

Prospects of Statecraft: Diplomacy, Territoriality, and the Vision  
of French Nationhood in Rome, 1660-1700

by

Elena Cristina Napolitano

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Art  
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Elena Cristina Napolitano, 2012

# Prospects of Statecraft: Diplomacy, Territoriality, and the Vision of French Nationhood in Rome, 1660-1700.

Elena Cristina Napolitano

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Art  
University of Toronto

2012

## Abstract

In this dissertation I examine spaces of French national interest in Rome, proposing that France made a unique claim to the city with a distinct urban impact. Beginning with the onset of Louis XIV's personal rule in 1661 and his death in 1715, I explore the ways in which France shaped the urban, social, and political fabric of Rome through a variety of media including architectural projects, urban claims, ceremonial displays, and city views. These expressions were not simply representations, but were visible and material manifestations of France's extraterritorial presence in the city. This history contributes a new and necessary dimension to the predominantly juridical history of early modern diplomacy and reevaluates a historiographical truism that the popes "authored" Rome.

This project centers on two key claims in Rome: the urban precinct surrounding the Palazzo Farnese (residence of the French ambassador) and the Pincian Hill, located below the French controlled church and monastery of SS. Trinità dei Monti, the proposed site of what came to be called the Spanish Steps. The legacy of France has been well documented in the scholarship on these sites but their histories have often been considered separately. I argue that the development of the diplomatic precinct and the struggle for control over the Pincio stemmed

from a shared objective: the exercise of French authority as an extraterritorial enterprise; a process that “revised” Rome itself as an extension of French territory. Chapters 1 and 2 focus on an urban discourse associated with embassy in diplomatic theory and practice. Chapters 3 and 4 explore manifestations of French territoriality on the Pincio, including urban strategies employed by the Minims to claim control over the hillside, and a monumental print by royal engraver Israël Silvestre depicting Rome through French eyes. I conclude by discussing the refectory program at Trinità dei Monti, a work that I argue encapsulates the territorializing efforts of the French in Rome. By addressing the common threads between these distinct historiographies and integrating new findings based on my archival research, this dissertation contributes to the understanding of French strategies of nation-building in early modern Rome.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to offer my gratitude to the institutions, mentors, colleagues, and friends who have offered their support over the course of this project. This topic began with a single question, “To whom does Rome belong?” posed to me by my supervisor, Dr. Evonne Levy. My sincere thanks to Professor Levy for helping transform this provocative question into a challenging research project, shaping me as a scholar along the way. Her intellectual rigor, sage advice, and mentorship have guided me through the course of this degree. I am very grateful for the support given to me by my committee members, Dr. Christy Anderson and Dr. Rodolphe el-Khoury. I have benefited tremendously from their insightful feedback as well as their sustained interest in and enthusiasm for this project. I also wish to thank my dissertation defense committee, Dr. Tod Marder and Dr. Georges Farhat, for their invaluable commentary and suggestions.

The research for this dissertation would not have been possible without the generous financial support of several institutions. I have been especially fortunate to receive funding from the University of Toronto Graduate Fellowship and Graduate Initiative Awards, the School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto, the Council of American Overseas Research Centers and the American Academy in Rome, the Mellon Foundation and the Vatican Film Archives at Saint Louis University, the Canadian Centre for Architecture, the Society of Architectural Historians, the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas Austin, the Center for the Study of France and the Francophone World at the University of Toronto, and the Society for French Historical Studies. These institutions have provided the means necessary to continue research on a topic with diverse monuments and archival sources.

I owe a debt of gratitude to several scholars who have assisted me in my research and opened up new avenues of thought, in particular Dr. Angela Vanhaelen, Dr. Shankar Raman, and Dr. Bronwen Wilson of the “Making Publics Project” at McGill University and my fellow seminarians of “Making Publics, Producing Spaces.” The participants involved in this project have introduced me to a whole range of new perspectives on early modernity. Belonging to a community with such shared enthusiasm for this period has been one of the delights of my graduate career. I owe thanks to Dr. Mirka Benes, Dr. Laurie Nussdorfer, Dr. Giancarla Periti, Dr. Kristen Triff, and Katherine Wentworth-Rinne who have all provided invaluable research tips. I also am grateful to the archivists and staff at the institutions and repositories where I conducted research. Without their assistance I would still be aimlessly leafing through inventories.

On a personal note, my friends and family have been an invaluable source of comfort and encouragement throughout my time in graduate school. Thank you to my colleagues and friends past and present at the University of Toronto who have provided me with so much support over the years, especially Betsy Moss for her generous spirit and GUSStA tea Fridays, and John McQuillen for keeping it all in perspective. I am tremendously grateful for the mentorship and friendship of my undergraduate advisor and fellow Wells Woman, Dr. Sara French, who continues to be an inspiration. My thanks also to the Lockhart sisters: Emily and Jessica (the dynamic duo of image editing and Latin translation), and to Michael Barbezat and Sarah Rolfe Prodin for their assistance with translations and paleography. My special thanks to Ali Smith for her inexhaustible patience, kindness, and wit, all of which has helped keep me grounded in the final stretch. Finally and most of all, my heartfelt thanks to my family, especially my parents, Elena and Frank Napolitano, whose support has been immeasurable and whose faith in me is unwavering. Thank you.

# Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Figures.....	viii
Introduction: Nationhood and Territoriality in Early Modern France and Rome	
Methodology: Tracing the Vision of French Rome.....	1
French Expansionism, Nationhood, and the Rise of the Territorial State: 1661-1700.....	10
The Body Politic of French Rome: Agents, Allies, and Institutions.....	20
Chapter 1 “On the Manner of Negotiating with Princes”: The Diplomacy of Louis XIV in its Historical Context	
Introduction.....	34
A Note on the Historiography of Diplomacy.....	37
Precedents for Early Modern Diplomatic Systems.....	39
Diplomacy in the Fourteenth through the Sixteenth Centuries.....	44
Diplomacy in Seventeenth Century Europe.....	51
Diplomatic Immunity:	
The Ambassador.....	57
Diplomatic Immunity: The Ambassadorial Residence.....	60
Problems with Diplomatic Asylum.....	65
Immunity of the Quarter.....	68
France and the Development of a Diplomatic Corps.....	71
“Angels” of Divine Rule: Louis XIV and the Model Ambassador.....	76
Mobile Encounters: Immunity and Street Space.....	83
Conclusion.....	89
Chapter 2 As Far as the Eye Can See: Embassy and Extraterritoriality at the Palazzo Farnese, 1660-1670	
Introduction.....	92
The Palazzo Farnese and its Urban Environs.....	98
Negotiations for the “Most Beautiful Palace in Rome”.....	106
The Palazzo Farnese as French Residence.....	117
Urban Effects of the “Créqui Affair”.....	126
Competing Urban Strategies: S. Salvatore in Onda.....	132
The French Quarter in the Absence of an Ambassador: 1665 and 1668.....	137
Conclusion.....	147
Chapter 3 ‘Nôtre Montaigne’: Designating the Pincio as Royal Territory	
Introduction.....	149
Foundational Myths: The Establishment of Trinità dei Monti.....	153
Politics of Materials and Style: The Debate over Royal Privilege, 1500-1645.....	164
Factionalization and Royal Intervention: 1650- 1662.....	172

In the Presence of All of Rome: “Feast for the Birth of Dauphin,” 1662.....	182
‘Nôtre Montaigne’: The Minims’ Pursuit of the Pincio, 1655-1662.....	189
From the Palazzo Farnese to the Pincian Hill: 1662-1664.....	198
“Devant les Yeux”: Spain and France on the Pincio.....	207
Conclusion.....	222
Chapter 4 ‘A Citadel without Ramparts’: French Territoriality in Rome 1670-1689	
Introduction: Political Relations between France and Rome, 1670-1688.....	226
Mapping the French Quarter in Rome in Text and Image.....	238
A View of “French Rome”: Israël Silvestre and the <i>Profil</i> of 1687.....	252
Conclusion.....	278
Conclusion: The Sovereign Eye	
Introduction.....	280
The Completion of the Spanish Steps in the Eighteenth Century.....	284
The Refectory at Trinità dei Monti.....	290
Narrative Scenes in the Vault.....	296
Royal Portraits.....	307
The Antechamber.....	317
Figures	
Chapter 1.....	319
Chapter 2.....	320
Chapter 3.....	331
Chapter 4.....	335
Conclusion.....	350
Bibliography.....	366
Appendix	
List of French Ambassadors in Rome: 1633-1691.....	394

## List of Figures

### Chapter 1

- Figure 1-1 Jean Marot, Engraving of the Ephemeral Arch of the Peace of the Pyrenees, 1659, Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 1-2 Jean Boisseau, “Le recontre et combat des ambassadeurs d’Espagne et de Portugal, arrivé à Rome, l’an 1642,” Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. From *Inventaire de la collection d'estampes relatives à l'histoire de France*, ed. Michel Hennin, (microform) Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1877, tome 36.

### Chapter 2

- Figure 2-1 Lieven Cruyl, View of Palazzo Farnese, 1660s. Albertina, Vienna.
- Figure 2-2 Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, Michelangelo Buonarroti, Palazzo Farnese (detail: principal facade, main portal, and balcony), ca. 1541, Rome. Photo by author.
- Figure 2-3 Giambattista Nolli, *1748 Map of Rome* (detail: streets around Piazza Farnese). From *The Interactive Nolli Map Website*, nolli.uoregon.edu.
- Figure 2-4 Antonio Tempesta, *1593 Map of Rome* (detail: Palazzo Farnese and Via Giulia). From Luigi Salerno, Luigi Spezzaferro, and Manfredo Tafuri, *Via Giulia: una utopia urbanistica del 500* (Rome: Staderini, 1973).
- Via Giulia*, 81.
- Figure 2-5 Giambattista Nolli, *1748 Map of Rome*, (detail: Southern terminus of Via della Scrofa and Piazza Farnese). From *The Interactive Nolli Map Website*, nolli.uoregon.edu.
- Figure 2-6 Plan of changes made to the urban fabric by the Farnese. From Luigi Spezzaferro and Richard Tuttle. “Place Farnèse: urbanism et politique,” in *Le Palais Farnèse*, ed. Ecole française de Rome (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1981).
- Figure 2-7 Antoine Lafréry, View of Palazzo Farnese, *Speculum Romanae Magnificentiae*, Rome, 1549. From James Ackerman, *The Architecture of Michelangelo* (London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).
- Figure 2-8 Anonymous, View of Palazzo Sacchetti and the French quarter in Rome, 1687. Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes, Archives des Affaires étrangères (AMAE). Photo by author.



- Figure 2-9 Giambattista Falda, *1676 Map of Rome* (second edition) (detail of Casa Grande, indicated), Piazza della Trinità dei Pellegrini, and Piazza Farnese. From Salerno, Spezzaferro, and Tafuri, *Via Giulia*.
- Figure 2-10 Falda, *1676 Map of Rome* (detail of the pyramid monument, indicated).
- Figure 2-11 Schematic plan of the French Quarter. Site of the barracks of the Corsican Guard (indicated). From Charles de Moüy, *L'ambassade de duc de Créqui*, 2 vols. (Paris, V. Lecoffre, 1893).
- Figure 2-12 François Ragout, Engraving of the Pyramid, Paris, 1664. Bibliothèque Nationale (BnF), Paris. From Dietrich Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV in Rom: ein Schaddenkmal im Dienst diplomatischer Vorherrschaft," *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 31 (1996): 427-458.
- Figure 2-13 Medal cast for the Treaty of Pisa, Paris, 1664. From Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV."
- Figure 2-14 Medal cast for the Treaty of Pisa, Paris, 1664 From Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV."
- Figure 2-15 Plan of the Pyramid with stanchions and gates, 1664. AMAE. Photo by author.
- Figure 2-16 Giambattista Nolli, *1748 Map of Rome* (detail: Via della Regola from SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini, indicated). From *The Interactive Nolli Map Website*, [nolli.uoregon.edu](http://nolli.uoregon.edu).
- Figure 2-17 Sketch indicating the French quarter in relation to the pyramid, 1667. BnF, Paris. From Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV"
- Figure 2-18 Gregorio Tomassini, Piazza Ponte Sisto (A), proposed site S. Salvatore in Onda (D), Via dei Pettinari (E), ca. 1662. Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV), Rome. Photo by author.
- Figure 2-19 Gregorio Tomassini, S. Salvatore in Onda, Plan with the Fontanone and proposed regularization of the Via dei Pettinari. ca. 1662. BAV, Rome. Photo by author.
- Figure 2-20 Gregorio Tomassini, S. Salvatore in Onda, Section, ca. 1662. BAV, Rome. Photo by author.
- Figure 2-21 Gregorio Tomassini, S. Salvatore in Onda, Elevation, ca. 1662. BAV, Rome. Photo by author.
- Figure 2-22 Gregorio Tomassini, Site Plan for S. Salvatore in Onda, ca. 1662. BAV, Rome. Photo by author.
- Figure 2-23 Pierre Paul Sévin (Gian Lorenzo Bernini), Design for the Celebration of the Peace of Aquisgrana, Piazza Farnese, 1668. Stockholm, Nationalmuseum.

Figure 2-24 Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Sketch for the Celebration of the Peace of Aquisgrana, Piazza Farnese, 1668. Windsor Castle, Collection of Her Majesty the Queen. From Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco. *La festa barocca* (Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1997).

### Chapter 3

Figure 3-1 Giovanni Battista Falda, “Novissima et acuratissima delineatio Romae veteris et novae, in viatorem usum et commoditatem”, Rome, originally published in 1667, (reprinted by Petrus Van der Aa, Leyden 1700-21).

Figure 3-2 Israël Silvestre, “Piazza dell Trinità de Monti,” Paris, undated. BnF, Paris From “Israël Silvestre et ses descendents” <http://israel.silvestre.fr/index.php>

Figure 3-3 Dominique Barrière, *Feast for the Birth of the Dauphin*, 1662. From Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco. *La festa barocca*.

Figure 3-4 Dominique Barrière, *Feast for the Birth of the Dauphin* (detail: Trinità dei Monti), 1662.

Figure 3-5 Dominique Barrière, *Feast for the Birth of the Dauphin* (detail: Piazza di Spagna), 1662.

Figure 3-6 Falda, Detail, Map of Rome, 1667 From Cesare D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma* (Roma: Stabilimento A. Staderini, 1974).

Figure 3-7 Elpidio Benedetti, Plan for the Staircase Project, 1660. From D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*.

Figure 3-8 Charles Errard, drawing of the royal escutcheon for the facade of Trinità dei Monti, Pen and Ink, 1670. From D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*.

Figure 3-9 Jean Pasquet (or Pasquier), Plan for the royal escutcheon on the facade of Trinità dei Monti, 1665. AMAE, Paris. Photo by author.

Figure 3-10 Jean Pasquet (or Pasquier), Plan for the royal escutcheon on the facade of Trinità dei Monti, 1665. AMAE, Paris. Photo by author.

### Chapter 4

Figure 4-1 Sébastien Leclerc, *Allegory of Fire*, engraving based on tapestry by Charles Le Brun, 1670. From André Félibien, *Les Fêtes de Versailles, chronique de 1668 & 1674* (Paris: Editions Dédale, Mazonneuve et Laros, 1674), f10r. Research Library, The Getty Research Institute, archive.org.

Figure 4-2 Sébastien Leclerc, *Allegory of Fire*, engraving based on tapestry by Charles Le Brun, 1670. Detail: Pyramid. From André Félibien, *Les Fêtes de Versailles, chronique de 1668 & 1674*.

- Figure 4-3 Charles Le Brun, Ceiling of Versailles, (detail: Pyramid of 1664). Versailles, 1678. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-4 Jean Regnaud, Tondo for the Place des Victoires Monument: Pyramid of the Corsican Affair, 1685. Louvre, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-5 Anonymous, Plan of the 1687 Quarter, AMAE, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-6 Anonymous, Plan of the 1687 Quarter: Legend, AMAE, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-7 Anonymous, Map of the 1636-1640 Quarter, AMAE Rome. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-8 Giambattista Nolli, Map of Rome, 1748 (detail: Castel Sant' Angelo and Piazza di Ponte). From *The Interactive Nolli Map Website*, nolli.uoregon.edu.
- Figure 4-9 Israël Silvestre, *Profile of the City of Rome Viewed from Trinità dei Monti, etching, 1687*, (version of 1773), From the Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.
- Figure 4-10 Israël Silvestre, *Profile* (detail: panel one, 1687. (version of 1773 ). From the Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.
- Figure 4-11 Israël Silvestre, *Profile* (detail: Pincian Hill and Piazza di Spagna), 1687, (version of 1687). BnF, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-12 Israël Silvestre, *Profile* (detail: panel two), 1687, (version of 1773). From the Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.
- Figure 4-13 Israël Silvestre, *Profile* (detail: panel three), 1687, (version of 1773). From the Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.
- Figure 4-14 Israël Silvestre, *Profile* (detail: panel four), 1687, (version of 1773). From the Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.
- Figure 4-15 Israël Silvestre, *Roma*, 1646. From the Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.
- Figure 4-16 Giovanni Temini, *Roma*, 1665. From Mario Gori, Sassoli ed. *Roma Veduta: Disegni e stampe panoramiche della città dal XV al XIX secolo* (Rome: Artemide Edizioni, 2001).
- Figure 4-17 Giovanni Temini, *Roma* (detail: vedute by Gian Battista Falda), 1665. From Mario Gori, Sassoli ed. *Roma Veduta*.
- Figure 4-18 Sébastien Le Clerc, (Charles Le Brun), *Les Grandes Conquêtes du Roy, Rèduction de la Ville de Marsal en Lorraine par le Roy*, (etching), 1683-1694.
- Figure 4-19 Sébastien Le Clerc, (Charles Le Brun), *Les Grandes Conquêtes du Roy, Siège de Douay*, 1683- 1694. BnF, Paris.

- Figure 4-20 Sébastien Le Clerc, (Charles Le Brun), *Les Grandes Conquêtes du Roy, Siège de Tournay*, 1683-1694. BnF, Paris.
- Figure 4-21 Pietro Santi Bartoli, Feast for the Revocation of Nantes, Trinità dei Monti, etching, 1685. From Fagiolo dell' Arco, *La Festa barocca*.
- Figure 4-22 Pietro Santi Bartoli, Feast for the Revocation of Nantes, Pincian Hill, etching, 1685. From Fagiolo dell' Arco, *La Festa barocca*.
- Figure 4-23 Vincenzo Mariotti, Feast for the Recovery of Louis XIV, facade of Trinità dei Monti, 1687 Fagiolo dell' Arco, *La Festa barocca*.
- Figure 4-24 Anonymous, Feast for the Recovery of Louis XIV, (etching), 1687 From Fagiolo dell' Arco, *La Festa barocca*.
- Figure 4-25 Israël Silvestre, Profile, (detail: S. Pietro), 1687, (version of 1687). BnF, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-26 Israël Silvestre, *Profile* (detail: S. Atanasio dei Greci), 1687 (version of 1687). BnF, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-27 Israël Silvestre, *Profile* (detail: figures), 1687 (version of 1687). BnF, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-28 Israël Silvestre, Coversheet: *Livre de diverses vues de France, Rome, et Florence*, etching, ca. 1668. BnF, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-29 Israël Silvestre, *Veue de l'Eglise de la Trinité du Mont à Rome*, ca. 1668. From "Israël Silvestre et ses descendents" <http://israel.silvestre.fr/index.php>
- Figure 4-30 Israël Silvestre, *Profile* (detail: Trinità dei Monti, 1687), 1687 (version of 1687). BnF, Paris. Photo by author.
- Figure 4-31 Israël Silvestre, untitled view of Trinità dei Monti and the Pincian Hill, ca. 1680s? Louvre, Paris.

### Conclusion

- C-1 Girolamo Rossi, Plan of the Spanish Steps designed by Francesco de Sanctis, Rome, 1726. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*.
- C-2 Sebastiano Cipriani. Design for the Spanish Steps. Rome, 1717. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*.
- C-3 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), "Wedding at Cana," Refectory (far wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-4 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), "Wedding at Cana," Refectory (left wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.

- C-5 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (left wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-6 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (right wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-7 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (right wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-8 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (entrance wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-9 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “St. Francis Prophetically Designates the Place of this Monastery.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-10 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “The Diplomat of the Most Christian King Buys the Pincian Hill, 1494.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-11 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “St. Francis, Obeying the Request of the King, Sends French Monks to Rome.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-12 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “St Francis Decrees that this Monastery Should Be Inhabited by Franchmen Alone.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-13 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Julius III Confirms the Aforementioned Privilege by Means of His Diplomat.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-14 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Paul V Increases the Privileges of the Monastery.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-15 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Urban VIII Confirms the Same Privileges.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-16 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Innocent X Confirms by Solemn Judgment Possession of this Monastery to the French Alone.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-17 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Innocent X Confirms by Solemn Judgment Possession of this Monastery to the French Alone.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-18 Avanzino Nucci, Portrait of Charles VIII, Cloister, Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1616-1618. Photo by author.
- C-19 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Holy Trinity. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-20 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), S. Francesco de Paola in Glory. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.

- C-21 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), St. Francis de Sales in Glory. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-22 Andrea, Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallion of St. Louis IX. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-23 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallion of Charelegmagne, Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-24 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait of King Robert of France. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-25 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait of S. Gontran. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-26 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallions of Louis the Grand Dauphin and Louis duc de Bourgogne. Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.
- C-27 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallion of Philippe duc d'Anjou. Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-28 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallion of Charles duc de Berry. Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-29 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallions of Philippe duc d'Anjou and Charles duc de Berry. Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti , Rome, 1694. Photo by author.
- C-30 Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait of Louis XIV. Refectory (entrance wall), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694. Photo by author.

# **Introduction**

## **Nationhood and Territoriality in Early Modern France and Rome**

### **Methodology: Tracing the Vision of French Rome**

In the summer of 1662, Louis XIV dispatched the first ambassador to Rome of his personal reign. When Charles de Blanchefort de Bonne, Duc de Créqui, arrived in July, he took up residence at the Palazzo Farnese and began the business of representing the affairs of the Most Christian King. Among these were Louis XIV's interests in the city itself: a French community of friars at the church of Trinità dei Monti who had recently fought (and won with royal intervention) for a claim to royal privilege; the garnering of allies, including the Barberini, Farnese, and Este families; and the establishment of a residence and a diplomatic quarter that befit the young and ambitious King of France. It was only two months into Créqui's embassy, however, that an altercation occurred between the soldiers of the ambassador and the papal Corsican guard. The event was seized upon by Louis XIV to demonstrate his political will in Rome, in turn shaping relations between the France and the papacy until the close of the century. At the core of this conflict was the exercise of French authority as an extraterritorial enterprise: a process that at times "revised" Rome itself as an extension of French territory. Beginning with the onset of Louis XIV's personal rule in 1661 and concluding with the calming of tensions at the turn of the eighteenth century, I explore the ways in which France shaped the urban, social, and political fabric of Rome in the seventeenth century. Through architectural projects, claims for territory among the city's neighborhoods, ceremonial displays, and commissioned city views, the French negotiated a tense political

relationship with the Holy See precisely by insisting on a *territorial* definition of French national identity in Rome itself during a key period in the state's own expansion of its borders. Symbolically highly charged, these expressions were not simply representations, but were visible and material manifestations of France's extraterritorial presence in the city. In addressing the architectural and urban implications of the exercise of French power in Rome, I trace the ways in which an increasingly centralized state exported its self-definition just as it was being formed, creating a small proxy for itself in a foreign urban space.

This study draws upon a range of existing scholarship on French and Roman art and architectural history, visual culture, urban theory, and diplomatic history. A point of departure for my work is the field of Roman baroque urbanism, in which scholars have traditionally focused on the history of papal patronage.<sup>1</sup> In the last twenty years, scholarship has expanded in scope, to the urban vision of particular individuals but also to the network of interests and influences that competed in shaping early modern Rome.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a wealth of sources that discuss the papal authoring of Baroque Rome. A selection of these include: Richard Krautheimer, *The Rome of Alexander VII, 1655-1667* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985); Christian Elling, *Rome: the Biography of her architecture from Bernini to Thorvaldsen* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1975); Christopher Hibbert, *Rome: The Biography of a City* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1985); Helge Gamrath, *Roma Sancta Renovata: Studi sull'urbanistica di Roma nella seconda metà del sec. XVI con particolare riferimento al pontificato di Sisto V (1585-1590)* (Rome: "L'erma" di Bretschneider, 1987); Christoph Frommel, "Papal Policy-The Planning of Rome during the Renaissance," in *Art and History- Images and Their Meanings*, eds. R. Rothberg and T. Rabb (Cambridge, 1986), 39-65; Dorothy Metzger Habel, *The Urban Development of Rome in the Age of Alexander VII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). For scholarship on cartography that focuses on papal intervention see Stefano Borsi, *Roma di Sisto V: La pianta di Antonio Tempesta, 1593* (Roma: Officina Edizioni, 1986); Borsi, *Roma di Urbano VIII: La pianta di Giovanni Maggi, 1625* (Roma: Officina Edizioni, 1990); P.A. Wilson, "The Image of Chigi Rome: G. B. Falda's Il nuovo teatro," *Architettura*, 26 (1996) 1:33-46.

<sup>2</sup> Several texts have concentrated on particular areas in the urban fabric of Rome. Work in this area has included the investigations of women's patronage, the urban strategies of religious institutions, national rivalries within the city, and the negotiation of urban space as a product of power relations between noble families. See for example, Charles Burroughs, "Below the Angel: An Urbanistic Project in the Rome of Pope Nicholas V," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 45 (1982), 94-124; Joseph Connors, *Borromini and the Roman Oratory: Style and Society* (New York and Cambridge, Mass.: The Architectural History Foundation, 1980); Dorothy Metzger Habel, "Alexander VII and the Private Builder: Two Case



While investigations into the papal role continue, research is now well advanced into how other groups experienced or claimed spheres of influence within the city.<sup>3</sup> From this scholarship also emerges a compelling view of the many types of “urbanisms” that were at work in shaping seventeenth-century Rome.<sup>4</sup> Not exclusively focused on a history of built forms, this scholarship recognizes all types of strategies for the use of space, including the mobilization of street space as a tool of political action.<sup>5</sup> Viewed together, these works form a body of literature that addresses the complexities of the city’s own social and political landscape, of the production of meaning in the urban fabric.<sup>6</sup> In keeping with the emerging view of a Rome composed of many fragmented interests, this project explores how the French faction in Rome may be regarded as a collective force in defining the city in its own terms.

---

Studies in Development of Via del Corso in Rome,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 49, no. 3 (1990), 293-309; Carolyn Valone, “Women on the Quirinal Hill: Patronage in Rome, 1560-1630,” *Art Bulletin* 76 (1994), 129-146; Fabio Barry, “Apartheid? The Counter-Reformation Ghettos,” *Daidolos*, 5 (1996), 18-31; Carla Keyvanian, “Charity, architecture and urban development in post-Tridentine Rome: The hospital of the SS.ma Trinità del Pellegrini e Convalescenti (1548--1680),” Ph.D. diss. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2000); and Thomas Dandeleit, “Spanish Conquest and Colonization at the Center of the Old World: The Spanish Nation in Rome, 1555-1625,” *Journal of Modern History*, 69 no. 3 (1997), 479-511. Thomas Lucas has also addressed the correlation between the institutional identity and the conscious urban planning of the Society of Jesus. See Thomas Lucas, *Landmarking: City, Church, and Jesuit Urban Strategy* (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1997).

<sup>3</sup> Rosemarie San Juan, for example, examines how in graphic representations the city is conceptualized “from the bottom up” offering heterogeneous literary evidence and images rooted in everyday practice on the level of the street, and marked by conflict. San Juan’s research is of particular relevance here in its investigation of urban authorship outside of a historical narrative of papal purview. Rosemarie San Juan, *Rome: A City Out of Print* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001).

<sup>4</sup> One of the most relevant examples of this approach is Joseph Connors’s investigation of social networks in Baroque urbanism. (Joseph Connors, “Alliance and Enmity in Baroque Urbanism,” *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 25 (1989): 239-265). His study is of particular interest here for its demonstration of the influence of private interests on the built environment but also of how visibility worked as a primary component in the early-modern reading and construction of urban space.

<sup>5</sup> For example, Laurie Nussdorfer has examined the temporary utilization or usurpation of street space as a “vehicle of political expression,” addressing how social groups’ identities were topographically bound. See Laurie Nussdorfer, “The Politics of Space in Early Modern Rome,” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 42 (1997–1999), 161-185.

<sup>6</sup> In addition, work on bureaucratic and international influences in the city’s governmental and social makeup have offered a richer picture of a “web of jurisdictions,” in which projects were negotiated and executed. See for example, Laurie Nussdorfer, *Civic Politics in the Rome of Urban VIII* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

This project also engages with the ongoing examination of the intersections between art and diplomacy, including typical artifacts such as commemorative monuments, ephemeral projects and printed pamphlets and views. Within art history, questions of international exchange have been addressed primarily through the modes of diplomatic gift exchange and patronage.<sup>7</sup> Here, micro-studies have provided a rich though somewhat tessellated view of the links between this particular aspect of politics and material and visual culture. By attending to the role of the artist as diplomat or the diplomatic gift as political currency, these works have also broadened contemporary understanding of diplomatic participation in early modernity.<sup>8</sup> In the case of Rome, scholarship pertaining to the architectural or artistic patronage by self-identified members of individual foreign “nations” has also given a clearer idea of the thriving cultures of different groups who competed for influence and prestige in the city. For example, French affiliated churches (S. Luigi dei Francesi, S. Nicola dei Lorensi, S. Giovanni in

---

<sup>7</sup> The scholarship on foreign patronage in Rome is quite extensive. On French-Barberini relations see, for example: P. J. Reitbergen, *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Policies* (London and Boston: Brill, 2006); Marc Fumaroli, “Richelieu, Patron of the Arts,” in *Richelieu, Art and Power*, ed. Hilliard Todd Goldfarb (Montreal: Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, 2002), 15-47; and Karin Wolfe, “Protector and Protectorate: Cardinal Antonio Barberini’s Art Diplomacy for the French Crown at the Papal Court,” in *Art and Identity in Early Modern Rome*, eds. Jill Burke and Michael Bury (Cornwall: Ashgate, 2008), 113-134. Mazarin was also an avid patron in Rome. His financing of the Hieronymite brothers’ renovation of Santi Vincenzo ed Anastasio on Piazza Trevi has been discussed by Joseph Connors in the context of the political effects on architecture and urban space. Joseph Connors, “Alliance and Enmity in Baroque Urbanism,” and M. Laurain-Portemer “Mazarin, Benedetti et l’Escalier de la Trinité des Monts,” *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 102 (1968): 273-294.

<sup>8</sup> Inquiry into the cultural and political associations of diplomatic gift exchange represents its own discrete area of study. See, for example, Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner, and Bernhard Jussen, eds. *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-modern Figurations of Exchange* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003); Nina Birgukova, “Decoration and Diplomacy: Eighteenth-Century French Tapestries,” *Apollo*, 101 (1975): 458-465; Suzanne Butters, “The Uses and Abuses of Gifts in the World of Ferdinando de’ Medici: (1549 - 1609),” *I Tatti studies*, 11 (2008): 243-354; Brigitte Büttner, “Past Presents: New Year’s Gifts at the Valois Courts, ca. 1400,” *Art Bulletin*, 83 (2001): 598-625; Janet Cox-Rearick, “Sacred to Profane: Diplomatic Gifts of the Medici to Francis I,” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 24 (1994): 239-258; Elizabeth Cropper, ed. *The Diplomacy of Art: Artistic Creation and Politics in Seicento Italy* (Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 2000); Georgina Masson, “Papal Gifts and Roman Entertainments in Honour of Queen Christina’s Arrival,” in *Queen Christina of Sweden: Documents and Studies*, ed. Magnus von Platen (Stockholm, Analecta reginensia, 1966): 244-261; Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001).

Laterano), which have been well investigated by French researchers, received continual monetary support through ambassadorial patronage or directly from the French crown itself.<sup>9</sup>

The organization of national factions in the Roman court of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was one part of a larger, more complex political network that included patrons and clients bound by political alliances and loyalties and subject to change with the onset of a papal conclave. While historians have focused on how this network formed (and was formed by) the governance and administrative organs of the papal court in Rome, an analysis of the how this system operated specifically within the French faction in Rome has yet to emerge. One comparable study, however, offers insight into the structure of one such foreign faction in Rome. Thomas Dandelelet's study of "Spanish Rome" takes into account both the top-down brokerage of powerful officials such as ambassadors and cardinals, but also the more loosely defined networks of confraternities, merchants, or members of the working class who all formed part of a self-identifying Spanish "nation" in Rome. Dandelelet demonstrates how several modes of Spanish "colonization" of Rome (client networks, political patronage, and charitable and pious institutions) contributed to the formation of an Iberian identity and asserted the

---

<sup>9</sup> For example, in 1978 the Académie de France and the École Française de Rome jointly sponsored a conference and subsequent publication entitled, "Les Fondations Nationales dans la Rome Pontificale." Two articles on seventeenth-century confraternities that appear in this volume are particularly relevant in their documentation of new sites of French religious patronage. Henri Moreau, "Saint-Claude des Franche-Comte au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle," in AAVV, Académie de France Villa Médicis and École Française de Rome (eds.), *Les Fondations Nationales dans la Rome Pontificale* (Rome, École française de Rome, 1981), 715-721 and Patrick Violette, "Le decoration de l'église de Saint-Nicholas-des-Lorrains (1623-1870) in *Les Fondations Nationales*, 487-539. In addition to its national church, S. Luigi dei Francesi, the Lateran was also a key site for French political patronage and celebrations of state. As Steven F. Ostrow has noted, the renewal of this relationship was celebrated by the Chapter with the commissioning of a sculpture of Henry IV by Nicolas Cordier in 1605 or 1606 for the lateral portico of the basilica. Steven F. Ostrow, "Gianlorenzo Bernini, Girolamo Lucenti, and the Statue of Philip IV in S. Maria Maggiore: Patronage and Politics in Seicento Rome," *Art Bulletin*, 73, no. 1 (March 1991): 89-118. For further discussion of French national institutions in Rome see note 65.

nation's political authority in the European sphere in Rome itself. Ideologically bound to the notion that the Spanish nation was the new heir to the Roman Empire, the formation of "Spanish Rome" was in fact a practice of self-constitution.<sup>10</sup> While Dandelelet is not interested in urban questions *per se*, his work suggests that Spain's Roman "conquest" was executed by a variety of mechanisms. Drawing on his conclusions, my dissertation concentrates on France's urban, visual, and architectural strategies of foreign nation-building in Rome.

The groundwork for this project has also been laid by documented histories of French architectural patronage in Baroque Rome, though relatively few have directly addressed the efforts of nation-building and its visual and spatial ramifications. One of the few synthetic accounts of French artistic and architectural activity in Rome is Dietrich Erben's important analysis of artistic exchange between France and Rome in the seventeenth century.<sup>11</sup> Exploring cultural transfer between France and Rome during the reign of Louis XIV, Erben examines how the selective imitation of classical Roman forms and the works of contemporary Italian artists, as well as the establishment of a patronage network in the city reflected a twofold aim of the French king. It acted as a springboard for the development of a distinctly French artistic tradition and also created an image of universal monarchy through the strategic appropriation of classical and imperial forms. By exploring the various ways in which state-sponsored artistic programs and patronage took hold in Rome and the network of agents involved, Erben's contribution is especially valuable in nuancing the understanding of the development of

---

<sup>10</sup> The terms (noted above) used to describe this process are discussed by Dandelelet, in "Spanish Conquest and Colonization."

<sup>11</sup> Dietrich Erben, *Paris und Rom: die staatlich gelenkten Kunstbeziehungen unter Ludwig XIV* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004).

what has been understood as a turning point in the history of art: the transfer of artistic primacy from Rome to France circa 1665-1666 following Bernini's trip to Paris and the establishment of the Académie de France à Rome.<sup>12</sup> While my dissertation builds on his in terms of its close parallel study of French diplomacy, it differs in its methods and goals: this project emphasizes the urban and territorializing manifestations of French absolutism in Rome and focuses on the interrelation between optics and power in the articulation of these claims.

Finally, at the center of my study is the development of a visual language of diplomacy that coincides with the pan-European institutionalization of the foreign embassy. Rome became the nerve center for this new culture of political mediation in the fifteenth century, with the Holy See acting as chief negotiator among sovereign powers.<sup>13</sup> Rome already had longstanding status as a central meeting point for diplomatic negotiation among sovereign states. Whether or not, as some scholars have argued, that the early modern period laid the foundations of the modern system of diplomacy, it was a period of profound development of formal channels of negotiation among European powers. As early as the 1450s, the city had taken on importance as a diplomatic “listening post” during the negotiations of the Peace of Lodi. By 1455, ten of the major Italian principalities had resident ambassadors posted in the city, more than any other city in the

---

<sup>12</sup> On Bernini's trip to France see Cecil Gould, *Bernini in France*. For an account of his journey see the diary of Paul Fréart Chantelou available in English translation: *Diary of the Cavaliere Bernini's Visit to France*, ed. Anthony Blunt, annot. George C. Bauer, trans. Margery Corbett (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); in French: *Journal de voyage du cavalier Bernin en France*, ed. Milovan Stanic (Macula: L'Insulaire, 2001). For Domenico Bernini's account of his father's trip, see Domenico Bernini, *The Life of Gian Lorenzo Bernini, by Domenico Bernini; a Translation and Critical edition*, intro, commentary, ed. Franco Mormando (University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).

<sup>13</sup> According to political historian Garrett Mattingly, the primacy of Rome as a diplomatic center began in the mid-fifteenth century. There is no evidence of residential ambassadors in the 1430s, but at the Jubilee of 1450 there were an unprecedented number of ceremonial embassies to the Eternal City. With the conclusion of the War of the Milanese Succession in 1454 many ambassadors were instructed to remain in Rome as permanent representatives. Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (London: Butler & Tanner Ltd, 1955), 86-87, 105.

Italian peninsula. Moreover, beginning in the 1460s, Rome became, as diplomatic historian Garrett Mattingly notes “the chief training ground” for diplomats, with principals sending their most talented statesman to the negotiating table.<sup>14</sup>

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also marked the decline in the temporal influence of the papacy, whose role as the mediator among Christian powers was increasingly replaced by a growing network of diplomatic agents as permanent residential posts were instituted in Europe’s capital cities. The movement toward formalized channels of political negotiation also led to a fundamental shift in the conception of mediation: ‘the body’ through which it operated no longer belonged to the vicar of Christ, but rather resided in the institutional framework of codes and courtesies that made up the nascent system of diplomacy. Kings, who had long since abandoned the traditional journey to the Eternal City to receive papal sanction of their right to rule, increasingly relied on their ambassadorial representatives to meet and be in dialogue with one another.

For historians, the negotiations of the Treaty of Westphalia, formalized in 1648, have marked the definitive turning point in the decline of the Holy See’s mediating role among Catholic powers. As the diplomatic historian William Roosen noted, “unable to exert any diplomatic influence on the Protestant half of Europe, the popes became increasingly ineffective with Catholic states... Innocent’s X’s condemnation of the Peace of Westphalia was simply ignored, while his successors were treated quite harshly by many secular princes who pressured popes just like any other secular ruler.”<sup>15</sup> The

---

<sup>14</sup> By the sixteenth century, both Spain and France also had regular envoys stationed in Rome. Under Ferdinand and Isabella, for example, a total four ambassadors were deployed, two accredited to the Holy See and two charged with negotiation with other foreign diplomats. This also corresponds with the Holy See’s expansion of its own diplomatic network, especially after the threat of invasion by Charles VIII in 1495. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 105-106, 154.

<sup>15</sup> William James Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1976), 15.

decline of papal mediatory power continued in the second half of the century, as it became common for principals to simply refuse or deny papal nuncios presence at court.

While the papacy may have lost much of its diplomatic influence after 1659, Rome itself remained Europe's central hub for meetings and negotiations. As such it was a seedbed for changes in the development of a diplomatic network in Europe, not least and the most visible of which, was the transition from temporary to permanent residential embassies. By the mid-seventeenth century, Rome was host to more foreign residential diplomats than any other city. By this time most major powers in Europe had permanent postings of diplomats in Rome, including France, Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, England, Poland, Sweden, and Portugal.<sup>16</sup> These two concurrent and paradoxical trends – a loss of papal power and the rise of Rome as a diplomatic center – raise significant questions about the city itself as the central staging ground for the political representation and display of European states. By examining French presence in Rome, my research engages with two essential questions: to what degree did foreign diplomacy shape (or represent itself as shaping) the city, and conversely, how did the urban fabric of Rome itself as diplomacy's "capital city" influence the political relations among powers and the institutionalization of diplomatic exchange as a whole? My approach to these questions pairs a history of visual and urban artifacts generated by the seventeenth-century French state in Rome with the predominantly juridical history of early modern foreign diplomacy.

---

<sup>16</sup> Paul Lesourd, *L'ambassade de France près le Saint-Siège sous l'ancien régime* (Paris: Editions Spes, 1924), 3.

## French Expansionism, Nationhood, and the Rise of the Territorial State: 1661-1700

In order to discuss the expression of French “nationhood” abroad, one must begin with the meaning of the term itself in its historical context. For early modern audiences the concept of national identity differed greatly from the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century ideology of the nation state.<sup>17</sup> The concept of “the nation” is generally considered to postdate the seventeenth century, particularly concerning polities such as France that were governed by absolute monarchies. Furthermore, to address the notion of geopolitical identities in the early modern era is a lesson in qualification, as states’ boundaries shifted with the vicissitudes of dynastic authority, war, intermarriage, or religious confessionalization.<sup>18</sup> The term “nation,” however, did hold currency in the early modern lexicon, appearing in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts with some regularity.<sup>19</sup> For example, the 1694 edition of the dictionary of the Academy of France, part of Richelieu’s own contribution to the fashioning of a distinctly French cultural legacy, defines “nation”

---

<sup>17</sup> From an anthropological perspective, “nation-building” in early modernity has been defined as a voluntary practice of self-identification and a collective imagining of people. For a discussion of nation-building in Rome, see Dandeleit, “Spanish Conquest and Colonization,” 486-487. Key historical studies on this topic include, Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London and New York: Verso, 1983), Josep R. Llobera, *The God of Modernity; The Development of Nationalism in Western Europe* (Oxford: Berg 1994); John Armstrong, *Nations Before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006) and Anthony Smith, “Nationalism in Early Modern Europe,” *History and Theory*, 44, no.3 (October 2005): 404–415.

<sup>18</sup> The closest approximation of a “nation” in early modernity could be Britain or the Netherlands, but the political systems of either these states were not completely divorced from the system of contacts between elites and did not fully subscribe to the concepts of collectivity and popular representation that underpin modern ideas around nationhood. Roosen does acknowledge the difficulty this poses for the contemporary scholar: “Yet, the use of ‘international’ has become so widespread in modern times that it is almost an affectation not to use it to describe inter-state relations in the seventeenth century.” Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 5.

<sup>19</sup> Texts and pamphlets devoted to the subject of “national character,” for example, rose in popularity during this period. These works were often designed to substantiate existing political rivalries. The emergence of this genre also suggests the development of the conception of separate states within a greater European community. See, for example, F. de la Mothe la Vayer, *Discours de la contrariété d’humeurs qui se trouve entre certains nations* (Paris, 1636), cited in Matthew Smith Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy, 1450-1919* (London and New York: Longman Group Ltd., 1993), 158. On intersections between subjectivity, political consciousness, and national identity see Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.



in relation to both state and country (*état* and *pays*), referencing the term's associations with both political and territorial registers.<sup>20</sup> In seventeenth-century France, “état” and “pays” were both directly associated with the preservation and expansion of the dynastic realm, a concept famously summed up by Louis XIV's reputed declaration that “L'État c'est moi.” This direct, top-down flow of power from a singular and sacralized head of state has been considered by many as that which separates early modern from modern understandings of nationhood.<sup>21</sup>

The question of nationhood has had particular centrality in French historical studies as there continues to be scholarly debate over whether a national *consciousness* emerged before the French Revolution.<sup>22</sup> In a review of several books written on the subject in the 1990s, the historian David Bell concluded that scholars of early modern France have not reached any consensus on this issue precisely because of the nebulous quality of the term “nationhood” itself.<sup>23</sup> Cultural and political historians, alike, however, have addressed this question in productive ways.<sup>24</sup> While the range of contributions is too

---

<sup>20</sup>“Nation. s. f. Terme collectif. Tous les habitants d'un mesme Estat, d'un mesme pays, qui vivent sous mesmes loix, & usent de mesme langage &c. Nation puissante. nation belliqueuse, guerriere. nation civilisée. nation grossiere. nation barbare, feroce, cruelle, meschante nation. chaque nation a ses coustumes, a ses vertus & ses vices. il n'a aucun des defauts de sa nation. la nation Française. la nation Espagnole. c'est l'humeur, l'esprit, le genie de la nation. toutes les nations de la terre. les nations Septentrionales. les nations Meridionales. un Prince qui commande à diverses nations. il est Espagnol de nation, Italien de nation.” From the *Dictionnaire de l'Academie de France* (Paris, 1694).

<sup>21</sup> For Benedict Anderson, for example, the four criteria of a “nation” were that it was an imaginary political community, limited in terms of membership, sovereign, that is not based on hierarchical and divinely ordained system of rulership, and conceived as a community. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6-8.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-9.

<sup>23</sup> David Bell, “Recent Works on Early Modern French National Identity,” *Journal of Modern History*, 68 no. 1 (March 1996): 84-113. Bell indicates that while most historians agree on the existence of a post-revolutionary French national consciousness, there is less consensus over this issue for the period before 1789. As he states: “Until recently, rather than confronting the contradictions and difficulties raised by material such as the eighteenth-century debate over patriotism, historians mostly elided or ignored them.” See Bell's, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

<sup>24</sup> For example, following Fernand Braudel's seminal text on the economic and geographical constructions of French identity, Pierre Nora's multivolume anthology, *Les Lieux des Memoires*, may be considered as a

broad to be addressed here, Orest Ranum, Philippe Sagnac, Marie Madeleine-Martin, Sharon Kettering should be singled out for having devoted specific attention to the development of a *national consciousness* in *Ancien Regime* France.<sup>25</sup> Of these, Kettering's work bears special note because, while several of the aforementioned works consider the top-down administration of Louis XIV's government an a priori condition of the French state, Kettering engages with the complexity of this political framework and its significance in the formation of a state identity. It is useful for this study in order to understand how representatives (especially those abroad) factored into a much larger and more complex framework of mechanisms of state-making in early modern France.

Any conception of nationhood in seventeenth-century France must take into account the comprehensive restructuring of the political bureaucracy and geographical boundaries of the French state that took place during the long reign of Louis XIV. With the death of his chief minister, Cardinal Jules Mazarin, on March 9, 1661, the young king did not appoint a replacement and instead took the reins of government himself, marking the beginning of a tightly controlled bureaucracy that was to become a hallmark of his rule. The king's cabinet of ministers was deliberately small and lacked any executive power of its own. Louis XIV also instituted a highly effective, professionalized standing

---

type of cultural encyclopedia of the various loci where French national sentiment developed. Pierre Nora, ed. *Les Lieux de mémoire*. 7 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1984-1992).

<sup>25</sup> The foundational texts on French nationalism before 1749 remain, Philippe Sagnac *La Formation de la société française moderne*, 2 vols. (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1945-46), Marie-Madeleine Martin, *The Making of France: The Origins and Development of National Unity*, trans. Barbara North and Robert North (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948, 1951), and Jean Lestocquoy, *Histoire du patriotisme français des origines à nos jours* (Paris: A Michel, 1968). More recent work includes, Robert Bell's monograph and Sharon Kettering, *Patronage in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-century France* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001). Orest Ranum has examined how the political structures put into place during this period had concrete effects on the urban fabric and social structure of Paris during the reign of Louis XIV. See Orest Ranum, *Paris in the Age of Absolutism: an Essay* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002). For the transition between early modern and modern French national identity, see *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture, volume 1: The Political Culture of the Ancien Regime*, ed. Keith Michael Baker (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987).

army, setting France apart from other sovereign powers on two accounts: the army lessened the influence of the nobility and facilitated the aggressive acquisition of new territories.<sup>26</sup> Members of the nobility, whose authority to rule their own semi-independent political centers had been stripped, now earned recognition through their participation in Louis XIV's war machine, effectively neutralizing any potential threat to governance by competing claims.

Both the centralization of the government and the professionalization of the army, contributed to the new perception of France as a "territorial entity."<sup>27</sup> As has been argued by political historians, the main objective of war during this period was not economic, but territorial gain (although economic benefits accrued through expansion). As the inscription of French identity into the landscape itself, the territorial effect of statecraft was created through the visualization and spatialization of political boundaries.<sup>28</sup> It is a longstanding misconception, however, that extension of French frontiers was motivated by the desire to regain the state's "natural frontiers." Seventeenth-century statesmen did not have any geographical concept of a "natural" frontier and did not use the term in their political writing. Rather, the acquisition of land was a direct expression of the sovereign's

---

<sup>26</sup> Because of the centralization of its government and finances and the professionalization of its army during this period, France has often been considered the first "modern state." In her study on the material culture of territoriality in France, Chandra Mukerji notes of this shift: "With this war machine, the state no longer had to depend for its territorial power on the traditional loose set of alliances among nobles who sustained quasi-independent political centers." Chandra Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 48.

<sup>27</sup> Territorialization, the making and marking of political space into geographical boundaries, was one of the driving forces behind Louis XIV's numerous military campaigns and aggressive foreign policy in the first decades of his reign. The use of this term to describe the physical and ideological manifestations of political enclosure during the reign of Louis XIV is discussed by Chandra Mukerji in *Territorial Ambitions*.

<sup>28</sup> Here I am conflating two terms: Mukerji's discussion of territorial ambition and Marin's discussion of the "king effect" to describe the intersection between the possession of land and, what Marin describes as the conflation between sovereign and state achieved through representation. See Louis Marin, *Portrait of the King*, trans. Martha M Houle (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1988) in particular, 12-15, and "The Magician King," 205.

*gloire*, a term loosely defined at the time as both reputation and prestige.<sup>29</sup> At the heart of this ideology was the inseparability of the interests of the sovereign and the state, which was the guiding principle of Louis XIV's governance.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, territory was defined by possession: not only was the state possessed and commanded by the king, but the state *did not exist* outside of the conception of dynastic kingship. This was summed up by the diplomat, Philippe de Béthune, who wrote of the king's power: "The legitimate state is the one that belongs to us, either by the gift of him who has the power to give it, or by just conquest, or it may be that one that is bestowed by the laws providing either succession, election, or lot."<sup>31</sup> In this sense, the expansion of the realm was a direct reflection of the power of the sovereign, and through his divine right, an extension of the will of God.

If the sixteenth- and early-seventeenth centuries were characterized by the rise of Spain in the European political sphere, the second half of the seventeenth century belonged to France, more specifically to Louis XIV, whose aggressive statesmanship and pursuit of territorial expansion had a lasting effect on the political landscape of the European states. In the early years of his reign (1661-1678) Louis XIV aggressively pursued the acquisition of new territory for France, while in the second half he sought to maintain and regularize France's borders. Prior to Louis's majority, both the Treaty of

---

<sup>29</sup> Defined by French historian, Paul Sonnino, in *Louis XIV and the Origins of the Dutch War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), and cited in John A. Lynn, "The quest for glory: the Formation of strategy under Louis XIV, 1661-1715" in *The Making of Strategy: Rulers, States, and War*, eds. Williamson Murray, Macgregor Knox, Alvin Bernstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 185.

<sup>30</sup> In his memoirs to his son, Louis XIV wrote of the relationship between kingship and the state: "Everything that is done or proposed in the administration of the state should have its principal relationship to the prince." Charles Louis Dreyss, ed., *Étude sur les Mémoires de Louis XIV pour l'instruction du Dauphin*, 2 vols. (Paris: Genève Slatkine Reprints, 1971), 150.

<sup>31</sup> Philippe de Béthune, *Le conseiller d'etat, ov, Recveil general de la politique moderne, se ruant au maniemment de affaires publiques...* (Paris : La Compagnie des Libraires du Palais, 1665), 22. Cited in Herbert Harvey Rowen, *The King's State: Proprietary Dynasticism in Early Modern France* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1980), 81.

Westphalia of 1648 and the Peace of the Pyrenees of 1659 consolidated and increased France's control over formerly Spanish Habsburg holdings and disputed borderlands between the two states.<sup>32</sup> Louis continued to pursue the expansion of these areas in the first decades of his reign.<sup>33</sup> Overall, four major military campaigns were launched by the king: the War of Devolution (1667-1668), the Dutch War (1672-78), the Nine Years War (1688-97), and the War of Spanish Succession (1700-1714).<sup>34</sup> The territory gained, however, did not always match the king's ambitions. For example, Louis only took possession of twelve fortified towns in the War of Devolution of 1667-68, which had been fought on the pretext of asserting the title of his wife, the Spanish *Infanta*, to the entire territory of the Spanish Netherlands.<sup>35</sup> While the threat of war with Spain continued throughout Louis XIV's reign, the king shifted his focus on the United Provinces of the Netherlands, launching a series of campaigns from 1672 to 1678, which resulted in the annexation of Franche-Comté and the (disputed) acquisition of Lorraine with the Treaty of Nijmegen.<sup>36</sup>

With the Nine Years War and the War of the Spanish Succession, however, the emphasis shifted from acquisition to the *defense* of territory. From 1678 until the close of

---

<sup>32</sup> On frontier expansion see J.F. Noel, "Les Problèmes des frontières entre la France et L'Empire dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle," *Revue Historique* 235, no .2 (1966): 333-346. See 336-7 for a map of frontier rationalization.

<sup>33</sup> Using the claim that French kings were the inheritors of the empire of Charlemagne, Louis XIV attempted to expand the French frontiers into Spanish Flanders, Metz, Toul, and Verdun (all attempted during the 1660s) as well as Castile, Aragon, Navarre, Portugal, Sicily and Naples.

<sup>34</sup> In addition to claiming to be the heirs to the empire of Charlemagne, Louis also claimed to be the rightful owner of land holdings belonging to the Holy Roman Emperor. According to Anderson, "The War of Devolution also both produced and was preceded by a burst of official propaganda which was rebutted by defenders of Habsburg rights." Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 61. (See also, Antoine Bilain *Traité des Droits de la Reyne très-e-Christienne sur divers Etats de la Monarchie d'Espagne* (Paris, 1667). The discussion of the history of this claim in W.F. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 352-2, 396, 372.

<sup>35</sup> Recognizing Louis XIV's ambitions for territorial gain, rival powers banded together to prevent further annexation. The War of Devolution ended after the Dutch allied with England and Sweden. The Dutch and the French were also economic rivals. Lynn, "Quest for Glory," 177-178.

<sup>36</sup> Lynn, "Quest for Glory," 198.

the century, the French military strategy was to regularize and maintain control of its defensible borders. Several factors contributed to this shift. First was a change of guard in Louis XIV's administration. In 1674, with the death and retirement, respectively, of two of Louis XIV's chief military advisors, Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, Vicomte de Turenne and Louis de Bourbon, Prince of Condé, the posts were filled by the Marquis de Louvois and his protégé, the leading military engineer, Sébastien le Prestre de Vauban. In addition, Louis himself did not go into the field as often as he had earlier in his reign, instead drafting tactics with his advisors in a "cabinet de guerre" launched from Versailles. Second, France was increasingly politically isolated, facing several more enemies than it had at the start of the 1660s, including England, Spain, Savoy, and the Dutch Netherlands.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, the Holy Roman Empire proved a significant threat to France after it increased its army and defeated the Ottomans in the siege of Vienna in 1684. The threat of invasion influenced Louis XIV to administer a series of tactics, known as "aggressive defense," in order to shore up and fill out his borders. With this in mind, Louis seized Strasbourg, Luxembourg, and defended his claim to Alsace in a series of attacks known as "Reunions," so-called for the pretext that these territories had originally belonged to the French crown.

Underlying all of these endeavors was the understanding of territoriality as a physical and material practice.<sup>38</sup> It required a way of acting on the land, and transforming it so as to mark it as a political entity.<sup>39</sup> Territory was "cultivated" through the building of

---

<sup>37</sup> Lynn, "Quest for Glory," 203-204.

<sup>38</sup> Mukerji notes, "No wonder the king and Colbert associated the authority of the absolutist state with the land and its improvement: canal building, fortress construction, factory sponsorship, warfare and colonial land management." Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions*, 21.

<sup>39</sup> Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions*, 35, and Samuel E. Finer, "State and Nation-Building in Europe: the Role of the Military," in Charles Tilly, ed., *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 3-83.

fortresses and other fortifications, the straightening of frontiers (a process known as *pré carré*) in order to make them defensible, the building of bridges, siege plans, and other earthworks made in preparation for war.<sup>40</sup> Louis XIV's interest in fortification was part of his general pursuit of what has been called "positional warfare": the strategic placement of forces along disputed borderlines, as opposed to open field battle. Vauban, the first titled military engineer in France, was charged with building a line of defense along the French borders, while simultaneously destroying citadels (vestiges of noble power) within the state's interior.<sup>41</sup> The line of fortresses planned by Vauban acted like links of a chain, defining the borders of the territory as a whole. As permanent strongholds at the farthest reaches of the realm, fortresses also allowed for the quick mobilization and deployment of troops into enemy territory. Not only did fortresses serve as part of a defensive tactic, but they were also potent reminders to enemies that French power was literally in view, a phenomenon scholars have described as the "power projection" of the French state.<sup>42</sup>

While these defensive structures were a key part of constituting the state in practical terms, Vauban's fortresses remind us that territorialization was also a symbolic endeavor. Svetlana Alpers has noted the overarching connection between image-making and seigneurial possession throughout Europe, citing the Northern Netherlands as an exception to this predominant form of understanding the early-modern landscape.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Louis XIV's growing interest in massive earth projects is suggested by an increased budget for fortifications. From 1643-1660 the budget for fortifications was 347,000 livres, from 1663-1667 it was 1,374,000 livres, and in the 1680s expenditures peaked at 8,016,000 livres annually. Lynn, "Quest for Glory," 193-194. For fortifications in warfare see Christopher Duffy, *The Fortress in the Age of Vauban and Frederick the Great, 1660-1678: Siege Warfare*, 2 vols. (London: Routledge, 1985).

<sup>41</sup> Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions*, 52.

<sup>42</sup> Lynn, "Quest for Glory," 200-201.

<sup>43</sup> See for example, her discussion of the relationship between "land known" as "land owned" in *The Art of Describing, Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983): 148-149.

Similarly, scholars including Louis Marin, Tom Conley, and Christian Jacob have explored how the desire to “know” the land of the king’s state as a visual entity permeated seventeenth-century French material and political culture.<sup>44</sup> An interest in representing France as a national entity led to advances in cartographic sciences including mathematics, survey geometry, and astronomy. Published in almanacs, both maps and views of newly acquired territories conceptualized diverse communities into a collective and cohesive geopolitical image of the French state.<sup>45</sup> Optical exercises associated with military surveyance also became widely disseminated through contemporary printed texts on perspective and tactics of siege warfare.<sup>46</sup> These manuals trained the eye of the contemporary French reader (and royal subject) for the measurement of distances, and the tracking and assessment of space. It has also been argued that these skills informed the seventeenth-century understanding of French gardens. As itineraries suggest, measuring distances by sight was an integral part of the experience of the gardens, designed to

---

In addition, an excellent study of the relationship between landscape representation and ownership is, Kenneth Olwig, *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain’s Renaissance to America’s New World* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002).

<sup>44</sup>See, for example, Marin, *Portrait of the King*, 169-180. Cartography played a crucial role in seventeenth-century France, where the strategies of envisioning nationhood developed in early atlases continued to inform the representation of newly conquered territories and the expansion and consolidation of French national borders. Tom Conley and Christian Jacob have addressed the ideologies at work in early modern French cartography, examining maps as a productive site for national subject formation. Christian Jacob, *The Sovereign Map*, ed. Edward Dahl, trans. Tom Conley (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006). One of the earliest examples of this trend was evident in François de Belleforest’s revision of the German Sebastian Münster’s *Cosmographia universalis* (1544). See Daniel Nordman, “From the Boundaries of the State to National Borders,” in *Rethinking France*, ed. Pierre Nora, 4 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 1: 105-132, 106. Belleforest’s publication was chiefly concerned with creating a sense of historical continuity legitimizing national origins by eliding contemporary French borders. For a history of French cartography see Josef F. Konwitz, *Cartography in France, 1660-1848* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987). See also: Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).

<sup>45</sup> Towards the end of the century Louis XIV contracted the first national survey in order to inventory and lay visual claim to his domain. Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions*, 8, 263. For a semiotic investigation of the map in *Ancien Regime* France see Christian Jacob, *The Sovereign Map: Theoretical Approaches to Cartography Throughout History*, trans. Tom Conley (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

<sup>46</sup> Treatises on perspective, such as those by Abraham Bosse and Sébastien LeClerc also demonstrated that the French landscape was steeped with the pleasure of the surveying gaze, often including images of estates, formal gardens, and townscapes to illustrate the operations used to measure objects in the world. Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions*, 85-88.



delight and amuse the educated gentleman-surveyor and spectator.<sup>47</sup> Following sight lines in the garden was also a political lesson in absolutism as the perspectival organization of the chateau and the gardens centered on the limitless extension of the sovereign gaze into the landscape.<sup>48</sup> Finally, the perspectival organization of these large territories also served to visually reunify the disparate parcels of land that made up these grand scale manorial holdings.<sup>49</sup>

Finally, the conception of French nationhood that arose during the reign of Louis XIV was also firmly entwined with the power of its sovereign and the diffusion of his royal image. Self-presentation was a powerful tool in the substantiation and glorification of Louis XIV's control of the state; as Louis Marin has demonstrated, authority of the king existed both through and in representation. Like warfare, the central aim of representations was, as Peter Burke has argued, to augment the king's *gloire*, memorializing his deeds and sacralizing his right to rule. This interpellative fusing of sovereign and state applied equally in the center and the periphery and was articulated in manifold ways, from visual and literary representations to spectacles, costume, and even the monitoring of courtly behavior.<sup>50</sup> The saturation of the royal image in seventeenth-

---

<sup>47</sup> The implementation of perspective in both landscape design and visual representation was also part of a much broader debate in seventeenth-century academic circles commonly known as the Quarrel of the Ancients versus the Moderns. Charles Perrault, Supervisor of the King's Buildings under Louis XIV was the major author of this debate, whose support for the "Moderns" was outlined in his text *Parallèle des Anciens et des Modernes* (1688-92).

<sup>48</sup> The optical organization of the gardens of Versailles is discussed by Robert Berger, in "Bernini's Louis XIV Equestrian: A Closer Examination of Its Fortunes at Versailles," *Art Bulletin*, 63, no. 2 (1981), 232-248.

<sup>49</sup> For a discussion on the use of optical devices such as anamorphosis, technology and land use in the construction of seventeenth-century French gardens see Georges Farhat, "Le Nôtre. Anamorphoses, Topography, Territories," in *Diachronicles/Pages Paysages*, eds. Claramunt M. and C. Mosbach (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2000): 44-53.

<sup>50</sup> On the relationship between representation and absolutism see Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994); Louis Marin, *Portrait of the King*, idem, "Frontiers of Utopia," *Critical Inquiry*, 19, no. 3 (Spring, 1993): 397-420; Jean-Marie Apostolides, *Le Roi Machine: Spectacle et politique au temps de Louis XIV* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1981).

century France, a phenomenon Marin has coined the “king-effect,” aimed to dazzle the spectator with the brilliant effect of Louis XIV’s magnificence; in doing so, a royal claim to power both totalizing and omnipresent was articulated. In essence, through the collapse of representation and authentic prototype, Louis became the ever-present and ex-temporal point of origin in the social and political landscape of seventeenth-century France. I am interested in how a similar optically-driven conceptualization of territoriality helped define French claims in seventeenth-century Rome.

### **The Body Politic of French Rome: Agents, Allies, and Institutions**

By the time Louis XIV began his personal reign, France was already well established in Rome, with a network of cardinals, noble allies, and religious and lay authorities contributing to the maintenance and advancement of the crown’s interests in the Eternal City. In addition to their formal role as allies of the king at the Roman court and at times of papal conclave, the members of the French nation in Rome also advocated on his behalf in a variety of ways, from artistic brokerage to the provision of lodgings, security, and supplies for visitors and diplomats attached to the royal court, as well as the gathering of news and intelligence. They also comprised the myriad self-identifying *francesi*, among a population of approximately 120,000 people.<sup>51</sup> While a comprehensive demographical study of French faction in Rome during the seventeenth century is beyond the scope of this study, it is nonetheless helpful to situate the key agents that formed the

---

<sup>51</sup> In 1600 Rome’s population according to the annual *Stati dell’ Anime* registers, totaled 112,000. By 1700 it had risen only slightly to 140,000. Anne Puaux, *Introduction au Palais Farnese* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1983), 182. For a comprehensive discussion of foreign populations in Renaissance Rome see Anna Esposito, “Roma e i suoi abitanti,” *Roma del Rinascimento*, ed. A. Pinelli (Roma-Bari, Laterza, 2001), 3-47.

political alliance in the city, their duties and reach in the political arena of the Roman court.

The structure of this network was hierarchical. At the top was the king who was in direct communication with the pontiff or with the papal cardinal nephew, the latter of whom often served as the head of the Roman curia and held administrative responsibilities of the city along with the governor of Rome.<sup>52</sup> Directly below the king was the ambassador, who served as his personal representative abroad and was the chief agent in charge of his affairs. Louis XIV played a personal role in the management of diplomatic affairs, evidenced by the regular letters dispatched to his diplomatic agents throughout Europe, reflecting his philosophy that his agents, like sunrays, disseminated the glory of the king wherever he was not physically present. During the reign of Louis XIV, Rome received the largest budget of the foreign embassies (about 150,000 to 200,000 livres per year).<sup>53</sup> Between 1661 and 1690, when the controversy over foreign quarters in Rome was at its height, there were a total of nine diplomats in residence in Rome, though only five held the rank of *ambassadeur* (Appendix, figure 1).<sup>54</sup> Three of these, the Duc de Créqui, the Duc d'Estrées, and the Marquis de Lavardin, were the most influential figures in the dispute over the *franchise du quartier* in Rome, and their embassies will be discussed at length in Chapters 2 and 4.

---

<sup>52</sup> My structuring of this system is drawn from a variety of sources, including relations noted in the diplomatic correspondence of the period (AMAE), the Franco-papal relations discussed by Pastor and Lesourd, and the structures of embassy most carefully noted by McClure, Roosen, and Côté. Most importantly, I have drawn conclusions through comparison to the composition of the Spanish nation in Rome discussed by Dandeleit, "Spanish Conquest and Colonization," 487-496.

<sup>53</sup> Côté, "What Did it Mean to be a French Diplomat," 244. Neveu disputes this number, citing the amount of money dispatched to Rome in 1685 for the ambassador is 72,000 livres, London received 48,000, The Hague, Madrid and Lisbon received only 36,000. Neveu, "Regia Fortuna," 481, note 42.

<sup>54</sup> Côté, "What Did it Mean to be a French Diplomat," 241, Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 60-61.

Most ambassadors were of low- or middle-ranking nobility and were relatively wealthy; personal wealth was essential to sustain an ambassador while abroad, as postings were never lucrative endeavors for the diplomats. They were furnished with a suite ranging from 100 to 200 members and a rented palace, which, during the time of their residence, was under the aegis of the king.<sup>55</sup> Reduced tariffs on imported goods and immunity from taxes on local labor reduced the expense of the ambassador's household. The ambassador was responsible for keeping regular correspondence with the Secretary of State or the king himself, reporting major events, the activities of the French nation as well as other nations in Rome, and ongoing political negotiations in the papal court. The ambassador also sent circular letters to diplomats and allies at other major courts throughout Europe, which, like *avvisi*, reported the major news in the city.

At the onset of each appointment, a diplomat was furnished with two sets of instructions, those to be read and circulated at court and "secret instructions" that outlined the chief objectives of the embassy. In the case of Rome, ambassadors were consistently instructed to openly profess loyalty to the pope, while actively pursuing policies that furthered the king's expansionist goals and his greater control over the administration of the French Catholic Church, accorded by the tenets of Gallicanism.<sup>56</sup> Ambassadors were also to work diligently to maintain relations with allies and with the families of the "*papabili*" in residence in Rome, and often lobbied for the elevation to the cardinalate of French subjects or allies. The latter two objectives were aimed at control of the papal

---

<sup>55</sup> This approximation of the size of the ambassadorial suite has been drawn from my examination of the "Stati dell' Anime" Registers for the Parish of Santa Caterina della Rota (in which the Palazzo Farnese and its quarter were located), from 1662 through 1688. Archivio Storico del Vicariato di Roma (ASV), 5 vols: (1678-1679: ff. 33r- 36r, 100r-102v); (1680: 27r-28v, 326v) (1682: ff.23v-24v) (1684 22v-24v); (1686: f. 340r); (1688: f. 44r).

<sup>56</sup> Ludwig von Pastor, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, 40 vols. (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1936-67) 30: 90-96.

congress during conclaves, as a pope sympathetic to the French king could offer much in the way of monetary support and political cooperation. Finally, ambassadors were instructed to maintain a standard of living and conduct appropriate to the majesty of their principal, a command that applied to everything from the observance that appropriate courtesies were accorded to the office, to provision for lavish fêtes and artistic patronage.

Assisting the ambassadors were the cardinal protectors of the crown, whose primary role was to secure alliances for the French faction in Rome, especially in preparation for papal conclaves.<sup>57</sup> Access to the papal court and an established network of patronage also ensured these cardinals a valuable position as brokers on behalf of the king. The cardinal protector was also the chief of the French cardinals and received special instructions from the king. After a conclave, if the pope that was elected was hostile to French interests, the cardinal protectors could also lose their titles and positions. This was the case for Antonio Barberini, who was dismissed by Mazarin in 1644 after the Barberini had voted in the papal conclave for the Spanish favorite, Giovanni Battista Pamphili, the future Innocent X (1644-1655). Though Rinaldo d'Este filled his post in 1645 Antonio Barberini continued to advocate for the French in Rome until the Barberini changed their alliance to the Spanish faction in the mid 1660s. Below the ambassador and the cardinal protector in rank, a French representative (or auditor) in the papal council of the Rota, such as Abbé Bourlemont, could negotiate on behalf of the king in the papal council and, if need be, fulfill the duties of the ambassador.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Olivier Poncet, "The cardinal-protectors of the Crowns in the Roman Curia During the First Half of the Seventeenth Century: the Case of France," in *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*, eds. Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maia Antonietta Visceglia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 158-176, 163-164.

<sup>58</sup> Paul Lesourd, *L'Ambassade de France près le Saint-Siège sous L'Ancien Régime* (Paris: Editions Spes, 1924). See especially, "Les Cardinaux Protecteurs des affaires de France et les principaux agents ou établissements français à Rome." On the French network in Rome, see, for example,

A number of illustrious Italian families were also in service to the king. The royal arms featured prominently on palaces of the Barberini, Este, Farnese, Aldobrandini, Orsini, Grimaldi, Mairaldi, and Mancini, all of whom either advocated for French interests in the Roman Curia or during conclaves or consistories.<sup>59</sup> Over the course of the seventeenth century, family allies were particularly crucial in representing French interests in Rome. In this way, such political networks maintained a widespread and constant presence of French power in Rome. In return for their allegiance, the families could receive royal appointments, benefices, and the alliance of the king of France in the protection of their own interests. The king also often lobbied for promotion of these families in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, hoping to cultivate as many sympathizers in the upper ranks of Roman curia and courts. During the early years of Louis XIV's reign, both the d'Este and Farnese family benefited greatly from France's recognition of their claims to the territories of Castro and Comacchio and demand for their return as one of the stipulations of the Treaty of Pisa.<sup>60</sup>

Family alliances could also serve to amplify a foreign power's influence on an urban scale. Family allies would often contribute to the preparations of celebrations of state, and the routes of the processions were planned to pass by their houses. The celebrations of the Birth of the Dauphin in November 1638, for example, were one of the most popular politicized celebrations of French alliances of the century. Led by French Ambassador François Annibal d'Estrées and Cardinal Barberini, the procession travelled

---

Orest Ranum, "A Glimpse at the French Colony in Rome, 1666-1669"

[http://ranumspanat.com/html%20pages/rome\\_hypotheses.html](http://ranumspanat.com/html%20pages/rome_hypotheses.html), accessed 12 October, 2011.

<sup>59</sup> Information on family alliances is discussed in relation to festival patronage in Rome by Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco and Silvia Carandini in *L'Effimero Barocco, Strutture della festa nella Roma del '600*, 2 vols. Rome: Bulzoni, 1977-1978. Family alliances are also discussed in relation to the papacies of Alexander VII and Innocent XI by Pastor and by Olivier Poncet, "The Cardinal-Protectors of the Crowns."

<sup>60</sup>Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 30: 104-107.

along a route that included stops at the Barberini, Orsini, and Farnese palaces, all of which were decorated for the event, while the Ambassador of the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Auditor of the Rota, Amato Dunogetto, both illuminated the façades of their palaces.<sup>61</sup> In this way the urban streetscape temporarily became the purview of the French king.

Perhaps the most heightened expression of alliance was the rental of the noble's palace to the French king's ambassador. Unlike the Spanish, who had purchased a palace for their ambassador, the French relied on their noble alliances in Rome to furnish a residence. Over the course of the seventeenth century, the French ambassadors and diplomats resided in several palaces of their allies, including Palazzo Sacchetti, the Barberini palaces at Via dei Giubbonari and Quattro Fontane, Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi (belonging to Mazarin), and the Palazzo Ceri. The Palazzo Farnese, however, was the most longstanding residence and, as I will discuss here, the most desirable for the French in Rome over the course of the seventeenth century.

The lowest ranking constituents of this network were the members of the religious orders and confraternities associated with France, such as the brothers of Trinità dei Monti, as well as individuals (French and non-French alike) in the employ of the king and his ambassadors both within and without the official ambassadorial suite. This group made up the largest body of the French nation in Rome, attending mass at the French national church of S. Luigi dei Francesi, belonging to the pious organizations such as the confraternity France-Comtois de Bourgogne, and, in the case of the non-French (from

---

<sup>61</sup> Gaia Bindi, “‘Roma gran teatro del mondo’ la guerra festeggiata.” In *La festa barocca*, ed. Maurizio Fagiolo dell’Arco (Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1997), 100-109.

artisans to petty officials), providing goods and services in the name of the king.<sup>62</sup> Those who held these positions were entitled to hang the royal arms from their shops or residences, ensuring the protection of the king and, in the cases of higher-ranking individuals, receiving pensions for their services.<sup>63</sup>

An individual deserving special note as one of the most vocal advocates of French interests in Rome was Elpidio Benedetti. Benedetti, who had worked as one of Mazarin's agents in Rome, continued to serve Louis XIV as a type of "artistic attaché" until his death in 1690. In the early 1660s, Benedetti was also actively involved in securing a place of residence for the Duc de Créqui and planning the ceremonials associated with Créqui's arrival in 1662. Perhaps best known for his zealous propagation of the staircase project on the Pincio, Benedetti also contributed to royal patronage in Rome, hosting and organizing three royal festivals in Rome, and overseeing the construction of the French pyramid of 1664 in commemoration of the Treaty of Pisa. His own villa, Il Vascello, on the Janiculum was a visual testament to his allegiance to the crown, including a complex interior decorative program devoted to the glory of the French monarchy.<sup>64</sup>

From an institutional standpoint, there were also several nuclei of French influence in Rome. One of the most significant sites in which national allegiances were displayed was the national church, S. Luigi dei Francesi, granted to the French by Cardinal Giuliano de' Medici in 1480. In addition to its national church, there was a constellation of religious institutions associated with the French nation in Rome. Both the

---

<sup>62</sup> Nussdorfer, "The Politics of Space in Early Modern Rome," 169.

<sup>63</sup> Neveu, "Regia Fortuna," 485.

<sup>64</sup> For a comprehensive history of Benedetti's patronage of this building, see Carla Benocci, *Villa il Vascello* (Rome: Eraso, 2003). For biographical information on Benedetti see Alberto Merola, "Elpidio Benedetti," *Dizionario Biografico Italiani* 8 (Rome: Treccani, 1925-2012) [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/elpidio-benedetti\\_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/elpidio-benedetti_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/). Accessed March, 2012; and, G. Mazzuchelli, *Gli Scrittori d'Italia*, 2 vols. (Brescia: Bossini, 1760), 815.



Chapter of S. Giovanni in Laterano and the church and monastery of Trinità dei Monti claimed the status of *fondation royale*, while several other confraternities, hospices, and pious institutions all held some affiliation with the king of France; the oldest, S. Salvatore in Ossibus, was founded by Charlemagne in the year 800.<sup>65</sup> Under Louis XIV, in 1666, France was the first foreign nation to establish an artist's academy in Rome, a satellite to the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture aggregated with the Accademia di San Lucca in 1675. The *pensionnaires* of the Academy, French artists and architects who had won the prestigious *Prix de Rome*, comprised an active and consistent presence in both the cultural and artistic life of the French nation in Rome.<sup>66</sup>

My research centers on two key French territorial claims in Rome: the urban precinct surrounding the ambassadorial precinct at the Palazzo Farnese and the Pincian Hill, located below the French controlled church and monastery of SS. Trinità dei Monti and the proposed site of the Spanish Steps. In my first chapter I flesh out the historical and theoretical context for French diplomacy in Rome, examining the development of a system of protections and immunities associated with embassy, including the role of the ambassador, the ambassadorial residence, and the diplomatic precinct. Perhaps more than any of his contemporaries, Louis XIV kept very close contact with his diplomats and

---

<sup>65</sup> From the fifteenth to the seventeenth century, smaller churches and confraternal organizations became associated with the French nation in Rome. The marriage of Louis XI to Anne of Brittany resulted in the annexation of the Sant Yves des Bretons to the French crown in 1455. Around 1474 S. Maria in Cellis, SS. Benedetto e Andrea, and the Ospedale S. Giacomo were granted to the French. These were combined by Sixtus IV into one institution, SS. Maria, Dionigi, and Luigi in 1478. Sixtus IV also granted permission for the French nation in Rome, whose statutes were later to become the origin of the modern Pii Stabilimenti. S. Yves des Bretons was located on the Via Ripetta (established 1511-1513), Saint Nicolas des Lorraines near the Piazza Navona, and the confraternity of France-Comtois de Bourgogne in Piazza San Silvestro. In 1587, a bull of Sixtus V established the confraternity of Lorraine, which obtained permission in 1622 to renovate the existing church of Saint Nicolas in Agone. Louis XIV's conquest of Franche-Comte annexed the confraternity of France-Comtois de Bourgogne established since 1473. Luigi Salerno, *Roma Communis Patria* (Rome: Cappelli, 1968), 164-167.

<sup>66</sup> See especially, Gil Smith, *Architectural Diplomacy: Rome and Paris in the Late Baroque* (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1993).

envoys, keeping in regular correspondence and equipping them with detailed instructions for their missions. Historian Ellen McClure has argued that Louis XIV's control of his ministers stemmed from a principle fundamental to his absolutist regime: the primary role of the ambassador was to serve as a direct extension of his sovereign power, promoting the notion of glory or "prestige" associated with the French monarch. In some cases, the king even instructed his ambassadors to deliberately incite controversy so as to underscore the primacy of the French king among the representatives of other rival sovereigns. Rome's status as a diplomatic hub allowed it to serve as an international stage for the display of Louis XIV's power, namely in the unprecedented claims of privileges accorded to his ambassador, the most controversial of which was the freedom of the diplomatic quarter. My aim here is to flesh out the context for this controversial practice and the ways in which, for the French, it was associated with a broader effort to display their power territorially.

In Chapter 2 I examine the development of French extraterritoriality specifically at the palace and in the urban environs of Palazzo Farnese in the first decades of Louis XIV's personal reign. The French had a venerable historical presence at the Palazzo Farnese, traceable even to prior to the building's completion. Cardinal Jean du Bellay resided there 1533 as did Cardinal Alphonse de Richelieu from 1635-38, but the most controversial period of residence was during the second half of the seventeenth century, beginning with the rental of the palace to the French ambassador, the Duc de Créqui, in 1662. The demarcation and defense of France's diplomatic quarter was both fluid and tactical: expanding during times of political tensions and decreasing as a gesture of concord, its boundaries were dependent on both the political climate of relations between

France and the Holy See and other states, as well as the individual tactics of successive ambassadors. As a result, the mapping of this space was under constant negotiation; the interest here is in how these politics were visualized, how politics shaped the French zone in the city urbanistically and, to some extent, architecturally. For example, at times the boundaries of the French quarter only “came into view” after claims of their apparent transgression (often manifested as violent altercation) or at the sighting of the French royal arms over shops, residences, and on the palace facade.

The parameters and justifications for French claims of extraterritorial sovereignty over its embassy and urban quarter were, in fact, the subjects of intense discussion within the French court itself and amongst its representatives in Rome. Letters and dispatches to and from the French court and Rome upon which my account is based (some of which are unpublished) reveal an evolving discussion on the conception of French territory outside of the state’s territorial bounds within the representative sphere of embassy, a conception I argue was closely bound to the specifically absolutist principles of sovereignty and governance pursued by Louis XIV.

Chapter 3 investigates the French strategy of using Rome’s topography to assert power at a second site: the Pincian hill. Concurrent with debates over extraterritoriality at the Palazzo Farnese, the heightened value of visibility drove the struggle for jurisdictional control over the Pincio the site of a land claim by the Friars Minor (Minims) of the French royal establishment of SS. Trinità dei Monti. The most monumental aspect of this effort was the staircase project of 1660, pursued by Cardinal Mazarin and Elpidio Benedetti. While the project’s building history is well documented, the “pre-history” of the Spanish Steps, a revised account of which, based on new archival

sources, is presented here, remains to be understood as part of the larger French effort to inscribe itself into the Roman topography. One aspect that has been overlooked in the history of monument is the Minims' sustained efforts to "reserve" the Pincio as French territory. The Minims' ongoing campaign for the staircase was fueled by a two-pronged desire to exhibit their newfound royal status as well to erase the stain of a contentious internal struggle regarding French privilege over the course of the monastery's history. Considered by scholars as a period of dormancy in the monument's building history, in fact, the 1660s was one of the most active periods for the Minims who turned to a variety of methods to reserve "their mountain" until the project's eventual completion. Toward this end, the placement of the French royal crest on the facade of Trinità dei Monti was an act with particular resonance for the Minims. Not only did it express royal patronage, but it purposefully removed any trace of past papal sponsorship in the form of a dedicatory inscription on the church's facade. As a territorializing marker of royal dominion and royal presence, the crest also bestowed a kind of panopticality on the church, which, by virtue of its elevated site, was described by the Minims as "exposed to everyone's eyes."

Chapter 4 focuses on the exercise of French extraterritoriality in Rome at the height of diplomatic tensions between Louis XIV and Pope Innocent XI from 1680 to 1689. Three artifacts that heretofore have not been considered together are shown to be part of an integrated and explicitly visual expression of French nationhood in Rome. The first component is a new written discourse that emerged in this period over the characteristics of the French diplomatic precinct in Rome, representing an expansion from the private discussions among French diplomats and the court in Paris (which

characterized the 1660s) into the broader field of public (and published) debate. Unlike previous discussions, this discourse also attempted to give French extraterritoriality representational form in maps and schematic plans depicting the limits of French immunity from Roman law and the streets and palaces within the jurisdictional claim. I examine how the claims made by the French ambassadors in Rome essentially transformed the urban precinct into a small French principality located in one of the most prestigious and populated areas of the city.

The second component is the spectacular form this visibility took on at the height of Franco-papal tensions in Rome, when the Pincian Hill once more became the primary site for two major festivals. The “Revocation of the Edict of Nantes” in 1685, and the “Recovery of Louis XIV” in 1687 were each designed by prominent artists and financed by illustrious members of the French community in Rome.<sup>67</sup> Like the celebrations of the Dauphin of 1662, these festivals and perhaps, more influentially, the printed representations of them, created an image of spectacular representation of French presence in the city. The French festivals in Rome took the place of the unbuilt staircase, transforming the hillside into an emblem of French royal domain, imbuing the space with specific meanings and associations through repeated and performative transformation. On a larger scale, the festivals also reiterated similar claims of territoriality at play at the Palazzo Farnese.

The third artifact of this moment was the publication in 1687 of a multi-panel urban view of Rome made by a French artist, from a French promontory in the city: Rome envisioned as an extension of French territory. At over eight feet long and four feet

---

<sup>67</sup> Gaia Bindi, “‘Roma gran teatro del mondo’ la guerra festeggiata,” in *La Festa a Roma dal Rinascimento al 1870*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo, 2 vols. (Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1997) 100-109, 100.

wide, unprecedented in terms of its size and detail, Israël Silvestre's *Profile of the City of Rome Viewed From Trinità dei Monti* has received relatively little scholarly attention beyond its role as a typical precursor to the city panorama. The view, however, presents an outdated and inaccurate rendering of the city and its monuments, suggesting its rhetorical value far outweighed a "truthful" representation of the city. By employing the format of the panoramic cityscape, Silvestre emphasized the subjective capacities of the view in the process of "capturing" Rome through French eyes: presenting an image of Rome that countered and even subverted the papal "authorship" of the city that contemporary engraved views of the city celebrated with their dedications, inscriptions, coats of arms and allegorical frames celebrating the city as pertaining to the Church. Subsequently, Silvestre's rendering of the city's French (and other) monuments was intentional and would have been understood as politically coded, a subtle assertion of French dominion in the city.

I conclude with an overlooked fresco cycle at the heart (or the pinnacle) of "French Rome" that, I argue, gives visual expression not only to many of the debates around French territoriality in Rome, but to the conception of French nationhood itself, as seen and understood by its proponents in Rome. I argue that the Minims' desire to see their community as a "citadel" of French nationhood is the aim of Andrea Pozzo's refectory decorations of 1694 at Trinità dei Monti. Central to this effort was the visual evocation of a living royal presence that enshrined the conception of the royal proprietary (and territorializing) gaze that manifested itself in the French quarter, relinquished in that very year, and in Silvestre's panoramic view of the city. The aim of this work was to

capture Rome within the view of France (both of and from the Pincio), as the farthest reaches of the realm of the Most Christian King.

# Chapter 1

## “On the Manner of Negotiating with Princes”: The Diplomacy of Louis XIV in its Historical Context

### Introduction

By the time Louis XIV dispatched his first ambassador to Rome in 1662, the majority of sovereign powers in Europe had developed some type of formal diplomatic corps, and were regularly sending envoys on missions to their allies and enemies alike. Under the reign of the Sun King however, radical new interventions challenged the codes and conventions already in operation. While Louis XIV did not singlehandedly redefine diplomatic procedure in the seventeenth century, the new liberties to which he claimed he was entitled caused contemporaries throughout Europe to question the moral, philosophical, and legal underpinnings of diplomacy. By the end of the seventeenth century, early modern diplomacy had transformed from a series of practices based on the ethical responsibilities of the office (the model of the fifteenth through the early seventeenth centuries) toward one focused on the pragmatic gains to be made from successful negotiation.<sup>1</sup> Central were changing conceptions of the roles and duties of diplomatic agents. As diplomatic historian Daniela Frigo has noted, in the early modern period, diplomacy was not understood as an institutionalized practice with its own “formalized actions.” Rather, negotiations among states were thought of in terms of the office of the ambassador.<sup>2</sup> In turn, diplomatic procedures became increasingly bureaucratized, transforming the role of the ambassador from one previously associated with the courtly idiom to an office solely devoted to the pursuit and preservation of the

---

<sup>1</sup> John Watkins, “Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 38 no. 1 (Winter, 2008): 1-14, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Daniela Frigo, “Prudence and Experience: Ambassadors and Political Culture in Early Modern Italy,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 38 no. 1 (Winter, 2008): 15-34, 16.



sovereign's interests. Louis XIV both capitalized upon and contributed to this shift by utilizing his ambassadors as "political instruments" designed to increase his glory and reputation, from their presence at ceremonials to their expertise in surveillance.

As the office of the ambassador became professionalized, new questions arose concerning the liberties claimed, particularly by residential ambassadors whose missions to foreign states could last several years. One of the most salient concerns was the extension of diplomatic immunity from the ambassadorial residence to the diplomatic precinct. The urban extension of immunity was particularly abused in Rome, where the courts of Spain, France, and Sweden were among the most notorious culprits in extending their precincts far beyond the streets and piazzas neighboring their palaces. Over the course of the seventeenth century, the diplomatic parsing of Rome grew so complicated that by the end of the century papal guards were equipped with special maps that denoted areas within foreign jurisdiction.<sup>3</sup>

In this chapter I trace the historical context of early modern diplomatic engagement and immunities from its European beginnings in the fifteenth century to the development of diplomatic corps under Louis XIV. While I take up the urban effects of the French diplomatic quarter in Rome in the subsequent chapter, it is necessary to fully comprehend the historical precedents that helped shape Louis XIV's own diplomatic decision-making, including the designation of his diplomatic precinct at the Palazzo Farnese. As Ellen McClure has shown, Louis's foreign policies were markedly different from other sovereign rulers, in part bolstered by his strong military gains, but also directly shaped by absolutism, in particular the cultivation of the inseparability of state

---

<sup>3</sup> Matthew Smith Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy, 1450-1919* (London and New York: Longman Group Ltd., 1993) 55, citing V.E. Hrabar (Grabar), *Le Legatorum jure tractatum catalogus completus ab anno MDCXXV usque ad annum MDCC* (Dorpat, 1918). Hrabar does not reproduce any of these maps.

and sovereign and the divine qualities of kingship that legitimated his rule. Both of these aspects helped define the role of the French ambassador somewhat differently from that of his contemporaries, and reveal the resolution to the paradoxical situation he occupied as a representative proxy of an omnipotent king.

I begin with an examination of debates and issues surrounding diplomatic immunity, a discourse that emerged in a growing body of texts on early modern diplomacy from the sixteenth through the seventeenth centuries. It is important here because the extension of immunity from the ambassador's palace into the urban fabric stemmed from the legal fiction of ambassadorial immunity. Diplomatic immunity was inextricably tied to the growth of the territorial state, and the legal codes on which these states were founded. The idea that the embassy was a jurisdictional "island" was designed in theory to protect the ambassador from hostility, allowing him to speak freely as a representative of his sovereign. The idea of bearing the protections of his sovereign's laws was in keeping with the idea of the territorial state because the ambassador, as a symbol of the state, could not be divorced from its jurisdictional bounds. I intend to show here, however, that the extension of the principle of extraterritoriality into the urban fabric surrounding the ambassador's residence reflected a different aim of the territorial state: not as a protection of its rights but as an exercise of political leverage. In essence, unlike the immunity of the embassy which can be considered "extraterritorial" the urban quarter was "territorializing": an extension of rights that purposefully infringed upon the host state's sovereignty as a demonstration of power. I discuss how this aim is articulated early on in development of a diplomatic corps under Louis XIV and in the examples of diplomatic incidents that in many ways presaged the management of French territory at

the Palazzo Farnese, the focus of chapter 2. This chapter concludes with an example of the king's deployment of his ambassador to represent his territorializing ambitions at the celebrations of the Peace of the Pyrenees of 1659, an event that also exemplifies the role of pageantry as diplomatic practice.

### **A Note on the Historiography of Diplomacy and Primary Sources used in this Study**

The scholarship on early modern diplomacy ranges from specific institutional histories to broader systems-based approaches to issues such as diplomatic immunity.<sup>4</sup> It crosses over topics including war and military technology, royal ceremonial, legal history, and geography. Several studies have focused on the contributions of particular theorists,

---

<sup>4</sup> Scholarship on early modern diplomacy is quite extensive. Early sources include: Edward Robert Adair, *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, New York, and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1929), and Ernest Satow, *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice* (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1917). For critical discussions of the development of international diplomacy see Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*; Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (London: Butler & Tanner Ltd, 1955); and William James Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1976). More recently, studies by Ellen McClure (*Sunspots and the Sun King: Sovereignty and Mediation in Seventeenth-Century France* (Urbana Champagne and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006) and Paul Sonnino, *Mazarin's quest: the Congress of Westphalia and the Coming of the Fronde* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008) have addressed the development of a diplomatic corps in France during the seventeenth century. The authoritative sources on the history of French and Papal relations in Rome remain: Charles Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, 2 vols. (Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1894); Camille-Georges Picavet, *La diplomatie française au temps de Louis XIV (1661-1715): Institutions, moeurs et coutumes* (Paris: Bibliothèque de la revue historique, 1930); Ferdinando de Bojani, "L'affaire du 'quartier' à Rome à la fin du XVIIe siècle. Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège," *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* (1908): 350-378. See also, Paul Lesourd, *L'ambassade de France près le Saint-Siège sous l'ancien régime* (Paris: Editions Spes, 1924); Jean Orcibal, *Louis XIV contre Innocent XI; les appels au future concie de 1688 et l'opinion française* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1949). For published correspondence between French and Roman officials see: François-Seraphim Regnier-Desmarais, *Histoire des des mêlés de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome au sujet de l'affaire des Corses*, (1707); Angelo Ranuzzi, *Correspondance du nonce en France, Angelo Ranuzzi (1683-1689)*, ed. Bruno Neveu (Rome: École française de Rome, 1973); Fabrizio Spada, *Correspondance du nonce en France, Fabrizio Spada: (1674-1675)*, ed. Ségilène de Dainville-Barbiche (Rome: École française de Rome and Université pontificale grégorienne, 1982); Angelo Ranuzzi, *Lettere a Parigi a Domenico Federici: 1683-1687*, ed. Francesco Maria Cecchini (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1988); Pierre Biet, *Les nonces du pape à la cour de Louis XIV* (Paris: Perrin, 2002). Two of the most relevant art historical accounts of French embassy in Rome are: Bruno Neveu, "‘Regia Fortuna’: le Palais Farnèse durant le seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle," in *Le Palais Farnèse*, 2 vols., ed. Ecole française de Rome (Rome, 1981) 1:475-507; and Dietrich Erben, *Paris und Rom: die staatlich gelenkten Kunstbeziehungen unter Ludwig XIV* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004).

jurists, and statesmen, but few have offered a synthetic account of the historical contexts in which the early modern system of international exchange was formed. By and large, however, the majority of work in this field is comprised of archivally-based accounts of the development of foreign policies of particular monarchical states.<sup>5</sup> Several of these works have also attended to the stark contrasts between diplomatic theory during this period and its practices. Within this genre, individual case studies on embassy practices or international exchange have also provided a rich and interdisciplinary view of early modern diplomacy. For example, scholarship on the debates over embassy chapels during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation helps to clarify the debates around the inviolability of the embassy as well as the problematic distinctions drawn between statecraft and religious practice during the age of confessionalization.<sup>6</sup> Other authors have sought farther afield for a more integrated view of what embassy and international exchange actually meant in the early modern period by engaging with sources outside of the traditional channels of early modern diplomatic correspondence or theory.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Scholars including Garrett Mattingly, Edward Robert Adair, Camille-Georges Picavet, Pierre Biet, and Matthew Smith Anderson have traced the development of embassy through case studies, diplomatic correspondence, and historical contextualization. Garrett Mattingly's *Renaissance Diplomacy* remains a touchstone in the literature of this period, tracing the development of a diplomatic system of envoys, residential embassies, and regulations from the late Middle Ages through the seventeenth century. A more recent critical reassessment of this work is Adam Watson's *Diplomacy: The Dialogue between States* (London: Methuen, 1982). The most complete synthetic account of the history of and historiography on diplomatic immunity remains: Linda S. Frey and Marsha L. Frey, *The History of Diplomatic Immunity* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1999). Frey and Frey trace the development of immunity from its roots in classical antiquity to its implementation in modern diplomacy. Their comparison of contemporary diplomatic theory with historical accounts of its practice reveals the struggle to define the parameters of immunity and the evolution of its use and abuse throughout Europe.

<sup>6</sup> For example, see Benjamin Kaplan, "Diplomacy and Domestic Devotion: Embassy Chapels and the Toleration of Religious Dissent in Early Modern Europe," *Journal of Early Modern History*, 6 no. 4 (2002): 341-361.

<sup>7</sup> Both McClure and Hampton, for example, engage the idea of the diplomat in early modern literature and drama. Another example of this broadening of the scope is Jonathan Wright's *The Ambassadors* (London: Harper Press, 2006), in which the author contextualizes the individual agency of the ambassador and the role of psychology and personality in diplomatic exchange through micro-studies of individual diplomats. On the use of espionage in early modern diplomacy see Lucien Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV*, (Paris: Fayard, Collection "Nouvelles études historiques," Paris, 1990).

The most rich and varied cache of information on diplomatic life during the early modern period comes from the vast collection of correspondence, *memoires*, and dispatches produced by the envoys themselves. This study draws upon the major repositories of this material: the Archivio Segreto (as well as some holdings in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana) which contains dispatches from papal nuncio and official Roman and papal documents pertaining to the reception of foreign ambassadors; the Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères de France with the most complete record of French diplomatic correspondence as well as letters, pamphlets, and notes from other allies and agents connected to the French crown in Rome; and the Archives Nationales and the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris) with collections of visual and documentary material pertaining to French religious, political, and artistic ties to Rome.

### **Precedents for Early Modern Diplomatic Systems**

With the rise of the territorialized state in the fifteenth century, the modes in which sovereigns negotiated with one another were fundamentally transformed. The basis for early modern residential diplomacy has often been located in the development of independent duchies and city-states in the Italian peninsula during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.<sup>8</sup> In this period of political instability, Italian princes required a more efficient and systematic codification of embassy in order to maintain peace or, as was

---

<sup>8</sup> Following Mattingly, Queller, and Adair, there is general scholarly consensus over the emergence of a diplomatic system in the Italian duchies of the fifteenth century. Nonetheless, as John Watkins has pointed out, a pitfall of this approach is that it “[Perpetuates] the notion of a Burckhardtian Renaissance...an Italian invention that spreads beyond the Alps and creates modernity.” Newer approaches have attempted to separate early modern diplomacy for a narrative of birth and decline, and instead focus on the historical context and political motives behind diplomatic engagement in the early modern period. A powerful challenge to Mattingly’s approach can be found in the selections an edited volume by Daniela Frigo (translated into English by Adrian Belton), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy: The Structure of Diplomatic Practice, 1450-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). For further discussion see John Watkins, “Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe,” 1-5.

most often the case, avoid conquest by their neighbors. While the emerging system of secular diplomacy was fundamentally different than previous models, it did draw upon existing conventions.<sup>9</sup>

Three separate traditions formed the basis of Renaissance diplomacy: canon law, Roman imperialism, and feudal custom.<sup>10</sup> Underlying all of these was the understanding of unity among Christian nations, the *res publica Christiana*.<sup>11</sup> As the Vicar of Christ and father of Christian princes, the pontiff served as mediator among Christian states and, in fact, it was the Papal State that was the first power to deploy an organized corps of diplomats beginning in the thirteenth century. In addition, several of the early doctrines and rules that guided political negotiation were derived from Christian canon law, laying the foundation for the secular system to follow.<sup>12</sup>

The underpinnings of an organized system of diplomacy were also derived from pre-existing customs associated with European feudal society. Codes of chivalry, including those pertaining to good governance, just war, and treaty negotiation were already in place as well as principles founding equitable trade among merchants and rules of conduct between feudal lords and their servants.<sup>13</sup> One of the points of commonality between both the Christian and feudal systems was the treatment of envoys, and here is where the first formal acknowledgments of personal immunity emerge. The custom of diplomatic immunity was derived from the theory of personal representation (an aspect of both civil and canon law), in which the person of the ambassador was considered the

---

<sup>9</sup> Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 21.

<sup>10</sup> The foundations for the early modern system have also been characterized by Mattingly as Christian, German, and Roman, embodied in canon law, customary law, and civil law. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 24-25.

<sup>11</sup> Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 21-25.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

representative proxy of his sovereign.<sup>14</sup> The most abiding security allotted to the ambassador during this period was the sanctity of the messenger, an immunity that was only revoked if he violated the “dignity of his office” regardless of his personal, religious, or political allegiance. This meant that the ambassador was beholden to diplomatic rules, but not to the religious or political codes of the host power. Medieval jurists often sought Christian texts to support the practice of personal immunity, but over the course of the fifteenth century, scholars sought legitimacy through classical Roman works on political engagement and classical moral philosophy.<sup>15</sup>

According to the Roman law, the immunity of the ambassador was founded in his sacred status. The term “immunity” was, in fact, derived from Roman practice, meaning those exempt from *munera* or public or obligatory service.<sup>16</sup> In Rome, the organized body of envoys (known as fetials) was comprised of men from noble families who served both a political and religious function. These envoys, referred to as “arbiters,” “guardians of the peace,” or “guardians of the faith” (*praseides fidei*), allied themselves with Jupiter and Janus, fusing their associations with leadership and divine protection as well as their roles of custodians of peace and the fostering of alliances.<sup>17</sup> Typically dressed in red, symbolizing their priestly status, one of the four fetials dispatched on any mission also wore a headpiece decorated with the sacred herbs or grasses from the Roman citadel.

---

<sup>14</sup> Remarkably, during this period the ambassador often had more safeguards than that of his sovereign. One reason for this is that the conception of ambassadorial immunity predates that of sovereign immunity. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 85.

<sup>15</sup> Though he does not cite specific texts, Hampton notes that fifteenth-century authors drew from classical moral philosophy of the works by Cicero, Quintillian, Aristotle, and Seneca. Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 18. During the Roman period, sacred texts were often selectively transformed into apologies for secular law. For example, the inviolability of the ambassador was Sacred law (*fas*) underlay and supported secular law (*ius*). On the development of political language and its classical roots, see Maurizio Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State: the Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics, 1250-1600* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

<sup>16</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 66.

<sup>17</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 39.

These sacred herbs had both protective and symbolic powers for the fetial, who literally carried with him a piece of his homeland on his mission.<sup>18</sup> The college of fetials also held juridical powers, maintaining peaceable negotiations and prosecuting any violation of immunity. Finally, the fetial was also responsible for the ceremonial acts that initiated war, by throwing a sacred spear into foreign territory that marked the first crossing of the enemy frontier.<sup>19</sup>

In the shift from republic to empire, the Roman legate began to take on the diplomatic duties of the fetial, who became associated with the ritual acts of embassy and no longer held political responsibility after 171 B.C. The legate system formed the basis of early modern laws of immunity, following the Roman concept of *ius gentium*, or “law among nations.” Attacks against the ambassador violated the protections of the *ius gentium*; in addition, the immunity of legate was codified into law with the *lex Julia de vi publica* even during periods of war.<sup>20</sup> Despite the safeguards of the Roman imperial system, as the Roman Empire expanded throughout Europe and into the Mediterranean, the practice of reciprocity, a necessary prerequisite for the inviolability of the ambassador, began to lose its universal application. With the pursuit of Roman hegemony beginning after 200 BCE, the safeguards of diplomatic immunity were entirely lost in exchange for the claim to universal domination, “the *imperium mundi*.”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> The tradition of colored garments continued into the medieval period during which diplomats often wore differentiating garb as a sign of their protected status. Verbena could have been frankincense or rosemary. Other terms used for these grasses were *herba*, *gramen*, or *samina*. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 44.

<sup>19</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 44-45 and Alan Watson, *International Law in Archaic Rome: War and Religion* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985): 7-60. Watson’s work on the Roman fetials is a critical re-assessment of Thomas Wiedermann’s, “The Fetiales: A Reconsideration,” *Classical Quarterly*, 36 (1986): 478-90. See also, Tenney Frank, *Roman Imperialism* (New York: Macmillan, 1914).

<sup>20</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 44 -45.

<sup>21</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 65.



The customs and laws of the Roman Republic regarding diplomatic conduct greatly influenced early Christian and Medieval diplomacy. Constantinople, the New Rome, adopted several of the policies associated with Roman imperial envoys, including the inviolability of the ambassador. Under canon law, envoys under the authority of the pope were sent throughout Christian states to negotiate both sacred and secular matters. In the eleventh century, with the reforms of diplomacy by Pope Alexander III (1159-1181), papal envoys were formally organized: divided into ranks and assigned different responsibilities. The major divisions were the members of the cardinalate *legati a latere* (“those sent from the side of the pope”), and the non-cardinalate *legati missi* (“those sent”). By the thirteenth century, a third and the most subordinate group, the *nuntii*, was added, eventually replacing the *legati missi*.<sup>22</sup> While *nuntii* could send and receive messages, unlike the *legati* they had no authority to negotiate on behalf of pope. As in the Roman imperial system, the papal envoy was granted immunity, but as a bearer of spiritual authority now carried additional protection. Under Boniface VIII (1294-1303), papal legates were granted the further rights as his representative to depose rulers, impose interdicts, excommunicate, or grant indulgences. Finally, canon law adopted and expanded the Roman imperial system of *ius gentium* (law of nations), a set of rules universally applied to other states that protected the inviolability of the envoy. Attacks on legates not only violated the *ius gentium* but, because of the pope’s sacred status, also

---

<sup>22</sup> Frey and Frey, 79-81. Sources consulted for this chapter on the development of papal diplomacy also include: Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1962); Richard A. Schmutz, “Medieval Papal Representation: Legates, Nuncios, and Judges Delegate,” *Studia Gratiana* 15 (1972): 441-63; and Gino Paro, *The Right of Papal Legation* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947). For additional discussion see also, Michael Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964); and Donald Queller, *The Office of the Ambassador in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967).

violated divine law (*ius divinum*). Punishment for attacks on ambassadors could include excommunication, anathema, or interdict.<sup>23</sup>

### **Diplomacy in the Fourteenth through the Sixteenth Centuries**

While the papacy laid the groundwork for the first organized system of diplomacy, sovereign states during this period also began to develop their own systems of diplomatic exchange. By the fourteenth century, three types of diplomats were routinely dispatched by their principals: the nuncio, the procurator, and the ambassador (also known as the orator).<sup>24</sup> Described as the “living letter” the nuncio lacked the authority to negotiate and simply acted as a messenger. Another transfer from Roman law was the procurator, who could act with regard to a special mandate but also had the agency to negotiate if circumstances required it. As in the case of the papal legate, the rank of the procurator also carried with it the special protections of the *ratihabitio* clause that certified his actions as a representative of his principal. Ambassadors were the highest-ranking diplomats, often nobles or ecclesiastics, dispatched on missions with the most important ceremonial value, and therefore used to both honor the host power and display the magnificence of their principals. As was typically the case, the theory of the role of the ambassador lagged behind practice, and the first documented discussions only emerged in the mid-fifteenth century. Like canon law, scholarly discussions of the ambassador drew upon conventions loosely based on Roman Imperial conduct, but also were largely derived from humanist philosophy by theorists who sought to develop moral codes for the diplomatic process.

---

<sup>23</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 81.

<sup>24</sup> Frigo, “Prudence and Experience,” 17.

There are also cases in which both papal and secular interests coincide, for example, in the arguments put forward by one of the earliest theoreticians of the moral and ethical responsibilities of the ambassador, the diplomat and theologian, Bernard du Rosier. His treatise of 1436 is the first known textbook of diplomatic theory published in Europe and the first attempt to provide working guidelines for the practice of embassy and the duties of the ambassador.<sup>25</sup> The work has been of much interest to scholars of early modern diplomacy in part because of the volatile political situation from which it arose. Rosier, provost of Toulouse, likely wrote *Ambaxiator Brevilogus* while on a diplomatic mission at the court of Castile in 1436, just a year following attempts by Pope Eugenius IV (1431-1447) to end the Hundred Years War. Eugenius had hoped to end the fighting among the rival powers of England, France, and Burgundy in order to enlist their united support against the heretical Bohemian Hussites. Rosier's text defended the pope's temporal authority and claim as mediator of all Christian powers, thus serving in the effort to regain papal authority lost during the negotiations at the Council of Basel. For his effort, Rosier was rewarded the Archbishopric of Toulouse and his text continued to be used throughout the fifteenth century in defense of the papal diplomatic role.<sup>26</sup>

Despite the beginnings of an institutionalized system of embassy, by the close of the fifteenth-century theorists still held serious reservations about the intentions of embassy and the protections accorded to ambassadors. For example, Rosier and his contemporaries, Ermalao Barbaro and Conardus Brunus, both practicing diplomats,

---

<sup>25</sup> The full title of this work is *Ambaxiator, Brevilogus Prosaico Moraliqne Dogmate pro Felici et Prospero Ducato circa Ambaxiatas Insistencium Excerptus*. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 28.

<sup>26</sup> Watkins, "Toward a New Diplomatic History," 3 and Joycelyne Gledhill Russell, *The Congress of Arras, 1435: A Study in Medieval Diplomacy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).

considered the risk that ambassadors would act as spies.<sup>27</sup> This is perhaps one of the main reasons that Rosier repeatedly stresses that the primary aim of the ambassador was to bring concord and mediation among princes:

‘The business of the ambassador’, is peace...An ambassador labors for the public good...The speedy completion of an ambassador’s mission in the interest of all...An ambassador is sacred because he acts for the general welfare.’<sup>28</sup>

The definition of the “loyalty” of the ambassador differed fundamentally in fifteenth and seventeenth-century diplomatic theories. The only way Rosier could justify immunity for an ambassador is if he served as a type of public official, acting for the greater good regardless of political affiliation. If the ambassador abused his office for purposes other than peacemaking, he forfeited his immunity.<sup>29</sup>

The anxiety around the ambassador’s true intentions, whether as a herald of peace or conversely, as an agent of political intrigue, provided a key backdrop for the development of Renaissance attitudes toward diplomacy and diplomatic immunity.

Martin V (1417-1431) and later Pius II (1458-1464), for example, were both uneasy about the ambassador’s ability to foster political instability, and stipulated that ambassadors could only stay in Rome for up to six months. On the other hand, ambassadors were also used to establish political alliances among principals. The Sforza,

---

<sup>27</sup> Barbaro was Venetian and considered resident envoys the most important diplomatic agents. For the development of Venetian channels of diplomacy see the numerous works by Donald Queller, in particular: “Early Venetian Legislation Concerning Foreign Ambassadors,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 12 (1965): 7-17; and “How to Succeed as an Ambassador: A Sixteenth-Century Venetian Document,” *Studia Gratiana* 15 (1972): 653-66. Brunus was a lawyer and an assessor of the high court of the Holy Roman Empire at Speyer. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 49.

<sup>28</sup> Quoted in Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 48.

<sup>29</sup> Rosier continues this warning later in the text: ‘The office of an ambassador is always for good, never for discord or evil... and the ambassador of evil, coming for a bad purpose brings evil upon himself and will come to a bad end.’ In other words, an ambassador who used his office for other than its proper ends forfeits his immunity, and is liable to punishment at the hands of the offended prince.” Quoted in Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 45.

for example, was one of the first families to employ a permanent residential ambassador, Nicolò Trancedini, to maintain its alliance with the Medici in Florence.<sup>30</sup> Despite such ambivalence, the number of resident ambassadors rose in Rome and throughout Europe as diplomacy became a necessary (and certainly a less expensive) form of political negotiation and alternative to war. The increase in regular missions gave rise a rudimentary system of diplomatic conventions. On the one hand, the accountability of the diplomat was crucial: to ensure that the sacred status of his office was not abused, checks needed to be in place. On the other hand, the overarching understanding of a legal commonality of the *ius gentium* (even if it was not precisely defined), guaranteed the diplomat's safe passage and eliminate a fear of retaliation in order to preserve the channels of negotiation. By and large, however, the most durable guiding principle behind early modern diplomacy was the theory of reciprocity: each principal respected the rights of foreign ambassadors on their soil in exchange for equal treatment of their own envoys. If this was observed, these diplomats were immune even after war was declared, as long as they maintained their responsibilities of conducting peace negotiations.<sup>31</sup>

As custom became law throughout Europe, the ambassador began to occupy a unique place in maintaining peace and the implementation of justice among states. One of the definitive turning points in the development of a diplomatic corps was the French invasion of the Italian peninsula in 1494 and the subsequent shift in the balance of power

---

<sup>30</sup> Frigo, "Prudence and Experience," 18.

<sup>31</sup> A common problem, however, was disagreement among powers over precedence or the parameters of these privileges, often leading to the breakdown of relations between an ambassador and his host or conflict among states. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 45

among European states.<sup>32</sup> As was the case of the Italian princes in the fourteenth century, the machinery of diplomacy began to be viewed as a proactive safeguard against the threat of invasion.<sup>33</sup> Ermalao Barbaro's *De officio legati* marks the beginning of the change in attitude on the agency of the diplomat, particularly because it is the first treatise to even mention the concept of the resident ambassador. Barbaro was a native of Venice and the son of the former Venetian ambassador to Naples and Rome. Shortly after a post in Milan, in 1490 Barbaro was dispatched to Rome, where he wrote *De officio legati*, some time around the French invasion. Barbaro's text is markedly different from Rosier's in his conception of the ambassador's duty and loyalty. Unlike Rosier, who honored above all the impartiality of the ambassador in favor of maintaining peace, Barbaro acknowledged the ambassador's first responsibility is always to his principal and the "preservation and aggrandizement of his own state."<sup>34</sup> This fundamentally different approach marked a turning point in early modern diplomacy, and was later to be a guiding principle in Louis XIV's own views of embassy.

As an agent of the sovereign, the ambassador had two major responsibilities: the courting of allies and the protection of his principal's interests through advocacy and the gathering of information.<sup>35</sup> On both points charm was key. Because of the responsibilities of the ambassador in the cultivation of friendships among princes, a chief concern for Renaissance theorists was the "performative" aspects of diplomacy: the roles played by the mediator required to achieve harmony between princes.<sup>36</sup> In the fifteenth and

---

<sup>32</sup> Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 121.

<sup>33</sup> Because of his suspicion of the use of ambassadors as spies, Louis XI was a notable exception to this trend and did not send or receive any formal ambassadors during his reign. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 133.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 108-109.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 109.

<sup>36</sup> Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 15-16.

sixteenth centuries, the terms “orator” and “*ambasciatore*” were used interchangeably, demonstrating both the importance of the ambassador’s skills of persuasion, and also his personal and representative character as one who “speaks for” his principal. Furthermore, it was understood that underlying the representative capacities of the ambassador was a *sotto voce* discourse on authority, power, and control that must be channeled correctly in order to mediate effectively. Therefore, the conduit for this discourse, the messenger, himself needed to be morally aware in order to represent and negotiate wisely.

In the sixteenth century new manuals on the subject of the ideal or “perfect” ambassador entered the formal debate on the office of the envoy.<sup>37</sup> These manuals indicate an increasing awareness of the agency of the diplomat himself, with the practice of diplomacy closely intertwined with representational and rhetorical strategies of power.<sup>38</sup> Among these texts, one of the most widely circulated of the period was *De Legationibus libri tres* of 1585 by Alberto Gentili, a jurist and professor of law at Oxford. Gentili, an authority on Roman law, was the first scholar to systematically explore the relationship between diplomacy and law, in particular the application of civil law in relation to ambassadorial privilege. Unlike Rosier, Gentili based his arguments on secular law, not on classical philosophy, canon law, or Christian theology, and as a result *Legationibus libri tres* may be considered the first work that examined questions of

---

<sup>37</sup> Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 3.

<sup>38</sup> Some of these texts include Étienne Dolet’s essay based on his experience as a “junior” in the French embassy in Venice and one written around the same period by the German scholar Conrad Braun. In 1566 Ottaviano Maggi produced *De legato libri* based on the text by the Venetian diplomat, Ermalao Barbaro. After Maggi there was a hiatus of about ten years in which nothing new was produced. Then within six years four texts appear: Ayrault, La Mothe Le Vayer, Torquato Tasso and Alberico Gentili. All major texts were republished 1590s, including that of Gentili, which was republished in three separate editions. In addition, two new contributions were written by the Polish Christopher Warszewicki and the Italian (naturalized in France) Carlo Pasquale. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 211-213.

ambassadorial privilege and diplomatic immunity through a legal framework.<sup>39</sup>

Nonetheless, Gentili was in step with his contemporaries in expressing his concern over the personal conduct of ambassadors with regard to immunity. An ambassador's position "did not exempt him from the dictates of Christian morality."<sup>40</sup> In sum, the ambassador was still under the dictates of international law, and thus should not abuse the privileges accorded to him. Gentili notes in *De legationibus libri tres* that the ambassador is both the figure who can bring peoples together and the one who, who by his very nature, must keep them distinct.<sup>41</sup> His duty was not always to blindly obey, but to interpret in order to bring opposing sides closer to compromise and agreement. In this sense, the ambassador's role was productive, not strictly a handmaiden of statecraft, but more a guiding hand in the process of negotiation.<sup>42</sup>

Confessionalization in Europe surprisingly helped solidify the legal foundations for diplomacy. The Reformation and the political instability that followed the splintering of Christianity definitively broke the old model of the *res publica Christiana*.<sup>43</sup> Religious differences also caused friction among sovereign powers. The inviolability of the embassy chapel (to be discussed at length below) was one of the most extreme examples of this phenomenon. While the dissolution of Catholic hegemony led to the temporary decrease or closure of resident embassies in Europe, confessionalization proved the need for an international system based on law rather than on custom alone, setting the tone for the theoretical debates of the seventeenth century.

---

<sup>39</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 171.

<sup>40</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 169-170.

<sup>41</sup> As Hampton has described, the early modern diplomat was a figure "of suture," bringing together various interests and agents, but remaining distinct in his own identity and agency as a messenger and mediator.

<sup>42</sup> Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 72.

<sup>43</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 8,160.



## Diplomacy in Seventeenth-Century Europe

The seventeenth century saw a great expansion of both the number and frequency of embassy missions and resident embassies throughout Europe, Asia, and the Middle East and along with this a solidification of the rules and practices of international exchange.<sup>44</sup>

As the sense of confessional unity among Christian powers rapidly disintegrated, the diplomatic model of *ius inter gentes* (law among nations), which recognized the sovereign autonomy of states, replaced the older model of the *res publica Christiana*.<sup>45</sup>

The conventional models of seventeenth-century diplomacy, therefore, were based on a legal rather than a moral standard, recognizing and acknowledging difference as a fundamental part of the mediation process.<sup>46</sup> As a result of the transition from customary practices to legal codes, a new stability emerged in diplomacy, increasingly centered on promoting the interests of the state. One of the results of this transformation was that leverage in diplomatic engagement became firmly tied to the military and bureaucratic influence of sovereign states, and those who were the most powerful were the most authoritative in determining the ground rules of the diplomatic game.

The most immediate laboratory for the development of an institutionalized system of diplomacy was the negotiation of the close of the Thirty Years War.<sup>47</sup> By 1650 the lengthy negotiations and the agile power brokerage that led to the Peace of Westphalia proved the necessity of stable and efficient channels of communication among envoys

---

<sup>44</sup> While the seventeenth century is generally considered a period of rapid development in diplomatic theory, laying the foundations for the modern political structure of “international relations” produced in the eighteenth century, there is a certain inconsistency in the development of diplomatic practices. For example, while the expansion of the Dutch Republic’s diplomatic network of residential embassies was quite slow, other states, including France and Spain, established residential embassies in almost all major European capital cities by the mid-seventeenth century. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 74-75.

<sup>45</sup> Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 4. Furthermore, in the medieval period changes were also less profound and occurred much more gradually.

<sup>46</sup> On the differences between systems, see Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 4-5.

<sup>47</sup> Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 51-52.

and ministers of state throughout Europe.<sup>48</sup> Scholars of the period also recognized the treaty as a watershed in diplomatic relations, and much of the criticism of this period either directly or obliquely was framed within the historical setting of this war.<sup>49</sup>

The rapidity with which diplomacy evolved during this period gave rise to new types of political writing about diplomatic engagement. Prior to the seventeenth century there were only about sixteen titles on the topic of the ambassador. Between 1598 and 1620 twenty new texts were published in addition to reprints of the older ones.<sup>50</sup> By 1648, the number had increased exponentially with at least ninety-four new theoreticians writing on the subject of the diplomat, as well as various reprints of earlier editions.<sup>51</sup> While publications on diplomatic theory proliferated in the seventeenth century, naturally certain texts of this period carried greater weight and were more broadly circulated than others.<sup>52</sup> These works also represent a geographical cross-section of ideas pertaining to diplomacy as it developed within individual courts and governmental bodies across Europe. Furthermore, the authors of these works varied widely with respect to their own personal experience, religious, and moral backgrounds.

---

<sup>48</sup> For example, Mazarin's deployment of multiple envoys allowed him greater agility to negotiate for France's advantage. A critical timeline of Mazarin's negotiations is discussed in Sonnino's most recent book, *Mazarin's Quest: the Congress of Westphalia and the coming of the Fronde* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008). France's role in the development of a diplomatic corps during this period will be discussed at length below.

<sup>49</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 260.

<sup>50</sup> Three of the most reputable produced during this period at those by Jean Hotman, *The Ambassador* (London: James Shawe, 1603), the German jurist Hermann Kirchner *Legatus: Ejusque jura, dignitas, et officium duobus libris explicata* (Marburg, 1614); and the Belgian, Frederick van Marselaer, *Legatio mentis ad Deum*, 1666. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 213.

<sup>51</sup> From 1648 to 1700 at least ninety-four new contributed new works on immunity, with twelve works appearing in 1677 alone. In addition, seventeen anonymous works were published on the same topic and 136 new editions of various tracts were also produced. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 261.

<sup>52</sup> These include: Jean Hotman de Villiers, *Traité de la charge et dignité de l'ambassador* of Paris, 1603; Juan Antonio de Vera Zuñiga y Figueroa's conde de la Roca, *El Embaxador* (Seville, 1620); Hugo Grotius, *De jure belli ac pacis* (Paris, 1625); Abraham van Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions* (The Hague, 1681), and *Mémoires touchant les ambassadeurs et les ministres publics*, 1676; François de Callières. *De la Maniere de negocier avec les souverains* (Paris, 1716). For a critical edition of Callières including the historical context of his work in the court of Louis XIV see François de Callières, *The Art of Diplomacy*, eds. H. M. A. Keens-Soper and Karl W. Schweizer (New York: Leicester University Press, 1983).

Such breadth of opinion also suggests the wide range of influences that contributed to early modern debates on the art of negotiation. In his *Traité de la charge et dignité de l'ambassador* of 1603, Hotman de Villiers' for example, drew primarily from the Old Testament and Roman law to develop an argument around the "ethics" of diplomacy.<sup>53</sup> Juan Antonio de Vera Zuñiga y Figueroa's conde de la Roca's, *El Embaxador*, represents the other end of the spectrum, a practical guide that Mattingly has remarked was most likely to be found in the "saddlebags of traveling envoys." Better known in its French and Italian translations, *Le Parfait Ambassadeur* was written in Seville in 1620 and was a record of de Vera's own recollections from his experience as Spanish ambassador to Venice.<sup>54</sup> Hugo Grotius's *De jure belli ac pacis* was written in the midst of the Thirty Years War, and in many respects was considered a reaction to the gross injustices that the Protestant jurist felt took place during this period. The text was widely circulated and in it Grotius argues very strongly for the honoring of a "common law" which nations should all obey.<sup>55</sup> The Spanish Jesuit theologian Francesco Suarez also shared some of the same sentiments as Grotius in expressing his reservations about the lack of moral unity of the Christian commonwealth. In his *Tractatus de legibus ac deo legislatore* of 1612, Suarez discusses the problems of interdependence among states and the importance of a functional system of law governing the international community.<sup>56</sup> There is a sense of Suarez's anxiety about the power vacuum emerging in a society no

---

<sup>53</sup> Hotman's text was strongly influenced by the career of his father, François Hotman, a Huguenot and professor of Roman law. As a result, his text is theoretical rather than practical.

<sup>54</sup> Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 211.

<sup>55</sup> The popularity of this text is also a testament to its impact: it was published in fifty Latin editions and translated into Dutch English, German, Swedish, and Spanish. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 187.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 187, Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 250.

longer governed by emperors or popes.<sup>57</sup> Notably, Suarez's work was one of the last of the century that placed equal weight on theology and legal history asserting a moral ideal of embassy over its pragmatic uses.

Despite their variety, over the course of the seventeenth century the theoretical literature on embassy saw an overarching shift from an interest in the ethical principles of ambassador to the role of the ambassador as an instrument of political gain. With some exception, authors that relied upon commentaries on classical texts and exegesis of scripture to justify contemporary practice were less favorably received.<sup>58</sup> Citations of classical and canon law also do not appear as often in the works of later seventeenth-century writers, who were more directly concerned with practices rather than origins. Overall, writers exhibit less interest in the humanistic values associated with friendship and peace and place greater emphasis on loyalty and obedience to the sovereign.<sup>59</sup> Notably, this transition occurs even within the seventeenth century, while citations of Roman law were accepted in the first decades, by the turn of the eighteenth century, such writers who based their arguments on these principles, including Gentili, had significantly faded in popularity.<sup>60</sup>

The increasing emphasis placed on the office of the ambassador as a tool of political gain is best seen in two works produced at the end of the seventeenth century. In

---

<sup>57</sup> For example, he notes: "Though each perfect polity, republic, or kingdom, is in itself a perfect community, consisting of its members, nevertheless each of these communities, inasmuch as it is related to the human race is in a sense also a member of this universal society. Quoted in Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 186-187.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 261.

<sup>59</sup> Frigo, "Prudence and Experience," 25-26.

<sup>60</sup> By the eighteenth century, there was a shift toward the theoretical discussions of natural law. This can be credited in part to the developments in philosophies of natural law including Spinoza, Hobbes, Wiseman, and von Pufendorf. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 262. Even as the climate began to shift, the French upheld the claim to the privileges of its ambassadors, and generally did not follow this trend until after the reign of Louis XIV. *Ibid.* 265. See also Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 210.

*L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions* of 1681 (as well as an earlier version entitled *Mémoires touchant les ambassadeurs et les ministres publics* of 1676), the Dutch diplomat and spy Abraham de Wicquefort expressed none of the anxiety of earlier writers about the lack of steady leadership or questionable morality in diplomacy. In fact, Wicquefort based his text on his own diplomatic scandals and imprisonments while acting as a special envoy and spy accredited by various foreign powers in The Hague and later in Paris.<sup>61</sup> In his writings Wicquefort argues strongly for the case of immunity for the ambassador, regardless of national affiliation or personal political affiliations. Like Wicquefort, the French historian and envoy François de Callières emphasized the role of the envoy as a political instrument. Callières's *De la Manière de la Négociation* (written around 1696-7, but only published in 1716) was colored by his own career as a diplomat serving Louis XIV in the negotiations with the Dutch during the Nine Years War and previously as a theorist and historian.<sup>62</sup>

Both Wicquefort and Callières have been credited with heralding a new, distinctly French, approach to diplomacy.<sup>63</sup> While Wicquefort himself was not a subject of the French crown, he had been employed by both Richelieu and Mazarin over the course of his career, and following his imprisonment and return to The Hague in 1659 continued to receive a French pension. Wicquefort's correspondence with the French secretary of state, Hugues de Lionne, also reveals that his French connections continued until Louis

---

<sup>61</sup> Wicquefort was in fact a native of Amsterdam, but served as a spy and diplomat for hire, working at various points in his career as an informant for Denmark, Holland, the United Provinces, England, and Poland. He was accused of several offenses during his tenure as a diplomat and served time in prison in Paris and in Amsterdam. For a more complex history of Wicquefort's trials, see Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 237-242.

<sup>62</sup> François de Callières, *The Art of Diplomacy*, ed. H.M.A. Keens-Soper and Karl W. Schweizer (New York: Leicester University Press, 1983), 7.

<sup>63</sup> Maurice Keens-Soper, "François de Callières and Diplomatic Theory," *The Historical Journal*, 16 no. 3 (September 1973): 485-508, 494-495.

XIV's invasion of his native country in 1672. Furthermore, Wicquefort's text was the first diplomatic manual written in French since Jean Hotman's *De La Charge et Dignité de L'Ambassadeur* of 1603.<sup>64</sup> Above all, it is Wicquefort's frequent references to contemporary French political developments, the practices of Richelieu and Mazarin, and his praise for French diplomatic theorists, which characterize Wicquefort's preoccupation with French models of diplomatic engagement.<sup>65</sup> By establishing French practice as the most significant in Europe, Wicquefort, as the diplomatic historian Maurice Keens-Soper has argued, set the stage for Callières, whose own work readily acknowledges France's ongoing claim for European hegemony.

In *De la Manière de Négociier*, Callières echoes Wicquefort's strong claim for the utility of the ambassador as tool of political gain, but situates his role in a larger theoretical debate on the aims of diplomacy. Unlike Wicquefort, Callières also wrote his text primarily as a guide for the practicing diplomat. Diplomacy, according to Callières, had the potential to serve as a more effective tool than any act of warfare in the preservation of the wellbeing of the state and the interests of the sovereign.<sup>66</sup> While the making of a diplomatic "system" does not factor into Callières' discussion, he nonetheless credits the importance of a disciplined diplomatic routine to preserve some level of order in the face of unstable and shifting alliances of the political landscape. Unlike Wicquefort, however, for Callières the successful diplomat was both one who

---

<sup>64</sup> This linguistic choice predates Louis XIV's own refusal to correspond with foreign sovereigns in Latin, insisting on using French after 1682. This had a lasting legacy into the modern period, with the adoption of French as the official language of diplomacy. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 101. See also A. Ostrower, *Language, Law, and Diplomacy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965).

<sup>65</sup> The diplomatic historian Maurice Keens-Soper notes of the text, "[Wicquefort's] meaning is manifest; the functions of the envoy, no less than the law relating to his situation are to be established by reference to recent European history in which French example maintained pride of place." Maurice Keens-Soper, "François de Callières and Diplomatic Theory," 494-495.

<sup>66</sup> Keens-Soper, "François de Callières and Diplomatic Theory," 502-503.

could undertake espionage but also one who, because of his training and expertise, could inspire confidence in the dealings between sovereigns. In this way the ideal diplomat was essential to the preservation of the careful balance of power among states, especially during periods of precarious relations that could lead to war. This final precept, in fact the core of Callières argument, was not taken up by Louis XIV, who utilized his ambassadors as gatherers of intelligence but did not always employ them to keep his negotiations peaceable.<sup>67</sup> While Callières may have argued for more peaceful conduct in the negotiation among states, he did nonetheless espouse one of the most fundamental elements of Louis XIV's diplomacy: the necessity of the diplomat to "bear the person" of his principal in order to negotiate on his behalf.

### **Diplomatic Immunity: The Ambassador**

The writers of early diplomatic texts were specifically concerned with questions of diplomatic immunity, seeking historical precedents or critically engaging with contemporary affairs in order to form a loose system of rules, rights and privileges associated with the envoy.<sup>68</sup> Depending on the circumstances, the early modern diplomat could be called upon to deceive or spy on his hosts, or bestow honor upon them through elaborate ceremony. His responsibilities could vary from very little– the simple herald with no negotiating power of his own– to quite weighty, as the honorable and perfect mediator and "binder of friendship."<sup>69</sup> The debate over rights of the ambassador

---

<sup>67</sup> For this reason it has been argued that the text was published after Louis XIV's death to avoid the king's criticism. Keens-Soper, "François de Callières and Diplomatic Theory," 503.

<sup>68</sup> Between 1436 (the year *Ambaxiator breviologus*, was published by du Rosier) and 1620 (the year la Vera wrote *El Embaxador*) forty-three additional tracts were produced by forty-two theorists on ambassadorial privilege. Twenty-two additional authors contributed tracts produced between 1623 and 1648. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 185.

<sup>69</sup> Hampton quoting Torquato Tasso, *Fictions of Embassy*, 58-59.

was not simply a legal argument, it was a philosophical one as well, cutting across moral issues such as virtue and honesty, social ones including privacy and agency, and political questions such as the mediatory capacity of a sovereign's representative.<sup>70</sup>

Prior to the rise of the territorialized state, the immunity of the ambassador was a fairly stable concept.<sup>71</sup> In the Middle Ages canon law recognized the importance of diplomatic immunity to safeguard the envoy and followed precedents based on classical Roman law. In general a diplomat was not responsible for crimes committed before the mission, but was held responsible for those crimes committed during the embassy. The idea of personal immunity had also been grounded in the underlying conception of the universality of the Christian commonwealth or the *res publica Christiana*. Bonded to his principal's allies and enemies alike by common religion, when a diplomat committed a crime he violated both the laws of God and those of the state. As this was replaced by the *ius inter gentes* (law among nations) and states grew increasingly more independent, the ambassador's role as a representative also became more individuated as the personal representative of his principal.<sup>72</sup> Peter Ayrault writes in his *L'Ordre, formalité, et instruction iudiciare, dont les anciens grecs et romains, ont usé en accusations publiques, conféré à l'usage de nôtre France* (1588), for example, that "The ambassador is inviolable because he represents a sacrosanct sovereign and because his business is

---

<sup>70</sup> Fifteenth and sixteenth-century writers described the role of the ambassador in several ways. For the humanist writer Torquato Tasso, he was the "ruffiano" uniting princes in peace, like the procurer brings together lovers. (Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 5). For Machiavelli, the ambassador, like his sovereign, should be like the fox, with a keen awareness of traps and the ability to dissimulate others toward his own gain. Papal tradition, however, considered the ambassador an "angel of peace" serving as a messenger of divine authority of God. The idea of the ambassador as angel may also derive from Roman antiquity when messengers were seen as descendants of Hermes. The diplomat as angel also formed the basis of the role of the papal legate (or nuncio) as a representative of the governor of Christendom, a concept dating back to the early Middle Ages. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 78, Schmutz, "Medieval Papal Representation," 76-77, and Queller, *The Office of the Ambassador in the Middle Ages*, 10.

<sup>71</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 8.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.



vital.”<sup>73</sup> Ayrault believed that in order to ensure that the duties of the ambassador would be faithfully carried out, from a legal standpoint the ambassador was absent from the state to which he was sent, and therefore did not reside within its civil or criminal jurisdiction. While he does not use the term “extraterritorial” Ayrault’s concept is fundamentally the same insofar as the ambassador carries with him the laws of his homeland.<sup>74</sup>

By the seventeenth century, as diplomatic immunity had become completely integrated with the sovereignty of the territorialized state, the status and the privileges of the ambassador no longer stopped at his body: in many ways a violation against the person of the ambassador was a violation of the dynastic state. This identification of the body of the ambassador with the state he represents was not entirely without precedent, and in fact has its origins in early Christian customs associated with the papal legate, the personal representative of the pope. The phrase describing the ambassador as the “Eye of the Church, Arm of the Pope,” vividly illustrates the integration between personal or actual bodily conduct and corporate identity.<sup>75</sup> Pope Gregory VII (1073 –1085) captured this elision further: “One sees in the legate the pope’s own face and hears in his voice the

---

<sup>73</sup> The reference to “inviolability” here means exemption from search or seizure. The term is used by Frey and Frey and others in general references to the protections applied to the person of the ambassador. The “inviolability” of an envoy is included within the range of diplomatic immunities, including the protection of the residence and protection from criminal prosecution. Pierre Ayrault was a lawyer known for his expertise in civil and canon law, including the treatise *Variété et la mutation de lois*, and *De la puissance paternelle*. Ayrault, *L’Ordre*, book. I, part. 4, sections 13-16, 50-53, quoted in Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 193, 205.

<sup>74</sup> A comparison can be made here to ancient Roman custom and the carrying of the *verbenae*. While not physically present, the ambassador occupies the legal jurisdiction of his home state no matter where he travels. This opinion was by no means unequivocal. Hotman, for example, essentially denied the ambassador any special privileges at all and considered him completely subject to local law. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 174.

<sup>75</sup> Papal legations started around the fourth and fifth centuries at the ecumenical councils of Nicea (325), and Constantinople (381). Concepts of personal immunity also develop around personal representation of the principal, and from the tradition of the papal legate See, for example, Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 78, Schmutz, *Medieval Papal Representation*,” 76-77, Wasner, “The Papal Legatus a Latere,” 298, and Bernardus Parmensis, quoted in Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty*, 37-38.

living voice of the pope.”<sup>76</sup> By turning to earlier precedent, and thus skipping over medieval and humanist traditions associated with the impartiality of the ambassador in the service of the greater good, this aspect of seventeenth-century diplomacy favored a much more direct relationship between the principal and his representative.

### **Diplomatic Immunity: The Ambassadorial Residence**

Personal immunity remained, with few notable exceptions, a constant observance over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries even as the role, rights, and responsibilities of the ambassador were debated and the ambassador was no longer considered a neutral negotiator but more a representative agent of change. Nonetheless, while most theorists considered the inviolability of the ambassador as a precondition for a successful mission, the extent to which these immunities could apply *beyond the personal conduct* of the ambassador himself was vigorously debated.<sup>77</sup> As diplomatic missions increased, so did the envoy’s length of stay, necessitating in many cases a fixed embassy. The most fundamental transformation of sixteenth-century diplomacy was the establishment of the residential embassy in capital cities throughout Europe.<sup>78</sup> The sixteenth century saw a steady increase in the frequency and length of ambassadorial

---

<sup>76</sup> Queller, *The Office of the Ambassador*, 10.

<sup>77</sup> The practice of permanent residential embassy arose with the court culture of the Italian princes beginning around 1450 and spread throughout Europe by 1500. Mattingly notes that the practices associated with the early resident embassies continued even until the outbreak of the First World War, which he credits as the beginning of modern diplomacy. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 10.

<sup>78</sup> Venice, for example stretched the length of its embassies from three or four months in the thirteenth century, to an average of three years by the end of the sixteenth. The papacy was also part of this movement, with permanent nunciatures in Vienna, Lucerne, Cologne, Paris, Madrid, and Lisbon by the end of the sixteenth century. The permanent resident embassy dates back to fifteenth century Italy though precedents have been debated, for example nunciatures may have been established as early as the pontificate of Gregory IX (1227-41), or by Italian princes in fourteenth-century Milan. For sources on this debate see Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 121; Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, “The First Resident Embassies,” 423-39, Luis Weckmen “Les Origines des missions diplomatiques permanentes” *Revue générale de droit international public*, 56 (1952): 161-88; and Alfredo Reumont, *Della diplomazie italiani dal secolo XIII al XVI* (Florence: Barbera, Bianchi, 1857).

missions in which residential embassies became states' "command centers" for negotiation with foreign powers. With the establishment of the residential embassy, the immunities previously associated with the diplomat himself took on built form, representing a shift from a personal to a territorial model of embassy<sup>79</sup> The responsibilities of the resident ambassadors assigned to these posts likewise adapted with this shift.<sup>80</sup> By the mid-sixteenth century, resident embassies had become standard, and in the seventeenth century, this immunity extended to the residence of the ambassador and his suite. By the seventeenth century it was an accepted custom that anything that occurred in the residence of the ambassador was immune from local law.

The rights of the residential embassy presented a new set of challenges for the early modern legal structure. While the concept of asylum or sanctuary within ecclesiastical establishments (originating in the fifth century) was an ongoing practice throughout the period, it could not be directly translated to the embassy for two primary reasons. The first was that, unlike the churches, resident embassies were not considered spaces under sacred jurisdiction. Secondly, with the disintegration of the *res publica Christiana* and the acknowledgement that the ambassador served the interests of his principal and that of his state, the legal status of these spaces was under debate. In addition the legal standing of the ambassador himself was under debate. Ambassadors were rarely in residence for longer than a decade, thus, while the post was constant, the individual occupant was constantly in flux. Finally, because ambassadors not only served as representatives and negotiators, but also as spies and informants, the leaders of host

---

<sup>79</sup> Hampton, among others notes, discusses the transfer and spatialization of personal immunity into the "extraterritorial fiction" of the resident embassy. Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 74-76.

<sup>80</sup> A conceptual shift occurred with the transition from the special to the permanent envoy: the ambassador was no longer just employed to negotiate with foreign powers, but to gather information and report back to their principal. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 130.

countries, other resident ambassadors, or allies, were wary of their presence and carefully monitored their activities and conduct.<sup>81</sup> Even if the factions were on friendly terms, shifting alliances typical of the seventeenth century did not guarantee a longstanding relationship, and a break between powers could have effects on the personal safety of the resident ambassador and his suite. It is because of the tenuous status of a state's own political standing, that the embassy, as a permanent foothold from which a foreign nation could conduct its affairs abroad, became increasingly essential for successful diplomacy. Viewed as both a necessity and a liability, the main question was this: if the ambassador himself enjoyed immunity from the laws of the host state, to what degree could such immunities apply to anyone else attached to his residence: whether they be members of his household and suite, or those who sought protection from local law by seeking refuge inside his palace?

Neither theory nor practice was able to resolve the status of residential immunity. Up until this point, Roman law and Christian canon law had outlined the legal arguments for the sanctity of the ambassador, not of his residence or of his entourage. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, most problems were approached on a case-by-case basis, often resulting in the personal intervention of the diplomat's principal who was more often concerned with the obedience of his ambassador than the finer points of legal precedent.<sup>82</sup> This problem became compounded as the displays of ambassadorial magnificence became ever more elaborate, and the suites accompanying his missions

---

<sup>81</sup> A case in point can be gathered from Machiavelli, who wrote in a letter to Francesco Guicciardini, "For some time I never say what I believe and I never believe what I say, and if it sometimes occurs to me that I say the truth, I conceal it among so many lies that it is hard to find it out." Machiavelli, 1521, quoted in Strauss, *Thoughts on Machiavelli* (Glencoe, Ill. Free Press, 1958), 36 and in Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 129.

<sup>82</sup> Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 279.

increased in size.<sup>83</sup> Even by the end of the sixteenth century, however, the acknowledgement of the resident embassy as an essential organ of diplomacy put a strain on the system in place and, more and more, a tacit understanding began to form around the immunity of the ambassador's residence, which came to be treated as if an extension of the ambassador's homeland and subject to its laws.<sup>84</sup> If at the beginning of the seventeenth century customs associated with residential immunity varied by city and the principals involved, by the end of the century ambassadorial residences were claimed and defended as "islands of extraterritorial sovereignty," completely outside of the jurisdiction of the host state.<sup>85</sup>

Without a solid legal foundation and a wide range of customary precedents, early modern theorists' opinions varied greatly on the subject of residential immunity.<sup>86</sup> For example, according to de Vera, an ambassador cannot grant asylum to those accused of serious crimes, but implies that non-serious crimes are acceptable. He does make clear, however, that if an ambassador grants asylum inappropriately he gives up his right of immunity, and that local officers have a right to enter the embassy.<sup>87</sup> Hotman also draws a distinction between immunity and personal responsibility, writing that the embassy should serve as an asylum for the ambassador and his suite, but only if they have not broken the law. He does not specify what type of asylum the embassy should serve, if it is not immune from local jurisdiction.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Conflicts increased as the suite of the ambassador increased. Households could include younger nobles, secretaries, messengers, kitchen and general household staff, and couriers. Ibid., 272.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 272-273.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 280.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 279.

<sup>87</sup> de Vera, *La Parfait Ambassadeur* (1620), 107-14.

<sup>88</sup> Hotman, *De la Charge et Dignite de l'Ambassadeur* (1603), ff. 82v-83r.

In his treatise of 1625, Hugo Grotius was one of the first scholars to offer a theory on diplomatic immunity that called direct attention to the legal quandary immunity presented. Ambassadors were by “a kind of fiction” thought to represent their principals, and by “a second fiction” were, therefore, “outside the limits of the country to which they were accredited.” In addition to this double fiction, Grotius envisioned immunity in territorial terms, marking the beginning of a discourse of “extraterritoriality” to be debated at length with the development of the *franchise du quartier*. Grotius coined the term in his argument that ambassadors be considered *quasi extra territorium* (as if outside the territory).<sup>89</sup> Furthermore, an ambassador should not be penalized for breaking civil or criminal law of the host country during his mission, no matter how severe the transgression. The only recourse a host sovereign had in this case was to return the ambassador to his principal and request that the ambassador be punished for his crimes.<sup>90</sup>

Grotius saw the advantage of diplomatic immunity as a way to preserve peace and foster the channels of communication among sovereigns, but many other theorists were ambivalent about the privilege. Pasquali, for example, hedges the issue, writing: “The house of the ambassador should be so especially privileged that no man will enter except reverently and with the consent of its master.”<sup>91</sup> He also notes that while those fleeing persecution and oppression can seek refuge, those who have committed serious crimes should not be granted asylum. Marselaer expresses a similar view, recognizing the need

---

<sup>89</sup> Cited in the Grotius, *Rights to War and Peace Including the Law of Nature and of Nations*. Translation of *De jure belli et pacis* by A.C. Campbell (Washington D.C.: M. Walter Dunne, 1901), 442-44.

<sup>90</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 186-187.

<sup>91</sup> Carlo Pasquali, *Legatus*, Rouen (1598), 445-6 quoted in Adair, *Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*. See also Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 220.

for asylum for the ambassador, his suite, and those who need refuge. He warns that the ambassador, however, should use careful discretion in deciding to grant asylum.<sup>92</sup>

### **Problems with Diplomatic Asylum**

The exercise of diplomatic immunity in the palace was defended much more frequently in practice than in theory. But as many powers did not even maintain permanent embassy buildings at the outset of the seventeenth century, the recognition of this claim was inconsistently applied.<sup>93</sup> The general trend, however, during this period was a gradual extension of personal immunities (those which prevented arrest and harm to the ambassador himself) to residential immunities, included the prevention of local authorities from attempting any forms of search or seizure within the ambassador's place of residence.<sup>94</sup> One of the first major incidents in which the immunity of the embassy was tested was in Venice, in 1542, around Guillaume Pellicier, the French Ambassador to the Venetian Republic. Pellicier had been involved with a French espionage network, which had been leaking Venetian state secrets to the Turks. Several of the members were found out, including well-connected members of Venetian society such as Agostino Abondio, Maffeo Leone, Giovanni-Francesco Valiero, the Strozzi, Fregosi, and Cavazza families and Pellicier's mistress, the noblewoman Camilla Pallavicina. Abondio sought refuge in the palace of the ambassador but the Venetian Council of Ten stated that immunity did

---

<sup>92</sup> Marsalaer, *Legatus* (1626), 278-81. Others who voiced opinions on this include Anastasius Germonius (whose view is similar to Pasquali's) and Hardouin de Perefice, the Bishop of Rodez, who claimed that the embassy is always immune from local law. See Adair, *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*, 200-201. Adair's work, while fundamental in the historiography of immunity, does not include full textual citations. In the cases in which Adair has been cited by Frey and Frey, I have included their more complete references.

<sup>93</sup> For example, the British did not buy a permanent embassy in Paris until 1814. Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 20.

<sup>94</sup> Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 25.

not apply to traitors. With Abondio inside, the palace was surrounded by 600 soldiers and an angry mob. The Council then entered the palace and took some members of the ambassadorial suite hostage. Pellicier eventually surrendered Abondio to the authorities but later claimed that the incident had violated the law of nations.<sup>95</sup> The king of France, Francis I, was inclined to agree with his diplomat and in retaliation refused an audience with the Venetian ambassador, Jean-Antoine Venier, for two months. In the end, the Venetians backed down, not wanting to jeopardize an alliance with the French in the likely event of an invasion by the Turks, but did revise their laws pertaining to embassy. The Council of Ten ruled that no noble *under any condition* could enter the house of an ambassador without the permission of the three heads of council, thereby incorporating issues around foreign embassy into their own legal code.<sup>96</sup>

From the mid-sixteenth to the mid-seventeenth century, the most acrimonious debate over the inviolability of the embassy centered on the question of religious practice. The embassy chapel in particular became a flashpoint in which debates over religious freedom within the embassy transformed a previously sacred space into a political one. Because of the violence this debate also spurred, confessional differences forced the states to directly confront the legality of diplomatic immunity.<sup>97</sup> Both Catholic and

---

<sup>95</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 145- 147 and Gaëtan de Raxis de Flassan, *Histoire générale et raisonnée de la diplomatie française*, 7 vols (Paris and Strasbourg: Treuttel et Würtz, 1811), 2: 6-8.

<sup>96</sup> A similar case in France suggests that a chief concern regarding ambassadors at this time was the threat of espionage. The “Bruneau Case” occurring during the reign of Henry IV involved the secretary to the Spanish Ambassador to France, Balthazar Zuñiga. Bruneau was involved in a plot to overthrow French rule in Marseilles in favor of the Spanish. Bruneau was arrested, and Zuñiga complained that Henry IV violated the law of nations in the arrest. Henry responded that the ambassadors should only be considered sacred if they do not conspire against their hosts “under the cover of peace and friendship.” To conclude the incident, however, Henry did release Bruneau into Spanish custody. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 177.

<sup>97</sup> For example, the murders committed in Spain by the French staff in 1601 and 1621, and in England in 1603. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 180-182. For cases later in the century see William



Protestant ambassadors dealt with problems in countries of the opposite faith. In an incident occurring in England in January 1563, for example, an individual pursued by English officials ran through the house of the Spanish ambassador Alvaro de la Quadra, exiting through the back door of the embassy into the river. Quadra was charged with harboring a criminal who had attempted to kill a Huguenot envoy. English officials used this incident as a pretext to control the embassy, confiscated Quadra's keys, changed the locks on the river door, and stationed guards to allow only embassy staff into the palace. Shortly afterwards, the English invaded the palace once more, and arrested Catholics (of Flemish, Spanish, and Italian origin) attending mass there.<sup>98</sup>

Rather than dissuading Catholics from using the embassy chapel as a sanctuary from religious persecution, however, Quadra's case encouraged diplomats to use their residences for Catholic worship and several ambassadors began to hold regular services in their palaces.<sup>99</sup> After several unsuccessful attempts to stop Catholic ambassadors from holding mass in their embassy chapels, the English government decided that the ambassadors' houses were privileged, but any Catholic could be apprehended upon leaving them. By 1630, the English Parliament passed a law that prevented English Catholics from attending mass at embassy chapels and stationed guards near embassies. Troops were stationed about twenty paces from the Venetian, Spanish, and French embassies and arrested Catholics as they left the residences. The reaction of the ambassadors of these states was likewise extreme. At both the French and Spanish

---

Raleigh Trimble, "The Embassy Chapel Question, 1625-1660," *Journal of Modern History* 18, no. 2 (June 1946): 97-107.

<sup>98</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 178-179.

<sup>99</sup> In some cases this even had architectural effects, such as the installation of back doors onto the residences of the Spanish ambassadors in England. In addition, the Spanish hired chaplains who could speak English in order to encourage English-speaking Catholics to seek asylum there. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 179.

embassies the guards who had attempted to arrest the Catholics were attacked by the ambassadors' staff, who proceeded to free the worshipers.<sup>100</sup> A decade later, the rights of the embassy were successfully defended when, in 1640, after the palace of the secretary of the French embassy in England was searched (the owner of the residence was suspected of being a Catholic), the ambassador complained and Parliament apologized.<sup>101</sup>

### **Immunity of the Quarter**

As the residential embassy became a permanent installation throughout Europe's capital cities, the question of immunity began to take on an urban dimension. The spatial extent of diplomatic asylum steadily expanded over the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, so that by the 1640s and 50s it grew not only to include the residences of the ambassador's suite but extended far into the streets surrounding the embassy, delineated only at the ambassador's discretion. This annexation of diplomatic immunity from palace to street was described by the French as the "*franchise du quartier*" and considered by its proponents as a necessary protection against potential retaliation by the residents or government of a host city, or other rivals of state. The pursuit and defense of extraterritoriality varied from city to city, and depended heavily on the diplomatic relations between powers and the governing practices of individual sovereigns. For

---

<sup>100</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 180.

<sup>101</sup> Reactions of Catholic states to the English attempts varied. The Venetian ambassador employed over twenty priests and held mass in his chapel six times a day. The Spanish and the Portuguese, on the other hand, disbanded their resident priests in 1644 after the English threatened to search their residences. The incidents indicate the paradoxical situation that the English faced in honoring the inviolability of the embassy but forbidding Catholic practice in their state. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 180. On the development of diplomatic immunity in England see: Margaret Cowan, "Origins of Diplomatic Immunity in England," *Solicitor Quarterly*, 4 (April, 1965): 104-17.

example, it was not established in Northern Europe at all, but was a continual point of conflict in the capital cities of rival Catholic powers France and Spain.<sup>102</sup>

“Urban extraterritoriality” was never fully endorsed by contemporary diplomatic theoreticians, even those who argued for the complete inviolability of the embassy itself.<sup>103</sup> Notably, the silence of theorists on the topic speaks of their hesitation to even engage in an ethical debate over the concept.<sup>104</sup> Callières, well aware of his sovereign’s frequent utilization of the *franchise*, nonetheless criticized its practice as detrimental to relations between powers. Even the notorious Wicquefort, one of the few scholars that directly addressed the notion of *franchise du quartier*, condemned the idea, and thought immunity should only extend to the palace of the ambassador.<sup>105</sup> The Dutch jurist, Cornelius van Bynkershoek wrote much later, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, that such extensions were completely unnecessary and detrimental to the cause of diplomacy.<sup>106</sup>

Despite the lack of theoretical argumentation, the case for or against the extension of immunity was often forged through practice and from these incidents we can gather the general terms of the debate. In brief, critics of such extension of immunity into the city characterized it as a breach of the host nation’s self-governance and in the most extreme cases a form of territorial domination. Proponents considered urban

---

<sup>102</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 196-198.

<sup>103</sup> Adair, *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*, 198

<sup>104</sup> While the discussion of extraterritorial rights beyond the ambassador’s palace is essentially absent in seventeenth-century theory, it thrived in the propagandistic literature produced in response to French claims in Rome. The arguments of these texts will be taken up at length in Chapter 4.

<sup>105</sup> Other scholars including Zuñiga, Hotman, Grotius, and Marsalaer held rather conservative views about the inviolability of the ambassador’s residence, much less that of the urban quarter surrounding it. For the sake of brevity, I will not repeat those arguments here but reference their opinions stated in the section on the immunity of the embassy above.

<sup>106</sup> Adair, *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*, 202-203. For a complete discussion see: Cornelius van Bynkerhoek, *Traité du Juge Compétent des Ambassadeurs*, 1723, 247-57.

extraterritoriality a measure of a state's influence, arguing that it was akin to rules of courtesy that governed the exercise of precedence and rank.<sup>107</sup> Some early examples demonstrate the murkiness of the issue of extraterritorial boundaries. In 1615 at the English embassy in Madrid, local authorities arrested a man within the gates of the embassy. The man called out for help and the members of the ambassador's household rescued him. The incident, however, prompted an appeal by the authorities to the Governor of Castile, who in response used the arrest as a pretext to search all of the surrounding households for fugitives seeking asylum under English protection.<sup>108</sup> A similar episode occurred in Venice in 1637, when the English ambassador, Lord Fielding, complained to the Doge that two men had been arrested in a house across the street from the embassy where some of his household lived. Venetian authorities claimed that because there was no sign over the door indicating that it was an official residence it did not qualify for sanctuary.<sup>109</sup>

The dispute of 1637 also draws attention to the problem of visible signage in denoting extraterritorial space. What, if any, were physical indications of occupation that were considered markers of inviolability? A remarkable incident that occurred in France in 1623 suggests the weight that such material traces of statecraft could carry. The English ambassador in Paris refused to allow his residence to be decorated along with the

---

<sup>107</sup> Scholarship on the history of international diplomacy as well as archival research into French embassy to Rome has documented how this new conceptualization of diplomatic immunity disrupted existing practices of governance in cities in which it was implemented. For example, under foreign administration, "*il quartiere*" was immune to civic and papal authority. Papal criticism that these areas disrupted the civic order of the city was not unfounded as nations deliberately harbored bandits as political leverage. Furthermore, the exercise of authority within the zone fragmented the social fabric of the city in other ways: since shop owners and residents under the protection of a foreign crown were not obligated to pay taxes to the city they were often reluctant to protest against sovereign protection thus insuring the maintenance of these spheres of influence through popular participation. Adair, "Inviolability of the Ambassador's Residence: Theory and Practice," *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*, 198-230.

<sup>108</sup> The ambassador lodged a protest for this investigation but Adair does not note how it was resolved. Adair, *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*, 212.

<sup>109</sup> Adair, *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*, 212-213.

rest of the street in honor of the festival of Corpus Christi. The issue was brought to the attention of Henry IV, who claimed that while he recognized the inviolability of the ambassadorial palace, the streets were his own. The resolution that the parties arrived at was this: scaffolding was erected in front of the English ambassador's house and covered with an ephemeral display that matched the decorations of the surrounding environs. In this way neither jurisdictional claim was violated, and the dignity of both parties was preserved.<sup>110</sup>

### **France and the Development of a Diplomatic Corps**

The development of an institutionalized diplomatic corps in France did not really take place until the reign of Louis XIII (1601-1643). Unlike the princes of the duchies in the Italian peninsula, the French kings did not deploy resident ambassadors in the states of their allies until the end of the sixteenth century.<sup>111</sup> Louis XII, for example, had one procurator-ambassador in Rome who was not equipped with the full rights of embassy and relied on the cardinals allied with the French crown for information and lobbying.<sup>112</sup> Similarly, in 1520 Francis I also had only two resident ambassadors, one in Rome and the other in Venice.<sup>113</sup>

The year 1526 was a turning point for the development of French diplomacy, as both England and the Holy See turned to France for protection against the growing threat

---

<sup>110</sup> Cal, of S.P. Ven 1623-5, 171, no. 221, Dec16, 1623, Venetian ambassador to the Doge in Rome, cited in Adair, *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*, 208.

<sup>111</sup> Louis XI also had a distrust of resident ambassadors, often sending special ambassadors and refusing ambassadors sent by other sovereigns. Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 123-124.

<sup>112</sup> During this period, the term procurator-ambassador was widely used, and essentially served as an unofficial diplomat granted the power to negotiate on behalf of his sovereign. For a more detailed discussion of terminology and duties of diplomats employed by the Valois kings see Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 4-5. Venice was the only state in which Louis held a constant diplomatic presence. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 158.

<sup>113</sup> Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 172.

of expansion of the Holy Roman Empire. Over the next decade Francis I increased his diplomatic network, establishing resident embassies to England, the Low Countries and Spain and reorganized its offices in Venice and Rome. By 1529, the internal governmental organ, the *Conseil des affaires*, was functioning as a centrally-administered foreign office and employed secretaries with specialized skills in diplomatic negotiation. In addition, Francis I greatly expanded the number of special envoys and diplomats sent on temporary missions, and was the first sovereign to establish diplomatic ties with the Ottoman Empire.<sup>114</sup> Regular envoys were now sent to Denmark, Sweden, Poland, and Hungary, eliminating the reliance on exiles and allies for information.

The major philosophical change regarding embassy occurred under Armand Jean du Plessis, Duke of Richelieu. Richelieu saw embassy as a proactive method of maintaining France's power and control among states. He wrote in his *Political Testament* of 1624:

It is necessary to act everywhere, near and far...to negotiate ceaselessly either openly or secretly, and in all places, even in those from which no present fruits are reaped and still more in those for which to future prospects as yet seem likely.<sup>115</sup>

While Richelieu was unable to fully deploy the diplomatic network to ensure the outcome he envisioned, he did lay the foundation for a new approach toward diplomacy adopted by his successors. Wicquefort, Callières, Torcy, Colbert, and Louvois all quoted

---

<sup>114</sup> Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 178, Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 122.

<sup>115</sup> Armand Jean du Plessis, duc de Richelieu, *Political Testament*, trans. Henry Bertram Hill (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961), 94-95 quoted in Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 185. See also, Joseph Bergin, *The Rise of Richelieu* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

Richelieu in their own arguments substantiating the movements toward a model of continual negotiation.<sup>116</sup>

The first half of the seventeenth century saw the gradual rise of France as the dominant power in Europe, but overall the period was a time of tremendous flux and instability for all of Europe's major leading powers.<sup>117</sup> Several factors contributed to this tenuous political situation, the most influential of which included the social and political tensions of confessionalization, the economic, and for some, territorial losses of the Thirty Years War, and the threat of the Turkish invasion.<sup>118</sup> For France in particular, the decades leading up to Louis XIV's reign in 1661 were mired with the internal political turmoil of the Fronde rebellion, but also marked the growing consolidation of monarchical power that would reach its apex during the absolutist regime of the Sun King. The delicate maneuvering of the king's first minister Cardinal Jules Mazarin, in particular, was able to fend off governmental collapse threatened by the Fronde, the general dissatisfaction of the people and Parliament with the crown's expenditures for the wars, and religious conflict between Catholics and Huguenots that had been abetted in part by the Protestant sympathies of the French Queen and Regent Anne of Austria.

By the time of his death, Mazarin had already put into place the skeleton of an administrative system that Louis XIV would implement and greatly expand over the

---

<sup>116</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 197, 215. McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 156, 170, Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 93.

<sup>117</sup> The historiography of French foreign policy of the *Ancien Regime* is particularly well studied, in part due to the accessibility and wealth of archival sources from which to draw, but also because issues of foreign policy and security were tantamount to the pursuit and spread of French expansionism during this period. Moreover, France had one of the most organized and extensive diplomatic networks in the early modern period. Picavet, *La diplomatie française au temps de Louis XIV*, 3.

<sup>118</sup> Scholars are generally in agreement that the period of pre-modern diplomacy begins after the Treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees. It is only at this point that the organs of diplomatic negotiation were able to fully function without the threat of war and political reorganization. The institutions that have been working on a micro level in Italy during the renaissance were finally grafted onto the European stage, and adapted to the more complex and precarious political climate of the seventeenth century. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 207.

course of his reign. Part of this framework was the reorganization of specialized diplomatic staff, made up of a series of attachés, secretaries, special envoys, and ambassadors both permanent and “extraordinary,” often drawn from the lower nobility. Even prior to Louis XIV’s majority, the peace negotiations of the Treaty of Westphalia were a laboratory for the development of an international system of diplomacy.<sup>119</sup> During this period, Mazarin relied heavily on the deployment of multiple diplomatic agents to carry on simultaneous negotiations with rival factions in Spain, the Low Countries, and the Dutch Republic, allowing for deft political maneuvering.<sup>120</sup> Charged with the constant relay of information back to Paris and constantly receiving instructions, the ambassadors were able to keep apace with diplomatic intrigues as they unfolded in other courts. This modus operandi was later adopted Louis XIV, who himself noted: “Nothing happens in the world which does not come under the cognizance of a good ambassador.”<sup>121</sup>

As historian William Roosen has noted, there is consensus among historians on two points regarding politics during the reign of Louis: “first, that the Sun King and France dominated international relations in the last half of the seventeenth century, and, second, that the king personally directed French foreign policy throughout his personal reign from 1661 to 1715.”<sup>122</sup> One must consider the selection of these agents in keeping

---

<sup>119</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 207.

<sup>120</sup> Sonnino, *Mazarin's quest: the Congress of Westphalia and the coming of the Fronde* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

<sup>121</sup> Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 43. See also, W. J. Roosen, “The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV,” *French Historical Studies*, 6 No. 3 (Spring, 1970): 311-332 and “The True Ambassador: Occupational and Personal Characteristics of French Ambassadors under Louis XIV,” *European Studies Review*, 3 (1973), Paul Sonnino, “The Sun-King’s ‘Anti-Machiavel’” in *Louis XIV and the Craft of Kingship*, ed. John C. Rule (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1969): 345-61.

<sup>122</sup> Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 4.



with Louis XIV's overall approach to governance, one that necessitated a close familiarity with the capabilities of an intimate inner circle of power.

When Louis XIV took over the reigns of government in 1661 the French upper nobility and parliament had already been significantly stripped of their power.<sup>123</sup> To fill the void the king put in place a centralized system, installing personnel overseen by the king and an intimate circle of his advisors. The new governmental structure was designed to curb the threat of the landed nobility by reducing their influence over local governance, diverting income from feudal land holdings into state coffers, and, perhaps most effectively, transforming the marks of status from individual ranks and titles towards the military in service of the king. Louis took an active and personal role in the management of foreign diplomacy during the entirety of his reign, requiring all of his diplomats to abide by his decisions once they were made and cease any internal disagreements. He also charged one secretary, Hugues de Lionne, with the management of all diplomatic correspondence, thus further limiting the possibility of fragmentation and internal dissent.<sup>124</sup> Furthermore, the checks within this top-down structure actively encouraged the officials' rivalry for the king's favor, and enforced the ultimate deferral to him.

What emerged from Louis's reorganization was a systematic and hierarchical bureaucratic machine. These men in Louis's inner circle (of whom there were only two or three at any given time) controlled the complex administrative apparatus, which saw to

---

<sup>123</sup> Roosen argues that it is necessary to approach the history of diplomacy from the perspective of practice over theory because many diplomatic procedures were based on practicality, or more specifically the careful weighing of the advantages of the desirable with the reality of what was possible. Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 4.

<sup>124</sup> The unitary nature of Louis's system is typical of his style of rule and administration. The king also appointed a first minister to assist in the decision-making part of the government, and in some cases, one person occupied both positions simultaneously as in the case of Pomponne and Torcy, but they worked well together. With Lionne's death in 1671, Pomponne filled the post of Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs. Later Pomponne was replaced by Charles Colbert in 1679. His nephew, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Marquis de Torcy, inherited the post in 1696. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 34.

the day-to-day operations of foreign policy and oversaw its effectiveness. At the top of the administration, directly below the king, was his first minister or secretary.<sup>125</sup> The secretary of foreign affairs was one of four other major secretariats, including the secretaries for war, the navy and the *maison du roi*. There was also a *cabinet noir* that served as a proto-intelligence agency, charged with intercepting, deciphering, and copying correspondence from diplomats from rival powers.<sup>126</sup> The last piece of this machinery was the link between foreign affairs and the administration of war, which was not entirely connected even by the close of the seventeenth century. Nonetheless, it was under Jean Baptiste Colbert that a merging of the two departments first began when his brother, Colbert de Croissy was first appointed as secretary of foreign affairs in 1679. After this point, he refused to meet with foreign diplomats, thus strengthening his brother's position in court and requiring the secretary of war, Louvois, to attend these meetings as well.<sup>127</sup>

### **“Angels” of Divine Rule: Louis XIV and the Model Ambassador**

In the seventeenth century, efforts to describe the role of diplomacy were mired in issues concerning the “personhood” of the ambassador.<sup>128</sup> As a professional “go-between”, the position was essentially one of liminality: charged with personal agency to negotiate, but considered the voice of his principal, a part public, part autonomous individual, and

---

<sup>125</sup> Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 76. The post was held a succession of officials including Lionne, Pomponne, Colbert de Croissy, and Torcy.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>127</sup> Roosen notes, “After this point, the minister-secretary for foreign affairs regularly received envoys, nuncios, ambassadors, and other diplomats on Tuesdays.” Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 37.

<sup>128</sup> Here I am quoting McClure's thorough and provocative discussion of the issue. McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 104. The following section in many ways reiterates what McClure-argues in her chapter, “Representing the Sun: Diplomatic Theory and Practice Under Louis XIV.” In summarizing her argument, I have used her translations.

straddling the geopolitical boundaries of two separate states. Prior to the reign of Louis XIV, early seventeenth-century theorists struggled to find the correct language to describe the ambassador's relation to his sovereign. By this period, the idea of the ambassador as an "angel of peace" espoused before the Reformation, had been replaced with the distinctly secular association of the ambassador as a representative of a sovereign state.<sup>129</sup> The question remained, however, how to reconcile the independence of the ambassador in a way that did not detract from his sovereign's agency. The ambiguous relation between sovereign and diplomat was often discussed in reference to the model of the actor. For example, in his treatise, *El Embaxador*, the Spanish theorist, Juan Antonio de Vera compares the ambassador to an actor in a tragedy, playing a role as "two people together, the first is the person of his king, and the other his own." In a similar vein, Callières writes that the ambassador "resembles in some respect a comedian, exposed upon the theatre to the eyes of the world, to act there the parts of great personages."<sup>130</sup> But the doubling of personas that was implicit in an actor's taking up his role was problematic on several accounts. Even de Vera acknowledged the precariousness of this position in stating that the ambassador can only try, but never truly succeed in truly speaking the words of his sovereign.<sup>131</sup> Alberto Gentili, whose *De Legationibus libri tres* of 1585 continued in circulation into the seventeenth century, noted that an ambassador's role as a representative should not be described as lightly as

---

<sup>129</sup> This is reflective of the adoption of the law of nations (*droit des gens*) model. See the section above on sixteenth century diplomacy, and McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 120.

<sup>130</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 208.

<sup>131</sup> McClure notes that one of the essential problems in this comparison is that unlike the actor of a tragedy, who represents someone who is dead, the ambassador always represents his living sovereign. Her explanation is worth quoting in full: "Such language, which indeed immediately precedes the passage above in de Vera, serves to limit the use of this metaphor, since the ambassador's (temporary) embodiment of his king is both more real (insofar as he is vested with authority) and less (the spectators witnessing his 'performance; are fully aware that the true king is alive and elsewhere) than that of the actor." McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 123.

that of a character in a play, who only takes up a role without true implications for his own subjectivity.<sup>132</sup> Gentili continued to describe what he saw as blending of both the secular and sacred interests in the ambassador's character: "The ambassador's personality is mixed, not double; and since in this mixture the right of God is the stronger, the other element should certainly be controlled by it."<sup>133</sup> In his *De La Charge et Dignité de L'Ambassadeur* (1603), Jean Hotman, however, flatly refused to acknowledge any similarities between diplomacy and theater. Only Wicquefort, whose personal intrigues as a spy and envoy shaped his stance, shows an acute awareness that the "realpolitik" of statecraft could overshadow Gentili's idealism. Wicquefort, in a similar vein to Machiavelli a century before him, acknowledged the duplicity of the ambassador as both an agent of peace but also an "honorable spy."<sup>134</sup> These examples suggest that theorists of the early and mid-seventeenth century wrestled with how to reconcile the ambassador's personal agency in relation to his representative function. These works also put into even greater relief the different approach that Louis XIV espoused toward diplomatic representation, which revolved around his claim as a divinely appointed sovereign.

As Louis Marin has shown, Louis XIV understood the currency of representational strategies in both the legitimization and diffusion of his sovereign power. One of the key aspects of this strategy was the deployment of his authorial agency. The king's "presence" was not strictly bound to his physical embodiment, but duplicated and

---

<sup>132</sup> McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 122.

<sup>133</sup> McClure quoting Gentili, *Ibid.*, 121-22, footnote 55. McClure's use of this example also supports her argument that this represents a fundamental transformation of the idea of the king's two bodies described by Kantorowicz, in recognizing the distinctions between the individual and his professional duty. See also, Ralph E. Giesey, "The King Imagined," *The Political Culture of the Ancien Regime*, 1, 41-59.

<sup>134</sup> McClure quotes from the second version of Wicquefort's treatise. McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 128-29.

reproduced in myriad ways through visual, literary, and theatrical re-presentation. In this way, the king was both ever-present and omnipotent, the living image of the divine on earth.<sup>135</sup> A similar approach may be found in the work of French diplomatic theorists of the time, who actively promoted this relationship between king and his representation, and in so doing changed the status of the ambassador from an inadequate substitute for the absent sovereign to an extension of the sovereign's power.<sup>136</sup>

An essential aspect of the subsuming of the ambassador into the language of kingly representation was the maintenance of the status of the king as sole authority, eliminating the role of the ambassador as an active agent of peace. The only way this could be achieved was in Louis's own personal interest in the management of his external affairs of state, maintaining control of the decisions but entrusting his ministers to execute them.<sup>137</sup> In diplomatic treatises of the period, this relationship is described using various metaphors that situate ambassadors as extensions of the king. Pierre Le Moyne illustrates the concept of sole authorship with numerous examples, including the king's ministers as planets revolving around the royal sun, and also in embodied terms, indicating the fundamental links between the authentication of royal power, ambassadorial representation, and physical presence:

The dependents and subalterns of the prince are like his instruments and his limbs, He signs laws and judgments with their hands: he pronounces them with their mouths...His name is at the head of all edicts, the seals

---

<sup>135</sup> Louis also understood the use of religion as a powerful currency in maintaining the loyalty of his subjects. He notes in his instructions to the Dauphin that obedience to the king serves as a model for the more abstract notion of obedience to God. McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 82.

<sup>136</sup> McClure also notes that this unique approach may in fact account for the lack of French theoretical texts of diplomacy in the second half of the seventeenth century. McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 152. Callières may be considered an exception, but his work is directed more as a practical manual than a theoretical discussion.

<sup>137</sup> McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 154.

carry his mark and his arms...the prince is everywhere where his limbs are:  
he acts everywhere where his officers act for him and in his name.<sup>138</sup>

Le Moyne is careful to stress that the ambassador multiplies the king's presence in a way that does not dilute but compounds his influence. Dominique Bouhours in his *Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène* (1671) writes of the representative function of ambassadors:

Those who have been raised to these eminent dignities possess a character of grandeur and authority that distinguishes them from the rest of men, they are on earth what angels of the first order are in the sky, who approach closest to God's throne, who receive their orders directly from him and who are destined for the most important things.<sup>139</sup>

In comparing the ambassador to an angel, Bouhours also makes a deliberate reference to a previous model, one that related papal legates to messengers of Christ. For example, in his work, *De legationibus*, Conradus Brunus characterized legates as angels of heaven, apostles of Christ, and even compared them to Christ himself. The sacred nature of the legate's mission was reinforced in his instructions with the phrase "in nomine Domine."

<sup>140</sup> With the reintroduction of an older term with a new meaning, Bouhours simultaneously praises the king and substantiates his rule as divinely ordained.

Within the French absolutist diplomatic system, titles and the symbolism of ceremony helped fuse the connection between sovereign and his representatives. Louis XIV considered diplomats' actions in "my service" or noted that a state would seek "my

---

<sup>138</sup> Ibid, 162.

<sup>139</sup> McClure, p. 167, note 27.

<sup>140</sup> Conradus Brunus, *De Legationibus*, 1548, cited in René Maulde-la-Clavière, *La Diplomatie au temps du Machiavel* (Paris: E Leroux, 1893) 31-32. Several other examples are discussed by B. Behrens, "Treatises on the Ambassador Written in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries," *The English Historical Review*, 51, no. 204 (October 1936): 616-627.

alliance.”<sup>141</sup> Elaborate diplomatic ceremonials such as entries or formal presentations were therefore considered not only gestures of courtesy but also essential marks of the king’s magnificence.<sup>142</sup> These types of celebrations were not merely representations of power; they could also constitute a form of political negotiation. One of the most charged moments of diplomatic ceremonial to occur early in Louis XIV’s reign was the celebration of the Peace of the Pyrenees in 1659. Mazarin’s crowning achievement, the negotiation of this treaty not only sealed France’s power over Spain but also served as a decisive blow to the power of the papacy as mediator even among Catholic states. The peace treaty marked the conclusion of the Thirty Years War, waged between France and its chief rival Spain over Spanish Flanders and parts of Catalonia. The offer of marriage made by Louis XIV to Marie-Thèrese, the daughter of the King of Spain Philip IV, spurred the first serious discussions of the conclusion of the war. In the spring of 1659, the two sides met on the Island of Pheasants at the western part of the Pyrenees Mountains in the middle of the river dividing the two realms. Here, in a temporary structure designed to straddle the border between the two kingdoms, the first ministers Mazarin and Don Luis de Haro carried out the negotiations that would be sealed by the Sun King’s marriage to Marie-Thèrese, each remaining on their own respective soil until concord was reached.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 52.

<sup>142</sup> Appearance was political currency in the early modern period. Manifestations of power could include coats of arms, titles, seating arrangements in public functions, forms of address, and the right to receive rather than initiate a first visit. This last aspect was a key part of the negotiations for the Crèqui affair, when Louis XIV required the papal nephew to travel to France to make a formal apology. For a critical discussion of the role of precedence and courtesy in France see William Roosen, “Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial: A Systems Approach,” *The Journal of Modern History*, 52, no. 3 (September 1980): 452-476 and Orest Ranum, “Courtesy, Absolutism and the Rise of the French State,” *Journal of Modern History*, 52 (1980): 426-451.

<sup>143</sup> The French gained several parts of disputed territory, including Perpignan, Montmédy, Rousillon, Thionville, Gravelines, and Artois. Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 17.

The ceremony marking the Peace of the Pyrenees illustrates the significance of the frontier as both a territorial and political marker of successful diplomacy. The frontier was subsequently adopted as a recognizable visual trope by Louis XIV for the “equilibrium and balance between the opposing forces of expansion and resistance.”<sup>144</sup> Great attention is paid to the physical description and spatial organization of the location of the negotiations in both printed illustrations of the event by Sebastien de Pontault de Baulieu, and in the design and illustration of the commemorative ephemeral arch by Jean Marot (figure 1-1) near Vincennes, both of 1659.<sup>145</sup> Both include maps and views of the setting that delineate the territorial boundaries of each state as well as the central meeting point on the island.<sup>146</sup> In Marot’s arch, in particular, this separation is literally inscribed into the arch itself: views of the French and Spanish sides decorate the lateral piers, while the opening of the arch marks the location of the island itself. The lintel is decorated with an image of Louis XIV presiding over the meeting of the two ministers, his right foot centered directly above the arch’s keystone, hovering above the exact midpoint of the island passageway. Louis himself was not physically present during these negotiations, yet he appears alongside Mazarin (who was present), who served as his “angelic” minister/messenger. The tripartite ensemble successfully integrates this “triumph” of diplomacy both literally and figuratively by embedding it within the

---

<sup>144</sup> Le Brun’s scenographical staging of the celebration of the wedding of Louis and Marie Thèrese in 1665 reiterated this concept by recreating the island that straddled the border between France and Spain, thus eliding geographical location with the notion of neutrality. Louis Marin, “Frontiers of Utopia,” *Critical Inquiry*, 19, no. 3 (Spring, 1993): 397-420, 408.

<sup>145</sup> Jean Marot, *Porte de la ville du côté du Saint-Anthoine*, A.M.A.E., Série E: scènes et paysages XVII-XIXe siècles. These works appeared in an exhibition devoted to the anniversary of the Peace of the Pyrenees at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in October, 2009 and a conference, “1659: La Paix des Pyrénées ou le triomphe de la raison politique,” organized by Lucien Bély in November 2009.

<sup>146</sup> On a semiotic critique and ideological mapping of the development of the conceptions of the border, frontier, and limit in early modernity see Louis Marin, “Frontiers of Utopia.”



architectural frame of the triumphal arch, the imperial symbol of victory and a reference to the creation of new frontiers that the event enshrined. Furthermore, the framework of the arch reiterates and spatializes the act of crossing frontiers: moving through the arch, the subject of the triumph, Louis XIV steps through the place of the island, reenacting his claim through imagined space. This work suggests an alternative association with the ambassador as a “figure of suture” described by Timothy Hampton, one beyond his role as mediator between two rival interests. Here the ambassador also connects the authority of the king with the territorialization of his state by extending the royal presence to places that the king does not physically occupy. In this sense, by virtue of his mobility, the ambassador becomes a living signifier of sovereignty beyond the geographical bounds of the state. The commemorations of the Peace of Pyrenees put on display the relationship between diplomacy and the physical expansion of France’s borders, relating how diplomatic negotiations were often articulated through the language of territoriality, particularly as the occupation of rival frontiers. In this sense, the crossing over of borders not only served as a physical extension of the French realm but also underscored the “limitlessness” of Louis XIV’s power.

### **Mobile Encounters: Immunity and Street Space**

Louis XIV utilized the public role of the ambassador to advance his reputation. Like rays of light, or extensions of his own limbs, the ambassador’s chief duty was to defend and increase the king’s privileges and claims abroad. As Frey and Frey note, this often meant that the king instructed his ambassadors not to diffuse but to incite confrontation, seeing

it as an opportunity to increase his *gloire*.<sup>147</sup> Occasions to display the king's magnificence often arose in relation to the complex court ceremonials associated with the ambassador's public encounters and meetings with other representatives. As discussed above, by the early seventeenth century more formal exercises of immunity were already beginning to manifest in association with foreign ambassadors and their residences. As foreign envoys increasingly began to be viewed as extensions of their sovereign, so too were the types of claims associated with their persons, both inside and outside of their places of residence. In Rome, for example, recurrent and fixed spots of conflict were already to be found in the vicinity of national churches and palaces, where national rivalries could erupt into violence. But increasingly fraught too were areas associated with the ambassador's movements, where issues of precedence and courtesy became publicly enacted.<sup>148</sup> The street itself and movement through it, emerged, as what Lefebvre characterized as a zone of (hostile) encounter, defining the meaning and experience of urban space.<sup>149</sup> Cases in which the ambassador's body (and its physical movement through space) became a site of political action, and importantly for us here, would serve as important precedents for the subjective and flexible marking of the *franchise du quartier* later in the century. It is important to note that the ambassadors under Louis XIV were not the first to engage in conflict in the streets. Nonetheless, early into his reign the king saw the opportunity to use such incidents to his benefit, especially in the skirmish between French and Spanish retinues in London of 1661, a case that I will discuss below. What is of most interest here are how these examples articulate the beginning of a

---

<sup>147</sup> Frey and Frey, *History of Diplomatic Immunity*, 209.

<sup>148</sup> On the significance of *préséance* (precedency), see McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 169-176.

<sup>149</sup> Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001), 232-233, 340-343.

territorial discourse that ties diplomacy to urban space, calling attention to the tensions provoked by what Hampton has described as the “fiction of spacelessness” associated with embassy.<sup>150</sup>

One of the first incidents of this kind occurred in 1642 during the war of Portuguese independence. In August of that year the Portuguese ambassador, the Bishop of Lamego, traveled to Rome in the hopes of securing the support of Pope Urban VIII, renting the Palazzo de Cupis in Piazza Navona.<sup>151</sup> According to the diarist Giacinto Gigli, on the afternoon of the 20<sup>th</sup> of August, as Lamego was returning from the residence of the French ambassador at Palazzo Ceri, he was assaulted in his carriage by a group of eighty armed men in the employ of the Spanish ambassador, the Marchese de los Velez. Gigli describes at length the snare of alleyways in which the confrontation occurred. As the carriage of the Portuguese ambassador wended its way behind Santa Maria in Via, the carriage of the Spanish ambassador left the Palazzo Monaldeschi, entering a lane near Palazzo Veralli in Piazza Colonna, and down the Corso. The French, who had been warned of the impending attack, intercepted the Spanish ambassador’s retinue, and an armed scuffle ensued along the narrow streets and alleys around Santa Maria in Via. The Portuguese ambassador escaped unscathed and spent the night in a *hosteria*, but the following morning the pope dispatched 500 soldiers to Piazza Navona in order to guard against another attack. The Spanish ambassador was subsequently dismissed and forcibly removed in 1643, though his successor in the post continued to provoke such incidents.<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 76.

<sup>151</sup> Laurie Nussdorfer, “The Politics of Space in Early Modern Rome,” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 42 (1997–1999): 161-185, 170.

<sup>152</sup> A similar incident of 1646 also ended in violence with a dispute over precedent between Cardinal Rinaldo and the Spanish Ambassador Extraordinary, Cabrera, Admiral of Castile. According to Gigli, the Spanish Ambassador left his house with his retinue but avoided the Via del Corso, claimed by the Card. d’Este, opting for the Via Papale instead. Gigli notes that: “Questa era la sua strada, perche per quella del

The dynamics of the street encounter are the focus of an engraving of the incident produced, interestingly, in Paris, one of the few images of the period, to my knowledge, to illustrate a diplomatic skirmish.<sup>153</sup> The work (figure 1-2) depicts the French and Portuguese allies, including the ambassador himself, repelling the men of the Spanish ambassador, shown fleeing into a company of papal guards and subsequently arrested. The conflict is depicted as staged at an intersection. The street corner divides the opposing factions, one avenue running parallel to the picture plane, the second advancing into its interior. While a specific locale is not depicted, a Barberini crest visible on the portal of a palace adjacent to the French and Portuguese faction suggests the papacy is literally “on their side.” Furthermore, the arrangement of the carriages, which feature prominently in the view, reverses the sequence of events as recounted by Gigli, depicting the Portuguese and French in pursuit of the Spanish, rather than the attack and escape of the Portuguese ambassador. Contrary to historical accounts, both ambassadors are shown on the street, Lamego advancing with sword in hand, de los Velez taking flight in the foreground and, again in the background, arrested. Recalling the role of the ambassador as a corporeal representative of his principal, this image may allude to the growing concern with the boundaries of ambassadorial immunity and the potential of urban space as a place of encounter and dispute. A contrast is presented between the heroic Portuguese ambassador, whose violence is justified in defense from an attack against his person, and the Spanish ambassador whose aggression causes him to forfeit his immunity

---

corso non passava, per rispetto del Cardinal d’Este.” Regardless, an armed battle between Cardinal d’Este’s retinue and that of the Spanish Ambassador ensued at the Piazza del Gesù. Pastor, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages* (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1936-67), 30: 59. Thomas Dandele, *Spanish Rome, 1500* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 197-199; Giacinto Gigli, *Diario di Roma, 1608-1670* (Rome: Colombo, 1994), 1: 358-359 and 2: 466-470.

<sup>153</sup> Jean Boisseau, “[1642] Le recontre et combat des ambassadeurs d’Espagne et de Portugal, arrivé à Rome, l’an 1642.” Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, tome 36, 1.

through his arrest. In this way the image shows us both the agency of ambassadorial immunity and its limitations.

Another street incident involving the French ambassador to Rome presents an interesting debate on the spatial limitations of immunity and movement through the city. In 1647 the French ambassador, Marquis de Fontenay-Mareuil, claimed that the same privileges of immunity that applied to his person, suite, and palace, should extend to his coach as well.<sup>154</sup> The Pope's Corsican guards had intercepted some escaped prisoners, who had been granted asylum in the residence of the ambassador, the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane, and were being transported out of Rome. While Innocent X was unable to deny the sanctity of the embassy, he did not accept its extension beyond the immediate precinct of the residence.<sup>155</sup> Perhaps one of the most interesting aspects of this case, and what differentiates it from the previous one, is the ambassador's absence. Rather it is the ambassador's coach that functions as a kind of mobile receptacle of immunity. The case foreshadows a larger discussion later in the century over whether or not the immunity of the quarter was in effect when the ambassador was not in residence, a key issue discussed at the French embassy at the Palazzo Farnese.

Finally, one of the most violent attacks involving diplomats to take place on the street did not occur in Rome, but in London between the retinues of the French and Spanish ambassadors. But it has often been cited as foreshadowing the Créqui affair of 1662, as both incidents characterize the mindset of a young and inexperienced Louis XIV determined to assert his prestige and solidify his reputation in Europe.<sup>156</sup> The official

---

<sup>154</sup> Fontenay-Mareuil resided at the Barberini Palace alle Quattro Fontane during this period of time. Gigli, *Diario di Roma*, 498.

<sup>155</sup> Adair, *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors*, 220.

<sup>156</sup> Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 63 and McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 176-180.

entry of the Swedish ambassador into London on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 1661 erupted in violence between the retinues of the French and Spanish ambassadors over the right of precedence. The French ambassador, Mareschal d'Estrades, had been warned of the potential for dispute and arrived with an armed detail of 200 French soldiers, sixty members of his own retinue, and other armed men of Charles II, the English king. Conflict was sparked when the Spanish faction managed to disable the carriage of the French ambassador and the street battle that ensued resulted in the death or injury of around fifty men, including d'Estrades' son. Louis XIV's reaction to this incident was strong, believing, as he claimed in his memoirs, that it was a premeditated act of aggression by the Spanish ambassador who had spent 50,000 livres in organizing a troop of 2,000 men for the attack.<sup>157</sup> He informed d'Estrades in November that he had succeeded in having the king of Spain recall his ambassador from London, even to follow Louis' recommendation for punishment. The victory lay in the fact that, for Louis, the admission of fault by the Spanish ambassador, was equivalent to an admission from the King of Spain. Louis persisted in having the Spanish king draw this apology out in firm terms.<sup>158</sup> As McClure has shown, this event was a turning point in the king's early reign, demonstrating Louis XIV's understanding of the representative roles of ambassadors with their sovereigns, as stand-ins for the king in both word and action.

---

<sup>157</sup> Cited in *Memoirs for the Instruction of the Dauphin*, ed. and trans. Paul Sonnino (New York, and London, 1970) 69,71. This number is likely taken from d'Estrades' own account, in which he describes the mob as "watermen, butchers, and other bourgeois as well as a quantity of Irishmen all numbering more than two thousand men mixed with Watteville's men." McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 177.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*,181.

## Conclusion

While diplomacy was a longstanding form of political mediation throughout Europe, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw a profound transformation in the policies and rules of formalized negotiation and the methods of their implementation among sovereign states.<sup>159</sup> By the mid-seventeenth century, most sovereign states in Europe recognized a loose system of diplomatic conventions including the capacity of the envoy as a negotiator and representative of his principal, as well as the inviolability of ambassador and his residence. The standardization of diplomatic practice, however, was neither consistent nor continual and as a result innovations were often forged through specific conflicts and resolutions. Early modern diplomacy lacked both a pan-European legal framework and a set of conventions and standard practices.

In the face of inconsistencies, early modern theorists debated the parameters of diplomatic engagement. While manuals on the comportment of the ambassador and practical guides to negotiation existed prior to the seventeenth century (and seventeenth-century theorists often drew from these texts), the turn of the century saw a veritable explosion in the production of scholarship on diplomacy. It is difficult to classify early modern diplomatic theory as its own discrete genre as writers were often in dialogue with one another, or employed diverse literary conventions to represent the interests of their own states. Furthermore, many authors were also often writing from personal experience having served as envoys themselves. These works, therefore, may be approached as intersections between the theoretical and practical, serving to both complement and

---

<sup>159</sup> The evolution of diplomatic practices in the early modern period has been characterized as a process of “ossification,” in which courtesies and conventions eventually formed into laws. The concept of a legal system as a systematized, codifiable body of law did not even exist in Western Europe until the end of the eleventh century. See Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 17-45.

complicate contemporary records of embassy and the personal *memoires* of those in power.

The foundation of a code of ambassadorial privileges and immunities was the most hotly debated topic among contributors to the genre of diplomatic theory. While most agreed that the person of the ambassador should enjoy a certain level of immunity to ensure his safety and the success of his mission, many authors were ambivalent over the extensions of these rights to ambassadorial residences and none claimed that these privileges should extend into the urban surroundings of the embassy for any reason whatsoever. Regardless of the overall caution in theory, in practice principals continued to claim increasing privileges for their diplomatic representatives abroad. Of the sovereigns of the seventeenth century, Louis XIV made the most far-reaching, assertive diplomatic policies, causing the most problems for the host states. The king actively encouraged his ambassadors to defend and pursue any action that would increase his royal *gloire*, especially if it was in retaliation for a lack of courtesy expressed toward his rank and royal privilege. While seventeenth-century theorists debated the agency of the ambassador, Louis considered his envoys as living extensions of his own power. While they were equipped to negotiate in his name, his own active involvement in foreign affairs ensured that the “authorship” of the negotiations was always his own. The role of the ambassador as an “angel” of his sovereign, encapsulated this relationship as a messenger for a divinely appointed king. The ambassador as sacred messenger was in fact a revision of both Roman imperial and Early Christian and medieval traditions in which the ambassador was a sacred figure associated with peace and harmony. In Louis’ model, however, the ambassador’s sacrality was neither religious nor a safeguard to



ensure his honor in pursuit for peace; it served solely as a reflection of his prestige. If the king's ministers served as political extensions designated to emanate and reflect the rays of his sovereign authority, they made up but one aspect of this multifaceted spectacle of royal power. Likewise, the material accoutrements of embassy (the palace, coaches, etc.) were all considered reflections of the king's magnificence.

The rise of street skirmishes raises another key issue with which early modern principals were increasingly preoccupied: the control and movement of their diplomats, and the "spatial practices" with which they used to mark out and define sovereign space.<sup>160</sup> Together these examples help form a clearer picture of the problematic relation between the physical presence of the ambassador and the sovereign he represented, especially in settings such as public streets, in which inviolability could not be controlled or rigidly defined. Unlike the palace of the ambassador, whose walls served as a physical barrier and form of demarcation, the ambassador was mobile. The spaces of encounter, therefore, were no longer necessarily confined to a place of residence, but to the spatial embodiment of the ambassador himself.

---

<sup>160</sup> Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, 76, citing Michel de Certeau's discussion of "spatial practices" and urban narratives.

## Chapter 2

### As Far as the Eye Can See: Embassy and Extraterritoriality at the Palazzo Farnese, 1660-1670

#### Introduction

In the mid-seventeenth century, the unidentified French author of the guidebook *Specchio di Roma Barocca* wrote of the Palazzo Farnese:

The Duke of Parma is the proprietor [of the Palace] and he only lends it for the use of their Excellencies, our Ambassadors, and the lilies covering the walls and on all of the architectural ornaments of that palace seem to have been destined from birth to one day celebrate the seat of the French crown.<sup>1</sup>

By referring to the shared emblem of the lily, the author framed a prophesy in which the palace's initial design and decoration foreshadowed its future use as the residence of the ambassador of the French king. This suggestion of the Palazzo Farnese's "destiny from birth" is provocative for several reasons. It points to the early modern recognition of architecture as a vehicle for the self-representation of its owners, in this case born of the fusion of architectural ornament and heraldry on the palace's facade.<sup>2</sup> It reminds us of the capability of architecture to serve as a political vehicle, here a marker of the alliance between the Farnese family and the King of France."<sup>3</sup> Finally, it also raises the issue of *who* a building could represent over its "lifespan," prompting the question of whether the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Specchio di Roma Barocca*, ed. Joseph Connors and Louise Rice (Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1991), 45.

<sup>2</sup> On the role heraldry on Renaissance palace facades, Charles Burroughs notes, "As itself a signifier, however, a facade can be seen as a representative or even surrogate of the individual or family whose arms or devices it bears." Charles Burroughs, *The Italian Renaissance Palace Facade: Structures of Authority, Surfaces of Sense* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 31-32. On Alberti's discussion of the spatial arrangements of buildings in relation to the functions of the body see "The Bones of Grammar and the Rhetoric of Flesh," in Burroughs, *The Italian Renaissance Palace Facade*, 94-107.

habitation of a building, though subject to change, could shape its meaning and impact on the urban environment as much as the architectural form itself.

In this chapter I examine the foundations of permanent embassy in Rome in the early years of Louis XIV's personal reign, beginning in 1661 with the rental of the Palazzo Farnese for the Duc de Créqui and concluding with the departure of his replacement, the Duc de Chaulnes in 1669. During this period, the French king took a radical turn from previous customs associated with embassy, transforming the ambassador's palace into the jurisdictional equivalent of an outpost of his own realm. As the correspondence between the French officials in Paris and Rome suggests, many aspects of the control and maintenance of the French quarter in Rome were the result of discussions between Louis XIV and his ministers on the nature of embassy, the rights to which it was entitled, and the most effective ways to express French power in Rome. The king's personal involvement with the architectural and urban aspects of his embassy, I argue, was in keeping with his overall approach to political and diplomatic administration, which, like the ministers in his employ, served as a reflection and extension of his sovereign power.

The historical record of French embassy to Rome in the 1660s is quite extensive, in part because the period was marked by considerable controversy between France and the papacy. In addition to a cache of letters exchanged between members of the royal court in Paris and French diplomats in Rome, the personal secretary of the Duc de Créqui, Regnier Desmarais, published an account of the embassy in the early eighteenth century.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> François-Seraphim Regnier Desmarais, *Histoire des desmêlés de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome au sujet de l'affaire des Corses* (Paris, 1707). Desmarais died in 1713. In addition, the archival record of French embassy to Rome is contained within the "Rome" fonds of the Archives des Affaires étrangères, of

Louis XIV's instructions to both the Duc de Créqui and the Duc de Chaulnes were also published by Gabriel Hanotaux in the late nineteenth century.<sup>5</sup> This material has formed the basis of the two authoritative histories of Louis XIV's early diplomatic missions to Rome: *L'ambassade de duc de Créqui* by Charles de Moüy and *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège* by Charles Gérin.<sup>6</sup> While the two accounts were published within a year of one another, de Moüy situates this period as exemplary of Louis XIV's political maneuvering, while Gérin more closely examines the influence of individual agents on the resulting diplomatic policies.<sup>7</sup> A third account, decidedly more critical of the French policies of the period, was published by Ernesta Cappelli in 1899.<sup>8</sup> These three sources served as the basis for Ludwig von Pastor's discussion of Franco-papal relations during the pontificate of Alexander VII.<sup>9</sup>

The role of the Palazzo Farnese during the period of French embassy in seventeenth-century Rome was examined at length by Bruno Neveu in an article of 1981.<sup>10</sup> Neveu's investigation gave a precise account of the palace and its occupants during the second half of the seventeenth century beginning with its use as the residence

---

the Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes (AMAE), La Corneuve Paris. Holdings researched for this study are comprised of AMAE "Rome" fonds 144-337.

<sup>5</sup> Gabriel Hanotaux, *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Révolution française*. Publié sous les auspices de la Commission des archives diplomatiques au Ministère des affaires étrangères (Paris: Alcan, 1884).

<sup>6</sup> Charles de Moüy, *L'ambassade de duc de Créqui*, 2 vols. (Paris, V. Lecoffre, 1893), Charles Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège* (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1894). According to an editor's note in Gérin's text, the manuscript for Gérin's text was completed by 1887, and thus did not take into account subsequent publications such as that of Moüy. Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, vi-viii.

<sup>7</sup> Full accounts of the correspondence of these ambassadors have not yet been published, though individual letters and excerpts appear in both Gérin and de Moüy.

<sup>8</sup> Ernesta Cappelli, *L'Ambascieria del Duca di Créquy alla corte pontificia: studia fatto secondo i documenti del R. Archivio di Stato di Firenze, 1662-1664* (Rocca S. Casciano, 1899).

<sup>9</sup> Ludwig von Pastor, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, 40 vols. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1936-67), 31: 78-123.

<sup>10</sup> This article appears as part of a two-volume anthology of works devoted to the history and culture of Palazzo Farnese organized by the Academie Française in Rome. Bruno Neveu, "'Regia Fortuna': le Palais Farnèse durant le seconde moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Le Palais Farnèse*, 2 vols. AAVV (Rome : École française de Rome, 1981), vol. 1, 475-507.

of the Queen of Sweden in 1655 and concluding with the departure of the French ambassador, the Marquis de Lavardin, in 1689. Drawing on the contemporary accounts of embassy at the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Neveu traced the series of conflicts between France and Rome and their results on the foreign policy between the two powers. Neveu paid particular attention to the two peaks of Franco-papal controversies in the 1660s and 1680s. As he demonstrates, it was during these periods that the French in Rome exercised the most liberal definition of the *droit du quartier*.<sup>11</sup> What arises from Neveu's research is one of the most compelling aspects of the French claim: its demarcation of French territory based on views both of and from the Farnese palace.<sup>12</sup> Considering the Palazzo Farnese's command of its urban environs, this view was quite expansive. The palace and its piazza served as a hinge between two densely populated areas of the city: the southern terminus of the Via Giulia and the east-west arteries leading from the Piazza Navona and the Campo dei Fiori, crossing the borders of two of the city's *rioni*, Parione and Regola. While other ambassadors and Roman nobles also claimed juridical control over the streets surrounding their residences, none had such far-reaching boundaries.<sup>13</sup>

The history of the urban and architectural typology of the early modern embassy has, to date, not comprised its own discrete area of study. The historical evidence presented by Neveu suggests the necessity of a visual and urban history of this

---

<sup>11</sup> Gérin differentiates two types of rights associated with the embassy: the *franchise* and the *quartier*. The *quartier* is the geographical area in which the ambassador claims immunity, while the *franchise* refers to the fiscal and commercial freedoms associated with the ambassador. The second also has a geographic aspect in that any merchant or house bearing the French arms was therefore exempt from local law. Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siege*, 1: 297.

<sup>12</sup> Neveu, "Regia Fortuna," 483.

<sup>13</sup> The only relevant comparison studied thus far is the Spanish quarter, examined by Alessandra Anselmi in "Il Quartiere del Ambasciata di Spagna a Roma," in *La città italiana e i luoghi degli stranieri XIV-XVIII secolo*, eds. D. Calabi and P. Lanaro (Rome: Bari, 1998), 206-221. Unlike the French, the Spanish conformed to a specific area bounded by the streets surrounding the Piazza di Spagna.

phenomenon, one that attends to both the history of its development and its impact on the urban fabric of the city. Recognized by historian Laurie Nussdorfer as urban “hot spots,” the areas surrounding residences of ambassadors were major points of conflict in early modern Rome where larger political rivalries played out in the streets.<sup>14</sup> In this sense, rivalries between nations in Rome fit into a larger web of “alliances and enmities,” which Joseph Connors has demonstrated could play a significant role in the shaping of the built environment.<sup>15</sup> While scholars have traditionally concentrated on the building activities of the papacy, religious orders, and the nobility, Rome’s place as a diplomatic capital city also drove foreign powers to display their own authority in the city. These efforts were not always characterized by the initiation of projects “from the ground up.” As has been suggested in previous scholarship, the built forms of the city did not always prove to be a barrier in the reclamation, reuse, or redefinition of spaces of authority and even the loftiest of urban plans could be sabotaged by the accretions of everyday life in Rome.<sup>16</sup> The case of the French in Rome suggests that foreign embassy not only disrupted more “traditional” patterns of shaping the city but also, in doing so, could be considered a form of Roman baroque urbanism all its own.<sup>17</sup>

This chapter lays out a small but crucial episode in this ambassadorial urban history, one that I would argue shaped contemporary thinking on the rights of foreign

---

<sup>14</sup> Laurie Nussdorfer, “The Politics of Space in Early Modern Rome,” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 42 (1997–1999): 161-185.

<sup>15</sup> Joseph Connors, Alliance and Enmity in Baroque Urbanism,” *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 25 (1989): 239-265.

<sup>16</sup> The reclamation of urban space through the medium of print, for example, is the subject of Rosemarie San Juan’s *Rome: A City Out of Print* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2001). Richard Krautheimer has demonstrated that even Alexander VII’s plans for clearing Piazza Rotunda, for example, were repeatedly foiled by the tenacious local vendors who used the space for their market stands. Richard Krautheimer, *The Rome of Alexander VII, 1655-1667* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985), 105-106.

<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, its relation to other forms of “scopic territorialization” pursued by the Louis XIV at home and in Rome will be the subject of Chapter 4.

embassy until the following century. Two key issues inform my discussion. The first is that the French, unlike the Spanish, did not build or even own their embassy, but instead chose to rent the Palazzo Farnese from the Dukes of Parma. The decisions around the rental, including its location, size, urban situation, and the rights associated with proprietorship, all had lasting effects on the exercise of French extraterritoriality in Rome. The building history of the Palazzo Farnese and its urban environs, therefore, is essential to this context and is discussed at length in the first part of this chapter.

The second issue is that, unlike the diplomatic incidents of the late 1670s and 80s (which I will take up at length in Chapter 4), the demarcation of the French quarter during this period predated any formal discourse on the rights of extraterritoriality. In this sense, the early years of French embassy in Rome may be considered a seedbed for developing thought on the architectural and urban rights associated with embassy. In addition, during this short timespan several incidents informed decisions around the marking and maintenance of French territory in Rome. The most notorious of these was the violent altercation between French and Roman guards on 20 August 1662, an event now referred to as the Créqui Affair. With this in mind, I have also divided my discussion into four sections: Créqui's embassy prior to August, the Créqui Affair and its urban effects, the periods in which there was no French ambassador in Rome, and finally, the first period of embassy of his replacement, the Duc de Chaulnes (1666-1668).<sup>18</sup> The political circumstances that informed these periods each reflect a different facet of French embassy.

---

<sup>18</sup> Charles-Albert d'Ailly, the Duc de Chaulnes had three periods of embassy in Rome, the first was from 1666-1668, the second from 1669-1670, and the third was from 1689-1691.

## The Palazzo Farnese and its Urban Environs

The Palazzo Farnese (figure 2-1) originally sprang from the ambitious vision of a young cardinal named Alessandro Farnese, who in 1534 would rise to the papacy as Paul III (1534-1549).<sup>19</sup> In 1495 Alessandro purchased a small house from the Augustinian Monks of S. Maria del Popolo for his family residence.<sup>20</sup> As early as 1510, he began to make alterations to this edifice, hiring Antonio da Sangallo the Younger as his architect to head the project around 1513-14. Over the next two years Sangallo restored the palace and began to erect new elements, including the courtyard and the facade, and by 1523 Alessandro ordered the demolition of the surrounding houses to make way for the expanded footprint of his new palace.<sup>21</sup> The project was suspended briefly after 1527 following the Sack of Rome, but work resumed in 1534 when Alessandro was elevated to the papacy.

---

<sup>19</sup> The Palazzo Farnese has been the subject of a wealth of scholarship. Foremost among these remain Ferdinand Henri de Navenne, *Rome et le Palais Farnèse pendant les trois derniers siècles* 2 vols. (Paris: A. Michel, 1923); Herbert Siebenhüner, "Der Palazzo Farnese in Rom," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 15 (1952): 144-168; Raoul de Broglie, *Le Palais Farnèse: ambassade de France* (Paris: H. Lefebvre, 1953); Anthony Blunt, "Two Unpublished Plans of the Farnese Palace," *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, 10 (1960-1961): 15-17; Christoph Luitpold Frommel, *Der römische Palastbau der Hochrenaissance* 3 vols. (Tübingen, E. Wasmuth, 1973); François Charles Uginet, *Le palais farnèse à travers les documents financiers* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1980); Luigi Salerno, "Palazzo Farnese," in Luigi Salerno, Luigi Spezzaferro, and Manfredo Tafuri, *Via Giulia: una utopia urbanistica del 500* (Rome: Staderini, 1973), 472-488. See also, James Ackerman, *The Architecture of Michelangelo* (London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

<sup>20</sup> The house belonged to a Don Pedro Ferritz. The first mention of the Farnese appears in Albertini's *De Mirabilibus*, in which is the following notation: "domus farnesia ab Alexandro ...amplificata est quotque exornata." cited in Salerno, "Palazzo Farnese," 473. The insertion of the Farnese family into this area was also a result of a political alliance between the Orsini and the Farnese after the marriage of Giulia, the sister of Alessandro Farnese, to Orsino Orsini in 1489. The relative proximity of the palazzo Farnese to the main Orsini residence of Palazzo Orsini Pio Righetti ensured that the pairing would only strengthen control over the area that had been traditionally considered Orsini territory since the mid-twelfth century. On the Orsini family settlements in Rome see Kristin Triff, "Patronage and Public Image in Renaissance Rome: Three Orsini Palaces" (PhD diss., Brown University, 2000).

<sup>21</sup> Christoph Luitpold Frommel has noted that the demolitions were already advanced by 1519. Christoph Luitpold Frommel, "La Construction et la décoration du Palais Farnèse: San Gallo et Michel-Ange," in *Le Palais Farnèse*, 127-275, 143-145.



The family's rise in status allowed for the unbridled expenditure on its construction including the expansion of the palace from eleven to thirteen bays, new arcades in the court, and the reconstruction of the main staircase. In addition to the new expenditures, the project's principal architect also changed. With Sangallo's death in 1546, Michelangelo inherited the project and in a brief period of time made several revisions to Sangallo's original design.<sup>22</sup> Though the facade had already reached the third storey, Michelangelo designed a new cornice substantially larger than that originally planned by Sangallo.<sup>23</sup> The architectural ornament also varied from Sangallo's, achieving a much more sculptural effect in its variety and in the interplay of light and shadow.<sup>24</sup> In order to correspond to the new emphasis on the palace's crowning element, Michelangelo revised the proportions of the third story, raising its overall height and increasing the distance between the top of the wall and the window pediments.

In addition to the cornice, Michelangelo's aim to give the facade a more sculptural quality was realized in his revision of Sangallo's central window (figure 2-2). Sangallo's original design was a series of concentric arches and engaged columns, framing a small papal coat of arms. Michelangelo eliminated the arches, creating a wide expanse of wall space above the windows on the *piano nobile*. He filled this void with a colossal Farnese coat of arms (over three meters high) surmounted by the papal tiara. In place of Sangallo's simple arch, he capped the central window with a broken segmental pediment, on which the arms seem to rest. Finally, he added alternating segmental and triangular pediments to each of the remaining windows. The result was a dynamic composition that

---

<sup>22</sup> Frommel, "La Construction et la décoration du Palais Farnèse," 160-169.

<sup>23</sup> Ackerman, *The Architecture of Michelangelo*, 178-179. Michelangelo was also charged with finishing the remaining three wings of the palace.

<sup>24</sup> Ackerman, *The Architecture of Michelangelo*, 179.

emphasized the dominating central composition of pediment, window, and balcony and emphasized the Farnese escutcheon.<sup>25</sup>

The palace was originally conceived as the Farnese *insediamento* in Rome, a permanent foothold for Alessandro's two sons, Ranuccio and Pier Luigi Farnese, to continue the family line. The premature deaths of both sons (Ranuccio died in 1529 and Pier Luigi in 1547), however, ensured that with the pope's death in 1549, the palace became the property of Pier Luigi's four sons, Ottavio, the Duke of Parma, Orazio, and Cardinals Alessandro and Ranuccio. Cardinal Ranuccio remained in residence and commissioned Vignola to continue work on the palace, which by that time had only been completed to the level of the second floor and the facade. Vignola completed the third floor, the rear of the facade, and the two wings. Following a hiatus after Cardinal Ranuccio's death in 1565, his elder brother, Alessandro, oversaw the completion of the palace, commissioning Giacomo della Porta to design and erect the rear facade overlooking the Tiber. The building was finished in 1589, though the final element, the bridge over Via Giulia connecting the palace to the Farnese gardens along the Tiber, was subsequently undertaken by Cardinal Odoardo Farnese, Alessandro's grand-nephew, in 1603.

The urban and architectural planning of Alessandro Farnese capitalized on the interventions of previous popes. Beginning with the construction of the Ponte Sisto by Sixtus IV (Francesco della Rovere, 1471-1484), the area had already been transformed to conform to the urban agendas of successive popes. Constructed in preparation for the Jubilee, the Ponte Sisto was begun on 29 April 1473 and the bridge was completed in

---

<sup>25</sup> Siegfried Giedeon, *Space, Time, and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1941), 57; Ackerman, *The Architecture of Michelangelo*, 180-182, and Frommel, "La Construction et la décoration du Palais Farnèse," 161-163.

1475.<sup>26</sup> Sixtus' main objective in constructing the bridge was to facilitate the movement of pilgrims from the interior of the city into Trastevere, but the bridge also fostered the urban development of several major families in the ancient quarter of Arenula. Sixtus codified this aim in the bull *Etsi cunctarum civitatum* (30 June 1480), which encouraged families, among them the Orsini, Pamphili, and Massimo, to construct their own private residences in this area.<sup>27</sup> These grandiose palaces and their piazzas were all immediately connected to existing street systems, fostering what has been described by Christoph Frommel as “radiating centers of urban renewal” in the built environment.<sup>28</sup>

Between 1473 and 1503, the streets surrounding the Campo dei Fiori, particularly the axes between Via dei Giubbinari and Via Cappellari, and the Campo dei Fiori and Via Capo di Ferro, were regularized and straightened (figure 2-3). The Campo itself was paved by 1489 and connected to the Via dei Pellegrini by 1497. Under Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia, 1492-1503), the piazza of the church and hospice of Santissimi Trinità dei Pellegrini became a nucleus for a convergence of streets: the Via Pontis Novis (Via dei Pettinari), the Via della Regola, and the Vicolo dei Venti. The via Pontis Novis was created in 1492, connecting the Ponte Sisto with the Campo dei Fiori (through via dei Giubbonari) and the holdings of the Orsini and Colonna. This street also crossed over the long north-south axis of the Via della Regola.<sup>29</sup> In sum, the urban interventions of Sixtus IV and Alexander VI created a nodal point in the city that channeled movement east and west across the Tiber and connected areas of both religious and commercial importance.

---

<sup>26</sup> Enrico Guidoni, “Les transformations du Quartier Arenula et le rayonnement de l’urbanisme farnésien,” in *Le Palais Farnése*, 63-84, 66.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 66-67.

<sup>28</sup> Christoph Luitpold Frommel, “Papal Policy: The Planning of Rome during the Renaissance” in *Art and History* ed. Robert I. Rotberg and Theodore K. Rabb (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 39-66,48.

<sup>29</sup> Guidoni, “Les transformations du Quartier Arenula,” 68 and Umberto Gnoli, *Topografia e toponomastica di Roma medioevale e modern* (Rome, Staderini, 1939), 51-55, 225-226.

With the elevation of Sixtus's nephew, Giuliano della Rovere, to the papacy (Julius II, 1503-1513) in 1503, the vicinity of the palace again changed dramatically with the construction of the Via Giulia (1508-1511) (figure 2-4). At the time of the Farnese's purchase of their property, the palace lay along the former Via della Regola (present day Via del Monserrato), which had acquired importance because it was the shortest and most direct route from the Vatican to the Porto di Ripa Grande. The street was recognized by Nicolas V as one of the principal streets of Rome, a route that connected the *rioni* on the slope of the Capitoline, (Ripa, Campitelli, and Sant Angelo) with the more northern inhabited areas along the Tiber (Ponte, Regola).<sup>30</sup> Julius designed the Via Giulia with another primary objective in mind: the connection of the city's commercial, judicial, and civic centers along one route.<sup>31</sup> Coinciding with the construction of the Via Giulia, Julius commissioned the construction of the Via della Lungara, running parallel to it on the other side of the Tiber towards the Porto di Ripa Grande. These two axes were designed to form a loop between the two sides of the river, crossing at the Ponte Sisto to the south, and at a second bridge in the area of the Ospedale di Santo Spirito, though this latter bridge, a reconstruction of Nero's Ponte Triumphalis, was never realized.<sup>32</sup>

With the death of Julius II and the election of the Medici pope, Leo X (Giovanni di Lorenzo de' Medici, 1513-1521), the original plans for Via Giulia changed. The pope utilized his predecessor's route to elevate the urban status of his fellow Florentines in

---

<sup>30</sup> Guidoni, "Les transformations du Quartier Arenula," 63-64.

<sup>31</sup> Having moved his nephew, Cardinal Sisto della Rovere, into the Cancellaria, Julius commissioned Bramante to build the Palazzo dei Tribunali across from it. The piazza, marking the space between the palaces and the convergence of the Via Giulia with the Via dei Banchi, would designate the area as a Forum Iulium. This project was never realized. The street also cut directly through the Banchi, the center of the Florentine community and numerous banks, and connected via the Via dei Banchi, to the Zecca, the papal mint. Frommel, "Papal Policy: The Planning of Rome," 53, and Manfredo Tafuri, "Via Giulia: storia di una struttura urbana," in *Via Giulia*, 65-152, 73-75.

<sup>32</sup> Luigi Spezzaferro, "La politica urbanistica dei Pape e le origini di via Giulia, in *Via Giulia*, 15-64, 46-48.

Rome. In 1518 construction began on the national church of S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, located at the opening of the Via Giulia, marking an extension of the Florentine community from the interior of the *rione* of Ponte westward to the Tiber. Overall however, the urban interests of the Medici, which favored development in the north-eastern sector of the city, lessened the impact of an artery so close to its western end. Among Leo X's interventions were the regularization and development in the area of the Porto del Popolo and the construction of the Via Leonina (Via di Ripetta), forming the third arm of the trident leading down into the area of Piazza Navona by way of Via della Scrofa (figure 2-5).<sup>33</sup> This became the site of a new Medici palace (Palazzo Lante), begun by Giuliano da Sangallo in 1505. This new route initiated urban development towards the north and east of the city, and influenced the plans for Palazzo Farnese to turn its principal facade toward the interior of the city.<sup>34</sup>

Construction of the Palazzo Farnese began just after the completion of Via Giulia, and its garden facade was designed to face the street. Via del Mascherone (flanking the palace's south-eastern side) existed at the time of the purchase, but from 1515 to 1516 was enlarged and straightened by Alessandro along with Via dei Vaccinari (present day Vicolo dei Venti), Via del Mascherone, and Via dei Farnesi.<sup>35</sup> At the same time, the cardinal began to buy properties in the surrounding area, particularly along Via della Regola, in order to accommodate the expansion of the new palace. It was not until the elevation of Alessandro to the papacy, however, that the most comprehensive interventions, the laying of the Piazza Farnese and the Via dei Baullari, were initiated.

---

<sup>33</sup>Luigi Spezzaferro, "Place Farnèse: urbanisme et politique," in *Le Palais Farnèse*, 85-126, 90. On the development of the Via di Ripetta, see Frommel, *Der römische Palastbau*, vol. 1, 19-22.

<sup>34</sup> Spezzaferro, "Place Farnèse: urbanisme et politique," 96.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 94-95.

The piazza began to take shape around 1535 and was essentially complete by 1537, though demolition continued into the early 1540s.<sup>36</sup> The resulting space was bounded on all four sides with newly regularized facades and streets: extending from the Via Giulia, the Vicolo del Gallo led northeast toward the Piazza della Cancelleria while the Via del Mascherone was widened and lengthened to terminate at the Campo dei Fiori. Finally, the longest and most ambitious urban development was the laying of the Via dei Baullari (figure 2-6). Conceived in preparation for the Jubilee of 1550, the new street took shape quite rapidly in the years 1548 to 1549.<sup>37</sup> Two hundred meters long, and ten meters wide, Via dei Baullari began at the main portal of the Palazzo Farnese, skirted the western flank of the Campo dei Fiori, and terminated at the Via Papale.<sup>38</sup> It effectively created a direct link between Palazzo Farnese and the papal processional route, the Via Papale. As a result, the Palazzo Farnese was a successful example of what Christoph Frommel has characterized as the *Visualisierungsprozess*, the visual projection of a palace's authority into space.<sup>39</sup> The axes created from the Tiber to the Via Papale, the extensions of the Via dei Baullari and Via della Regola, and the Via Giulia worked in concert to project this authority in all directions.

Michelangelo's enlargement and alteration of the central window and balcony of the palace in 1549 coincided with the laying of the Via dei Baullari. According to James

---

<sup>36</sup> Spezzaferro notes that there were other changes taking place after 1538. Note 123 in Spezzaferro outlines a thorough chronology of the houses demolished in the area over the course of the 1530s. The decision to create a monumental piazza was in part influenced by the visit of Charles V to Rome in 1536. Spezzaferro, "Place Farnèse: urbanisme et politique," 110.

<sup>37</sup> The axis of this street would have continued on the other side of the palace with the project for a bridge across the Tiber leading to the Farnesina. Ibid., 120-121).

<sup>38</sup> Originally, Michelangelo conceived the continuation of via Baullari in the form of a bridge spanning the Tiber to connect the palace with the villa Farnesina, but this was never realized. Ibid., 115-121.

<sup>39</sup> First introduced by Christoph Luitpold Frommel (*Der römische Palastbau*), the strategic manipulation of facades, streets, and *piazze* by architects of the Renaissance and Baroque, a process identified as *Visualisierung*, represents a type of conscious urban planning in which the ability to engineer an unobstructed view was considered a projection of authority onto the urban topography.

Ackerman, an engraving produced in the same year (figure 2-7) suggests that the artist conceptualized the integration of the coat of arms, the palace, its piazza, and the new street in terms of an ideal viewing point, using linear perspective.<sup>40</sup> In the work, the entire pavement of the piazza is divided into bands forming squares that correspond to the width of one of the palace's bays. Entering into the piazza from its new primary route, an observer would conceive the bands as orthogonals leading towards a vanishing point directly below the central arch of the palace's rear facade. In this way, Michelangelo emphasized the original plan for the extension of the axis of the Via dei Baullauri through the palace and across the river via a bridge to the Farnesina, though neither the pavement nor the extension was actualized.<sup>41</sup>

Michelangelo's conceptualizations of the piazza and the balcony each emphasize the palace's design according to projection of lines of sight. From the elevated point of the balcony, the view of the palace's occupant could extend along an unobstructed visual track, piercing deep into the city's urban fabric. Conversely, the eye of an observer turning from the Via Papale toward the Campo dei Fiori would be conditioned to follow a linear succession of Farnese monuments, beginning with via dei Baullauri and terminating across the river at the limits of his view. While this second aspect was not realized to its full potential, the palace still presided over the western portion of Regola and stood at the convergence of several of Rome's newest thoroughfares. With its imposing size and command over a significant portion of its urban environs, the palace

---

<sup>40</sup> Ackerman notes that the work appears in Albrecht Dürer's *Vier Bücher von menschlicher Proportion, Nürnberg* of 1528. First published by Erwin Panofsky, *Dürer* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1943), 200. See also, David Summers, *Michelangelo and the Language of Art* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1981), 380-96. Finally, a copy of this plan was reproduced by the French engraver, Antoine Lafréry, appearing in the guidebook, *Speculum romanae magnificentiae*, 1579. This suggests that the design was still in circulation into the seventeenth century. Reproduced in *Le Palais Farnése*, 217-218.

<sup>41</sup> Ackerman, *The Architecture of Michelangelo*, 191-192.

became a register of the new authority of the Farnese family, transformed, in the words of Vasari, from a palace of a cardinal to that of a pontiff.<sup>42</sup>

Though no single representation of this Farnese territory seems to have been made, the design and urban situation of the Palazzo Farnese worked in concert to articulate the self-presentation of the owner through the physical fabric of his palace. The central element of the facade's design anticipated the physical presence of the Farnese duke himself, signaled by the central open window and balcony. Similarly, the immense Farnese coat of arms in this ensemble acted as a placeholder for the patron when he was not physically present. The effect is one of expectation. As Siegfried Gideon remarked, "the monumental window seems to await the arrival of the great overlord who is about to show himself to the populace."<sup>43</sup> The "embedding" of the patron in the facade illustrated contemporary understandings of the palace as a portrait of its owner, but even more so, activated the facade as a visual place of encounter, both of and from the palace. This aspect would come to be used to its full potential by the French in the marking of a jurisdictional domain in Rome.

### **Negotiations for the "Most Beautiful Palace in Rome"**

With the death of Cardinal Jules Mazarin in March of 1661, Louis XIV began his personal reign. In June of that year, the king dispatched the Sieur d'Aubeville as a resident diplomat to Rome.<sup>44</sup> Among his duties, d'Aubeville was charged with paving the

---

<sup>42</sup> "...essendo (Cardinal Farnese) creato pontifice, Antonio (da Sangallo) alterò tutto il primo disegno (del Palazzo Farnese) parendogli avere a fare un palazzo non più da cardinale ma da pontefice." Vasari, *Le opere di Giorgio Vasari* ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence, Sansoni, 1878-1885) 469-470 quoted by Spezzaferro, *Place Farnèse: Urbanisme et Politique*, 109.

<sup>43</sup> Gideon *Space, Time and Architecture*, 56-57.

<sup>44</sup> For reference to diplomats, the duration of their appointments, and place of residence see Appendix Figure 1.



way for the arrival of a new resident ambassador, a position that had not been filled since Hugues di Lionne's embassy had ended in 1656.<sup>45</sup> By November of 1661, d'Aubeville received instructions from Lionne, now the king's chief secretary, to begin preparations for the arrival of the Duc de Créqui. Those instructions included the selection of a residence.<sup>46</sup> d'Aubeville had been staying in one of the apartments at the Barberini palace, the Casa Grande, but because Antonio Barberini himself had only recently moved in and intended to use it as his primary residence it would not be suitable for a long-term rental.<sup>47</sup>

Unpublished correspondence between French officials in Rome and Paris suggests that, even in the initial planning stage, the king had specific requirements for the type of palace and its situation appropriate for the first ambassador dispatched in his personal reign. The seed for the Palazzo Farnese may have been planted by Elpidio Benedetti, who, in early January suggested the palace in a letter to the auditor of the Rota, Abbé Bourlemont, noting that, "sarebbe per il bel colpo di far' alloggiare il Signore Duc de Créqui nel più maestoso Palazzo di Roma senza spendere."<sup>48</sup> Benedetti's delight at the prospect of such hospitality also likely referred to Cardinal Antonio's initial proposal, supported by Benedetti, to purchase, rather than rent, a palace for the ambassador. In a plan for the staircase on the Pincio of 1660 Benedetti identified a suitable palace for the ambassador adjacent to the French church and monastery of Trinità dei Monti at the crest

---

<sup>45</sup> D'Aubeville's instructions essentially outlined a continuation of affairs discussed by his predecessor: a resolution against Cardinal de Retz, conflict over control over Castro and Ronciglione, as well as a negotiations with the pope for a league against the Turks. Hanotaux, *Recueil des instructions*, 60.

<sup>46</sup> Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (AMAE) vol. 144 f. 188r [7 November 1661], Lionne to d'Aubeville. Lionne informs the ambassador to begin making preparations for the arrival of Crequi, possibly by January.

<sup>47</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 143 ff. 27r -52v [29 April 1661], "Project d'Instruction au S' d'Aubeville..." Envoyee a M. de Brienne.

<sup>48</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 144 ff. 40r-41r [5 January 1662], Benedetti to Abbé Bourlemont.

of the Pincio, noting in a letter to Mazarin that this palace could be purchased for approximately forty or fifty thousand *scudi*.<sup>49</sup> With the death of Mazarin, who had initiated plans for the staircase, however, the project slowed; the prospect of completing a monumental French complex on the Pincio by 1662 did not seem likely, hence that palace ceased to be of interest.<sup>50</sup>

On 6 February, d'Aubeville reported that negotiations were underway with several members of the French faction in Rome for other possible residences, including the palaces belonging to the Cardinal Virginio Orsini and his brother Flavio Orsini, the Duke of Bracciano.<sup>51</sup> In a dispatch to the King, d'Aubeville noted:

The Duke of Bracciano came to see me this morning regarding some news he received from his *homme d'affaire* ...that his conduct and that of his brother M. de Cardinal Orsini has been complained of at court...and that the complaints that are made of his Excellency are founded from his refusal to rent his palace to the Duc de Créqui. On the refusal of M. Cardinal Orsini, [Bracciano] said to me that his brother was not intending to rent his house at all, that he had wanted to live there, and that having come to this conclusion he thought that the king would not be unhappy that he would no longer be able to give it to M. de Créqui who had wanted to live there. And that on this matter I had said that his uncle, the Duke of Bracciano, had given his house to the late M. de Créqui and that consequently perhaps he or his brother would want to do that same thing for the present M. Duc de Créqui. He responded to me that his uncle had primarily lived in the country, coming to Rome quite infrequently, and that he will do as his brother [and] remain there. M. la Duc de Bracciano also complained to me that the manner in which Cardinal Antonio [Barberini] runs his household is so rigorous, that neither his brother nor he would

---

<sup>49</sup> “Il s. card. Antonio sarebbe di parere che là su alto ove sono le case del morto Toscanelli si accomodasse con 40 o 50 altri mila *scudi* una nobile habitatione per un imbasciatore che con la vicinanza di quel convento e per il sito verrebbe ad havere in Rome come una cittadella che rimanerebbe sua et haverebbe in vicinanza le mure della città. Il pensiero merita essa considerato e veramente starebbe bene alla Francia haver qui un palazzo regio.” Quoted in Laurain-Portemer, “Mazarin, Benedetti et l’escalier,” 291, note 60 and D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 280. The proposal for the Pincio as the site for an embassy is taken up at length in Chapter 3.

<sup>50</sup> The complexities of this building history are taken up at length in Chapter 3 and the Conclusion of this dissertation.

<sup>51</sup> George L. Williams, *Papal Genealogy: The Families And Descendants Of The Popes* (Jefferson North Carolina and London: McFarland, 2004), 93. Both were the sons of Ferdinando Orsini (d. 1660), the Duke of Bracciano, who resided in the palace at Piazza Pasquino.

ever be able to accommodate the functions that reflect the honor of France.<sup>52</sup>

While d'Aubeville does not specify the location, the palaces in question were likely the Orsini's primary *insediamento* at Monte Giordano and the Orsini family palace at Piazza Pasquino. In spite of their efforts to sell Monte Giordano (as early as 1636), the Orsini were in possession of both of these palaces during the mid-seventeenth century, the latter the residence of the Duke and Cardinal's father, Ferdinando, until his death in 1660, and Ferdinando's wife, Giustiniana, until 1663.<sup>53</sup> Though the family was clearly vulnerable to an arrangement for one of their palaces, the Orsini refused to give up their residences. Meanwhile the prospect of making an arrangement for the Palazzo Farnese was improving. Only a week later, d'Aubeville sent a second dispatch to Paris, to inform the

---

<sup>52</sup> AMAE Rome 144 f. 117rv [6 February 1662], d'Aubeville to Lionne. "M. Le Duc de Bracchane m'est venu voir ce matin sur un avis qu'il a receu de Paris de son homme d'affaire à qui M. Bouty à dit qu'on se plaignoit à la Cour de sa conduite, et de celle de M. de Le Cardinal des Ursins, et que pour les plaintes que l'on fait de S.E. elles sont fondées sur le refus qu'elle a fait de louer son palais à M. Le Duc de Crequy... Sur le refus de M. le Cardinale Des Ursins il m'a (dit ?) que son frere n'estoit point en dessein de louer (sa ?) Maison, qu'il la vouloit habiter, et qu'estant en [--] resolution il croyoit que le Roy ne trouveroit pas mauvais qu'il ne la donnait pas à M. De Crequy ayant dessein d'y demeurer. Et que sur ce ce qu'on [--] dire que son oncle le Duc de Bracchane avoit au donné sa maison à feu M. le Duc de Crequy [--] que par consequent un pouvoit desirer de luy ou (de ?) son frère qu'il fit la mesme chose pour le service present de M. le Duc de Crequy, il m'a repondu que son oncle se tenoit ordinairement à la campagne et ne venoit à Rome que tres rarement, et il fait comme son frere d'y demeurer. M. Le Duc de Bracchane s'est aussy plaint à moy que le maniere dont M. le Cardinal Antoi ne a soit [...] l'esgard de sa maison estoit tres rigoureuse, que ny son frere ny luy n'estoient quasi jamais conveniente aux fonctions qui regardant l'honneur de la France..." All translations and transcriptions are mine, unless otherwise indicated. Many of the original documents at the AMAE were available only in microfilm. In the places where the quality of these reproductions was too poor, I have done my best to fill in missing words or have inserted [...] to indicate words cut off from the margins. I have preserved the original orthography.

<sup>53</sup> Mounting debt forced the sale of Monte Giordano in 1688 to Pietro Garbielli. Palazzo Braschi now stands on the site of the original Palazzo Orsini at Piazza Pasquino, having been torn down in 1791. The Orsini held several palaces in Rome, but had sold or rented most by the mid-seventeenth century. The Palazzo Pio, for example, which was sold by the Orsini to Prince Alberto Pio di Savoia da Carpi in 1652. Anthony Blunt, *Guide to Baroque Rome* (London: Granada, 1982), 190. One of the palaces may have also been the Palazzo dei Piceni (also known as the Palezzetto di Sisto V), which was constructed as a wedding present for the marriage of Virginio Orsini, the Duke of Bracciano and Favia Peretti, niece of Pope Sixtus V. Kristin Triff, "Patronage and Public Image in Renaissance Rome, 382-385 and Pio Pecchiai, *Palazzo Taverna a Monte Giordano* (Rome, Istituto di studi Romani, 1963), 27-28. My thanks to Dr. Triff, who graciously responded to my queries on the occupancy of the Orsini palaces in the second half of the seventeenth century.

king that a minister had been sent to Parma to negotiate with Ranuccio II Farnese, the Duke of Parma, for the rental of his palace:

Seigneur Cellario said to me that he sent a gentleman to Parma that Créqui had sent to Rome, and that he believes that the Duke of Parma will grant the Duc de Créqui the Palazzo Farnese. If this palace is not obtained, God would not want to allow the Duc de Créqui to think himself reduced, or to take [the palace] of the Duc de Cheri where Monsieur de Fontenay once lived, or [the palace] where Cardinal Acquaviva lived for a long time, which is in the Campo Marzio and not beautiful. With regard to the indecisiveness of Cardinal Antonio, it is so legion that I would be surprised if he could make a firm decision on anything.<sup>54</sup>

The letter refers to other palaces, both previous residences of French ambassadors. One was the Palazzo Cheri, located near the Trevi Fountain, and rented by the Marquis de Fontenay-Mareuil from 1642-1646. The “palace of Cardinal Acquaviva” can be identified as the Palazzo Sacchetti, which belonged to the French ally Cardinal Ottavio Acquaviva from around 1608 to 1615, though members of the Acquaviva family continued to reside there until at least the 1620s into the 1650s.<sup>55</sup> An unpublished anonymous drawing in pen

---

<sup>54</sup>AMAE Rome vol. 144 f. 140r-v [13 February 1662], d’Aubeville to Lionne . “Le dit S. Cellario m’a dit qu’il avoit laissé a Parma un gentilhomme que M. D. Crequy envoie a Rome, et croit que M. Le duc de Parma accorderoit au (Roy ?) pour M. D. Crequy Le Palais farnaise, si ce palais ne s’obtenoit pas, ce que Dieu ne veuille pas permette M. De Crequy s’croit réduit ou à prendre celui de la duc de Chery ou à logé autrefois M. De Fontenay, ou en [...] prendre un autre ou a logé long temps M. Le Cardinal Acquaviva qui est a Campo Marzo et qui n’est point beau. Quant aux irresolutions de M. Le Cardinal Antoine sont si frequentes que je serois surpris s’il avoit de la fermeté pour quelque chose.” François du val, Marquis de Fontenay-Mareuil was the French ambassador in Rome from 1647-1649. The remark about Antonio Barberini’s indecisiveness may also allude to Barberini’s shifting alliance back to the Spanish faction, a move made official with the purchase of lands in Abruzzo and Naples in 1663. For the history of Barberini alliances see Maria Antonietta Visceglia “Factions in the Sacred College in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,” in *Court and politics in papal Rome, 1492-1700*, ed. Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 99-131, 128.

<sup>55</sup> Based on its urban situation in Figure 8, I have identified Palazzo Sacchetti as the residence of the French ambassador, Francois Annibal d’Estrées during the period 1636-42. This residence has previously been referred by Neveu to as a palace near S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini. Neveu, “Regia Fortuna,” 483. The ambassador did, however, launch the celebrations for the Birth of the Dauphin of 1638 from the river balcony of the Palazzo Farnese. On the spectacle see Margaret Murata “Why the First Opera Given in Paris Wasn’t Roman,” *Cambridge Opera Journal* 7 (July, 1995): 87-105; Maurizio Fagiolo dell’Arco and Silvia Carandini, *L’effimero barocco: Strutture della festa nella Roma del’ 600* 2 vols. (Rome: Bulzoni, 1977-1978), vol. 1, 108-10; and Frederick Hammond, *Music and Spectacle in Baroque Rome* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), 231-232, 276. The role of Palazzo Sacchetti as a French embassy will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

and ink of the French quarter of 1687 also indicates that the Palazzo Sacchetti served as the residence of the French ambassador, François Annibal d'Estrées, from 1636-1642 ("a", figure 2-8).<sup>56</sup>

On 21 February 1662, d'Aubeville confirmed to Lionne that the Duke of Parma had agreed to allow the Duc de Créqui to reside in his Roman palace during his embassy. Benedetti confirmed this in a second letter written to Lionne between the 21 and 25 of February, again noting that the Palazzo Farnese was, in his opinion, the most beautiful in Rome.<sup>57</sup> Furthermore, as a circular letter from Rome of 25 February describes, the decision between the king and the duke had been mutual:

The evening of the [25 February] a minister of the new Ambassador of France arrived here having returned from Parma, and asked in the name of the king for the Palazzo Farnese in which to house his ambassador. He said that the king had asked for this palace, but that the Duke had the same wish that the ambassador dispose himself to his home.<sup>58</sup>

Not only had the king requested this palace, but the Duke had offered it freely, likely a gesture of his continued loyalty to France especially in light of the king's ongoing advocacy of his claim against the papacy to his land holdings in Castro. The cases of the Farnese and the Orsini reveal both sides of the coin of French allegiance: an arrangement that proved advantageous for the former, while the refusal of the latter may have expedited a loss of status and the opportunity of personal advancement.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> This map brings to light the location of the palace, which has up until this point been only been indicated as on Via Giulia near S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini. It will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 4.

<sup>57</sup> AMAE Rome 144 f. 179rv, [21 February 1662], Letter of Benedetti to Lionne..

<sup>58</sup> AMAE Rome 144 f. 186rv, [25 February 1662], "Nouvelles de Rome." "Le sera del sudetto giorno giunse quà un ministro del novello Ambre di Francia quale rendo passato di Parma, e chiesto a nome del re cristianissimo il Palazzo Farnesiano per habitare del suo Ambre...Il dise che il re ha chiesto detto Palazzo, mà che il Duca habbia egli medesimo preferenza che dette Ambasciatore si serva della sua habitatione."

<sup>59</sup> The Duke of Bracciano also complains in another part of the letter of his being denied the Order of the Holy Spirit, and suspects the rumors at court contributed to this decision. AMAE Rome 144. 186rv, [25

The preceding passages shed much light on the negotiations for the residence of the new ambassador. The letters suggest that one aspect of this process was that, initially, several palaces were considered for both their suitability for ceremony and their grandeur. Palazzo Sacchetti, the smallest of the options, was not considered “beau” enough for the arriving ambassador, but the holdings of the Orsini family at Piazza Pasquino and Monte Giordano had both been recently renovated and expanded, which likely added to their appeal.<sup>60</sup> From 1615 to 1636, Paolo Giordano Orsini made extensive additions and renovations to unify and update the plan, including a fountain in the courtyard, a new entranceway, and a two-story loggia in the courtyard to facilitate passage between its northern and southern wings. As Kristin Triff has demonstrated, a cash-strapped Orsini had undertaken these renovations to make it more marketable to a potential buyer and had put the palace up for sale as early as 1636.<sup>61</sup> Because it was still on the market by 1660, the Orsini may have feared, rightly, that a long-term lease of the palace to the king of France would have prevented the possibility of a sale.

The second Orsini palace, at Piazza Pasquino had also undergone a series of renovations by Orsini’s brother (Flavio and Virginio’s father) Ferdinando, in at least two successive building campaigns between 1647 and 1658. Among the most extensive changes were the regularization and re-cladding of the palace’s facades on both the Piazza Navona and Via Papale sides, and the restructuring of the Duke’s private

---

February 1662], “Nouvelles de Rome.” Flavio Orsini only fell back into the good graces of the king after his marriage to the French widow Marie-Anne de la Trémoille in 1675. Louis XIV signed the marriage agreement himself, paid the stipend he owed the Orsini for their allegiance and promised his entry into the Order of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore the wedding celebrations were held at the Palazzo Farnese, still in the possession of the French. Caroline Castiglione, “When a Woman Takes Charge: Marie-Anne de la Trémoille and the End of the Patrimony of the Dukes of Bracciano,” *Viator*, 39 no. 2 (2008): 363-380, 369.

<sup>60</sup> The Orsini palace at Monte Giordano had been the Orsini family stronghold since the early fourteenth century, first appearing in connection with Orsini name in a legal document of 1328. Pecchiai, *Palazzo Taverna a Monte Giordano*, 63.

<sup>61</sup> Triff, “Patronage and Public Image in Renaissance Rome,” 380-385.

apartments.<sup>62</sup> These changes as well as a foothold on the Spanish-controlled Piazza Navona may have also contributed to the desirability of this residence.<sup>63</sup> The Orsini's fortunes were in decline by the latter half of the seventeenth century, and they may not have been able to afford to offer the king a political favor, especially if it meant relinquishing one of the few remaining residences in their possession in Rome.<sup>64</sup> The Duke of Parma, on the other hand, was already indebted to the king of France. D'Aubeville was instructed to press for the release of disputed lands claimed by the Duke as his own and seized by the Holy See.<sup>65</sup> As he had done only six years earlier for Queen Christina of Sweden, the Duke willingly leased his palace for political leverage.<sup>66</sup> A letter from Benedetti suggests that arrangements for the lease of the palace were finalized by the end of February 1662.<sup>67</sup>

Furthermore, location was likely a significant factor informing the selection of a residence. Four of five palaces (those of the Orsini, Farnese, and Sacchetti) were located in the western portion of the Campo Marzio, the oldest part of the city's *abitato*. In an area shaped by the urban interests of the Renaissance popes, including the Farnese, della Rovere, and Medici, each of these palaces were already linked to major routes in the city

---

<sup>62</sup> Triff, "Patronage and Public Image in Renaissance Rome," 385-391.

<sup>63</sup> Spain's national church, S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli, was also located on that side of the Piazza Navona, and would have been yards away from the palace entrance. For a discussion of the Piazza Navona as a Spanish stronghold, see Dandeleit on the Spanish Easter celebrations in Rome. Thomas Dandeleit, "Spanish Conquest and Colonization at the Center of the Old World: The Spanish Nation in Rome, 1555-1625," *Journal of Modern History*, 69, 3 (1997): 479-51.

<sup>64</sup> During the seventeenth century four loans were obtained by the Orsini, adding to mounting debt that forced the sale of the palace in 1688. Triff, "Patronage and Public Image in Renaissance Rome," 380-385.

<sup>65</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 90.

<sup>66</sup> Christina was in residence at the Palazzo Farnese from 1655 to 1657, Neveu, "Regia Fortuna," 478-479, and Per Bjurström, *Feast and Theatre in Queen Christina's Rome* (Stockholm: Stockholm Nationalmuseum, 1966). As noted above, the French ambassador d'Estrées had also organized the festivities for the Birth of the Dauphin to take place at the Palazzo Farnese.

<sup>67</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 144 f. 191rv, [27 February 1662], Benedetti to Lionne .. At this point, Benedetti was also already beginning to make arrangements for the ambassador's arrival into the city including the prepping of carriages for the formal entry.

and within close proximity to the city's major judicial and commercial centers. The fifth, Palazzo Ceri, was located near the Trevi fountain, which while, tucked away in a nest of small alleyways and removed from both the concentration of noble palaces was close to the Chigi palace at Montecitorio. Of these choices, the Palazzo Farnese commanded the largest portion of its urban environs in relation to the surrounding streets and the footprint of its piazza. As we have seen, the axial relation between the palace and its surrounding streets allowed for its maximum visibility in the heart of one of Rome's busiest neighborhoods.

Most importantly, the documents suggest that the king was actively involved in the selection process for the Palazzo Farnese. It has been previously understood that the selection of the ambassador's residence was a minor consideration. Pastor, for instance, argues that the king anticipated Créqui's embassy to be of a short duration, since the king was not "in need of the favor of the Holy See, whereas the Popes are bound to rely on France, since she is the centre of gravity of European policy."<sup>68</sup> Pastor misunderstands the importance of Créqui's embassy by conflating Louis's regard for papal power with the king's opinion of Rome. Since by the early seventeenth century Rome was recognized as a diplomatic capital, hosting more representatives than any other city in Europe, Louis would have recognized the importance of Rome for the display of his authority. In another letter of July 1662 to Cardinal Imperiali, the Governor of Rome, the king makes this clear: "The Spanish and French factions, when they are joined in Rome, could easily be much more powerful than that of the papal person, whose temporary power ends with

---

<sup>68</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 93. Gérin of the same opinion, Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siege*, vol. 1, 286.



his life.”<sup>69</sup> According to the dispatches, Louis XIV had expressed a preference for the Palazzo Farnese as early as January 1662, and had requested it himself via his representatives in Rome.<sup>70</sup> That Louis XIV would have specific expectations for the residence of his ambassador is in keeping with the overall control he exercised over diplomatic affairs. Nonetheless, it is an aspect that has been overlooked in the scholarship on diplomatic history, which has concentrated primarily on political negotiations rather than the more representational aspects of embassy.

The Palazzo Farnese also held another advantage as an ambassadorial palace, one that has not previously been considered in the scholarship on French embassy in Rome. The palace was in close proximity to the residence of Cardinal Antonio Barberini, France’s former cardinal protector and vocal ally of the crown in Rome (figure 2-9). While in Paris, Cardinal Antonio had already extended the use of the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane to the crown, renting it to the French ambassador, the Marquis de Fontenay-Mareuil from 1647 to 1653.<sup>71</sup> Upon his return to Rome, Antonio first repossessed the palace at Quattro Fontane, later moving to the Palazzo Bonelli on the piazza SS. Apostoli. In 1658 he purchased the original family home, Palazzo Barberini ai Giubbinari (Casa Grande), where he would live until his death in 1671.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Ellen McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King: Sovereignty and Mediation in Seventeenth-Century France* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006), 187.

<sup>70</sup> This is confirmed by a second letter of 6 January 1662, from the wife of Monsieur Servien, Lionne’s uncle, to the Duchesse of Parma, which states that Louis XIV wanted to rent the palace from the Duke for eighteen to twenty months. Reprinted in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siege*, 286.

<sup>71</sup> The Casa Grande was still inhabited by Anna Colonna, Carlo’s wife, who stayed in Rome for the majority of the exile to protect Barberini interests in Rome. According to the diarist Giacinto Gigli, the Palazzo Barberini was rented to the French in part to prevent Innocent X’s seizure of the property. Beginning in 1646 Cardinals Valençay and Grimaldi aided the Barberini, deploying French soldiers to occupy the palace until the arrival of Fontenay, 24 May 1647. The ambassador stayed in the palace until 1653. Giacinto Gigli, *Diario di Roma, 1608-1670*. 2 vols. (Rome: Colombo, 1994), 2: 498.

<sup>72</sup> A series of renovations in the first half of the seventeenth century allowed the Casa Grande to command a substantial section of the city between the Campo dei Fiori and the Ponte Sisto, Purchased by Francesco Barberini in 1581, the Casa Grande took shape under three generations of the Barberini family, slowly

The visual display of alliance with France by Cardinal Barberini at the Casa Grande may be said to have “primed” the area for a French affiliation. Only a year into his residence, the cardinal hosted a festival for the Peace of the Pyrenees that clearly celebrated the French king.<sup>73</sup> The event was the second hosted by Barberini, following a smaller banquet in honor of the peace between the Spanish and French factions that took place on 19 December 1659.<sup>74</sup> Towards the end of February 1660, with the final celebrations of the treaty and marriage between Louis and the Spanish Infanta, three palaces were illuminated as a final public declaration of peace: the Casa Grande, the Palazzo di Spagna, and the papal palace on the Quirinal. The Casa Grande represented the French faction, filling in as it were, for the lack of an ambassadorial residence. According to Francesco Moneta, the author of the pamphlet describing the event, Cardinal Antonio’s *apparato* included:

a sumptuous *macchina* of fireworks, composed of the arms of the Most Christian King, filled by more than 600 flaming torches of white wax, and inside the Palace [were] three levels of white torches at the windows, and all the surrounding streets were illuminated with lights dispensed by [Cardinal Antonio] depicting the arms of the Most Christian King.<sup>75</sup>

---

growing to eventually encompass the block bounded by the via dei Giubbini and via dei Pettinari. Renovations were undertaken in three stages by Maffeo Barberini, his brother Carlo, and Carlo’s son, Taddeo, in three periods: 1609-09, 1621-32 and 1641-1644. The building history of this palace is addressed at length by Patricia Waddy, *Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces: Use and Art of the Plan* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: MIT Press, 1990), 172, 250-252.

<sup>73</sup> Francesco Moneta, “Vera Relatione della Feste Fatte in Roma per la pubblicazione della Pace Stabilita tra le due corone con le Cerimonie fatte & estate descrizione del Suntuoso Apparato della Chiesa di S. Maria della Pace. Con un racconto delle Funtioni delle due Chiese Nationali.” (In Roma, per Francesco Moneta MDCLX, Si vendono à Pasquino con licenza de’Superiori). Bibliotheca Corsiniana, 170 G15 (18 176r-179v).

<sup>74</sup> According to Moneta, the banquet occurred after a celebratory mass at Santa Maria della Pace, and included a concert and a public *apparato* in honor of the two factions in which Barberini decorated his palace with stucco figures and flags: “Si ritararono tutti nel Palazzo di esso Sig. Card. Antonio al Regio e sontuoso Banchetto preparato da S.E. che fù così lauto, e solenne quanto Prencipe generoso, pieno di una meraviglioso magnificenza in tutte le sua attoni. Concorse tutta Roma à vedere l’apparato maestoso degl’imbandimento, e degl’ adobbi.” Moneta, “Vera Relatione,” 179v.

<sup>75</sup> “...una Pomposa Macchina di fuochi artificiali, consistente nell’Armi della Maestà Christianissima tutta piena di accese torcie di cera bianca ascendenti al numero di più di 600 & intorno al Palazzo tre ordini di torcie bianche alle fenestre, e tutte le strade circovicine illuminate con lumi, dispensati dal medesimo Eminentissimo, ove si vedevano espresse le armi del Re Christianissimo.” Moneta, “Vera Relatione,” 179v.

A visual record of this event has not surfaced to date, but according to the written description, the central conceit of the facade's decorative schema was a monumental display of the arms of France, composed of small torches or candles. This theme was reiterated with the proliferation of smaller illuminated arms in the surrounding streets, adding an urban dimension to the *apparato*. In this way, the cardinal could not have made his affiliation more clear, effectively branding his palace and its precinct as firmly French in its alliance.

### **The Palazzo Farnese as French Residence**

On 24 April 1662, in one of his final dispatches from Rome, d'Aubeville complained of growing hostilities between Roman officials and members of the diplomatic corps in the vicinity of his residence at the Casa Grande. While d'Aubeville considered these minor breaches of protocol indecorous toward the French king, he did not deem them worth jeopardizing a relatively positive rapport with the pope. Nonetheless in a shrouded critique of his replacement, the Duc de Créqui, d'Aubeville noted that similar acts would likely not be met with the same patience by his successor and may even lead to “unfortunate consequences” for French diplomacy in Rome.<sup>76</sup>

D'Aubeville's comment would prove to be prophetic. On 11 June 1662, the French ambassador, Charles de Blanchefort de Bonne, the Duc de Créqui, entered the northern gate of Rome at the Porta del Popolo accompanied by livery, trumpets, and attendants in

---

<sup>76</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 144 f. 352v [24April 1662], d'Aubeville to Lionne.

a majestic procession befitting his royal master.<sup>77</sup> Créqui was a Noble of the Sword, notorious for his quick temper and sour demeanor.<sup>78</sup> Less than three months after Créqui's arrival, a violent altercation occurred between French soldiers and the members of the papal Corsican guard in the vicinity of the Palazzo Farnese. The confrontation became one of the most infamous incidents in the history of early modern diplomacy and a turning point for the demonstration of power by Louis XIV over the Holy See.

While scholars have often cited the Créqui affair as a watershed moment in the debate over privileges associated with embassy, several events predating the incident suggest the active pursuit of French authority in Rome. The contentious nature of Créqui's embassy began even before the ambassador's arrival. Créqui took his time making his way to the city, refusing a welcoming ceremony in Genoa as "unworthy of his character" and delaying his entry into Rome.<sup>79</sup> Both Louis XIV and Lionne applauded these decisions as expressions of the king's superior status. On the latter point, Lionne even remarked, "I think that it is a good sign that the pope was heard to say that you were taking a long time to make your entry, it is a sign that he is more eager to see you than you are to kiss his slipper."<sup>80</sup> Upon his arrival, Créqui refused to grant the papal relatives the honor of his first visit, delaying the negotiations over who would visit whom over the course of several weeks. This prevented the papal nephews from attending the opening

---

<sup>77</sup> "Entrata fatta in Roma dal Sig Duca di Crequi Ambasciatore del Re Cristianissimo di Francia Ludovico XIV alla Santita di N.S. Alessandro VII 14 giugno 1662." 1 leaf rv, Ranuzzi Collection, Austin: Ransom Center for the Humanities, Ph 12565.

<sup>78</sup> Cardinal d'Este described the Duc de Créqui as "un homme hautain, un emporté, un fier, venu à Rome avec du monde qui ne demandait qu'à mener les mains," cited in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, 299. There is debate over whether or not the Créqui affair arose because the ambassador's personality was ill-suited for such a significant post as Rome. Pastor and others have credited much of the diplomatic disaster to the overreaction of Créqui himself. Another more credible point of view is that the king deliberately chose Créqui in order to represent his new dominance in the European political arena after the Peace of the Pyrenees. This is in keeping with Louis XIV's overall tendency to capitalize on political tensions and disagreements as an opportunity to exert his dominance. McClure *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 184.

<sup>79</sup> McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 183 and Moüy, *L'Ambassade du Duc de Créqui*, 1:158-179.

<sup>80</sup> McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 185.

receptions for the ambassador, an act the pope considered a public snub. Louis XIV eventually recommended that Créqui capitulate in order to satisfy the pope who was more concerned with “small ceremonial circumstances than with solid things.”<sup>81</sup> On this point, Louis XIV may have underestimated Alexander VII. In anticipation of the liberties the king may have felt his ambassador would be entitled to take, the pope had already increased the number of Corsican guards patrolling the area around the Palazzo Farnese.<sup>82</sup>

Créqui’s arrival also marked a new level of protection of the Palazzo Farnese. Ambassadors had always been concerned about the implementation of local justice, including searches and arrests, within their extraterritorial boundaries. The ambassador had already complained after Cardinal Imperiali conducted a search of some empty houses near the Palazzo Farnese.<sup>83</sup> Likely wishing not to cause another diplomatic incident, Imperiali also ordered all of the prostitutes who lived near the palace to move to other parts of the city and directed the head of the local company of guards to move his patrol towards the Palazzo Pio Righetti and away from view of the Palazzo Farnese.<sup>84</sup>

Despite these measures, on 29 June the transfer of prisoners from the Campo dei Fiori to the prison of the Corte Savelli on Via Giulia prompted the ambassador to complain that his dignity had been violated by the administration of local law in the

---

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.

<sup>82</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 144 f. 267v [28 March 1662] and f. 323r [15 April 1662], “Nouvelles de Rome.” The author of this memoir (likely Bourlemont) also notes that the increase in guards was also being done in preparation for Queen Christina who took up residence at a palace on the Lungara upon her return to Rome.

<sup>83</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 94.

<sup>84</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 144 f366r, “Nouvelles de Rome.” “La famiglia del nuovo Ambre di France sia lontana da ogni attacco di romori (sic), [La ambasciatore] frà l’altre diligenze ordinato che tutte le meretrici che habitano in vicinanze del Palazzo Farnesiano vadano ad habitare in altre parti per ogni cattiva occasione di strepito et ancora per un certo rispetto è stato ordinato al caporale de sbirri di Campo di Fiore di ritirarsi al quanto verso il Palazzo dell Emmo Pio per non stare tanto esposto a quello di farnese...”

vicinity of the palace.<sup>85</sup> In a letter to Lionne, Abbè Bourlemont, Auditor of the Rota in Rome, confirmed the instances of crime occurring in the vicinity of the palace. His description not only alludes to the discrepancies in defining the quarter's boundaries but also characterizes the marking of these boundaries as a visual process:

And also there is nothing in the Bulls to express what determines the extent of the *franchise* of the ambassador, nevertheless the truth is it (as you know much better than I) comprises *not only the palace [of the ambassadors] but also everything that is within his neighborhood and seen from his windows[.]* And all the governors of Rome respect this tradition of propriety and only when it is necessary make an execution near the residence of the ambassador[.] If the crime is not very severe or the necessity for the public good very great, one must wait until another time and another situation, and also the ambassadors must not abuse this courtesy and take great care that the houses of the [ambassador's suite] and of his palace are not serving as a place of retreat for villains and criminals.<sup>86</sup>

Bourlemont's letter is revealing on several points. To my knowledge, it is the first recorded attempt to define and describe the quarter at the Palazzo Farnese.<sup>87</sup> While it refers to some conflicts between French and Roman officials, it predates the Créqui

---

<sup>85</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 144 ff. 229v [8 July 1662] and f 247v, "Nouvelles de Rome." The complaint is mentioned again in an anonymous memoir on the rights of the quarter written in 1687: AMAE Rome vol. 308, ff. 297r-308r, "Lettre d'un Gentilhomme..." [24 April 1687]. Regnier-Desmarais also notes two other complaints. One on 28 June regarding a chain gang of galley slaves passed *within view* of the palace, and a second regarding a group of guards who executed an arrest warrant "assez proche du mesme Palais." Regnier-Desmarais, *Histoire des mêles de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome*, 7.

<sup>86</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 145, f. 213rv [3 July 1662], Bourlemont to Lionne. (Partially quoted by Neveu, with an incorrect citation, noted as 145 fol. 144rv). "Et encore qu'il ny aye point de Bulles expresser qui determinent l'étendue de la franchise aux Ambassadeur, toutefois l'vraye est luy (comme vous scavoir beaucoup mieux que moy ...) savoir consideration *non seulement pour leur palais mais pour tout ce qui est de dans leur voisinage Et (sic) veue de leur fenestres*, Et a cette tradition de bienséance tous le gouverneurs de Rome sont en beaucoup l'égard et lorsqu'il a estre necessaire de faire execution proche le logis les Ambassadeur, si le Crime n'estoit bien atroce et la necessite grande pour le bien publique de faire capture, l'on la remise jusque un autre temps et un autre conjuncture et les ambassadeurs aussi n'abusent point de cette courtoisie et prenant grande soins que les maisons d'ambassadeur et de leur palais ne servient point de retraite aux mechants et malfaiteurs." (Italics denote areas underlined in the original text).

<sup>87</sup> A similar description is noted by Regnier-Desmarais in his description of an incident of 24 July in which some members of the Créqui's suite incited a fight with some soldiers in the Piazza Farnese. Because the French were already drunk and "because the view of the palace of the ambassador rendered them insolent" they began an argument with the soldiers and attacked them, causing the soldiers to flee. Regnier-Desmarais, *Histoire des mêles de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome*, 8-9.

affair, suggesting that French claims to a diplomatic precinct far beyond the palace began with arrival of the ambassador and were not a response to the affair itself. Notably, Bourlemont's comment also predates much of the discussion on extraterritoriality, which was virtually absent in diplomatic theory of the time. Debates on its practice in Rome emerged only later in the century with the abolition of the rights of quarter by Innocent XI in the 1670s.<sup>88</sup> Finally, it introduces the concept that the quarter was defined in two ways: comprising the field of sight of the ambassador from his palace windows, and an ill-defined notion of the urban environs of the palace itself.

By delimiting the bounds of French territory both by sight and by urban proximity, the ambassador was ensured a very flexible definition of his precinct. The extent to which the immunity of the quarter affected the urban environs of the Palazzo Farnese is suggested by a list of crimes committed by the members of the French ambassadorial suite from June through August 1662 in areas as far as across the Ponte Sisto.<sup>89</sup> Compiled by Governor Imperiali, and later published by Créqui's secretary, Regnier Desmarais, the list not only documents the acts committed, the victims, perpetrators, and locations of the crimes but also Créqui's response to each of the accusations. According to this document, twenty incidents were recorded ranging from petty theft to assault, rape, and kidnapping all within the short three-month period of Créqui's embassy. Of this group of incidents,

---

<sup>88</sup> To be discussed at length in Chapter 4.

<sup>89</sup> "Proces verbal envoyé par la cour de Rome, des prétendus excès commis par les François, depuis l'arrivée du Duc de Créqui à Rome en qualité d'Ambassadeur Extraordinaire au commencement du mois de Juin 1662 jusqu'à sa sortie au commencement de Septembre de la même année: avec les observations et les responses de la part de l'Ambassadeur." Ransom Center for the Humanities, vol.Ph 12565. Appearing in manuscript form, without the comments by the Duc de Créqui in AMAE Rome vol. 146 ff. 162r-167r. The number of crimes and their locations (when specified) is as follows. Via Giulia, 2; Via Giulia at the Mascherone fountain, 2; Via Giulia near Ponte Sisto, 1; S. Caterina da Siena, 1; Piazza Fontanone, 1; Trastevere off Ponte Sisto, 2; Strada dei Balestrari, 2, S. Girolamo della Carità, 2, Vicolo della Cerqua "vicino à Piazza Farnese", 1; Campo dei Fiori, 1, Ponte Sisto, 1; Via Trinità dei Pellegrini, 1. The locations of two crimes were unspecified.

only two do not specify a location but from the remainder a clearer picture emerges of the “hot spots” associated with the French precinct. The majority of crimes reported are in the immediate vicinity of the palace including the fountain of the Mascherone, the Via di Ponte Sisto, and the Piazza Farnese. Others, however, were farther away, including Santa Caterina da Siena, the Campo dei Fiori, Via Balestrari, and S. Giralamo in Carita. Finally, two incidents were recorded as far as across the Ponte Sisto in Trastevere, resulting from armed pursuits that began closer to the ambassadorial residence.

The list suggests that the conduct of members of the French ambassador’s suite had its own urban effects. Even if members of the suite committed serious crimes, their status as members of the royal household protected them from local prosecution. Their actions map out an urban zone of high crime associated with the ambassador’s palace, an area in which offenses were repeatedly committed by the French suite in Rome. Furthermore, based on Créqui’s testimony, it is apparent that the ambassador was aware of the majority of these incidents at the time they were committed and administered his own justice in response to them. In some cases, the ambassador justified the actions of his suite, claiming, for example, that victims had trafficked prostitutes into the area, an activity that he had forbidden at the time of his arrival. In claiming the role of arbiter in these cases, the ambassador was indeed following the chief precept that defined an extraterritorial zone: the juridical control of an area outside of the host power’s own legal structure.

The tension that began with Créqui’s arrival came to a head on 20 August 1662. According to Desmarais, the incident began with an altercation between three Corsican guards and three members of the French ambassador’s household in the vicinity of Santa



Dorotea in Trastevere.<sup>90</sup> The exchange developed into a pursuit across the Ponte Sisto to the stables of the ambassador and the barracks of the guard, where the latter called out to other members who then surrounded the palace and all of the adjacent streets. The skirmish led to the Piazza Farnese, where Créqui himself witnessed the attack from his balcony. When the members of the French faction escaped inside the Palazzo Farnese the Corsican guards began to fire upon the palace itself. The ambassador's wife was also attacked in her coach near S. Carlo ai Catinari and one of her pages was killed.<sup>91</sup>

Alexander VII's response to the incident was immediate and conciliatory. The pope assigned two commissions: one to punish the offenders, and a second congregation of Cardinals to examine the dispute at length. Despite the pope's appointment of the French ally, Cardinal Sacchetti, to head the congregation, Créqui instructed the French cardinals to refuse to take part.<sup>92</sup> The papal nephew offered his apologies to the ambassador and his wife, while the Corsicans were transferred to another part of the city, and the culprits were arrested and imprisoned until trial. Finally, two papal briefs (28 August and 2 September) offered the pope's apologies and appealed to Louis XIV to resume relations. Despite these efforts Créqui withdrew from Rome on 1 September, marking the abrupt discontinuation of a heretofore relatively friendly diplomacy between Louis XIV and Alexander VII.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Regnier-Desmarais, *Histoire des mêles de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome*, 13-14. A detailed account of the incident is also related by Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 308-310.

<sup>91</sup> Regnier-Desmarais, *Histoire des mêles de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome*, 15-20, 28.

<sup>92</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 96-97.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 97-98 and Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 311-315. Regnier-Desmarais justifies Créqui's arming of the palace as a response to the arrival of the papal guard after the incident: "Les dernières remarques de toutes concernoient l'armement de l'Ambassadeur, dont la Cour de Rome faisoit de si grandes plaintes, et là-dessus, après avoir établi, Que cet armement ne consistoit qu'en une centaine de François qui s'estoient refugiez dans le Palais de l'Ambassadeur, et que l'Ambassadeur n'avoit fait autre chose avec cela que marcher une fois ou deux mieux accompagné qu'à l'ordinaire, pour n'estre pa esposé tout de nouveau à la fureur des mesmes Corses, que les Ministres du pap appelloient gens féroces et

On the streets of Rome, the effects of this incident were immediately apparent. According to Flavio Chigi, Créqui began to arm the palace with over 2000 soldiers, and mounted artillery in the windows of the Palazzo Farnese, though Lionne asserted that these measures had been taken by Antonio Barberini.<sup>94</sup> The papal nephew pleaded with Lionne to allow him to replace the guards with soldiers from the Monte di Pietà, promising to restrict the Corsicans from entering the quarter altogether. Furthermore, Chigi reported that the fear of the French had sparked crime throughout the city as other families began to arm themselves. Rome, he wrote, was now filled with “ogni stato di persone in terrore, et in confusione.”<sup>95</sup> In response to the threat of a total outbreak of violence, the streets around the palace were barricaded, the city gates closed, and cannons readied at the Castel Sant’Angelo. Finally, on the 18 September the French arms were taken down from the Palazzo and the soldiers ordered to disperse.<sup>96</sup>

The incident was seized upon as an opportunity by Louis XIV to demonstrate his newfound authority sealed by the Peace of the Pyrenees.<sup>97</sup> Even before news of Créqui’s withdrawal had reached Paris, d’Aubeville was dispatched to Parma and Modena to arrange plans with the Farnese and d’Este to recapture the disputed territories of Castro and Comacchio. The papal nuncio, Celio Piccolomini, and the papal vice-legate were

---

intraitables, il adjoustoit; Que cette juste précaution ne méritoit guère, qu’on eust faire entrer quatre mille hommes dans Rome, qu’on eust déclaré un nouveau Général des Armes, ni qu’on environnast de Corps de garde la Palais de l’Ambassadeur, et tous les Palais des Cardinaux de la faction de France.” He also notes that the Corsicans continued to patrol in front of the Palazzo Farnese insulting the household of the Ambassador and even forced open the doors of the monastery of French monks at S. Antoine in order to search for arms. Regnier-Desmarais, *Histoire des mêles de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome*, 77, 82.

<sup>94</sup> The arming of the palace is one of the last references to Cardinal Antonio’s alliance with the French that I have found in the archival records. As Dandelet notes, the Barberini switch to the Spanish side was a major victory for King Philip IV. In 1663 Maffeo Barberini was awarded the honor of presenting the Neapolitan *china* to the pope, serving as a public announcement of the new alliance. Dandelet, *Spanish Rome, 1500* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 209.

<sup>95</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 146 ff. 156r-160v, [30 August 1662] and ff. 203-221v, [31 August 1662] Letters from Cardinal Chigi to Lionne.

<sup>96</sup> AMAE vol. 147 ff. 35rv-36rv [18 September 1662], “Nouvelles de Rome.”

<sup>97</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 100.

forcibly removed from Paris and taken to Savoy, where a French army of 20,000 troops had been assembled to march onto the Italian peninsula. The king also ordered the seizure of papal Avignon, which was returned only after the signing of the Treaty of Pisa on 12 February 1664. Among the other stipulations of the treaty was a written apology by Mario Chigi whom Créqui accused of inciting the incident, and a personal apology to the king made by Cardinal Flavio Chigi in Paris; the dismissal of Governor Imperiali, the disbanding of the Corsican guard, and the transfer of Castro and Ronciglione, and Comacchio to the Farnese and Este families, respectively.<sup>98</sup> Finally, the king ordered a pyramid to be constructed on the former site of the guards' barracks with an inscription describing the incident and proclaiming why the Corsicans would never again be allowed to serve in the papal employ.

As both Gérin and Moüy have noted, the Treaty of Pisa did not result in any financial or territorial gain for Louis XIV or his allies. The transfers of the duchies to the Farnese and Este were never completed, and Avignon had been released back into papal control after the signing of the treaty. Gérin, however, has demonstrated that these issues were not the priority behind Louis XIV's insistence on reparations. In a letter of 24 February 1664, Lionne explained to the English ambassador the aims of the treaty in rather visceral terms: "Despite the secret whispering of our bigots, we have had no scruples in flogging [the pope and Roman government] both front and back and making them pay this time for former affairs that went very badly for us."<sup>99</sup> Lionne goes on to

---

<sup>98</sup> Moüy, *L'Ambassade du Duc de Créqui*, vol. 2, 247-290. A printed copy of the Treaty can be found in BAV Barb Lat 5640 ff.234-248. An engraving of the legation of Cardinal Chigi, may be found in BAV Barb Lat 5640 f. 294.

<sup>99</sup> Letter from Lionne to Lord Cummings, Ambassador of England, of 24 February 1664, quoted in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 471-472. Lionne goes on to refer to two incidents against members of the French faction for which the French now seek revenge, one in which Innocent X allowed the seizure of a palace belonging to a French bailiff named Valencay and another incident in which Urban VIII ordered the

describe the Créqui affair as a “*cas fortuit*” in which to settle the score. In this light, the Créqui affair may be interpreted as a convenient excuse for the king’s primary objective: to force papal submission to the point, one may argue, of public humiliation.

### **Urban Effects of the Créqui Affair**

Of all of the measures of the Treaty of Pisa, it was the pyramid that was considered by the papacy as the most controversial and was met with significant protest during the process of its construction.<sup>100</sup> Scholars have argued, convincingly, that the sole purpose of such a work was as a *Schanddenkmal*, or shame monument, a typology whose historical use Dietrich Erben has linked both to the iconography of royal glory and to memorials condemning crimes against the state.<sup>101</sup> I propose that in addition to this symbolic register, the pyramid also served as a direct manifestation of the king’s absolute control over his foreign diplomacy, a symbol made more potent by its display to an international audience in Rome. A significant aspect of this control was the management of the architectural and spatial aspects of diplomacy: the embassy and its precinct.<sup>102</sup>

In order to grasp the pyramid’s effectiveness as a marker of French dominion, it is necessary to address its role in its urban context. The contract for the pyramid required

---

severed head of coachman of the French ambassador, d’Estrées to be publicly displayed after his was prosecuted for a crime.

<sup>100</sup> The building history of the pyramid is the subject of a comprehensive building history by Dietrich Erben. The author describes in detail the circumstances of its constructions and dismantlement, beginning with the actions of the Corsican guard during the Créqui affair and the negotiations of the treaty of Pisa, and concluding with its ceremonial destruction after a peace accord in 1668. Dietrich Erben, “Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV in Rom: ein Schanddenkmal im Dienst diplomatischer Vorherrschaft,” *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 31 (1996): 427-458.

<sup>101</sup> In Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia* Glory is depicted holding an obelisk. Erben identifies the 1594 monument erected in Paris on the site of the execution of Jean Chastel as a model for the 1664 pyramid. Chastel attempted to murder King Henry IV. Erben, “Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV,” 444-447.

<sup>102</sup> The documentary evidence is derived from a variety of sources: the stipulations of the treaty of Pisa, site plans of the proposed monuments, and most importantly, the correspondence between Bourlemont and Lionne during the period 1663 to 1664.

that the pyramid be erected on a site just east of Piazza Trinità dei Pellegrini known as the Piazza dei Corsi. It appears in both the 1668 map of Rome by Matteo Gregorio de Rossi and the 1676 Map of Rome by Giambattista Falda located directly in front of the former barracks (figures 2-10 and 2-11). According to the plans and Bourlemont's written stipulations, the pyramid was to be 42 *palmi* in height (approximately 30 feet), solidly built, protected by a railing, and to include a plaque on the monument indicating the permanent disbandment of the guard from the pope's service.<sup>103</sup> Regarding this final stipulation, the letters were to be carved as large and deeply as possible to ensure the inscription could be read from a distance.<sup>104</sup> In addition, two architects were assigned to its construction. One known as the "architect of San Louis" was to supervise the Roman architect and stone masons to ensure the monument was not sabotaged by those sympathetic to the pope; the second is referred to only as the "architect de la chambre" in reference to his employment by the papacy. Erben has identified these architects as Plautilla Bricci and Matthia de' Rossi respectively.<sup>105</sup> As a final insult, the funds for its construction were also to come from papal coffers. The building of the pyramid itself only took two weeks, and at its conclusion Bourlemont specified that an engraving of it be sent to Paris, allowing for its visual dissemination in the state whose victory it

---

<sup>103</sup> The *palm* was the standard unit of measurement at the time, approximately 8.75 inches. According to Erben, the wording of this inscription was a topic of much debate between Rasponi and Bourlemont. The original inscription emphasized the attack on the family of the ambassador, further undermining the pope's position. Rasponi negotiated to have the emphasis shifted to the disbandment of the Corsican guard. The final version read: IN EXECRATIONEM DAMNATI FACINORIS / CONTRA EX<sup>m</sup> DUCEM CREQUEUM ORATOREM / REGIS CHRISTIANISSIMI/A MILITIBUS CORSIS / XIII. KAL. SEPT. ANNO MDCLXII PATRATI / CORSICA NATIONE INHABILIS ET INCAPAX/ AD SEDI APOSTOLICAE INSERVENDUM/EX DECRETO IUSSU / S<sup>m</sup> D.N. ALEXANDRI VII. PONT. MAX. / EDITO / IN EXECUTIONEM CONCORDIAE PISIS INITAE / AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM / DECLARATA EST/ ANNO M.DC.LXIV. For the other proposed inscriptions see Erben "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV," 440.

<sup>104</sup> Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV," 437-439.

<sup>105</sup> Plautilla Bricci had been involved in several French projects in Rome, including Elpidio Benedetti's villa and the chapel of Saint Louis in Saint Luigi dei Francesi. Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV," 438-439.

celebrated. This was most likely the engraving produced of the pyramid in 1664 by François Ragout (figure 2-12) that depicts the pyramid in a rather vacant landscape, which does not allude to its location in Rome, and a brief description of the event and the inscription.<sup>106</sup> In addition, the pyramid appeared on the reverse of two portrait medals of 1664 (figures 2-13 and 2-14).<sup>107</sup>

Both the documents and a reading of the pyramid's urban situation suggest that the French carefully considered how to maximize the monument's visibility and its capacity to disrupt urban flow. Though the piazza itself was relatively small, the monument's placement directly in front of the hospice of SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini (the largest pilgrim residence in Rome), anticipated its exposure to a wide international audience.<sup>108</sup>

Furthermore, as noted above, the piazza was at the central point of a web of interconnected streets, intentionally designed to connect the houses of the wealthy families of Rome with the major commercial and government centers of the city. As a

---

<sup>106</sup> Published in Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV," 438 and Neveu, "Regia Fortuna," 494. A second engraving roughly based on Ragout's was also produced around the same time.

<sup>107</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 111, Moüy, *L'Ambassade du du de Créqui*, vol. 2, 424.

<sup>108</sup> Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV," 439. The work would have reached the window level of its dormitory and refectory. The pyramid also usurped the urban strategies of two other competing groups, the Monte dei Pietà and the Archconfraternity of Trinità dei Pellegrini who had previously been engaged in property suit over rights to build the church's piazza. The proceedings of the lawsuit occurred from 1639 to 1640 and the ruling was found in favor of the Archconfraternity's claim over the piazza. Furthermore, pyramid project may have disturbed plans for further development on the piazza by the archconfraternity. In 1669, less than a year after the demolition of the pyramid the Archconfraternity paid for a new and larger staircase to be built from the piazza to the church. The Archconfraternity of SS Trinità dei Pellegrini maintained the streets in the surrounding area. See Rome, Archivio di Stato, Archivio Trinità dei Pellegrini, b. 464 Chiesa Fabbrica e Giurisdizione. "Discorso Ragione per mantenere un qualche dritto sù la piazza di nostra chiesa contro il Monte di Pietà" and (unfoliated) documents of 28 August 1669, "Pianta della scalinata avanti la Porta Grande della Nostra Chiesa con la Licenza de Mastri di Strada in pie di detta per portare pigliare il Sito pubblico per fare detta Scalinata." A plan of the new staircase is included in the documents indicating an extension from the church of about 12 palmi in length. The work is signed by Lodovico Casale Maestro di Strade and Francesco Palombara Mastro di Strade, and attributed to the architect Francesco Chelli.

result it was a highly trafficked area, a feature that the author of a circular dispatch of 1664 confirmed by stating, “il concorso del popolo qui é sempre grande.”<sup>109</sup>

The most disruptive aspect of the project, however, was the stipulation of a series of iron gates to be erected in order to block off the piazza from carriage traffic.<sup>110</sup> These can be seen in a plan of the work produced in 1664 (figure 2-15), in which axes on both sides of Via dei Pettinari and the small lane leading to Piazza S. Salvatore in Campo are blocked by locking gates, which “serra affatto la strada.” In his correspondence with Lionne, Bourlemont stipulated that the gates would be closed every evening at 5 or 6 and a guard would be posted to keep the area under surveillance and control access to the piazza.<sup>111</sup> While the inclusion of the gates was said to have been simply to prevent potential damage or vandalism, they also would have disrupted one of the only direct routes from the heart of the city near the Campo dei Fiori to Trastevere by way of the Via dei Pettinari and the Ponte Sisto. Ultimately, Bourlemont did not succeed in having the piazza completely blocked. The papal nuncio, Rasponi, well aware of the potential disruption this would cause, successfully managed to have this stipulation removed from the contract, but the stanchions surrounding the pyramid itself remained. In this way, the piazza became defined by the new monument and allowed it enough space to be viewed from a distance.<sup>112</sup> Furthermore, the pyramid’s placement in this area (even without the gates) still effectively blocked or severely impeded any vehicular traffic traveling along the Via della Regola toward Via dei Pettinari. This route, which led all the way down to

---

<sup>109</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 159 f. 100 [17 May, 1664], “Nouvelles de Rome.”

<sup>110</sup> Erben, “Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV,” 440, citing a brief from Bourlemont to Lionne of 7 May 1664 (AMAE Rome vol. 159, ff. 67rv). Rasponi had complained that this would have been an additional insult, likening it to a type of cage used to expose outlaws to public view.

<sup>111</sup> AMAE vol. 159 ff. 66r.-68bis [7 May 1664], Bourlemont to Lionne.

<sup>112</sup> AMAE Rome, vol 159 f. 100 [17 May, 1664], “Nouvelles de Rome.”

Isola Tiberina to the south and stretched to the north to connect with the Via Monserrato, was one of the longest thoroughfares in the western part of the city (figure 2-16).

Unsurprisingly the monument was placed along a direct axis from the Palazzo Farnese, at the terminal point where Via della Regola opened into the Piazza SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini. In other words, it tracked a natural extension of the view from the palace, and thus fell within the confines of French territory. Bourlemont's stipulation that the inscription be made large enough to be seen from a distance also suggests the visibility from the palace was already a factor from the very onset of the monument's design, and is not unlike the same stipulations he defined for the marking of French territory through the process of visual encounter. The awareness of the jurisdictional motives behind the work are also suggested by a fragment of a plan produced in 1667 that depicts the palace and piazza in relation to the pyramid (figure 2-17). An inscription included in the image reads, "La piramide est sur les confins de la Juresdiction de France et la commencement de ripagrande."<sup>113</sup> The pyramid effectively extended Louis XIV's "urban reach" into Rome, creating a visual marker and entry point into the French quarter. Even the form itself, which represented something closer to an obelisk than a pyramid, recalled and subverted the urban image of the Ecclesia triumphans exemplified by the *guglie* that marked forecourts of the major churches in Rome.<sup>114</sup> Its proximity to the Casa Grande marked a more permanent display of alliance than what Cardinal Antonio had first

---

<sup>113</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Estampes, Vb 87 (Rome), fol. 155 reproduced in Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV," 439. Erben's discussion of this work is in relation to its location, but makes no mention of the notation that the pyramid also demarcated the boundaries of the French quarter.

<sup>114</sup> Erben notes the Roman context of the pyramid, as a symbol for triumph of Catholicism, citing Alexander VII's commission to Bernini for the elephant obelisk in front of S. Maria sopra Minerva as a possible response to the pyramid, after Bernini's own return from France in November 1665. In addition to the Elephant-obelisk, one may also consider Alexander's other contemporary project, the renovation of the Pyramid of Cestius (ca. 1663), which employed the same iconography of glory in a Christian context. Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV," 450. Plans for the pyramid may be found in BAV Chigi Lat P. VII 13.



established through festive display with the illumination of the same streets during the celebrations for the Peace of the Pyrenees. The result was that the pyramid not only symbolized the relationship between Louis XIV and the pope but also served as a legal and jurisdictional marker of French territory in Rome.<sup>115</sup>

The Créqui Affair was a turning point for Louis XIV's diplomacy in Europe, particularly in his establishment of complete personal control over his diplomatic agents. Shortly after the resolution, the king sent a circular letter to all of his diplomats in Europe, instructing them to send their reports to him and him alone, and to keep their affairs secret from any other ministers or family members.<sup>116</sup> It was a policy he would continue to follow throughout his reign, thereby maintaining close control not only over policy decisions but also his own political image both within and outside his realm. In this way the king tightened the link between himself and his ambassadors, and by extension, any aspect of their embassy. This sentiment was expressed by Louis XIV in a letter to Créqui shortly after the ambassador's departure from Rome in which he characterized the actions committed against the person of the ambassador, his wife, the French suite and even the palace itself as personal offenses:

The acts of the papal militia against your person and your palace, against the person of my servants and all of the Frenchmen they encountered in the streets, represent circumstances so atrocious and cruel that they will be forever hated by all nations, even barbaric ones, This is why even though I am the offended party and offended in a manner that has no example in any time or with any other people that the Pope has even more interest than myself in punishing the offense appropriately, if he can find a punishment that equals the enormity of this assassination.<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup> I would argue that this was the one of most significant aspects of the pyramid project, a point that has not been addressed in the historiography on this monument to date.

<sup>116</sup> For the full text of the letter, see McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 191.

<sup>117</sup> McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*, 189. McClure points out the transition from “vous” and “votre” to “je”, suggesting that these acts were perceived by the king as personal attacks.

Within this context the king's intentions for the pyramid are more evident: the monument was not only designed to humiliate the pope but also as a demonstration of absolute control over a domain he considered his own.

### **Competing Urban Strategies: Alexander VII's Plan for S. Salvatore in Onda**

The territorial implications of the Créqui affair may have also prompted Alexander VII to respond in kind, with an urban project of his own. Large-scale projects that combined architectural renovation with extensive urban planning were a hallmark of the pontificate of Alexander VII. Seven years into his pontificate the Chigi pope had already pursued several projects aimed at transforming the city into a series of elegant *teatri*, monuments that attested to the authority of the Holy See and the sanctity of Rome as the center of the Catholic world.<sup>118</sup> By 1660 the plans were already underway for refashioning the Piazza del Popolo, Piazza S. Pietro, Piazza del Collegio Romano, and Piazza Colonna. By 1662, two other urban projects, the regularizing of the Via del Corso and the clearing of Piazza Rotonda had also been initiated.<sup>119</sup> Visibility was a key component of these works. By laying out a series of prospects and termini Alexander envisioned the city as a performative entity capable of inscribing meaning into the very act of walking the streets.<sup>120</sup> A series of plans detailing a radical renovation of the small church of S. Salvatore in Onda on Via dei Pettinari, suggest that in the early 1660s Alexander VII also

---

<sup>118</sup> Krautheimer, *The Rome of Alexander VII*, 4-5.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>120</sup> See for example, Krautheimer's discussion on the "Illustrious Foreigner," in *The Rome of Alexander VII*, 131-148.

considered transforming the church and its urban environs into Alessandrine *teatro* at the southern end of Via Giulia, the very site of the Créqui Affair.<sup>121</sup>

Drawn in pen and ink and comprising five sheets, the plans for San Salvatore are the work of a young architect and assistant of Carlo Rainaldi named Gregorio Tomassini (figures 2-18 through 2-22).<sup>122</sup> According to Wittkower, the project, was probably designed as an individual submission shortly after Tomassini's training with Rainaldi, as Wittkower has suggested, or since he was already producing signed works, while he was still part of the studio.<sup>123</sup> If this is the case, it may have been completed a short time after the plans for S. Andrea della Valle and the second medal for Santa Maria in Campitelli, that is, after 29 September 1662.<sup>124</sup> Manfredo Tafuri has confirmed Wittkower's dating,

---

<sup>121</sup> S. Salvatore in Onda founded circa 1127, has undergone extensive renovations (the last in 1845 and in 1877, by Luca Carimini). The inclusion of "onda" in the church's name was probably a reference to the frequent flooding of the area from the Tiber. An attempt to stop this was made in the 17<sup>th</sup> century with the raising of the pavement. The annexed convent was first occupied by a confraternity devoted to St. Paul the Hermit, and later by a community of Augustinians. It later transferred into the ownership of Conventual Franciscans. Among them were two popes Franciscans Sixtus IV and Sixtus V. On S. Salvatore in Onda See *Le Chiese di Roma: Cenni religiosi, storici, artistici, San Salvatore in Onda a cura dell' Istituto di Studi Romani* (Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani 1947); Silvia Barchesi "S. Salvatore in Onda," *Roma Sacra* 13 May (1998): 14-18; and Valentina Valerio, "Commodità e maggior splendore": gli interventi settecenteschi nel complesso di San Salvatore in Onda tra ordinaria manutenzione e riattamenti straordinari," in *L'arte per i giubilei e tra i giubilei del Settecento: arciconfraternite, chiese, artisti* (Roma: Bonsignori, 1999), 161-174. Archival material consulted for this dissertation also includes the holdings of the Rome Archivio Generalizio, Ordine dei Frati Minori, Convento San Salvatore in Onda, Parrocchia 1627-1824.

<sup>122</sup> The plans are in 5 Sheets, located in a red leather volume, impressed with the Chigi arms, containing the documents and projects during the Chigi pontificate. The first publication of these works appeared in Luigi Huetter, "Un Progetto di Chiesa di Gregorio Tomassini," in *San Salvatore in Onda* (Rome: Marietti, 1947). While Tomassini would eventually become one of the first instructors of architecture at the Accademia di San Luca in 1672, little is known of his independent work beyond his training with Rainaldi. He was a member of the Accademia di San Luca since 1660, and a member of the Virtuosi dal Pantheon since 1680. Tomassini was also listed as one of the judges for the architectural competition of 1677 at the Accademia di San Luca. He died in April 1698. Gil Smith, *Architectural Diplomacy: Rome and Paris in the Late Baroque* (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1993), 27-32 and Wittkower, "Carlo Rainaldi," 256.

<sup>123</sup> Krautheimer, *The Rome of Alexander VII*, 90; Rudolf Wittkower, "Carlo Rainaldi and the Roman Baroque," *Art Bulletin* 19 (1937): 242-313.

<sup>124</sup> Although the plans are not dated, Wittkower ascertained an approximate date for the project based on formal similarities to three other works by Rainaldi of the same period: the facades of Santa Maria in Campitelli, and S. Andrea della Valle and the dome of S. Agnese. Gregorio Tomassini's early work as a draftsman can be seen in the first plans for S. Maria in Campitelli of 1658. These plans include two sheets with his signature but are considered by Wittkower as too conceptually advanced to have been conceived by anyone but Carlo Rainaldi. According to Wittkower, the projection of the facade of S. Salvatore in Onda

adding that the proposal does not reveal certain changes made to the piazza between the years 1670-72.<sup>125</sup>

As Krautheimer has noted, Alexander VII had an active hand in most of the major urban and architectural projects of his pontificate, leaving very few new projects to be pursued outside of his control.<sup>126</sup> This is in keeping with both Wittkower and Tafuri's consideration of Alexander's patronage of S. Salvatore in Onda. Neither author, however, examines how the changes outlined in the proposal are in keeping with the pope's *modus operandi* of urban transformation.<sup>127</sup> One of the accompanying sheets of the series reveals a sweeping renovation to the church and streets surrounding S. Salvatore in Onda, rotating the angle of the church 90 degrees so that the new facade faced the Piazza Ponte Sisto instead of its previous frontage on the narrow Via dei Pettinari. According to the plan, the rotated church would also be expanded to occupy the entire block between the lane adjacent to Palazzo Spada and Via dei Pettinari, spanning the entire length of the existing Piazza di Ponte. The project would have transformed the southern terminus of the Via Giulia into an Alessandrine hinge, creating a *teatro* visible from three directions:

---

most closely resembles Rainaldi's second plan for Santa Maria in Campitelli, which replaced the single story convex design with a double-story "aedicule" facade. There is no extant drawing of the facade elevation in this first series for Santa Maria in Campitelli. However, the foundation medal of 29 September 1662 (the date the cornerstone was laid) shows a high dome fronted by a single storey convex facade with a central broken aedicule. In addition, Tomassini borrowed from Rainaldi's conceptualization of the second-story of S. Andrea della Valle, and the projection of the dome from S. Agnese, which Rainaldi had planned but did not get to execute in 1653. Wittkower also attributes the stylistic elements of the strong horizontal emphasis on the first story entablature and the articulation of second-storey pediment (both are segmented inscribed in triangular with dentil molding) to Rainaldi's plans for S. Andrea della Valle. Rainaldi's projects for the facade lasted from 1661-1665, but a project elevation of the facade in 1662 (Wittkower, "Carlo Rainaldi," 260, fig. 20) reveals a strong visual correlation, especially in the second storey of Tomassini's facade, where, like in S. Maria in Campitelli, a segmented pediment is inscribed into a triangular one. Wittkower, "Carlo Rainaldi," 280, fig. 45. In all, Tomassini's plans for the S. Salvatore in Onda bear many formal similarities to the work of his teacher, resulting in what Wittkower has characterized as an awkward and "mediocre" composition by an inexperienced architect.

<sup>125</sup> Manfredo Tafuri, "L'Insula fronteggiante l'antica piazza di Ponte Sisto e la chiesa di San Salvatore in Onda, in *Via Giulia*, 505-510, 508.

<sup>126</sup> Krautheimer notes, however, this control may not have extended to private building projects such as family palaces. Krautheimer, *The Rome of Alexander VII*, 75, 77.

the Ponte Sisto, the Via Giulia and the Via dei Pettinari. Furthermore, the church and piazza complex of S. Salvatore in Onda would have added an elegant terminus to the Via Giulia, thereby capping both ends with pendant churches with S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini at its northern end.

Alexander's interest in this area must also be considered in the context of both his other ongoing projects and the church's urban situation. By creating such a nodal point, Alexander followed the urban interest of his papal predecessors: the piazza was already the site of a large offshoot of the Aqua Paola (the Fontanone) as well as the terminus of the Via Giulia, and a crossing point into Trastevere via the Ponte Sisto. It is also notable that Julius II had sought financing for his street from Alexander VII's grand uncle, Agostino Chigi, and perhaps a continuation of this legacy was another reason the pope saw it fit to add a Chigian mark to the space.<sup>128</sup> Finally, during the fifteenth century both Sixtus IV (Francesco della Rovere, 1471-1484) and Sixtus V (Felice Peretti, 1585-1590) had resided in the Franciscan community at S. Salvatore in Onda before their elevation to the papacy. Alexander was currently involved with the renovations of two other churches founded by Sixtus IV in which the Chigi family had chapels: Santa Maria del Popolo and Santa Maria della Pace.<sup>129</sup> The renovation of the S. Salvatore in Onda would have reinforced Chigi's della Rovere connections. It is also significant that Alexander was not

---

<sup>128</sup> It was also not the first of Alexander's projects on the Via Giulia; the precedent had been established early in his pontificate with the building of a prison that also housed the soldiers of the Corsican Guard close to the northern end of Via Giulia in 1656. The project had been initiated by Innocent X, who died before its completion. Manfredo Tafuri, "Le 'Carceri Nuove' e le case di correzione per i minorenni," in *Via Giulia*, 359-369.

<sup>129</sup> Another possible indication of this connection is the external decoration of the church façade and its plan. A central plan, which suggests a votive dedication could be for the recent plague but the sculptural decoration also suggests a Marian dedication, the pediment is topped by the heart and sword of the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the center right sculpture figures the Virgin offering a heart pierced by nails. This was also the impetus for Alexander's renovation of S. Maria in Campitelli, which was designed to house a miracle-working Marian icon formerly housed in S. Maria in Portico. Wittkower, "Carlo Rainaldi," 278.

implementing changes to any other church in the immediate area. Following a south-west trajectory, San Salvatore in Onda would have served as the midpoint between S. Andrea della Valle and another ongoing Chigi project, Santa Maria in Trastevere, strategically placed at the only connecting point to Trastevere in the southern part of the city. This area was already noted on a record of a papal walk on 19 December 1658, recording stops around the Palazzo Farnese, and again on 9 January 1659, when the pope passed from S. Andrea della Valle to the Ponte Sisto, crossing to view S. Maria in Trastevere, and then finally to the project for the pyramid of Cestius in Ripa.<sup>130</sup>

The factors noted above may have all contributed to Alexander's interest in developing the site. The events of 20 August 1662, however, must also be considered for they add new significance to both Alexander's plans for the church and the urban impact of the incident itself. Indeed, if Tomassini's plans were produced after 29 September, as the designs suggest, the project was initiated in the wake of the Créqui affair, perhaps even after the completion of the pyramid designed to humiliate the pope and brand the space as French territory. Claimed by the French as part of their precinct in Rome, this area was the same space that Alexander intended to transform. Within steps from the Piazza di SS Trinità dei Pellegrini, the church's new dome would have been the defining feature of the area. Furthermore, as the crime documents of 1662 testify, the church's proposed frontage on the Piazza di Ponte was at the heart of the crime zone of the French ambassador's precinct. The project would have completely reconceptualized the experience of urban space in the area, utilizing the axes of visibility of the existing urban

---

<sup>130</sup> Richard Krautheimer and Roger B. Jones, "The Diary of Alexander VII: Notes on Art, Artists, and Buildings," *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 15 (1975): 199-233, 210.

thoroughfares to form an elegant Chigian *teatro*, thereby integrating the area into the comprehensive urban scheme of Alessandrine Rome.

The renovated church of S. Salvatore in Onda never materialized.<sup>131</sup> Monetary concerns were likely a significant factor; Tomassini's plans would have required a significant investment during a period in which the pope already had several ongoing projects. But it may be also be that Alexander could not have anticipated the severe measures Louis XIV would implement in the wake of the Créqui affair, including the defense of his expansive diplomatic precinct. Because the plans can only be approximately dated between 29 September 1662 and Alexander's death on 22 May 1667, there is no way of knowing whether the French controversy was also the cause of the project's demise. During this period, however, this area was consistently claimed by the French as their own. Therefore the plans suggest a conscious effort to reclaim a space fraught with controversy since the arrival of the Duc de Créqui. Thus, the urban ambitions of the pope and the king were in direct conflict, with Louis XIV prevailing over this space, at least for a time. Alexander did not live to see a loosening of Louis' grip over the quarter, an act celebrated by the ceremonial destruction of the pyramid in 1668. But even this period of armistice was short lived, as is demonstrated by the controversy over the *droit de quartier* in the 1680s.<sup>132</sup>

### **The French Quarter in the Absence of an Ambassador: 1665 and 1668**

The Duc de Créqui returned to Rome on 31 May 1664. The king's instructions to Créqui stated that one of the ambassador's primary missions was to monitor the pope's

---

<sup>131</sup> I have found no note of it in the published portions of Alexander's diary.

<sup>132</sup> The controversy over the quarter during the latter half of the seventeenth century is discussed at length in Chapter 4.

implementation of the stipulations of the Treaty of Pisa. He also required that Créqui refuse to participate in the activities of the Roman court (including the Easter celebrations) and to cut off contact with former allies who had intervened on the pope's behalf, including Queen Christina of Sweden, Cardinal Azzolini, and Cardinal Orsini.<sup>133</sup> Moüy has characterized the remainder of Créqui's embassy as successful, despite a climate of hostility in the Roman court and the ambassador's dissatisfaction with the management of his affairs during his hiatus.<sup>134</sup> According to Gérin, however, he was recalled less than a year after he arrived as the king heard too many complaints of his ill temper and indecorous behavior.<sup>135</sup> This is confirmed by a number of letters written by Lionne and de la Bussière, his Maître de la Chambre, regarding the ambassador's conduct at the palace, including gambling and refusing to pay previous debts.<sup>136</sup> Unfortunately, neither Gérin nor Moüy make note of the management of the French quarter after Créqui's return to Paris, although some criticism of the local guards' actions at the Campo dei Fiori by Bourlemont in January and February of 1665 suggest that its maintenance and defense were still a priority.<sup>137</sup> Créqui departed for Paris in March of 1665, leaving the post of ambassador in Rome unfilled until the arrival of the Duc de

---

<sup>133</sup> Moüy, *L'Ambassade du Duc de Créquy*, 2: 368-371.

<sup>134</sup> On Créqui's return see Moüy, *L'Ambassade du Duc de Créquy*, vol. 2, 365-422, in particular 377-380. Cardinal Orsini, however, regained French favor when he refused a Spanish bid for his alliance. Dandeleit, *Spanish Rome*, 204.

<sup>135</sup> Gérin also notes the numerous complaints of the M. de la Bussière, the ambassador's Maître de la Chambre, who accused him of being malevolent, greedy, and even violent. (de la Bussière to Lionne, AMAE Rome vol. 168, 24 March, f. 70, 31 March, f.89, cited in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 568-569.

<sup>136</sup> Letter of Lionne to Louis XIV, 2 December 1664 (AMAE Rome, vol. 162, foliation not given), cited in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 568. Letter of Bourlemont to Lionne, 28 April 1665 (AMAE Rome, 168, foliation not given), cited in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 575-576.

<sup>137</sup> Unfortunately, as the microfilm for this volume (168) is missing from the collection of AMAE, I was unable to verify if any territorial disputes had occurred during this period. Bourlemont does mention briefly an incident in which the local guard at Campo dei Fiori crossed within view of the palace, but does not elaborate on Créqui's reaction. AMAE Rome, vol. 165 f.4r [15 January] and f. 140r [23 February 1665], Bourlemont to Lionne.



Chaulnes in July of 1666. In the absence of an ambassador, however, some of the most interesting debates on extraterritoriality arose between members of the French faction remaining in Rome and the court in Paris: namely concerning the preconditions that defined a French space, especially in the absence of the living representative of the king. The embassy of Créqui had a lasting effect on the public association of the Palazzo Farnese as a royal residence. A circular dispatch from Rome to Paris of 4 May 1665 included the following notation: *Il palazzo Farnesiano é dichiarato palazzo regio e vi restiano l'armi de X'mo, dovendo essere perpetua residenza de suoi Ambasciatore.*<sup>138</sup> According to the author of the dispatch (not given), the royal distinction was based on the continued appearance of the royal arms, and the subsequent supposition that the palace would remain leased to the King of France. In a letter of the same date, Bourlemont confirmed to Lionne that the arms had not been taken down with the departure of Créqui, justifying his decision by noting that certain members of the ambassadorial household remained in residence.<sup>139</sup> The simultaneous presence of the arms and absence of an ambassador, however, proved to be problematic, for while the view of the arms on the palace first signaled to an urban onlooker entry into the French quarter, the absence of person of the ambassador no longer allowed for the extension of the royal view (as embodied by the king's personal representative) to demarcate this space.

That this was a point of considerable concern is suggested by Bourlemont's continual preoccupation with the presence of the royal arms. In August of 1665, a

---

<sup>138</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 169, f. 16v, [4 May 1665], "Nouvelles de Rome."

<sup>139</sup> AMAE Rome, vol. 169, 18v [4 May 1665]. "Je n'ay fait ôter les Armes du Roy de dessus le palais farnese, M. le Duc (de Parma) ne me l'ayant ordonné pas et M. de la Buissiere, maître de Chambre des Ambassadeurs y etant encor logé et quelques (autres?) de la Famille de M. le Ambassadeur."

complaint made by de la Bussière to Bourlemont about an execution that occurred in the Piazza Farnese, prompted him to write a lengthy explanation of his dilemma.

M. de la Bussière in his zeal to serve the King desires to conserve the immunity or the *franchise* within the piazza and environs of the Palazzo Farnese because the arms of His Majesty are visible on the palace, saying that it is almost as if the king were in possession of it, and wants to know my opinion. I said to him that I would not advise him to declare his claim so strongly. Although he is not present, it is quite true that the Palazzo Farnese is considered a house of the Duke of Parma, his agent in residence and in possession of the keys and disposed of everything excluding the apartment of M. de la Bussière. However, with the arms of the king presently on the door, the Governor of Rome is obliged, it would seem to me, to pay a particular respect to a palace whose entry is honored by the said arms. [O]f all the palaces with this distinction, the palaces of the faction of cardinals are the most important by reason of the royal arms by which they are honored. [B]ut regarding the immunity of the environs, I believe *that the person of a minister must be present in this court in order to carry the immunity over to the houses in view*, and on this matter the palace of the ambassador of Spain, who is from the Catholic King, is never without the presence of a minister who holds the right and this was the reason that Cardinal d'Aragon, after the departure of D. Ponce de Leon, went to live there leaving his own [palace]. And presently, even here, if Ministers are not of the highest rank, they are not able to assert the immunity of the environs.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> Letter of Bourlemont to Lionne, AMAE Rome vol. 170 ff. 291r -293r [23 August 1665]. "M. de la Bussiere m'est venu trouver et m'a donné part d'un Demelé qu'il a eu avec le barigelle pour des Sbirres qui avaient fait une Execution en la place de Palais Farnaise contre un voleur qui s'était retiré dans la franchise de l'église de Ste Brigide située en la dit place. Les sbirres disent avoir eu la license du Cardinal viquaire du Pape et du Cardinal Protecteur du cette Eglise pour chercher en cedit lieu./M. de la Bussiere meu de zele pour le service du Roy desirerait conserver d'immunité ou le franchise de dans la place et aus l'environs du Palais Farnese a cause des Armes de S. Mte qui sont sur ledit palais disant qu'il était quasi comme en possession de cela et desirant savoir mon avis la dessus[--]/Je luy ay dit que je ne luy conseillais pas de se declare hautement de cette pretantion la qui (fait) souvant naître des Embarras au Ambassadeurs meme presans icy a qui cela est deu absolument. Il est bien vray que le Palais Farnaise quoyqu'il ne fût pas a presant considere comme un Maison du Duc de Parme, Son Agent y etant en tenant les clefs et disposant de tout ce qui y est hors l'Apartement de M. del Bussiere, toutefois les Armes du Roy etant sur la porte le Gouvernor de Rome devait ce me samble faire porter un particulier respect a un Palais dont l'Entree est honoree desdites Armes et cette qui fesait a ici que les Palais des Cardinaux Factionnaires etaient plus consideres que les autres a cause des Armes des Roy dont ils sont honores, mais que pour l'immunité des Environs je croyais qu'il faillait la personne d'un Ministre presant en cette cour pour la porter aux maisons voisines, et par ce sujet le Palais de Ambassadeur d'Espagne qui est au Roy Catholique n'est jamais sans la presance d'un Ministre pour tenir [--] ces droit la et ce fut la raison pourquoy le Cardinal d'Arragon apres le depart de D. Ponce de Leon l'alla habiter quittant celuy qu'il avoit, et l'on pretant meme que tous Ministres s'ils ne sont des plus qualities ne peuvent pas faire valoir l'immunité des Environs croy qu'il en soit j'approvais que par adresse M. de la Buissier maintint ce qu'il pourrait de cette jurisdiction mais qu'il faillait pour l'en declare hautement qu'il attendis vos ordres, Monseigneur..." I have only included relevant sections of this text, as it appears in a more complete dispatch to the royal court written by Bourlemont, who at the time fulfilled the duties of an ambassador, as his position of Auditor the Rota allowed

This passage suggests the precarious foundation on which the conventions of extraterritoriality lay. By drawing an analogy to the continued ownership of the Duke of Parma, despite his absence from the palace, Bourlemont makes a case that a similar privilege should apply to the palace's renter, the King of France. Bourlemont recognized and endorsed the power of the arms even in the absence of the ambassador, claiming that the Governor of Rome should still respect any house that bore the arms, above all those that belonged to the French faction of cardinals. According to Bourlemont, the royal arms constituted royal presence and secured the immunity of the palace itself. The extension of this immunity to the surrounding streets, however, continued to depend upon a personal, embodied representative.

In his resolution, Bourlemont turned to the example of Spain, recognizing in the smooth transition of power from ambassador to ambassador, that there was never a question of relinquishing the rights of their quarter. Bourlemont emphasizes, however, this representative must be a minister of the king, thus eliminating de la Bussière as a candidate because his duties were limited to household management. I do not think Bourlemont's concern stemmed simply from questions of rank, however, but rather expressed an anxiety to preserve a chain of command that led directly back to the king. Only a minister who received orders from the king could represent his interests in places wherever he was not physically present. According to Bourlemont's interpretation of past practice, this representation was also optical: a minister who could speak on the king's behalf was qualified to *see* in his place as well.

In the conclusion of his letter, Bourlemont integrated the issues of royal arms into a larger theoretical argument on diplomatic representation. The minister instructed de la

Bussièrre to maintain the jurisdiction as best he could, but that he must do so in strict accordance to the orders of Lionne, adding that it was not advantageous for the French to risk another incident with local justice. He followed this remark with a statement on the representative duties of those in the king's employ: "Per traittant d'engager non seulement nôtre seule personne mais encore le bien des affaires du Prince ce qui nous doit être plus cher que la vie." By endorsing the obfuscation or even displacement of one's own person for the pursuit of the interests of the king, Bourlemont essentially echoed the sentiments of French diplomatic theorists such as Le Moyne and Bouhours, who considered the king's representatives as extensions of his own sovereign power.<sup>141</sup> By contextualizing this discussion in the framework of extraterritoriality, however, Bourlemont applied the emerging discourse on the king's representation to architectural and the urbanistic concerns.

The resilience of this issue is suggested by the fact that de la Bussièrre wrote of a similar concern over the protection precinct four years later, again during a period between ambassadors. In a letter to Lionne, dated 8 October 1668, de la Bussièrre underscored the increasing difficulty of defining the quarter in the absence of an ambassador:

On the subject of the arms of the king which are always on the Palazzo Farnese awaiting a new ambassador, there isn't a single person who does not whisper of the privileges and immunities that they allow and that the Spanish and Venetians even in the absence of their ambassadors conserve very carefully, as the pope Alexander VII although haughty and unpleasant has always put up with them. I dare to very humbly beg of your Excellency to address [this matter], since one should consider well and respect the arms of our great monarch just as much and more than those of Spain and Venice.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> See my discussion in Chapter 1.

<sup>142</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 193, ff. 209r-210v, de la Bussièrre to Lionne. "...Sur le sujet des armes du roy qui sont toujours au palais Farnese en attendans un nouveau ambassadeur n'y ayant ny personne qui murmure des

Is it important to remember that in the 1660s the practice of extraterritoriality had not yet been codified and only with its abolition by Innocent XI in the 1680s did a theoretical discourse emerge in texts both justifying and decrying its existence. These letters, however, suggest by the 1660s a debate had already begun to emerge on its practicalities, one directly connected to broader discussions on diplomatic representation as a whole. Furthermore, as de la Bussière and Bourlemont's comments both reveal, the French also turned to the examples of other foreign powers as a benchmark for the exercise of extraterritoriality, using Rome as a laboratory in which to test the legitimacy of these claims.

Venice and Spain were also the only foreign states in Rome to have purchased their own palaces.<sup>143</sup> Spain's example was particularly relevant for the French not only because of their rivalry with the power, but also because of the Spanish embassy's location at the base of the French-claimed Pincian hill. In 1647 the Spanish Ambassdaor, Iñigo Veles de Guevara, the Count of Oñate purchased the Palazzo Mondescalchi through an Italian agent, Bernardino Barber, and from that point forward the Palazzo di Spagna became the center of Spanish political ritual and the seat of the Spanish faction in Rome.<sup>144</sup> From 1654 to 1656, Philip IV sponsored a series of renovations to the palace, and with its expansion came increased claims to extraterritorial space. Unlike the French,

---

privileges et immunités quelles données et que les Espagnoles et les Venetiens en l'absence même de leur ambassadeurs conservent très soigneusement. Le Pape Alexandre VII quoy que fier et facheux l'ayant toujours souffert. J'ose donc supplier très humblement votre Excellence de vouloir faire réflexion la dessus puis que les armes de nôtre grand Monarque méritent bien que qu'on les considère et qu'on les respecte autant et plus que celle d'Espagne et de Venis."

<sup>143</sup> Alessandra Anselmi, "Il Quartiere del Ambasciata di Spagna a Roma," *La Città Italiana: Luoghi degli stranieri, xiv-xviii secolo*, eds. Donatella Calabi and Paolo Lanaro (Rome: Laterza, 1998), 206-221.

<sup>144</sup> The Spanish ambassadors had already been renting Palazzo Mondescalchi for about a decade prior. The palace was sold with permission by the Congregation of the Barons of the Papal State for 22,000 escudos. Dandele, *Spanish Rome*, 205.

however, the Spanish made a concerted effort early on to map the boundaries of their precinct. The first plan of the Spanish quarter was produced just a few years prior to the rental of the Palazzo Farnese in 1660, after an altercation between the Luiz de Guzman, the Spanish ambassador and Governor Imperiali.<sup>145</sup> While de la Bussière uses the example of other states to bolster France's own claim, it is important to distinguish a fundamental difference in approach. Through mapping, the Spanish gave their quarter definitive boundaries, something the French did not wish to do. Rather, as the discussions between French officials in Rome and Paris suggest, their claim continued to rely on symbols of royal presence and visual encounter in the urban environment. In this way, French territory in Rome was inscribed by the act of looking upon the city, and moving through it.

The embassy of the Duc de Créqui and the interim years between the arrival of his replacement, the Duc de Chaulnes, both served as test cases for the rights of extraterritoriality of the French in Rome. In many ways, they also exemplify the two extremes of the French response: the first resulting in the violent defense and militarization of the quarter, the second marked by uncertainty of its very boundaries. The embassy of the Duc de Chaulnes may be considered a third case, characterized by a slackening of the defense of French territory in the aim of preserving diplomatic concord between France and the Holy See. Unlike that of his predecessor, the arrival of Chaulnes in Rome was marked by celebration. The ambassador noted that the Roman people stood on the street corners shouting "*Vive le Roy*" and filled the piazza drinking and setting off

---

<sup>145</sup> Anselmi, "Il Quartiere del Ambasciata di Spagna a Roma," 208-211. A copy of this plan is reproduced in Anselmi, figure 2. The quarter designated by this plan included several blocks surrounding the Piazza di Spagna as well as the entirety of Pincian Hill. As I will discuss in the following chapter, this second claim was contested by the French in their own effort to brand the hillside as their own.

fireworks.<sup>146</sup> This general tenor of amity would continue over the course of Chaulnes' embassy and, notably, there is little evidence in the archives of skirmishes in the French precinct during this time or of complaints made by the ambassador regarding the execution of local justice.<sup>147</sup>

The new level of peace between France and Rome was partially due to a decisive shift in foreign policy with the new pope, Clement IX (1668-1669). The French faction had supported the candidacy of Giulio Rospigliosi, who was elected on 20 June 1668. Papal briefs introduced by Alexander VII condemning Gallican supporters in France had been refused by Louis XIV, but were now accepted by the king, in part through the skillful negotiation of Chaulnes. Furthermore, Clement and Louis XIV embarked on a joint initiative to curb the propagation of Jansenism in France, which had begun to spread through the publication of texts at the Sorbonne, and reached audiences as diverse as the nuns of Port Royale, the nobility, and the parochial clergy.<sup>148</sup> Despite new levels of accord on ecclesiastical matters, however, Louis XIV still refused to consider the papacy as a viable mediator in affairs of state. In 1668, the king denied Clement's attempts to conduct the negotiations for the conclusion of the War of Devolution in Rome, moving them instead to Aquisgrana where the treaty was signed on 2 May 1668.<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 177, f.76r (undated). Chaulnes to Louis XIV. This letter was likely written shortly after the ambassador's arrival on 10 July 1666. Chaulnes was appointed ambassador in May of 1666.

<sup>147</sup> I have found only one example of a dispute between the ambassador and the local government during the period of the Duc de Chaulnes' embassy, a case in which the guard at Campo dei Fiori passed in front of the arms of the king. Chaulnes, however, negotiated with the head of the guard and resolved the issue without further altercation. AMAE Rome, Volume 183 f.160r [6 May 1667], Chaulnes to Lionne. A list of requirements that accompanied the ambassador to Rome continued to preserve the jurisdictional rights of the quarter, forbidding the Roman officials to enter or conduct searches in it. See AMAE Rome, Supplement 6 (1665-1668), f. 260r.

<sup>148</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 351-360.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, 414-415. Dandeleet concludes that the choice of Aquisgrana was an indication that Rome was no longer of importance to the French, especially in light of the Spanish increase in reputation after the Créqui affair. I would argue, however, that this is consistent with Louis XIV's attempts to neutralize any influence of the pope in political affairs. Dandeleet, *Spanish Rome*, 208-209.

While the pope was only allowed a marginal role in the negotiations, his image was the central figure in the *apparato* commissioned to celebrate the Peace of Aquisgrana (figure 2-23).<sup>150</sup> Taking place on 27 June 1668, the festival was hosted by the Duc de Chaulnes who commissioned Bernini to design a pyrotechnical and sculptural display on the Piazza Farnese. The *apparato* consisted of a globe surmounted by the figure of the Church (crowned by the papal tiara and holding the keys of St. Peter), at whose feet kneeled figures of War and Victory. War was depicted laying her sword down in defeat, while Victory offered palm branches to the Church. The ensemble was surrounded by pyrotechnical flames, while the facade of the palace was decorated with illuminated fleur de lys.<sup>151</sup> Preliminary drawings by Bernini reveal that he had originally conceived of the two kneeling figures as France and Spain, offering their crowns to the Church (figure 2-24). This may have been too overt a statement of submission, for while the event was designed to celebrate peace between the Most Catholic and the Most Christian kings, the latter had not allowed the papacy to interfere with the pursuit of his own territorial interests.

The festival marked another turning point in Franco-papal relations: the ceremonial destruction of the pyramid ordered by Louis XIV on 31 May 1668.

---

<sup>150</sup> The War of Devolution was prompted by Louis XIV's attempts to annex Spanish Habsburg holdings in the Netherlands and Franche-Comté that he claimed had passed to him through his wife, Marie Thèrese. Ultimately, Louis XIV was forced to relinquish these gains after the formation of a triple alliance by England, Sweden and the Dutch Republic, proving the war to be costly and relatively ineffective for the French king.

<sup>151</sup> Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco, *La festa barocca* (Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1997), 458-460, Fagiolo and Carandini, *L'Effimero Barocco*, 49, 128, 141-142; Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 617-618. On the discussion of Bernini's preliminary designs see Heinrich Brauer and Rudolf Wittkower, *Die Zeichnungen des Gianlorenzo Bernini* (Berlin: H. Keller, 1931); Anthony Blunt and Herward Lester Cooke, *The Roman Drawings on the XVII and XVIII Centuries in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle* (London: Phaidon, 1960); and Marc Worsdale, "Bernini Studio Drawings for a Catafalque and Fireworks, 1668," *Burlington Magazine* 120, 904 (July 1978): 462-466. See also, Rudolf Wittkower, *Bernini's Bust of Louis XIV* (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), 10.



According to Pastor and Gérin, this act of diplomacy was made in return for papal concessions to Louis XIV's appointments in the dioceses of newly acquired territories of Metz, Toul, Verdun, Arras, and Belgium.<sup>152</sup> With this in mind I would argue that while the destruction of the pyramid removed a significant marker of French dominion in Rome, the gesture itself still held territorial meaning, as it was prompted by the relinquishment of papal control of newly acquired French lands. Furthermore, the celebration itself was a public demonstration of French control, substituting the militaristic command of the space with the marvels of festive display.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter I have traced the emergence of French extraterritoriality in Rome, from the early negotiations for the Palazzo Farnese in 1661 to the departure of the Duc de Chaulnes in 1669 and the subsequent uncertainties brought about by the absence of a residential ambassador. My primary focus has been on the development of a discourse associated with the jurisdictional rights of French embassy, which emerged, in part, from the larger effort by the Louis XIV to exercise personal control over every aspect of his foreign policy and diplomatic engagement. This discourse manifested as a unique form of urban authorship. While a range of private families and ecclesiastical institutions had shaped the city through formal and informal negotiations, the urban impact of foreign states was based on the fundamentally different premise of legal autonomy. By imposing their own legal systems within their precincts, foreign principals created small territorial enclosures within the very hearts of other states. This demarcation of territory raises significant questions about the locations and patterns of statecraft and the role of the

---

<sup>152</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 418; Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 227.

capital city as both a center and periphery for the construction and representation of nationhood.

The case of France in Rome also raises interesting questions about architectural authorship and ownership in the early modern period. With the rental of the Palazzo Farnese, the French capitalized on existing urban configurations laid out by various popes, in turn subverting and redefining the political agenda behind their initial design. While the French at times resorted to violence in defense of their claims, the modes by which they sustained a presence on the city were primarily optically driven: marking of territorial bounds by visual encounter, not just by the ambassador himself but of any passerby (regardless of his own national affiliation) who encountered the sign of French dominion, the royal crest. The dual nature of this visual encounter, both of and from the palace, was unique to French extraterritoriality in Rome. Furthermore, it capitalized on the axially of the palace's formal design, a key feature that defined the work's urban impact.<sup>153</sup> One only need recall Michelangelo's plan for orthogonal in the Piazza Farnese to note the French appreciation of the Palazzo Farnese's unique potential in this regard. Ultimately, it was the combination of three elements that defined the marking of French territory in Rome. In addition to the viewing subject and the palace as portrait by means of the royal arms, it was the ambassador's own prospecting eye which evoked and supported the link between the sovereign and his representative abroad. Only by standing in the place of the king, could the urban dimensions of French territory be activated in Rome, and this view spanned as "far as the eye could see."

---

<sup>153</sup> Marvin Trachtenberg, *Dominion of the Eye: Urbanism, Art, and Power, in Early Modern Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 239-240. Trachtenberg defines axially as "the shaping of form and space around one or more linear axes" one of the formative features of an optical and perspectival building model.

## Chapter 3

### ‘Nôtre Montaigne’: Designating the Pincio as Royal Territory

#### Introduction

According to a sixteenth-century legend, French hegemony on the Pincian Hill began with a transgressive urban act. The French faction of the Friars Minor (Minims) at Trinità dei Monti organized a procession with their brothers at S. Andrea delle Fratte. The members of other nations were grouped together, and when the group arrived at the threshold of the Trinità, the French faction quickly entered and locked the doors behind them, expelling their Italian and Spanish brethren from the monastery forever. While the authenticity of this account is dubious, the narrative illustrates two themes fundamental to both the historiography and the history of French presence on the Pincio.<sup>1</sup> It describes a unified French faction pitted against a non-French contingent, and, if we can imagine the act as it unfolded at the threshold of the church, a very public display of territorialization along national lines. Historically, the struggle for French preeminence on this site was neither spontaneous nor unified, but its proponents did rely heavily on public assertions of power to articulate their claim.

---

<sup>1</sup> A wealth of scholarship on the monastery and the order was produced in the early twentieth century, and continues to serve as the basis for scholarly research on Trinità dei Monti. The most authoritative history on the Minims of Trinità dei Monti remains Fourrier Bonnard's monograph published in 1933. Conceived as a general history of the order, Bonnard draws from the records of the Pieux Établissements, which include seventeenth-century chronicles on the order, correspondence of the brothers, and inventories from the monastery's collection and library (two major inventories were taken in 1654 and 1774) and correspondence from the Ministère des Affaires étrangères. Pieux Établissements Français: Liasses 215-231, 238-250; Registres 235-243, 349-351, and 242. Bonnard also consulted Padre C. P. Martin's history of the Minims at Trinità dei Monti, completed in 1806 and published in part by Calmet (Pierre Calmet, "Une fondation française a Rome, La Trinité des Monts," *Annales de Saint Louis-des-Français*, 9 (1904-1905): 198-219. Martin's work is also located at the Archives des Dames du Sacré-Coeur a la Trinité du Mont under the title "Histoire du couvent royal des Minimes français de la très sainte Trinité in Monte Pincio à Rome.(ms. in-4, three books: 161, 219, 431 pages) Liasse 240 n. 4.. This story was recounted by the Bonnard at the beginning of a chapter devoted to the "Le Grande Querelle" over French privilege at the monastery. Fourrier Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royal de la Trinité du Mont Pincio à Rome* (Rome and Paris, 1933), 81.

In this chapter I trace the foundations for the French claim to the Pincio, focusing on the activities of the French order of Minims in the struggle for French predominance on the site. The chapter begins with a historical overview of the dispute over the designation of the monastery as a royal institution, initiated by the controversy surrounding the foundation of the monastery at the turn of the fifteenth century. This controversy continued into the mid-1660s, factionalizing the membership of the monastery, until direct intervention by Louis XIV definitively closed the debate in favor of the French claim. The Minims' preoccupation with the order's "true foundational origins" was the primary motivation behind their pursuit to concretize the new affiliation through art and architecture, using patronage to legitimize and revise a historical narrative rife with contradictions.

The second half of this chapter examines the activities of the friars from 1662 to 1670, a period in which the French faction at Trinità dei Monti fought for the governance of the monastery against their Italian and Spanish brothers, and pursued multiple and controversial strategies to promote French hegemony on the Pincio. From the early sixteenth through the mid-seventeenth century, the Pincio was the site of a dispute between the French crown and the Roman government, each claiming jurisdiction over and the building rights for the land connecting the Piazza di Spagna and the monastery and church of Trinità dei Monti above.<sup>2</sup> The effort to establish control over the hillside

---

<sup>2</sup> This area was also a zone of competing interests among French, Spanish, and Roman officials with the Spanish embassy and papal Congregation of the Propaganda Fide flanking each side of the piazza below. Tod Marder has discussed the iconography of the Barcaccia fountain as a papal "reminder" of Spain's loyalty to the Holy See while Andrea Anselmi has documented Spain's extension of its quarter in the area. Tod Marder, "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps: From Project to Monument," in *Projects and Monuments in the Period of the Roman Baroque*, eds. Helmut Hager and Susan Munshower (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1984), 83-95; Alessandra Anselmi, "Il Quartiere del Ambasciata di Spagna a Roma," in *La città italiana e i luoghi degli stranieri XIV-XVIII secolo*, eds. D. Calabi and P. Lanaro (Rome: Bari, 1998), 206-221. The iconography and attribution of the fountain has

affected a wide range of issues including the internal organization and membership of the monastery, the selection of generals of the order of Minims, land management on the Pincio, and, perhaps most notably, the commission and construction of the monumental staircase, known today as the Spanish Steps.<sup>3</sup>

One significant motivation behind the battle for control of the Pincio was its urban prominence. A defining feature of Roman urbanism was the city's hilly topography. Many groups – including the papacy, and the civic government of Rome – capitalized on the far-reaching prospects and sweeping vistas offered by elevated sites to create highly visible marks of power in the city. Lying on the northeastern edge of the city, the Pincio's direct proximity to Rome's urban core made it one of the most visible elevated sites in seventeenth-century Rome. Its urban situation had already been considered in relation to its defensive value as the site of a proposed fortress during the pontificate of Paul III, which, while never actualized, prompted the construction of one of the city's most

---

also been examined by Howard Hibbard and Irma Jaffe, "Bernini's Barcaccia," in *Burlington Magazine*, 106 (1964): 159-170. Robert Stalla has examined the notion of Spanish as well as Jesuit influence in the development and management of the congregation and its architecture in "Architektur im Dienst der Politik: Borrominis Kirchenbau der Propaganda Fide in Rom; ein jesuitischer Bautypus für die Zentrale der Weltmission," *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 29 (1994): 289-341. Discussion of this plan has most recently appeared in the exhibition *Roma Barocca*, eds. Marcello Fagiolo and Paolo Portoghesi (Rome: Electa, 2006), 242-248.

<sup>3</sup> The realization of the staircase over the course of the second half of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was one of the most controversial exercises of French influence over a building project in Rome. During this period, the evolution of the project embodied the interests of both papal and French factions, affecting every aspect of its patronage including the iconographic program, the appointment of architects, and the allocation of building funds. Cesare D'Onofrio's account of its building history is an authoritative synthesis of previous scholarship. Cesare D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma* (Roma: Stabilimento A. Staderini, 1974). D'Onofrio drew upon the published archival research of several authors to offer a critical account of the project's evolution. Foremost were Pio Pecchiai's publication of the Minims' archives Pio Pecchiai, "Regesti dei documenti patrimoniali del monasterio romano della Trinità dei Monti," *Archivi*, 25 (1958) : 131-240; Luigi Salerno, *Piazza di Spagna* (Cava dei Terreni, 1967); Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royal*, 1933; Wolfgang Lotz, "Die Spanische Treppe. Architektur als Mittel der Diplomatie," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 12 (1969): 39-94; Madeleine Laurain-Portemer "Mazarin, Benedetti et l'Escalier de la Trinité des Monts," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 102 (1968): 273-294. The history of the French involvement in the project is also discussed by Calmet, "Une fondation française a Rome, 1905; and, following Pecchiai, Carlo Alberto Ferrari, *Curiosità storiche e odierne realtà su: I viventi diritti dell' Italia a Palazzo Farnese alla scalinata ed alla Trinità de' Monti in Roma dal 1865 al 1965* (Rome: Edizioni d'arte, 1965).

important east-west arteries, the Via Trinitatis.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the Pincian hill rose directly above one of the most populated areas: the urban quarter surrounding the Piazza di Spagna, where the long east-west thoroughfare of the Via Condotti transects the Via Babuino and the Via del Corso (figure 3-1).<sup>5</sup> The French desire to capitalize on the power of the unimpeded view (both of and from the hill), informed their pursuit of control over the Pincio, especially in the face of competing efforts by the papacy and the Spanish crown. Unlike the Roman government or the Holy See, however, the French crown in Rome did not have rights to govern in Rome. Rather, the French crown and its constituencies in Rome turned to other tools in their arsenal, including traditions associated with divine right of Kings, the political dependency of the papacy on France, and the currency associated with the visual display of power in the built environment in order to demonstrate its own authority in the city. As a result, over the course of the seventeenth century, the Pincio became publicly recognized as a French site, entering into a dialogue with both the Capitoline and the Quirinale, the acknowledged topographical citadels of civic and ecclesiastical rule.

Because little progress was made in the planning and execution of the Spanish steps in the 1660s, scholars have often considered this period as a hiatus in the building history.<sup>6</sup> The efforts of the Minims during this period, however, had lasting effects on the

---

<sup>4</sup> Richard Ingersoll, "Piazza di Ponte and the Military Origins of Panopticism," in *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, eds. Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro, and Richard Ingersoll (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994) 177-188, 182-183.

<sup>5</sup> The area, part of the rione of Campo Marzio, was considered an international enclave in the city, with both the Spanish Embassy and the Greek National Church and College, S. Atanasio dei Greci, as well as the residences of numerous foreign artists, including Claude Lorraine, Nicolas Poussin, and several of the Dutch and Flemish genre painters, known as the Bamboccianti. The zone also included several papal residences including the family palaces of the Borghese and the Medici.

<sup>6</sup> Neither D'Onofrio nor Pecchiai explore how the period of the 1660s factored into other political and urban displays of French hegemony in Rome. Marder notes the continued tension during this period over control of the hillside, but focuses on the development of the planning prior to Mazarin's death and with the

transformation of the hillside into a French stronghold in Rome. This overlooked chapter in the building history of the Spanish Steps is not only key to understanding the political motivations that informed the work as it was eventually built, but also demonstrates the implementation of strategic (and unconventional) forms of urban planning to secure French control over the staircase from its inception to its eventual completion.

### **Foundational Myths: The Establishment of Trinità dei Monti**

The national divisions that have framed the historiography of this site have created several nebulous and often conflicting accounts of the early modern history of Trinità dei Monti and its affiliation. The authors of the earliest modern French histories on Trinità dei Monti (most notably Bonnard, Calmet, and Vidal) considered the French privilege an *a priori* condition of the monastery from the moment of its foundation.<sup>7</sup> These authors drew from accounts of the monastery's history written during the prolonged conflict over the French privilege in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries: histories written by Minim Friars P. Peyrinis, P. Isnard (both of 1631), Fr. de la Noue (1635), the substantial history by one of the order's last members, Pere Martin (completed in 1806), as well as a cache of letters and records drawn from the chapter's holdings at the Archives of the

---

project's resurrection at the beginning of the eighteenth century. For a summary of the later stages in the building history of the monument (following Lotz, Pecchiai, D'Onofrio, and Marder) see, the Conclusion "The Completion of the Spanish Steps in the Eighteenth Century."

<sup>7</sup> The modern accounts include: Pierre La Croix, *Mémoire historique sur les institutions de la France à Rome puisé dans leurs archives et autres documents la plupart inédits*, ed. Jean Arnaud (Rome: Imprimerie Ed. Romana, 1892); Calmet, "Une fondation française a Rome," *Annales de Saint Louis-des-Français* 9 (1904-1905): 198-219; Jean M. Vidal, *Les droits de la France à la Trinité des monts à Rome* (Rome: Etablissements Français, 1933); Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royal* (1933); and, Wladimir d'Ormesson, *La Presence de la France dans la Rome des Papes* (Paris: Hachette, 1959); Two general works on the Minims were produced at this time by Italian authors, but neither addresses the question of the Minims' affiliation in depth. *Acta Capitularum Generalium Ordinis Minimorum*, ed. P. J. M. DiLauro, 2 vols. (Rome, 1916) and G.M. Roberti, *Disegno Storico dell'Ordine de' Minimi*, 3 vols. (Rome: 1902, 1908, 1922). The last French Minim (Bruno Monteinard) left Trinità dei Monti in 1828. D'Onofrio notes that both Vidal and Bonnard (who closely follows Martin) have written with a firm bias in favor of the French claims at Trinità dei Monti. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Rome*, 148-149.

Pièux Établissements. Such sources were gathered and the accounts were written by the very Minims whose primary concern was to substantiate and defend the royal claim.

This French bias went unquestioned in the foundational architectural histories of the Spanish steps, including those by Eberhard Hempel and Wolfgang Lotz, who also drew from these French accounts in their discussions of the historical context of architectural patronage on the Pincio. In the mid-twentieth century, as the issue of the French claim again worked through the Italian courts, scholars, including Ferrari, D'Onofrio and Pecchiai worked to expose this bias, but, like previous scholars, continued to draw from early modern sources. Their primary aim was to disprove these sources, but in a quest for the “truth” behind the royal claim, did very little to offer a critical analysis of the reasons behind the dispute. Even the most recent scholarship on Trinità dei Monti, such as the 2002 exhibition catalogue organized in celebration of the renovations to the monastery, continues to perpetuate an implicit unacknowledged national bias.<sup>8</sup>

In light of these conflicting accounts, historians have failed to emphasize a fundamental aspect of the Minims' institutional history that sheds light on the political currency of the Pincian hill: that it was not always the case that Minims at Trinità dei Monti unilaterally exercised a claim to French privilege. Until the mid-seventeenth century, when Louis XIV officially took control over the monastery's governance, the monastery's national affiliation was the source of division among the members of the order and especially the residents of the very monastery itself. The affiliation varied over time, dependent on the internal politics of the order as a whole and among its key

---

<sup>8</sup> *Trinitè-des-Monts redécouverte, arte, foi, et culture*, ed. Yves Bruley (Rome: De Luca, 2002). The restoration of Trinità dei Monti and the subsequent exhibition of 2001 were sponsored in part by the French government, while the introduction for the text was written by the French ambassador to the Holy See, Pierre Morel.



decision-makers, including the provincial correctors, generals, and cardinal protectors whose loyalties could lie with the Spanish, Italian, or French factions in Rome. Only *after* Louis XIV's direct intervention, did Trinità dei Monti undergo a dramatic shift becoming firmly understood as a French outpost in Rome, with all of the territorial rights and privileges associated with the royal realm. From this point forward, the Minims created visible signs to display their unilateral loyalty to the crown and erase any evidence of past dissension. Part of these efforts took shape in the very fabric of the church, monastery, and the Pincian hill.

Trinità dei Monti's associations with the French crown were longstanding and controversial. The foundation of the monastery was a touchstone in the institutional history of the Minims to begin with because it was one of the first residences established by the order's Calabrian founder, Saint Francesco de Paola (1416-1507).<sup>9</sup> Because of its proximity to the papal court, the residence on the Pincio served as an administrative center during most of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century.<sup>10</sup> While it was widely accepted that Francesco had close ties to France during his life, the degree to which the monastery itself held allegiance to the French crown was the source of a bitter conflict within and without the order that reached its apex in the mid-seventeenth century.

Advocates of the royal privilege argued that since its inception, Trinità dei Monti was the property and under the aegis of the French king, an assertion they based on two fundamental claims: Francesco's purported desire that the monastery be restricted to French nationals and that the initial funds for its construction had been donated by King Charles VIII (1470-1498). Critics, however, considered the efforts of the French

---

<sup>9</sup> P. J. S. Whitmore, *The Order of the Minims in Seventeenth-Century France* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967), 3-12.

<sup>10</sup> For the early history of urban development on the Pincio see, D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 198-244.

unprecedented and without legal basis, resting their case on the fact that, regardless of a royal donation, the church and the monastery were ecclesiastical establishments (specifically ones within Rome), and therefore ultimately subject to the authority of the pope.

In fact, there is little documentary evidence surrounding the Minims' establishment on the Pincio. In 1482 Francesco, an acknowledged healer, was called from Calabria to France to treat (unsuccessfully) the dying King Louis XI. According to the seventeenth-century chronicler and general of the Order, François de la Noue, it was in this year during a brief stay in Rome that Francesco first selected the top of the Pincio for a monastery and left some of his early followers in the city, who were later to become the nucleus of the order in Rome.<sup>11</sup> In all likelihood, the transition from Calabria to Rome was not as smooth as de la Noue's description. Francis had first received papal recognition of his new order in 1472, but did not have the funds or official permission from the pope to establish a residence in Rome.<sup>12</sup> The only evidence related to the Minims' early establishment is in the form of a letter written to Pope Sixtus IV in June of 1483, in which Francesco sought protection from the Franciscans at Ara Coeli.<sup>13</sup> It is

---

<sup>11</sup>François de la Noue (general of the order) also stresses that Francesco was drawn to the site because of its fertile soil, connecting this monastery early on with its expert reputation in horticulture and herbalism. On a description of the garden del la Noue writes, "De là on a la plus belle vue sur toute la Ville; nulle part l'air n'est plus salubre; la terre y est fertile, toujours printanière et plaisante, tout y concourt à la joie: c'est là qu'aux frais de son trésor la roi acheta un nombre considérable d'arpents, en fit don aux nôtres!" de la Noue, *Chronicon*, 43 in Bruley, *Trinitè-des-Monts redécouverte*, 14, and Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royal*, 18 (citing Fr. de la Noue, *Chronicon generale ordinis Minimorum*, Paris, 1635).

<sup>12</sup> Francesco di Paola's ministry began in Calabria in 1453. The recognition of the order first occurred in November 1471 in the constitution "Decet nos ex officio," confirmed by Sixtus IV in June 1472. Whitmore, *The Order of the Minims*, 3-10.

<sup>13</sup> Francesco received papal approval of the order's constitutions and by 1474 Pope Sixtus IV granted the order the same privileges as the other Franciscans. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 148.

likely that without a special dispensation, the founder sought the aid of his fellow friars in the transition from Calabria.<sup>14</sup>

While little documentary evidence remains of Francesco's time in Rome, much more is known about his establishment of the order in France. Although Louis XI died shortly after the Francesco's arrival in France, Charles VIII continued his father's patronage of the Calabrian friar's young order. In 1485, Charles funded the construction of the order's first monastery in France at Plessis-les-Tours and four years later in 1489, issued an official brief granting the founder the privilege to expand the order throughout the French kingdom.<sup>15</sup> Concentrated efforts to establish a monastery in Rome began one year after Alexander VI's recognition of the statutes and ordinances of the Friars Minor on the 26 February 1490.

Historians are sharply divided over the events around the order's foundation beginning with the purchase and possession of the site on the Pincio. According to French histories, the Minims purchased an estate on top of the Pincio in 1494 and construction on the monastery began in earnest the following year, coinciding with a large donation from Louis XII.<sup>16</sup> Early in 1494, Francesco dispatched two members of the order, Jacques Matan (or Malan) and Jacques Pulisio de Cellariato, to begin negotiations for purchasing a site in Rome. D'Onofrio has shown, however, that these two brothers were from

---

<sup>14</sup> D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 143. D'Onofrio considers Francesco's relationship with the Franciscans at Ara Coeli as evidence that the order's membership was fundamentally Italian in its origin, rather than being established after Francesco's arrival in France and the subsequent royal recognition of his order in Paris.

<sup>15</sup> Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royal*, 7. Other monasteries belonging to the Minims established in France included Nigeon (now known as Passy) in 1493, Vincennes under Henry III in 1584, and Place Royale under Henry IV (led by P. Olivier Chaillou, grand nephew of the saint) in 1605. Whitmore, *Order of the Minims*, 13.

<sup>16</sup> Although Louis XI died shortly after Francesco's arrival, Francesco was successful in establishing royal ties in France, fostered by Louis's successor King Charles VIII. Construction began after receiving special privileges from Pope Alexander VI (1492-1503) and a substantial royal donation from Louis XII. See above, note 15 and D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 148.

Calabria and, moreover, already in residence in Rome, likely since Francis's initial passage through the city in 1482.<sup>17</sup> Following their superior's orders, the brothers entered negotiations for the sale of a *vigna* on the Pincio. While they waited for money to arrive from Tours, they sought the financial backing of another member of the French court in Rome, the wealthy French Cardinal Jean de Bilhères de Lagraulas, Charles's resident ambassador in Rome since 1491.

The prevailing view held by French scholars has been that Lagraulas was the primary benefactor of the sale, but in publishing the contract and bill of sale dated 20 March 1494, D'Onofrio demonstrated that Lagraulas did not act so much as a benefactor but as a financial "real estate agent" for the Minims. Rather than fronting the purchase on his own, Lagraulas sought three other investors, arranging a loan to be paid back by the Minims with interest in the case that the funds did not arrive from France in time to seal a contract.<sup>18</sup> By tracing the financial exchanges involved in the original sale of the land, D'Onofrio unraveled what was characterized by the French scholars as a straightforward financial exchange: that the land was purchased with the financial backing of Charles VIII and the assistance of the ambassador Lagraulas.<sup>19</sup> Instead, the purchase was

---

<sup>17</sup> D'Onofrio records their names Giacomo di Matano (from Calabria) and Giacomo di Pulisco da Cellaria (from Cosenza) and notes that Bonnard made their names French. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 156, note 6. He includes the original documents pertaining to the sale in his Appendix, 366, note 6: "Strumento di acquisto della proprietà Barbaro sul Pincio, Notaio Ugolino de Matteis, Curia Generalizia frati Minimi," Archives des Pieux Établissements de la France à Rome et à Lorette, Rome, cod. T1, c. 63; A. St., Camerale III, busta 2000, fasc. 13.

<sup>18</sup> D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 156-157.

<sup>19</sup> Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royal*, 11. Daniel and Lodovico Barbaro were the owners of the property, having inherited it from Ermalao Barbaro, who had died in May of 1493. Daniele Barbaro was the seller on the contract- the sale was dated 20 March 1494 (February was the note of sale), for 1,500 Florins (653 ducats), and included the land, a small construction in the vineyard, and taxes. Lagraulas also contributed his own donation for the purchase (760 ducats) and remained in Rome until his death on 15 August, 1499. D'Onofrio records a slightly different history of the property rights. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 150-155. The first owner of the villa was Giovanni da Tuscania who sold his property to the Ermalao Barbaro in 1491. The property passed to Barbaro's brothers Daniele (managed by Lodovico), who sold it to the Minims for 1500 florins on the 23 June 1493. D'Onofrio notes another mediator in this transaction named

achieved through a concert of financial support: an investment arranged by a French cardinal by three other members of the court in Rome: Francesco Quirini, bishop of Sebenico (a Venetian), and two French members of the Roman curia: the protonotary Guglielmo (Guillaume) Roger of the archdiocese of Châlons, and the protonotary Lesin Chéminart, deacon of Le Mans.<sup>20</sup> According to D’Onofrio, the fact that the initial funds did not come directly from the royal coffers weakened the argument that the king and the founder envisioned Trinità dei Monti to be a royal institution from its inception.

To date, no document from 1494 has come to light linking the contract of sale to a direct donation from Charles VIII.<sup>21</sup> But, shortly after the installation of the Minims in Rome, the king did arrive in the city with a military retinue. Charles’s visit to Rome was designed to be a show of political might towards the Holy See. With the death of King Ferrante of Aragon on 27 January 1494, Charles VIII began a campaign to claim the Kingdom of Naples, leaving France on 22 August. Arriving in Rome on 31 December 1494, the king remained in the city for one month, residing at the Palazzo Venezia while Alexander VI took refuge in the Castel Sant’ Angelo. When Charles and Alexander finally met, among the negotiations was the election to the purple of one of Charles’s

---

Agostino Sindri but does not mention his role in negotiating with the Minims. According to Ferrari, Vidal published a text of a second donation by Francesco di Paola, after the sale of the original small vineyard paid directly to Alexander VI. According to this text, Francesco asked for permission to build a monastery on the Pincio for the Order. Furthermore, as D’Onofrio, following Ferrari, reminds us, this letter also asks permission from the pope to build on this site, against the order of Boniface VIII.

<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, the first Quirini was actually made to sound French (Martin changes his name to François Guérin), and wrote “xxx” to leave uncertain the bishopric. Bonnard incorrectly replaced the “xxx” with “Bazas.” D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 156.

<sup>21</sup> Bonnard and Lacroix (Arnaud) both cite Martin’s history, but the latter gives no document or author substantiating this claim. (D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 157). It may taken be from Pere Peyrinis’ *Opera Omnia* of 1631, which includes a list of royal donations, beginning with Charles VIII and concluding with Marie de’ Medici (Peyrinis, *Opera Omnia*, 225). According to Peyrinis, Charles donated 20,500 florins for the purchase of the land and for building expenses, and an additional 80 gold ducats. Peyrinis estimated that the king’s entire donation totalled 9, 580 *livres*. An abbreviated list of these donations is included in a document of 1668, which gives a brief history of Trinità dei Monti, aimed at substantiating the claim to royal privilege. Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (AMAE), Rome Supplement 7, 1668 (Correspondance and documents divers), ff. 10r-15v.

constituents, Guillaume Briçonnet, who remained with Lagraulas in Rome and took over his post as ambassador after his death.

On 21 February, less than a month after the king's departure from Rome, Francesco di Paola sent a letter to Alexander VI concerning the establishment of the Minims on the Pincio. The letter stated that the king "donated and conceded to the founder and his order the money for the purpose of constructing a house and an oratory on the Pincio."<sup>22</sup> Francesco asked permission from the pope to allow for this construction and to grant the order the same privileges accorded to other mendicant orders, in effect requesting that he make an exception to the bull of Boniface VIII of 1295, which prevented the acquisition and construction of new monasteries for mendicant orders.<sup>23</sup> According to French historians, the letter provided irrefutable evidence that Trinità dei Monti had royal ties that directly involved the French king in the establishment of the monastery.<sup>24</sup>

For D'Onofrio as well as for Pecchiai, however, the letter provided the most solid evidence against the Minims' claim of royal privilege. In a chapter devoted to the royal foundation in Rome, D'Onofrio refuted the letter's legitimacy as a document stipulating a royal foundation, offering an analysis of Francesco's intentions in writing the pope.

---

<sup>22</sup> D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 157, 160. Bonnard gave a very clear description of the boundaries of the French claim (though he does not indicate a source). He writes: "Il ne nous reste pas document où les limites du foudns acquis des frères Barbaro soient clairement indiquées. Il est pourtant hors de doute qu'elles comprenaient tout le flanc ouest de la montagne jusqu'à sa base, dan les alignements marqués aujourd'hui par les angles de l'église de la Trinité et de la villa Médicis: emplacement où les Minimes ont toujours fait actes propriétaires: notamment jusqu'à une mesure et un 'jeu de boules' situés devant la *barcaccia*..." Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 11, note 3. The author also notes the tree-lined winding path, and the border of via San Bastienello. It is possible that Bonnard derived boundaries of the Minims' property lines based on the history of their land purchases.

<sup>23</sup> D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 161.

<sup>24</sup> According to Bonnard, the money, which must have arrived from France some time in 1494, was the result of a royal donation and was even increased the following year by Charles while he was in Rome, when he left an additional 347 gold *scudi* for the construction of the monastery and another sum for a chapel dedicated to the Trinity (left with Cardinal Lagraulas). Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 13.

D’Onofrio (citing Pecchiai) noted that even if funds had been given directly by the king, this “irrevocable donation” then belonged to the Minims, who, as a holy order, were subject to the authority of the pope. The money was essentially a pious donation of the type that mendicant orders commonly relied on, but in and of itself did not guarantee propriety of the donor. Furthermore, D’Onofrio argued, the letter was primarily aimed at seeking permission from the pope to bypass the restrictions of the papal bull, indicating the phrase that the donation of the king was to be used “allo scopo di costruire ed edificare una casa e un oratorio,” limiting the funds for the express use of building a residence.<sup>25</sup> D’Onofrio concluded that Francesco, in emphasizing this royal connection, hoped that the pope would concede, as he was already intimidated by Charles’s recent threats in Rome.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, D’Onofrio indicated that the pope’s concern in maintaining control over the property influenced the wording of Alexander VI’s bull approving the order in 20 May 1502, which stipulated that all offerings made to the monastery belonged to the Holy See and the Church.<sup>27</sup>

Despite disagreement over the circumstances of the establishment of Trinità dei Monti, scholars are in agreement about the emergence of the first debates over royal privilege, which occurred immediately after Francesco’s death in 1507. In 1511 during the chapter meeting in Tours, the order elected a new general, Lionet, who was then transferred to Rome. During this meeting the provincial correctors decided that the general had the authority to oversee all the monasteries in Italy with the exception of the

---

<sup>25</sup> The final part of the letter, which reads, “il numero di religiosi che a lui sarebbe sembrato opportuno,” was also cited by proponents for the royal foundation, who claimed that it was Francesco’s original intention to restrict the membership and national affiliation of the monastery. D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 164.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 159.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 163.

Pincio.<sup>28</sup> By 1514, the year of the third chapter meeting, internal conflict between the French and Italians had erupted at Trinità dei Monti. The French brothers with the backing of the crown, the cardinal protector, and other French cardinals in Rome began to show “signs of intolerance” towards their “foreign” brothers.<sup>29</sup> The year 1553 seemed to be a turning point in the debate over membership.<sup>30</sup> On 25 September, after several years of petitioning, Julius III granted the French faction a brief that allowed only French correctors to govern the monastery.<sup>31</sup> The letter stated that because Charles VIII purchased a place for the Minims on the hill the monastery would be governed and lived in by “monaci di nazione francesi, fino a che se ne trovassero disposti ad abitarlo e ad officiare il culto divino, altrimenti dovesse essere retto, governato, e abitato da altri [monaci di altre nazionalità].”<sup>32</sup> However, as D’Onofrio has noted, the prescription was not followed, as testified by the following twenty-five years during which both Italian and French correctors were elected.<sup>33</sup> This suggests that it was the vicissitudes of internal

---

<sup>28</sup> D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 174. D’Onofrio does not mention the reason behind the Minims’ decision to exclude Trinità dei Monti from the oversight of the general.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 274, 186. D’Onofrio’s characterization of the situation is vague. The French faction was probably led by Briçonnet, who was so adamant about French rights he was excommunicated by Julius II.

<sup>30</sup> Just prior to this, in 1552, the brothers at Trinità dei Monti elected Francesco da Cutre, a Calabrese corrector.

<sup>31</sup> Between 1514 and 1552, two more “documents” were produced as proof of the founder’s intentions: In 1532 at a chapter meeting in Genoa, the Italians produced another letter supposedly written by Francesco, but it seemed to have little effect. And on 24 May 1553 a third letter (also supposedly written by the founder) was produced by the French faction, contradicting what was said in the letter of 1532. D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 174-175.

<sup>32</sup> “Pertanto Noi volendo acconsentire e soddisfare la volontà e l’ordine di così devoto Padre [S. Francesco di Paola], e riconoscere il pio, caritatevole e liberale dono di detto re [Carlo VIII] fatto per memoria di sé (come si convene), Noi spinti a ciò dalle suppliche del detto Enrico...approviamo e confermiamo la volontà e l’ordine di s. Francesco, il pubblico strumento su ciò rogato, come pure tutte e singole disposizioni in essi contenute e da essi derivanti...rigorosamente proibendo che fino a quando si troveranno monaci francesi del detto Ordine nessuno osi o presuma eleggere, o ammettere, o una volta eletto confermare nella carica di Correttore un monaco che sia di nazionalità diversa da quella francese...” D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 167, citing de la Noue, *Bullarium Ordinis Minimorum* 1635, 126; and Marder, “The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps,” 84.

<sup>33</sup> D’Onofrio also notes flexibility of membership during this period. Francesco died in Tours on 2 April 1507, never having returned to Rome. The first general chapter meeting was held in Rome in December 1507. The Minims elected François Binet as the first Corrector General of the order, already the corrector



politics that dictated the monastery's alliances rather than a unified front against papal authority, as the French accounts seemed to suggest.

In 1578, the French faction of Minims produced a "lost letter" written by Francesco that became the basis of a renewed claim for royal privilege and provided "proof" to subsequent scholars that the recognition of Trinità dei Monti as a French institution existed even during Francesco's lifetime. The document, transcribed by a notary (Gregorio Brèves), outlined Francesco di Paola's desire for the order to be governed by those of French nationality because of the donation by the King of France.<sup>34</sup> The letter was presented in two ceremonies that took place in France, one to the papal nuncio, Anselmo Dandini, and a second in front of the Bishop of Tours. On 24 May, during the order's general meeting in Avignon, the monastery's cardinal protector proclaimed that because it was the will of the founder, French correctors would govern Trinità dei Monti from that point forward. The most likely explanation for this letter's sudden appearance was that it was a forgery, a stance taken even during the period by the Italian faction at Trinità dei Monti. D'Onofrio has claimed that Francesco would never have produced such a document because its political tone was not in his spirit. According to D'Onofrio, the most damning evidence against the letter's authenticity, however, was that it contradicted Francesco's own stipulation that the general of the order be freely elected, implying the founder sought a spirit of democracy in the order's governance.

---

of the Roman monastery at the Pincio. At this point, the monastery still had brothers of various nationalities. Additionally, all of the generals were French from 1507 to 1535, but from 1535 to 1547 three out of four generals were Italian. From 1547 to 1556 three more generals were French. During this period the Pincio was the residence of the corrector general (until the mid seventeenth century). D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 166-167.

<sup>34</sup> Bonnard cites 9 July 1501 as the date for the letter written by the founder that restricts membership and governance to the French, and claims it was the basis for the French claim over Trinità dei Monti. The original document was translated from Latin by Martin and is cited in D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 170.

D'Onofrio's discussion of Francesco's general intentions, while relevant, does not directly address the management of affairs at Trinità dei Monti. A stronger case can be made, however, for the likelihood that the founder's intention for Trinità dei Monti was to establish a nucleus for the order, rather than a French outpost in Rome. As French proponents had argued, it was true that Francesco did have good cause to maintain and promote his connection with the French king. Ever since the founder's sojourn to France, the spread of Francesco's mission depended on royal patronage. Even after Louis XI's death, Francesco did not return to Calabria or Rome, but remained in France to establish the first monastery in Tours. Several of the early monasteries were directly linked to French patronage and so Trinità dei Monti was not an exception to this early pattern in the founder's mission. In the last chapter of the rule of the order, however, Francesco stipulated that because the Trinità dei Monti was the monastery in closest proximity to the Roman Curia it would serve as a link between the whole order and governmental affairs in Rome. Throughout the first half of the seventeenth century the general of the order was almost always in residence on the Pincio, supporting the idea that Trinità dei Monti served as both as an administrative center for the order as a whole, and as an outpost of the French realm.<sup>35</sup>

### **Politics of Materials and Style: The Debate over Royal Privilege, 1500-1645**

The debate over Trinità dei Monti's affiliation ran parallel to the construction of the church and monastery's construction history. Completed in 1585, Trinità dei Monti was built over the course of the sixteenth century, with French, Italian, and papal patrons

---

<sup>35</sup> D'Onofrio cites this as proof for diverse membership, but does not mention Francesco's desire for Trinità dei Monti serve as a central administrative post for the order.

contributing to the costs of its construction. While the donations funding the institution's establishment were the source of much controversy for the Minims, little concern was raised regarding the sources of or political alliances attached to subsequent endowments. As a result, in many ways the fabric of the church reflected the diversity of its patrons. Comprised of a nave and choir designed in the Gothic style by a French architect with imported French stone, a facade and staircase in the architectural language of Roman classicism, and the Northern typology of double bell towers, the fabric of Trinità dei Monti was literally an embodiment of the multi-national roots of its foundation.<sup>36</sup>

The strength of a royal connection during the order's early history provided the financial impetus to begin design and construction on the church and residence. According to Martin, in addition to Charles VIII's initial donation, around 1498 a donation of 12,000 livres arrived from France to finance the construction of the church.<sup>37</sup> By 1501, Louis XII added 4,000 *scudi* to this sum and by 1502 the church was under

---

<sup>36</sup> The original plans for the bell towers were to be based on models similar to Chartres and Strasbourg. Linda Boyer Gillies, "An Eighteenth-Century Roman View: Panini's Scalinata della Trinità dei Monti," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 30 no. 4 (February-March 1972): 176-184, 180. D'Onofrio notes that in a letter to Alexander VI, Francesco envisioned only a single bell tower (as can be seen in the map of Rome by Cartaro of 1576), in the late seventeenth century, the plan changed to the more "gothic" typology of the double bell tower. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 188-189.

The church underwent a few other renovations in the second half of the seventeenth century. In 1676 the French ambassador, the Duc d'Estrées and his brother Cardinal d'Estrées (titular cardinal of Trinità dei Monti) financed the demolition of the old choir and the building of a new one. This was also completed with 4,000 *scudi* drawn from the Gueffier legacy. According to Bonnard, the new octagonal choir was paved with "stones from France," interlaced with "mattons de fayence," and embellished with fleur de lys. The second half of the project was completed in 1694 when the sanctuary received marble and jasper pavement, designed by the architect Simone Felice. In 1678, Charles Plumier the notable Minim botanist decorated the choir stalls while in residence at Trinità dei Monti. Later the stalls were removed for the placement of a monument to Etienne Gueffier. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 15-21. For a history of the church see also, Paul Lacroix, *Mémoire historique sur les institutions de la France à Rome*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Rome: Editrice Romana, 1892) and Antonietta Dell'Agli and Francesca Romei, "La Trinité-des-Monts," in *Les églises françaises à Rome* (Rome: Gangemi, 2001): 35-62.

<sup>37</sup> Louis XII's donation for Trinità dei Monti is significantly larger than those he gave to other Minim communities in France (600 *livres* annually for Plessis, and 400 for Amboise). Martin, Ms. Trin. lib. I, 7, cited in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 18.

construction.<sup>38</sup> The French ambassador Briçonnet also contributed his personal funds to the project, and was largely responsible for financing the construction of the choir. Likely attributed to the influence of the patron, the choir was one of the most overt material references to a French connection: designed in a French Gothic style with stones imported from Narbonne and stained glass by the master Guillame de Marcillat, who was sent from France for the project.<sup>39</sup>

By May 1527 the fabric of the church had neared completion but the interior had suffered damage during the sack of Rome and required repair.<sup>40</sup> In response, the French faction in Rome assembled to form a type of “collective sponsorship” for the restoration and the expansion of the church. By 1550 (one year after another royal donation from Henry II of 6,000 livres) the monastery’s cardinal protector and French ambassador, Georges d’Armagnac, organized a significant donation from many of the influential members of the French faction in Rome including Charles de Bourbon, Jean de Lorraine, François de Tournon, Odet de Coligny, Philippe de la Chambre, Jean du Bellay, Robert de Lénoncourt, and Charles de Lorraine. The donations financed the construction of the new cloister.<sup>41</sup> D’Armagnac alone who gave 7,000 *scudi*, was responsible for the construction of the refectory, painted decorations in the church, and bells and an Italian clock for the campanile.<sup>42</sup> By 1572 the restoration of the nave was completed with a tribune and two side chapels attached to the extant choir. At this point only the facade and door remained unfinished. Both Henry III and the grand admiral Anne de Joyeuse

---

<sup>38</sup> Louis XII donated another 6000 *livres* between 1503 and 1510. *Ibid.*, 18

<sup>39</sup> The choir and two lateral chapels were constructed first, but in 1676 the choir was destroyed to make way for the extant choir. Yves Bruley and Alain Rauwel, “Dans la Rome des XVIe et XVII siècles,” in *Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte, arte, foi, et culture* (Rome: De Luca, 2002), 56.

<sup>40</sup> Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 18-21.

<sup>41</sup> Their arms are visible in the cloister arcade.

<sup>42</sup> In his will of 1560, Jean du Bellay donated an additional 3000 *scudi*, as well as his furniture and silver. *Ibid.*, 19.

donated 6,000 *livres* and 2,000 *scudi* toward this end. While a definitive chronology does not exist for the completion of these elements, we know for example, that the bell towers were partially complete by 1584, and the lower part of the façade, including the cornice was complete by 1570.<sup>43</sup> The inscription on the cornice (figure 3-2), dated in that year, read “The Order of the Minims helped by the munificence of the King of France and by charity of the pious (*piorum elemosynis*) dedicated this temple to the Holy Trinity in the year 1570.”<sup>44</sup>

While the construction of the church’s main fabric was paid with French funds, the patronage of the private chapels within the church was decidedly Italian. Several families contributed to the construction of chapels over the course of the sixteenth century. Lorenzo Pucci, a Florentine and close ally of the Medici, financed a family chapel in 1520-1522; Angelo Massimo constructed his family’s chapel in 1542; Giacomo Cauco, Archbishop of Corfu (a close ally of Clement VII) was buried in his family’s chapel after his death in ca.1565; and Giovanni Battisti Altoviti (son of the wealthy Florentine banker Bindo Altoviti) purchased a chapel in 1573. Two papal families also financed chapels: the della Rovere purchased a family chapel and tomb for Lucrezia della Rovere in 1548 and Marc Antonio Borghese purchased his family’s chapel in 1574.<sup>45</sup>

Papal patrons were also involved at Trinità dei Monti. Both Julius II (1503-13) and Leo X (1513-21) granted the church indulgences, and the latter canonized the founder in 1519. Paul III (1534-1549) was also a benefactor and Paul V (1605-1621)

---

<sup>43</sup> D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 22-223.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 196.

<sup>45</sup> Artists involved in the decoration included J. de Champagne (high altar), 1676; and G.A. Tedeschi and M. Begère (ciborium), 1683. Cavaliere d’Arpino, G.F. Romanelli, and Claude Mellin all contributed to the painted decorations for the cloister of the monastery, begun in 1550 and completed in 1622 (depicting stories from the life of S Francesco di Paola and the crests and portraits of French kings). Yves Bruley and Alain Rauwel, “Dans la Rome des XVIe et XVII siècles,” 56.

increased the privileges of his family's chapel during the first year of his pontificate in 1605.<sup>46</sup> Of all the papal patrons involved in the development of Trinità dei Monti, Pope Sixtus V (1585-1590) had the most the prominent role in the completion of the church. Sixtus's former confessor had resided in the monastery and because of this association the community at Trinità dei Monti received his patronage in the construction of the church's façade and double staircase (completed in 1589), designed by the papal architects Giacomo della Porta and Domenico Fontana.<sup>47</sup> Here again, a Franco-Italian collaboration exists between the elements of design, financing, patronage, and construction. While Sixtus initiated the project, it was financed in part by Anne de Joyeuse's brother, François who donated 1,200 *scudi* to finish the bell towers. The initial design and construction of the facade was begun by Giacomo della Porta, but was completed by the Florentine architect Antonio Ilarione Ruspoli, while the French ambassador, Paul de Foix was charged with overseeing the work.<sup>48</sup> Sixtus also attended the church's dedication in that year.<sup>49</sup>

Sixtus's patronage at Trinità dei Monti coincided with an unprecedented royal claim over the church and monastery by King Henry III, marking a new turning point in the dispute over royal privilege just as the church was reaching completion. While, as we

---

<sup>46</sup> Marder, "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps," 84.

<sup>47</sup> Domenico Fontana completed the double ramped staircase in 1589, but D'Onofrio argues that it was designed by Giacomo dell Porta. Della Porta also designed the campanile and is credited with the design façade. D'Onofrio, *Le Scalinate di Roma*, 182, 222-223, Wolfgang Lotz, *Architecture in Italy 1500-1600* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 123, 184.

<sup>48</sup> D'Onofrio notes with irony that French historians have converted his name to Antonie Hilarion. While Martin does not ascribe a nationality to Ruspoli, Bonnard describes him as a "French architect." D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 189 quoting Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 26.

<sup>49</sup> Sixtus had also planned (but did not execute) a monumental staircase on the Pincio to reach the newly completed Strada Felice, incorporating it into his larger urban schema of long thoroughfares connecting the major pilgrimage sites in Rome This conception appears in a medal with Santa Maria Maggiore in the center, flanked by Trinità dei Monti, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, San Giovanni in Laterano and Santa Croce in Gerusalemme (undated). Yves-Bruley and Alain Rauwel, "Dans la Rome des XVIe et XVIIe siècles," 56-58, 58.

have seen, the national affiliation of the monastery had been the subject of intermittent conflict within the order since the early sixteenth century, the matter had never prompted the direct intervention of a French monarch. However, on 10 December 1586 Henry III wrote to Sixtus to request that the monks in residence at Trinità dei Monti be restricted to his own subjects. Referencing the “royal donation” of Louis XII, Henry claimed that the church and monastery fell under the purview of the French crown, noting his own financing for the double bell towers and the main portal.<sup>50</sup> On 12 February 1587 Sixtus responded to the king’s request, and while he refused to place any restrictions on the nationality of the brothers, he granted the Italian and Spanish Minims in Rome a second church, S. Andrea delle Fratte.<sup>51</sup>

In 1592, Clement VIII made a decisive move to close the debate over royal privilege for good, issuing a decree forbidding the closure of the monastery to non-French members, but quickly withdrew it under pressure from Henry IV.<sup>52</sup> A congregation of cardinals was appointed to the matter and after deliberating for nearly a decade produced a final decision on 20 June 1605.<sup>53</sup> The brief seemed to take a moderate

---

<sup>50</sup> “Etant donné, Très Saint Père, que nous avons la même dévotion que les rois nos prédécesseurs, pour l’ordre des Minimes et spécialement pour ce couvent de la Trinité, dont nous avons fait construire la porte et les deux clochers, avec l’intention de lui faire encore d’autres aumônes..., nous prions V.S. aussi affectueusement que possible... de confirmer le susdit privilège et déclarer que le susdit couvent ne sera gouverné et habité que par des religieux français.” Translated from Italian. Arch. Vat. Nunz. Francia, t. 21 f. 89), cited in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 87.

<sup>51</sup> Sixtus also elevated the status of Trinità dei Monti to that of a titular church with his bull of September 7. That same year, the brothers held their chapter general meeting in Rome, having been prevented from convening at Aix-en-Provence due to civil war. Out of 35 voting members, only four were French, and a Calabrese general was elected (P. Gregorio de Paule Carbonello). The political landscape within the order changed greatly. The French Minims did not take up their cause again until the pontificate of Clement VIII in 1593. *Ibid.*, 87-88.

<sup>52</sup> Clement was also responsible for consecrating the church on 9 July 1594 (a century after its canonical foundation) Rauwel, “La fondation d’un monasterie royal,” 49.

<sup>53</sup> The cardinalate commission was led by Cardinal Pamphili and Cardinal Arrigoni (begun in 1596) the other members of the commission included: P. Humblot procurer general of the order, the Italians and Spanish were represented by P. Paul de Paterno, corrector of Sant’Andrea delle Fratte, and the French were represented by P. Jacques Emard, corrector of Trinità dei Monti. Also included were the lawyer Fabio Romanini. The sentence at the request of the ambassador was confirmed by papal brief on 13 July 1606.

stance on the issue, but favored the French cause. Among its stipulations were the requirement that the correctors must be from the French nation, members from other nations must cease and desist their “vexations and perturbations;” but they also absolved the foreign brothers of their legal fees.<sup>54</sup> The question of national privilege, however, was not put to rest by the brief. The order’s cardinal protector, Orazio Lancelloti, along with the general of the order, the Calabrian Francesco de Mayda, and Silvestro de Maiorato continued a campaign to expel the leaders of the French faction from the monastery.<sup>55</sup>

The issue came to the attention of Louis XIII after having received word from the French faction via dispatch from his ambassador in Rome, the Marquis de Coeuvres. Louis reviewed the patent letter of Francesco de Paola and wrote Paul V on 16 June 1615 requesting that the pope honor his predecessor’s decision.<sup>56</sup> The pope, however, did not budge, as is attested by two letters written by Louis to to the Minims and his

---

According to Bonnard, the papal brief approved of French membership and royal privileges, and included the following rulings: The kings of France were recognized as “direct authors, founders, and protectors” of the monastery; its inhabitants must be French, subjects of the king, and of his crown, as long as they are enough of them to perform divine service; the corrector and the officers must be French; the monastery is submitted to the immediate jurisdiction of the general; other foreign brothers are not authorized to live there, with the exception of the general during his time of visit; fugitives, vagabonds, and all other criminals are excluded; and anyone who attacked these privileges would be excommunicated. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 95). D’Onofrio correctly indicates, however, that the claim that the church was a French institution was difficult to uphold because it would have included several different branches of French nationalities, including Flemish. The definition of nationality pertaining to this church was only addressed in the reign of Louis XIII in 1645. D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 180.

<sup>54</sup> Contrary to Marder and D’Onofrio’s reading, the dictum “perpetual silence” does not seem to be aimed at the issue as a whole, but rather toward the non-French faction’s argument. The relevant passage of the brief reads: “And moreover, to those and to whatever pretensions or claims of the same *brothers of other nations*, regarding and including the above said matters, we command that perpetual silence be imposed now and in the future.” From the excerpt in Vidal, *Les droits de la France*, 96-97, translated from the Latin by Michael Barbezat, University of Toronto. Marder, “The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps,” 84 citing D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 180-181.

<sup>55</sup> Lancelloti specifically wanted to expel the leaders of the French faction, le Roi and d’Asse. In addition, another vocal critic within the monastery’s walls was François de la Rivière.

<sup>56</sup> “Qu’il lui plaise, par un nouveau bref imposer silence à tous ceux qui me voudroient derercher troubler en ce qui m’appartient et à mes religieux naturels françois, privativement à tous autres. Et, pour oster toute ambiguïté, comme je le désire, pour le repos de tous, déclarer que le nom de religieux françois contenu en la sentence ne sera entendu ni interprété sinon des religieux Minimes originaires et naturels François, et qui auront pris naissance dans nos royaumes et terres de nostre obeissance.” Letter of Louis XIV to Paul V, quoted in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 108.



ambassador dated 20 April and 7 May 1620, respectively. In these letters, Louis instructed his ambassador to intervene on his behalf, and also promised the Minims that he would write both the pope and the papal cardinal nephew, Camillo Borghese. By the time of Paul V's death on 29 January 1621, the king had still not received assurances that the royal privilege at Trinità dei Monti would be preserved.<sup>57</sup>

It was not until the pontificate of Urban VIII (1623-1644) that fortunes began to reverse for the French faction at Trinità dei Monti.<sup>58</sup> Urban, an ally of the French crown, acknowledged the royal foundation in 1624.<sup>59</sup> He also granted the Calabrians of the order a separate institution in Rome, S. Francesco di Paola ai Monti.<sup>60</sup> Despite continual tension between the international membership of the order at large and the French residents within the monastery, Urban's ruling was maintained.<sup>61</sup> Innocent X (1645-1655)

---

<sup>57</sup> Letters reprinted in Vidal, *Les droits de la France*, 162-164 Appendix XIII. Originally printed in Martin, *Histoire du Convent*, vol. II, 83-84.

<sup>58</sup> Lancellotti died in 1620, eliminating a considerable impasse against the French cause.

<sup>59</sup> Another attempt to open Trinità dei Monti to non-French residents occurred in 1637, characterized by Bonnard as the "second campaign." The newly elected vicar general of the order, a Sicilian named Paulo de Pulcio, and his assistant, Piero Vasquez, requested to reside at Trinità, supported by the Genovese Minim, Raffaello Pizzurno. Cardinal d'Estrées, who had returned to Rome in the post of ambassador, ejected them from the monastery. The group appealed to the congregation of bishops and regulars, and the judge Pietro-Paulo Cabelletto ordered them to wait at S. Andrea for the ruling. On 10 June, the ruling was held to uphold the royal privilege: "maintenir, defender, protéger, conserver le roi très chrétien et les frères de la nation française ...dans le pacifique possession de leur privilège, aux termes de la sentence des deux cardinaux" and to employ the use of armed force in order to protect this effect. Pizzurno received, as a peace offering, the bishopric of Guardia in 1639. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royal*, 109. The proceedings are preserved in a document in the Archivio di San Luigi (now the Pii Stablimenti). See, Arch. de S.L. liasse 242, number 7. Shortly thereafter in 1640, there was a discussion of pairing the Saint Francois de Paule in his hermitage in Calabria by Nicéron, with an anamorphic portrait of Louis XIV. *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>60</sup> This was located in the rione Monti just north of S. Pietro in Vincoli and granted by Urban VIII on 17 September 1624. Including SS. Trinità dei Monti, this was the third residence of the Minims in Rome. The rivalry among factions was also evident with the publication of Laurent de Peyrinis's *Opera omnia* of 1631. Peyrinis claimed that the monastery be open to all subjects of the king including Flemish, Lorrains, Savoyards, Franks-Comtois, Avignonanais etc. Isnard refuted Peyrinis in his 1631 *Codex Minimorum* (the refutation spurred a response in Peyrinis' second and third editions). Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 108-9.

<sup>61</sup> An interesting exception to national ruling occurred in 1642 when d'Estrées and the French Minims at Trinità dei Monti allowed the newly-elected general Roncha, from Parma, to reside in the monastery. This may suggest that the issues at stake were not always exclusively nationally-motivated but also involved individual personalities. According to Bonnard, the decision sparked a new opening for the non-French brothers in the order to push for open admission, causing the ambassador to withdraw his permission. With

confirmed the royal privilege in 1645, and in records beginning in that year the Minims referred to Trinità dei Monti as a *couvent royale*, stressing its independence from the city of Rome and the influence of the Holy See.<sup>62</sup>

### **Factionalization and Royal Intervention: 1650- 1662**

The victory of the French faction at Trinità dei Monti was shortlived. Soon after Innocent X's death, the claim to royal privilege came under scrutiny in a series of disputes that took place between 1655 and 1668 in which political alliances dominated the internal affairs of the monastic community.<sup>63</sup> Bonnard has considered this period the second of two distinct "campaigns" waged against the French faction by Italian and Spanish interests: the first (discussed above) taking place during the end of the sixteenth century, and the second occurring with the elevation of Fabio Chigi (Alexander VII) to the papacy

---

Roncha's death in 1642 the issue was temporarily laid to rest and at the chapter meeting held at Trinità dei Monti, the new corrector general Bachelier agreed to lodge foreign chapter members for the eight days of the meetings' proceedings. That year, however, after the cardinal protector, Ippolito Aldobrandini also died, the pope assigned Cardinal Bernardino Spada, Bishop of Albano, to fill his post, believing that as the former nuncio to Paris, he would serve as an experienced mediator between the French court and Rome. Spada, however, was firmly sided with the Calabrian camp and began his own effort to open the monastery shortly after his appointment. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 132-135.

<sup>62</sup> The title ensured that the King of France held primary authority over the management of the monastery, including the appointment of correctors and the oversight of membership. It also recognized that as a royal institution, the monastery was the property of the king. On 10 April 1645 with the intervention of M. Nicolas Brethel de Grimonville, Innocent X published the brief *Incumbenti* that confirmed the royal privilege. A plaque was erected on the door of the church to commemorate this privilege. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 132 and D'Onofrio *Scalinate di Roma*, 181. In the same year, a royal brief issued by a seven-year old Louis XIV, also excluded French friars who have professed in Italy from residing at Trinità dei Monti. Vidal, *Les droits de la France*, Appendix XIV, 85.

<sup>63</sup> In 1654 a Franc-Comtois general, Claude d'Orchamps, was elected and though he was on friendly terms with Hughes de Lionne the new ambassador, he was not permitted to live at Trinità dei Monti. This was a period of rapid change for the order itself, which began to spread throughout Spain, Italy, Germany and the Low Countries. The order was divided into 6 provinces: Calabria, Tours, France (Paris), Aquitaine, Spain, and Germany. In France the monasteries included, le Plessis-lès-Tours, Amiens, Nigeon (Passy, Paris), Montgaugier, Gien, Toulouse, Abbeville, Châtellerault, Amboise, Grenoble, Châteliers, Bomiers, and Bracancour. In 1600 there were 38 monasteries in France and 112 by 1623. The increase in monasteries necessitated the creation of four more provinces – Lorraine, the Duchy of Burgundy, County of Burgundy, and Auvergne. By 1673 there were 448 monasteries throughout Europe, 150 in France. One third of the Order was French and the other two thirds were distributed over a wide area of Europe from Calabria, Flanders, Leobschutz (east of Prague), Munich, Newburg. Calabria had 53 monasteries alone. Whitmore, *Order of the Minims*, 13.

in 1655. According to Bonnard, the “coup” was largely instigated by the order’s cardinal protector, Virgilio Spada, following the election of the pro-Spanish Louis Desfresnes to the position of corrector at Trinità dei Monti in 1657. Together Desfresnes and Spada began to restructure the monastery’s role in the order into a vicarage which would allow it to operate semi-independently under their own control without the intervention of the French general of the order. Unlike Urban or Innocent, however, Alexander did not initially take an active stance in promoting French autonomy at Trinità dei Monti, but became involved after these internal conflicts escalated to include intervention by the king’s ministers, diplomats, and eventually Louis XIV himself.

Among the French faction at Trinità dei Monti, Dion de Noillan, who was later to serve as the monastery’s corrector, led the effort against Spada by seeking the direct intervention of the king. When Louis was informed of the situation at the monastery, he dispatched a series of letter to the friars via his diplomatic agent, Etienne Gueffier, who was in residence in Rome.<sup>64</sup> The letters suggest two significant aspects of the institutional culture and administration at Trinità dei Monti during the second half of the seventeenth

---

<sup>64</sup> During this period there was no official resident ambassador for the king of France in the city. Negotiations with the papal curia were managed by a series of attachés including Gueffier, Antonio Barberini, and Rinaldo d’Este. The following letter, dated 20 April 1657, reveals Louis’ displeasure with the situation unfolding in the monastery: “La prétention dont le P. Louis Desfresnes, correcteur de ce monastère de la Trinité à Rome, s’est déclaré en plein chapitre de pouvoir avoir plusieurs supériorités en sa personne sur ce même monastère, sçavoir: en ladite qualité de correcteur et comme nommé par le P. général de l’ordre comme son vicaire général en Italie pendant le temps qu’il ferait sa visite es provinces de France et d’Espagne, est sur peu fondée et si contraire aux immunités de ce monastère, qui ne doit reconnoître autre supérieur que ledit général et celui de la dite maison, qu’il semble que le P. de Noillan pouvoit espérer avec justice d’estre appuyé de la communauté, dans la résistance qu’il taschoit d’apporter à cette entreprise. Mais, au contraire, nous sommes informé qu’on a refusé de lui donner acte de’opposition qu’il avait informée. Ce qui nous oblige à vous faire cette lettre pour faire connoître que nous nous promettons de votre prudence que vous ferez les réflexions convenables pour prévenir les suires que seroient à appréhender, si vous souffrez ces nouveautés dans votre monastère, lequel, ayant toujours été sous la protection des Rois nos prédécesseurs, reçoit des marques bien assurées de la nôtre en cette occasion; vous conjurant de vous fair justice à vous-mêmes, aussi bien qu’audit P. de Noillan, que est une personne dont nous connoissons le mérite et le zèle qu’il a pour maintenir les avantages que nous avons procurés à votre maison.” Reprinted in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 112.

century.<sup>65</sup> The first is that, despite the efforts put forward by the French faction during the pontificates of Urban and Innocent, the problem of membership continued, suggesting that partisanship persisted within the monastery itself. Perhaps the strongest evidence of this was the election of Desfresnes, who was Franc-Comtois, not French, and was pro-Spanish. As was the case in the early sixteenth century, the problem was exacerbated whenever either the order's general meetings were held at the monastery or a non-French general was elected, suggesting a fundamental disjuncture between the role of Trinità dei Monti as a central administrative hub for the Minims and as a religious outpost for the French crown.

The second aspect of this period was the unprecedented involvement of the French crown. Louis XIV, who had just begun his personal reign, took an acute interest in the affairs at Trinità dei Monti that surpassed that of any of his predecessors. The method by which he managed his control over the monastery was also markedly different. Unlike his father, Louis XIV did not limit his negotiations primarily to the pope, but rather deployed multiple agents to monitor activity at Trinità dei Monti and negotiate with the various factions. As discussed in Chapter 1, Louis XIV's use of representative, served not to dilute but to distill his personal control, extending his presence where he could or would not physically travel. The intricate political negotiations in the decade between 1658 and 1668 effectively sealed Trinità dei Monti off from the influence of anyone who threatened the institution's loyalty to the king. Furthermore, they reveal the king's personal management of affairs at Trinità dei Monti as if it were a small French principality in the heart of Rome, similar to the management

---

<sup>65</sup> The letters are reprinted in Vidal and Bonnard.

and defense of the French diplomatic precinct. A careful record of the events is worth recounting here.

On 16 June 1658 the General of the Minims, Claude d'Orchamps, died in Madrid and Cardinal Spada, backed by Alexander VII, named Jean Guillard to take his place. Guillard, who was Franche-Comtois and also notorious for his anti-French stance, was said to have remarked upon his election that he was, by the power of Spain going to "beat the points off the bell towers of the Trinità." Guillard arrived in Rome on 25 November 1658 for his first official visit to Trinità dei Monti. One of his first acts was to expel one of the most vocal French allies, P. Pierre Ruffat, from his residence there. When the news of Guillard's appointment reached Louis XIV, he instructed Gueffier to surveil the activities at Trinità and shortly thereafter sent him a letter of support to be delivered to the French friars on his behalf, stressing that Ruffat was sent to Rome by his command and ordered him to return.<sup>66</sup> In addition, he appointed Cardinal Antonio Barberini to advocate for the French friars and notify him of the changes taking place.<sup>67</sup> Barberini informed the king that the monastery's corrector, Bruyant, had been suspended from his office by a papal decree signed by Emilio Altieri, the secretary of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. The papal congregation accused Bruyant of having postponed the brief that named Guillard as general, of having not wanted to receive a messenger sent by the congregation, and of having suppressed arguments in the monastery in favor of

---

<sup>66</sup> "Révérends Pères, mon intention étant que le couvent de la Trinité du Mont à Rome soit habité par mes sujets naturels, à l'exclusion non seulement des étrangers, mais aussi des originaires de ce royaume qui, par leur profession dans l'Italie, y ont pris telle habitude que, par l'intelligence que l'expérience fait voir qu'ils y pratiquent et entretiennent, sont plus dangereux et brouillons que les étrangères eux-mêmes pour ladite maison et monastère. Louis XIV to the friars of Trinità dei Monti, Ms.Trin, lib. II p. 120 Pièces justificatives, n. XIII reprinted in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 112. The management of the king's correspondence with the monastery was often through his secretary, M. de Brienne.

<sup>67</sup> For Barberini's response see AMAE, Rome, vol. 137 ff. 577-598, c 138 f. 242, letter 7. Bonnard notes that the Minims were not all together satisfied with Barberini's actions, accusing him of being lukewarm on the issue but does not list a source. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 115.

Guillard.<sup>68</sup> They also decided to replace Bruyant with another less partisan friar, P. Ringard. Finally, the congregation ordered that the most vocal of the French constituents in the monastery (Noillan, Bauvarlet, Aymond, and Araud) were to be sent back to France.

Finding himself involved in delicate political maneuvering among competing interests of fellow cardinals, friars, and the French crown, Barberini played a mediatory role, using his position in the papal court as leverage. He reproached Bruyant for directly disobeying the will of the pope but also obtained from Spada the assurance that the cardinal protector would not revoke the royal privileges at Trinità dei Monti during his next visit, as well as his word to reinstate Bruyant as corrector. On 7 April, Bruyant was reestablished on the condition that he expell Ruffat, accept a second visit from Guillard, and offer the general a public apology.<sup>69</sup>

Louis XIV was not satisfied with this act of diplomacy, writing in May that he wanted Ruffat to return to Rome, that all of this was due to the actions of a “caballe espagnolle” that aimed to revoke the monastery’s rights and privileges, adding that everything that had transpired in the revocation and reinstatement of Bruyant was against the foundational regulations of the monastery.<sup>70</sup> While Louis pressed for Bruyant to return to his post, Alexander was opposed to his reinstatement and on 24 May the pope issued a brief that revoked Bruyant’s short-lived return in order to enforce the

---

<sup>68</sup> Alexander appointed a congregation to look over the arguments in support of Guillard, heading by Spada, Altieri, and Fagnano. Bruyant argued that this defence was invented by the general (Guillard) as a pretext to make a second canonical visit to the monastery, which, according to the statutes of the order, was not allowed to take place. According to Barberini’s letter, the cardinal had come to Bruyant’s aid and spoken to Spada and Altieri but even to Barberini, Bruyant seemed too zealous against Guillard. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 115.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 116.

<sup>70</sup> Dated 2 May 1659, *Ibid.*, 116-117.

congregation's decision that Ringard remain corrector for one year.<sup>71</sup> In response, the king met with a council of provincial correctors of the Minims, and on 29 September Louis called for the removal of Jean Guillard from the position of corrector general.<sup>72</sup>

The king's notice did little to stop Spada, and by 20 October Barberini wrote to Mazarin to report that the cardinal protector had met with Ringard and another Spanish supporter, d'Avila, to arrange the expulsion of two other vocal French allies, François Noël and Antoine Mercadier, and that the order had been signed by Guillard.<sup>73</sup> On the same day, Celio Piccolomini, the papal nuncio in Paris, wrote to Mazarin, expressing his concern over Louis' decision, and demanding that all matters be postponed until he heard from Rome. A dispatch arrived from the pope less than two weeks later on 3 November. In it Alexander made clear that as a pious institution, the ultimate governing authority over Trinità dei Monti was the Holy See.<sup>74</sup>

What had begun as an internal quarrel within Minim ranks had now grown to "an affair of state," with Louis and Alexander at odds with one another's claims of precedence. The king refused to accept the pope's position, and also noted that the protection of the monastery should not fall to the cardinal protector of the order but to the

---

<sup>71</sup> On 24 May 1659, Antonio Barberini wrote to the king, via Brienne: "Je crois toutefois vous devoir advertir que cette affaire est pour se rendre de plus importance, parce que j'y vois le pape assez engagé, et qu'il en fait son affaire propre, d'où vient, qu'il peut arriver à tous moments des résolutions de Sa Sainteté contraires aux sentiments que le Roy monstre d'avoir dans sa lettre pour les intérêt et l'indemnité des privilèges de ce monastère." Reprinted (uncited) in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 118. On the same day, Barberini gave an almost identical note to Mazarin. In a letter written eight days later (AMAE Rome, vol. 138 f. 155), he insinuated that it was the lack of delicacy of others (particularly Gueffier) that had inflamed the pope.

<sup>72</sup> AMAE Rome, vol. 137 f. 276-277 Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 125.

<sup>73</sup> According to Barberini, Spada wanted d'Avila to take over the position of corrector at Trinità dei Monti, then later planned to install him as the corrector general of the order. For Mazarin's response (which falls firmly on the side that the French remain under the aegis of the king) see, Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 127-128.

<sup>74</sup> During this period the monastery was factionalized. The French members who sided with the Pope included: Ringard, Desfresnes, Burel, Tosta, Durdess. Noted in a letter from Noillan to the king (AMAE Rome, vol. 137, f. 505r) and cited in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 136.

cardinal protector of France, meaning authority should be granted to Rinaldo d'Este, not Cardinal Spada.<sup>75</sup> He dispatched Jean-Baptiste Colbert in the first week of December 1660, with specific instructions to end the affair at Trinità dei Monti, but unable to convince the pope to budge. Colbert returned to Paris after six months.<sup>76</sup>

It was not until Louis appointed a special ambassador to negotiate with Alexander that any progress toward a resolution was made. In April, Sieur Jean d'Aubeville was sent to Rome and by August, both Barberini and d'Aubeville began to pressure Ringard to address the issue of the royal privilege. D'Aubeville's arrival was welcomed by the Minims, who in a letter to Lionne expressed their gratitude that he was in residence, adding that recent troubles seemed to have worsened because of the lack of a resident ambassador in Rome.<sup>77</sup> A letter from d'Aubeville written shortly after his arrival outlined how much the situation had devolved, describing how certain anti-French members had even broken into the archives of the monastery at Spada's command in order to steal any evidence related to royal privilege.<sup>78</sup> By August of 1661 d'Aubeville had worked out a

---

<sup>75</sup> Bruyant also wrote a memoire in support of French privilege that states (according to M. de Brienne) that the right stems from: *dos, aedificatio, fundus* (endowment, construction, and funds). AMAE Rome vol. 137, ff. 512-517, 518-546 (these are two responses in the collection of Brienne) cited in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 134. In my conclusion, I discuss how these principles framed a pictorial narrative in the monaster's refectory. Hugues de Lionne also recommended to the king that he should hand matters over to Cardinal D'Este as royal protector and order Gueffier to relinquish his papers to d'Este. *Ibid.*, 137.

<sup>76</sup> To make matters worse in August, 1660 Antonio Barberini received a letter from the court instructing him that his secretary Braccesi had been plotting with Spada, and that because of his stalling the rebel Minims were able to elect one of their own as the chapter head. Barberini was admonished by the king for allowing his secretary to much control over the affairs. *Ibid.*, 137.

<sup>77</sup> AMAE Rome, vol. 143, f. 49 rv (April 1661). The Minims were incorrect in designating d'Aubeville as a residential ambassador. D'Aubeville was not an official ambassador in the true sense of the position, but did carry most of the privileges associated with the rank. For the context of d'Aubeville's mission, see my discussion in Chapter 2 and Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 142. The king's instructions for his mission are reprinted in Hanotaux, *Recueil des instructions*, 1: 87- 89. He wanted the Pope not only to confirm the privilege but also to increase it and to stop the struggles caused by Spada at the monastery.

<sup>78</sup> AMAE Rome, vol. 143, f. 60rv (5 May 1661) A letter from D'Aubeville describes the ongoing crisis at Trinità dei Monti, outlining the troubles with "five bad Frenchmen" (he mentions specifically Tostat and Burelle), who entered the archives of the monastery and stole papers, including the order's minutes (Capitulaires) of 1620-21. These papers were later delivered by Burelle to d'Avila with assistance from Ringard and Spada. In May of 1661, Louis, through Lionne wrote to the provincial general in Barcelona,



series of propositions with the pope that were then sent to the king via Piccolomini.<sup>79</sup> The pope on his part accepted a memoir from d'Aubeville outlining the king's requests, sending Piccolomini his own propositions to the king that month. By 18 September 1661 the congregation of cardinals approved the articles, which were quickly ratified by Alexander.<sup>80</sup>

The new guidelines cemented the bond between the king and the monastery. The French brothers who had been expelled were to be replaced, and the brothers were to have total freedom to elect their own corrector without the influence of their cardinal protector or even the general of the order. Furthermore, the general could not send new brothers to Trinità without the consultation of the provincial general, nor could the general reside in the monastery except during times of his visit, which should not exceed twelve to fifteen days, once every six years. In order to erase the stain of controversy, the king also stipulated that decrees against Bruyant were to be expunged from the archives and the all measures taken since 1658 that aimed to dissolve the royal privilege were annulled. Finally, all brothers in residence must not only be subjects of the French king, but also had to have professed in France and to be equally represented from all the king's

---

urging him to forbid d'Avila to run for general. He also stipulated that if d'Avila was elected he would request from the pope a replacement of a corrector general for France and a French corrector for Trinità dei Monti. Apparently this letter never made it to its destination because Guillard and d'Avila bribed the messenger. The French faction did succeed in electing Francesco Navarro as corrector general, as well as a French assistant named Quinquet. D'Avila and Guillard were not elected. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 141.

<sup>79</sup> These included that the election of a corrector be approved by the king, that the new general would be able to visit France, and that P. d'Avila's privileges to contribute to any of the proceedings involving Trinità dei Monti were to be revoked (he had previously been given control over all monasteries in Rome).

<sup>80</sup> It is unclear what made Alexander finally acquiesce to the king's demands, but it is interesting to note that the negotiations only proceeded after Louis appointed someone of the equivalent rank of the papal nuncio. Considering the importance of rank and protocol in the early modern period, this may have been a contributing factor in convincing Alexander to come to the bargaining table. Eleven days later P. Menant was elected corrector with the help of Cardinal Barberini. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 143. In addition, Spada died on 10 November 1661, a fact that was noted, with relief, by d'Aubeville in his letter to Lionne of 9 December 1661. AMAE Rome, vol.143 f. 210r. The affair with the Minims of Trinità dei Monti is mentioned in almost all of the dispatches written by the ambassador.

provinces, and the king would have the authority to place or remove any member at will. These final stipulations not only certified the monastery's French affiliation, but also transformed its residential profile into a true microcosm of the French realm.

On 3 January 1662 Bruyant wrote Lionne to discuss the appointment of a new cardinal protector, remarking that it was probable that the king would be able to choose his own candidate.<sup>81</sup> D'Aubeville echoed the same sentiments in his own letter to Lionne, when he reported that the pope had recommended his own cardinal nephew, Flavio Chigi, for the post. D'Aubeville added that Chigi had assured him that the privileges of the order would not be disturbed as they had been under Spada.<sup>82</sup> Alexander's selection of his nephew also ensured that any new developments at Trinità dei Monti would occur under the watchful eye of his most trusted administrator. On 12 February, the Minims illuminated the facade of Trinità dei Monti and a high mass was celebrated in honor of Chigi's appointment.<sup>83</sup> The victory was sealed with the restoration of Ruffat and Noillan, who had accompanied the new ambassador, the Duc de Créqui, arriving on 31 May.<sup>84</sup> In a letter to Lionne dated 5 June 1662 Créqui made the definitive statement, "L'affaire des Minimes de la Trinité du Mont est achevée."<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Letter of Bruyant to Lionne, AMAE Rome vol. 144 f. 27rv [3 January, 1662].

<sup>82</sup> Letter of D'Aubeville to Lionne, AMAE f.115 r [January 1662].

<sup>83</sup> Around this time Menant began to recall from Paris his former French allies Ruffat, De Noillan, Beauvarlet, Aymond, Artaud. Alexander's naming of his nephew was considered by Bonnard as a treaty, satisfying the interests of both sides. Menant presided over the ceremony and the church was lit with torches. This was one of three major events that occurred within quick succession of another early in 1662. On 16 January, the brothers received an apostolic visit on 2 February, the French nation in Rome celebrated the birth of the Dauphin with the lavish festival commissioned by Antonio Barberini, and finally, on 12 February, they received their first formal visit from Cardinal Chigi. The proceedings were recorded in detail in the chapter's minutes. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 145-146 and "Ordini dei Frati Minimi de S. Vincenzo de Paola Conclusiones et Actes Capitularies faits dans ce Couvent de la Tres Sainte Trinite de Monts des Peres Minimes de la Nation Francaise Annees 1652-1677," BAV, Ferraioli vol. 391, ff. 99r-100rv.

<sup>84</sup> Ringard had already left Trinità dei Monti on 29 May 1662. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 147.

<sup>85</sup> AMAE vol. 145, ff. 108, 110, 121, 162 (5 June 1662) cited in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale* 147.

The political intrigues at Trinità dei Monti were really the first of Louis's personal reign to involve French interests in Rome. They served as a prelude to the Créqui affair—a strong exercise of French authority in Rome in the face of papal claims of authority. At the heart of both incidents was the royal assumption that the two “French” areas of the city (the zone around the ambassador's residence at Palazzo Farnese and the royal monastery on the Pincio) did not belong to Rome, but were in fact extraterritorial parcels belonging to the royal realm.<sup>86</sup> Antonio Barberini understood this when he suggested in 1661 that a house adjacent to Trinità dei Monti would be an advantageous location for a French embassy in Rome.<sup>87</sup> The king's personal involvement not only operated on this claim, but also served to strengthen it. Louis's presence was made apparent through his diplomatic and religious representatives, and those who may have thought to challenge the new regulations would know that it would come to the king's immediate attention.

The internal turmoil and subsequent royal intervention that solidified the French claim to Trinità dei Monti set the stage for the introduction of the most visible sign of French preeminence on the Pincio: the monumental staircase project first introduced by Mazarin and his agent, Elpidio Benedetti, in 1660. The solicitation of the plans Mazarin coincided with Louis' new personal administration of the monastery. I see these two events as linked, with the staircase project designed to reflect both the long reach of the

---

<sup>86</sup> The imposition of their rights in Rome actually extended into a claim for diplomatic immunity of the convent – for example, during the embassy of marechal d'Estrées and Abbé Canillac wanted to disrupt justice by harboring Turks and criminals in the monastery. (Cf. A.V. Nunziature Francia, t. 86, passim and Arch..de l'Amb près le St-Siege, liasse 32) cited in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 148.

<sup>87</sup> “Il s. card. Antonio sarebbe di parere che là su alto ove sono le case del morto Toscanelli si accomodasse con 40 o 50 altri mila *scudi* una nobile habitatione per un imbasciatore che con la vicinanza di quel convento e per il sito verrebbe ad havere in Rome come una cittadella che rimanerebbe sua et haverebbe in vicinanza le mure della città. Il pensiero merita essa considerato e veramente starebbe bene alla Francia haver qui un palazzo regio.” Quoted in Laurain-Portemer, “Mazarin, Benedetti et l'escalier,” 291, note 60 and D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 280.

king's authority and the collective self-identification of the Minims as French subjects.<sup>88</sup> By claiming French membership, the order not only stressed the nationhood of its members, but the national origins of the monastery itself: the land was donated by the French king and was thus within his dominion. Furthermore, by strengthening royal ties the Minims not only enjoyed the king's protection, but the property, as part of the French realm, was no longer simply understood as reflective of the order, but of the king himself. The significance of Louis's absolute presence in Rome was even noted by the corrector of Trinità dei Monti, when he remarked in 1664 that the king's growing influence in the city would soon ensure his position as the "Master of all Rome."<sup>89</sup> This is a critical shift, and must be understood as the lens through which the French perceived the site and future projects on it, including the Spanish Steps.

### **In the Presence of All of Rome: "Feast for the Birth of Dauphin," 1662**

Louis XIV's direct intervention at Trinità dei Monti coincided with one of the most spectacular displays of French proprietary rights over the Pincio: the festive celebrations of the birth of the Dauphin. On November 1, 1661 Queen Marie Thérèse gave birth to Louis, Le Grande Dauphin, heir apparent to the French throne.<sup>90</sup> In celebration, Cardinal Antonio Barberini, one of the French crown's most powerful allies in Rome, organized a series of lavish fêtes, which took place over a course of three months.<sup>91</sup> The finale was a

---

<sup>88</sup>This is a shift in focus from D'Onofrio, who considered the jurisdictional issues at Trinità dei Monti as a pretext for the claim to the slope, but does not consider them as a part of a larger more complex series of expressions of French territoriality in Rome.

<sup>89</sup> AMAE Rome, Vol. 157, f. 261v-263r, Noillan to Lionne (19 February 1664).

<sup>90</sup> Louis Le Grande did not in fact receive the crown of France and Navarre, having predeceased his father in 1711 at the age of 49. The title instead went to his son, Louis, Le Petit Dauphin, the future Louis XV.

<sup>91</sup> Alexander VII designated Cardinal Barberini papal nuncio extraordinary to deliver the papally blessed swaddling clothes to Paris. The events were organized by the Cardinal upon his return, though Bernini's was originally scheduled for Epiphany it was delayed to 2 February because of the technical complexities

spectacular multimedia and pyrotechnical display designed by Gianlorenzo Bernini (assisted by Giovanni Paolo Schor and Marcello Gondi), which took place on the Pincian Hill on 2 February 1662 (figure 3-3).<sup>92</sup> The event was in many ways a deliberate re-evocation of the 1638 celebrations for the birth of Louis XIV, which had also been financed and commissioned by Cardinal Antonio and designed in part by Bernini.<sup>93</sup> Instead of being launched at the Palazzo Barberini, however, as had been done for the 1638 celebration as well as the more recent carousel in honor of the arrival of Queen Christina of Sweden in 1656, the “Birth of the Dauphin” took place in two more central locations. A small *apparato* was staged on the Piazza Navona while the finale was launched on the Pincio, setting a precedent for the slope as the location of the most lavish French celebrations of state throughout the remainder of the century.

One of the primary factors in the selection of the Pincio and Piazza Navona as sites was its intended message of the definitive rise of French hegemony in Europe specifically over Spain. The “Birth of the Dauphin” represented the union of the French king and the Spanish Infanta, a marriage alliance that sealed the Peace of the Pyrenees decisively in French favor. The Spanish national church, S. Maria in Monserrato degli Spagnoli, was located on the Piazza Navona the primary location for Spanish festive celebrations, while the Piazza di Spagna at the foot of the Pincio was the location of the palace of the Spanish ambassador. The selection of both these sites, therefore, could not

---

of the display. Karin Wolfe, “Protector and Protectorate: Cardinal Antonio Barberini’s Art Diplomacy for the French Crown at the Papal Court,” in *Art and Identity in Early Modern Rome*, eds. Jill Burke and Michael Bury (Cornwall: Ashgate, 2008), 113-134, 124.

<sup>92</sup> In a letter from the diplomatic attache to the court in Rome, Sieur d’Aubeville note that Cardinal Barberini paid 3,000 *scudi* for the celebration of the Birth of the Dauphin in 1662. AMAE Rome, vol. 144 (January, 1662) f.112v-115r.

<sup>93</sup> Hammond, “Music and Spectacle,” 230-231.

have made the political undercurrent of the works more clear.<sup>94</sup> The works were designed to remind Spain and the international community in Rome of the former's diminished position by celebrating the continuation of Louis XIV's legacy with the production of an heir from this advantageous union.

The program of the "Birth of the Dauphin" on the Pincio served this political end. The hillside was the site of a magnificent multi-tiered display that combined the façade of Trinità dei Monti with the entire slope into a complex pyrotechnical and landscape design.<sup>95</sup> The bell towers of the church were decorated with olive branches and palms, the king's initials LM (standing for Louis Magno), and stucco sculptures of Peace and Hymen, referencing the Peace of the Pyrenees and the royal wedding respectively (figure 3-4). Together, these figures supported the crown of France above a dolphin, the newborn heir, surrounded by three winged putti bearing the golden fleur de lys. The hillside itself comprised the second tier of the *apparato* and was completely transformed into a volcanic mountain, its craggy opening engulfed in flames and smoke (figure 3-5). In the center of the scene was the figure of armed Discord appearing to fall into the mouth of the flames while the figure of Fame rose from the base of the mountain. Finally, the elm trees that lined the paths leading up to the church were pruned, festooned with

---

<sup>94</sup> The arrival of the Spanish prince Charles II occurred only five days after the birth of the dauphin, heightening the direct competition between the two powers. The Pincio, therefore, was an ideal setting to broadcast the claim of both rivals' political might, as the celebrations for Charles occurred on the Piazza di Spagna only two weeks later. The Spanish hosted a feast in honor of the prince's birth on the Piazza di Spagna less than a month later (17-19 February). Fagiolo dell' Arco, *La Festa Barocca*, 414-419, Diez, *Il Trionfo della parola*, 46-47.

<sup>95</sup> On the evolution of Bernini's *concetto* for the celebration of the Birth of the Dauphin, see Pamela Gordon, "Fireworks Display Honoring the Birth of the French Dauphin," in Irving Lavin, Pamela Gordon, Linda Klinger, Steven Ostrow, Sharon Cather, Nicola Courtright, and Ilana Dreye, *Gianlorenzo Bernini, Drawings from the Museum der Bildenden Künste Leipzig, German Democratic Republic* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981), 219-225. The selection of the Pincio for the subsequent birth of Louis XIV's son added a sense of spatial and visual continuity to the conception of the continuation of the royal bloodline.

banderoles, and illuminated with candelabra. The festival spilled into the piazza, where the crowd gathered to view the spectacle.

Four festival pamphlets were published for this event, while two prints, by the French engravers, Dominique Barrière and Louis Rouhier, depict the *apparati* on the Pincio and the Piazza Navona respectively. *Un Breve Panegirico*, by Virginio Bifolco was first published with the permission of the Reverenda Camera Apostolica, and quickly reprinted by de Lazari. A second (anonymous) work, *La Relatione dell'Allegrezze* concentrates on the festivities on Piazza Navona. Finally Evangelista Dozza's *Primi lampi della Relatione delle Feste* provides the fullest account of the narrative program.<sup>96</sup> The pamphlet was published in Italian by Stefano Cavalli and includes an indication of a Roman printing license.<sup>97</sup>

According to Dozza, the events of the day were carefully timed, beginning in the late afternoon, at which time the Roman people gathered while servants lit the torches and candles along the hill. The pyrotechnical show began at dusk (around six PM), with smoke, flames, and fire designed to emit from the mountain. Three viewing boxes were located in a house on the piazza for cardinals, prelates and princes, each decorated with tapestries and glassed in to protect the viewers from the elements. This was also the location for an accompanying feast and musical performance. The spectacle concluded

---

<sup>96</sup> The full title of this work was, *Primi lampi della Relatione delle Feste, e fueche di giubilo, fatti risplendere nel Teatro di Roma per la Nascita dell'Emin. Sig. Card. Antonio Barberini*. Fagiolo dell'Arco, *La Festa Barocca*, 406-412. Portions of this work are reprinted in Fagiolo dell'Arco, *La Festa Barocca*, 407-412 and Fagiolo dell'Arco and Carandini, *L'Effimero Barocco*, 1:185-93. Bernini's design for the *apparato* is discussed by Gordon, Pamela in "Fireworks Display Honoring the Birth of the French Dauphin," in *Gianlorenzo Bernini, Drawings*, ed. Irving Lavin, 219-227. The spectacle is also mentioned in brief in several other publications. For a complete bibliography see, Fagiolo dell'Arco, *La Festa Barocca*, 412. A copy of Dozza's pamphlet in the holdings of the BnF, Paris was viewed in preparation for this dissertation.

<sup>97</sup> The title of the pamphlet also mentions the financial contribution of Giuliano II Cesarini, a member of the wealthy Cesarini family and Duke of Cenzano. There is no indication as to whether the printed views were published in France or in Rome.

with the invitation for people to ascend the hillside, at which point, the “common people became insane with merriment.”<sup>98</sup>

True to the form of the festival narrative, Dozza’s account gives a thorough description of the event’s program, its notable guests, composers and artists. Interlaced with the descriptions of the conceits, however, Dozza also repeatedly notes the festival’s impact on its audience. Several passages describe how the festival inspired the pleasure and approval of the Roman people: the air was not only filled with the beautiful songs of the horns and tambourines, but also the “universal applause of the people, which never ceased,” the pyrotechnical display “uplifted and amazed all the people, who were ecstatic to witness such a marvel,” and through festive celebration “all of the City of Rome participated in the glory of the Royal Dauphin.”<sup>99</sup> While these phrases are couched within the hyperbolic language of rhetorical praise, and thus appropriate to the literary mode of the festival pamphlet, they also suggest an underlying anxiety with stimulating the pleasure and the approbation of the public. These references index the collective approval of the people as a testament of the event’s (and by extension French) success, expressions that would also appear in the Minims’ own correspondence to the court in Rome.

While festival makers always sought (or touted) the success of their events, the use of this language takes on new meaning when viewed in the context of the French crown’s political standing in Rome. First, the Roman people did have good reason to be assuaged by the French. Even if the average Roman was not aware of the French plans to transform the Pincian hill, he would have been cognizant of the growing animosity

---

<sup>98</sup> “Il popolo minuto...insanica di allegrezza.” Quoted in Gordon, “Fireworks Display Honoring the Birth of the French Dauphin,” 221.

<sup>99</sup> “...Tutta la festante Città di Roma partecipava nelle glorie del Regio Delfino...” Dozza quoted in Fagiolo dell’Arco, *La festa Barocca*,” 408.



between French and Spanish residents in the city, which had spiked in the years leading up to the Peace of the Pyrenees. Several of these incidents also affected the safety of Roman residents, including two public revolts resulting from partisan violence between the two crowns in 1636 and a series of kidnappings of Romans in front of the Piazza di Spagna in 1650.<sup>100</sup> In addition to the ongoing (and disputed) claim for the hillside the selection of the Pincio for these festivals by the both the French and the Spanish factions in Rome may have also been an attempt to replace the memory of this violent act on the very site on which it occurred.

A chief aspect of praise in Dozza's text is the site itself. The chronicler writes, the festival "was produced at the highest point of Trinità dei Monti, because of its great and sublime situation, shown in the presence of all of Rome."<sup>101</sup> The aspiration for visual totality, not only grants the spectacle a transcendent quality that not only allows this work to surpass rival celebrations, but also ennobles all other subsequent French demonstrations of power made on the site. This also differentiates it from other rival festive celebrations, for the French in Rome were the only major foreign power to utilize an elevated site for celebrations of state. The spatio-visual prominence of the Pincio is emphasized in a printed view by the French engraver, Dominique Barrière. In the work, Barrière creates a visual frame from the opening of Via Condotti, one of the most prominent east west arteries in all of Rome. The buildings to left and right are shown in shadow, forming a type of proscenium with audience members depicted viewing the works from their balconies (likely those embellished for the event). Dozza's "theatrical"

---

<sup>100</sup> These are two of several incidents of violence among foreign nations in Rome. For further discussion, see Laurie Nussdorfer, "The Politics of Space in Early Modern Rome," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 42 (1997–1999), 161-185.

<sup>101</sup> "...Se gli fece Avanti l'alta prospettiva della Trinità dei Monti, luigo per la sua grande, e sublime situazione esposto al cospetto di tutta Roma." Dozza quoted in Fagiolo dell'Arco, *La festa Barocca*, 408.

framing of the space and spectator reference the visual engagement of the viewer with the narrative events of the festive celebration. And as Karin Wolfe has noted, even the silhouetted figures of audience members below are positioned like theatrical *staffage*, giving the impression of a scene unfolding as if on stage.<sup>102</sup>

In Barrière's print, however, the figures do not simply stand and admire. Much like the works produced by genre artists of the period, the urban environment is depicted as thriving: the exhibition of people enjoying the event is as integral a part of the scene as the architecture itself. The artist took pains to represent different social classes and occupations, the nobility approaching in their carriages, young families, servants, ecclesiastics, musicians, and guards, scattered throughout the image in a depiction of "all of Rome." The groupings even serve as a visual device uniting each tier of the *apparato* by leading the eye from the lower register of the work on the level of the piazza, into fictive space following the path of the hillside to its peak surmounted by the embellished facade of the church.

The inclusion of the interspersed figures also serves as an index of the festival's multi-sensorial experience. As *meraviglie*, the works were not meant to simply be viewed, but also experienced as a range of bodily stimuli, in this case even moved through. The print's emphasis on the sensorial recalls the subjective experience described by Michel de Certeau as "pedestrian enunciation," a narrative playing out of space that occurs as one moves through the urban fabric.<sup>103</sup> Nonetheless, these spectators were not accorded any agency in defining the urban space on their own terms. Rather, they were

---

<sup>102</sup> Wolfe, "Protector and Protectorate," 124-125.

<sup>103</sup> Michel de Certeau, "Walking in the City," in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 97-100.

presented with a specific conception of the Pincian Hill and asked both to witness, and participate in its spectacular transformation.

The celebrations for the “Birth of the Dauphin” created a precedent for the use of the Pincio as the site for the most lavish French festivals in Rome, with two other major festivals launched on the site over the remainder of the century.<sup>104</sup> The undeveloped hill was in many ways the perfect staging site on which to project the political messages of the crown, particularly because of the “captive audience” made up of Spain’s ambassadorial suite in residence at the base of the hill. Furthermore, the celebrations contributed to the popular identification of the hillside as French territory. In this sense they serve as an important aspect of the campaign to inscribe French presence into the topography, especially in the absence of a permanent monument. In this sense they may even be considered to have “primed” the hillside for a more permanent evocation of French territoriality in the form of the future staircase.

### **‘Nôtre Montaigne’: The Minims’ Pursuit of the Pincio, 1655-1662**

The endowment of the royal status at Trinità dei Monti coincided with the first assertions by the Minims over the Pincian hill, a connection that has not been emphasized in the scholarship on the Spanish Steps.<sup>105</sup> The first written claim of proprietary rights over the Pincio appeared in the minutes of a chapter meeting on 4 October 1652, which recorded the Minims’ decision to plant elm trees on the slope.<sup>106</sup> This informal designation of

---

<sup>104</sup> The Festival for the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) and the Festival for the Recovery of Louis XIV (1687) will be discussed in the following chapter.

<sup>105</sup> It is also significant that the Palazzo di Spagna was completed at the base of the hill in 1647. The competing urban claims between the French and the Spanish will be the focus of a separate section below.

<sup>106</sup> As Marder has noted, the Roman government did not accept this as evidence of proprietary right and issued an ordinance a few years later prohibiting anyone to damage the trees, or hang laundry, throw garbage or pasture animals on the hillside. Marder, *The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps*,” 83-95. A

ownership became codified only a few years later with the initiation of the staircase project under Mazarin. The contributions of the brothers to the securing of French control over the Pincio, however, have largely been overlooked in the historiography of the Spanish Steps. The primary reason for this omission is that following Mazarin's death in 1661 the project was put on hold, with serious planning efforts resuming only in the first decades of the eighteenth century, during the pontificate of Clement XI.<sup>107</sup> The new institutional makeup at the Trinità (over which the king now presided) generated the Minims' own efforts to secure control over the Pincian hillside when it seemed that the project would falter after Mazarin's death.

In "Die Spanische Treppe: Architektur als Mittel der Diplomatie," of 1969, Wolfgang Lotz gave the first synthetic account of the role of political developments between France and the papacy in the building history of the Spanish Steps, tracing the complex and often conflicting interests involved in the design and execution of the project from its inception in the sixteenth century to its completion in 1725.<sup>108</sup> Lotz outlined four distinct stages of the building history: papal initiative by Gregory XIII and

---

record from the brothers' chapter records reads: "Le mesme jour feut conclu qu'on planteroit des ormeaux le long des deux chemins de ntre montaigne." BAV Ferraioli 391, f 17r [4 October 1652]. Two years later there is another note of a contract made between the Villa Medici and the brothers at Trinità dei Monti for permission to cut a path on "nôtre montaigne" from the piazza S. Sebastianello to the villa, suggesting that the Minims controlled some of the property on the south-eastern part of the Pincio. (Martin, Ms Trin. lib. III, 143) cited in Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 11-12.

<sup>107</sup> The building history of the Spanish Steps is well documented and has been informed by a wealth of architectural plans and printed views tracing the participation of architects and patrons from the sixteenth through the eighteenth century. While D'Onofrio's account remains the most thorough synthesis of Italian and German scholarship on the project to date, numerous other studies have examined various actors and circumstances related to French patronage of the Pincio. For example, Madeleine Laurain-Portemer has mapped the involvement of Jules Mazarin and Bernini during the project's early stages, Maurizio and Marcello Fagiolo dell'Arco and Silvia Carandini have carefully documented the material history of festive *apparati* launched on the Pincio by the French in Rome. *La festa barocca*, ed. Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco (Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1997) and Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco and Silvia Carandini, *L'Effimero Barocco, Strutture della festa nella Roma del '600* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1977-1978).

<sup>108</sup> Wolfgang, Lotz, "Die Spanische Treppe. Architektur als Mittel der Diplomatie," in *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* 12 (1969): 39-94.

Sixtus V, an active planning stage under Mazarin, a hiatus from 1661 to 1717, and the final stages of execution in which the funds were released and the project completed during the pontificate of Innocent XIII.<sup>109</sup> The first stage began in 1577 under Gregory XIII, who had envisioned a staircase to connect the newly completed Via Gregoriana with the Piazza Trinitatis below. The staircase would have replaced the two paths that ran up the hillside, which had been originally put into place by the Maestri delle Strade in 1567.<sup>110</sup> In 1577 Gregory donated the land to the public domain in order to have a staircase built and in the following year commissioned a wooden model. Gregory visited the site in 1579 and 1582 and also began planning the work with Ferdinando de' Medici, who had recently acquired a villa at the top of the hill in 1576.<sup>111</sup>

With the death of Gregory in 1585, Sixtus V continued the project of his predecessor, working in concert with the Medici who had already commissioned a Florentine architect named Tribaldesi to draw up plans for the work. The idea of a

---

<sup>109</sup> The building history of this project has been acknowledged by scholars as both complex and highly politically-motivated. What began as a papal project in the sixteenth century was co-opted by the French in the seventeenth century, and then lapsed as Franco-papal controversies surrounding Jansenism made the idea of such a grand project politically untenable. Finally, the project was reintroduced in 1717 under Clement XI as a gesture of concord toward the French and after a series of negotiations over the design and another dispute over the jurisdiction of the hillside (again between the Minims and the Tribunale delle Strade), the staircase was completed during the papacy of Innocent XIII. See, Wolfgang, Lotz, "Die Spanische Treppe."

<sup>110</sup> This followed an earlier project of 1564, where the Maestri delle Strade built a street that cut from the Piazza del Popolo to the church. Pecchiai has published the document of agreement drawn up between the Magistrato delle Strade and the monastery of SS. Trinità dei Monti of 1567. "Convenzione fra i Maestri delle Strade ed Il Convento della Trinità dei Monti circa la via nuova da costruire dinanzi alla chiesa ed al convento: 3 maggio 1567", in Pecchiai, *La Scalinate in Piazza di Spagna*, 17-18, Appendix, I, 60.

<sup>111</sup> Via Trinitatis (later Via Condotti), completed in 1547, cut across the bottom of the hill and continued the axis of the church into the populated quarters of the city. As a result, Platea Trinitatis became a popular place to settle. In 1559 the Maestri delle Strade proposed a project for a staircase in the area, likely as a result of the new residential density, the first evidence of such a project. Marder has correctly noted that the Minims were never included in any of the papal discussions over the staircase. (Marder, "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps," 84). However, in 1578 (the year after the model was built) the Minims did assert a new claim to the royal founding at Trinità dei Monti, in the form of the "lost letter" discussed above. While there is no direct reference to the slope, the sudden revelation of the letter was in and of itself an expression of the "territorial ambitions" of the French faction of Minims, who considered their monastery the property of the French crown. It may have been the pope's newfound interest in the Pincio that prompted the faction at Trinità dei Monti to act, whether out of fear of losing control over the management of their lands or the hope that avoiding a tangle with the French king would give them political leverage.

monumental staircase likely appealed to Sixtus as both a terminus to the Via Felice at the crest of the Pincio, and also as a complement to the facade of Trinità dei Monti, completed under his patronage. The pope reviewed the plans and model for the staircase at the Villa Medici in 1587. Nonetheless, construction was not begun during his pontificate and the idea of edifying the Pincio remained dormant until 1655 with the legacy of the French diplomatic agent Etienne Gueffier that specified for a staircase to be built on the hill.<sup>112</sup>

Prior to Gueffier's donation, however, the Minims at Trinità dei Monti had already begun to consider the property below their church as their own. The first evidence of this is a notation (mentioned above) in the minutes of a meeting of 4 December 1652 in which the brothers resolved to plant trees along the paths on "their hillside" (figure 3-6).<sup>113</sup> On 8 June 1654, the Grand Duke of Tuscany also agreed to pay the Minims 40 *scudi* for the permission they granted him to build a path on the hill leading to the Medici palace. These notes suggest that the Minims already assumed a certain amount of proprietary rights over the undeveloped hillside, if not sanctioned by law then through convention.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> The original sum was 20,000 *scudi* but on 24 June 1660, less than a week before his death, Gueffier amended his will and reduced the sum to 10,000 to be placed in a trust, known as a *moltiplico*. He stipulated that the corrector of the Minims would be in charge of carrying out the project. This bond continued to earn interest (with a few withdrawals made) over the course of the seventeenth century. Pecchiai has published the codicil as well as other supporting documents related to Gueffier's legacy. Pecchiai, *La Scalinata di Piazza di Spagna*, 66-73. For further discussion, see also, Lotz "Die Spanische Treppe," 53-54, D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 279-280, Salerno, *Piazza di Spagna*, 67, and Marder, "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps," 85.

<sup>113</sup> D'Onofrio dates this letter to December 4, 1651, cited from the "Conclusions et actes capitulaires," BAV Ferraioli 391. This is in fact incorrect as the document only includes records from 1652 to 1677. See, Ferraioli vol. 391 f. 17r. This in turn prompted the Maestri delle Strade to reassert their own jurisdiction over the area, issuing an edict in 1658 prohibiting anyone from damaging the trees, hang laundry from them, or graze livestock, dump garbage or leave animal carcasses on the site, renewing it on 26 May 1664. Marder, "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps," 86 (Archivio di Stato di Roma, Camerale III, b 2100A, fasc. 10 (cited by Pecchiai, *La Scalinata di Piazza di Spagna*, 19, D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 371.)

<sup>114</sup> Martin, Ms Trin. lib. III, 143, cited by Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 11-12.

After Gueffier's death in June of 1660, plans for the staircase began in earnest. On 6 January 1661, Jules Mazarin wrote to Benedetti, instructing him to solicit plans for the project from François d'Orbay, Carlo Rainaldi, and G.F. Grimaldi.<sup>115</sup> While there is scholarly speculation over Gueffier's motives for initiating the project, a letter from Mazarin to Benedetti outlined Mazarin's regard for the staircase as an act of retribution for Alexander VII's recent appointment of a Spanish general to the Minim order, and an insulting reminder of the Peace of the Pyrenees. Furthermore, Mazarin's comment on Alexander's own delight in the "embellishment of [Rome]" suggests that such a glorification of the French crown through monumental architecture was designed from its inception to compete with the pope's own urban vision.<sup>116</sup>

Benedetti had also submitted a design in his own hand, based on an original design by Bernini, which clearly elevated the French monarch (figure 3-7).<sup>117</sup> The program (whose formal aspects have been discussed at length by Tod Marder and Madeleine Laurain-Portemer) included a series of stairs and ramps surrounding a central

---

<sup>115</sup> The letter also expresses a desire that Benedetti solicit plans from Bernini, indicating a preference early on for the sculptor and architect.

<sup>116</sup> "...This will be a work in memory of the Peace and I think (if I don't deceive myself) it will meet with the pleasure of Our Lord (Alexander VII) not only for the above reason, but because the genius of His Holiness tending toward the embellishment of this city and being difficult to build something there that is of great ornament, His Holiness ought to be happy that this is done in His pontificate." Letter from Mazarin to Benedetti, 6 January 1660, translated in Marder, "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps," 85.

<sup>117</sup> The early planning stages of the Spanish Steps have received a great deal of scholarly attention, too extensive to include in detail here. While the evolution of the design of these plans is not my primary focus, it is significant to note the attributions of these works and the participation of several key agents involved in the design process. Two extant drawings are associated with Benedetti's plan. The first is a sheet signed by Benedetti in the collection the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Chigi P. VII, 10, fols. 30v-31r). The second is located at the Stockholm Nationalmuseum (CC790). The attribution of the plan to Bernini is the subject of Tod Marder's "Bernini and Benedetti at Trinità dei Monti," *Art Bulletin*, 62, no. 2 (1980): 286-289. In the late seventeenth century, the Swedish architect Nicodemus Tessin noted that the plan was in a collection of Bernini's works. See *Nicodemus Tessin the Younger. Sources, works, collections. Travel Notes 1673-77 and 1687-88*, eds. M. Laine and B. Magnusson (Stockholm, 2002). Marder was the first to convincingly attribute the Stockholm sketch to the workshop of Gianlorenzo Bernini, following the preliminary work of Christian Elling in 1956, and Wolfgang Lotz, in 1968. Madeleine Laurain-Portemer has credited Benedetti with the execution of the Vatican drawing as a close copy of the first Stockholm sheet.

sculptural group of river gods, allegorical figures, and putti supporting the royal crest, flanked by the coat of arms of Jules Mazarin and surmounted by a bronze equestrian statue of Louis XIV. The plan also displayed a unique compositional engagement with existing interventions on the site, in particular the arrangement of the stair on axis with the Barcaccia fountain below, and the king's statue directly above the papal monument at the midpoint of the slope.<sup>118</sup> The stairs were also on axis with the Trinità dei Monti. This arrangement, coupled with the wide tiered parapets that provided both spaces of passage and congregation, would have allowed the staircase to function as a type of piazza, extending the church's urban footprint all the way down to the Piazza di Spagna, and providing a direct route to the church and monastery from the city below.<sup>119</sup>

The inclusion in the drawings of figures and carriages interspersed on the ramps also demonstrate Benedetti's urban consideration for both pedestrian and vehicular traffic, the new urban condition. A gate depicted in the lower right corner of the sheet also indicated the desirability of restricting traffic on the staircase and signalled property rights. Little has said about the significance of this unusual element, which I believe demonstrates an early attempt to convert a public space into private one under French control.<sup>120</sup>

Edicts issued by the Maestri delle Strade in this period demonstrated that the hill in its undeveloped state had taken on the character of area of common use for the Roman

---

<sup>118</sup> In addition to incorporating the *Barcaccia* into the design of the stairs the plan included the conspicuous use of Chigi emblems on the balustrade of the uppermost register. The equestrian statue of Louis XIV also would have been viewed within the context of the Constantine project for S. Pietro. For a further discussion of the dialogue between these two monuments, see below note 122.

<sup>119</sup> The Minims may have also been considering this when they resolved to build a carriage house at the base of the hill. BAV, Ferr 391, f. 151r (14 May 1668). "Le 14 on a conclu de faire une remise de carosse en nre maison au pied de la montagne pour trouver plus facilment a la loüer."

<sup>120</sup> The gate, as well as the figures and carriages, are unique to Benedetti's version and do not appear in the Stockholm drawing.



people, who not only traversed its dirt pathways but also utilized the land itself for a variety of domestic activities. While the staircase would have fundamentally transformed the site's public character by paving areas formerly used for grazing and laundry, the inclusion of a gate had the potential to restrict public access all together. In this sense, the gate was not in keeping with the plan's overall transformation of the hill into a forecourt for SS. Trinità dei Monti. Few, if any, church piazze in Rome completely restricted public access, and certainly none of comparative size and centrality to the urban core.

Benedetti may also have included the gate with a projected second use for the site in mind, namely its proposed use as a diplomatic residence. In the upper right hand corner of the sheet, Benedetti included the outline of a building adjacent to Trinità dei Monti located on the southern portion of the crest of the hill. In a letter to Mazarin, Benedetti noted that the house was that of the "morto Toscanelli," adding that Antonio Barberini believed it could be purchased for about forty or fifty thousand *scudi* and would serve as a suitable location for a house for the French ambassador in Rome. Benedetti, echoing Barberini, described the ecclesiastical and diplomatic pairing in militaristic terms, as a "citadel" for the French in Rome, even noting that the presence of the Aurelian walls, which presumably Benedetti (or Barberini) envisioned as a type of fortification for the site. This first known use of the term citadel in this context also combined two distinct building types (the church and the palace) into a single complex under the jurisdiction of the French crown.<sup>121</sup> The restricted access provided by gates would have responded to the site's requirements as a both a diplomatic precinct and a royal pious institution, enclosing this "citadel" of French territory from the rest of city of Rome.

---

<sup>121</sup> In Chapter 4, I discuss the visual references to French citadels in views of the hillside by the French engraver Israël Silvestre.

In a separate letter to Mazarin of 1 November 1660, Benedetti emphasized the staircase's diplomatic, and specifically ambassadorial associations. Addressing Mazarin's concern that the statue of Louis XIV would not meet papal approval, Benedetti responded that he does not think that the statue of the king would present difficulty because the site already belonged to him, and it was no different than if the statue were placed in the courtyard of the ambassador's palace. Benedetti's comparison of the hill to the courtyard reveals the *spatial* "fiction of immunity" underlying the staircase project: as one imagines the curious conceptual twisting of space (forecourt enveloped by courtyard, or courtyard turned outward) required to accommodate such a concept.<sup>122</sup> The resulting space also reveals the obfuscation of the distinction between "public" and "private": with the statue serving as a (public) sign that the hill was, in fact, exclusively the (private) territory of the

---

<sup>122</sup> Furthermore, the imperial overtones of this work implied by its visual association to the bronze equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius on the Campidoglio would not have been lost on the pope. Mazarin suggested a compromise by substituting the equestrian statue of the king with one of St. Louis or St. Francesco di Paola, but it still did not meet with any response from the Pope. Scholarship on this topic has focused in particular on relation of the equestrian statue of Louis XIV to other projects by Bernini. Tod Marder has convincingly argued that Benedetti's original plan was ghosted by Bernini. Such a connection to Bernini is intriguing due to the chronological proximity and formal similarities of his Constantine statue for St Peter's and the equestrian monument of Louis XIV, realized in 1678. Marder has discussed the meaning and placement of the Constantine statue as an emblem of monarchic loyalty to the papacy, noting that the Constantine project was a reappropriation of the Francophilic imagery proposed by Mazarin, transforming the theme back into one of deference to papal authority. Work on the Constantine monument (1654-1670) was underway around 1662-1664 and suspended during Bernini's trip to France from April to December 1665. Rudolf Wittkower noted that the idea for Louis XIV's own equestrian statue was discussed during this trip and ideas regarding the *concetto* of the statue and its comparison to Constantine were expressed in a letter from the artist to Colbert in 1669. An intriguing note in an *avviso* dated 30 May reports that the statue was to be erected on the Pincian hill in a revitalization of Mazarin's scheme: "This is on account of his having started the great statue of his majesty which is to be placed at the Trinità de' Monti, though others say it will go to France," quoted in Stanislaio Frascchetti, *Il Bernini* (Milan, 1900), 360, cited in Cecil Gould, *Bernini in France: an Episode in Seventeenth-Century History* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981), 126. See also, Rudolf Wittkower, "The Vicissitudes of a Dynastic Monument: Bernini's Equestrian Statue of Louis XIV," in *Studies in the Italian Baroque* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), 83-102, 83-86. On French associations to Constantinian imagery see also Marc Fumaroli, "Cross, Crown and Tiara: the Constantine Myth between Paris and Rome, 1590-1690," in *Studies in the History of Art* (Washington D.C., 1995) 48, 88-102. Steven F. Ostrow also discusses two precedents for the use of monarchic imagery in portico sculpture related to Spanish and French rivalry in "Gianlorenzo Bernini, Girolamo Lucenti, and the Statue of Philip IV in S. Maria Maggiore: Patronage and Politics in Seicento Rome." *Art Bulletin*, 73, no. 1 (March 1991): 89-118.

French king.<sup>123</sup> For Benedetti, and, as we will see for the Minims as well, the Pincio was defined as French territory by this fiction.

First suffering a setback with Alexander's tacit rejection of the plan, formal discussions over the staircase ceased altogether with the death of Mazarin in 1661. As Marder has noted, the project would have likely died a natural death had it not been for Gueffier's donation, which once invested as a *moltiplico* continued to accrue interest over the course of the seventeenth century.<sup>124</sup> Scholars, including Marder, have often credited Benedetti with continuing to promote the project after Mazarin's death.<sup>125</sup> In 1669 and 1671 rumors attributed to Benedetti circulated that Bernini's marble equestrian of Louis XIV (begun in 1665 after his return from Paris) would be placed on the Pincio.<sup>126</sup> Benedetti also began an official correspondence with Louis XIV through the French ambassador about financing the construction of the staircase in August of 1672, even

---

<sup>123</sup> With the term "spatial fiction of immunity" I am applying Grotius's characterization of ambassadorial immunity as a "double fiction" to the built environment, arguing that the occupation of space that takes place in an extraterritorial claim itself may in fact work as a fiction, serving both to represent sovereignty but also to embody it. See my discussion in Chapter 1, 29 and Grotius, *Rights to War and Peace Including the Law of Nature and of Nations*, translated by A.C. Campbell (Washington D.C.: M. Walter Dunne, 1901), 442-44.

<sup>124</sup> By 1680 Gueffier's legacy grew to 24,000 *scudi* and the Minims were granted permission by Innocent XI to use part of it to purchase some property and reinvest the remainder. Marder, "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps," 86 and note 43. See also, Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent royale*, 162, Pecchiai, *La Scalinata di Piazza di Spagna*, 34-36, and Lotz, "Die Spanische Treppe," 80) from a papal brief of 6 March 1702 (ASV, Segreteria di brevi, 2090, cc. 476-481, cited in D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 322).

<sup>125</sup> There is ample evidence that Benedetti was actively involved in French projects in Rome during this period, particularly with the construction of the pyramid in front of SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini in 1664-1668 and a chapel devoted to Saint Louis in S. Luigi dei Francesi (both by the architect Plautilla Bricci), as well as two funerary catafalques, one for Mazarin in 1661 and a second for the Queen of France, Anne of Austria in 1666.

<sup>126</sup> Included in an *avviso* of 27 July 1669 was the notation that the project would be for Trinità dei Monti. On 30 May 1671, the ambassador for the d'Este family wrote to Modena to report that Bernini has started work on the project that "will be placed at the Trinità dei Monti, although some maintain it will be for Paris." Rudolf Wittkower has included a thorough chronology of the equestrian statue in his article, "The Vicissitudes of a Dynastic Monument: Bernini's Equestrian Statue of Louis XIV," *Studies in the Italian Baroque* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), 83-102.

proposing that he sell his own villa on the Janiculum to provide additional funds for the project.<sup>127</sup>

While Benedetti was a vocal advocate for the project, it was the Minims themselves who worked most diligently to keep it alive, calling into question the conclusion reached by many scholars that this was a period of dormancy for the staircase project and for expressions of French territoriality in Rome more generally. A series of letters preserved in the Archives des Ministères des Affaires Etrangères between the friars at Trinità dei Monti and officials and diplomats of the French court in Rome and in Paris give a vivid account of the Minims' activities between 1662 and 1689, a period in which the community devoted considerable funds and effort to prevent any rival building projects on the Pincio in order to preserve the space for the staircase. In the letters the Minims demonstrate an awareness of the status of the broader French community in Rome, including reports of the activities of various allies, the political leanings of the pope, or the slights or affronts to the French king made by various individuals or groups in the city. The letters were aimed at both elevating and solidifying the Minims' as a newly French religious institution in order to gain royal favor and continued patronage.

### **From the Palazzo Farnese to the Pincian Hill: 1662-1664**

The connection that the Minims sought with the French court through these letters acquired new weight in the aftermath of the Créqui affair of 1662, when Franco-papal relations required delicate repair and the activities of the French community in Rome

---

<sup>127</sup> The latter indicates the seriousness of his conviction about the project, as the Villa Vascello was almost complete in 1665. For a building history of this monument see Carla Benocci, *Villa il Vascello* (Rome: Erasmio, 2003). In April of 1687 the equestrian theme reappeared as the central panel of a display at Benedetti's palace on the Janiculum in celebration of Louis XIV's recovery from illness. Fagiolo dell'Arco, *La festa barocca*, 536.

were watched closely by Rome's entire international community. As discussed in Chapter Two, the Créqui Affair definitively changed the political landscape between France and the Holy See. A young and ambitious Louis XIV seized the opportunity to demonstrate his autonomy from the papacy, forcing the hand of Alexander VII to pay reparations and transfer contested lands to the crown and its allies. For a period of time French troops also occupied the contested papal territories of Castro, Comacchio, and Avignon, adding an additional threat of violence to the negotiations. In Rome, this new exercise of power took on multiple visible manifestations, from the militarization of the diplomatic precinct by both French and papal guards, to the exhibition of royal arms on the palace facades, to the construction of the pyramid denouncing the Corsican guard, all with the knowledge that such displays were visible to an international and interested audience.

For the Minims, the tenuous political situation in Rome arrived directly on the heels of their newfound status as a royal institution. In letters to Paris dispatched from the monastery, their sense of pride was also tinged with a detectable anxiety that their behavior directly influenced both the perception of the French community at large by the Roman people, and, more importantly, their own reputation with their official patron, the King of France. On 2 October 1662, less than two months after the departure of Créqui, the entire community at Trinità dei Monti sent a letter to Hugues de Lionne pledging allegiance to Louis XIV, reassuring the king against rumors of political unrest at the monastery:

The king ordered us, urging peace and moderation, and that his Excellency (Monsieur de Brienne) has been warned that there are brothers in our community who are very angry and very opinionated in their sentiments. This notice has made us wonder if we should resolve to assure his Excellency (as we are assuring you by this letter that is signed by all the brothers) that we are in a perfect union since the departure of those who

had altered it, and that *all of Rome* has no less admired our modesty in our prosperity as it has admired our patience during our persecution: the memory of the suffering we had been caused by the division. We are so enjoying the taste of the fruits of peace at the moment, by the grace of God, that if anyone came to disturb us we would be the first to plead to your Excellency to represent [us] on the part of his Majesty to our General to return [this person] to France. If we discover the ones who have so badly informed M. de Brienne we will request justice from this calumny.<sup>128</sup>

Perhaps what is most remarkable about this letter is the community's recognition of public opinion, revealing the belief that the Minims' activities were the object of scrutiny, and by extension, significant enough to be a topic of interest to "all of Rome." The meaning of this phrase can also be interpreted as a subtle form of flattery to the king: by remarking that the community had received Rome's admiration, the Minims were assuring that their comportment was worthy of their royal affiliation and reflected the king's magnificence.

The Minims also revealed that scrutiny in Rome could be reciprocal. In a second letter written just a week after the first, the monastery's corrector, François Noël, reaffirmed his community's allegiance to the crown in the form of political commentary,

---

<sup>128</sup> AMAE Rome, vol.147, ff. 165r-166r [2 October 1662]. Letter to Lionne from community of Minims professing their loyalty to the king. "La protection si particuliere que Vre Exce a eu la bonté de prendre de cette maison Royale, nous oblige a ne pas differer davantage de l'en remercier tres humblement, et de luy faire scavoit que le R.P. Quinquet Collegue general nous a mandé de Calabre que M. Le Comte de Brienne le fils luy a escrit du xo auest que le Roy luy a donné ordre du nous exhorter a la paix et a la moderation, et que Son Exce est bien avertie qu'il y a des Religieux de nre communauté que sont trop vehemens et trop opiniastres en leurs sentiment. Cet avis si surprenant nous a fait prendre resolution de protester a son Exce comme nous protestons a la Vre par la presente qui est signée de tous les Religieux, que nous avons receu dans une parfaite union depuis la sortie de ceux qui l'ont alteré, et que tout Rome n'a pas moins admiré nre modestie dans la prosperité, que nre patience dans la persecution: la memoire des souffrance qui nous ont esté causees par la division[,] nous fait gouter avec tant de plaisir les fruits de la paix dont nous jouissons a present par la grace de Dieu que si quelque particulier venoit a la troubler nous serions les premiers a supplier V.E. de faire instance de la part de sa Majeste a nôtre General de la renvoyer en France. Si nous connoissions ceux qui ont si mal informé M. de Brienne nous demanderions justice de cette calomnie..." Signed: François Noël (corrector), Pierre Ruffat, F. Pierre Dijon, Fr. Bonaventure, F. Denis de Noillan, Fr. A Mercadier, Fr. Albert Vidal, Fr. Julien Menant, Fr. Claude Feburier, Fr. Jean Pommier, Fr. Guillaume Varroquier (?), Fr. Charles Dalbepieres, Fr René Tenys, Fr. François Coulon, Fr. Jean Pasquier, Fr Victor Touguin (?), Fr. Jean Louis Savoursin, F.r. Etienne Fort, Fr. Bernard Mathelin, Fr. Hacque Rousselon, Fr. Anthoine Bruneau, F. Jules Boussemy, F. Ciprien Raynaud, Fr. Simon Bruyant.

emphasizing the Roman people's sympathy with the French and the stress the affair was causing Alexander VII:

The departure of Bishops d'Eureux and Soisson has greatly angered the pope and although he called a public consistory and has even visited the churches for plenary indulgences, the work at St. Peter's has stopped. The news of Avignon has troubled the [government] but not the Romans who are very dissatisfied with the current government and it has been assured to me that the common people do not plan to defend him if the French come.<sup>129</sup>

By reporting on the general political climate of the city and its population, Noël may have wanted to demonstrate his value as a source for both French intelligence and representation in Rome, especially during a time when official channels, notably the office of the ambassador, had been disrupted. Regardless of whether these observations were correct, the Minims, in letters quoted above, describe a constitutive and discrete body: the "Roman people" whom they recognized as an entity separate from themselves and wielding the power of collective opinion. This notion of public regard was a continual and pressing concern for the Minims that I introduce here to demonstrate that the preoccupation with the visible manifestations of the French affiliation emerged

---

<sup>129</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 147, ff.191r -192r [8 October 1662]. "...[L]e depart de mrs. Les evesques d'Eureux et Soissons a fort faché le pape et quoyqu'il aye faict tenir le consistoire public et qu'il aye lui mesme visité les eglises pour l'indulgence pleniére[.] Les travaux qu'on faisoit a st. pierre desistant. La nouvelle d'Avignon a consterne la palais mais non pas le Romains qui sont tres mescontents du gouvernement present et on m'a assureé que la commun peuple est dans le dessein de ne se defendre pas si les françois viennent..." "Avignon" refers to Louis XIV's seizure of the city from the Holy See. An earlier section of the letter also reveals some of the political effects of the Créqui Affair on the community. The ambassador's absence from Rome, for example, was felt by the community as a loss of an ally and a vital link between them and the court in France. Noël continued in this letter, "Mgr de Brienne who had commanded R. Pere Quinquet to write to us on his behalf, notes that the king is very angry with our quarrels, which we have had hardly known since the departure of Pere Louis and his adherents. If the Ambassador were here he would certainly have testified to our innocence, knowing how dearly the trouble the deceased Cardinal Spada has caused us, and we can say that without the very valuable assistance of your Excellency there would not be a single Frenchman here. I can assure you that I have never seen this community so united nor so observant..."

alongside the recognition (or perception) of a discrete audience comprised of the (viewing) public.

The Minims' early exercises of control over the Pincio emerged during the course of the difficult negotiations between the King of France and the Holy See, which were codified in the Treaty of Pisa. It was a period in which the ambassador was not in residence, public interest was turned toward Franco-papal diplomatic relations, and the Minims were anxious to prove their allegiance to the French king. On 1 March 1663, a notation in the chapter minutes recorded a dispute over land usage on the hill, in which the Minims detected a potential loss of control of the site to the Maestri delle Strade who had begun displacing earth and investigating sections of "their mountain."<sup>130</sup> After appealing to their cardinal protector, Flavio Chigi, the work was halted, but no formal papal ruling was made on the ownership of the property. In the absence of any legal precedent, however, the Minims began to administer their own proprietary rights on the hillside, leasing land and negotiating access to their water supplies with nearby residents.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> BAV Ferraioli vol. 391, f. 114 [1 March 1663]. "Le Chapitre ayant esté informé que les officier des Maistres des Strades, ne se contentoient pas de fouilles (excavation) sur nre montaigne, mais encores passoient sous nre muraille et entroient dans les grottes de nre jardin, le R.P. Correcteur fut prie de recourir a nre Eme Protecteur, qui les a fait desister de leur recherché et remettre la terre qu'ils ausient tirée."

<sup>131</sup> The water in question was likely runoff received by the Minims from the Villa Medici, a gift they had received since its donation by Ferdinando de' Medici. Ferdinando had financed the construction of a conduit to the Pincio in the late sixteenth century, after receiving his own gift of 60,000 litres of water per day from Sixtus V, after the restoration of the aqueduct supplying the Acqua Felice. My thanks to Katherine Rinne, who offered me a copy of her unpublished essay, "Water the Currency of Cardinals in Early Modern Rome" originally presented at the Society of Architectural Historians Annual Meeting, 2006. For more information on the landscape of water in early modern Rome, see Katherine Rinne, *The Waters of Rome: Aqueducts and the Birth of the Baroque City*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011. The minutes for 3 December 1663 read: "La Lecture de la Minute de l'Instrument de Monsignore Fagnano a Elle Letüe, Et acceptée, par laquelle le Convent Luy donne en Emphiteose (long lease) une Certaine portain attachée a l'Escalier, par lequel on monte au Palais du Pin, d'un Coté, et de l'autre Confine aux la Maison de Dominico Magi, a raison de 15 Baoqe de Canon par Chaque Case avec les pactes accoutumes, Et e suite fut donnée procuration au Reverend Pere Procureur, pour traiter avec luy." BAV Ferraioli vol. 391, f. 121. Monsignore Fagnano is first mentioned in a notation from 14 October 1663: "De plus fut conclu d'obliger de la belle Maniere Monsignore Fagnano en luy donnant un jet d'Eau qui Se perd en terre, don't il veut Se



It was also during this period that the Minims broached the subject of the staircase with Louis XIV. A letter written at the end of April 1664 from Noillan to Lionne indicates that the Minims had been in contact with the king about the project as early as March 1663, working in concert with Elpidio Benedetti to secure royal permission to continue the project. The Minims claimed that their royal privilege entitled them to even more donations than those received by other orders located in Paris, including even the nuns of Val de Grace who had received a royal donation to build their residences.

Having taken the liberty of writing to [Elpidio Benedetti] on the third of last March, on the subject of the staircase projected to be built in front of our church I have learned from him that upon his return to Rome, after having been interrogated by several people on what he had obtained from his Most Christian Majesty, he responded notably to the Ambassador of Florence: ‘God pardon anyone who prevents that which he wants to do, His Majesty appreciated the drawing that he had shown him but did not want to begin [the project] again.’ I have since written to his Excellency of a way of doing it without great expense asking only for [royal donation] of four of five thousand *scudi*, which is not without precedent, a priory of 30 *livres* having been given to the nuns of Val de Grace in order to build their convent, the Feuillants of Rue St. Honore likewise having obtained quite a considerable abby for this purpose. Although these convents are in Paris and very large, I believe that the royal convent in Rome is more important and by this [donation], his Majesty puts undoubtedly the title of founder and [patron] forever. Your excellence can even send, following the donation, a clause preventing the brothers from using the revenue from this benefice.<sup>132</sup>

---

sorvir (sic) pour une Maison, qu’il veut faire bastir sur nr Fonds, a condition quil nous laisseroit les retours des autres Canaux d’eau, qui sont dans Sa Maison, et Jardins, pour nous Servir a ce que voudrions, et que nous aurions encore le retour du retour de la ditte Eau quil faire dans la ditte Maison que fera batir.”

Another notation in the chapter minutes of 25 May, mentions negotiation of permission to an Abbé Renzi for opening a door onto the hillside across from the Minims’ property. The contract for Fagnano was resolved on 30 July 1664. The contract for Renzi was resolved on 4 August 1664, when the Minims permit abbé Rienzi, who lived in a house on the foot of the Pincio “subtus ecclesiam” to open a door in the hedge of his garden that bordered the hillside path to the church, in order to permit his servants to go to mass. Ferraioli vol.391 f. 369r.

<sup>132</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 158, ff.330r-331r [24 April 1664], Noillan to Lionne. “Ayant prins la liberte de lui écrire en date du 3me mars derniere au subject de l’escalier projeté a faire devant nre eglise jay appris que l’Abbe Elpidio apres son arrivee a Rome ayant este interroge de plusieurs ce qu’il avoit obtenu de sa Majeste tres Chrestienne pour ce subject il a respondu notamment a l’Ambre de Florence “Dio pardoni (sic) a chi ha impedito quello che lo voleva fare, sua Maestà gradisce il disegno che li ho fatto vedere ma non vol comminciarlo ancora.” Jay depuis escript a Vre Exce un moyen de le faire sans donner de l’argent je demande seulement un prieure ou abbaye de 4 ou 5 mille escus ce n’est pas sans exemple on a doné aux

The letter also indicates that Louis XIV had already notified the Minims of his decision. He did not want to revive the staircase project. One can only speculate about the reasons behind the king's decision, though the initiation of such a monumental and controversial project would have occurred during a delicate period of negotiation with the Holy See. The Treaty of Pisa, which resolved the Créqui Affair, was less than two months old, and included a host of stipulations designed to embarrass the pope as well as reparations that required him to delve into the public coffers. It is likely that the king recognized the importance of concord in the wake of this severe political setback to the papacy, a gesture that would have also inferred the impression of reverence appropriate to the "Most Christian King." Furthermore, with the Jansenist crisis at its peak in France, Louis XIV sought papal support, requesting Alexander VII to send an official brief that condemned Jansenism and required bishops to sign a formulary that rejected its tenets.

The news that the king would not endorse the staircase did not deter the Minims from pursuing the project further. With the plans put on hold, the emphasis shifted to controlling the hillside itself. The chapter minutes of 21 May 1664 include a notation that the friars had received word from both the papal nuncio, Roberto Carlo, and the diplomatic attaché, Abbé Bourlemont, about a new threat to the potential execution of the staircase: the Basilian monks of Grottaferrata, were planning on purchasing a house in

---

religieuses du Val de Grace un prieure de 30 mille livres de vinte pour bastire leur convent, les feuillants de la rue St. Honoré ont obtenu autrefois une abbaye tres considerable pour ce subject. Quoique ces convents soient dans Pars et tres considerables je croy que La Convent Royal dans Rome est plus important et par ce moyen Sa Majeste mit hors de conteste le tiltre de fondateur et l'affermit a jamais. Vre Exce pout mesme envoyer en suite [...] une depense aux religieus d'employer le revenu de ce benefice..."

Rome at the foot of the Pincio.<sup>133</sup> The note concluded that it was necessary to purchase the house directly from its previous owners, a mendicant order of unmarried women, in order to prevent the Basilians from moving in. On 25 May, the Minims resolved to contact the protector of the women's order to finalize the sale.<sup>134</sup> It was only after the decision had been made that they decided to contact Lionne to inform him of their decision.

According to the chapter minutes the contract was finalized two days later for a total of 3,000 *scudi*.<sup>135</sup> Despite various measures to secure the funds, including emptying their own financial reserves, collecting outstanding rent, and receiving a small donation from the French ally, the Duke de Bracciano, the Minims were still forced to appeal to Lionne via Bourlemont for additional funds.<sup>136</sup> Bourlemont's letter to Lionne confirms that the Minims' objective was to preserve the site for the future staircase, indicating that this project was still very much a reality for the friars, despite Louis's previous rejection

---

<sup>133</sup> BAV Ferraioli vol. 391 f.125r [21 May 1664]. It is also interesting to note that this house was located next to an area already in use by the Minims, a ballcourt at the base of the hillside. "Le Reverend Père Correcteur ayant assemblé Le Chapitre pour luy faire sçavoir la reponce que luy avait fait Messeigneurs Rasponi, et de Bourlemont touchant l'Achapt que les Reverends Pères de Grotta Ferrata de l'ordre de St. Basile vouloient faire d'une Maison qui est au bas de nr Montagne proche le Jeu des Boules, et ayant dit que leur sentiment et celui de nr Procureur estoit de demander la preference, la Chapitre eu égard aux inconveniens qui en peuvent arriver, a conclu d'achepter cette Maison quoy que le prix fut Excel. (sic), pour empecher cet Establissement."

<sup>134</sup> BAV Ferraioli v. 391 f.126r [25 May 1664].

<sup>135</sup> BAV Ferraioli vol. 391 ff. 126r-127r [27 May 1664]. "Le 27 a esté Conclu que pour achapter la Maison des zitelles Mendicanti que est au bas de nr. Montage, on prendroit tout l'Argent qui se retrevue dans le Convent, pour payer la Somme de trois mille Escus, quil nous faut payer Contant pour cet achapt et pour ce qui manquera de Surplus, les Reverends Peres de Noillan, Albert avec le Reverend Pere Procureur deputez pour cet affaire chercheront de l'Argent a Cens. Pour ce qui est des trois mille Escus qui restent a payer pour le dit Achapt, on a Conclu que lon s'accollera les Cens que seront specifiques dans l'Instrument d'Achapt, jusques a la Concurrence de la ditte comme a raison... de 4 Cents." The notation also mentions a donation from the Duke of Bracciano received on the 16 May. The sale was finalized in 1665.

<sup>136</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 159 ff. 168v-169r [1 June 1664]. Bourlemont to Lionne. "Le religieux du convent de la Trinite de Mont [...] voulirent achapter [du moines Basilions...] maison establi au pied de leur montagne par ci etablissement une vindrent (?) parler du preindice et concernant du voisinage avant un monacler a leur porte et que cette prejudicter au desein que le Roy avoit de faire un Escalier que alles de la place a leur Eglise en (cette?) dessein que eu fait du vivant defunt mgr le cardinal Mazarin puisque les dite bas estan establis la (?) probilment achapter certain lieux de feuilles (?)."

of the plan. Over a month transpired before the Minims heard from Lionne, who informed the friars that he would write the French ambassador, the Duc de Créquy, to resolve the issue.<sup>137</sup> Finally, on 1 September, a letter written to Lionne by the Minims' corrector, Menant, indicated that Duc de Créquy had successfully convinced the king to provide the necessary funds to complete the sale.

Several events had transpired over the spring and summer of 1664 that may have influenced the king's decision or the Minims' tactics in their appeal for royal funds. One was the conclusion of the Treaty of Pisa in August of 1664, and the subsequent return of the King's ambassador, the Duc de Créquy to the Palazzo Farnese. With an official ambassador in residence, the management of French affairs in Rome became more stable and secure. Noillan even wrote to Lionne in July that the French quarter was "the most peaceful in Rome since the ambassador's return."<sup>138</sup> A second reason may have been that Louis had now received what he had requested from Alexander in the form of an official papal brief condemning Jansenism, the *Regiminis Apostolici*, issued on 15 February 1664. But, perhaps the most influential motivation was the new enterprise of an old opponent in the contest for control over the Pincio: that of the Spanish crown, whose residential embassy presided over the Piazza di Spagna.

---

<sup>137</sup> Ferraioli vol. 391 f. 128 [23 July 1664]. In a notation in the chapter minutes of 23 July 1664, the Minims recorded receiving a letter from Lionne on 23 May, "for our plea of our wish to obtain from his Majesty some free donation in order to be able to restore some of the costs incurred which we have had to make, in order to buy the house of the Mendicant zitelle, which now, we have resolved to write to Duc de Créquy, and recommend us to his Excellence on our behalf, [and] in all manners prevent the brothers of the order of Saint Basile, from establishing themselves at the foot of our Mountain, which they have planned."

<sup>138</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 160 ff. 31r-32r [1 July 1664]. Noillan to Lionne on the conduct of Crequy at the Palazzo Farnese: The ambassador has put everything in such good order since his return to his palace that it is said publicly that the most peaceable quarter in Rome is that of the Palazzo Farnese."

## “Devant les Yeux”: Spain and France on the Pincio

The completion of the Palazzo di Spagna in 1647 was a motivating factor whose importance cannot be overlooked.<sup>139</sup> The longstanding rivalry between France and Spain, exacerbated by the Thirty Years War, had already been the source of several open conflicts in the streets of Rome.<sup>140</sup> As the diplomatic precincts of both the Spanish and French crown began to expand, the frequency of these disputes increased with claims of extraterritorial immunity used to their full advantage by both sides. The Spanish crown's claim to the area surrounding its ambassadorial residence on the Piazza di Spagna began as early as the 1640s. One of the first recorded disputes occurred in 1645 during appointment of the Spanish ambassador, the Count of Siruela, who was accused of using the residence to board soldiers and a gunsmith.<sup>141</sup> Spain's diplomatic precinct in Rome grew in 1654 with the residence of the ambassador, the Duke of Terranova, and by 1660, the limits of immunity claimed by his successor, Luis de Guzman Ponce de León, extended beyond the piazza to the Via Paolina.<sup>142</sup> It was in this year that the first map of the quarter was produced, which, though now lost, is mentioned in a letter by Antonio del

---

<sup>139</sup> The Spanish had been in residence on the piazza since the initial rental of the palace in 1622. For full citations on work addressing the urban development of this area, see Anselmi, *Il palazzo dell'ambasciata di spagna*, and Thomas Dandelelet, “Spanish Conquest and Colonization at the Center of the Old World: The Spanish Nation in Rome, 1555-1625,” *Journal of Modern History*, 69, no. 3 (1997): 479-511; and *Spanish Rome, 1500-1700* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001).

<sup>140</sup> Dandelelet writes: “Indeed, Rome on a microlevel became yet another front in the Spanish French wars that raged in other parts of Europe.” Dandelelet also notes that the governor of Rome, Giovanni Battista Spada, was concerned that the levels of violence were rising in the city between the Spain and France. Dandelelet, *Spanish Rome*, 191.

<sup>141</sup> Anselmi, *Il palazzo dell'ambasciata di spagna*, 171, note 9.

<sup>142</sup> The Spanish embassy was first diplomatic residence in Rome purchased by a foreign power. It was purchased for Spain by Iñigo Veles de Guevara, count of Onate and the Spanish ambassador, whose bid was approved by the Papal Congregation of the Barons of the Papal State. The renovations to the palace were completed by Antonio del Grande in 1647. Dandelelet, *Spanish Rome*, 205. The first plan of the quarter was realized around 1660, though now lost, it is mentioned in a letter by Antonio del Grande. Anselmi, *Il Palazzo dell'ambasciata di spagna*, 190, note 17. A second plan was completed in 1683 and is reproduced in Anselmi, fig. 8, 178 (“Calle del Corso, y donde se terminaba el quartel que tenía El.cmo s.or Marqués del Carpio mi S.r siendo embaxador en Roma.” Archivo General de Simancas).

Grande.<sup>143</sup> Maps of Rome produced during the period also reflected the extension of Spanish primacy. On the *Pianta di Roma Moderna* of 1665 by Giovanni Battista de Rossi the piazza, formerly referred to as the “Platea Trinitatis,” is for the first time designated the “Forum Hispanicum.”<sup>144</sup> Over the course of the 1670s the Spanish greatly increased their claims of immunity and by 1678, with the publication of a new map of the quarter, the area claimed under Spanish jurisdiction included 850 houses and 205 shops. Among these were both the palace of the Propaganda Fide and SS. Trinità dei Monti.<sup>145</sup>

The Spanish extension of control over their diplomatic precinct had a direct effect on the Minims’ pursuit of French control over the Pincio. On 26 May 1664, Noillan wrote to Lionne in another attempt to revive the staircase project, citing the encroaching Spanish presence as a threat to its future development.

Yesterday this chapter had the honor of writing to your Excellency of an affair that Monseigneur de Bourlemont judges to be quite significant. He has even written to your Excellency and I humbly agree to offer him my most humble prayers and to say to him with respect that this is a Spanish enterprise, [the members of which] are ambitiously trying to become masters of our quarter, most notably of the piazza and even Innocent X who quite favored the Spanish refused to put the Piazza di Spagna into the public contracts, as we have already begun to do. Mr. l’Abbe Elpidio said yesterday to our superior that he would write about it to Mr. Colbert. I, moreover, speaking for this foundation and all of this community in asking for the assistance of his Excellency who have given me the liberty to ask

---

<sup>143</sup> In addition to the juridical claim of extraterritoriality, Spanish predominance over the Piazza manifested itself through festive celebrations of state, including a large scale *fiesta* for the birth of the Infante Don Carlos in 17 to 19 February 1662, just two weeks after the celebration of the Birth of the French Dauphin. In her text on the building history of the Palazzo di Spagna, however, Alessandra Anselmi attributes the aftermath of Créqui Affair of 1662 for a shift in the political relations that led to a temporary cessation of festive rivalry between the two powers. According to Anselmi, the dispute served as a catalyst to forge a tentative alliance between the Spanish and the French crown, together united against the Government of Rome and the papacy in defense of their extraterritorial quarters. Anselmi, *Il palazzo dell’ambasciata di spagna*, 173-177.

<sup>144</sup> Giovanni Battista Falda’s “Nuova pianta et alzata della città di Roma...” of 1676, however, indicates the nomenclature designated for this space was still in flux as late as 1676, where it is referred to as the “Piazza sono la SS. Trinità dei Monti.”

<sup>145</sup> Anselmi, *Il palazzo dell’ambasciata di spagna*, 177, and Archivio Segreto Vaticano, *Estado*, 3059, cited in Anselmi, 191, note 40.

with respect that it seems that the occasion would be good to request to his Majesty for a benefice for this good convent, as I have been given the honor of writing to your Excellency with the order from the brothers that all the purchases we will make or the expenditures will be in the name of his Majesty as founder and patron of the convent. We are waiting for the return at the end of this week of Mgr Ambassadeur who has placed this morning the arms of France on the door of the Palazzo Farnese where he will continue to live. The pyramid is perfect with this inscription...<sup>146</sup>

The letter is remarkable in its summation of the urban and territorial concerns of the French in Rome. In it Noillan makes a subtle connection between concerns over the Pincio and the broader issue of French diplomatic representation in Rome, emphasizing the importance of visible displays of authority in Rome. Furthermore, Noillan uses the phrase “nôtre quartier” in reference to the area in conflict, a term primarily used in the period to designate urban areas associated with diplomatic immunity. While Noillan does not specify the boundaries of this area, he does make specific note of the Piazza di Spagna as the area most threatened by the “Spanish enterprise,” suggesting that the quarter belonging to the Minims not only extended to the undeveloped area of the Pincio, but to the Piazza di Spagna itself, a claim that had absolutely no documentary or legal basis.

I do not think that Noillan’s use of the term “quartier” is accidental, but referenced a specific type of urban phenomenon, namely the foreign zones of influence that emerged with the discourse over extraterritoriality. As Laurie Nussdorfer has discussed, the political landscape of Baroque Rome was a “web of jurisdictions,” but the primary spatial framework of the city’s legal structure was based on the *rioni*. In the seventeenth century there were fourteen *rioni*, each under the jurisdiction of an elected *caporione* (often from one of the members of the district’s most prominent families) and

---

<sup>146</sup> AMAE Rome, vol. 159, ff.161r-162r [26 May 1664].

patrolled by a band of young men under the local *capotero*.<sup>147</sup> In addition to the *rione* was a second formal framework that gave spatial form to the religious fabric of Rome, the *parrocchia*. The early modern equivalent of the census, the *stati dell' anime* were divided by parish and were designed to give a demographic (and moral) profile of each area. The *quartiere*, however, was a separate entity. In both its Italian and French usages, “quartiere” designated the socio-cultural units of the city, districts in which certain discrete groups, such as nations or professions, predominated. In the seventeenth century, the term was also adopted in political discourse to designate any area belonging within the diplomatic precinct that surrounded the ambassadorial palace. For the French in Rome, the boundaries of the *quartiere* were kept deliberately vague and flexible, encouraging potential dispute, and therefore in keeping with the king’s tactics for increasing his *gloire*. Most importantly, the claim to extraterritorial space was completely independent of the juridical system of the Roman government. This process also characterized the claim on the Pincio: vague in its definition, flexible in its boundaries, and operating independently of the judicial oversight of the Roman government, the Minims considered the slope in front of their church extraterritorial (French) space.

The most significant aspect of extraterritoriality was the visual nature of its designation. In the second half of the letter, Noillan makes two references to his awareness of this visual marking of space in his description of the preparations being made for the ambassador’s return. The first reference is to the pyramid constructed on the Piazza SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini, the most controversial stipulation of the accord between Louis XIV and Alexander VII. As discussed in Chapter Two, the pyramid not only

---

<sup>147</sup> Nussdorfer, *Politics of Space*, 173-174 and Eleonora Canepari, “The Making of Local Power: *Caporioni* and Neighborhood’s Inhabitants in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Rome.” Presented at the Renaissance Society of America Annual Meeting, Montréal, 24-26 March 2011.



functioned as a “shame monument” but also indexed the very process by which French defined their territory in Rome. From an iconographical perspective, it referenced similar monuments erected by the French in other annexed territories in Europe, while simultaneously echoing, and subverting the triumphant and proprietary connotations of the papal *guglie* placed in church piazze throughout Rome. The monument’s placement was also directly on axis with the Piazza Farnese and visible to anyone traveling from the Piazza Navona to the Ponte Sisto along the busy Via dei Pettinari. The king’s primary concern, however, was the monument’s *visibility*, stipulating that the letters in the inscription be large enough and carved deeply enough to be seen from a distance. Noillan makes note of the inscription in his letter, suggesting that he has seen (and read) the monument, thereby coding his own process of observation into the visual demarcation of the king’s territorializing gaze.

Noillan’s second reference to the diplomatic precinct appears in his observation that the arms of France had been placed back on the Palazzo Farnese, their first appearance since August 1664. This had been done in preparation for the ambassador’s imminent return to Rome and was a public sign that relations between France and Rome had stabilized. The French crest on the palazzo had multiple meanings and was the most potent sign of territoriality *as a visible process* employed by the French in Rome. With the crest in place, the Palazzo Farnese and everything within its view once again was transformed into French territory. It also indicated that the ambassador (who served as the king’s eyes, ears, and voice abroad) was – or in this case, would soon be – in residence, thus sealing the connection between architecture, sight, and the royal surveilling presence.

The reporting of these events, as in many previous letters to the royal court, fulfilled the etiquette required and expected from Noillan as a client writing to his royal patron. As Noillan would have known, Lionne, as the First Minister of the King, was already aware and involved in the execution of the pyramid project. In remarking on the pyramid and the crest Noillan exhibited not only his loyalty as a subject of the king and as a part of the greater French nation in Rome, but also demonstrated his knowledge of the very ways in which French territory was shaped, coded, and defended in Rome. Noillan's observations on these objects and his understanding of their significance may have also served as a subtle promotion for the staircase project, the primary purpose of his letter. In writing of both "French" quarters, Noillan makes an underlying comparison between their designating monuments and presents the case that, like the pyramid and the crest, the staircase was a necessary marker of French territory in Rome, particularly in the face of the encroaching Spanish threat.<sup>148</sup> This connection is key to understanding how the Minims defined and substantiated their own territorial claims on the Pincio.

Noillan's efforts to secure funds only proved partially successful: the Minims received a response to their request and were granted a royal donation to defray part of the costs of their purchase.<sup>149</sup> By this point, however, as two letters of 1 September 1662 reveal, the community was in significant debt, having taken their own initiative in purchasing the land without first receiving the permission or financial support of the king. In these letters, one written to Lionne and the second directly to the King, the Minims'

---

<sup>148</sup> This letter may have also been prompted by renewed attempts by the Maestri delle Strade to reassert control over the hillside. On 26 May 1664, an edict was published by the Maestri di Strade prohibiting damage to the hillside. "Editto dei maestri delle strade col quale si vieta di danneggiare e di gettare immonizie nella piantata d'olmi alla salita della S.S. Trinità al Pincio." Archivio di Stato, Bandi vol. 26. While Marder makes note of this new edict, the actions of Minims over the weeks prior put it into new light, perhaps as a direct response to the conflict over the space.

<sup>149</sup> BAV Ferraioli, vol. 391, f.128r [23 July 1664], see above, note 137.

corrector, P. Menant, tried (after the fact) to convince the court not only of the necessity of their decision but that it even was an indication of their devotion to the king. In the letter to Louis the Minims' corrector reported that the community had successfully purchased the properties at the foot of the hillside, in turn thwarting those that would have prevented the construction of such a "grand staircase" that would be the "ornament of all of Rome." In the letter to Lionne, Menant elaborated on the direness of the Minims' financial situation. The total purchase of the building, including repairs and property rights, had cost the Minims over twelve thousand *scudi* (over nine thousand more than the original cost of the property) and they now hoped for a donation of 20,000 *livres* in order to recover their costs.<sup>150</sup>

With the return of the Duc de Créqui to Rome on 31 May 1664, the Minims received assurances that the ambassador would continue to advocate on their behalf.<sup>151</sup> To date, there is no record in the chapter minutes of another donation made in this period, nor are there any letters to or from Paris mentioning a second benefice. In all likelihood the Minims' extravagant request was denied, despite rumors circulating in Rome that Colbert was interested in beginning the staircase project again.<sup>152</sup> Nonetheless, with the

---

<sup>150</sup> AMAE Rome vol.161 f.23r -24r [1 September 1664].

<sup>151</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 170, f.210rv [4 August 1665], Noillon to Lionne on the staircase and Crequi's support for the project, second paragraph: "Ceste communauté escript par cest ordinaire a mr le duc de Crequi pour le congratuler de son heureux retour a la cour et le prier de sa souvenir des promesses qu'il nous avoit fait estant a Rome de nous obtenir quelque liberalite de sa Maieste pour la scala que le defunct Cardinal Mazarin disoit vouloir faire [.] Je soutiendrais ce convent en eust toute l'obligation a vre Exce pour lui procurer ceste grace comme elle a deigne nous en procurer de plus grandes qui nous obligeront de la reconnoiste comme nre unique protecteur comme je fais pour mon vrai patron et la suplie me continuer la grace de me croire toujours."

<sup>152</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 161 f.66r [8 September 1664. "Monseigneur, Le RP Correcteur (Menant) escrivant a Sa Maieste et a vre Exce au nom de ceste communauté en subject de l'achapt de ceste maison au pied de nre monagne a tenué a propos que je joignitte mes tres humbles prieres aus lienes ce que le fais d'autant plus volontiers esperant quelle l'agreera que jay occassion de lui escrire une nouvelle qu'on a publiéé dans Rome que Mr Colbert avoit dit a Sa Maieste que avoit temoigné vouloit faire la scala devant ce bien convent qu'on ne sauroit entreprendre cest ouvrage sans discontinuer la bastiment du Louvre. Il croy pourtant que si sa Maieste a la bonte de gratifier son convent de quelque benefice considerable elle pourre

property purchased, the Minims did manage to prevent other groups from becoming ensconced on the Pincio, knowing that Gueffier's legacy provided some insurance that the project would be revived in the future. As time would reveal, these funds would not be released until the close of the century, but the actions taken by the Minims during the 1660s were the first steps toward definitively controlling the property as if it were French territory.<sup>153</sup>

The perception of the Spanish "threat" in 1664 also brought a second project to life: the modification of Trinità dei Monti's facade to accommodate the royal arms of France. Completed in 1670 by the pensioners of the French Academy in Rome under the supervision of Charles Errard, this project consisted of a monumental crest supported by two angels that partially covered a section of the inscription running the length of the cornice (figure 3-8).<sup>154</sup> On 3 October 1665 Noillan wrote to Lionne, asking for permission to hang the royal arms on the facade of Trinità dei Monti.

[I write of] the ignominious inscription on the portal of the church of the Royal convent, which has made [the king] suffer with great pain. A few years ago a friend made me hope for some donation but presently [I have] some money at hand and a brother [who is] an excellent sculptor and a

---

et faire construire la scala et faire parachever ceste maison sans metre la main a la bourse d'ailleurs ce bien dont elle est fondateur n'aura pas moins d'avantage que l'eglise St. Louis a Rome qui a 2 pour cent sur tous les benefices consistoriaux ce qui veut beaucoup mais en cest affaire nous ne pourrions rien que avec l'intercession de vre Exce laquelle il implore avec toute sorte de respect et en qualite de...Noillan."

<sup>153</sup> By 1721, when the funds were finally released by Innocent XII, the *moltiplico* had appreciated to 49,163 *scudi* and 70 *baiocchi*. Pecchiai, *La Scalinata di Piazza di Spagna*, 38 and Marder, "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps," 89. The work was completed in 1726 and cost 52,765 *scudi*.

<sup>154</sup> Completed in 1670, the arms have been noted as one of the early commissions completed by the nascent French Academy in Rome. The first letters to be published concerning the commission appeared in Anatole de Montaiglon's compendium of the correspondence of the directors of the French Academy in Rome, including letters written from 1666 to 1670 between Noillan and Lionne on the commission of the work to the Academy's director, Charles Errard. Both Lotz and D'Onofrio have used these letters to identify the works' provenance in their discussions of the Minims' contribution to the building history of the Spanish Steps. Several letters written by Noillan to Lionne prior to 1666 have not been included with those published by de Montaiglon, and, paired with the existing documentation, offer a richer picture of the history of the commission and its connection to the larger effort by the French in Rome to territorialize the Pincio. For the letters see Anatole de Montaiglon, *Correspondance des Directeurs de l'Academie de France à Rome*, 10 vols. (Paris: 1889) vol. 6, 373-378.

good friend residing here, as I had spoken about to M. Bourlement who had approved my design and about which we are writing to your Excellency. It is also my thought to ask for the money in the event that it cannot be done in this tiresome (*rude*) pontificate, so that I can put everything in place for it to be done during the *sede vacante* under the supervision of the Ambassador who would do nothing more but tell the sculptor what to do and order the superior to let the sculptor who had made the design (which entirely covers the *piorum elemosinis adiuta*) work. The crest and the figures will not be of true marble. It would cost 1000 *scudi* for the material and the labor but it will be of the same material that the grand duke of Tuscany had his arms made of on the Palazzo Madama, which have been there since the year 1620 and are as beautiful as when they were first made.<sup>155</sup>

Noillan was referencing the inscription that spanned the cornice of Trinità dei Monti's facade, which had been carved to celebrate the completion of the church during the pontificate of Sixtus V. The friar proposed to cover the offending phrase, "piorum elemosinis adiuta" with a royal crest made of stucco, thus obscuring the phrase and emphasizing the church's affiliation through the king's insignia. Attached to the letter was a full page drawing in pen and ink (figures 3-9 and 3-10) by a Minim from Aquitaine

---

<sup>155</sup> AMAE Rome, vol. 171 f. 260r-262v [3 October, 1665). Les inclination tres particulieres que jay pour le service de mon souverain par dessus ceux que la nature m'oblige m'a faict souffrir avec grand peine la tiltre ignomineux qui est sur le portail de l'eglise de ce convent Royal: *Sme Trinitati Regum Gallice munificentia piorum elemosinis*. Il y a quelques annees q'un ami m'avoit faict esperer quelque charite mais presentment ayant de quoi en main et un Religeuse tres excellent sculpteur et fort mon ami resident (local ?) j'en ay parle a Mgr de Bourlemont qui aprouvent mon dessein à dessus a propos que j'en escrivesse a vr Exce. Aussi estoit ce ma pense et la prier en cas elle ne trouvent pas a propos de rien faire durant ce Rude pontificat que je misse le tout en estat pour le faire durant le siege vacant sous l'appuy de l'Ambre qui sera lequel n'aura autre chose a faire que le dise qu'il la faict faire et ordoner au superieur de laisser travailler cest sculpteur lequel a faict la dessein ci joint qui couvere entierement *piorum elemosinis adiuta*. L'escu et les figures ne seront pas a la verité de marbre. Il y faudroit mille escus pour le moins et le grand temps mais de la mesme matiere que la grand duc de toscane a faict metre ces arme sur son palais de place madame que y sont depuis l'an 1620 aussi belles que le premier jour."

named Jean Pasquet (as identified in an earlier letter by Noillan).<sup>156</sup> The top section of the drawing consists of a view of the offending portion of the facade, while the bottom section depicted the facade as Noillan had envisioned it with two angels supporting a large escutcheon bearing the arms of the King of France. This is the first known sketch for the crest project, predating Errard's plans for the project by nearly five years.

In the letter Noillan did not disguise his distrust of Alexander VII, who, resistant to both the claim of French privilege and to the staircase project, had not been well received by the French faction of Minims. In order to avoid any complications that could arise from papal disapproval, Noillan proposed a detailed plan of execution that involved having all the elements in place (sculptor, funds, and permission) in order to be completed in the short window of the *sede vacante*, the transitional period in which the conclave met to select the next pope.<sup>157</sup> This would require the oversight of the ambassador, who, as noted above, would only have to direct the sculptor to complete to work. A year passed before any word came from Paris, but in April of 1666 a notice that their request had been received was sent by Nicolas Pachau, the chief clerk in the department of Foreign Affaires under Louis XIV, and a notation was made in the minutes of the chapter meeting the following month.<sup>158</sup> By 10 May 1666, the Minims had received official permission from the king and by September of that year, Noillan

---

<sup>156</sup> AMAE Rome, vol. 173, ff.112r-113r [26 May 1665], Noillan to Quinquet.

<sup>157</sup> For discussion on the political upheavals that occurred during the *sede vacante*, see Laurie Nussdorfer, *Civic Politics in the Rome of Urban VIII* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

<sup>158</sup> Minims receive permission from the king to raise the royal arms on the façade: "...une lettre de Monseignr Le Ambassadeur qui mande au R. P. Correcteur de faire entendre aux religieux qu Sa Majesté aura tres agreeable qu'on embelisse les frontispiece de l'eglise de queques ornament nouveaux, pour support des armes de la Maieste." BAV Ferraioli, vol. 391, f. 144r [10 May 1667].

dispatched two letters, one to the ambassador in Rome, the second to Lionne in Paris, granting permission to begin the project.<sup>159</sup>

The two letters provide insight into the motives behind the commission, one regarding the public dimension of the affiliation, the other addressing the internal tensions that lingered within the convent walls even after the royal designation.<sup>160</sup> The first, of 14 September is a direct appeal to Lionne, while the second is the official petition to the ambassador in Rome, the Duc de Chaulnes. In the petition, Noillan, writing on behalf of his community, stipulated the formal reasons for the commission, noting that the royal arms would cover an area of the inscription on the church facade (“piorum elemosynis adjuta”) that was considered an affront to the king.<sup>161</sup>

The overarching theme of the proposal is a concern with the public appearance and reputation of the monastery as a representation of its newly established status. Noillan expresses particular concern with the proliferation of signs of Spanish privilege in Rome, both on the portal of the Spanish-affiliated S. Pietro in Montorio, and the fountains on the piazza of “S. Trinità dei Monti.”<sup>162</sup> He continued that the royal crest on Trinità dei Monti would not only be comparable to the one on S. Pietro in Montorio, but would even surpass it because King of Spain was not the royal founder of the church

---

<sup>159</sup> AMAE Rome vol. 173 ff.112r, 113r [26 May 1666] and vol 176 f. 364r-365r [27 April 1666]. The latter letter concludes: “On attend icy avec impatience mgr l’ Ambr je espere que Vr. Exce lui aura dit ces sentiments touchants ces armes que je voudrais fair metre sur la porte de nre eglise je attend ces ordre pour les esecuter avec tout la punctualité possible...”

<sup>160</sup> Montaiglon dates this letter only as “September 1666”, however a notation (written in a hand other than the scribe of the letter) on the verso side of the last page of the petition dates the letter to 24 September 1666. (AMAE Rome vol. 178 f. 147r.) There are also two paginations on the folios, 147 likely corresponds to Montaiglon’s 148.

<sup>161</sup> The petition was published by Montaiglon and later translated and reprinted by D’Onofrio.

<sup>162</sup> The mention of the fountains is likely a reference to Piazza di Spagna, though Noillan does not mention the Barberini *stemma* on the Barcaccia, the piazza’s primary fountain.

while the King of France was both founder and “absolute master” of Trinità dei Monti.<sup>163</sup> In his final point, Noillan complained that with the inscription still visible, foreigners (“*estrangers*”) accused the Minims of “laxity” and of little affection in the service of the king of France.<sup>164</sup> This concern with the foreign eye echoed similar anxieties about the reputation of the French in Rome, discussed above. Nonetheless, it is important to note that the growing awareness of Rome’s status as a gathering place for foreigners affected not only the urban interventions of popes, but also the very self-perceptions of the resident members of such communities, and was capitalized upon by both groups to gain influence and prestige.

Noillan’s first letter of 14 September reveals another reason for the commission, as a definitive sign of allegiance designed to quell any lingering dissension within the community at Trinità dei Monti itself.<sup>165</sup> According to Noillan, two friars in the

---

<sup>163</sup> The title of “absolute master” was, in fact, an exaggeration of the role of the Spanish monarchy at S. Pietro in Montorio. Spanish royals acted primarily as patrons of the church, financing a number of renovations and the construction of the Tempietto. This was particularly relevant in the early part of the seventeenth century. Beginning in 1604, Philip III and his successor Philip IV petitioned the Holy See in order to gain sole patronage rights over S. Pietro in Montorio. The notably pro-French Urban VIII rejected the petition. In fact, Urban VIII’s interest in the site prompted his own effort to mark the space with Barberini arms. As Jack Freiberg notes, signs of royal patronage feature prominently in several areas of the church, including a royal coat of arms on the fountain in the piazza in front of the church and an inscription on the wall of the access road leading to church. Both are of 1605. Jack Freiberg, “Bramante’s Tempietto and the Spanish Crown,” in *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 50 (2005): 151-205, 173, 178-183.

<sup>164</sup> According to its date, the inscription was carved in 1570. Because of its mention of other donors, the phrase implied, according to Noillan, that the king of France did not possess sole rights to the church. Noillan continued by stating that French privileges need to be revived, and especially in light of insults to the French nation in the time of Cardinal Spada from 1659 to 1661, and that such a project would be in accordance with the will of the founder. Montaiglon, *Correspondance*, 373-374 and D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 307-310.

<sup>165</sup> AMAE Rome vol, 178 ff. 102r-103v [14 September 1666]. “Suivant les ordres, qu’il pleust a vre Exce me faire donner par Monsieur Pachau dans sa lettre du 9 avril a Versailles. Jay eu l’honneur de parler a Monseigneur l’Ambassadeur au subject du dessein que jay de faire oster ou a tous les moins cacher ce tiltre injurieux a nre tres Auguste Monarche qui est sur le portail de l’Eglise de ce convent Royal mais comme le bones (sic) actions sont toujours traversees de pere Noel que vre Exce cognoist tres bien avec un autre prestre de la province de Paris apele (sic) pere d’Eschamps furent prier mon dit seigneur de ne souffrir pas que ce fusse metre ces armes ce qui m’oblige de faire ce memorial que j’envoye a vre Exce tout semblable a celui que jay presente a mgr l’Ambr le supliant d’avoir la bonte de ce le faire lire, jay eu assez de bonheur de trouver mon dit seigneur fort dispose a m’accorder ceste grace mais comme il me temoigna qu’il en



community, François Noël and another friar from Paris named Deschamps, had voiced their opposition to covering the inscription, fearing backlash from the local community (*les italiens*) if it were perceived that the friars did not have sufficient deference toward the Holy See. Noillan felt that their opinion was so intolerable that they should no longer be permitted to reside at the monastery, and also indicated to Lionne that there was already Italian support for the inscription, particularly from the French ally, the Venetian, Marcantonio Giustiniani. Furthermore, Noillan added that if the community were to be so irresponsible as to allow the inscription to remain, the king would have every right to terminate his patronage at Trinità dei Monti.

Little is mentioned of the crest until July of 1667, when Noillan wrote to the ambassador the Duc de Chaulnes with the news that the project (in stucco) was complete. As had been discussed, the plan had been executed quickly and efficiently, taking place immediately following the pope's death on 22 May. In the letter, Noillan also includes a curious detail, heretofore unmentioned, on the completion of the commission: "I have had the entire inscription erased and filled in the letters with very strong cement, the letters of "piorum elemosines" are for the most part chiseled away...I was obliged to have it

---

vouloit escrire en cour jay prins la liberte d'escrire a vre Exce lui demandant tres humblement sa protection[.] Le subject que ces peres ont du traverser ceste action ne peust estre que pure envie qui les (exempla ?) si fort qu'ils ne considerent pas que par ces oppositions ils se rendent indignes de la demeure de ce convent Royal il disent que cachant ce tiltre cela empeschere que les italiens ne nous seront pas du bien et moy je croy que nre grand Roy a subject de ne nous departir pas ces liberalites y sachant ce tiltre piorum elemosines adiuta d'ailleurs ne puis protester a vre Exce que l'argent que jay pour cela vient de plusieurs italiens qui l'ont donne a cest effect et le prince Giustiniani m'a mesme dit souvent ne pouvoir souffrir ce tiltre et n'oser pas venir sur nre montagne ni a nre eglise le peur de le voir en c'est affaire. Le convant n'y met pas un quatrain et celui qui le veust faire m'a proteste que cest ouvrage durera un siecle si on veust, de la faire de marbre. Je advoce a vre Exce que je ne saurais trouver de la facon quil sera faict il sera aussi beau que de marbre[.] Je remets pourtants le tout avec tout sorte de soubmission a vre Exce ni protestant ni vouloir avoir jamais autre volonte que la siene en qualite de monseigneur."

completely erased, because what remained made it known what was written before.”<sup>166</sup>

To cover the inscription with the royal crest, apparently, was not a strong enough symbol of royal predominance. Rather, the Minims were compelled to transform the very skin of the facade itself, carving out, plastering over, and obliterating the entire inscription.<sup>167</sup>

The desire to doubly transform the facade through both “additive” and “subtractive” techniques may reflect the Minims’ own tenuous status as a royal institution, and the desire to show through symbolic form the fundamental transformation that took place within the walls of the monastery itself. Even with the project complete, Noillan notes of lingering criticism by Noël and others who feared that changing the inscription would anger the Italians.<sup>168</sup>

This latest episode of dissension from within may have encouraged Louis XIV to revise his regulations for Trinità dei Monti established five years earlier. An order of the king issued on 28 June 1668 required that, in addition to the other stipulations for the royal privilege, all brothers in residence could only stay a maximum of 6 years, at which point they were required to return to their respective provinces. The culture at Trinità dei Monti could no longer be shaped by individual personalities, and the royal affiliation became sole commonality that bound the community as whole. As a result Trinità dei Monti took on the character of a microcosm of the nascent French state and its king: its membership representative of all the territories of the crown, the sense of community was

---

<sup>166</sup> AMAE Rome, vol 184 ff. 233r-234r [5 July 1667]. The complete effacement of the facade is also mentioned in a letter of 12 July from Noillan to Lionne. AMAE Rome, vol. 184 ff.382r-383r [12 July 1667].

<sup>167</sup> On the theory of the façade as “skin”, see, for example, Gottfried Semper’s introduction of the concept in *Die vier Elemente der Baukunst* (Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg, 1851), later taken up at length by Charles Burroughs, in *The Italian Renaissance Palace Façade: Structures of Authority, Surfaces of Sense* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

<sup>168</sup> The façade appears today with a different crest located above the central window, inscribed with the French royal crown and the letter “L” (Ludovicus). According to the inscription beneath, the crest was erected in 1871. D’Onofrio, *Le Scalinate di Roma*, 305.

based on common faith and allegiance to the French sovereign rather than a longstanding connection with the monastery itself.<sup>169</sup>

Two years later, the king replaced the stucco crest that decorated the facade of Trinità dei Monti with a permanent one of marble designed by Charles Errard and executed by the students at the newly founded satellite academy in Rome. In the letter to Lionne on 26 August 1670 Noillan reminded the minister that the crest would be for the honor and glory of the monarch and of the entire nation of France, but also for the “confusion of our enemies, particularly the Spanish, who would not be able to put their heads out of the windows of their palace on the piazza without seeing this object in front of their eyes!”<sup>170</sup> With this statement, Noillan refers to both the active and receptive visual processes by which foreign nations created extraterritorial space in Rome: the view from the ambassador’s window and the visual encounter of the royal crest from the level of the street. The statement had additional impact because the Spanish had included the Pincio as part of their own quarter in Rome.<sup>171</sup> The sight of the French crest (from the very windows of the his palace) would have transformed the Spanish ambassador’s view from active and proprietary to passive and subjugated. This process may have been perceived as only symbolic, if not for the fact that the French claimed the church, hillside, and piazza as their own.

---

<sup>169</sup> This not only excluded members from all other European states but also groups that had come under French rule but did not wholly identify as subjects of the king. Flemish and Avignonese members are two examples cited by D’Onofrio. D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 180-181.

<sup>170</sup> Montaiglon, *Correspondance*, 6: 376 and D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 310.

<sup>171</sup> Alessandra Anselmi, *Il Palazzo dell’Ambasciata di Spagna*,” 171. Anselmi notes that an execution in the vicinity of the Palazzo di Spagna prompted the production of the first plan of the Spanish quarter in Rome of 1660.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter I have examined the landscape of political “alliances and enmities” that shaped both the institutional history of Trinità dei Monti and the very architectural and urban fabric associated with the church and monastery itself. From its very establishment, Trinità dei Monti played a controversial yet foundational role in shaping the identity of the order of the Minims as a whole. Because of its proximity to the papal court, the affiliation at Trinità dei Monti had a tangible and representative function for the order at large, including the Spanish, French, and Italian residences throughout Europe. Over the course of the sixteenth century, the French constituents at Trinità dei Monti fought for the monastery to be restricted to French nationals, claiming that it was a royal institution under the aegis of the king. As part of the royal realm, the French faction could not tolerate the idea of a residential community that did not wholly pledge loyalty to crown. These two incommensurate identities- its recognition as a center for an international order and as a outpost for the French realm- may have been the most fundamental cause of the tension in the monastery, producing a kind of “splitting” in the institutional psyche of the Minims at Trinità dei Monti during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This tension was only resolved after Louis XIV’s personal intervention, when the monastery’s membership and residential requirements took on a fundamentally different character. The management of political affairs at the monastery were the first of Louis XIV’s personal reign to directly involve the Holy See, and in many ways foreshadowed the negotiations that followed only a few years later with the Créqui Affair of 1664.

With the royal foundation in place, the French community at Trinità dei Monti actively pursued concrete expressions of their newfound status, expressions that were

also aimed at erasing the stain of a fraught history. I believe this desire also informed Gueffier's own decision to leave a legacy for the building of the staircase, intending it to be not a statement of concord between the Holy See and the King of France, as has been previously argued, but as a definitive claim of French preeminence on the Pincio directly associated with the longstanding battle for Trinità dei Monti. Even after Alexander's tacit rejection of the project and the death of Mazarin, the friars never lost sight of the desire to imprint upon the landscape a permanent symbol of the royal claim. According to the chapter records and letters to the French court in Paris, which consistently refer to the Pincian hillside as "*nôtre montaigne*," the brothers purchased several parcels of land on the hillside, specifying that the transactions aimed to preserve the hill for their future staircase.<sup>172</sup> The conviction behind their endeavor even drove them into debt, forcing them to appeal to Louis XIV for additional funds.<sup>173</sup> The king did contribute financially to this endeavor and while he did not directly reinstate the staircase project, he did keep well informed of his subjects' efforts.

The Minim's desire to expand French control over the Pincio was also likely encouraged by the circumstances surrounding the diplomatic tensions between France and the Holy See. The brothers were, in fact, keenly aware of the developments at Palazzo Farnese, and saw their own political struggle as an analog to the diplomatic dispute. This in turn had a direct influence on their decisions to pursue the staircase project in absence of a patron or plans, as well as seeking other visual means or "place holders" to display French territorial primacy on the site. These works, particularly the

---

<sup>172</sup> BAV Ferraioli vol 391, notations for the days: 3 December 1663, f. 121r-v; 19 May 1664, ff. 124r-125r; 21 May 1664, f. 125v; 25 May 1664, f.126r; 27 May 1664, f. 126v; and 23 July 1664, f. 128r-v.

<sup>173</sup> The brothers also discussed building a carriage house at the base of the hill, and expanding their ballcourt located near one of the slope's pathways. BAV Ferraioli vol. 391f. 151r [14 May 1668].

campaign to hang the royal arms on façade of the church, were essential means by which to transform the site into a French citadel, a crucial step in both the building history of the staircase and the display of French hegemony in Rome at large. As a result, the Pincio became, as Tod Marder has described, “imbued with symbolic expressions of the political and diplomatic relations between France and the papacy,” forging a direct association between the hillside and the increasing political currency of the French crown in Rome and throughout Europe.

The methods by which the Minims claimed this space were both conventional and unorthodox. The Minims’ planting of trees on the hillside in 1652, for example, can best be described as a form of “strategic urbanism,” a term used by modern architectural historian Eve Blau to describe the process (in both its material and ideological forms) of staking claims in the face of unstable or transitional socio-political circumstances.<sup>174</sup> These trees became the primary support for the Minims’ claim to ownership over the Pincio over fifty years later, when active planning for the execution of the Spanish Steps was once again underway. Other strategies, such as the campaign to purchase parcels of land on the hillside to prevent other groups from taking up residence, suggest that despite the belief that the hillside was already in their possession, the Minims were forced to navigate the legal structures associated with property that dictated seventeenth-century Roman urbanism. The most forceful assertion of territoriality, however, was surely the placement of the royal crest on the facade of Trinità dei Monti. A visible sign of the church and monastery’s royal affiliation, the crest was not only a sign of allegiance but also delineated a realm, which like at Palazzo Farnese, was limited only to the extent of

---

<sup>174</sup> Eve Blau and Ivan Rupnik, *Project Zagreb, Transition as Condition, Strategy, Practice* (Harvard University, Actar, Barcelona, 2007).

its visibility. In this way, the Pincio can be considered an extraterritorial space of French dominion in Rome.

In his work on Spanish nation-building in Rome, Thomas Dandeleit has characterized the Eternal City as a microcosm of European political affairs, serving as a point of distillation and display for the alliances and rivalries of competing states and their principals. In the mid-seventeenth century, the urban politics of the French in Rome were particularly threatening to their Spanish rivals. 2 May 1668 marked the conclusion of the War of Devolution, in which Louis XIV had successfully gained several Spanish territories he claimed were France's by right of his marriage to the Spanish Infanta.<sup>175</sup> These territories were the disputed borderlands between France and Spain, and marked the first large-scale expansion of French lands during the reign of Louis XIV. The French claim to the Pincio usurped an area already considered by the Spanish to be their own, lying as it did within their diplomatic precinct. The Pincio, yet to be developed, was in Rome the disputed borderland between areas claimed as French and Spanish. In this sense, the hill can be considered as a type of frontier space, and the crest the most potent sign of French predominance.

---

<sup>175</sup> The death of Philip IV in 1665 prompted Louis to make claims on territory within the Spanish Netherlands. The war also marked the evolution of French tactics in siege warfare. For a discussion of French military tactics against Spain in relation to the aggrandizement of Louis XIV, see John Lynn, "A Quest for Glory: The Formation of Strategy under Louis XIV, 1661–1715," in *The Making of Strategy: Rulers, States and Wars*, eds. Williamson Murray, Alvin Bernstein, and Macgregor Knox (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000): 178-204.

## Chapter 4

### **‘A Citadel without Ramparts’: French Territoriality in Rome 1670-1689**

#### **Introduction: Political Relations between France and Rome, 1670-1688:**

The late 1660s were characterized by a brief period of calm in Franco-papal relations in Rome. The peace between the two powers was celebrated by the ceremonial destruction of the pyramid on 31 May 1668, a gesture that, as I argued earlier, also marked the further relinquishment of papal control in the ecclesiastical affairs of France. With the departure of the Duc de Chaulnes from Rome in 1669, the king did not immediately dispatch another ambassador, first leaving affairs to the former Auditor of the Rota, Abbé Bourlemont (1670-1671), then to an influential member of the French faction and son of a former ambassador, Bishop César d’Estrées (1671-1672). D’Estrées’ dispatch to Rome helped to secure his elevation to the purple, which was granted by Clement X Altieri (1670-76) by a papal brief of 21 September 1671. In January of 1672, d’Estrées’ brother, the Duc d’Estrées (François Hannibal II), arrived at the Palazzo Farnese to fill the appointment of ambassador, while Cardinal d’Estrées remained in Rome to serve as the royal cardinal protector.<sup>1</sup>

The arrival of the new ambassador coincided with a change in the political climate between France and Rome, with tensions reaching their height in 1687 with the excommunication of the d’Estrées’ replacement, the Marquis de Lavardin in 1687.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> With the arrival of a French ambassador in Rome, Clement X appointed Francesco Nerli as his nuncio in Paris. Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 32: 419, 473-476.

<sup>2</sup> Two separate caches of documents regarding legal disputes over the quarter are located in Paris (Affaires Étrangères Correspondance Politique, Mémoires et Documents: Rome) and the Vatican Biblioteca and Archivio Vaticano respectively. In addition, a collection of published works including Louis XIV’s instructions to ambassadors and the papal nuncio in Paris’ correspondence provides a helpful roadmap for archival documents. See, for example: Paul Lesourd, *L’ambassade de France près le Saint-Siège sous*



Louis XIV's increasing control over the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in France played a significant role in this shift. In 1673 Louis extended the *régale*, the right of the king to collect benefices from all vacant dioceses throughout France, denying the Holy See a significant source of revenue.<sup>3</sup> In response, in April of that year Clement X (Emilio Altieri, 1670-1676) issued a brief condemning this new royal authority. While the brief was ineffectual, Clement did not press the issue because of Louis' promise to restore Catholicism to the Dutch Republic following his invasion of 1671.<sup>4</sup>

The installment of the Duc d'Estrées as ambassador further complicated relations between France and Rome. Two years into his embassy, in September of 1674, the Duc d'Estrées issued a complaint against the papal nephew and governor of Rome, Paluzzo Paluzzi-Altieri over customs exemptions for goods imported to the ambassadorial household. Paluzzi-Altieri had revoked the tax-free status claimed by ambassadors as part of the rights of diplomatic immunity, issuing an edict that placed a three percent tax on incoming goods, with revenues collected by the Camera Apostolica.<sup>5</sup> In a rare display of ambassadorial solidarity, a coalition was formed against the legislation. Headed by d'Estrées, the members included the ambassadors of the Holy Roman Emperor and

---

*l'ancien régime* (Paris: Editions Spes, 1924); Jean Orcibal, *Louis XIV contre Innocent XI; les appels au future concie de 1688 et l'opinion française* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1949); Angelo Ranuzzi, *Correspondance du nonce en France, Angelo Ranuzzi (1683-1689)*, ed. Bruno Neveu; Fabrizio Spada, *Correspondance du nonce en France, Fabrizio Spada: (1674-1675)*, ed. Ségilène de Dainville-Barbiche (Rome: École française de Rome and Université pontificale grégorienne, 1982); Angelo Ranuzzi, *Lettere a Parigi a Domenico Federici: 1683-1687*, ed. Francesco Maria Cecchini (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1988); Pierre Blet, *Les nonces du pape à la cour de Louis XIV* (Paris: Perrin, 2002).

<sup>3</sup> The extension also allowed Louis XIV to appoint bishops to fill the vacant bishoprics. Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 31: 494. For a discussion of the development of the right of the *régale* in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, see Pastor, *History of the Popes*, vol. 32, 251-53.

<sup>4</sup> Sonnino, *Origins of the Dutch War*, 18-25.

<sup>5</sup> Edict of 11 September 1674, cited in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, 2: 539, 568-613 and Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 32: 501. Pastor notes several accounts of this incident, including "Narrazione de' disturbi accaduti 1674 fra i quattro ambasciatori di Francia, Spagna, Venezia, e dell'Impero con il cardinal Paluzzi-Altieri," BAV Urb Lat 1693, 36 seqq. Gérin also cites AMAE Rome vols. 233, 236, 238 but does not give specific pagination.

Spain, and an envoy from the Venetian Republic. Even after Altieri capitulated to their demands and loosened the restrictions (and his fellow diplomats accepted the new terms) d'Estrées refused to budge on the issue and called for Paluzzi-Altieri to be removed from office.<sup>6</sup> Ultimately this proved ineffectual, but in keeping with Louis XIV's administration of his representatives, d'Estrées's efforts alone can be interpreted as an assertion of French authority in Rome.

A second ambassadorial incident occurring during a papal audience of 25 May 1675 proved to be even more damaging for Franco-papal relations than the issue over taxation. D'Estrées, upon learning that Clement had refused to appoint the ambassador's preferred candidate, Cardinal Forbin-Janson, to the Bishopric of Marseilles, accused the pope of having broken his word. Clement refused to acknowledge the ambassador's complaint and instead called an end to the audience, but as the pope rose from his chair, the incensed ambassador pushed him in the chest forcing him to resume his seat. The pope excommunicated d'Estrées on the spot, and, in further retaliation, refused to create any other French cardinals at the following consistory on 27 May.<sup>7</sup>

With the death of Clement X on 22 July 1676, the French faction rallied around Benedetto Odescalchi (Innocent XI, 1676-1689), who was elected by the conclave on 21 September 1676. What at first promised to be calmer period in Franco-papal relations (one point of interest for the French was that Odescalchi had been a critic of Altieri) quickly devolved into one characterized by political controversy, violence, and civic unrest in Rome. Conflict arose between the two powers as a result of the crown's extension of authority into the ecclesiastical governance of France. Louis XIV's claim to

---

<sup>6</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 32: 502.

<sup>7</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 32: 479. The account of this altercation by Cardinal Altieri (recounted by the papal nuncio, Fabrizio Spada), has been reprinted in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, vol. 2, 585, note 3.

greater control over the Church in France stemmed from the tenets of Gallicanism that had been initiated by the French crown as early as 1438 with the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. By 1594 the tenets were codified and published in a text dedicated to Henry IV, which later formed the basis of Richelieu's own policy. During the first years of Louis XIV's personal reign, the king had negotiated the right of nominations of the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun as part of the papal concessions that formed the Treaty of Pisa of 1663.<sup>8</sup> Later that year, a series of theological propositions in support of the king was drawn up by the Faculty of Paris, and submitted to the French Parliament. The Assembly of 1682, which marked the ratification of the Four Articles drew from both the propositions of 1663 and the extensions of the *régale* passed in 1673 and 1674. The resulting legislation severely limited papal authority in France and granted the king the power to dictate ecclesiastical regulations, appoint bishoprics, and prevent the administration of papal dispensations, appointments, or excommunications made without his consent.<sup>9</sup> While Innocent repeatedly expressed his disapproval of the *régale* via the papal nuncio, Angelo Ranuzzi, the king did not change his policy.<sup>10</sup>

Louis XIV's increasing autonomy from the papacy in ecclesiastical affairs in France coincided with what Innocent considered another act of defiance against his

---

<sup>8</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 32: 248.

<sup>9</sup> The Declaration of the Clergy of France included the following stipulations: The king had the right to assemble church councils and make laws on ecclesiastical matters; the pope needed the king's consent to send legates to France; legates needed the king's consent to exercise power in France; Bishops could not leave France without the permission of the king, even if commanded to by the pope; royal officers could not be excommunicated for any act performed within their duties; the pope did not have control over the administration of church estates in France; bulls required the king's permission to be enacted in France; the pope could not issue dispensations regarding French cathedral churches; it was lawful to appeal papal decisions through the formation of a council. Antoine Dégert, "Gallicanism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 6. (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909). 21 Mar. 2012  
<<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06351a.htm>>.

<sup>10</sup> Ferdinando de De Bojani, "L'affaire du quartier a Rome du XVIIe siecle. Louis XIV et le Saint-Siege," *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* 22 (1908): 356-78. BAV Urb Lat, "Notizie particolare occorse nel Pontificato di Papa Clemente X," 177-181, 364-365. Letter of Ranuzzi to Cibo [3 September 1685], also cited in De Bojani, "L'affaire du quartier," 368.

authority: the king's refusal to renounce his quarter in Rome. From the onset of Innocent's pontificate, the pope had considered extraterritorial immunity a threat to civic safety. An ongoing complaint (one that existed since the 1660s) was that the foreign quarters were used as places of asylum for criminals to escape local justice, in many cases ambassadors collecting fees in exchange for their protection. However, by the 1670s, ambassadors had begun to profit from their privileges of immunity by selling certificates that assured the bearer his status as a member of a foreign suit, granting him the right to hang the royal arms from his residence or shop.<sup>11</sup> Considering that the crest carried with it a powerful privilege of immunity, Innocent rightly feared that a proliferation of royal arms above the doors of houses and shops throughout Rome could cause a serious disruption to the execution of local justice. In 12 May 1677 Innocent made his displeasure official by publishing a bull ordering all foreign powers in Rome to renounce their zones of immunity under penalty of excommunication.<sup>12</sup> Shortly thereafter, on 30 June, King Charles II of Spain indicated to the pope that he would forgo his the quarter if other principals would as well. After some negotiation, the pope prevailed, and by 1682, both Spain and the Republic of Venice renounced their quarters in Rome.<sup>13</sup> Louis XIV, however, continued to maintain his quarter, despite repeated protests by Innocent via the cardinal nephew, Alderano Cibo and Pompeo Varese, the

---

<sup>11</sup> De Bojani, "L'affaire du quartier," 181.

<sup>12</sup> Confirmation Constitutionum Contra quoscumque habere, & tueri praetendentes Franchitias, vulgò Quartieri, & sub illarum praetextu acclamantes, provocantes, aut impediendes quoslibet Iustitiae Ministros, ne Officium fuum tam in Civilibus, quàm in Criminalibus liberè, ac tutè exercere valeant, necnon etiam in illas pro eisdem causis se recipientes, siue ad eas confugientes, sub poena, ultrà illas EXCOMMUNICATIONIS MAIORIS ipso facto incurrenda. (Similar edicts published on 26 November 1677 and 22 February 1680). See Archivio di Stato, Roma, Bandi b. 38 1687-1689.

<sup>13</sup> Varese died during the process of these negotiations and the position of the nuncio in Paris remained vacant. This resulted from the offense taken by pope and Cardinal Cibo by the refusal of the Archbishop of Paris, Monseigneur de Harlay, to obey Varese's wishes to be interred in the Church of the Theatines. As a result, his body remained in his house for over a week. De Bojani, "L'affaire du quartier a Rome," 362-363. For an account of Varese's nunciature, see Bruno Neveu, *Un rival de L'averre: le nonce Varese à Paris 1676-1678* (Paris: Boccard, 1982).

papal nuncio in Paris.<sup>14</sup> As a result, France was the only major power in Rome that still controlled a diplomatic precinct.

In a letter to Ranuzzi of 19 August, 1684 Cibo succinctly explained the papal position by comparing the French quarter to an urban extension of ecclesiastical immunity:

[The ambassador] neither wants to authenticate nor decree with particular facts the abuses and usurpations introduced here in the last few years. Considering that if one were in the street tied by a cord attached to a church, one could not be able to say that he enjoyed ecclesiastical immunity. Even less sound is [the ambassador's] claim to the exemption for which he does not have a legal right.<sup>15</sup>

Cibo's reference to ecclesiastical immunity suggests that, in the absence of a legal precedent, similar comparisons had been made on the part of the French to justify their defense of immunity.<sup>16</sup> Papal concern was also registered in another letter to Ranuzzi of 14 October, 1684 in which Cibo complained of the growing abuse of the quarter by the French in Rome:

It was never made law or any conditions admitted over the claimed Quarters, and always what the ambassadors had done to maintain and extend it was a mere usurpation concealed and tolerated in order to avoid disturbances and perplexity but never permitted by past popes. His Holiness has always disapproved [of them]. Once, a guard who accidentally passed through the zone claimed by this sig. ambassador of France, was taken to prison with uncustomary violence...<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> For a full history of the negotiations see De Bojani, "L'affaire du quartier," 357- 361.

<sup>15</sup> "...che sono abusi et usuparzioni introdotte da pochi anni in qua ma che non vuole autenticarli né canonizarli con fatti particolari, considerando che se uno fosse in strada legato con una corda che stasse attaccata alla chiesa, non per questo si potrebbe dire che godesse l'immunita ecclesiastica, e tanto meno giudica che la possa suffragare l'essenzione che si pretende che non ha titolo giuridico." Dispatch from Alderano Cibo to Angelo Ranuzzi. Rome [19 August, 1684] in Angelo Ranuzzi, *Correspondance du nonce en France, Angelo Ranuzzi (1683-1689)*, ed. Bruno Neveu (Rome: École française de Rome, 1973), n. 837.

<sup>16</sup> While I have not come across a direct reference to this from the year 1677, the comparison of the quarter to the practice of ecclesiastical immunity appears in an anonymous French document of 1687 (AMAE Rome 308, f. 306v).

<sup>17</sup> Quoted in Neveu, *Correspondance du nonce en France*, " #918, 427.

Moreover, the census records of the parish of S. Caterina della Rota suggest a gradual expansion of the French quarter, indicating an increase in self-identified members of the French ambassador's "famiglia" over the 1670s and early 1680s. From 1672 to 1678, the ambassador's household grew from 93 to 121 members, all of whom lived at the palace and or in nearby residences on the Via Giulia.<sup>18</sup> The ambassador's personal staff nearly doubled from 15 in 1672 to 29 in 1678 and 1680. By 1687, records indicated that the staff housed in the Palazzo Farnese alone totaled around 200.<sup>19</sup> To put this in perspective, the neighboring household of the Falconieri including servants, attendants, and family members of the staff totaled 51 in 1672 and 1673, about half the size of the ambassador's suite.<sup>20</sup>

From these records, one also can get a sense of the area claimed by the French ambassador, which aligns with the areas described in the crime reports of 1664. In 1684, the residences of the household spanned the majority of the western portion of its rione, Regola, from the riverfront behind the Spanish church of S. Maria in Monserrato on Via Giulia, to the royal stables behind S. Salvatore in Onda on Via dei Pettinari.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Archivio Storico del Vicariato di Roma (ASV), Rome Stati dell' Anime, Santa Caterina della Rota, 1673-1688, 2 vols. Most references to the *famiglia* are noted as part of the "Palazzo dell' Serenissima Mr Sig. Duca di Parma" with the ambassador heading the list. In 1673, number of residents totaled 93 (23-24); in 1678, 121 (33 -36); and in 1679, 117 (100-102). In 1680, number of residents is not treated as a unit, included are only the immediate ambassadorial party: 29 people (27-28); In 1682, the residents in the palace included 80 members of the ambassadorial court (23-24).

<sup>19</sup> ASR, Santa Caterina dell Rota, 33-36, 100-102.

<sup>20</sup> The census records also suggest that the area was a demographic center for self-identified members of the French nation. Of the 633 members whose nationalities are listed in the 1673 Stati dell' Anime, 156 are French, representing the largest non-Italian demographic in the parish. Of the others, 255 listed as Roman, 138 listed from other Italian cities. Only 41 identified as Spanish, 41 as English, and 9 as German. The total population was 1,610. Unfortunately, a comparison with the Duc de Créqui's embassy cannot be made, as records for the parish of Santa Caterina dell' Rota are missing for this period.

<sup>21</sup> I have based the parameters of the quarter on the streets and houses listed in the records of 1684. Under the name of the Duc d'Estrées, 110 persons listed as part of the family in residence at the Palace and the shops beneath servicing the Ambassador (22-24); 1688, no number is given however, a note written by Domenico Galli, Curatori S. Caterina della Rota states, "Non sono compressi nel Suo numero gli Habitanti nel Palazzo Farnese, non essendo stati dà me descritti di Orde di NS. num. circa 200."

In August of 1684 d'Estrées complained that the rights of the quarter had been violated when papal guards arrested a man in the vicinity the Palazzo Farnese.<sup>22</sup> The incident is of particular note because of its direct connection to debates over extraterritoriality during the embassy of the Duc de Créqui in the 1660s. When hearing of d'Estrées' complaint, Louis XIV discussed the matter with none other than Créqui himself, who claimed that Cardinal Imperiali, the governor of Rome of that time, had issued a regulation protecting the French quarter following the events of August 1664. On 2 September 1684, Ranuzzi reported to the pope:

...The former ambassador responded that during his embassy [the issue of the quarter] had been settled with a regulation from the governor of Rome... An order was immediately sent to the Ambassador d'Estrées to reestablish this rule, but I had said to the king that this regulation does not exist.<sup>23</sup>

While Créqui may have argued that the concessions made by Imperiali had been codified into law at the time, the complaints made by the governor over the ambassador's abuse of diplomatic privilege in 1664 seem to support the contrary.<sup>24</sup> Moreover, as discussed previously, French officials in Rome continued to debate the designation of the quarter well after Créqui's departure. Rather than a Roman regulation, it had been the establishment of visible and urban markers (the pyramid, views of and from the palace, and the royal crest) that, for the French, served to delineate the extent of the diplomatic precinct.

---

<sup>22</sup> De Bojani, "L'affaire du quartier," 352.

<sup>23</sup> De Bojani, "L'Affaire du quartier," 352. Cardinal Cibo responded on behalf of the pope that he was quite certain that no such regulation was issued, and that such an usurpation would never be permitted.

<sup>24</sup> "Proces verbal envoyé par la cour de Rome, des prétendus excès commis par les François, depuis l'arrivée du Duc de Créqui à Rome en qualité d'Ambassadeur Extraordinaire au commencement du mois de Juin 1662 jusqu'à sa sortie au commencement de Septembre de la même année: avec les observations et les responses de la part de l'Ambassadeur." Ransom Center for the Humanities, University of Texas, Austin, Volume Ph 12565. Appearing in manuscript form without commentary by the Duc de Créqui in AMAE Rome vol. 146 ff. 162r-167r. See my discussion in Chapter 2.

Créqui's embassy, and its visual trace in the pyramid, seemed to have increasingly become not only the benchmark for the extraterritorial quarter in Rome, but also more generally a symbol of Franco-papal relations. While the ceremonial destruction of the pyramid in 1668 removed one of the visual markers of the Créqui Affair in Rome, its visual presence endured in France, incorporated into the visual iconography celebrating the king's conquests and the territorial expansion of the realm. Two years after its destruction, the image of the pyramid reappeared in the tapestry of the Allegory of Fire, one of the series of the four elements by Charles Le Brun completed in 1670 (figures 4-1 and 4-2).<sup>25</sup> The work is an allegorical celebration of the king's military might, depicting Vulcan at his forge crafting an array of weapons. Etchings of these works by Sébastien Leclerc appear with a written description of the allegory in the *Tapisseries du roy, ou sont representez les quatre elements et les quatre saisons* by André Félibien. Of the pyramid, Félibien writes:

Et dans l'autre [tableau] on a représenté la Pyramide qu'on a élevée dans Rome pour la satisfaction de l'injure faite à son Ambassadeur, sans qu'Elle ait employé autre chose que le bruit de ses armes. C'est ce qui est exprimé dans la bordure d'en bas sur une table feinte de lapis, où l'on voit écrit: LUDOVICUS XIV. POTENTISSIMUS REGIAE DIGNITATIS CUSTOS ET VINDEX, POSTQUAM IGNI VIM INIMICAM ERIPUIT, TUM SOLA FULMINIS MILITANTIS CORUSCATIONE, ET MARSALII FIRMISSIMAM ARCEM EXPUGNAVIT, ET VIOLATAM APUD ROMANOS IN LEGATO MAJESTATEM ASSERVIT.<sup>26</sup>

The pyramid appears as one of two pendant pieces integrated into the border decorations of the tapestry, the second a city profile depicting the siege of Marsal. This visual

<sup>25</sup> Erben, "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV in Rom," 452-458.

<sup>26</sup> André Félibien, *Tapisseries du roy, ou sont representez les quatre elemens et les quatre saisons avec les devises qui les accompagnent et leur explication* (Augsburg: Gedruckt daselbst durch Jacob Koppmayer, 1690), 6rv. I have kept transcriptions in their original French and Italian for this and all subsequent excerpts from French and Italian texts and pamphlets.



juxtaposition, along with the accompanying inscription, suggest a parallel, placing the ambassador's quarter in Rome on equal footing with the ongoing campaigns to expand borders of the French realm.

The pyramid also appears as a subject of a medallion in Le Brun's painted program for the Hall of Mirrors in Versailles of 1678 (figure 4-3). Positioned prominently above the entrance to the enfilade, the pyramid was the first of a series of works celebrating the military conquests of the Sun King. In addition in 1685 Louis XIV commissioned a bronze tondo for the socle of the equestrian statue on the Place des Victoires, depicting the construction of the commemorative pyramid in Rome with an inscription celebrating the French "victory" of the Créqui Affair (figure 4-4). This final work incited a complaint from Ranuzzi to both Colbert de Croissy, the First Minister to the King and the king's confessor, the Jesuit Pierre La Chaise, who noted in return that the papacy had not been responsible for the actions of the Corsican guard. In response, Colbert reminded the nuncio of the rights of French sovereignty in Rome accorded by the 1664 Treaty of Pisa.<sup>27</sup>

The death of the Duc d'Estrées on 30 January 1687 proved to be a tipping point in the controversy over the French quarter in Rome. With the position of the ambassador now vacant, Innocent followed the same policy as he had with the King of Spain in 1677, informing Louis XIV that he would refuse to accept a replacement until Louis XIV relinquished his quarter.<sup>28</sup> In addition, the pope instructed the Governor of Rome,

---

<sup>27</sup> De Bojani, "L'affaire du quartier," 352-353. The treaty only stipulates, however, that immunity would be granted to the ambassador, his palace, and his suite. See, for example, "Sur l'Attentat commis en la personne de Mr le Duc de Crequy, Ambassadeur Extraordinaire de la Majesté, & Madame la Duchesse de Crequy son Espouse leurs Domestiques, & les aytres Francois estans en la Ville de Rome" Barb Lat 5640, f.59r. BAV, Rome.

<sup>28</sup> In addition Queen Christina of Sweden also renounced her quarter early in 1687, leaving France the only power remaining.

Cardinal Giambattista Spinola, to dispatch police into the neighborhood around Palazzo Farnese in order to make arrests. Louis XIV conceded to reduce the limits of the quarter if Innocent XI would acknowledge the appointment of the brother of the deceased Duc d'Estrées, Cardinal Cesar d'Estrées, who had previously served as an interim diplomat in the early 1670s. The pope, however, refused Louis XIV's preference, declaring that no cardinal could be eligible to serve as a foreign state's ambassador.<sup>29</sup>

In March of 1687 Louis XIV appointed Henri de Beaumanoir, the Marquis de Lavardin, to the post of ambassador, but delayed his departure for Rome, hoping to resolve the issue of the quarter before his arrival.<sup>30</sup> Cardinal d'Estrées, now the most powerful member of the French faction in Rome, refused to subscribe to a papal bull of 12 May 1687 that confirmed the dissolution of the quarter, but with the collaboration of the French ally Cardinal Spinosa, began to draft a compromise that would allow the king to keep a limited urban quarter.<sup>31</sup> Despite the intervention of Spinola and d'Estrées, Innocent refused to allow the French any concessions to the bull.

The hostilities between France and the Holy See reached their climax in the winter of 1687. At the king's command, Cardinal d'Estrées prepared for Lavardin's arrival by stockpiling weapons and quartering French soldiers in the Palazzo Farnese.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> During this time, Cardinal d'Estrées vacated the Palazzo Farnese for the Villa Pamphili. Pastor, *History of the Popes*, vol. 32, 349 citing Cibo, Cifra of 18 February 1687 to Ranuzzi. The question of purchasing an embassy was brought up by Cardinal d'Estrées as a way to relinquish the quarter at Palazzo Farnese without seeming to capitulate to papal demands, but plans do not seem to have been pursued. Ferdinand Henri de Navenne, *Rome et le Palais Farnèse pendant les trois derniers siècles* 2 vols. (Paris: A. Michel, 1923), 8. Also cited in Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 353. Neither Navenne nor Pastor makes any mention of a specific palace.

<sup>30</sup> In the official protest to this act, the secretary of state, Colbert de Croissy, stated to Ranuzzi that Rome differed from all other courts where the sovereign could decide accept or refuse an ambassador according to his liking. Rome's status as Catholic and cosmopolitan locus for the affairs of all Christian nations exempted the pope from this privilege. De Bojani, "L'Affaire du Quartier," 24.

<sup>31</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, vol. 32, 353. According to Pastor, d'Estrées and Cardinal Maidalchini, who was on the French payroll, were the only two cardinals who refused to honor the bull.

<sup>32</sup> Letter of Abbé de Sanctis to Lionne, 30 September 1687 cited in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, 392.

Louis XIV instructed Lavardin to depart for Rome and seize control of the quarter, and on 11 November of 1687, the ambassador arrived with a suite of over 200 members. A letter from the Abbé de Sanctis to Lionne described the militaristic aspect of the entry, which, in addition to the ambassadorial suite and families of the French faction in Rome, included a guard armed with arquebuses and pistols that surrounded the Piazza Farnese after the ambassador's party had entered the palace.<sup>33</sup> The security detail remained in place as the ambassador ordered the removal of squatters and criminals from within the courtyard of the palace and its surrounding environs.<sup>34</sup> In an interesting case of rival urban occupation, Innocent responded in kind by deploying his own "army" of penitents to process around the palace.<sup>35</sup> Louis XIV had cautioned Lavardin to keep both crime and the use of force under control, but as Pastor has noted, the political tension between the king and the pope made the situation untenable. As he had threatened, the pope immediately excommunicated the ambassador and when Lavardin received communion at Christmas Mass at S. Luigi dei Francesi, Innocent likewise put the French national church under interdict.<sup>36</sup> Innocent XI deliberately hoped to sway public sentiment in Rome against the French, by publishing the interdict and papal bull in print in both Latin

---

<sup>33</sup> Instructions of 14 July 1687. Hanotaux, *Recueil des Instructions* 2 vols. (Paris: Alcan, 1885), 287. On Lavardin's entry see: AMAE Rome, 309 ff.130-132v [18 November 1687] published in Navenne, *Rome et le Palais Farnèse*, 2: 13 and an account by Abbé de Sanctis to Lionne (undated), AMAE Rome 309 ff. 133r-135r.

<sup>34</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 32: 360.

<sup>35</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 32: 359.

<sup>36</sup> This debate was particularly virulent during the pontificate of Innocent XI who, in 1688 published a bull condemning the French and the Marquis de Lavardin in particular for the management of the French quarter. "...que le Pape n'est pas en droit de luy demander une renonciation à ses Franchises, encore moins de luy refuser audience sous ce pretexte; & qu'il est encore plus insoustenable de le declare excommunié pour n'avoir pas fait ce qui n'est pas en son pouvoir, c'est à dire, pour n'avoir pas abandonné des droits temporels de la Couronne de France, don't on ne doit jamais esperer le moindre relaschement, que de a bonté du Roy, & par une conduite toute contraire à celle que la Cour de Rome a tenue envers la France, depuis qu'Innocent XI a été élevé au Pontificat." Excerpted from "Refutation d'un Libelle italien en forme de reponse a la protestation du Marquis de Lavardin Ambassadeur extraordinaire de France, a Rome An. 1688," BAV, Barb Lat 5647, ff. 75r-90v.

and Italian. The bull was also published and circulated as a Bando, thus reinforcing the papal ruling by incorporating it into the civic legal codes of Rome.<sup>37</sup> To underscore the gravity of these measures and to rouse public anger against the French, the pope issued an edict banning the carnival celebrations of 1688.<sup>38</sup>

### **Mapping the French Quarter in Rome in Text and Image**

The events of 1687-1688 marked the peak of a decade-long dispute between France and the papacy on the diplomatic freedoms accorded to France in Rome. In many ways, the dispute echoed the Créqui Affair of 1662-4: it was the second time during Louis XIV's reign that the French quarter in Rome was militarized and that an ambassador of the king deliberately incited controversy in defense of the royal claim. This connection was made overt by both Louis XIV's own consultation with the former ambassador and the inclusion of the pyramid in the program of the monument on the Place des Victoires of 1685, the first time such imagery was used in a public setting, a slight that did not go unnoticed by the papal nuncio. Unlike the debates following the events of the 1660s, however, those following the events 1687 produced an unprecedented written record on the legality of the French quarter and its claims to immunity.<sup>39</sup> The years 1687 and 1688 saw the production of propagandistic pamphlets, circular letters and dispatches written by

---

<sup>37</sup> ASR, Rome, b.38 Bando of 12 March 1687 12 March banning all foreign quarters in Rome. Similar edicts published on 26 November 1677 and 22 February 1680.

<sup>38</sup> AMAE Rome, 310 f.154r [30 February 1688], Lavardin to Louis XIV on the cancellation of carnival. See also, BAV Barb Lat 5647 f. 67, "Editto con cui si proibisce Carnevale," 1688. In two letters to king of 3 and 10 February, 1688, Lavardin states that Innocent XI's prohibition of Carnivale that year was designed stir up the Roman sentiment against the French. Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 32: 368.

<sup>39</sup> As I have noted in previous chapters, the rights of extraterritoriality were rarely discussed in depth within the scholarly discourse of diplomatic engagement of the period. Rather, perhaps because of its controversial nature, the practice of the *franchise du quartier* was often defined by practice rather than by legal precedent.

both members of factions supporting the French and papal sides respectively. The holdings of the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana contain, for example, at least fourteen printed pamphlets published by the papal faction and nine by the French.<sup>40</sup> The Archives des Affaires Étrangères, contain seventeen additional *memoirs* by French supporters, and three by the papal faction. While these appear in manuscript form, both the re-issuing of several works (for example, there are three separate copies of a text entitled, “Griefs de la France contre la cour de Rome sous le Pontificat d’Innocent Onze” in the collection), and the serial installments of others (there are three memoirs penned by the French ally Abbé Melani on the subject) suggest an expanded and interested readership and a prolonged discussion. Furthermore, several works are written under pseudonyms or by anonymous authors, suggesting not only a high level of interest in the issue but also a desire for candid discourse on such a controversial topic. This new written discourse on extraterritoriality reframed the debate beyond the relatively small circle of papal and royal officials to include a broader reading public both in Paris and Rome.

One of the most detailed of these works is an anonymous memoir of 24 April 1687, entitled “Lettre d’un Gentilhomme françois a un ses amis a Rome touchant l’immunité du quartier des ambassadeurs de France...” Appearing in three copies in the collection of Archives des Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, it provides a comprehensive summation of the chief points argued by those in support of the preservation of the French quarter in Rome.<sup>41</sup> The work’s anonymous author begins by offering a general

---

<sup>40</sup> See holdings contained in the ASR Barb Lat 5647: “Scritture diverse concernenti d’Affaire del Sig Marchese de Lavardino venuto a Roma nel’ Undicesimo di novembre dell’ Anno 1687 con carattere di Ambasciatori straordinario di Ludovico XIV. Re di Francia alla Santa Sede, et al Sommo Pontefice Innocenzo XI. Odescalchi.”

<sup>41</sup> For example, the author of the text echoes the complaints made by the Duc d’Estrées to Innocent XI during his embassy, opinions expressed by the Duc de Créqui and M. Pomponne on the freedom of the quarter resulting from the Treaty of Pisa, and makes reference to the preservation of the immunity between

definition of the quarter as the area within the vicinity of the palace. The text is then roughly divided into two parts comprised of a general history on the rights of the quarter and followed by a list of potential critiques against the quarter and the author's responses.<sup>42</sup>

In the first section, the author lays out a chronology of the practice of extraterritoriality in Rome, which is, to my knowledge, one the first written records of its type produced by the French. A crucial part of his argument is the claim that extraterritoriality was *not* limited to foreign nations, but was a longstanding practice among cardinals and noble families in Rome:

Il paroist par une bulle du Pape Jules III de l'année 1552 que des ce temps la c'est a dire il y a cent trente cinq ans les Ambassadeurs jouissoient a Rome de cette immunité dans les places et rues voisines de leurs palais en sorte qu'on avoit mesme marqué dans les rues des limites que les off[iciers] de la justice du Pape n'avoient pas la liberté de passer. Il est vray que ce Pape voulut abolir ce droit auquel on avoit des lors donné le nom de franchises et dont les Cardinaux et les grands seigneurs de Rome jouissoient aussy bien que les Ambassadeurs mais il paroît par une bulle de Pie IV de l'année 1562 et par une autre de Gregoire XIII de l'année 1573 que les Ambassadeurs maintenoient toujours la franchise de leurs palais et des lieux circonvoisins et ce fut apparemment a cause de cela que Sixte V desfendant quaucun de ses sujets n'eut plus a donner retraite aux malfaiteurs ne comprit point les Ambassadeurs dans la bulle qu'il fit en 1585 sur ce sujet quoy que ces bulles ne condamnent les franchises des quartiers des Ambassades elles servent neanmoins a faire connoître quils en jouisse dez le siecle passé.<sup>43</sup>

---

embassies by the appearance of the royal arms, also noted by Hugues di Lionne and M. de Chamlay. For Chamlay's remarks, see below, cited below by Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 297-299.

<sup>42</sup> AMAE Rome, 309 f297v. "Il faut premierement convenir de bonne foy que l'immunité ou franchise d'un Ambassadeur ne concisse point en aucune jurisdiction qu'il pretende pouvoir exercer sur le voisinage do son palais en quoy nous reconnoissons que la souveraineté de prince du lieu seroit blessée. L'immunité du quartier de L'ambassadeur de France a Rome fait partie du respect que les Papes ont consenti et mesme promis qu'on porteroit au ministre qui representeroit en cette ville la personne du Roy et celle consiste seulement en ce que pour la reverence de cet Ambassadeur du fils aisne de l'eglise les minstres de la justice du Pape ne sont aucunes captures ny executiones aux environs de son Palais.

<sup>43</sup> AMAE Rome 309 ff. 297v-298r.

The bulls to which the author makes reference are the “Contra franchitias in Urbe retinens et Curiam in executione Impedientes, cum approbatione, constitutum, contra bannitos etc. editarum” issued by Julius III (Giovanni Maria Ciocchi del Monte, 1550-1555) in 1552 and its subsequent confirmations by Pius IV Medici (1559-1565) and Gregory XIII Boncompagni (1572-1585).<sup>44</sup> While the author is correct to indicate that the practice of the franchises in Rome predated its implementation by the French ambassador, he downplays the fact that the repeated issuing of these bulls was designed to eliminate the practice all together. Precedent, it would seem, served as a more compelling argument to preserve the practice of the quarter than papal disapproval, an implicit critique of the authority of papal ruling both in the past and in response to the more recent ban by Innocent XI. In the following section, the author continues to support the argument for historical precedent for the quarter by citing the Créqui affair as a violation of the *droit des gens*, thereby drawing the analogy closer to the 1680s and to France, and also stressing that the exercise of the quarter was a legal and secular affair, and therefore could not be regulated by papal decree.<sup>45</sup> According to the author, the

---

<sup>44</sup> *Bullarum diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum romanorum pontificum taurinensis editio locupletior facta collectione novissima plurium brevium, epistolarum, decretorum actorumque S. Sedis a S. Leone Magni usque ad praesens cura et studio collegii adlecti Romae virorum s. theologiae et ss. canonum peritorum quam ss. d.n. Pius Papa IX apostolica benedictione erexit auspicante* ..., ed. Francisco Gaude, 24 vols (Turin: Dalmazzo, 1857), 6: 463-464. The subsequent titles of the bull are, “Contra franchitias in Urbe acclamentes aut illas pro malefactoribus vel aere alieno ad strictus tenentes sive curiam in eorum captura impediens.” (Bullarum Diplomatum, v. 7, 166-67). These translate to, “Against claiming franchises in the City, holding them for evildoers or for those constrained by foreign debt, or impeding the court from taking them.” Translation by Jessica Lockhart, University of Toronto.

<sup>45</sup> AMAE Rome 309 ff. 298rv. In reference to Duc de Créqui’s embassy: “Un juge criminel avec sbirres commit une execution dans le voisinage du palais Farnese dans le temps que cette Ambassadeur estoit a Saint Pierre[.] Il en témoigna son ressentiment au Cardinal Chigi et a plusieurs autres Cardinaux et fut sur le point de faire quelques affront au Cardinal Imperiali e M. de Lionne marqua aussi en France a Nonce que le Roi avoit estre tres choqué de ce manque de respect qu’on avoit eu pour son Ambassadeur et lui declara que le Duc de Crequy ne souffriroit une pareille entreprise. Ce premier violement de respect dû a l’Ambassadeur de France servit de degré a l’attentat que les Corses et les Sbirres commirent le 20 Août entrants a main armée dans le quartier de l’ambassadeur assiegeans son palais et commettans les autres excès qui sont trop connû et pour qu’il soit necessaire de les rapportes ici. Le Roy demanda justice au Pape de ce violement de droit de gens...”

Treaty of Pisa codified the defense of the quarter, insofar as it administered punishment to the papal guards who participated in the attack. Furthermore, the rights were maintained even in the absence of an ambassador, as long as the royal crest remained visible.

L'execution de cet article en fait connoistre le veritable sens car le Pape Alexandre ne voulut plus qu'on fit aucunes executions dans le quartier de Lambassadeur de france. il fit chastier ceux qui desobeirent a ses ordres et voulut qu'on portast si avant ce respect que l'on desfendit même aux sbirres de faire aucunes executions dans les quartiers du palais Farnese dans lintervale qui s'ecoula entre le depart du Duc de Créqui et larrivéé du duc de Chaunes parce que les armes de france estoient demeurées sur la porte de ce palais et que l'on mis en prison des officiers qui avoient fait une execution dans une maison scize hors du quartier du duc de Chaunes parce que ses armes estoient sur la porte.<sup>46</sup>

The second half of the text, "Objections and Defenses Concerning the Abolition of the Quarter" begins with what is perhaps the most forceful argument in favor of the French cause. According to the author, the King of France was entitled above any other sovereign to enjoy special privileges in Rome:

La premier objection est que les Ambassadeurs de France nés pas plus droit de conserver a Rome les immunités de leur quartier que les Ambassadeurs des autres couronnes qui y ont renoncé. Le ne pretend point entre dans les raisons qui ont obligé les autres princes de donner les mains a cette suppression des immunités de leurs Ambassadeurs il me suffit de dire que le Roy ne regle sa conduite point sur le exemple de ces princes et qu'outre qu'ils n'avoient point passé de traité avec le Ste Siège *pour ce sujet jamais leurs prédécesseurs n'ont donné un pouce de terre a l'eglise Romain...mais des Rois de France que le Pape tient sa souveraineté qu'il a dans Rome* estre ne sont point leurs états mais la seul France qui a servi d'asile au Papes et a l'eglise Romaine meritent bien quel leurs Ambassadeurs ayant a Rome quelque marque particuliere du respect qui est du a ceux qu'ils represents.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> AMAE Rome 309 f. 299r. The designation of the quarter based on the appearance of the royal arms also supports the definition proposed by Bourlemont and Bussière discussed in Chapter Two.

<sup>47</sup> AMAE Rome 308 f. 304r. Emphasis mine.



A similar sentiment is expressed later in the text in relation to why ambassadors deserve greater privileges than papal nuncios

La second response est que les Papes n'ont jamais été souverains en France et n'ont jamais donné aucunes provinces ny villes aux Rois de France, *au lieu que nous Rois ont été souverains dans Rome et dans tout l'Estat de l'Eglise et ont donné l'une et l'autre au Papes.*

The two passages are of interest because they relate the quarter to a larger history of territoriality between France and Rome. According to the author, a special privilege is now owed to the French because at one point France granted the Roman church its own land, both in Rome and as a temporary place of asylum in France. Furthermore, as the second passage implies, the very basis for the rights of ownership (and its associative right to rule) stemmed from the claim that Rome itself once belonged to the king of France.<sup>48</sup> While Louis XIV did not have any intention of invading Rome or the Papal States in the 1680s, the rhetoric of land possession present in these arguments drew from powerful sources. One was the recent memory of the 1660s, in which Louis XIV's forces were poised to invade the Papal States and Avignon as a result of the Créqui Affair.<sup>49</sup> A second was Louis XIV's ongoing wars of the 1680s, the *Reunions*, which themselves were launched under the pretext of claiming land that was once part of the French realm. As noted above, the association of the French quarter in Rome with French territorial conquest and military victory had already been overt in the program of the Place des Victoires monument completed the same year as the *memoire*.

---

<sup>48</sup> AMAE Rome 309 f. 298r. Emphasis mine. Earlier, the author claims that Rome itself was the product of a French donation, stemming from the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne.

<sup>49</sup> The author's references to the Treaty of Pisa, just prior to these statements suggest this connection. See note 45, above.

The language of conquest and territoriality also appeared in other texts on debate of the quarter that circulated in both France and Rome. More specifically, in at least three discussions, the term “citadel” was used to define French urban development in Rome. The term is used as an epithet condemning the exercise of diplomatic immunity by the French in Rome in two printed texts of 1687. In these diatribes, papal supporters accused the French of usurping authority in “the Pope’s own metropolis,” treating the extraterritorial quarter as a “citadel” and Rome “as a place of conquest”:

“Un Re Christianissimo...voglio corrompere appresso Dio il merito, ed appresso il mondo, el la posterità tutta la gloria di si eroico proponimento, con angustiare nella sua propria sede un santo vecchio quasi ottuagenerio, introducendo nella sua metropoli, sotto specie e colore d'ambasciata, una più che mediocre truppa d'huomini d'arme, che in faccia di lui esercitano quelle forzioni, che solo parebbero proportionate à praticarsi in *una Citadella delle sue fortunate Conquiste*.”<sup>50</sup>

The anonymous author of a second work, responding to the ambassador’s protest of his excommunication, described the actions of the French in Rome similar terms:

“Le gardes marines, & d'autres troupes des Gladiateurs sont dans le Palais de Farnese comme si c'estoit une Citadelle<sup>51</sup>, du une Place de conquete, & à fin, que toute Rome les cache.”<sup>52</sup>

The critique, however, was not limited to papal supporters. The Marquis de Chamlay, the Captain General of Camps and Arms of the King, described the French quarter in Rome as a type of stronghold:

Un quartier d'ambassadeur, terme inconnu au souverain et à la justice, est regardé à Rome, *comme une citadelle sans remparts, sans murailles, sans portes, au milieu d'une ville* où les filous au jeu, les gens accablés de dettes, ceux qui ne vivent que d'industrie sans s'occuper d'aucune profession, les blasphémateurs, les adultères, les faux monnayeurs, les

---

<sup>50</sup> “Écrit Italien en forme de Response a la Protestation du Marquis de Lavardin Ambassadeur extraordinaire de France à Rome,” BAV, Barb Lat 5647, ff. 91r-112r, 92r. Emphasis mine.

<sup>51</sup> Quoted in Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Sainte-Siège*, 297-298 (AMAE Rome 337, page number not cited).

<sup>52</sup> “Qui Maledixerit Patri Suo,” 1688, BAV Barb Lat 5647 98r-112v, f. 906r

faiseurs d'avis secrets, les femmes de joie, les voleurs reconnus et les assassins même à gages, évitent non seulement la rigueur des lois, mais les bravent publiquement, à la honte de la majesté du prince au désavantage de l'État et de la police, au scandale du peuple et des étrangers, et au préjudice de la sûreté publique de la religion, contre laquelle on y commet journellement mille abus.

While Chamlay's description shares the same critical tone as the papal documents above, it was not an outright call to dissolve the quarter. Chamlay was, in fact, responding to Louis XIV's previous instructions to reduce the limits of the quarter in 1676 after Innocent's initial attempt to dissolve the foreign precincts in Rome. The king repeated these instructions a year later to Chamlay himself, when the Marquis was dispatched to Rome as an interim diplomat.<sup>53</sup> Chamlay's remarks, therefore, signal the disjuncture between the rhetoric and the practice of the French quarter in Rome in the 1680s. Unlike the 1660s, there was a new attempt not only to document the historical precedent for the quarter, but also to manage it, and thus confine it to a specific urban zone.

The two-pronged attempt to both justify the quarter's existence historically and give it a more concrete spatial definition gave rise to the first visual representation of its limits, which appeared in a two-sheet plan of 1687 (figure 4-5). The work, published by Neveu, depicts the streets and palaces included within the boundaries of French claim in Rome along with a legend, which outlines in greater detail the streets and monuments under French jurisdiction (figure 4-6).<sup>54</sup> As in the 1660s, the French continued to

---

<sup>53</sup> "Que [Sa Majesté] consentira que l'étendue [du quartier] soit réduite aux places et rues dont le Palais Farnèse est environné, et qui sont absolument nécessaires pour loger les domestiques de l'ambassadeur. Recueil des Instructions, Rome, 2, 11-12 quoted in Neveu "Regia Fortuna," 485. For a reference to Louis XIV's instructions of 1676, see "Lettre d'un Gentilhomme françois" f.307r.

<sup>54</sup> The legend reads: " a) Le Tibre; b) Le Palais Farnèse; c) La Place Farnèse; d) Les fontaines de la Place; e) Basse Court du palais; f) escuries du palais; g) jardin sur le tibre; h) le pont sixte; i) la fontaine du pont sixte; l) la rue du pont sixte; m) la rue Julia que passé sous l'arcade de farnese; n) la rue de l'église de la mort aboutissent a la place; o) la rue san petronio aboutissent a la place; p) place devant la paroisse st. Catherine; q) la rue san giralomo; r) la rue santa caterina; s) college des anglais; t) place de campo fiore ou

capitalize on the urban prominence of their chosen palace, including within the quarter's limits all of the radiating streets and *piazze* that arose as a result of the intensive urban planning around the time of the Palazzo Farnese's initial construction. A reference to the location of the former pyramid, although incorrect, makes the association with Créqui's embassy even more overt.<sup>55</sup> Moreover, several areas denoted in the legend suggest how the French consciously constructed their own urban control in relation to competing influences, in particular those belonging to other foreign states in Rome. Included within the quarter's boundaries were the Swedish church of Santa Brigida, the streets leading to the Spanish church of S. Giralomo and the Bolognese church of S. Petronio, the English College, and the Sienese church of Santa Caterina di Siena. Among the noble families who would have to contest the French over jurisdictional control were the Falconieri and the Spada. Cardinal Spada had already roused the anger of Louis XIV with his actions against the French faction at S. Trinità dei Monti). A dotted line surrounding Casa Grande suggests that the Barberini's palace principal facade remained outside the boundaries of the quarter. The zone of immunity did include the portion of Via Pettinari leading to the Ponte Sisto, which had previously been regularized by the Barberini as part of their own urban planning.<sup>56</sup> Finally, the most blatant claim to juridical control is the notation that that quarter would extend to the "place de campo fiore ou est le strapade et

---

est le strapade et corps du garde; v) place spada devant le palais de ce nom, ou a été la piramide; x) la rue de gibonar (sic); y) la rue de cappellari; z) la rue nommée vicolo de Spada; 2) la rue de les grotes; 3) la rue de Balestrari; 4) L'Eglise de la mort; 5) L'eglise Saint Brigida; 6) La rue Courta Savel (sic) ce qui est ponctué marque les bornes du quartier; 7) le Palais Falconieri; 8) la Trinité du Ponte Sixte." I have kept the original spelling and punctuation as it appears in the document. Neveu, "Regia Fortuna," 484. Neveu does not discuss the specific urban footprint of this plan or the individual monuments it included.

<sup>55</sup> The pyramid is noted as located in Piazza Spada, when it was actually located in Piazza S. Trinità dei Pellegrini. See above, note 54, "V."

<sup>56</sup> For a discussion of Barberini urban planning along Via dei Pettinari see Carla Keyvanian, "Concerted Efforts: The Quarter of the Barberini Casa Grande in Seventeenth-Century Rome," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64 no. 3 (September 2005): 292-311.

corps du garde.” This would have prevented the civic government of Rome from dispatching any soldiers or executing prisoners on the Campo dei Fiori, a location used for the public execution of justice in Rome.

Bound into a volume of works on the defense of the French quarter in Rome, the 1687 plan precedes another document which also contains a drawn map of the quarter (figure 4-7), entitled, “Memoire touchant l’immunité du quartier de Monsieur les Mareschal d’Estrées.” In this pamphlet, the author (anonymous) recalls the embassies of the elder Duc d’Estrées (1636-1641) and his replacement, the Marquis Fontenay-Mareuil (1641-42, 1647-51).<sup>57</sup> According to the author, the concept of the immunity of the quarter “as far as the eye can see” derived from the elder Duc d’Estrées who complained to Urban VIII to keep and soldiers from the palace:

*“Aussy loin que le veue de luy ambassadeur pouvoit s’étendre, par cette expression il entendoit un espace raisonnable qu’il reigleroit luy mesme pour conserver la dignité et la beinséance deüe à son caractère...”*<sup>58</sup>

The author continues to describe the area of the quarter surrounding the French ambassador’s residence at the Palazzo Sacchetti in precise detail, referring to an accompanying map:

*Le plan que J’ay fait faire marque toute l’étendue du quartier, je diray seulement comme le devant du Palais estoit sacré a cause des armes du roy, et que les rues qui y aboutissoient l’esoient aussy par le mesme raison, il prétendoit que les maisons qui estoient à la opposite de son palais de l’autre costé de la rivière environ de 40 toises, parce que c’estoit à sa veüe et du costé qu’il estoit ordinairement, devoient jouir de la mesme immunité que la reste.*<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> AMAE Rome 309 ff. 253r-256r, cited in Neveu, “Regia Fortuna,” 483. “Memoire touchant l’immunité du quartier de Monsieur le s Mareschel d’Estrées.” The map of 1687 quarter is reprinted in Neveu, Regia Fortuna,” 483.

<sup>58</sup> AMAE Rome 309 f. 253r, quoted by Neveu, “Regia Fortuna,” 483.

<sup>59</sup> AMAE Rome 309 f.254r, partially quoted by Neveu, “Regia Fortuna, 483. Emphasis mine.

The map (unpublished) provides a stunning representation of the previous quarter's urban parameters, one that I believe was meant to evoke a deliberate comparison with the designation of the quarter of 1687. Not drawn to scale, the former ambassador's residence at Palazzo Sacchetti occupies a large portion of the urban area near the church of S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini at the northern terminus of Via Giulia. The quarter itself is similarly commanding. Comprised of the Palazzo Sacchetti, its surrounding streets, an area across the Tiber, and even parts of the river itself, the area marked as French territory seems to conform to the author's description as all within the field of vision of the ambassador from his palace windows.<sup>60</sup> While it describes the French quarter in 1636, the text and accompanying plan were actually written nearly fifty years later, in 1687, and is one of two separate works produced in this year on the embassy of the elder Duc d'Estrées, which began in 1636.<sup>61</sup> As a retrospective work, the text may not be a reliable description of the French diplomatic situation in the 1630s, but it certainly may be read as an attempt by the French to historically frame, conceive, and thereby justify their quarter after its dissolution in the 1680s.

The 1630s may have been fitting comparison to the 1680s not only because of the familial ties between embassies of the elder and younger d'Estrées, but also because

---

<sup>60</sup> AMAE Rome 309 f.254r. "Plan du Palais de Mons. Le Mareschale d'Estrées Ambassadeur Extraordinaire a Rome en 1636, 1637, 1638, 39, 40 avec le cours du Tibre qui passoit derrière et toutes les maisons que assoient comprises dans son quartier." Included in the legend: "(a) La Palais; (b) St. Jean des Florentins; (c) Maison de procureur fiscal de Rome; (d) rues traversantes comprises dans l'immunité; (e) rue aboutissentes a la riviere dont toutes les maisons assoient pareillement comprises dans l'immunité; (f) coin du rue ou finissoit l'immunité et auquel estoit une boutique d'un Mareschal Ferrant; (g) La riviere en franchise ainsy qu'il est marqué par les lettres "g"; (h) espace d'autre coste de la riviere de mesmes essendue que la face de Palais aussy en franchise."

<sup>61</sup> There is also a series of *memoires* written by a Chevalier Zacherie that make note of the embassy of the elder Duc d'Estrées. Zacherie describes himself as a member of the ambassadorial suite who was held prisoner by the Romans and shares several of the same views as the anonymous author of the "Memoire touchant l'immunité dy quartier..." In total, there are four documents penned by Chevalier Zacherie. See AMAE 308 ff. 259r-263v (26 February 1687); ff. 264r-265v (3 March 1687); ff. 281r-284v (12 March 1687); and 284rv (21 March 1687). The first *memoire* is cited by Neveu in reference to extraterritoriality in the 1630s, but not specifically as a document of the 1680s. See Neveu, "Regia Fortuna," 48.

it referenced the militaristic and disruptive strategies of French urbanism in Rome. The quarter of 1636 included within its boundaries one of the most important ceremonial points in the urban landscape of early modern Rome: the trident at Piazza di Ponte.<sup>62</sup> Comprised of the merging of three radiating streets, the Via Paola, Via de' Banchi, and the Via di Panico, the trident worked with the Ponte S. Angelo as a vital link connecting the Vatican Borgo and the densely populated area of the Campo Marzio. The area not only marked the transition from secular to sacred space as a gateway into the Borgo and St. Peter's, but it was also an important site for the city's economic life. Inhabited primarily by the Florentine community, the trident was the location of over thirty banks and the papal mint, the Zecca, located at the end of the Via de' Banchi.<sup>63</sup> The plan of 1687 draws attention to the economic importance of this zone by denoting that the house of the fiscal procurator of Rome (indicated in the legend by the letter c) is included within French territorial bounds.

One of the trident's most significant functions was as a theater for the ritualistic display of civic control in Rome. Beginning in the sixteenth century, the Piazza di Ponte became the primary location for public executions. The radiating streets provided five different perspectives of the scaffold, forming an urban construction that, as Richard Ingersoll has discussed, envisioned Jeremy Bentham's panopticon in its psychological and punitive effect.<sup>64</sup> The arrangement of streets was a result of a comprehensive urban planning program designed to both accommodate the traffic of pilgrims and strengthen

---

<sup>62</sup>Richard Ingersoll, "Piazza di Ponte and the Military Origins of Panopticism," in *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, eds. Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro, and Richard Ingersoll (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 177-188, 177.

<sup>63</sup> It was also designated as one of the few legal markets of the period Ingersoll, "Piazza di Ponte," 177, 180. After the financial collapse of 1605, the Zecca became the location of the papal Banco Santa Spirito, the papal bank.

<sup>64</sup> Ingersoll notes that the hanging scaffolds were visible from five directions. Ingersoll, "Piazza di Ponte," 178-179.

Rome's defensive capabilities. Initiated by Alexander VI Medici (1492-1503) after the French invasion of 1494, the Castel Sant' Angelo, Ponte Sant' Angelo, and Piazza di Ponte underwent several renovations in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Projects came to a halt during the sack of Rome in 1527, during which Clement VII Medici (1523-1534) sought refuge in the Castel Sant' Angelo. It was not until the pontificate of his successor, Paul III Farnese (1534-1549) that the project reached its culmination.<sup>65</sup> Immediately after his elevation, Paul ordered a special commission to study the city's defenses. This commission would prove to be the seedbed for new thinking on Italian military and defensive architecture and urban planning of the sixteenth century, theories which favored radial planning. In 1542, Antonio da Sangallo, who was charged with executing the commission's plans, proposed a strategy that concentrated on strengthening the defenses around Castel Sant' Angelo. A key component of this plan was the implementation of the three radial streets leading from the Piazza di Ponte designed to form direct paths from the fortress to outlying battle stations and bastions, including a new citadel (never executed) on the Pincio adjacent to Trinità dei Monti (figure 4-8). This last element likely prompted the opening of the Via Trinitatis, the fourth prong leading east from the Piazza di Ponte in 1544.<sup>66</sup> Finally, as an ornament to the city, long straight streets provided vistas through the urban fabric. The terminal points of these axes laid a map of Farnese and Medici alliances, with the Via Paola, Via di Panico, and Via Trinitatis all leading to the palaces or churches belonging to their nation or family allies, including S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, Palazzo

---

<sup>65</sup> Ingersoll, "Piazza di Ponte," 179-182.

<sup>66</sup> Ingersoll, "Piazza di Ponte," 182-183.



Farnese, and Monte Giordano (the Orsini family compound and residence of Cardinal Ippolito d'Este).

Given the significance of this site in the Roman urban landscape, both in terms of its ritualistic and defensive value, the reintroduction of the 1636 quarter into the debate of 1687 is quite suggestive. On a fundamental level, the implicit comparison of the two quarters demonstrates that at some point during the seventeenth century, a sizable portion of the city's *abitato* (everything along the Via Giulia and the north-western portion of the Campo Marzio) was under French control. It also references the role of French alliances in the very shaping of this area. This was due in part to the urban legacy of the powerful alliances of the French crown in Rome, the Farnese, the Medici, and the Orsini who controlled this area and dictated the course of its development. As Ingersoll notes, the terminus of the Via di Panico at Monte Giordano was not only as a gesture of gratitude to the Borgia family (Ippolito d'Este's uncle, Alexander VI Borgia, had made Farnese a cardinal) but also a statement of a common French alliance with d'Este, who was the cardinal protector of the French in Rome. In fact, in 1638, the extent of this alliance was made overt in the birthday celebrations of Louis XIV, which included two ceremonies at either terminal point of the Via Giulia, one at the residence of the ambassador at Palazzo Sacchetti, the second a pyrotechnical display on the Tiber behind the Palazzo Farnese.<sup>67</sup> The 1636 map also recalls a period of French control over

---

<sup>67</sup> The festivities of 1638 took place in multiple locations including the Palazzo Barberini, Trinità dei Monti, S. Luigi dei Francesi, and the palace of the French ambassador at Palazzo Sacchetti. The pyrotechnical finale, was financed by Cardinal Antonio Barberini and took place in front of Palazzo Barberini, where a mountain alight with fireworks, opened to reveal a tower (also replete with fireworks), which itself opened to reveal a brilliantly illuminated French crown. In total the fête cost the cardinal over four thousand *scudi*, and served as a spectacular display of Barberini loyalty to the French crown. The French ambassador, the elder d'Estrées, was also responsible for two other *macchine* in celebration of the event. The first was erected in front of S. Luigi dei Francesi was a cloud that opened to reveal the sun and the dauphin, who destroyed an allegorical hydra representing war, famine, and plague. The second took

the city's defensive center, an urban sector that itself was first initiated in response to a French threat during the occupation of the city in 1494. Finally, it presents continuity between the 1630s and the 1680s, not just in the area that was claimed but also in the mode in which this territory was marked: as a visual process. As noted above, the projection of sight was also a key component in the framing of civic, juridical, and martial control over the city of Rome at work at the Piazza di Ponte. In the context of the militarization of the quarter in 1687, this dialogue between "citadels" (one French, the other papal) and the subsequent rereading of urban space it proposed suggests both a re-inscription and a subversion of papal authority and civic control in the heart of Rome.

#### **A View of "French Rome": Israël Silvestre and the *Profil* of 1687**

The political unrest between France and the papacy was the backdrop for the publication of one of the most magnificent printed views of Rome of the seventeenth century.

Produced in 1687, at the height of the Franco-papal controversy, the *Profil de la ville de Rome, veüe de côté de la Trinité du Mont* (figures 4-9 through 4-14) depicts the city from the crest of the Pincian Hill.<sup>68</sup> At over eight feet long and four feet wide, the etching was

---

place on the Tiber itself, and was a boat representing the Argo from which emanated the music of trumpets and drums, which echoed between the banks of the river. This second work, was deliberately designed for the amusement of the common people of Rome, whose "antics" became part of the entertainment of the noble guests invited to view the scene from the back balconies of the Palazzo Sacchetti, before the performance of a musical commedia. Hammond, "Music and Spectacle," 230-231.

<sup>68</sup> Entitled in Italian, "Profilo della Città di Roma dalla parte dell Trinità dei Monte." The work went through four editions. A copy of the first edition published by Silvestre in 1687, located at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and a copy of the third edition, published by Carlo Losi in 1773 at the Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, were studied in preparation for this chapter. The only changes from the original in the 1773 edition are the dedication to Benedict XIV and the substitution of the Dauphin's arms for those of the Pope. The original dimensions of the work are 515 x 2600 mm (540 x 2600 including the border). For a reproduction see *Roma Veduta: Disegni e stampe panoramiche della città dal XV al XIX secolo*, ed. Mario Gori Sassoli (Rome: Artemide Edizioni, 2001), 171-172, and *Imago urbis romae: l'immagine di Roma in età moderna*. Exh. Cat., ed. Cesare de Seta (Rome: Electa, 2005), 130-131. A reproduction of the original French version appears in *Incisioni romane di Israel Silvestre*, ed. Cesare Nissirio (Rome, 1979). The

one of the largest views of Rome of the period, and the first panoramic view taken from the Pincio. It was produced in four panels and included a legend identifying fifty-six of Rome's most prominent ancient and modern monuments in both French and Italian. Unlike previous views and maps of Rome of similar expense and size, however, the *Profil* was not the product of papal patronage, nor was it dedicated to any member of Rome's influential families. Produced under royal privilege, by Israël Silvestre, the Dessinateur et Graveur du Roi, it was published in France and dedicated to the Dauphin, whose coat of arms prominently appears in the center of the legend. In the following section, I examine how the *Profil* may be read in the context of the acute diplomatic tension between France and Rome of the 1680s and the ongoing struggle between those powers for control over the Pincio, as a work that aimed to capture a view of Rome through French eyes.

Silvestre produced the *Profil* only seven years before his death, after having served the majority of his career as one of the premier engravers and publishers of printed works under Louis XIV. As for many of his contemporaries, the study of Rome's contemporary and classical monuments was a crucial part of his artistic development. After his initial training under his uncle, the engraver Israël Henriet, Silvestre embarked on three successive journeys to Italy during the periods 1640-42, 1643-1644, and 1653. These trips served as the basis for the production of several series of views of Italian cities during the early part of his career, the majority of which were views of contemporary and ancient Roman architecture, following closely in the tradition of his

---

provenance of the *Profil* is published in L.E. Faucheux, *Catalogue raisonné de toutes les estampes qui forment l'oeuvre d'Israel Silvestre* (Paris, 1969), 80.

contemporary, Stefano della Bella, and his predecessor, Jacques Callot.<sup>69</sup> These early works proved to be quite influential in the later development Italian *vedutismo*; they were studied by contemporary Dutch landscape artists Gaspar van Wittel and Lieven Cruyl, and the Italian, Gian Battista Falda, and were later reprinted by Giovanni Battista Piranesi and François Noblesse.<sup>70</sup>

It was after his return from Rome that Silvestre rose in prominence, beginning in 1661 when he inherited his uncle's atelier.<sup>71</sup> According to the notations from Royal *Registres des comptes de dépenses* of 1664, Silvestre's first official commission from this period was to create views of all royal buildings and public spectacles. After inheriting the plates of his mentor, Jacques Callot, Silvestre also became the chief publisher of French landscapes in Paris.<sup>72</sup> Like his predecessor, Stefano della Bella, under Richelieu, Silvestre was dispatched by Colbert in 1665 to illustrate the cities captured and annexed by the French army in the Lorraine and Champagne regions. These series comprised his first works completed under royal patronage, an association

---

<sup>69</sup> Scholars have often noted two distinct periods in Silvestre's oeuvre, the first comprised of smaller-scale views is heavily influenced by the lyricism and pastoral qualities of works by Callot and by early collaboration with his contemporary della Bella. Silvestre's works differ from those of his predecessors in his sustained interest in the urban fabric and architecture of *contemporary* Rome, opposed to a more prevalent focus of the depiction of classical ruins or pastoral themes in the work of later sixteenth-century engravers, and the pastoralized landscape traditions of his earlier contemporaries. Even Silvestre's early works, though often representing a single monument or isolated space, reveal his continued interest in capturing the overall impression of a place, as opposed to the concentration on a monument's site and architectural detail. In this regard, Silvestre's work may be best compared to that of his contemporary Lievin Cruyl whose series of views of the urban transformations of the 1660s may be interpreted as "authorized" images of contemporary papal Rome and articulate the subjective capacity of viewpoint that defined the urban projects of Alexander VII. Jean-Pierre Babelon, "Silvestre Paysagiste," in *Paris et Rome: vue par Israël Silvestre*, ed. Délégation à l'Action Artistique de la Ville de Paris (Paris: Mairies Annexes des Xe et Ier Arrondissements, 1981), 4-8 and Cesare Nissirio, "Silvestre a Rome," *Paris et Rome*, 8-9.

<sup>70</sup> J-R Thomé "Le Commerce des estampes au XVII siècle, Israël Silvestre" *Le Courrier graphique* n. 29 (1947): 53-58, 55.

<sup>71</sup> On Silvestre see also: E. De Silvestre, *Renseignements sur quelques peintres et graveurs des XVII et XVIII siècles, Israël Silvestre et ses descendants* (Paris, 1869) and *Scelta de Vedute di Roma* ed. Simonetta Prosperi Valenti (Milan, Edizioni il Polifilo, 1984).

<sup>72</sup> Silvestre also received permission from Louis XIV to republish Callot and della Bella's works. Silvestre, *Renseignements sur quelques peintres*, 8-20.

that Silvestre rapidly developed, becoming the Maître a dessiner des pages de la Grande Écurie in 1667, receiving the title of Academician Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture in 1670; in 1673 he was named the drawing instructor to the Dauphin of France. Perhaps the most indicative testament of Silvestre's influence comes from the travel diary of the architect Nicodemus Tessin the Younger, who was guided in Paris by Silvestre, Andre Le Nôtre and others in 1687. As Tessin's notes suggest, Silvestre was one of the few members of the king's "inner circle" of artists and intellectuals, and the young architect benefited from this unprecedented access to the king's collection and court during his three-month stay.<sup>73</sup>

Little is known of the initial circumstances surrounding the *Profil*'s publication, though as a testament to its popularity, the work remained in circulation long after Silvestre's death in 1694, reprinted in three updated editions until the close of eighteenth century. Etienne Faucheux, the author Silvestre's catalogue raisonné, included a brief description of the work, noting only that Silvestre himself was responsible for its initial publication and that it was indicative of his later style.<sup>74</sup> The plates were acquired and republished in the early eighteenth century by the publisher Jacques Fagnani. At least two other versions appear in Italian collections, one was rededicated to Benedict XIV and published by Carlo Losi in 1773 and a final edition, with some new inscriptions was

---

<sup>73</sup> Nicodemus Tessin the Younger: *Sources, Works, Collections: Travel Notes 1673-77 and 1687-88*, eds. Merit Laine and Börje Magnusson (Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, 2002). He also collaborated with France's most renowned artists and printmakers including della Bella, Francois Collignon, Charles Perrault, Jean le Pautre, and the Perelle family, and was particularly close to Charles Le Brun, who had been an influential ally in his acceptance to the academy and was the godfather to his daughter Charlotte Le Brun also produced portraits of Silvestre and his wife Henriette Sélincourt, engraved by Edelinck, as well as a portrait for her tomb, designed by the architect Francois D'Orbay. Édouard Meaume, *Recherches sur quelques artistes lorrains, Claude Henriet, Israël Henriet, Israël Silvestre et ses descendants* (Nancy: Grimblot et Ve Raybois, 1852), 113-25.

<sup>74</sup> Faucheux, *Catalogue Raisonné*, 80.

published in 1807, by Giovanni Maria Cassini by the Calcografia Camerale based on the design of Francesco Miccinielli.<sup>75</sup>

Adding to the obscurity of the *Profil*'s origins is the unusual choice of both subject matter and format during a late point in Silvestre's career. Not only is the *Profil* the largest of Silvestre's works but it is also a return to a subject he had not considered since his early excursions to Rome in the 1640s and 1650s. Of the engravings he produced during this period, a two-panel urban profile of 1642, entitled *Roma* (figure 4-15) has been considered a pendant for the *Profil*.<sup>76</sup> Completed when the engraver was just twenty-one years old, the view taken from the western portion of the city, outside of the Porta Angelica and the Porta Castello was, according to Faucheux, was based on a drawing by the artist, Louis de Lincllet.<sup>77</sup> The two etchings, however, share very little in terms of size, conception, and format, casting doubt on this presumed connection.<sup>78</sup> While *Roma* depicts the city from outside the walls, concentrating on the forms of St. Peter's and the Castel Sant' Angelo in the foreground, the *Profil* depicts Rome's dense urban fabric in exquisite detail, appearing as if in a valley below the Pincian hill (on left) extending to the northern entrance to the city at the Porta del Popolo. Space recedes in orderly planes, from the sweep of hillside in the foreground to the distant cityscape that dominates the horizon line. A series of closely packed buildings and streets span all four panels, some, like the Palazzo Farnese, appearing disproportionately larger in scale than their urban surroundings. On either side of the work, the imposing silhouettes of the

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid, 80.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 79.

<sup>77</sup> *Imago Urbis Romae*, 22.

<sup>78</sup> Like the *Profil*, little is known of *Roma*, except that it is completed in 1642 with a privilege from the king. Unlike the *Profil*, there is no evidence of a dedication. *Roma* is also four sheets long, the total dimensions of the work are significantly smaller than the *Profil* (1225 x 185 centimeters versus 2620 x 508) and depicts far few monuments, instead focusing on St. Peter's and the Castel Sant' Angelo, which appear prominently in the foreground of the work. Faucheux, *Catalogue Raisonné*, 79.

Villa Medici and a ruin of an ancient arch enclose the view, forming a proscenium, while a dark band of vegetation runs along the bottom of the scene. This framing device also trains the eye onto the central urban “stage” of the cityscape itself.<sup>79</sup> The resulting image was unprecedented. While Claude Lorraine, Gaspard Dughet, and Gaspar Van Wittel all produced painted views from the Pincio (which likely served as models for Silvestre) the *Profil* offered a novel view of Rome, which could be disseminated through the medium of print.<sup>80</sup>

In addition to Silvestre’s own 1642 panoramic view of Rome, the *Profil* owes much to Giovanni Temini’s 1665 panorama of Rome, engraved by Hendrick van Cleef (figure 4-16).<sup>81</sup> Following conventional cartographic orientation of views of the city, Temini’s *Roma* depicts the city from west to east, from the Janiculum hill, with St. Peter’s and the Vatican Palace depicted at left and Monte Testaccio at far right. The western portion of the city’s *abitato* appears in the middle ground, with the Tiber running roughly through the image’s midpoint, bisecting the two halves of the cityscape. In place of a legend, nineteen tiny *vedute* of the major urban and architectural projects of Pope Alexander VII Chigi (1655-1668) appear on the lower edge of the sheet (figure 4-17). These scenes are copies of views of Rome published by Gian Battista Falda in 1665. Nearly seven feet (220 cm) in length, Temini’s *Roma* is only less than a foot shorter than the *Profil*. Produced on five separate plates, it is, to my knowledge, the only view of

---

<sup>79</sup> Silvestre’s employment of a fictive proscenium appears in his engraved series of illustrations for the “Pleasures of the Enchanted Island” of 1660 that includes the silhouette of the king in the center of the audience viewing the performance on the stage above.

<sup>80</sup> The Pincio was a popular neighborhood for French artists, Claude Lorraine and Nicolas Poussin having both resided there. It was also home to Johann Paul Schor, who while of German descent, was responsible for some major French commissions in Rome including the artistic program for the celebrations around the Birth of the Dauphin. See Jorge Fernández-Santos Ortiz-Iribas, “A 1679 Inventory of the Schor Residence at the Trinità dei Monti” in *Un regista del gran teatro del barocco: Johann Paul Schor und die internationale Sprache des Barock* (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2008).

<sup>81</sup> Sassoli, *Roma Veduta*, 173-174.

Rome predating Silvestre's that is of comparable size, format, and composition.<sup>82</sup> Unlike contemporary maps of Rome, reproduced throughout the eighteenth century, Temini's grand scale urban view fell out of circulation some time around 1687, suggesting that the *Profil's* publication may have also filled a new gap in the print market, or eclipsed it.<sup>83</sup>

Temini's profile was one of several new images of Rome produced during Alexander VII's pontificate. One of the notable "building popes," Alexander's urban enterprise was comprehensive: to imprint the city with the radiant mark of the Church Triumphant, enshrined by the Chigi Monti.<sup>84</sup> A primary aim of the pope's renovations had been to widen and straighten major streets and squares in order to provide increased visibility throughout the city. In its actualization, however, Alexander's vision was subjected to compromise and negotiation among a network of agents competing for urban prominence.<sup>85</sup> The grand vision of the pope's scheme was realized through visual representation: six new maps of Rome were produced in the 1660s (all dedicated to a member of the papal family), as well as two new series of urban views that depicted the

---

<sup>82</sup> The view also includes the pope's coat of arms as well as the insignia of Rome in the upper right and left hand corners respectively.

<sup>83</sup> This occurred after the death of its publisher, Stefano Scolari. Sassoli, *Roma Veduta*, 172

<sup>84</sup> Richard Krautheimer's discussion of Lievin Cruyl's series of views commissioned by Alexander VII remains an influential examination of printed representations of seventeenth-century Rome. Richard Krautheimer, *The Rome of Alexander VII* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 93, 143-145. Another more recent source on Lieven Cruyl is Barbara Jatta, *Lievin Cruyl e la sua opera grafica. Un artista fiammingo nell'Italia del Seicento* (Brussels and Rome, 1992). For a discussion of the prints in relation to a late seventeenth-century French guidebook of Rome see Joseph Connors and Louise Rice, *Specchio di Roma Barocca* (Rome: Edizione dell'Elefante, 1991). On the De Rossi family see Francesca Consagra, "The De Rossi Family Print Publishing Shop: A Study in the History of the Print Industry in Seventeenth-Century Rome," Ph.D. Diss. (Johns Hopkins University, 1992); "De Rossi and Falda: A Successful Collaboration in the Print Industry of Seventeenth-Century Rome," in *The Craft of Art: Originality and Industry in the Italian Renaissance and Baroque Workshop*, eds. A. Ladis and C. Wood (Athens, Georgia, 1995), 187-203; and "The Marketing of Pietro Testa's 'Poetic Inventions,'" in *Pietro Testa 1612-1650 Prints and Drawings*, Exh. Cat., ed. Elizabeth Cropper (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1988), lxxxvii-civ.

<sup>85</sup> For a discussion of the roles of compromise and alliances in the urban planning of Alexander VII see Dorothy Metzger Habel, "Alexander VII and the Private Builder: Two Case Studies in Development of Via del Corso in Rome," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 49, no. 3 (1990): 293-309.



pope's urban projects.<sup>86</sup> The maps and views of Rome produced during Alexander's pontificate provided a new image of the city through print, one that had not been updated since the production of Giuseppe Di Rossi's *Roma* of 1637.<sup>87</sup> In addition, several of these works, including Temini's *Roma* and a map of Rome by Falda of 1676, included more than one form of geographical representation in the form of views, maps, and cityscapes. While the maps traced the city's changing face on a macro-level, the views focused on Alexander VII's individual interventions, ranging from the ceremonial gateway formed by the twin churches on the Piazza del Popolo and the grand *teatro* of Piazza S. Pietro (initially designed with the *terzo braccio*), to his public works such as the renovation of the Acqua Cetosa. The overall impression of these "composite" images is one of the legibility and grandeur of the Roman urban fabric achieved through unobstructed visibility of its streets and monuments. These images fostered a cohesive and mediated conception of Alexander's urban scheme by depicting Rome as a unified product of papal initiative (both in its sum and its parts), a conception Carlo Argan has referred to as the "city as monument."<sup>88</sup> After Alexander's death in 1667, new map production in Rome slowed, nonetheless, two revised editions of the De Rossi and Falda maps were published in Rome in 1668 and 1676 respectively.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> At least six major map projects were commissioned during Alexander's pontificate. In 1661 by Antonio Tempesta edited by Giovanni Giacomo de Rossi, 1663 by Giovanni Blaue, 1665 Lieven Cruyl (without views), 1666 Federico Agnelli, 1667 Giovanni Battista Falda, 1668 Matteo de Rossi with illustrations by Cruyl. Lievin Cruyl worked in Rome from 1664 to 1674, when he was commissioned by Alexander VII to produce a series of about 30 views of Rome. Joseph Connors and Louise Rice, *Specchio di Roma Barocca* (Rome: Edizione dell'Elefante, 1991), 162.

<sup>87</sup> Amato Pietro Frutaz, *Le piante di Roma*, 3 vols. (Roma: Istituto di studi romani, 1962) 1: 211-212, reproduced in vol. 3 tav. 333. First published in 1637, *Roma* was reissued in 1650. It includes 146 monuments and sites in its legend, including the churches, gates, towers, *piazze*, and ruins.

<sup>88</sup> Giulio Carlo Argan, "The Monument," in *The Baroque Age* (New York: Rizzoli, 1964).

<sup>89</sup> Matteo Gregorio De Rossi, printed by Giovanni Battista De Rossi, dedicated to Clement IX, also includes Cruyl's series of 22 views. "Roma Grande," dedicated to Innocent XI. See Frutaz, *Le Piante di Roma*, 1: 219-220, 221-222, 3: tav. 350-356, 357-363.

Notably the *Profil* does not include any of Alexander VII's urban and architectural projects. Piazza del Popolo, for example, appears without its twin churches, while Piazza S. Pietro is no more than an open space lacking any indication of Bernini's project. The inclusions of the view will be discussed at length below, but it is necessary here to stress that the decision to produce an outdated view, especially one that would have required considerable expense and time, seems quite deliberate. While the inventory of Silvestre's estate does not specify his possession of Temini's profile, the formal similarities between the two works and Silvestre's own prominence as a publisher in the European print market suggest that it was likely that he was aware of the view, and may have even considered creating his own cityscape to counter it. Furthermore, the inventory does note that the Silvestre owned a set of Falda's views as well as a copy of the Falda map of 1676 (that included Cruyl's series) and, therefore, was likely aware of the range of urban updates that had occurred since his own visits to Rome, especially those pursued by the Chigi pope.<sup>90</sup> Considering the saturation of the market by Alexandrian images of Rome, including those produced by his contemporary, Stefano della Bella, Silvestre's decision to represent an outdated version of the Roman urban landscape would also have been apparent to the contemporary viewer. Finally, while it is possible that Silvestre may have used preliminary drawings from an earlier stage of his career, according to Faucheux, the final work is stylistically distinct from his earlier work, suggesting that he cut the plates around the time of its publication.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> The manuscript of Silvestre's inventory taken after the engraver's death in 1691 was consulted at the Archives Nationales, Paris in preparation for this study. See AN 383 AP/1 Dossier 4. The inventory is also published in part by E. Silvestre, "Renseignements," 26-31, 153-159.

<sup>91</sup> Faucheux, *Catalogue Raisonné*, 80. That the work is characteristic of a later style is also noted in *Imago Urbis Romae*.

Like many of Silvestre's previous engravings the work belonged to the genre of the topographical view. During the reign of Louis XIV the emerging genre of the topographical landscape exploited the symbolic capacity of this view and tied it specifically to the ideological collapse between sovereign and state.<sup>92</sup> Similar in principle to Alexander VII's cityscapes, the topographical view was essentially propagandistic: giving representational form to the power of the monarch by collapsing sovereign and his domain. This elision, famously summed up in Louis XIV's purported statement, *l'état c'est moi*, was a central construct of the absolutist state, and, as Louis Marin has argued, was evoked solely through representations (visual, theatrical, historical) of the sovereign and his realm.<sup>93</sup> Unlike maps, in which the symbolic language of geometry offered its viewers a theoretical representation of the city devoid of any one point of view, the landscape image relied closely on the sensory impression of place *as seen*, implying a viewer, all the while constructing a narrative that frames a specific and authored conception of the place. In some respects the landscape view can be best compared to the king's histories of the period, which aimed to provide the reader with the ability to form their *own* image of the king's eternal heroism through the carefully constructed narration of events.<sup>94</sup> Silvestre's views of France's annexed territories often appeared in historical almanacs alongside maps of the same areas, suggesting they were on equal footing with

---

<sup>92</sup> Adam Frans van der Meulen, *A la gloire du roi: Van der Meulen, peintre des conquêtes de Louis XIV* (Dijon : Musée des beaux-arts de Dijon, Luxembourg : Musée d'histoire de la ville de Luxembourg, 1998).

<sup>93</sup> Marin, *Portrait of the King*, 14-16.

<sup>94</sup> Marin, "The King's Narrative, Or How to Write History" in *Portrait of the King*, 39-88. Another comparison can be drawn from the rules of courtesy that enforced a coercive and hierarchal culture of compliance between sovereign and court, where the king's *regard* (or lack thereof) was a defining feature of one's constituency. Orest Ranum, "Courtesy, Absolutism and the Rise of the French State," *Journal of Modern History*, 52 (1980): 426-451, 430.

maps as representations of the expanded realm.<sup>95</sup> Produced in Paris, these views literally brought the frontiers back to their center, strengthening its status as a capital city while promoting a territorially-driven conception of nationhood.

Topographical views often included an urban profile of the annexed territory, integrating the forms of the cityscape and the landscape into a historical narrative that celebrated both the omnipotence of the sovereign and the consolidation and expansion of the nation's borders. As a distinct form, the urban profile was derived from the cartographic typology of the navigational profile (defined by its horizon line orientation), which depicted the city's "face" from a distant view.<sup>96</sup> In the seventeenth century, "horizon" had a topographical meaning: the part of the landscape at the limits of one's vision. Marin has traced the lexical history of this term in relation to a second limiting term, the "*frontière*", which denoted the boundary between states and was a recognizable trope in Louis XIV's royal iconography for resolution and balance reached between the forces of expansion and opposition.<sup>97</sup> The signing of the Peace of the Pyrenees, for example, took place on the island that straddled the border between France and Spain, eliding geographical location with the notions of neutrality and concord.<sup>98</sup> Marin characterized the tenuousness that defined the *frontière* as careful stasis between forces of opposition and a boundary that marked a place between territorial domains. The limit, he continues was the semiotic "no-man's-land" of the frontier, an uncertain place belonging

---

<sup>95</sup> Silvestre's "Profil de la ville de Metz en Lorraine," for example, contains the same general planar arrangement, use of the profile typology, and axonometrically rendered monuments.

<sup>96</sup> Dennis Cosgrove, "Prospect, Perspective, and the Evolution of the Landscape Idea," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 10 no. 1 (1985): 45-62, 51-53.

<sup>97</sup> Marin, "Frontiers of Utopia," 406-408.

<sup>98</sup> Islands or other neutral or undeveloped spaces were also recurrent theme in the spectacle culture under Louis XIV. The subject of the island as a recurrent theme in Louis XIV's spectacles is discussed at length in Orest Ranum, "Islands and the Self in a Ludovician Fête," in *Sun King: The Ascendancy of French Culture During the Reign of Louis XIV*, ed. David Lee Rubin (Washington: Folger Books, 1992), 17-34.

to “neither one or the other.”<sup>99</sup> Similarly, Michel de Certeau characterizes the frontier as a type of void, an “in between space,” but nonetheless also considers the impulse to *cross* this space, and thus define it, as an essential aspect informing the frontier’s meaning.<sup>100</sup> This desire to cross over was the implicit tension associated with the frontier. Vauban’s construction of fortresses along France’s borders in the 1670s and 80s, for example, exploited this tension by serving to both mark the frontiers of the French state and ready the army for the expansion of these frontiers. The latter has been described by military historians as the “power projection” of the French state.<sup>101</sup>

Silvestre’s production of an urban profile of Rome must take into account not only his own previous urban profiles of France’s annexed territories, but also one of the most prominent examples of the topographical view in mid-seventeenth century France: Le Brun’s *Les Grandes Conquêtes du Roy* tapestries.<sup>102</sup> The series commemorated Louis’ military engagements in Europe, utilizing the urban profile view to connote the *expansion* of the king’s frontiers. In this series, engraved by Sébastien Le Clerc, the king’s territorial ambitions are expressed by the “visual conquest” of the king surveying the distant city of the annexed territory. For example, the “Rèduction de la Ville de Marsal en Lorraine par le Roy” (figure 4-18), depicts Louis observing Marsal’s distant city profile in the midst of the battle.<sup>103</sup> Two other panels of this series, the “Siège of Douay” (figure 4-19) and the “Siège of Tournay” (figure 4-20) also mobilize the urban view as a sign of territorial

---

<sup>99</sup> Marin, “Frontiers of Utopia,” 407-410.

<sup>100</sup> de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 122-129.

<sup>101</sup> Lynn, “Quest for Glory,” 200.

<sup>102</sup> It is also important to note that Silvestre and Le Brun were close friends throughout their careers. Silvestre, *Resignements*, 22-24.

<sup>103</sup> Le Clerc produced both the *Grandes* and *Petites Conquêtes du Roi*. The first series of twenty- eight plates was printed between 1683 and 1694, the second comprised of eight plates was printed in 1702. Maxime Préad, *Inventaire du fonds français: Graveurs du XVIIIe siècle, VIII: Sébastien Leclerc* (Paris, 1980), 160-175, nos. 617-644.

dominion: in the former the urban profile is represented three times, and in the latter possession is emphasized by the clouds of gun powder that envelope the distant city of Tournay. Other examples of this genre can be found in the work of Adam Franz van der Meulen whose painted landscapes of the king's sieges also combine the urban profile of the captured territory with the observing monarch. The infinite reach of the king's *regarde* is a predominant theme in the tapestries: the monarch's surveying gaze signifies the inevitability of the territorial gain that the tapestries commemorate.<sup>104</sup>

The physical presence of the king in these works drew upon the foundational correlation between a territorial conception of the state and the royal body in the legitimization of sovereignty in France. For example, royal itineraries stipulated a sovereign could consecrate and legitimize territory through the physical act of treading upon its borders and viewing its limits. This practice was used several times in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries especially in attempts to claim disputed territory. Louis XIV's visit to Roussillon shortly before the Peace of the Pyrenees was one of the most notable examples of royal visitation taken as a sign of possession.<sup>105</sup> Similarly, heraldry could serve as a stand-in for the sovereign, as was the case in the designation of the diplomatic quarter in Rome.<sup>106</sup> The tapestries effectively transformed the meaning of the horizon from that of a geopolitical borderline to the expanding frontier resulting from the king's (visual and actual) conquests. As a result, Le Brun's works depict the urban

---

<sup>104</sup> Marin, "Frontiers of Utopia," 408-409.

<sup>105</sup> Nordman, "From the Boundaries of the State," 110.

<sup>106</sup> Anne Marie Lecoque "The Symbolism of the State: The Images of the Monarchy from the Early Valois Kings to Louis XIV" in *Rethinking France*, ed. Pierre Nora, 4 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) 1: 217-267.

cityscape as what Michel de Certeau has described as “a coherent and knowable subject” discursively bound to the limitlessness of the sovereign’s power.<sup>107</sup>

In Silvestre’s *Profil* as in Le Brun’s series, the horizon is both a limit and a frontier, the disputed “territory” depicted is none other than the urban fabric of Rome. Even though Silvestre’s cityscapes (including the *Profil*) do not depict the physical figure of the king, the association of the profile typology with the act of conquest implied his surveying eye. In the case of the views of successfully acquired territory, the urban prospect *is* the prospect of the royal gaze. Though the French never besieged Rome like Marsal, their urban strategy in the city was remarkably militaristic in tone.<sup>108</sup> And because the crown considered parts of Rome their territory, these Roman piazzas and streets were in fact the farthest frontiers of the French state. The key difference, however, was that these disputed areas were not contested borderlands but were actually within Rome, the capital city of the Christian world. The implication of appropriation is made even stronger if we take into account the discourse around French territoriality in Rome circulating in both Paris and Rome at the time of the *Profil*’s production.

In depicting Rome from the vantage point of a controversial French stronghold, that is the Pincian Hill, Silvestre articulates this claim visually. As we have seen, the ongoing struggle for control over the Pincio had multiple associations for the French: a desire by the Minims to express their newfound status as a royal institution, a gesture of rivalry with the Spain, who held a counter claim to the space, and statement of Louis XIV’s political autonomy from the papacy. The effort to designate the Pincio as French territory was expressed in multiple ways, from the planting of elms trees on its slope, to

---

<sup>107</sup> Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 93-94.

<sup>108</sup> A comparison may be made, however, to the invasion of 1494 in which the French army did occupy Rome under Charles VIII.

the campaign for the royal crest on the church facade, and most importantly, the planning of a monumental staircase to claim the entire hill. In many ways, like the extraterritorial quarter, the Pincian hill became the preeminent staging ground for the display of French power, not only because it was considered royal territory by the French, but also, and perhaps more importantly, because it was an area that was simultaneously accessible and contested. Claimed by the French, Spanish, and Roman government, in its undeveloped state the Pincio was also utilized on a daily basis by local residents for domestic chores. The hill was also an important urban passage connecting the lower lying and populated areas of the Campo Marzio to the crest of the Pincian Hill, the city's eastern gate, and to the Quirinal Hill via the Via Felice. While private interests continued to compete for control over its development, its use in everyday life fell into the common domain.<sup>109</sup>

In sum, the hillside in its undeveloped state became a contested site, formed because of its potential and the mutual desire of conflicting interests to claim and “fix” its ownership. One of the most spectacular forms of these proprietary claims was its use as the primary staging area for French festivals in Rome. From the period of 1662 to 1687 the hillside below Trinità dei Monti was the site for three major festivals: the “Birth of the Dauphin” in 1662 (discussed in Chapter 3), the “Revocation of the Edict of Nantes” in 1685, and the “Recovery of Louis XIV” in 1687, each designed by prominent artists and financed by illustrious members of the French community in Rome.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> Certain parcels of land surrounding the hillside had already been under development and ownership such as the women's community purchased by the friars in the 1660s. Other parts were “managed” by certain parties, for example the construction of an informal playing field on the base of the hill by the Minims. Finally, there seemed to be confusion over certain areas, as revealed by the comment by Noillan that certain areas had already been donated by the Pope to the city, but protested that the Spanish had then considered these areas as their own. Overall, it was the *Maestri delle Strade* that considered the land belonging to the city of Rome and continued to legislate throughout the seventeenth century against the misuse of the land.

<sup>110</sup> The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes of 1685 was commissioned by Cardinal d'Estrées, a vocal member of the French faction of cardinals, and brother of the ambassador, François Annibale II Duc



The aim of festivals was threefold. First, in the absence of a permanent monument, festivals could be used to “reserve” the Pincio through repeated identification of the hillside as the very image of French royal glory. Second, these works engaged both the urban and virtual spectator (viewing a print capturing the festive apparatus) to take on new itineraries and experiences of the built environment, becoming both a willing participant and shaper of the spatio-political agenda initiated by the event’s makers.<sup>111</sup> To follow Maarten Delbeke’s characterization, ephemeral works could serve to *activate* the space of their performance for future and more permanent evocations of meaning and power.<sup>112</sup> Finally, each of the three festivals served to unite the French community in Rome in the act of collective patronage, bringing together illustrious members of the community, powerful allies, and other institutions including the French academy. In sum, the celebrations launched on this site brought the manifestation of French nationhood into high relief through the spectacular nature of festive display while their reproductions

---

d’Estrées. Antonio Gherardi designed the *apparato*. Gaia Bindi, “‘Roma gran teatro del mondo’ la guerra festeggiata,” in *La Festa a Roma dal Rinascimento al 1870*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo, 2 vols. (Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1997), 100-109, 100.

<sup>111</sup> Because of its multi-faceted and engaging character, the baroque festival has benefited from a wealth of scholarship that has attended to issues concerning patronage, formal design, and socio-political meaning. Works on Italian festival culture and ephemera in Rome include: O. P. Berendsen, *The Italian Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Catafalque*, PhD Diss. (New York, 1961); Per Bjurström, *Feast and Theatre in Queen Christina’s Rome* (Stockholm: Analecta Reginensia III, 1966); M. Fagiolo Dell’Arco and Silvia Carandini, *L’Effimero Barocco, Strutture della festa nella Roma del ‘600* (Rome: 1977-1978); Anthony Blunt, “Gianlorenzo Bernini. Illusionism and mysticism” *Art History* 1 (1978): 67-89; *La Scenografia barocca, Atti del XXIV Congresso CIHA (1979)*, ed. Antoine Schnapper (Bologna: CLUEB, 1982); *Il teatro, l’effimero, l’allegoria*, eds. Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna (Rome, 1984); W. Oechslin and A. Buschow, *Festarchitektur, Der Architekt als Inszenierungskünstler* (Stuttgart, 1984); R. Diez, *Il Trionfo della parola. Studio sulle relazioni di feste nella Roma barocca 1623-1667* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1986); Frederick Hammond, *Music and Spectacle in Baroque Rome* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994); *Europa Triumphant: Court and Civic Festivals in Early Modern Europe*, 2 vols., ed. J.R. Mulryne, Helen Watanabe-O’Kelley, and Margaret Shewring (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

<sup>112</sup> The roles festive culture and ephemeral architecture in the establishment and mobilization of meaning for more permanent structures is discussed at length by Maarten Delbeke in his article on the *Baldacchino* of St. Peter’s. He describes this development in terms of “activation,” a term that I believe addresses the range of formal, performative, spiritual, and site-specific aspects of this process. Maarten Delbeke, “Framing History; the Jubilee of 1625, the Dedication of New Saint Peter’s and the Baldacchino,” in *Festival Architecture*, eds. Sarah Bonnemaïson and Christine Macy (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), 129-134, 131.

perpetuated this claim into the virtual spaces of print. While these works have received careful scholarly attention, their place in a larger political context of French territoriality of the 1660s and 1680s has largely been overlooked. During the 1680s, in particular, when French presence in Rome was under the most scrutiny, these lavish spectacles would not only serve as a powerful display of national solidarity but also as an attempt to regain public favor.

All three of the French celebrations spurred the production of festival books (or pamphlets), and festival prints.<sup>113</sup> Circulating in both Rome and Paris, the works provide an important context for visual and literary representations of the Pincian Hill around the time of the *Profil's* publication.<sup>114</sup> From 1685 to 1687, seven printed descriptions of the French festivals on the Pincio entered the market, including four engravings depicting the

---

<sup>113</sup> Festival narratives, however, whether in visual or literary form, were never a factual account of the events as they occurred, but were their own distinct genre based on the literary and artistic conventions of the rhetoric of praise. Laurie Nussdorfer's 1998 essay on the publishing trade of printed festival narratives remains the most authoritative intervention on the subject. Laurie Nussdorfer, "Print and Pageantry in Baroque Rome," *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 29, 2 (Summer 1998): 439-64. And, despite several more recent examinations of the print trade in Rome and other major cities, little work has focused on the market for printed festival views and narratives in Rome, especially in the second half of the seventeenth century. Rosemarie San Juan has focused on certain illustrations of festive events, notably visual descriptions of papal conclaves and of papal *possessi* that "mapped" out the processional routes through the city, but does not discuss the role of foreign celebrations in Rome. (Rosemarie San Juan, *Rome: A City Out of Print* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 166-186. The use of Rome as a primary setting for foreign festivals in Europe has also been the focus of a series of discrete articles that appear in the most recent catalog on Roman Festive culture, *La Festa a Roma*. In addition to the sources cited above, see also, John Moore, *The Chinea: A Festival in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1992).

<sup>114</sup> Four festival pamphlets were published for the Birth of the Dauphin, while two prints, by the French engravers, Dominique Barrière and Louis Rouhier, depict the *apparati* for the 1662 event on the Pincio and the Piazza Navona, respectively. *Un Breve Panegirico*, by Virginio Bifolco was first published with the permission of the Reverenda Camera Apostolica, and quickly reprinted by de Lazari. A second (anonymous) work, *La Relatione dell'Allegrezze* concentrates on the festivities on Piazza Navona. Finally, Evangelista Dozza's, *Primi Lampi della Relatione della Feste* provides the fullest account of the narrative program. The full title of this work was, *Primi lampi della Relatione delle Feste, e fueche di giubilo, fatti risplendere nel Teatro di Roma per la Nascita dell'Emin. Sig. Card. Antonio Barberini*. Fagiolo, *La Festa Barocca*, 406-412. Portions of this work are reprinted in Fagiolo, *La Festa Barocca*, and Fagiolo dell'Arco and Carandini, *L'Effimero Barocco*, 1:185-93.

festive *apparati* (two for each) commissioned for the events.<sup>115</sup> The theme for the “Revocation of the Edict of Nantes,” captured in two engravings by Pietro Santi Bartoli (figures 4-21 and 4-22) was the celebration of Louis XIV’s piety and a demonstration of concord between the monarch and Innocent XI.<sup>116</sup> The facade of Trinità dei Monti included three tiers of stucco and painted decorations. Presiding between the two bell towers was an enormous figure of Religion, from whose head sprouted a palm tree (representing victory), and whose outstretched arms held two crowns above the heads of Louis XIV and France. Dressed in the guise of Hercules, commonly adopted by the Kings of France, Louis XIV is depicted receiving the crown of stars from Religion, a reference to his title, the “Most Christian” of kings. Both figures support the papal keys, and are flanked by two additional sculptures of Faith and Piety. The second tier is comprised of three paintings depicting demolition of the temple of heretics, the conversion of Calvinists, and the construction of the temple of faith. While the third tier included a scene of the destruction of false idols appears to be represented on the left, a second unspecified scene of conversion, and a “gran Sole” in the middle of the balustrade. The hillside was festooned stars, and at its base were two large-scale portraits of Innocent and Louis XIV. The deployment of this imagery therefore, not only helped solidify the French claim to the Pincio but also helped put a political “spin” on the souring of relations between the two powers and the growing controversy of the king’s disregard for

---

<sup>115</sup> For the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, two editions of a festival pamphlet (in both French and Italian) were written by Vincenzo Coronelli, geographer of the Venetian Republic, and published in Venice. Two printed illustrations of the event exist, one of the decorations of the facade and a second of the hillside, both by the famous etcher Pietro Santi Bartoli, likely published by the De Rossi printing house with which he was affiliated. On the connection between the Giovanni Giacomo de Rossi and Pietro Santi Bartoli see Consagra, “De Rossi and Falda,” 197. Antonio Gherardi designed the *apparato*. Fagiolo, *La Festa Barocca*, 518.

<sup>116</sup> Together, Coronelli’s account and Bartoli’s representations give a thorough description of the decorative schema, which centered on the triumph of Catholicism in France. Fagiolo dell’Arco, *La Festa Barocca*, 518-521.

papal directive regarding his quarter in Rome. It is not surprising therefore, that the festival was financed by the Cardinal d'Estrées, the ambassador's brother.

The "Recovery of the King from Illness" was even more direct in its celebration of Louis XIV's magnificence.<sup>117</sup> Touted as a celebration of the king's recovery from a risky surgical procedure, the event prompted two engraved illustrations, one of the church facade by Vincenzo Mariotti (figure 4-23) and a second by an anonymous artist (figure 4-24) that illustrated the entirety of the *apparato* from the facade to Piazza di Spagna. Both of these works depict the complete transformation of the Pincian hill into a complex allegorical program.<sup>118</sup> Between the two towers of Trinità dei Monti, a complex *apparato* depicted a chariot pulled by four steeds with the allegorical figure of Glory at the reins. It bore the figure of Eternity, surrounded by angels who supported three *fleur de lys* in front of a giant sphere. The royal crown surmounted the entire ensemble. Flanking Eternity were sculptures of Hercules and Asclepius, symbolic references to the French king and the return of his health, respectively. The second tier of the apparatus, corresponding to the upper register of the church facade, comprised two narrative scenes

---

<sup>117</sup> The program of the "Recovery of Louis XIV" was conceived by Elpidio Benedetti and financed by the Duc d'Estrées while the *apparato* was designed by a Minim at Trinità dei Monti named Simone Felice Delino. Vincenzo Coronelli, who had documented the "Feast for the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes," was also the primary chronicler of the event, publishing a twenty-four page description of the event in French and Italian. A shorter, four-page pamphlet, entitled *Ragguaglio delle Suntuose Feste* was published in Italian by Giovanni Battista Molo in Rome. Benedetti also financed an additional *apparato* at his villa on the Janiculum. For further discussion of the composition of the works see Fagiolo, *La Festa Barocca*, 532-536. Of these, three were written in French. Of those written in Italian, *Ragguaglio* was dedicated to Cardinal d'Estrées, while *Roma Festeggiante* was dedicated to Croissy, the Secretary of State. The works viewed in the BnF's collection in preparation for this study include: Vincenzo Coronelli, *Roma Festeggiante nel Monte Pincio negli Applaudi alle Glorie della Pietà del Cristianissimo Lodovico il Grande*, 1685 (4 pgs); Anonymous, *Delle Gran Feste per l'Estirpata Eresia*, 1685 (8 pgs); Vincenzo Coronelli, *Roma Triomphante sur le Mont Pincius dans les applaudes a la gloire...*, 1685 (4pgs); Anonymous, *Rome Triomphante et Applaudissante sur le Mont Pincio a la gloire du Roy tres Chrestien Louis le Grand a l'occasion de la destruction de l'heresie*, 1685 (9 pgs); Anonymous, *Rome Applaudissante pour le Restablissement de la sante de sa Maieste*, 1687 (8pgs); Vincenzo Coronelli, *Ragguaglio delle Suntuose feste celebrate in roma in honore della sacra real maestà christianissima di Luigi XIV*, 1687 (2pgs); Anonymous, *Delle Gran Feste per la ricuperata salute*.

<sup>118</sup> Fagiolo dell'Arco, *La festa barocca*, 532.

in medallions supported by angels. In the center, the figure of Fame with a trumpet appeared to lift a veil from the resplendent the face of the sun, only slightly obscured by the royal crest on which rested a smaller royal crown. On the lowest level, Hope and Fortitude occupied niches adjacent to the main portal, while the balustrade was decorated with candelabra and giant *fleur de lys*. Finally at the base of the balustrade were two river gods flanking a central figure, likely the river goddess Sequana, the source of the Seine. Two ephemeral obelisks also appeared on either side of the balustrade, also replete with candelabra and *fleur de lys*. The hillside itself was completely illuminated with torches. While the thorough examination of these festive works is beyond the scope of this study, it is nonetheless important to draw attention to their role in sustaining the French claim to the Pincio, and disseminating this claim through text and printed representation. For Silvestre's own depiction of the Pincian Hill would have been considered among –and compared with- many other printed works of the period that envisioned the Pincio as French.<sup>119</sup>

Because of its immense size, the *Profil* lends itself to multiple readings. Viewed from a relative distance, one is presented with an image of the city in its entirety, starkly contrasted by the surrounding rolling countryside of the *disabitato* and distant farmland. The effect is pastoral, if not for the crowded urban fabric that dominates the central panels. The work is not a true profile; in fact, the cityscape is mostly comprised of axonometric renderings of low vernacular structures, peppered with the black apertures of

---

<sup>119</sup> William MacGregor had argued that the act of comparison formed a key part of reading practices associated with prints. A print was subject to manifold juxtapositions among others works in a collection or cabinet, prompting a variety of visual analogies and comparisons that were an essential part of early-modern interpretative strategies associated with printed visual imagery. William Macgregor, "The Authority of Prints: an Early Modern Perspective," *Art History* 22 no. 3 (September 1999): 389-420, 395-398.

the windows of these modest buildings. Unlike the Temini, the Tiber is not visible in this work, and only two main *piazze* are visible: the Piazza di Spagna and the Piazza del Popolo. Silvestre has depicted the majority of notable monuments (those denoted in the legend) along or near the horizon line.<sup>120</sup>

Upon closer inspection, certain monuments appear more prominently within the cityscape, the largest of which are S. Atanasio dei Greci (center foreground) and S. Giacomo degli Incurabili (far right panel). Of the 56 monuments named in the legend, over half are churches, the rest include noble family palaces (nine), towers (three), columns and obelisks (four), and fountains (two). Silvestre portrays the city's fortification structures, gardens, and, curiously, the houses of two artists: Federico Zuccaro and the Cavaliere d'Arpino. Overall, the selections suggest a general mapping of the major institutions and social fabric of seventeenth-century Rome. For example, Silvestre includes multiple sites associated with foreign nations in Rome, including S. Pietro in Montorio, S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli, S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, and S. Anastasio dei Greci, as well as the palaces of the Spanish and Venetian ambassadors. He also includes several of the churches and institutions of major orders in Rome, such as the Gesù, the Collegio Romano, S. Maria in Aracoeli, S. Maria del Popolo, S. Maria sopra Minerva, and S. Onofrio. Finally, the major monuments associated with the papacy: Monte Cavallo, the Vatican Palace, Castel Sant' Angelo, the Belvedere, and St. Peter's are all noted in the legend.

---

<sup>120</sup> From left to right, these include the Villa Medici, Trinità dei Monti, Monte Cavallo, SS. Domenico e Sisto, Torre della Milizia, the Campidoglio, the Gesù, S. Carlo ai Catinari, the Pantheon, S. Andrea della Valle, S. Pietro in Montorio, S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, the Acqua Paola, Castel S. Angelo, S. Pietro, and S. Maria del Popolo. The more prominent monuments within the cityscape include the Palazzo di Spagna, the Propaganda Fide, Palazzo S. Marco, S. Anastasio dei Greci, S. Giacomo degli Incurabili, the Palazzo Farnese, S. Carlo al Corso, and S. Rocco.

Perhaps more suggestive than its inclusions, however, are the monuments Silvestre chose to omit or depict outdated. Unlike Temini, Silvestre does not depict any of the city gates or walls, or all of the city's seven principal churches, commonly featured in most cartographic renderings of the city, and even in his own previous views of Rome such as *Roma* of 1642. Nor (as noted above) does it depict any of Alexander VII's urban or architectural interventions. For example, while the Acqua Paola (1609-1612) is featured, the Acqua Acetosa (1661) is not. S. Carlo al Corso is missing its dome (1668-69), and the Piazza del Popolo its gateway (1655) and twin churches (1662-1679). The most obvious sign of construction is, in fact, Bernini's lone bell tower of Saint Peter's shown being dismantled in 1642, considered even in 1687 an embarrassing episode in Rome's architectural history, both for one of its most prominent architects and its most celebrated papal monument (figure 4-25). Silvestre had documented the construction and subsequent disassembly of the infamous monument in a series of engravings and drawings over the 1640s, suggesting that his decision to depict this particular moment was deliberate and symbolic.<sup>121</sup> The choice to depict the church in this state, in addition to the complete lack of Alexander's urban projects, may have been intended as a subtle critique, given recent political events between France and the papacy. It is even tempting to imagine that Louis XIV's recent rejection of Bernini's long awaited equestrian sculpture of Louis XIV in 1685 (as well as the memory of the rejection of his plans for

---

<sup>121</sup> Three etchings by Silvestre can be used for comparison. "Veue de l'Eglise Saint Pierre et du Chateau Saint Ange," (1641) depicts the bell towers a year before they were finished. This image shows the left tower with the scaffolding on the upper most story, while the statues have not been installed. "S. Pietro L'èglises de Saint Pierre au Vatican," (1642) shows the bell towers complete, right before they were dismantled. Both the left and right bell towers are depicted, and no scaffolding is visible. A third, "Panorama di Roma" (1646) also shows the bell tower in a period of dismantlement, without scaffolding, and stripped to the first tier above the roofline. Based on a comparison with these works, Silvestre chose to depict the bell towers in the 1687 *Profil* in the process of being dismantled: no scaffolding is depicted but the top sculptures have already been removed. The building history of the bell towers is discussed by Sarah McPhee, *Bernini's Bell Towers*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

the Louvre in 1665), may have also primed the *Profil's* viewing audience for this visual critique.<sup>122</sup>

Silvestre's presentation of the city in the *Profil* does not emphasize the up-to-date depiction of individual monuments, but rather, opens a discourse on the urban viewing process itself. In the *Profil*, the horizon line creates a visual dialogue between Trinità dei Monti and St. Peter's, the two churches standing in for their respective opposing powers in Rome. The bell towers of Trinità dei Monti and the dome and bell tower of St. Peter's are the highest points along the horizon, the latter appearing taller only by the height of the cross atop its dome. Silvestre's view draws a direct comparison between two versions of this emblematic architectural form: a mark of triumph for the French and one of failure for the papacy. Silvestre also emphasizes two other churches with double bell towers, a rarity in Rome. S. Atanasio dei Greci (1582) and S. Giacomo degli Incurabili (1600) were both completed in the same period as Trinità dei Monti, the former considered a model for the Trinità. Dominating the foreground in the center of the four panels, S. Atanasio dei Greci's double bell towers, which served as models for those at Trinità dei Monti, draw the eye back toward its twin pair on the Pincio (figure 4-26). This "mirror effect" also serves as a visual cue that invites the viewer to deconstruct the perspectival construction of the view. While S. Atanasio is the closest and most frontal monument in the *Profil's* imaginary projection into space, the facade of St. Peter's and the church of S. Giacomo both appear disproportionately large. Directly perpendicular to the picture plane, these three churches confront the viewer as if each is directly before it. Sight lines

---

<sup>122</sup> For a discussion of the reception of the equestrian statue in Paris see Robert Berger, "Bernini's Louis XIV Equestrian: A Closer Examination of Its Fortunes at Versailles." *Art Bulletin*, 63, no. 2 (June, 1981): 232-248.



drawn from these monuments converge at the spot in the view occupied by two silhouetted figures in panel one, indicating that the location of the artist/observer is also depicted in the view.

Situated in the foreground, and directly below the angle of light falling against the side of Trinità dei Monti, the figures are the most prominent in the sparsely populated image, their gestures alerting us to their own observational act (figure 4-27). One leans over the other who in turn extends his arm toward the urban scene, in a conventional gesture. Often dressed as peasants or shepherds, viewing figures were commonly included in early-modern landscapes, and appear in many of Silvestre's urban and architectural views. In addition to providing scale, the figures signal to the viewer that the image of the city presented here is not simply a geographic mapping of architectural forms and urban thoroughfares, but a sensory one as well, alerting us to the importance of human perception. This pair, particularly the seated figure, also references the figure types that appeared in maps to indicate the creator's vantage point, which often included a self-portrait of the artist engaged in drawing the view.<sup>123</sup> By depicting both the image of our viewing proxies in addition to their field of vision, Silvestre makes visible what is optically impossible: both the object and act of observation. This double conception draws attention to the limitations of the Albertian perspectival frame, suggesting an underlying discourse on both the process and product of vision.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> The observing figure was common to the Northern tradition of topographical representation, standing in place of the artist's signature. Appearing as early as Georg Braun and Franz Hogenberg's paradigmatic *Civitas orbis terrarum*, the figures of the artist Georg Hoefnagel and his friend and fellow geographer Ortelius (author of *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*) survey the landscape in an engraved view of Mola and Castelnuovo (1581). A famous example of this trope is Francesco Rosselli's "Chain Map" of Florence from 1471. Lucia Nuti, "The Perspective Plan in the Sixteenth Century: The Invention of a Representational Language," *The Art Bulletin* 76 no. 1 (March 1994): 105-128, 105-108.

<sup>124</sup> Furthermore, through the assimilative staging of multiple spatial representations (the urban profile, chorographical view, and pastoral landscape) the image can also be interpreted metonymically as a

The compositional conceits of the *Profil* may have been intended as both a visual and a political “lesson” for his royal student, Louis le Grand. Considered first among viewers, the Dauphin was the work’s dedicatee and his prominent royal crest divides the bilingual legend. Silvestre’s emphasis on Trinità dei Monti offered his (royal) viewer a directed narrative by which to decipher the political undercurrent of the work. Just how strategic the appearance of Trinità dei Monti is in the *Profil* is suggested by the value attributed to the church in another royal commission to Silvestre. An engraving of the church (one of four *vedute* of the church engraved by Silvestre during his career) appeared in a series of views of fortifications or *citadelles*, including those Silvestre completed for Colbert in the late 1660s (figure 4-28). Trinità dei Monti is a notable inclusion in that it is the only non-martial structure of the series. The cover sheet, a variation on the fifteenth-century series of paintings of the *Ideal City*, suggests the common theme uniting the group.<sup>125</sup> Like the original works, Silvestre’s *Ideal City* is symmetrical and rendered in one point perspective, but is also elevated on a tall plateau overlooking a vast landscape. It is because of this commanding view that Silvestre considered Trinità dei Monti a tactical and potent sign of French nationhood in Rome, and like the other military fortifications, a *citadelle* or stronghold in its own right.

The use of the term “citadel” for the description of French monuments in Rome had an important precedent. As discussed in the previous chapter, the term had been used by Antonio Barberini in 1660, as paraphrased by Benedetti in a letter to Mazarin urging

---

representation of the act of perspective. The spatial relationship of monuments is notably skewed and distant points are condensed so that monuments as far as the Tiber are clearly visible. Notably, Palazzo Farnese has been reoriented so that its front facade (which faces further east than depicted) is perpendicular to the picture plane.

<sup>125</sup> See for example, the series of works commissioned by Duke Federico da Montefeltro, attributed to Fra Carnevale. On this series, see Federico Zeri, *Italian Paintings in the Walters Art Gallery* (Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1976) catalogue no. 96, 143-151.

him to consider the purchase of a house located adjacent to Trinità dei Monti for the new ambassadorial residence. According to Barberini, the proximity of two buildings would function “*come una cittadella*” for the French in Rome, made even more secure by its location close to the city walls.<sup>126</sup> It appeared again with some frequency in texts of the 1680s (discussed above), in reference to the practice of French extraterritoriality in Rome.

Notably, Silvestre’s inclusion of the royal crest on Trinità dei Monti was the *only* monument depicted in its current form, (figures 4-29 and 4-30), while the rest of the city, as noted above, appeared as it did in 1642.<sup>127</sup> This selective revision renders the image atemporal, transforming it into a truly idealized image of French territorialization in Rome. A drawing by Silvestre (figure 4-31) in the Louvre that I identify as a preliminary sketch for the first panel of the *Profil* suggests this visibility was part of Silvestre’s earliest conceptions for the work.<sup>128</sup> The facade of Trinità dei Monti is shown with the royal crest, while the prominent inclusions of the Propaganda Fide and the Palazzo di Spagna indicate the engraver’s particular attention to how these buildings appeared in relation to the French church.<sup>129</sup>

In the *Profil* the relationship between the Dauphin’s coat of arms and the crest on the facade of the Trinità collapses viewer and viewed into a closed system of royal visual dominion. Standing in for the work’s dedicatee, the larger crest implies the eyes of the

---

<sup>126</sup> This visibility was also very likely understood by the French nation in Rome as a key advantage in the continued use of the site for its most elaborate *feste*. While the French opted for the Palazzo Farnese, the proposed site is depicted in Benedetti’s early plan for the Spanish Steps.

<sup>127</sup> The spatial relationship of monuments is notably skewed and distant points are condensed so that monuments as far as the Tiber are clearly visible. Notably, Palazzo Farnese has been reoriented so that its front facade (which faces further east than depicted) is perpendicular to the picture plane.

<sup>128</sup> Louvre, Paris, Cabinet du Roi, vol. 13; p. 353, Inv. 33003, Recto, pen and ink, dimensions of image: H. 10 x L. 18 cm (dimensions of the sheet: H. 12 x L. 19,5 cm). There has been no secondary literature on this image, and heretofore it has not been attributed as a preliminary sketch for the *Profil*.

<sup>129</sup> D’Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 310.

Dauphin, for whom the work is literally inscribed, while the facade of Trinità dei Monti recalls the visible projection of French territory onto the Roman landscape. The link between crests also closes the gap between two worlds, the represented (in the form of the *Profil*) and the experienced (what is seen in the built environment). In its evocation of an extra-spatial and totalizing view, Silvestre's *Profil* represents Rome as if from the omniscient perspective of Descartes' "angelic eye" or, in the visual economy of absolutist France, through the totality of royal vision.

### **Conclusion**

Created during a period in which French urban interests in Rome were most threatened, the *Profil* was an evocative visual manifesto on both the political stakes and the power of sight in the pursuit of French territorialization in Rome. Silvestre's view depicted the limitlessness of French "vision" on the Pincio: extending beyond the confines of the hillside in order to engage in the hegemonic language of sight essential to both to Roman urbanism and French absolutism. Because the unimpeded view was an essential and disruptive aspect of French diplomacy and urbanism in Rome, this new imagining of the city challenged a pre-existing conception of Rome (represented by Falda, Temini, and others) as a product of papal authorship. One may ask to what degree French claims, in text, image, and in the urban environment itself, aimed to undermine not only the political nerve center of the papacy but the very concept of papal claim to universal spiritual and temporal sovereignty (*urbi et orbi*) in the early modern period. By emphasizing the visual nature of French diplomacy and the political tactics that it

underscored, the *Profil* constructed a persuasive image of French territoriality and the farthest frontiers of the French realm.

## **Conclusion: The Sovereign Eye**

Throughout the previous chapters I have traced the development of a visual language of French diplomacy in Rome, one connected to the emergence of a new consciousness associated with the territorial state, a unified conception of “French” identity, and most importantly, the conflicts between the political ambitions of Louis XIV and the secular and sacred authority claimed by the papacy. This marking of “French Rome” took several forms and occurred in multiple sites, but shared a common goal: the deployment of a French vision of Rome that counteracted and subverted a conflicting notion of papal authorship of the city. If indeed, as Chandra Mukerji has argued, a “period eye” defined by territoriality can be ascribed to seventeenth-century France, it was this vision that could also be said to inform the making and marking of French claims in Rome. This was in keeping with the “representational effects” of Louis XIV’s absolutism, in which the Sun King was both the frame and point of origin in the historical narrative of his glorious reign. In this sense it mattered little whether the king’s territorial claims in Rome were successfully upheld; rather it was the very *process* by which they were articulated that was the locus and marker of sovereign dominion. Nonetheless, the diffusion of these claims in the forms of printed representations, ephemeral celebrations, and triumphal monuments constituted French Rome. It was through these works that a direct challenge and reinterpretation of “Rome” took shape, one that directly inculcated the viewer in the process, in both images of the city as a whole or in parts, or on the level of the city street itself.

I have also stressed that, counter to previous interpretations of French patronage in Rome that have concentrated on isolated sites, French agents in the city were mutually informed of their pursuits, and articulated a conscious and coordinated presentation of nationhood at the very moment it was being formed in France. The Roman court was a key site for the cultivation of loyalty among French allies, who in turn capitalized on the city's status as a "microcosm" of the European political landscape to display the rising status of their monarch.<sup>1</sup> Rome's status as an international staging ground and diplomatic capital fostered the deliberate and carefully orchestrated efforts of nation-building by foreign representatives. Thus the city became its own center for the development of national identities.

A key agent in this endeavor was the (French) ambassador, who was likened to a ray of the Sun King, extending Louis XIV's sovereign power to places he himself could not physically occupy.<sup>2</sup> The ambassador was the head of the French faction in Rome, and it was through him that the king conducted his affairs, granting him a representative capacity that manifested itself not only in his powers to negotiate but also in the physical spaces he occupied, and, to a certain extent, his own embodied presence in the city. The degree to which the ambassador was a royal proxy in the visual marking of French territory in Rome was a matter of continual debate among French and Roman contemporaries, shaping an emerging discourse on diplomatic protocol and an architectural and urban language associated with embassy. For Louis XIV, the extension of territory "as far as the eye could see" was also related to the sacrality of the royal

---

<sup>1</sup> Here I am borrowing from Dandelelet's term to describe the relationship of nation formation to the political landscape of early modern Rome. See Thomas Dandelelet, *Spanish Rome*.

<sup>2</sup> McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King*. See my discussion of the role of Louis XIV's ambassadors in Chapter One.

body, a central feature in the conception of space within his personal seat of power at Versailles. I have suggested that in the pursuit of extraterritoriality in Rome a similar and deliberate transfer and manifestation of royal presence took place abroad.

The ambassador could also, in the words of Timothy Hampton, serve as a “figure of suture,” not only between the king and other foreign executives, but also among the disparate members of the French faction in Rome. The Minims, for example, lamented that the conflict over their claim to royal privilege in the early 1660s was exacerbated by the lack of a residential ambassador in the city, and later championed the diplomatic disputes caused by the Duc de Créqui as analogous to their own struggle. Later, the Pincio itself was initially considered as the site for the residence of the ambassador, reinforcing the contentious claim the French held to Trinità dei Monti by creating a “citadel” of the realm in Rome.

The Minims’ own ongoing campaign for the staircase was fueled by a two-pronged desire to exhibit their newfound royal status and to erase the stain of a contentious internal struggle around French privilege over the course of the monastery’s history. Considered a period of dormancy in the monument’s building history, the second half of the seventeenth century was in fact one of the most active periods for the Minims who employed a variety of methods to reserve “their mountain” until the project could be completed. The primary reason behind such concerted efforts was to secure a stable identification of the hillside as French in the absence of a clear definition of ownership. The Minims were still at odds with the Roman government, which considered the Pincio



public land and under their own jurisdiction.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, Spain exerted its own claim to the base of the hillside, considering it within the exterritorial jurisdiction of their ambassadorial palace, and using the piazza to launch their own ephemeral celebrations.

During this period, the placement of the royal crest on the facade of Trinità dei Monti was an act with particular resonance for the Minims. Not only did it express the royal patronage but was also intentionally designed to remove any trace of sponsorship besides that of the king in the form of a dedicatory inscription. I have argued that, as a territorializing marker of royal dominion and royal presence, the crest also bestowed a kind of panopticality on the church, which by virtue of its elevated site was described by the Minims as “exposed to everyone’s eyes.” The royal crest also could be said to recall the memory of another iteration of the royal portrait: the equestrian statue of Louis XIV first proposed by Benedetti for the staircase. While this aspect of the project was never realized, the persistence of rumors of its placement on the Pincio contributed to the public association of the hillside with the French crown throughout the second half of the seventeenth century. The use of the Pincio as the primary launching site for French festivals of state in Rome also underscored this claim.

Louis XIV did not live to see the construction of the monument initially designed to glorify his reign. After several twists in its complex building history, the final stage of the staircase project took place in the early 1720s, during the minority of his grandson, Louis XV, and the pontificate of Innocent XIII (1721-1724). Scholars have attributed this delay to the ongoing religious instability in France during the first decades of the

---

<sup>3</sup> In 1703 there was also a dispute between the Minims and the Jesuits over a portal that the latter wanted to knock down on the slope. The Tribunale interceded and declares both parties in the wrong, claiming that the property was public land and therefore within their jurisdiction. Pecchiai, *La scalinata*, 16-17.

eighteenth century.<sup>4</sup> Although the history of this issue is too complex to be addressed in full here, it is significant to note that the Jansenist controversy was one of the most critical threats to the Catholic hierarchy since the Protestant Reformation, and its suppression had been pursued since the posthumous publication of Cornelius Jansen's influential text, *Augustinus*, in 1640.<sup>5</sup> While the king wished to stop the spread of the belief because it threatened the unity of the Gallican Church, the pope condemned its practice because the Jansenist espousal of predestination limited the intercessory role of the Catholic hierarchy in salvation. Because it marks the conclusion of Louis XIV's political patronage in Rome, the critical fortunes of the Spanish Steps in the eighteenth century are worth summarizing here.

### **The Completion of the Spanish Steps in the Eighteenth Century**

In 1712, Etienne Gueffier's legacy reached maturity, but the funds were not released nor was there any initiative on the part of Clement XI (1700-1721) or Louis XIV toward reinstating the project.<sup>6</sup> It was also around this time that Louis XIV made a formal request to Pope Clement XI to support his efforts to curb the spread of Jansenism in France, which already permeated the Church to level of the Archbishop of Paris, Charles Noailles. The pope honored this request in 1713 by condemning the practice with the bull "Unigenitus." The Minims at Trinità dei Monti were also directly implicated in the affair, through the Vicar General of the order, Zacharias Roslet, who was Noailles' chief

---

<sup>4</sup> Marder, "The Spanish Steps from Project to Monument," 88-90. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 321-340. On the Jansenist controversy in France and Rome in the latter seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries see Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 33: 210-310.

<sup>5</sup> Marder, "The Spanish Steps from Project to Monument," 87.

<sup>6</sup> The final stages of the project are summarized by D'Onofrio in *Scalinate di Roma*, 321-358.

correspondent in Rome. As Tod Marder points out, the order's connection to the controversy likely did not encourage papal favor for their project.<sup>7</sup>

With the death of the Louis XIV on 1 September 1715, the responsibility for the suppression of Jansenism fell to the regent, Philippe II the Duc d'Orléans, who in May 1717 issued a royal prohibition against the publication of writings on the subject. On 7 October 1717, the regent ordered silence on the discussion of the bull, passing the responsibility of settling the dispute to Clement.<sup>8</sup> The effect was unsatisfactory for all parties involved, including the pope, whose earlier condemnation was now essentially perceived as having been ineffectual. According to Marder, it was this prohibition that prompted Clement to reinstate the project six days after its publication. On 13 October 1717, Clement instructed the Minims' cardinal protector, Cardinal de la Trémouille, to solicit estimates and plans from architects in Rome.<sup>9</sup> The project was to symbolize, in Marder's words "a monumental reaffirmation of French allegiance to Rome" and a statement of alliance by the French clergy toward the papacy.<sup>10</sup>

Given the site's contentious history, it seems unclear whether Clement's decision was meant as a gesture of allegiance to his French allies in Rome or a renewal of papal control: over the site, the order, and, symbolically, over religious affairs in France. The recent deaths of Roslet (in 1713) and the king had silenced two voices that, while with different impact and in different ways, had both called to curb papal authority. One was a Jansenist and the head of an order that had vociferously fought for independence from

---

<sup>7</sup> Marder, "The Spanish Steps from Project to Monument," 87-88.

<sup>8</sup> Pastor, 33: 212-215, 285-287.

<sup>9</sup> The competitors included Francesco de Sanctis, Sebastiano Cipriani, Alessandro Specchi, Filippo Juvarra, Alessandro Gaulli, and two French competitors, Pierre Hustin and Antoine Valeri. For a discussion of these plans, see D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 328-340.

<sup>10</sup> Marder, "The Spanish Steps from Project to Monument," 88.

papal supervision, the other was that order's preferred master and the founder of the Gallican church.<sup>11</sup> Clement also refused to communicate with the regent over papal plans for the project, suggesting even more than his dissatisfaction with the proclamation, an unwillingness to relinquish any control over the staircase to the royal successor.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, while Trinità dei Monti was considered French territory, the issue over ownership of the Pincio had never been resolved. What better way for the pope to settle it than by seizing an opportunity in which there was little possibility for resistance, as the Minims themselves had done forty-five years earlier with the mounting of the royal crest during the *sede vacante*?

With the death of Clement XI in 1721, it is uncertain how the pope would have carried out the final stages of the project, but the increased contention over the jurisdiction over the hillside reinforces the theory that territorial issues were still at stake for both the papacy and the Minims.<sup>13</sup> On 10 July 1721 Clement's successor, Innocent XIII, closed the Gueffier account, which had now grown to the sum of 49,163 scudi and 70 baiocchi.<sup>14</sup> There was also another change of guard for the friars at Trinità dei Monti, who, with the death of Trémouille in January 1720, were appointed a new cardinal protector, Arman Gaston de Rohan. The new diplomatic agent (*chargé d'affaires*), the Abbé de Tencin, was presented by Rohan to the pope in December of the year. It was also in 1721 that the Tribunale delle Strade appealed to Clement to allow them control over the project, citing the pathways cut into the hillside in 1567 and the suit between the

---

<sup>11</sup> Roslet was the general of the order from 1703 to his death in 1713. For his correspondence, see Roberti, *Disegno Storico dell'Ordine de Minimi*, 111.

<sup>12</sup> Marder, "The Spanish Steps from Project to Monument," 88, note 62.

<sup>13</sup> Unfortunately, Noailles did not submit to the papal bull or the regent's prohibition, and by the time of Clement XI's death in March 1721, little progress had been made toward the staircase's completion.

<sup>14</sup> Marder, "The Spanish Steps from Project to Monument," 89.

Minims and the Collegio Romano (adjudicated by the Tribunale in 1703-04) as evidence that the area was public, and therefore within their jurisdiction. A document of 23 October 1721, issued by the Tribunale accused the Minims of attempting to spend money allocated for a public work as if they were a private group building on their own property. The Minims in response outlined their own claims over the hillside in a petition of 14 April 1722 (the planting of elm trees included among the reasons), prompting the pope to organize a meeting between the papal auditor and the president of the Tribunale.<sup>15</sup> Despite the papal acknowledgement of the Tribunale's claim that the Pincio was public land, the president was informed that the pope recognized the Minims' claim in order to facilitate the completion of the project. By allowing the Minims some freedom in the design and execution of the stairs, Innocent was able to achieve a more lasting goal: a magnificent monument in Rome to commemorate his pontificate. Towards this aim, he may have also realized it was easier to reign in the ministers employed in his own city (and for all intents and purposes in his service), than engage in a potentially drawn out dispute with the French Minims in residence at Trinità dei Monti and, by proxy, the king of France.

The contribution of the French diplomat, Tencin, cannot be overlooked in the execution of the staircase project. Without a residential ambassador, Tencin, as the head of the French faction, became the most influential advocate of French interests in Rome. It was Tencin who reinitiated negotiations with the pope, and acted as the official channel between France and the Holy See. On 31 August 1723, Tencin recounted to the king an

---

<sup>15</sup> On 14 April 1722 the Minims presented their own defense to pope. This document has been transcribed in full by D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 371-374. On 17 April, the papal auditor forced the Tribunale to facilitate the construction of the staircase, thus granting a concession to the Minims.

audience with the pope three days earlier, in which Innocent granted Tencin and the Minims permission to carry out their plans for construction. While Innocent received criticism for bending to the will of the French, he insisted that this had not been the case, despite his continued support for the Minims and Tencin over the recommendations of the Tribunale. Though they made a few final attempts to seize control, including the approval of plans for the project in Tencin's absence, the Tribunale was essentially required to fall in line. While the project would have a few more hiccups, including the subsequent rejection of the plans by the Tribunale's preferred architect, Alessandro Specchi, in favor of those by the architect Francesco de Sanctis, the final designs were approved by both the pope and Louis XV and on 25 November 1723, the cornerstone was laid.<sup>16</sup> De Sanctis was appointed the architect of the project, Tencin the main administrator, while the Minims' General, Monsinat, was entrusted with overseeing the expenditures for the project. In some ways, the project had come full circle: initiated in 1655 by a diplomat who had entrusted a Minim with its execution, it was completed under the aegis of the same.

At the death of Innocent in 1724, the new pope Benedict XIII (Vincenzo Maria Orsini, 1724-1730) raised no objection to Monsinat's and Tencin's ongoing roles as overseers of the project until its completion in 1726. De Sanctis' plans did not deviate widely from those of Specchi, incorporating elements from Specchi's designs with previous proposals for the staircase, including the 1660 plans by Bernini. Scholars have also noted the compositional similarities to Specchi's Porto di Ripetta, completed in 1704. Tencin also had a hand in the staircase's decoration, proposing that the Académie

---

<sup>16</sup> D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 337-338. Tencin's correspondence has been published in full by Montaignon, *Correspondance des directeurs de l'Académie de France à Rome*, 6: 296-305.

Française in Rome produce several sculptures of notable examples of French saints and defenders of the faith to decorate the balustrades.<sup>17</sup> These were to include a veritable pantheon of French sacred figures, including the pope saints, Felix and Adrien; as well as St. Clotilde, St. Louis, Clovis, Charlemagne, St. Genevieve, St. Francesco di Paola, St. Denis, St. Remy, St. Hilaire, and St. Martin. While these statues were never executed, they are depicted in a 1726 engraving of the stairs by Girolamo Rossi.<sup>18</sup> This was subsequently sent to Paris complete with an elaborate dedication to Louis XV (figure C-1). From the engraving it is also evident that a second royal crest was initially considered for the second parapet, echoing that which appeared on the facade on axis directly above. The inclusion of the second crest recalled the initial proposal by Bernini, in which a monumental crest surrounded by a sculptural group of river gods can be seen in the parapet directly beneath the equestrian statue. That other architects were considering this ensemble from an even earlier point is also suggested by Sebastiano Cipriani's competition entry for the staircase of 1717 (originally thought to be by Specchi), which depicts both the crest and a fountain with river gods occupying a gated area in the centre of the middle tier of the composition (figure C-2).<sup>19</sup> Neither the sculptural figures, nor the second royal crest appear in the staircase as it was executed and while it is unclear whether this was because of the additional expense required for the sculptural works, the inclusion would likely have been too overt a statement of French predominance over a

---

<sup>17</sup> This is also an indication of the ongoing relationship between the monastery and the academy as part of the larger French community in Rome. The Minims had also worked with the Academy in the commission of the royal crest in 1668 and again in 1681, paying 1000 *scudi* for a tabernacle designed by academicians under the direction of Charles Errard, who was interred in the church in 1689. Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 55.

<sup>18</sup> The saints are mentioned in a list attached to a letter by Tencin to the Comte de Morville of 24 August 1723. Montaiglon, *Correspondance*, 7: 8.

<sup>19</sup> It is evident that Cipriani was experimenting with these forms, however, the crest that appears in his final competition submission was of Clement XI, not of the king of France. D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 334-335, figs. 254-255.

monument that (at least superficially) was deemed to be a joint Franco-papal venture or even been considered in direct competition with the ongoing sculptural program at the Piazza S. Pietro.<sup>20</sup> The main decorative elements ultimately included were the eagles of the Conti family belonging to Innocent XIII and the royal fleur-de-lis, both of which can be seen on the decorative spheres on the balustrades of the staircase's first tier.<sup>21</sup> Tencin himself remarked on the latter in a letter to the Comte de Morville on 24 May 1724: "Work on the staircase continues apace, fleur-de-lis are already beginning to appear in abundance."<sup>22</sup> It is tempting to read Tencin's comment as a metaphor for the French victory over control of the Pincio: with the long sought after recognition that the hillside was French, the staircase could finally "blossom" after so many years of acrid debate.

### **The Refectory at Trinità dei Monti**

Because the concluding stages of construction of the Spanish Steps are so well documented, it is easy to perceive the building history as a series of progressive steps toward the monument's actualization. But, as noted above, during the latter half of the seventeenth century the fate of the staircase could not have been anticipated. The jurisdictional issues over the land, as I have argued, were the most controversial sticking point in the project's history, above all for the Minims' for whom the notion of land possession was deeply rooted in the foundational narrative of their church, monastery,

---

<sup>20</sup> Carlo Fontana does not include a complete list of saints in *Il Tempio Vaticano* (Rome, 1694), noting only the appearance of Christ and the twelve apostles, and "furono fatte da diversi Scultori de' quali non si ha notizia." Carlo Fontana, *Il Tempio Vaticano*, ed. G. Curcio (Milan: Electa), 127. Included in the finished program, however, were the figures of S. Felix, S. Francesco de Paola, S. Denis, and S. Hilaire.

<sup>21</sup> A similar design component can also be found in Benedetti's submission, in which Chigi Monti decorate the upper balustrade.

<sup>22</sup> "L'ouvrage de l'escalier de la Trinité des Monts continue avec le même succès qu'il a commencé. Les fleurs de lys paroissent déjà en abondance et les ordres du Roy sont exécutés ni sans aucun partage." Montaignon, *Correspondance*, v. 7, 8.



and in the institutional identity of the order itself. Furthermore, the effort to mark the Pincio as French was a demonstration of the Minims' loyalty, not only by preserving a French right to build but also for the very reason that it showed Minims' ability to speak the "language" of French territoriality. While this was manifested on the land itself through the numerous efforts to claim the space, it also may also been seen in another work, the refectory commissioned by the Minims in the confines of their monastery and therefore for their own view and the view of their visitors. Because this work encapsulates several themes examined in this dissertation it serves here as a final illustration of the pursuit of visual territoriality by the French in Rome.

In 1694 the Minims commissioned a large-scale painted program for their refectory at Trinità dei Monti, likely produced in celebration of the 200<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the founding in 1694.<sup>23</sup> There is very little documentary evidence of the project's commission, but, according to the Minim historian Martin, the Corrector Antoine Beaupoil employed the Jesuit Andrea Pozzo to decorate both the refectory and library at Trinità dei Monti, noting that, "The chronicles of the convent record that to everyone's astonishment he frescoed the whole of the hall in three days, with a view of a palace with one hundred columns as well as the 'Wedding of Cana' on the rear wall. The figures were made by another painter."<sup>24</sup> In 1995, the refectory underwent its first major restoration

---

<sup>23</sup> To my knowledge this connection has not been noted in previous scholarship. In addition to the review of secondary sources, as well as the published documentation by D'Onofrio and Bonnard, on-site examination of the refectory was undertaken in preparation for this study.

<sup>24</sup> Bernhard Kerber, *Andrea Pozzo* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971). Martin also attributed the vault scenes of the Holy Trinity, St. Francis de Sales, and St. Frances di Paola to Pozzo. Up until recently, the work has received little critical attention, in part because the frescoes had suffered considerable damage, and also because no documentary evidence solidifying the attribution to Pozzo has surfaced. As a result, scholars have been divided over the authorship of the work, and while all are in agreement over Pozzo's role in its conception, several disagree over the hands involved in its execution. Referencing Martin, Bonnard and Salerno assigned the overall conception of the work to Pozzo and the completion of the figures to another

and the question of attribution was reconsidered once more in two monographs on Pozzo produced the following year.<sup>25</sup> In an essay appearing in De Feo and Martinelli's edited anthology on Andrea Pozzo, Claudio Strinati characterized the work as an extreme example of Pozzo's style, noting that while the conception may have been by the artist, the execution was closer in form to the earlier *settecento* work of his students. Strinati suggested that the *quadratura* work, in particular, may have been completed by his student, Alberto Carlieri, born in Rome in 1672 (d. 1720).<sup>26</sup> According to the biographer Antonio Orlandi, Carlieri was a student of Pozzo in Rome and was trained in *quadratura* painting, though the majority of his later works are easel paintings similar to those by Panino Panini.<sup>27</sup>

The debate over attribution remained open until 2002 when the refectory underwent a second, more intensive restoration in honor of Trinità dei Monti's five-

---

artist.<sup>24</sup> Bernhard Kerber confirmed this attribution in his 1971 monograph on Pozzo, noting the program and titles of the narrative cycle as reported by Martin

<sup>25</sup> Alberta Battisti ed., *Andrea Pozzo* (Milan: Luni Editrice, 1996) and Vittorio De Feo and Valentino Martinelli eds., *Andrea Pozzo* (Milan: Electa, 1996).

<sup>26</sup> Claudio Strinati, "Gli affreschi nella chiesa di Sant' Ignazio a Roma," in De Feo and Martinelli, *Andrea Pozzo*, 66-93, 90.

<sup>27</sup> The association with Carlieri was first put forward by Luigi Salerno in *I pittori di vedute in Italia (1580-1830)* (Rome: Ugo Bozzi, 1991), 53. Strinati's identification was based on the refectory's similarity to two paintings by the monogrammist A.C.F. that had been attributed to Carlieri by Luigi Salerno. Strinati concluded, however, a definitive attribution was difficult to attain due to the condition of the work and the lack of documentation surrounding its commission. Strinati does not include a citation here, but notes that very little is known about the artist. A brief biography of Alberto Carlieri appears in, Pellegrino Antonio Orlandi's *L'Abecedario Pittorico dall'autore ristampato, corretto, ed accresciuto di molti professori, e di altre notizie spettanti ala pittura, ed in quest'ultima impressione con nuova, e copiosa aggiunta di alcun'altri professori...* (Naples: Nicolo e Vincenzo Rispoli, 1733), 36. Orlandi's biography was also cited in Stefano Ticozzi, *Dizionario egli Architetti, Scultori, Pittori, Intagliatori in Rame ed in Pietra, Coniatori di Medaglie, Musicaisti, Niellatori, Intarsiatori d'Ogni Eta e d'Ogni Nazione*, 4 vols. (Milan: Gaetano Schiepatti, 1830-33) vol. 1, 282; and Luigi Lanzi, *Storia Pittorica della Italia* (Florence: Gaspero Ricci), 1834, 229. Bernhard Kerber rejected any attribution to Pozzo, thus reversing his previous attribution of the architectural scheme to Pozzo and the figures to another artist. Bernhard Kerber, "Opere di Andrea Pozzo," *Andrea Pozzo*, ed. Battisti, 465-469.

hundredth anniversary.<sup>28</sup> In an article appearing in the exhibition catalogue devoted to the restoration, Yves Bruley returned to Martin's original attribution, crediting Pozzo with the conception of both the program and the fictive architectural scheme but was unable to assign a second artist to the work and did not mention Strinati's previous identification of Carlieri.<sup>29</sup> Rather, by drawing comparisons between the illusory effects of the ceiling decorations by Pozzo at S. Ignazio and the refectory, Bruley downplayed the interventions of a second artist, making a concerted effort to include the work as an important example of Pozzo's late work.<sup>30</sup> Nevertheless, Bruley noted that a detailed study on the possible role of a second artist had not been yet been undertaken.<sup>31</sup> A subsequent publication on the restoration published by Colette di Matteo, inspector general of Historical Monuments at the Pieux Établissements, also related the architectural schema of the program to the cult rooms dedicated to St. Ignatius, underscoring the attribution to Pozzo.<sup>32</sup>

In an article devoted to the oeuvre of Alberto Carlieri of 2004, David Marshall returned to Strinati's original suggestion of Carlieri as the second artist involved in the decoration of the refectory. The aim of Marshall's article was to assign definitive attributions to Carlieri's corpus through a stylistic analysis of the architectural components found in works produced over the course of his career. Marshall discounted

---

<sup>28</sup> The project was a collaborative effort financed by the city of Rome and the four major French institutions in Rome: the Pieux Établissements de la France à Rome et à Lorette, the French Embassy to the Holy See, and the French academies in Rome: the École française à Rome, and the Académie de France à Rome.

<sup>29</sup> Yves Bruley, "Un réfectoire baroque," in *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte*, ed. Yves Bruley (Rome: De Luca, 2002), 106-112.

<sup>30</sup> Bruley notes, "En effet le décor peint du réfectoire del la Trinité est considéré comme l'une des importantes réalisations romaines du frère Andrea Pozzo- qu'on appelait jadis Pozzi." Ibid., 106.

<sup>31</sup> "De cette autre artiste, on ne sait rien, et les restaurations achevées en 2002 n'ont pas encore permis une étude approfondie de cette question." Ibid., 107.

<sup>32</sup> Colette di Matteo, "La restauration des décors peints de la Trinité-des-Monts, Rome," *Monumental* (2003): 142-154.

Salerno's identification of the monogrammist A.C.F. as Carlieri, but supported Strinati's overall connection to Carlieri, suggesting that while the *quadratura* work in the refectory was more similar in style to that of Pozzo than Carlieri, the latter was primarily responsible for the figures in the refectory scenes.<sup>33</sup> Marshall arrived at this conclusion from a stylistic analysis of figures in Carlieri's later paintings. If Marshall's analysis is correct, it would also confirm Martin's initial statement that the figures had been completed by another artist. Marshall concluded that Carlieri probably worked on the refectory while he was still an assistant to Pozzo.<sup>34</sup>

Marshall's study was the first to systematically address the question of attribution, and he is correct to point out that the figures do bear formal resemblance to those found in some of Carlieri's canvases while the architectural scheme and motifs likewise differ. If another point can be found in Carlieri's favor it is, according to Marshall, the likelihood that Carlieri was French in origin. Marshall notes that Alberto was a relatively uncommon Italian name, citing Thieme-Becker, which lists several seventeenth-century and eighteenth century French artists under the name Carlier.<sup>35</sup> If Carlieri was indeed French, his nationality may have been a contributing factor to his employment at the *couvent royale*, as the Minims historically gave commissions to French artists in Rome.

---

<sup>33</sup> David Marshall, "The Architectural Piece in 1700: The Paintings of Alberto Carlieri (1672-1720), Pupil of Andrea Pozzo," *Artibus et Historiae* 25, no. 50 (2004): 39-126. Marshall notes that the architecture is "subtly different" than that found in Carlieri's works, and a closer comparison can be made based on the figures.

<sup>34</sup> Marshall, "The Architectural Piece," 42.

<sup>35</sup> Ulrich Thieme and Felix Becker (Thieme-Becker), *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, 37 vols. (Leipzig: Verlag?) 1911, 5: 123. Bertolotti also mentions a French sculptor of the name Martin Carlier living in Rome. Alberto Bertolotti, *Artisti Francesi in Roma nei Secoli XV, XVI, e XVII*, *Ricerca e Studi negli Archivi romani* (Mantova, Mondovi, 1886), 111-184.

Most recently the attribution of the refectory program has been examined by the chief restorer of the refectory, Cristiana Bigari in an article of 2011.<sup>36</sup> Bigari's stylistic and technical analysis made a strong case for the overall attribution of the work, including the design to Andrea Pozzo, noting similar architectural and perspectival configurations in previous works by Pozzo. The design of the vault, in particular, bears a strong stylistic affinity to the cult rooms at the Jesuit Casa Professa, which likely served as a model for the Minims' own commission.<sup>37</sup> Nonetheless, Bigari also noted that the stylistic inconsistencies especially between the figures on the vault and the "Wedding of Cana" suggest numerous hands involved in the work. While Bigari credited the vault designs to Pozzo himself, she proposed that the architectural framework and figures may have been the work of one of his students, an artist named Antonio Colli, who was in Rome and producing works at this time. While Bigari makes a strong case for the involvement of Colli, she does not address the alternative attribution to Carlieri, as presented by Marshall. In either case, the scholarly consensus remains that the overall design and conception primarily belonged to Pozzo, who likely entrusted parts of its execution to one or more assistants.

While the attribution has been at the center of the discussion, little has been said about the motivation behind the project and its imagery, its political aims, or what it can tell us about the Minims' self presentation at the turn of the eighteenth century.

---

<sup>36</sup> Cristiana Bigari, "Andrea Pozzo e Antonio Colli da Trinità dei Monti alle opere toscane. Nuove contributi sulla tecnica pittorica," *Artifizi della metafora: saggi su Andrea Pozzo* eds. Richard Bösel and Lydia Salviucci Insolera (Rome: Artemide, 2011), 127-142.

<sup>37</sup> Bigari, "Andrea Pozzo," 128. The work bears a strong similarity to Pozzo's architectural designs and perspectival configurations seen in his *Perspectiva pictorum et architectorum* (the first volume of which appeared in 1693) and in details such as the gilded bases of columns. Bigari also notes that the work was painted *a secco*, thus allowing for the rapidity of its completion as noted by Martin.

The room's decorative program is divided into two sections, with a scene of the "Wedding at Cana" along all four of the main walls, and decorations recounting scenes from the history of the monastery and its privileges along the vaults and ceiling. The fictive architecture is the organizational frame for the entirety of the room, and is roughly divided into three registers consisting of the palace courtyard of repeating serlianas, vaults (including spandrels), and a ceiling decoration with enframed scenes. Above, interspersed among the ribs of the vaults, are monochrome narrative scenes of the monastery's history with accompanying Latin inscriptions. Portrait medallions of the Grand Dauphin and three of the *petits-fils* are located in the corners of the vault. The ceiling's decorative program combines both sacred imagery and portraits of notable French monarchs. A center panel depicts the Holy Trinity while two additional scenes in *quadro riportato* feature Francesco de Paola and Francesco de Sales in glory. Each of these works is flanked by portrait medallions of four pious French kings: Louis I, Charlemagne, Robert, and Gontran. Finally, on the entrance wall, above the door a fictive balcony decorated with a portrait of Louis XIV supports an ensemble of five trumpeters in concert.

### **Narrative Scenes in the Vault**

While the lower register of the refectory is devoted to the "Wedding at Cana," the second tier is comprised by a series of fictive panels depicting the house's history (figures C-3 to C-8). Each element of the cycle was framed by fictive architecture; "supported" by the entablature of the fictive portico below, the scenes appear between a series of decorated pilasters. Unlike the "Wedding at Cana," however, this program appears only along the

two long walls of the room, while the upper register of the short walls are devoted to portraits of the royal family. The narrative scenes (C-9-C-16) are painted in alternating red and green grisailles and set into frames, each with a plaque bearing the narrative inscription in Latin. The scenes alternate each wall in chronological progression.

Beginning from the wall to the left of the entrance, farthest from the door the accompanying inscriptions read: scenes include: “St. Francis prophetically designates the place of this monastery,” (left); “The diplomat of the Most Christian King buys the Pincian hill 1494,” (right); “St. Francis, obeying the request of the king, sends French brothers to Rome,” (left); “St. Francis decrees that this monastery should be inhabited by Frenchmen alone,” (right); “Julius III confirms the aforementioned privilege by means of his diplomat,” (left); “Paul V increases the privileges of this monastery,” (right); “Urban VIII confirms the same privileges,” (left); and “Innocent X confirms by solemn judgment possession of this monastery to the French alone,” (right).<sup>38</sup>

The series, which documents the establishment of the convent and the accordance and defense of its royal privilege, is one of several cycles focusing on origins and lineage (both textual and visual) at Trinità dei Monti. We know, for example, that the monastery was replete with royal portraits, decorating both the vestibule to the library built in 1677, as well as the vaults of the interior courtyard (figure C-17).<sup>39</sup> The latter of these works was one of the most complete series of portraits of the period outside of France beginning with Pharamond, the legendary ancestor of the Merovingians, and concluding with Henry

---

<sup>38</sup> Inscriptions in Latin are as follows: “S. Franciscus propheticè locum huius conventus designat,” “Christianissimi Regis legatus emit Montem Pincium 1494,” “S. Franciscus regis votis obsequens romam mittit religiosos Gallos,” “S. Franciscus hunc conventum a solis Gallis inhabitandum decernit,” “Paulus V. huius conventus privilegia ampliat,” “Iulius III. praefatum privilegium suo diplomate roborat,” “Urbanus VIII. eadem privilegia confirmat,” “Innocentus X. possessionem huius conventus solis gallis solemnè iudicio confirmat.”

<sup>39</sup> Isabelle Balsamo, “Les sources des portraits des rois de France dans le cloître de la Trinité-des-Monts,” *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte*, 105.

IV. Inspired by a Minim named Honoré Sigaudi, it was completed by the painter Avanzino Nucci from 1616 to 1618. The portraits were based on a 1597 Venetian edition of an early seventeenth-century illustrated chronicle on royal portraits, entitled *Recueil des Effigies des Roys de France avec un brief sommaire des généalogies, faicts et gestes d'iceux*.<sup>40</sup> These works, located on the ceiling and vaults of the main cloister, preceded the entry to the refectory.

A narrative history of the monastery's royal privilege also appears on a plaque affixed to the door of the sacristy at Trinita dei Monti, which records the papal recognition of the privilege issued by Paul V (1605), Gregory XV (1621), Urban VIII (1624), and Innocent X (1645).<sup>41</sup> Commissioned in 1648, the plaque was completed only a few years after Innocent confirmed Urban VIII's acknowledgement of the royal privilege, and it was in the year that the Minims first began to refer to themselves as a *couvent royale*. Rather than beginning with the papal recognition of the order, the first record of papal recognition of the royal privilege is dated 1606, over a hundred years after the monastery's foundation. The record also does not include any mention of Julius III (1550-1555). The pontificate of Julius III was a pivotal moment in the Minims' longstanding campaign for restricting the monastery to French subjects, for it was the first time the French faction received papal support. Rather, the chronology begins with Paul V (1605-1621), who issued a brief that upheld the faction's claim for French correctors in the monastery. The brief had actually been the decision of a papal

---

<sup>40</sup> This text was originally printed in 1567 in Paris by François Desprez, and in Lyon by Raulant de Neuchâtel. The book contained 62 engraved portraits from Pharamond to Charles IX. The Venetian edition, entitled *Cronica Breve dei fatti illustri de re di Francia*, was published by B. Giunti with copied engravings by Francesco Franco. Balsamo, 105 and Colette de Matteo, "La restauration des peintures du cloître de Trinité-des-Monts," *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte*, 101-105, 105.

<sup>41</sup> Full text cited by D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 137.



congregation appointed by Paul's predecessor, Clement VIII (1592-1605), but was issued on 20 June 1605, a little over a month after the former's election. The congregation had been called by Clement after the controversy was renewed as a result of the miraculous "rediscovery" in 1578 of a letter by Francesco de Paola, a letter that supposedly outlined the founder's desire that the monastery be restricted to subjects of the French crown. According to D'Onofrio, the French faction of Minims deliberately chose this letter as the primary evidence in their case for exclusive French membership in the convent, despite the existence of the earlier bull issued by Julius III confirming the rights of French nationality. The reason for the continued effort, as suggested earlier, was likely due to internal political struggles within the monastery. For nearly twenty-five years following Julius's bull both French and Italian correctors continued to be elected at Trinità dei Monti, suggesting factionalization persisted inside the monastery. As discussed above, the letter itself was a highly contested document, the validity of which was argued immediately after its appearance. But unlike the bull of Julius, the letter, according to its proponents, offered proof of the founder's original intent, rather than the privilege confirmed *after the fact* by papal resolution. This may be the underlying reason that the plaque also began the chronology in 1606, thereby supporting the validity of the letter and implicitly tracing the moment of royal privilege to its foundation.

The refectory scenes present a much longer chronology than the plaque of 1648, beginning even prior to 1494. Both chronologies, however, begin with Francesco's intentions. In the scene, "St. Francis prophesying the site of the future monastery," the founder is depicted in a woody grove, pointing to himself with one hand and extending

the other towards a distant hill (presumably the Pincio).<sup>42</sup> He is surrounded by a group of early followers, whose gestures of wonder and deference seem to suggest they are witnessing a moment of inspiration. By drawing a direct link between the hillside and the will of the saint, the implied message is that the selection of the Pincio for the friars was divinely sanctioned. The scene recalls an episode in the early history of the order in which Francesco claimed the Pincio while in Rome, on his way to France to heal the dying Louis XI. It was a significant moment in the history of Trinità dei Monti, for it was the only time the saint was physically present at the site, having never returned to Rome after his initial passage. The scene as depicted also emphasizes the origins of the monastery to the site, whose ownership was still contested in the late seventeenth century. That this was still a pressing concern for the Minims is suggested by the fact that the Minims were continuing to purchase property on the hillside as late 1692 when they received papal dispensation to prevent inflation of the land prices by owners.<sup>43</sup> In this year the friars also received papal permission to renew Gueffier's bonds in order to keep the money solvent for the future staircase.

The hillside also features prominently in the second narrative grisailles. Not only does the inscription specify the site, "Monte Pincium" but also states that the hillside was *purchased* by the Most Christian king, via his ambassador: "Christianissimi regis legatus *emit* Montem Pincium, 1494."<sup>44</sup> The scene refers to the crux of the controversy over the

---

<sup>42</sup> Francesco's selection of the Pincio was noted in the saint's hagiography, written by Fr. de la Noue in 1636. See my discussion of the origins of Trinità dei Monti's foundation, in Chapter Three, 8-10, and de la Noue, *Chronicon*, 43 in Bruley, *Trinitè-des-Monts redécouverte*, 14.

<sup>43</sup> The Minims petitioned Alexander VIII and receive permission to prolong the investment of the funds on 25 November 1690. Marder, 86 and Pio Pecchiai, "Regesti dei documenti patromoniali del convento romano della Trinità dei Monti" *Archivi*, 25 (1958): 131-224.

<sup>44</sup> Emphasis mine. It is also the only panel of the series that includes a date. The official foundation of the monastery in 1494 also supports the idea that Pozzo's cycle was commissioned in celebration of the foundation.

proprietary rights of the hillside, which was whether, as the Minims purported, the site for the future monastery had been acquired by a royal donation from Charles VIII and administered by his ambassador, Cardinal Jean de Villiers Lagraulas. The main figure in the image, likely Lagraulas himself depicted in cardinal's garb, extending his arm toward the distant Pincian Hill, in a gesture that echoes that of Francesco in the previous scene. Lagraulas is depicted next to a kneeling figure who is not identified in the inscription, but may be one of the sons of Ermalao Barbaro. According to the Minims Lagraulas purchased the villa from these brothers after their father's death in 1493.<sup>45</sup> Both men are depicted holding a document with a drawing of the monument, reiterating the exchange. Barbaro indicates the elevation of an edifice on the page, the sketchy outline of which suggests a single bell tower, while Lagraulas points to the undeveloped site. The sketched work on the page is echoed by the indication of a second edifice on the hillside, a three-storey palazzo whose location directly above the Barbaro's head implies that it is the object of the sale. The emphasis on architecture here is suggestive. It underscores the structural permanence of built form as an indisputable sign of proprietary rights. The fact that the second building is depicted at the hillside's base also underscores the message of the narrative's inscription, that the hillside in its *entirety* was possessed by the French king as a result of this critical purchase. From the property records of this period, we know this was not, in fact, the case: that the villa was located in the gardens at the hillside's crest.<sup>46</sup> The extension of this claim in representation, however, fulfilled the Minims' desire to own the hillside in its entirety, and therefore claim sole control over its present and future development.

---

<sup>45</sup> For a full chronology of this complex series of exchanges, see my discussion in Chapter 3.

<sup>46</sup> D'Onofrio, *Scalinate di Roma*, 154-155.

The work is also the only one of the series whose accompanying inscription includes a date, calling attention to the scene as a pivotal moment in the institutional history of the community: its foundation. The decision to depict the ambassador as the agent of this crucial exchange, therefore, is all the more suggestive of the perceived role of the ambassador as a direct representative of the king.<sup>47</sup> The arrival of Lagraulas in 1494 came on the heels of a Charles VIII's own visit to Rome, during his campaign to seize Spanish Naples. Moreover, it has been suggested by D'Onofrio that it was the fear of invasion by Charles that prompted Alexander VI to grant permission to Francesco to purchase land on the hillside with royal funds. According to de la Noue's history, Lagraulas also carried out these negotiations with the pope after the king's departure. If the Minims based their selections of the narrative on their own historical accounts, as they likely were, the depiction of the ambassador would have been a significant polyvalent symbol alluding to the following: the memory of the king's own presence in Rome, the acquiescence of the pope, and above all an acknowledgment of the diplomat's representative power as a standin for royal authority.<sup>48</sup> This final point was particularly relevant in the Minims' historical struggle to claim royal privilege nearly two hundred years later. Recalling the height of the controversy in the mid-seventeenth century, the Minims had turned to the French diplomats, Bourlemont and Colbert, to advocate on their

---

<sup>47</sup> Perhaps coincidentally, the owner of the property, Ermolao Barbaro, was also the resident diplomat in Rome of the Republic of Venice and a notable theorist on diplomatic theory. For a brief biography of Barbaro, see Alain Rauwel, "Ermolao Barbaro, diplomate et humaniste," *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte*, 31-33.

<sup>48</sup> Diplomatic patronage at Trinità dei Monti had a venerable history. Among the other diplomats who contributed to the fabric of the church or monastery were Cardinal Georges d'Armagnac, (1549); Duc d'Estrées 1642; Etienne Gueffier 1655; Hugues de Lionne; Cardinal d'Estrées and the Duc de Créqui, The ambassador, Briçonnet, is also buried at Trinità dei Monti.

behalf, and it was through these agents and the Duc de Créqui that the intervention of Louis XIV was administered.

The ambassador also functions in the refectory as a “figure of suture” by forecasting the appearance of Charles VIII in the following panel. The figure of Francesco also reappears in this scene, now in a direct encounter with the king of France. Compositionally the third scene is also reminiscent of the one previous, but the king himself stands in the place of his royal representative, while Francesco appears on his left in a more subordinate position. According to the inscription, Francesco receives the king’s command to send French friars to Rome, a few of whom kneel at the founder’s feet. Both Charles and Francesco extend their arms toward to these figures, whose humility confirms their willingness to obey both king and spiritual leader. The inclusion of this scene in the narrative is instructive in the ways in which it recounts the origins of the early inhabitants at Trinità dei Monti. First, it credits the order’s establishment in Rome to a royal decision, essentially eliminating any trace of papal directive, such as the approval of the rule of the order by Alexander VI. Second, by locating the scene in France and in the presence of the king it designates the core group of early members at Trinità dei Monti as subjects of the French crown. The royal mandate also resolves one of the strongest arguments against the claim for royal privilege: that both the founder and his earlier followers were not French, but Italian. By signaling the essential role of the king in this panel, the episode also denotes that the royal precedence was manifest not only through donation, but also helped shape the very profile of the community in Rome.

The delivery of the command is the subject of the following panel, “St. Francis decrees that this monastery should be inhabited by Frenchmen alone.” While the subject

is similar to the previous scene, it represents the most fundamental point argued by those in support of the royal privilege: that it was the original desire of the founder to restrict the monastery to subjects of the French crown. In many ways the visual organization of the scene also complements and affirms the message of the previous panel. Francesco, now in a more authoritative position, is depicted standing over Charles VIII, pointing to a document the king holds in his hands. Could this be the “lost letter” of 1578, or, does the entire image, as an ex post facto representation, serve as a historical document unto itself? In either case, the scene serves a counterpoint to one previous by indicating the mutual desire of Francesco and Charles VIII to designate the community in Rome for the French alone. It also emphasizes the intimate and privileged relationship that Francesco had with royalty. In this sense, the royal connection the French Minims wished to perpetuate was not only a demonstration of loyalty to their chief patron, but also a form of modeling of the life and acts of their saintly founder. The inclusion of a Minim behind Francesco seems to validate the solemnity (and sanctity?) of this moment as he witnesses the scene with hands clasped in prayer.

The remaining four scenes comprise a shift of emphasis from the early foundation history of the monastery to the designation and confirmation of its royal privileges after the death of Francesco in 1507. Each panel depicts a scene of papal acknowledgement, beginning with the confirmation of the royal privilege by Julius III with a papal brief of 25 September 1553 and concluding with the acceptance of the royal privilege by Innocent X with the brief *Incumbenti* on 10 April 1645.<sup>49</sup> In the first and second scenes the royal privilege is both codified via a document (the brief) and issued via a representative (the

---

<sup>49</sup> The other two scenes in this series are “Paul V increases the privileges of this monastery” (right) and “Urban VIII confirms the same privileges”(left).

pope's diplomat), a pairing of the types of authorial registers seen in previous panel, while in the final two, "Urban VIII confirms the same privileges" and "Innocent X confirming by solemn judgment possession of this monastery by the French alone" the popes issue briefs directly into the Minims' hands.<sup>50</sup> In the scene of Urban VIII, moreover, several Minims are depicted in deferential poses toward the pope. One bends to kiss the pope's foot, a second holds his gown, while several others kneel to receive his blessing. Notably, this is the most outward expression of obedience to papal authority in the entire program and may have signaled special allegiance to the notably pro-French Maffeo Barberini, whose nephew Antonio was also a vociferous ally of the Minims during the controversies over the royal privilege in the late 1650s.

Together, the four papal scenes work in relation to the previous scenes by affirming the precepts established by early meetings between the king and the founder. As noted above, the Minims' selection of this episode deviated from the chronology codified in the plaque, which began with the papal acceptance of Paul V. The different chronologies presented in the plaque and the refectory may speak to a rise in anxiety around the legitimacy and identity of the convent from the mid to the late seventeenth century. The refectory program presents a much longer chronology beginning with the premonition of the founder, acknowledging the significance of the royal connection in the development of the order and its establishment in Rome, and concluding with a series of episodes illustrating papal recognition. In doing so, it emphasizes continuity between the community's early history and the modern royal establishment, as well as unanimity among members of the order, the crown, and the papacy, thus making this highly contested claim appear indisputable. This emphasis on foundational origins may have

---

<sup>50</sup> Minim friars are also depicted in the background of these works.

seemed even more pressing after the events of the 1650s, when dissension over the royal privilege fractured relations among the community, its cardinal protector, and the order's general, leading to a clash of wills between Alexander VII and Louis XIV. Furthermore, as a result of Louis XIV's intervention, the community and its historical record also underwent several fundamental changes. First was an enforced impermanence among the membership at Trinità dei Monti. The circulation of new members every six years prevented any one personality from dominating internal affairs in the monastery while ensuring the common denominator besides their religious profession was their singular loyalty to the French crown.<sup>51</sup> Second was the directive that required members from each province to be in residence, lending the community a uniquely representative character of the French "nation" abroad. Finally, was the expunging of documents that contradicted the royal claim, included the records of charges leveled against the Minims who had been expelled for their French sympathies. By providing a seamless narrative of the monastery's Frenchness, the refectory program served as a corrective to what was in reality a tumultuous and fractured history, and also served as its own record and account to replace an existing history that was just as highly contested.<sup>52</sup>

Finally, the desire for a revised narrative may have also been prompted by events even more recent than the conflicts of the 1650s. The protection of the royal privilege came under threat just two years prior to the decoration of the refectory, in 1692, when Alexander VIII submitted a brief naming an Italian Minim, P. Fuscalda, General of the Order. The king in response issued an order excusing the Minims at Trinità dei Monti

---

<sup>51</sup> The royal order of 28 June 1668 required that all brothers in residence could only stay a maximum of six years, and then required return to their provinces. See my discussion in Chapter 3 and Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 149.

<sup>52</sup> This second point may explain the emphasis on the transfer of various documents (deeds, briefs, and letters) supporting these claims, which appear in six of eight of the narrative panels.



from recognizing Fuscalda as their general or receiving him at the monastery. Innocent XII smoothed the affair over and the king revoked the order in 1694, an act coinciding with the commission of the refectory.<sup>53</sup> The event may have served as a tangible reminder of how closely the monastery relied on royal protection as well as how tenuous their royal status could become and all the more reason to reassert this claim through the fresco cycle.

### **Royal Portraits**

The third element of the decorative program is a series of figural works appearing in the ceiling and upper register of the walls of the refectory. The central image is a depiction of the Holy Trinity (figure C-19). The most sacred subject matter of the overall program, the scene also marks the optimal viewing point for the perspectival construction, indicated by a star (no longer extant) in the original pavement directly below.<sup>54</sup> On either side of the work, close to the terminal walls, two lateral enframed scenes depict S. Francesco de Paola and S. Francis de Sales in glory (figures C-20 and C-21). The latter, of French origin, was a figure of particular devotion for the Minims, having participated in the saint's canonization ceremony of 1662.<sup>55</sup>

Interspersed among the three main paintings, between trompe l'oeil ribbing appear four tondo portraits of French royal and pious figures (figures C-22 through C-25). St. Louis IX (1215-1270) and Charlemagne are depicted on either side of the central

---

<sup>53</sup> Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 152. The author does not specify Innocent's actions to resolve this issue.

<sup>54</sup> Bigari, "Andrea Pozzo e Antonio Colli," 130.

<sup>55</sup> S. François de Sales was especially devoted to S. Francesco de Paola, including embarking on a pilgrimage to the founder's first monastery at Plessis-les-Tours. Whitmore, *The Order of Minims*, 30-31. As Bigari has noted the depiction of S. Francesco de Paola also bears formal resemblance to the scene of St. Ignatius of Loyola in glory in Pozzo's series for the corridor in the Jesuit Casa Professa, an element she suggests supports Pozzo's subsequent involvement the design and execution of the refectory. Bigari, "Andrea Pozzo e Antonio Colli," 127-128.

panel of the Trinity while King Robert (ca.), and St. Gontran (d. 593) are closest to the lateral walls; the former imitate patinated bronze medallions, the latter appearing as if they are gilded stone. The placement of these portraits confirms the ceiling register as the celestial realm of the program, but also underscores the refectory's nationalistic message. Emperor Charlemagne, in particular, was often cited as a "new Constantine" and the original exemplar of French royal piety. In the seventeenth century, the figure of Charlemagne was also linked to the Counter-Reformatory defense of the Catholic faith. Toward this end, Alexander VII had originally conceived of the Constantine statue to serve as a pendant to an equestrian of Charlemagne in the narthex of St. Peter's, following a similar program evoked by Urban VIII with the commission for a tomb devoted to the Countess Matilda.<sup>56</sup> As Marder has argued, the works were to form part of a larger program at St. Peter's designed to reiterate the themes of the defense of the Christian faith and deference to papal authority by secular leaders in the wake of the Counter Reformation. The placement of these works also referenced the route in which these themes found their ultimate expression: the coronation ceremonies of kings taking place at St. Peter's. This connection was made overt by Urban VIII, who concluded an ode commemorating the arrival of Matilda's body in Rome with the following: "Thus I

---

<sup>56</sup> Alexander VII's original stipulation for the Constantine was to be "similar to" Bernini's tomb for the Countess Matilda located in the right aisle of St. Peter's. Commissioned by Urban VIII, the work was also meant to serve as exemplum of secular leaders in service of the Catholic faith. In addition to the tomb of Matilda, the other aspects of this program included the tombs of Christina of Sweden (1702) and the Stuarts. Tod Marder, *Bernini's Scala Regia at the Vatican Palace* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 184-185, 203-204. For a discussion on the political ramifications of this program see also, Tod Marder, "Gian Lorenzo Bernini (1598-1680) and workshop, The funerary monument (1633-1644) to Countess Matilda of Canossa (1046-1115)," *La Basilica di San Pietro in Vaticano* ed. Salvatore Settis, 4 vols. (Rome: Franco Cosimo Panini, 2000), 2: 706-708.

crown thy tresses, and sound, from which reverberates in the Vatican/Eternal praise to thy generous hand.”<sup>57</sup>

Charlemagne also appears in the mosaics of Leo III in the Sancta Sanctorum in the Lateran, whose connection to the French crown was longstanding.<sup>58</sup> In the latter work, both Constantine and Charlemagne are paired on either side of the apse decorations. Constantine appears to the west of the apse in a grouping with Pope Sylvester flanking the figure of Christ, while Charlemagne is depicted with Leo III beneath the figure of St. Peter east of the apse. The work received renewed attention in the seventeenth century as a result of the intervention of the French ally, Francesco Barberini, who sponsored its restoration in 1624-25, and a history of the work by Niccolò Alemanni, entitled, *De lateranensibus parietinis ab Illustriss. et Reverendiss. Domino D. Francisco Cardinale Barberino restitutis dissertatio historica*, of 1625. Here again, the intertwined themes of secular deference to papal authority and rightful succession form the central conceptualization of the works. According to Alemanni, the mosaic program was meant to represent the restoration of peace in Rome after an uprising against Pope Leo III and the successful transfer of the Christian empire from Constantine to Charlemagne. Its placement within a broader scheme celebrating French patronage at the Lateran was a tacit reminder of the French king’s preeminence as the Most Christian of monarchs.

---

<sup>57</sup> Marder, “Gian Lorenzo Bernini,” 706.

<sup>58</sup> Richard Krautheimer, “The Carolingian Revival of Early Christian Architecture,” *Art Bulletin*, 24, no. 41 (March, 1942): 1-38 and Ingo Herklotz, “Francesco Barberini, Nicolo Alemanni, and the Lateran Triclinium of Leo III: an episode in restoration and Seicento Medieval Studies,” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 40 (1995): 175-193. On the French connection to the Lateran in the early modern period, see for example, Jack Freiburg, *The Lateran in 1600: Christian Concord in Counter-Reformation Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), and Edward Maser, “The Statue of Henry IV in St. John Lateran: A Political Work of Art,” *Gazette des beaux-arts*, 6 (1960): 148-156.

As exempla of ideal Christian rulers, the figures of both Louis IX and Charlemagne also held symbolic import for Louis XIV. Louis XIV was represented as Louis IX in both painting and sculpture and compared to him by the French scholar, Charles Du Fresne Du Cange, in his dedicatory inscription of a thirteenth-century biography of the king-saint produced in 1668. According to Peter Burke, Louis IX's feastday celebrations also increased in extravagance over the course of Louis XIV's reign, growing to include a panegyric that celebrated both the saint and the Sun King himself.<sup>59</sup> The symbolic identification of Louis XIV with Charlemagne was deployed in particular relation to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Perhaps one of the most well known examples of this at the time was Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet's eulogy for Michel Le Tellier, in which the king was compared to a new Charlemagne as a defender of the Christian faith against Protestant heresy. The figure of Charlemagne also factored significantly into Louis XIV's coronation ceremony of 1654, in which the king received both the sword and crown of the emperor as part of the ritual of consecration of his rule.<sup>60</sup>

The implied theme of succession in the ceiling decorations is made explicit in the form of four portraits of the Grande Dauphin and the *petit-fils* and the portrait of Louis XIV in the registers below (figures C-26 through C-29), thus affirming the link between the reigning king, his royal predecessors, and his descendents. The four portraits of the royal family appear in each corner of the refectory's vaults, on the short wall opposite the entrance are the portraits of Grand Dauphin (Louis, 1661-1715) and Louis, the duc de Bourgogne (Louis, 1682-1712) while on the entrance wall are Philippe, duc d'Anjou (Philip V of Spain, 1683-1746) and Charles, duc de Berry (1686-1714). The portraits

---

<sup>59</sup> Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*, 28.

<sup>60</sup> Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*, 105.

share the medallion form of the works above, though while two of the latter are colored in the green hue of patinated bronze, the former appear in gold tones. The contrast between the aged and new medals alludes to continuation of the lineage of French sovereigns. The numismatic program may have also referenced the Minims' own efforts to document the king's reign through a medallic history. Beginning in the mid-1680s members of the Royal *Petite Academie* embarked on the compilation of this numismatic history, but were preceded by the Jesuit Claude Menestrier with his publication, *Histoire de roy Louis le Grand par les médailles* of 1689. Menestrier's publication included the engravings of 122 medals celebrating the domestic and military achievements of Louis XIV, as well as inscriptions and devices associated with his reign. With the academy's subsequent publication of 286 engravings of medals in a work of 1702, the numismatic history of the king was incorporated into a pantheon of visual expressions of Louis XIV's absolutism. This would have been appreciated by the Minims at Trinità dei Monti, who along with their brothers at Place Royale, had an impressive collection of royal medals among the objects in their "museum."<sup>61</sup>

The portrait of Louis XIV above the doorframe appears as its own discrete spatial register, providing both a symbolic and visual link between the ceiling and vault decorations (figure C-30). Located directly above the doorway, the portrait is situated in the only place in the room that is not visible upon entry. Rather, one confronts the work as the last image upon exiting the room. At the room's threshold, it occupies its own fictive space, presiding over the entirety of the interior scene. Nonetheless, the suggestion of interruption comes in the form of an aural disjunction by a group of musicians featured

---

<sup>61</sup> The Minim Jacques de Bie also published an influential text on numismatics, *Le France Métallique* of 1636. Whitmore notes the collection, but does not specify if the medals correspond to those published by the Academy. Whitmore, *The Order of Minims*, 224-225.

in the fictive balcony behind the portrait. Described by Bruley as “in concert” three play a folded trumpet, or “baroque trumpet,” while a fourth plays a single straight slide trumpet, traditionally used for fanfares.<sup>62</sup> Situated above the ensemble of strings and the chorus that comprise the wedding scene and distinct from them in their dress (one also bears the royal standard on his instrument), the viewer can readily differentiate this group as a second concert. It is as if the festivities of the scene below are temporarily suspended by the brighter and louder ringing tones of the brass instruments announcing the king’s “entry” into the room.<sup>63</sup> The juxtaposition of these two scenes also calls into question the program’s illusionistic function. If the fictive architectural framework of the wedding scene is meant to envelop the space of the refectory, the interruption of the concert breaks this illusion by offering a separate and equally lifelike scene. The king’s portrait, moreover, seems to complicate this relationship by occupying three spaces: hanging from the fictive balcony it also appears nestled between the piers of the Wedding scene, and canted so that that it slips behind the lintel of the open doorway. What then is “real” presence within the space?

Unlike the other depictions of royalty in the room, the portrait of Louis XIV is not executed as a medallion, rather it is polychrome and oval in form (figure C-31). Bearing remarkable similarity to Louis XIV’s portrait of 1694 by Hyacinthe Rigaud, the work is meant to be a lifelike and engaging representation of the king. Louis Marin has described the semiotic collapse between icon and prototype that operates within the royal portrait:

---

<sup>62</sup> The symbolic register of the trumpet in the early modern period cannot be overlooked in this context. On the subject, the music historian, Don L. Smithers, writes, “It is no accident that the trumpet became such a ubiquitous emblem of pomp and a symbol of divine right and majesty in the hands of the majority of baroque composers. Few people of discernment during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries would not have recognized the symbolic implications of trumpets, cornets, and other highly charged musical-allegorical emblems.” Smithers, “The Baroque Trumpet after 1721: Some Preliminary Observations. Part Two: Function and Use,” *Early Modern Music* 6 no. 3 (July, 1978): 356-361, 358.

<sup>63</sup> Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 43, from Martin, Ms Trin. lib. vol. 1, 187-189.

“the portrait is in some way and in some fashion the person it represents.”<sup>64</sup> In other words, representations of the king are not simply reproductions of his form or appearance, but were a source of the king’s unbounded power. They could also serve as authority in his stead, not only as “marks of allegiance” but as legitimizing manifestations of royal presence unto themselves.<sup>65</sup> Such is one impetus for the deployment of the king’s image throughout the newly acquired territories of his realm, a project initiated in the 1680s by his chief military minister, the Marquis de Louvois.<sup>66</sup> This in turn, affirmed their claim as a site of royal privilege, for here, through representation, their king was eternally present.

In the refectory Louis XIV is figured as a military chief in suit of armor draped with a royal blue sash. In one hand he holds a sword, in the other a blue staff decorated with fleur de lis. Turning outward to face the viewer, he is set against a silhouette of a city cresting a hill. The scene is an abbreviated topographical landscape, similar to those codified by Van der Meulen and Le Brun, referencing the king’s military conquests and the territorial expansion of his realm. The selection of the type is suggestive, considering the Minims’ own preoccupation with marking their monastery and the Pincio as royal territory. As described earlier, these works not only conceptualized a territorially-driven conception of France through the expansion and naturalization of its borders, but also depicted this process as an *ocular* exercise. In its totalizing effect the gaze of the king

---

<sup>64</sup> Marin, *Portrait of the King*, 206.

<sup>65</sup> For a discussion of the representative representational qualities of royal portraiture as a form of loyalty in provincial outposts of New Spain, see Michael Schreffler, *The Art of Allegiance: Visual Culture and Imperial Power in Baroque New Spain* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 62-73. On the political currency afforded to royal portraits see also, Antonio Feros. “‘Sacred and Terrifying Gazes’: Languages and Images of Power in Early Modern Spain,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Velázquez*, ed. Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2002), 68-86,

<sup>66</sup> These works all are based on the Augustan model, with the king in a static position of command. It was Louvois’s aim to have one placed in each of the French provinces. See S. A. Callisen, “The Equestrian Statue of Louis XIV in Dijon and Related Monuments,” *The Art Bulletin* 23 (1941): 131-140.

was both a form of consecration of the object seen and a perfect self-representation. This dual positionality, described by Marin as the gaze of the “I-one”(on), was a crucial underpinning of the narrative accounts (historical, visual, spectacular) of the king’s reign.<sup>67</sup> In this way, land seen by the king was always land possessed, or as the royal dramatist, Pierre Corneille, noted in reference to Louis XIV’s military victories, “Louis has only to appear and your walls collapse.”<sup>68</sup>

The portrait also references an overarching theme among depictions of land contained within the refectory program, the conflation of the gaze of the king with the possession of territory. It is one of three images that depict a hilly landscape, the other two are of the Pincio appearing in the first and third panels depicting Francesco and the royal ambassador. The repetition of this form suggests a visual link between the act of royal possession and the Minims’ own narrative of possession of the Pincio. The link between the land and possession may also be referenced by the placement of the royal insignia, an “L” surrounded by laurel leaves, which appears in the window casings (figure C-32). Standing at the window, the viewer’s own gaze is literally framed by the iconic presence of the king, with the object of view the Pincian slope below. In this way, the totality of the king’s surveying gaze manifests through the connection of three spatial dimensions: the imagined landscapes of the portrait and narrative scenes, the interior of the refectory space itself, and last, beyond the walls of the monastery onto the exterior prospect of the Pincio and beyond, the city of Rome.

---

<sup>67</sup>In writing of relation of the totalizing gaze to historical narrative, Marin notes, “And since the gaze of the absolute master sends the light that gives sight and produces what is to be seen, to be present at his side is to participate in his gaze and to share, in a fashion, his power: to double and substitute for him in the narrative-to-come that this past presence not only authenticates but permits and authorizes. The king’s history is really, then, the original history in Hegel’s sense; it is the narrative of the origin of History, History seized by the narrator at the origin of the historical event, worthy of being noted and retained at the very moment of its production by its agent.” Marin, *Portrait of the King*, 72-73, 74.

<sup>68</sup>Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*, 82.



By considering how the portrait of Louis XIV operated as manifestation of royal presence, the program's themes come into view. To begin, in its evocation of a desire to provide a permanent and enduring symbol of French affiliation, the refectory program articulates similar goals as the staircase project. But unlike the mired history of contestation over the hillside, the narrative presented here was a fabrication, the product of singular perspective of a community seeking to solidify its ties with the crown and erase its own conflicted institutional history.<sup>69</sup>

The primary vehicle of this new and unified message was a seamless narrative that, above all, celebrated and legitimized the concepts of succession and the transfer of power. This operated on several levels. Within their own history, the Minims sought to locate and perpetuate the will of the founder through his supposed desire to found a residence on the Pincio for the explicit use of French royal subjects. This also was a re-evocation of royal will, underscored by the joint endeavor between the founder and Charles VIII as illustrated in the first three narrative panels. The Pincio, as a result, was perceived by the Minims at Trinità dei Monti as doubly bound to their community through both temporal and spiritual mandate: the first as part of a royal realm, the second as the product of a divine vision by their spiritual guide. The combination of the sacred-secular mandate occurs in the celebration of the divine right of kings, represented by the visual lineage from the French kings and saints above to the future of the French realm in the depiction of the Grand Dauphin and his children. Together, the conception of succession formed by the series of royal portraits (past, present, and future) form the third evocation of Marin's royal body: the eternal sacramental body, or the image of kingship

---

<sup>69</sup> Here my use of the term "fabrication" is deliberate, referencing Burke's notion of the visual and material manifestations of power used to legitimize Louis XIV's sovereign rule.

itself, which unlike the physical body of the king, never dies.<sup>70</sup> In his own negotiations with the Holy See, Louis XIV himself had noted this as a fundamental difference between papal and royal power, the former he remarked died with the person of the pope while the latter was carried on in perpetuity through royal succession. But what of the king's status as the defender of the faith, as referenced by the figures of the French royal and pious figures, particularly that of Charlemagne? As noted above, the ritual of the coronation of kings was a reenactment of the original *Adventus* of Constantine, who received his authorization as the defender of the faith from Pope Sylvester. The figure of this succession was Charlemagne, who like Constantine received his mandate to rule by papal consent. The deference of royal leaders toward the sacred authority of the pope was a central conceit of Alexander VII's decorative program in St. Peter's, which incorporated both the figures of Charlemagne and Constantine into this schema. The series of papal scenes in the refectory, however, reverses this relationship, instead showing successive moments of *papal* deference to the French king's authority. Nonetheless, it still underscores the conception of succession, but rather, exclusive to sacred and royal French lineage.<sup>71</sup> In the era of Louis XIV the king is no longer crowned by the pope, but rather, is directly and divinely sanctioned to rule. This is perhaps the most complex aspect of this refectory program, which can be said to both celebrate the status of French kings as the Most Christian of rulers, but also the authority of the king

---

<sup>70</sup> Quoting Marin, "To prolong in all modesty the work accomplished by Kantorowicz for the Middle Ages, my study would propose the following hypothesis for 'classical' absolutism: the king has only one body left, but the sole body, in truth, unifies the three, a physical historical body, a juridico-political body, and a semiotic sacramental body, the sacramental body, the 'portrait' operating the exchange without remainder between the historical and political body." Marin, *The Portrait of the King*, 14.

<sup>71</sup> It may be argued that a similar conception of royal succession was re-introduced with the sculptures of French holy figures proposed by Tencin for the staircase.

(above that of the pope) as the ultimate protector and sovereign leader of the community of Minims at Trinità dei Monti.

### **The Antechamber**

A final addition to the refectory program was a painted program for the vestibule commissioned by the Corrector P. Roslet in 1695. Though the work has unfortunately been lost, according to Martin its subject was a sixteenth-century legend about the rejection of an Easter feast sent to the Minims' in gratitude by Pope Gregory XIII (1572-1585). The Minims' vocation stipulated the practice of perpetual Lenten fasting (eschewing of all forms of meat, fat, and dairy) directed at the purification of the soul. This practice dated back to the institution of the rule of the order by Francesco in 1470, later approved by Alexander VI in 1493.<sup>72</sup> The brothers' extraordinary conviction around the practice was also the subject of a longstanding legend associated with a papal visitation of Pope Gregory XIII, who as a cardinal had a Minim confessor. According to the legend, shortly after his election Gregory delivered to the monastery a great quantity of food, including meats, in celebration of the Easter feast. The monks refused to break their fast, claiming they were held by their vow. The prelate who had accompanied the gift, responded to them that the pope had suspended their vow for the holy day. Thanking Gregory and his envoy, Minims returned the food without touching it.<sup>73</sup> Read together with the scenes of the refectory, the rejection of the gift not only also spoke not only of

---

<sup>72</sup> The time frame spans Francesco's early establishment of a community in Italy to his eventual petition to Alexander VI. After a period of debate between Charles VIII and Alexander VI, the pope approved the "Règle et mode de vie des frères de l'Ordre des Minims pauvres ermites de frères de François de Paule" on 26 February 1493. Among the other stipulations, the brothers were to live a solitary life, pray at canonical hours, engage in acts of charity and manual labor, and live a life of general austerity and poverty. A supplementary version of the rule was approved by Julius II in 1506. R.P. Giuseppe Morosini O.M. "La spiritualité de saint François de Paul et des Minimes," *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte*, 122-126, 124.

<sup>73</sup> Full text cited in Bruley, "Un réfectoire baroque" 106.

the Minims' unwavering spiritual conviction but also of their unwillingness to break their vows even if it meant disobeying the pope. In this sense the work may be read as a coded undermining of papal authority, a message in keeping with Roslet's own Jansenist convictions.<sup>74</sup>

Above all, the refectory program outlines the role of sight in the making, marking, and defense of French spaces in Rome. As spaces defined by the royal gaze, both the Pincio and the ambassadorial precinct were able to convey the absolute authority of the king, as both a function of the embodied and corporeal (through the mechanism of vision) and the limitless and eternal (manifested through representation). The coalescence of these two factors occurred in various ways, for example, in the figure of the ambassador, whose "representational power" included his ability to replicate the territorializing gaze of the king through the windows of his palace or through representations, such as Israël Silvestre's *Profil*, which aimed to present the city of Rome within the totalizing vision of royal absolutism. All of these instances ran counter to a competing totalizing claim to Rome, that of the papacy. Ultimately, however, through their very incongruity, such conflicting claims reveal that such a totality can never truly be attained. Rather, they open up a discursive space for multiple and simultaneous narratives of authorship, agency, and the perceptual politics of space. Existing in and through representation, the question of "to whom Rome belonged" was a matter of shifting perspectives.

---

<sup>74</sup> Bonnard, *Histoire du couvent*, 175. On Roslet's own publication supporting Jansenism and instructing the order at large to consider following the precepts of Jansenism. (1703) According to Martin, Clement XI personally asked Roslet to deliver to bull to Paris.

## Figures

**Figure 1-1.** Jean Marot, engraving of the ephemeral arch of the Peace of the Pyrenees, AMAE, Paris, 1659.

**Figure 1-2.** Jean Boisseau, “Le recontre et combat des ambassadeurs d’Espagne et de Portugal, arrivé à Rome, l’an 1642,” Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

**Figure 2-1.** Lieven Cruyl, *View of Palazzo Farnese*, 1660s. Vienna, Albertina. Sight lines suggest spectators are depicted surveying the facade.

**Figure 2-2.** Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, Michelangelo Buonarroti, Palazzo Farnese, ca. 1541. Detail: principal facade, main portal, and balcony.

**Figure 2-3.** Giambattista Nolli, *1748 Map of Rome*. Detail of streets around Piazza Farnese (706) and SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini (726) including Via dei Pettinari (728), Via dei Giubbinari (720), Vicolo dei Venti (711), and Via Capo dei Ferro (717).

**Figure 2-4.** Antonio Tempesta, *1593 Map of Rome*. Detail of Palazzo Farnese and Via Giulia.

**Figure 2-5.** Giambattista Nolli, *1748 Map of Rome*.  
Southern terminus of Via della Scrofa and Piazza Farnese.

**Figure 2-6.** Plan of changes made to the urban fabric by the Farnese, *Le Palais Farnèse*,  
97.



**Figure 2-7.** Antoine Lafréry, Palazzo Farnese. Detail from *Speculum Romanae Magnificentiae*, Rome, 1549.

**Figure 2-8.** Anonymous, View of Palazzo Sacchetti and the French quarter in Rome, 1687. (AMAE Rome vol. 309 f.294r)

**Figure 2-9.** Giambattista Falda, *1676 Map of Rome* (second edition). Detail of Casa Grande (indicated), Piazza della Trinità dei Pellegrini, and Piazza Farnese.

**Figure 2-10.** Falda *1676 Map of Rome*. Detail of the pyramid monument (indicated).

**Figure 2- 11.** Schematic plan of the French Quarter in Motüy, *L'Ambassade du duc de Créqui*. Depicts the site of the barracks of the Corsican Guard (indicated).

**Figure 2-12.** François Ragout, Engraving of the Pyramid, BnF, Paris, 1664.

**Figures 2-13, 2-14.** Medals cast for the Treaty of Pisa, Paris, 1664.

**Figure 2-15.** Plan of the Pyramid with stanchions and gates, 1664.  
(AMAE Rome vol. 158 f.234r)

**Figure 2-16.** Giambattista Nolli, *1748 Map of Rome*.  
Via della Regola from SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini (indicated).

**Figure 2-17.** Sketch indicating the French quarter  
in relation to the pyramid, 1667. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.

**Figure 2-18.** Gregorio Tomassini, Piazza Ponte Sisto (A), proposed site S. Salvatore in Onda (D), Via dei Pettinari (E), ca. 1662. BAV, Rome.

**Figure 2-22.** Gregorio Tomassini, S. Salvatore in Onda, Plan with the Fontanone and proposed regularization of the Via dei Pettinari. ca. 1662. BAV, Rome.

**Figures 2-20, 2- 21.** Gregorio Tomassini, S. Salvatore in Onda, Section and Elevation, ca. 1662. BAV, Rome.

**Figure 2-22.** Gregorio Tomassini, Site Plan for S. Salvatore in Onda, ca. 1662. BAV, Rome.

**Figure. 2- 23.** Pierre Paul Sévin (Gian Lorenzo Bernini),  
Design for the Celebration of the Peace of Aquisgrana, Piazza Farnese, 1668.  
Nationalmuseum, Stockholm.

**Figure 2-24.** Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Sketch  
for the Celebration of the Peace of Aquisgrana, Piazza Farnese, 1668.  
Windsor Castle, Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, London.



**Figure 3-1.** Via Babuino from the Piazza del Popolo to the Piazza di Spagna. Detail from Giovanni Battista Falda, “Novissima et acuratissima delineatio Romae veteris et novae, in viatorem usum et commoditatem”, Rome, originally published in 1667, (reprinted by Petrus Van der Aa, Leyden 1700-21).

**Figure 3-2.** Israël Silvestre, “Piazza dell Trinità de Monti,” BnF, Paris, undated.

**Figure 3-3.** Dominique Barrière, *Feast for the Birth of the Dauphin*, etching, 1662.

**Figure 3-4.** Dominique Barrière, *Feast for the Birth of the Dauphin*, Detail: Trinità dei Monti, 1662.

**Figure 3-5.** Dominique Barrière, *Feast for the Birth of the Dauphin*, Detail: Piazza di Spagna, 1662.

**Figure 3-6.** Falda, Map of Rome, Detail of elm trees on the Pincio, 1667.

**Figure 3-7.** Elpidio Benedetti, Plan for the Staircase Project, Pen and Ink, 1660.

**Figure 3-8** Charles Errard, drawing of the royal escutcheon for the facade of Trinità dei Monti, 1670.

**Figures 3-6 and 3-7.** Jean Pasquet (or Pasquier), Plan for the royal escutcheon on the facade of Trinità dei Monti, 1665, AMAE, Paris.

**Figure 4-1.** Sébastien Leclerc, *Allegory of Fire*, engraving based on tapestry by Charles Le Brun, 1670, BnF, Paris.

**Figure 4-2.** Sébastien Leclerc, *Allegory of Fire*, Detail: Pyramid.

**Figure 4-3** Charles Le Brun, Ceiling of Versailles, Detail: Pyramid of 1664, Versailles, 1678.

**Figure 4-4.** Jean Regnaud, Tondo for the Place des Victoires Monument: Pyramid of the Corsican Affair, 1685.

**Figure 4-5.** Anonymous, Plan of the 1687 Quarter, AMAE, Paris.

**Figure 4-6.** Anonymous, Plan of the 1687 Quarter: Legend.

**Figure 4-7.** Anonymous, Map of the 1636-1640 Quarter, AMAE, Paris.

**Figure 4-8.** Giambattista Nolli, Map of Rome, 1748, Detail: Castel Sant' Angelo and Piazza di Ponte.



**Figure 4-9** Israël Silvestre, *Profile of the City of Rome Viewed from Trinità dei Monti*, etching, 1687, (version of 1773), Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.

**Figure 4-10.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: panel one, 1687. (version of 1773 ).

**Figure 4-11.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: Pincian Hill and Piazza di Spagna, 1687, (version of 1687).

**Figure 4-12.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: panel two, 1687, (version of 1773).

**Figure 4-13.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: panel three, 1687, (version of 1773).

**Figure 4-14.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: panel four, 1687, (version of 1773).

**Figure 4-15.** Israël Silvestre, *Roma*, (etching) 1646.

**Figure 4-16.** Giovanni Temini, *Roma*, (etching), 1665. Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.

**Figure 4-17.** Giovanni Temini, *Roma*, (detail: *vedute* by Gian Battista Falda), 1665.

**Figure 4-18.** Sébastien Le Clerc, (Charles Le Brun), *Les Grandes Conquêtes du Roy, Réduction de la Ville de Marsal en Lorraine par le Roy*, (etching), 1683-1694. BnF, Paris.

**Figure 4-19.** Sébastien Le Clerc, (Charles Le Brun), *Les Grandes Conquêtes du Roy, Siège de Douay*, 1683-1694. BnF, Paris

**Figure 4-20.** Sébastien Le Clerc, (Charles Le Brun), *Les Grandes Conquêtes du Roy, Siège de Tournay*, 1683-1694. BnF, Paris.

**Figure 4-21.** Pietro Santi Bartoli, *Feast for the Revocation of Nantes*, Trinità dei Monti, 1685. Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.

**Figure 4-22.** Pietro Santi Bartoli, *Feast for the Revocation of Nantes*, Pincian Hill, 1685. Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.

**Figure 4-23.** Vincenzo Mariotti, *Feast for the Recovery of Louis XIV*, facade of Trinità dei Monti, 1687. Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.

**Figure 4-24.** Anonymous, *Feast for the Recovery of Louis XIV*, 1687. Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome.



**Figure 4-25.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: S. Pietro, 1687, (version of 1687).

**Figure 4-26.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: S. Atanasio dei Greci, 1687 (version of 1687).

**Figure 4-27.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: figures, 1687 (version of 1687).

**Figure 4-28.** Israël Silvestre, Coversheet: *Livre de diverses vues de France, Rome, et Florence*, etching, ca. 1668. BnF, Paris.

**Figure 4-29.** Israël Silvestre, *Veue de l'Eglise de la Trinité du Mont à Rome*, ca. 1668.  
BnF, Paris

**Figure 4-30.** Israël Silvestre, *Profile*, detail: Trinità dei Monti, 1687 (version of 1687).

**Figure 4-31.** Israël Silvestre, untitled view of Trinità dei Monti and the Pincian Hill, ca. 1680s? Louvre, Paris.

**Figure C-1.** Girolamo Rossi, Plan of the Spanish Steps designed by Francesco de Sanctis, Rome, 1726. BAV, Rome.

**Figure C-2.** Sebastiano Cipriani. Design for the Spanish Steps, 1717. Bibliotheca dall'Istituto di Archeologia e Storia, dell'Arte, Rome.

**Figure C-3.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), "Wedding at Cana," Refectory (far wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-4** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (left wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-5.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (left wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-6** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (right wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-7.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (right wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-8.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Wedding at Cana,” Refectory (entrance wall), SS. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-9.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “St. Francis Prophetically Designates the Place of this Monastery.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, 1694.



**Figure C-10.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “The Diplomat of the Most Christian King Buys the Pincian Hill, 1494.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-11.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “St. Francis, Obeying the Request of the King, Sends French Monks to Rome.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-12.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “St. Francis Decrees that this Monastery Should Be Inhabited by Frenchmen Alone.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-13.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Julius III Confirms the Aforementioned Privilege by Means of His Diplomat.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-14.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Paul V Increases the Privileges of the Monastery.”  
Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-15.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Urban VIII Confirms the Same Privileges.”  
Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-16.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), “Innocent X Confirms by Solemn Judgment Possession of this Monastery to the French Alone.” Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-17.** Avanzino Nucci, Portrait of Charles VIII, Cloister, Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1616-1618.

**Figure C-18** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Holy Trinity. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-19.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), S. Francesco de Paola in Glory. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-20.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), St. Francis de Sales in Glory. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-21.** Andrea, Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallion of St. Louis IX. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-22.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallion of Charelegmagne, Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-23.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait of King Robert of France. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, 1694.

**Figure C-24.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait of S. Gontran. Refectory (ceiling), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-25.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallions of Louis the Grand Dauphin and Louis duc de Bourgogne. Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.



**Figure C-26.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallion of Philippe duc d'Anjou. Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-27.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallion of Charles duc de Berry. Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-28.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait Medallions of Philippe duc d'Anjou and Charles duc de Berry. Refectory (vault), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-29.** Andrea Pozzo (attrib.), Portrait of Louis XIV. Refectory (entrance wall), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

**Figure C-30.** Portrait of Louis XIV, detail.

**Figure C-31.** Andrea Pozzo, (attrib.), Window casing. Refectory (right wall), Trinità dei Monti, Rome, 1694.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

Benedetti, Elpidio. *Le glorie della virtù nella persona di Luigi il Magno...* Lionne, 1682.

Bernini, Domenico. *The Life of Gian Lorenzo Bernini, by Domenico Bernini; a Translation and Critical Edition*. Introduction, Commentary, and Edited by Franco Mormando. University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Bifolco, Virginio. *Un Breve Panegirico*, Rome, 1662.

Chantelou, Paul Fréart. *Diary of the Cavaliere Bernini's Visit to France*. Edited by Anthony Blunt, Annotated by George C. Bauer, Translated by Margery Corbett. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Chantelou, Paul Fréart. *Journal de voyage du cavalier Bernin en France*. Edited by Milovan Stanic. Macula: L'Insulaire, 2001.

Connors, Joseph and Louise Rice eds., *Specchio di Roma Barocca*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1991.

Coronelli, Vincenzo. *Ragguaglio delle Suntuose feste celebrate in roma in honore della sacra real maestà christianissima di Luigi XIV*. Rome, 1687.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Roma festeggiante nel Monte Pincio negli applausi alle Glorie della Pietà del Cristianissimo Lodovico il Grande in occasione della di lui estirpata eresia mediante l'Editto di Fontanblò 1685 e della ricuperata sua salute...* Venice, 1686.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Rome Triomphante et Applaudissante sur le Mont Pincio a la gloire du Roy tres Chrestien Louis le Grand a l'occasion de la destruction de l'heresie*. Venice, 1685.

de Callières, François. *The Art of Diplomacy*. Edited by Maurice Keens-Soper and Karl W. Schweizer. New York: Leicester University Press, 1983.

de la Noue, François. *Chronicon generale ordinis Minimorum*, Paris, 1635.

*Delle Gran Feste per l'Estirpata Eresia*, Rome, 1685.

De Montaignon, Anatole. *Correspondance des Directeurs de l'Academie de France à Rome*. Paris: Charavay, 1889.

de Rouvroy, Louis (Duc de Saint-Simon). *Memoirs of Saint-Simon on the Times of Louis XIV and the Regency*. Translated by Katherine Prescott Wormely. Boston: Hardy, Pratt, and Company, 1902.

- de Vera, Juan Antonio *Le Parfait Ambassadeur*, Seville, 1620.
- de Wicquefort, Abraham. *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions*. The Hague: M.G. Venuer, 1682.
- DiLauro, P. J. M. *Acta Capitularum Generalium Ordinis Minimorum*, 2 vols. Rome, 1916.
- du Plessis, Armand Jean (Duc de Richelieu), *Political Testament*. Translated by Henry Bertram Hill. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.
- Dozza, Evangelista. *Primi lampi della Relatione delle Feste, e fueche di giubilo, fatti risplendere nel Teatro di Roma per la Nascita dell'Emin. Sig. Card. Antonio Barberini*. Rome, 1662.
- “Écrit Italien en forme de Response a la Protestation du Marquis de Lavardin Ambassadeur extraordinaire de France à Rome,” Rome, 1687.
- “Entrata fatta in Roma dal Sig Duca di Crequi Ambasciatore del Re Cristianissimo di Francia Ludovico XIV alla Santita di N.S. Alessandro VII 14 giugno 1662.” Rome, 1662.
- Félibien, André. *Les Fêtes de Versailles, chronique de 1668 & 1674*. Paris: Editions Dédale, Masonneuve et Laros, 1674.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Relation de la Feste de Versailles du 18e Juillet 1668*. Paris: Pierre le Petit, 1668.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tapisseries du roy, ou sont representez les quatre elemens et les quatre saisons avec les devises qvi les accompagnent et leur explication*. Paris, 1690.
- Gaude, Francisco, ed. *Bullarum diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum romanorum pontificum taurinensis editio locupletior facta collectione novissima plurium brevium, epistolarum, decretorum actorumque S. Sedis a S. Leone Magnus usque ad praesens cura et studio collegii adlecti Romae virorum s. theologiae et ss. canonum peritorum quam ss. d.n. Pius Papa IX apostolica benedictione erexit auspicante*. 24 vols. Turin: Dalmazzo, 1857.
- Gigli, Giacinto. *Diario di Roma, 1608-1670*. Edited by Manlio Barberito. 2 vols. Rome: Colombo, 1994.
- Grotius, Hugo. *Rights to War and Peace Including the Law of Nature and of Nations*. Translated by A.C. Campbell. Washington D.C.: M. Walter Dunne, 1901.

Hanotaux, Gabriel, ed. *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Révolution française. Publié sous les auspices de la Commission des archives diplomatiques au Ministère des affaires étrangères.* Paris: Alcan, 1884.

Hotman, Jean. *De la Charge et Dignité de l'Ambassadeur.* Paris, 1603.

“Lettre d'un Gentilhomme françois a un ses amis a Rome touchant l'immunité du quartier des ambassadeurs de France...” Paris, 1687.

Memoire touchant l'immunité du quartier de Monsieur les Mareschal D'Estrées.” Paris, 1687.

Moneta, Francesco. *Vera Relatione della Feste Fatte in Roma per la pubblicazione della Pace Stabilita tra le due corone con le Cerimonie fatte & estate descriptione del Suntuoso Apparato della Chiesa di S. Maria della Pace. Con un racconto delle Funtioni delle due Chiese Nationali.* Rome, 1660.

“Proces verbal envoyé par la cour de Rome, des prétendus excès commis par les François, depuis l'arrivée du Duc de Créqui à Rome en qualité d'Ambassadeur Extraordinaire au commencement du mois de Juin 1662 jusqu'à sa sortie au commencement de Septembre de la même année: avec les observations et les responses de la part de l'Ambassadeur.” Paris, 1662.

“Qui Maledixerit Patri Suo.” Rome, 1688.

Ranuzzi, Angelo. *Correspondance du nonce en France, Angelo Ranuzzi (1683-1689).* Edited by Bruno Neveu. Rome: École française de Rome, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Lettere a Parigi a Domenico Federici: 1683-1687.* Edited by Francesco Maria Cecchini. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1988.

Regnier-Desmarais, François-Seraphim. *Histoire des des mêlés de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome au sujet de l'affaire des Corses.* Paris, 1707.

“Refutation d'un Libelle italien en forme de reponse a la protestation du Marquis de Lavardin Ambassadeur estraordinaire de France, a Rome An. 1688.” Paris, 1688.

*La Relatione dell'Allegrezze.* Rome, 1662.

*Rome Applaudissante pour le Restablissement de la sante de sa Maieste, 1687,* Rome, 1687.

“Scritture diverse concernenti d’Affaire del Sig Marchese de Lavardino venuto a Roma nel’ Undicesimo di novembre dell’ Anno 1687 con carattere di Ambasciatori straordinario di Ludovico XIV. Re di Francia alla Santa Sede, et al Sommo Pontefice Innocenzo XI. Odescalchi.” Rome, 1687.

Spada, Fabrizio. *Correspondance du nonce en France, Fabrizio Spada: (1674-1675)*. Edited by Ségilène de Dainville-Barbiche. Rome: École française de Rome and Université pontificale grégorienne, 1982.

Van Bynkershoek, Cornelius. *Traité du Juge Compétent des Ambassadeurs*, The Hague, 1723.

### Secondary Sources

Ackerman, James. *The Architecture of Michelangelo*. London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Adair, Edward Robert. *The Extraterritoriality of Ambassadors in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. London, New York, and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1929.

Adams, Robyn and Rosanna Cox. *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Algazi, Gadi, Valentin Groebner, and Bernhard Jussen, eds. *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-modern Figurations of Exchange*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

Alpers, Svetlana *The Art of Describing, Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso, 1983.

Anderson, Christy. “The Secrets of Vision in Renaissance England.” In *The Treatise on Perspective: Published and Unpublished*, edited by Lyle Massey, 323-248. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art and New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003.

Anderson, Matthew Smith. *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy, 1450-1919*. London and New York: Longman Group Ltd., 1993.

Anselmi, Alessandra. *Il Palazzo dell'Ambasciata di Spagna presso la Santa Sede*. Rome: De Luca, 2001.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Il Quartiere del Ambasciata di Spagna a Roma." In *La città italiana e i luoghi degli stranieri XIV-XVIII secolo*, edited by D. Calabi and P. Lanaro, 206-221. Rome: Bari, 1998.
- Apostolidés, Jean-Marie. *Le Roi Machine: Spectacle et politique au temps de Louis XIV*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1981.
- Appuhn, Karl. "Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy: The Structure of Diplomatic Practice, 1450-1800." *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32, no.1 (2001): 122-123.
- Argan, Giulio Carlo. *The Baroque Age*. New York: Rizzoli, 1964.
- Armstrong, John. *Nations Before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Babelon, Jean-Pierre. "Silvestre Paysagiste." In *Paris et Rome: vus par Israël Silvestre*, edited by Délégation à l'Action Artistique de la Ville de Paris, 4-8. Paris: Mairies Annexes des X<sup>e</sup> et I<sup>er</sup> Arrondissements, 1981.
- Baker, Keith Michael, ed. *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture, volume 1: The Political Culture of the Ancien Regime*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987.
- Ballon, Hilary. *The Paris of Henry IV: Architecture and Urbanism*. Boston: MIT Press, 1991.
- Balsamo, Isabelle. "Le mécénat des Guise dans l'église de la Trinité-des-Monts à Rome (1570-1630)." *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome* 94, no. 2 (1982): 923-928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les sources des portraits des rois de France dans le cloître de la Trinité-des-Monts." In *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte: art, foi et culture*, edited by Yves Bruley, 105. Rome: De Luca, 2002.
- Barchesi, Silvia. "S. Salvatore in Onda." *Roma Sacra* 13 (May 1998): 14-18.
- Barry, Fabio. "Apartheid? The Counter-Reformation Ghettos." *Daidolos* 5 (1996): 18-31.
- Battisti, Alberta, ed., *Andrea Pozzo*. Milan: Luni Editrice, 1996.
- Beam, Sara. "Apparitions and the Public Sphere in Seventeenth-Century France." *Canadian Journal of History* 29, no. 1 (1994): 1-22.
- Beik, William. *Absolutism and Society in Seventeenth-Century France*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.



- Bell, David A. *The Cult of The Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Recent Works on Early Modern French National Identity." *Journal of Modern History* 68, no. 1 (March 1996): 84-113.
- Benocci, Carla. *Villa il Vascello*. Rome: Eraso, 2003.
- Berendsen, Olga Paris. "The Italian Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Catafalque." PhD diss., New York University, 1961.
- Berger, Robert. "Bernini's Louis XIV Equestrian: A Closer Examination of Its Fortunes at Versailles." *Art Bulletin* 63, no. 2 (June, 1981): 232-248.
- Berger, Robert, ed. *In the Garden of the Sun King*. Washington: Dumberton Oaks, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tourists during the Reign of the Sun King: Access to the Louvre and Versailles and the Anatomy of Guidebooks and Other Printed Aids." In *Paris Center of Artistic Enlightenment*, edited by G. Maurer, 126-158. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1988.
- Bertolotti, Antonio. *Artisti francesi in Roma nei secoli XV, XVI e XVII*. Mantua: Mondovi, 1886.
- Biet, Pierre. *Les nonce du pape à la cour de Louis XIV*. Paris: Perrin, 2002.
- Bigari, Cristiana. "Andrea Pozzo e Antonio Colli da Trinità dei Monti alle opere toscane. Nuove contributi sulla tecnica pittorica." In *Artifizi della metafora: saggi su Andrea Pozzo*, edited by Richard Bösel and Lydia Salviucci Insolera, 127-142. Rome: Artemide, 2011.
- Bindi, Gaia. "'Roma gran teatro del mondo' la guerra festeggiata." In *La festa barocca*, edited by Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco, 100-109. Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1997.
- Birgukova, Nina. "Decoration and Diplomacy: Eighteenth-Century French Tapestries." *Apollo* 101 (1975): 458-465.
- Bjurström, Per. *Feast and Theatre in Queen Christina's Rome*. Stockholm: Analecta Reginensia III, 1966.
- Blunt, Anthony. "Two Unpublished Plans of the Farnese Palace." *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 10 (1960-1961): 15-17.
- Brauer, Heinrich and Rudolf Wittkower. *Die Zeichnungen des Gianlorenzo Bernini*. Berlin: H. Keller, 1931.

- Bonnard, François. *Histoire du couvent royal de la Trinité du Mont Pincio à Rome*. Rome and Paris, 1933.
- Bonney, R. "Absolutism: What's in a Name?" *French History* 1 (1987): 93-117.
- Borsi, Stefano. *Roma di Sisto V: La pianta di Antonio Tempesta, 1593*. Roma: Officina Edizioni, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Roma di Urbano VIII: La pianta di Giovanni Maggi, 1625*. Roma: Officina Edizioni, 1990.
- Bowron, Edgar Peters and Joseph Rishel, eds. *Art in Rome in the Eighteenth Century*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2000.
- Bruley, Yves, ed. *Trinitè-des-Monts redécouverte, arte, foi, et culture*. Rome: De Luca, 2002.
- Bryson, Norman. *Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Burke, Peter. *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Burroughs, Charles. "Absolutism and the Rhetoric of Topography: Streets in the Rome of Sixtus V." In *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, edited by Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro, Richard Ingersoll, 189-202. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Below the Angel: An Urbanistic Project in the Rome of Pope Nicholas V." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 45 (1982): 94-124.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Italian Renaissance Palace Facade: Structures of Authority, Surfaces of Sense*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Butters, Suzanne. "The Uses and Abuses of Gifts in the World of Ferdinando de' Medici: (1549 - 1609)." *I Tatti studies* 11 (2008): 243-354.
- Büttner, Brigitte. "Past Presents: New Year's Gifts at the Valois Courts, ca. 1400." *Art Bulletin* 83 (2001): 598-625.
- Callisen, S.A. "The Equestrian Statue of Louis XIV in Dijon and Related Monuments." *The Art Bulletin* 23 (1941): 131-140.
- Calmet, P. "Une fondation française a Rome, La Trinité des Monts." *Annales de Saint Louis-des-Français* 9 (1904-1905): 198-219.

- Cappelli, Ernesta. *L'Ambasceria del Duca di Créquy alla corte pontificia: studia fatto secondo i documenti del R. Archivio di Stato di Firenze, 1662-1664*. Rocca S. Casciano, 1899.
- Carpo, Mario. *Architecture in the Age of Printing: Orality, Writing, Typography, and Printed Images in the History of Architectural Theory*. Translated by Sarah Benson. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001.
- Castiglione, Caroline. "When a Woman Takes Charge: Marie-Anne de la Trémoille and the End of the Patrimony of the Dukes of Bracciano." *Viator* 39 no. 2 (2008): 363-380.
- Ceen, Alan. "Giambattista Nolli." In *Art in Rome in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Edgar Peters and Joseph Rishel, 137-139. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Pianta grande di Roma of Giambattista Nolli in Facsimile*. Highmount, New York: J.H. Aronson, 1984.
- Collines, James. *The State in Early Modern France*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press 1995.
- Connors, Joseph. "Alliance and Enmity in Baroque Urbanism." *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 25 (1989): 239-265.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Borromini and the Roman Oratory: Style and Society*. New York and Cambridge, Mass.: The Architectural History Foundation, 1980.
- Consagra, Francesca. "De Rossi and Falda: A Successful Collaboration in the Print Industry of Seventeenth-Century Rome." In *The Craft of Art: Originality and Industry in the Italian Renaissance and Baroque Workshop*, edited by A. Ladis and C. Wood, 187-203. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The De Rossi Family Print Publishing Shop: A Study in the History of the Print Industry in Seventeenth-Century Rome." PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Marketing of Pietro Testa's 'Poetic Inventions'." In *Pietro Testa 1612 1650 Prints and Drawings*. Exh. Cat., edited by Elizabeth Cropper, 1xxxvii-civ. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1988.
- Cosgrove, Dennis. "Prospect, Perspective, and the Evolution of the Landscape Idea." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 10, no. 1 (1985): 45-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998.

- Côté, Marie Hélène. "What did it Mean to be a French Diplomat in the Seventeenth and Early-Eighteenth Centuries?" *Canadian Journal of History* 45, no. 2 (Autumn 2010): 235-258.
- Cowan, Margaret. "Origins of Diplomatic Immunity in England." *Solicitor Quarterly* 4 (April, 1965): 104-17.
- Cox-Rearick, Janet. "Sacred to Profane: Diplomatic Gifts of the Medici to Francis I." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1994): 239-58.
- Cropper, Elizabeth, ed. *The Diplomacy of Art: Artistic Creation and Politics in Seicento Italy: Papers from a Colloquium Held at the Villa Spelman, Florence, 1998*. Milan: Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'Idée di Bellori." In *L'Idée del Bello, viaggio per Roma nel seicento con Giovan Pietro Bellori*, Exh. Cat., 81-86. Rome: Palazzo delle Esposizioni, 2000.
- Dandeleit, Thomas. "Spanish Conquest and Colonization at the Center of the Old World: The Spanish Nation in Rome, 1555-1625." *Journal of Modern History* 69, no. 3 (1997): 479-511.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Spanish Rome, 1500-1700*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001.
- de Bojani, Ferdinando. "L'affaire du quartier à Rome à la fin du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège." *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* 22 (1908): 350-378.
- de Broglie, Raoul. *Le Palais Farnèse: ambassade de France*. Paris: H. Lefebvre, 1953.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- De Feo Vittorio and Valentino Martinelli eds., *Andrea Pozzo*. Milan: Electa, 1996.
- de Flassan, Gaëtan de Raxis. *Histoire générale et raisonnée de la diplomatie française*, 7 vols. Paris and Strasbourg: Treuttel et Würtz, 1811.
- de Fleury, Georges Rohault. *Le Latran au moyen âge*. 2 vols., Paris: Ve. A. Morel, 1877.
- Delbeke, Maarten. "Framing History; the Jubilee of 1625, the Dedication of New Saint Peter's and the Baldacchino." In *Festival Architecture*, edited by Sarah Bonnemaïson and Christine Macy, 129-54. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

- Dempsey, Charles. *Annibale Carracci and the Beginnings of Baroque Style*. Glückstadt: Augustin, 1977.
- De Moüy, Charles. *L'ambassade de duc de Créqui*. 2 vols. Paris: Hachette, 1893.
- de Navenne, Ferdinand Henri. *Rome et le Palais Farnèse pendant les trois derniers siècles*. 2 vols. Paris: A. Michel, 1923.
- De Nolhac, P. *Le Création de Versailles*. Paris: Vincent Fréal, 1925.
- de Seta, Cesare. "Introduzione." In *Imago urbis romae: l'immagine di Roma in età moderna*. Exh. Cat., edited by Cesare de Seta, 13-46. Rome: Electa, 2005.
- De Silvestre, E. *Renseignements sur quelques peintres et graveurs des XVII et XVIII siècles, Israel Silvestre et ses descendants*. Paris: Buchard-Huzard, 1869.
- d'Ormesson, Wladimir. *La Presence de la France dans la Rome des Papes*. Paris: Hachette, 1959.
- Diez, Renato. *Il Trionfo della parola. Studio sulle relazioni di feste nella Roma barocca, 1623-1667*. Rome: Bulzoni, 1986.
- Di Matteo, Colette. "La restauration des décors peints de la Trinité-des-Monts, Rome." *Monumental* (2003): 142-154.
- Di Matteo, Colette. "La restauration des peintures du cloître de Trinité-des-Monts," *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte*, 101-105.
- D'Onofrio, Cesare. *Scalinate di Roma*. Roma: Stabilimento A. Staderini, 1974.
- du Crest, Sabin. *Des Fêtes à Versailles*. Paris: Aux Amateurs de Livres, 1990.
- Dunlop, Ian. *Versailles*. New York: Taplinger Publishing Co., 1970.
- Elling, Christian. *Rome: The Biography of her architecture from Bernini to Thorvaldsen*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1975.
- Erben, Dietrich. "Die Pyramide Ludwigs XIV in Rom: ein Schanddenkmal im Dienst diplomatischer Vorherrschaft." *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 31 (1996): 427-458.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paris und Rom: die staatlich gelenkten Kunstbeziehungen unter Ludwig XIV*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.
- Faucheux, Louis Etienne *Catalogue raisonné de toutes les estampes qui forment l'oeuvre d'Israël Silvestre*. Paris: Veuve Jules Renouard, 1864.

- Fagiolo, Marcello. *Roma Sancta: La città delle basiliche*. Rome: Gangemi, 1985.
- Fagiolo, Marcello and Maria Luisa Madonna eds. *Barocco romano e barocco italiano: Il teatro, l'effimero, l'allegoria*. Rome: Gangemi, 1985.
- Fagiolo, Marcello and Paolo Portoghesi eds. *Roma Barocca*. Rome: Electa, 2006.
- Fagiolo dell'Arco, Maurizio. *La festa barocca*. Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1997.
- Fagiolo dell'Arco, Maurizio and Silvia Carandini. *L'Effimero Barocco, Strutture della festa nella Roma del '600*. 2 vols. Rome: Bulzoni, 1977-1978.
- Farhat, Georges: "Le Nôtre. Anamorphoses, Topography, Territories." In *Diachronicles/Pages Paysages*, edited by Claramunt M. and C. Mosbach, 44-53. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2000.
- Fernández-Santos Ortiz-Iribas, Jorge. "A 1679 Inventory of the Schor Residence at the Trinità dei Monti." In *Un regista del gran teatro del barocco: Johann Paul Schor und die internationale Sprache des Barock. Akten des Internationalen Studientages der Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rom, 6-7. Oktober 2003*, edited by Christina Strunck, 73-82. München: Hirmer Verlag, 2008.
- Feros, Antonio. "'Sacred and Terrifying Gazes': Languages and Images of Power in Early Modern Spain." in *The Cambridge Companion to Velázquez*, edited by Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt, 68-86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2002.
- Ferrari, Carlo Alberto. *Curiosità storiche e odierne realtà su: i viventi diritti dell'Italia a Palazzo Farnese alla scalinata ed alla Trinità de' Monti in Roma dal 1865 al 1965*. Roma: Edizioni d'arte, 1965.
- Fiorani, Francesca. *The Marvel of Maps: Art, Cartography, and Politics in Renaissance Italy*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Frank, Tenney. *Roman Imperialism*. New York: Macmillan, 1914.
- Fraschetti, Stanislao. *Il Bernini, La sua vita, la sua opera, il suo tempo*. Milan: Hoepli, 1900.
- Freiberg, Jack. "Bramante's Tempietto and the Spanish Crown." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 50 (2005): 151-205.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Lateran in 1600: Christian Concord in Counter-Reformation Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "In the Sign of the Cross: The Image of Constantine in the Art of Counter-Reformation Rome." In *Piero della Francesca and His Legacy*, ed. Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, 66-87. *Studies in the History of Art*, no. 48, Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1995.
- Frey, Linda S. and Marsha L. Frey, *The History of Diplomatic Immunity*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1999.
- Frigo, Daniele, *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy: The Structure of Diplomatic Practice, 1450-1800*. Translated by Adrian Belton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prudence and Experience: Ambassadors and Political Culture in Early Modern Italy." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 38, no. 1 (Winter, 2008): 15-34.
- Frommel, Christoph Luitpold. "Papal Policy-The Planning of Rome during the Renaissance." In *Art and History- Images and Their Meanings*, ed. R. Rothberg and T. Rabb, 39-65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der römische Palastbau der Hochrenaissance* 3 vols., Tübingen: E. Wasmuth, 1973.
- Frutaz, Amato Pietro. *Le piante di Roma*, 3 vols. Rome: Istituto di studi romani, 1962.
- Fumaroli, Marc. "Cross, Crown and Tiara: the Constantine Myth between Paris and Rome, 1590-1690." In *Piero della Francesca and His Legacy*, edited by Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, 88-102. *Studies in the History of Art*, no. 48. Washington D. C.: National Gallery of Art. 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Richelieu, Patron of the Arts." In *Richelieu, Art and Power*, edited by Hilliard Todd Goldfarb, 15-47. Exh. Cat., Montreal: Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, 2002.
- Gamrath, Helge. *Roma Sancta Renovata: Studi sull'urbanistica di Roma nella secondametà del sec. XVI con particolare riferimento al pontificato di Sisto V(1585-1590)*. Roma: "L'erma" di Bretschneider, 1987.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Maiden, MA: Blackwell, 2006.
- Gérin, Charles. *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, 2 vols. Paris: Libraire Hachette, 1894.
- Giedeon, Siegfried. *Space, Time, and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1941.
- Giesey, Ralph. *Cérimonial et puissance souverain: France, XVe-XVIIIe siècles*. Paris, Armand Colin, 1985.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The King Imagined." In *The Political Culture of the Old Regime*, edited by Keith Baker, 41-59. Oxford: Pergamon, 1987.
- Gill, Meredith. "'Where the Danger was Greatest': A Gallic Legacy in Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome." *Zeitschrift Kunstgeschichte*, 59, no. 4 (1996): 498-522.
- Gillies, Linda Boyer. "An Eighteenth-Century Roman View: Panini's Scalinata della Trinità dei Monti." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 30 no. 4 (February-March 1972): 176-184.
- Girard, Jacques. *Versailles Gardens: Sculpture and Mythology*. London: Sotheby's Publications, 1985.
- Gnoli, Umberto. *Topografia e toponomastica di Roma medioevale e modern*. Rome, Staderini, 1939.
- Gordon, Pamela. "Fireworks Display Honoring the Birth of the French Dauphin." In Irving Lavin, Pamela Gordon, Linda Klinger, Steven Ostrow, Sharon Cather, Nicola Courtright, and Ilana Dreya, *Gianlorenzo Bernini, from the Museum der Bildenden Künste Leipzig, German Democratic Republic*, edited by Irving Lavin, 219-225. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Gould, Cecil. *Bernini in France: an Episode in Seventeenth-Century History*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981.
- Graham, Robert. *Vatican Diplomacy: A Study of Church and State on the International Plane*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1959.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Introduction: Fifty Years of the King's Two Bodies." *Representations* 106 (Spring 2009): 63-66.
- Guidoni, Enrico. "Les transformations du Quartier Arenula et le rayonnement de l'urbanisme farnésien," in *Le Palais Farnése*, 3 vols., École française de Rome, vol. 1, 63-84.. Rome: École française de Rome, 1982.
- Gunn, J.A.W. *Queen of the World: Opinion in the Public Life of France from the Renaissance to the Revolution*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1995.
- Hamilton, Mark. "New Imaginings: The Legacy of Benedict Anderson and Alternative Engagements of Nationalism." *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 6, no. 3 (2006): 73-89.
- Hammond, Frederick. *Music and Spectacle in Baroque Rome*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994.



- Hampton, Timothy. *Fictions of Embassy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- Harries, Karsten. "Descartes, Perspective, and the Angelic Eye." *Yale French Studies* 49 (1973): 28-42.
- Harwood, B.R. "Nicolo Cordieri: His Activity in Rome 1592-1612." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1979.
- Hedin, Thomas. "Tessin in the Gardin of Versailles, 1687." *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift/Journal of Art History* 72, no. 1 (2003): 47-60.
- Herklotz, Ingo. "Francesco Barberini, Nicolo Alemanni, and the Lateran Triclinium of Leo III: an episode in restoration and Seicento Medieval Studies." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 40 (1995): 175-193.
- Hibbard, Howard. "Scipione Borghese's Garden Palace on the Quirinal." *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 23, no. 4 (December, 1964): 163-192.
- Hibbard Howard and Irma Jaffe. "Bernini's Barcaccia." *Burlington Magazine* 101 (1964): 159-170.
- Hibbert, Christopher. *Rome: The Biography of a City*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1985.
- Hills, Helen. *Invisible City: The Architecture of Devotion in Seventeenth-Century Neapolitan Convents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Ingersoll, Richard. "Piazza di Ponte and the Military Origins of Panopticism." In *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, edited by Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro, and Richard Ingersoll, 177-188. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Jacob, Christian. *The Sovereign Map*. Edited by Edward Dahl, Translated by Tom Conley. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Jarrard, Alice. "Inventing in Bernini's Shop in the Late 1660s: Projects for Cardinal Rinaldo d'Este." *The Burlington Magazine* 144, no. 1192 (July 2002): 409-419.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Representing the Royal Spectacle in Paris, 1660-1662." *L'Esprit Créateur* 39, no. 3 (Fall 1999): 26-37.
- Jatta, Barbara. *Lievin Cruyl e la sua opera grafica. Un artista fiammingo nell'Italia del Seicento*. Brussels and Rome: Institut historique Belge de Rome, 1992.
- Johns, Christopher M.S. *Papal Art and Cultural Politics: Rome in the Age of Clement XI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

- Jussen, Bernhard. "The King's Two Bodies Today." *Representations* 106 (Spring 2009): 102-117.
- Kahn, Victoria. "Political Theology and Fiction in The King's Two Bodies." *Representations* 106 (Spring 2009): 77-101.
- Kaplan, Benjamin. "Diplomacy and Domestic Devotion: Embassy Chapels and the Toleration of Religious Dissent in Early Modern Europe." *Journal of Early Modern History* 6, no. 4 (2002): 341-361.
- Keens-Soper, Maurice. "François de Callières and Diplomatic Theory." *The Historical Journal* 16, no. 3 (September 1973): 485-508.
- Kerber, Bernhard. *Andrea Pozzo*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Opere di Andrea Pozzo," In *Andrea Pozzo*, edited by Alberta Battisti, 465-469. Milan: Luni Editrice, 1996.
- Kettering, Sharon. *Patronage in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-century France*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.
- Keyvanian, Carla. "Charity, architecture and urban development in post-Tridentine Rome: The hospital of the SS.ma Trinità del Pellegrini e Convalescenti, (1548 1680)." PhD diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Concerted Efforts: The Quarter of the Barberini Casa Grande in Seventeenth-Century Rome, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64, no. 3 (September 2005): 292-311.
- Kieven, Elisabeth. "'Il Gran teatro del mondo'. Nicodemus Tessin the Younger in Rome." *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift/Journal of Art History* 72, no. 1 (June 2007): 4-15.
- Krautheimer, Richard. "The Carolingian Revival of Early Christian Architecture." *Art Bulletin* 24, no. 41 (March, 1942): 1-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Rome of Alexander VII, 1655-1667*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Krautheimer Richard, and Roger B. Jones, "The Diary of Alexander VII: Notes on Art, Artists, and Buildings." *Römische Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* 15 (1975): 199-233.
- Konwitz, Josef F. *Cartography in France, 1660-1848*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

- La Croix, Pierre. *Mémoire historique sur les institutions de la France à Rome puisé dans leurs archives et autres documents la plupart inédits*, ed. Jean Arnaud. Rome: Imprimerie Ed. Romana, 1892.
- Laine, M. and B. Magnusson eds. *Nicodemus Tessin the Younger: Sources, Works, Collections. Travel Notes 1673-77 and 1687-88*. Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 2002.
- Landwehr, John. *Splendid Ceremonies: State Entries and Royal Funerals in the Low Countries, 1515-1791*. Leiden, Hes and De Graaf, 1971.
- Lanzi, Luigi. *Storia Pittorica della Italia*. Florence: Gaspero Ricci, 1834.
- Laurain-Portemer, Madeleine. *Études Mazarines*. Paris: De Boccard, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mazarin, Benedetti et l'Escalier de la Trinité des Monts." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 102 (1968): 273-294.
- Lauer, Philippe. *Le Palais de Latran: Étude historique et archéologique*. Paris, Leroux, 1911.
- Lavin, Irving. "Bernini's Image of the Sun King." In *Past-Present: Essays on Historicism in Art from Donatello to Picasso*, 139-202, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Rome of Alexander VII: Bernini and the Reverse of the medal." In *Visible Spirit: The Art of Gianlorenzo Bernini*, 1087-1126. London: Pindar Press, 2009.
- Lecoque, Anne Marie. "The Symbolism of the State: The Images of the Monarchy from the Early Valois Kings to Louis XIV." In *Rethinking France*, 4 vols., edited by Pierre Nora, vol. 1, 217-267. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.
- Lenotre, Georges. *Versailles au temps du Rois*. Belgium: Marabout, 1934.
- Lesourd, Paul. *L'ambassade de France près le Saint-Siège sous l'ancien régime*. Paris: Editions Spes, 1924.
- Llobera, Josep R. *The God of Modernity; The Development of Nationalism in Western Europe*. Oxford: Berg 1994.
- Levy, Evonne. "Architecture and Religion in 17th-Century Rome." *Studiolo* 2 (2003): 219-253.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Lotz, Wolfgang. "Die Spanische Treppe. Architektur als Mittel der Diplomatie." *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* 12 (1969): 39-94.
- Lucas, Thomas. *Landmarking: City, Church, and Jesuit Urban Strategy*. Chicago: Loyola Press, 1997.
- Lynn, John A. "The Quest for Glory: the Formation of Strategy Under Louis XIV, 1661-1715." In *The Making of Strategy: Rulers, States, and War*, edited by Williamson Murray, Macgregor Knox, Alvin Bernstein. 178-204. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- McGuiness, Frederick J. "The Rhetoric of Praise and the New Rome of the Counter Reformation." In *Rome in the Renaissance: The City and The Myth*, edited by P.A. Ramsey, 355-370. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1982.
- Macgregor, William. "The Authority of Prints: an Early Modern Perspective." *Art History* 22, no. 3 (September 1999): 389-420.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Illustration and its Afterlife: The Visual Uses of Sébastien Le Clerc's *Pratique de la géométrie*." *Visual Resources* 17 no. 1 (2001): 37-94.
- MacCormack, Sabine. "Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: The Ceremony of 'Adventus.'" *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 21, no. 4 (1972): 721-752.
- Marder, Tod. *Bernini and the Art of Architecture*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Bernini and Benedetti at Trinità dei Monti." *Art Bulletin*, 62, no. 2 (1980): 286-289.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Decision to Build the Spanish Steps: From Project to Monument." In *Projects and Monuments in the Period of the Roman Baroque*, edited by Helmut Hager and Susan Munshower, vol. 1, 83-95. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gian Lorenzo Bernini." *La Basilica di San Pietro in Vaticano, 4 vols.*, ed. Salvatore Settis, vol. 2: 706-708. Rome: Franco Cosimo Panini, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Bernini's Scala Regia at the Vatican Palace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Marin Louis, "Frontiers of Utopia." *Critical Inquiry* 19, no. 3 (Spring, 1993): 397-420.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Le portrait du Roi*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1981.
- Marshall, David. "The Architectural Piece in 1700: The Paintings of Alberto Carlieri (1672-1720), Pupil of Andrea Pozzo." *Artibus et Historiae* 25, no. 50 (2004): 39-126.
- Martin, John Rupert. *The Farnese Gallery*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Martin, Marie-Madeleine. *The Making of France: The Origins and Development of National Unity*. Translated by Barbara North and Robert North. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948, 1951.
- Martini, A. *Il Seicento, in riti, cerimonie e feste di popolo nella Roma dei papi*. Bologna: 1970.
- Maser, Edward A. "The Statue of Henry IV in Saint John Lateran A Political Work of Art." *Gazette des beaux-arts* 6 (1960): 148-156.
- Massey, Lyle. *Picturing Space, Displacing Bodies: Anamorphosis in Early Modern Theories of Perspective*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press: 2007.
- Massey, Lyle, ed. *The Treatise on Perspective: Published and Unpublished*. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art and New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Masson, Georgina. "Papal Gifts and Roman Entertainments in Honour of Queen Christina's Arrival," in *Queen Christina of Sweden: Documents and Studies*, edited by Magnus von Platen, 244-261. Stockholm: Analecta reginensia, 1966.
- Mattingly, Garrett. *Renaissance Diplomacy*. London: Butler & Tanner Ltd, 1955.
- Maulde-la-Clavière, René. *La Diplomatie au temps du Machiavel*. Paris: E Leroux, 1893.
- McClure, Ellen. *Sunspots and the Sun King: Sovereignty and Mediation in Seventeenth-Century France*. Urban and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006.
- McGowan, Margaret. "Contrary Impulses in Montaigne's Vision of Rome." *Renaissance Studies* 4 no. 4 (1990): 392-409.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Vision of Rome in Late Renaissance France*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.
- McPhee, Sarah. *Bernini and the Bell Towers: Architecture and Politics at the Vatican*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

- Meaume, Édouard. *Recherches sur quelques artistes lorrains, Claude Henriet, Israël Henriet, Israël Silvestre et ses descendants*. Nancy: Grimblot et Ve Raybois, 1852.
- Melzer, Sara E. and Kathryn Norberg, eds. *From the Royal to the Republican Body: Incorporating the Political in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century France*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1998.
- Metzger Habel, Dorothy. "Alexander VII and the Private Builder: Two Case Studies in Development of Via del Corso in Rome." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 49, 3 (1990): 293-309.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Urban Development of Rome in the Age of Alexander VII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Michaud, Eugene. *Louis XIV et Innocent XI d'après les correspondances diplomatique inédites*. 4 vols. Paris: G. Charpentier, 1882-83.
- Milani, Raffaele. *The Art of the Landscape*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2009.
- Millon, Henry, ed. *The Triumph of the Baroque: Architecture in Europe, 1600-1700*. New York: Rizzoli, 1999.
- Moore, John. *The Chinea: A Festival in Eighteenth-Century Rome*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Moreau, Henri. "Saint-Claude des Franche-Comte au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle." In *Les Fondations Nationales dans la Rome Pontificale*, edited by Académie de France Villa Médici and École Française de Rome, 715-721. Rome: Académie de France, 1981.
- Morosini, R. P. Giuseppe O.M. "La spiritualité de saint François de Paul et des Minimes." In *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte, arte, foi, et culture*, edited by Yves Bruley, 122-126. Rome: De Luca, 2002.
- Mukerji, Chandra. *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Mulryne, J.R., Helen Watanabe-O'Kelley, and Margaret Shewring, eds. *Europa Triumphans: Court and Civic Festivals in Early Modern Europe*. 2 vols. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Murata Margaret. "Why the First Opera Given in Paris Wasn't Roman." *Cambridge Opera Journal* 7 (July, 1995): 87-105.

- Naddeo, Barbara. Cultural Capitals and Cosmopolitanism in Eighteenth-Century Italy: The Historiography and Italy on the Grand Tour. *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 10 no. 2 (2005): 183-199.
- Neveu Bruno. “‘Regia Fortuna’: le Palais Farnèse durant le seconde moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle.” In *Le Palais Farnèse*. Edited by Ecole française de Rome, vol. 1, 475-507. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Un rival de L'aveve: le nonce Varese à Paris 1676-1678*. Paris: Boccard, 1982.
- Nissirio, Cesare, ed. *Incisioni romane di Israel Silvestre*, Rome: Centre culturel français de Rome 1979.
- Noël, J.F. “Les Problèmes des frontières entre la France et L’Empire dans la seconde moitié du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle.” *Revue Historique* 235, no. 2 (1966): 333-346.
- Nora, Pierre ed. *Les Lieux de mémoire*. 7 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1984-1992.
- Nordman, Daniel. “From the Boundaries of the State to National Borders.” In *Rethinking France*, edited by Pierre Nora, vol. 1, 105-132. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Nussdorfer, Laurie. *Civic Politics in the Rome of Urban VIII*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Politics of Space in Early Modern Rome.” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 42 (1997): 161-186.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Vacant See: Ritual and Protest in Early Modern Rome.” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 18, no. 2. (Summer, 1987): 173-189.
- Nuti, Lucia. “The Perspective Plan in the Sixteenth Century: The Invention of a Representational Language.” *The Art Bulletin* 76, no. 1 (March 1994): 105-128.
- Oechslin W. and A. Buschow. *Festarchitekture, Der Architekt als Inszenierungskünstler*. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje 1984.
- O’Brien, Louis. “The Huguenot Policy of Louis XIV and Pope Innocent XI.” *The Catholic Historical Review* 17, no. 1 (April 1931): 29-42.
- O’Kelly Watanabe, Helen, “The Early Modern Festival Book: Function and Form,” in *Europa Triumphans: Court and Civic Festivals in Early Modern Europe*, edited by J.R. Mulryne, Helen Watanabe-O’Kelly, Margaret Shewring, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 3-18. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

- Olwig, Kenneth. *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002.
- Orcibal, Jean. *Louis XIV contre Innocent XI; les appels au future concie de 1688 et l'opinion française*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1949.
- Orlandi, Pellegrino Antonio. *L'Abecedario Pittorico dall'autore ristampato, corretto, ed accresciuto di molti professori, e di altre notizie spettanti ala pittura, ed in quest'ultima impressione con nuova, e copiosa aggiunta di alcuni altri professori...* Naples: Nicolo e Vincenzo Rispoli, 1733,
- Ostrow, Stephen. "Gianlorenzo Bernini, Girolamo Lucenti, and the Statue of Philip IV in S. Maria Maggiore: Patronage and Politics in Seicento Rome." *Art Bulletin* 73, no. 1 (March 1991): 89-118.
- Ostrower, Alexander. *Language, Law, and Diplomacy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965.
- Le palais Farnese*. École française de Rome, ed. 3 vols. Rome: École française de Rome, 1982.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Idea: A Concept in Art History*. Columbia: University of Columbia Press, 1968.
- Paro, Gino. *The Right of Papal Legation*. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947.
- Parrott, David. "The Utility of Fortifications in Early Modern Europe: Italian Princes and Their Citadels, 1540-1640." *War in History* 2 (2007): 127-153.
- Pastor, Ludwig von. *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*. 40 vols., London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1936-67.
- Puaux, Anne. *Introduction au Palais Farnese*. Rome : École française de Rome, 1983.
- Pecchiai, Pio. "Regesti dei documenti patrimoniali del convento romano della Trinità dei Monti." *Archivi*, 25 (1958): 131-240.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *La Scalinata di Piazza di Spagna*. Rome: Palombi, 1941.
- Pevsner, Nikolaus. *Academies of Art, Past and Present*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.
- Picavet, Camille-Georges. *La diplomatie française au temps de Louis XIV (1661-1715): Institutions, moeurs et coutumes*. Paris: Bibliothèque de la revue historique, 1930.



- Pinto, John. "Origins and Development of the Ichnographic City Plan." *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 35, no. 1 (March 1976): 35-50.
- Poncet, Olivier. "The cardinal-protectors of the Crowns in the Roman Curia During the First Half of the Seventeenth Century: the Case of France." In *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*, edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maia Antonietta Visceglia, 158-176. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Posner, Donald. "Concerning the 'Mechanical Parts of Painting and the Artistic Culture of Seventeenth-Century France.'" *Art Bulletin*, 75 (December 1993): 583-98.
- Préad, Maxime. *Inventaire du fonds français: Graveurs du XVIIe siècle, VIII: Sébastien Leclerc*. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1980.
- Queller, Donald. *The Office of the Ambassador in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.
- Ranum, Orest. "Courtesy, Absolutism and the Rise of the French State." *Journal of Modern History* 52 (1980): 426-451.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Islands and the Self in a Ludovician Fête." In *Sun King: The Ascendancy of French Culture During the Reign of Louis XIV*, edited by David Lee Rubin, 17-34. Washington: Folger Books, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paris in the Age of Absolutism: an Essay*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Rauwel, Alain. "La fondation d'un monastère royal." In *Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte, arte, foi, et culture*, edited by Yves Bruley, 46-55. Rome: De Luca, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ermolao Barbaro, diplomate et humaniste," *La Trinité-des-Monts redécouverte*, ed. Yves Bruley, 31-33, Rome: De Luca, 2002.
- Reitbergen, Peter J. *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Policies*. London and Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Reumont, Alfredo. *Della diplomazia italiana dal secolo XIII al XVI*. Florence: Barbera, Bianchi, 1857.
- Rice, Louise. *The Altars and Altarpieces of New Saint Peter's Outfitting the Basilica, 1621-1666*. New York and Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Rinne, Katherine Wentworth. *The Waters of Rome: Aqueducts and the Birth of the Baroque City*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

- Roberti, Giuseppe Maria. *Disegno Storico dell'Ordine de' Minimi*, 3 vols. Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta della S.c. de Propaganda Fide - Societa Tipografico-Editrice Romana-Industria Tipografica Romana, 1902-1922.
- Roosen, William James. *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial: A Systems Approach." *The Journal of Modern History* 52, no. 3 (September 1980): 452-476.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV." *French Historical Studies* 6 no. 3 (Spring, 1970): 311-332.
- Rowen, Herbert Harvey. *The King's State: Proprietary Dynasticism in Early Modern France*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1980.
- Russell, Joycelyne Gledhill. *The Congress of Arras, 1435: A Study in Medieval Diplomacy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Le Saint-Siège et la France: douze siècles d'histoire : exposition, Bibliothèque Vaticane, Salle Sixtine, 3 octobre - 15 décembre, 1987*. Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1987.
- Sagnac, Philippe. *La Formation de la société française moderne*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1945-46.
- Salerno, Luigi. "Palazzo Farnese." In Luigi Salerno, Luigi Spezzaferro, and Manfredo Tafuri, *Via Giulia: una utopia urbanistica del 500*, 472-488. Rome: Staderini, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Piazza di Spagna*. Rome: Cava dei Terreni, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Roma Communis Patria*. Rome: Cappelli, 1968.
- Sanfilippo, Matteo. "Roma nel Rinascimento: una città di immigrati." In *Roma nel Rinascimento: una città di immigrati*, in *Le forme del testo e l'immaginario della metropoli*, edited by Benedetta Bini and Valerio Viviani, 73-85. Viterbo, Sette Città, 2009.
- San Juan, Rosemarie. *Rome: A City Out of Print*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.
- Sassoli, Mario Gori, ed. *Roma Veduta: Disegni e stampe panoramiche della città dal XV al XIX secolo*. Rome: Artemide Edizioni, 2001.
- Satow, Ernest. *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice*. London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1917.

- Saule, Béatrix. "Nicodemus Tessin à la cour de Versailles." *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift/Journal of Art History* 72, no.1 (2003): 67-73.
- Senkevitch, Tatiana V. "The Printmaker's Perspectives: Abraham Bosse and the Pedagogic Debates at the Académie de Peinture et de Sculpture, 1648-1661." PhD diss., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2005.
- Settis, Salvatore, ed. *La Basilica di San Pietro in Vaticano* 4 vols., Rome: Franco Cosimo Panini, 2000.
- Schmutz, Richard A. "Medieval Papal Representation: Legates, Nuncios, and Judges Delegate." *Studia Gratiana* 15 (1972): 441-63.
- Schnapper, Antoine. "Gardens and Plant Collections in France and Italy in the Seventeenth Century." In *The Architecture of Western Gardens*, edited by Monique Mosser and George Teyssot, 175-178. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.
- Schnapper, Antoine, ed. *La Scenografia barocca, Atti del XXIV Congresso CIHA (1979)*. Bologna: CLUEB, 1982.
- Schreffler, Michael. *The Art of Allegiance: Visual Culture and Imperial Power in Baroque New Spain*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006.
- Semper Gottfried. *Die vier Elemente der Baukunst*, Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg, 1851.
- Siebenhüner, Herbert. "Der Palazzo Farnese in Rom." *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 15 (1952): 144-168.
- Smith, Gil. *Architectural Diplomacy: Rome and Paris in the Late Baroque*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1993.
- Smithers, Don. "The Baroque Trumpet after 1721: Some Preliminary Observations. Part Two: Function and Use." *Early Modern Music* 6, no. 3 (July, 1978): 356-361.
- Sonnino, Paul. *Louis XIV and the Origins of the Dutch War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sun-King's 'Anti-Machiavel.'" In *Louis XIV and the Craft of Kingship*, ed. John C. Rule, 345-61. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1969.
- Spezzaferro, Luigi. "La politica urbanistica dei Pape e le origini di via Giulia." In Luigi Salerno, Luigi Spezzaferro, and Manfredo Tafuri, *Via Giulia, una utopia urbanistica del 500*, 15-64. Rome: Staderini, 1973.

- Spezzafaro, Luigi and Richard Tuttle. "Place Farnèse: urbanism et politique." In *Le Palais Farnèse*, edited by Ecole française de Rome, vol. 1, 85-123. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1981.
- Stalla, Robert. "Architektur im Dienst der Politik: Borrominis Kirchenbau der Propaganda Fide in Rom; ein jesuitischer Bautypus für die Zentrale der Weltmission." *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 29 (1994): 289-341.
- Strauss, Leo. *Thoughts on Machiavelli*. Glencoe, Ill. Free Press, 1958.
- Strinati, Claudio. "Gli affreschi nella chiesa di Sant' Ignazio a Roma." In *Andrea Pozzo*, edited by Vittorio De Feo and Valentino Martinelli, 66-93. Milan: Electa, 1996.
- Tafuri, Manfredo. "Via Giulia: storia di una struttura urbana." In Luigi Salerno, Luigi Spezzaferro, and Manfredo Tafuri, *Via Giulia, una utopia urbanistica del 500*, 65-152. Rome: Staderini, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Le 'Carceri Nuove' e le case di correzione per i minorenni." In Luigi Salerno, Luigi Spezzaferro, and Manfredo Tafuri, *Via Giulia, una utopia urbanistica del 500*, 359-369. Rome: Staderini, 1973.
- Thieme, Ulrich and Felix Becker (Thieme-Becker). *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. 37 vols. Leipzig: Verlag, 1911.
- Thomé, J.R. "Le Commerce des estampes au XVII siecle, Israel Silvestre." *Le Courier graphique* 29 (1947): 53-58.
- Thompson, Ian. *The Sun King's Garden, Louis XIV, André Le Nôtre and the Creation of the Gardens of Versailles*. London: Bloomesbury, 2006.
- Ticozzi, Stefano. *Dizionario egli Architetti, Scultori, Pittori, Intagliatori in Rame ed in Pietra, Coniatori di Medaglie, Musaicisti, Niellatori, Intarsiatori d'Ogni Eta e d'Ogni Nazione*. 4 vols. Milan: Gaetano Schiepatti, 1830-33.
- Trachtenberg, Marvin. *Dominion of the Eye: Urbanism, Art, and Power in Early Modern Florence*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Triff, Kristin. "Patronage and Public Image in Renaissance Rome: Three Orsini Palaces." PhD diss., Brown University, 2000.
- Trimble, William Raleigh. "The Embassy Chapel Question, 1625-1660." *Journal of Modern History* 18, no. 2 (June 1946): 97-107.
- Uginet, François Charles. *Le palais farnèse à travers les documents financiers*. Rome: École française de Rome, 1980.

- Ullmann, Walter. *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*. London: Methuen, 1962.
- Valenti, Simonetta Prosperi, ed. *Scelta de Vedute di Roma*. Milan, Edizioni il Polifilo, 1984.
- Valerio, Valentina. "Commodità e maggior splendore": gli interventi settecenteschi nel complesso di San Salvatore in Onda tra ordinaria manutenzione e riattamenti straordinari." In *L'arte per i giubilei e tra i giubilei del Settecento: arciconfraternite, chiese, artisti*, edited by Elisa Debenedetti, 161-174. Roma: Bonsignori, 1999.
- Valone, Carolyn. "Women on the Quirinal Hill: Patronage in Rome, 1560-1630." *Art Bulletin* 76 (1994): 129-146.
- Van der Meulen, Adam Frans. *A la gloire du roi: Van der Meulen, peintre des conquêtes de Louis XIV*. Exh Cat., Dijon and Luxembourg: Musée des beaux-arts de Dijon, Luxembourg, Musée d'histoire de la ville de Luxembourg, 1998.
- Verin, Helene. "Technology in the Park: Engineers and Gardeners in Seventeenth Century France." In *The Architecture of Western Gardens*, edited by Monique Mosser and George Teyssot, 135-147. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.
- Vidal, Jean M. *Les droits de la France à la Trinité des monts à Rome*. Rome: Etablissements Français, 1933.
- Violette, Patrick. "Le decoration de l'église de Saint-Nicholas-des-Lorrains (1623 1870)." In *Les Fondations nationales dans la Rome pontificale*, eds. Accademia di Francia Académie de France, Villa Médicis and École Française de Rome, 487 559. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1981.
- Visceglia, Maria Antonietta. "Factions in the Sacred College in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." In *Court and politics in papal Rome, 1492-1700*, edited by Maria Antonietta Visceglia, 99-131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Viroli, Maurizio. *From Politics to Reason of State: the Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics, 1250-1600*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Waddy, Patricia. "L'architettura del Palazzo a Monte Cavallo nel Seicento e nel Settecento." In *Il Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi e la Galleria Pallavicini*, edited by Daniela di Castro, Anna Maria Pedrocchi, Patricia Waddy. Rome: Umberto Allemandi, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Seventeenth-century Roman Palaces: Use and the Art of the Plan*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990.

- Watkins, John. "Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 38, no. 1 (Winter, 2008): 1-14.
- Watson, Adam. *Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States*. London: Methuen, 1982.
- Watson, Alan. *International Law in Archaic Rome: War and Religion*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Weckmen Luis. "Les Origines des missions diplomatiques permanentes." *Revue générale de droit international public* 56 (1952): 161-88.
- Weil, Marc. "The Devotion of Forty Hours and Roman Baroque Illusions." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 37 (1974): 218-248.
- Wells, Charlotte C. "New Views on Citizenship and National Identity in Early Modern France." *History Compass* 2 (2004): 1-4.
- Whitmore, P.J.S. *The Order of the Minims in Seventeenth-Century France*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967.
- Wiedermann, Thomas. "The Fetiales: A Reconsideration." *Classical Quarterly* 36 (1986): 478-90.
- Wilks, Michael. *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Williams, George L. *Papal Genealogy: The Families And Descendants Of The Popes*. Jefferson, North Carolina and London: McFarland, 1998.
- Wilson, Bronwen. *The World in Venice: Print, the City, and Early Modern Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Wilson, P.A. "The Image of Chigi Rome: G. B. Falda's Il nuovo teatro." *Architettura* 26 (1996): 33-46.
- Wisch, Barbara. "The Roman Church Triumphant: Pilgrimage, Penance, and Processions Celebrating the Holy Year of 1575." In "*All the world's a stage...*" *Art and Pageantry in the Renaissance and Baroque*, (Papers in Art History from the Pennsylvania State University Volume VI), edited by Barbara Wisch and Scott Munshower, vol.1, 82-111. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990.

- Wisch, Barbara and Scott Munshower eds. *"All the world's a stage..." Art and Pageantry in the Renaissance and Baroque*, (Papers in Art History from the Pennsylvania State University Volume VI). 2 vols., University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990.
- Wittkower, Rudolf. *Bernini's Bust of Louis XIV*. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Carlo Rainaldi and the Roman Baroque," *Art Bulletin* 19 (1937): 242-313.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Drawings of the Carracci in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle*. London: Phaidon Press, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gian Lorenzo Bernini*. London: Phaidon, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Vicissitudes of a Dynastic Monument: Bernini's Equestrian Statue of Louis XIV." In *Studies in the Italian Baroque*, 83-102. London: Thames and Hudson, 1975.
- Wolfe, Karin. "Protector and Protectorate: Cardinal Antonio Barberini's Art Diplomacy for the French Crown at the Papal Court." In *Art and Identity in Early Modern Rome*, edited by Jill Burke and Michael Bury, 113-134. Cornwall: Ashgate, 2008.
- Worsdale, Marc. "Bernini Studio Drawings for a Catafalque and Fireworks, 1668." *Burlington Magazine* 120, no. 904 (July 1978): 462-466.
- Wright Jonathan. *The Ambassadors*. London: Harper Press, 2006.
- Yates, Francis. *Astrea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*, London and Boston, 1975.
- Young, William Anthony. *War and diplomacy in the Age of Louis XIV: An Historical Study and Annotated Bibliography*. PhD diss., University of North Dakota, 2000.
- Zeri, Federico. *Italian Paintings in the Walters Art Gallery*. Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1976.

## Appendix

**Figure 1.**

<b>Name of Diplomat</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Place of Residence</b>
Comte de Noailles	Ambassadeur	February 1633- January 1636	Palazzo Sacchetti
Duc d'Estrées (François-Annibal d'Estrées)	Ambassadeur Extraordinaire	February 1636 to September (?) 1641	Palazzo Sacchetti
Marquis de Fontenay-Mareuil	Ambassadeur	1641-1642, 1647- 1651	Palazzo Ceri, Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane
Hugues de Lionne	Ambassadeur Extraordinaire	January 1655- March 1656	Palazzo Mazzarino (present day Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi)
Sieur d'Aubeville	Envoyé Extraordinaire	May 1661-April 1662	Palazzo Barberini (Casa Grande)
Duc de Créqui	Ambassadeur	April 1662- September 1662 May 1664-June 1665	Palazzo Farnese
Abbé de Bourlemont	Agent (Auditore della Rota) Charge d'Affaires	August 1662, July 1665-July 1666 July 1670 –March 1671	Palazzo Farnese
Duc de Chaulnes	Ambassadeur	May 1666- December 1669	Palazzo Farnese
Cardinal César d'Estrées	Envoyé Extraordinaire	May 1671 – December 1671	Palazzo Farnese
Duc d'Estrées (François Hannibal II d'Estrées)	Ambassadeur	January 1672 -30 January 1687	Palazzo Farnese
Marquis de Lavardin	Ambassadeur	July 1687-August 1689	Palazzo Farnese
M. de Chamlay	Chargé de Mission	July 1688	Palazzo Farnese
Duc de Chaulnes	Ambassadeur	August 1689-1691	Palazzo Farnese