Papal Rome in Lockdown: Proximities, Temporalities, and Emotions during the Im/mobility of the Conclave

The invitation to which this article responds has provided a unique – hopefully, once in a lifetime – opportunity to rethink familiar material in the light of new questions and priorities. The papal conclaves of the period 1523-1775, which have been a focus of some of my recent research, would seem to offer one of the closest parallels in the lives of early modern Italians to conditions many of us have experienced globally in 2020-21. Then, as now, lockdown prevailed, quite literally for cardinals shut away behind secure doors. Other Romans also were subjected to curfews and assorted restrictions on movement or activity for a variety of reasons, notably to prevent the violent disorder which could rock Rome during conclaves. The hiatus created by a conclave could go on for months (72 days in in 1549-50, 113 in 1559, 130 days in 1669-70, 151 in 1691, and 180 in 1740 are some of the longer examples).[1] Statues sometimes toppled during that time; released prisoners roamed the streets; plagues even occasionally stalked the land. *Sede Vacante*, the period without a pope, liberated some but was a source of anxiety for many others: it re-ordered positions in public and private life – and with that routines, certainties, and experiences of time, place, emotions, and the senses.

Many scholars have provided compelling overviews of this unusual, even idiosyncratic, occurrence in Roman history, in particular regarding what we might term its "social dimensions". Joëlle Rollo-Koster's work on the 1378 papal vacancy, like Laurie Nussdorfer's on that of 1644, and John Hunt's on the run of vacancies from 1559 to 1655, stands out, and not least for its most surprising conclusion: that the city in lockdown was never a site of *immobility* but rather of multiple and continuous *micro*-mobilities, including new forms of fluidity or

circulation and hidden oscillations only thence revealed.[2] Luca Zenobi, writing in the *Journal of Early Modern History*, has recently contended that "mobility is key to our appreciation of (urban) society in the early modern period".[3] This is surely true in the sense that Zenobi invokes it: mobility had transformative effects on cities, altering the ways in which space was ordered. However, we might go further: events in these "Cities in Motion" (such as the pope's death) could restructure kinesis – of ideas as well as people and goods – as extensively as kinetic energy shaped space. The papal vacancy certainly transposed how all Romans, from prelate to pauper, in curia as well as city, experienced the urban surroundings through which they moved. Social historians, alert to this, have therefore used it to write Rome into wider historiographies. The result has been a valuable intervention: a case study on movement and its intersections at a particular time and in a single specific location. This case study has proved timely when so much history of mobilities retains focus on the macro-scale.[4]

This essay seeks to shine a light on the conclave itself which is commensurate to that provided by the work already undertaken on *Sede Vacante*. It argues that more was in motion in the Vatican's darkest recesses too than might perhaps first meet the eye. Stephen Greenblatt and others argue that neither people nor their cultural practices are ever confined to a fixed territory, always existing within multiple spatial networks and temporal linkages.[5] The conclave zone, fixed territory though it was, underlines this at least as effectively as any example drawn from the wider city during vacancy. The zone's fluidity and permeability can be our starting point for engaging the conclave as both temporal phenomenon and emotional event: the fluidity and permeability were key catalysts for restructuring how its participants internalized their environment and its liminalities. In undertaking this journey, I have been informed by a wide literature by colleagues here in Australia and overseas which I summarize.[6] However, I should

note at the outset that the conclave's very nature in fact belies its reputation for stagnancy. A conclave was, in the end, a transformative process, a time of providence and investiture in which the cardinals – for all their chimerical stasis – had to build momentum to deliver a specific outcome: a new pope *urbi et orbi,* for city and world.

Mobilities of the Vacant See

In Rome, the pope's death moved everything in city and curia. Most Romans first learned of this trigger from the Patarina, that great bell which hung up high in the Campidoglio's *campanile*, ready to ring out only for the city's most momentous events.[7] The bell's vibrations, rippling out across the urban space, were its catalyst to spring into life. The heads of each district (*rione*), who knew just what the doleful sound portended, went door-to-door to instruct householders to stay at home and to light candles in their windows in the pope's memory.[8] Crowds congregated across the city: sometimes at sites of memory relating to the old regime, which they now ritually expunged; at others at sites of decision, where the cardinals (or others) were negotiating about the next pope.[9] In 1559 – a particularly violent vacancy after a spectacularly unhappy pontificate – a mob specifically targeted places associated with the late pontiff Paul IV (1555-59) and his hated nephews.[10] In 1590, and again in 1644, large groups menaced the gates to the Vatican palace demanding the election of a particular pope, in the first case, and the exclusion of a particular cardinal from consideration, in the other.[11] Statues were attacked on all three occasions.[12] However, surviving accounts from some other vacancies are notable for their commentaries on how peaceful things are – at least compared to contemporary recollections of times past.[13] In fact, each *Sede Vacante* developed rhythms of its own, the nature of which might

depend both on what had gone before but also how long the *Sede Vacante* itself was lasting. In every case, the city adapted to its new state, which, by the seventeenth century, most would have known had potential to last for many months.

On paper, officialdom tried to control movement of persons during this time. Everywhere gates and bridges were closed shut and swelled tumescent with troops.[14] Those who wished to enter or leave – as, for instance, the city's Jews when they went to bury their dead in the fields outside Porta Portese – needed authorization, and sometimes even an escort.[15] In 1590 the cardinals instructed the Governor of Rome (a papal official) to recruit five hundred men of his to guard the city walls and gates.[16] In an early example of "social distancing", ordinary Romans were instructed to gather or go about in groups no larger than four.[17] The purpose of this last injunction was to keep the peace rather than to prevent the spread of contagion. Yet like the other interventions, it was never truly successful. For one thing, the mobilities of the *Sede Vacante* were not those of the *Sede Piena*: people often moved about expressly to challenge power and so were hardly put off by the fact those in power proscribed movement. For another thing, officials could rarely agree among themselves on how to police mobility. The cardinals and the city's communal magistrates, in particular, often squabbled, for both typically saw the pope's demise as a chance to reassert some of their own ancient claims to authority.[18] The result was a surfeit of legislation but a deficit of enforcement. One of the commune's conservators paraded at the head of a cavalcade of two hundred horses each day – thus demonstrating the commune's collective resources.[19] And reports from 1590 and 1591 note aggressive police tactics by the *caporioni*: a hundred men patrolled day and night, illegal weapons were confiscated and offenders flogged in plain sight.[20] But anyone who feared the violence which freedom of movement might induce – and that included all nobles and most cardinals – made his own private arrangements to protect

persons and property. That held, even if such a notable ended up making arrangements contravened by rules he himself had endorsed.[21]

In contrast to Rome's other inhabitants, the cardinals in *Sede Vacante* endured something we tend to think of a state of meaningful lockdown. After all, this was what papal legislation mandated for them. Gregory X (r. 1271-76), the pope who is usually identified as having legislated conclaves into existence, insisted that his successor's electors convene in a single room behind locked doors and that they remain there, forsaking communication with the outside world, until they reached unanimous agreement.[22] Subsequent popes modified the letter of Gregory's prescriptions but not his principle. The Savelli family, who bore the honorable title of Conclave Marshals, later became empowered to organize a guard to block exit or entry from the holy space.[23] And yet, many cardinals still experienced the papal election as a mobile moment at the macro-level. Some came to Rome to vote and then returned home; others merely saw the locations in which they lived their lives within the city temporarily upended. Cardinals who reached Rome early enough also spent at least part of the vacancy, before the entry into the conclave, busying themselves by organizing the funeral rites for the papal corpse – including its translation to St Peter's and the nine days of mourning rites (the *novena*). Moreover, entering the conclave rarely brought cardinals to a standstill at all: they moved around plenty within their confined area – daily processions between their dormitory and the voting hall, exercise in the sealed-off space's ancillary zones, regular visits to each other's cells in between voting sessions to undertake the extensive informal negotiations on which a conclave's outcome always depended. Some cardinals even obtained special dispensation to move in and out of the conclave, or else only to enter it at the last minute, because of illness.[24] And cardinals were only ever a minority of the figures inside the conclave. By the sixteenth century each cardinal was entitled to

two or three personal attendants (known as conclavists), while a host of conclave officials, including doctors, an apothecary, barbers, carpenters, and masons, also circulated to do the cardinals' bidding.[25] Plenty of third parties also penetrated the conclave's confines during this time – most notably, the agents of Italian princes and ambassadors of Catholic powers. An *Avviso* from 1644 notes how different ambassadors now took turns to address and converse with the cardinals – Sunday for Spain, Tuesday for France, etc – almost as if their admission were becoming institutionalized.[26]

Nor were venerable souls the conclave's only mobile forms of matter: all manner of objects also flowed around the space in organized or spontaneous patterns. Voting papers, distributed, inscribed, and gathered twice a day, were a feature of all seventeenth- and most sixteenth-century conclaves. Cardinals and their conclavists also received letters and returned dispatches. Some of these missives were of a formal nature, facilitating the cardinals' attempts to govern Church and Papal States in the pope's absence. Yet others were mere vectors of private correspondence – documents whose existence the cardinal might prefer to keep hidden lest his opinions or intentions be prematurely revealed. Food was sent into the conclave through hatches (*ruote*) in the conclave's door twice a day. Gregory X had limited the cardinals to a meagre fare which was reduced to just bread, wine and water from the ninth day. However, his views on the subject, already modified by Clement VI in 1351, were not much respected after 1500.[27] In 1570, the chef Bartolomeo Scappi published a recipe book which contains dishes he claimed to have prepared for the cardinals.[28] Many cardinals also brought plenty of personal effects into the conclave with them. Paris de' Grassi, Master of Ceremonies in 1503 produced a lengthy list of what was acceptable: it included a bed and bedding, clock, bed cap and nightshirt, portable couch, two water bowls, two chamber pots, a commode, trestle tables with cloths and napkins,

three carpets for the floor, a box of clothes, writing materials, and a small selection of appropriate books.[29] Yet some cardinals imported far more than just these items, a turn of events which led to the emergence of a 'conclave economy' in which they shared or exchanged objects. Sometimes transactions were charitable or made on the basis of reciprocity; however, just as often they asserted status or established credit with colleagues that could be used to extract favors. Ippolito d'Este, whose account books for 1559 show him to have arrived in conclave with a veritable field supply (plates, cutlery, silverware, dish-warmers, crystal lamps, a perfume-burner, a copper basin and water pot, wine coolers, lined coats, understockings, and thermal bloomers are just some of the more memorable items), was particularly active in this line.[30]

Finally, the most interesting category of things that moved through the conclave were ephemerals and intangibles: sounds, communications, rumors, ideas. Renaud Villard and John Hunt have explored the passage of such media through the city – a process which began long before the conclave itself (indeed, sometimes seemingly from the moment the previous conclave had ended).[31] Was the pope still alive? What did it mean that palaces were being boarded up or statues removed? Romans were accustomed to scouring for tell-tale signs of any impending vacancy – if only to make money off this 'news' by selling it or by placing a bet with one of Rome's notorious bookies.[32] But rumors always spread within the conclave space too, even as they leaked outside it; their presence had major effects on individual papal elections. Alessandro Casale's enthusiastic observation to Philip II in 1565 that "the site and form of the conclave are better disposed to stratagems and tricks than others in the past because it has more than one exit and the cells are not all on one level but are split by many rooms" invokes their potential.[33] In 1590 a rumor swept the conclave that the then candidate Giulio Antonio Santori had threatened

to exhume Sixtus V's corpse and burn it as that of a heretic.[34] Sixtus' nephew Alessandro Peretti di Montalto withdrew his support for Santori's candidacy.

The movement of rumor inside the conclave was arguably more intense than outside: hampered in their ability to collect or process information, many cardinals seem to have been apt to overreact to what they had simply heard. Conclave officials certainly went to considerable efforts to restrict information flows to and from the conclave, although they were rarely able to stem much. The master of ceremonies and his officials would check the food for hidden messages, a laborious process which could take four hours at a time. In 1513 these officials discovered suspicious scratches on the bases of certain silverwares and ordered all such items to be replaced by simple earthen vessels.[35] The conclave marshal and his men were also supposed to prevent the exchange of illicit correspondence – and occasionally they succeeded: in 1566, the Governor of the Borgo caught Cardinal del Monte with an illicit letter tucked inside his glove.[36] Yet we have far more sources for what went on inside the conclaves of the 1500s and 1600s than for the 1900s and 2000s, which testifies to the ultimate failure of most efforts to preserve the conclave's inviolability. In those circumstances, the interesting question probably ought to be what kinds of information about events in the conclave truly were *immobile* – i.e. not readily transmitted to external third parties? It is surprisingly difficult to find a category, although the reliability and authenticity of what was transmitted can hardly be subjected to reassuring verification. Pasquinades, the anonymous poems affixed to the "talking statue" of Pasquino outside what is now Palazzo Braschi, imagined the cardinals as a pack of tarot cards – one of which would trump the others. John Hunt has remarked on how this perfectly captures Romans' love of games and gambling, but it also expresses their willingness to conceive of the vacancy through a kaleidoscopic lens.[37]

Proximities of the Conclave

Sede Vacante in fact saw so much movement that its onset reshaped much of how people experienced spaces within curia and city. Once again, the urban aspect to this – the politicization of city spaces – has been better studied than the ecclesiastical. The closing, and sometimes even walling up, of most urban gates detached the city from its hinterland. The Tiber, always a fault-line in Roman civic affairs, had its liminal status reinforced, with the Vatican and the Borgo district that surrounded it severed from the main settlement by blocked bridges. The city's political centre of gravity transmogrified, drifting from those places where pope and cardinals had been residing to the conclave site and to the Capitoline (where the communal magistrates were effecting their displays of power).[38] Detailed mobilities of the various locations around Rome would no doubt be very revealing, uncovering new supply chains and unexpected pathways for people and goods (such as from the Vatican to Parione and Ponte, the *rioni* where brokers and newsletter writers generally set up shop). However, my focus here remains those privileged actors, the cardinals. Conclave exposed them too to a whole new set of proximities: new physical environments, new social connections, new mental associations, and a new arrangement of power.

On entering the conclave, many cardinals encountered colleagues whom they otherwise did not know well, either because they rarely saw them in daily business in Rome or because those cardinals did not even reside in Rome. Each cardinal was also assigned a space within the conclave by lot: a meager wooden cubicle was constructed on it for the election's duration.[39] However, the cardinal had no control over the identities of his neighbors, who might be either

friends or foes. A cardinal whose cell abutted that of an enemy or rival was greatly disadvantaged in the proceedings, for he could hope to keep few of his machinations secret. Yet a cardinal who was too far from the main action could suffer just as much from marginalization – and the risk of that grew as the size of the College increased (it more than doubled over the course of the sixteenth century).[40] Sites for some conclave cells were considered particularly auspicious – beneath Perugino's fresco of Christ handing the keys to St Peter or Signorelli's Last Acts of Moses, and in the area of the papal throne itself – because these sites were believed to bring the cardinal in question closer to God.[41] Did they also bring the cardinal closer to election? Many Romans were said to believe in the power of such superstitions and the College never explicitly condemned such flagrant heterodoxies. Some sites were clearly also more comfortable than others: Angelo Massarelli, a conclave attendant in 1549-50, noted how the sick cardinals had successfully petitioned to be exempted from drawing lots for cells and were assigned special ones "in the hall where secret consistories are usually held, which is further away and warmer, the area least beset by wind and noise, and which also has the advantage of a fire."[42]

Yet, just as conclave brought cardinals into new interpersonal situations, it also exposed them to a new physical habitat. While in conclave these *porporati* lost access to much of their everyday material world: its physical objects, as well as its accustomed sights, sounds, smells, touches, and tastes. Of course, we can overstate this: a vast range of material goods percolated through conclaves, as I mentioned earlier. And yet, this range was probably still much smaller for many cardinals than the one they encountered in their palaces every day. Moreover, availability of goods or cost factors (such as the high prices in Rome relative to their normal place of residence) restricted some cardinals' ability to maintain normal diets, the lax enforcement of regulations about food notwithstanding.[43] Cardinals also had to confront their

communal facilities, which were assuredly cramped and unpleasant. It may be fashionable to emphasize the generally unclean and insanitary nature of early modern existence,[44] but conclave life presented cardinals with a marked intensification of general problems. Each cardinal had to share his conclave cubicle with two or three servants; he expected them to sleep on the floor beside his bed. All cardinals and their conclavists made use of the same bank of latrines, the smell from which was sometimes unbearable.[45] Above all, the conclave space within the Vatican palace – typically, the Sistine and Pauline Chapels, plus adjacent rooms and corridors – was oppressively stuffy in a hot summer but damp and bone-chilling in a cold winter. And this sequestered space proved to be a veritable petri dish for infectious disease. Malaria struck the 1623 conclave, when ten cardinals and more than two dozen conclavists fell sick within just two weeks.[46] It struck again in 1644 and this time the physicians in attendance petitioned for the conclave to be postponed.[47] Unsurprisingly, participation in a conclave proved a potentially mortal hazard for many of the elderly and infirm men of whom the Sacred College was composed.[48]

Perhaps the most important of the mental proximities which cardinals experienced differently from normal was that with time. I noted earlier how each *Sede Vacante* had its own rhythms – and these applied within the conclave as much as outside it. The urgency of the moment of the pope's death could make time seem to speed up suddenly. Would the city remain in good order? Had they secured the necessary alliances to put themselves in good stead in the negotiations that were to follow? Yet all this usually gave way to something more eirenic, especially as conclaves grew longer over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The cardinals' daily schedule, which the Master of Ceremonies Johann Burchard set down in 1484, included a morning mass followed by voting, lunch, a second ballot, dinner, and lights out

at 11.30pm.[49] Cardinals, though they had provision for light exercise, were not permitted to undertake other forms of exercise or entertainment. Awareness of time itself could certainly be proximate or remote in these conditions – and, in any case, Elizabeth Cohen has reminded us of how early modern Romans experienced the hours differently from us.[50] Unlike regular days, when we say we follow our routine but are in fact constantly surprised by new goings on, one day of the conclave lockdown probably looked very much like every other. Indeed, tally sheets survive for many conclaves between 1623 and 1730 and they disclose voting patterns that barely budged for weeks on end.[51] The voting itself was often an act of physical and mental endurance: each cardinal would process up to the altar and drop his ballot into a sacred silver chalice; three cardinals, appointed in rotation, then counted the votes and threaded them together into a meticulous bundle over a period of hours. The inclusion of a clock in de Grassi's conclave inventory of 1503 (mentioned above) is itself fascinating in this context. What was such an item for in these circumstances? Which time systems would the cardinal have been trying to observe and keep to? What does it reveal about his priorities (or perhaps those of the master of ceremonies')?[52]

There is also a bigger question here: did cardinals perceive of *Sede Vacante* as time "disrupted' or merely "suspended"? In legal terms, it was certainly the latter, and much research has focused on the implications of this.[53] Yet, something still more significant seems to me to have happened in liturgical terms. Liturgy without the pope was itself a novel, strange, even grotesque experience: the pope's funeral and, just as importantly, the masses of the Holy Spirit, which the cardinal-electors celebrated prior to their entry into conclave presented a decisive rupture to rhythms and roles. These events were important in and of themselves, underlining as they did the extinction of a particular papal era and also the Paraclete's descent into the College's

midst.[54] But for many cardinals, they became the foundation for a new liturgical calendar involving annual commemoration of the late pope to remember his protection and generosity.

In the end, all cardinals also had to confront the fact that the conclave redrew proximities to power within the College. During each pope's reign the College existed within an informal hierarchy: the pope's own "cardinal nephew" and other trusted insiders of his regime exercised considerable influence; however, other cardinals, especially those associated with the previous regime, were left out in the cold.[55] Conclave time shook that up: the now former "cardinal nephew" could easily find himself eclipsed while his predecessor in that role regained lost importance. Negotiations inside the conclave often pitted these two men against each other because the cardinals were wont to organize themselves in factions based around their leadership.[56] The rituals associated with the conclave even visualized this. Those cardinals created by the late pope wore plaintive purple robes to signify their mourning, but the rest of the College, created by previous popes, wore life-affirming green to signify the continuity of Holy Mother Church.[57] Other cardinals, hitherto marginal, could also acquire new prominence. Those appointed to lead the factions loyal to particular Christian princes (for instance, the kings of France and Spain) often acquired a central role, even if they had rarely resided in Rome up to that point. Likewise, many of those who found themselves in contention for election had not been particularly notable figures during the previous pontificate – and, indeed, inconspicuousness was sometimes an important qualification for being considered, because the other parties who negotiated with the most recent "cardinal nephew" strongly resisted anyone too closely associated with his uncle's regime. Last in this hierarchy were the poor conclave officials caught up in the midst. Their role, in theory, was to supervise the cardinals' behavior. Alas, this proved an impossible task for many officials, not least because both they and the cardinals knew

that their relative statuses would revert as soon as a new pope was chosen. Officials found it extremely difficult to enforce any rules on the cardinals in these circumstances, and some evidence of bribery suggests they did not always even try: in 1559 the master of ceremonies Gian Francesco Firmani turned a blind eye to Ippolito d'Este's extravagances, accepting a portion of what he was bringing into the conclave as a gift.[58]

Emotions at a Time of Expectation

What then of emotions? All Romans self-evidently reacted to the new temporal and geographical paradigm of *Sede Vacante* in many different ways. John Hunt and Maria Antonietta Visceglia propose the city's predominant emotions to have been fear and loathing as well as jubilation and liberation. Yet, even within the populace at large, many were experiencing this as their first vacancy. After all, Rome was one of early modern Europe's great melting-pots for immigrants.[59] Who knows how such individuals reacted to the awesome sight of the papal catafalque "like a castle in the middle of the Church, a fortress on top with four small black flags, above which are large amounts of torches… and [it is] founded on twelve black columns with paintings of the bones of the dead," as an *avviso* from 1565 put it.[60] Or what of the toppling of a papal statue and its destruction into tiny pieces? Again, my point here is that we can also detect the same sort of composite emotional admixture in the conclave itself: the event aroused new emotions caused by the changed circumstances. Fear – not only of the wailing crowd outside but also of particular colleagues – was probably one such emotion, and understandably so. Revulsion at the surroundings seems to have been another, based on those reports about the latrines. Boredom at the proceedings was commonly a third; anger at colleagues a fourth. Indeed, one account from

1592 noted that “there was rarely a conclave so full of contentiousness, bitterness, travails and dangerous acts.”[61] A kerfuffle in 1605 which ended with at least two cardinals struck down by painful blows and several others with torn clothing, leads me to conclude that this particular record (if true) did not last long.[62] Discomfort and despair were almost certainly further common emotions. Many cardinals, elderly and frail even before they had to face the conclave’s hardships, struggled to cope. And the endless rivalries and bickering which accompanied some of the more contentious sixteenth-century conclaves (1549-50, 1559, 1590-92) can only have brought dread to those cardinals who worried about their own futures or else the fate of Christendom. Yet, on the other hand, it is all too easy, and perhaps too salaciously satisfying, to fixate on this array of negativities. In fact, more positive emotions were certainly also present: joy at a successful election, elation at the success of a negotiating stratagem, the serenity and contentment which came from feeling that one was doing God’s work. The emotional life of conclave surely ran the whole gamut of human experience.

What matters, in terms of the conclave’s emotional life is that, just as in the city, a conclave’s emotions would unfurl over the course of its duration (and there was no set timetable for how this would happen). Political deadlock in some conclaves caused anxiety to rise over time. However, in others it merely triggered tedium because the cardinals were less perturbed by the consequences of their failure to elect a pope immediately. Most cardinals must have known in advance that the outcome of a given day’s voting would be inconclusive, because the election’s eventual outcome was very rarely spontaneous. What did they do: sit in silence and pray or gossip with those sitting alongside them? Did they sneak off back to their cells? Contemporary miniatures of the pope and cardinals at mass in the Sistine Chapel tend to portray them in lively discussion. However, the fact is we know very little except for via periodic

complaints by officials that protocols for silence or curfew were not being observed.[63] We get some sense of their mood from remarks such as the Spanish ambassador Vargas' claim towards the end of the 1559 conclave that they were so fed up "they would probably now be willing to elect a block of wood".[64] However, still better stories come from the 1655 conclave when several cardinals resorted to practical jokes to while away the hours. Cardinal Medici tried to send a fake gift, a foul-tasting stuffed fish, to a courtesan in order to make trouble between her and an admirer.[65] He also entered a bet for fifty doubloons with Cardinal Maidalchini that the latter would not dare to sneak into the cell of Cardinal Carafa dressed as the Holy Ghost. Maidalchini took the bet on. Donning a white sheet, wig, false beard, saucepan halo, and angel wings fashioned from the conclave's voting papers, he used a secret passage round the back of Carafa's cell to reach him during the night.[66]

Contemporaries accepted that emotions could have a significant bearing on conclave outcomes – and historians have often agreed with them. But which emotions? Stereotypically, we might well think of greed as the key one – and sometimes it was. Accounts of several fifteenth-century conclaves make clear that the promise of future financial benefits was common enough in that period. Think of Pius II's description of Guillaume d'Estouteville brokering deals in the latrines in 1458, or reports of the four mules that Rodrigo Borgia loaded up with silver for Ascanio Sforza in 1492.[67] In 1559 ambassador Vargas was said to have enlisted Carlo Carafa's opposition to Ercole Gonzaga with a 7,000-ducat bribe.[68] And yet, there is a much more compelling case for fear or anxiety as the conclave's decisive emotion. Hence these words by the former conclave attendant Gian Francesco Lottini (1512-72):

> I can testify to having seen with my own eyes that the papal election arises exclusively from the will of God, for I have been involved in several conclaves... and have had the chance to learn the minds of nearly all the cardinals. And I can say clearly that most of them eventually elect a pope contrary to their own will. This is neither through force, nor because they are guided by any reason, but because in that moment the cardinals seem to go out of their minds (one driven by fear of the other, they act until together they go where each individually would not want to go alone).[69]

This fear inside the conclave was certainly very different from Jean Delumeau's archetypal *peur en Occident* or the loathing which John Hunt has analysed outside the locked gates. It was, above all, an anxiousness about the risks of being left out and exposed ("FOMO": fear of missing out, in our own contemporary patois). The pope's personal authority over the College was such that no cardinal wished to end the election having failed to be seen as supportive of the eventual winner – and so the various mechanisms which cardinals developed in the early modern period all aimed to mitigate this risk.[70] This was true of not only the practice of negotiating through factions but also the canonically suspect practice of election "by adoration" (*per adorazione*).[71] Even the cardinals' collective preference for old or sick candidates, evidenced over a prolonged period, can be ascribed to this motivation as easily as it can to any wish to maximise their own chances of eventual election (greed again). An old pope increased the probability of a short pontificate which, in turn, reduced the seriousness of any electoral error. It also ensured that a current cardinal was more likely still to be alive when the next conclave, and thus to remain worth courting for his future votes. But it also meant that that cardinal would have to put himself through the whole process again. There was no optimal approach.

Perhaps an important final point to consider is how far their shared emotional experiences brought all cardinals together as an emotional community of the kind Barbara Rosenwein has discussed.[72] This question is difficult to answer because it hinges on being able to assess how many emotions cardinals experienced in common solidarity rather than as contributors to a zero-sum game in which one man's rapturous joy was another's seething anger. Certainly, conclaves furnish plenty of examples of both scenarios. The felicity all cardinals felt at a successful outcome is often recorded in depictions of the papal coronation. And yet, consider remarks in Giulio Antonio Santori's *Autobiography* which reveal a personal sense of frustration and the affective vocabulary of a failed *papabile* candidate of this era. "I was very ill and in danger, first with a grave toothache and then with incessant fever," Santori wrote in 1590. "On 25th November I rose from bed – only to face many distresses and persecutions, discovering many falsehoods among fake friends, and much bitterness from the bad sorts who spread calumnies against me in all forms."[73] Later in 1592 Santori again retired to his cell full of bitterness – a third emotion that conclaves often brought out in those who did not emerge from them triumphant: "That night was the most painful to me, above all a torment in which a severe grief of spirit and internal anguish. I sweated blood – a most incredible thing! – but turning to Our Lord for help with much humility and in much pain I found myself freed from all desires of the mind and from every sense of the mundane."[74] Humility in the face of defeat: a highly virtuous emotion that may well have been more common than the historical record shows – and more important, as recent events pertaining to a quite different electoral contest have once again coincidentally illustrated.

Yet a further factor is also relevant: how far the cardinals really constituted a shared emotional community outside the conclave. The answer here is similarly problematic to discern, not least because many cardinals did indeed operate in a common environment, with overlapping

values and understandings. However, many cardinals, in particular those who ordinarily lived outside Rome, did not. The question would then become how far their experiences inside the conclave strengthened such bonds as did exist outside it. Probably they did because the election was, above all, the process in which every cardinal performed his identity. Choosing the pope was what underpinned his status and, ultimately, gave him his political power. This as much as anything separated *all* cardinals from the many others who participated in the process of the election in one way or another, as witnesses in the crowd. However, it also created a further paradox: that preserving the integrity of the electoral process – that key constitutional obligation – itself became the cardinals' ultimate goal. That may have affected their moods and their calculations more than we might realise, for it gave them license to disobey and undermine at the margin. Going through the motions of the process – even a process that, on the surface, suppressed motion – was the key to obtaining legitimacy. And that legitimacy still pertained, even if the process was conducted imperfectly or in a manner that others found corrupt.

The "New Normal"

Sede Vacante, like those better-known phenomena Time of Plague and Time of War, altered geographies, pathways, and emotional responses. We can use that to reflect on issues of movement, emotions, and identities. But here, to end, I offer something which – in the spirit of the call for papers that inspired this essay – is as much admonition as conclusion. The new pope, when he had finally been chosen, had to negotiate a route to reinstate old norms because he needed to rule. Yet the disruption and dislocation caused by the vacancy were sometimes very substantial and the emotions that it had unleashed very raw. Santori cannot have found it easy to

work during the rest of the 1590s with those colleagues he had denounced for their treachery towards him (he died in 1602). His luck (or bad luck) was that Clement VIII (1592-1605), the pope elected when he was not, proved to be among the more skilful players of power politics to have sat on St Peter's throne.[75] For Clement, and many other popes, asserting himself involved a vigorous program of personal movement around the city to show himself to his people; the famous papal *possesso*, by which the pope moved from the Vatican to the Lateran to "take possession" of the city's cathedral was only the best studied part of this.[76] Clement, like other popes, also backed up his symbolic moves with a legislative frenzy and a focus on exemplary justice, for cardinals as well as commoners.[77] And yet, there was much that Clement could not accomplish, for memories of *Sede Vacante* could scarcely be erased once they had been experienced. Everyone knew throughout Clement's reign – as they did throughout every papal reign – that another vacancy could arrive at any moment: "if a pope dies, another will be made", as the pithy Roman proverb goes.[78]

This brings me to my final point about the conclave lockdown's long-term effects: they were substantial because they were ever-anticipated. Each pope imposed himself on his first day but the countdown on his regime also began in that moment. Even the pope's own coronation ceremonies, replete with ritual reminders of his own mortality, reflected this.[79] A pope elected at seventy probably faced a faster clock than one elected at fifty. However, the pendulum from *Sede Piena* to *Sede Vacante* began to swing faster over time in every pontificate in any case, as the prospect that the pope had many more years before him gradually, and then rapidly, receded. Papal efforts at re-imposing old geographies, proximities, and temporalities thus only ever met with mixed success. After all, Rome, in *Sede Piena* too, was a city in constant flux.[80]

[1]Acknowledgements: The author would like to thank Michael Barbezat, Susan Broomhall, Matthew Champion, Shannon Gilmore, Peter Howard, Andrew McKenzie-McHarg, Christopher Ocker, David Parrott, Miri Rubin, Rachel Teubner, Lana Stephens, and the journal's anonymous reviewers for their help and insights in improving this paper.

Günther Wassilowsky, *Die Konklavereform Gregors XV. (1621/22). Wertekonflikte, symbolische Inszenierung und Verfahrenswandel im posttridentinischen Papsttum* (Stuttgart, 2010), 337. The long conclaves of 1523-1775 are a specific phenomenon within the history of papal elections, distinct from fifteenth-century conclaves (which lasted only a few days) and nineteenth- or twentieth-century ones (which were similarly brief). On the immediate causes of this change in conclave duration, see Miles Pattenden, *Electing the Pope in Early Modern Italy, 1450-1700* (Oxford, 2017), 92-94; and for a detailed overview of the conclave and papal vacancy in this period, Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa: norme, riti e conflitti. 2. L'Eta moderna* (Rome, 2013).

[2] Jöelle Rollo-Koster, *Raiding Saint Peter: Empty Sees, Violence, and the Initiation of the Great Western Schism (1378)* (Leiden, 2008). Laurie Nussdorfer, "The Vacant See: Ritual and Protest in Early Modern Rome," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18 (1987): 173-89; Idem., *Civic Politics in the Rome of Urban VIII* (Princeton, 1992), 228-53; John M. Hunt, *The Vacant See in Early Modern Rome: A Social History of the Papal Interregnum* (Leiden, 2016). Rose Marie San Juan has described something similar with respect to physical itineraries, flows of water, commerce, and information in both *Sede Vacante* and *Sede Piena*, *Rome: A City out of Print* (Minneapolis, 2001), esp. 161-86. On the relationship of mobility and immobility, see Peter Adey, "If Mobility is Everything Then it is Nothing: Towards a Relational Politics of (Im)mobilities," *Mobilities* 1 (2006): 75-94.

[3] Luca Zenobi, "Mobility and Urban Space in Early Modern Europe: An Introduction", *Journal of Early Modern History* 25 [Special Issue: "Cities in Motion"] (2021): 1-10 at 4.

[4] See, for instance, Nina Glick Schiller and Noel B. Salazar, "Regimes of Mobility Across the Globe," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39 (2013): 183–200; Jacques Dupâquier, "Macro-migrations en Europe (XVI[e]-XVIII[e] siècles", in *Le migrazioni in Europa, secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. Simonetta Cavaciocchi (Florence,1994), 65-90; Jan Lucassen and Leo Lucassen, "The Mobility Transition Revisited, 1500-1900: What the Case of Europe Can Offer to Global History", *Journal of Global History* 4 (2009): 347-77; or work on "Confessional Mobility" in early modern Europe, Henning P. Jürgens and Thomas Weller (eds.), *Religion und Mobilität: Zum Verhältnis von raumbezogener Mobilität und religiöser Identitätsbildung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa* (Göttingen, 2010); Liesbeth Corens, *Confessional Mobility and English Catholics in Counter-Reformation Europe* (Oxford, 2018).

[5] Stephen Greenblatt "Cultural mobility: an introduction," in Greenblatt et al. (eds.), *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto* (Cambridge, 2009), 1-23.

[6] On emotions, key texts to have informed my thinking include Barbara Rosenwein, *Communities of Emotion in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, 2006); Susan Broomhall and Andrew Lynch (eds.), *The Routledge History of Emotions in Europe, 1100-1700* (London, 2020); Katie Barclay and Jade Riddle (eds.), *Urban Emotions and the Making of the City* (Abingdon, 2021); and Jean Delumeau, *La peur en occident, XIVe-XVIIIe siècles: une cité assiégée* (Paris, 1978). On temporalities, Jacques Le Goff, *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago, 1980); Gerhard Dohrn-van Rossum, *History of the Hour, Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders* (Chicago, 1996); Matthew Champion, "The History of Temporalities: An Introduction", and "A Fuller History of Temporalities", *Past & Present* 243 (2019): 247-54 and 255-66.

[7] Francesco Cancellieri, *Le due nuove campane di Campidoglio benedette dalla santità di N.S. Pio VII P.O.M.* (Rome, 1806), 40-44. Recent historiography generally claims that the bell rang only for papal deaths and the onset of *carnevale*, but Cancellieri collected evidence from a range of sources to show its somewhat wider application in Roman civic life.

[8] On the patrols, see Laurie Nussdorfer, *Civic Politics*, 80-81 and 238.

[9] Hunt, *The Vacant See*, 217-18.

[10] Andrés Vela to Philip II, August 19-22, 1559, Archivo General de Simancas, *Estado 1210*, n. 182.

[11] Gregorio Leti, *Conclavi de' romani pontefici quale si sono potuti trovare fin à questo giorno* (Cologne, 1667), 283-84. Giacinto Gigli, *Diario di Roma*, ed. Manlio Barberito, 2 vols. (Rome, 1994), 2:431.

[12] Carlo Ginzburg, "Saccheggi rituali. Premesse ad una ricerca in corso," *Quaderni storici* 65 (1987): 615-636. John M. Hunt, "The Pope's Two Souls and the Space of Ritual Protest during Rome's *Sede Vacante*, 1559-1644," in *The Sacralization of Space and Behavior in the Early Modern World: Studies and Sources*, ed. Jennifer Mara DeSilva (Farnham, 2015), 177-96 at 181-89.

[13] Hunt, *The Vacant See*, 132-173. Apropos of the view that violence in the *Sede Vacante* declined over time, Katharine Fellows has recently re-emphasized the chaos of fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century vacancies, "A Very Roman Affair: Conflict and Disorder in the Eternal City, 1433-1533," in *Religion and Conflict in Medieval and Early Modern Worlds: Identities, Communities, and Authorities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson et al. (London, 2021), 204-22.

[14] See, for example, Matteo Dandolo to the Senate, November 9, 1549, in Rawdon Brown, ed., *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, relating to English affairs existing in the archives and collections of Venice*, 38 vols. (London, 1864-90), 5:272.

[15] Hunt, *The Vacant See*, 46. On the bridges, see Attilo Milano, *Il Ghetto di Roma* (Rome, 1964), 262-66. This cemetery was rediscovered in 2017.

[16] Alberto Badoer to the Senate, Archivio di Stato di Venezia, *Dispacci degli ambasciatori al senato: Roma, f. 26*, September 29, 1590, 72v.

[17] Archivio di Stato di Roma, *Bandi* (various).

[18] Hunt, *The Vacant See*, 56. Nussdorfer, "The Vacant See," 181.

[19] Nussdorfer, *Civic Politics*, 67.

[20] *Avviso di Roma*, September 15, 1590, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Urb. Lat. 1058*, 473r, and October 23, 1591, *Urb. Lat. 1059, part II*, 311r.

[21] Hunt, *The Vacant See*, 113-14; Pattenden, *Electing the Pope*, 128.

[22] Gregory X, "Ubi Periculum," in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman Tanner, 2 vols. (Washington, DC, 1990), 1:314–15.

[23] Niccolò del Re, *Il Maresciallo di Santa Romana Chiesa custode del conclave* (Florence, 1962).

[24] See for instance, Blasio Martinelli, "Diarium," in Giambattista Gattico, *Acta Selecta Caeremonialia Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1753), 1:319; Matteo Dandolo to the Senate, January 15, 1550, in Rawdon Brown (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers: Venice*, Vol. 5, 298-99 (n. 627); Agostino Nanni to the Senate, May 7, 1605, Archivio di Stato di Venezia, *Dispacci al Senato: Roma*, filza 24, n.24, 131r-137r.

[25] See for instance, the list of fifty-eight assistants supplied by the papal master of ceremonies Johann Burchard in his diary for the 1484 conclave, *Liber notarum ab anno MCCCCLXXXIII usque ad annum MDVI*, ed. Enrico Celani, 3 vols. (Città di Castello, 1906-14), 1:51-52. On the doctors, see Elisa Andretta, "Les médicins du conclave. L'élection pontificale entre medicine et politique au début de l'époque moderne," *Chrétiens et Sociétés XVI^e^ a XXI^e^ siècle* 19 (2012): 17-38; on conclavists, see Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa*, 247-53.

[26] Archivio Segreto Vaticano, *Segretario*: *Avvisi*, t.9, *avviso* of September 3, 1623, 235r.

[27] Clement VI, "Licet in constitutione" December 6, 1351, in *Bullarium Romanum: Bullarum diplomatum et privilegiorum santorum romanorum pontificum: taurinensis editio*, ed. Luigi Tomassetti et al., 24 vols. (Turin, 1857-72), 4:501.

[28] Bartolomeo Scappi, *Opera dell'arte del cucinare* (Venice, 1570).

[29] De' Grassis, "Diarium," in Gattico, *Acta Selecta Caeremonialia*, 1:310. Burchard offers a similar list for 1484, *Liber Notarum*, ed. Celani, 1:56-57, and Visceglia reproduces a further list from the seventeenth century, *Morte e elezione del papa*, 209.

[30] On Ippolito d'Este in the 1559 conclave, see Mary Hollingsworth, *Conclave 1559: The Story of a Papal Election* (London, 2013), which is a detailed study of his role in that conclave constructed from materials in the Modena archives.

[31] Renaud Villard, "Incarnare una voce: Il caso della sede vacante (Roma, XVI secolo)," *Quaderni storici* 121 (2006): 39-68; John M. Hunt, "The Conclave from the 'Outside In': Rumor, Speculation, and Disorder in Rome during Early Modern Papal Elections," *Journal of Early Modern History* 16 (2012): 355-82. On the circulation of rumor and news in Rome during Sede Piena, see Brendan Dooley, *The Social History of Skepticism: Experience and Doubt in Early Modern Culture* (Baltimore, 1999), 45-86; San Juan, *Rome: A City out of Print*, 161-86; Mario Infelise, "Roman *avvisi*: information and politics in the seventeenth century," in *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*, ed. Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Cambridge, 2002), 212-28.

[32] Renaud Villard, "Le Conclave des Parieurs: Paris, Opinion Publique et continuité du pouvoir pontifical à Rome au XVI[e] siècle," *Annales. Histoire Sciences Sociales* 64 (2009): 375-403; Hunt, *The Vacant See*, 224-34. On the passage of rumors from the conclave to the outside, see Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa*, 276-83.

[33] "Discurso de Alessandro Casale," Archivo General de Simancas, *Estado 900*, n.157.

[34] Alberto Badoer to the Senate, October 12, 1590, Archivio di Stato di Venezia, *Dispacci al Senato: Roma*, filza 26, n.26.

[35] Jacopo Salviati and Filippo Strozzi to the *Dieci di balìa*, March 10, 1513, in Ferdinando Petrucelli della Gattina, *Histoire diplomatique des conclaves*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1864-66), 1:491.

[36] *Avviso di Roma*, January 15, 1566, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Urb. Lat 1040*, 161v.

[37] Hunt, *The Vacant See*, 239-40. On pasquinades and the conclave, in addition to Hunt, see Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa*, 283-89.

[38] The Quirinal Palace, not the Vatican, was often the pope's main residence after the 1580s. On geographies of power in early modern Rome, see Miles Pattenden, "The Roman Curia," in *A*

Companion to Early Modern Rome, 1492-1692, ed. Pamela Jones, Barbara Wisch, and Simon Ditchfield (Leiden, 2019), 44-59 at 55-56.

[39] Burchard, *Liber Notarum*, ed. Celani, 1:23. For a description of the cubicles, see Paris de' Grassis, "Diarium," in Gattico, *Acta Selecta Caeremonialia*, 1:311-12.

[40] For a discussion of conclave machinations, see Pattenden, *Electing the Pope*, 133-76.

[41] D.S. Chambers, "Papal Conclaves and Prophetic Mystery in the Sistine Chapel," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 41 (1978): 322-26.

[42] Angelo Massarelli, "Diarium," in *Concilium Tridentinum: diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatuum nova collectio*, ed. Sebastien Merkle, 13 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1901-2001), 2:25.

[43] Mary Hollingsworth, *Conclave 1559* (London, 2013), 176-77.

[44] Alexander Lee, *The Ugly Renaissance: Sex, Disease and Excess in an Age of Beauty* (New York, 2013); Mark Bradley (ed.), *Rome, Pollution and Propriety: Dirt, Disease, and Hygiene in the Eternal City from Antiquity to Modernity* (Cambridge, 2012), esp. 139-201.

[45] For remarks on the latrines and their smell, see Dandolo to the Senate, December 7, 1549, in Brown, *Calendar of State Papers: Venice*, 5:281-82. Ludovico Branca de Firmani, "Diarium", *Concilium Tridentorum*, ed. Merkle, 2:526; *Avvisi di Roma*, December 2 and 11, 1559, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Urb. Lat. 1039*, 105v, 106v. Visceglia also offers more detail on conclave conditions and hygiene, *Morte e elezione del papa*, 267-72.

[46] Various accounts of this conclave and its victims survive: Antonio Caetani, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Urb. Lat. 856*, Part 1, 40r, 48v-49r, the *Avviso di Roma*, August 5, 1623, *Urb. Lat. 1093*, 591r-v. Petrucelli della Gattina, *Histoire diplomatique des conclaves*, 3:70-74 provides a useful synthesis.

[47] Ludwig Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages: Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican and Other Original Sources*, trans. Ralph Francis Kerr, 40 vols. (London, 1891-1953), 30:15.

[48] Pattenden, *Electing the Pope*, 74-75.

[49] Burchard, *Liber Notarum*, ed. Celani, 1:47.

[50] Elizabeth S. Cohen, "Times told: Women narrating the everyday in early modern Rome," in *Gendered Temporalities in the Early Modern World*, ed. Merry Weisner-Hanks (Amsterdam, 2018), 115-34. John M. Hunt has also analysed how the rhythms of papal government enabled the people to articulate expectations for papal rule, "Ritual Time and Popular Expectations of Papal Rule in Early Modern Rome," *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 45 (2019): 29-49.

[51] Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Barb. Lat. 4435-4449*.

[52] We know little of cardinals and their clocks. Clocks belonging to several cardinals appear in J.H. Leopold, *The Almanus Manuscript. Staats-und Stadbibliothek Augsburg Codex in 2 no. 209* (London, 1971). Ippolito d'Este lists four clocks in his 1555 inventory, Archivio di Stato di Modena, *Camera Ducale Amministrazione Principi*, 928, 77 Ent. I thank Mary Hollingsworth for this reference.

[53] See the original study by Lorenzo Spinelli, *La vacanza della Sede Apostolica: dalle origini al concilio tridentino* (Milan, 1955). Agostino Paravicini-Bagliani, *The Pope's Body*, trans. David Peterson (Chicago, 2000), 99-107, and Pattenden, *Electing the Pope*, 109-14 both develop and critique his arguments.

[54] Dykmans, *L'oeuvre de Patrizi Piccolomini*, 2:443-46.

[55] On hierarchies within the Sacred College and its internal politics, see Visceglia "Factions in the Sacred College in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *Court and Politics in Papal Rome*, 99-131; Wolfgang Reinhard, *Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621). Mikropolitische Papstgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 2009); Pattenden, *Electing the Pope*, 177-217.

[56] Wolfgang Reinhard, "Papal Power and Family Strategy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age*, ed. Ronald Asch and Adolf Birke (London and Oxford, 1991), 329-56.

[57] Massarelli, "Diarium," 2:25.

[58] Hollingsworth, *Conclave 1559*, 179.

[59] Emily Michelson and Matthew Coneys Wainwright, "Introduction," in *A Companion to Religious Minorities in Early Modern Rome*, ed. Matthew Coneys Wainwright and Emily Michelson (Leiden, 2021), 1-12. Mario Romani, *Pellegrini e viaggiatori nell'economia di Roma dal XVI al XVII secolo* (Milan, 1948). Sara Cabibbo and Alessandro Serra (eds.), *Venire a Roma, restare a Roma: forestieri e stranieri fra Quattro e Settecento* (Rome, 2017). Irene Fosi, "The Plural City: Urban Spaces and Foreign Communities", in *A Companion to Early Modern Rome*, 169-81. Anna Esposito, "Pellegrini, stranieri, curiali ed ebrei", in *Storia di Roma dall'antichità a oggi: Roma medievale*, ed. André Vauchez (Rome, 2001), 213-39.

[60] *Avviso di Roma*, December 15, 1565, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Urb. Lat. 1040*, 158r-160r.

[61] "Conclave di Clemente VIII," Archivio Segreto Vaticano, *Archivio Consistoriale: Conclavi*, 585v.

[62] Federico Cornaro to Giovanni Cornaro, May 21, 1605, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Boncompagni C.20*, 136r-141v. Giovanni Magni to Vincenzo Gonzaga, May 25, 1605, Archivio di Stato di Mantova, *Archivio Gonzaga 979*.

[63] Gian Paolo Mucanzio, "Gl'abusi et convenienti che si fanno nelle rote del conclave," Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Vat. Lat. 12316*, 492r-501r.

[64] Francisco Vargas to Philip II, December 21, 1559, in Johann Josef Ignaz von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen, une Cultur-geschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte*, 3 vols. (Regensburg, 1862-82), 1:317.

[65] Philibert Carretto, letter of February 1, 1655, in Petrucelli della Gattina, *Histoire diplomatique*, 3:169. Petrucelli cites several further pranks, including how Maidalchini mocked a sermon by Cardinal Corradi by translating it into a vulgar colloquial dialect, and how conclavists diluted the cardinals' wine with water and left "sneezing powder" in their missals, 3:166-68.

[66] Carretto, letter of February 14, 1655, in Petrucelli della Gattina, *Histoire diplomatique*, 3:167-68. According to Carretto's account, Carafa recognized Maidalchini immediately, but felt he could hardly report these high jinks to the other cardinals without letting on that he had known about, and

had been using, the secret passage all along.

[67] Enea Silvio Piccolomini, *Pius II: Commentaries*, ed. and trans. Margaret Meserve and Marcello Simonetta, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 2003-07), 1:182-83; Stefano Infessura, *Diario della città di Roma*, ed. Oreste Tommasini (Rome, 1890), 281–2.

[68] Vargas to Philip II, December 14, 1559, in Döllinger, *Beiträge*, 1:314-15.

[69] Gian Francesco Lottini, "Discorso sopra l'attioni del conclave,'' in Idem., *Thesoro Politico* (Frankfurt, 1612), 444-64, at 444.

[70] Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa*, 149-92; Pattenden, *Electing the Pope*, 56-97. Josep Colomer and Iain McLean, "Electing Popes: Approval Balloting and Qualified-Majority Rule," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 29 (1998): 1-22.

[71] For a list of elections by adoration, see Wassilowsky, *Die Konklavereform*, 104; and for more detailed discussion of the phenomenon, see also Idem., "Dall''adorazione' allo scrutinio segreto. Teologia e micropolitica nel cerimoniale del conclave riformato da Gregorio XV (1621-22)," *Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica* 1 (2007): 37-55.

[72] Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*.

[73] Giuseppe Cugoni, "Autobiografia del Cardinale G.A. Santori," *Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria* 12 (1889): 329-72 and 13 (1890): 151-205, at 13:195.

[74] Cugoni, "Autobiografia del Cardinale G.A. Santori," 13:204.

[75] Maria Teresa Fattori, *Clemente VIII e il Sacro Collegio: Meccanismi istituzionali ed accentramento di governo* (Stuttgart, 2004).

[76] On the *possesso*, see Irene Fosi, "Court and city in the ceremony of the *possesso*," in *Court and Politics in Papal Rome*, 31–52; *Eternal Ephemera: The Papal Possesso and Its Legacies in Early Modern Rome*, ed. Jennifer Mara DeSilva and Pascale Rihouet (Toronto, 2021).

[77] Irene Fosi, *Papal Justice: Subjects and Courts in the Papal States*, trans. Thomas V. Cohen (Washington, DC, 2011), 87-88, 159; on the more general point, see also Idem., "Justice and Its image: Political Propaganda and Judicial Reality in the Pontificate of Sixtus V," *The Sixteenth*

Century Journal 24 (1993): 75-95.

[78] Marco Besso, *Roma e il Papa nei proverbi e nei modi di dire* (Florence, 1971), 312.

[79] Reinhard Elze, "'*Sic transit gloria mundi*': la morte del papa nel medioevo," *Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento* 3 (1977): 1–18. Paravicini-Bagliani, *The Pope's Body*, 29-39.

[80] There is, predictably, a vast literature on movement in Rome during the *Sede Piena* which has also shaped my thinking in this essay. Key interventions include Jean Delumeau, *Vie économique et sociale de Rome dans la seconde moitié du XVIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1957-59); Irene Fosi, *La società violenta. Il banditismo nello Stato pontificio nella seconda metà del Cinquecento* (Rome, 1985), 27-43; Elizabeth S. Cohen, "Honor and Gender in the Streets of Early Modern Rome," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 22 (1992): 597-625; Laurie Nussdorfer, "The Politics of Space in Early Modern Rome," *Memoirs of the American Academy of Rome* 42 (1997): 161-86; John M. Hunt, "Carriages, Violence, and Masculinity in Early Modern Rome," *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance* 17 (2014): 175-96; Idem., "The Ceremonial Possession of a City: Ambassadors and their Carriages in Early Modern Rome," *Royal Studies Journal* 3 (2016): 69-89.