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3. PATRONAGE, PROTECTORATE AND REGULAR REFORMS

Orazione e Morte

The name of the brotherhood of Santa Maria dell'Orazione e Morte, from which Farnese rented the Camerino degli Eremiti in 1611, alluded to its two aims: orazione indicated the act of prayer, and morte referred to burying the dead. The sodality had originally been erected for the latter reason in 1538; at regular intervals groups of brothers would inspect the roads and fields in and around Rome for any anonymous deceased, left without a decent burial.1 During the first decades of its existence, the brotherhood remained relatively small, which hindered their activities as the number of dead bodies along the roads and in the river steadily increased; in 1551, a public liturgical prayer-service was thus organised to attract more members.2

This special service of the Quarant'ore was such a success that not only the number of brothers and sisters grew rapidly, but also the epithet orazione was added to the name of the brotherhood by Julius III Del Monte (1550-1555) on the occasion when the sodality had papal approval conferred upon it.3 The elevation of the Orazione e Morte to the status of an arch-brotherhood in 1560 by his successor Pius IV de' Medici (1559-1565) meant that they were also authorised to receive alms and bequests.4 Subsequently, the confraternity was able to buy their own premises on the Via Giulia in 1572, behind the Palazzo Farnese, on which they built a new

---

1 Fanucci 1601 p.273: "Inanzi alla confermatione s'intitolava la Compagnia della Morte semplicemente: ma il Papa considerando essere questo nome horrido, & odioso; inteso che havesa per istituito di fare ogni mese l'oratone continua delle Quarant'ore, volse che si nominasse la Cofraternita dell'Oratione, altrimenti della Morte, & così dapi in tutte le scritturé e stata chiamata, benche volgarmente si dica della Morte solamente, ..." See also Bevignani 1910, p.7; Maroni Lumbrera 1962, pp.255-261; Hager 1964, pp.5-10; Chiabò Roberti 1985, pp.199-210; Fiorani et al. 1985, pp.330-332, and Black 1989, pp.231-232.

2 These events were related in the Statuti 1590, pp.1-2: 'Deliberorno ancora di fare una volta il mese l'oratone continua per spatio di 40. hore, in memoria delle hore, chel Signor Nostro Giusu Christo doppò la sua morte fu posto nel sepolcro fino alla sua Santissima Resurrettione, le quali opere, si per la tepidizze delle persone, come anche per la qualità di quelli tempi non havesano preso molto vigore, occorse, che nell'Anno del Signore 1551 predicado nella Chiesa di santo Lorenzo in Damaso di Roma nel temp del'Advento di Christo un Frate Cappuccino, cercava detto frate cò molta efficacia mostrare quanto fosse devota, & utile cosa la continua Oratione. Il che inteso da quelli della Compagnia pregorno il detto frate, che volesse aiutare questo loro proposito, il quale laudando molto il loro pio, & buono desiderio, & ringraziandone la Divina Maestà, operò tanto con esortare il Popolo, che in pochi giorni si accrebbe detta Compagnia in numero de frateilii, & sorelle. Onde il giorno della Natalità del Signore Gesu Christo dell'istesso Anno nelle detta Chiesa nella Cappella della Concettione si fece l'oratone delle Quarant'ore con molta sodisfazione del Popolo, le quali opere tanto di seppellire gli morti, quanto della detta oratione, si sono continue, et si esercitano con tanto fervore, che per la Dio gratia detta Compagnia, essendo poi stata eretta in Archiconfraternita, & capo di tutte le Compagnie, che si aggregaranono a essa, è cresciuta di numero de fratellii & sorelle, & ogni giorno va prendendo augmento, &vigore, la quale percio si e chiamata Archiconfraternita della Morte, & Oratione.'


4 Chiabò Roberti 1985, p.110.
church, rendering them independent from their previous parochial contexts. This building was consecrated in 1575: construction of the adjacent oratory was begun in 1594. The first stone of this oratory was laid by cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564-1631), at that moment cardinal protector of the sodality.

Burial the dead had remained an important activity for the Archconfraternity especially during calamities, such as famines occurring after bad harvests, epidemics, and especially the Liber-floods that occurred regularly from the 1570s to early 1600s. It also constituted the main characteristic of the brotherhoods’ public image, as can be understood from the account of Gregory Martin upon his visit to the Eternal City in 1581:

The Companie de morte is a marvelous great Companie, so called for their Charitie toward the dead, whose profession is to bury of their owe charges and to accompany to the grave all such as either in the Citie or fildes about the Citie, are otherwise destitute of honest and competent burial, as having no special frendes that have a peculiar care for them, or that are able. Of all such they take a special care, both of Citizen and stranger, imitating herein the zele of Holy Tobie, whose Charitie in this very point the Angel Raphael presented unto God: and for all such they have Masses, and prayers in their Societie. Others also (not onely them of their owe brotherhood) they do willingly accompanie to the grave. if they be called, making a grave and morneful shew all in blacke being the colour of that Companie very correspondent to their profession. These also for confessing, receaving, procession, and quarant of prayer, do as is said before of the Companie of the B. Trinitie. They have a goodly Church new built of their owne Charges.

After the initial public celebration of the Forty-Hours prayer in 1551 to attract members, this important religious event was staged henceforth only for the members of the Orazione e Morte and for a selected number of special invitees; contrary to other Roman associations such as the Trinità dei Pellegrini (also mentioned by Martin), and later the Congregazione dei Nobili in

---

\[^{1}\] Black 1989, pp.234-238.
\[^{2}\] Hager 1964, pp 15-16 the accounts for the building of the oratory are in ASVR. ASMOM 546, and a description of the ceremony of the first stone Federico Borromeo are in ASVR. ASMOM 19, vol 169; on 16 August 1594. Borromeo was mentioned as being protector of the brotherhood in the Statutes of 1590, p.2. For Federico Borromeo, see Rivola 1656, DBI 1960-present vol.13, p.33-42 and Jones 1993.
\[^{3}\] Pancirolli 1600, p.545: "si dimostraronoperentissimi in quest'opera [della misericordia] con l'occasione dell'ultima inundazione del Fiver, andando in infrad'Osta a ricercar i corpi per seppellirli, per esser sola parte lasciata dal fiume, parte ributtati dall'onde del mare; E di qui ha preso questo compaginia il nome della Morte..." See also Di Martino Belati 1980, pp.551 for the floods caused by the Liber in the early Seicento.
the Gesù, the brotherhood did not aim at attracting the general public." It was thus especially important to secure regular attendance at this occasion. In the Statutes of 1590, this was suggested in the description of the preparation of the monthly event: 'And for that reason, all the brothers and sisters should be notified of [the occasion of] that Prayer. Also the Illustrious Protector, and other Lords and cardinals and prelates, as the Governor and Guardians see fit, could be given message.' Many high officials were thus invited, but the only ones obliged to be present were the members of the 'Numero della Notte', attending the service during the night in shifts to secure at least one person praying in front of the Eucharist at any given moment.

As prescribed above, also the Cardinal Protector of the brotherhood was notified of the occasion of the Quarant'Ore, which implies that by 1590, his presence at the prayer was deemed important. His function was described in the same statutes: 'It being most useful and necessary, that all pious institutions have their Head and Guidance, by whose authority and favours they will be helped, defended and favoured.' However, in the rest of the chapter on the cardinal protector nothing more specific was said about his role; it seems that in 1590, when these regulations were formulated and printed, the brotherhood avoided ceding explicit power to the cardinal performing this function and possibly tended to defend its autonomy. But it was Farnese's own initiative to request in 1611 the use of a room for the special and regular attendance of the Quarant'Ore and other religious gathering, and he indeed seems to have attended often, when in Rome. This seems to be different from anything suggested in the 1590 statutes; cardinal Odoardo aimed at performing a quite different role as protector than his immediate predecessors. What were the reasons for this change?

The Arciconfraternita and its cardinal protectors

Odoardo Farnese was not the first protector to be granted privileged access to the property of the brotherhood. In 1598, the members had allowed Paolo Emilio Sfondrato, nephew of pope Gregory XIV Sfondrato (reigned 1592) and life-long intimate of Odoardo Farnese, and then protector of the sodality, to open a door leading directly from Palazzo Falconieri, this cardinal's

---

1 Martin 1969, p.206.
2 On public stagings of the Quarant'Ore, see Weil 1974 and Imorde 1997; the Bull issued in 1592 by Clement VIII was one of the instances in which the practice was proclaimed salutary for all Christianity, and promoted as a public devotion. For the Quarant'Ore at the Trinità dei Pellegrini see O'Keen 1995, pp.25-27; on the Congregazione dei Nobili see Castellani 1954, pp.51-56; for the staging of the Quarant'Ore in the Gesù see Maher 1997.
3 Statuti 1590, p.78: 'Ett perciò a questa Orazione si doveranno intimare tutti gli fratelli, & sorelle. Si potra anco farlo intendere all' Illustrissimo Protettore, & altri signori Cardinali, & Prelati, parendo al Governatore, & Guardiani.'
residence, which he rented from the Odescalchi-family, into the choir of the church. This project was never realised, for the relations between the brotherhood and Sfondrato quickly became troubled. On the site behind the church of the Santa Maria dell'Orazione e Morte, where the confraternity had planned its new sacristy, Sfondrato intended to build an extension to his Palazzo. This dispute probably triggered the wish by the sodality to have a new representative - that person was Odoardo Farnese. He was installed as their protector in 1599, and one of his first tasks was solving the quarrel between Sfondrato, with whom he was on the best of terms, and the archconfraternity.11

Notwithstanding former quarrels between Farnese himself and the brotherhood - around 1595, the confraternity’s plans for an oratory had initially been opposed by the cardinal12 - by the time that the members of the Orazione e Morte decided to grant Farnese his request, which was similar to the one they had earlier conceded to Sfondrato, cardinal Odoardo had clearly demonstrated his good intentions towards them. This also meant that his involvement with the sodality had become much more direct than had been the case during the office of either Borromeo or Sfondrato. This was exemplified on a number of occasions, when Farnese used his contacts with the papal authorities for the benefit of the confraternity. In 1600, he made special arrangements for the Jubilee, obtaining the following privilege for the members of the Arciconfraternita:

It is hereby made public that, on our request, his Holiness Pope Clement the Eighth has, vivae voceis, conceded, graced the brothers and sisters of the Archconfraternity of the Morte and Oratone in Rome, so that when they visit the usual four churches once in procession and twice more at will and at one’s convenience, they will acquire the Jubilee, as if they would visit them thirty times, according to the above cited Bull issued by His


12 ASVR, ASMOM 546(3): ‘I Scriptur in Causa oratorij Con Ill[ustrissimo]no de Farnesij’.
Holiness. And truthfully we have signed this presently. In Rome, this 2nd day of March 1600.

Cardinal Farnese Protector
Alfonso Carandino secretary.

This document attests to Farnese's concern with the affairs of the brotherhood, as he requested this indulgence and saw to it that it was granted. He also had, as protector of the sodality, to sign the papal decision.

The second signature under this document belonged to Alfonso Carandino, member and sometime governor of the Orazione e Morte; he was also private secretary to Farnese. In 1609, he had acted as spokesman for Farnese in the request for the Camerino. Carandini attended most gatherings of the brotherhood, playing a double role of governor and that of messenger or representative of the cardinal protector. The latter of the two roles will have counted the most in every-day reality; secretaries in the early seventeenth century were considered to be bending to their patron's wishes in every occasion. Thus, even when Farnese was not in person interfering with the sodality's administration, he influenced the course of things more profoundly than his direct predecessors had done. This dual role of the cardinal's secretary was new, with respect to the periods in which Borromeo and Sfondrato were protector; they kept their distance from the daily affairs, and had no representative with the brotherhood.

Farnese arranged many other practical issues during his protectorate, either directly or indirectly. For example, in 1606 the brotherhood received the right of interment in the crypt beneath the oratory, and in 1611, another papal decision documented the brotherhood's privilege to release one prisoner from the papal penitential institutions per annum. The wish to have another altar in the church for the special celebration of Offices for the Dead was also handled by Cardinal Odoardo; this permission was obtained in 1610. The Brief explicitly mentioned the

---


16 On the juridical power granted to protectors, see Forte 1959, pp.23-51 and the discussion below, in chapter three; on the additional signature of the protector under papal documents that occurs from the sixteenth century onwards, see Forte 1959, pp.21, 30.


18 For the function and role of secretaries in the early modern period, see Biow 2002, pp.155-196, esp. pp.174-177. An early modern treatise discussing the double function of the secretary as scribe and agent for his lord is Ingegneri 1594, esp. pp.9-13.

19 Bevignani 1910, p.23, brev. dd 29 12 1611. Pius Christi tidum. On the tradition of releasing prisoners at special holidays in Rome, see Black 1989, pp.219-221.
cardinals’ involvement in this affair in its text.21

Farnese’s charitable deeds toward the brotherhood included more than mere administrative interventions on their behalf: he also supported them in other ways. In 1603, Farnese offered the brotherhood the use of the water from the conduit he had constructed for the garden of the adjacent Palazzetto, when he did not need it himself.22 During the Jubilee of 1625 he rented out a part of his palace to the confraternity, to lodge members of affiliated Italian confraternities who came to Rome for the occasion.23 His participation in their activities was proudly proclaimed at that occasion, by affixing his stemma above the entrance to the quarters, between those of the two vice-protectors, cardinals Aldobrandini and Barberini. A letter from the brotherhood’s assembly reporting these events to Farnese by then residing in Parma thanked him profusely for this favour, as the grandeur of his palace reflected upon the image of the brotherhood as well.24

Although the confraternity paid some rent for the use of a part of the Farnese palazzo in 1625, they had to lodge some of the Cardinal’s own guests, and even the financial agreement itself was reciprocal. During the Jubilee, Farnese granted them 25 scudi a month, to pay the expenses of lodging and feeding all these pilgrims.25 The brotherhood was also more regularly financed by Farnese at the amount of 3 scudi and 60 baiocchi a month, at least from 1609 on, but probably from the time he took on the role of protector.26 When Cardinal Odoardo died in 1626, moreover, he bequeathed the confraternity the considerable amount of 500 scudi.27

Apart from this regular support, all the major projects of decoration and refurbishment were financed in large part by Odoardo, with joint support from his brother Ranuccio, Duke of Parma (1569-1622). The connection to the cardinal thus also opened the way to his family and their wealth. When a new ceiling was made for the church in 1605, they paid the largest share of

22 ASVR. ASMOM 20, fol. 154r.
23 On the organised lodgings for members of affiliated confraternities, see Black 1989, pp.117-121  and Cabibbo 1997, esp. pp.418-419.
26 See the various volumes ‘Entrate e Uscite’ in the ASVR, ASMOM.
27 Farnese’s will of 1619 in ASR. Trenta Not. Capit. UE 25, Not. Giulio Raimondi, vol. 250, fol. 82v, stipulated this sum: ‘Al’Alt. confraternita della Morte lascio cinquecento scudi di moneta con obli gi di venticinque messe l’anno’, the acceptance by the brotherhood is recorded in a letter of 6 August 1626 in ASVR. ASMOM 457, ‘Farnese Cardinale.”
the costs together. For that reason, the design made by Francesco Nicolini was sent to Odoardo for his final approval (fig.50). During the work - which was only completed in 1608 - steadily increasing costs necessitated the brotherhood to ask Farnese for additional funding. When, in 1610, the space of the adjacent oratory was also redecorated, the two brothers again covered a large part of the expenses. The Farnese escutcheon was applied to the ceilings of both church and oratory to underline the family’s continuing affiliation to and support of the confraternity; the escutcheon included the duca crown and cardinal’s hat.

On the official level, cardinal Odoardo’s pivotal role in the brotherhood’s affairs can be deduced from the papal decisions, which he, as protector, was obliged to countersign. It was he who raised these issues with the authorities and obtained the permissions from the papal government. On a lower level, Farnese was also consulted regularly on questions concerning the confraternity’s own government. During the preparations for the Jubilee, in November 1599 he was asked to appoint officials responsible for the decoration of the church and the organisation of processions - internal quarrels had obstructed the elections for these functions. A year later, Farnese intervened in the appointment of a doctor to assist the brothers in their work of burying the dead, and help the members who had fallen ill.

**The Quarant’Ore and the Camerino**

When the attendance of the members at the primary activity of the sodality, the devotion of the Forty-Hours prayer, became a matter of concern, the confraternity again asked Farnese’s assistance. In the course of years between the beginning of the sixteenth century and 1609, participation of the brothers and sisters of the Orazione e Morte to the monthly Quarant’Ore had...
fallen dramatically. The 'Libro dei Decreti' of those years remarked on this fact when reporting the meeting held on 1 February 1609 in which it was recorded that:

because few members of our Company attend during the day to participate at the Prayer of the Forty Hours that is usually being organised in our church, for that reason it was proposed that that number who assist during the night, would also pray during the day; about which matter it was decided to raise a discussion during the general meeting. 33

Three weeks later, on 20 February, this proposal was put by the guardians to the general meeting, but in the end a special Numero del giorno was created, instead of burdening the Numero della Notte with additional duties. This meant that a new group of brothers and sisters would schedule this attendance in the church during the Quarant'Orse during the daytime. 34 In 1610, the statutes of this new group were approved by the brotherhood, prescribing their duties and obligations. 35

Exactly during the period in which the attendance of the most important religious activity became a matter of concern, Farnese proposed to rent the Camerino degli Eremiti from the brotherhood. The positive reaction of the secret and the general meetings of December 1609 to the request were triggered by the hope that the presence of Cardinal Farnese would raise the status of the Quarant'Orse in the eyes of the other participants. The contract of 1611 thus mentioned the attendance of the monthly prayers as the first motif for the use of the room. 36

Furthermore, they expected more than mere spiritual co-operation; and indeed in the following years Farnese tried to raise the appeal of the brotherhoods' religious gatherings with still other means. In 1611, he started paying for the musical accompaniment of the Mass, after the example of the Trinità dei Pellegrini, where the power of music in the context of pious acts had first been realised. 37 On January 1, 1612, the Libro dei Decreti recorded: 'And because Mons. Cardinal Farnese our Protector desires that during the coming Quadragesima there will be music made at

33 ASVR. ASMOM 21, fol.20r: 'Nella qual detto, p[er]ch[e pochi della Compagnia intervengono di giorno all’assistenza dell’orazione sino alle 40, hore che si sogliono fare nella nra Chiesa, p[er] questo fu detto di voler fare, ch[é] quelli del numero, qualf[ei] intervengono la notte, ottersero il giorno, del ch[é] fu resoluto, che se ne parli nella Congregazione publica.'

34 ASVR. ASMOM 21, fol.20r: 'Li Signori Guardiani proposero, che si facessi oltre il numero delle 48 Oratori ch[e] orano la notte, mentre si hanno l’orazioni delle 40 hore nella nra Chiesa, un’altra numero di 40. P[er] assistere di giorno alle de orazioni, et fu detto che si rimetta alla Congregazione pubblica.'

35 At the following gatherings the names of volunteers for this new group are listed. See also Fiorani et al. 1985, p.331. 'Per una più profonda esperienza religiosa dei suoi ascritti, la compagnia istituita dal 1565 il cosiddetto Numero del notturno (adorazione notturna del Santissimo) e dal 1610 il Numero del giorno (adorazione diurna).'

36 Bevignani 1910, p.22: the statutes of this group can be found in Rome, Biblioteca Angelica Z 11-48

37 O'Regan 1995, pp.254f.
his expense on each Friday in our Church, with a sermon. Similar payments were still made by Farnese in 1614, for musical oratories during the Holy Week.

The relations between Farnese and the brotherhood of the Orazione e Morte went far beyond the expectations and requirements formulated in the *Statuti della veneferanda archiconfraternita della Morte et Oratione*, drafted some ten years before Farnese accepted his role. Considering how often he actually interfered in their affairs, and even wanted a private 'box' to attend their various activities, the confraternity might have protested about this as an infringement on their autonomy. Instead, they welcomed and even stimulated his interventions; the happiness of the secret and public congregation in confirming the agreement on the Camerino undoubtedly referred to these past and future acts of support. Their gain was most obvious, because through Farnese's dedication to them, they were helped in daily affairs and gained in prestige. For them, the Camerino degli Eremiti thus expressed Farnese's official involvement with the brotherhood in an enduring and tangible manner.

Why did Odoardo Farnese accept such a tedious role and follow it so faithfully for almost three decades? And why did he ask them to have the Camerino at his disposal, and again, pay rent for it? He might also have requested a privileged place in the church itself for the monthly occasion of the Forty-Hours prayer, in response to the invitation of the brotherhood to attend. It has been suggested that the Camerino degli Eremiti was more convenient and appropriate to his rank. But none of his predecessors in the role of protector had tried to obtain a similar privilege, although Sfondrato did request a private entrance to the church – which was not realised in the end, and which was less than Farnese asked for. Instead, the comparison of Farnese with his predecessors indicated a changing interpretation of the protectorate by both the Archconfraternity and the cardinal during the first decade of the Seicento, of which the Camerino was a mere physical expression. This new interpretation of the function of protector reflected a more general phenomenon in early seventeenth-century Rome.

**Sixteenth-century concepts of protectorate**

Was there a generally applicable definition of protectorate around 1600? Virtually no sixteenth-

---

"ASVR. ASMOD 21, fol.43r, 17 January 1611 (i.e.1612): 'Et p[er]che Monsignor Card[inali] Farnese n[ost]ro Protettor desidera volere che questa Quadragesimo pro[ssimo ogni Venardi nella n]ost[n]a Chiesa si facci un poco di musica a spese sue con un sermone." Bevignani 1910, p.46 put the beginning of this tradition of musical accompaniment only in the late 1620s. See also Smither 1985, p.46 for musicians connected to the confraternity, and Black 1989, p.273 for the use of music at the Orazione e Morte.

Payments by Farnese to the confraternity for musicians are in ASVR. ASMOD 286, 'Entrata e uscita ... al Principio di Gennaro M.D.C.xii', fol.l1v, 20r. Around 1628, Pietro Paolo Sabbatini was hired as musician of the brotherhood, for which he composed a number of sacred oratories; see Smither 1985, p.8.
century texts treated the function of protectors at length, which seems striking, given the large number of books on the life and work of a cardinal following Cortesi's *De cardinalatu* of 1510. For that reason, the issue of protecting an institution might seem anything but a debated topic in that period. This is however a misleading idea. The system of protectorates originated in the monastic context, in the twelfth century, and almost immediately it resulted in quarrels that surfaced regularly during the next centuries until erupting with new vigour in the early seventeenth century.

The position and title of cardinal protector had been assigned for the first time to cardinal Ugolino by Saint Francis himself. He wanted the cardinal to intervene on behalf of the Order with the Curia and Pope, and to constrain the brethren to follow the constitutions and obey the superiors of the Franciscan order. The twelfth chapter of the Franciscan Rule of 1223 described three different tasks:

The Ministers, too, are bound to ask the Pope for one of the cardinals of the holy Roman Church to be governor, protector, and corrector of this fraternity, so that we may be utterly subject and submissive to the Church. And so, firmly established in the Catholic faith, we may live always according to the poverty, and the humility, and the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, as we have solemnly promised. With this provision, Saint Francis appointed the protector with task of ensuring the conservation of observance of the Rules and obedience to the institution of the Church. The text also implied that the authority of the Cardinal protector was restricted to general issues concerning the Franciscan Order: as a relative outsider, the cardinal was to govern, protect and if necessary correct their institution as a whole. Individual cases and requests were to remain the competence of priors and generals.

When, soon afterwards in 1383, more detailed questions of authority were raised. Gregory XI de Beaufort (1370-1378) issued the Bull *Cunctis Christifideles*, redefining the powers of the Cardinal Protector of the Franciscan Order - and that of all other regular Orders. The new rules transferred responsibilities from the Pope to the cardinal, relieving the pressure exerted by regular issues on the papal administration that formerly had to handle these cases. In the new situation,
little was permitted on the general level; a protector was only consigned to preside over general chapters - for which an additional papal warrant had to be obtained - which was a mere representational function.\textsuperscript{46} In other issues, however, the jurisdiction of the protector was much enlarged. He could act as arbiter in conflicts within the Order, which meant that he became a 'court of appeal', with the right to inflict canonical punishment. In governmental affairs, a protector could appoint the prior general and acknowledge the election of other officials - for his signature was needed for the approval of decrees of provincial and general chapters. He could even issue a decree on his own accord: cancelling or rearranging provinces, assigning monastic houses to provinces, or transferring individual friars to other houses of the Order. The cardinal protector was also entitled to give friars permission to travel, or to sojourn outside the monastery's walls. Awarding privileges or pardons was unquestionably the right most often requested and exerted, with detrimental effects on the morals of regulars. Instead of speaking of restrictions, it is possible to typify these new papal rules from 1373 on as a licence to interfere with almost anything, concerning the persons and affairs within, and even outside of the Order. The protector had become an added superior instead of a defender, which led to troubled relations between Orders and protectors in the following two centuries.

Abuse seems to have occurred often, especially since the topic received little juridical attention at central ecclesiastical level after the Bull by Gregory XI.\textsuperscript{47} The position of the protector thus depended primarily on the constitutions of the religious institutions - a fact noted in 1559 by the ecclesiastical lawyer Quintilliano Mandosi.\textsuperscript{48} Only in specific instances did the papal Bull of appointment contain rules of conduct. The cardinal thus gained importance when the Orders' Rules left a void, the papal assignment lacked clarity, or when the general was inattentive.

Only at the end of the sixteenth century did the popes introduce new regulations to answer the cries for reform that had been raised by the regular Orders from the early sixteenth century onwards. Following the Council of Trent, during which the problem of the protectorate had not

\textsuperscript{15} Bernardino da Siena 1940, p.75.
\textsuperscript{16} Forte 1959, p.15-36.
\textsuperscript{17} Jedin 1966 vol.2, p.368 n.43, referring to Quintilliano Mandosio, \textit{Signaturas gratae præxis}, Rome 1559. 'Quid autem possit talis protector, & circa quae se intromittat, videatur per Rui. consil. 109, circa quaestionem, num.3,vol.5. Est verum, quod plurunque à constitutione, seu regula alciatus religionis, vel à constitutione ipsius Papae, seu creatione protectoris major, vel minor, seu limitata facultas protectori datur. Quantum autem ad clausulam, de qua agimus, sat est p. psi committatur, p. videat; & sic rescriptum in quoadq; materia protector cognoscet, comprobabit, seu infirmabit, vel impetrantem, seu supplicantem excluder .' See also Mandosio 1571, fol.37v.
been discussed - as most issues concerning cardinals had been avoided - measures were introduced to restrict the influence of cardinals on monastic Orders. Gregory XIII in his brief *Cum nihil* of 1580 limited the power of non-regulars, including cardinal protectors, over the government of monastic institutions, especially in individual cases. The subsequent institution of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars in 1587 by Sixtus V, as part of his reform of the College of Cardinals, formed another hindrance to usurpation of influence by protectors, by assuming the position of judge in internal affairs of religious Orders. In 1594, Clement VIII forbade any acceptance of gifts for any superior, including protectors, to avoid partial government.

During these last decades of the century, also a number of treatises began to mention complications connected to the position of protector, and to lament the frequently occurring infractions. These books reflected the changes introduced by subsequent popes and the zeal for reform in particular factions of the Curia. The Jesuit writer Gerolamo Piatti treated the subject of the protectorate at the end of his treatise on the ideal cardinal called *De cardinalatis dignitate et officio*, which was composed for the benefit his brother, Cardinal Flamino Piatti. The book reflected the situation at the time of writing, around 1591, but was only published posthumously in 1602. Piatti described the function of the protector with direct reference to the original duties of the protector in the Franciscan Rules; the historical argument which became so important after the Tridentine Council was also applied in this case. According to him, the interference of the protector with particular and individual issues after Gregory’s Bull of 1373 had led to grave errors, and this should be abolished, as it was one of the major threats to regular observance.

The protector of an Order should be aware of the limitations of his power, as Piatti reminded his readers:

Accordingly, the Cardinal Protector should primarily understand what his limits and

---

5. Piatti was also known under his latinised *nom de plume*, Hieronymus Platus, which was used for the publication of the *De cardinalatis dignitate et officio*. Sommervogel 1960 vol.1, p.695 cited a 1592 edition of this treatise mentioned by Sotewel, but doubted its existence. Moroni 1840-1879 vol.40, p.323 mentioned a *consiglio* written by Piatti for his brother, cardinal Flamino Piatti, which will have been the basis of the chapter on protectorate; the 1602 edition of the book was also dedicated to Cardinal Flamino. See also Venochoi 1689 vol 3, pp 520-522 for a paraphrase of this letter.
6. Platus 1602, p.231: 'Quare non potest dicere credi quam multa mala ex hac una re in religiones invehantur, si Cardinales protectores protectionem suae metas transgressi, gubernationem eam tractare incipient.'
boundaries are, which should not be transgressed. The boundaries are these. We have explained in that manner, in the opinion of those many Popes, that no government will be put under pressure, nor will authority be exercised for one self, or [regarding] the appointment of deputies or rectors, or drawing or changing of a place, or finally constitute either individual, or general things. These things do not appertain to him, and when he interferes in them, necessarily great disturbance will follow, and much damage.\[^{55}\]

According to Piatti, the primary task of the protector should once more be the general supervision over religious observance, as it had been decreed by Saint Francis himself:

What if somewhere this religion, and discipline weakens, or is lying prostrate, when what is bad cannot be sufficiently cured internally, then obviously a strong medicine is to be sought, and that pertains without any doubt to the Protector, but in such a way that nothing will be arranged according to his own opinion, but from the institutions of the proper Order, and its prescriptions.\[^{56}\]

Since Francis had created the function with a particular aim in mind, the present situation should return to this; the changes introduced by Gregory in 1373 had proven erratic in the long run, and should thus be abolished. But in conjunction with this historical argument, a new expectation was explicitly formulated: the protector himself should be exemplary in conduct and religious life.\[^{57}\]

Even if he did not belong to the regular community to which he was appointed - which applied to the majority of protectors - he had to be aware of its particulars in life and spirituality. For this reason, Piatti recommended to his readers in this same chapter on the protectorate that the Cardinals, even if we admit are earnest and frugal, because they ... are never experts in the religious life, they cannot in any way not know that art, the rudiments of which they sometimes never deal with, and even if thanks to the soundness of their judgement they understand something better, for sure there will never be anyone who understands it as well as those Religious Prelates themselves, who now by their own, then

\[^{55}\] Platus 1602, p.230: 'Igitur hoc in primis intelligere debet Cardinalis Protector, qui sui sint limites, ac termini, ne extra eos egrediatur. Sunt autem iij limites, quos modo diximus, ex sententia huius tanti Pontificis, ne se imperat gubernationi, neve auctoritate sibi usurpet, vel instituendii Praepositos, & Rectores, vel designandi, vel mutandii loco, vel denique aliquid constituendii, sive de singulis, sive de universis. Haec enim non ad eum pertinent, & si ex invadat, necesse est magnum sequi perturbationem, & magna detrimenta.'

\[^{56}\] Platus 1602, p.232: 'Quod si alcuhi ita religio, & disciplina languet, aut prostrata iacet, ut quod mali est, non satis intus sanari quaeat, tum sane quaerenda est fortis medicina, idque sine dubio ad Protectorem pertinet, sed ita ut tune quoque nihil ad suum arbitrium, sed ex ipsius ordinis institutis, ac praeceptis, omnia moderetur.'

\[^{57}\] Platus 1602, p.248 stated this in general about the spiritual life of the Cardinal: 'Tertia causa est ex obligatione perfectionis, quae, ut supra a nobis demonstratur es, ex ipso Cardinallis officio nascitur.'
by the daily experience of others arrive at its best use, and practical knowledge.

Piatti here juxtaposed the limited knowledge of cardinals with the devotional experience of the regulars, and admonished the protector in matters of religious life to trust those professed in the Order, as cardinals themselves in most cases were inexperienced or, as other sources stated, had little time to devote to the practice of prayer. In other words, his duty to supervise spiritual matters obliged the protector to follow the example of the regulars who dedicated their life to the practice of prayer.

On the protectorate of brotherhoods, which applied to the situation of Farnese and the confraternity of the Orazione e Morte, Piatti defined only few things. Although in certain aspects the two forms were comparable, in the case of lay-sodalities the juridical status depended even more upon the particulars of the constitutions. The phenomenon of the protectorate over lay-sodalities was comparatively new and had not generated much jurisprudence. For this reason, the tutelage by cardinal Odoardo over the brotherhood was not restricted by anything except the regulations of 1590 cited above. But the changing interpretation of the protector's role between the formulation of these rules and the actual situation of the first decades of the seventeenth century indicate that also in this context the expectations shifted in conjunction with the Tridentine reforms. Indeed, the differences between the protectorates over Orders and sodalities became a topic of discussion.

Impending abolition and renewal of the protectorate in 1606

In the eyes of pope Clement VIII Aldobrandini, or that of his advisors, the measures introduced in the last quarter of the sixteenth century for the reform of the protectorate over religious Orders did not have the desired effect, but rather the reverse: it led to an even greater diversity, and thus hindered the centralisation of the ecclesiastical apparatus. As a result, the protectorate itself came under attack. Immediate abolition of the function was regarded by Clement as too drastic a decision: it would probably have met with fierce resistance from both Orders and cardinals. Thus, on Clement's orders, from 1592 on, no successor would be appointed when a cardinal protector died. The seventeenth-century historiography of the Franciscan Order contains an illuminating remark on the situation:

88 Platus 1602, pp.230-231: 'quod Cardinales, ut concedamus probos, & frugi esse, tamen cum religiosam vitam ... nunquam experti sint, non possant ullo modo nosse cum arte, quia nunquam tractarunt interdum etiam ne rudimenta quidem, aut si fortasse propter iudiciam bonitatem aliquod amplius intelligent, certe nemo unquam erit, qui tam bene intelligat, quae religiosi ipsi Praedati, qui tum sunt, tum aliorum distuma experientia magnum cius usum, ac peritiam consequi sunt.'
Clement VIII often listened to [the advice of] a man of great and grave authority, whose advice was that for the best possible reform of the Regulars, a goal he completely supported, he should seriously think about abolishing the Protectors of those Orders.

Dispensing with the system by refraining from new appointments became Clement's goal - which he nearly met. During the thirteen years of his pontificate, many religious orders were deprived of their cardinal protector. In the Avvisi of 1602 a remark about the recently deceased cardinal Salviati points at this pending abolition:

Our Lord has, after the death [of Cardinal Salviati], consigned the seal that belonged to the highest Inquisitor of the Sacred Office to Cardinal Borghese, but concerning all the other many protectors the said Cardinal had, none is yet available: two [protectors] of kingdoms, like the Greek Moroniti and other Christians of the Levant, and of Egypt, because for the Friars of the Capuchins and the brethren of Saint Marcellus no others will be provided because similar protectors will be suppressed ['extinguished'] in the order of their vacation.

But while according to these sources the succession of protectors of religious orders was halted - the use of the word 'similar' in the above citation referred to monastic institutions - in the case of charitable and secular institutions protectors continued to be nominated. The above-cited Avviso continued by announcing the nomination of cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini as protector of the Monte della Pictà, a charitable bank, and Odoardo Farnese as protector of the Casa degli Orfanelli, a lay-institution for the orphans of Rome. The unbroken succession with regard to the brotherhood of the Orazione e Morte during the years around 1600 - first Borromeo, then Sfondrato and immediately thereafter Farnese - is another case in point, that the protectorate of...
lay-sodalities was not abolished together with that over the regular institutions. Why did Clement continue in one sort of religious institution what he wanted to halt in other circumstances?

The need for clerical supervision over lay-institutions, especially brotherhoods and charitable societies, was felt to be more important than the possible disadvantages of the protectorate.\textsuperscript{14} This was the outcome of the call for more control over semi-religious institutions that had first been voiced at the Tridentine Council. Firstly, brotherhoods were seen as an effective means to involve the laity more closely in the Catholic Faith, during a time that saw the hegemony of the Catholic church seriously threatened by the Protestants. These brotherhoods, which could be joined voluntarily, were mediating institutions between clerics and the populace and this opened possibilities that the church hoped to fully employ for popular edification. Secondly, these lay sodalities could become potential homes to subversive doctrines and turn into centres for the diffusion of heretical ideas. For that reason, the Council of Trent had ordered clerical supervision of these societies, which in general fell to parochial authorities.\textsuperscript{15}

The later sixteenth century also witnessed a further tendency in the Catholic context: that of increasing centralisation. Sodalities of lay brothers were encouraged to congregate in larger structures, and one of the means to stimulate this was the creation of arch-brotherhoods, the\textit{ Arciconfraternite} - of which the Orazione e Morte presented a typical example.\textsuperscript{16} They were one of the most successful in attracting affiliations, as they already boasted in the 1590 statutes - at the beginning of the eighteenth century they counted as many as one thousand aggregated societies.\textsuperscript{17} Connected to the status of arch-brotherhood, and making it attractive to potential members, were privileges such as the right to receive alms, own property, and obtain indulgences and other spiritual advantages. The elevation to this grade was obtained by papal decree and was always preceded by the ecclesiastical approval of the constitutions.

For related sodalities, affiliation to such an archconfraternity added prestige, gave all the affiliates the same privileges and indulgences, and constrained them to adjust their own Rules to the example of the archbrotherhood. It also meant that they in turn accepted ecclesiastical control, allowing visitations by Episcopal authorities. Religious uniformity throughout Christianity was the primary aim of this system.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{14} For the position of protectors in lay-confraternities and other non-ecclesiastical institutions, see Black 1989, esp. pp.8 and 621, and Faber 1999 for a recent research project on this topic.


\textsuperscript{18} Black 1989, pp.72-74, 92, 273.
This development towards hierarchy among laysodalities had been set in motion in the first half of the sixteenth century by Leo X de Medici (1513-1521), and was concluded and confirmed in 1604 in the papal Bull *Quaecumque*. This gave priests the right to check the secular as well as spiritual affairs, of all confraternities in their parish. As a result, at the beginning of the seventeenth century brotherhoods were firmly enshrined in ecclesiastical structures. Not by chance, most archconfraternities were located in Rome, thus providing easy communication between papal and confraternal institutions. It also meant that they received additional access to the Vatican authorities by means of a cardinal protector, which almost all archbrotherhoods had. These cardinals presented a way of keeping an eye on the affairs of the sodalities, acting as contacts between those new structures and the Curia.

After Clement's death in 1605, considerations of supervision over religious institutions led to a reversal of his decisions with regard to the regular protectorate. While cardinal protector fulfilled a useful function in the reform of lay organisations due of his position as an intermediary, he could potentially do the same for religious Orders, as originally intended by Francis. Pope Paul V Borghese decided to discontinue his predecessor's policy, and in consistory of 6 March 1606 named new protectors on all open positions. In all, nineteen cardinals were installed as protector, of which only five had been appointed by the orders themselves. The decision to preserve the position of cardinal protectors had to serve papal interests, which explains the papal choice of cardinals in fourteen cases - prior to Clement VIII, the choice was left to the Orders, which was nearly always accepted by the Pope. Some of the orders indicated that they were not completely satisfied with the papal choice, through their representatives who reacted in a positive but somewhat reserved manner to the announcements, as the account by Mucanzio. Papal master of ceremonies suggests:

> On the sixth day of the same month, a consistory was held in the usual hall in the Vatican Palace, during which the Pope elected, as was later published, diverse cardinal protectors for many religions that lack a protector. This fact was a reason for happiness for these religious. It is better for a religion to be governed by any given cardinal protector then to be without.
Solutions still had to be found to the problems of the past that had inspired Clement VIII to abolish the system. Paul V thus asked Cardinal Paolo Emilio Sfondrato to write a memorandum on the matter shortly afterwards. This document, dated around 1607, defended the position of the protector with recourse to his position as mediator between the papal court and the specific monastic government. An important change was the prescription of the protectors’ jurisdiction henceforth to be included in the briefs of nomination, through which papal control over the protectors was gained.

Sfondrato’s memorandum was meant to form the basis for a papal Bull, composed around 1607, which would further define the juridical status of the cardinal protector. The title of the official document leaves no doubt as to the aim of its contents: Decision about the office of the most Illustrious Lords Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, Protectors of whichever regular Order, Institution or Congregation. This almost complete draft reveals that Sfondrato’s advice was followed: it described the duties, obligations as well as the prohibitions of the protector of regular orders. Although both documents were left unpublished, the effect of the pope’s initial decision was that the role of cardinal protector continued, and was even reinvigorated.

At first sight, neither the memorandum nor the Bull offered a rigorously new definition of the function of protector - it described its Franciscan origins and the status quo, with specific admonitions added to avoid future abuse. The special congregation of cardinals called for by Paul V on 8 March 1606 - probably to prepare the official proclamation for which the memorandum supplied the basis - had come to this same conclusion that the continuation of the given situation was the best option, as was noted in an Avviso:

After the long description of the reform of the Protectorates of Religious Orders in a separate congregation at the order of Our Lord there has not been found a better moderation than to follow the familiar road...

---

1 Sfondrato’s advice is in ASV. Fondo Borghese IV. 47, fols.79r-84r, without a title: it bears the inscription ‘Protettori’ on its verso. Other documents in this volume are dated to 1606. That it was planned early in 1606 can also be assumed on account of external evidence: a remark by Roberto Bellarmino in the letter to his brother of 29 March 1606, in ARSI Opp.NN.244-II fol.246r, where the delegation of tasks to courtiers was named an undesired practice - exactly as Sfondrato had recommended in his memorandum.

2 These briefs had in some prior cases been written, see the appendix in Forte 1959, pp.71-81 that gives the briefs of institution of protectors of the Dominican Order between 1534 and the nineteenth century.

3 The full text of the Bull can be found in ASV. Fondo Borghese IV.47, fols.68r-74v.

4 Constitutio super officio Illustriissimorum Dominorum S.R.L. Card., ordinum, institutorum et congregationum quarumcumque regularium Protectorum

5 ASV. Avvisi 2. cited after Forte 1959, p.88: ‘Dopo la lunga descrizione sopra la riforma delle Protettioni de Religiosi in una congregazione apparte d’ordine di N.S. non si è trovato il miglior temperamento che di camminar per la strada fatta...’
Between regular reform and curial changes

Although the unpublished status of the Bull meant that the new concept of the protectorate remained unofficial, Paul V on various occasions constrained the cardinals to its general outlines. As noted in the memorandum, the return to the situation anterior to 1592, ideally to the time of Saint Francis, was accompanied by a desire to prevent former abuses by means of stricter regulation. Moreover, the episode around 1606 had obviously been triggered by the will to further the process of general ecclesiastic reform. In his advice of 1607, Sfondrato stressed the protector’s position as intermediate between general superiors and papal authorities, with particular attention to the obedience of the cardinal to the Pope. In theory, the responsibility of regular reform remained in the hands of the Pope, but its practical side was entrusted to his cardinals. The stress on the decree of nomination, that had to be issued henceforward, was proposed to define the task entrusted to the cardinal in writing.

Clement’s original arguments for abolishment of the system were turned around by Sfondrato: he did not primarily blame the protector for these past abuses, he attributed this to defects in monastic government. Out of his own experience, Sfondrato evoked an image of conventual authority as largely dependent on favours or obstructed by internal enmities. The protector could stand above the quarrelling parties thanks to his position as outsider, and this also explains the new policy to appoint protectors by the Pope himself, instead of appointing the person nominated by the Order. In Sfondrato’s formulation, these elements of supervision by an disinterested outsider were used as main argument in favour of the system:

When the religious orders have a good protector ... with the usual authority he will watch over the general, over the visitator, and over the Abbots, over the spiritual and temporal as well as a good and saintly bishop would over his parishioners, over his chapters, and the other priests; and since he is not of that religion [i.e. Order], the passions and interests that occur between regulars that by an excess which could happen to one of us others do not affect him. Your Holiness will see betterment of government in the superiors of the orders, as my own experience alas has made me handle, and mostly on the presupposition that always zealous cardinals will be appointed, and that protectorates will not be given indistinctly, as in the past, to those who asked for them.77

77 AS Fondo Borghese IV, 47, fol.80r: ‘Che se le religioni hanno un buon Protettore, che qui sta il tutto, con l’autorità solita, questo vigila sopra il Generale, sopra il Visivator, sopra gli Abbati, sopra il spirituale, e temporale così bene come possi fare un buono, e tanto Vescovo sopra i suoi Parrocchiani, sopra i Capitolari, e altri Preti, e in lui, come non è dell’istessa Religione, non cadono le passioni, et interessi che fra Regolari, Che per un eccesso nel quale uno di noi altri potesse incorrere, ne vedra la S[antità] Vostra migliorar in materia di governo
The cardinal protector should not only oversee the practical government of the Order in question, but also its spiritual ideal. The latter aspect constituted the particular character that should be preserved, even reinvigorated. Already Piatti proposed the participation of the cardinal in the spiritual life of the regulars. Sfondrato's proposal also reflected the suggestion made during a session of the Council of Trent, that monastic reformation must return to its inner roots and not concern itself only with correct behaviour. Special emphasis was thus given in the memorandum to the duty of the protector as corrector, evoking the first definition of the protectorate as given in the Franciscan Rule:

When the orders would today be in their former vitality, and observance, and [invested] with the same spirit with which they were founded, or at least less in decline from that saintly discipline, I certainly would not so easily believe that giving them a Protector would be so useful and necessary for their preservation; even when the example of the glorious Father Saint Francis seems to me [to the point] in this case, who notwithstanding the rigour of his Rule ... thought it right to ordain that his Religion should always have a Protector, and what counts even more, he wanted him also to be a corrector. We can believe that this Holy man so much illuminated by God, foresaw in his mind the great decline of his Order, and how helpful it would be to have a good protector and corrector. One main task of the protector was, according to Francis, to make the regulars abide by the vows they had taken and follow the Rules of their Order; he had to preserve the orthodoxy of the community's life. The Tridentine decrees had been very explicit on the point of observance as well. It was, in fact, the opening sentence of the first chapter of the decree regarding ecclesiastic and regular reform: 'All Regulars shall order their lives in accordance with what is prescribed by the rule which they have professed; Superiors shall assiduously provide that this is done.' It was to this Tridentine prescription that Sfondrato alluded in his memorandum by mentioning the corrector, whose duty was to conserve and possibly reinvigorate the intentions of the original

ne superiori delle religioni, come l'esperienza stessa mi ha purtroppo fatto toccar con mano, e massime presupposto sempre che si facciano le elezioni di Cardinali Zelanti, e non si diano le Protezioni a coloro che per il passato indistintamente, e a chi le dimanda.' See also Forte 1959, p.92.

ASV Fondo Borghese IV, 47, fol.79r: 'Se le Religioni fossero oggi nell'antico vigore, et osservanza, et dello stesso spirito col quale furono fondate, o almeno poco declinate da quella santa disciplina, io certo non sarei così facile in credere che il darsi Protettore fosse cosita tanto utile et espediente per la conservazione loro: se bene l'esempio del glorioso P. S. Franc, mi pare ancora in questo caso, che debba poter mollo, il quale non ostante il rigore della sua regola ... tuttavia[...]a hebbe per bene di ordinare che la sua Religione dovesse aver sempre un Protettore, et, quello che importa piu, vuoile che sia anco Correttore. Il che potiamo credere che faccesse questo santo tanto illuminato da Dio, prevedendo in spirito la declinazione grande della sua Religione, et di quanto avuto le potesse essere l'avere un buon Protettore e Correttore.' See also Forte 1959, p.91.

Forte 1939, p.10, and Siena 1940, p.73.

Waterworth 1848, p.237.
Rules and Constitutions; he, in turn, had to supervise that the superiors would take this admonition to heart. The discussion about, and revival of the protectorate after 1606, was thus the results of spiritual reforms initiated at the Council of Trent, both with regard to lay organisations and regular institutions.\(^2\)

The measures for renewal and recovery of the protectorate over religious Orders, and the strengthening of the system in the case of confraternities, took effect in the first half of the seventeenth century. An increasing standardisation of requirements and duties was reflected in treatises; at the same time a broadening of the definition of protectorate can be discerned, in which the protectors of confraternities gradually received the same recognition and status as a regular protector, and even other forms of involvement by higher ecclesiastics within organisations were denominated with this term. In all these cases, cardinals were deemed to exert spiritual government and supervision.

In his juridical exposition of 1653 on the cardinals’ College and the individual rights of its members, Giacomo Coelli described the phenomenon of the cardinal protector in its historical perspective and present-day state, reflecting on the broadening of the role since 1606. Now, not only religious institutions could be ‘protected’ by a cardinal, but secular organisations, cities, regions, and even entire states as well. The latter obligation was included as a result of the Catholic mission: protectors of countries and states supervised the activities of the various orders in spreading the Faith. Coelli discussed all these forms of protectorate as one kind of duty with one generally applicable rule of conduct. In this new light, the prior differences were largely levelled. Protectors of lay-organisations were assigned the same function and importance as those of regular institutions, as Coelli made explicit at the end of the chapter entitled *Of the Cardinal Protectors of the Regular Orders.*\(^3\)

In 1675, Giovanni Battista De Luca codified the life and function of the cardinal in his encyclopaedic *Il cardinale della S.R. Chiesa Pratico*, which described the obligations of the *porporato* towards the Pope and the Ecclesiastical State.\(^4\) The title of the chapter on the

\(^{17}\) Wright 2000, p.79

\(^{2}\) Coelli 1653, pp 327-328: ‘De Cardinalibus Regularium Ordinarum Protectoribus. ‘Et hoc, quod in protegenidis Religionis Ordinis dictum est, ad alia loca pia, ad alios hominum, & mulierum Coetus, ac Sedalitias, quibus S.R.F. Cardinales Protectores dati solent, adaptari potest: eternum quia* huiusmodi Protectiones suscipiunt, ita sibi persuadere debent, se tutelam quandam orphanorum, ac papillorum gerere, ac proinde naves esse, ut eam ad proprium commodum, vel escutaneer gerant: gorum tantum sibi utilitates prosperantes, quorum se Protectores appellant, ut nomen ipsum indicat. Sed tutelam quoque, & patrocinium Provinciarum, Civitatum, & Regnorum, Cardinales habent, non sequus ac ab omnipotent Deo nedom hominibus, sed Civitatis, Provinciis, ac Regnis constituti sunt, & assignati Angeli tutelares, ut in Sacra Pagina Persarum Angelus, Smirnae, & Laodiceae appellatur...’

The protectorate reveals the changes that had taken place in the preceding half-century: Of Cardinal protectors, and of the various sorts of protection. Here, the term of protector had finally turned into a general denomination of all kinds of governmental and political influence exerted by cardinals. In most cases, still no determined regulations existed - which at the end of the seventeenth century would lead again to a discussion on the protectorate. A contrast was no longer perceived, neither by the authorities, nor by the general public, between the supervision over a variety of institutions, whether they were monasteries, Orders or lay-confraternities; the context of general ecclesiastical reform and the absence of a strict juridical definition made these duties all seem equal. This implied that in the public eye of the Seicento, the protectorate was considered a political structure binding orders, sodalities, states and cardinals in matters of spiritual and governmental involvement.

**Odoardo Farnese's protectorates**

Around 1600, these changing relations between religious institutions and cardinals had a number of effects. Cardinals began to take their tasks much more serious, in some cases, utterly seriously, such as Federico Borromeo who resigned all his Roman protectorates upon his nomination as archbishop of Milan, and Cesare Baronio who had restored and redecorated all the churches with which he was officially involved. As a result of the reforms, the new definition of the role urged many cardinals in the latter half of the sixteenth century to undertake works of artistic patronage to express their commitment. Indeed, artistic patronage was invested with a new importance around 1600 because of the changes to the system of protectorate.

Within this atmosphere of spiritual renewal, Odoardo Farnese played a conspicuous role because of his position and contacts; as Stondonato belonged to the same faction in the College of Cardinals as Farnese, the latter certainly knew the import of the memorandum on the new protectorate. But practical obligations as protector also brought home the implemented changes; in the course of his ecclesiastical career, Farnese accepted the position of protector for a number of institutions and countries. Immediately following his creation as a cardinal, such honours were arranged for him by his father, Duke Alessandro Farnese, using his political contacts with the royal houses of Europe. One of his first nominations was as protector of the Kingdom of Aragon

---

1. This situation was resolved with the Bull *Confessiofidei*, issued by Clement XII in 1691; this tried to restrict and define the role of the cardinal protector within ecclesiastical law. See *DIP* 1974-1997 vol.2, p.280 and *Siena* 1940, p.104.
3. A list of all churches and religious buildings that were restored and/or redecorated in the last quarter of the sixteenth century can be found in the *Roma di Sesto I*, 1993.
in 1592, which was followed in 1600 by that of England, in 1601 by that of Sweden, and in 1607 by that of Portugal. In the following years the republic of Ragusa, the Catholic parts of Switzerland and Germany were added, as was, ultimately, the protectorate of India.\footnote{On Farnese’s creation as protector of Aragon in 1592, see Zappi 1988, pp.339-340 and Zappi 1994, pp.80-81, where also an overview of the interventions of Duke Alessandro and Cardinal Alessandro to obtain benefits and protectorates is given; Zappi interpreted these positions strictly as income for the young cardinal. On the distribution of prebends and dependence on the papal willingness in this matter, see Rietbergen 1983, pp.77-79. For Odoardo’s other positions, see the papal letters confirming his nominations in the ASV, Arm.44.1.45, fol.306 (protectorate of Sweden, 1601), Arm.45.T.2, fol.171 (protectorate of Portugal, 1607). ASN Fondo Farnesiano 1346, contains the Bull on the nomination as protector of England: ‘Clemente VIII sub die 19 Februarii 1600 creavit in protectorum Regni Anglici Card. Odoardus Farnesius’.}

Farnese was also protector of a number of laysodalities. In his funeral oration and in his will he named, apart from the Orazione e Morte, also the Confraternita of Santa Maria del Carmine, which chose him in 1599, and the Casa degli Orfanelli, an orphanage in the centre of Rome of which he became protector in 1606.\footnote{On Odoardo’s protectorate over the Confraternita del Carmine see Filippini 1644, fol.3v; for the Casa degli Orfanelli, see note 63 above.} Odoardo was also involved with the Compagnia del Rosario in the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, the Oratorio del Gonfalone, and with the hospital of San Girolamo della Carita.\footnote{The inclusion of the aforementioned brotherhoods in his will, each of these with a considerable sum, is exceptional for the time around 1600 when compared to the average cardinal’s legacy; see Black 1989, p.20 on testamentary dispositions to brotherhoods (which is still a desideratum), Voelkel 1993, pp.95-101 on the wills of cardinals during the lifetime of Scipione Borghese, and especially the study on the will of Cardinal Paolo Emilio Sfondrato in Gallagher 1999, which is of particular interest as comparison to Farnese’s testament.} Notwithstanding his absence from Rome after 1622, institutions continued to seek favours from him. A letter of 10 June 1623 from the Confraternita dei Lombardi connected to San Carlo al Corso indicates that Farnese was asked to replace as protector Cardinal Scaglia, who had left Rome.\footnote{The fact that he left this confraternity 500 scudi in his will means that he accepted their offer and took on this responsibility as well, even when he continued to reside in Parma.} The fact that he left this confraternity 500 scudi in his will means that he accepted their offer and took on this responsibility as well, even when he continued to reside in Parma.

The most important and prestigious position was that of protector of one of the regular Orders. Farnese acquired two of these positions during his ecclesiastical career. In 1600 the Carthusian Order chose him as their new protector, but Clement’s policy of suppressing the system prohibited papal recognition of this position; Paul V approved it only in 1606.\footnote{On Farnese’s creation as protector of Aragon in 1592, see Zappi 1988, pp.339-340 and Zappi 1994, pp.80-81, where also an overview of the interventions of Duke Alessandro and Cardinal Alessandro to obtain benefits and protectorates is given; Zappi interpreted these positions strictly as income for the young cardinal. On the distribution of prebends and dependence on the papal willingness in this matter, see Rietbergen 1983, pp.77-79. For Odoardo’s other positions, see the papal letters confirming his nominations in the ASV, Arm.44.1.45, fol.306 (protectorate of Sweden, 1601), Arm.45.T.2, fol.171 (protectorate of Portugal, 1607). ASN Fondo Farnesiano 1346, contains the Bull on the nomination as protector of England: ‘Clemente VIII sub die 19 Februarii 1600 creavit in protectorum Regni Anglici Card. Odoardus Farnesius’.}

\footnote{On Odoardo’s protectorate over the Confraternita del Carmine see Filippini 1644, fol.3v; for the Casa degli Orfanelli, see note 63 above.} Around
1616, the protectorate of the Capuchin Order was granted to Farnese. Other attempts – by Farnese himself, or by the Order in question – to be nominated to such positions were obstructed by diverse factors, but in each case, unofficial relations continued to exist, and demonstrate that Farnese was considered a valuable contact at the papal court and an able advisor in regular disputes. In 1611, Farnese was asked to become protector of the Order of the Camaldolesi, but Paul V refused to grant him this, as he wanted to nominate his own nephew Scipione Borghese. The pope’s refusal to grant this request was not immediately accepted by the Order’s general, Angeloni, who even went so far as to contest this decision in front of the pope. An eighteenth-century general of the Camaldolesi, Losanna, described the discussion between Paul V and Angeloni:

'having had notice of the death of this prince [cardinal Ottavio Paravicini] and having celebrated the funeral services for him, general Angelus went to Rome to treat the issue of the new protector, and being closely affiliated with cardinal Odoardo Farnese, his plan was to get him as protector, considering [Farnese’s] qualities for the Congregation; for Odoardo, like all his ancestors, had always venerated the Congregation of the Camaldolesi, and even in the consistories of cardinals had always favourably offered his support to the Camaldolese fathers, and he seemed to solicit for the protectorate with deliberate propensity. However, Pope Paul V’s politeness preoccupied the diligence and concern of the general, because, before the general came to Rome, the Pontiff had assigned the office of protector to his nephew cardinal Scipione Borghese … and commended with fatherly care the Camaldolese congregation to him. Approaching to kiss the feet of the blessed [pope], father Angelus was thus addressed by him: ‘Why, Father General, did you desire Odoardo Cardinal Farnese as protector of the congregation? Why did you reject Scipione Cardinal Borghese, our nephew?’ The general did not want to hide the truth from the Pontifex, but advanced as an excuse the fact that he had considered himself unworthy of so great a favour of protection by His nephew; and that the Congregation also considered [itself] not worthy of so much benevolence from the Pope; but when the Pontiff himself truly would want to employ his dignity, he had his sincerest thanks, and the congregation would repose safely in the shade of so great a protector. And the Pontiff added: ‘I want you to know, general, that when we make Scipione Borghese, …

1 This is suggested by correspondence of the years between 1622 and 1626 in ASP, Cart.Farnesiano e Borbonico Esterno, 5, 419 from members of the Capuchin Order to Farnese in which he was addressed as ’protettore’.

2 On 5 February 1611, the then protector of the Camaldolesi, cardinal Ottavio Paravicini died, see Mitiarelli 1764, p.211.
our nephew, protector of the Camaldoliesi, we personally want to take care of the Congregation's needs, and fulfil the office of protector.\textsuperscript{96}

By intervening in the traditional process of electing the protector, Paul V clearly intended to get a grip on the protectorate, and by electing his nephew instead of Farnese, he wanted to maximise his influence on the process of reform.

Obstructed by this irrevocable papal decision, relations between Farnese and the Camaldolese were destined to remain unofficial. Correspondence between the Camaldolese monks and Farnese document ongoing contacts, dealing with matters that were officially part of the protector's duties. In March 1625, the Camaldolese hermit Hilarion d'Ancona wrote a letter to cardinal Farnese to ask him the favour of intervening in the general chapter, to be held that year in Rome, and to go and talk to cardinal Rivarola, then protector of the Order, on behalf of the congregation and convey its wishes.\textsuperscript{97} This particular request concerned matters of monastic observance, namely the co-operation of two separate Camaldolese congregations. Like the Franciscans, one of these followed the rules in a literal sense; the other had a less strict interpretation. Thus, even while Farnese was not their protector, they requested favours from him that touched upon the issue of regular reform.

Also in the case of the Jesuit Order, Farnese was invested with an unofficial position on

\textsuperscript{96} Mittarelli 1764 p.227: 'habito de obitu hujus principis nuntio, & parentalibus ei celebritis. Romam pro novo protetore impetrando Angelus generalis accurrerit, & qui cum cardinale Odoardo Farnesio familiaritate multa erat conjunctus, hunc in protectorem exquirere designat ... nam Odoarud, ut omnes ejus majores, congregationem Camaldolensem semper veneratus erat, immo suum favorem voluamque suam benignie in congregatnombus cardinalium patribus Camaldulensibus semper praestitit, ac propensione voluntate videbatur protectionem hanc ambire. Verum humanitas summii pontificis Pauli V diligentiam & curam generalis praoccupavit, nam, antequam generalis Romam perveniret, protectionem munus contulit Scipioni Burgesi ... cardinalem nepotem sui, illisque paterna caritate congregationem Camaldulensem commendavit. Accidentem pro osculandis vestigis beatissimus pater Angelum sic alloquuas est: Cur pater generalis Odoarum cardinalem Farnesium in protectorem congregationis cupiebas? Cur Scipionem cardinalem Burgesium nepotem nostrum rejiciebas? Generalis noluit pontifici veritatem caelare, sed pro excusatione attulit, se de tanto favore protectionis nepotis indig财务管理 existimasse, congregacionem quoque existimare non mereri tantam pontificis benignitatem, verum quandoque ipse pontifex ea dignatione uti voluisset, summus ei gratias habere, congregationemque sub umbra tantus protectoris tutam quiescere. Addition Pontifex: Sciis volo generalis, quod si congregations Camaldulensi protectorum Scipionem Burgesium cardinalem nepotem nostrum tribuimus, tamen nos ipsi congregationem necessitatibus consolare, & officium protectoris exercere volumus.'

the grounds of his family's long-standing ties with the Society. In this case it had been the decision of the institution itself to rid itself of its official protector. Only one cardinal, Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, had ever been appointed to that position, around 1544. When he died in 1564, the Jesuits deemed it better not to have a cardinal representing them, but rather to be under the direct governance of the Pope. Pius IV accepted this proposal, and regulations concerning the cardinal protector were erased from the editions of the Jesuit Constitutions after that date.

This did not preclude contacts between the Society and cardinals; Jeronimo Nadal proclaimed in his *Tractatus de consuetudine S.I* that all cardinals were protectors of the Order. Obviously, some were more influential than others. Because Paul III had officially approved the Jesuit Order, the members of his family ranked of the first importance in this context. This expressed itself most clearly in the building of the church of the Gesù; this was considered by Alessandro not only as a prestigious project displaying his wealth, but also serving as an act of appropriation. The same symbolical message was conveyed by the building of the Casa Professa, financed and initiated by Farnese, on which this historical bond was proclaimed in the form of an inscription stating that Odoardo followed in the footsteps of his ancestors by supporting the Order in this way.

**Discalced Carmelites and the mission**

Another unofficial but important contact was maintained between Farnese and the Discalced Carmelites, for whom in 1621 Odoardo commissioned the convent of San Silvestro e Teresa in Caprarola (figs.51 and 52). This church and convent were built for the new Italian congregation of the Discalced Order, which had been instituted by papal approval in 1600. This creation of a new Congregation had no formal influence on the protectorate of the Order. In the Bull proclaiming the independence of various branches it was specifically stated that the Discalced Order would remain under the guidance of cardinal Domenico Pinelli, appointed their protector by Sixtus V.

The Rules of the Discalced Order favoured the authority of the general, as was stated in a discussion in the middle of the seventeenth century, and little room was left for the protector.
A treatise written by Carmelite theologian, Juan Bautista Lezana, discussed the position and function of the cardinal protector quite profoundly. His *Summa Quaestionum Regularium* of 1637 defined the protector as an apostolic delegate and representative of the pope towards the order, while internally 'conserving the authority of the prior'. Although the protector could thus act in favour of the order in Consistory, the Carmelites took care to keep him out of domestic and spiritual affairs.

Instead of depending upon one protector, the Discalced Carmelites turned to more local forms of patronage. When they were allocated their own monasteries in 1598 by Clement VIII, patronage was taken up by individual cardinals and local nobles. One Roman settlement at Santa Maria della Scala was financially supported, by cardinal Paolo Emilio Sfondrato among others, and the building of a second convent in Rome, San Paolo in Terzo Cielo, (later rededicated as the Santa Maria della Vittoria), was funded by cardinal Scipione Borghese. The building of the church and convent of Santi Silvestro e Teresa in Caprarola by Odoardo Farnese can thus be regarded as a public statement of individual patronage. It was also a result of the delegation of another task to the Discalced Carmelites in the first decades of the *Seicento*: that of the mission.

Odoardo Farnese harboured close contacts with the Discalced Carmelites in conjunction with his position as a member of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, the Propaganda Fide. Farnese was nominated as member of this congregation, instituted in 1622 for the co-ordination of the missionary activities of various individual Orders. A number of cardinals close to Farnese had been appointed to the predecessor of this congregation, a short-lived initiative of 1599-1600: Federico Borromeo, Roberto Bellarmino, Pietro Aldobrandini, and others; Farnese himself seems not to have been involved by then. This failed attempt was followed by a new initiative around 1607, in which the mission was to be administrated by a newly instituted congregation of the Discalced Carmelite Order. This did not come to fruition as this proposal was not unanimously accepted by the General Congregation of this Order, but it did result in the establishment of an active role of Discalced Carmelites later on in the Propaganda Fide.

---

102 Lezana 1646, p.56: 'Possunt nihilominus predicti Protectores dici Superiores Ordinum qubus praestantur, & largo modo Praelecti quatenus sunt Commissarii Apostolori, Vicarii delegati, & Locumtenentes Papae in his quae pertinens ad bonum regimin, & gubernia Religionum modo inferior explicando, pro conservanda scilicet purlatorum auctoritate, & quando ab ipsis requisiti fuerint, vel ipsis Domino protectores id necesse esse cognoverit. Iuxta inferior dicèda. Omnes enim habens curam animarum alienum, etsi delegatum, dicit potest Praebutus.'
103 Buchowiecki 1967-1974 vol.3, pp.280-301. It seems that the gift of the Barberini Faun, found on the site of the new church in 1608, was necessary to win Borghese's financial support for the new convent.
104 Perbal 1957, pp.112-120 and Del Re 1970, pp.185-203.
105 Schmidlin 1921.
An important influence on the organisation, assignment, and even the name of the new Propaganda as it was set up in 1622 came from the writings of Tomas de Jesus OCD (1564-1627), who had originally been appointed by Paul V in 1607 to organise the Discalced missionary congregation. As a response to resistance to this plan, Tomas wrote a pamphlet entitled Stimulus missionum, published in 1610, in which he discussed the necessity of missionary activities for the Discalced Congregation. Within three years, he expanded this introductory argument into a large compendium on missionary theory directed to all regulars, the De procuranda salute omnium gentium of 1613 (fig.53). This book, which discussed aims and methods of conversion of heathens, was used by the Propaganda Fide as vade-mecum for regulars in foreign regions until well into the eighteenth century. The Discalced Order, in the end, became one of the driving forces behind the missionary activities of the Catholic Church.

The new convent of Santi Teresa e Silvestro in Caprarola was commissioned by Farnese in exactly the years in which the missionary congregation was erected. Between 1620 and 1622, Odoardo was appointed one of its members, and in which he also corresponded with Domenico di Gesù Maria, a Discalced friar who was consulted regularly by the papal authorities with regard to missionary questions. Although it was only officially declared as such by the Discalced General Chapter in 1628, the convent in Caprarola was from the start meant to be a place for study and intellectual preparation for foreign missions. The monastic architecture, which according to the agreement with Farnese was designed to house fifteen monks, contained room for a total of thirtyfive. The internal organisation of the complex clearly divided the top story of the building - for the lodging of groups of students - from the lower two floors where the regular monks lived, by means of access through a separate stairwell. The ward for the students was thus autonomous from the quarters of the permanent residents.

The art commissioned by Farnese for this new complex seems to underline its function as a convent for missionary preparation. In the church of San Silvestro e Teresa, one of the paintings commissioned by Farnese and painted around 1626 by Alessandro Turchi called l'Orbetto showed
Saint Anthony of Padua preaching to the fish (fig. 54). In contrast to the traditional iconography of the theme, this painting does not show the saint alone with the creatures of the sea. Turchi depicted a number of bystanders, inhabitants of the city of Rimini who, according to the saint's hagiography, first refused to listen to him, but after witnessing this miracle lent him their ears.

Thus, after first meeting with adversity, a natural miracle helped the saint in transmitting the Divine message to his intended audience. In the context of the San Silvestro, the figure of Saint Anthony represented the apostolate of the Faith, which connected the interests of Cardinal Farnese with those of the Discalced Carmelites, and for which goal the convent in Caprarola had been intended.

Farnese's patronage of the Discalced convent should be seen in conjunction with his work as counsellor of the Propaganda Fide, and the general duties of a cardinal in the early seventeenth century. The combination of power, knowledge and prestige obliged the cardinal, in the eyes of theorists of the early Seicento, to sustain the mission. Albergati's treatise on the cardinal's life, dedicated to Farnese upon his nomination in 1592, stated that this was a primary concern for the cardinal of high birth:

'it will be precisely for the cardinal born a prince to accompany advice in this affair [the dissemination of the Faith] with works, so that with by means of his wealth and power the officials of the Church, not only in his own state but also in those of the others will be prepared in the manner that not only in Catholics lands will good education be introduced, but also in heretical states, and heretics and atheists will not lack support or a clear path to the real Faith ...

The monastery in Caprarola thus profited from Farnese's support through his wealth but also his the 'advice' as mentioned by Albergati. Another treatise of 1599 written by Giovanni Botero on the obligations of a cardinal stressed his obligatory spiritual involvement in this matter, and his participation in religious preparation. It was precisely through his involvement with the mission...
that the truly devout cardinal could demonstrate his personal piety and virtues: the practice of the one involved the other.118

In all his ecclesiastical functions, Farnese was obliged to supervise processes of spiritual edification, as the foregoing exposition on the protectorate implied. In the perception of the early seventeenth century, these two actions were interrelated: as Sfondrato formulated the main requirement for protectors in his memorandum to Paul V: 'But the true remedy is to provide for pastors [who are] good and zealous for the souls." 119 Prayer for one's own soul would prepare one to assist with the spiritual salvation of others.

The Camerino's Eucharistic message

The Camerino degli Eremiti served Odoardo Farnese in his position as cardinal protector of this sodality: the existence of the two windows giving onto the church and oratory provided ample occasion for him to attend liturgical and devotional events for his own as well as the brotherhood's benefit. General councils of the brotherhood were held in the oratory, so even the practical affairs of government might have been observed from the Camerino. The architectural constellation, as discussed in the first chapter, was not intended merely for the benefit of its user, but was devised to offer Farnese the full exertion of his practical and spiritual duties with regard to this company.

The decoration of the room reflected the theme of the protectorate on two different levels; the first of which was the specific devotional practice that had given the brotherhood of the Orazione e Morte half of its name. Panfranco's decoration in the Camerino led the occupants' thoughts to the monthly Adoration of the Host during the Quarant'Ore, and more in particular to the central importance of the Host in this act of devotion. This took place either in the church or the oratory and started with a Eucharistic Mass in which the Host was consecrated and subsequently put on the altar for the set period of forty hours.120

What the members of the brotherhood adored in the exposed Eucharist was the Body of Christ after the transubstantiation. On the one hand, this confirmed one of the prime dogmas of the Catholic Church that the consecrated Host indeed turned into His Body, as Bellarmino had...
stated in his explanation of the Christian Doctrine. According to Catholic theology, on the other hand, this corporeal Presence of Christ in the Sacrament was considered a means to ascend with the mind to spiritual union with its Creator, and thus the accent was laid on the spiritual nutrition it offered. In a treatise of 1598 on the significance of the Eucharist, this was given as the main reason why the Host should be considered the most perfect work of God on this earth:

But see the admirable work of the magnanimous Jesus, who in order to make you as perfect as any creature can be, which consists in the perfect union with its Creator, he gives you this precious Sacrament, and searches for your Love: because it is precisely love which transforms the lover into the loved one, which is God. And it pertains to this heavenly Sacrament, just like divine food, that transforms within he who eats it, uniting us with God himself, from which it follows that the Sacrament and our love taken together unite us in such a way with God, that they make us one soul and one heart with him.

What counted was not the actual form of the Host, but its spiritual significance. For this reason, the adoration of the Eucharist during the Forty Hours Prayer was an important occasion for receiving its salvific qualities, in the eyes of the devout in the early Seicento. As the Jesuit Louis Richeome stated in another treatise on Communion, the necessary preparation consisted of prayer and contemplation, to secure spiritual reception instead of a mere swallowing of the Host.

The subjects depicted in the decoration of the Camerino, such as Saints Mary Magdalene, Benedict, Onuphrius, Saints Paul the First Hermit and Anthony Abbot, and most obviously Christ himself in the middle of the ceiling, all alluded to the Host as adored by the brotherhood of the Orazione e Morte during the prayer of the Quarant'Ore, and especially directed the beholder towards the brotherhoods' function of mediating divine inspiration through the act of prayer. The

---

121 Bellarmino 1614, p.74: 'M.: Che effetto fa l'Eucharistia? D.: Nutrisce la carità, che è la vita dell'anima, & l'accresce ogni giorno più. Et però si dà sotto specie di pane: se bene veramente quello non è pane, ma il vero corpo del Signore...'. For the relation of the Quarant'Ore and the dogma of the Presence of Christ in the Host, see McGinness 1988, pp.103-104.

122 Pinelli 1597, pp.12-13: 'Ma vedi l'ammirabile artificio del liberale Gesù, il quale per darti la maggiore perfettione, che si possa dare à Creatura, la quale consiste nella perfetta unione col suo Creatore ti dona questo prestigioso Sacramento, e cerca da te l'amore: perché essendo proprio dell'amore trasformare l'amante nella cosa amata, che è Idio. Et essendo anche proprio di questo celeste Sacramento, come cibo divino, che converte in se chi lo mangia, unisci con Fisceso Dio, ne segue, che il Sacramento, e l'amore nostro congiunti insieme, di tal modo si uniscono con Dio, che ci fanno un'anima, & un cuore con esso'. See DS 1937-1994 vol.4, cols.1586-1621 for the relation between the Host and the Quarant'Ore.

123 On the subject of Communion, especially the frequency with which this should be taken, a large number of works were written. See Moroni 1840-1879 vol.15, pp.108-133 and Maher in Confraternities and Catholic Reform 1999, pp.75-80.

centrally placed painting of Christ hosted by angels after fasting for forty days in the desert formed the key to the understanding of the cycle (fig. 4). Its subject was based upon the Gospel of Saint Matthew, 4.11: 'Then the devil left him, and behold, angels came and ministered to him.' In Roman painting of around 1600, this topic was especially popular in the context of refectories: one such illustration was commissioned from Cristoforo Roncalli by Cinzio and Pietro Aldobrandini for the refectory of the monastery at Camaldoli (fig. 55) and another depiction of this scene was found in the room with the same function in the noviciate of Sant'Andrea al Quirinale in Rome.125 These, and Lanfranco's painting as well, illustrated to the viewer the spiritual and corporeal Presence of Christ at the same time: it literally showed how bread turned into the Body of the Saviour.

But the meaning of the subject of this key painting went beyond the defence of the dogma of Eucharistic transubstantiation: this particular episode was interpreted in seventeenth-century devotional literature as a contrast between spiritual and physical nutrition: and an incitement to prayer. In a treatise of 1598 with meditations on the life of Christ, Jesuit Vincenzo Bruni linked this scene to the words that Christ spoke to the devil when tempted to turn stones into bread: 'Man cannot live on bread alone, he lives on every word that God utters.'126 In meditating upon the particular episode of the angels serving Christ, the soul of the reader was called to join the Saviour at this 'sacred table', an obvious reference to prayer and Eucharistic Mass, the two elements of which the devotion of the Quarant'Ore consisted.127

An explicit reference to the devout turning into an image of Christ was the depiction of the Stigmatisation of Saint Francis in the Camerino. The praying saint was literally unified with his Creator, and the Stigmata were merely exterior signs of this spiritual union. A familiar epithet of this saint was 'alter Christus'. It implied that the figure of Francis was another symbol for the Eucharist.128 At the same time, the scene of Francis' Stigmatisation illustrated the means by which he had attained this identification with Christ. His spiritual union was reached by means of prayer and penitence: the spiritual methods that were practised in the devotion of the

125 For the depiction of the Angels serving Christ in Camaldoli by Cristoforo Roncalli, see Chiappini di Sorio 1975, pp. 107-108; for the painting in the Sant'Andrea, see Richome 1611, p. 109-112. Other examples for Lanfranco's composition were paintings by Ludovico Carracci and Francesco Albani, see Nelli di Correggio 1986, p. 316, cat. no. 112 and Puglisi 1999, p. 206, cat. no. 168.

Bruni 1598, p. 219. See Pigler 1973 vol. 1, pp. 217-222. Schiller 1966-1991 vol. 1, pp. 153-155 and JCT vol. 1, cols. 446-450 for the iconography of this scene; during the Middle Ages the predilection was for the depiction of the three scenes of temptation: Only with the late sixteenth century, representations of Christ served by Angels became more frequent, and became popular in refectories of monasteries; see JCT vol. 4, col. 449.

Bruni 1598, p. 223: 'Accede tu quoq; anima mea hanc sacram mensam, & reliquias ex ea cadentes studiose collige.'

Quarant'Ore. It was to this theme that the painting referred in the context of the Camerino.

The two subjects of meditation and the Eucharist were also combined in the depiction of Saint Mary Magdalene rising up to heaven (fig.5). The iconography of this painting deviated from the sixteenth-century tradition in which the saint was depicted grieving over her worldly excesses. In contrast, Lanfranco here stressed the daily assumption of the saint to heaven where, as Jacobus de Voragine wrote, she enjoyed spiritual instead of material nourishment. As seventeenth-century texts explained, this particular grace was the result of the frequent and assiduous dedication of the saint to prayer and penitence.

The two little figures, hardly visible, standing in the landscape in the lower half of the painting, deviated from the few known depictions of the Ascension of the Magdalene in the sixteenth century, and even from other versions of this scene painted by Lanfranco. These figures are Bishop Maximinus together with a priest who had been called by the saint to bring her the last communion before dying; she was however admitted to heaven before they reached her. The Eucharistic connotation of the present scene was thus taken further by stressing the essentially divine and incorporeal character of the Host, and the mental preparation and reception versus the actual communion. The depiction of Saint Mary of Egypt, of which the descriptions from the inventories mentioned that she was represented in the act of receiving the Host from the hands of a priest, will have conveyed a comparable message to the Seicento viewer.

The following scene of Saint Onuphrius, depicted in a kneeling position and being administered the Host offered a further example of spiritual preparation for Communion. By depicting angels bringing the Host to the fourth-century hermit, a direct relation was constituted...
with the scene where angels hosted Christ, which once again underlined the divine origin and spiritual character of the Eucharist. The painting also stressed the replacement of physical with spiritual food: according to a hagiography of Onuphrius of 1604, this heavenly administration would only take place when penitence had been sufficient to purify the saint for the reception of Christ’s Body and the real bread was no longer necessary for corporeal sustenance.  

The episode from the life of Saint Benedict that was depicted in the Camerino stemmed from his biography by Gregory the Great. Benedict, living in a cave, had ignored the arrival of a basket containing his daily food, as the Devil had broken the bell on the rope. He had not noticed the basket for a number of days as he had been continually immersed in prayer.  

The contradiction between spiritual versus corporeal nourishment was also the subject of one of the frescoes, depicting the meeting of Saints Paul the first hermit and Anthony Abbot (fig.7). The half loaf of bread, which was brought daily to Paul by a raven, was doubled on the occasion of the visit. In Lanfranco’s composition, the direction of the folded hands of Saint Anthony and the gaze of Saint Paul towards the raven, with the loaf in its beak, in the first place expressed the wonder of the two saints at this divine provision, and in the second place turned the fresco into a visual analogy of the Adoration of the Host during the prayer of the Forty Hours, for which the Camerino had been intended.

Saints, protectorates and paintings

Beyond the particulars of the spiritual practices of the Orazione e Morte, the subject of a number of paintings alluded to a second level of meaning. The saints depicted in the paintings and frescoes not only carried a significance related to the devotion of the Quarante Orci, but at the same time called the protectorates to mind with which Farnese was invested around 1616. Saint Eustace (see fig.6) recalls the Roman church of Sant’Eustachio, of which Odoardo was titular cardinal from 12 June 1595 until 3 November 1617, which obliged him to exert pastoral.

---

13 Regio 1604, p.61.
137 BS 1616-170 vol.2, col.1113. The source of this episode is the Dialogue of Gregory the Great, II.1.5-6: 'Ad eundem vero specum a Roman i cella iter non erat. qua excelsa desuper rupis eminebat. sed ex cadere rope in longissimo lume religat Romanus deponere panem consipserat. in qua eliam resti parum tintinabulum inservit ut ad somum tintinabuli vir Dei consipseret quando sibi Romanus panem praebet. quem evisus acquirit. Sed antiquus hostis unius caritati inviderat. alterius refectio, cam quadam die submitti panem consipserat. iactavit lapidem et tintinabulum fructi.'
139 For the iconography of the Meeting of Saints Paul and Anthony, see Pigler 1974 vol.1, p.423-424 and LCT vol.5, col.231 and ibidem vol.8, col.513.
140 Witte 2001a, p.56-57.
care over its parish. Simeon Stylite (fig.8) was an implicit reference to the Basilian abbey of Grottaferrata, the Greek-rite monastery near Rome of which Farnese was commendatory abbot from 1589 onwards (fig.56). This saint was especially venerated in Greek liturgy on the first day of its liturgical calendar and in the Menologio of Saint Basil in particular. Saint Bruno was the founder of the Carthusians, of whom Farnese had been protector since 1599. Saint Anthony of Padua, being born in Lisbon, here represented the reign of Portugal of which Farnese was elected protector in 1607 - and it also stressed the family connection with the country through Maria of Portugal, Odoardo's mother. 

Saints Mary Magdalene (fig.5) and Benedict both functioned on two levels. Apart from alluding to the Eucharist and the Quarant'Ore, the Magdalene constituted a secondary allusion to the hermitage of Camaldoli where Farnese had founded a cell dedicated to this repentant saint in 1599. As Benedict was the founder of monastic rules upon which those of many other Orders had been based, among which were the Camaldolese, he also formed a hidden allusion to this Order with which Farnese had long-standing - but never formalised - contacts.

The largest fresco of the Camerino, now largely hidden behind the organ of the Santa Maria dell'Orazione e Morte, depicted Count Roger discovering Saint Bruno, the founder of the Carthusian Order (fig.9): this scene expressed Farnese's involvement with this regular institution. The fresco was probably copied in print, as part of a series depicting the life of the saint made by Theodor Crüger in twenty engravings after designs by Lanfranco (fig.57). This publication of 1621 was dedicated to Odoardo Farnese, as protector of Carthusian Order, and was

---

141 For the titular church of Sant'Eustachio, see Christoforii 1888, p.255; for the pastoral obligations linked to the function of titular cardinal after the reforms of Sixtus V, see Pastor 1925-1933 vol.10, p.167. The painting referred to the Quarant'Ore, as well, as Fratecchiachrist on the Cross between the antlers of the deer.


143 The link between Saint Symeon Stylite and Grottaferrata was indicated in Barry 1999, p.207; for the situation of the feast of Symeon at the beginning of the Byzantine liturgical calendar and in the Menologio of Saint Basil, see BS 1961-1970 vol.11, col.1128. For the iconography of Symeon Stylite and the snake around the column, see also Sodini 1989, esp. pp.52-53.

144 Tromby 1779, p.437 n.8; this protectorship seems not to have resulted in artistic patronage, as far as research has been done on the subject. The only secure instance of patronage is mentioned in his will of 1619, when he left the Gran Certosa in Grenoble money with which a Crucifix and six chandeliers should be purchased on which the cardinal's arms should be engraved, for which see ASR., Trenta,Not.Capit.lli;25, Not.Giulio Ramondi vol.250, fol.82v.: 'Alla Gran Certosa di Grenoble lascio mille scudi di moneta da farsene una croce et sei candelieri dargento che restino in quella casa per memoria della mia affettione verso l'ordine cartusiano, et vi si doveranno pero porre le mie armi.'


147 On this fresco, see Schleier 1964, p.10, ill. 12, 16. It has been proposed that the fourth and lost fresco depicted another scene of Bruno with Carthusian monks; this would have underlined the association between Farnese and the Order. See Whitfield 1981, p.321 and Schleier 1983, p.81.
based upon the hagiography written by Lorenzo Surio, himself a Carthusian monk, in the fifth volume of his De probatis Sanctorum historiis of 1574. His version of the Life of Bruno contained a number of narrative details that were eliminated from later accounts - even from the critical anthology of the Acta Sanctorum. It was the only source which recorded in detail the event and interpretation of the episode depicted in Lanfranco’s fresco.

The image of Bruno and Roger illustrated the systematic and reciprocal relation between spirituality and protection: the result of this first encounter between the saint and the count was one of mutual dependence between this solitary saint and the secular ruler. Count Roger, according to the hagiography, discovered Bruno during the hunt, was much impressed by his divine qualities, and continually asked him for advice. This solitary saint’s intercession also helped him during a battle to miraculously defeat the enemy by means of a horrific vision; as a result, count Roger decided to donate him land and funds to found two hermitages, and to have a house constructed in the vicinity of one hermitage so that he might be close to the saint and to imitate his solitary life.

The scene of the first encounter between Bruno and Roger was a prelude to a long-lasting reciprocal relationship in which the worldly ruler physically sustained the saint, and the saint aided and directed the count by means of spiritual assistance. This kind of practical help given in return for spiritual edification surely evoked in the seventeenth-century beholder a comparison with the new protectorate after the reforms of Paul V Borghese. According to the guidelines in the memorandum by Stondrato and the unpublished Bull, the cardinal protector was supposed to offer his aid to Orders and confraternities, and should be able to partake in their devotional practice in return. After all, his spiritual perfection was a requirement for a successful exertion of his duties, and monks were still supposed to be the best guides and assistants to help one along the path of devotion and spirituality.

The Camerino degli Eremiti was not only a room where Odoardo Farnese could participate in the religious and liturgical activities of the adjacent church of Santa Maria dell'Orazione e Morte, but at the same time it was an architectural expression of the institutional relations between the brotherhood and its protector. It confirmed the mutual relationship between the two parties and offered the cardinal the possibility to watch over the sodality's obedience to authority: the two windows looking into the church were the ‘eyes’ of the supervisor. At the same time, it enhanced the gatherings of the brothers with the presence of a high church official and

---

15 The Italian translation, Pentimalli 1622, was not accepted as a reliable source by the BN, vol October 1.
secured them the devotion of the cardinal to their own cause. By accepting the interference of the authorities in their affairs, they hoped to gain a privileged position.

In the particular iconography of Lanfranco's frescoes, on the one hand the hermit-saints depicted one of the central spiritual obligations of the Orazione e Morte, the Adoration of the Host during the monthly occasion of the Quarant'Ore. These figures all enacted scenes in which the Host as the Body of Christ and its meaning of spiritual nourishment were the main theme. At the same time, the saints stood for Farnese's obligations to the Catholic Church in general as protector of various institutions. Thus, the staffage conveyed in this case a singular message for an intended viewer. But this leaves undiscussed that all saints, according to the general iconography of the hermits, were taken by the seventeenth-century viewer as a reference to the act of contemplation in solitude. How singular was the Camerino in this respect in early Baroque Rome, in its function as a room for retirement ('ritirare'), as Bellori stated? And what kind of occupation did this word exactly refer to?