

Béla Vilmos MIHALIK

The Fall of an Imperial Ambassador: Count Georg Adam von Martinitz and His Recall from Rome

Abstract: *The paper discusses the changes in the diplomatic relations between Rome and Vienna during the embassy tenure of Count Georg Adam von Martinitz (1696–1700). The series of his conflicts with the Holy See (e.g., the scandal at the Corpus Christi procession, the affairs of the imperial feuds in Italy and finally a poisoning attempt) deteriorated his situation at the Roman Curia. That resulted in his being denied Papal audiences and the recall of Martinitz from Rome. But it should have been anticipated by his relatives in Vienna. Martinitz received another Imperial Court posting, although he was not satisfied with it. Although he inherited most of these conflicts, he was not able to dissolve them; in fact, he made some of them worse. His successor, Count Leopold Joseph von Lamberg, arrived to Rome with the task “to put water on the fire”. But it was not an easy task, especially on the eve of the War of the Spanish Succession.*

Keywords: *Habsburg – diplomacy – Rome – Papal Court – Martinitz*

The last two decades of the seventeenth century were marked by three popes. Innocent XI is the best known of them: he symbolized the organization of the Holy League and the beginnings of the Great Turkish War (1683–1699). His papacy is still one of the most researched from the post-Westphalia period.¹ The relationship between Innocent XI and the Habsburg Court in Vienna was examined by Vilmos Fraknói, whose work is still required reading for the period, mostly in regard to the Great Turkish War.² Innocent's successor Alexander VIII reigned only one and a half years, but his period and particularly his relations with the Habsburgs were well researched (although a century ago). Sigismund von Bischoffshausen wrote about the relations between Rome and Vienna during Alexander VIII on the basis of Viennese sources, namely the reports

1 A new volume recently published about Innocent XI: Richard BÖSEL et al. (cura di), *Innocenzo XI Odescalchi. Papa, politico, committente*, Roma 2014.

2 Vilmos FRAKNÓI, *Papst Innocenz XI. (Benedikt Odescalchi) und Ungarns Befreiung von der Türkenherrschaft*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1902.

of the imperial envoy to Rome.³ A decade after Bischoffshausen's work, János Scheffler examined the same topic, but he used the sources of the Vatican Secret Archives.⁴ The volumes of Bischoffshausen and Scheffler complete each other and show us the two sides of the diplomatic relations between the Roman Curia and the Habsburg Court.

Contrary to those of his predecessors, the decade-long reign (1691–1700) of the last pope of the seventeenth century, Innocent XII, received less interest.⁵ Particularly in terms of his relationship to the Viennese Court, we should mention the article of Elizabeth Garms-Cornides, who examined the pope's decade from the side of the imperial ambassadors' protocol activity in Rome. Garms-Cornides focused on two ambassadors, Anton Florian Liechtenstein and this paper's protagonist, Georg Adam von Martinitz.⁶ Another valuable viewpoint on diplomatic relations between Vienna and Rome is provided by Friedrich Polleroß, who researched the activity and career of Leopold Joseph Lamberg, the imperial ambassador to Rome in the last months of Pope Innocent XII's life. Polleroß examined Lamberg as a diplomat and an art patron, but had a retrospective narrative on Lamberg's predecessors in office, i.e. Liechtenstein and Martinitz.⁷

We can interpret the period of Innocent XII as the prelude to the War of the Spanish Succession as well as the end of the Great Turkish War. Over this decade of his pontificate, the post-Westphalian system of the European powers began to change. From that point of view, it is necessary to examine how the relations between Vienna and Rome changed on the eve of the War of the Spanish Succession. As part of broader research, which aims at the examination of those diplomatic relations during Innocent XII, we will shed a little light on a crucial moment of this period, the fall and recall of the imperial ambassador Georg Adam von Martinitz.

During the last decade of the 17th century, Emperor Leopold I was represented by three ambassadors in Rome. Prince Anton Florian von Liechtenstein arrived to Rome

3 Sigismund von BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII. und der Wiener Hof (1689–1691). Nach den Beständen des Kaiserl. Und Königl. Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs und des Fürstlich Liechtensteinischen Archivs in Wien*, Stuttgart – Wien 1900.

4 János SCHEFFLER, *VIII. Sándor pápa és a bécsi udvar (1689–1691)* [Pope Alexander VIII and the Viennese Court], Ungvár 1914.

5 Bruno PELLEGRINO (cura di), *Riforme, religione e politica durante il pontificato di Innocenzo XII (1691–1700)*, Lecce 1994.

6 Elizabeth GARMS-CORNIDES, *Scene e attori della rappresentazione imperiale a Roma nell'ultimo Seicento*, in: Gianvittorio Signorotto – Maria Antonietta Visceglia (a cura di), *La corte di Roma tra Cinque e Seicento. „Teatro” della politica europea*, Roma 1998, pp. 509–535. She also examined the representative role of the nuncio in Vienna in the 17–18th centuries: EADEM, *Liturgie und Diplomatie. Zum Zeremoniell des Nuntius am Wiener Kaiserhof im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, in: Richard Bösel et al. (Hg.), *Kaiserhof – Papsthof (16.–18. Jahrhundert)*, Wien 2006, pp. 125–146.

7 Friedrich POLLEROß, *Die Kunst der Diplomatie. Auf den Spuren des kaiserlichen Botschafters Leopold Joseph Graf von Lamberg (1653–1706)*, Petersberg 2010.

as an imperial envoy in 1689 for the conclave that elected Alexander VIII. Due to the worsening of diplomatic relations, the Viennese Court planned to recall Liechtenstein, but as Alexander VIII died in early 1691, they decided to leave the prince there for the new conclave.⁸ Moreover, Liechtenstein was appointed as imperial ambassador. Leopold I at last recalled his ambassador in February 1693, after he nominated Liechtenstein as the tutor (ayo) of his younger son, Archduke Charles.⁹ But the Viennese ministers struggled so long to find a suitable new ambassador to Rome that Liechtenstein only left his post in September 1694—and still without a successor in the embassy.¹⁰

Finally, the Emperor appointed the Bohemian aristocrat Count Georg Adam von Martinitz as his new ambassador in December 1694. Martinitz was a member of the Imperial Court from 1675. His first significant diplomatic mission was accomplished in 1682–1683 to Italy, then in 1685 to England. In 1692 he was sent to the Polish Diet. After spending years in Rome he had a career in the Viennese Court, but in 1707 he returned once again to Italy as Viceroy of Naples.¹¹

Martinitz began his journey to Rome only in the autumn of 1695, one year after his appointment as ambassador.¹² Although Martinitz arrived to Rome already 19 November 1695, he was not able officially to begin his activity until early 1696.¹³ After four years of service, Count Martinitz left Rome 25 April 1700.¹⁴ His successor, Count Leopold

8 S. von BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, pp. 169–173.

9 Hausarchiv der regierenden Fürsten von Liechtenstein (= HAL), Familienarchiv (= FA), Kart. 112. Vienna, 7. 2. 1693. Autographed letter of Emperor Leopold I to Prince Anton Florian von Liechtenstein.

10 Ludwig BITTNER – Lothar GROSS, *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter alle Länder seit dem westphälischen Frieden (1648)*. Bd. 1. 1648–1715, Berlin 1936, p. 156.

11 Petr MAŤA, *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)* [The World of Bohemian Aristocracy (1500–1700)], Praha 2004, pp. 473–474.

12 Archivio Segreto Vaticano (= ASV), Segreteria di Stato (= Segr. Stato), Germania, vol. 227, fol. 529r–530r. Vienna, 4. 12. 1694. Nuncio Sebastiano Antonio Tanara reports to Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada that Count Martinitz was appointed by Emperor Leopold as ambassador to Rome on 3 December; Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (= ÖStA), Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (= HHStA), Staatenabteilungen (= StAbt), Rom, Hofkorrespondenz, Kart. 15, Ebersdorf, 5. 10. 1695. The letter of credence of Count Georg Adam von Martinitz by Emperor Leopold I to Pope Innocent XII. The same day other letters of credence were issued to various cardinals of the Roman Curia.

13 L. BITTNER – L. GROSS, *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter*, p. 156. They wrote incorrectly 19. 10., probably it was a misprint. The first report of Count Martinitz from Rome to Emperor Leopold I just after his arrival: ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 75, fol. 13r. Rome, 19. 11. 1695. The first public audience of Count Martinitz took place 16. 1. 1696: ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 76, Rome, 21. 1. 1696. Count Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold I.

14 L. BITTNER – L. GROSS, *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter*, p. 156. Friedrich Polleroß wrote incorrectly 23. 4. 1700: F. POLLEROSS, *Die Kunst der Diplomatie*, p. 302. The right date is 25. 4., the successor of Count Martinitz, Count Leopold Joseph von Lamberg wrote that in his diary: “25 Aprilis. Heuth gegen 3 Uhr Nachmittag ist der Herr Pottscaffter Graff von Martinitz von hier nach Teutschland

Joseph von Lamberg, arrived in Rome 13 January 1700, and was recalled during the War of the Spanish Succession in 1705.¹⁵ Beside the three ambassadors we should mention as well Cardinal Johannes von Goëss, who had lived in Rome since the conclave of 1689. Although he steadily asked permission of the emperor to return into his diocese of Gurk, finally he died in Rome 19 October 1696, aged 85.¹⁶ The role of Cardinal Goëss was quite important for Vienna, as he participated in the work of several congregations of the Roman Curia.¹⁷ As the Cardinal Protector of the Habsburg countries and the Holy Roman Empire (Francesco Maria de Medici) resided in Florence, Goëss became one of the most important supporters and defenders of the imperial interests in Rome.¹⁸ After the departure of Liechtenstein, Cardinal Goëss became the temporary imperial chargé d'affaires, together with secretary Francois Chassignet.¹⁹

In this article we will examine the main causes of the fall of Count Martinitz and how his recall happened, a process which includes the search for a suitable position for him in the Viennese Court. In a broader context, we will explore to place the failure of the imperial ambassador in the diplomatic relationship between Rome and Vienna.

A scandalous procession

Precedence was always a hot issue in court life, even more so when it had diplomatic undertones. Martinitz was not shy to cause offense in such issues. Just a few weeks after his very first papal audience, on 2 February 1696 in the *cappella papale*, he entered in a dispute

abgeraißt...” Niederösterreichisches Landesarchiv (= NÖLA), Herrschaftsarchiv (= HA) Lamberg, Handschriften, nr. 54, pag. 1.

15 F. POLLERROSS, *Die Kunst der Diplomatie*, p. 302. At Bittner and Groß, in the list of the imperial ambassadors the arrival of Count Lamberg is incorrect (15. 1.), see: L. BITTNER – L. GROSS, *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter*, p. 156. Lamberg's diary proves Polleroß: “...ich den 13 Januarii Anno 1700 angelanget”. NÖLA, HA Lamberg, Handschriften, nr. 54, pag. 1.

16 Anneliese KERMAUNER, *Johann Freiherr von Goess*, Diss. Univ. Graz 1966.

17 Cardinal Goëss was member of the Congregazione Concistoriale, the Congregazione de Propaganda Fide and the Congregazione dell'Indice dei libri proibiti, see: Christoph WEBER, *Die ältesten päpstlichen Staatshandbücher. Elenchus Congregationum, Tribunalium et Collegiorum Urbis 1629–1714*, Freiburg – Rom 1991, p. 116.

18 In the absence of Cardinal Medici, officially the Spanish Protector Cardinals (José Saens de Aguirre, then Francesco del Giudice) represented the imperial nominations of bishops in the papal consistory as conprotectors: Josef WODKA, *Zur Geschichte der nationalen Protektorate der Kardinäle an der römischen Kurie*, Innsbruck – Leipzig 1938, p. 68.

19 L. BITTNER – L. GROSS, *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter*, p. 156. Bittner and Groß do not mention Chassignet, but he had an increasing role beside the aging Cardinal Goëss. The cardinal struggled with some Viennese minister who wanted to recall Chassignet, but Johannes von Goëss counted on his help: A. KERMAUNER, *Johann Freiherr von Goess*, p. 150.

over the precedence with Filippo Colonna, the Gran Contestabile of Naples.²⁰ A few months later, Martinitz prepared for the next dispute. He emphasized his precedence over the Roman governor Ranuccio Pallavicino in the order of the Corpus Christi procession. He stated that the governor at the time of Prince Liechtenstein demanded to be in the procession in the same line with the royal ambassadors, who refused it. The pope then ordered the governor to be rather at his side, in the case of being commanded by the pontiff.²¹ As Cardinal Goëss wrote to Prince Liechtenstein, Governor Pallavicino wanted to march between the ambassadors and the deacon cardinals, which made Martinitz angry.²² Hence, weeks before the procession, Count Martinitz summarily demanded a change of the order, which caused a storm of indignation in the Sacred College of the Cardinals. After the papal consistory held on 18 June 1696, the cardinals organized a separate meeting over the issue of precedence. The Spanish Cardinal Protector Francesco del Giudice warned both Cardinal Goëss, who was confined to bed, and Count Martinitz that the further demands would not remain without consequences.²³

In the end, the governor stayed away from the procession due to a minor illness, which seems to have befallen him at the request of the pope and after an intensive intervention by the Carmelite Karl Felix Slavata, a close relative of the new ambassador. But these secret moves in the background did not prevent a major scandal.²⁴ Martinitz marched so slowly in the procession by way of protest that it caused almost two hours' delay of the Corpus Christi procession on 21 June 1696. The outcry of the cardinals was deafening. The Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada sent a report to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce in Vienna on 23 June. Cardinal Spada informed the nuncio about the scandal at the procession, and asked Santacroce to express the indignation of the Holy See to

20 Ibidem, pp. 156–157.

21 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 76, fol. 100r–108v. Rome, 2. 6. 1696. Count Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold I. For a general overview of the Corpus Christi procession, see: Maria Antonietta VISCEGLIA, *Tra liturgia e politica: il Corpus Domini a Roma (XV – XVIII secolo)*, in: R. Bösel et al. (Hg.), *Kaiserhof – Papstthof*, pp. 125–146.

22 HAL, FA, Kart. 144. Rome, 2. 6. 1696. Cardinal Goëss to Prince Liechtenstein.

23 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 76, fol. 116r–123r. Rome, 23. 6. 1696. Count Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold I.

24 E. GARMS-CORNIDES, *Scene e attori*, p. 527.

Emperor Leopold I.²⁵ According to the rumors, Innocent XII was also outraged: he said, “Never again a Bohemian!”²⁶

Santacroce was not in a good situation, as he had literally been dropped into the middle of the conflict, having arrived only a few days before to Vienna. As he answered Cardinal Spada on 14 July, the report about the scandalous procession was the first letter from Rome which he received in the imperial capital. This means that Santacroce had not yet even been able to gain his first audience with the emperor in these weeks. He had also not yet been visited by the ministers of the Habsburg Court, but the Venetian ambassador advised him to break protocol and visit the ministers, given that the affair was so urgent. But the court was busy in these days, as they prepared for the funeral commemorations for Mariana of Austria, Queen Mother of Spain and sister of the emperor. But the nuncio had the information that the Viennese Court explained the behavior of Martinitz with two arguments: they claimed first that because of his gout, he was able only to march slowly, and second, the deacon cardinals had gone slowly to account for keeping enough space for the absent governor. In short, they claimed that the cardinals were liable for the delay of the service.²⁷

Martinitz worsened the situation with his argumentation. He stated that the governor – even if he was a prelate – was still just a member of the secular government of Rome, and so his power descended from the power of the emperor. He argued that the governor of Rome is simply the same position as the burgomaster of Vienna.²⁸ It seems that Martinitz did not realize how far he had gone, as he did not report the case to Cardinal Goëss. The next day, Pope Innocent XII sent Giuseppe Gozzadini, the secretary of the Segretaria dei memoriali to the cardinal, who welcomed Gozzadini (knowing nothing of the affair). Cardinal Goëss tried to defend the situation and Count Martinitz, but the Sacred College demanded satisfaction. They protested with their absence from the procession held at the church of the German nation, Santa Maria dell’Anima on 26 June

25 Archivio di Stato di Roma (= ASR), Archivio Santacroce, Busta 1168. Rome, 23. 6. 1696. Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce. We know from a letter of Francois Chassignet to Prince Liechtenstein that the deacon cardinals went with such a distance after the ambassadors, which showed apparently where would be the reserved place of the governor: HAL, FA, Kart. 133. Rome, 30. 6. 1696. Secretary Francois Chassignet to Prince Anton Florian von Liechtenstein. About the scandalous procession see also: Joseph SCHMIDLIN, *Geschichte der deutschen Nationalkirche in Rom S. Maria dell’Anima*, Freiburg im Breisgau – Wien 1906, pp. 545–551.

26 Tomáš PARMA, *František kardinál Dietrichstein a jeho vztahy k římské kurii* [Cardinal Franz von Dietrichstein and his Relations to Roman Curia], Brno 2011, p. 137.

27 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, Busta 1166, vol. of year 1696, pag. 16–19. Vienna, 14. 7. 1696. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

28 Maria Antonietta VISCEGLIA, *La città rituale. Roma e le sue cerimonie in età moderna*, Roma 2010, p. 160.

1696.²⁹ As the ‘chronicler’ of the pontificate of Pope Innocent XII, Giovanni Battista Campello wrote in his diary such an absence of the cardinals from the procession of the Santa Maria dell’Anima had never happened in memory.³⁰ The most humiliating aspect for Martinitz was that the same cardinals not long thereafter appeared decidedly healthy in the San Lorenzo in Damaso at the inivation of Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni, nephew of the late Pope Alexander VIII.³¹

Cardinal Goëss wrote to Liechtenstein that he knew about this plan of the cardinals but did not believe it. He complained to some of his confidants in the Sacred College that it was why they did not want to pray together against the Ottomans for new Christian victories.³² As Martinitz was not able to negotiate or moderate the issue concerning the procession, the Viennese Court again counted on the old Cardinal Goëss. The prelate tried to calm down the feelings against Martinitz inside the Roman Court. Although Pope Innocent XII did not deny Martinitz audiences, they were no longer than half an hour and confined only to pure formality. The conflict between the two courts undermined the health of the 85-year-old Cardinal Johannes von Goëss, who finally died in autumn of the same year.³³

After the death of Cardinal Goëss, Martinitz remained alone with his tough manner in Rome. In autumn of 1696, he wrote to the Emperor that he suspected the absence of the cardinals from the Santa Maria dell’Anima concealed French influence and diplomacy.³⁴ While Martinitz was not able to let the affair go, the Holy See wanted to close it down. They argued that already during Gregory XIV (1590–1591), the governor marched on the right hand of the imperial ambassador.³⁵

In Vienna the ministers wanted to validate the compromise between Liechtenstein and the former governor. They stated that this compromise allowed the governor to go

29 A. KERMAUNER, *Johann Freiherr von Goess*, pp. 158–159.

30 Paolo CAMPELLO DELLA SPINA, *Pontificato di Innocenzo XII. Diario del Conte Gio. Battista Campello*, Studi e documenti di storia e diritto 10, 1889, p. 460. “*La mattina si fece la tanto decantata processione della chiesa dell’Anima della nazione tedesca; v’intervenve l’ambasciatore Cesareo, ma nessun cardinale benche da lui invitati, il che non si ricorda mai. La causa furono le precedenze straordinarie pretese da detto ambasciatore nella processione ponteficia.*”

31 E. GARMS-CORNIDES, *Scene e attori*, p. 527.

32 HAL, FA, Kart. 144. Rome, 30. 6. 1696. Cardinal Goëss to Prince Liechtenstein.

33 A. KERMAUNER, *Johann Freiherr von Goess*, pp. 159–161.

34 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 76, fol. 77r–84v.

35 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, Busta 1168. Rome, 11. 8. 1696. Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce. The Cardinal Secretary cited the work of Gasparo Alveri, who described a cavalcade on the occasion of the *posse* of Gregory XIV. The then-Governor of Rome, Girolamo Matteucci, marched on the right side of the imperial ambassador, Guido di Romberg, see: Gasparo ALVERI, *Roma in ogni stato*, Roma 1664, Parte prima, p. 387.

behind the deacon cardinals and near the pope, to serve him.³⁶ The origin of the problem was that before Liechtenstein there had been no secular imperial ambassador for a long time in Rome, so the old traditions had faded from memory. The governor and the ambassador reached the mentioned compromise most probably in 1694. But as we can see, this agreement was quite fragile, mainly because in the next year there still was no secular imperial ambassador in Rome.³⁷

On the other hand, Emperor Leopold expressed to the nuncio that they recognize the immunity of the church and also maintain respect toward the pope.³⁸ It seems then that the core of the controversy was a different interpretation of this mentioned compromise of Prince Liechtenstein. In an audience on 13 November 1696, Nuncio Andrea Santacroce and the emperor tried to find a solution to these misinterpretations ahead of the coming Christmas holidays. Leopold I promised the nuncio that he would review all the documents he received and then issue an instruction to Martinitz.³⁹

It appears the holidays and services of Christmas took place without any further trouble. We know only that in the spring of 1697 Martinitz still protested against the absence of the Sacred College from the service in the Santa Maria dell'Anima, but without any consequences.⁴⁰ The Corpus Christi procession of 1697 came off without incident, although it should be noted that Innocent XII absolved the nobility, the ambassadors and the cardinals from participation in the procession. Martinitz was again informed through Slavata that the governor would not participate, so at last the imperial ambassador marched in the procession.⁴¹ In 1698 Martinitz was absent from Rome, as he was in Vienna to get the Golden Fleece. During these years the relations between the two courts were determined by other political issues, though this did not mean that the conflicts over precedence had been resolved. In 1710, some sources discussed a dispute in precedence, this time between the imperial ambassador Marquis du Prié and the governor Francesco Caffarelli. They referred again to the compromise of Prince Liechtenstein, although these sources stated that the agreement was officially drawn up by Cardinal Goëss and the Cardinal Secretary

36 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 221, fol. 126r–127v. Vienna, 1. 9. 1696. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada. It seems that the interpretation of this compromise differed in Rome and in Vienna.

37 E. GARMS-CORNIDES, *Scene e attori*, pp. 521–522.

38 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, Busta 1166, vol. of year 1696, pag. 88–90. Vienna, 1. 9. 1696. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

39 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, Busta 1166, vol. of year 1696, pag. 158–160. Vienna, 17. 9. 1696. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

40 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 219., fol. 324r–327r. Rome, 2. 3. 1697. Secret letter of Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce.

41 E. GARMS-CORNIDES, *Scene e attori*, p. 532.

Fabrizio Spada.⁴² In 1710 they also referred back to the work of the German lawyer Johann Theodor Sprenger. Sprenger, in his work *Roma nova* (1660), gave the list of precedence, where the first five follow one another in the following order: 1. Cardinals; 2. Governor; 3. Imperial ambassador; 4. Roman senators; 5. Royal ambassadors.⁴³

The imperial feuds in the Papal States

In the days of the Corpus Christi procession of 1697, Martinitz corresponded about a completely different issue with the Viennese Court, as he waited impatiently an imperial edict. After Louis XIV's France had negotiated successfully with some North Italian principalities (Mantua, Parma, Tuscany, Modena) in 1692 during the Nine Years' War, the Habsburgs were a step behind. Emperor Leopold I had to reinforce his weakened positions with the Italian states. One approach was to dust off and to revitalize the rights connected to the imperial feuds in Italy.⁴⁴ The new Italian policy of Vienna already started after 1683 in the wake of the liberation of the imperial capital and the eruption of the Great Turkish War. As the Spanish monarchy decayed, Emperor Leopold and his circle again revived the old imperial dreams of Charles V. An early manifestation of this policy was the rethink of the relationship with the North Italian states.⁴⁵

This question was of vital importance during the Nine Years' War, as North Italy again became a buffer zone between France and the Habsburg monarchy. Vienna would have to address the quartering and movement of her armies in that area as well. The Imperial Court demanded greater contribution to the war from the little states of this region, and therefore Vienna tried to refer back to imperial vassal connections of the early Middle Ages. When new papal nuncio Sebastiano Antonio Tanara was appointed to Vienna in 1692, he received in his instruction important orders on how to deal with the ministers of the Habsburg Court regarding the North Italian question. One disputed region was Parma, where the Imperial Army wanted quarters, while the Holy See claimed the principality as a papal vassal. In the North Italian territories like the Diocese of Novara,

42 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (= BAV), Vat. Lat. 12.431, fol. 140–187.

43 Johann Theodor SPRENGER, *Roma nova*, Francofurti 1660, p. 155 (Liber IV. Caput VII. Ordo Praecedentiae Ecclesiasticarum et secularium dignitatum).

44 Daniela FRIGO, *Gli stati italiani, l'Impero e la guerra di successione spagnola*, in: Matthias Schnettger – Marcello Verga (Hg.), *Das Reich und Italien in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Bologna – Berlin 2006, pp. 88–89.

45 Cinzia CREMONINI, *La mediazione degli interessi imperiali in Italia tra Cinque e Settecento*, in: Cinzia Cremonini – Riccardo Musso (a cura di), *I feudi imperiali in Italia fra XV e XVIII secolo*, Roma 2010, pp. 31–48, here 47.

the Imperial Army wanted to levy war taxes and other contributions, while the Holy See claimed them as papal feuds.⁴⁶

The most problematic point was the feud of Farnese, which was situated in the Papal States. The feud was originally possessed by a collateral branch of the famous Farnese family of Pope Paul III. The members of this branch bore the title of Prince of Latera, but by the middle of the seventeenth century, they had gradually become impoverished: the last members of the family sold Farnese to the Chigi family, relatives of the then-reigning pope, Alexander VII (1655–1667). The pope elevated the possession to the rank of principality, meaning his relatives were granted the title of Prince of Farnese. Almost simultaneously, Emperor Leopold I donated the Imperial Prince title to the Chigi family in recognition of the papal support against the Ottomans. This simultaneous elevation of rank resulted in a serious misunderstanding a few decades later. In 1693 the predecessor of Martinitz, Prince Liechtenstein, demanded the obligatory visit from Prince Agostino Chigi, who was the owner of the Farnese feud. That should have been a symbolic act when the vassal of the emperor visits the representative of the emperor, i. e. the imperial ambassador; however, Prince Chigi refused that visit. Moreover, imperial taxation of the Farnese feud also emerged as a possibility. The affair became really unpleasant because the cousin of Agostino, Cardinal Flavio Chigi, was one of the most influential supporters of the imperial policy in Rome. Finally the cardinal successfully settled the question with the help of the Italian-born Antonio Caraffa, general of the Imperial Army.⁴⁷

The above-mentioned imperial edict, which was impatiently awaited by Georg Adam von Martinitz in 1697, was a general order of Emperor Leopold about the imperial feuds in Italy. The edict is dated 29 April 1697 and can be interpreted as a consequence of the new Italian policy of Vienna. Leopold I ordered his Italian vassals to renew their oath in front of the general war commissioner (*commissarius generalis*), Count Maximilian Breuner or the imperial ambassador in Rome, Count Georg Adam von Martinitz. The vassals were obligated to hand in requests for the imperial confirmation of their feuds within three months after the publication of the edict. In case of failure to take the oath or submit the request, they would be pronounced traitors and their feuds confiscated.⁴⁸ Martinitz complained to the Jesuit Pietro Giuseppe Ederi in early June that he had

46 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 39, fol. 668v–672r. Rome, 10. 5. 1692. Instruction of Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Sebastiano Antonio Tanara.

47 BAV, Vat. Lat. 14.137, fol. 252r–269r.

48 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, busta 1169. Vienna, 29. 4. 1697. The copy of the imperial edict as an attachment of the letter of the Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada on 17. 6. 1697.

informally (from Ederi) and not yet officially received the edict.⁴⁹ Finally, Martinitz got the edict a week later – just a day after the Corpus Christi procession of 1697.⁵⁰ A few days later, on 11 June, the ambassador displayed the imperial edict in two places at his residence in Rome.⁵¹ Moreover, he ordered his hajduks to guard the displayed edicts. Pope Innocent XII flew into a rage, feeling himself offended not just in the Papal States, but now in his capital as well. As an answer, several days later, the pope accepted the suggestions of the Congregazione di Stato, and ordered the Cardinal Camerlengo Paluzzo Altieri to issue a contraedict. This warned all the landlords in the Papal States obeying the imperial order in any form would result in confiscation their possessions because of disloyalty to the Holy See.⁵²

It seems that the imperial edict and the papal contraedict were in close connection with the case of the feud of Albano. That was possessed by the family Savelli, one of the most supportive Roman aristocratic families in imperial politics. Generations of the family represented emperors in Rome in the first half of the 17th century.⁵³ By the end of the century they had run into debts, according to contemporary sources, which reached 617,000 scudi.⁵⁴ The creditors of Prince Giulio Savelli turned to Pope Innocent XII, who then warned the prince that it may cause further serious consequences. The prince therefore turned for help to the emperor and handed over some old documents to prove that Albano was an imperial feud. Through an auction he sold the estate for 440,000 scudi to Prince Livio Odescalchi, nephew of the late Pope Innocent XI and prominent figure of the imperial party in Rome. This transaction threatened the Holy See with an immediate investiture of Prince Odescalchi by the emperor into the possession of Albano. The Apostolic Chamber quickly intervened and citing their pre-emptive right, acquired Albano.⁵⁵ No wonder, then, that both sides felt their rights threatened after the confusing case of Albano, one which demonstrates a more general conflict over feuds in Italy.

49 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 4r–6v. Rome, 1. 6. 1697. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Pietro Giuseppe Ederi SJ. About Father Ederi: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 52, pp. 285–286.

50 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 7r–11v. Rome, 8. 6. 1697. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Pietro Giuseppe Ederi SJ.

51 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, busta 1169. Rome, 17. 6. 1697. Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce.

52 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 43, fol. 273v–274r. Rome, 17. 6. 1697.

53 Irene FOSI, *La famiglia Savelli e la rappresentanza imperiale a Roma nella prima metà del Seicento*, in: R. Bösel et al. (Hg.), *Kaiserhof – Papsthof*, pp. 67–76.

54 Paolo CAMPELLO DELLA SPINA, *Pontificato di Innocenzo XII. Diario del Conte Gio. Battista Campello*, *Studi e documenti di storia e diritto* 11, 1890, p. 109.

55 E. GARMS-CORNIDES, *Scene e attori*, p. 533; Gaetano MORONI ROMANO, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*, vol. 1, Venice 1840, pp. 187–188.

That the two courts avoided the final break in their relations is partly thanks to the famous Capuchin friar Marco d'Aviano. The old friar, who died one and a half years later in 1699, was urged by Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to mediate. D'Aviano's intervention resulted in a mutual exchange of letters between the pope and the emperor. Leopold I expressed that he did not intend to offend Innocent XII or his sovereignty, an argument which satisfied the pontiff (if not completely). Although they did not solve the conflict, the two courts tried to cover the affair of feuds with silence. The glorious victory of Eugene of Savoy over the Ottomans in Zenta on 11 September 1697 offered a good occasion for a partial reconciliation, as the pope gave an audience again to Martinitz in the autumn.⁵⁶ Further progress was evident after the Treaty of Rijswijk in the autumn of 1697 when Pope Innocent XII seemed to be willing financially to support the Vienna's war against the Ottomans again. After the peace between France and the Habsburgs was announced officially in Rome in February 1698, the pope contributed a support of 200,000 florin at the end of April.⁵⁷

Despite this thaw, the one who was not really content with the issue of the affairs about the feuds was Martinitz. As Venetian ambassador to Vienna Carlo Ruzzini reported to the Senate in early 1698, the imperial ambassador still tried to keep the feuds on the agenda. Martinitz wanted the Holy See to answer the latest letter of Leopold I, and brought up the issue from time to time at the Roman Curia.⁵⁸ The Venetian Ruzzini was among those who expressed his dismay in a report after the affair broke out again: "*After long time of sleeping and as it was believed almost extinct, the delicate matter with the Roman Court about the contraedict and the imperial feuds burst in flames again.*"⁵⁹

The Papal Court found the scapegoat in the person of Martinitz – not totally without cause. Martinitz arrived at the end of May 1698 and spent two weeks in Vienna, where he had received the Golden Fleece from the emperor.⁶⁰ As the nuncio reported to the cardinal secretary, the ambassador had a suprisingly long three-hour audience with the emperor, and the next day another one. Andrea Santacroce was not able to learn completely of all the issues that Martinitz discussed with Leopold I, but he was informed

56 E. GARMS-CORNIDES, *Scene e attori*, pp. 534–535.

57 About the official announcement of the peace: ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 51r–61v. Rome, 22. 2. 1698. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold. About the papal aid against the Ottomans: *ibidem*, fol. 116r–118v. Rome, 26. 4. 1698. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold.

58 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Venedig, Dispacchi di Germania, vol. 178, pag. 544–548. Vienna, 22. 2. 1698. Carlo Ruzzini to the Venetian Senate.

59 *Ibidem*, vol. 179, pag. 256–258. Simmering, 26. 7. 1698. Carlo Ruzzini to the Venetian Senate.

60 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 235, fol. 472r. Vienna, 14. 6. 1698. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

that the ambassador complained in general against the Roman Court, and in particular against the Gran Contestabile Colonna and the Prince of Farnese Agostino Chigi, who had neglected his obligatory visit. The nuncio learned also that the Viennese Court prepared to take measures against the Prince of Farnese, and had floated the idea to strip his title of Imperial Prince.⁶¹

Martinitz arrived back to Rome on 1 July 1698.⁶² On 9 July, the Abbot Pietro Paolo Domenici, an imperial agent in Rome, carried a call of the emperor to Agostino Chigi. Chigi was urged to express his loyalty toward the emperor and confirm the imperial claim in the feud of Farnese. Chigi answered the abbot that he recognized only one lord (the pope) and he referred Domenici to the contraedict issued by the Holy See a year before. The prince immediately reported the imperial admonition to the pontiff, upon which Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada sent an extraordinary courier to Vienna to the nuncio, warning, that if they allow the imperial policy “*to inflame a fire, blazing in the territories of the Church, it could be able to carry on into a great firestorm in the whole of Italy*”. He ordered the nuncio to request an audience immediately with the emperor to express how upset the pontiff was due to the affair of Farnese, and how offended by this breach of his sovereignty in his own land. Cardinal Spada wrote that the nuncio should proceed with “*strength and sweetness*” toward the emperor. The cardinal secretary emphasized also, that even if Chigi is an Imperial Prince, it has not got any connection with the feud of Farnese.⁶³

Nuncio Santacroce, soon after he received the letter of the cardinal secretary, asked for an audience at the emperor. He presented to Leopold I the dismay of the pontiff and emphasized that the Holy See would under no circumstance renounce any of her rights. The nuncio suggested that the whole procedure of the ambassador was a secret, personal plot against Prince Chigi. Santacroce asked the emperor to appoint a minister with whom he could negotiate about the feuds. The emperor emphasized in his answer that his ambassador was acting under his own orders, and that, though he would keep respect for the Holy See, he would also defend the rights of the Holy Roman Empire.

61 Ibidem, vol. 222, fol. 101r–103v. Vienna, 31. 5. 1698. Secret report of the Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

62 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 128r. Rome, 5. 7. 1698. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold.

63 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, busta 1230. Rome, 13. 7. 1698. Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce. Spada attached to his instruction a short description about the history of Farnese from the 11th century on, and also a copy of the imperial admonition to the Prince Agostino Chigi. See also: ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 42–43. Rome, 12. 7. 1698. Abbot Domenici's report.

He did, however, appoint Imperial Vice-Chancellor Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz as a negotiating partner for the nuncio.⁶⁴

The nuncio and the vice-chancellor had a long meeting in early August. Kaunitz claimed that even in the Papal States many imperial feuds can be found, such as Castiglione. He proved it with the fact that during the previous war in Italy, these feuds contributed to the provision of the Imperial Army. Kaunitz emphasized that even if the Holy See claimed in the contraedict that no imperial feud exists in the Papal States: it is not true. Santacroce returned that even if some contribution had come from a feud in the Papal State, it might be only represent a forced taxation or the independent support of some landlords. The nuncio repeated again, that neither the pope nor his predecessors ever recognized any other lord in the territory of the Ecclesiastical States, and they always invigilated over the rights and privileges of the Holy State. Therefore, Pope Innocent XII could not permit any modification to the status of the feuds, said the nuncio.⁶⁵

In the light of that attitude of the Holy See, it is no wonder that in the meantime, Procamerlengo Cardinal Galeazzo Marescotti issued an order that Prince Chigi, according to the contraedict of 17 June 1697, must not obey the imperial admonition in any form.⁶⁶ Both the answer of the emperor and of the vice-chancellor raised the anger of the Roman Curia. As Cardinal Secretary Spada wrote to the nuncio in mid-August, all these answers and arguments showed the intent of the Viennese Court was to continue the usurpation in the Papal States.⁶⁷ Spada's opinion seemed to be confirmed by the conference of the Court Council in Vienna on 30 August 1698. The council ratified the previous measures and referred to the original edict of 1697 as a valid foundation of their policy. They ordered the collection of more documents that would support their rights and prove the existence of imperial feuds in the Papal States. These were then to be presented to the pontiff as testimonials of the Viennese demands.⁶⁸

The situation was clear: both sides claimed they were defending their own rights and blamed the other for usurping privileges. During this impasse, Martinitz painted himself into a corner. It seems that the ambassador tried to make the Roman Court believe that

64 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, busta 1166, year of 1698, pag. 305–312. Vienna, 26. 7. 1698. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

65 Ibidem, pag. 337–345. Vienna, 2. 8. 1698. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

66 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, busta 1230. Rome, 28. 7. 1698. The order of Cardinal Marescotti is together with the letters of the Cardinal Secretary on 9. 8. 1698.

67 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, busta 1230. Rome, 16. 8. 1698. Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce.

68 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 222, fol. 206r–208r, 215r–219v. Vienna, 30. 8. 1698. Secret report of the Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

he was simply the executor of the imperial order, which had been prepared months before his stay in Vienna and subsequent return to Rome. But Nuncio Santacroce reminded the cardinal secretary that Martinitz was one of the most influential accusers against Prince Chigi ever since the prince had declined to visit the ambassador. Santacroce supposed that it had been Martinitz's suggestion to strip the title of Imperial Prince from the family Chigi, even though Martinitz prepared the above-mentioned imperial order on Prince Chigi with the help of some confidant Viennese ministers. According to the information of the nuncio, this imperial order was antedated to absolve Martinitz in case of any impropriety in the affair. Santacroce reported that these actions caused such confusion in the Viennese Court that they were completely helpless about how to deal with the conflict over the feuds. But others, called by the nuncio as instigators, suggested that the matter be submitted to the Imperial Diet in Regensburg.⁶⁹

The controversy over the feuds extended for a long time, which essentially froze the relations between Rome and Vienna. When Fabrizio Paolucci, an extraordinary nuncio to Poland, stopped in Vienna for a short time in October 1698, he asked for an audience with the emperor. The meeting had begun cheerfully, until Paolucci started talk about the affair about the feuds. The atmosphere of the talks changed dramatically, and the emperor just answered coldly with the usual arguments, that he had to keep the privileges of the empire in view. Paolucci talked also with the Jesuit confessor of Leopold I, Francesco Menegatti. The confessor confided that he was not able to change anything about the mind of the emperor, as Leopold was unwilling to speak about the feuds.⁷⁰

As mentioned above, the nuncio complained against Martinitz and alleged that he was the principal instigator of the conflicts. But it was yet another affair which caused Martinitz's downfall. It can be said that the controversy about the feuds was the oil, but the spark flew out from somewhere else to cause the fire which consumed the Roman Curia's patience with Martinitz for good.

Poisoned relations

On the afternoon of 7 April 1698, the nurse of Maria Anna, the newborn daughter of Martinitz, fell suddenly ill and showed immediately signs of poisoning. She had eaten a roasted apple with powdered sugar just before. The members of the household accused a servant whose wife had just been dismissed as a former nurse of the ambassador's

69 Ibidem, fol. 183r–184v. Vienna, 16. 8. 1698. Secret report of the Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

70 Ibidem, fol. 271v. Vienna, 4. 10. 1698. Secret report of the Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada.

daughter. He admitted his act, and confessed that he bought the powder from a woman called Agnese Bracci. A member of the household informed Ranuccio Pallavicino, the Governor of Rome, about the crime which had occurred in the house of the ambassador. The governor ordered his men to capture Agnese Bracci, and asked a judge to interrogate the woman. The judge at first refused to interrogate her, as the confession of the servant had happened in the Martinitz house without the confirmation of any legal entities, and therefore the judge did not consider the interrogation of Agnese Bracci legally substantiated. Due to pressure by the governor, the woman was eventually interrogated. She confessed that the servant had requested of her a medicine which could stop the breast milk of the nurse who had taken his wife's position. Bracci also emphasized that the powder was neither arsenic nor any other type of poison, but a medicine against fever which she had obtained a few months earlier from another woman, Anna Acquavitaro. The governor's men then captured Anna as well, and she confessed that she sold Bracci the powder which she had obtained from Sicily, where it is called the "powder of the devil" (*"esser detta polvere Terra di Sicilia, detta del Diavolo"*). The interrogations had just ended when a man of the Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada was sent to the governor to warn him that the ambassador was already complaining that the governor had not yet provided information about the captures and confessions. Martinitz also sent one of his cavaliers to the judge, who declined to tell him anything without the permission of the governor. They finally asked the ambassador to allow them to interrogate the servant themselves. The next day, Martinitz had already complained to the pontiff that Governor Ranuccio Pallavicino had refused to make a proper process.⁷¹

A week later Martinitz informed the Viennese Court that the culpable servant – owing to an attack of conscience – asked the ambassador to appoint some trustworthy men, because he wanted to amend his previous statement. The servant then told Abbot Domenici and the German secretary that he had brought two sacks from Agnese Bracci. One was for the powder to dry out the breast milk of the nurse, but in the other was arsenic to poison the ambassador. But the servant accidentally swapped the two sacks, and gave the arsenic to the nurse. Martinitz emphasized that he had never had any conflict with the servant which would cause such a murderous hatred. Moreover, two brothers of the servant were also the members of his household; therefore, it was suspected that somebody

71 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 100r–107v. Rome, 12. 4. 1698. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold. He attached a report about the "poisoning" act. Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada sent the same account to the nuncio in Vienna, and informed him that Martinitz complained against the governor, but he did not let the servant out from his house to be interrogated: ASR, Archivio Santacroce, busta 1230. Rome, 12. 4. 1698. Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce.

else was the instigator. Martinitz evidently already has a suspicion, but he preferred not to write it but rather tell it personally to the emperor on his next trip to Vienna.⁷² A few weeks later, on the evening of 2 May, the servant somehow escaped from the coal cellar where he had been detained. He tried to get to the room of the ambassador, but he was stopped by others, and was taken back to the cellar. Although the servant claimed he only wanted to ask for the pardon of Martinitz, the ambassador reported to the emperor that in fact the servant had a metal tool in his hand, which suggested that he was again about to assassinate the ambassador.⁷³

Although Martinitz did not write his suspicion to the emperor about the real instigator, he wrote to one of his agents in Vienna that he suspected the governor behind the poisoning attempt. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce informed the Roman Court about it but did not believe the emperor would entertain such statements. But he did fear the influential supporters of Martinitz in the Habsburg Court might blow up the case. He reported also that he was informed by Cardinal Leopold Kollonich that the emperor was dissatisfied with the approach of Martinitz in this case, specifically his detention of the servant in his palace and accusations against the governor of improper investigation.⁷⁴ Since Martinitz had arrived in Vienna to receive the Golden Fleece, the nuncio was able to add more details of the ambassador's behavior. After the first audiences which Martinitz had with the emperor, the nuncio was able to describe the attitude of the ambassador to the Roman Curia more precisely. The ambassador made a general overview about the different factions of the Papal Court, but mostly about the ministers of the court, who proceeded with prejudice against the imperial policy. Martinitz tried to emphasize that he had made attempts to mitigate the trouble caused by the actions of the ministers of the Roman Curia. Martinitz also added the dangers and troubles suffered by him during his activity as ambassador. The nuncio wrote that all those speeches by Martinitz served only one purpose: to argue for compensation for his own financial expenses. But Santacroce reported that Martinitz had spoken with utmost veneration and respect about the pontiff and the cardinals, who were residing in their palaces and influenced by the malevolent disinformations. He particularly complained with anger against the governor, accusing him of being behind the poisoning. Martinitz stood by his opinion that he had

72 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 108r–110v. Rome, 19. 4. 1698. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold. The ambassador sent also a testimony of two doctors, Vincenzo Antonio Gattucci and Giovanni Maria Lancisi. They verified that the poison was a corrosive one, most probably arsenic, see: *ibidem*, fol. 111r–112v.

73 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 119r. Rome, 3. 5. 1698. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold.

74 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 222, fol. 89r–90r. Vienna, 10. 5. 1698. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Santacroce.

the right to detain his servant in his residence because the ambassadors judges in their own households, particularly if a crime is committed in their residences. Martinitz told the emperor that the French and Spanish ambassadors proceed the same way in such cases. He denied that the servant was mistreated, and insisted he received daily wine, bread and meat.⁷⁵ Martinitz castigated the governor both privately to the emperor and publically as well.⁷⁶

After Martinitz returned from Vienna to Rome, the next weeks passed with the controversy about the feud of Farnese. In early August, the pope sent to him the secretary of the Segretaria dei memoriali, Giuseppe Gozzadini. According to the contemporary diary of Giovanni Battista Campello, the purpose of Gozzadini's visit was to discuss the feuds.⁷⁷ But despite of the note of Campello, it seems that the meeting touched rather more on the poisoning affair. Due to later reports it became known that Martinitz gave a memorandum to Gozzadini of his complaints on 3 August.⁷⁸

It seems that Martinitz promised Gozzadini to hand the servant over to the Roman authorities. But a few days later the ambassador changed his mind, and came out with further demands. He wanted the permission of Pope Innocent XII to hold the trial of the servant in his residence.⁷⁹ In an audience on 29 August 1698, Martinitz told his demands to the pontiff, accused Governor Pallavicino of being the instigator of the poisoning affair and pressed for an investigation against the governor. The old pope at last lost his patience, and furiously demanded an explanation of Martinitz's behaviour: who does he think he is, ordering the prince of Rome – the pope! – to upset the inner order of and justice in the Papal State. According to the reports from Rome, Martinitz, frowning, without bowing or bidding goodbye, simply walked out on Innocent XII. Cardinal

75 Ibidem, fol. 104r–109v. Vienna, 7. 6. 1698. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Santacroce.

76 Ibidem, fol. 115v. Vienna, 14. 6. 1698. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Santacroce.

77 Paolo CAMPELLO DELLA SPINA, *Pontificato di Innocenzo XII. Diario del Conte Gio. Battista Campello*, Studi e documenti di storia e diritto 12, 1891, p. 389, see the note about 3. 8. 1698.

78 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 140r–147v. Rome, 16. 8. 1698. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold I. From that report we know that Martinitz informed the emperor in detail about his meeting with Gozzadini in his previous letter of 3. 8., but unfortunately that relation is missing from the Rom. Korrespondenz. We did not find it in the register of Martinitz's letters that was prepared for his successor in Rome, Count Leopold Joseph von Lamberg: NÖLA, HA Lamberg, Kart. 70, nr. 381, Register of the letters of Georg Adam von Martinitz, nr. 10. Here only extracts of the letters of 2. 8. and 30. 8. could be found. Martinitz wrote to the emperor that he sent a copy of his memorandum to the Imperial Vice-Chancellor Dominik Andreas Kaunitz, but we have not found that copy yet.

79 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 219, fol. 407r–410v. Rome, 30. 8. 1698. Secret letter of the Cardinal Secretary Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce.

Secretary Fabrizio Spada informed the nuncio with indignation that Martinitz behaved towards the pope in a way that even Protestants would not dream of doing. He ordered Andrea Santacroce to inform the emperor in detail about the audience, and let him know that the pope will no longer stand the presence of the ambassador.

Predictably, Martinitz wrote in another tone about the audience. At the beginning, he wrote, they started to talk about the feud of Farnese, but the pope interrupted that, and asked the ambassador in fury about his demands against the governor. According to Martinitz, the pope told him that even a Turk would not dare to make such accusations, and his accusations against Pallavicino are only his personal suspicion without any foundation. Martinitz answered that the confession of the servant and the memorandum he had given to Gozzadini made everything clear. The pope then asked the ambassador to hand over the servant, and although Martinitz refused it, he was open for a process and investigation to be held in his residence, without the actual extradition of the delinquent. He stated that the ambassadors have the right for it, and nuncios proceed in the same way as well. The pope lost his patience after these arguments, and started shouting with passion how dare he keep a prisoner in his house and demand justice in Rome, where the pope is the lord. Martinitz tried to explain that this happens everywhere, that ambassadors have absolute right over their household without any interference from the local sovereigns. He emphasized that he recognizes the supremacy of the pontiff, and therefore he does not want to proceed on his own, but asks the pope to administer justice. The pope shouted at him after that, “*Who are you, what are you? We are the pope, we are the monarch, we command, do not make any trouble, do not disturb us!*” Martinitz answered him, “*Holy Father, I am the imperial ambassador, and Your Holiness acknowledged me as that one, and therefore I do not have to and I cannot suffer all these injustices, and I would like to leave in order not to hear all that, and not to be forced to harm my own respect toward Your Holiness, but I will report and complain it to His Majesty, my most majestic lord!*” After that, Martinitz kissed the shoes of the pope and left the audience.⁸⁰

Of course, Martinitz wanted to leave only the audience, not Rome – even if it is what the Roman Curia expected. It had become clear by the end of the year in Vienna as well that Pope Innocent XII really did not want to suffer any longer the imperial ambassador in his presence.⁸¹ There were only two questions, but they were hard ones: How can Vienna manage the recall of Martinitz without a clear loss of prestige (i.e. of the Imperial Court

80 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 78, fol. 154r–165v. Rome, 30. 8. 1698. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold.

81 Paolo CAMPELLO DELLA SPINA, *Pontificato di Innocenzo XII. Diario del Conte Gio. Battista Campello*, Studi e documenti di storia e diritto 14, 1893, p. 181. 13. 12. 1698.

and of Martinitz as well)? And what would be a suitable position for a fallen ambassador? Both the family network of Martinitz and the papal diplomacy were set in motion.

To put water on the fire

In early August 1696, just two months after the scandalous procession, Nuncio Andrea Santacroce reported secretly to Rome that Emperor Leopold I told his ministers, that he “[got to] know that the Roman Court and especially the Cardinals are commiserating about a secular and German ambassador, and they would like a Cardinal without any character and dependence.” Santacroce wrote to the cardinal secretary that he would try to abolish these opinions in the Imperial Court because the pope would only like an imperial ambassador who would keep a good connection with the Holy See.⁸² Prince Ferdinand Joseph von Dietrichstein, the *Obersthofmeister* of the emperor, told the nuncio that some ministers had talked about removing Martinitz and sending back Prince Liechtenstein.⁸³ But the nuncio had the opinion that Dietrichstein had only said it because he had wanted to soften the voices that had been saying the Imperial Court would be partial toward Martinitz.⁸⁴ These letters show us that already half a year after Martinitz had begun his service in Rome, the Viennese Court was dealing with the disgust of Rome and the desire of the Papal Court to remove Martinitz. And even though that it seemed to be only a tactical consideration, influential members of the court suggested the removal of Martinitz from Rome.

Although both Count Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach, the *Oberstallmeister* of the Imperial Court, and the Jesuit Father Menegatti told the nuncio that the emperor disapproved of the behavior of Martinitz, they still doubted that to judge the ambassador more and more guilty would cause his recall. They suggested that all the expositions which were told by the nuncio to the emperor would more successfully open the emperor’s

82 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 221, fol. 83r–v. Vienna, 4. 8. 1696. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada. A week later the nuncio reported to the cardinal secretary that the Grand Duke of Tuscany and his brother Francesco Maria Medici, Protector Cardinal of the Empire, intervened in the affair of the Corpus Christi procession. It affirmed the opinion in Vienna that in Rome they did not want a secular German ambassador, but for example Cardinal Medici as the sole representative of the emperor. *Ibidem*, fol. 101r. Vienna, 11. 8. 1696. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

83 *Ibidem*, fol. 111r. Vienna, 18. 8. 1696. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

84 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 221, fol. 129r. Vienna, 8. 9. 1696. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

mind, especially after Cardinal Goëss also condemned the actions of the ambassador.⁸⁵ Francois Chassignet, the secretary of the imperial embassy also sent letters to the emperor, to Prince Liechtenstein and to Father Pietro Giuseppe Ederi, all of which complained about how Martinitz treated him.⁸⁶

Even Martinitz seemed ready to give up his position, should anyone want to accept such an expensive position. But the nuncio reported that such a request previously was only a consideration suggested by the supporters of Martinitz. The Imperial Court had not wanted to recall the ambassador because they did not want to satisfy the Papal Court with such a quick removal of Martinitz. Therefore, any such plea from the ambassador would have strengthened the intention of the Viennese Court to retain Martinitz longer in his position. Andrea Santacroce wrote to the cardinal secretary in early November that the situation probably had changed, and that Martinitz really wished to return home from Rome because he felt that the Roman Curia was full of enemies of the emperor, and because he found it impossible to fulfill his duties. The nuncio believed that Heinrich Franz von Mansfeld, Prince of Fondi, would apply for the embassy in Rome, as he was already a candidate after the return of Liechtenstein. But Mansfeld did not have enough financial funds to carry out service in Rome.⁸⁷

Santacroce also discussed the situation with Cardinal Kollonitsch. The cardinal admitted that he talked with the confessor of the emperor, Francesco Menegatti, and they agreed that it would be not just useless but also harmful to retain Martinitz in Rome further. According to Kollonitsch, Menegatti had done everything to recall Martinitz from Rome, even without having an immediate successor in mind. But the nuncio told the cardinal that even in Rome they would not like such a step, because they know that the presence of the representatives of the monarchs give light to the Holy See as well. The pope's only wish was that the main purpose of each ambassador should be to keep a good correspondence between the courts. Both Cardinal Kollonitsch and the nuncio praised the late Cardinal Carlo Pio di Savoia (the protector and the representative of the empire until his death in 1689) under whose watch the affairs of the emperor in Rome were managed to the satisfaction of both sides. Cardinal Kollonitsch promised that he and the imperial confessor would do everything to hasten the discharge of the ambassador.

85 Ibidem, fol. 142r–144r. Vienna, 22. 9. 1696. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

86 HAL, FA, Kart. 133. Rome, 1. 9. 1696. Letters of Francois Chassignet to the emperor, Prince Liechtenstein and the Jesuit Ederi, who was the councillor of the emperor in Italian affairs.

87 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 221, fol. 175r–v. Vienna, 3. 11. 1696. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

Still, Santacroce did not expect a quick solution as he knew that there was no suitable candidate for the embassy in Rome.⁸⁸

Indeed Santacroce's expectation was borne out, but the nuncio's discussions with various ministers of Vienna show us the different factions of the Imperial Court and their attitudes toward Martinitz. A brief description about the Viennese Court written around 1701 with a retrospective review for the time of 1699 and 1700 gives us an exact insight into the factions.⁸⁹ These parties and the balance of power between them determined the fate of Martinitz. The removal of Martinitz was mostly supported by the party around Cardinal Kollonitsch, *Obersthofmeister* Count Ferdinand Bonaventura Harrach⁹⁰ and Court Chancellor Count Julius Friedrich von Buccelleni. According to the discussions and the reports of Nuncio Santacroce, both Count Harrach and Cardinal Kollonitsch seemed to be open-minded about a replacement for Martinitz already in autumn 1696.

Another faction had been organized around Heinrich Franz von Mansfeld, Prince of Fondi, who had applied previously for the embassy in Rome. He was allied by Prince Karl Theodor zu Salm, *Obersthofmeister* of the King of the Romans (Joseph I), and Prince Liechtenstein. Cardinal Grimani also belonged to that party, and was made cardinal by Pope Innocent XII on 22 July 1697, after a presentation by Emperor Leopold I.⁹¹ It caused a surprise in Vienna, since they did not expect really a cardinal to be created for the emperor, especially during the controversy about the feuds.⁹²

The third party was marked by the Imperial Vice-Chancellor Dominik Andreas Kaunitz, a brother-in-law of Martinitz.⁹³ His supporters were *Oberstkämmerer* Karl

88 Ibidem, fol. 195r–197v. Vienna, 1. 12. 1696. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

89 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 760, fol. 104r–113v. *Breve relatione dello stato della Corte di Vienna con alcune particolarita seguite nel 1699 sino al 1700 nel Mese di Settembre*. The memorandum was written by an anonymus author to a cardinal. The author was most probably Claudio Martelli, an Italian captain of an independent company (*libera compagnia*) in the Hungarian fortress Komárom. Independent companies appeared during the Great Turkish War and were independent from the regular army. Thanks to András Oross, the Hungarian Archivist Delegate at the Österreichische Staatsarchiv, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv for his help to identify the author of the memorandum. About Martelli and the independent companies: András OROSS, *A Magyar Királyság törökellenes határvédelmi rendszerének felszámolása és átszervezése* [Dissolution and Reorganization of the Border Defence System in Hungary], Budapest 2013, pp. 179–181, 249.

90 Harrach became *Obersthofmeister* in 1699, which also helped to dated the source.

91 ÖStA, HHStA, StAbt, Kart. 78, fol. 20r–21v. Rome, 22. 7. 1697. Georg Adam von Martinitz to Emperor Leopold I.

92 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 221, fol. 531r–v. Rome, 10. 8. 1697. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

93 Both Martinitz and Kaunitz married the daughters of Ulrich Adolf Wratislaw von Sternberg, the *Oberstburggraf* of Prague (Martinitz married Maria Josefa, while the wife of Kaunitz was Maria Eleonore).

Ferdinand von Waldstein, and *Obersthofmeister* of Empress Eleonore Prince Ferdinand von Schwarzenberg. No wonder that this party supported most of all Martinitz. As to the affair of the feuds, in autumn 1697 Vice-Chancellor Kaunitz did his best to keep his brother-in-law in Rome, which resulted in the letter which was sent by the emperor to the pontiff.⁹⁴

Martinitz needed their support, while in Rome the Curia waited for his recall. After the first months of the affair about the feuds, the cardinal secretary informed the nuncio that they were glad to hear of the imminent removal of the ambassador.⁹⁵ But their expectations were too early. Although Marco d'Aviano also informed Santacroce about the displacement of Martinitz, the nuncio suspected that the information of the Capuchin father was only a presumption. However, Santacroce had also heard such rumours, in fact that the successor of Martinitz would be Livio Odescalchi, nephew of the late Pope Innocent XI.⁹⁶ A possible nomination of Odescalchi was supported by Cardinal Kollonitsch. The main reason for the Italian prince was his good connection with the Sacred College of the Cardinals, while in Vienna it was expected that the appointment of Odescalchi would help also to satisfy the Roman Curia and the pope, thereby helping to secure further papal financial aid against the Ottomans.⁹⁷ Beside Odescalchi, other candidates were mentioned in Vienna: Hermann Jacob Czernin (imperial envoy to the Polish Diet in 1695), Christoph Wenzel Nostitz (a previous imperial envoy to Poland in 1693) and Karl Ernst, the son of the *Oberstkämmerer* Karl Ferdinand von Waldstein. But the nuncio noted that Czernin and Waldstein were rather unwilling to go to Rome due to the costliness of that embassy.⁹⁸

Mansfeld and his circle tried to gain some position in the struggle for the embassy in Rome. Their biggest hope was Cardinal Grimani. It seems that the Viennese court had tapped him to replace the late Cardinal Goëss as a residing prelate in Rome to support imperial interests. Mansfeld supported Grimani, and an order was expected for Martinitz to share all secrets and essential information with the cardinal after his arrival in Rome.⁹⁹

94 E. GARMS-CORNIDES, *Scene e attori*, p. 534.

95 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 219, fol. 374v-375v. Rome, 14. 9. 1697. Secret letter of the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada to Nuncio Andrea Santacroce.

96 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 221, fol. 562v-563v. Vienna, 7. 9. 1697. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

97 Ibidem, fol. 634v-635r. Vienna, 9. 11. 1697. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

98 Ibidem, fol. 640r-643r. Vienna, 23. 11. 1697. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

99 Ibidem, fol. 616r-617r. Vienna, 19. 10. 1697. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

Even though Kaunitz tried to keep Martinitz longer in Rome, the circle of his relatives had begun to think about how to prepare for his recall. A good occasion for it would have been the reception of the Golden Fleece in 1698.¹⁰⁰ Weeks before the arrival of Martinitz to Vienna, Cardinal Kollonitsch told the emperor that the actions of Martinitz in the poisoning affair are really injurious to the relations between the two courts. The cardinal suggested that his further stay in Rome would only increase discord with the Papal Court. But the emperor did not decide anything; he wanted to wait for Martinitz's arrival. Nuncio Santacroce learnt from some ministers that Martinitz had only permission from Leopold I for an absence of six weeks at longest, and they wanted him to return to Rome as soon as possible due to the possibly threatening news about the health of Charles II of Spain.¹⁰¹ Santacroce expected that after the ambassador received the Golden Fleece, he would not return to Rome. But he also knew that decisions were not made lightly in Vienna, and so they decided to play for time. They did not want to leave Rome without an ambassador. Santacroce also admitted that he did not see any suitable diplomat among the Germans in Vienna to replace Martinitz, and therefore did not expect an imminent amelioration in the diplomatic relationships.¹⁰²

Although Martinitz seemed to be really confident in his future, Santacroce learnt that he aspired to two other positions. One was the post of the general commissary residing in Milan, but for this position he competed with Mansfeld. Martinitz also aspired to the captaincy of the imperial guard. Therefore, the nuncio still held out hope that Martinitz would not return to Rome.¹⁰³ The ambassador's name came up as a candidate for *Obersthofmeister* to Archduke Joseph's future wife Wilhelmina Amalia of Brunswick-Lüneburg. But the members of the future queen's court were selected mainly by Empress Eleonore, and she supported for *Obersthofmeister* Johann Jakob Hamilton, who was favored by the empress' family, the Electors Palatinate. Also the captaincy of the imperial guard was dedicated by the emperor to Franz Sigismund von Thun und Hohenstein, brother of the Archbishop of Salzburg. The plans to establish an imperial general commissariat

100 Ibidem, fol. 640r–643r. Vienna, 23. 11. 1697. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

101 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 222, fol. 84r–85r. Vienna, 3. 5. 1698. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

102 Ibidem, fol. 91r–v. Vienna, 17. 5. 1698. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

103 Ibidem, fol. 102r–103v. Vienna, 31. 5. 1698. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

in Milan provisionally were suspended as well. That meant that even in the case of the discharge of Martinitz, there was no suitable position for him in the Habsburg Court.¹⁰⁴

The lack of an honourable position for Martinitz became a crucial question very soon after the final scandal and break with Rome in early autumn of 1698. In Vienna the supporters and relatives of Martinitz had to face the fact that they had no other choice than to recall him from Rome. In November 1698, already Imperial Vice-Chancellor Kaunitz, brother-in-law of Martinitz, admitted to the nuncio that Martinitz will be dismissed. But the list of the candidates was still long: the name of Hermann Jacob Czernin came up again along with Franz Sigismund von Thun and Leopold Joseph von Lamberg, the imperial plenipotentiary at the Imperial Diet in Regensburg.¹⁰⁵ Kaunitz was in correspondence with Lamberg, and in January 1699 he wanted to know whether Lamberg would like to apply for the embassy to France or to Rome.¹⁰⁶ Lamberg chose Rome, and finally the emperor appointed him as the new ambassador to Rome.¹⁰⁷

However the dismissal of Martinitz caused a family dispute, mostly because of the possibilities for the ambassador were quite few. His name came up again as a captain for the imperial guard, namely the trabant guards. But finally in March 1699, it was given to the Hungarian aristocrat Miklós Pálffy.¹⁰⁸ In the end, Martinitz was appointed as the captain of the archery guards, but he was extremely disappointed by this position. Even his wife, Maria Josefa von Sternberg, complained loudly, because she feared that they would have to leave Rome before the Jubilee of 1700: *“It is totally indecent and improper, that when everybody will come to Rome for the Holy Year, we should leave, like we were Lutheran or Calvinist.”* The nuncio wrote to the cardinal secretary that even Vice-Chancellor Kaunitz seemed to be really tired of these affairs and all the complaints by the Martinitz family. Santacroce added that there was a real “war at home” for Kaunitz, since Maria Josefa von Sternberg wrote and complained constantly to her sister, Maria Eleonore von Sternberg, wife of Kaunitz. Maria Josefa accused her brother-in-law that he had done nothing to keep them in Rome. She brought up that *“Prince Liechtenstein, who had not got any other supporters [other] than a simple father (the late Father Ederi), was always strongly*

104 Ibidem, fol. 114r–115r. Vienna, 14. 6. 1698. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

105 Ibidem, fol. 317v. Vienna, 8. 11. 1698. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

106 NÖLA, HA Lamberg, Kart. 67, Nr. 371, Briefe von Dominik Andreas Kaunitz, fol. 271r–272v. Vienna, 14. 1. 1699.

107 NÖLA, HA Lamberg, Kart. 66, Nr. 360, Leopold I. an Graf Leopold Joseph von Lamberg, fol. 112r–114v. Ebersdorf, 20. 9. 1699.

108 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 236, fol. 144r–v. Vienna, 7. 3. 1699. Foglio d'avvisi (Newsletter).

supported, while her husband, who is related to the Imperial Vice-Chancellor, remained abandoned with common, extreme shame.”¹⁰⁹

At least Maria Josefa was compensated a little: Leopold Joseph von Lamberg arrived to Rome in 1700, so Martinitz and his wife left Rome only in spring. The papal diplomacy’s expectations of the the new ambassador, Count Lamberg, were extremely high. It seems that he was conscious of it. Not long before his journey to Rome, he met Nuncio Santacroce for a final discussion. As the nuncio reported, Lamberg told him, “*He knows it very well that his two predecessors brought fire; now he wants to put water on it.*”¹¹⁰

The long shadow of Father Ederi?

The poisoning affair just topped the long process which had eroded the relationships between Rome and Vienna. From a certain perspective, this erosion had begun during the time of Martinitz’s predecessor, Prince Liechtenstein. The protocol scandals and the controversies with the Roman authorities and the political differences – especially the case of the feuds – were already on the carpet in the first half of the 1690s. Of course the roots of all these conflicts traced back decades or even centuries. Practically, Martinitz inherited these affairs; still, gradually but quickly, he lost his political space in Rome. His deep loyalty and the cramped adherence to defend the least interest of the emperor resulted in a tough inflexibility that caused both his failure and a grave deterioration between the two courts. Lamberg had only a short time to ameliorate these connections before the deaths of Pope Innocent XII (27 September 1700) and of King Charles II of Spain (1 November 1700).

The fall and recall of Martinitz is therefore most insightful. Liechtenstein had been appointed as the tutor of Archduke Charles in early 1693, but he left the Eternal City only in autumn 1694. Though in the meantime he had some serious conflicts with the Roman Curia, he did not lose the favour of the pontiff. On the other hand, Martinitz had to function in Rome for one and a half years without even having an audience with the pope: his political influence was strongly limited. The imperial diplomacy had to find other political channels to carry their interests (mostly through Spanish diplomats) but that was a tight compromise.

Although it necessitates further research, the fall of Martinitz probably ended a period in the Italian policy of the Austrian Habsburgs. That policy was marked by Father

109 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 222, fol. 477r–479v. Vienna, 16. 5. 1699. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

110 Ibidem, fol. 569r–571v. Vienna, 7. 11. 1699. Secret report of Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to the Cardinal Secretary, Fabrizio Spada.

Ederi, who was almost almighty in Italian affairs until his death in 1697. That policy was characterized by an expansive imperial trend, whose most apparent symptom was the affair of the feuds. From a letter written by the Spanish ambassador in the Imperial Court and the Bishop of Solsona, Gaspar Alonso de Valeria, we know that the real author of the edict was supposedly Father Ederi.¹¹¹ If we take in regard another letter written by Andrea Santacroce to his brother, Marquis Antonio Santacroce, the nuncio noted mockingly that the two best disciples of the Jesuit Father were Prince Liechtenstein and Count Martinitz.¹¹² Then, the above-mentioned remark of Count Lamberg can be understood as his desire to end the period of the ambassadors from the circle of Ederi, to rake out the fire caused by Liechtenstein and Martinitz and open a new chapter in the history of diplomatic relations between Rome and Vienna.

111 ASV, Segr. Stato, Germania, vol. 114, fol. 417r. Vienna, 1. 2. 1698. Letter of Bishop of Solsona to anonymus.

112 ASR, Archivio Santacroce, busta 1226. Vienna, 2. 8. 1698. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce to Marquis Antonio Santacroce.

