

6

Benoît Maréchaux

CONTENDING REPUBLICANISMS

Pamphlets, Liberty, and Political Uses of the Past in Genoa, Venice, and Rome at the Time of the Interdict (1606–07)

As the publication of the book that includes this article shows, a renewed approach to the republics and republicanism in early modern Europe aims at analysing the republican phenomenon beyond certain historiographical traditions that have been prone to isolate republican discourses from their context and surrounding environment. While works on Italian and European republics have, on the one hand, often been the subject of studies at a local, regional, or national level, the Cambridge School of Intellectual History ideas has, on the other hand, adopted a genealogical view of republicanism mostly based on republics that appeared to be (at least on the paper) independent from monarchies.¹ Despite their important contribution to our understanding of republicanism, these research lines have often tended to dissociate the words and the thing from the surrounding historical realities, which has led to an exceptionalist view of certain republics, as well as to a certain essentialisation of the republican phenomenon. In particular, the binary opposition to the monarchies has often been described in a way which is largely disconnected from the political practices of early modern republics. In this context, several studies have recently attempted to better situate the analysis of republics in relation to the value systems and political models that surrounded them and with which they often interacted to a greater extent than scholarship has traditionally considered. Building upon relevant contributions on single republics (e.g., on Genoa), this approach has helped to obtain a better idea of the multifaceted nature of republican uses and representations and to focus on the complex interactions that were often at work between different political regimes. In the same manner, research is also currently analysing, from a perspective of connected and comparative analysis, how republics represented themselves and were represented on the 'stage of the kings', with reference to the political regime that was dominant at the time.²

This contribution seeks to enrich our understanding of the latter question by analysing three short opuscles produced at the beginning of the seventeenth century, specifically during the 'war of writings' of 1606–1607 that involved the Republic of Venice, the Papacy and, by proxy, as we shall see, the Republic of Genoa. By analysing pamphlets whose main object was the attack or defence of Venetian policy and ideas during the Interdict, by means of a continuous and purposeful comparison with its Genoese counterpart, we aim to contribute to this cross-history of republican states whose representations tended to enter into conflict more frequently than the literature on republicanism usually assumes. As we shall see, these opuscles were not produced in a vacuum, nor did they concentrate on classical republican values. On the contrary, they were forged in contact with other contemporary states with which the republics of Venice and Genoa were interdependent.³ Although it opposed the two republics, the first pamphlet was likely produced by a Roman theologian, which points out how republican representations were also shaped by external thinkers. In this context, the question of the differing relationship that the two republics maintained with some of the major European powers was central to the three pamphlets. The problem was not so much that of republican liberty per se (as opposed to the tyranny of dynastic regimes), but rather the instrumental comparison between the past and present policies pursued by each republic in relation to these monarchical powers.

As it could hardly be otherwise, the strong multi-secular rivalry between the two republics was at the heart of the

6.1

Ludovico Leoni (Padovanino, attributed),
Portrait of Paul V Borghese. Rome, Galleria Borghese, 1633 ca.
Photo: © Galleria Borghese,
Mauro Coen. Reproduced with permission.



multi-media discourses under scrutiny. As is well known, the two republican states had shared a common history since the Middle Ages, which had stimulated cross-views where rivalry, admiration and emulation coexisted. This was still true in the early modern period, and not only in the time of Machiavelli, Botero or Campanella. In the first half of the seventeenth century, many Genoese reformist thinkers took Venice as a model for reforming their institutions and forging collaborative links with its patriciate.⁴ As we shall see, the Republic of San Marco claimed to enjoy liberty (e.g. independence from other states), which made ‘comparison’ between the two republics both a source of influence for Genoese reformers and a form of political distinction for Venetian patricians. Yet, the same comparison could also become a rhetorical instrument to be used against the jurisdictional policy pursued by Venice. The discourses here analysed discussed these questions in the context of the Interdict when the question of the relation between the two republics and the Papacy became a subject of controversy. By looking at how the comparison between the republican states was used for purposes that had little to do with republicanism and was instead very connected to jurisdictional disputes, we will examine how conflicts shaped the representations of republics, their real or alleged view of freedom, and their interdependent nexus with monarchical powers. We shall deal with the Ottoman Empire, the Spanish Monarchy, and the Papacy.

The Genoese letter: an anti-Venetian Roman Pamphlet

In seventeenth-century Italy, the boundaries between governmental, private and public spheres were sometimes blurred when dealing with political communication. Letters were inclined to escape their authors and their recipients. Not only were the private letters of rulers and intellectuals read within their circles of sociability; those sent or received by the chancelleries might also be leaked.⁵ Another sort of letter was also circulated, however, always for political purposes: the fake ones, which made institutions or real people communicate ideas whose offbeat use aroused the reader’s curiosity and produced rhetorical effects for political purposes that were very real.

The starting point of this article belongs to the latter sort of letters. In 1606, an anonymous author produced a letter that the Republic of Genoa had allegedly written in response to another that the Republic of Venice had sent to it to complain about political concessions made to the Papacy. Known as *Copia della lettera scritta dalla Serenissima Repubblica di Genova in risposta d’una scrittale dal Doge et Repubblica di Venetia* (‘Copy of the Letter Written by the Most Serene Republic of Genoa in Reply to the One

Written by the Doge and Republic of Venice’), it circulated as a manuscript.⁶ As was often the case, the fiction started from a real pretext. After having enacted, in August 1605, measures to dissolve ecclesiastical confraternities, the Republic of Genoa had withdrawn the decree a few weeks later under pressure from the newly elected Pope, Paul V (fig. 6.1).⁷ As a Genoese patrician noted in a diary entry dated 25 October 1605:

They told that the Most Serene Senate, with the necessary votes, had retracted and annulled the decree made to dissolve the confraternities and the companies, and left everything as it was before, so as not to bring upon themselves the wrath of the Pope, who felt it was wrong.⁸

Far from being satisfied, the Pope had then taken offence that the Republic had not asked for the absolution of the ecclesiastical censure, leading the Genoese Senate to use Cardinal Antonio Maria Sauli to avoid excommunication.⁹ The *Lettera scritta dalla Serenissima Repubblica di Genova* written a few months later starts from this Genoese concession to the Papacy by imagining that the Genoese Republic had to justify itself after receiving complaints from Venice. The production of the letter is obviously to be understood in the context of the critical political crisis following the Pontifical Interdict to the Venetian Republic issued in April 1606. It is well known that Paul V excommunicated Venice following its refusal to abrogate several laws that required the authorisation of the Senate for the construction of places of worship, as well as for the alienation of ecclesiastical real estate. The arrest and detention of two clergymen by the Venetian justice system had also been critical. From this point on, a famous *guerra di scrittore* (‘war of writings’) took place that opposed the two powers and their visions of the Papacy’s temporal power and republican liberty. More broadly, the conflict involved a vast Venetian, Roman, and European public.¹⁰

Although the handwritten versions of the *Copia della lettera* in our possession are undated, their production and distribution took place in the midst of the ‘war of writings’. A copy published in a Venetian collection of the eighteenth century indicates that the first copy would have been received by the College of Venice in May 1606, being attributed to the Jesuit Possevino.¹¹ This dating is doubtful, however, since the manuscript copy kept at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana was very likely sent from Rome with the *avvisi* of 26 July 1606, that is, during the summer period in which a large series of writings of Roman origin circulated in Italy to discredit the Venetian cause.¹² The *avvisi* of Rome of 29 July (which were attached to those of the 26), indeed referred to the publication of the letter considered by the Lordship of Genoa a fake meant to reply to the Doge of Venice. According to the same *avvisi*, the contents of this letter were ‘completely innocent,

but not entirely praiseworthy, since they showed too much resentment towards Venice.¹³ A *Copia della lettera* published in 1868 is dated 28 July 1606, which seems to confirm this approximate dating.¹⁴

The pamphlet was therefore distributed when an explosion of writings was taking place. The already mentioned *avvisi* of 29 July informed that a second fake letter written by the city of Verona to that of Brescia was actually circulating. It targeted Venice, too, since both cities were presented as dominated by the latter after having lost their liberty.¹⁵ The pamphlet was clearly one among several opuscles produced – likely by the same author – in July 1606. Depending on the place where it circulated, the pamphlet could be purposely complemented by documents related to the news, whose analysis is both indicative of the context of its circulation and its connection with the city of Genoa. Hence, the copy kept in Vicenza was supplemented by *avvisi* from Genoa dated, here again, 28 July 1606.¹⁶

Interestingly, the *avvisi* stated that the Spanish ambassador in Genoa had visited the Senate to ascertain the position of the Republic, which had expressed its willingness to support ‘con tutte le forze’ the resolution of the King of Spain, i.e., to back the Papacy in the event of an armed conflict.¹⁷ In the same way that, ‘as good Catholics’ (‘come buoni catholici’), they had already granted 500 Corsican mercenaries to the Papacy, the Genoese patricians showed interest in continuing the collaboration. The purpose of attaching this news to the pamphlet was undoubtedly to make the false letter more polemical by linking it to real events that showed the hostile attitude of the Genoese Republic towards Venice. Three days earlier, the Spanish ambassador in charge in Genoa, Juan de Vivas, had indeed written to Philip III to inform him that he had visited the Republic’s councils and received such favourable support for the King of Spain and the Pope that Genoa deserved to be praised.¹⁸

The texts produced during the Interdict were published through various interdependent media (manuscripts, printed, and oral) and took multiple forms (*avvisi*, pamphlets, letters, official statements, etc.). The transfers between media, contents and formats were frequent since their combination served both specific political and economic purposes.¹⁹ From this point of view, it was no accident that the pamphlet studied here took the form of a letter from the Republic of Genoa. In order to attack the government of Venice, the author used this procedure to put into the mouth of another republic – Genoa – the argument according to which obeying the Papacy was not a form of servitude detrimental to the interests of the Republic and its patriciate, but was on the contrary a source of honour and dignity:

Most Serene Prince, we have received Your Serenity’s letter, which has caused us a different effect from what you thought. Since we have yielded to the will of the Supreme Pontiff in revoking the decrees we have made against the orators, not only does it not harm us, but it is more likely to increase the dignity of our Republic, and to shame those who, on such an occasion, would be in defiance of the pious mind of His Holiness.²⁰

Rather than merely stating this argument from the perspective of the Papacy, the author thus instrumentalised the Roman-Genoese dispute of 1605 in order to adopt the point of view of the Genoese Republic which had reacted in a very different way to Paul V’s injunctions than had Venice, even though it shared the same republican form of government. In its answer to the alleged critiques made by Venice, the Republic of Genoa justified its decisions by criticising the Venetian policy, especially in relation with the Papacy and the Ottoman Empire. Throughout the text, the author thus confronted the two states, constantly playing on the opposition between ‘la nostra Republica’ (Genoa) and ‘la vostra Republica’ (Venice). Quoted 16 times in the text, the term ‘republic’ was always present in this form (and thus as a synonym of the one or the other state), without any association with liberty being found here.

As already argued, Venice and Genoa were not just two republics. They shared a long history of military, maritime and commercial rivalry that was continually reactivated by historians and political observers who were fond of a comparative reading that had become, over the centuries, a common practice.²¹ From this point of view, using the counterpoint of the Genoese Republic was a very clever way of demonstrating the mistakenness of the Venetian position during the Interdict, since it gave voice to a similar political entity that instead affirmed that obeying the temporal power of the Pope was a duty that brought benefits, and refusing to do so was a threat to the Catholic faith in Italy. This comparison with Genoa actually echoed the *Risposta del Sig. Paolo Anafesto*, another pamphlet attributed to Possevino and published in 1607. In this opuscle, the author praised in the same way the fact that, unlike Venice, the Republic of Genoa had withdrawn some of the controversial decrees, for which the Genoese deserved ‘to be praised, and magnified as true Catholics, and most faithful Christians; nor therefore have they lost their freedom: nay, by such an action they have added to themselves an inestimable joy’.²² The truth was obviously less simplistic, since the Genoese Republic had during those years defended with some vigour some of its jurisdictional prerogatives through the social and political connections – much more discreet though – woven by its patriciate within the Roman Curia.²³ This question of historical truth was not, however, the concern of the pamphlet under consideration. By portraying a republic that was not ashamed but honoured

to defend the cause of the Papacy, even at the expense of its own political prerogatives, the author presented an alternative path that helped to portray Venetian politics as radical. Behind this, the text defended a definition of liberty that was compatible with obedience to papal authority since – it was argued – the Genoese had not lost their liberty despite the fact that they had withdrawn some of the decrees under papal pressure. By doing so, it was a different view of liberty – the one promoted by the Venetians – that was criticised and questioned. Although the text was not signed, it has been repeatedly attributed to the Jesuit Possevino, a theologian who was very active during the Interdict and known for many of his writings against the Venetian cause.²⁴ The confrontation with the Republic of Genoa, from this point of view, was an excellent pretext to defend the papal jurisdiction, as well as a way of attracting the attention of the public, and therefore the publishers' investments. The manuscript letter was printed in 1606, and we shall see that it would not be the only edition.²⁵ The text was short (one double-sided folio in its printed version), which favoured its distribution due to limited production and purchase costs.

Despite this short format, the pamphlet attempted to develop a comparison in which religion played a key role. By opposing the very Catholic Genoese to the Venetians who were not, the text sought to associate the Venetian position with an anti-Catholic policy. In the fake letter, the Genoese proudly boasted of having defended the Catholic faith in the East and West against the 'Turchi, Mori, and Saraceni', in reference to the naval (and colonial) power they had developed in the Mediterranean since the Crusades. Moreover, the text argued that the Genoese had always been faithful supporters of the Papacy; unlike their Venetian counterparts, they had never suffered the disgrace of being excommunicated by the Pope.

More importantly, the text criticised what would later be known as *giurisdizionalismo*. In contrast to the reason of state that led the Venetian republic to 'not yielding in nothing to the Pope' ('non cedere un punto al Papa') in terms of temporal power, the Genoese defended – always allegedly – a Roman vision of the controversy, assuming that no Prince could exercise a form of superiority over the heir of St Peter and the members of the ecclesiastic hierarchy. Using language accessible to a wide public, the text did not dwell so much on the deep theological reasons for the controversy as on the alleged consequences for the preservation of the Catholic faith in Italy.²⁶ To justify non-obedience to the Pope, Venice actually employed theologians defined as 'sad and lurking', 'of false religion, and of bad conscience' ('tristi et appostati', 'di falsa religione, et di mala coscienza'). The reference to Paolo Sarpi, who was one of the direct targets of the text, was obvious. The Republic of Genoa, on the contrary, employed

theologians 'very wise and incorruptible' ('di molta dottrina, et de integrità de vita'), who did not divide the Catholic world.

Moreover, the text discussed religious matters in order to overturn the central argument of Venetian republicanism, that is, the original liberty of Venice born as a territory free of any foreign *dominio* and able, over the centuries, to remain independent thanks to divine favour (since the *predestinatio* of St Mark) and to the armed defence of its sovereignty in the Adriatic.²⁷ If the 'Genoese letter' recognised that the Republic of Venice had never been dominated by foreign lords in terms of temporal power ('vergine quanto al Dominio temporale di forastieri'), it argued, on the other hand, that Genoa had always maintained itself 'virgin in the Catholic faith to this day, persecuting with assiduous study the heretics, and the enemies of the Holy Church' ('vergine nella fede Cattolica fin'a questo giorno, perseguitando con assiduo studio gli heretici, & nemici della Chiesa Santa'). Such success had not been seen in Venice, which had become a 'recitals of various sects, and religions' ('recettacolo di varie sette, et religioni'). Using the same metaphor of virginity (in the sense of absence of heretics and of foreign soldiers), the author thus took advantage of the presence of Protestants, as well as people of Jewish and Muslim faith, to put Venice on the same level as Genoa and to challenge the argument of original liberty ('libertà originaria').²⁸ Here again, it is possible to read how the letter mirrored the Roman vision of Venetian politics and perhaps, that of Possevino. The Jesuit thinker continuously confronted the myth of Venetian original liberty in his writings, and it is well known that the Roman authorities opposed Venetian policy of welcoming religious minorities.²⁹

Religion was furthermore brought into play in order to discuss the central issue of liberty, understood here as the degree of autonomy that the two republics had in their relationship with the surrounding dynastic and elective monarchies. Not surprisingly, the strong ties maintained between Venice and the Ottoman Empire played a central role. Hence, the *Lettera* emphasised that the Republic of Genoa sought to maintain friendly ties with the Vicar of Christ, while the Venetian Republic 'cherishes the peace and friendship of the Turk' ('tiene gran conto della pace, et amicitia del Turco'), another classic way of attacking Venice for the collaborative relationship it maintained with the Ottoman Empire. Interestingly, the text did not stop there, however. It attacked Venice's liberty, arguing that although the Republic of Genoa was protected by the King of Spain, it did not pay any kind of secret or manifest tribute ('tributo, o donativo secreto, o manifesto'). The pamphlet thus questioned the Venetian liberty, arguing that far from being independent, 'it depends on a Barbarian king, for whom we know, that under the name of donations to his ministers, he continually disburses tribute of large amounts of gold'.³⁰

The author thus pointed out a true, but highly problematic, aspect of the Venetian republican narrative as it had been built over the centuries. In the same way that in its origins, the Republic was subject to Byzantium, which it had left out of its first chronicles, such as that of Giovanni Diacono, it now paid a tribute, albeit symbolic, for the occupation of the island of Zante.³¹ Furthermore, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, it had become a frequent practice to make donations and payments to the Ottoman authorities, both in money and in kind (cloth, clocks, glass objects, etc.), for very large amounts. It is important to note that these payments were part of a much more complex system of donations with which other Christian nations had to deal in Istanbul. Yet they materialised the asymmetrical relationship, not to say of dependence, between the Venetian Republic and the Ottoman monarchy. The estimation of the monetary flows involved goes far beyond the objectives of these few pages, but the payments made when the new sultan ascended the throne, for the renewal of peace agreements, or in the course of diplomatic conflicts (which resulted in the payment of tens or even hundreds of thousands of ducats), do not cast any doubt on the scale and significance of the phenomenon.³² In Istanbul, as in other cities of the empire, it was not uncommon for certain Ottoman elites to consider Venice as a dependent state of the empire (such as Ragusa), and the Ottoman administration's own records were sometimes quite explicit about it.³³ Although it always defended its own political and jurisdictional prerogatives, the Venetian Republic could not be inflexible on these matters in view of the very close economic and diplomatic interdependence that linked the two empires (i.e.: grain supply, trade, shared frontier, merchant communities, soldiers' recruitment, etc.). Like the Ottoman Empire, the Venetian Republic had to compromise some of its principles and mobilise intermediaries (essentially, through the activity of the drogmans) to find common ground at the margins of the respective legal systems.³⁴

In the context of the Interdict, this argument led to questions about the rationality of the Venetian policy towards the Papacy: what sense did it make to claim full sovereignty in relation to the Holy See, while at the same time Venice continuously accepted clear infringements of its sovereignty when dealing with the Ottoman Empire? The pamphlet therefore shows that the representation of Venetian republicanism escaped its official narratives and histories. Beyond the 'Venetian myth', in early seventeenth-century Italy not everyone took at face value the narrative of Venetian liberty.³⁵ On the contrary, there were those in Rome who conveyed the image of a republic dependent on the Ottoman Empire and thus implicitly maintained that the Republic of Genoa was

freer, because it was less subordinate to the Spanish Monarchy, than the Republic of Venice was to the Ottomans.

In what was ultimately a critique of the Venetian jurisdictional ambitions, the text also came to deal with the economic implications of such a difference with the Republic of Genoa. 'Our people go all over the world negotiating, and this world is not only confined to your domain, so that when they lack your lands, they are not lost' (*'Gli nostri huomeni vanno per tutto il mondo negoziando, il qual mondo non si vi stringe solamente nel vostro dominio, onde quando manchassero ad essi le vostre terre, non sono pero perdute'*), argued the pamphlet, in clear reference to the extension of the Genoese diaspora and its ability to develop commercial and financial activities without having territorial control over large possessions. Again, the contrast with Venice, which had based its wealth on control of the *Terraferma* ('Mainland'), the Adriatic, its colonies, and major maritime routes, was striking. By concluding that the world was not limited to the Venetian *dominio*, the author of the text, again, questioned (and mocked) the benefits of Venetian jurisdictional and territorial ambitions.

A diplomatic Venetian answer

The controversy did not end there, however, since a reply to this letter was produced in 1606, probably in Venice. It circulated as a manuscript copy, as evidenced by the one kept in the Correr Museum.³⁶ Its title, '*Risposta per l'auttore della lettera scritta dalla Serenissima Republica di Genova al Serenissimo Doge di Venetia [di G.B.L.] scritta da un nobile, à cui fu mandata, come opera novamente stampata*', indicates that the reply was conceived as a response to the printed version of the first letter. By indicating that the text had been written by a nobleman, the title also shows that the author(s) sought to avoid a confrontation with the Republic of Genoa. Although everything was a fiction, but precisely because fiction could have an impact on political and diplomatic reality, the letter was not formalised as a response from the Republic of Venice to the Republic of Genoa, but as the response of an anonymous patrician to an anonymous writer. By removing any assignment of authorship to the Republic of Genoa, the intention was to target the anonymous author, and by proxy, the Papacy.

Once again, a transfer between media took place: the answer was printed twice, probably because of market opportunities, and perhaps also because the Venetian government viewed it positively. As explained above, both because of the similarities and differences between the two republics, it was obvious that the production of pamphlets featuring a dispute between them could attract the curiosity of potential readers. The possible outlets of the letter were optimised by the form given to the publication. As with other Venetian pamphlets that addressed

the papal policy (e.g., Marc'Antonio Capello's *Risposta* to the aforementioned Antonio Possevino), the reply was not printed on its own, but in conjunction with the first letter.³⁷ The editors thus created a booklet of eight pages that included both letters and had as title *Due lettere una publicata sotto nome della Republica di Genova alla Republica di Venetia. L'altra che contiene il parere sopra la medesima Lettera*. A first edition was published in Venice in 1606.³⁸ As a sign of its circulation, many copies of this edition are preserved in Italy (in Venice, Padua, Florence, Bergamo, Genoa, and Ravenna), but also in Paris, London and Madrid.³⁹ A second edition was released the following year, in Vicenza according to the frontispiece.⁴⁰

The document was obviously not signed by the Venetian government, nor did it have an official licence. We do not know if the Republic intervened directly in its publication. However, it is now well known that, aware of the magnitude and implications of the flood of writings that were being published against them, the Venetian authorities reacted in the late summer of 1606 by promoting the publication of works favourable to their cause. Following Sarpi's precepts and adopting the concept of tacit licence (*permesso tacito*), the Republic did not necessarily grant licences but encouraged or turned a blind eye to publications critical of the Papacy's policies.⁴¹ From this point of view, it is important to observe that the 1606 edition of the *Due Lettere* is dated 2 September 1606. The pamphlet, whether on the initiative of the publishers and/or the government, thus participated in the communication campaign of the autumn 1606.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the Republic, through its representatives, did its best to spread the pamphlet. The two editions mentioned were indeed included in the compilation *Pro libertate status et reipublicae Venetorum Gallofranci ad Philenetum epistola* published in Paris in 1607.⁴² Edited by Louis Servin, an influential Gallican jurist and parliamentarian, the work included 19 writings on the Interdict that had previously been published separately.⁴³ The work was published following the solicitations made by the Venetian ambassador in Paris Piero Priuli, who, in agreement with the government but also on his own initiative, promoted the Venetian cause beyond the republican territory.⁴⁴ The pamphlet would later be included in another collection published in 1607, this time in the Calvinist stronghold of Geneva.⁴⁵

The content of the document was in line with its format. It was tough on the anonymous author, but very diplomatic with regard to Genoa, towards which it was not appropriate to create a diplomatic conflict. After underlining that the two supposed letters were fake, which amounted to denying the existence of a complaint from the Venetian Republic to its Genoese counterpart, the authors of the Venetian text sought to unveil the intentions of the author of the anti-Venetian

pamphlet, in order to better underline how much his objective was to add fuel to the fire by forcing Venice to take a position against both the Republic of Genoa and the Ottoman monarchy. Rather than not answering, which was presented as the second alternative pursued by the author of the *Lettera*, the text sought therefore to criticise and to discredit the 'diabolic, and scelerate considerations' (*diaboliche, e scelerate considerationi*) of the 'false, malicious, petulant, and scandalous' (*falsario, maligno, petulante, e scandaloso*) author, also qualified as a 'lying historian' (*historico fraudolente*) for his erroneous reading of the past of the two republics. Interestingly, the text also provided a positive judgement towards Genoa by highlighting the common points that the two republics shared. In this way, the text argued not only that they shared the same political regime, but also that they professed esteem for the Holy See and looked after the liberty of Italy. Both republics were governed by prudent senators and did not submit their deliberations to the judgement of 'consultori', in reference to Paolo Sarpi:

Just as Genoa and Venice, two republics, which are the ornament and glory of Italy, esteem the Apostolic seat in the same way as their elders did, so they are both attentive to the preservation of the liberty of Italy and the greatness of the Christian name, they regulate and conduct their affairs according to the opportunities with circumspection and vigilance of prudent senators and ministers, and do not submit their deliberations to the foolish and angry petulance of contagious and insolent consultants. [...] This very indiscreet slanderer has to understand that just as Genoa, with great maturity and prudence, is united with that great King, so Venetia on her own, and with arms and negotiation for so many years has made and continues to make glorious [resistance] to the forces of the Turks, who have absorbed so many vast kingdoms, and all this no less for the defence of her own liberty, than for the rest of Italy, and in particular of the Apostolic seat.⁴⁶

As much as highlighting commonalities was necessary in order not to arouse tensions with the Republic of Genoa, it was dangerous since it risked placing the two republics on the same level, which was inconceivable for at least a large part of the Venetian patriciate. In the second part of the quoted extract, the authors thus acknowledged that Genoa was under the protection of the Spanish Monarchy, while distinguishing very clearly the Venetian case. Rather than depending on another state, the Venetian Republic acted independently by mobilising its own armies and trading with the Ottoman Empire, which was beneficial to the whole of Christendom, including the Papacy. This was a very diplomatic way of recalling some of the essential principles of Venetian republican thought, namely that it was not dependent on other powers and was therefore free.

The unpublishable Venetian answer?
A handwritten anti-Genoese pamphlet

However, this answer was not welcomed by everyone in Venice. In the archive of the Correr Museum, a manuscript is preserved that has remained unnoticed so far. Entitled *Un'altra nova. Risposta alla lettera da Genova*, the document attests the writing of another answer, which probably remained handwritten, to the first letter allegedly produced by Genoa.⁴⁷ The fact that this document remained handwritten does not mean that it was not distributed.⁴⁸ Before joining the Correr collection, it was actually part of the library of the *Congregazione dei Chierici Regolari Somaschi* in Venice.⁴⁹ Although its author is unknown, it is quite possible that it was written by a patrician or a group of Venetian patricians who were not satisfied with the first *Risposta*. Although diplomatic, and effective, the letter had left the harsh attacks on Venice without a real response. It is well known that the production of writings following the Interdict went far beyond governmental control, and from this point of view, it is likely that some members of the patriciate, with or without the support of the Republic, took the initiative to produce another response. It is difficult to know at this point whether the two versions represented different pressure groups; in any case, the Republic could never have given its authorisation to a text of such violence towards its Genoese counterpart.

As a matter of fact, the response used a tone and an argumentation that were completely different from those previously chosen. Focusing on the dialectic relation liberty/servitude, the incipit of the text revealed the harsh tone and the general aim of the whole text:

It is no wonder that you, who are accustomed to the Spanish servitude, are happy to receive the Church's yoke, for once you have lost your freedom, you appreciate little more the one than the other kind of servitude, and it may even be that you have done it in revenge for the violence that you feel in their oppression and from the envy of seeing us others free, hoping by this example to make us capable of your misery and unhappiness. But you deceive yourselves, if you believe that you can live in servitude, from those who are nourished in freedom. You, servants by the election of your elders and by your birth and nature, also wait to celebrate this false freedom, which you think you have, because as in other times your own discord caused you to lose the name of the Republic and submit to the Dukes of Milan and foreigners, so, since at present the interests and ambitions of your citizens have made you accept the laws of the will of others, contrary to the custom of free principalities. They make you little less than worthy of the name of slaves, whose only right is to obey their patron without distinction of reason or time. And you enjoy this

great dignity and such a great privilege, which you seem to have acquired, by registering it in the memory of your posterity, so that they may detest your name in every age.⁵⁰

The opuscle differed from the previous one in that it responded directly to the Genoese Republic, as if the latter had been the real producer of the first letter. Although the authors were not fooled, it probably seemed to them that the defence and the honour of the Republic required a strong and sharp answer to the Genoese Republic, which, in any way, could not be placed on the same level as the Venetian one (or serve as pretext to jeopardise some foundations of the republican edifice). The political thoughts linked to republics here appear closely interdependent on each other in the sense that one of them – Venice – distinguished itself from the other to define its own identity, status and prestige. For this reason, the author(s) of the text rejected any kind of republican relativism, and, adopting a conception of full sovereignty, represented the Republic of St George as a slave subordinate to the Spanish Monarchy, as well as a political body dependent on the temporal power of the Catholic Church. From its point of view, this type of dependency was incompatible with the idea of a free republic, which was obviously a way to define and represent Venice as different and unique.

Not surprisingly, the central argument rested on the notion of original liberty (*libertà originaria*) so important to Venetian thinkers because of the continuous *dominio* that Venice had allegedly exercised over its territory. This notion was a source of political distinction, since other states, such as Genoa, could hardly claim the same. In this very Venetian perspective, the fifteenth century occupation of Liguria by the Visconti of Milan was interpreted as a point of no return. By recalling that the *leggi nuove* of 1576 (which had followed the civil war of 1575) had been signed thanks to the intermediation of a papal representative, the text again described Genoese political practice as contrary to the usages of free princes.⁵¹ On the basis of these historical events, the pamphlet essentialised the supposed Genoese servitude as the very nature of a state that was by definition submissive and therefore inferior to the Venetian Republic. The loss of freedom under Milan's rule was thus not compatible with the possibility that a free republic could later emerge in Genoa.

Moreover, the authors attacked the Genoese republic to better target the Papacy. History books in hand, the Venetian author(s) affirmed that the excommunications against Venice had been essentially due to the ambition of misguided Popes to compete in political and military affairs with the Venetian Republic. To illustrate their point, they chose, not

without irony, two Ligurian popes, Sixtus IV and Julius II:

The fact that some of these Popes argued that we were opposing that Seat, can be ascribed more to the fault of the ambition, or emulation, that they have exercised with the Republic, than the demerit of it. Sixtus and Julius, one the Fourth and the other the Second, by name, dared to do so with so little reason, that in addition to the censure of the people they manifestly incurred the indignation of the Lord God [...] since the one who was Sixtus died of rabies five hours after the notice, which he had of the peace concluded by us with his adherents with so much glory, and useful to our state, and so little dignity of him [...]. And the other, who was Julius, died unexpectedly in a few days, oppressed by the fear that the Council would depose him of that dignity, in which he had given occasion to shed so much blood of Christians and to send so many souls to perdition [...] having made himself known [...] more worthy to handle the sword than the cross.⁵²

According to the pamphlet, the two Popes had excommunicated Venice with so little reason that they had outraged God and had been punished. Sixtus IV was a member of the Della Rovere family from Celle Ligure (near Savona), who had actually excommunicated Venice in 1483. According to the pamphlet, he had died of anger five hours after learning that the Venetian Republic had signed the peace with its allies.⁵³ The reference to his nephew Julius II, who was so much a part of the Venetian collective memory, was even less hazardous. The instigator of the League of Cambrai (1508) which had led the allied troops to the outskirts of Venice, had excommunicated the Republic at the risk of becoming, during the wars of Italy (1494–1559), the archetype of the ‘warrior pope’.⁵⁴ Julius II had at the time been vilified by Venice, but also by writers such as Erasmus, Guicciardini or Machiavelli, becoming the heart of battles of multimedia communication which had set fire to Italy and a part of the European continent.⁵⁵ A century later, during this new (albeit different) confrontation between Venice and the Papacy, he was mobilised in a pamphlet that sought to associate the Roman power with one of its most controversial figures. Julius II was here remembered for having worn more ‘the corselet, that the mantle’ (‘il corsaletto, che il manto’) and shed Christian blood. The text finally ironised the fact (not proven) that he died abruptly for fear of being deposed by a hostile council, in reference to the failed one of Pisa. These criticisms echoed the diatribes uttered at the time of the defeat of Agnadello (1509) when illustrious Venetians like Sanudo presented Julius II as both a troublemaker among Christians, and as being hostile to the Venetians. In May 1509, another famous Venetian patrician, Girolamo Priuli, also blamed ‘Julius II Pope of Savona, great enemy of the Venetian name, and always the Venetians will remember him’ (‘Iulio pontifice secundo de Saona, inimicissimo del nome veneto, et sempre li Signori Venetiani se ricorderanno

de lui’).⁵⁶ A little less than a century later, there is no doubt that the Venetians still remembered him very well.

As was common practice in writings that linked Venice and Genoa, the political use of the past was thus central to the narratives in place. The great Genoese-Venetian wars of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as well as the interest that the governments had had in each other, had constantly fuelled the historical cross-views.⁵⁷ In the Middle Ages, the historians and chroniclers of the two city-states read and discussed writings that composed and recomposed their Mediterranean past.⁵⁸ Yet the history of Genoa was not written in the same way as in Venice, where the considerable and constantly renewed effort of the ruling group had led to the construction of a unified – and mythical – narrative about the original liberty of the Republic, the perfection of its institutions, its sovereignty over the Adriatic and its Christian vocation. The asymmetry was such that it was still felt in the early modern period. The Genoese writers of the first half of the seventeenth century, such as Foglietta, Andrea Spinola, or Giovanni Vincenzo Imperiale, were great readers of Venetian classical works. They were inspired by them and also appropriated them to promote a policy less dependent on the Spanish Monarchy.⁵⁹

In this case, it is interesting to observe that it was the Venetians who read and quoted Genoese works, specifically the *Annali* of Agostino Giustiniani (1537), which the author(s) of the pamphlet quoted in order to show that the Genoese had actually been banned by the papacy on several occasions. Examples of the excommunications issued by Pope Gregory X (1272–76) and Innocent VIII (1484–92) were made.⁶⁰ Using a Genoese source was obviously a convenient way to learn about these issues; quoting it explicitly in order to deny an alleged Genoese pamphlet brought another ironic touch to the story. In the same way, the author used the *Ristretto delle Historie genovesi* (Lucca, 1551) by Paolo Interiano, a History of Genoa from the year 1000 to 1506 that the Genoese Republic had also approved.⁶¹ The Venetians here used this history of Genoa to trace the excommunication of Genoa by Pope Urban IV (1261–64). By using historical examples found in Genoese literature, the Venetians thus attempted to show that the Genoese had also disobeyed the Papacy because of Roman political ambitions. With the same purpose, they ultimately quoted a (true) excerpt from Interiano’s *Historie* concluding that ‘in those times the love of the fatherland was esteemed more than the fear of the Pontiffs’ (‘in quei tempi più l’amor della Patria, che il timor dei Pontefici era stimato’) by the Republic of Genoa.⁶² Ironically, Genoese Histories now appeared to be instrumental to the Venetian cause.

Moreover, the text addressed the central issue of the relationship with the ‘infidels’. Here, the pamphlet accused the Genoese for their role in the eastern Mediterranean, where

they had prioritised their merchant interests over religious ones. In particular, the Genoese were accused of infamy for having brought the Turks to Europe on their own ships at one ecu per head, which would have led to nothing less than the loss of Eastern Christianity:

You have defended our religion against the infidels according to your interests, for which several times you mercenarily sailed to the East, but they cannot exonerate you from the infamy that you earned when, at the price of a shield per head, you ferried the Turkish nation from Asia to Europe with your own ships. And from this fact derived the loss of Christianity in the East, and the dangers of Western Christianity were accelerated⁶³.

The text referred to the Varna Crusade (1443–1445), when Genoese ships allegedly transported Murad II's army from Anatolia to the Balkans, allowing the Ottomans to defeat the Crusader troops mobilised by Pope Eugene I (who was Venetian), and the Venetian Republic itself. According to some chronicles, such as that of Jean de Wavrin, the Genoese had indeed provided many ships to transport the Turkish troops across the Dardanelles Strait, precisely south of Gallipoli.⁶⁴ During the previous decades, and partly because of the rivalry with the Venetians, the Genoese had collaborated on several occasions with the rising force of the eastern Mediterranean, and the Venetians had already been quick to disseminate news of this activity for propaganda purposes. In the same way, they had spread the rumour of Genoese complicity when Constantinople was taken in 1453. By playing on the reputation of the Genoese as mercenaries, the Venetian pamphlet therefore reversed the arguments of the first letter concerning the defence of the Catholic faith.

The text also shows that the Roman initiative led one or more Venetians to feel the necessity of defending the privileged relations they maintained with the Ottoman Empire. Hence, the author of the third pamphlet took care to explain that the commercial interests with the 'infidel' corresponded exactly to those that any prince maintained with the surrounding territories because of the bilateral nature of trade. The text therefore tried to normalise the political relations maintained with the Ottoman Empire: the other Christian princes also paid money to the ministers of the Empire and to the sultan 'when they have to deal with such a barbarous and rapacious nation' ('quando hanno da trattare con natione co[si] tanto barbara e rapace'). The text also formally denied that the Republic was dependent on the Ottoman Empire because of the question of Zante. Rather than truly addressing the issue, however, it shifted it by stating that according to this argument, the King of Spain should be considered tributary to the Papacy because of the census he paid to it. In the same manner, the pamphlet normalised the relationship

with the Ottomans by arguing that the Christian princes also declared war against each other when it was in their interest. On this specific issue, there were therefore no difference between Christians and Muslims ('tra fedeli, che tra infedeli'). The text also denied the accusations of heresy, assuring that 'no Venetian has ever been a heretic' ('non si trovando, che alcun venetiano sia stato giamai heretico').⁶⁵

Ultimately, sharp criticisms were made against the Genoese and about the weakness of their state. It was obviously, here again, a way to support the Venetian political model. The text referred to the allegedly weak protection that the Spanish Monarchy offered to the Republic and introduced several stereotypes about the Genoese financiers who sucked the blood of the Papacy and the rest of Italy due to usury. Lastly, the pamphlet mocked the argument of the first letter according to which the Genoese military forces would support the Pope in case of conflict:

The offers that you wish to make to the Pope to defend him, the broader they will be in words, the narrower they will be in deeds, since you aim at nothing more than private interest. And what can you give to the Pope, if you have neither public richness, nor forces, nor state, that he will accept, since he is bound to govern himself by his own will alone?⁶⁶

By implicitly comparing Genoa to Venice, the text here referred to the weakness of Genoa's public finances, which were heavily compromised by its dependence on the Bank of San Giorgio, the weakness of the state, and the limited fiscal resources of Liguria.⁶⁷ The text thus took up the Botero's parallel that had become classic between Venice and Genoa and the different importance that the two Republics had given to the *res publica* over the centuries.⁶⁸

This distinction was to some extent true, but it also underestimated and disdained the capacity that Genoa had to defend its interests through its privileged links with the Spanish Monarchy. It was the case in the military field, where, at that time, the participation of its elites in the Mediterranean fleet was matched by imperial protection.⁶⁹ The price to pay was that of a limited autonomy while Venice, on the other hand, had to assume a role of territorial power with all its implications.

Conclusion

This study has uncovered conflicting discourses exchanged – fictitiously, but with real meanings and implications – between the two main Italian republics of the early modern period. While the School of Cambridge has mostly focused on underlining the similarities between the different components of an alleged European republican heritage, these texts

show how, in the concrete context of the early seventeenth century, the two republics were opposed and confronted – both by external and local authors – for political propaganda purposes. The policy of Genoa – indeed more conciliatory towards the Papacy – was instrumentalised by a third party in order to criticise the anti-papal policy of Venice. By portraying a Genoese Republic that considered obeying the Papacy not as a political weakening or even a threat to republican liberty, but as a source of honour, an author – perhaps the Jesuit Possevino – found a very clever way of presenting an alternative path that demonstrated that Venice had opted for a radical position. The apparent similarities between the two merchant republics made the Venetian policy more questionable. Although the letter was not written by the Genoese patriciate, the fiction was closely linked to historical reality.

The republican thinking here portrayed was not far from that assumed by many members of the Genoese *nobiltà vecchia* that had effectively bet on a republicanism compatible with relations of conciliation (and sometimes dependence and obedience) towards the Papacy and the Spanish Monarchy. From this perspective, the text also makes visible certain differences in terms of political culture. Although the imperative of maintaining friendly relations with Genoa prevented Venice from responding vehemently in an official manner, the third pamphlet is nonetheless indicative of the refusal of some Venetians to consider Genoa on the same level as its Venetian counterpart. In this sense, the pamphlets that arose during the Interdict provide another example of the rivalry that often characterised relations between republics.

As shown by the third pamphlet, the representation of Venice was based on its distinction from other republics considered as inferior because they were not originally free. Underlining the dependence of other republics was a way to represent the Venetian one as unique. Hence, the two

republican models appeared not only as competing, but also as useful to at least one of the parties. This conclusion is in line with the condescending attitude of the Venetian patriciate when, during the 1640s, Genoese reformers tried to establish collaborative links with it.⁷⁰

However, at the beginning of the seventeenth century it had become complicated to demonstrate that a republic was perfectly free and independent. Even though the texts analysed were short pamphlets, their analysis is significant for how republican representations were shaped by the high degree of political, economic, military, jurisdictional and symbolic dependence of Genoa, but also of Venice, towards the papal authority, the Ottoman Empire, and the Spanish Monarchy. From this point of view, the representations here analysed are different from what emerges from most studies of the School of Cambridge, which have focused on republican liberty in opposition to tyranny and often excluded republican regimes that were not fully sovereign. The limitations of such a selective view of republicanism appear here clearly. Rather than being defined by resistance against the rule and influence of surrounding monarchies, the Genoese Republic was portrayed as a republic that assumed its dependence on the Spanish Monarchy and the Papacy. As for the Venetian Republic, it was forced to defend its close ties with the Ottoman Empire – while recalling past struggles and normalising different ties of interdependence. Behind this, the lack of total autonomy from the Papacy, though heavily fought against, and with great success, was obvious. In the midst of these diatribes, the question of the republican regime became marginal, since the essential issue here was not so much the political model as the degree and the complex forms of liberty and interdependence of both republics with respect to the diverse political regimes directed from Madrid, Istanbul and Rome.

- * This article was produced within the frame of the research project 'Res Pública Monárquica. La Monarquía Hispánica, una estructura imperial policéntrica de repúblicas urbanas' (PGC 2018–095224–B–100) directed by Manuel Herrero Sánchez and funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation. I am grateful to the École française de Rome, where I completed this article as a visiting scholar.
- 1 On this important issue, see the contribution of Manuel Herrero Sánchez in this book. About the School of Cambridge: Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*; Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*; Van Gelderen and Skinner, eds, *Republicanism*; Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*.
 - 2 Sánchez, 'Introducción'; Zucchi, 'Republicanesimo antico e moderno'.
 - 3 On this topic: Zucchi, 'Republicanesimo antico e moderno', pp. 168–69.
 - 4 Maréchaux, 'Cultiver l'alternative'.
 - 5 De Vivo, *Information and Communication*.
 - 6 MCV, MS 1020, fols 246r–247v (henceforth indicated as *Copia della lettera*); BAV, Urb. lat. 1113, fol. 281r–v, 'Copia d'una lettera della Serenissima Repubblica di Genova in risposta di una scrittali dalla Repubblica di Venetia'; BCBV, MS 1202, fols 615r–618r, 'Lettera della Repubblica di Genova alla Repubblica di Venetia'. I would like to thank Andrea Savio for providing me with the copy kept at the BCBV.
 - 7 Bitossi, 'L'antico regime genovese', p. 417; Grendi, *Inaltri termini*, pp. 60–61; ASCG, MBS, ms 109 D4, 'Racconto delle cose successe in Genova dall'anno 1600 sino al 1610', fol. 90^r, 18 August 1605.
 - 8 'Fù mandato grida [...] come il Serenissimo Senato haveva con li voti necessari ritrattato, e annullato il decreto fatto circa l'annullare le confrattarie, et le compagnie, et lasciato ogni cosa, com'era prima et questo per non tirarsi adosso l'ira del Pontefice, che fù scritto, che la sentiva male', ASCG, MBS, ms 109 D4, 'Racconto', fol. 93^r, 25 October 1605.
 - 9 ASCG, MBS, ms 109 D4, 'Racconto', fol. 94^r, 12 November 1605. On Sauli: Pizzorno, *Genova e Roma tra Cinque e Seicento*; Ben Yessaf Garfia, 'Mobilità e cooptazione'.
 - 10 The bibliography on the Interdict is vast. Sarpi, *Opere*; Cozzi, *Paolo Sarpi tra Venezia e l'Europa*; Cozzi, *Paolo Sarpi. Consulti*; De Vivo, *Information and Communication*.
 - 11 Lazzarini, 'Officina Sarpiana', p. 36; Cappelletti, *I Gesuiti e la Repubblica di Venezia*, pp. 169–72.
 - 12 BAV, Urb. lat. 1113, fol. 281r–v, 'Copia d'una lettera della Serenissima Repubblica di Genova in risposta di una scrittali dalla Repubblica di Venetia'. In the upper left corner of the *Copia* there is a reference to the *avvisi* of 26 July 1606.
 - 13 'Assai innoenti', 'ma non in tutto laudate, mostrando tropo risentimento con Venetiani'. A AV, Segretaria di Stato, *Avvisi*, n. 2, fols 202r–206r, 26 and 29 July 1606.
 - 14 Peirano, *Lettera della Repubblica di Genova*.
 - 15 Cappelletti, *I Gesuiti e la Repubblica di Venezia*, pp. 159–68; Lazzarini, 'Officina Sarpiana', p. 36.
 - 16 BCBV, MS 1202, fols 615r–618r, 'Lettera della Repubblica di Genova alla Repubblica di Venetia' with an *avviso* from Genoa, 28 July 1606.
 - 17 Maréchaux, 'Negociar, disuadir y comunicar', pp. 101–04.
 - 18 AGS, Estado, leg. 1433, doc. 176, Juan Vivas to Philipp III, 25 July 1606.
 - 19 De Vivo, *Information and Communication*; Viallon and Dompnier, 'Le traité de la matière bénéficiaire'.
 - 20 'Serenissimo Principe [the Republic of Venice], Abbiamo ricevuto la lettera de Vostra Serenità, la quale ha cagionato in noi [the Republic of Genoa] diverso effetto da quello, che ella pensava; poiche l'havere noi ceduto alla volontà del Sommo Pontefice in revocare li decreti da noi fatti contra li oratori, non solo non torna in pregiudicio nostro, ma piu tosto è in augumento della dignità della nostra Repubblica, et in vergogna di coloro, li quali in simile occasione fossero renitenti alla pia mente di Sua Santità'. *Copia della lettera*.
 - 21 Assereto, 'Lo sguardo di Genova su Venezia'; Maréchaux, 'Cultiver l'alternative'.
 - 22 'D'esser lodati, & magnificati come veri Catholici, & fidelissimi Christiani; né perciò hanno persa la loro libertà: anzi con tale attione si hanno aggiunta una gioia inestimabile', Possevino, *Risposta del Sig. Paolo Anafesto*.
 - 23 Pizzorno, *Genova e Roma tra Cinque e Seicento*, pp. 270–86.
 - 24 Lazzarini, 'Officina Sarpiana', p. 36; De Vivo, *Information and Communication*, p. 222; Mazetti Petersson, *A Culture for the Christian Commonwealth*, p. 191.
 - 25 De Vivo, *Information and Communication*, p. 222.
 - 26 See Sarpi, *Opere*; De Franceschi, *Raison d'État et raison d'Église*.
 - 27 See in particular Gaeta, 'Venezia da "stato misto" ad aristocrazia "esemplare"'; Fasoli, 'I fondamenti della storiografia veneziana'; Crouzet-Pavan, *Venise: une invention de la ville*; De Vivo, 'Historical Justifications of Venetian Power in the Adriatic'. See also Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*.
 - 28 Stella, 'La riforma protestante'; Calabi, Camerino, and Concina, *La città degli ebrei*; Pedani, 'Between Diplomacy and Trade'.
 - 29 Gaeta, 'Venezia da "stato misto" ad aristocrazia "esemplare"', pp. 467–68.
 - 30 'Dipende da un Re Barbaro, per il quale sappiamo, che sotto nome di donativo ai suoi ministri sborsate di continuo tributo di gran quantità d'oro'.
 - 31 Crouzet-Pavan, *Venise: une invention de la ville*, p. 241; Maria Pia Pedani, *Dalla frontiera al confine*.
 - 32 Fabris, 'Un caso di pirateria veneziana'; Raby, 'La Sérénissime et la Sublime Porte'; Molà, 'Material Diplomacy'; Maréchaux, "Non andare mai alla giustizia".
 - 33 Pedani, *La dimora della pace*, pp. 34–38; Maréchaux, "Non andare mai alla giustizia".
 - 34 Maréchaux, "Non andare mai alla giustizia".
 - 35 Crouzet-Pavan, *Venise triomphante*.
 - 36 MCV, MS 1020, fols 248r–249v, 'Risposta per l'auttore della lettera scritta dalla Serenissima Repubblica di Genova al Serenissimo Doge di Venetia [di G.B.L.] scritta da un nobile, à cui fu mandata, come opera novamente stampata'. The added words '[di G.B.L.]' remain unclear.
 - 37 De Vivo, *Information and Communication*, p. 228; Possevino, *Lettera del Padre Antonio Possevino*.
 - 38 *Due lettere una pubblicata sotto nome della Repubblica di Genova alla Repubblica di Venetia. L'altra che contiene il parere sopra la medesima Lettera*, Venice, 1606.
 - 39 Several copies have been retrieved from the catalogues of the Biblioteca Marciana and the Museo Correr, the Biblioteca del Seminario vescovile e della Facoltà teologica del Triveneto (Padova), the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale (Florence), the Biblioteca Universitaria di Genova, the Biblioteca Civica Angelo Mai (Bergamo), the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, the Bibliothèque Mazarine de Paris, the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, the British Library, and the Biblioteca comunale Classense of Ravenna.
 - 40 *Copia di due lettere una pubblicata sotto nome della Repubblica di Genova alla Repubblica di Venetia. L'altra che contiene il parere sopra la medesima Lettera*.
 - 41 De Vivo, *Information and Communication*, pp. 218–19.
 - 42 *Pro libertate status et reipublicae Venetorum Gallofranci ad Philenetum epistola*. Some copies used the edition of 1606 published in Venice, others the one published in Vicenza in 1607.
 - 43 About Servin, see Cozzi, *Paolo Sarpi. Consulti*, pp. 81–82.
 - 44 De Vivo, *Information and Communication*, p. 219; De Vivo, 'Francia e Inghilterra di fronte all'Interdetto di Venezia', pp. 175–76.
 - 45 *Raccolta degli scritti vscti fvi in istampa, e scritti a mano, nella cavsa del P. Paolo V. co' Signori Venetiani. Secondo le stampe di Venetia, di Roma, & d'altri luoghi*. See De Vivo, *Information and Communication*, p. 167.
 - 46 'Et cio è, che si come Genova, e Venetia due Republiche, che sono l'ornamento, e la gloria d'Italia, stimano egualmente come hanno fatto i loro maggiori la Sede Apostolica, cosi l'una, e l'altra attente alla conservatione della libertà d'Italia, e della grandezza del nome Christiano, regolano e conducono le attioni loro secondo le opportunità delle occasioni con circospettione e vigilanza di prudenti Senatori e ministri, e non hanno da sottoporre le loro deliberationi alla sciocca, & arrabbiata petulanza di consultori contagiosi & insolenti [...] Et insieme intenda questo indiscretissimo calunniatore, che si come Genova con molta maturità, e sicurtà di prudenza stà unita con quel gran Re, cosi Venetia per se sola, e con l'armi, e co'l negotio per tanti anni ha fatto, e fa gloriosa [resistenza]

- alle forze de Turchi, che s'hanno assorbito tanti vastissimi Regni, e tutto ciò non meno per difesa, e sostentamento della propria libertà, che del rimanente d'Italia, & in specie della Sede Apostolica'. *Due lettere*, fol. 8.
- 47 MCV, ms. 1020, fols 250r-255v, 'Un'altra nova. Risposta alla lettera da Genova di [Gier./Gio. Tiep.]'. The indication '[Gier./Gio. Tiep.]' has not allowed us to identify the author of the manuscript so far.
- 48 Bouza Álvarez, 'Corre manuscrito'; De Vivo, *Information and Communication*.
- 49 <https://www.nuovabibliotecamanoscritta.it/Generale/ricerca/AnteprimaManoscritto.html?codiceMan=9348&language=EN> (catalogue record created by Sabrina Salis).
- 50 'Non è meraviglia, che voi altri avezzi alla servitù spagnola vi siate contentati di ricevere anco il giogo della Ecclesiastica, poiche perduta una sol volta la libertà, poco si apprezza piu l'una, che l'altra sorte di servitù, potendo essere anco, che voi l'abbiate fatto in vendetta delle violenze, che provate nelle oppressioni loro et dall'invidia di veder noi altri liberi, sperando con questo essemplio de farci capaci della miseria et infelicità vostra; ma ve ingannate al sicuro, se credete, che si possa viver in servitù, da chi è nutrito in libertà. Voi servi per ellectione de vostri maggiori et per nascimento e natura vostra attendete pure à gloriarvi nei cessi di questa falsa libertà, che vi pensate di havere, che come in altri tempi le proprie discordie vi hanno fatto perdere il nome di Republica et sottoporvi ai Duchi di Milano, et à genti straniere, cosi havendovi al presente gli interessi et l'ambitione de vostri cittadini fatto ricevere le leggi dell'altrui volontà, contro al costume de Principati liberi, vi fanno poco meno, che degni del nome de schiavi, de quali non è proprio altro che l'obedire al Patrone senza distintione di ragione, ò di tempo. E godete de questa gran dignità et de cosi gran privilegio, che vi pare, d'haver acquistato, registrandolo à memoria de vostri posterì, à fine, che habbino à detestare il nome vostro in ogni età'. 'Un'altra nova', fol. 250r.
- 51 On the 1575 crisis, see Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*.
- 52 'Che poi da alcuni di essi Pontefici siamo stati dichiarati contumaci di quella Sede, può forse dirsi con più ragione, colpa dell'ambitione, o emulatione, che hanno essercitato con la Republica, che demerito di lei. De quali due aponto della vostra Patria, o natione, Sisto et Giulio, l'uno Quarto et l'altro Secondo, di nome, ardirono farlo con cosi poca ragione, che oltra il biasimo delli huomeni incorsero manifestamente nell'indignatione del signor Dio [...] essendo l'uno che fu Sisto morto di rabbia cinque hore dopo l'aviso, che hebbe della pace conclusa da noi con suoi adherenti con tanta gloria, et utile dello stato nostro, et cosi poca dignità di lui [...] Et l'altro, che fu Giulio mancato di vita improvvisamente in pochi giorni oppresso dal timore, che il concilio l'havesse à deponere di quella dignità, nella quale haveva dato occasione di spargere tanto sangue de christiani et di mandare in perditione tante anime [...] havendosi fatto conoscere [...] più degno di maneggiar la spada, che la croce'. 'Un'altra nova', fol. 250r.
- 53 See Lombardi, 'Sisto IV, Papa', in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*.
- 54 Pastore, 'Giulio II, Papa', in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*.
- 55 Rospocher, *Il papa guerriero*.
- 56 Rospocher, *Il papa guerriero*, pp. 242–56.
- 57 See Lane, *Venice: A Maritime Republic*; Ortalli and Puncuh, eds, *Genova, Venezia, il Levante nei secoli XII–XIV*; Musarra, *Il Grifo e il Leone*.
- 58 Crouzet-Pavan, *Venise: une invention de la ville*, pp. 235–55.
- 59 Maréchaux, 'Cultiver l'alternative'.
- 60 Giustiniani, *Castigatissimi annali*.
- 61 Interiano, *Ristretto delle historie genovesi*.
- 62 In the *Historie*, Interiano argued that 'perciò che piu in quei tempi l'amor della Patria, che il timor dei Pontefici era stimato' (Interiano, *Ristretto delle historie genovesi*, fol. 69').
- 63 'Che habbate poi difesa la nostra religione contra infideli, lo possono affirmare i vostri interressi, per i quali vi conduceste piu volte mercenariamente à navigare in oriente, ma non vi possono già escusare dall'infamia, che guadagnaste quando à prezzo d'un scudo per testa trahettaste con le vostre istesse navi d'Asia in Europa la natione Turchesca, dal qual passaggio è nata la perdita del Christianesimo di oriente, et si sono accelerati i pericoli della occidentale christianità'. 'Un'altra nova', fol. 252r.
- 64 Tuleja, 'Eugenius IV and the Crusade of Varna'; Imber, *The Crusade of Varna, 1443–45*, pp. 5–7, 30, 126–29; Musarra, *Il Grifo e il Leone*, p. 281; Musarra, *Genova e il mare nel Medioevo*, p. 167.
- 65 'Un'altra nova', fol. 252r–v.
- 66 'L'offerte, che dite voler fare al Pontefice, per diffenderlo, quanto piu saranno larghe nelle parole, tanto piu ristrette saranno nei fatti, non mirando ciascuno di voi ad'altro, che all'interesse privato. Et che potete voi dare al Papa, se non havete ne publico erario, ne forze, ne stato, che quando haveste consiglio che fosse buono per voi, meno egli lo accettaria, essendo ressoluto di reggersi con la sua sola volontà'. 'Un'altra nova', fol. 252r.
- 67 Felloni, 'Stato genovese, finanza pubblica e ricchezza privata'.
- 68 See, among many other studies, Felloni, 'Ricchezza privata, credito e banche'; Herrero Sánchez, 'Génova y el sistema imperial hispánico'; Maréchaux, 'Cultiver l'alternative'. See also the contribution of Manuel Herrero Sánchez in this volume.
- 69 Lo Basso, *Uomini da remo*; Maréchaux, 'Business Organisation in the Mediterranean Sea'.
- 70 Maréchaux, 'Cultiver l'alternative'.