

**POWER MANAGEMENT AT THE ROMAN COURT AT THE BEGINNING
OF THE 17TH CENTURY: THE CASE OF CARDINAL GIOVANNI GARZIA
MILLINI**

Silvano Giordano
(Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Roma)

I. Men and Factions

In a famous essay published in 1988, entitled *Fazioni e lotta politica nel Sacro Collegio nella prima metà del Seicento*, Maria Antonietta Visceglia outlined a detailed scenario concerning the coordinates within which the political discourse moved in the early seventeenth century.¹ References to Leopold von Ranke, used by the distinguished scholar to begin her text, as well as the subsequent quotes from Petruccelli della Gattina and Ludwig von Pastor, clearly define the scope of the narrative. The College of Cardinals and its dynamics in the first half of the seventeenth century are truly expressed in a period of *sede vacante* and in the conclave. That is to say, when, in the absence of his supreme moderator, the *Senatus Divinus*² unfolds the entire range of its strategies.

The theme of the factions, which characterised the life of large and small courts, was marked in Rome by a peculiar feature, linked to the intrinsic structure of the papal court. Indeed, the recurring change of rulers, if did not affect a basic underlying continuity, did however favour the change of tones and repositioning of people, in a constant search for structure and balance that proceeded hand in hand with the evolution of the situation. It has been observed how groupings and alliances were defined in specific circumstances, i.e. in conclaves and in times of crisis of the papacy, and then destroyed and eventually reconstituted in different ways according to the changing of the situation. In the more specific sense of the term, however, the factions of cardinals were organised during conclaves.³

The process of composition and recomposition at all levels was strongly influenced by the strategies of individual players. Thus it appears from the long and significant statement attributed to Cardinal Pier Donato Cesi, transmitted in a document of uncertain origin placed chronologically in Innocent X's pontificate. Maria Antonietta Visceglia quotes it at the end of her essay:

¹ Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "Fazioni e lotta politica nel Sacro Collegio nella prima metà del Seicento", in *La corte di Roma tra Cinque e Seicento, "teatro" della politica europea*, eds. Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 1998), 37-39. The study was translated in Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "Factions in the Sacred College in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", in *Court and politics in papal Rome 1492-1700*, eds. Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Cambridge: University Press, 2002), 99-131.

² Christoph Weber, *Senatus divinus. Verborgene Strukturen im Kardinalskollegium der frühen Neuzeit (1500-1800)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996).

³ Olivier Poncet, *La France et le pouvoir pontifical (1595-1661). L'esprit des institutions* (Rome: École française, 2011), 252.

I am not ungrateful otherwise to Barberini, having his uncle promoted me to a [cardinal] hat, the memory of which I keep with the gratitude and obligation that I hold and that a Roman knight owes and from a house that in the time of only a hundred years has received four times the honour of the porpora [cardinalate], without including mine in the present. Furthermore, having exercised the most rewarding charges with big cheers and purchased offices at stricter prices, it follows that I am free of myself, and as a result I may dispose of myself in whatever way I like.⁴

Pier Donato Cesi,⁵ born of a noble family, which belonged to the branch of Pier Donato, reached the zenith of his career during the pontificate of Urban VIII. Cleric of the Apostolic Camera and prefect of the port of Civitavecchia, in 1634 he became general treasurer, replacing Stefano Durazzo then raised to the Cardinalate, and in 1641 Cesi became Cardinal himself. In the 1644 conclave, he sided with the Spanish party, thus contributing to the failure of Giulio Sacchetti's candidacy,⁶ supported by Barberini; since then he offered a constant support to the Spanish. To the accusations of ingratitude made by the French Ambassador, the cardinal felt compelled to respond with a letter to Luis de Haro, minister of Philip IV. His story, as one can gather from the words of the protagonist, is indicative of the freedom that those who were given the opportunity had at the court of Rome to pursue their own personal objectives, rather than a more or less abstract idea of loyalty.⁷

II. To Represent the Interests

The concept of faction automatically invokes the space of the court. In recent years, research related to the court of Rome in the early modern period, both in its internal dynamics and in its relations with the main Italian and

⁴ *Istruzione per gli ambasciatori che assisteranno alla Corte di Roma per il re Cristianissimo*, attributed to Henri d'Étampes, Bailiff of Valençay and French ambassador in Rome (1649-1653). Cit. in Visceglia, "Fazioni e lotta politica", 91.

⁵ Marco Palma, "Cesi, Pier Donato", in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 24 (Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1980), 266-267, [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pier-donato-cesi_res-9eff2316-87ea-11dc-8e9d-0016357eee51_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pier-donato-cesi_res-9eff2316-87ea-11dc-8e9d-0016357eee51_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (consulted on 9 May 2015).

⁶ On Giulio Sacchetti, see Irene Fosi Polverini, "Illusioni e delusioni: l'immagine della Spagna nelle lettere del nunzio a Madrid Giulio Sacchetti (1624-1626)," *Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica* 2 (1995): 91-109; Irene Fosi, *All'ombra dei Barberini. Fedeltà e servizio nella Roma barocca* (Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 1997); *La legazione di Ferrara del cardinale Giulio Sacchetti (1627-1631)*, ed. Irene Fosi in collaboration with Andrea Gardi (Città del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 2006); Lilian H. Zirpolo, *Ave Papa Ave Papabile. The Sacchetti family. Their art patronage and political aspirations* (Toronto, Centre for reformation and renaissance studies, 2005).

⁷ Silvano Giordano, "Il Colloquio delle Volpi. Lealtà al Papa, alla Chiesa, a sé stessi?," *La doble lealtad: entre el servicio al rey y la obligación a la iglesia*, eds. José Martínez Millán, Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, Gloria Alonso de la Higuera, Koldo Trápaga Monchet, Javier Revilla Canora (Madrid: IULCE-UAM, 2014), 91-106, <http://sigecahweb.geo.uam.es/ojs/index.php/librosdelacorte/article/view/69> (consulted on 9 May 2015).

European courts, has increased. These two areas are difficult to separate, given the structure of the court itself and the convergence in Rome of the most diverse interests. Olivier Poncet, in a recent essay, highlighted the polysemy, but one could also say the indefiniteness of the term: no one among those who referred to it took care to clarify what they actually had in mind when referring to 'the court of Rome.' Certainly it could not be assimilated, except partially, to other European courts, such as those of France or Spain, characterised by the presence of courtiers, specific administrative structures, and a certain etiquette. What in the seventeenth century distinguished Rome were its historical Roman heritage, a major cultural reference, and its quality of capital of Catholic Christianity, which far exceeded its function as capital of the Papal States. Its effective internationalism, which made it a real world metropolis, was testified by not only the massive influx of "foreigners", the composition of the staff of governing bodies, the interests represented, the diversified world of ambassadors, agents and procurators, but also by a myriad of small local courts: the cardinal courts,⁸ the central organs of government of the religious orders, the palaces of the great aristocratic Roman families.⁹

In contemporary language the term "faction" was recurring and to be applied, with the necessary clarifications, to the variable geometry of the College of Cardinals. Notwithstanding, the factionary arena was not the only space where political discourse, developed by the interaction between a multiplicity of subjects, unfolded. The people and the relationships they weave, therefore, have to be considered as the raw material, the foundation from which networks and factions are articulated, as demonstrated by studies that use the category of *Mikropolitik*, applied by Wolfgang Reinhard to the Roman case.¹⁰

France returned to play a central role in the Roman scenario following the resumption of diplomatic relations that ensued Henry IV's acquittal to defend the interests of the Most Christian King and counterbalance the influence that the Catholic Kings had exercised over the papacy in previous decades. It seems therefore better to talk of influence groups, rather than a party or faction. The French king took care to send qualified representatives, ambassadors and cardinals, who closely presided over Roman decisions touching the interests of the kingdom: political issues dealt with by the various congregations, in the first place by the Holy Office, assignment of benefits through the Chancellery and the Dataria, granting of pardons and dispensations to compatriots. The lobbying work carried out by the ambassadors and the cardinals reached the pinnacle of publicity when a cardinal "declared" in favour of the King of France, by displaying the French coat of arms at the main entrance of his palace and accepting a pension. Equally important was the daily work of uptake of Curia officials who could in

⁸ Gigliola Fragnito, "Le corti cardinalizie nella Roma del Cinquecento," *Rivista Storica Italiana* 106 (1994): 5-41.

⁹ Poncet, *La France et le pouvoir pontifical*, 231-233.

¹⁰ The results of several decades of research on this topic are summarised in Wolfgang Reinhard, *Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621). Mikropolitische Papstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2009).

various ways influence the decision-making process or the support given to compatriots to obtain the vacant seats in the administration of the curia.¹¹ Figures considered as less important are however also significant, despite the fact that it is more difficult to reconstruct their movements. It is the case, for instance, with auditors of the *Rota*, clerks in the curia, princes' or bishops' agents, clergy of various nations, merchants, and intermediaries. On the same level and with the same operating procedures, one can place the Spanish group, larger and more solid than the French, while a group representing the interests of the Emperor could not find continuity and adequate visibility.¹²

Lastly, in the Roman scenario it is necessary to consider the well-established large local families, able to lay their own policy developed in its long and very long term. To them, in more recent times, were added the families of the new papal nobility and the princely Italian houses, expression of interests and relationships complementary with those of the papal court.¹³

III. The Aldobrandini System

The general lines of politics were dictated by the reigning pope and his closest collaborators. It is by now well established that Pope Clement VIII's Pontificate represents, not only chronologically, the crossing point between two centuries, in its internal relations as well as those with the Catholic courts. Pope Aldobrandini was the last pontiff to refer effectively to the Tridentine programme, at least in the first decade of his government, and to formulate a positive proposal of political mediation and stabilisation between the two Catholic powers. The creation of cardinals in 1596 and 1599, in which men were promoted from the curia, who did not belong to noble families or princely rank, accentuated the neutrality of the College of Cardinals or, if you will, its dependence on the Pope. This trend was underlined by the fact that those newly promoted in 1596 were forbidden to accept pensions from the King of Spain.¹⁴

The inclusion of the new cardinals at the head of the main congregations increased the political weight of the Cardinal-nephew Pietro Aldobrandini,¹⁵ who, in the meanwhile, was gaining space in the Curia at the

¹¹ Bernard Barbiche, "L'influence française à la cour pontificale sous le règne de Henri IV," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 77 (1965): 277-299; Guido Metzler, *Französische Mikropolitik in Rom unter Papst Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621)* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2008), 41-68; Poncet, *La France et le pouvoir pontifical*, 251-259.

¹² Alexander Koller, "La rappresentanza imperiale a Roma intorno al 1600. Una panoramica," in *Papato e Impero nel pontificato di Urbano VIII (1623-1644)*, eds. Irene Fosi and Alexander Koller (Città del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 2013), 105-126.

¹³ Marco Pellegrini, "Corte di Roma e aristocrazie italiane in età moderna. Per una lettura storico-sociale della curia romana," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 30 (1994): 543-602.

¹⁴ Maria Teresa Fattori, *Clemente VIII e il Sacro Collegio 1592-1605. Meccanismi istituzionali ed accentramento di governo* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2004), 329-331.

¹⁵ Klaus Jaitner, ed., *Die Hauptinstruktionen Clemens VIII. für die Nuntien und Legaten an den europäischen Fürstenhöfen 1592-1605*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984), vol. I, XCVI-CXXV.

expense of his cousin Cinzio Passeri, although the Pope was trying to maintain a balance between his two nephews. The devolution of Ferrara (1598), as well as the delegation of 1600-1601 to Florence for the wedding of Maria de Medici with Henry IV, the mission to Turin for the negotiations between Spain and Savoy, and to Chambery and Lyon for the peace between France and Savoy, marked the pinnacle of Pietro Aldobrandini's political career and allowed him to forge relationships with the authorities of Venice, Milan, Savoy and with the French court. The conclusion of the Treaty of Lyon in 1601 coincided with a stalemate in the pontificate of Clement VIII: Cardinal Robert Bellarmine reproached the Pope for having abandoned his reform mission of the previous years,¹⁶ while also his support to the anti-Turkish league, much for financial troubles as for the difficulty of mobilising the Catholic sovereigns, was becoming less convinced. In the following years a policy meant to consolidate the social and financial position of his family prevailed, through important assignments of church property to nephews.

The measures adopted by Pope Aldobrandini regarding the management of the curia shaped the system in the early decades of the seventeenth century, both in terms of structures, as well as with regard to the people who were called to hold positions of responsibility. In particular, in addition to changes to the system of the congregations, organised a few years earlier by Sixtus V, it should be noted the division of powers between the two nephews, Cinzio and Pietro, which produced to a certain extent a parallel run, a sort of split, in the central government. This split was supported by their trusted men, who organised themselves as heads of office with their respective employees and associates. One should remember Minuccio Minucci,¹⁷ Cinzio's creature and collaborator, who in 1596 was appointed bishop of Zadar and replaced by Lanfranco Margotti,¹⁸ while Pietro introduced Erminio Valenti, secretary of State from 1597, and created cardinal in 1604.¹⁹ A case of particular interest for its *carsicità*, which is to say capacity for action at different levels, is embodied by the Bolognese Giovanni Battista Agucchi, nephew of Cardinal Filippo Sega, who entered the orbit of Pietro Aldobrandini after his uncle's death (1596). Released by the Curia in 1605, he remained in the service of his patron until 1621, when his countryman Gregory XV put him in charge of the Papal Secretariat, from which he was dismissed by Urban VIII, who sent him as nuncio to Venice in the end of 1623.²⁰

¹⁶ Klaus Jaitner, "De officio primario Summi Pontificis. Eine Denkschrift Kardinal Bellarmins für Papst Clemens VIII (Sept./Okt. 1600)," in *Römische Kurie. Kirchliche Finanzen. Vatikanisches Archiv. Studien zu Ehren von Hermann Hoberg*, ed. Erwin Gatz (Roma: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1979), 377-403.

¹⁷ Alexander Koller, "Minucci, Minuccio," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 74 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2010), 710-714; *I Codici Minucciani dell'Istituto Storico Germanico. Inventario*, eds. Alexander Koller, Pier Paolo Piergentili and Gianni Venditti (Roma: Istituto Storico Germanico, 2009).

¹⁸ Marco Maiorino, "Margotti, Lanfranco," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 70 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2008), 180-183.

¹⁹ Jaitner, *Die Hauptinstruktionen Clemens VIII.*, XLII-LIX.

²⁰ Ilaria Toesca and Roberto Zapperi, "Agucchi, Giovanni Battista," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 1 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960), 504-506; Klaus Jaitner, ed., *Die Hauptinstruktionen Gregors XV. für die Nuntien und Gesandten an den europäischen Fürstenhöfen 1621-1623* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1997), I, 191-221.

The second factor of bipolarity, in the broader sense, was due to the new French presence, originating from the absolution of Henry IV and the subsequent resumption of diplomatic relations. Probably this new situation has some relationship with the diplomatic incidents that broke out in Rome and Madrid in the final year of the Aldobrandini pontificate. These had resulted in the distancing of Spain from Cardinal Pietro and certainly influenced the first conclave of 1605, which was favourable to the French side.²¹ In the same context, it should be read the incident that took place in August 1604 between the Cardinal Odoardo Farnese and Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini. Farnese was supported by the Spanish Ambassador Juan Fernández Pacheco, Duke of Escalona and Marquis of Villena, while Cardinal Prieto was closer to France after his recent diplomatic mission, which had earned him a pension of 10,000 crowns paid to him by the royal treasury. The episode, which brought to light the rivalry between the old Roman nobility and the new papal family, went together with a defeat of the Cardinal-nephew and urged him to move even closer to France.²² Simultaneously, in Madrid the contrast between the court and the nuncio Domenico Ginnasi, created cardinal in June 1604, took place as he risked being expelled as a result of one of the many conflicts of jurisdiction. Disagreements about the successor, Tommaso Lapi, a creature of Aldobrandini, rejected by Spain because Florentine and of humble origins, left the main nunciature in a precarious situation for around one year.²³

IV. The Borghese System

The Pontificate of Paul V, created Cardinal by Clement VIII, began in the sign of continuity. The Pope confirmed as Commissioner General of the Apostolic Chamber Laudiovio Zacchia²⁴ and as prefect of the Dataria Pompeo Arrigoni,²⁵ who also became secretary of the Inquisition.²⁶ Cardinal Erminio Valenti and Lanfranco Margotti, who from 1597 held up the two sections of the Secretariat of State, were kept in their place together with the secretary of the Cipher, Matteo Argenti, in office since 1591.²⁷ The first signs of change were manifested in the appointment of Cardinal-nephew Scipione Borghese and the subsequent resignation of Cardinal Valenti, with whom the ambassadors of the princes, particularly that of Spain, refused to deal with as he was

²¹ Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa: norme, riti e conflitti. L'Età moderna* (Roma: Viella, 2013), 356-359.

²² Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "La reputación de la grandeza. Il marchese di Villena alla corte di Roma (1603-1606)," *Roma Moderna e Contemporanea. Numero monografico: Diplomazia e politica della Spagna a Roma. Figure di ambasciatori*, ed. Maria Antonietta Visceglia 15 (2007): 136-141.

²³ Silvano Giordano, "Tra Roma e Spagna all'inizio del XVII secolo: La nunziatura di Giovanni Garzia Millini (1605-1607)," in *Centros de Poder Italianos en la Monarquía Hispánica (siglos XV-XVIII)*, eds. José Martínez Millán and Manuel Rivero Rodríguez (Madrid: Polifemo, 2010), I, 380-382.

²⁴ ASV, Sec. Brev., Reg. 396, fol. 35rv, 26 May 1605. Zacchia was confirmed in his office by Leo XI.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, fol. 1r-2r, 21 May 1605. Arrigoni was confirmed in his office by Leo XI.

²⁶ *Avviso*, 21 May 1605, BAV, Urb. Lat., 1073, fol. 270v.

²⁷ Jaitner, *Die Hauptinstruktionen Clemens VIII.*, XLV-LIX.

considered as a man of Pietro Aldobrandini.²⁸ In his place, as second secretary, Marzio Malacrida was hired, who had been dismissed by Leo XI. Thus began the structuring of the system, described in detail by Birgit Emich, which was centred on the Cardinal-nephew Scipione Borghese. Although with varying intensity depending on the age of the Pope, Borghese was in charge at the same time of the Secretariat of State, the administration of the Papal States and foreign policy, patronage strategies and the administration of a personal and family patrimony in consolidation.²⁹

Like his predecessor Clement VIII,³⁰ Paul V firmly held the reins of government and worked to prevent that alternative centres of power would form in the curia. This was done firstly to fight the legacy of his predecessor, embodied in Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini; so it appears from the diverse tasks assigned to Cardinal Scipione Borghese and the many changes that occurred in those years among the staff of the Secretariat of State. Interesting in this regard is the choice of Giovanni Garzia Millini as head of political and ecclesiastic affairs in parallel with the Cardinal-nephew, with an institutionally different profile, but with considerable influence in decision-making. With his presence in the curia a new hub was created, capable of modifying the existing balance to his advantage.

Paul V chose Millini³¹ as he was an expert official, whose work in the curia unfolded for almost forty years, from Gregory XIV's until the early years of Urban VIII's pontificate. Of Florentine origins, he was a distant relative of the Pope,³² but could claim blood ties with Cardinals Girolamo and Fabrizio Verallo, Gaspare Paluzzi degli Albertoni and his mentor Giambattista Castagna, who had become pontiff in 1590 for a few days under the name of Urban VII. After entering the prelature under Pope Sixtus V, he obtained the office of auditor of the Rota in 1591 under Gregory XIV and from there he built his career. During the pontificate of Clement VIII he accompanied Cardinal Enrico Caetani's legation to Poland (1596-1597). In the following years he accompanied Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini to Ferrara, Florence and Lyon and lastly, from 1604, along with colleagues Francisco Peña and Alessandro Litta, took up the cause of Carlo Borromeo's canonization.³³

In his trajectory during Paul V's pontificate one can distinguish two major strands: the diplomatic phase, which saw him busy in Spain and at the imperial court from 1605 to 1608, and the period of his stay at the curia, which developed along two lines. On the one hand, the Congregation of the Holy

²⁸ Reinhard, *Paul V. Borghese*, 307-308.

²⁹ Birgit Emich, *Bürokratie und Nepotismus unter Paul V. (1605-1621). Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen Mikropolitik in Rom* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2001).

³⁰ Helmut Jaschke, "Das persönliche Regiment Clemens VIII. Zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Staatssekretariats," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 65 (1970): 133-144.

³¹ Silvano Giordano, "Millini, Giovanni Garzia," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 73 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2009), 339-342.

³² Christoph Weber, *Genealogien zur Papstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1999), II, 615.

³³ Angelo Turchini, *La fabbrica di un santo. Il processo di canonizzazione di Carlo Borromeo e la Controriforma* (Casale Monferrato, Marietti, 1984).

Office, of which he became secretary on 20 October 1616, but that he was *de facto* running since 1608,³⁴ and on the other the government of the diocese of Rome, to which he was appointed vicar on 14 August 1610.

After 1621 his influence decreased; he was confirmed, however, until his death to the government of the diocese of Rome and in 1622 was ascribed to newly created Congregation of Propaganda Fide and charged with the two colleagues Ottavio Bandini and Roberto Ubaldini to draw the constitutive Bull. Lastly, despite his reservations concerning the reform of the papal election promulgated by Pope Gregory XV, in the conclave of 1623 he received 26 votes out of 52, supported by Scipione Borghese's faction.

V. To Choose Collaborators

Millini's nunciature in Madrid reveals peculiar traits.³⁵ The manner in which it took place, aside from the exceptional conjuncture with the conflict between Paul V and Venice that resulted in the Interdict and the subsequent pacification, was common practice. It is significant, however, because it manifested the Pope's intention to promote him, in view of his effective intervention in the power balance at the curia to free himself from Pietro Aldobrandini's tutelage. In an audience with the Spanish ambassador Marquis of Villena on 22 May 1605, a week before being crowned, Paul V finally dismissed the candidacy of Thomas Lapi, supported by Cardinal Aldobrandini, and expressed his intention to appoint Millini «deudo suyo y aficionado a las cosas de esa Corona».³⁶ The following day the appointment was made public, along with the injunction to leave immediately.³⁷

One can already consider this appointment as a break with the Aldobrandini Papacy, which anticipated what would have happened a few months later in the Curia. Millini was sent to Spain not only to restore relations between the Catholic King and the Holy See, but also to establish a special relationship between the Crown and the Borghese family. Such special relation would develop throughout his pontificate not only with regard to political issues, but also for the social and economic consolidation of the Pope's family. Among the four ordinary nuncios that Paul V sent to Spain, Decio Carafa and Antonio Caetani owed their appointments to the fact that they belonged to great hispanophile families, while in the embassies of Millini and Francesco Cennini, personally linked to the Pope, one has to consider the promotional aspect for the Borghese family. The achievement of the title of Grandee of Spain for Marcantonio Borghese, Prince of Sulmona, was Cennini's specific task; a considerable number of benefits and graces were also obtained for affiliates to the Borghese clan.³⁸

³⁴ Miguel Gotor, "Millini, Giovanni Garzia," in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, ed. Adriano Prosperi, II (Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2010), 1045.

³⁵ Giordano, "Tra Roma e Spagna all'inizio del XVII secolo", 375-414.

³⁶ The Marquis of Villena to Philip III, Rome, 22 May 1605, AGS, E, leg. 980.

³⁷ *Avviso*, 25 May 1605, BAV, Urb. Lat., 1073, fol. 279v.

³⁸ Hillard von Thiessen, "Außenpolitik im Zeichen personaler Herrschaft. Die römisch-spanischen Beziehungen in mikropolitisch-er Perspektive," in *Römische Mikropolitik unter*

During Millini's nunciature, it became evident in Madrid the rivalry that in the meantime had broken out in Rome between the Borghese and the Aldobrandini, both interested in winning Philip III's favour. The rivalry was taken care of prudently in the Spanish court, as the two families obtained almost simultaneously their desired feuds in the Kingdom of Naples (Sulmona and Rossano respectively, in 1610). The court observed the war that Millini and, after him, the auditor Cesare Ventimiglia of Morra fought on behalf of the Borghese against the *fiscale della collettoria* Niccolò Benigni, Pietro Aldobrandini's man in Madrid. Benigni was virtually unmovable as Aldobrandini was *Camerlengo* of the Holy Roman Church from 1599 to 1621.³⁹

The promotion to the Cardinalate, the second of his pontificate, appears unusual for its speed; it took place on 11 September 1606,⁴⁰ a year after Millini's departure to Spain. To return to Rome he had to await the conclusion of the dispute with Venice; the rapid elevation, however, testifies to Paul V's design to give the chosen person the possibility of gaining international experience to justify the cardinal's hat and the subsequent central place that he would occupy in the curia. In the same direction should be considered the legation to Emperor Rudolf II and his brother Matthias, between May and September of 1608. While the mission was unsuccessful, it was nevertheless significant for its political value, as part of the larger project shared by Spain, the Holy See, the House of Austria and Catholic princes in general to preserve the Catholic character of the Imperial dignity.⁴¹

In the period between the two diplomatic missions came Millini's Roman "enthronement": he arrived to the City in early December 1607, he was given the cardinal's hat in the consistory on 15 December, and on 19 December, during the meeting *in feria quarta* of the Holy Office, gathered in the palace of Cardinal Pinelli, he took the usual oath *de silentio servando*.⁴²

Papst Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621) zwischen Spanien, Neapel, Mailand und Genua, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004), 48-50; Hillard von Thiesen, *Diplomatie und Patronage. Die spanisch-römischen Beziehungen 1605-1621 in akteurszentrierter Perspektive* (Epfendorf/Neckar: Bibliotheca academica Verlag, 2010).

³⁹ *Hierarchia catholica medii et recentioris aevi, IV: a pontificatu Clementis PP. VIII (1592) usque ad pontificatum Alexandri PP. VII (1667)*, ed. Patritius Gauchat (Monasterii: Sumptibus et typis Librariae Regensbergianae, 1935), 58.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, 10. Maffeo Barberini was promoted at the same time than Mellini. Barberini was sent in 1604 as nuncio in France by Clement VIII and remained at his post some months more than Millini.

⁴¹ *Iohannis Garziae Millini ad cardinalem Burghesium Epistulae e legatione apud imperatorem a. 1608 datae*, ed. Milena Linhartová (Pragae: Ministerium Scholarium et Instructionis Publicae, 1946); Jan Paul Niederkorn, "Papst, Kaiser und Reich während der letzten Regierungsjahre Kaiser Rudolfs II. (1605-1612)," in *Die Außenbeziehungen der römischen Kurie unter Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621)*, ed. Alexander Koller (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2008), 83-99.

⁴² ACDF, Decreta 1607, fol. 274r.

VI. To Govern the Administration

With the arrival of Millini in Rome, following his mission to the Imperial court, there was a major change in the curia as in the promotion of 24 November 1608 Michelangelo Tonti and Lanfranco Margotti were elevated to the Cardinalate.⁴³ The promotion of Margotti was not painless, because it meant the departure from the Secretariat of State of his colleague Marzio Malacrida,⁴⁴ as it has been stated above. Malacrida was also a man of Pietro Aldobrandini, dismissed by Leo XI and replaced with the Florentine Pietro Strozzi, but reinstated by Paul V upon the request of his patron as a collaborator and then successor of Erminio Valenti.⁴⁵ Michelangelo Tonti, client of Cardinal Camillo Borghese and tutor of his nephew Scipione, was appointed in 1605 as auditor of the Cardinal-nephew, but in fact, rather than dealing with legal issues, he was appointed to liaise with the Borghese clients.⁴⁶ This led to a new structure in the leadership, as Margotti remained solely responsible for the Secretariat of State and Tonti was appointed as datary, succeeding Cardinal Pompeo Arrigoni.⁴⁷

The expulsion from Rome of Arrigoni, who in 1607 was appointed Archbishop of Benevento,⁴⁸ was part of the policy of weakening the power group headed by Pietro Aldobrandini. Probably it was voluntary rather than enforced upon him, given the working relationship established between Arrigoni and Cardinal Camillo Borghese during the Clementine pontificate. This enabled a smooth transition of his responsibilities to Cardinal Millini. The two had entered the Court of the Rota almost at the same time⁴⁹ and they shared a special relationship with Cardinal Federico Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan,⁵⁰ for whom Arrigoni was the Roman referent through his agent Antonio Seneca. Immediately after the election of Paul V, Cardinal Borromeo had pleaded for Millini for the nunciature in Spain, considering him the most

⁴³ *Hierarchia Catholica Medii et Recentioris Aevi*, IV, 11.

⁴⁴ Filippo Crucitti, "Malacrida, Marzio," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 67 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2007), 707-710.

⁴⁵ *Avviso*, 4 June 1605, BAV, Urb. Lat. 1073, fol. 324v.

⁴⁶ Ludwig von Pastor, *Storia dei Papi dalla fine del Medio Evo. XII: Storia dei Papi nel periodo della Restaurazione cattolica e della Guerra dei Trent'Anni. Leone XI e Paolo V (1605-1621)* (Roma: Desclée & C. Editori pontifici, 1962), 241-242; Emich, *Bürokratie*, 134-135.

⁴⁷ ASV, Sec. Brev., Reg. 595, fol. 582rv, 3 December 1608.

⁴⁸ *Hierarchia Catholica Medii et Recentioris Aevi*, IV, 113; Gaspare De Caro, "Arrigoni Pompeo," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 4 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1962), 320-321; Maria Teresa Fattori, "Arrigoni Pompeo," in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, I, 101.

⁴⁹ Millini became auditor of the Rota on 26 June 1591 and Arrigoni on 20 December 1591. Hermann Hoberg, "Die Antrittsdaten der Rotarichter von 1566 bis 1675," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 48 (1953): 211-224.

⁵⁰ The relationship between Borromeo and Millini is documented thanks to around 300 letters written by Millini to Borromeo between 20 June 1592 and 18 December 1626. Currently they are at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano. Federico Borromeo, cardinale arcivescovo di Milano, *Indice delle lettere a lui dirette conservate all'Ambrosiana. Appendice. Opere manoscritte e a stampa del card. Federico esistenti all'Ambrosiana* (Milano: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 1960), 228-230.

suitable candidate to settle conflicts of jurisdiction, particularly virulent in Milan between the governor and the archbishop.⁵¹

At the end of 1608 it was then established a new balance in the governance of the Curia on the level below that of the Cardinal-nephew. Margotti controlled the Secretariat of State, Tonti the Dataria and Millini, though not officially, the Inquisition, taking the place of Cardinal Arrigoni, normally absent from Rome.

This situation, which was settled further in 1610, when Millini was appointed as the Pope's vicar for the diocese of Rome, did not last long. In late 1611, Michelangelo Tonti, who had acquired the confidence of Paul V but also the reputation of being a strict minister, accused the Cardinal-nephew of dishonesty. Tonti perhaps felt threatened in his position by Domenico Rivarola, who had succeeded him as auditor of Cardinal Borghese and had recently been raised to the Cardinalate (17 August 1611). However, Tonti was in turn accused of corruption and sent to his diocese of Cesena to remove him from the curia. Contemporary accounts indicate as the main protagonists of the "coup" Scipione Borghese, the Cardinals Millini, Giovanni Battista Leni, Luigi Capponi and Domenico Rivarola, all linked in various ways to the Borghese.⁵² On 30 November 1611, Cardinal Margotti died suddenly and the Secretariat of State acquired a new structure: Porfirio Feliciani,⁵³ that during the last year had become Margotti's main collaborator, was responsible for the Secretariat of State, while Giovanni Battista Confalonieri, significant until 1610, took his leave. A few days after his appointment, Feliciani was joined by Giovanni Battista Perugini, in order to restore the division of the office into two sections. When the process was complete, starting from 1 May 1612, Francesco Cennini, auditor of Cardinal Borghese, although he was not part of the Secretariat of State, played an important role there until 1618 when he was sent nuncio in Spain. Thus Cennini was the one controlling, on behalf of the Cardinal-nephew, the daily activities of the office. It is to be noted, at it shows the political role played by Cardinal Millini, that Cennini was given two general instructions, the second of which prepared by his predecessor in the nunciature, concerning Spanish issues.⁵⁴ In the office of datary, instead of Michelangelo Tonti, known as the Cardinal of Nazareth from the name of his diocese, Paul V appointed in late 1611 Marco Aurelio Maraldi,⁵⁵ to whom a few months earlier the Pope had granted the office of subdatary.⁵⁶ In this way, the Pope took precautions against the excessive power that the leaders of the main offices could acquire. The real beneficiary of these measures, however,

⁵¹ Julia Zunckel, "Handlungsspielräume eines Mailänder Erzbischofs. Federico Borromeo und Rom," in *Römische Mikropolitik unter Papst Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621) zwischen Spanien, Neapel, Mailand und Genua*, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004), 490-491.

⁵² Ibidem, 515-517; Julia Zunckel, "Come la testa dell'Idra. La politica milanese di Paolo V fra problemi giurisdizionali e Sacro Macello," in Koller, *Die Außenbeziehungen*, 331.

⁵³ Franco Pignatti, "Feliciani, Profirio," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 46 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996), 79-82.

⁵⁴ *Le istruzioni generali di Paolo V ai diplomatici pontifici 1605-1621*, ed. Silvano Giordano, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2003), I, 242-243; instruction's text: II, 1095-1107.

⁵⁵ ASV, Sec. Brev., Reg. 474, fol. 194rv, 1 December 1611.

⁵⁶ ASV, Sec. Brev., Reg. 472, fol. 161r, 19 September 1611.

was Cardinal Millini, who became for the remaining ten years of his pontificate the main interlocutor of the Pope next to the Cardinal-nephew.

In his case he was not, however, a sort of *éminence grise* because as well as being a member of the Congregation of bishops and rites, he was also appointed prefect of the Congregations of the Council and the Index. Millini exercised great influence on the curia thanks to his direct relationship with the Pope, which developed in a parallel fashion than that between Paul V and the Cardinal-nephew, also for business that normally passed through the Secretariat of State. Birgit Emich has briefly studied this aspect of the administration and management of power in the second decade of the seventeenth century at the court of Rome, by roughly distinguishing between the political responsibilities entrusted to Scipione Borghese and the religious matters handled by Giovanni Garzia Millini.⁵⁷ Probably such distinction remained quite nuanced, as shown by the extant traces of contemporary internal correspondence. From the Fondo Borghese at the Vatican Secret Archives comes a volume of *Biglietti diversi mandati da Palazzo per ordine del Papa dal Pavoni, da Mons, di Foligno, Memmoli, Cobelluccio e dal S. Card. Borghese a diversi, e per lo più al S. Card. Millino*, which also contains letters from Cardinals Millini and Bellarmino to the Pope and from Cardinal Ludovisi to Cardinal Millini.⁵⁸ It is a volume of 332 sheets that preserves original letters, in the period between November 1608 and 1626, corresponding to the time in which Millini was in power. A few individuals were responsible for the central government and all the affairs passed through their hands: Pietro Pavoni, secretary of the memorials; Porfirio Feliciani, bishop of Foligno and secretary of State; Decio Memmoli, serving Millini from 1608, secretary of State from 1611 and two years later Feliciani's collaborator; and Scipione Cobellucci, secretary of Briefs from 1606 and Cardinal of Santa Susanna in 1616. In particular, Pavoni's letters show that a number of issues were solved directly between the Pope and Millini, without the Cardinal-nephew's mediation. The volume *Ordini diversi dati di sua propria mano dalla s. m. di Paolo V per diverse materie passate per Segreteria di Stato. 1612-1619*⁵⁹ is of the same kind. The volume has 285 sheets and from f.126, contains notes written by Millini to Porfirio Feliciani, where there are also memorials addressed directly to the Pope. Internal notes within the Secretariat of State can be analysed in conjunction with the correspondence preserved in the archives of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, especially since 1616, when Millini was given the seal and began to correspond officially with the nuncios and the local ecclesiastical authorities.

Lastly, one should remember Millini's constant presence in consultative and deliberative committees. Miguel Gotor has calculated that between 1608 and 1629 Millini participated in 75% of the sessions that the Congregation of the Inquisition held on Wednesdays and 84% of those held on Thursdays.⁶⁰ Similar percentages can be found for the Congregation of Propaganda Fide,

⁵⁷ Emich, *Bürokratie*, 250-255.

⁵⁸ ASV, Fondo Borghese, serie I, vol. 2.

⁵⁹ ASV, Miscellanea, Arm. XI, 55.

⁶⁰ Miguel Gotor, "Millini, Giovanni Garzia," in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, II, 1045.

in which Millini actively intervened up to early August 1629,⁶¹ two months before his death.

VII. Parallel Experiences

The case of Giovanni Garzia Millini testifies to a management of power coexisting with the factionary model but essentially different in nature, since it was based on his integration in the administrative apparatus, with characteristics of permanence and stability that shift over time. In this specific case, the origin of this integration is to be found in the personal relationship with Camillo Borghese, later Pope Paul V, corroborated by the *virtue* demonstrated in carrying out various tasks and offices entrusted to him, which helped to further strengthen his position and authority. His biographer-hagiographer, Decio Memmoli, once his secretary, described him as a man not prone to factions, but rather averse to them. Indeed, by envisaging that the provisions for the conclave prepared by Gregory XV would strengthen the role of factions at the time the papal election, he endeavored to obstruct the introduction of the new legislation.⁶²

The story of Millini can be compared to the following one of the Barberini,⁶³ a sort of family saga that had as protagonists Urban VIII, the three nephews Francesco, Antonio and Taddeo, the Capuchin Cardinal Antonio, brother of the pontiff, and the brother-in law, the secretary of State and Cardinal Lorenzo Magalotti. To this saga also actively participated some of their collaborators, such as the Pope's High Steward and then secretary of State, Francesco Adriano Ceva, Pietro Benessa, and Antonio Ferragalli. During Barberini's times, dynamics developed that went beyond the management of power, arriving instead to its total occupation. A system defined by Markus Völkel as «sfera padronale» was created, which was characterised not only by an active presence at the top of government institutions, but also by the participation in all the groups that could have an influence on society in both its civil and religious aspects.⁶⁴

Both experiences, the story of Giovanni Garzia Millini and the Barberini saga, are two illustrations, among many possible others, of the strategies put in place at the court of Rome to control power, in different contexts and with different goals than the well-known factions of cardinals. The two models are not self-excluding, but rather coexisted and emerged when appropriate conditions occurred.

⁶¹ ASPF, Acta 6, fos. 310v-318v, 7 August 1629.

⁶² Decio Memmoli, *Vita dell'eminentissimo signor cardinale Gio. Garzia Mellino romano* (Roma: Per Gio. Paolo Rocchetti, 1644), 44-46.

⁶³ Andreas Kraus, "Amt und Stellung des Kardinalnepoten zur Zeit Urbans VIII.," *Römische Quartalschrift für Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte* 53 (1958): 238-243; Andreas Kraus, "Der Kardinal-Nepote Francesco Barberini und das Staatssekretariat Urbans VIII.," *Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 64 (1969): 191-208.

⁶⁴ Markus Völkel, *Römische Kardinalhaushalte des 17. Jahrhunderts. Borghese - Barberini - Chigi* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1993), 413-415.

Who could afford it, would have certainly agreed with the words of Pier Donato Cesi, «I am free of myself, and as a result I may dispose of myself in whatever way I like.»