

“Persuaded by the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius V, the most Catholic king sent his commission to Cardinals Granvelle and Pacheco and his ambassador Don Juan de Zuñiga: and the Signory of Venice sent its ambassador Soriano to treat and conclude a League between the Pope, king Philip and the Venetians: their credentials were examined and considered sufficient.

“Having on the 1st July had summoned to his presence the king’s deputies and the ambassador of Venice, the Pontiff addressed them words of great weight and full of prudence in the course of a long discourse on the actual state of affairs, on the difficulties in which Christendom stands, and on the steps which His Holiness, as the universal Father, had taken—first of all, to turn to God, to placate His wrath roused against us for our sins, and then to negotiate for the union of forces of the Christian princes against the common enemy, and principally those of the king and of the Signory of Venice. . . . He went on to speak of the kingdom of Cyprus, that it was necessary to use every effort to keep it in the power of the Christians, that it was the sole route to gaining the kingdom of Jerusalem and the Sepulchre of Christ. . . . Our Lord God, who will not abandon Christendom, and who in His wrath still does not cease from His mercies, has sent this opportunity to preserve that kingdom and gain others. He next said that, when this League had been concluded between the King and the Signory, the Emperor, as the first in authority among the temporal princes, would be invited to join it. . . . On the 2nd July there were summoned to the Pope’s presence the king’s agents and the ambassador, to whom His Holiness gave a writing, in the form of Capitulations, which had been sketched by His Holiness’ representatives. On the 4th July, all the others (except the Cardinal Alessandrino, indisposed) being present and the ambassador, a beginning was made of the business in the name of the Holy Spirit. . . . The Venetian ambassador wished that more thought should be given to an offensive, because to stand on the defensive cost a great deal and aided but little: the real defence was to attack the enemy and deprive him of the way of attacking them; but it was decided that both one and the other should be set down” (i.e. in the articles) “as was done in the League of 1537. Next came up the third point, by Cardinal Granvelle, viz. against whom was the League directed, and he desired that it should be not only against the Turk, but against all Infidels, as the mandate from the king specified: and many other of the Cardinals deputed by His Holiness were of the same opinion, moved by respect for the Faith and because they knew that it would please the Pope . . . but the ambassador of Venice said that they were summoned only to deliberate against the Turk and that was what had been written to the Christian princes, and for that he had his mandate—whoever named other infidels was disturbing them from their principal objective, because it was not well to make suspect those from whom help might be had. . . . Cardinal Morone, thinking the same, said that *the Sophy* too was among the number of the infidels, and *yet it was hoped to have his aid.*” (Cardinal Granvelle” (i.e. as delegate of the king of Spain) “added that it was needful to make clear that the League was against the Turk and his other confederates, to name the Moors of Barbary and the Sophy, as they were tools of the Turks in doing damage to Christians. . . . It came to declaring the forces, and it was decided by all that these should be 200 galleys, of which 100 should be contributed by the Signory and 100 by the King of Spain, 50,000 footmen and 10,000 horse, as it was laid down in the former articles of agreement. . . .”

Lepanto won, as far as S. Pius V was concerned there would be no stopping and no truce, and up to the last months of his life he was working, as his predecessors in former centuries had worked for the Crusades, witness the document dated 11.2.1572:¹

“In the name of the Most Holy and Individual Trinity. Since, according to the

¹ Vide Vat. Arch. Misc. Arm. II, 116, Spagna, pp. 96-7.