[16] Alum was highly sought after due to its use in tanning, dyeing, cosmetics and medicine.[17] Before the discovery of the mineral on Italian soil, the monopoly of alum was in Ottoman hands. Pope Paul II (r.1464-1471) made it compulsory for Christian dealers to acquire the crystal from Tolfa.[18] When Pope Urban VIII leased the mines to the Sacchetti, they exploited them with efficiency and fared even better than previous lease holders.[19] Such revenue enabled the family to buy property and land, in particular land which had a title of nobility attached to it, because although prominent since the

---

[10] Lilian H. Zirpolo, 'Climbing the Social, Political, and Financial Ladders: The Rise of the Sacchetti in Seventeenth-Century Rome', *The Seventeenth Century*, 12: 2 (1997), 161.
[11] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 151.
[12] AOM 4754, f.5r, 4 September 1645, Proofs of Nobility. Dante, Paradiso, Canto XVI, 103-105.
[13] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 151-152.
[14] Irene Fosi and Maria Visceglia, 'Marriage and politics at the papal court in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *Marriage in Italy, 1300-1650*, Trever Dean and K.J.P. Lowe (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 209.
[15] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 153.
[16] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 155.
[17] Paula De Vos, 'Apothecaries, Artists, and Artisans: Early Industrial Material Culture in the Biological Old Regime', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 45: 3 (2015), 408.
[18] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 155.
[19] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 155.

Middle-ages, the Sacchetti still lacked a much coveted title. This came about in 1633, when Pope Urban VIII bestowed the title of *Marchesato* to the land known as Castel Rigatti which they had bought a year before. In 1661 the family acquired Castel Romano, which already carried the same title.[20] Conscious of their image, the Sacchetti acquired or built villas in the Roman countryside, which had been the custom of patricians in antiquity and revived by the early modern nobility as a statement of 'imperial and aristocratic power.'[21]

Power and status are intimately linked with their own display. They are a human construct which is communicated through the medium of objects, from the grandest villa to the minutest gem. If not exhibited, status, and with it, power, cease to exist. The Sacchetti were part of this. Going through the inventories of the Barberini, the Borghese, the Rospigliosi, the Pallavicini, and of course the Sacchetti, one finds very similar objects. There is nothing surprising in this, neither in the fact that families owned similar objects nor that the same material is found throughout. Had one to compare the inventories of two moderately affluent families today, similar results would be had. So for instance, walnut and ebony featured prominently both for furniture and for frames. The style of furniture found is also similar if not identical. For instance, an ebony cabinet in the Barberini inventory of 1685, 'with a clock and tortoiseshell mounts' was also found in the 1671 Pamphili inventory and the Pallavicini one of 1682.[22] Aristocratic families expressed their status through their possessions. The higher strata of society establish fashion and modes of behaviour, which the middling classes then are determined to imitate. Through her meticulous scrutiny of a number of inventories, Ago deduces 'the existence of a social class among the intermediate strata of the population that wanted to be recognized as "cultivated", and "refined" and that it is not only the owners who give a meaning to things, but objects 'define the appearance of their owners.'[23] Of course, income plays an important role in social stratification, but through her analysis a new hypothesis in the understanding of social stratification emerges, one 'based on lifestyle rather than

[20] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 160.
[21] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 161.
[22] Alvar González-Palacios and Emma-Louise Bassett, 'Concerning Furniture: Roman Documents and Inventories: Part I, c. 1600-1720', *Furniture History*, 46 (2010), 7.
[23] R. Ago, *Gusto for Things*, 219.

on other categories.'[24] As Hazlitt says, 'Fashion is gentility running away from vulgarity and afraid of being overtaken.'[25] The lower classes sought to imitate the one above them. The upper classes had to keep finding out ways and means to keep ahead. The Sacchetti family had both a good eye for style and the means to show it.

Material culture encompasses both the study of objects intrinsically and the meaning that the objects have. The latter is a much harder target to reach. The meaning of an object stems from the relations an owner has with the thing possessed and the effect the object transmits to his contemporaries.[26] The study of material culture gives a voice to possessions that time has denied to their owner. While classification can serve the purpose of organising the research, it would thwart the results if allowed to interfere in the deductions. Umbrella terms such as 'utility' and 'ostentation' may create a dichotomy that neither exists in the objects themselves nor in the mind of their owner. Going through Sacchetti's possessions, it will be seen that utility and ostentation are two sides of the same coin. Sacchetti himself unwittingly justified this: 'The five carriages and their trappings that make up my train as Ambassador are mine, having been bought with my own money.'[27] It was patently obvious to him that notwithstanding the fact that it was a twenty-minute walk from Palazzo Sacchetti to the Vatican, as ambassador of the Order he needed five carriages. As Oscar Wilde said for his age, so for all ages: 'We live in an age when unnecessary things are our only necessities.'[28]

10.3 A Knight's Possessions

What an individual knight possessed throughout his life is found in the *dispropriamento*, defined as:

> An inventory of assets and liabilities drawn up by a Hospitaller. Originally, a constraint that bound moribund Hospitallers or those embarking on a risky voyage, by the sixteenth century it was allowed to develop into an annual requirement for all Hospitallers.[29]

---

[24] R. Ago, *Gusto for Things*, 219.
[25] William Hazlitt, *Conversations of James Northcote, Esq. R.A.* (London: 1830), 264.
[26] Krzysztof Pomian, *Collectors and Curiosities. Paris and Venice, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), 7.
[27] AOM 931/35, 15, f.107r: '*sono mie proprie essendo state fatte con I miei proprj denari = cioe le cinque carrozze con suoi fornimenti, che compongono il mio treno di Amb[asciato]re*'. For the discussion on the importance of carriages, see this work, Chapter 8, 168-170.
[28] Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (Victoria Canada: McPherson Library, 2011), 60.
[29] Stefan Cachia, 'Treasury, Death and Debts' (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta, 2004), 261.

It was Grand Master Fra Claude de la Sengle (r.1553-1557) who had established the statute that the *dispropriamento* had to be done yearly.[30] It is very probable that only the latest one was kept. During research for this work, two *dispropriamenti* drawn up by Sacchetti were encountered, one dated 1715 confirmed with some additions five years later, on 30 November 1720. Fra Marcello Sacchetti died on 6 December at midnight, six days after this last obligation to the Religion was fulfilled.[31]

His *dispropriamento* mirrored the Hospitaller's life, with its blend of sacred and profane, its adherence to duty yet with an eye for the protection of one's kin in the '*quinto*'.[32] As in his life, so in his death, the Hospitaller lived the paradox of piety and pride, poverty and opulence. Similar to others viewed for the purpose of this study, Sacchetti's *dispropriamento* starts with a prayer and admittance of mortality then moves from lofty thoughts to the necessity of 'leaving things clear and distinct so that after my Death there is no cause for litigation between my Holy Religion and my nephew the Marquis Matteo Sacchetti.'[33] As ambassador, he had to deal with a number of squabbles between the next of kin of recently deceased knights and the Common Treasury, and evidently did not want his family or his beloved Religion to undergo such indignities. Funerary arrangements followed, where Sacchetti expressed his wish that his funeral was to be without pomp and his body laid to rest with that of his ancestors in the family chapel in the Church of San Giovanni de Fiorentini in Rome. Regretfully, the crypt suffered a flood which washed away the remains of many laid to rest in this church.[34] His nephew was to make sure that a thousand masses were to be celebrated for the repose of his soul.[35] This wish is echoed by various other knights, including his predecessor as ambassador Fra Giovanni Caravita, and the painter Fra Mattia Preti. Fra Caravita left one hundred scudi to the Prior of the Conventual church

---

[30] Bosio, Statuti (1718), 183, '*Statuimo, che i Priori, Bagliui, Commendatori, e fratelli, siano tenuti di fare ogn'anno dispropriamento*'.
[31] AOM 931/35, 15, f.106r-109r.
[32] This work, Chapter 4.
[33] AOM 931/35, 15, f.106r: '*lasciar le cose chiare e distinte, accio dopo la mia Morte non possino nascer liti e controversie tra la mia Sacra Religione, et il S[igno]r Marchese Matteo Sacchetti mio Nipote*.'
[34] Curator, Private conversation, May 2018.
[35] AOM 931/35, f.106r: '*Primieramente raccomando la mia Anima a Dio, et all S[antissi]ma Vergine, e voglio seguita, che sara la mia morte, il mio Cadavere sia portato senza pompa nella chiesa di S. Giovanni de Fiorentini, et abbia la Sepoltura nella cappella del S[antissi]mo Crocefisso, ove sono sepoliti miei Antenati, e si faccino celebrare dal Sig[nor]e Marchese Matteo Sacchetti mio Nipote per suffragio dell'Anima mia Messe numero Mille.*'

for the celebration of masses 'as quickly as possible' from his *quinto*.[36] Similarly, Fra Preti left fifty scudi for the same purpose and with the same alacrity.[37]

Although there was no standard formula, the structure of a number of *dispropriamenti* researched was similar. The first part dealt with the spiritual aspect. Having declared their sane state of mind, the moribund knight then abandoned his soul in the hands of God, Jesus, St Mary and other saints according to one's own personal devotions. Thus, Fra Averaldo de Medici appealed to St John the Baptist, St Joseph, St Anthony of Padova, St Anne and 'all the other saints.'[38] Fra Preti mentioned St John the Baptist, his guardian angel and interestingly specified all male and female saints.[39] Having set provision for his soul, the knight would then turn to more mundane affairs and dispose of his earthly goods through which he had expressed his tastes, opulence and indeed, personality.

Immediately after the provision of a thousand masses, Sacchetti then proceeded to list items that he underlined as his, 'having been bought with my own money'.[40] The items in question are:

- the five carriages and trappings that make up my train as Ambassador;
- a hooded cloak of green velvet which I use privately;
- three crosses, one with diamonds, the others of plain gold;
- three swords, one of gilded silver, one steel and the other enamelled, which I carry all the time;
- all my clothes and linen I use for my person as found after my death.

The disclaimer that they belong to him implies that the above items were to be handed over to the Order on his death. Taken within the context of the whole document, the phrase 'my own money' is used to distinguish from the other items that he had made use of throughout his life but actually belonged to the family, hence could not devolve to the Order on his death. There is a similar statement in the *dispropriamento* of Fra

---

[36] AOM 931/32, f.284: '*per la celebratione di Messe p[er] l'anima mia il piu presto, che sia possible.'*
[37] AOM 931/32, f.252r: *'subito seguita la mia morte s'impieghino scudi cinquanta per la celebratione di tante Messe in suffragio dell'anima mia.*'
[38] AOM 931/32, f.50r, 4 November 1694.
[39] AOM 931/32, f.252r, 28 December 1698: '*del mio Angelo Custode, di S. Gio[vanni] Batt[ist]a n[ost]ro P[ad]rone, e de gl'altri Santi, e Sante miei Avocati*'.
[40] AOM 931/35, f.107r: '*essendo state fatte con I miei propri denari*'.

de Medici, where he stated that out of three swords, two were his but one belonged to his uncle Fra D. Alberto Fardella.[41]

The first items listed were the most expensive, as a carriage 'could cost up to tens of thousands of scudi.'[42] Horses and trappings were equally important in the showcase of the world that was early modern Rome.[43] By the seventeenth century, six was the established number of horses for maximum ostentation effect.[44] The number of horses kept was also a financial strain. Sacchetti's *dispropriamento* does not mention how many horses were kept in the Marquis' stables, which Fra Marcello made use of. In 1715 he had a bay one called Maccaroncino, which he had bought.[45] In the revised version, Maccaroncino must have died, for he mentions two black Friesian horses, which he used daily.[46] Michel de Montaigne wrote that having a train of carriages was not reserved for official visits but a train would accompany the distinguished person even on leisure outings such as going for a ride about the city.[47] Trains of carriages were not reserved for the singular occasion of official entries, but were a daily occurrence for ambassadors going about their daily business of attending congregations, private meetings with other ambassadors or Church officials and even for 'trips to operas and other entertainments.'[48]

The latter raises the question whether Sacchetti, as an ambassador of a religious order, did frequent theatres and operas. Such information cannot be found in official despatches. As a member of an aristocratic family, it would be almost expected of him to be seen in the circles of high society. On the other hand, he was the ambassador of the Religion, inhabiting a city ruled by the head of the Catholic Church. This is of prime importance since how theatres and such places were viewed depended on the

---

[41] AOM 931/32, f.155r.
[42] John M. Hunt, 'The Ceremonial Possession of a City: Ambassadors and their Carriages in Early Modern Rome', *Royal Studies Journal*, 3: 2 (2016), 73.
[43] For the discussion on the importance of carriages, see, this work, Chapter 8, 168-170.
[44] J. Soldani, *Satire del Senatore Iacopo Soldani* (Florence: 1751), 111-112.
[45] AOM 931/35, 15, f.107v: '*li cavalli; de quali mi sono fin'ora servito, sono del sud[ett]o Sig[nor]e Marchese Matteo Sacchetti mio Nipote, alla riserva d'uno di pelame bajo scuro chiamato Maccaroncino, da me comprato*'.
[46] AOM 931/35, 15, f.108r: '*sono miei proprj li due Cavalli Frigioni di pelame morello, de quali giornalm[en]te mi servo*'. The Friesian horse, known affectionately in the equestrian world as 'the black pearl', is associated with knighthood and described as having 'great presence and to carry itself with elegance' especially due to its bouncy and elegant pace, powerfully muscled 'Baroque' body type and a thick mane and tail. It is suitable for shows, dressage and carriage. (Retrieved from https://www.cavalluna.com/en/our-horses/friesian/ on 1 September 2020.)
[47] M. Montaigne, *The Complete Works*, 1168.
[48] J. M. Hunt, 'Ambassadors and their Carriages', 73.

attitude of the reigning pontiff. Sacchetti served under four popes: Innocent XI (r. 1676-1689), Alexander VIII (r. 1689-1691), Innocent XII (r. 1691-1700), Clement XI (r. 1700-1721). Innocent XI had changed the recently built theatre Tor di Nona into a granary, prohibited public operas and looked upon 'private theatres with great displeasure, and, of course, much more so the amusements of the carnival.'[49] It was only with great perseverance that he was convinced to permit two *operattas*, and even so, women were not allowed to participate.[50] The more worldly Alexander VIII regenerated the theatre and carnival festivities but his reign was short lived.[51] His successor, Innocent XII, picked up where his namesake had left and demolished the Tor di Nona.[52] Likewise, Clement XI 'realized that the abuse of the theatre might become a source of danger for the morals of the people.'[53] Private performances thus rose in popularity whenever a puritanical pope sat on the throne of Peter. Just as artists and sculptors found patronage among the aristocracy, so did composers and musicians, who found an outlet for their music and an income for their creations in the halls of the mighty. For instance, the unconventional Christina of Sweden (1626-1689) was considered as one of the most important musical benefactors in Rome.[54] The Barberini family had even held an opera in her honour, a piece entitled *La Vita Humana, overo Il Trionfo della Pieta*, within their private theatre which was called the *Teatro delle Quattro Fontane*.[55] The libretto was penned by none other than Cardinal Giulio Rospigliosi, destined to become Pope Clement IX (r.1667-1669).[56] The Roman populace, the various ambassadors with their retinue and of course the patrician families, had been used to splendour and endless festivities. The election of Pope Innocent XI who seemed to model his life on a hermit rather than a baroque prince, must have come as a shock. As Pastor put it, 'The Romans were less agreeably

---

[49] Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, *The History of the Popes. From the close of the Middle Ages*, xxxii (London, Trubner and Co, 1940), 29.
[50] Pastor, xxxii, 29.
[51] Pastor, xxxii, 583.
[52] Pastor, xxxii, 583.
[53] Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, *The History of the Popes. From the close of the Middle Ages*, xxxiii (London, Trubner and Co, 1940), 339.
[54] Terra Murdoch, 'Queen Christina of Sweden as a Patron of Music in Rome during the Mid-Seventeenth Century', *The Music Room in Early Modern France and Italy*, Deborah Howard and Laura Mauretti (eds) (Oxford: 2012).
[55] Nathan Alan Popp, 'Expressions of power: Queen Christina of Sweden and patronage in Baroque Europe' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Iowa, 2015), 278.
[56] A. Popp, 'Queen Christina and patronage', 278.

impressed by the Pope's measures'.[57] Lavish entertainment was thus driven underground, as Veronica Buckley says:

Lacking a secular court, and periodically hampered by popes unsympathetic to artistic extravagance, Rome had developed instead a tradition of private performances in the houses of the rich.[58]

Such informal venues would have served as places for exchanging information, ironing out ruffles between prominent families, forging alliances and similar intrigue. Unofficial gatherings such as theatres and dinner parties had the advantage of fostering confidential exchange. This had been the practice at least since the advent of resident ambassadors. As Nicholas Hawkins, English resident ambassador to Henry VIII at the court of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, from 1532 to 1534, wrote:

Treuth it is, that the cnowledge of suche thingis whiche I shuld certifi the King on, for the most parte I must gett it of thother Imbassatours; and therfor must bothe invite them, and be invited.[59]

Indeed, this practice is still strong today, as Kishan S. Rana states: 'the professional access that he or she [the ambassador] enjoys is as much dependent on the glamour and attractiveness of his receptions or dinners, as to his diplomatic skills.'[60] Sacchetti would have attended such gatherings and paid private visits as well as received visitors. It was through these encounters that most of his diplomatic spadework was done. In the conviviality of dinner parties, a shrewd ambassador could learn the disposition of cardinals presiding over the various Congregations that wielded justice in the many cases in which the Order was involved. It was in such settings that Sacchetti exchanged greetings and information with other ambassadors, especially the French, Spanish, and Imperial ones, on whose monarchs' favour the Order depended. There are occasional hints at informal meetings in Sacchetti's letters to his Grand Master. For instance, a short note in November 1682 stated: 'I have casually let the French Ambassador subtly know of the festivities held there [Malta] for the birth of

[57] Pastor, xxxii, 27.
[58] Veronica Buckley, *Christina Queen of Sweden* (London New York, Toronto, Sydney: Harper Perennial, epub edition, 2010). Not paginated.
[59] Catherine Fletcher, 'Furnished with gentlemen': the ambassador's house in sixteenth-century Italy, *The Society for Renaissance Studies*, 24 (2010). 518.
[60] Kishan S. Rana, *The 21st Century Ambassador. Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive* (Malta and Geneva: DiploFoundation, 2004), 39.

the son of the Dauphin of France.'[61] The euphemism of the words chosen imply that the encounter between the two ambassadors was not an official bilateral visit, but hint at others being present, otherwise there would not have been the need for Sacchetti to be so tacit in passing on a message of congratulations. On another occasion when Sacchetti visited the French ambassador, he simply used 'spoke about the commands I had received from Your Eminence'.[62] With Pope Innocent XI exceedingly absent from public life, the noble houses vied against each other to hold court and manage Roman politics.[63] The pope banned theatre, spectacles, carnival games and even the new French fashion in clothes, but he did not have the power to enforce his edicts and convince the nobility to shun the splendour it so much loved.[64]

The Pope's restrictions on luxury were never popular and impossible to implement, especially within the diplomatic circle. From the inception of resident ambassadors, sumptuous hospitality had been a valuable characteristic. The ambassador was after all the extension of his prince and court. Liberality had always been a virtue of princes, so the liberality of the ambassador's board reflected well on the honour of his prince.[65] Moreover, Rome had become used to luxury 'which had grown enormously since the days of Urban VIII' (r.1623-1644).[66] During Sacchetti's time as ambassador certain luxuries had become needs for those who could afford them and, those who did not, preferred to curtail domestic spending rather than cut down on visible extravagances.[67] Once one ventured out, it was the horses, the carriages, the clothes, the accessories and jewellery that showed one's status and made a good impression.

So, notwithstanding Pope Innocent XI's scrupulous nature, his legislation to curb luxury clothes did not leave much impact on Roman fashion.[68] As Rachel Kemper puts it; 'traditionally, women have dressed for seduction, men have dressed for

---

[61] AOM 1297, f.166v, 14 Nov 1682: '*Ho fatto con bel modo, e senza affettatione penetrare a questo Sig[nor] Amb[asciator]e di Francia le allegrezze che si fanno costa per la nascita del figlio del Delfino di Francia.*'
[62] AOM 1298, f.69r, 22 May 1683: '*Nella visita che feci a questo Amb[asciatore] di francia, gli parlai dell'ordine, che havevo ricevuto dall'E[minenza] V[ostra]*'.
[63] Renata Ago, 'Sovrano Pontefice e Societa di Corte. Competizioni Cerimoniali e Politica nella Seconda Meta del XVII Secolo', *Cérémonial et rituel à Rome (XVIe-XIXe siècle)* (Rome: Publications de l'École Française de Rome, 1997), 231.
[64] R. Ago, 'Sovrano Pontefice e societa di corte', 232.
[65] C. Fletcher, 'The ambassador's house in sixteenth-century Italy', 520.
[66] Pastor, xxxii, 27.
[67] J. M. Hunt, 'Ambassadors and their Carriages', 73.
[68] Pastor, xxxii, 583.

status.'[69] Both reasons appeal to human vanity, and vanity is too deeply embedded in the human psyche to be curtailed by strict morality and sumptuary laws. Sacchetti describes only one item of clothing, 'a hooded cloak of green velvet which I use privately'[70], whilst the rest of his clothing are grouped together with the linen. Still some deductions can be made from this meagre description. The material itself had always been associated with royalty and nobility. Velvet was first woven in Europe in the late thirteenth century in Spain and Italy.[71] By the seventeenth century, various countries in Europe were producing this prestigious cloth.[72] Apart from its richness and depth of colour, the reputation of velvet was undoubtedly enhanced by certain sumptuary laws forbidding it to commoners. As Michel de Montaigne keenly observed:

> For to say that none but princes … shall be allowed to wear velvet and gold braid, and to forbid them to the people, what else is this but to give prestige to these things and increase everyone's desire to enjoy them?[73]

Velvet was the choice fabric of kings and nobility not only for clothes. In various forms, it found itself on tables, on furniture, as curtains and even covered the seats in carriages. Sacchetti mentions eight chairs covered in coloured velvet in his *dispropriamento*. He does make a difference between velvet used for clothing and that used to cover furniture. The latter he called '*trippa*' which seems to be derived from the Dutch word for velvet – *trijp*. It refers to brocaded and voided velvet.[74] Interestingly he dictated the adverb 'privately'. It seems unnecessary to say so, as clothes are not shared. It is possible that 'privately' refers to the occasions when he wore it, when it would have been necessary not to wear his knight's habit. The rest of his clothing are simply mentioned as 'all my clothes and linen for the use of my own person'.[75] There are no descriptions, especially when compared to other *dispropriamenti*. For instance, the *dispropriamento* of Fra Vicenzo de Medici has a

---

[69] Rachel H. Kemper, *A History of Costume* (Verona: Newsweek Books, 1977), 12.
[70] AOM 931/32, f.50r: '*un cuppe di velluto verde di cui mi servo privatamente*'.
[71] Kathryn Hennessy et al (eds), *Fashion. The Definitive History of costume and Style* (New York: Smithsonian, 2012), 45.
[72] Retrieved on 5 February 2021 from https://trc-leiden.nl/trc-digital-exhibition/index.php/velvet/item/173-a-brief-history-of-velvet
[73] M. Montaigne, *The Complete Works*, 238.
[74] Marloes Cornelissen, 'The World of Ambassador Jacobus Colyer: Material Culture of the Dutch 'Nation' in Istanbul during the first half of the 18th Century' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Sabanci, 2015), 198.
[75] AOM 931/35, f.50r: '*Tutti li mie Abiti, e biancherie per uso dello mia propria Persona*'.

description of his whole wardrobe, going into details such as 'a *giustocore* with silver chevrons, a leather waistcoat trimmed with a small silver fringe, and breeches of the same fabric as the *giustocore*.[76] The '*giustocore*', in French *justaucorps*, was 'a term in France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to refer to a man's jacket. It had no collar and was worn with a sleeveless vest, and closefitting knee-length breeches.'[77] Fra de Medici had five, described meticulously as whole outfits with matching waistcoats and breeches.[78] Allegedly, Louis XIV had had a hand in its design by shortening the length and flaring the skirts, that is the lower part of the jacket.[79] By the 1680s, the *justaucorps* had been around for about twenty years and with some modifications it had remained 'the most distinctive article of male attire'.[80] It lasted well into the 1720s and is considered as the ancestor of the male suit.[81] It was the obvious dress-code for courts. The attire would have been complemented with the large wig typical of the time and wide-brimmed hat. In fact the *justaucorps* did not have a collar, as this would have been hidden by the rich locks of the wig.[82] Sacchetti does not specifically mention either wigs or hats, but it would have been very unconventional to venture out without both, unless he was 'lucky enough to have thick and luxuriant hair', in which case the natural hair would have been 'dressed and powdered in the style of the currently fashionable wig.'[83] Fra De Medici lists three wigs along with their box,[84] and three hats 'one of which is white with a plume.'[85] The outfit would have been completed with a silk sash or baldric to hold the sword.[86]

Of all the weapons available to the military man, none carried more status than the sword, 'the queen of weapons'.[87] The roots of this marriage between the nobility and the sword go deep. In fact, 'the legislation on weapons forbade those who were

---

[76] AOM 931 (32), f.154r: '*Un giustacore gallonato d'Argento, con una cammisola di pelle guarnita di una piccolo franga d'Argento, e sue brachi del drappo del giustacore*'.
[77] Rachel H. Kemper, *A History of Costume*, 183.
[78] AOM 931 (32), f.154r-f.155r.
[79] H. Kemper, *A History of Costume*, 102.
[80] H. Kemper, *A History of Costume*, 102.
[81] *Fashion. The Definitive History of costume and Style*, 136.
[82] H. Kemper, *A History of Costume*, 102.
[83] Aileen Ribeiro, *Dress in eighteenth-century Europe. 1715-17-89* (London: Holmes and Meier, 1984), 30.
[84] AOM 931 (32), f.155v.
[85] AOM 931 (32), f.154v: '*tre Cappelli uno de quali biancho con la penna*.'
[86] *Fashion. The Definitive History of costume and Style*, 131.
[87] Franco Davies, 'The Practical and Symbolic Dimensions of Edged Weapons for the Hospitallers, in particular Swords, 1530-1798' (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta, 2014), 2.

not knights to possess a sword', with a dispensation granted to those below the status of knight serving in the militia. The advent of the *justaucorps* saw the sword being shortened in order to better fit with the rest of the accoutrement, as the rapier, 'easy enough to carry and draw in the days of doublet and hose did not sit well with brocaded jackets, breeches and silk stockings.'[88] The lower part of the *justaucorps,* known as the skirt, 'had back and side openings to allow a sword to poke through.'[89] In other words, the sword, an indispensable accessory, had to be visible. Sacchetti mentions three swords; a highly decorated one of gilded silver, a practical one made of steel, and the enamelled sword which he carried 'all the time'.[90] Similarly, the knight de Medici lists three swords, one silver, another of gilt copper and 'a large one in the Spanish style'.[91] The absence of decorative elements in the latter indicates that this large sword would seem to have been equivalent to Sacchetti's steel sword, that is, designed for use rather than as an accessory. Sacchetti's three swords are somewhat representative of him as knight and ambassador. The steel weapon harks to his knightly calling, a reminder of the readiness to fight and die if necessary for the faith. The other two reflect his appointed mode of service to the Order; the ceremonial sword for grand occasions and the daily one that served the purpose of showing the status of its bearer without showing off. Of the other weapons, namely arquebuses and pistols, there is no description. They are almost brushed off along with the other possessions that belonged to the family.[92] The descriptions of the swords seem to have a parallel with the three crosses in his possession and imply their use as accessories. The two plain gold ones could have been for daily usage, whereas the other, described as 'with diamonds' could have been reserved for grand occasions. The fashion of the time was not big on male accessories, except for sword, and towards the end of the seventeenth century, the cane.[93] One might add the hat, 'playing a minor role subservient to the wig' and plain gloves of untrimmed leather that perhaps served to set off the ruffles of lace emerging from the sleeves of the *justaucorps*.[94] Thus accoutred, the ambassador

---

[88] Richard Cohen, *By the Sword* (London: Pocket Book, 2010), 71.
[89] *Fashion. The Definitive History of costume and Style*, 130.
[90] AOM 931/35, 15, f.107r: '*che si porta da continuo'*.
[91] AOM 931 (32), f.155r: 'e la terza grande a la Spagnola'.
[92] AOM 931/35, 15, f.108v: '*E piu rinuovo la dichiarazione, che li quadri, argenti, libri et altri mobile, che sono stati in mio uso, comprese l'Armi, cioe Archibug… sono propri del Sud[ett]o Marchese mio nipote e sua casa*'.
[93] A. Ribeiro, *Dress in eighteenth-century Europe*, 32.
[94] A. Ribeiro, *Dress in eighteenth-century Europe*, 32.

would have ventured out, the procession of five carriages trundling out of Palazzo Sacchetti in Via Giulia to wherever the Order's business took him.

10.4 Of House and Home

The statement made by this picture is evident. A member of an affluent and important family, a high-ranking knight of a prestigious military Order and ambassador to its Grand Master, himself a prince of a realm and prime defender of Christendom. That is the image projected, the way Sacchetti interacted with the populace that thronged the streets and squares of Rome. But this non-verbal interaction did neither begin nor end outside the doors of Palazzo Sacchetti. The world within loudly announced style, nobility and status. Palazzo Sacchetti housed a marquis, a cardinal and an ambassador, so a stream of visitors was to be expected, visitors that had to be suitably impressed. However, projecting style through possessions, and allowing possessions to mould one, was not merely a matter of ostentation. It was not conscious showing off that drove the upper classes. Rather it was their own sense of self and the need to project it. Their palaces bore their name on the outside, and their being on the inside.

The palace on Via Giulia was not the Sacchetti family's first abode in Rome. Previously they had lived in the old Palazzo Borgia, built in the fifteenth century by Rodrigo Borgia, later Pope Alexander VI (r.1492-1503).[95] The family had moved to Via Giulia when Marcello's uncle, Cardinal Giulio (1587-1663) acquired the palace there in 1649, when Marcello, was five years old.[96] The house must have had great influence on young Marcello. When the Sacchetti moved in, not only did they acquire a prestigious address, but the house itself oozed art off its walls, with the audience hall boasting frescoes by the prestigious artist Francesco Salviati depicting the story of King David and ten other rooms on the same storey with magnificent frescoes, albeit the handiwork of lesser known artists.[97] The themes depicted were biblical (King Solomon, Moses, Tobias); mythological (Ulysses and Hercules) and historical (Hannibal and Alexander the Great). It is difficult to imagine the impressions that life size images made on the early modern mind. People today are inundated with images. But in the early modern world, depictions came only on coins and as works of art.

[95] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, 'Roman Documents and Inventories', 19.
[96] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, 'Roman Documents and Inventories', 19.
[97] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 162.

Other frescoes adorned the walls of the chapel and the gallery. The family's love affair with art did not end with the death of the senior Marcello in 1629. Giulio continued the tradition both as collector and patron of artists, being instrumental amongst others, in securing a commission for Guido Reni by Queen Henrietta Maria of England (wife of Charles I from 1625-1669).[98] Unlike his brother, Giulio tended to approach artists who were already established. The reason may have to do with the family's financial position. When Marcello senior took his first steps into the field of artistic patronage, the family was still beginning to make its fortune, and possibly could not afford the services of more famous artists. By the time Giulio took over, the family was one of the wealthiest in Rome.[99] Giulio's character and career deserve a biography in their own right. What concerns this work however, is the influence he may have exerted on the young Marcello.

Unfortunately, no contemporary of his wrote his biography, but from his words and actions, Giulio comes across as a man of 'fervour, benevolence and a commitment to justice.'[100] He wrote vehemently to his friend Pope Alexander VII (Fabio Chigi r.1655-1667) against abuses and corruption in the Church and worked energetically and with practical ingenuity in alleviating the plight of the communities that the Church entrusted in his hands.[101] Giulio was appointed priest and ordained Bishop of Gravina in 1623. In 1624 he was the papal nunzio in Madrid, which was a risky choice considering the family's known pro-French tendencies. In fact the Spaniards did not welcome this decision and made it plain that his predecessor, Monsignor Innocenzo Massimi (nunzio from 1622 to 1624) was preferable.[102] The crisis that Giulio had to face was the Franco-Spanish disagreement on 'the control of the passage of the Valtellina' in the Lombardy region.[103] Cardinal Barberini was nunzio in France tackling the same issue that was swiftly progressing towards armed conflict. Cardinal Barberini was then ordered to leave Paris for Madrid to boost the negotiations there. Eventually the two monarchs signed the Treaty of Monzon on 5 March 1626 without

---

[98] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 164.
[99] Lilian H. Zirpolo, *Ave Papa Ave Papabile: The Sacchetti Family, Their Art Patronage, and Political Aspirations* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2005), 100.
[100] L. Zirpolo, *Ave Papa Ave Papabile*, 97.
[101] L. Zirpolo, *Ave Papa Ave Papabile*, 97.
[102] Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, *The History of the Popes. From the close of the Middle Ages*, xxviii (London, Trubner and Co, 1940), 53-65.
[103] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 155.

the Pope's knowledge. Giulio's interventions do not seem to have had any impact on these proceedings. Nevertheless, the pope was well pleased with the result and Giulio was given the purple of the cardinalate, the Bishopric of Fano and, in 1627, sent as legate to Ferrara. The papacy had annexed Ferrara in 1598, not recognising the illegitimate branch of the Este family. Cardinal Giulio effectively became governor. This was an onerous task, having to provide food for the people in a time of scarcity, face the crisis of the Mantuan succession, protect the borders and interests of Ferrara from Venetian hostile policy and eventually even deal with the plague brought by refugees fleeing from Imperial troops that had invaded the Mantovano with force of arms and the region with disease.[104] It was during his stay at Ferrara that Giulio became friends with Fabio Chigi who was his vice-legate and with Jules Mazarin, later minister of France. After Ferrara, he was sent as legate to Bologna, from 1637 to 1640, a city he was familiar with as he had been vice-legate there from 1621 to 1623.[105] In Ferrara, Giulio met Velázquez and Guido Reni. By 1640, when Giulio returned to Rome, he had amassed an impressive art collection.[106]

Giulio was physically present during Marcello's formative years as he remained in Rome till his death in 1663, when Marcello was 19. Although no tangible proof exists, it would be very unlikely that an uncle, twice nominated for the papacy, having an illustrious career in the Church, and an art patron and connoisseur, did not exert some influence on his young nephew. It is documented that it was Giulio who took Marcello's brother Urbano (1640-1705) under his wing. As Urbano himself wrote about what his uncle had advised concerning his education: 'If you cover physics and metaphysics this year – he [Giulio] suggested – you can apply yourself to theology next year, you would have covered a lot' and that in two or three years' time Urbano could 'proceed with reading Law and Theology away from Rome to acquire a knowledge of other customs and the diversity of lineages.'[107] Thus Urbano (1640-1705) was moulded for a career in the Church like his uncle and tutor Giulio, whilst

---

[104] See Irene Fosi, Andrea Gardi (eds), *La Legazione di Ferrara del Cardinale Giulio Sacchetti, 1627-1631*, vol. 2 (Vatican City: 2006).
[105] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 158.
[106] L. Zirpolo, 'The Rise of the Sacchetti', 164.
[107] Irene Fosi, *All'Ombra dei Barberini: fedelta e servizio nella Roma barocca* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1997), 253.

Marcello was chosen for a military and eventual diplomatic career.[108] Another possible influence in Marcello's education could have been the architect Paolo Falconieri (1634-1704), himself a boyhood friend and later co-traveller with the philosopher, author, diplomat and poet Lorenzo Magalotti (1637-1712). In this voyage, they accompanied the Grand Duke Cosimo III (r.1670-1723) on his grand tour that took the party to Spain, Portugal, England and France. It was in fact from Paris that Falconieri wrote a beautiful letter to Marcello, addressing him as 'My beautiful knight' and professing a friendship so deep that, in his own words 'It would be stupefying if I did not write some love to you from Paris'.[109] The letter is reminiscent of humanist friendship, celebrating its own abstract beauty as Francis Bacon said: 'A principal fruit of friendship, is the ease and discharge of the fullness and swellings of the heart, which passions of all kinds do cause and induce.'[110] It sums up the sentiments echoed in the letter. Paolo Falconieri was the son of Piero (1574-1653), brother of Orazio (d.1664). The family had transferred from Tuscany to Rome and made its fortune in the salt business. Both brothers lived with their families in the Palazzo Falconieri in Via Giulia. Orazio was married to Marcello's widowed aunt Ottavia (1590-1645).[111] Apart from being neighbours and both members of the Tuscan community in Rome, the Falconieri were linked to the Sacchetti through business and marriage. As sons of patrician families, Marcello and Paolo would have had a similar upbringing. They shared Tuscan origins and very probably retained the Tuscan dialect, as evident in certain words in Fra Marcello's *dispropriamento*. As regards their schooling, much depended on what career the parents had designed for their offspring. Similar to Marcello, Paolo had two brothers and an uncle in an ecclesiastical career, whereas his own training prepared him for a political career, realised by being attached to Cardinal Leopoldo dei Medici (1617-1675) and then in the court of Grand Duke Cosimo III.

---

[108] Guido Sante, Giuseppe Mantella, Maria Teresa Sorrenti (eds), 'Mattia Preti e Gregorio Carafa: Due Cavalieri Gerosolimitani tra Italia e Malta', *Atti della giornata di studio 12 June 2013* (Malta), 122.

[109] ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Corrispondenza 22, fascicolo n. 7 and n. 8: '*Cav[alie]re mio bello, Fu si da maravigliare ch'io non si scriva qualche mio amore di Parigi*'.

[110] Francis Bacon, 'Essay XXVII Of Friendship' in *Complete Essays* (New York: Dover Publications, 2008), 70 (epub generated page). See also Peter Burke, 'Humanism and friendship in sixteenth-century Europe', *Friendship in Medieval Europe* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1999). 262-274.

[111] Elisa Johanna Goudriaan, 'The Cultural Importance of Florentine Patricians: Cultural exchange, brokerage networks, and social representation in early modern Florence and Rome (1600-1660)' (Published online PhD dissertation, Leiden University, 2015), 273. https://scholarlypublications.universiteitleiden.nl/access/item%3A2888883/view

It might seem a long stretch by today's standards to predestine children at such an early stage, yet it has to be kept in mind that Marcello was enrolled in the Order in 1645, when he was one year old. This was quite common among families that treasured their dynastic history.[112] Such families prided themselves in their ancestry and inculcated their young with a sense of obligation towards the family. They wallowed in the collective memory of their ancestors and in the future generations that were to uphold the families' greatness.[113] Within such families, the choice of career was made early in the offspring's life, so it is logical to assume that grooming for that chosen career would constitute the main education of the child. Children of both genders had their future established early in life. The first-born male had obviously to head the family, while the remaining male children were prepared for an honourable career and females were destined for marriage worthy of the family's name and one that would enhance the family's fortune and influence. For the upper classes, marriage tied up property as much as the spouses. As Fosi and Visceglia state, 'The marriage policy practised by the Sacchetti family between the late sixteenth and the early seventeenth century can be seen as representative of the behaviour of the group in general.'[114] In this manner, 'excess offspring could be considered useful to connect the family through marriage or patronage with other families or groups, instead of a threat to the main heir.[115]

The decision to enrol Marcello in the Order would have been guided by the same motives. A military order not only bestowed prestige but could serve the family well by extending connections. The education given would not have been specifically for diplomacy. Rather, knightly and patrician qualities were similar to those desired in ambassadors. An ambassador should have a 'juridical and humanist education', knowledge of court etiquette and the manners and customs of various cities, skill in oratory and the financial means to uphold one's status.[116] Patricians were educated in such a way that made them suitable for this role. On 3 November 1681, the Grand

---

[112] Emanuel Buttigieg, *Nobility, Faith and Masculinity. The Hospitaller Knights of Malta, c.1580-1700* (London - New York: Continuum, 2011), 36.
[113] Liesbeth Geevers and Mirella Marini (eds.), 'Introduction: Aristocracy, Dynasty and Identity in Early Modern Europe, 1520–1700', *Dynastic Identity in Early Modern Europe. Rulers, Aristocrats and the Formation of Identities* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2015), 3.
[114] Irene Fosi and Maria Visceglia, *Marriage in Italy, 1300-1650*, Trever Dean and K.J.P. Lowe (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 208.
[115] L. Geevers and M. Marini (eds), 'Aristocracy, Dynasty and Identity', 1520–1700, 11.
[116] E. J. Goudriaan, 'Florentine Patricians', 61.

Master and the Venerable Council selected Fra Marcello Sacchetti to be the Order's ambassador in Rome, the appointment to take place on 1 May 1682 and last for three years.[117] However, Sacchetti had already been 'frequenting this [the papal] court for several months' before his official appointment, as attested by the Grand Master's letter to his then ambassador Fra Caravita.[118] The Grand Master also alludes to his prudence, described as 'well-known' even before he had been appointed as ambassador.[119]

Fra Marcello lived and worked in an apartment within Palazzo Sacchetti, Via Giulia, as attested in the family inventory. The apartment consisted of a study which led to two rooms, one of which was the ambassador's summer bedroom. The other room is simply described as next to the study (*stanza contigua alla segreteria*). Two other rooms follow, one described as *anticamera* and another as 'the compass room' (Stanza dove è la bussola). There was then a room defined by its position, being in the corner between Via Giulia and the alley. Finally there was the ambassador's winter bedroom. The Marquis and Cardinal Urbano also had summer and winter bedrooms.[120] Judging from the inventory and the *dispropriamento*, the ambassador made use of two rooms within the palace in connection with his work: the visitors' room and his study. In the *dispropriamento*, he states that everything that was in the room where he received visitors belonged to his family. Fra Marcello must have used one of the noble halls to give audience. This is reinforced by the fact that the inventory does not mention a specific room for visitors within the ambassador's apartment. It is known that Cardinal Giulio gave audience in the room known as *Camerone del Salviati*, where today stand the two famous globes by Vincenzo Coronelli showing the sky and the Earth.[121] The inventory lists two rooms as '*camera d'udienza*', one described as the 'audience room towards Via Giulia' and the other simply as 'the second audience room after the painted hall'.[122] Fra Marcello's study is described in the

---

[117] AOM 127, 57r, 3 November 1681.
[118] AOM 1449,f.39r, 28 January 1682: '*Vi habb[iam]o dato p[er] successore nel carico di cot[es]ta Ambas[cia]ta n[ost]ra ord[ina]ria il Cav[alier]e fra Marcello Sacchetti, il q[ua]le essendo gia da molti mesi nella Corte, come sapete*'.
[119] AOM 1449, f.20r, 5 January 1682: '*ben conosciuta prudenza*'.
[120] ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Libri Mastri -Serie II, n. 214, f.41r., Inventario dei mobili, argenteria e oro esistenti nell'appartamento dell'Ecc.ma Casa Sacchetti (1688), Appartamento del Signor Ambasciatore sopra li Mezzanini.
[121] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, 'Roman Documents and Inventories', 18-19.
[122] ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Libri Mastri -Serie II, n. 214, f.75r (Camera d'udienza verso strada giulia) and 106r (Stanza dell'udienza seconda doppo il camerone dipinto), Inventario dei mobili, argenteria e

dispropriamento as 'the room where I write' and '*stanza della secreteria*' in the inventory.[123] It must have been of considerable size, judging from the fact that it contained over forty pieces of art.[124] The works listed can best be described as eclectic, and it would be a futile exercise to find meaning in either the subjects of the paintings or in the way they were placed. So a painting of an angel with folded hands held to his breast in the attitude of prayer stood next to a nude woman who was forcefully embracing a shepherd. Although religious themes and biblical events feature prominently with twelve of the paintings depicting Mary the mother of Jesus, other subjects occur. There were pastoral scenes, depictions inspired from the classical world, pictures of commoners as well as nobility. Since the inventory describes where the paintings hang, it can be concluded that there was no method in organising them by subject. A painting depicting a man embracing and kissing a nude woman was next to one of the Madonna with child and St Sebastian rubbed shoulders with Bacchus and Ariadne.

Although there seems to be no method behind the display of paintings, through his *dispropriamento*, Sacchetti comes across as better organised in his work, preferring to keep his different roles within the Order in separate spaces. In his study he kept his papers dealing with different activities separate. Papers concerning his role as receiver were kept in a cabinet with shelves.[125] This was to be found in a room described as 'the tapestry room'.[126] Only this one piece of furniture is mentioned as the rest belonged to the family. In his study he kept papers dealing with the Priory of Lombardy and his commanderies of Lodi and Montefiascone in 'a small, walnut chest of drawers with two doors.'[127] Here he also kept his books, though unfortunately he fails to mention any titles.[128] There was a library within the palace, but the inventory

---

oro esistenti nell'appartamento dell'Ecc.ma Casa Sacchetti (1688), Appartamento del Signor Ambasciatore sopra li Mezzanini.

[123] AOM 931/35, 15, f.176r-107v: '*nella Camera dove io scrivo*'. ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Libri Mastri -Serie II, n. 214, f.41r

[124] ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Libri Mastri -Serie II, n. 214, f. 41v-44r, *Inventario dei mobili, argenteria e oro esistenti nell'appartamento dell'Ecc.ma Casa Sacchetti (1688), Appartamento del Signor Ambasciatore sopra li Mezzanini*.

[125] AOM 931/35, 15, f.107r: '*Una Scanzia, o sia armario di Noce, in cui vi sono scritture appartenenti alla mia Ricetta*'.

[126] AOM 931/35, 15, 106v: '*Nella camera parata di Arazzi*'.

[127] AOM 931/35, f.107r: '*Un Armario piccolo, parimente di noce con due sportelli, nel quale si conservano le scritture appartenenti al mio Priorato di Lombardia, e Commende di Lodi, e Montefiascone*'.

[128] AOM 931/35, 15, f.107r, '*Una Scanzia di noce ad uso di cantarano per tener libri*'.

does not specify titles either.[129] Interestingly he makes use of the term '*cantarano'* which betrays his Tuscan origins, as this word was used in Lombardy and Tuscany for what other Italians would call '*cassettone'*, a set of drawers enclosed within an outer case.[130] His writing desk is described as 'a small table serving as a desk' (*un tavolino fatto a scrittoria*). The room contained three small walnut tables, 'made in the French style, or possibly English' and 'six chairs of different coloured brocaded velvet.'[131] The number of chairs in diverse rooms encountered in various inventories belies solely practical use.[132] Chairs were a symbol of status, associated with the throne. Even in today's language, 'chair' in a formal context carries the idea of leading.[133] The term Holy See itself, after all, traces the etymology to chair, and the seat of Peter is a metaphor for the papacy.[134] In stately homes of patrician families, chairs were heavily decorated and expensively upholstered. Their very unnecessity declared opulence. Whatever the purpose of a room, it invariably held paintings and chairs. The idea of chairs for decorative purposes has remained till the present day.[135]

What was chosen to remain in modern households and what was discarded reflects the mentality of the present society as much as it did the early modern one. One item which disappeared except for the occasional quirky design is the *inginocchiatore* – the kneeler. They were found in all patrician households, most of them lavishly decorated with gilded carvings. The Princess Olimpia Giustiniani Barberini (d.1729) had one that doubled up as a dressing table, balancing vanity with piety.[136] The kneeler was usually in the form of a cabinet where books and other items could be kept. The Marquis Sacchetti had one described as 'made in the form of a

---

[129] ASC, Archivio Sacchetti, Libri Mastri -Serie II, n. 214. Folio number not clear.
[130] Gianfrancesco Rambelli, *Vocabolario Domestico* (Bologna: 1850). For *cantarano* see 92, *cassettone* see 93.
[131] AOM 931/35, 15, f.107r: '*Tre altri tavolini piccolo di noce fatti alla Francese, o sia all'Inglese.* Also '*Numero sei sedie di trippa di varj colori*'.
[132] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, '*Concerning Furniture*', 102 – 103.
[133] Eric Denker and William E. Wallace, *Artibus et Historiae*, 2015, 36: 72 (2015), 199.
[134] Retrieved on 8 November 2020 from https://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/ricerca/santa-sede/
[135] Today they are called accent chairs in interior design jargon, defined as seating places that have a role beyond function. They are meant to complement the décor, hence accent. An accent chair stands out as a focal point by adding colour or contrast, interesting upholstery or a powerful profile. Velvet is still popular today. See https://www.decorium.com/accent-chairs/
[136] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, '*Concerning Furniture*', 64.

small cabinet'.[137] Another one was etched with the Sacchetti family crest.[138] Fra Marcello had one in his bedroom,[139] as did Fra Carlo Spinelli.[140] Whether one can make deductions on personal devotion is hard to tell. Patrician families certainly paid much attention to external religiosity, as evidenced by their lavish decorations of family chapels in prominent churches. However, it is very difficult to judge to what extent people made private use of kneelers. Even today, people are not immune to this where a certain image is portrayed through accessories. For instance not all deep sea watches are owned by deep sea divers. As Henry Kamen states, 'Christianity was not simply the list of beliefs and practices laid down by the Church; it was also the sum of inherited attitudes and rituals relating both to the invisible and to the visible world.'[141] Religion was entwined with daily life and dictated the calendar of early modern Christian society. Leisure and work were determined by religion and all sections of society participated in the rituals that staggered the year.[142] Mortality was omnipresent, and the proximity of death would have undoubtedly emphasised the need of caring for one's soul. [143]Apart from studies in demography, the presence of death can be deduced from the early modern fixation with death imagery, as found in art (whether religious or secular), poetry, drama and in the teaching of religion.[144] Time itself was measured by the ringing of church bells for most of the population. Bells not only marked time but also indicated the appropriate prayer. For instance, the Angelus, a Catholic prayer commemorating the Incarnation, was heralded by the typical knell at the hours of 6.00, 12.00 and 18.00, whilst thirty-three strokes of the bell at 4.00 was the sound of the Pater Noster (Latin for Our Father). Time was tied to religion, and work, rest and prayer regulated by the sound of bells. Moreover, bells pealed for baptisms and marriages and tolled for funerals, marking the stages of human existence. Time was thus communal.[145]

---

[137] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, 'Concerning Furniture', 96. '*Un inginocchiatore di noce fatto di credenzino*'.
[138] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, 'Concerning Furniture', 99. '*Un inginocchiatore di noce tutto intagliato con arme Sacchetti*'.
[139] AOM 931/35, 15, 107r.
[140] AOM 931(33) No. 29, f. 234r.
[141] Henry Kamen, *Early Modern European Society* (London: Routledge, 2000), 51.
[142] H. Kamen, *Early Modern European Society*, 51.
[143] H. Kamen, *Early Modern European Society*, 18.
[144] H. Kamen, *Early Modern European Society*, 24.
[145] Marcus Tomalin, 'The Intriguing Complications of Pocket Watches in the Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 66: 274 (2015), 304.

Up to the sixteenth century, clocks were still regarded as a novelty and 'the preserve of a minority.'[146] But what had begun as rich men's toys steadily gained popularity and the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries saw the rise in attractiveness of pocket watches.[147] Although the early specimens were far from accurate, they were still a feat of engineering and the technology soon improved. Samuel Pepys captures both joy and woe of owning a watch:

> Lord! To see how much of my old folly and childishnesse hangs upon me still that I cannot forbear carrying my watch in my hand in the coach all this afternoon, and seeing what o'clock it is one hundred times, and am apt to think with myself, how could I be so long without one; though I remember since, I had one and found it a trouble, and resolved to carry one no more about me while I lived.[148]

The pocket watch personalised and privatised time, taking it from the steeple into one's own pocket. The effects of the pocket watch should not be underestimated. The first apparent fact is that pocket watches secularised time, in the sense that it was no longer solely a physical part of the church. Clocks had begun this revolution, but a watch that could be carried about one's person had even greater psychological impact. One's own private timepiece changed man's perception of time. The church clock told the time, but a glance at a pocket watch told relative time. Church bells tolled what time it was, pocket watches told how much time was left. Public clocks could regulate the activities of the community but were extremely limited when it came to private timetables. With the proliferation of pocket watches, the personalisation of time became more widespread which in turn was 'a major stimulus to the individualism that was an ever more salient aspect of Western civilization.'[149] The inventories of notable Roman families mention a number of clocks and watches. Cardinal Carlo Barberini had a number of watches made in London, Paris and Lyon and even kept the list of their makers.[150] Fra Marcello Sacchetti mentions a silver pocket watch in his *dispropriamento*, which he left in his study when not upon his person.[151] In his

---

[146] H. Kamen, *Early Modern European Society*, 36.
[147] M. Tomalin, 'Pocket Watches', 304.
[148] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, entry dated 13 May 1665.
[149] David S. Landes, *Revolution in Time. Clocks and the Making of the Modern World* (Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 2000), 92.
[150] A. González-Palacios and E. Bassett, '*Concerning Furniture*', 59.
[151] AOM 931/35, 15, 107r: '*Un oriolo di argento da portare in saccoccia*'. Again, the Tuscan dialect stands out, '*oriolo*' instead of '*orologio*' and '*saccoccia*' for '*tasca dei pantaloni*'. Stefano Rosi Galli, *Vohabolario del Vernaholo Fiorentino e del Dialetto Toscano di ieri e di oggi* (Romano editore, 2008), 34, 42.

correspondence with the Grand Master, there is hardly any reference to time but there is one mention which shows a certain mentality in considering day and night:

It is now 4 o'clock at night, the letter from the secretary of state has not arrived and I must close the letter so as not to miss the arrival of the courier. It has arrived at this point I am writing.[152]

The statement '*4 hore di notte*' shows that the mentality of early modern man was still linked with the sun and that, whatever the hour, light was day, darkness night. Day was considered to be from sunrise to sunset.[153] Mentality is always slightly slower than technology. Once a particular invention becomes widespread enough, society adapts to its impact. The internet is a fine example of this, starting as a pastime and becoming an integral part of life in less than a decade. Another mention of a particular hour is one which recorded Fra Marcello's time of death: 'Passed from this life to the next Friday 6 December at hour 24.'[154]

10.5 Conclusion

This chapter tried to catch a glimpse of Fra Marcello Sacchetti and his milieu through the persons and objects that surrounded him. The subject matter imposed a rhizomatic structure, whereby persons and objects discussed served as pegs upon which to hang the rest of the discourse. Departing from Sacchetti's *dispropriamento* and the family's inventory, it branched into the meaning of things and the influence of persons. A brief history was given to the objects encountered, with a focus on their meaning rather than physical attributes.

Whatever people have in their houses, whatever people put on their person, has a meaning established by convention. The convention gives the meaning to the object, and then the object conveys the same upon the person. This chapter tried to read the meanings behind the objects. But objects can never be divorced from the people that made use of them, in the same way that language can never be separated from its users. After all, it is through objects that people interact, and that makes things a form of language. Language is thought expressed in perceptible signs and the significance of all the items encountered in this chapter was immediately understood by the populace,

---

[152] AOM1297, f.124r, 29 August 1682: '*In questo punto che sono 4 hore di notte non e' vennuta la lettera di segretario di stato, ed Io chiudo la lettera per non perdere l'occasione del Procaccia. A questo punto che scrivero e' giunta*.'
[153] H. Kamen, *Early Modern European Society*, 36.
[154] AOM 931/35, 15 f.109v. '*Passo da questa all'altra vita Venerdi 6.Xmbre ad hore 24*'.

patricians and commoners alike. The stratum of society one is born into will of course dictate a substantial portion of one's later life. Thus this chapter strove to explore people that could have had some influence on Fra Marcello. This was not something peculiar to a particular age although the present age allows for more flexibility in climbing up the social ladder. But whoever does, will start speaking the same language. The fancy car replaces the carriage, designer clothes replace the *justaucorps*, and all the paraphernalia that modern man finds himself surrounded by, without really knowing why except that it seems to be the conventional thing to do. Within the parameters of family, fashion, norms and conventions, man expresses his own tastes, his own personality. Fra Marcello Sacchetti was very much a product of his age. He interacted with his contemporaries through the way he was brought up and through the products that were available at the time. The letters he wrote speak of the ambassador, his possessions tell a fragmented story of the man.

General Conclusion

The spark that gave rise to this work was a simple sentence by David F. Allen – 'So much of the Order of St John's history remains wrapped up in its diplomacy.'[1] The aim of this dissertation was to peel away such wrappings in order to unveil as much as possible of this history. Arriving at the end of this dissertation, it was not without trepidation that I opened the volume, finally with the correct *folios*, that housed the 'Instructions to you, Religious and Knight Fra Marcello Sacchetti, elected ordinary Ambassador to us and our Religion in Rome.'[2] A previous search had proved futile due to changing archival practices over the years. The fear was that I might have gone astray. As it happened, this fear turned to unfeigned joy as one by one the instructions paralleled my core chapters, even mentioning some individual cases that I had deemed important enough to use as case studies. The topics covered by these instructions; jurisdiction, patronage, *spoglie*, devolution of commanderies and priories, corsairing… were almost as if the instructions had given my work a seal of approval. With my concerns abated, a more thorough reading showed to what extent Fra Marcello Sacchetti had adhered to these instructions. So I decided to loosely structure the conclusion on these instructions, whose running thread was the protection of the relevance and identity of the Religion.

This dissertation has explored the Order's diplomatic endeavours in Rome through the person of Fra Marcello Sacchetti. The main purpose of the ambassador in Rome was to protect the interests of the Religion. This he strived to achieve through persuasion, patronage, appeal to previous papal privileges and past rulings. He tried to show that the Order was still a necessary institution and that the original passion that had fashioned its identity was still there, but the only way that this identity and relevance could be retained was by allowing its liberties and privileges to function. The ambassador in Rome had to see that whoever sat on the throne of Peter was convinced of this. In this sense, this dissertation is the first one to intrinsically tackle in detail the work of the Order's ambassador in Rome. Other works have touched upon

---

[1] David F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors' in Counter-Reformation Europe', *The Military Orders: Welfare and Warfare*, Helen Nicholson (ed) (Aldershot: Ashgate 1998), 363.

[2] AOM 262, ff.134v-136r, 9 May 1681: '*Instruttioni a voi Relig[io]so & Cav[alie]re fra Marcello Sacchetti eletto Ambas[ciator]e n[ost]ro, e della nostra Religione ordinario in Roma*.'

various aspects, helping to show areas that had hitherto been hidden. Thus Godfrey Wettinger, in his book on slavery, mentions Sacchetti in the alleged maltreatment of slaves in Malta.[3] Although he does touch upon the ambassador's share in defending the Order from ecclesiastical encroachment, Keith Sciberras focuses with impressive depth on Sacchetti's role as procurer of works of art for the Order.[4] Victor Mallia-Milanes also mentions Sacchetti's role in the introduction to *Descrittione di Malta*, when in 1714, the Ottoman Empire was brooding on how to remedy the losses borne in the War of the Morea (1684-1699).[5] Chris Vella's dissertation comes close to a work dedicated to the Order's ambassador in Rome, but focuses on the religious side.[6] Indeed, Allen himself made use of Sacchetti's correspondence in discussing James II's attempt at reinstating the Order in England.[7] But as his article on the Order's diplomacy reflects, there is still a lacuna. This work tried to be the first piece of the whole picture. What would complete the picture would be parallel studies of the ambassadors in Paris, Madrid and Vienna. Another area worth exploring would be similar works dealing with ambassadors in Rome in different periods. Both areas would help to further reveal the history of the Order, by comparing and contrasting the work of its representatives abroad, spatially and chronologically. It would show aspects of change and continuity in the Order's history through studying its diplomatic activities. This dissertation has endeavoured to offer a possible structure and methodology for future work.

Exploring the history of an institution which spanned so many centuries requires first and foremost an understanding of its self-perception. This is crucial because it dictates the institution's interaction with the rest of the world, and it is precisely this interaction which constitutes a considerable part of its history. The other part is its administrative machinery that made this interaction possible. The administration created and sustained its diplomatic corps who in turn presented the

---

[3] Godfrey Wettinger, *Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo ca. 1000 – 1812* (Msida: PEG, 2002), 54-55, 76.
[4] See Keith Sciberras, *Roman Baroque Sculpture for the Knights of Malta* (Malta: Midsea Books, 2012).
[5] Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed), *Descrittione di Malta. Anno 1716. A Venetian Account* (Malta: Bugelli Publications, 1988), 12-21.
[6] Christopher Vella, 'Aspects of Catholicism in Late Hospitaller Malta. The perspective of a contemporary Hospitaller Ambassador 1758-1778' (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 2007).
[7] David F. Allen, 'Attempts to Revive the Order of Malta in Stuart England', *The Historical Journal*, 33: 4 (1990), 947.

Order as it wanted to see itself, because self-perception was equated with self-preservation.

This leads to the permanent challenge institutions have to face, that is, how to retain their identity in an everchanging world. The birth of the military-religious orders was already a paradox, as the leap was made from religious being forbidden to carry arms to religious bearing arms as their vocation. Prior to adopting a military wing, the Order of St John was already a functioning hospitaller order. By the 1130s its identity of lance and lancet, hostility and hospital, had been forged. During this phase, identity and relevance were in harmony but with the loss of Acre in 1291 came the first storm of dissonance. Its charitable side and the menace of a strong enemy enabled the Order to continue projecting itself as a relevant and valid institution. But the fact that it had to constantly justify itself shows that the Europe that had given it birth had changed. Those that before had shared its vision now wanted a share of its bounty. What were once friendly forces were seeing the Order as a 'quarry for patronage', and popes were as much to blame as princes.[8] Papal encroachment on the Order's Italian possessions dictated part of the agenda of its ambassador in Rome.

In the minutes of the langue of Italy (dated between 1579 and 1635), the advice to the newly elected ambassador to Rome considered the reason for the election as 'nothing else than the peace of mind of this Holy Religion, and that the Religious can apply themselves to saintly Hospitality and holy militancy with mind at rest.'[9] This was crucial, but it was also awkward for an order of the Church which swore allegiance to the pope to have to continuously wrest promises from the reigning pontiff to respect the promises made by his predecessors. The 'peace of mind' referred to the hope of a commandery after serving the Religion for a number of years.[10] The instructions given to Fra Marcello Sacchetti are even more detailed on the areas that troubled the Religion most.

His appointment was to start with the kissing of the pope's feet as a symbol of fealty. The newly appointed ambassador was to use this occasion to assure the pope of the loyalty and filial love that the Religion bore for him and that it was eternally

---

[8] D. F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors', 379.
[9] AOM 2178, f.10r, from 1579 to 1635, exact date uncertain: '*per il quale e' stato eletto, che non e' altro se non la quiete di questa sacra Religione, et che con animo piu riposato possano li Religiosi di essa attendere alli essercitij della santa Hospitalita et sacra Militia*.'
[10] AOM 2178, f.10r, from 1579 to 1635, exact date uncertain.

grateful to his Holiness. Ideally during his first audience, Sacchetti had to pass on the message of the strict vigilance on the religious observance of the convent and the honesty of the brethren.[11] Having dispensed with this expression of loyalty to the pope and the Catholic Church, the instructions immediately passed on to the Order's dual purpose of hospitality and the continuous struggle against the common enemy. Again the need was felt to underline the Order's relevance and identity:

> The galleys sail continuously in ambush of infidel pirates; and although for some years fortune has deprived us of any noteworthy encounter, at least the aim of keeping the enemy at bay and securing the most dangerous Italian sea routes has been achieved.[12]

The words are carefully chosen. The perpetuity of war and the Order's constant vigilance stand out. This readiness at sea is not merely to defend the convent, but to ensure safer sea routes. That the Religion was not involved in any major conflict is simply because there was none. Implied in these words is the assurance that the Order never shied away from confronting the enemy. Sacchetti lost no opportunity in mentioning how the knights of the Religion were always where the fighting was thickest, ready to shed their blood in defence of Christendom. The first part of the instructions concluded with a promise of intensifying naval hostilities with the building of ships of the line. This promise did not come without subtle additions that loudly hail the Order's commitment and the stumbling blocks it daily faced:

> God willing, once the treasury is out of the penury it has been reduced to due to plagues, the war in Sicily, past famines and the immense expenditure of these fortifications, with God's help we plan to arm several ships of the line to be able to persecute the said corsairs in all seasons.[13]

The message is clear. Even with all these setbacks, the Order has kept its presence felt in defence of Christendom, with bastions and forts on land and its galleys on sea. When more money flowed in, it would be invested in the further defence of Christendom and in patrolling the sea all year round. The next area the instructions addressed was dealings with the cardinals and other personages. Nothing was added here except to

---

[11] AOM 262, f.134v, 9 May 1681.

[12] AOM 262, f.134v, 9 May 1681: '*far navigare di continuo q[ue]ste galere in busca di pirati infedeli; nel che se la fortuna non ci ha concesso da qualche anno in qua alcun considerabile incontro, almeno si e' conseguito il fine di fugar l'inimici e tenerli lontani dale crociere piu pericolose dell'Italia'.*

[13] AOM 262, f.134v, 9 May 1681: *'Se Dio ci dara vita, e vederemo sollevato l'erario dall'angustia, a che l'ha ridotto la peste, Guerra di Sicilia, carestie passate, e l'immenso dispendio di q[ue]ste fortification, pensiamo col divino aiuto far armare alcuni vascelli, per potere in ogni stagione perseguitare d[et]ti corsari*.'

follow the usage of his predecessors, which Sacchetti did, making use of contacts, relations and friends of the family.[14] Protocol and ceremonial had long been established. Moreover, Sacchetti grew up within a family that had had close contacts with Church ministers, apart from having a brother and an uncle who were cardinals. He was quite well-trained as to the manner of conducting negotiations. Regarding the matter of discussions, Fra Caravita and the Order's lawyers had to brief him on each pending case.[15]

A detailed handover from his predecessor Fra Caravita concerning pending issues was to be solicited, both for cases dealing with the embassy and the *ricetta*. Sacchetti was to receive a summary of the cases from the present ambassador (Fra Caravita) along with the copy of the instructions. Two points stand out in this section. First the unresolved cases are described as 'appertaining to the Religion or this Principality'.[16] The Order made a distinction between convent and the government of Malta, but was very jealous of interference in either. So for instance, a case of a churchman carrying out inspections in an Order's church on a commandery would be a case appertaining to the Religion, whereas the multiplicity of clerics under the inquisitor and the bishop of Malta could be considered as acts of defiance against the Grand Master as prince of Malta not as head of a religious order. In all cases, Sacchetti was extolled to commit himself with fervour because 'above all, the main dignity of the Minister is to obtain what is best for the Order.'[17]

The next section continued to underline the role of ambassador as protector of the Order:

> The main aim of your position is the defence of the privileges of the Religion, bestowed by the Apostolic See, which you must present on every occasion that arises as being given due to the distinguished service towards the Church, and consequently are entitlements and almost as binding as a contract. Above all, let it be known that the Religion is no less deserving now nor ever of the generosity of Apostolic benefits for its continued fervour in the uninterrupted service of Christianity, a service that goes back hundreds of years.[18]

---

[14] This work chapters 3 to 10.
[15] AOM 262, f.135r, 9 May 1681.
[16] AOM 262, f.135r, 9 May 1681: '*un sommario de negotij, che attualm[en]te pendono appartenenti alla Religione, o a q[ue]sto Principato*'.
[17] AOM 262, f.135r, 9 May 1681: '*giache nel conseguim[en]to delli vantaggi dell'Ordine consiste sopra tutto il mag[io]r decoro del Ministro.*'
[18] AOM 262, f.135r, 9 May 1681: '*Il principal fine del v[ost]ro carico e' la diffesa delli privileggi concessi alla Religione della Sede Ap[ostol]ica, nel che porrete in ogni occorrenza particular studio (or studi), rappresentadno esserci stati dati in ricompensa de segnalati servitij resi alla Chiesa,*

And that is a clear plea at self-justification through presenting that there was no dichotomy between relevance and identity in the self-perception of the Order. It is almost a syllogism: the privileges were granted for service (welfare and warfare) to Christianity. The Order still offers the same service with the same zeal. Therefore, the Order has the right to those privileges and to others that may be given in future. Obviously, the validity of welfare was never put to question, but there had always been a certain ambivalence towards warfare, even against non-Christians. In fact, as early as the mid-thirteenth century, 'Pope Innocent IV had established that no infidel rulers could justifiably be attacked simply because they were infidels.'[19] However, Western thinkers still considered war against the Ottoman Empire as justified, particularly since it still posed a threat either through potential hostilities or through the corsairing activities of its allies, in particular the north African regencies. In any case, while the Order could, and did cause repeated annoyance to the Sultan, it could never defeat such a larger foe on its own; large-scale activities were generally linked to alliances.

The next part then defined the nature of these privileges, namely the total freedom for the Convent to dispose of commanderies according to its rules and traditions.[20] The blatant encroachment from the Curia on the possessions of the Langue of Italy still smarted, and in fact the instructions go on to say that 'within sixty years, the number of knights of this langue was probably reduced by two-thirds.'[21] The argument hinges with the Order's mission and its traditions. The mission had to be financed partly through responsions, and it seems that a commandery managed by a knight tended to be more well-kept than when that person had not risen from within the ranks of the langue. Apparently, they did not invest in the upkeep of the commandery. A knight could had to show diligence in managing the commandery to qualify for promotion.[22] Someone who acquired it out of favouritism tried to milk it as much as possible. It seems that the latter were not too punctual with their

---

conseguentem[en]te con titolo e quasi con vigor di contratto. Ma sopra tutto significarete non esser men degna la Relig[io]ne in q[ue]sti tempi, che in qualsisia altro dell'abbondanza delle gratie ap[osto]liche per il continuato fervore al servitio del Christianesimo con un corso non interrotto dopo tanti secoli.'

[19] Noel Malcolm, *Useful Enemies. Islam and the Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought 1450-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 246.

[20] For instance, for the devolution of the Priory of Germany, see this work, Chapter 3.

[21] AOM 262, f.135r, 9 May 1681: '*il numero de Cav[alier]I di essa in modo che da 60 anni a q[ue]sta parte son mancati forse li due terzi di essi*'.

[22] See Gregory O'Malley, *The Knights Hospitaller of the English Langue 1460-1565* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 41-42, 50-51, 202, 270, 290.

responsions either. In fact, towards the end of the instructions, Sacchetti, as receiver of the Priory of Rome, is told 'to exercise his prudence and dexterity' when collecting money owed by cardinals.[23] When commanderies were wrested from the hands of the Order, it lost both materially and psychologically. The latter is evident in the valid argument that commanderies were a way for rewarding merit. Knights who had spent their familial legacy and risked life and limb in the service of Christendom were denied the comforts of an income when at an advanced age. It killed ambition, commitment, zeal, because a young knight had nothing to aspire for.

The question of merit was also raised in the problem of granting grand crosses *ad honores*, described as 'hateful to all the Convent' because it undermined the Order's hierarchy and put the least deserving before the experienced. This practice was also considered to be 'detrimental to the wider public, because it deprives the public from the service and assistance of the most outstanding knights'.[24] Sacchetti is exhorted to keep any pretensions of this kind within sight to be able to prevent them. But the irony is that the Order itself was prone to patronage from within as the conclusion of this section shows: 'We do not intend to include the pretension we have orally communicated to you, this subject does not cover exceptions on which you have been fully informed.'[25] Early modern society was propped up by patronage, and the Order was part of this. It therefore sought patronage, offered it and reaped advantages as well as suffered damage when patronage did not go its way.

Corsairing, with which the next instruction dealt, was one area where the Order bore the brunt of having influential persons championing the cause of corsairing victims, notably Greeks. 'Seek opportunities to speak to the Pope how corsairing has been effectively annihilated to the detriment of the Religion and all this Island.'[26] The blame for this is largely put on the Greeks and their complaints in Rome. There was

---

[23] AOM 262, f.136r, 9 May 1681: '*pratticare in cio la v[ost]ra prud[enz]a e destrezza.*'
[24] AOM 262, f.135r, 9 May 1681: '*Le concessioni delle gran Croci ad honores sono odiosis[iss]ime a tutto il Convento, e preventono non solo l'ordine stabilito da n[ost]ri maggiori, ma della natura med[esi]ma con anteporre li giovani alli vecchi, e li men degni a loro antiani spesse volte carichi di merito et insieme sono pregiudicialis[si]me al publico, essendo defraudato dall'assistenza e servitij delli Cav[alier]I piu conspicui*'.
[25] AOM 262, f.135r, 9 May 1681: '*Non intend in cio comprendere la pretens[io]ne da noi communicatavi a bocca gia che nel soggetto non concorrono l'eccettioni riferite, come sapete, e v'habbiamo pienamente informato.*'
[26] AOM 262, f.135rv, 9 May 1681: '*Vi occorrera discorrere qualche volta con n[os]tro Sig[nor]e delli n[ost]ri corsair ne cui proposito rapp[rese]ntarete a Sua S[anti]ta esser affatto annichilato il corso con sommo danno dalla Religione, e di tutta quest'Isola*'.

no love lost, even in a document as formal as a set of instructions for the newly appointed ambassador. The Greeks are described as 'betrayers of their nation' and 'perpetrators of a thousand frauds' who would stop at nothing to save the merchandise of Turks, on whom they depend.[27] This state of affairs was driving corsairs to seek other flags to sail under, flags with much less restrictions than that of the Religion and its Tribunals, which punish excesses and return ill-gotten goods. Apart from the loss of revenue, there was a deeper reason why the Religion continuously petitioned the pope in corsairing matters. Corsairs were an informal wing of the military side. In the absence of official war, corsairing maintained hostilities, offered safety to Catholic shipping, and provided naval experience. Naval warfare was part of the Order's identity. And when Catholic powers frowned upon the Order's corsairing activities, they were implying that the Order was becoming irrelevant. In each activity that the Order participated in or experienced, there is this running thread of perpetually trying to justify its relevance but retaining its identity. Protection of its revenues and its liberties went hand in hand with relevance and identity. The ambassador in Rome embodied these concerns. The Religion was supposedly free from interference to allow it to practise its twin vocation. Its revenue financed these vocations. No prince declared during this time that the Order was an anachronism or outwardly said that it should be disbanded. The most vociferous of the Hospital's critics was perhaps Venice, but it clamoured against alleged abuses, not challenged its very existence. Still, the Order's main struggle remained a continuous endeavour to convince princes and popes to act according to their supposed belief in Christendom. Rulers who professed belief in continuing the 'good fight' but then impoverished the Order through briefs, misguided patronage, and the lavish bestowing of exceptions were only paying lip service to the ideal. The Order saw itself as the prime champion of the cause of Christendom and anyone challenging its rules and traditions was undermining the cause. During the seventeenth century there were on the one hand Catholic writers who attributed romantic terms such as the bulwark of Christendom to Malta[28], yet conversely rulers encroached upon the Order with severe consequences.[29]

---

[27] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681: '*la cagione in gran parte si e' il troppo eredito, che si da in quelli tribunal ai lamenti de Greci mendacis[si]mi di loro nat[ion]e e che hoggi per la dipendenza de Turchi pratticano mille fraudi per salvare le mercantile di essi*'.
[28] N. Malcolm, *Useful Enemies*, 14.
[29] D. F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors', 379.

One such interference with the Order's administration was the privilege of allowing a knight to dispense of his earthly goods as he wished. According to the instructions being discussed, the *spoglio* 'was the main means by which the Religion sustained itself'.[30] But again continuous briefs allowing a knight to testate as he pleased were diverting this income from reaching the common treasury. Such briefs were not only to be opposed, but the instructions added that those given by previous popes were to be revoked, even going into the detail of mentioning two individual cases: that of the Prior of Bagnara Fra Fabritio Ruffo[31] and Prior of Santa Eufemia Fra Virginio Valle.[32] The instructions are strongly worded:

> We have told your predecessor to clarify this with His Holiness and effectively ask him to revoke them [the briefs], and a writ has been sent regarding this with the reasons, that must oblige His Holiness to grant us this favour.[33]

The Order believed that the revocation of these two briefs was of great consequence. It was very probable that other knights had such briefs which neither the common treasury nor the venerable council knew about. The ambassador had to ensure that the revocation of these two briefs meant that all other briefs were null and void based on this ruling.[34] This would supposedly save the common treasury from future losses. But in fact, ambassadors had to constantly strive to get popes to honour previous rulings, so it seems that there was no guarantee that the decision of one pope would ensure similar decisions in future. The early modern world worked with a system of privileges and patronage, not equal rights. Merit did count to a certain extent, but influential friends even more. But it was not just the fear of losing cases, and the related revenue; that spurred the Order to prevent interference, but a deeply embedded aversion of interference itself.

The next two items of instruction deal with court cases in Malta, the first for the brethren and the other concerning the Grand Master's lay subjects. In both cases, there was supposedly no right of appeal to Rome, but there were exceptions and abuses. The right of appeal for a knight was allowed only if there was evidently a

---

[30] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681: '*Il mezzo piu prinicipale che tiene la Relig[io]ne per il proprio mantenim[en]to e' il dretta degli spogli de Religiosi*'.
[31] This work, Chapter 4.
[32] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681.
[33] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681: '*Habbiamo incaricato al v[ost]ro antecessore di chiarirsene, e fare efficacis[si]ma istanza a Sua San[ti]ta per la rivocat[io]ne, e li fu mandata una scr[ittu]ra in tal proposito con li motivi, che devono obligare Sua San[ti]ta a far alla Relig[io]ne q[ues]ta gr[ati]a*'.
[34] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681.

negation of justice in the hearing, or if the ruling went against the statutes. In such a case, the defendant could appeal to obtain a rescript from the Pope and the case would be examined by the Signature of Grace.[35] The ambassador had to see that this method was retained. He also had to supplicate the Pope to refrain from giving attention to brethren who simply took their case to Rome without a hearing at the ordinary council. Such cases had to be referred back to local tribunals. This jealousy over the authority over the brethren is quite logical. The Grand Master had already to contend with bishop and inquisitor over jurisdiction of subjects. If his own brother religious started to appeal to Rome on every pretext, his authority would disintegrate and with it the whole institution. It would also open the door for even more intrusion, more bending of rules and more uncalled for favouritisms. Similarly, lay hearings in the tribunals in Malta did not come with a right of appeal to Rome, but 'with the force of a single law, a certain widow took her case to the Court of Rome'.[36] Sacchetti was to be informed further and instructed to prolong the case as much as possible unless the ruling was favourable and keep the Order updated with the proceedings.[37]

The consequences of the next piece of advice were even more telling. The case centred around the Archbishop of Toledo, the Prior of Castile and the Order's ambassador in Madrid. This bitter row over jurisdiction escalated to the point where violence was allegedly shown towards churchmen.[38] The instructions describe the case as 'concerning jurisdiction, which is of paramount importance'.[39] Sacchetti was to 'defend it with the utmost fervour possible', keeping constant correspondence (*carteggiandovi*) with both the prior and the ambassador.[40]

Another particular case which the instructions mention is for the ambassador to do his utmost to recover the Priory of Germany should a vacancy arise. Sacchetti was to be vigilant and know if the pope receives any recommendation from the emperor. If the emperor was in fact recommending someone as prior of Germany,

---

[35] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681.
[36] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681: '*sotto il pretesto della legge unica si e' preteso da certa vedova portar la causa all Corte di Roma*'. Local tribunal hearings had the right of a local appeal as Mercieca states: 'Appeal was possible and this was done in front of the Auditor of the Grand Master,' See Simon Mercieca, 'How was Judicial Power balanced in Malta in Early Modern Times? A Cursory look at the Maltese Legal System through a Historical Perspective', *Journal of Civil Law Studies*, 2: 4 (2011), 457.
[37] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681.
[38] See this work, Chapter 5.
[39] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681: '*in materia di giurisd[izio]ne, la q[ua]le e' importantis[isim]a*'.
[40] AOM 262, f.135v, 9 May 1681: '*incarichiamo di difenderla col mag[gior] fervore possibile, carteggiandovi col Ven Bag[lio]*'.

Sacchetti was to convince the pope not to give in to such demands.[41] The responsibility was immense. Persuading the head of the Catholic Church to ignore the demands of the Holy Roman Emperor would need all diplomatic skills. That particular cases are mentioned within a set of general instructions show how important they were for the Order.

All matters were linked, and ultimately boiled down to the survival of the Religion in a form that was as close as possible to its original identity. Loss of territory implied loss of revenue and loss of freedom. An impoverished Order that was not allowed to administer its own affairs in the interest of its vocation would become irrelevant. If hampered from exercising its vocation, the Order risked being reduced to a prestigious warehouse for favours. Towards the end of the instructions the Grand Master told Ambassador Fra Marcello Sacchetti to remind the pope what the Order of St John stood for:

> Finally, when you are in the pope's presence, show how, in execution of his revered commands, we have not failed, in our letters as well as through our ambassadors to the Most Christian King and to His Catholic Majesty, to plead with the most vigorous remonstrances to unite their arms against the common enemy, to which occasion we would offer the whole being of the Religion, all her Knights and even my own very person, and confirm the same to His Holiness as an expression of our most ardent zeal.[42]

Grand Master Carafa was here echoing the definition of the Order of St John that Cardinal Mazarin had told the young Louis XIV in 1655: 'it was an army whose function was to fight the enemies of Christendom, and to work for the unification of Christian princes.'[43] When the enemies of Christendom have been vanquished and Christian princes lived in harmony, then the Religion would sheathe her sword. But until then, the Order remained relevant and necessary.

---

[41] AOM 262, f.136r, 9 May 1681.

[42] AOM 262, f.136r, 9 May 1681: '*Per ultimo quando portera la congiuntura significarete a Sua S[anti]ta, come in essecut[io]ne de suoi riveriti comandi non habbiamo mancato di eccitare con le n[ost]re l[ette]re, come continuam[en]te facciamo per mezzo de n[ost]ri Ambas[ciato]ri le M[aes]ta del Re Christ[ianissi]mo e Cat[olli]co alla congiuntione de loro armi contro il nemico commune, con adoperare le piu vive dimostranze, et offerire in tal occas[io]ne tutto l'essere della Relig[io]ne tutti li Cav[alie]ri di essa, e la n[ost]ra med[esi]ma persona, e lo stesso confirmarete a Sua San[ti]ta con espressione del n[ost]ro ardentis[si]mo zelo*.'

[43] D. F. Allen, 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors', 363.

Appendix 1 Short Biographies

Giovanni Battista de Luca (1614–1683)

Giovanni de Luca was from a common but well to do family from Venosa. He studied the Humanities and Law During the pontificate of Pope Innocent XI, he was referendary of the Tribunals of the Apostolic Signature of Justice and of Grace, auditor of His Holiness and secretary of Memorials. He was made cardinal in 1681. Cardinal de Luca is best known for being a great reformer of Canon Law and in his achievements in curbing nepotism.

Johannes Walter Slusius (1628-1687)

Johannes was born in Vise, Liege, then part of the Spanish Netherlands. After his studies, he remained in Rome where he became the Referendary of the Tribunals of the Apostolic Signature of Justice and of Grace. He became Secretary of Apostolic Briefs when his uncle, who had also occupied this post, died. He was given the purple of the cardinalate a year before his death.

Giacomo Altoviti (1604-1693)

Giacomo Altoviti was Fra Marcello Sacchetti's great-uncle. His father was Lorenzo Altoviti, a rich papal banker. Giacomo's sister, Francesca Sacchetti Altoviti, married Giovanni Battista Sacchetti, Fra Marcello's grandfather. Giacomo was a friend of Fabio Chigi and joined him when Chigi was sent as papal legate by Pope Urban VIII to Ferrara and as Inquisitor in Malta in 1653. In 1658 he was appointed as Apostolic Nuncio to Venice, until he resigned in 1666. He was made Titular Patriarch of Antioch, a position he held till his death.

Alderano Cibo or Cybo (1613-1700)

Alderano Cibo was from a noble family from Genoa. He went to Rome at an early age and became papal prelate during the pontificate of Pope Urban VIII. He was made papal major-domo in 1644 and a cardinal a year later. He served as papal legate in Urbino (1645), Romagna (1648) and in Ferrara (1651). In 1676 he was appointed Secretary of State, a position he kept till 1689. He was also Secretary of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Roman and Universal Inquisition (1683-1700) and Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (1687-1700).

Antonio Pignatelli (1615-1700)

Antonio was born from an influential family from Naples. He had an eminent career serving as vice-legate in Urbino in 1646, Inquisitor of Malta (1646-1649), Governor of Viterbo (1649-1652), Archbishop of Larissa and Nuncio of Florence (1652-1660). He was also Nuncio of Poland (1660-1668) and Nuncio of Vienna (1668-1671) posts which were considered as the last stepping-stone to the dignity of cardinal. When Pope Clement IX died, Pope Clement X was elected and Pignatelli's career waned. Still, in 1673 he was appointed Secretary of the Congregation of Bishops and Maestro di Camera. Pope Innocent XI recognised his abilities and awarded the purple of the cardinalate in 1681, appointing him Archbishop of Faenza in 1682 and Naples in 1686. Pignatelli eventually became Pope Innocent XII (r. 1691-1700) after Pope Alexander VIII (r. 1689-1691).

Girolamo Casanate or Casanata and Casanatta (1620-1700)

Girolamo was from an important Spanish family in Naples. After serving as Referendary of the Tribunals of the Apostolic Signature of Justice and of Grace in 1657, he was sent to Malta as Inquisitor (1658-1663). In the next three years, he served as Consultor of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and Consultor of the Sacred Congregation of Propoganda Fide. He was a member of a number of Sacred Congregatrions: Inquisition and Propogandae Fide (1667-1699), Congregation of Bishops and that of Rites (1674-1699) and Congregation of the Council (1679-1699) amongst others. Girolamo became a cardinal in 1673.

Fabrizio Spada (1643-1717)

Fabrizio Spada was born in Rome from a noble family. He was groomed for an ecclesiastical career at a young age. After studying both canon and civil law in Perugia, he returned to Rome. He rose from Archbishop of Patrae (1672) to Apostolic nunzio to Savoy (1672-1674) and France (1675), becoming cardinal in 1675. He was appointed Secretary of State (1691), a position he kept till he resigned in 1700 when he became Prefect of the Apostolic Signatura, a position (amongst other honours) he kept till he died in 1717.

Gianfrancesco Albani (1649-1721)

Gianfrancesco was from a distinguished family from Pesaro. After studying canon and civil law in Rome he embarked upon an ecclesiastical career. During the

pontificate of Innocent XI, he was made Referendary of the Tribunals of the Apostolic Signature of Justice and of Grace, Governor of Rieti, Governor of Sabina, Governor of Orvieto, and Secretary of Apostolic Briefs (1687 – 1700). He was created cardinal in 1690. In 1700 he became Pope Clement XI.

Giambattista Spinola (1615-1704)

Giambattista was born in Madrid, to where his family had emigrated from Genoa. During his career as cardinal, he participated in three papal conclaves. He studied law at a young age and received the degree of *Doctor in utroque iure*. The date of when he took Holy Orders is not known, but he was appointed Archbishop of Acerenza and Matera in 1648 and Archbishop of Genoa in 1664. Pope Clement X (1670-1676) appointed him Secretary for the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, Governor of Rome and Vice Camerlengo. He was also Governor of Rome from 1675 till 1681, when he was elevated to cardinal. He resigned from the bishopric of Genoa in the same year due to ill health. Pope Innocent XI appointed him Cardinal Priest and held a succession of churches in this position. He was also appointed Chamberlain of the College of Cardinals, a position he held briefly, again resigning due to poor health.

Giuseppe Renato Imperiali (1651-1737)

Giuseppe was born in Oria near Francavilla. It is known that he obtained a doctorate but little further is known about his education. During the pontificate of Pope Innocent XI he became Cleric of the Apostolic Chamber and eventually its treasurer and auditor. He was also Commissary general of galleys, fortresses and maritime towers of the Papal States (1686). He was made cardinal in 1690, the same year he became Legate in Ferrara.

Cardinal Carlo Colonna (1665-1739)

In 1696, Carlo Colonna was the Referendary of the Tribunals of the Apostolic Signature and of Justice and of Grace and Prefect of the Apostolic Palace. He was made Cardinal in 1706.

Appendix 2: List of Popes, Grand Masters, Inquisitors and Bishops of Malta during the tenure of Fra Marcello Sacchetti

Popes

Innocent XI	Benedetto Odescalchi	r.1676-1689
Alexander VIII	Pietro Vito Ottoboni	r.1689-1691
Innocent XII	Antonio Pignatelli	r.1691-1700
Clement XI	Giovanni Francesco Albani	r.1700-1721

Grand Masters

Gregorio Carafa	(Italian)	r.1680-1690
Adrien de Wignacourt	(French)	r.1690-1697
Ramon Perellos i Rocafull	(Portuguese)	r.1698-1720
Marc'antonio Zondadori	(Italian)	r.1720-1722

Inquisitors in Malta

Giacomo Cantelmi	1678-1686
Innico Caracciolo	1686-1691
Francesco Acquaviva d'Aragona	1691-1694
Tommaso Ruffo	1694-1698
Giacomo Filiberto Ferrero di Messerano	1698-1703
Giorgio Spinola	1703-1706
Giacomo Caracciolo	1706-1711
Raniero D'Elci	1711-1718
Lazzarao Pallavicini	1718-1720
Antonio Ruffo	1720-1728

Bishops

Miguel Jerónimo de Molina	1678-1682
Davide Cocco Palmieri	1684-1711
Joaquín Canaves	1713-1721

Bibliography

Unpublished Primary Sources

Archive of the Order of Malta (AOM), National Library of Malta (NLM)

Letter by Fra Francisque de Seytres-Caumons to Grand Master Nicolas Cotoner
1284 (dated 1665)

Letter by Fra Giovanni Maria Caravita to Grand Master Fra Gregorio Carafa
1296 (dated 1681)

Letters by Fra Marcello Sacchetti to Grand Master Fra Gregorio Carafa
1297 (dated 1682)
1298 (dated 1683)
1299 (dated 1684)
1300 (dated 1685)
1301 (dated 1686)
1302 (dated 1687)
1303 (dated 1688-1689)
1304 (dated 1690)

Letters by Fra Marcello Sacchetti to Grand Master Fra Adrien de Wignacourt
1305 (dated 1691-1692)

Letters by Fra Marcello Sacchetti to Grand Master Fra Ramon Perellos
1311 (dated 1699)
1316 (dated 1704)
1321 (dated 1709)
1324 (dated 1712)
1326 (dated 1714)
1327 (dated 1715)
1329 (dated 1717)
1330 (dated 1719)
1331 (dated 1720)

Letters by Grand Master Fra Gregorio Carafa to Fra Marcello Sacchetti
1449 (dated 1682)
1450 (dated 1683)
1451 (dated 1684)
1452 (dated 1685)
1453 (dated 1686)

Letters by Grand Master Fra Ramon Perellos to Fra Marcello Sacchetti
1461 (dated 1700)
1463 (dated 1702)
1464 (dated 1703)
1465 (dated 1704)
1467 (dated 1706)
1468 (dated 1707)

1470 (dated 1709)
1473 (dated 1712)
1477 (dated 1716)
1481 (dated 1720)
1482 (dated 1720)

Letter by Grand Master Perellos
1561 (dated 1705-1713)

Dispropriamenti
931/35

Liber Conciliarum
127 (dated 1681-1684)
152 (dated 1755-1757)

Libri Conciliarum Status
258 (dated 1645-1650)
262 (dated 1672-1686)
265 (dated 1700-1709)
266 (dated 1709-1716)

Minutes of the Langue of Italy
2178 (1579-1635)

Sententiae Conciliarum
217 (dated 1595-1610)
740 (1668)

Processi delle Prove dei Cavalieri Italiani
4754 (dated 1645)

Statuti ed Ordinanzioni
1649 (dated 1459)

Cathedral Archives, Archivum Inquisitionis Melitensis (AIM)
Corr. 92 (dated 1706)

Archivio Storico Capitolino (ASC), Rome
Archivio Sacchetti, Corrispondenza.
Archivio Sacchetti, Libri Mastri.
Miscellanea per materia.

Archivio Sovrano Militare Ordine di Malta (ASMOM), Rome

Archivio dell'Ambasciata presso la Santa Sede, Sacchetti, DP3
Archivio dell'ambasciata presso la santa sede, DP6

Published Primary Sources

Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologica* (ST IIaIIae 47.2 ad and ST IIaIIae 47.4), Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. http://www.iep.utm.edu/aq-moral/#SH3a
(Used for the definition of 'virtue'.)

Bosio, Giacomo, *Dell'istoria Della Sacra Religione Et Ill.ma Militia Di S. Gio. Gierosol.no*, vol. 2 (Rome: 1629).

Bosio, Giacomo, *Gli Statuti Della Sacra Religione Di S.Giovanni Gierosolimitano* (Roma: 1589.)

Caravita, Giovanni, *Trattato dell'Offizio Del Ricevitore E De' Procuratori Del Comun Tesoro, Fuor di Convento e Straordinarj* (Malta: 1763).

Castiglione, Sabba da, *Ricordi overo Ammaestramenti* (Venice: 1613).

Codice del Sacro Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano riordinato per comandamento Del Sacro Generale Capitolo (Malta: 1782),

Dal Pozzo, Bartolomeo, *Historia Della Sacra Religione Militare Di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano Detta di Malta*, vol. 1 (Verona: 1703)

Dal Pozzo, Bartolomeo, *Historia Della Sacra Religione Militare Di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano Detta di Malta*, vol. 2 (Venezia: 1715).

Istruzioni sopra gli Obblighi piu principali De' Cavalieri di Malta (Rome: 1713)

Dubois, Pierre, *De recuperatione Terrae Sanctae*, Alphonse Picard (ed) (Chartres: 1891).
(Used to establish the first known person to use the term *res publica Christiana*.)

Micallef, Carlo, *Summa Iurium Ierosolymitanum Equitum*, vol. 2, [17th century]. (The date of publication is uncertain). BSMOM, ms. 63.

Moroni, Gaetano, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica* (1852).

Tanner, Norman P. (ed), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990).
(A very important work that explains the origins of the Order's privileges. It also throws light on the position of the Order within the Catholic Church. These two volumes help put the conflicts between the Order and local bishops in the right perspective.)

Vertot, Abbe de, *The History of the Knights of Malta*. VOL II (Malta: Midsea Books, 1989).

Treatises on the ambassador

Bragaccia, Gasparo, *L'Ambasciatore* (Padova: 1627).

Callières, François de, '*De la manière de négocier avec les souverains* (Paris: 1717).

Carafa, Carlos Maria, *El Embaxador Politico Christiano* (Palermo: 1691).

Clavière, René de Maulde-La, *La Diplomatie au Temps de Machiavel*, 3 volumes, vol 1 (Paris: 1892).

Dolet, Étienne, *De officio legati* (Lyons, 1541), James E. Dunlap (translator), 'On the Office of Legate, commonly called Ambassador', *The American Journal of International Law* , 27: 1 (1933).

Hotman, Jean, *Lo Ambasciatore del Signor Di Ville* (Venice: 1659),

Le Vayer, François de La Mothe, *Scuola de Prencipi e de Cavalieri* (Bologna: 1677).

Wicquefort, Abraham de, 'L'ambassadeur et ses fonctions' (Cologne). https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k93844c/f77.image

Vera, Juan Antonio de, *Idea del Perfetto Ambasciadore*. *Dialoghi Historici, e Politici* (Venetia: 1654).

Secondary Sources

Abulafia, David, 'Introduction: From Ferrante I to Charles VIII', *The French Descent into Renaissance Italy 1494-95. Antecedents and Effects*, David Abulafia (ed.) (Hampshire: Variorum Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 1995).
(Used to compare the situation of a fragmented Italy with that of Ancient Greece.)

Abulafia, David, *The Great Sea. A Human History of the Mediterranean* (London: Penguin Books, 2012).
(Used for relations between Venice and the Ottoman Empire after Candia)

Addis William E. and Arnold Thomas (eds), A Catholic Dictionary (London: Virtue and Co. Ltd, 1955.)
(Dictionary consulted for definition of terms related used by the Roman Catholic Church.)

Ago, Renata, 'Sovrano Pontefice e Societa di Corte. Competizioni Cerimoniali e Politica nella Seconda Meta del XVII Secolo', in *Cérémonial et rituel à Rome (XVIe-XIXe siècle)* (Rome: Publications de l'École Française de Rome, 1997).
(used for ceremonials in Rome.)

Allen, David F., 'The Order of St John as a 'School for Ambassadors' in Counter-Reformation Europe', *The Military Orders: Welfare and Warfare*, Helen Nicholson (ed.) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998).
(This article is of particular relevance to any work on the Order's diplomacy. It expounds on the importance of diplomacy for the Order to interact with foreign powers and protect its interests in Europe.)

Allen, David F., 'Attempts to Revive the Order of Malta in Stuart England', *The Historical Journal*, 33: 4 (1990).
(Read because the author makes use of Fra Sacchetti's correspondence.)

Ago, Renata, *Gusto for Things. A History of Objects in Seventeenth-Century Rome* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006).
(Used for material culture in Rome.)

Ago, Renata, 'Hegemony over the Social Scene and Zealous Popes (1676–1700)', *Court and Politics in Papal Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
(Struggle for precedence between old Roman families and the papal nobility.)

Aloisio, Mark, *'The Maltese Corso in the Fifteenth Century',* Medieval Encounters, 9: 2 (2003).
(Concerned corsairing in Malta before the arrival of the Order.)

Anderson, Matthew S., *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450-1919* (London: Longman, 1993).
(An authority on the history of diplomacy. This work picks up from Mattingly's influential *Renaissance Diplomacy*.)

Asch, Ronald, G., 'Introduction: Court and Household from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries', *Princes, Patronage and Nobility: The Court at the*

Beginning of the Modern Age, Ronald Asch, Ronald, G., and Birke, Adolf M. (eds.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
(Used for information on the concept of 'court' in Rome.)

Asch, Ronald, G., *The Thirty Years War: The Holy Roman Empire and Europe, 1618-48* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997).
(Provided background history to European relations and the Peace of Westphalia.)

Ashley, Maurice, *The Golden Century. Europe 1598-1715* (London: Phoenix, 2002).
(Used to expound on Pope Innocent's XI crusading fervour.)

Amorós i Gonell, Francesc, 'Malta i els cavallers hospitalers de l'orde militar de Sant Joan de Jerusalem durant la Guerra de Successió (1702-1714). Notícies extretes de la correspondència Diplomàtica', *Pedralbes: revista d'historia moderna*, 26 (2006).
(Used for information about the Order during the War of the Spanish Succession.)

Bacon, Francis, 'Essay XXVII Of Friendship', *Complete Essays* (New York: Dover Publications, 2008).
(Friendship from a humanistic point of view.)

Bagehot, Walter, *The English Constitution* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1867).
(Used to elaborate on qualities of ambassador as described by early modern theorists.)

Balch, Thomas Willing, 'Albericus Gentilis', *The American Journal of International Law*, 5: 3 (1911).
(Used for information on early modern theorist Albericus Gentilis regarding the qualities of an ambassador.)

Ballor, Jordan J., 'The Council and the Catechism', *Journal of Markets and Morality*, 16: 1 (2013).
(On the abuses of relics as expounded by the Council of Trent.)

Bamford, Paul Walden, 'The Knights of Malta and the King of France', *French Historical Studies*, 3: 4 (1964).
(Useful for underlining the nature of the relations between the Order and France.)

Goñi, Carlos Barquero, 'The Military Orders. On land and by sea', *The Military Orders*, vol 4, Judi Upton-Ward (ed) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).
(Used for information on the Order's diplomacy during the Rhodian period.)

Barker, J. Craig, *The Protection of Diplomatic Personnel* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016).
(Used to elaborate on early modern theorists.)

Barry Alfred, 'Boussuet and the Gallican Declaration of 1682', retrieved on 20 February 2011 from http://www.jstor.org.ejournals.um.edu.mt/stable/25012610
(This article was used to study the nature of the disagreements between France and the Holy See.)

Bearfield, Domonic A., 'What Is Patronage? A Critical Reexamination', *Public Administration Review,* 69: 1 (2009).
(Used for better understanding of patronage.)

Behrens B., 'Treatises on the Ambassador written in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries', *The English Historical Review,* li, 204 (1936).
(This article provided a valuable account of the historiographical development of the concept of the 'perfect ambassador'.)

Beloff, Max, *The Age of Absolutism: 1660-1815* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014).
(On taxation during the age of Absolutism.)

Berridge, G.R. and Lloyd, Lorna (eds), *Dictionary of Diplomacy* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
(An indispensable handbook for definitions and general information.)

Bewes, Wyndham A., 'Gathered Notes on the Peace of Westphalia of 1648', *Transactions of the Grotius Society*, Problems of Peace and War, Papers Read before the Society in the Year 1933, 19 (1933).
(Article used for further elaboration on the Peace of Westphalia.)

Bizzocchi Roberto, 'Church, Religion, and State in the Early Modern Period', *The Journal of Modern History*, 67, Supplement: *The Origins of the State in Italy, 1300-1600* (1995).
(On conflicts arising due to unclarity of Tridentine precepts.)

Black, Jeremy, *A History of Diplomacy* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2010).
(Very important book on the evolution of diplomacy.)

Black, Jeremy, *European International Relations 1648-1815* (New York-Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002).
(A good source of general information. Used mainly for details on the Peace of Westphalia.)

Blondy, Alain, 'Malta and France 1789-1798: The Art of Communicating a Crisis', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem*, Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed) (Msida: Mireva, 1993).
(Concerning the office of Grand Hospitaller.)

Bonnici, Alexander, 'Maltese Society under the Hospitallers in the light of Inquisition Documents', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva Publications, 1993).
(This article helped to see the nature of relations between the Order and the Inquisitor in Malta from a different perspective.)

Bonnici, Alexander, *Medieval and Roman Inquisition in Malta* (Malta: Religjon u Hajja, 1998).
(Used for information on Cardinal Girolamo Casanate when inquisitor of Malta.)

Bonnici, Alfred, 'The Postal System of the Order of St John' (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 2011).
(Concerning the fumigation of letters arriving in Malta from abroad.)

Bonnet Stéphane, 'Botero Machiavélien ou l'invention de la Raison d'État', *Les Études philosophiques.* Philosophie politique Classique, 3 (2003).
(Used for understanding early origins on separation of Church and state.)

Bonney, Richard, *Political Change in France under Richelieu and Mazarin, 1624-1661* (Oxford: 1978).
(Used for understanding the vertical approach to concept of patronage.)

Bono, Salvatore, *Corsari nel Mediterraneo. Cristiani e Musulmani fra Guerra, Schiavitu e Commercio*, Arnoldo Mondadori (ed) (Milan: Mondadori, 1993).
(Corsairing during the Order's period in Malta.)

Bono, Salvatore, 'Naval Exploits and Privateering', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993).
(This article elaborates on the Order's naval commitment.)

Bosi, Mario, 'Quando ai Cardinali fu dato il titolo dei eminenza', *Strenna dei Romanisti*, 41 (1980).
(Use of the title 'Your Eminence' for Cardinals and Grand Masters – showing their equal status, hence horizontal patronage.)

Braudel, Fernand, *A History of Civilizations* (New York: Penguin Books, 1995).
(This book gives an overall view of history. Braudel's multidisciplinary approach to history makes his work obligatory.)

Braudel, Fernand, *Civilisation and Capitalism, 15th – 18th Century: the Perspective of the World*, vol 3 (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992).
(Traces the social and economic history of the world from the Middle Ages to the Industrial Revolution, focusing on Europe. Imparted information on the relations between Venice and the Ottoman Empire.)

Braudel, Fernand, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (London, Fontana Press, 1987).
(This book helped form an outlook on the study of history in its social, economic and political aspects. It also provided background information to the forces that helped to give the seventeenth century its form.)

Braun, G., 'Les traductions francaises des traits de Westphalie: de 1648 à la fin de l'ancien régime', *XVIIe siècle*, 48 (1996).
(Used for the discussion on the Treaty of Westphalia.)

Brodman, James W., 'Rule and Identity: The Case of the Military Orders', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 87: 3 (2001).
(Used for understanding the religious-martial nature of military orders.)

Brundage, James, 'The Lawyers of the Military Orders', *The Military Orders: Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick*, Malcolm Barber (ed.), 1 (Hampshire: Routledge, 1994).
(Used for elaborating on the use of lawyers by the military-religious orders.)

Buckley, Veronica, *Christina Queen of Sweden* (London New York, Toronto, Sydney: Harper Perennial, epub edition, 2010).
(Used to better understand the Roman penchant for celebrations and ostentation.)

Buhagiar, Mario, 'The Treasure of Relics and Reliquaries of the Knights Hospitaller in Malta', *Melitensium Amor. Festschrift in honour of Dun Gwann Azzorpardi*, Toni Cortis, Thomas Freller and Lino Bugeja (eds) (Malta: The Contributors, 2002).
(Used for information on the relic of Santa Toscana.)

Burckhardt, Jacob, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1981).
(Used for discussing different perspectives in historiography.)

Burke, Peter, 'Popular Religion', *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Reformation*, Hans S. Hillebrand (ed.), vol. 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
(On the concept of Catholic reformation predating Luther's reformation.)

Burke, Peter, 'Humanism and friendship in sixteenth-century Europe', *Friendship in Medieval Europe* (Stroud, Sutton Publishing, 1999).
(On the humanistic view of friendship.)

Butler, Lionel, 'The Siege of Rhodes 1480', *Historical Pamphlets*, 11 (London).
(Gave information on Maltese corsairs aiding besieged knights in Rhodes.)

Buttigieg, Emanuel, *Nobility, Faith and Masculinity. The Hospitaller Knights of Malta, c.1580-1700* (London - New York: Continuum, 2011).
(Used for elaborating on how seniority within the Order was being eroded due to encroachment by the Church.)

Buttigieg, Emanuel, 'The Pope wants to be the Ruin of this Religion. The Papacy, France and the Order of St John in the Seventeenth Century', *Symposia Melitensia*, 5 (2008).
(This article provided important information on the Order's delicate balance between its sovereignty and its dependence on the Papacy and France.)

Buttigieg, Emanuel, 'Corpi e anime in schiavitù: schiavi musulmani nella Malta dei Cavalieri di San Giovanni (1530-1798)', *Schiavitù del corpo e schiavitù dell'anima. Chiesa, potere politico e schiavitù tra Atlantico e Mediterraneo (sec.XVI-XVIII)*, E. Colombo, M. Massimi, A. Rocca and C. Zeron (eds.) (Milan: 2018).
(Informative on the treatment of Muslim slaves.)

Buttigieg, Emanuel, 'The Pope wants to be the Ruin of this Religion', The Papacy, France, and the Order of St John in the Seventeenth Century', *Symposia Melitensia*, 5 (2009).
(Concerned with patronage and how the Church's protection of the Order's status came at a price.)

Cachia, Stefan, 'The Treasury, Debts, and Deaths' (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta, 2004).
(Work perused for information on role of receiver, rules concerning bequeathment, definitions of related terms and the role of the common treasury.)

Cannadine, D. and S. Price (eds.), 'Introduction: divine rights of kings', *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

(Concerned the importance of ceremonials as part of politics.)

Carrio-Invernizzi, Diana, 'A New Diplomatic History and the Networks of Spanish Diplomacy in the Baroque Era', *The International History Review* (2013).
(Article used in the discussion of historiography.)

Carrió-Invernizzi, Diana, 'Gift and Diplomacy in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Italy', *The Historical Journal*, 51: 4 (2008).
(Added information on the style of diplomacy in the seventeenth century.)

Cassar, Carmel, 'Between Africa and Europe: Corsairing Activities and the Order of St John in Malta', *Corsari, schiavi, riscatti tra Liguria e Nord Africa nei secoli XVI e XVII. Atti del Convegno Storico Internazionale Ceriale* (2004).
(Provided information on the Order, corsairing in Malta and slavery.)

Cassar, Paul, *Medical History of Malta* (London: Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 1964).
(Information on the Grand Hospitaller.)

Cavaliero, Rodrick, 'The Decline of the Maltese Corso in the 18th Century: A Study in Maritime History', *Melita Historica*, 2 (1959).
(Used for the discussion on the threat of corsairing as an activity in Malta.)

Cavaliero, Rodereick, *The Last of the Crusaders: The Knights of St John and Malta in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Tauris Parke, 1960).
(Used for the detail of the Order celebrating Philip's of Anjou entry in Madrid.)

Ciappara, Frans, 'Christendom and Islam: A Fluid Frontier', *Mediterranean Studies*, 13 (2004).
(Used to elaborate on slavery.)

Ciappara, Frans, 'Gio. Niccolo Muscat: Church-State Relations in Hospitaller Malta during the Enlightenment, 1786-1793', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem*, Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993).
(Used for Church-State relations and the Order's perspective of inquisitor and bishop.)

Ciappara, Frans, Malta, 'Napoli e La Santa Sede nella Seconda Meta` del '700', *Mediterranea ricerche storiche*, 12, aprile 2008.
(Although this work falls beyond the period under study, it serves to provide continuity of thought thereby helping to contextualise the project.)

Cohen, Richard, *By the Sword* (London: Pocket Book, 2010).
(Used to show how the length of swords was influenced by fashion.)

Cohen, Raymond. and Westbrook, Raymond (eds), *Amarna Diplomacy: The Beginnings of International Relations* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 2000).
(Used to show the first extant example of diplomatic correspondence.)

Cooperstein, Theodore M., 'Letters of Marque and Reprisal: The Constitutional Law and Practice of Privateering', *Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce*, 40 (2009).
(On the first known example of privateering.)

Cornelissen, Marloes, 'The World of Ambassador Jacobus Colyer: Material Culture of the Dutch 'Nation' in Istanbul during the first half of the 18th Century' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Sabanci, 2015).
(Used to elaborate on discussion of material culture.)

Côté, Marie-Hélène, 'What Did It Mean to be a French Diplomat in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries?', *Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d'histoire*, 45 (2010).
(Very important article for historiography and methodology.)

Cowan, H. Lee, 'Cardinal Giovanni Battista De Luca: Nepotism in the Seventeenth Century Catholic Church and De Luca's Efforts to Prohibit the Practice' (Published online Ph.D. dissertation. University of North Texas, 2012).
(Used for elaborating on De Luca's and Pope Innocent's efforts to curb nepotism.)

Croxton, Derek, '"The Prosperity of Arms is Never Continual": Military Intelligence, Surprise, and Diplomacy in 1640s Germany', *Journal of Military History*, 64 (2000).
(Used for studying the link between military and diplomacy.)

Croxton, Derek, 'The Peace of Westphalia of 1648 and the Origins of Sovereignty', *The International History Review*, 21: 3 (1999).
(Article provided information on the role of the papal nuncio at the Peace of Westphalia.)

Daniel-Rops, Henri, *The Church of Apostles and Martyrs* vol II (New York: Image Books, 1962).
(Used specifically to explain the origins of monasticism.)

Davis, Robert C., *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters. White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast, and Italy, 1500-1800* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
(Used to elaborate on the treatment of Christian slaves.)

Davies, Franco, The Practical and Symbolic Dimensions of Edged Weapons for the Hospitallers, in Particular Swords, 1530-1798 (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta, 2014).
(On the powerful symbolism of the sword.)

Delle Inscrizioni Veneziane. Raccolte ed Illustrate da Emmanuele Antonio Cigogna (Venice: 1824).
(Made use for information about Giovanni Lando, Venetian ambassador.)

Delumeau, Jean, *L'Italie de Boticelli a` Bonaparte* (Paris: A. Colin, 1974).
(Used to show the attitude of the post-Tridentine church to regain ecclesiastical rights lost to the state.)

Denker, Eric and William E. Wallace, 'Artibus et Historiae', 2015, 36: 72 (2015).
(Used for the discussion on material culture, specifically the symbolism of chairs.)

Ditchfield Simon, 'Tridentine Worship and the Cult of Saints', *The Cambridge History of Christianity - Reform and Expansion 1500-1660*, R. Po-Chia Hsia (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2007.
(On the Council of Trent's teachings on the cult of saints.)

Dooley, Brendan, 'Political Publishing and its Critics in Seventeenth Century Italy', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, xli (1996).
(Article provided information of use of printed matter by the Order.)

Douglas, Mary and Isherwood, Baron, *The World of Goods. Towards an Anthropology of Consumption* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).
(Used for the discussion on material culture.)

Dulska, Anna Katarzyna, 'Malitia temporis. Priorato navarro de la Orden de San Juan de Jerusalén bajo fray Martín Martínez de Olloqui (1383-1435)' (Unpublished Phd. dissertation, University of Navarre, 2016).
(Used to show how knights employed by monarchs as diplomats.)

Earle, Peter, *Corsairs of Malta and Barbary* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1970).
(Used for the discussion on corsairing and slavery.)

Ertman, Thomas, *Birth of the Leviathan. Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
(Emergence and nature of absolutism.)

Faroqhi, Suraiya, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around it* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007).
(Used for information on Franco-Ottoman relations.)

Farr, Jason, 'The Westphalia Legacy and the Modern Nation-State', *International Social Science Review*, 58: 3/4 (2005).
(Article used for the discussion on the Peace of Westphalia.)

Fava, Peter, 'Malta and Venice: The War of Candia 1645-1669' (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 1976).
(Used for understanding relations between Order and Venice during the War of Candia.)

Fedele, Dante, 'Naissance de la Diplomatie Moderne. L'ambassadeur au croisement du droit, de l'éthique et de la politique' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Lyon, 2014).
(Showed the importance that De Vera's treatise, The Perfect Ambassador, was considered as the most important treaty on the subject in its time.)

Fleet, Kate, 'Law and Trade in the Early Fifteenth-Century: The Case of Cagi Sati Oglu', *Oriente Moderno, Nuova serie*, Anno 25 (86), Nr. 1, The Ottomans and Trade (2006).
(This article showed how the Order negotiated with Muslim rulers during the Rhodian period.)

Fletcher, Catherine, T., 'Furnished with Gentlemen: the Ambassador's House in Sixteenth–Century Italy.', *The Society for Renaissance Studies*, 24 (2010).
(This article provided information on the use of hospitality by ambassadors as a way of conducting diplomatic affairs.)

Forey, Alan, 'The military orders in the crusading proposals of the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries', VIII, *Military Orders and Crusades* (Ashgate: Routledge, 2001).
(Used to show the rise of unpopularity of the religious-military orders after the loss of the Holy land.)

Fosi, Irene, *All'Ombra dei Barberini: fedelta e servizio nella Roma barocca* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1997), 253.
(Used to deduct information on the education of Urbano Sacchetti, Fra Marcello's brother.)

Fosi, Irene and Visceglia, Maria, 'Marriage and politics at the papal court in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *Marriage in Italy, 1300-1650*, Trever Dean and K.J.P. Lowe (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
(Relations between the Sacchetti and the Barberini.)

Fosi, Irene and Maria Visceglia, *Marriage in Italy*, 1300-1650, Trever Dean and K.J.P. Lowe (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
(Used for showing marriage policy of the nobility.)

Fosi, Irene, Andrea Gardi (eds), *La Legazione di Ferrara del Cardinale Giulio Sacchetti, 1627-1631*, vol. 2 (Vatican City: 2006).
(Used for biographical notes on Cardinal Giulio Sacchetti.)

Freeman, Charles W., *The Diplomat's Dictionary* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1994).
(Used for quoting Ottoviano Maggi.)

Frigo, Daniela, '"Small States" and Diplomacy: Mantua and Modena', *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy. The Structure of Diplomatic Practice, 1450-1800*, Daniela Frigo (ed) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
(Used for information on the evolution of diplomacy in Italy.)

Gauci, Liam, *In the Name of the Prince: Maltese Corsairs 1760-1798* (Malta: Heritage Malta, 2016).
(Used for information on corsairing in Malta.)

Glassie, Henry H., *Material Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).
(Used for the relationship between owning objects and beliefs.)

Geevers, Liesbeth and Mirella Marini (eds.), 'Introduction: Aristocracy, Dynasty and Identity in Early Modern Europe, 1520–1700', *Dynastic Identity in Early Modern Europe. Rulers, Aristocrats and the Formation of Identities* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2015).
(Used for understanding the importance that the nobility attributes to the idea of family.)

Gerritsen, Anne and Riello, Giorgio, 'Introduction: Writing Material Culture History', in *Writing Material Culture History*, Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello (eds.) (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015).
(Used for the discussion on material culture.)

Gigli, Giglio, *Diario di Roma*, vol. 2 (Rome: Colombo, 1994).
(Describes the importance of carriages as a means of ostentation.)

Goudriaan, Elisa, *Florentine Patricians and their Networks. Structures Behind the Cultural Success and the Political Representation of the Medici Court (1600-1660)* (Leiden and Boston: Brill Academic, 2017).
(On the Altoviti's relations with the Barberini and their pro-French politics.)

Gombrich, E.H., *The Story of Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951).

(Used to elaborate on attitude of Roman Catholicism to art after the Luther's reformation.)

González-Palacios, Alvar and Bassett, Emma-Louise, 'Concerning Furniture: Roman Documents and Inventories: Part I, c. 1600-1720', *Furniture History*, 46 (2010).
(Used for material culture and for comparing possessions of noble families with that of the Sacchetti.)

Gramatowski, Wiktor, 'Il Fondo Liturgico piu antico dell'Archivio della S. Congregazione dei Riti (1588-1700).' *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 13 (1975).
(Used to show the role of the Congregation of Rites.)

Grech, Ivan, 'Il Prezzo dell'Onore nel Mediterraneo. Rapporti e Dissidi Diplomatici tra Genova e l'Ordine di Malta nel Seicento', *Cavalieri di San Giovanni in Liguria e nell'Italia Settentrionale. Quadri regionali, uomini e documenti*, Atti del Convegno, Istituto Internazionale di Studi Liguri (Genoa: 2004).
(Used to show the receiver acting as ambassador of the Order.)

Greene, Molly, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants. A Maritime History of the Mediterranean* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2010).
(Used for corsairing, Greek perspective as victims of corsairing.)

Groot, Alexander H. de, 'The Ottoman Threat to Europe', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993).
(Used to show Venetian fears of Ottoman reprisals due to Christian corsairing activities.)

Gross, Hanns, *Rome in the Age of Enlightenment. The post-Tridentine syndrome and the ancient regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
(Used to elaborate on the Congregations of the Church.)

Guida, L. M., *L'Ordine di San Giovanni di Gerusalemme. Le Sue Commende e i Suoi Conventi*. (Taranto: Centro Studi Melitensi, 2007).
(Concerns the loss of popularity of the Order due to mismanagement of commanderies.)

Guilday, Peter, 'The Sacred Congregation De Propaganda Fide (1622-1922)', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 6: 4 (1921).
(Used to show the institution of the Congregations by the Holy See.)

Guiterrez, Conchi, 'The diplomacy of letters of the Count of La Roca in Venice (1632-1642)', *Embajadores culturales. Transferencias y lealtades de la diplomacia espanola de la Edad Moderna*, Diana Carrió-Invernizzi (ed), Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (Madrid, 2016).
(Important for elaborating on de Vera's *The Perfect Ambassador*.)

Harding, Robert, *Anatomy of a Power Elite: The Provincial Governors of Early Modern France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978).
(On the vertical approach of patronage.)

Hazlitt, William, *Conversations of James Northcote, Esq. R.A*. (London: 1830).
(Used for a comment on fashion.)

Heer, Friedrich, *The Holy Roman Empire* (London: Orion Books, 1996).

(Used for background to Holy Roman Empire and general history of the period.)

Hellwald, Ferdinand de, *Bibliographie methodique de L'Ordre Souverain de St Jean de Jerusalem* (Farnborough, Hants.: Gregg, 1968).
(A methodological bibliography perused to see previous works on the Order.)

Hennessy, Kathryn et al (eds), *Fashion. The Definitive History of costume and Style* (New York: Smithsonian, 2012).
(Used for the history of fashion.)

Hershenzon, Daniel, 'Para que me saque cabesea por cabesa: Exchanging Muslim and Christian Slaves across the Western Mediterranean', *African Economic History*, 42: 1 (2014).
(Used for statistics on slavery.)

Holzgrefe, J.L., 'The Origins of Modern International Relations Theory', *Review of International Studies*, 15: 1 (1989).
(Used for the discussion on early modern theorists of diplomacy.)

Hunt, John M., 'The Ceremonial Possession of a City: Ambassadors and their Carriages in Early Modern Rome', *Royal Studies Journal*, 3: 2 (2016).
(Used to show the love of splendour of resident ambassadors in Rome.)

Ilardi, Vincent, 'Crosses and Carets: Renaissance Patronage and Coded Letters of Recommendation', *The American Historical Review*, 92: 5 (1987).
(An article which shows the widespread use of patronage in European courts.)

Infelise, Mario, 'From merchants' letters to handwritten political avvisi', Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe, vol III, *Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400-1700*, Francisco Bethencourt-Florike Egmond (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
(This article gives details on correspondence and its importance in early modern diplomacy.)

Infelise, Mario, 'Roman Avvisi: Information and Politics in the Seventeenth Century', in *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*', G.Signoretto - Maria Antonietta Visceglia (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
(An article dealing with the spread of information in Rome.)

Jusserand, J.J., 'The School for Ambassadors', *The American Historical Review*, 27: 3 (1922).
(An article on diplomacy in general, it provided a good basis for historiography of diplomacy.)

Kamen, Henry, *Early Modern European Society* (London: Routledge, 2000).
(Used to show how Christianity was not only an internal religion but also an external way of life.)

Keens-Soper, Maurice, 'Francois de Callieres and Diplomatic Theory', *The Historical Journal*, 26: 3 (1973).
(Provided more information on historiography of diplomacy.)

Keogh, A., 'The Codification of the Canon Law', *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, 10: 1 (1928).

(Used to see body of laws which governed the Church prior to the codification of canon law.)

Kleinhenz, Christopher, *Medieval Italy: an Encyclopedia* (Ashgate: Routledge, 2004).
(Used to show loss of popularity in all religious orders due to mismanagement of their properties.)

Kemper, Rachel H., *A History of Costume* (Verona: Newsweek Books, 1977).
(Used to elaborate on the history of fashion in clothes.)

Kettering, Sharon, 'Brokerage at the Court of Louis XIV' *The Historical Journal*, 36: 1 (1993).
(Another work on patronage and its brokerage. It also shows how patronage had become institutionalized.)

Kettering, Sharon, 'Patronage in Early Modern France', *French Historical Studies*, 17: 4 (Autumn, 1992).
(Used for the important distinction between political and cultural patronage.)

Kettering, Sharon, 'Patronage and Kinship in Early Modern France', *French Historical Studies*, 16: 2 (1989).
(Expounds on patronage among those of equal status.)

Kettering, Sharon, 'The Historical Development of Political Clientelism', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18: 3 (1988).
(Used to show that patronage is hard to define since it changes according to the attitudes of society.)

Koster, Adrianus, 'The Knights State (1530 - 1798): A Regular Regime', *Melita Historica*, 8: 4 (1983).
(Used to show how the Bishop of Malta was chosen.)

Kugeler, Heidrun, R.I., '"Le Parfait Ambassadeur". The Theory and Practice of Diplomacy in the Century following the Peace of Westphalia.' (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Magdalen college, University of Oxford, 2006).
(Used to show Swedish interest in preparing personnel for diplomatic service.

Kusche, Isabel, 'Political clientelism and democracy: Clientelistic power and the internal differentiation of the political system', *Acta Sociologica*, 57: 3 (2014).
(Used for comparison with modern concept of patronage.)

Lamar, Jensen De, 'French Diplomacy and the Wars of Religion', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 5: 2 (1974).
(Provided additional information on early modern theorists on diplomacy.)

Landes, David S., *Revolution in Time. Clocks and the Making of the Modern World* (Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 2000).
(Used for the history of clocks and watches.)

Laven, Mary, 'Encountering the Counter-Reformation', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 59: 3 (2006).
(Used for more personal understanding of the impact of the Reformation and Counter-reformation.)

Levin, Michael J., *Agents of Empire: Spanish Ambassadors in Sixteenth-Century Italy* (London: Cornell University Press, 2005).
(On monarchs' interest in obtaining art and the Grand Masters' desire to emulate them.)

Loyeaux, Charles, *A Treatise of Orders and Plain Dignities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Luther, Martin, The Smalcald Articles. Article II, Of the Mass, 1537.
(On Luther's criticism of the mass.)

Luttrell, Anthony, 'From Jerusalem to Malta: the Hospital's character and evolution', Peregrinationes, Accademia Internazionale Melitense, 5, accessed on 5 November 2016 from https://www.orderofmalta.int/wpcontent/uploads/archive/pubblicazioni/FromJerusalemtoMalta.pdf
(The works of Luttrell provide links with the Order's origins and the experience of governing a group of islands.)

Luttrell, Anthony T., 'Intrigue, Schism, and Violence among the Hospitallers of Rhodes, 1377-1384,' *Speculum* 41: 1 (1966), 30-48.
(The works of Luttrell provide links with the Order's origins and the experience of governing a group of islands.)

Luttrell, Anthony T., 'Malta and Rhodes', in *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798. Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem*, Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993).
(Provides a link between Rhodes and Malta showing how certain practices remained consistent.)

Luttrell, Anthony, 'Studies on the Hospitallers after 1306. Rhodes and the West, The Island of Rhodes and the Hospitallers of Catalunya in the fourteenth century', Variorum Collected Study Series, xviii (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).
(The works of Luttrell provide links with the Order's origins and the experience of governing a group of islands.)

Luttrell, Anthony T., *The Hospitaller State on Rhodes and its Western Provinces, 1306-1462* (Aldershot – Hampshire: Ashgate/Variorum), 1999.
(The works of Luttrell provide links with the Order's origins and the experience of governing a group of islands.)

Luttrell, Anthony T., 'The Hospitallers' Historical Activities: 1400-1530', *Latin Greece, the Hospitallers and the Crusades 1291-1440* (London: Variorum, 1982).
(The works of Luttrell provide links with the Order's origins and the experience of governing a group of islands.)

Mackintosh, James, *The Miscellaneous Works of the Right Honourable Sir James Mackintosh* (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846).
(Used to trace Portuguese law of 1143 which forbade royalty marrying outside Portugal.)

Malcolm, Noel, *Useful Enemies. Islam and the Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought 1450-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).
(Concerning relation between the Catholic and the Orthodox churches.)

Mallia-Milanes, Victor (ed), *Descrittione di Malta. Anno 1716. A Venetian Account* (Malta: Bugelli Publications, 1988).
(Apart from the reference to Fra Marcello Sacchetti, this book also provides information on the relations between Venice and the Order.)

Mallia-Milanes, Victor, 'Introduction to Hospitaller Malta', in *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798. Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem*, Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva, 1993).
(An overall, view of the history of the Order with valuable insights on the method of studying history.)

Mallia-Milanes, Victor, *Venice and Hospitaller Malta, 1530-1798. Aspects of a Relationship* (Marsa: PEG, 1992).
(A book which explores deeply the relationship between Venice and the Order.)

Marino John A. Marino, 'Early Modern Italy 1550-1796', *The Short Oxford History of Italy*, John A. Davis (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
(Used to expound on attitude of the post-Tridentine church to consolidate ecclesiastical rights.)

Margaroli, Paolo, *Diplomazia e Stati Rinascimentali*. *Le ambescerie sforzesche fino alle conclusione della Lega italica (1450-1455*) (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1992).
(Provided a commentary on early modern theorists of diplomacy.)

Marshall, Sherrod Brandon, 'A Mediterranean Connection: French Ambassadors, the Republic of Venice, and the Construction of the Louisquatorzien State, 1662-1702.' (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Syracuse, 2016).
(Used for relations between Venice and the papacy.)

Mattingly, Garrett, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (New York: Dover Publications, 1955).
(Indispensable work on the development of European diplomacy.)

Mattingly, Garret, 'The First Resident Embassies: Mediaeval Italian Origins of Modern Diplomacy', *Speculum. A Journal of Mediaeval Studies*, 12: 5 (1937).
(Used for elaborating on historiography and illustrating the roots of European diplomacy.)

May, Niels F., 'Staged Sovereignty or Aristocratic Values? Diplomatic ceremonial at the Westphalian peace negotiations (1643-1648)', *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410-1800,* Tracey A. Sowerby and Jan Hennings (eds) (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017).
(Used to draw parellisms between ceremonial and status.)

McCormick, Michael, 'Byzantium's Role in the Formation of Early Medieval Civilization: Approaches and Problems', *Illinois Classical Studies*, Byzantium and its Legacy, 12: 2 (1987).
(Provided information on the evolution of diplomacy.)

McKay, D., Scott, Hamish Marshall, *The Rise of the Great Powers 1648-1815* (London-New York: Longman, 1983).
(Useful for the political background after the Peace of Westphalia.)

Mercieca, Simon, 'Aspects of the Office of the Receiver of the Hospitaller Order of St John' (Unpublished B.A. (Hons) dissertation, University of Malta, 1991).

(Used for discussing the role of the receiver.)

Mercieca, Simon, 'How Was Judicial Power Balanced in Malta in Early Modern Times? A Cursory Look at the Maltese Legal System through a Historical Perspective', *Journal of Civil Law Studies*, 2: 4 (2011).
(Used to elaborate on judicial courts in Hospitaller Malta.)

Montaigne de, Michel, *The Complete Works: Essays, Travel Journals, Letters*, trans. D. M. Frame (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003).
(Used to show contemporary attitude to certain aspects of life.)

Montesquieu, Charles de, *Oeuvres completes. Les Lettres Persanes*. https://www.arvensa.com/wp-content/Telechargements/Extraits_gratuits/Extrait%20Montesquieu.pdf
(Used to show diminishing of power of the papacy.)

Morgan, Sill Louise, 'The Gossip of an Ambassador', *The North American Review* cxciv, 670 (1911).
(Helped to add information on the use made of ambassadors by different rulers.)

Mortimer, G., 'Did Contemporaries Recognize a 'Thirty Years War'?', *The English Historical Review*, 116: 465 (2001).
(Important commentary on the Thirty Years War.)

Morton, Nicholas, 'Templar and Hospitaller attitudes towards Islam in the Holy Land during the 12th and 13th centuries: some historiographical reflections', *Levant*, 47: 3 (2015).
(Provided information on the relations between Muslims and the military-religious orders.)

Mosley, D.J., 'Diplomacy and Disunion in Ancient Greece', *Phoenix*, 25: 4 (1971).
(Provided information on ancient diplomacy.)

Munck, Thomas, *Seventeenth-Century Europe. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598-1700* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).
(Background literature to the seventeenth century. Helps to put primary sources in perspective.)

Murdoch, Terra, 'Queen Christina of Sweden as a Patron of Music in Rome during the Mid-Seventeenth Century', *The Music Room in Early Modern France and Italy*, Deborah Howard and Laura Mauretti (eds) (Oxford: 2012).
(Used to better understand the Roman penchant for celebrations and ostentation.)

Murray, Eustace Clare Grenville, *Embassies and Foreign Courts. A History of Diplomacy* (London: Routledge, 1856).
(Murray was a journalist and in the British diplomatic corps at Vienna. Provided interesting insights in the history of diplomacy.)

Muscat, Joseph, 'Rules and Regulations for Maltese Corsairs', in *Melitensium Amor. Festschrift in honour of Dun Gwann Azzorpardi*, Toni Cortis, Thomas Freller and Lino Bugeja (eds) (Malta: Outlook Coop, 2002).
(This article illustrated the legal framework for corsairing that the Order provided.)

Nicholson, Helen, *Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights. Images of the Military Orders, 1128-1291* (Leicester-London-New York: Leicester University Press, 1993).
(Used especially for information on the early years of the Order.)

Nicholson, Helen, *The Knights Hospitaller* (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2001).
(Consulted especially for information on the use of priors as government officials and representatives of the Order.)

Nuovo Archivio Veneto, Tomo IV (Venezia: 1892).
(Used for biographical notes on Cardinal Fabrizio Spada and his brother Fra Alviano.)

Nussdorfer, Laurie, 'Print and Pageantry in Baroque Rome', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 24: 2 (1998).
(Article provided information of use of printed matter by the Order.)

O'Malley, Gregory, *The Knights Hospitaller of the English Langue 1460-1565* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
(On the obligations of brother knights to improve commanderies in their charge.)

Panofsky, Erwin, 'Erasmus and the Visual Arts', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 32 (1969).
(On attitudes to the use of images in the Catholic Church.)

Pascoli, Lione, *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori, ed Architetti Moderni*, vol II (Rome: 1736)
(Concerns the arrival of Lorenzo Gafa in Rome.)

Pastor von, Ludwig Freiherr, *The History of the Popes. From the close of the Middle Ages*, xxviii, xxxii, xxxiii (London, Trubner and Co, 1940).
(Indispensable work for the history of the papacy.)

Pellegrini, Marco, 'Pope and Cardinals in the Age of Alexander VI', *Court and Politics in Papal Rome*, Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2004.
(On the Pope's relationship with ambassadors.)

Pepys, Samuel, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, entry dated 13 May 1665.
(On contemporary attitudes to the novelty of pocket watches.)

Phillips, Jonathan, *The Crusades, 1095-1197* (Harlow U.K.: Pearson Education, 2002).
(Used for searching elements of representation during the crusading period.)

Phillips, Simon, *The Prior of the Knights Hospitaller in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009).
(Used to elaborate on the use of priors as unofficial ambassadors of the Order.)

Pisani, Moira, 'Melchiorre Gafa's *Discorso* about the Designs and Models for the Main Altar of St John's Co-Cathedral, Valletta',
https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/handle/123456789/40118
(Used to discuss the history behind the statue 'The Baptism of Christ' in St John's conventual church.)

Pomian, Krzysztof, *Collectors and Curiosities. Paris and Venice, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990).

(On the meaning behind the object.)

Popp, Nathan Alan, 'Expressions of power: Queen Christina of Sweden and patronage in Baroque Europe' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Iowa, 2015).
(Used for showing the existence of private theatres in Rome.)

Prown, Jules David, 'Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 17: 1 (1982).
(On the theory of material culture.)

Rambelli, Gianfrancesco, *Vocabolario Domestico* (Bologna: 1850).
(Used for defining archaic terms related to furniture.)

Rana, Kishan S., *The 21st Century Ambassador. Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive* (Malta and Geneva: DiploFoundation, 2004).
(Used to show elements of continuity in modern diplomacy.)

Rapisardi, Antonio, 'Sacra Hierosolymitana Religio. Profili Storico-Giuridici E Relazioni Internazionali' (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Università Degli Studi Di Macerata, 2011).
(Used to show erraneous belief that the Order's permanenent embassies started under Grand Master Pinto's magistracy.)

Ribeiro, Aileen, *Dress in eighteenth-century Europe. 1715-17-89* (London: Holmes and Meier, 1984).
(Used for history of costume.)

Riley-Smith, Jonathan, *Hospitallers: The History of the Order of St John (*London and Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1999).
(Provided a general history of the Order.)

Riley-Smith, Jonathan, *The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c. 1070-1309* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
(Indispensable work for the history of the Order from its origins to Cyprus.)

Riley-Smith, Jonathan, *The Knights of St John in Jerusalem and Cyprus 1050-1310* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1967).
(Used to show the Order's policy of appointing two brethren for offices as a system of countercheck.)

Rivère de Carles, Nathalie, *Early Modern Diplomacy, Theatre and Soft Power. The Making of Peace, Early Modern Literature in History* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).
(Used to show that much of the work of the diplomat was conducted outside official circles and venues.)

Robinson, I.S., 'The institutions of the church, 1073-1216', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2004.
(Used to show legalities concerning appeal in the courts of the Church.)

Rodríguez-Picavea, Enrique, 'The Military Orders and Hospitaller Activity on the Iberian Peninsula during the Middle Ages, Mediterranean Studies', 18 (2009), Penn State University Press.

(Provided general information on the military orders.)

Romier, Lucien, *Les Origines politiques des guerres de religion*, 2 vols. (Paris: 1914).
(Used as an example of writers treating patronage from a hierarchical perspective.)

Romier, Lucien, *Le Royaume de Catherine de Medicis*, 2 vols. (Paris: 1922).
(Used as an example of writers treating patronage from a hierarchical perspective.)

Romier, Lucien, *Catholiques et Huguenots a la cour de Charles IX* (Paris: 1924).
(Used as an example of writers treating patronage from a hierarchical perspective.)

Roosen, William J., *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Cambridge MA: Shenkman Publishing, 1976).
(Concerning France-Ottoman relations.)

Roosen, William J., 'The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV', *French Historical Studies*, 16: 3 (1970).
(Provides information on the importance given to ceremony and protocol as an integral part of diplomacy in the early modern period.)

Roosen, William J., 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial: A Systems Approach', The Journal of Modern History, 52: 3 (1980).
(Elaboration on the study of ceremonials.)

Rule, John C., 'Gathering Intelligence in the Age of Louis XIV. Review of Lucien Bély's *Espions et ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV.*', *The International History Review*, 14: 4 (1992).
(Article used for historiography and methodology.)

Russell, Bertrand, *History of Western Philosophy* (London – New York: Routledge Classics, 2004).
(Philosophical background to help understand better early modern thought.)

Russell, J. Major, 'The Crown and the Aristocracy in Renaissance France', *American Historical Review*, 69 (1964).
(re difficulty of one encompassing definition of patronage.)

Russell, J. Major, 'Vertical Ties through Time', *French Historical Studies*, 17: 4 (1992).
(Used as an example of writers treating patronage from a hierarchical perspective.)

Russo Francesco, *Un Ordine, Una Citta, una Diocesi, La giurisdizione ecclesiastica nel principato monastico di Malta in età moderna (1523–1722)* (Roma: Aracne, 2017).
(On the relationship between the Order and the Church.)

Sante, Guido, Mantella, Giuseppe, Sorrenti, Maria Teresa (eds), 'Mattia Preti e Gregorio Carafa: Due Cavalieri Gerosolimitani tra Italia e Malta', *Atti della giornata di studio 12 June 2013* (Malta).
(Spoke about the predestining of Marcello and Urbano Sacchetti.)

Sannicandro, Francesco Bonazzi di, *Elenco dei Cavalieri di S.M. Ordine di S. Giovanni di Gerusalemme Ricevuti nella Veneranda Lingua D'Italia Dalla*

Fondazione Dell'Ordine Ai Nostri Giorni, Parte Prima (Napoli: Detken & Rocholl, 1897).
(Used for short biographical notes on Italian knights.)

Scerri, Adrian, 'Of Briefs and Privileges: the role of the ambassador to the Holy See (Fra Marcello Sacchetti in safeguarding the Order of St John's position in the 1680s', in *Proceedings of History Week 2011*, J. Abela-E. Buttigieg-K. Farrugia (eds) (Malta: Midsea Books, 2011).
(Used to expound on the role of ambassador as defender of the Order's privileges.)

Scerri, Adrian, 'Fra Marcello Sacchetti, Hospitaller Ambassador to the Papal States: His Official Correspondence' (Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta, 2011).
(Read especially to make use of translations of correspondence during the Carafa magistracy.)

Sciberras, Keith, 'Ciro Ferri's Reliquary for the Oratory of S. Giovanni Decollato in Malta', *The Burlington Magazine*, 141: 1156 (1999).
(Used for Fra Marcello Sacchetti's connection with art and artists.)

Sciberras, Keith, *Roman Baroque Sculpture for the Knights of Malta*, Midsea books Malta, 2012.
(This book makes reference to Fra Marcello Sacchetti's role in acquiring works of art for the Order, Patronage of the Gafa family.)

Scott, Hamish, 'Diplomatic culture in old regime Europe', in *Cultures of Power in Europe during the Long Eighteeenth Century*', Hamish Scott and Brendan Simms (eds), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007.
(On nobles being preferred to commoners as diplomats.)

Šefčovič, Maroš, Vice-President, Communication to the Commission on Guidelines on Gifts and Hospitality for the staff members, Brussels, 7.3.2012 SEC(2012) 167 final, retrieved from ec.europa.eu/.../docs/sec_2012_0167_f_en_communication_to_commission_en.pdf, on 8 August 2016.
(Used to show that certain elements of continuity in diplomacy today)

Sella, Domenico, *Italy in the Seventeenth Century* (London and New York, Longman, 1997), re ordinating clerics without
Seton-Watson, Robert, W., 'The Austro-Hungarian Ausgleich of 1867', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, xix, 53/54, The Slavonic Year-Book (1939 - 1940).
(Used for information on political relations between the Empire and the Germanic lands.)

Siecienski, Edward, *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).
(On relations between the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches).

Signorotto, Gianvittorio, 'The Squadrone Volante', in *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
(Used to discuss the encroachment of episcopates by the cardinals.)

Sire, H. J. A., *The Knights of Malta* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001).
(Used to discuss the General-Chapter of the Order.)

Skeat, Walter W., *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951).
(Consulted for etymology of certain terms.)
Sobieski, Jan, *Sobieski's Letter to Pope Innocent XI*, translated by Ludwik Kzyżanowski. Retrieved on 20 September 2018 from https://www.jstor.org/stable/25777983
(Used for elements of description of the lifting of the Siege of Vienna.)

Spiteri, Stephen C., *The Knights' Fortifications. An Illustrated Guide of the Fortifications built by the Knights of St John in Malta* (Valletta: PSL, 1990).
(Used for mentioning vulnerability of Ricasoli site and date of placing of guns on Fort once it was finished.)

Stoye, John, *The Siege of Vienna. The Last Great Trial between Cross and Crescent* (London: Collins, 1964).
(Used for the Siege of Vienna.)

Thomson, M. A., 'Louis XIV and the Origins of the War of the Spanish Succession'. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4 (1954).
(On attempts at preventing the War of the Spanish Succession.)

Tomalin, Marcus, 'The Intriguing Complications of Pocket Watches in the Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century', *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 66: 274 (2015).
(On the history of pocket watches.)

Treasure, Geoffrey, *The Making of Modern Europe 1648-1780* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003).
(On Charles II's alteration of his will leading to the War of the Spanish Succession.)

Tusor, Peter, *The Baroque Papacy (1600-1700)* (Viterbo: Sette Citta, 2016).
(On futility of austerity during the pontificate of Innocent XI due to Roman love for ostentation, games, theatre.)

United Nations, Treaty Series, Convention of the High Seas of 1958, Article 15 (United Nations, 2005).
(Used for the modern definition of piracy.)

Van der Essen, Leon, 'Le rôle d'un ambassadeur au XVIIe siècle. Contribution a l'histoire de la diplomatie', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*. 2: 2, 1923.
(Used for historiography and history of diplomacy.)

Vanesio, Valeria, *Il Valore inestimabile delle Carte*, Collectanea Bibliothecae Magistralis II (Roma, 2014). Online version, retrieved from http://www.hmml.org/uploads/2/1/6/0/21603598/collectanea-ii_versione-online.pdf on 10 October 2013.
(Provided information on the diplomacy of the Order during the Rhodian period.)

Vella, Christopher, 'Aspects of Catholicism in Late Hospitaller Malta. The perspective of a contemporary Hospitaller Ambassador 1758-1778' (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 2007).

(Used to see what similar works have been written on the Order's diplomacy.)

Verboven, Koenraad, Carlier, Myriam, Dumolyn, Jan, 'A Short Manual to the Art of Prosopography', 39, retrieved on 19 April 2016 from http://prosopography.history.ox.ac.uk/course_syllabuses.htm
(Used for analysing possible approaches to this project.)

Waddy, Patricia, 'Cardinals' Palaces: Architecture and Decoration', in *A Companion to the Early Modern Cardinal*, Mary Hollingsworth, Miles Pattenden, Arnold Witte (eds) (Leiden: Brill, 2020).
(Used to elaborate on the carriage as a means of ostentation.)

Waterworth, J. (ed.), The Council of Trent. The canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent (London, Dolman, 1848), Decree on Reformation, Chapter 5.
(Concerned rights and limits of bishops' authority.)

Watkins, John, 'Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 39: 1 (2008).
(Used for criticism of the Peace of Westphalia.)

Wettinger, Godfrey, *Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo ca. 1000 – 1812* (Malta: PEG, 2002).
(Book helps understanding on the relationship between the Order and the Inquisitor. It also sheds light on contemporary problems concerning slaves and petty crime.)

Weiler, Björn, 'The "Negotium Terrae Sanctae" in the Political Discourse of Latin Christendom, 1215-1311.', *The International History Review*, 25: 1 (2003).
(Used especially for the origin of phrase *res publica christiana*.)

Whaley, Joachim, *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire*, Vol 2 *From the Peace of Westphalia to the Dissolution of the Reich 1648-1806 (*Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
(Used for discussion of the Holy Roman Empire and the effects of the Treaty of Westphalia.)

White, Joshua M., *Piracy and Law in the Ottoman Mediterranean* (California: Stanford University Press, 2018).
(Used to elaborate on slaves in Malta.)

White, Neil Briscoe, 'Aspects of the International Relations of the Order of St John, 1683-1722' (Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Malta, 2011).
(Used showing the policy of the Order during inter-Christian wars.)

Wilde, Oscar, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (, Victoria Canada: McPherson Library 2011).
(Used to show permanency of link between possessions and status.)

Williams, Ann, 'Constitutional Development of the Order of St John 1530-1798', *Hospitaller Malta 1530-1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St John of Jerusalem,* Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.) (Msida: Mireva,1993).
(Traces the evolution of the Order's superstructure during the Maltese phase of the Order's history. This article also elaborates on the question of the Order's

sovereignty and the conflicts that arose between the Order and Church authorities due to rival jurisdictions.)

Wilson Peter H., The Thirty Years War. Europe's Tragedy (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009).
(Used for details on the Franco-Swedish alliance during the Thirty Years War.)

Wiffels, Alain, Early Modern Scholarship on International Law, Research Handbooks in International Law, Alexander Orakhelashvili (ed) (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2011).
(Work perused for the discussion on early modern treatises.)

Wolfgang Weber, 'What a Good Ruler Should Not Do: Theoretical Limits of Royal Power in European Theories of Absolutism, 1500-1700', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 26: 4 (1995).
(Used to show tendency of rulers towards excluding representative institutions.)

Wright, Michael, *An Account of His Excellence Roger Earl of Castlemaine's Embassy from His Majesty James II*^{d} *King of England Scotland France and Ireland &c to His Holiness Innocent II* (London: 1688)
(Used especially due to the description of the entry of the ambassador.)

Yale Law School, *The Avalon Project*. *Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy*, retrieved on 25 July 2015 from
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/westphal.asp.
(Used for the discussion on the treaties of the Peace of Westphalia.)

Zirpolo, Lilian H., *Ave Papa Ave Papabile: The Sacchetti Family, Their Art Patronage, and Political Aspirations* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2005).
(Used for details on the Sacchetti family.)

Zirpolo, Lilian H., 'Climbing the Social, Political, and Financial Ladders: The Rise of the Sacchetti in Seventeenth-Century Rome', *The Seventeenth Century*, 12: 2 (1997).
(Used for details on the Sacchetti family.)

Online Resources

Catholic Culture:
https://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/dictionary/index.cfm?id=35737
(used for definition of prelate.)

Catholic Hierarchy: http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bspadafa.html
(Used for biographical notes of Church dignitaries.)

Cavalluna: https://www.cavalluna.com/en/our-horses/friesian/
(Used for information on Friesian horses.)

Dizionario Etimologico: https://www.etimo.it/?term=ricetta&find=Cerca
(Used for etymology of Italian words.)

Legislation.gov.uk: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aosp/1707/7/section/I
(Used to see The Acts of Union in 1707.

Le Journal du Dimanche: https://www.lejdd.fr/International/Afrique/Exclusif-L-interview-integrale-accordee-par-Mouammar-Kadhafi-au-JDD-278745-3236552%20on%2015%20August%202019
(Used for the interview with Muhammar el Kaddhafi, concerning the memory of corsairing.)

Omnia Heritage Malta: https://www.omnia.ie/index.php?navigation_function=2&navigation_item=%2F08533%2Fartifact_aspx_id_537&repid=1
(Used for short biography of Fredrick, Landgrave of Hesse.)

Palacret: http://www.palacret.com/histoire-d-une-commanderie/2c--les-commandeurs-batisseurs/30---leonor-de-beaulieu-de-bethomas#_ftn6
(Used for short biography of Fra Leonor de Beaulieau de Bethomas.)

Palacret: http://www.palacret.com/histoire-d-une-commanderie/2c--les-commandeurs-batisseurs/31---jean-baptiste-de-sesmaisons
(Used for short biography of Fra Jean Baptiste de Sesmaisons.)

Rosarychurch: http://www.rosarychurch.net/answers/qa101999c.html
(Used for determining class of saints' days in the Roman Catholic calendar.)

SMOM: http://www.smom-za.org/saints/toscana.htm
(Used for information on Santa Toscana.)

The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church. Biographical Dictionary: https://webdept.fiu.edu/~mirandas/bios1681.htm
(Used for short biographies of cardinals.)

TRC Leiden: https://trc-leiden.nl/trc-digital-exhibition/index.php/velvet/item/173-a-brief-history-of-velvet
(Used for a brief history of velvet.)

Treccani: https://www.treccani.it/
(used as an encyclopaedia and dictionary.)

Vatican.va: https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cbishops/documents/rc_con_cbishops_pro_20011127_profile_it.html
(Used for information on the Congregation of Bishops.)