

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

GIANVITTORIO SIGNOROTTO AND
MARIA ANTONIETTA VISCEGLIA

Rome was defined during the early modern era as the *teatro del mondo* (theatre of the world) and *patria comune* (common homeland); these images expressed the awareness of a universalism that was not only religious in nature, but also a sign of cultural belonging and a recognition of an undisputed political centrality. The chapter on ‘*négotiation continuelle*’ in the *Testament politique* attributed to Richelieu, considered as a cardinal text of baroque politics, contains a warning that: ‘we need to act the world over, near, far, and above all in Rome’.¹ In the city of the pontiffs, where power was manifested at the highest level, private citizens and delegations from institutional bodies and nations constantly strove to gain concrete advantages, prestige and authority. It was precisely for these reasons that Rome can be considered – to use a modern term – a *political laboratory*, a place where experiments were made with original ways of doing politics and where such ways were the subject of reflection and theorizing. The identification of the environments, the specific forms, the protagonists of the culture and political practices formulated in Rome still await a systematic reconstruction, despite the abundant written material on the subject, both Italian and international.

First, it must be said that it is still possible to benefit from the tradition of political and diplomatic studies that arose throughout the Protestant world after the work of Leopold von Ranke, who, on the premise that foreign policy was paramount, recognized the vitality and dynamic potential of papal Rome, even after the crisis of the sixteenth century.² On the other hand, the Catholic historiographical approach to the ‘history of the popes’ has constantly stressed the front-line role of the Holy See in European and world politics, but from a somewhat restricted

¹ A.-I. Du Plessis Cardinal de Richelieu, *Testamento politico e Massime di Stato*, ed. A. Piazzzi, Milan, 1988, p. 301.

² L. von Ranke, *Storia dei Papi*, Florence, 1968 (the first German edition was in 1836).

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

2 GIANVITTORIO SIGNOROTTO AND MARIA ANTONIETTA VISCEGLIA

point of view within the political and cultural climate of the *Kulturkampf*,³ which was geared to the defence requirements of the papacy and was limited to the biographical perspective and the reconstruction of single papacies.

The revival of interest in the papal monarchy and papal state since the 1970s has marked a very clear change from those earlier approaches. This can only be understood by considering that a more wide-ranging discussion was by then in progress over the methods and interpretative categories of historical research, and that this debate was spurred by deep transformations in the general perception of politics and institutions. The discussion concerning the Papal Prince spearheaded by Alberto Caracciolo, Mario Caravale and Paolo Prodi between 1978 and 1983, which has remained a fundamental point of reference for subsequent studies, developed within a theoretical reflection on the state in the early modern era and on modernity.⁴ The re-examination and reassessment of these themes (the state and modernity) over the last two decades has profoundly changed the very meaning of the conceptual categories used in studies on the formation of the papal monarchy. In the line of research initiated by Wolfgang Reinhard, the topic of modernization is of course not absent. However, as Robert Descimon recently emphasized, it is 'separated from the idea of progress'.⁵ The interpretation put forward by the German historian places the emphasis on the question whether the relational categories of sociology are applicable to the papal oligarchy;⁶ it sees the church as a social system characterized by an extraordinary capacity to endure over time.⁷

³ L. von Pastor, *Storia dei Papi dalla fine del Medio Evo*, trans. by Angelo Mercati, Rome, 1931 (with different dates for the work's various volumes). Mercati's translation is based on the 1925 German edition. On the key issue of 'the lost victory of the Protestant Reformation and the vitality of the Catholic church', both in Ranke's work and in Catholic historiography, see the remarks by A. Prosperi, 'Riforma cattolica, Contro-riforma, disciplinamento sociale', in G. De Rosa, T. Gregory and A. Vauchez (eds.), *Storia dell'Italia religiosa. 2. L'età moderna*, Bari, 1994, pp. 12ff.

⁴ M. Caravale and A. Caracciolo, 'Lo Stato Pontificio da Martino V a Pio IX', in G. Galasso (ed.), *Storia d'Italia*, vol. XIV, Turin, 1978; P. Prodi, *Il sovrano pontefice. Un corpo e due anime: la monarchia papale nella prima età moderna*, Bologna, 1982 (*The Papal Prince. One Body and Two Souls: The Papal Monarchy in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge, 1987); A. Caracciolo, 'Sovrano pontefice e sovrani assoluti', *Quaderni storici*, 52, XVIII (1983), pp. 279–86.

⁵ See R. Descimon, *Empirisme et méthode. Présentation à W. Reinhard, Papauté Confessions Modernité*, Paris, 1998, p. 10 (the volume contains a translation from German into French of some of Reinhard's essays that appeared between 1972 and 1982 and his complete bibliography).

⁶ The reference is to W. Reinhard, *Freunde und Kreaturen. 'Verflechtung' als Konzept zur Erforschung historischer Führungsgruppen. Römische Oligarchie um 1600*, Munich, 1979.

⁷ Recently W. Reinhard has again stressed the 'incredible social closure and narrow-mindedness of the self-referential system of the holy Roman church from the Middle

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

3

Furthermore, the various analytical studies written from the perspective of historical sociology⁸ have, with a few exceptions, fought shy of ambitious diachronic synthesis.⁹ They have not produced any equivalent to recent studies on European diplomatic political history, which has become the subject of renewed interest over the last few decades. The major obstacles to a comprehensive discussion of Rome's role have derived, in part, from the legacy of the two historiographical traditions: on the one hand, Catholic apologetics and on the other, ideological Protestant prejudice of anti-curial origin.¹⁰ But there has been a more serious problem: the diverse interests that inspired the choice of a pontiff can hardly be interpreted as unambiguous, especially from a 'modernity' viewpoint.

It is significant that nepotism – that most characteristic phenomenon of the papacy in the early modern era, which was of course kept dark by Catholic historiography – has been discussed more for the impulse that it gave to artistic production and its economic role¹¹ than for its sometimes decisive function in certain political contexts,¹² diplomacy and also religious debate.¹³ In more recent historiography, furthermore,

Ages until the twentieth century – probably a fundamental reason for its endurance, which is almost unique in history': see 'Le carriere papali e cardinalizie. Contributo alla storia sociale del papato', in L. Fiorani and A. Prosperi (eds.), *Storia d'Italia. Annali 16: 'Roma, la città del papa. Vita civile e religiosa dal giubileo di Bonifacio VIII al giubileo di papa Wojtyła'*, Turin, 2000, pp. 264–90.

⁸ Analytical contributions, pursuing Reinhard's line but in an original way, to the reconstruction of the role of parental and patronage relationships in curial careers are P. Partner, *The Pope's Men. The Papal Civil Service in the Renaissance*, Oxford, 1990; R. Ago, *Carriere e clientele nella Roma barocca*, Rome and Bari, 1990; I. Fosi, *All'ombra dei Barberini. Fedeltà e servizio nella Roma barocca*, Rome, 1997.

⁹ On the recruitment of cardinals over this very long period see C. Weber, *Senatus divinus. Verborgene Strukturen im Kardinalskollegium der frühen Neuzeit (1500–1800)*, Frankfurt am Main, 1996.

¹⁰ See A. Lynn Martin's remarks in 'Papal Policy and the European Conflict, 1559–1572', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 11/2 (1980), 2, pp. 35–48, referring to N. M. Sutherland's *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the European Conflict, 1559–1572*, London, 1973.

¹¹ W. Reinhardt, *Kardinal Scipione Borghese (1605–1633). Vermögen, Finanzen und sozialer Aufstieg eines Papstnepoten*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1984; C. Robertson, *'Il Gran Cardinale'. Alessandro Farnese, Patron of the Arts*, New Haven and London, 1992.

¹² A purely political view of medieval nepotism was put forward by D. Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century*, London, 1961. S. Carocci continues and supports this line of interpretation in *Il nepotismo nel medioevo. Papi, cardinali e famiglie nobili*, Rome, 1999, pp. 152–64.

¹³ See, for example, the precise analysis by G. Fragnito, which demonstrates the substantial role of the 'spiritual' cardinals in persuading Parma and Piacenza to support Pier Luigi Farnese in 1545, inspired by their indifference to the territorial affairs of the papal state: 'Il nepotismo farnesiano tra ragioni di stato e ragioni di chiesa', in *Continuità e discontinuità nella storia politica, economica e religiosa, Studi in onore di Aldo Stella*, Vicenza, 1993, pp. 117–25.

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

4 GIANVITTORIO SIGNOROTTO AND MARIA ANTONIETTA VISCEGLIA

Reinhard's functionalist approach, which sets two fundamental functions of nepotism – support (*Versorgungsfunktion*) and domination (*Herrschaftsfunktion*) – in the context of values and standards that are far removed from contemporary individualism and related to the concept of *pietas*, has favoured detection of the phenomenon's socio-cultural constants¹⁴ over the reconstruction of specific situations in which, from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century, it found expression. The topic of nepotism has had no better luck with historians interested in 'state building'; the efforts of the pontiffs – sovereigns without a dynasty – to bequeath power and wealth to relatives after their demise has not aroused such interest as 'Renaissance diplomacy' or the existence and development of the church's 'international relations'.¹⁵ However, documentation relating to the activity of ambassadors in Rome, and the legacy of evidence from agents, papal nuncios and legations, gives a much more complete picture of endeavours (sometimes contradictory), simulations and dissimulations, where the concern to procure wealth and power for the *house* of the Pontiffs was just as important as the concern for the future of faith and European harmony.¹⁶

Lastly, we can assert that even the recent flurry of studies on the European courts has neglected that of the pontiffs.¹⁷ Perhaps the most significant themes of current European historiography on the courts – the reconsideration of the relationships between court and state, no longer seen as separate worlds but as interwoven and interdependent spheres; the concentration on the symbolic aspects of politics, on ceremoniousness as a manifestation and at the same time a creation of sovereignty – have

¹⁴ W. Reinhard, 'Nepotismus. Der Funktionswandel einer papstgeschichtlichen Konstanten', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 86 (1975), pp. 145–85.

¹⁵ P. Blet, *Histoire de la représentation diplomatique du Saint Siège des origines à l'aube du XIXe siècle*, Città del Vaticano, 1982.

¹⁶ In this perspective see now G. Signorotto, 'Note sulla politica e la diplomazia dei pontefici (da Paolo III a Pio V)', in M. Fantoni (ed.), *Carlo V e l'Italia*, Rome, 2000, pp. 47–76.

¹⁷ This lack of studies on the Roman court has been highlighted on many occasions: see A. Quondam, 'Un'assenza, un progetto. Per una ricerca sulla storia di Roma tra 1465 e 1537', *Studi romani*, 27 (1979), pp. 166–75; P. Hurtubise, 'Jalons pour une histoire de la cour de Rome aux xve et xvie siècles', *Roma nel Rinascimento* (1992), pp. 123–34 and, for a subsequent period, C. Weber, 'La Corte di Roma nell'Ottocento', in C. Mozzarelli and G. Olmi (eds.), *La corte nella cultura e nella storiografia. Immagini e posizioni tra Otto e Novecento*, Rome, 1983, pp. 167–204. W. Reinhard, 'Papal Power and Family Strategy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in R. G. Asch and A. M. Birke (eds.), *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility. The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, 1450–1650*, London and Oxford, 1991.

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

5

recently begun to be applied also to Rome.¹⁸ But there is still a lot of work to be done on the *household* of the pope, the court's financial administration, the matrimonial policy of the papal families and the network of relationships that linked them to the Italian ruling families and to European dynasties.

It is not our intention here to present a summary of previous research.¹⁹ It is necessary to assess the contribution of the different historiographical approaches, and to acknowledge that a comparison with them remains inevitable, before we can adopt a different perspective. However we are not bound to accept the results of recent years, nor is it our intention to return, albeit with the support of today's methods and knowledge, to Ranke or Pastor.

We believe that what was happening within the Holy See cannot be understood without an accurate assessment of outside influences. On the other hand, any explanation based solely on the impact of external factors will be wholly unsatisfactory and inadequate with respect to the complexity of the situation in Rome. Hence the need to take a closer look at the papal court, the workings of the curial bodies (beginning with the College of Cardinals and the Secretary of State), while highlighting the informal contexts that took on political significance, and acknowledging that the dual nature of the pontiffs' authority and the well-known constitutional characteristics of their power, as compared to that of European monarchs, are fundamental assumptions.

Therefore attention to the particularly 'Roman' character of the political struggle, to the dynamics of faction, to the complexity of patronage relationships, to the basic ambiguity of friendship – themes central to many contributions in this volume – is continuously related to the 'physiology' of Roman politics and to the institutional particularity of curial structures – that is, the elective nature of sovereignty, the centrality of nepotism and the active presence of representatives of European and Italian states in the city and government bodies.

¹⁸ See M. A. Visceglia and C. Brice (eds.), *Cérémonial et rituel à Rome (XVIIe-XIX siècle)*, Ecole Française de Rome, 1997; M. A. Visceglia, 'Cerimoniali romani: il ritorno e la trasfigurazione dei trionfi antichi', in Fiorani and Prosperi (eds.), *Storia d'Italia. Annali 16*, pp. 111–70.

¹⁹ Recent reviews of studies on court and curia in Roma in the modern age are: M. Pellegrini, 'Corte di Roma e aristocrazie italiane in età moderna. Per una lettura storico sociale della curia romana', *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*, 30 (1994), pp. 543–602; M. A. Visceglia, 'Burocrazia, mobilità sociale e patronage alla corte di Roma tra Cinque e Seicento. Alcuni aspetti del recente dibattito storiografico e prospettive di ricerca', *Roma moderna e contemporanea. Rivista interdisciplinare di storia*, 3 (1995), pp. 11–55.

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

6 GIANVITTORIO SIGNOROTTO AND MARIA ANTONIETTA VISCEGLIA

At the same time, we believe that a study of early modern European history from the Roman viewpoint may revive debate over the great traditional turning-points of the period. The change in the relationship between the Spanish crown and the papacy is as important as the victory at St Quentin for understanding the assumptions of 'Catholic Europe' and the intensity of its reactions in the following century. The modes and timing of the transition to the age of 'French dominance' are better understood by analysing the movements and political tendencies within the curia.

Considering that the level of current knowledge discourages any claim to exhaustiveness, we have decided to concentrate our attention within a limited period, from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the end of the seventeenth. There are two reasons for this choice. As appeared extremely clear to contemporaries, who have left us a precise picture of the court seen in this way, in the early modern age Rome was an open space, a meeting point for family ascents, a financial centre capable of mobilizing intense economic resources and a place of political decisions that interacted with the other centres of European politics. This dialectical and dynamic relationship between Rome and Europe became more rigid and weaker from the end of the seventeenth century to the early eighteenth century, changing the nature of the relationships between the court and the city and reducing the intermediary role that the Holy See had played in European political and diplomatic negotiations up to the peace of Westphalia. On the other hand, the decision not to undertake a diachronic synthesis left us free to study the chosen context in depth by drawing on the widest possible range of documentary sources. Hence the necessity for a more complex periodization, which could take into account the link between the important internal changes – the reorganization of the curia after the reform of Sixtus V, the bull of Gregory XV's conclave, the antinepotistic shift during the last decades of the seventeenth century – and those marked by the relationship between the papacy and international politics – the revival of Roman universalism in the period between the 1570s and the first decades of the seventeenth century, the unrest during the Barberini papacy, the setback of Westphalia and the difficult search for new harmonies in the second half of the seventeenth century.

The studies included here expand on aspects and episodes that demonstrate how the political way of doing things in the court and curia was projected externally, using different reference scales for nearby settings (the ancient states of the peninsula) and for those farther away. We are fully aware that in both directions the number of surveys is limited, but we hope that they constitute a good basis for renewing attempts at understanding this complex and problematic picture. It is nevertheless

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

7

our opinion that a clarification of the relationship between the political institutions of Catholic Europe and Rome may help us to grasp the particularity of the *Ancien Régime*, in that it introduces us to its cultural horizon and to the particular interaction of religion and politics, both indispensable coordinates for discovering the hierarchy of interests and the decision-making criteria. Thus, by rejecting a generic approach, by looking beyond the stereotypes and taking detailed account of the historical events, we hope to have introduced a variable – an element of complication that is still largely neglected – into the ‘general’ histories and into those of individual countries.

This need to penetrate as far as possible into the mechanisms of politics at the court of Rome does not imply that we have neglected a parallel assessment of the spiritual authority of the pontiffs and of the perception of contemporaries and political observers during the period between the reorganization following the Italian Wars – coinciding with the Tridentine watershed – and the ‘crisis of the European conscience’. Our investigations finish with the end of the seventeenth century, since the *età innocenziana* marked a significant turning-point in Rome with regard to all the paths that we have endeavoured to follow. In fact, the ‘reforming’ phase marked by the pontificates of Innocent XI and Innocent XII announced a new era for the church, which is also perceptible at the level of terminology. The definition ‘court of Rome’ – hitherto used interchangeably with ‘curia’ to indicate the persons in the service of the pope and the ecclesiastical government – was beginning to take on a negative meaning. At the same time, the Apostolic See was committed to acquiring a new image, extending its frontiers to include all Catholics. After the loss of territory in the struggle with the powers, this was the prerequisite for facing the still more difficult challenges that would come with the last tremors of the *Ancien Régime* and the onset of the contemporary world.

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

A TURNING-POINT IN THE HISTORY OF THE FACTIONAL SYSTEM IN THE SACRED COLLEGE: THE POWER OF POPE AND CARDINALS IN THE AGE OF ALEXANDER VI*

MARCO PELLEGRINI

Recently it has been suggested that we need to reconsider the ethos of the Renaissance cardinalate, taking that concept not so much in terms of generic morality but more narrowly in the sense in which it was used in the later fifteenth century, that is to say as the necessary point of intersection between legal *officium* and ethical *onus*.¹ In this perspective, the pontificate of Alexander VI Borgia (1492–1503) is of especial interest for the importance assumed in that period by what may be regarded as the factors leading to the decline of the Sacred College as an organ of government in the Roman church.

In the attempt to provide an historical interpretation of this process, it has been rightly pointed out that the exploitation of cardinalatial *dignitas* for purposes other than its institutional duties brought about its secularization. We find confirmation of this in the politicization of a conspicuous proportion of the Sacred College and in its domination by party politics, a phenomenon peculiar to the Renaissance age.² One might add that the later reform of the cardinalate, during the ‘long century’ when the Tridentine decrees were being applied to the structures of the curia, was obliged to concentrate on neutralizing the power of the cardinals at the level of temporal politics, as a necessary prelude to the bureaucratization of the Sacred College.³

* Translation by Mark Roberts.

¹ D. S. Chambers, ‘What Made a Renaissance Cardinal Respectable? The Case of Cardinal Costa of Portugal’, *Renaissance Studies* 12/1 (1998), pp. 87–108; M. Pellegrini, ‘Da Iacopo Ammannati Piccolomini a Paolo Cortesi. Lineamenti dell’ethos cardinalizio in età rinascimentale’, *Roma nel Rinascimento* (1998), pp. 23–44.

² J. A. F. Thomson, *Popes and Princes, 1417–1517. Politics and Policy in the Late Medieval Church*, London, 1980, pp. 57–77; M. Firpo, ‘Il cardinale’, in E. Garin (ed.), *L’uomo del rinascimento*, Rome and Bari, 1988, pp. 75–131; M. Pellegrini, ‘Il profilo politico-istituzionale del cardinalato nell’età di Alessandro VI. Persistenze e novità’, in the proceedings of the conference *Roma di fronte all’Europa nell’età di Alessandro VI*, now in press (a fuller version of the present essay).

³ W. Reinhard, ‘Struttura e significato del Sacro Collegio tra la fine del xv e la fine

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

The question is highly complex, and historians have not yet dealt with it in systematic and exhaustive terms. In summarily reconstructing here the juridical and institutional lineaments of the cardinalate in the time of Alexander VI, I take as my point of departure the widely agreed fact that the cardinals' *auctoritas* declined during the Renaissance.

From the very beginnings of the institution, in the eleventh century, what had governed the cardinals' code of behaviour, as vigilant *oculi Romanae Ecclesiae*, was constant deference to papal authority and to the honour of the church.⁴ The principle of *libertas Ecclesiae* was never to be compromised by a cardinal's behaviour, in public at least. This meant in practice that no cardinal was ever to owe his obedience, his *debitum fidelitatis*, to any earthly sovereign other than the sovereign pontiff. The pope in his turn was held to his particular *officium*, concerning the discharge of which he could be judged and condemned; this amounted to the *bonum Ecclesiae*, the just government of Christendom in general and of the Roman church in particular.

In juridical and institutional terms, the Renaissance proliferation of cardinals whose capacity correctly to exercise the prerogatives of government in the church was considered irrelevant, may be taken to indicate the erosion of those prerogatives and their replacement by something quite different.⁵ The origins of this process are to be sought in the early decades of the fifteenth century. After the crushing of those pretensions towards oligarchic government which had led the Sacred College down the slippery slope of the Great Schism,⁶ the way was open for the restoration of the papal monarchy, from Martin V Colonna onwards.⁷ This new historical context saw the cardinalatial dignity progressively absorbed into the sphere of supreme papal authority, and the gradual disappearance of every vestige of power independent of the latter. The old hierocratic notion of the indivisibility and universality of the sovereign pontiff's jurisdiction

del xvi secolo', in *Città italiane del '500 tra Riforma e Controriforma*, Lucca, 1988, pp. 257–65; N. Pellegrino, 'Nascita di una "burocrazia": il cardinale nella trattatistica del XVI secolo', in C. Mozzarelli (ed.), *'Familia' del principe e famiglia aristocratica*, vol. II, Rome, 1988, pp. 631–77; R. Tamponi, 'Il "De cardinalis dignitate et officio" del milanese Girolamo Piatti e la trattatistica cinque-seicentesca sul cardinale', *Annali di storia moderna e contemporanea*, 2 (1996), pp. 79–129.

⁴ E. Pásztor, *Onus Apostolicae Sedis. Curia romana e cardinalato nei secoli XI–XV*, Rome, 1999, pp. 29–46.

⁵ P. Prodi, *Il sovrano pontefice. Un corpo e due anime: la monarchia papale nella prima età moderna*, Bologna, 1982, pp. 169–89.

⁶ M. Souchon, *Die Papstwahlen in der Zeit des grossen Schismas. Entwicklung und Verfassungskämpfe des Kardinalates, 1378–1417*, vols. I–II, Brunswick, 1898–9; E. Pásztor, *Funzione politico-culturale di una struttura della Chiesa: il cardinalato*, now in Pásztor, *Onus Apostolicae Sedis*, pp. 347–63.

⁷ M. Miglio (ed.), *Alle origini della nuova Roma. Martino V*, Rome, 1985.

Cambridge University Press

0521641462 - Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700

Edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia

Excerpt

[More information](#)

10

MARCO PELLEGRINI

over the affairs of Christendom, both spiritual and temporal (*regimen totius mundi*), was updated by emphasizing the definition of the Roman church as a papal monarchy, according to the doctrinal coordinates expounded by Torquemada in his *Summa de Ecclesia*.⁸ It followed that the essence of the cardinalatial dignity could consist only in participation, at a subordinate level, in the multifarious jurisdictional activities of the Vicar of Christ, the absolute sovereign of the church on earth.

It remained an open question how far it was legitimate for a cardinal to exercise his just prerogatives of *iudicium* and *consilium*. In the middle of the fifteenth century the jurist Martino Garati da Lodi dealt with the matter in his treatise *De cardinalibus*. He emphasized the unity of the Sacred College with the pope, together with whom it constituted – in the anthropomorphic vision familiar to medieval culture – *unum corpus*, with the pope as *caput*: the entire organism was the Roman church.

As for the *officium* of the cardinals, it was defined as ‘gubernare totum mundum’ together with the sovereign pontiff with whom the *fratres* of the Sacred College had a relationship of necessary institutional proximity. It is possible to discern, in writings of this kind, a constitutionalist tendency which sought to distinguish the model of ecclesiastical government from that of the contemporary secular principate, since it had become evident that this latter, especially in Italy, had opted for a ‘tyrannical’ exercise of authority.⁹ Garati’s scheme, on the other hand, proposes an aristocratic model for the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs, in which the Sacred College assumes the function of a senate, explicitly recalling the example of ancient Rome – just as St Peter Damian had done at the very beginnings of the cardinalate as an institution.

These are the juridical sources of a terminology destined to be widely used in the later fifteenth and earlier sixteenth century, in the face of an historical reality increasingly deaf to the constitutional aspirations of a certain number of curial humanists. Paolo Cortesi in his *De cardinalatu* refers to the Sacred College as *senatus*, and maintains that the sovereignty of the *respublica christiana* is vested jointly in the pope and cardinals, as expressed by the Romanizing formula he himself devised, *P.M.S.Q.* (*Pontifex Maximus Senatusque*, making use of the learned term *Pontifex Maximus* introduced by Nicholas V). Behind this erudite artifice lay

⁸ T. M. Izbicki, *Protector of the Faith. Cardinal Johannes de Turrecremata and the Defense of the Institutional Church*, Washington DC, 1981, pp. 75ff.

⁹ G. Soldi Rondinini, ‘Per la storia del cardinalato nel secolo XV’ (with an edition of the treatise *De cardinalibus* by Martino Garati da Lodi), Milan, 1973, pp. 60–1; G. Alberigo, *Cardinalato e collegialità. Studi sull’ecclesiologia tra l’XI e il XIV secolo*, Florence, 1969; A. Black, *Monarchy and Community. Political Ideas in Later Conciliar Controversy*, Cambridge, 1970.