



THE TRANSITION IN EUROPE BETWEEN XVIIth AND XVIIIth CENTURIES

Perspectives and case studies

Edited by
Antonio Álvarez-Ossorio,
Cinzia Cremonini, Elena Riva



Informazioni per il lettore

Questo file PDF è una versione gratuita di sole 20 pagine ed è leggibile con



La versione completa dell'e-book (a pagamento) è leggibile con Adobe Digital Editions. Per tutte le informazioni sulle condizioni dei nostri e-book (con quali dispositivi leggerli e quali funzioni sono consentite) consulta [cliccando qui](#) le nostre F.A.Q.





COMITATO SCIENTIFICO

Guido Abbattista (Università di Trieste), Pietro Adamo (Università di Torino), Salvatore Adorno (Università di Catania), Filiberto Agostini (Università di Padova), Enrico Artifoni (Università di Torino), Eleonora Belligni (Università di Torino), Nora Berend (University of Cambridge), Giampietro Berti (Università di Padova), Pietro Cafaro (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore di Milano), Beatrice Del Bo (Università di Milano), Giuseppe De Luca (Università di Milano), Santi Fedele (Università di Messina), Monica Fioravanzo (Università di Padova), Alba Lazzaretto (Università di Padova), Erica Mannucci (Università di Milano-Bicocca), Raimondo Michetti (Università di Roma Tre), Roberta Mucciarelli (Università di Siena), Marco Pasi (Universiteit van Amsterdam), Alessandro Pastore (Università di Verona), Lidia Piccioni (Sapienza Università di Roma), Gianfranco Ragona (Università di Torino), Daniela Saresella (Università di Milano), Marina Tesoro (Università di Pavia), Giovanna Tonelli (Università di Milano), Michaela Valente (Università del Molise), Albertina Vittoria (Università di Sassari).

COORDINAMENTO EDITORIALE

Pietro Adamo, Giampietro Berti

Il comitato assicura attraverso un processo di double blind peer review la validità scientifica dei volumi pubblicati.

I lettori che desiderano informarsi sui libri e le riviste da noi pubblicati possono consultare il nostro sito Internet: www.francoangeli.it e iscriversi nella home page al servizio “Informatemi” per ricevere via e.mail le segnalazioni delle novità o scrivere, inviando il loro indirizzo, a “FrancoAngeli, viale Monza 106, 20127 Milano”.

**THE TRANSITION
IN EUROPE BETWEEN
XVIIth AND XVIIIth CENTURIES**

Perspectives and case studies

Edited by
Antonio Álvarez-Ossorio,
Cinzia Cremonini, Elena Riva

FRANCOANGELI

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore sustained the publication of this volume because of a positive evaluation of these results of research (cod.: 283C031 and cod.: 283A247).

Project joined by the Dirección General de Investigación del Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad “Sociedad cortesana y redes diplomáticas: la proyección europea de la monarquía de España (1659-1725)” [HAR2015-67069-PMINECO/FEDER, UE].

Copyright © 2016 by FrancoAngeli s.r.l., Milano, Italy.

L'opera, comprese tutte le sue parti, è tutelata dalla legge sul diritto d'autore. L'Utente nel momento in cui effettua il download dell'opera accetta tutte le condizioni della licenza d'uso dell'opera previste e comunicate sul sito www.francoangeli.it.

Contents

M. Verga, <i>Premise</i>	pag.	9
A. Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño – C. Cremonini – E. Riva, <i>Introduction</i>	»	13

Perspectives

A. Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño, <i>The Legacy of Charles II and the Art of Government of the Spanish Monarchy</i>	»	23
M. Schnettger, <i>A Turn of Tide. The War of the Spanish Succession and its Impact on German History</i>	»	35
C. Cremonini, <i>Transition, Autonomies, Factions: towards a Reconsideration of Italian and European History between the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries</i>	»	53
E. Riva, <i>Women, Power and Culture in the European Transition between the XVIIth and the XVIIIth Centuries</i>	»	62
F. Rurale, <i>On the Crisis of the European ‘Religious’ Mind</i>	»	71
V. Fiorelli, <i>Southern Transitions between Religious Life and Ecclesiastical Organization</i>	»	80
S. D’Amico, <i>Milan between the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries: Economic Dynamics and Social Transformations</i>	»	86

A. Buono, *Representation of Interests and Institutional Changes in the State of Milan across the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries. Notes and Possible Avenues of Research* pag. 93

P.M. Galimberti, *The Venerando Ospedale Maggiore (Venerable Maggiore Hospital) in Milan over the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries* » 103

Case Studies

C. Bravo Lozano, *A berretta for the Nuncio. Roman Diplomacy, Court Ceremony and Royal Favour in the Madrid of Charles II* » 115

R. Quiros Rosado, *Tradition and Change in the Neapolitan Provincial Government during the War of Succession: the Spanish presidi (1707-1714)* » 138

M.A. Noto, *The Kingdom of Naples to the Test of Succession: Aristocracy, the Desire for Autonomy and International Politics at the Beginning of the XVIIIth Century* » 160

G. Cirillo, *Between the Habsburgs and the Bourbons. The Integration of Nobility and the Self-Consciousness of Aristocrats in the Kingdom of Naples* » 192

S. Mantini, *Multiple Loyalties in the Kingdom of Naples: L'Aquila and Abruzzo between the Spanish Habsburgs and the Austrian Habsburgs (XVIIth-XVIIIth Centuries)* » 224

L. De Nardi, *Between Spanish Pactismo and French Absolutism: the Model of Government of Victor Amadeus II in Sicily (1713-1720)* » 250

M.C. Calabrese, *The Career of Francesco Avarna from the Spanish Domination to the Austrian Empire* » 266

D. Maffi, *All the King's Men. Aristocracy and the Profession of Arms in the State of Milan between the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries, an Attempt to Approach* » 286

S. Boero, *The Oratorians in the European Transition between the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries: Trends and Attitudes* » 302

G. Gibertoni, *The Political Function of Musical Patronage in the Years of the War of the Spanish Succession: Opera, Oratorio, Serenata* » 318

Contents

P. Venturelli, <i>Gonzaga Collecting: Palace Inventories and New Objects (1626-1709)</i>	pag. 334
E.C. Colombo, <i>Transitions in Political Intermediation. The Case of "Paesi di Nuovo Acquisto" within the Kingdom of Sardinia (1707-1775)</i>	» 349
<i>Authors</i>	» 361
<i>Index</i>	» 369

Premise

Marcello Verga*

In recent years, possibly following an Italian re-publication of Huizinga's essays on Renaissance, many have referred to the metaphor of Renaissance as «un cambiamento di marea». “Il passaggio dal Medioevo all'età moderna – as the famous Dutch historian wrote – deve essere visto (e come potrebbe essere altrimenti?) non come una grande svolta, ma come una larga serie di onde che vengono a frangersi sulla spiaggia”¹. In this context, one might wonder whether the word “transition” is an apt descriptor for such a break, which defined Western Europe on a political level, as well as having important consequences for Eastern regions.

In their thoughtful introduction, the editors of this volume investigate the meaning of this word and the use made of it in Italian and Spanish historiography, here invited to confront each other over the changes which marked European society across the 17th and the first decades of the 18th century². There is no doubt that these decades marked an authentic turning point for the domestic narratives of these two historiographies. Indeed, the *Istituto Storico Italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea*, founded in 1934 in Rome, dedicated the first volume of the series *Fonti per la storia italiana* (1935) to the edition

* Università degli studi, Firenze, Italy; Director of Istituto di Storia dell'Europa Mediterranea (ISEM-CNR).

Translation of Viviana di Giovinazzo.

1. J. Huizinga, “Il problema del Rinascimento”, in W. van de Boer (ed.), *Le immagini della storia. Scritti 1905-1941*, Torino, Einaudi 1993, p. 194. A more recent republication is: *Il problema del rinascimento. Con un saggio su “Rinascimento e realismo”*. Introduzione di Gabriele Pedullà, Roma, Donzelli 2015. The passage is also quoted by Silvia Mantini – one of the authors of this book – who used it as incipit for the introduction of her recent volume, *Appartenenze storiche. Mutamenti e transizioni al confine del regno di Napoli fra Seicento e Settecento*, Ariccia, Aracne, 2016.

2. *La transizione europa tra XVII e XVIII secolo. Riflessioni e progetti. Corte, politica, cultura e società (1665-1725)*: such is the title of the workshop organized by the Dipartimento di storia moderna e contemporanea dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, in collaboration with Red Sucesión, edited by Antonio Álvarez-Ossorio, Cinzia Cremonini and Elena Riva.

of *Relazioni di ambasciatori sabaudi, genovesi e veneti durante il periodo della Grande Alleanza e della guerra di successione di Spagna, 1693-1713*³, precisely in order to stress how much that period's wars – and in particular the Spanish War of Succession – marked a deep break in Italian domestic history, as Gioacchino Volpe wrote in his famous essay *Principi del Risorgimento nel '700 italiano*⁴.

On this account, it is worth mentioning the important essay by Leibniz, the title of which is particularly meaningful: *Finis saeculi novam rerum faciem aperuit*. It was written at the beginning of the new century, and it was intended as a comment on the new political situation that was emerging in Europe after the disappearance of the Spanish Habsburg dynasty. This essay – first published in 1861 in the third volume of Leibniz's *Oeuvres*, edited by Foucher de Careil⁵ – is one of the many that Leibniz, at the time under the service of the Viennese Habsburgs, devoted to the political affairs of his times.

The “political” Leibniz tackled many challenges during the years of the War of the Spanish Succession, serving as *Hofrat* to Emperor Leopold I, to Joseph I and to Archduke Charles (who aspired to the throne and became Emperor in 1711 under the name Charles VI). Remarkably, he was also able to draw the attention of the Viennese imperial chancellor's office to the possibility of claiming the Medicean possessions, having foreseen the extinction of the Florentine dynasty as early as 1711.

Finis saeculi reminds us that like Leibniz, a considerable portion of educated and politically informed European opinion (cfr. the political battle of *pamphlets* that animated English political life⁶) carefully observed the developments of these decades. These involved the relationships between states (the word “equilibrio” – described as a “new word” by Muratori – became prominent in this context), but also international policy and changes to the titles needed to claim territorial sovereignty.

Leibniz intervened directly on these topics some years later with *Le manifest contenant les droits de Charles III, roi d'Espagne et les justes motifs de son expedition* (1704). As one may infer from the title itself, this essay was written in support of the Archduke Charles of Habsburg, who was then about to land on the Iberian peninsula in order to lay claim to the Spanish crown.

In this essay, Leibniz stressed the need to respect the “*Veritable sentiment des peuples et des interessez*” in the assignation of the Spanish realms. As

3. C. Morandi (ed.), *Relazioni di ambasciatori sabaudi, genovesi e veneti durante il periodo della Grande Alleanza e della guerra di successione di Spagna (1693-1713)*, Bologna, N. Zanichelli, 1935.

4. G. Volpe, “Principi del Risorgimento nel '700 italiano”, in «Rivista storica italiana», 1936.

5. L.A. Foucher de Careil (ed.), *Oeuvres. Leibniz. Publiées pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits originaux*, Hildesheim-New York, G. Olms, 1969 (reproduction Paris, 1861-1875).

6. R.M. Lopez Campillo, *Imagen y propaganda política en la Guerra De Sucesión Española. Daniel Defoe Al Servicio Del Gobierno De Ana Estuardo*, Madrid, Silex, 2014; P. Losa Serrano (ed.), *Guerra de Sucesión española y la opinión pública hispano-británica*, Madrid, Silex, 2015).

the quote below highlights, Leibniz relies on a tradition which – beginning in the last decades of the 17th century – compared populations' characters and, most importantly, their styles and literary productions, as a means to building a “geography of temperaments” (Marc Fumaroli), and indeed a hierarchy of European culture.

It is also necessary to recall the *Aja Declaration*, issued by William of Orange on October 10, 1688, in preparation of his arrival in England. The opening words of the document, written by Caspar Fagel and translated into English by Gilbert Burnet, seem to employ the same tone as Leibniz's essay:

It is both certain and evident to all men, that the public peace and happiness of any state or kingdom cannot be preserved where the law, liberties, and customs, established by the lawful authority in it, are openly transgressed and annulled [...] being the greatness and security both of kings, royal families, and of all such as are in authority, as well as the happiness of their subjects and people, depend in a most especial manner upon the exact observations and maintenance of these their laws, liberties, and customs⁷.

Of course, one should keep in mind the instrumental character of declarations, pamphlets and manifestos that accompanied the wars of successions in the first part of 18th century Europe. However, we should also pay attention to the innovation in topics, references and neologisms – such as *equilibrio* – that marked European political culture in the decades this volume studies. Among these words – which so characterized the transition (should we wish to use this terminology) towards the modern European society which would emerge from the wars of succession – one cannot avoid recalling David Hume and his essay *On the Parties* (1742): «Parties from *principle*, especially abstract speculative principle, are known only to modern times, and are, perhaps, the most extraordinary and unaccountable *phaenomenon*, that has yet appeared in human affairs».

7. *The Declaration of His Highness William Henry, by the Grace of God Prince*, The Hague, Arnold Leers, 1688, p. 11.

*Introduction**

A. Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño – C. Cremonini – E. Riva

This volume, organized in two parts¹, originates in the joint collaboration of several specialists from different disciplines, which, in turn, stemmed from the need to shed more light on the European system in the decades spanning the 17th and 18th centuries. This theme was the subject of a workshop held in Milan in the Autumn of 2013². This meeting did not feature the presentation of papers on defined topics; rather, the invited speakers were asked to comment on a discussion document prepared by the organizers and made available in advance to all the participants³. The latter exchanged points of view in accordance with their specific competencies and expertise. This dialogue continued for months after the conclusion of the workshop, taking the form of the written contributions that we publish here in English in order to facilitate their international circulation.

Before reconstructing the key points that generated the dialogue, we wish to clarify what “transition” means to us. And, indeed, the recent renewal of interest in the theme among sociologists and historians⁴ made it possible to re-discover

* Translation of Viviana Di Giovinazzo.

1. The first part collects theoretical essays from current research; the second part presents some “case studies”.

2. The meeting was held in Milan on October 14, 2013. It is the result of the collaboration between the Dipartimento di Storia Moderna e Contemporanea of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore and the international study group “Red Sucesión”. It is one of the activities of the project “Gobierno de corte y sociedad política: continuidad y cambio en el gobierno de la Monarquía de España en Europa en torno a la Guerra de Sucesión (1665-1725)” (HAR2012-31189), which has been funded by the Spanish Ministry.

3. The participants in the meeting were (in alphabetical order): Antonio Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño, Stefano Boero, Cristina Bravo Lozano, Alessandro Buono, Giuseppe Cirillo, Emanuele C. Colombo, Cinzia Cremonini, Stefano D’Amico, Giuseppe De Luca, Loris De Nardi, Vittoria Fiorelli, Paolo Galimberti, Giacomo Gibertoni, Alessandra Kluzer, Davide Maffi, Silvia Mantini, Maria Anna Noto, Roberto Quirós Rosado, Elena Riva, Flavio Rurale, Marcello Verga.

4. The historiography on the subject is very broad. Here we wish to recall at least some considerations collected in P. Pombeni, “La transizione e le sue fasi. Riflessioni sui problemi

the “fil rouge” of a wide-ranging, long-lasting debate which cannot be detailed here, but which undoubtedly represents our epistemological background.

“Transition” implies the action or the effect of passing from one way of being to another. This concept is associated with the idea of change, transformation, metamorphosis or mutation. Hence, it is connected to the process of gradual change from a system (or paradigm) to another one, in contrast with the concept of “revolution”. Thus, in the various phases of the past and the contemporary age there have been political, social, economic and cultural transitions.

Undoubtedly, the diffusion of interest in the concept of transition and its numerous meanings in history belongs to an intellectual atmosphere⁵, and it is undeniable that our interest in transition springs from an awareness of being ourselves in an historical period of transition. In any event, in our opinion, the very “mutant” nature of history should not lead the reader to conclude that it is made of transition only⁶. Firstly, because this notion would rule out any discussion of the idea of the *Settelzeit*. Secondly, because it would prevent the proper identification of those more or less homogeneous features that characterize long periods of time.

A theory that may help solve the paradox of a history perceived only as “on-going transition”, is the that of the “Axial Ages”. As is well known, this and similar theories are necessary simplifications employed in historical conceptualization in order to support notions of evolution and progress, thus revealing a “teleological” interpretation of the historical process, which sees in the past, above all, the origins of the present⁷. However, beyond these aspects, there are further problems that, no doubt, need to be taken into consideration. For example, there is the question of the historical periodization and the one of the “axial” ages, with the consequent concept of crisis, and the naming of individual “phases” within the same periods. Each one seems to correspond to the main ages according to which, at least in Italy, the historical periodization is divided: the Classic-, Medieval-, Modern- and Contemporary Ages, with historiography concerned with the possibility of identifying for each of them a centre of gravity around which the human dynamics rotate. It seemed to be possible to locate this pivotal axis in the homogeneity of the cultural context and in the political order.

However, within each “axial age” we all contemplate further sub-periods, or thematic areas more restricted in size (e.g., within the Modern Age we have

aperti”, in P. Pombeni – H.G. Haupt (eds.), *La transizione come problema storiografico. Le fasi critiche dello sviluppo della modernità (1494-1973)*, in «Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento», Bologna, il Mulino, 2013, pp. 9-37, and in H.G. Haupt, “Società in transizione: riflessioni su un approccio storico e sulla sua portata”, *ibi*, pp. 437-446.

5. The interest of Transition “è significativo di un clima intellettuale”, *ibi*, p. 238.

6. P. Pombeni, “La transizione e le sue fasi”, p. 19, mentions K. Jaspers, *Origine e senso della storia*, Milano, Edizioni di Comunità, 1972, 1959.

7. R. Stauber, “Modernità? Sulla problematica relativa alla transizione attorno all’anno 1500”, in P. Pombeni – H.G. Haupt (eds.), *La transizione come problema storiografico*, pp. 101-116, here on p. 192; see also M. Verga, “Transizione e storia d’Italia”, *ibi*, pp. 39-52, here on p. 45.

the Age of the Protestant Reformation, the Counter-Reform and the Age of Revolutions), the identification of which depends also on the specific historical events that characterized the different European nations; or, alternatively, on the thematic area that has been taken in consideration (e.g., religious history, art history, political history, literary history, etc.)⁸.

What, therefore, should we understand by “transition”? Does it imply the crisis of a system, or is it something different from that? In our opinion, a crisis indicates a turning point that leads from one age to another. Thus, it does not properly correspond with a transition period but, rather, signals its imminent arrival. Therefore, each transition age is introduced by the crisis of the previous system and displays fairly specific characteristics. A system crisis begins a typically long transition phase during which new elements merge with those of the old system. This transition phase lasts until the new features prevail, even with competition from some old ones. In order to observe such changes we believe that some aspects are particularly important: a) institutional stability/instability of the political frame; b) homogeneity/diversification of the cultural context; c) a degree of articulation of the top *élite*; d) the presence of charismatic and/or representative personalities around whom may arise elements of change.

In our opinion, such considerations apply to every historical context of transition. However, we are persuaded that there may be radical differences from case to case, which require an appropriate space-time contextualisation contemplating a *focus* on the available historical and historiographical interpretations. In our case, in order to analyse the transition between the 17th and 18th centuries, we believe that it is important to start with a detailed study of the historical-historiographical perspective. The indisputable break in European history represented by the transition between the 17th and 18th centuries has received different interpretations among the European schools of thought. For example, according to the Spanish historiographical tradition, the relevant features of the above-mentioned period were the change of dynasty and the War of Succession, but also the consideration that these two events opened the path to the administrative State, which caused the gradual marginalization of the governance of the Court, that is to say, the centre of gravity of the previous system. On the contrary, according to the Italian historiographical school of thought (notwithstanding the small amount of specific research), the transition between the 17th and 18th centuries has been perceived as the starting-point of a change regarded as “epoch-making”. Indeed, the elimination of Spanish governance on the peninsula favoured the arrival of the Age of Reforms.

8. The period between the second half of 17th century and the first half of 18th century hardly fits in the historical categorization of the modern age. It is meaningful that the Anglo-Saxon concept of Renaissance (which, chronologically, is associated with the Italian Rinascimento), actually refers to the first decades of the 17th century. The same period introduces to the “Age of Enlightenment” which, in the English historiographical context is much broader than the French one. Indeed, the French locate “*Siècle des Lumières*” in the central decades of the 18th century, up to French Revolution.

For a long time, Italian historiography saw in the reforms the anticipation of those changes that, through the French Revolutions and Risorgimento, would eventually lead to national unification in the 19th century. However, the effect of this interpretation was to cancel the impact of one of the crucial events of the transition phase between the 17th and 18th centuries, namely, the Spanish war of Succession⁹. Indeed, even if unification was of great importance for Italian domestic history (not least because it caused major changes in the government of the pre-existing Italian States), such an interpretation led to it being understood as simply a complex of events that allowed liberation from Spanish domination. A political situation over which, since the beginning of the 18th century, there flourished a stigmatizing *leyenda negra*¹⁰.

Luckily, this type of interpretation, which prevented grasping the peculiarity of the epoch and studying this period independently, seems to have come to an end, at least theoretically. However, it is necessary to note that there is still a lack of studies that allow one to discover, at a European level, the overall features of this epoch, not only within the particular reality of the Spanish system (for example, in relation to Spanish Italy), but also, more broadly, in the various European countries. In our opinion, there still lacks a perspective that allows for study from within the different realities; a perspective that would be able to organize the relative results in terms of an overall vision; a perspective that would be able to overcome that feeling of “crisis of the European conscience”¹¹ which, even with its engaging reconstruction of the cultural context, seems, at this point, to only partially answer today’s questions. Given these premises, we wish to briefly summarize the key-points around which we tried to orient the dialogue. The structure of the preliminary document prepared for the workshop discussion was composed of four points: 1) the structure and the projects of the

9. With the exception of the contributions in: A. Álvarez-Ossorio – B.J. García García – V. León (eds.), *La pérdida de Europa. La Guerra de Sucesión por la Monarquía de España*, Madrid, Fundación Carlos Amberes, 2007; as for an historiographical analysis of the Italian territories is concerned, see N. Guasti, “La Guerra di Successione spagnola: un bilancio storiografico”, in S. Russo – N. Guasti (eds.), *Il Vicereame austriaco (1707-1734). Tra capitale e province*, Roma, Carocci, 2010, pp. 17-42; an attempt to consider simultaneously the Italian provinces subordinated to Spanish governance, see C. Cremonini, “Proyectos, aspiraciones y vínculos internacionales de las élites italianas entre 1700 y 1714 durante la Guerra de Sucesión al trono de España”, in *Els Tractats 'Utrecht. Clarors i foscors de la pau. La resistència dels Catalans*, Barcelona, Parlament de Catalunya- Museu d'Historia de Catalunya, 2015, pp. 41-50.

10. G. Signorotto, “Aperture e pregiudizi nella storiografia italiana del XIX secolo. Interpretazioni della Lombardia ‘spagnola’”, in «Archivio Storico Lombardo», 2000, pp. 513-560; C. Mozzarelli, “Il nero tunnel della tradizione”, in Id. (ed.), *Grandezze e splendori della Lombardia spagnola 1535-1701*, Milano, Skira, 2002, pp. 15-18; Id., “Eterna o colpevole. Tre schede ottocentesche sull’invenzione dell’identità italiana fra classicità e cattolicesimo”, in Id., (ed.), *Identità italiana e cattolicesimo. Una prospettiva storica*, Roma, Carocci, 2003, pp. 19-45; Id., “Dall’antispagnolismo al revisionismo”, in A. Musi (ed.), *Alle origini di una nazione. Antispagnolismo e identità italiana*, Milano, Guerini e Associati, 2003, pp. 345-368.

11. P. Hazard, *La crise de la conscience européenne*, Paris, Ancienne librairie Furne-Boivin, 1939-1940 (*La crisi della coscienza europea*, Torino, Utet, 2007).

monarchy of Charles II; 2) the dynastic turnover and the Bourbon monarchy; 3) the question of the Italian (and non-Italian) *élite*'s loyalty to the Spanish monarchy; 4) the relationship between the Italian social classes and the Empire.

1) In the last twenty years, Spanish historiography has been able to shed light on the structure and the projects of Charles' monarchy, which was marked by several changes in the political-economic-social dynamics. First of all, one must take into account the consequences of the monarchy's serious financial crisis which, as is known, during the second half of the 17th century, provoked an exceptional rise in the venality of nobility titles, feudalities and offices, especially in some parts of the Spanish system (in Milan, in Naples, in the South American *Reynos*, and then, in the Iberian ones)¹². The admission of supernumeraries in several institutional organizations and the acquisition through venality of the provincial offices was aimed at collecting money for the crown and creating a consensus among the provincial nobility in support of the Queen Marianna of Austria in her conflict with the Greats.

The other major changes which took place during the reign of Charles II are the *mediatizzazione* of the court's government through the ever more important role of the Greats of Spain (the major institutions, court offices, and *consejos*' presidencies were granted exclusively to the titled Greats). The eclipse of the *validimiento* system corresponded to a strengthening of the *Despacho universal*'s secretary¹³, which caused the obfuscation of the old predominance of the Madrilenian *Consejos*. Presumably, all these elements had an effect on the governance and management of the whole body of the poli-synodal monarchy. Another substantial change may be noted in international policy. The new alliances created by Charles II seem to stand in contrast with the continuity of devotional and cult practices through which the Monarchy confirmed its aspiration to be the guarantor of the Catholic faith. In contrast with the traditional alignments there is, for example, Charles II's support to William of Orange after the outbreak of the Glorious Revolution in England and in the Augustan League against France. In that case, *la raison d'État* posed serious obstacles to the model of the Christian prince, which gave rise to a new direction in the relationship between policy and faith¹⁴. Such a fact must be taken into account if one wishes to understand whether the Spanish Monarchy of Charles II was a "model" of governance for Europe between the 17th and 18th centuries, and whether some aspects of such a "model" survived the political and territorial re-arrangement after 1713. Recent research has begun to shed light on how the

12. A. Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño, *La república de las parentelas. El Estado de Milán en la monarquía de Carlos II*, Mantova, Gianluigi Arcari Editore, 2002.

13. One of the issues that we believed important to put at the centre of the discussion is if the replacement of a *valido* with a *privado* or prime minister, as happened for the case of the Duke of Medinaceli, turned into a sort of "bureaucratization" of the king's favourite.

14. C. Bravo Lozano, *Tierras de Misión. La política confesional de la Monarquía de España en las Islas Británicas, 1660-1702*, PhD unpublished dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 2014.

venality practice among the offices in Italy not only did not stop after the end of the Spanish War of Succession, but actually continued under the governance of Charles VI;¹⁵ it is possible to find traces of such practice in Milan even during the first years of the government of Maria Teresa¹⁶.

2) As for the dynastic turnover that occurred in Spain after the death of Charles II on November 1, 1700, one should consider that it was not an unexpected event, but rather a long-feared occurrence that gave rise to a major international *querelle* for the succession, and which had influenced Spanish domestic life as well as the European international dynamics since the Sixties and the Seventies of the 17th century — even if, in a less evident way, it also involved the domestic life of the ancient Italian States. The way in which it all happened still awaits a full and detailed reconstruction bringing together the various parts of the Peninsula. All over Europe, the parties and factions favourable to either the Habsburg or the Bourbon succession were active; the dynastic turnover brought to the Spanish throne a French prince who gave an executive impulse to administrative life, lessening the influence of courtesan dynamics over the political sphere and compressing the traditional autonomy of the monarchy's territories.

The impact that it provoked within each specific area has not yet been properly investigated. In our opinion, there still lacks a close reflection on the effects that the War of Succession and the death of Louis XIV had on the French monarchy, as well as on the overall European context. Our workshop raised various questions about the consequences of the dynastic turnover, especially taking into account those outcomes of the War of Succession that, in certain contexts, caused a further dynastic turnover (e.g., in Milan, Naples, Sardinia and Sicily). For example, how did the monarchic model of Charles II blend with the Bourbon one at the local level? Is it possible to assess the burden on the leading *élites* of the new tendencies in governance?

To what extent did the local *élites* interact with the new dynasty? What was the fate of the man of government and of female figures? Is it possible to see the policies and continuity (or discontinuity) of a social model and political project through their personal life events? What was the consequence of the change and/or continuities for the arts and cultural models?

3) In the Italian historiographical context, the issue of Spanish loyalty has raised a certain interest¹⁷. In organizing the discussion, we wanted to emphasize that the reason for the provincial *élites*' loyalty to the Spanish System was also connected with Charles II's testament, which assigned local governance to the *naturali*. At the outbreak of the War of Succession, this became a decisive

15. R. Quiros Rosado, *Constantia et fortitudine. La corte de Carlos III y el gobierno de Italia, 1706-1714*, PhD unpublished dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 2015.

16. ASMí, *Dispacci Reali*, cartt. 202-208.

17. R. Quirós – C. Bravo (eds.), *Los hilos de Penélope. Lealtad y fidelidades en la monarquía de España, 1648-1714*, Valencia, Albatros, 2015.

element in the relationship between the various parts of the Spanish system and a Bourbon government characterized by high centralism.

Even if it was more a theoretical than a real guarantee, one should bear in mind that, probably, it was also connected to the instances that emerged from the bottom during Charles II's sovereignty, when the local social classes asked (but did not obtain) to be assured the monopoly of the local administration. This happened at Solsona, Gand, in Milan, in Franche-Comté and in some Sicilian towns during the Messina Revolt¹⁸.

4) In the necessity to make a connection between the history of the individual local realities and that of the broader European horizon, we wanted to pay particular attention to the connections between the leading local social classes and the Empire during the War of Succession. Such classes were favoured by the robust relationships that Vienna had always had with the small Italian dynasties of the imperial feudalities (which, in turn, were connected with the court of the Italian *potentadillos*)¹⁹, and which the Cesarean court was able to reinforce by opening new connections of *patronazgo* with other Italian *élite* groups already during the War of the Augustan League (i.e., *Guerra de los nueve años*).

Indeed, when the Spanish crisis became evident, the imperial court grew anxious to find in Italy and in Spain personalities willing to support the legitimacy of the succession of a Habsburg to the Madrilean throne. However, the issue of the relationships between the Empire and the other European territories connected with Spain still awaits clarification. Again, in an international perspective, we wished to recall the necessity of keeping in mind that the Italian *élites* had as many robust connections with France, in part engaged during the brief but intense period of the Bourbon domination of the beginning of the 16th century, due to the close dependency between the Madrilean court of young Philip V and the Parisian one of the old and charismatic Sun King.

18. L. Ribot, “*Ira regis o clementia*. El caso de Mesina y la respuesta a la rebelión en la Monarquía de España”, in B. García – A. Álvarez-Ossorio (eds.), *Visperas de Sucesión. Europa y la monarquía de Carlos II*, Madrid, Fundación Carlos de Amberes, 2015, pp. 129-158.

19. As for the relationship between the Italian States and the Empire during the transition between the 17th and 18th centuries, see C. Cremonini, “La rivolta di Castiglione delle Stiviere negli atti della Plenipotenza dei feudi imperiali italiani”, in M. Marocchi (ed.), *Castiglione delle Stiviere. Un principato imperiale nell’Italia padana (sec. XVI-XVIII)*, Bulzoni, Roma, 1996, pp. 91-116; M. Schnetzger – M. Verga (eds.), *L’Impero e l’Italia nella prima età moderna*, in «Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento», Bologna, il Mulino, 2006; C. Cremonini, “Tra Austrias e Borbone: i feudi di Lunigiana durante la Guerra di Successione spagnola”, in *Feudi di Lunigiana tra Impero, Spagna e Stati italiani (XV-XVIII secolo)*, in «Memorie della Accademia Lunigianese di Scienze “Giovanni Capellini”», 2008, pp. 115-132; C. Cremonini – R. Musso (eds.), *I feudi imperiali in Italia tra XV e XVIII secolo*, Roma, Bulzoni, 2010; C. Cremonini, *Impero e feudi italiani tra Cinque e Settecento*, Roma, Bulzoni, 2012 (e-book); Ead., “Una piccola corte alla fine della sua storia. Vicende internazionali e conflitti familiari a Mirandola tra 1690 e 1711”, in C. Continisio – M. Fantoni (eds.), *Testi e contesti. Per Amedeo Quondam*, Roma, Bulzoni Editore, 2015, pp. 393-411.