Toby Osborne

Abbot Scaglia, the Duke of Buckingham and Anglo–Savoyard Relations During the 1620s

In December 1627 the Duke of Buckingham was in London, after returning from the English fleet that had disastrously failed in the expedition to aid the besieged Huguenots at La Rochelle. At a time when costly military failure abroad and political tensions in England over the handling of foreign policy presented serious problems to Buckingham, the duke's attention was also drawn to difficulties within his family. His marriage in May 1620 to Katherine Manners, daughter of the Earl of Rutland, had so far produced only one male heir, who had died in March 1627. While Buckingham had also fathered a daughter, the fragility of his line had opened the possibility of his properties passing by primogeniture to the family of his elder brother John Villiers, Viscount Purbeck. Yet his brother's wife, Frances, daughter of Sir Edward Coke, had reputedly borne an illegitimate son, bringing into serious doubt the suitability of inheritance through their line, and news of the pregnancy of Buckingham's wife and Purbeck's exclusion from any succession arrangement in the autumn of 1627 did little to reduce the duke's embarrassment.[1]

Constables and a sergeant-at-arms attempted to apprehend Lady Purbeck in January 1628 at her residence on The Strand, presumably York House, following the court of High Commission's sentence against her adultery. In her apparent absence they waited in the garden of the neighbouring house. According to John Finet, the future Master of Ceremonies, that building was employed to lodge ordinary ambassadors from the Italian states and was occupied by Abbot Alessandro Cesare Scaglia (1592–1641), the ordinary ambassador of Duke Charles Emmanuel of Savoy (1580–1630).[2] The constables' presence in the garden was taken by Scaglia's gentlemen followers as a slight to his ambas-

European History Quarterly Copyright © 2000 SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, Vol. 30(1), 5–32.
[0265-6914(200001)30:1;5–32;011339]

sadorial dignity and they were provoked into action. Cloaking one of his pages in a dress and a disguise, Scaglia's followers bundled the servant into a coach and in full view of the constables the coach left the abbot's residence for The Strand. The constables naturally assumed that the disguised servant was Lady Purbeck and went into pursuit with a crowd in tow. When the coach stopped and the page was unmasked in an inn, the assembled crowd took the incident as a joke and the constables were mortified. Buckingham himself was less than amused, not least because Scaglia, by this 'carnival trick', had seemingly aided Purbeck's escape from arrest, and for a week refused even to countenance the abbot at court.[3]

This comical incident, of seemingly little importance, had potentially serious consequences in the broader context of international power politics. During 1628 England was involved in separate wars with both Spain and France, and the Caroline regime under Buckingham's guiding influence was also engaged in diplomatic negotiations to settle for peace, playing the two conflicts and negotiations against each other for political advantage. These negotiations were critically important to Savoy. Duke Charles Emmanuel, operating through his leading ambassador, Scaglia, exploited diplomatic co-operation with England in the 1620s to influence France and Spain and to further his own territorial and political interests in north Italy. This strategy was heavily dependent on maintaining close relations with the Caroline court precisely because of the fact that England was at war with France and Spain. Scaglia's meddling in Buckingham's family interests, whether intentional or not, therefore jeopardized a diplomatic strategy involving Savoy, England, France and Spain at a highly sensitive juncture in European power politics, when Savoy had embarked on a potentially risky military campaign in Monferrat in alliance with Spain.

This perspective on the Thirty Years' War has been neglected in secondary accounts of the period. Historians of Caroline foreign policy, for instance, have perhaps been slow to contextualize England's interventions in the Atlantic theatre by examining their wider diplomatic impact on other European powers in other strategic theatres, reflecting the relative lack of research in continental archives. While Scaglia and, more broadly, Savoy invariably feature in English-based accounts, there has been little in-depth analysis of Scaglia's role and of Savoyard diplomatic

strategies, which have incorrectly been accorded a minor place in the Thirty Years' War.[4] However, a close study of Anglo–Savoyard diplomacy in the 1620s, drawing on the rich archival resources in Turin, affords valuable new insights into some of the key episodes of the Thirty Years' War — in particular, the Anglo–French and Anglo–Spanish conflicts and the war for Mantua and Monferrat. It also presents an assessment of Savoy's participation in those episodes.

Abbot Scaglia enjoyed considerable diplomatic influence in the 1620s, reflecting in part the nature of Savoy's involvement in European power politics. Like England, Savoy could not muster the sheer military or economic force of France or Spain, yet the north Italian duchy had geo-strategic resources that greatly magnified its importance, and indeed made it crucial to those leading powers. Savoy was the gatekeeper of the Alps with passes through the Alpine valley of Susa, to the west of the ducal capital of Turin, that were of value both to the Spanish for troop movements from the Italian peninsula to the Low Countries and to the French for access to the peninsula. The duke also commanded troops that could have a tangible impact on regional disputes, which had been demonstrated during the 1613–15 succession dispute in Mantua and Monferrat.[5]

One still-influential tradition of political and cultural historiography has in fact portrayed the Italian states as little more than passive puppets of the two leading powers in the period of so-called baroque 'decadenza', where Italy was accordingly the battlefield of Franco–Spanish rivalries.[6] A variation of this tradition, that had its strongest roots in the unification of Italy under the Savoyard dynasty during the nineteenth century, presented Savoy as the beacon of Italian liberty, the defender of independence against Spain's ambitions to dominate the hapless states of the peninsula.[7] Such interpretations are misleading. Duke Charles Emmanuel employed his strategic resources and actively exploited the rivalries between Spain and France to pursue long-standing territorial ambitions in north Italy, where there was incessant negotiation and military conflict among the Italian states over competing claims to land, such as Zuccarello, which was in the possession of the republic of Genoa, the duchy of Monferrat and the city of Geneva.[8]

The Duke of Savoy was without doubt a political opportunist who took advantage of circumstances as they changed. A second

historiographical tradition dating back as far as the seventeenth century has indeed presented him as reckless, inconstant and over-ambitious in the pursuit of foreign policies. After all, on Charles Emmanuel's death in July 1630, his patrimonial territories in north Italy were occupied by foreign troops as a direct result of his participation in the succession war for Mantua and Monferrat — hardly a suitable legacy for his successor.[9] Yet this tradition again seems to miss the point. Duke Charles Emmanuel was in fact like other early modern sovereigns in the way in which he approached international affairs. He almost always operated according to what he considered to be his legitimate rights, typically underscored by dynasticism and according to political circumstances. In this light his actions seem not only more comprehensible but also more justifiable.[10]

This approach to foreign policy was clearly in evidence during the Thirty Years' War. In 1619 Charles Emmanuel made an ambitious, though obviously unsuccessful, bid for both the vacant Bohemian and Imperial crowns. In the wake of his failure, he returned once again to the unresolved territorial issue of Zuccarello which he repeatedly argued juridically belonged to Savoy and which was central to Savoy's aspirations of expanding into Lombardy.[11] In one sense Charles Emmanuel was simply reactivating a long-standing territorial dispute, justifiable because of his juridical claim, though this opportunistic shift of interest towards a Spanish protectorate was not by coincidence linked to circumstances outside the peninsula. Zuccarello was nominally under Genoese jurisdiction, and the republic was part of the Spanish network of territories in the Italian peninsula. The Habsburg successes in Bohemia, the Palatinate and the Valtelline, however, had encouraged France to consider a coalition to counter the Habsburg threat in Europe, and when the Anglo–Spanish marriage negotiations collapsed in 1623 England was consequently drawn into military confrontation with Spain and into the emerging ambitious anti-Habsburg coalition, despite the vacillations of James I. These were therefore ideal political conditions for Savoy to press for its own (legitimate) interests in Spanish-held territory in north Italy, which the duke accordingly did through the anti-Habsburg coalition. Although various projects were discussed, the broad essentials of the coalition were eventually established: while the English planned military action with the mercenary general Ernst Mansfeld and the Dutch, Savoy

intended to mobilize troops in conjunction with France and Venice to cut the Spanish supply route through the Valtelline, while, significantly, also pursuing the territorial claim to Zuccarello.[12]

Co-operation between England and Savoy was not in fact unprecedented. Earlier in the century James I and Charles Emmanuel looked to establish a dynastic network that included the Habsburg and Bourbon Houses at a time when there was a general contraction in the number of royal dynasties, and thus marital options, in Europe.[13] For James I, a union with the Savoyard dynasty would have linked his dynasty with the Habsburgs as part of the broader strategy of establishing himself as a European paternal figurehead since Charles Emmanuel's deceased wife, Catherine, was the younger of Philip II of Spain's two daughters. Although Catherine had died in 1597, her sons, as nephews of Philip III and Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia, were raised by the Savoyard dynasty with the potential of inheriting the Spanish Netherlands, Lombardy or even the entire Spanish composite monarchy in the not improbable event of a break in the direct Spanish Habsburg line.[14] For his part, Duke Charles Emmanuel hoped that the marriage of one of his children with a member of the Stuart House would rank Savoy with the royal dynasties of Europe, a constant ambition of Savoyard dukes prior to the treaty of Utrecht in 1713, when Savoy was accorded the royal crown of Sicily (exchanged in 1720 for that of Sardinia). Two potential dynastic projects were raised to link the Stuart and Savoyard Houses. The first in 1611 involved Elizabeth Stuart and Victor Amadeus, the eventual successor to Savoy, and the second, Henry, Prince of Wales, and one of Charles Emmanuel's daughters.[15] While neither of these projects was fulfilled and the two Houses never forged direct links, the marriage in January 1619 between Marie Christine (Louis XIII's younger sister) and Victor Amadeus together with Henrietta Maria's and Charles Stuart's marriage in 1624 joined the Stuart and Savoyard dynasties through the Bourbons.

Through this indirect Bourbon connection both Houses participated in a structure of international relations that made use of kinship ties, at a time when they were both contemplating the military coalition against the Habsburgs. In the summer of 1625, Scaglia's secretary raised the possibility of Marie Christine writing to Henrietta Maria as 'ma soeur', 'as a title of special

affection between two sisters for reason of their blood as well as for the fact that they come from royal [sic] houses.'[16] Later in 1625 the English king reportedly said that he 'wished to have the duke as his father and the Prince of Piemonte [Victor Amadeus] as his true and loved brother, recognizing him as the son of the greatest prince of the age.'[17] Such language was far from thoughtless; it was deliberately flattering and ambiguous. Certainly, it referred to the fact that Henrietta Maria and Marie Christine were full sisters, which might equally explain Charles I's familiarity in addressing other members of the Savoyard House. Indeed, Charles I on occasion wrote to the Savoyard duke as 'mon père' rather than 'mon cousin', the customary form of address when writing to other sovereigns.[18]

Yet it was well-understood that 'ma soeur' was a typically royal address, to which Marie Christine as an individual might have been entitled as a sister of Louis XIII, but which also played on the wider aspirations of the ducal Savoyard House to royal status.[19] Savoy's pretensions generated sharp international controversy and few sovereigns were inclined to recognize the claim formally because of the intense rivalry over rank between Savoy and other Italian states, especially the republics of Venice and Genoa and the grand-duchy of Tuscany. Still, the willingness of Charles I to express affection for the House of Savoy, and by implication to flatter Savoyard royal claims, enabled Charles to forge a special diplomatic relationship with the duke of Savoy without formally conceding anything over protocol that would have set unwelcome precedents.[20] Dynastic kinship, even expressed through epistolary etiquette as in this example, could produce tangible political results by strengthening relationships during an important phase of anti-Habsburg diplomacy.

If Scaglia's success in cultivating Anglo–Savoyard relations was in part due to a convergence of political interests and a warming of dynastic relations between the two courts during the 1620s, then it was also influenced by his personal qualities. The second son of a noble family from Piemonte in the duchy of Savoy, he was marked out for a career in the church like other younger sons from the elite clans of early modern Catholic Europe where primogeniture was practised. In addition to wealth derived from family pensions and commendatory ecclesiastical properties in north Italy, he acquired diplomatic and cultural expertise through his family's close association with the ducal

clientele. His father, a leading figure at the Savoyard court, had taken Scaglia as a child on diplomatic missions, and between 1614 and 1623 Scaglia was Charles Emmanuel's ordinary ambassador to the papal court.[21]

While at Rome Scaglia also operated as a cultural patron and broker, and his involvement in the art market featured throughout his career, serving as a way for the abbot to identify himself with an international aristocratic and courtly culture. In Paris, between 1624 and 1627, the abbot was to acquire paintings, tapestries, finished products such as jewellery and clothing, diamonds and animals, including horses, hunting dogs and exotic animals.[22] During the 1630s, despite being in exile in the Spanish Netherlands, Scaglia was to make his major artistic commissions for which he is best remembered and which mark him out as a major patron. He commissioned up to ten works from Anthony van Dyck, in addition to acquiring works from the genre painters, Frans Snyders and Daniel Seghers, and in the last year of his life Scaglia brokered the commission for Jacob Jordaens to paint the ceiling panels for Henrietta Maria's apartments at the newly completed Queen's House in Greenwich.[23]

Scaglia was a wealthy and culturally sophisticated diplomat, a 'minister of unequalled astuteness and versatility'.[24] His sharp mind, refined personal qualities and smooth manners were ideally suited to cultivating contacts at the Caroline court which L.J. Reeve has defined as cosmopolitan and avant-garde 'from the world where international high politics merged with the arts and Roman religion.'[25] Charles I's diplomacy was underscored by criss-crossing dynastic connections that linked London with Paris and Turin, and ultimately with Madrid and Brussels. Charles and Buckingham, among other courtiers, were fascinated by the courts of Catholic Europe and wished to establish themselves as significant collectors of art and the English court as a centre of modern connoisseurship to assert both dynastic and cultural affinity with continental Europe, a point recently made by R. Malcolm Smuts: 'some early seventeenth century [Caroline] collectors began to associate art collecting with a cosmopolitan aristocratic culture they wished to emulate.' Political, cultural and economic contact between London and Catholic Europe during the 1620s and 1630s was indeed facilitated by the presence at the Caroline court of artists, most obviously Anthony van Dyck and Peter Paul Rubens, and by continental merchants such

as Philip Burlamachi and Peter Ricaut, both of whom lent money to the English crown and were also known to Scaglia.[26]

Alessandro Scaglia's success in working with the English court was thus based on a combination of favourable political circumstances, dynastic affinity and his own social and cultural background. His first actual contact with English courtiers came when in April 1624 he replaced his elder brother, the Count of Verrua, as Savoy's ordinary ambassador to Louis XIII. The primary aim of his mission was to advance the anti-Habsburg alliance with Savoy's participation, and this understandably brought him into regular contact with the English ordinary ambassador Henry Rich and the extraordinary ambassador James Hay, both of whom consequently became friends of the abbot. In May of the following year the Duke of Buckingham visited Paris, 'conquering everybody with his courtesy and refinement'.[27] While Buckingham was preoccupied with the finalization of marriage negotiations between Charles Stuart and Henrietta Maria, he and Scaglia had, according to the abbot, a long meeting organized by Carlisle in which they discussed in detail the anti-Habsburg coalition and the possible use of English ships in the Mediterranean against Genoa.[28]

Following Buckingham's return to England, Scaglia took the initiative to build on his meeting with the duke by sending his secretary, Peter Barozzio, to London, where Barozzio repeated Scaglia's plans for Anglo–Savoyard military co-operation. Although the English were understandably reluctant to consent to the suggestion of employing their fleet in the Mediterranean, Barozzio left with the warm wishes of Buckingham and Charles.[29] He also left with hopes that Scaglia would himself visit London; the Earl of Carlisle, now established as one of Scaglia's friends at the English court, repeatedly pressed the abbot to make the visit and later organized a boat to carry him across the Channel and coaches to bring him to court.[30]

It was not until the beginning of January 1626 that Scaglia arrived in London, as extraordinary ambassador of Savoy on a three-day mission to mediate in the worsening Huguenot dispute.[31] The extent of his rising credit at the English court soon became clear, expressed through the ceremonial treatment he enjoyed. The presence of formally accredited ambassadors at sovereign courts was regulated by procedures of diplomatic protocol, over such issues as diplomats' public audiences with

sovereigns, whether their living expenses could be defrayed by their hosts and where they ranked with other ambassadors during formal ceremonies. While these procedures were gradually codified in various courts during the seventeenth century, as ambassadors were recognized as the embodiments of sovereign powers, those sovereigns and their regimes could manipulate the ceremonial of diplomacy to transmit political signals. Indeed, the under-studied subject of diplomatic ceremony presents early modern historians with an additional perspective on international relations and power politics. If, for instance, an ambassador enjoyed 'exceptional' favours then contemporaries obviously concluded that the ambassador's mission was met with calculated approval, and correspondingly if an ambassador were coolly received then it could imply that his objectives or presence were not well considered.[32]

On his formal entry to the court Scaglia enjoyed a more than favourable welcome, in keeping with the tone of the entire mission; as he later remarked, 'the expressions of honour this king has shown to you through me have been exceptional. I can truly say that there has never been another representative who has been treated with such honours and showered with so many courtesies at the English court.'[33] Obviously room has to be given for rhetorical exaggeration — after all, the abbot evidently knew in writing to Charles Emmanuel that any favour he received as the ambassadorial embodiment of the duke was by extension favour shown to his sovereign. Yet Scaglia was not alone in believing that he enjoyed a seemingly unparalleled level of treatment; the Florentine agent Salvetti wrote of the concern felt in some unspecified quarters in London that the abbot's high-profile mission might have established an unwelcome ceremonial precedent for future diplomatic missions, not only for Scaglia but for all ambassadors.[34]

Following public and private audiences with Charles and Buckingham, Scaglia took formal leave of the king to return to France. Like the entry to a court, the formal departure of an ambassador presented opportunities for the manipulation of diplomatic etiquette, and again the abbot was marked out for special treatment. As was customary for a parting diplomat, the abbot received a standard gift from Charles of gilt silver plate. More exceptionally Charles ordered that Scaglia should be entertained with a 'very fine party [bellissimo festino]' at

Buckingham's house in the company of the duke and Carlisle, the two courtiers closest to the abbot. The king wished to attend the dinner but excused himself on the grounds of toothache, and in expressing his regret gave Scaglia a diamond ring from his hand, 'saying that I [Scaglia] should wear it with his Majesty in mind, as a testimony of the esteem in which he holds me.' By direct command of Charles, the abbot was later escorted to the coast in specially prepared royal coaches with a guard of troops and sixty royal officials, including twelve 'highly qualified and accustomed to serving the king', and provided with transport in an escorted ship of the admiralty.[35]

The reasons for the warmth of Scaglia's welcome in London are fairly straightforward. To his English friends who were looking for reliable continental allies, Scaglia was a culturally sophisticated courtier representing a dynasty that had shared political goals with the Stuart House, and certainly more co-operative and amenable than the frosty French extraordinary ambassador Blainville.[36] While Anglo–French relations continued to worsen in spite of his very high-profile mission, Scaglia had in a relatively short period of time succeeded in acquiring a position of favour at the English court and establishing himself as a potential mediator within a network of dynastically linked courts. This was to be the key to Savoyard diplomacy during the 1620s.

Scaglia's position of favour at the English court indeed remained secure in 1626 and was, if anything, strengthened as relations between Turin and Paris themselves deteriorated. The Huguenot dispute which had contributed to the breakdown of peace between England and France also contributed to Richelieu's unilateral decision to settle with Spain and withdraw his support of Savoy's military campaign against Genoa. The treaty of Monzón, signed in March 1626, effectively marked the failure of the anti-Habsburg coalition and Richelieu's 'betrayal' of his Italian allies, Savoy and the Venetian republic.[37] More broadly, it represented an important turning point in the Thirty Years' War and the beginning of a phase of intense diplomatic activity and uncertainty. Crucially, England and Savoy were both disappointed with Richelieu's handling of policy and yet still at odds with Spain, and it is not surprising given these circumstances that they were drawn to each other as diplomatic and dynastic allies in 1626–7. Co-operation between the Stuart

and Savoyard dynasties was important to both Charles and Charles Emmanuel at a time when they both remained actively committed to interventionist European policies while seeking to maximize their leverage over the leading powers.

Scaglia remained in Paris as Savoy's ordinary ambassador until April 1627.[38] While he and Buckingham were unable to meet in person, they maintained informal contact and pursued diplomatic negotiations through the duke's clients and agents. Walter Montagu (c.1603–1677), the younger of the Earl of Manchester's two sons, formed part of the cosmopolitan circle of courtiers who strengthened, both formally and informally, diplomatic and cultural relations with the courts of Catholic Europe. Historians have portrayed Montagu as a Catholic francophile closely associated with the clienteles of both Henrietta Maria and Marie Christine, the Duchess of Savoy following the accession of Victor Amadeus in July 1630 to the ducal throne.[39] It would be misleading, however, to assume that Montagu's affinity with the Bourbons, so clearly expressed during the 1630s, necessarily implied unequivocal support of Richelieu and his handling of foreign policies during the 1620s, as suggested at least by his first informal diplomatic mission.

In April 1627 Montagu reached Turin on the last stage of an informal mission, where he was lodged in the *Palazzo Scaglia*, the palace of the abbot's family, and entertained by the abbot's brother, the count of Verrua, even though he had no formal ambassadorial status (possibly reciprocating the warmth of Scaglia's welcome in London). Montagu conveyed messages that Charles I in fact wished to resolve the dispute with France with the participation of Savoy. In turn Charles Emmanuel informed Marini, the French ordinary ambassador in Turin, that Scaglia was ideally placed to mediate because of his exceptional personal credit with Buckingham.[40] A letter written by Marini later materialized in Brussels in July 1627 in which he claimed that the Duke of Savoy had secreted him behind a tapestry at court while Montagu spoke freely of Charles I's wish for peace with France and of his desire that Savoy should be involved in the peace process. While it would have been problematic for English and French representatives to meet in person because of the war, Marini was supposed to draw the obvious conclusion that Charles I's interest in a peace mediated by Savoy was totally genuine.[41] Yet this constituted only half of the mission.

After Montagu had left Paris in April 1627, where he had conveyed messages from Buckingham to the abbot, he had travelled through the independent duchy of Lorraine, whose political and dynastic relations with France remained constantly ambiguous. Following discussions with the Duchess of Chevreuse, exiled from the French court following her complicity in the Chalais conspiracy, Montagu had then contacted the Huguenot leader, the Duke of Rohan, in Languedoc, all, it was believed, with Scaglia's complicity.[42] Despite the informality of his status, Montagu also presented Duke Charles Emmanuel with a written promise in Charles I's name that there would be no French peace without the prior consent of Savoy, a pledge that was clearly at variance with the message informally, and secretly, conveyed to Marini. This diplomatically important promise, to which historians have hitherto paid little attention, was not intended so much to indicate Charles I's willingness simply to advance the Anglo–French negotiations. The pledge linked Anglo–Savoyard diplomatic interests with greater strength and clarity than before, as a sign of goodwill on the part of Charles I to a reliable dynastic ally at a time of general diplomatic uncertainty. It was also a potentially powerful weapon for Charles Emmanuel since it provided the Savoyard duke with the possible means of stalling any Anglo–French peace.[43]

Montagu advanced the possibility of an Anglo–French peace with one hand and linked it to Savoy with the other. The significance of this, and of his contact with Richelieu's domestic opponents, becomes comprehensible when placed in context. In June 1626 Scaglia wrote a long letter to Buckingham analysing the state of relations between Savoy, England, Spain and France in which he advocated opening peace negotiations with Spain, maintaining military aid to the Huguenots and supporting Richelieu's domestic opponents, while also continuing support for Christian IV of Denmark. Throughout 1626 and 1627, Scaglia believed that Richelieu's own political position was weak — Louis XIII's volatile court was, according to Scaglia, like a 'heaven full of comets' — and that if diplomatic pressure were applied to the cardinal without necessarily sacrificing the anti-Habsburg coalition, he might become more compliant in negotiations with England and Savoy.[44] In a courteous reply, Buckingham agreed with the broad thrust of his letter that pressure should be exerted upon Richelieu (evident in the

mission of Montagu) but rejected his specific suggestion of negotiating with Spain. The duke's opposition to negotiations with Spain, however, soon moderated and by the beginning of 1627 he had decided to adopt the strategy advanced by Scaglia, even to seek a settlement with Spain as an end in itself; while Montagu was in Turin another of Buckingham's clients, the sculptor and art-dealer Balthasar Gerbier (c.1591–1667), undertook negotiations for a suspension of England's war with Spain through informal talks with Peter Paul Rubens in the Spanish Netherlands.[45]

Scaglia had already opened discussions in the autumn of 1626 with the Spanish ambassador in Paris both to normalize diplomatic relations with Madrid and to sound out the possibility of an Anglo–Spanish peace through his mediation.[46] In April 1627 he left Paris for the Spanish Netherlands to pursue this strategy by involving himself in the Gerbier–Rubens talks. Certainly Scaglia had the right credentials to join them. Gerbier and Rubens, like Montagu, operated in the realm where Catholicism, artistic connoiseurship and diplomacy overlapped, the environment in which Scaglia also worked and which nurtured a common culture through which they could communicate. It was, in effect, diplomacy among friends. Rubens for one welcomed Scaglia, though to establish his diplomatic importance and confirm his place at the negotiating table, the abbot drew attention to his position as an Anglo–French mediator. He furthermore informed the Infanta Isabella that he actually controlled the peace talks and that he could postpone any settlement for up to two months (possibly referring to the written promises conveyed by Montagu).[47] In fact, Isabella, Charles Emmanuel's sister-in-law, was herself only too anxious to involve Scaglia. The Infanta was looking to use Scaglia to warm dynastic and political relations between Spain and Savoy because, so she said, of her affection for her Savoyard relatives, especially Charles Emmanuel's sons whom she held 'not only as her dear nephews but as her very sons.'[48]

Montagu's informal mission to Turin together with Gerbier's mission to Brussels therefore ensured that the Anglo–French peace process ostensibly remained open during 1627 while simultaneously raising the possibility of a Spanish settlement. This was in line with Scaglia's propositions already outlined to Buckingham and which had initially been raised as a means of re-invigorating the anti-Habsburg alliance by putting pressure

on Richelieu. At this stage either peace might have been desirable to England, though the *possibility* of settling with either France or Spain could itself have a diplomatic function by spurring them to offer more generous peace terms to Charles I. Richelieu and Olivares both wanted to end their respective conflicts with England in part to avoid the disadvantage of being left at war while the other was at peace, in spite of their apparent rapprochement of the summer of 1627.[49] There were also more interests at stake than just those of England. The informal missions of Montagu and Gerbier were critically important to Savoy, not so much because of what they achieved in terms of immediate and quantifiable results, which were in fact negligible, but because of the political leverage they afforded the duchy. It was through Scaglia's favoured position at the English court as a diplomatic mediator working with Buckingham and his clients that Savoy could potentially influence both the leading powers at a time of considerable diplomatic fluidity following the treaty of Monzón.

When in November 1627 Scaglia returned to London on his second mission to the Caroline court in the company of Gerbier, as extraordinary ambassador of Savoy, his credit remained undiminished and he again enjoyed privileged ceremonial treatment. On the day of his arrival in London the abbot was met by the Earl of Carlisle, who voluntarily fetched him for a dinner at court that evening. John Finet, with his incessant concern for 'correct' diplomatic procedure, was led to comment on this 'supererogatory courtesy of his lordship, and an irregularity of all precedent (when a baron, not an earl should have discharged that part for a duke's ambassador).'[50] The Venetian ordinary ambassador Alvise Contarini, moreover, later reported that the abbot had been granted access to the private apartments of the king, as a private gentleman rather than as an ambassador, favouritism that went beyond the usual custom for all visiting diplomats.[51] Remarkably, Scaglia's credit was not affected by the embarrassing diplomatic slight of the *Te Deum* celebrated in Turin to mark the defeat at La Rochelle of the English fleet, perhaps comprehensible given the position of the Savoyard court as a Catholic dynasty with Bourbon ties, though an act which provoked Isaak Wake to complain 'Let Abbot Scaglia put what colours he can upon it in England. I shall always hold it as an excuse of preposterous flattery'.[52]

In fact by the close of 1627, Scaglia was markedly opposed to Richelieu and his handling of French foreign policy, reflecting the crucial shift in Savoyard diplomacy that had occurred since the treaty of Monzón. The cardinal's withdrawal from the anti-Habsburg coalition in 1626 to secure his own position in France had done the initial damage to Franco–Savoyard relations, and while Scaglia had at first sought to revitalize the anti-Habsburg coalition and reconcile England and France, his perceptions of Richelieu and of Savoy's interests fundamentally changed. His strategy of diplomatic equivocation which he adopted after Monzón depended on the certainty of England reaching a settlement with one of the leading powers, but the pressure imposed on Richelieu, coupled with growing diplomatic contact with Spain, strained Scaglia's relationship with the cardinal.[53] Evidence of friction between the two was indeed produced when Montagu was seized by the French on his return from Turin to England in November 1627. Almost immediately it was known that he was carrying sensitive papers which included a letter from Charles Emmanuel to Scaglia and a copy of the written promise given to the Savoyard duke in Charles I's name, both confirming Scaglia's involvement in an international network of opponents of Richelieu that comprised the Huguenot leaders Rohan and Soubise, the count of Soissons and the exiled duchess of Chevreuse.[54]

While Scaglia had become effectively disillusioned with Richelieu and co-operation with France, political circumstances in Europe were themselves changing. The diplomatic uncertainties that had characterized the intense and complex period of international relations between 1626–7, and which had shaped Savoy's equivocal involvement in both the Anglo–French and the Anglo–Spanish negotiations, were replaced by concrete certainties. The two north Italian duchies of Mantua and Monferrat, bound under the sovereignty of a single duke and which had nearly brought France and Spain to open war in 1615, again became a focus of international tension. As the succession crisis of 1613–15 had already demonstrated, Mantua and Monferrat, with their different inheritance customs of partible inheritance in Mantua and inheritance through both the male and female lines in Monferrat, were destined to be a source of dispute among a variety of different dynastic claimants, importantly including the Duke of Savoy, who had a claim to Monferrat alone.[55] When

the heirless Vincenzo II eventually died in December 1627, the Duke of Savoy gambled on a military alliance with Spain to push his claim to the separable duchy of Monferrat in opposition to the Duke of Nevers.

The reasons for Savoyard military intervention in the dynastic dispute in part lay with diplomatic fortunes beyond the Italian peninsula. At least one of Charles Emmanuel's calculations was that Scaglia's close involvement in English diplomacy, despite its initial purpose of encouraging Richelieu into confrontation with Spain, could in fact be employed to restrict French military influence in north Italy by prolonging the Anglo–French conflict in the Atlantic theatre. The abbot's participation in the Anglo–Spanish talks seemed to raise the possibility of that war being concluded first, with the implication of still greater resources being released by Spain in support of Savoy, marking the shift of Savoyard diplomacy from the equivocation that had defined Scaglia's strategy after Monzón. In any case the Savoyard duke still had the pledge from Charles I obtained through Montagu.

It was against this background that the Purbeck incident occurred: having pursued a complex diplomatic strategy of linking Anglo–Savoyard diplomacy to strengthen Savoy's bargaining power with France and Spain through their separate peace negotiations with England, Scaglia was seeking to maximize his influence at the Caroline court. By angering the Duke of Buckingham he therefore endangered a strategy that depended on co-operation with the English regime. Certainly, the need to retain the favour of the duke, and by implication to prolong the Anglo–French conflict, had by the end of 1627 been clearly focused by Charles Emmanuel's decision to cut through the diplomatic cold war by forcing an armed conflict in north Italy over Mantua and Monferrat against his main dynastic rival. For Savoy, the Atlantic and Italian theatres of the European conflict were critically inter-dependent during the 1620s in a way that some historians have implicitly underplayed in questioning the very notion of a definable or unified Thirty Years' War.[56]

'What reason cannot do, time will.' Scaglia's reaction to Buckingham's ire was, appropriately enough, diplomatic, and the repercussions of the incident did not last long. Following the intercessions of Holland and Carlisle, and a gift of paintings from the abbot, 'hungry after his peace from a person of such power, and regarding his master's service and the public affairs',

Buckingham and Scaglia were reconciled.[57] Scaglia's choice of gift astutely flattered Buckingham's desire to establish himself as a leading connoisseur, and the exchange of art served to restore relations between two courtiers who shared in what might be described as a common cultural language. One English correspondent of Richelieu's was led to comment in May 1628 on the strength of the positions of the ambassadors of Savoy and Lorraine at the English court, 'especially Savoy, who has an expert diplomat here; to tell the truth he is too well established and wins all arguments . . . he has a great amount of credit with the duke.'[58]

Yet despite the ease with which Scaglia and Buckingham were reconciled, the Purbeck incident vividly demonstrated Scaglia's almost total dependence on Buckingham as the most influential proponent of active anti-French foreign policy at the Caroline court, and indeed the potential fragility of the abbot's diplomatic strategy.[59] This fragility was soon exposed by the assassination of the duke in September 1628. Following the death of his favourite, Charles I at least initially gave the impression that it would be business as usual, informing Scaglia through Secretary of State Dorchester that the English fleet would sail to aid the Huguenots, the Spanish peace talks would continue unhindered and that Scaglia's favoured status would remain intact: 'His Majesty has instructed me to assure you that he will continue with the same policies without any change or variation . . . and likewise he has urged me to assure you of the concern he has for you and your well-being.'[60]

For his part, Scaglia naturally wished to retain his favoured position at the Caroline court and to assure the court in Brussels that the Anglo–Spanish negotiations would continue as before.[61] With Buckingham dead, he turned to those courtiers who were emerging from the duke's shadow as potential favourites, among them his friend the Earl of Carlisle, who was at the time of the duke's death in Turin on a goodwill mission. The abbot wrote to the earl expressing his warm affection, while in a letter to Olivares, Scaglia implied that Carlisle was interested in establishing a positive relationship with the count-duke. Likewise Scaglia hoped to draw on his friendship with Henry Rich, the Earl of Holland, who emerged as a second candidate to replace Buckingham as the leading favourite of Charles I. Scaglia described him as 'well-disposed to the negotiations [the Anglo–

Spanish talks] and a very close friend of mine', a surprising comment given that Holland has been seen in retrospect as part of the 'French faction' at the Caroline court.[62]

However, Scaglia's diplomatic strategy, of prolonging the Anglo–French war while brokering peace with Spain, was doomed. In spite of Charles I's words, the English fleet never returned to the fortress of La Rochelle, which quickly fell to French troops in October 1628. Meanwhile, the scramble for power following Buckingham's death, the growing influence of Viscount Dorchester, who was resolutely opposed to co-operation with Spain in favour of a peace with France, and Charles I's serious difficulties with parliament, meant that the expensive and controversial foreign policies pursued by Buckingham could not be sustained without generating serious political problems.[63]

The reconfiguration of English foreign policy, with the suspension of the Anglo–French conflict in April 1629, infuriated Charles Emmanuel and Scaglia, not least because they believed that the written promise given by Montagu in Turin, and recently reiterated by Charles in a letter to the duke, had guaranteed their involvement in any talks.[64] Isaak Wake informed the duke that a courier had reported the impending peace negotiations and that his silence was interpreted in London as consent, a story maintained by Dorchester to Scaglia's secretary in London. The treasurer Richard Weston, however, shamefacedly admitted to Scaglia's secretary that Charles Emmanuel had indeed been badly treated but that a want of money and deteriorating relations with parliament had forced Charles I to settle with France.[65]

With the fall of La Rochelle in October 1628 and the conclusion of peace with England, Richelieu was freed from the Atlantic theatre, the very thing Scaglia had sought to avoid. The grave consequences to Savoy were soon felt, as Richelieu quickly turned his attention to north Italy and the war in Mantua and Monferrat, and French military intervention effectively marked the end of Charles Emmanuel's attempts to gain control of Monferrat by force of arms in alliance with Spain. Richelieu's military intervention in north Italy and the settlement of Anglo–French hostilities were indeed part of a broader shift in international relations that was only too apparent when in 1631 Scaglia prepared to return to London, uniquely, it seems, as the extraordinary ambassador of both Savoy and Spain.[66]

In the 1620s, when Buckingham and Charles were committed to active European intervention as part of the policy of securing the restitution of the Palatinate, Scaglia's favour at the Caroline court was apparently unassailable, publicly demonstrated in the special ceremonial treatment he enjoyed. He had shown himself to be a likeable diplomat from a dynastic ally who seemed much more reliable than either France or Spain. In contrast, the abbot's last mission to London began inauspiciously as he was seemingly refused the safety of an English ship for passage from Spain, and it likewise ended in confusion. By 1631 Scaglia had become unequivocally identified with a strong pro-Habsburg interventionist policy that was resolutely hostile to Richelieu, as the English secretary in Turin put it, 'The going of the Abbot Scaglia into England is much eyd by the French here and they do believe that that active and stirring minister will bring forth some dangerous and disadvantageous fruit to the French crown.'[67]

Yet his policy was now at odds with the low-intensity foreign policies of the English regime, and perhaps also with Victor Amadeus, the Duke of Savoy, who was himself looking to conclude the costly war over Mantua and Monferrat following the death of his father Charles Emmanuel in July 1630. True enough, the Anglo–Spanish war had been formally concluded, Scaglia's contribution even recognized in the final wording of the treaty of Madrid. But this did not necessarily mean that the Caroline regime was now ready to resume war with France; that political moment had probably come and gone with Buckingham's death. Having achieved little in a mission that was intended to revitalize diplomatic and military relations between England, Savoy and Spain, John Finet caustically wrote of Scaglia that 'he left many men ill satisfied after their hopes and trust given of his nobler proceeding.'[68] The abbot left England for the last time.

In drawing conclusions from this labyrinthine period of international relations, it seems that Abbot Scaglia's career was emblematic of a diplomatic culture that distinguished the 1620s. With his social background and cultural sensibilities he was well qualified to work within a diplomatic structure that was receptive to informal negotiations and which focused on the dynastically linked courts of Turin, London, Paris, Madrid and Brussels. His sophisticated tastes and smooth manners were at one with the cosmopolitan and avant-garde Caroline court where the king and

at least some of his courtiers fashioned themselves to be like their counterparts in Catholic Europe.

Indeed, Charles, closely supported by Buckingham and the courtiers in the duke's shadow, among them Carlisle, Holland, Montagu and Gerbier, seemingly wanted foreign policies that operated according to the cultural and political dynamics of dynasticism. Dynastic foreign policy implied not only an affinity with Catholic courts such as Turin but also active participation in the continental conflicts, with the broad aspiration of regaining the Palatinate; it seems that Charles, with Buckingham, saw himself within a wider network of European sovereigns and courts, with the assumption that he should take an active role in dealing with them. On Savoy's part, Scaglia had effectively tracked, and influenced, English foreign policy, a point most clearly illustrated by his mention in the Anglo–Spanish peace treaty. From the outset of his mission to Paris in 1624, and more particularly after the treaty of Monzón, Scaglia believed that England held the key to Savoy's diplomatic fortunes in Europe, and what began as a policy of opposition to Habsburg power soon evolved into a more subtle strategy of diplomatic equivocation, and ended in opposition to France. By exploiting Anglo–French and Anglo–Spanish problems, Scaglia hoped to increase Savoy's bargaining power with the leading powers in pursuit of legitimate, though unresolved, territorial interests in north Italy.

It would of course be crude to draw a sharp distinction between intense diplomatic activity and dynastic power politics in the 1620s and a period of English isolation in the 1630s. English foreign policy did not come to an abrupt conclusion after Buckingham's death and the settlement of the wars with France and Spain. Likewise, the kinship ties between England and Savoy did not, and obviously could not, end simply because of the change in diplomatic fortunes from 1628. In 1635 Henrietta Maria and Marie Christine exchanged portraits of their children, for instance, to signal their mutual affection within the dynastic framework that still linked the Stuart and Savoyard Houses.[69] But while Charles had flattered the House of Savoy's dynastic ambitions in the 1620s, noticeably through terms of address, it is revealing that he was much more guarded in supporting Duke Victor Amadeus's proclamation of royal status in 1632.[70] In one sense Charles I was simply avoiding a commitment to a clear and potentially inflexible policy that would annoy other European

powers. Yet his reluctance to endorse Savoyard dynastic claims also reflected a more introspective diplomatic position, which accordingly implied greater distance from Savoy.

The late 1620s had indeed shown to Savoy the dangers of depending on consistent diplomatic and military co-operation with England. To be sure, Buckingham's death and Charles's problems with Parliament could not have come at a worse time for the Duke of Savoy, in the midst of his struggle to gain control of Monferrat over his dynastic rivals. The subsequent reconfiguration of English foreign policy and the scaling down of military intervention doomed Scaglia's diplomatic strategy and dramatically affected events in what was undoubtedly one of the major theatres of the Thirty Years' War.

Notes

1. R. Lockyer, *Buckingham. The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (London 1981), 285–6, 408; [A]rchivio di [S]tato di [T]orino, [L]ettere [M]inistri [I]nghilterra [m]azzo 4, [fasc]iculo 3, 76, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 20 January 1628.

2. For a detailed study of Scaglia see my thesis, 'The Diplomatic Career of Abbot Scaglia during the Thirty Years' War' (Oxford D.Phil thesis, 1996).

3. AST LMI m. 4, fasc. 3, 76, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 20 January 1628; John Finet, *Finetti Philoxenis* (London 1656), 239–40; [C]alendar of [S]tate [P]apers [V]enetian 1626–8, 565; Lockyer, op. cit., 408. The incident raises questions about diplomatic immunity and privileges, a subject that has received scant attention from historians, though consult E.R. Adair, *The Exterritoriality of Ambassadors in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London 1929).

4. One exception is the rather dated and disorganized study by H.G.R. Reade, which also employs documents from the state archives in Turin. *Sidelights on the Thirty Years' War*, 3 vols. (London 1924). More recently, L.J. Reeve's *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge 1989) integrates domestic and foreign policies with reference to continental archival sources.

5. For the route through the Alps see Geoffrey Parker, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567–1659* (Cambridge 1972), 71. Such was the potential international risk posed by Savoy's activity that both France and Spain agreed in a secret clause of the treaty of Monzón not to intervene unilaterally in any regional dispute in north Italy without prior discussions. Jean Dumont (ed.), *Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens, un recueil des traitez d'alliance depuis le règne de Charlemagne jusques à présent*, 8 vols. (Amsterdam 1726–31), V, part II, 489.

6. The classic exposition of 'decadence' in Italian history is Benedetto Croce, *La storia dell'età barocca in Italia* (Milan 1993). Elsewhere, Savoy has been described as nothing more than a 'pawn in the larger diplomatic game between France and Spain'. Stuart Woolf, *Studi sulla nobilità piemontese nell'epoca*

dell'assolutissmo (Turin 1963), 7. See also the comments in Pierpaolo Merlin et al., *Il Piemonte sabaudo. Stato e territori in etá moderna* (Turin 1994), 173–8.

7. For example, Luigi Cibrario, *Origine e progressi delle isitutioni della monarchia di Savoia sino alla costitutionze del regno d'Italia* (Florence 1869), 148–9, and, more moderately, R. Quazza, 'La politica di Carlo Emanuele I durante la guerra dei trent'anni', *Carlo Emanuele I Miscellanea*, I (1930), 4–5. To be fair, Charles Emmanuel himself employed the rhetoric of liberty, albeit in a different sense, during the 1613–15 war for Mantua and Monferrat. Alessandro Tassoni, 'Filippiche contra gli spagnoli', in *Prose politichi e morali*, 2 vols. (Rome–Bari 1978), II.

8. The issue of Mantua and Monferrat has recently been examined by David Parrott, 'The Mantuan Succession, 1627–31: A Sovereignty Dispute in Early Modern Europe', *English Historical Review*, CXII (1997), 20–65. In 1601 Savoy realized another territorial ambition by acquiring the province of Saluzzo through the treaty of Lyon with Henry IV of France. On Saluzzo and Geneva see Merlin et al., op. cit., 182–7.

9. For example, Vittorio Siri, *Memorie recondite dall'anno 1601 sino al 1640*, 8 vols. (Lyon 1677–9), VII, 197–8; Pietro Giovanni Capriata *The History of the Wars of Italy from the Year MDCXIII to MDCLIV in XVIII Books, Rendered into English by Henry, Earl of Monmouth* (London 1665), 436–9; Salvatore Foa, *Vittorio Amadeo I, 1587–1637* (Turin 1930), 65–6.

10. On the importance of legitimizing territorial claims see Mark Greengrass, ed., *Conquest and Coalescence: the Shaping of the State in Early Modern Europe* (London 1991), especially Chapter one.

11. On the Bohemian and Imperial interests see Ruth Kleinman, 'Charles Emmanuel and the Bohemian Election 1619', *European Studies Review*, 5 (1975), 3–29, which also contains some useful historiographical comments.

12. Scaglia's correspondence between 1624 and 1625 constantly refers to this strategy. For example, AST [L]ettere [M]inistri [F]rancia m. 25, fasc. 1, 10, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 25 July 1624; 48, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 26 August 1624, with enclosure, 'Articoli sopra la diversione'. The anti-Habsburg alliance between France and Savoy can be traced back at least to the meeting between Charles Emmanuel and Louis XIII at Avignon in 1622. Domenico Carutti, *Storia della diplomazia della corte di Savoia (dal 1494 al 1773)*, 4 vols. (Rome 1875–80), II, chapter VII. On England's proposed involvement see Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–24* (Cambridge 1989), especially Chapter 1.

13. A point made by Robert Oresko. 'The House of Savoy in Search of a Royal Crown', 302, in Graham Gibbs, Robert Oresko and Hamish Scott, eds, *Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe. Essays in Memory of Ragnhild Hatton* (Cambridge 1997).

14. The mission of Scaglia's father to Spain in 1603, with the ducal sons and the Jesuit political theorist Giovanni Botero, was calculated to promote the Savoyard duke's eldest son, Philip Emmanuel, as a possible heir to Philip III. The plan was dashed by the sudden death of Philip Emmanuel and the birth of the future Philip IV in 1605. V. Ansaldi, 'Giovanni Botero coi principi sabaudi in ispagna (da lettere inedite)', *Bollettino Storico–Bibliografico Subalpino*, 35 (1934), 322, 328.

15. Elizabeth of course married Elector Frederick of the Palatinate while

Henry unexpectedly died in 1612. E. Passamonti, 'Relazioni Anglo–Sabaudo dal 1603 al 1625', *Bollettino Storico–Bibliografico Subalpino*, 36 (1934) 264–317; 488–543, and 37 (1935), 94–124. On Savoy's royal ambitions see Oresko, op. cit., and Luigi La Rocca, 'L'aspirazione del duca Carlo Emanuele I al titlolo di re del Piemonte', *Archivio Storico Italiano*, series V, XLVI (1910), 375–92.

16. AST LMI m. 4, fasc. 1, Barozzio to Scaglia, 29 October 1625; AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 271, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 15 November 1625.

17. AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 269, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 15 November 1625. See also 168, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 9 July 1625.

18. For example, AST [L]ettere [F]orestieri [I]nghilterra, m. 48, Charles I to Charles Emmanuel, 1629; Charles I to Charles Emmanuel, 1629 (?).

19. The title of address used by Marie Christine provoked a controversy precisely because of its royal connotations. Eventually as a compromise it was suggested that the two sisters might correspond with each other as 'mon coeur, ma soeur', emphasizing their affection, while perhaps retaining the ambiguity about royal status. AST LMI m. 4, fasc. 1, Barozzio to Scaglia, 29 October 1625; AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 271, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 15 November 1625. In practice, Henrietta Maria appears to have used the abbreviated 'mon coeur' in correspondence. Ermano Ferrero, ed., *Lettres de Henriette Marie de France Reine d'Angleterre à sa soeur Christine Duchesse de Savoie* (Turin 1881).

20. CSPV 1626–8, 314. Charles Emmanuel also made reference to the dynastic ties by reminding Charles I of the 'service' owed to him by the duke's children. For example, [P]ublic [R]ecord [O]ffice [S]tate [P]apers 92/12/37, Wake to Conway, 19 February 1626.

21. Further information about this mission can be gathered from J.A.F. Orbanni, 'Documenti sul barocco in Roma', *Società Romana di Storia Patria* (1920), 227, 238–9, 253, 265–6.

22. AST LMF m. 25, 119, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 8 November 1624; 114, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 1 November 1624. AST LMF m. 27, fasc. 3, 195, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 15 October 1626, with list of expenses attached; 248, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 8 December 1626; 259, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 21 December 1626.

23. On his collecting and patronage see Arabella Cifani and Franco Monetti, 'New Light on the Abbé Scaglia and Van Dyck', *The Burlington Magazine*, cxxxiv (August 1992), 506–14, which includes a partial transcription of his will, illustrating the extent of his possessions in Antwerp. On the Jordaens' commissions see L. Schlugleit, 'L'abbé de Scaglia, Jordaens et "l'Histoire de Pysche" de Greenwich-House (1639–1642)', *Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art*, 7 (1937), 139–65.

24. Romolo Quazza, *La guerra per la successione di Mantua e del Monferrato 1628–1631*, 2 vols. (Mantua 1926), I, 68.

25. Reeve, op. cit., 201, where Scaglia is also described as one of the 'exotic fruits' whose presence in London defined the culture of the Caroline regime.

26. R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Art and the material culture of majesty in early Stuart England', 96–7, in R. Malcolm Smuts, ed., *The Stuart Court and Europe. Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge 1996). See also Jonathan Brown, *Kings and Connoisseurs. Collecting Art in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (New Haven, CT and London 1995). Ricaut became the abbot's principal banker during the 1630s. CSPV 1632–6, 106, 109, 140.

27. AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 137, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 29 May 1625. The impact of Buckingham on the French court has been well described by Lockyer, op. cit., 236.

28. AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 144, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 1 June 1625, where Scaglia added further praise on Buckingham by describing him as 'a man of many great and generous opinions'; CSPV 1625–6, 66, 69.

29. AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 163, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 30 June 1625; CSPV 1625–6, 82, 86. Barozzio returned to London in October 1625.

30. AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 167, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 2 July 1625; 324, Carlisle to Scaglia, late 1625.

31. Scaglia had delayed his journey because of the presence of a papal nuncio in Paris, unhappy with the abbot's attempt to mediate in the Huguenot problem. AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 213, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 9 September 1625.

32. There is little secondary work on this topic, though consult Albert Loomie, 'The *Conducteur des Ambassadeurs* of Seventeenth Century France and Spain', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 43 (1975), 333–56. Albert Loomie, ed., *Ceremonies of Charles I: The notebooks of John Finet, 1628–1641* (Fordham 1987) also offers valuable information on issues of protocol. Diplomatic protocol evolved as embassies became permanent, particularly in the later seventeenth century, as examined by Lucien Bély: *Espions et Ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV* (Paris 1990).

33. AST [L]ettere [M]inistri [I]nghilterra m. 4, 4, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 7 January 1626. See also AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 1, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 3 January 1626; LMF m. 27, fasc. 3, 7, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 4 February 1626.

34. [H]istorical [M]anuscripts [C]ommission, Eleventh Report Appendix, Part I (Salvetti Correspondence) (London 1887), 76; CSPV 1625–6, 277, 284–5, 291.

35. AST LMF m. 27, fasc. 3, 10, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 4 February 1626. The exceptional use of a royal coach as departing transport to Dover, rather than for its more customary use to travel to a formal audience with the king, can be inferred from Finet's comments in Loomie, op. cit., 52. Soon after returning to France, Scaglia wrote a letter of effusive thanks to Carlisle for the warmth of his welcome. [B]ritish [L]ibrary [Eg]erton MSS 2597, fos. 8-v, Scaglia to Carlisle, 5 February 1626, while Duke Charles Emmanuel similarly thanked the English ordinary ambassador in Turin for 'the honours done unto his ambassador by his Majesty, the favours and caresses he received of my lord duke of Buckingham, my lord of Carlisle, and your lordship'. PRO SP 92/12/37, Wake to Conway, 19 February 1626.

36. AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 273, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 18 November 1625; CSPV, 1625–6, 277. Charles I was full of praise for Savoy's military actions in north Italy. AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 269, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 15 November 1625; CSPV 1625–6, 201, though it might also be added that the favour shown to Scaglia by the English regime, and Buckingham in particular, might have been retribution for the snub of refusing to allow Buckingham to return to France. CSPV 1625–6, 271, 291.

37. Scaglia made no secret of his anger with the treaty of Monzón. For example, AST LMF m. 27 fasc. 3, 68, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 31 May 1626; 80, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 9 June 1626. Likewise, the Venetians

were slow to forgive Richelieu for the treaty, leading Isaak Wake to comment that, 'As France did first delude their confederates with a clandestine treaty, so now these do requite them with dilatory answers, which are more equivocal and ambiguous than the ancient oracles.' [B]ritish [L]ibrary [Add]itional MSS 34,311, fo. 8, Wake to Conway, 11 September 1626.

38. Though his relationship with Richelieu became increasingly changeable. The cardinal became convinced that Scaglia was heavily involved in the Chalais conspiracy, probably the most serious plot of his ministry. Armand de-Plessis Richelieu, *Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu*, ed. *Société de l'Histoire de France*, 10 vols. (Paris 1907–31), VII, 2–4; AST LMF m. 27, fasc. 3, 135, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 13 August 1626. Yet Richelieu was also aware that Scaglia, as a friend of Buckingham, and reportedly his prime confidant in France, was in an undeniably powerful diplomatic position. CSPV 1626–8, 37, 54.

39. Information on Montagu can be found under the entry for his son in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. See also the index in Caroline Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill 1983) and Georges Dethan, *Mazarin: un homme de paix à l'âge baroque* (Paris 1981), both of which underline the impression of Montagu's French sympathies.

40. AST [N]egoziazioni coll'[I]nghilterra m. 3, fasc. 14, 'sujet de la venue du sieur de Montaigu vers S.A.', April 1627; 'Propositions faittes a S.A. par le sieur de Montaigu', April 1627; CSPV 1626–8, 208–10. See also HMC eleventh report, appendix part I, 123–4.

41. AST LMI m4, 17, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 26 July 1627; BL Eg. MSS 2597, fo. 29, Gerbier to Carlisle, 6 August 1627. While the incident may be true, Scaglia reasonably suspected that the letter had been deliberately leaked in Brussels to discredit his negotiations over the Anglo–Spanish peace with the Infanta Isabella, Peter Paul Rubens and Balthasar Gerbier.

42. CSPV 1626–8, 153, 168, 196, 213. Lockyer, op. cit., 369–70. Montagu had been to Paris ostensibly to congratulate Gaston on his marriage to Montpensier. AST LMF m. 27 fasc. 3, 161, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 10 September 1626. The content of Buckingham's messages for Scaglia remain unclear.

43. Charles Emmanuel, it should be added, had stressed his willingness to act according to the wishes of Charles I. PRO SP 92/13/29, Charles Emmanuel to Charles I, 1 April 1627.

44. PRO SP 92/12/113–5v, Scaglia to Buckingham, June 1626; AST LMF m. 28, fasc. 6, 6, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 8 January 1627; Lockyer, op. cit., 335–6. Scaglia's plan was repeated in July when he sent his secretary to London. AST NI m. 1, fasc. 11, 'Memoria delle Proposizioni fatte per parte di S.A.R. al Re d'Inghilterra dal segretaro Barozzio', July 1626.

45. PRO SP 92/12/117–8, Buckingham to Scaglia, June 1626. For biographical information on Gerbier see chapter four of Hugh Williamson's *Four Stuart Portraits* (London 1949).

46. [A]rchivo [G]eneral [S]imancas, [Est]ado K1480, 122, Mirabel to Juan de Villela, 24 August 1626; 28, Mirabel to Villela, 1 September 1626; K1433, consulta of council of state, 17 September 1626.

47. [A]rchives [G]énérales du [R]oyaume, Brussels, [S]ecrétairerie d'[E]tat et de [G]uerre 196, fo. 390, Infanta Isabella to Philip IV, 23 May 1627; fo. 393, anonymous paper, May 1627; AST LMI m. 4, 9, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 11 June 1627; Reade, op. cit. III, 72; PRO SP77/19/145, Rubens to Gerbier, 19

May 1627; L.P. Gachard, *Histoire politique et diplomatique de Pierre-Paul Rubens* (Brussels 1877), 52.

48. AST LMI m. 4, 9, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 11 June 1627, perhaps referring to the possibility of a member of the House of Savoy inheriting the Spanish Netherlands. The regime in Madrid was however initially hesitant in allowing Scaglia to participate because of Charles Emmanuel's anti-Habsburg track record and the unresolved dispute with Genoa. AGS Est. K1481, 100, consulta of council of state, 31 May 1627; AGR SEG 197, fo. 45, Philip IV to Infanta Isabella, 16 June 1627.

49. J.H. Elliott, *The Count-Duke Olivares. The Statesman in an Age of Decline* (New Haven and London 1988), 323–30. This short term rapprochement is surely one of the most puzzling acts of diplomacy in this period. In all probability both Richelieu and Olivares were suggesting joint action against England not only to give the appearance of a unified Catholic front but more importantly to complicate the other's peace talks with England. Certainly, it was thought that England's concurrent negotiations could be used to divide the leading powers, as Dudley Carleton, the future Viscount Dorchester, wrote, 'The duke of Savoy adviseth that either England should pacify with Spain, or by seeming so to do, to divert further treaty between Spain and France not doubting but that Spain will prefer the amity of England before France.' PRO SP 84/134/224, Carleton to Conway, 17 September 1627.

50. Finet, op. cit., 231; CSPV 1626–8, 445–6.

51. CSPV 1626–8, 545. According to Finet, Scaglia had stated that he had even been granted freedom to visit Charles I alone and without ceremony, a claim that excluded and thus irritated the future Master of Ceremonies. Finet, op. cit., 231–2. For further information on ambassadorial access to the royal apartments see Loomie, op. cit., 27–30.

52. BL Add. MSS 34,311, fos. 136v–7, Wake to Conway, 10 December 1627; fo. 135v, Wake to Conway, 3 December 1627; CSPV 1626–8, 513.

53. Indeed, from the Chalais conspiracy in 1626, there was a whispering campaign that Scaglia did not actually want the Anglo–French peace he was supposedly advocating. See for example, AST LMF m. 28, fasc. 6, 37, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 18 February 1627.

54. [A]rchives du Ministère des [A]ffaires [É]trangères, Paris, [C]orrespondance [P]olitique Angleterre 42, fos. 116–7, Charles Emmanuel to Scaglia, 5 November 1627, 'prise avec Montagu'; fo. 119v, copy of the promise made by Charles I to Charles Emmanuel. See also CSPV 1626–8, 526–7.

55. Detailed information on the conflict can be found in Quazza op. cit. See also the important recent contribution by Parrott, op. cit. The problems associated with Duke Vincenzo were being discussed as soon as he assumed the ducal throne in October 1626. AST LMF m. 27, fasc. 1, 278, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, late December 1626. See also LMF m. 28, fasc. 6, 60, Scaglia to Charles Emmanuel, 8 March 1627; PRO SP 92/13/30-v, Hales to Conway, 12 April 1627, where Hales wrote, 'Notwithstanding that the duke of Mantua doth seem outwardly to recover his health, yet is the inward state of his body so decayed, as much time cannot pass, but that out of necessity he must yield', and continued by stating that Charles Emmanuel was readying his troops for a possible succession crisis.

56. Two proponents of a more 'episodic' approach to the war are S.H.

Steinberg, *The Thirty Years War and the Conflict for European Hegemony* (London 1966), and N.M. Sutherland, 'The Thirty Years War and the Structure of European Politics', *English Historical Review*, 107 (1992), 587–625.

57. Finet, op. cit., 240. Unfortunately, it remains impossible to identify the pictures presented to Buckingham as the only substantive inventories of the duke's pictorial collection dating from 1635 and 1648 give no detailed information on the provenance of his acquisitions. Randall Davies, 'An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures, etc., at York House in 1635', *The Burlington Magazine*, X (1906), 376–82; Brian Fairfax, *A Catalogue of the Curious Collection of Pictures of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham* (London 1758).

58. AAE CP Angleterre 42, fo. 269, Forster to Richelieu, 17 May 1628.

59. Salvetti had described Buckingham as Scaglia's 'oracle'. HMC eleventh report, appendix, part I, 132.

60. PRO SP 92/14/37v, Dorchester to Scaglia, 2 September 1628; Reeve, op. cit., 36, 52–5.

61. AGS Est. 2042, Scaglia to Cueva, 29 October 1628; PRO SP 92/14/62-v, Scaglia to Dorchester 29, October 1628; AST Lettere Principi Diversi m. 46, Scaglia to Prince Thomas Carignano, 2 October 1628.

62. PRO SP 92/14/160-v, Scaglia to Carlisle, 3 December 1628, in which Scaglia wrote of the warmth of his feelings for Carlisle; SP 94/34/73, Scaglia to Olivares, 10 April 1629, with notes of Olivares in margin; AGS Est. 2517, 71, Scaglia to Cardinal Cueva, late 1628; AST LMI m. 4, Peter Barozzio to Charles Emmanuel, 25 January 1629. For a secondary study that portrays Holland as a francophile, anti-Spanish, courtier see R. Malcolm Smuts, 'The Puritan followers of Henrietta Maria during the 1630s', *English Historical Review*, 93 (1978), 26–45.

63. On the growing influence of Dorchester see Reeve, op. cit., 48–9, and ibid., *passim* for Charles's problems with parliament.

64. AST LFI m. 48, Charles I to Charles Emmanuel, January 1629; LMS m. 22, fasc. 5, 3, Charles Emmanuel to Scaglia, 20 January 1629; AST LMI m. 4, Barozzio to Charles Emmanuel, 24 February 1629. As Dorchester wrote, 'The Abbot of Scaglia doth in his last letters tax us for our sudden concluding the peace with France who as he writeth doth seek a peace with Spain'. PRO SP 92/15/82, Dorchester to Wake, 1 February 1629.

65. BL Add. MSS 34,311, fos. 317-v, Wake to Dorchester, 15 May 1628; AST LMI m. 4, Barozzio to Charles Emmanuel, 20 April 1629; Barozzio to Charles Emmanuel, 25 April 1629.

66. For his letters of credence see PRO SP 92/19/3, Victor Amadeus to Charles I, 13 February 1631; SP 94/35/221, Philip IV to Charles I, 22 May 1631. This mission in the service of two sovereigns seemingly went against the conventions of diplomatic practice as elaborated by contemporary writers such as Gasparo Bragazzi. *L'Ambasciatore in sei libri* (Padua 1627), 26.

67. PRO SP 92/19/71, Hales to Dorchester, 10 July 1631. Indeed, Scaglia made it clear before arriving in London that he wished to negotiate a military alliance between Savoy, England and Spain. For example, AGR SEG 600, Scaglia to Olivares, November 1631.

68. Loomie, op. cit., 23; CSPV 1629–31, 562, 566. On Scaglia's mention in the treaty of Madrid see Dumont, ed., op. cit., V, part II, 620; AST Lettere Duchi e Sovrani, m. 48, Charles I to Victor Amadeus, 15 December 1630.

69. Ferrero, op. cit., 40.

70. Loomie, op. cit, 163–8. Venetian ambassadors in England noted the derision with which Savoy's claims were met in London, though they were no doubt keen to downplay the Savoyard claim to the kingdom of Cyprus which the republic of Venice contested. CSPV 1632–6, 116, 126. On Victor Amadeus's campaign for royal status see Oresko, 272–326 in Oresko, Gibbs and Scott, op. cit.

Toby Osborne

is Lecturer in History at the University of Durham. He is the author of a forthcoming book, *Dynasty and Diplomacy: The Duchy of Savoy during the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge University Press).