

LOS SECRETOS MECANISMOS DE LAS CORTES: FACCIONES EN LA EUROPA MODERNA

MONOGRÁFICO

2



REVISTA LIBRODELACORTE.ES

Monográfico 2, año 7 (2015), ISSN: 1989-6425

INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO "LA CORTE EN EUROPA" (IULCE-UAM)
MADRID, 2015

REVISTA LIBROSDELACORTE.ES

CONSEJO CIENTÍFICO

Instituto Universitario “La Corte en Europa” (IULCE-UAM)

Prof. Dr. José Martínez Millán, Director, Catedrático de Historia Moderna, UAM
Profª. Drª. Concepción Camarero Bullón, Subdirectora, Catedrática de Geografía Humana, UAM.
Prof. Dr. Mariano de la Campa Gutiérrez, Secretario, Profesor titular de Literatura española, UAM

Prof. Dr. Tomás Albaladejo Mayordomo, Catedrático de Teoría de la Literatura y Literatura Comparada, UAM
Prof. Dr. Antonio Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño, Profesor Titular de Historia Moderna, UAM.
Prof. Dr. Carlos de Ayala Martínez, Catedrático de Historia Medieval, UAM
Prof. Dr. Lorenzo Bartoli, Profesor de lingüística, lenguas modernas, UAM
Prof. Dr. Agustín Bustamante García, Catedrático de Historia del Arte, UAM
Prof. Dr. Emilio Crespo Güemes, Catedrático de Filología clásica, UAM
Profª. Drª. Amelia Fernández Rodríguez, Titular de Teoría de la Literatura y Literatura Comparada, UAM
Prof. Dr. Teodosio Fernández Rodríguez, Catedrático de Literatura
Prof. Dr. Jesús Gómez Gómez, Catedrático de Literatura Española, UAM
Profª. Drª. José Luis Mora García, Profesor Titular de Historia del Pensamiento Español, UAM
Prof. Dr. Fernando Marías Franco, Catedrático de Historia del Arte, UAM
Profª. Drª. Gloria Mora Rodríguez, Profesora de Historia Antigua, UAM
Prof. Dr. Nicolás Ortega Cantero, Catedrático de Geografía Humana, UAM
Prof. Dr. Antonio Rey Hazas, Catedrático de Literatura Española, UAM
Prof. Dr. Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, Profesor titular de Historia Moderna, UAM
Prof. Dr. Javier Rodríguez Pequeño, Titular de Teoría de la Literatura y Literatura Comparada, UAM
Profª. Drª. Jesusa Vega, Profesora titular de Historia de Arte, UAM
Prof. Dr. Ángel Rivero Rodríguez, Profesor titular de Ciencia Política y Relaciones Internacionales, UAM
Prof. Dr. Virgilio Pinto Crespo, Profesor titular de Historia Moderna, UAM
Profª. Drª. Inés Fernández-Ordoñez, Catedrática de Filología Española, UAM
Prof. Dr. Fernando Hermida Blas, Profesor contratado doctor de Historia del Pensamiento Español, UAM

EQUIPO EDITORIAL

Director

Prof. Dr. Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, UAM-IULCE (sección Historia)

Subdirector

Prof. Dr. Jesús Gómez, UAM-IULCE (sección Literatura)

Vocales

Profª. Drª. Elena Alcalá Donegani, UAM (sección Historia del Arte y Cultura Visual)
Profª. Drª. Mª Teresa Carrasco Lazareno, UAM (sección Paleografía, Diplomática y Numismática)
Profª. Drª. Amelia Fernández, UAM-IULCE (sección Comunicación-Retórica-Oratoria)
Dra. Mercedes Simal López, MLG (sección Arte, Patrimonio y Museología)
Dr. Eduardo Torres Corominas, UAM-IULCE (sección Libros-Reseñas)

Secretaria de redacción y responsable de diseño

Raquel Salvado Bartolomé, UC3M



Librosdelacorte.es

ISSN: 1989-6425

Redacción, dirección e intercambios:
Instituto Universitario “La Corte en Europa” (IULCE-UAM)
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras,
Módulo VI bis, despacho 111
C/ Francisco Tomás y Valiente, 1
Ciudad Universitaria de Cantoblanco, 28049, Madrid, España.
Correo electrónico: info@librosdelacorte.es o secretaria@librosdelacorte.es
Teléfono: +34 – 91 497 5132

SUMARIO
Revista Librosdelacorte.es, Monográfico 2, año 7 (2015)
ISSN: 1989-6425

PONENCIAS

I. THE SPANISH FACTIONS: FIFTH-COLUMN OR POLITICAL PARTY AT EARLY MODERN COURTS?

- RUBÉN GONZÁLEZ CUERVA
From the empress to the ambassador: the “Spanish Faction” and the labyrinths of the Imperial Court of Prague, 1575-1585 11
- ESTHER JIMÉNEZ PABLO
Oratorian spirituality in the Roman Court and its incidence on the pro-spanish faction 26
- VALENTINA CALDARI
‘There is no Friendship among princes but for their owne interests’. Spanish faction at James I’s Court, 1603-1625 39
- LUIS TERCERO CASADO
A fluctuating ascendancy: the “Spanish Party” at the Imperial Court of Vienna (1631-1659) 54

II. INTO THE FACTION: MEDIATORS AND FEMININE POWER AT EARLY SEVENTEETH CENTURY COURTS

- GIUSEPPE MZOREK ELISZEZYNSKI
Service to the King and loyalty to the Duke: the Castro Family in the Faction of the Duke of Lerma 68
- SILVANO GIORDANO
Power management at the Roman Court at the beginning of the 17th century: the case of Cardinal Giovanni Garzia Millini 80
- FRÉDÉRIQUE SICARD
Continuity and identity at the Court of France: parties around Queen Marie de Medici and Queen Anne of Austria 95

THE SECRET MECHANISMS OF COURTS: FACTIONS IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE

Edited by Rubén González Cuerva and Valentina Caldari

This monographic issue is based on the contributions presented at two academic meetings marked by a common denominator, that of reflecting on courtly factions as a means to analyse early modern politics. In brief, to what extent can we change our perception of how power was managed and decisions taken if we start from the informal groups surrounding the sovereign? We collect here the results of the panel *The Spanish Factions: Fifth Column or Political Party in Early Modern Courts?*, held in Modena in June 2014 as part of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies. In addition, we include selected texts from the congress *A Europe of Courts, a Europe of Factions*, held in Rome in November 2014. In the first part, the essays question the existence of Spanish factions (which is to say funded by or loyal to the King of Spain) in various European courts and consider the ways in which they developed their activities. In the second part, specific case-studies are taken into account in order to demonstrate the inner workings of a faction and its evolution under female leadership. The discussion forms part of the Marie Curie Action FP7-MC-IEF 328536, which thus has its results partly published and opens opportunities for discussion within the academic community.

Since Jacob Burckhardt's seminal work, the existence of continuous diplomatic relations through permanent embassies is considered as one of the pillars of modern politics. In his *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860), the origin of this trend is localised between the small principalities of northern Italy in the second half of the fifteenth century. Such a system would spread throughout Europe during the sixteenth century to establish a system of international relations. This line was followed by subsequent books on diplomatic history, from the traditional book by Garrett Mattingly to that of Matthew Anderson.¹ Most recent contributions on the subject, however, have abandoned the institutionalist approach to shift the emphasis on informal relations and negotiations: in the early modern court, the key element of power was not the office (being an ambassador or a councillor) but rather the service (the compensation for graces and favours). These kind of relationships are recently being studied using the notion of *cultural transfer* as a starting point.² In line with the

¹ Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964); Matthew S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450-1919* (London-New York: Longman, 1994).

² Marieke von Bernstorff, Susanne Kubersky-Piredda and Tobias Daniels, eds., *L'arte del dono. Scambi artistici e diplomazia tra Italia e Spagna, 1550 – 1650* (Milano: Silvana, 2013).

proliferation of research on alternatives to official politics (the study of lobbies, soft power, and micro-politics),³ we apply this concept to the decision-making process.

Through this approach, we intend to present a social history of diplomacy, by inserting it in the space of the court where political communication occurred. Therefore, we do not focus on the institutions but instead on the people who allowed them to work, as well as on the set of factional relationships in which their actions took place. At this point, it is necessary to explain what is meant by 'faction'. The term appears in the political language of the early modern period, and it is therefore more fitting, despite being more problematic, than the most common notion of *network*, when discussing informal alliances. The faction involved a social network based on a system of patronage, which is to say relations between patrons (such as the King of Spain, who used to have a *broker* in other courts) and clients (courtiers or clergymen). In addition, the court faction relied on gaining and keeping the Prince's favour; thus we could simply define it as "an informal group seeking power."

The terms "faction" and "party" appear interchangeably in European contemporary sources, but we prefer "faction", mostly to prevent confusion with the more recent concept of (political) party. The etymology of faction comes from the military vocabulary, and refers to mutinous troops; then, more generally, to a group following a specific opinion, side, or bias. In our case, the factions at court were born in the Middle Ages from urban bands (which remained in early modern cities as well), and evolved within the court to have a clear arbitrator (the prince) and to be, in principle, nonviolent.⁴

Although factions seem a constant in political life, there was little theoretical reflection concerning them because they were seen as a disease of the body politic testifying to a lack of harmony.⁵ Erasmus of Rotterdam and Antonio de Guevara criticised factions as a sign of the corrupt and selfish life of the courts, while Giovanni Botero started from this assumption to make such weaknesses beneficial to others. This more pragmatic line was followed by Francis Bacon, who accepted factions as part of the political game.⁶

³ Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004); Wolfgang Reinhard, "Die Nase der Kleopatra. Geschichte im Lichte mikropolitischer Forschung. Ein Versuch," *Historische Zeitschrift* 293/3 (2011): 631-666; Jeremy Black, *A History of Diplomacy* (London: Reaktion Books, 2011); Diana Carrió-Invernizzi, "A New Diplomatic History and the Networks of Spanish Diplomacy in the Baroque Era," *The International History Review*, 36/4 (2014): 603-618.

⁴ Sebastián de Covarrubias, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* (Madrid: Luis Sanchez, 1611), fol. 394v; Klaus von Beyme, "Partei, Faction," in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, ed. Otto Brunner et al. (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978), IV, 677-733.

⁵ Bartolo di Sassoferrato, *Tractatus de Guelphis et Ghibellinis. Questiones et tractatus*, ca. 1350, in Diego Quaglioni, ed., *Politica e diritto nel Trecento italiano: con l'edizione critica dei trattati "De Guelphis et Ghibellinis", "De regimine civitatis" e "De tyranno"* (Firenze: Olschki, 1983), 131-141.

⁶ Antonio de Guevara, *Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea* (Barcelona: Hyeronimo Margarit, 1613, 1st ed. 1539), 44-45; Giovanni Botero, *Della ragione di Stato* (Venice: Gioliti, 1589),

Aside from the theoretical literature, what is interesting in investigating factions is the game of perceptions around them. While the alleged members of a faction relied on the language of service and friendship, their enemies discredited them as corrupt and disloyal. In the background, a set of conflicting loyalties was shaped: they operated at different levels and had to be renegotiated according to the occasion. Therefore, to research factions allows us to understand the features and limitations of the political society in early modern courts.

LOS SECRETOS MECANISMOS DE LAS CORTES: FACCIONES EN LA EUROPA MODERNA

Coord. Rubén González Cuerva y Valentina Caldari

El presente número monográfico se basa en las contribuciones de dos encuentros científicos marcados por un denominador común: reflexionar sobre las facciones cortesanas como elemento de análisis de la política de la Edad Moderna. Dicho de otro modo: ¿hasta qué punto podemos cambiar nuestra percepción de cómo se gestionaba el poder y se tomaban las decisiones si partimos de los grupos informales que rodeaban a los soberanos?. Recogemos aquí los resultados del panel *The Spanish Factions: Fifth Column or political Party at Early Modern Courts?* presentado en Modena en junio de 2014 en el marco de la 45th Annual Meeting of the Association for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies. Además, se incluyen textos seleccionados del congreso *A Europe of Courts, a Europe of Factions*, celebrado en Roma en noviembre de 2014. El primer bloque se pregunta por la existencia de facciones españolas (en el sentido de financiadas por o leales al rey de España) en otras cortes europeas y cómo desarrollaban sus actividades. En la segunda parte se toman casos más particulares para comprobar el funcionamiento interno de una facción y su evolución bajo liderazgos femeninos. La discusión forma parte de la Marie Curie Action FP7-MC-IEF 328536, que de este modo ve parcialmente publicados sus resultados y sus posibilidades de discusión para la comunidad científica.

Desde los tiempos de Jacob Burckhardt, la existencia de relaciones diplomáticas continuas a través de embajadas permanentes se considera uno de los signos de la política moderna. En su *La civilización del Renacimiento en Italia* (1860), esta tendencia se localiza entre los pequeños principados del norte de Italia en la segunda mitad del siglo XV. Tal sistema se extendería a lo largo de Europa durante el siglo XVI hasta constituir un sistema de relaciones internacionales. Esta línea explicativa fue seguida en los manuales al uso de historia de la diplomacia, desde el clásico de Garrett Mattingly hasta el de Mathew Anderson¹. Las propuestas más recientes, en cambio, han abandonado el enfoque de raíz institucionalista para poner el énfasis en las relaciones informales y la negociación: en la corte moderna, el elemento clave de poder no era el oficio (ser embajador o consejero) sino el servicio (la contraprestaciones de acciones por gracias y favores). Este tipo de relaciones se está estudiando recientemente de forma predominante a partir de la

¹ Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964); Matthew S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450-1919* (London-New York: Longman, 1994).

noción de transfer cultural². Nosotros lo proponemos para el proceso de toma de decisiones, en línea con la proliferación de investigaciones sobre las alternativas a la política oficial: el estudio de *lobbies*, el *soft power* o la micropolítica³.

Desde este acercamiento se pretende una historia social de la diplomacia, insertándola en el espacio cortesano en el que se producía la comunicación política. Por ello, no ponemos el foco en las instituciones sino en las personas que las hacían funcionar, así como en el conjunto de relaciones en que fluían sus acciones, dentro de la noción de facciones. Llegados a este punto se impone responder a qué se entiende por facción. Es un término que aparece en el lenguaje político de la época moderna, por lo que resulta más ajustado, aunque también más problemático, que el más habitual de *network* para hablar de alianzas informales. La facción implica una red social fundamentada en un sistema de patronazgo; es decir, en relaciones clientelares entre patrones (como el Rey de España, que solía disponer de un *broker* en otras cortes) y clientes (cortesianos o eclesiásticos). Además, la facción cortesana se basaba en la búsqueda y mantenimiento de la gracia del príncipe, por lo que podríamos definirla simplemente como “grupo informal que busca poder”.

Los términos de “facción” y “partido” aparecen indistintamente en las fuentes de los principales idiomas europeos, pero preferimos “facción” sobre todo para evitar confusiones con el concepto reciente de partido. La etimología de facción proviene del vocabulario militar, como tropa amotinada, y se definía generalmente como el grupo que seguía una opinión, bando o parcialidad. En nuestro caso, en la corte: nacieron en la Edad Media a partir de los bandos urbanos (que permanecieron también en las ciudades modernas), y evolucionaron en el marco cortesano por contar con un árbitro claro (el príncipe) y ser, en principio, incruentas⁴.

A pesar de que las facciones parecen una constante de la vida política, existió poca reflexión teórica sobre ellas porque se veían como una enfermedad del cuerpo político que indicaba la falta de armonía⁵. Erasmo de Rotterdam o Antonio de Guevara criticaban las facciones como muestra de la vida corrupta y egoísta de las cortes, mientras que Giovanni Botero partía de esa constatación para tomar tales

² Marieke von Bernstorff, Susanne Kubersky-Piredda and Tobias Daniels, eds., *L'arte del dono. Scambi artistici e diplomazia tra Italia e Spagna, 1550 – 1650* (Milano: Silvana, 2013).

³ Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004); Wolfgang Reinhard, “Die Nase der Kleopatra. Geschichte im Lichte mikropolitischer Forschung. Ein Versuch,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 293/3 (2011): 631-666; Jeremy Black, *A History of Diplomacy* (London: Reaktion Books, 2011); Diana Carrió-Invernizzi, “A New Diplomatic History and the Networks of Spanish Diplomacy in the Baroque Era,” *The International History Review*, 36/4 (2014): 603-618.

⁴ Sebastián de Covarrubias, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* (Madrid: Luis Sanchez, 1611), fol. 394v; Klaus von Beyme, “Partei, Faction,” in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, ed. Otto Brunner et al. (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978), IV, 677-733.

⁵ Bartolo di Sassoferrato, *Tractatus de Guelphis et Ghibellinis. Questiones et tractatus*, ca. 1350, in Diego Quaglioni, ed., *Politica e diritto nel Trecento italiano: con l'edizione critica dei trattati "De Guelphis et Gebellinis", "De regimine civitatis" e "De tyranno"* (Firenze: Olschki, 1983), 131-141.

debilidades en beneficio de otros actores. Esta línea más pragmática fue seguida por Francis Bacon, quien las aceptó como elemento del juego político⁶.

Al margen de la literatura teórica, lo interesante de investigar facciones es el juego de percepciones que llevaba unido. Mientras que los supuestos miembros de una facción se basaban en un lenguaje de servicio y amistad, sus enemigos los desacreditaban como corruptos y desleales. En el fondo se plasmaba un juego de lealtades contrapuestas en discusión, que operaban a distintos niveles y tenían que ser negociadas según la ocasión. Por ello, investigar las facciones permite entender las limitaciones y móviles de la sociedad política de la corte moderna

⁶ Antonio de Guevara, *Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea* (Barcelona: Hyeronimo Margarit, 1613, 1ª ed. 1539), 44-45; Giovanni Botero, *Della ragione di Stato* (Venezia: Gioliti, 1589), www.bibliotecaitaliana.it (consultado el 14 de mayo de 2015), cap. 6.8.

FROM THE EMPRESS TO THE AMBASSADOR: THE “SPANISH FACTION” AND THE LABYRINTHS OF THE IMPERIAL COURT OF PRAGUE, 1575-1585*

Por Rubén González Cuerva
(German Historical Institute in Rome -IULCE)

ABSTRACT

Since Charles V's abdication in 1556, the House of Austria was divided into two branches. Philip II of Spain intended to create around his relatives in the Holy Empire a group of courtiers and counsellors linked to the Spanish monarchy through ties of loyalty and service. That “Spanish Faction” needed a prestigious patron to act as a broker. Empress Mary of Austria, sister of Philip II, wife of Maximilian II and mother of Rudolf II played the role of mediator. When she decided to return to Spain in 1581, her absence meant a cataclysm for the Spanish network in the Empire. The new ambassador, Guillén de San Clemente, introduced a significant change: since then, ambassadors enjoyed greater authority and autonomy to win and reward courtiers for serving to the Spanish King, but the limitations linked to ambassadors' lower rank led to significant consequences in the management of affairs.

KEYWORDS: Philip II, Mary of Austria, Rudolf II, House of Austria, Guillén de San Clemente

DE LA EMPERATRIZ AL EMBAJADOR: LA “FACCIÓN ESPAÑOLA” Y LOS LABERINTOS DE LA CORTE IMPERIAL EN PRAGA, 1575-1585

RESUMEN

Desde la abdicación de Carlos V en 1556, la Casa de Austria se dividió en dos ramas. Felipe II se esforzó en conformar en torno a sus parientes en el Imperio un grupo de cortesanos y consejeros que mantuviera vínculos de lealtad y servicio con la Monarquía hispana. Esta “facción española” precisaba de una cabeza de alcurnia que pudiera ejercer eficazmente como mediadora. Tal persona fue la emperatriz María de Austria, hermana de Felipe II, esposa de Maximiliano II y madre

* Abbreviations: AGS (Archivo General de Simancas); ASMo (Archivio di Stato di Modena); BL (British Library); *CODOIN* (*Colección de documentos inéditos para la Historia de España*, Madrid, 1842–1895, 113 vols); E (Estado); HHStA (Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna); *NBD* (*Nuntiaturlberichte aus Deutschland*, 1892-2013, 42 vols); SDK (Spanien-Diplomatische Korrespondenz). This article was written thanks to the FP7-MC-IEF 328536.

de Rodolfo II. Cuando en 1581 ella abandonó el Imperio para retirarse a España, su ausencia significó un cataclismo para la red española. El nuevo embajador, Guillén de San Clemente, marcó un sustancial cambio a embajadores con mucha iniciativa y margen de discrecionalidad para ganar voluntades. A la vez, las limitaciones asociadas a su rango llevaron a un nuevo estilo de negociación.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Felipe II, María de Austria, Rodolfo II, Casa de Austria, Guillén de San Clemente

FROM THE EMPRESS TO THE AMBASSADOR: THE “SPANISH FACTION” AND THE LABYRINTHS OF THE IMPERIAL COURT OF PRAGUE, 1575- 1585

Por Rubén González Cuerva
(German Historical Institute in Rome -IULCE)

I. Dynastic diplomacy

Ferdinand I and his nephew Philip II began to rule the Austrian and Spanish Monarchy respectively in 1555-6, but they did not interchange ambassadors until 1558.¹ Such a delay was not a symptom of poor relations, but rather the proof of a familial style of negotiation. Throughout the previous decades, Emperor Charles V had maintained close ties with his relatives Ferdinand I in Austria, Mary of Hungary in the Low Countries and Philip II in Spain through direct correspondence and informal agents *ad hoc*.² In contrast, sending ordinary ambassadors was often regarded mistrustfully as the delivery of an honourable spy. The successful, though imperfect, alliance between the two branches of the House of Austria needed skilful ambassadors, agents and mediators, but the clue of the system was elsewhere, in the personal entente between the members of the dynasty. Along his reign, Philip II had to manage with his uncle Ferdinand I, his cousin Maximilian II, and his nephew Rudolf II. Every individual had different preferences and styles of negotiating, but a factor of continuity remained: the mediation of Empress Mary of Austria (1528-1603), wife of Maximilian II and loyal sister of Philip II. She represented the authority and patronage of his Spanish brother as an active mediator.

Mary of Austria arrived to the imperial court in 1552, much before any ambassadors, and remained there until 1581, while the successive ambassadors she dealt with (Count of Luna, Lord of Chantonnay, Count of Monteagudo, and Juan de Borja) held the office for only around five years. Aside from the continuity of her presence, Mary had an undisputed ceremonial position as second role at court after his husband Emperor Maximilian II and then her son Rudolf II. The ambassadors of Philip II were far from being marginal figures; they were granted special rights of access to the Emperor, who relied on them as intimate counsellors, and built a network of informants, at times more efficient than the Emperor's one.³ In 1577, the

¹ José Carlos Rueda Fernández and Friedrich Edelmayer, “Del caos a la normalidad: los inicios de la diplomacia moderna entre el Sacro Imperio y la Monarquía Hispánica,” in *Actas de la IV Reunión Científica de la Asociación Española de Historia Moderna*, ed. Pablo Fernández Albaladejo *et al.* (Alicante: Universidad de Alicante, 1997), I, 631-640; Pavel Marek, *La embajada española en la corte imperial (1558-1641). Figuras de los embajadores y estrategias clientelares* (Prague: Karolinum, 2013), 53-55.

² Christopher F. Laferl, *Die Kultur der Spanier in Österreich unter Ferdinand I. 1522–1564* (Wien: Böhlau, 1997), 62-76, 120-131.

³ Count of Monteagudo to Philip II, Vienna, 19 January 1572, in *CODOIN*, CX, 348-356; Idem to Luis de Requesens y Zúñiga, Vienna, 6 October 1574, AGS, E, leg. 671, n. 47; Xavier Sellés-Ferrando, *Spanisches Österreich* (Wien: Böhlau, 2004), 231-232.

Ferrarese representative considered them the most important ministers at court.⁴ However, they could not escalate from that rank. By contrast, Mary had within reach the means and occasions to develop an able interlocution with the Emperor and his ministers thanks to her prerogatives in court life. The early modern court was a space of power and thus a space of communication.⁵ Empress Mary had frank and intimate access to the Emperor and her own platform of power, her household, through which she was able to co-opt and reward individuals with advantageous marriages, offices and pensions.⁶

II. Mary of Austria and her Household in life of Maximilian II (1548-1576)

The Spanish ambassadors were able to develop their duties primarily thanks to the backing of the Empress and her entourage. To have a clearer idea on proportions, the embassy (excluding lower servants) employed 3-5 officials and at times was virtually inexistent, whereas Mary's household included around one hundred individuals. Financing and monitoring this retinue was a chief interest of Philip II, who deliberately used it as his bridgehead in the imperial court. According to the marriage contract of 1548, Charles V and thereafter Philip II agreed to send Mary an annual allowance. In contrast with the dominant ambient of mid-16th century Vienna, the household of Mary was an exotic island of severe Catholic theologians and Spanish aristocrats.⁷ This striking profile was very different from Maximilian II's entourage: to the scandal of Mary, he was confessionally near to Lutheran positions and expelled almost every Spaniard in his service. He had just reasons to resent the influence that they exerted as a lobby on behalf of Philip II over both his father Ferdinand I and his wife Mary. Maximilian's attempts to transform Mary's household were not a domestic issue but instead led to a diplomatic crisis. Philip II ordered two missions (Venegas de Figueroa in 1555 and Count of Luna in 1560) to reform Mary's household and reach an agreement with Maximilian II on this issue.⁸

⁴ Valentino Florio to Alfonso II, Duke of Ferrara, Prague, 26 April 1577, ASMo, Germania, 34, n. 10.

⁵ Mark Hengerer, "Court and communication: integrating the nobility at the imperial court (1620-65)," *The Court Historian* 5 (2000): 223-229; Rudolf Schlögl, "Der frühneuzeitliche Hof als Kommunikationsraum. Interaktionstheoretische Perspektiven der Forschung," in *Geschichte und Systemtheorie: Exemplarische Fallstudien*, ed. Frank Becker (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2004), 185-226; Ronald Asch, "The Princely Court and Political Space in Early Modern Europe," in *Political Space in Pre-industrial Europe*, ed. Beat Kümin (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), 43-60.

⁶ Count of Monteagudo to Philip II, Vienna, 14 April 1576, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 27.

⁷ Rafaela Rodríguez Raso, ed., *Maximiliano de Austria gobernador de Carlos V en España: cartas al emperador* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1963), 30, 273-6; Laferl, *Die Kultur der Spanier*, 125-131.

⁸ Charles V to Philip II, Brussels, 16 February 1554, in *Corpus documental de Carlos V*, ed. Manuel Fernández Álvarez (Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1973 – 1981), IV, 653; Luis Venegas to Charles V and Philip II, Vienna, 10 October 1555, AGS, E, leg. 649, n. 38; Count of Luna to Philip II, Vienna, 12 January 1560, in *CODOIN*, XCVIII, 109; R. Ceñal Lorente, SJ, "La emperatriz María de Austria: su personalidad política y religiosa" (Doctoral Thesis, University Complutense of Madrid, 1991), 425; Joseph F. Patrouch, *Queen's Apprentice. Archduchess Elizabeth, Empress Maria, the Habsburgs, and the Holy Roman Empire, 1554–1569* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 32-33.

The two crucial sections of Mary's household were her chapel and her chamber. The first one constituted a fine show of Spanish Catholic orthodox theologians; for example, her confessor Francisco de Córdoba was also a leading religious counsellor of Emperor Ferdinand I and took part on his behalf in the last session of the Council of Trent.⁹ Meanwhile, in Mary's chamber several ladies-in-waiting, from both Spain and Central Europe, found a place. Mary took full benefit of her role as patron and displayed an intense activity finding high-rank husbands for her ladies-in-waiting. Furthermore, she warranted those marriages through a generous dowry, which was paid by her brother Philip II.¹⁰ Thanks to this longstanding and discreet activity, three out of the four high officials of Rudolf II's household were married to former ladies-in-waiting of Empress Mary.¹¹

The familiar alliances and the sharing of patronage favoured a certain group conscience among these courtiers, who were characterised as zealous Catholics and loyal servers of both branches of the dynasty. Nevertheless, they did not refer to themselves as members of a faction because it was a discredited label, but as friends.¹² Apart from the Spanish patronage, other courtiers were regarded as «dependents» of the Pope,¹³ but the reality is that both groups tended to intertwine and that no other external patron was as generous and present as the Spanish King. The two other sovereigns continuously accredited in the imperial court were the Pope and the Republic of Venice, but their initiatives of patronage (courteous letters and gastronomic gifts) were very far from the vast array of honours and money granted by the Spanish King.¹⁴

⁹ Stefan Steinherz, ed., *Nuntius Delfino 1562 - 1563*, in *NBD*, II/3, 491-495; Klaus Ganzer, "Ein unbequemer Reformier am Rande des Konzils von Trient: Der Franziskaner Franziskus von Córdoba als Berater Kaiser Ferdinands I.," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 104/2 (1984): 309-347. In the chapel of Mary were also the composer Mateo Flecha and the Hebraist and lexicographer Bartolomé Valverde. Michael Zywiets, "Spanien, das Haus Habsburg und Prag: Las ensaladas de Flecha (Prag 1581) und ihr Kontext," *Anuario musical* 64 (2009): 47-56; Francisco Cantera Burgos, "Bartolomé Valverde y su desconocido léxico hebraico," in *Homenaje a Juan Prado* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1975), 607-643.

¹⁰ Bianca María Lindorfer, "Las redes familiares de la aristocracia austriaca y los procesos de transferencia cultural entre Madrid y Viena, 1550-1700," in *Las redes del imperio: élites sociales en la articulación de la Monarquía Hispánica, 1492-1714*, ed. Bartolomé Yun Casalilla (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2009), 265, 272-5.

¹¹ High Steward Adam von Dietrichstein married with Margarita Folch de Cardona, Lord Chamberlain Wolfgang Rumpf with María de Arco y Meneses, and Master of the Horse Claudio Trivulzio with Catalina Laso de Castilla. These women were, respectively, a Catalanian, an Italian and a Castilian, and born vassals of the Spanish King.

¹² Juan Manrique to Adam von Dietrichstein, Vienna, 4 November 1568, HHStA, SDK, 7/35, fol. 12. In this letter Jiri Pruskovsky, Alonso Gámiz, and Wratislav von Pernstein, noted members of the pro-Spanish group, are mentioned as common friends of the correspondents.

¹³ Valentino Florio to Alfonso II, Duke of Ferrara, Prague, 20 April 1577, ASMo, Germania, 34, n. 9

¹⁴ Cardinal Borromeo to nuncio Delfino, Rome, 22 August 1562, *NBD*, II/2, 110; *Relazion del Nobile homo S. Zuan Michiel Cavallier*, Venice, 22 July 1564, in Joseph Fiedler, ed., *Relationen venetianischer Botschafter über Deutschland und Österreich im sechzehnten Jahrhundert* (Wien: Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1870), 249.

Given this context, the success of the Spanish faction during the reign of Maximilian II is mostly witnessed beyond concrete actions, in the sphere of soft power. The active mediation of Empress Mary and her entourage allowed Maximilian II to maintain the image of a Catholic prince albeit his undeniable confessional heterodoxy, and thus the links with the Papacy were never broken.¹⁵ Furthermore, the majority of Maximilian and Mary's children received a Spanish education. Mary raised the two daughters, Anne and Isabella, as Spanish princesses, while four out of six male descendents were sent to the court of Madrid to learn the majestic style of their uncle Philip II.¹⁶ The underlining hope, that the next generation of the imperial family would be more attached to Spanish uses and interests than Maximilian II, was partially achieved.¹⁷

From 1564, Archdukes Rudolf (future Emperor Rudolf II), Ernest, Albert and Wenzel followed one another in Madrid. The dynastic presence was still more powerful between 1571 and 1580, when their sister Anne of Austria stayed in Spain as Philip II's fourth wife. The households of both the Archdukes and the Queen replicated the communication functions that Empress Mary's household developed in the Empire.¹⁸ These fluid contacts eased the contacts between Philip II and Maximilian II: the common interests and dependency were so high that the frequent moments of crisis never arrived to an open crisis and the image of dynastic harmony was reasonably kept alive. The conflicts derived from the conquest of Finale, the rebellion of the Low Countries and the attitude towards the Ottoman Empire were serious enough, but they were successfully channeled through Empress Mary and the pro-Spanish courtiers in Vienna together with their counterpart in Madrid.¹⁹

Notwithstanding, the cooperation was far from being idyllic. On the one hand, Philip II expected much more support from Maximilian II against the Dutch rebels; on the other hand, the Emperor fruitlessly demanded money for the crowning of Archduke Ernest King of Poland and military support against

¹⁵ Francisco de Córdoba to Philip II, Madrid, 30 May 1576, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 43; Idem, Madrid, 13 July 1576, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 41

¹⁶ The other two, Mathias and Maximilian, remained at the imperial court, but his uncle Philip II and his representatives no less monitored their progresses and inclinations. Count of Monteagudo to Gabriel de Zayas, Vienna, 13 April 1576, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 23.

¹⁷ Rudolf II to Philip II, Prague, 27 January 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 167. This was especially the case of Archduke Albert, who developed almost all his career in the Spanish world. Luc Duerloo, *Dynasty and Piety: Archduke Albert (1598–1621) and Habsburg Political Culture in an Age of Religious Wars* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2012).

¹⁸ Johann Khevenhüller to Maximilian II, Madrid, 17 December 1571, HHStA, SDK, 8/2, fol. 38; Ruiz de Azagra to Maximilian II, Madrid, 28 April 1574, HHStA, SDK, 9/7, fol. 7; Count of Monteagudo to Philip II, Vienna, 14 April 1576, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 27.

¹⁹ For the fief of Finale, see Empress Mary to Philip II, Vienna, 31 July 1571, in Juan Carlos Galende Díaz and Manuel Salamanca López, eds., *Epistolario de la emperatriz María de Austria* (Madrid: Nuevos Escritores, 2004), 219; Friedrich Edelmayer, *Maximilian II., Philipp II. und Reichsitalien* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1988), 83. For the conflicts with Florence, Marquis of Vélez to Philip II, 21 September 1575, AGS, E, leg. 653, n. 57. For Flanders, Count of Monteagudo to Philip II, Regensburg, 24 October 1575, AGS, E, leg. 673, n. 78. For the Ottoman Empire, idem, Vienna, 14 April 1576, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 27.

the Turks.²⁰ The sudden death of Maximilian II on 12 October 1576 paved the way to Rudolf II's succession. The new ruler was raised in Spain and appreciated Spanish culture and customs. Great expectations were laid upon him, the beginning of a golden age in the dynastic entente.

III. Hope and Despair: the Beginnings of Rudolf II (1576-1577)

In July 1577, some months after the accession to the throne of Rudolf II, Gabriel de Zayas, Philip II's secretary, encouraged the royal agent in Vienna, Flaminio Garnier, to report all the possible news on the imperial court. According to Zayas, for Philip II and his wife Anne of Austria «there is nowadays nothing in the world so cherished as the things coming from there».²¹ The first steps of Rudolf II were especially promising for the Spanish court. One of his first decisions as Emperor was to expel all the Protestant servers of the imperial household.²² Furthermore, the Spanish ambassador, Count of Monteagudo, stressed that the relationship between Rudolf and his mother Mary was excellent. Thanks to this, Monteagudo consulted her before Rudolf's audiences and agreed on how to put forward Philip II's instructions.²³

The new configuration of power seemed to be very favourable to Spanish interests. Foreign observers considered the appointments and task distribution in the Secret Council and the imperial household, which were regarded as the two decisive spaces of power. Three out of the four top officers of the imperial household (Dietrichstein, Rumpf, and Trivulzio) were renowned clients of Philip II and married to former Mary's ladies-in-waiting. The other was grand marshal Schwarzenberg, who was labelled as a good Catholic, but closer to the Duke of Bavaria. As happened during the reign of Maximilian II, the Dukes of Bavaria and the ministers linked to them counterbalanced the Spanish influence and eased an alternative Catholic alliance with the court of Munich.²⁴

In spite of the respectful image of the Secret Council as the supreme forum in policy-making, at times the most fruitful channels of influence were those articulated through the household. High Steward Dietrichstein refused to enter the Secret Council: he preferred to keep Rudolf's favour and direct communication without public exposure and bureaucratic responsibilities.²⁵

²⁰ Count of Monteagudo to Gabriel de Zayas, Vienna, 21 December 1575, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 1; Philip II to Johann Khevenhüller and Wolfgang Rumpf, Madrid, 23 December 1575, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 84.

²¹ «No tienen oy en el mundo cosa mas cara que lo que viene de ay.» Gabriel de Zayas to Flaminio Garnier, Madrid, 16 July 1577, AGS, E, leg. 680, n. 43.

²² Count of Monteagudo to Philip II, Prague, 16 January 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 76. Actually, the expulsion was limited to top positions; in lower echelons Protestants were decreasing but still present. Jaroslava Hausenblasová, *Der Hof Kaiser Rudolfs II. Eine Edition der Hofstaatsverzeichnisse 1576-1612* (Prague: Artefactum, 2002), 115-117.

²³ Count of Monteagudo to Philip II, Prague, 20 January 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 82.

²⁴ Idem, Prague, 16 January 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 77; Maximilian Lanzinner, "Geheime Räte und Berater Kaiser Maximilians II. (1564-1576)," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 102 (1994): 298, 301, 309-11.

²⁵ Dietrichstein «sempre sta alle orecchie di S. M. ne mai in alcuna occas.e l'abbandona, parendosi forse che q.ta strada far più che con q.ta altra.» Valentino Florio to Alfonso II,

Dietrichstein proved to be a key mediator for Philip II's initiatives, as in the case of the League of Landsberg's negotiation, an alliance of German Catholic princes to support his policy against the Dutch rebels. In this case, Dietrichstein helped speaking directly with Rudolf II and convincing his intimate friends Harrach and Pernstein, who were secret councillors and Spanish clients.²⁶

Dietrichstein and Pernstein appeared as the two more loyal and trusted pro-Spanish ministers. Their attachment with Empress Mary was so close that the Spanish ambassador Monteagudo assured that both men could replace him.²⁷ Actually, the support of these individuals, their families and clientele was crucial to create a dynastic infrastructure which would be hard to develop without their mediation. For example, when the Admiral of Castile arrived to the Empire in September 1577 as extraordinary ambassador of Philip II, Dietrichstein and Pernstein were in charge of advising him and lodging his retinue in their Vienna and Prague's palaces. Some months earlier, another representative of Philip II arrived, the Count of Galve, whose main merit was being the son-in-law of Dietrichstein.²⁸

Italian agents were especially heedful to the oscillations of Rudolf II's grace: Pernstein, a key element for Spanish policy, seemed to be displaced and near to retirement, while Harrach held a more solid position and the Spanish Crown was anxious to assure his commitment and fast in rewarding him with the Golden Fleece.²⁹ Notwithstanding, the new star in Rudolf's entourage was his future favourite, Wolfgang Rumpf, as discussed below.

Alongside the process of consolidation of the new elite around Rudolf II, a replacement in the Spanish representation was developing. The Count of Monteagudo had been the ambassador since 1570 and was anxious to return to Castile. His substitute, Juan de Borja, was delaying his departure from Spain and Empress Mary authorised Monteagudo to leave the imperial court without waiting for his successor. Aside from proving Mary's authoritative role in dynastic relations, this decision showed the preponderance of her particular interests: she conceded Monteagudo this long-desired permission in order to have a trustful advocate near to her brother Philip II.³⁰ After the death of Maximilian II, Mary's only will was retiring to Spain. She never integrated in the imperial *milieu* and believed that her mission had finished. Her position as Dowager Empress also meant a decreased ceremonial role: she lived her mourning almost in seclusion and depressed, while Rudolf II travelled without her across his new possessions to be recognised as sovereign. Mary settled in the Castle of Prague assisted by Khuen, Pruskovsky and Pernstein while

Duke of Ferrara, Prague, 2 March 1577, ASMo, Germania, 34, n. 2. See also Fiedler, *Relationen venetianischer Botschafter*, 372.

²⁶ Count of Monteagudo to Philip II, Almazán, 13 July 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 114, fol. 3r.

²⁷ Idem, Prague, 2 January 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 74, fol. 2v.

²⁸ Flaminio Garnier to Gabriel de Zayas, Vienna, 20 October 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 31; Count of Monteagudo to idem, Vienna, 20 April 1576, AGS, E, leg. 675, n. 47, fol. 8r.

²⁹ Valentino Florio to Alfonso II, Duke of Ferrara, Prague, 16 March 1577, ASMo, Germania, 34, n. 4, fol. 3; Idem, 20 April 1577, ASMo, Germania, 34, n. 9.

³⁰ Renato Cato to Alfonso II, Duke of Ferrara, Prague, 12 January 1577, ASMo, Germania, 33, s. n.

Monteagudo and her servants, like her chaplain Juan de Espinosa, started to insist with Philip II that she would be allowed to return to her native Spain.³¹

With the absence of Mary and the retirement of Monteagudo, the quality of Philip II's interlocution dramatically decreased: near to Rudolf II remained only Flaminio Garnier, the secretary of the Spanish embassy. Due to his low profile and lack of autonomy, Garnier was not granted access to the Palace and was dependent on Dietrichstein's mediation. The most urgent necessities were for Flanders, where levies of German infantry were required, and Northern Italy, about the investiture of fiefs. In both cases, Dietrichstein acted as officious ambassador.³² The obvious problem was that Dietrichstein had conflicts of interest, especially in the Finale's crisis, and was unable to support fully Spanish interests. To overcome this limitation, Garnier began to rely on the younger Lord Chamberlain Wolfgang Rumpf, who was favoured by Rudolf II as well as closely attached to Philip II's service. As Garnier pointed out, Rumpf could exert pressure in the Secret Council through his uncle Harrach and «he was eager to being taken as proxy.»³³

The necessity of a constant and intense monitoring was undoubted, and this lack partially explains one of the most severe blows in dynastic relations: the secret flee of Archduke Matthias from the imperial court to lead the Dutch provinces, which had rebelled against Philip II. This scandalous episode happened in October 1577 while no official representative of the Spanish King resided next to the Emperor.³⁴ The scandal was enormous and the lack of a powerful Spanish representation led to acts of mockery and revenge in Vienna against Philip II's prepotency.³⁵ Soon thereafter, the extraordinary ambassador Admiral of Castile arrived, who Garnier was anxiously waiting to offer a proper offended response.³⁶ According to the official version, only Mathias's closest brother, Archduke Maximilian, knew about this plan, but mistrust against Rudolf II spread at Madrid. This critical occasion served as a test bench of loyalty: Empress Mary reacted with authentic despair and Dietrichstein hastened to report Philip II what was going on. Rudolf II planned sending either Dietrichstein or Rumpf to Madrid to justify his innocence, but at the end, the traditional message was imposed: the misunderstandings between the courts were due to bad counsels of envious

³¹ Count of Monteagudo to Philip II, Genoa, 29 May 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 88; Fray Juan de Espinosa to Gabriel de Zayas, Prague, 24 April 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 4.

³² Flaminio Garnier to Gabriel de Zayas, Olomouc, 4 July 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 112; Philip II to Adam von Dietrichstein, San Lorenzo, 15 August 1577, AGS, E, leg. 680, n. 115.

³³ Rumpf «me parece mas entremetido y desseoso q se valgan del, como porque puede mucho con el Baron de Harach su tio.» Flaminio Garnier to Marquis of Ayamonte, Vienna, 19 October 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 33, fol. 2v.

³⁴ Howard Louthan, *The Quest for Compromise: Peacemakers in Counter-Reformation Vienna* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 145-151. The image of omnipotence of Philip II was so developed that the Ferrarese agent was sure that Mathias's adventure was impossible without the King's approval. Valentino Florio to Alfonso II, Duke of Ferrara, Vienna, 6 October 1577, ASMo, Germania, 34, n. 33.

³⁵ Idem, Vienna, 2 November 1577, ASMo, Germania, 34, n. 39, fol. 2v.

³⁶ Flaminio Garnier to Gabriel de Zayas, Vienna, 4 October 1577, AGS, E, 679, n. 27.

imperial ministers.³⁷ At the end of 1577, the new ordinary ambassador Juan de Borja arrived with a clear commitment: to win back the Emperor's counsellors and courtiers.

IV. A defective Tandem: Borja and Mary

On 6 December 1577, the ambassador Juan de Borja was approaching Vienna and a few kilometres before the capital a friendly group received him: Dietrichstein, Rumpf, Trivulzio, and other courtiers with their wives greeted the new representative «and all of them showed great affection to Your Majesty's service».³⁸ The main problem endured: the situation in the Low Countries was almost out of control, the brother of Rudolf was supposed to lead the rebels and the imperial help was essential. Notwithstanding, the Emperor fully disappointed Philip II's expectations. Rudolf stayed seven years at the Spanish court (1564-1571) and his uncle Philip II expected to forge with him a bond of trust and loyalty, by contrast with the tortuous personal relation Philip had maintained with Rudolf's father, Maximilian II. Surprisingly, Maximilian II's times were remembered as a better phase in dynastic relations. Rudolf was an enthusiastic follower of Spanish fashion and culture and had no xenophobic attitude towards Spaniards: the delicate point was his fierce defence of his authority, which he saw menaced by his overbearing uncle Philip II, and his melancholic humour, which worsened along the years until his final secluded life of manic depression.³⁹

Rudolf showed to be an ill and unreliable individual and his mother acknowledged to have lost all influence upon him.⁴⁰ Thus, the main effort of Philip II and Juan de Borja was to surround him of trustful servers and counsellors. The Dutch crisis proved that the Spanish faction was strong in the high ranks of the imperial household and relied on the committed services of Empress Mary, Dietrichstein, Rumpf and Pernstein. Their actions, however, were largely ineffective as long as in the Secret Council and the imperial chancellery, where actual decisions were taken and enforced, would survive «disinclined» ministers. The question of winning the will of the ministers arose in 1577: Philip II asked for concrete measures, avoiding the payment of regular pensions because «they will receive it as an annuity and therefore will attend my issues with less care».⁴¹

³⁷ Adam von Dietrichstein to Philip II, Vienna, 4 October 1577, AGS, E, leg. 679, n. 42-43; Valentino Florio to Alfonso II, Duke of Ferrara, Vienna, 14 December 1577, ASMo, Germania, 34, n. 47; Philip II to Juan de Borja, Madrid, 20 December 1577, AGS, E, leg. 680, n. 144.

³⁸ Juan de Borja to Philip II, Vienna, 14 December 1577, AGS, E, 680, n. 87, fol. 3r. "For Borja's embassy in general, see Vojtěch Kroužil, "Diplomatické mise dvou větví habsburské dynastie 1577-1583" (Master Thesis, University Masaryk of Brno, 2010)."

³⁹ María J. Rodríguez-Salgado, "I loved him as a father loves a son... Europe, damn me then, but I deserve his thanks: Philip II's relations with Rudolf II," in *La dinastía de los Austria: las relaciones entre la Monarquía Católica y el Imperio*, ed. José Martínez Millán and Rubén González Cuerva (Madrid: Polifemo, 2011), I, 349-351.

⁴⁰ Juan de Borja to Philip II, Prague, 13 May 1579, AGS, E, leg. 687, s. n., fos 1v-2v; Guillén de San Clemente to idem, Prague, 8 August 1581, AGS, E, leg. 688, n. 94.

⁴¹ «Es mejor darles algo de quando en quando porque con aquella esperança andaran mas finos, que teniendo la pension haran quenta que es juro de por vida y acudiran con menos cuydado a lo que me tocare.» Philip II to Juan de Borja, Madrid, 24 December 1577, AGS, E,

Borja's course followed the tracks of a 1572's precedent: the plan of gratifications for ensuring the Emperor's approval for the Spanish acquisition of the imperial fief of Finale, in the Liguria coast. In both cases, it was evident that the aristocratic style of management followed by Empress Mary and the Spanish ambassadors favoured noblemen of the imperial court but marginalised lawyer ministers. In the Secret Council, the closest to Philip II's service was Harrach, also the most ennobled, while the others were good Catholics but not especially inclined towards the Spanish branch of the dynasty. Among the secretaries and officers, the tendency was to reward the vice-chancellor as key of the system. This style could work in the times of authoritative vice-chancellors as Georg Sigismund Seld (1559-1565), but not in a transition period like the one between the interim Johann Baptist Weber and Siegmund Vieheuser.⁴² In contrast with the aristocratic image of gravity, these ministers held a negative reputation of venality. Juan de Borja had to enter a reserved but fierce competition to attract them, against other princes with competing interests at the imperial court, namely the Marquis of Finale and the Duke of Florence.⁴³

Borja shared Monteagudo and Philip II's negative vision about pensioning such unreliable individuals and preferred occasional payments after positive services. According to him, the only one deserving a fixed payment was Juan Saravia, valet of Rudolf II. Saravia could be trusted because he was a Spanish vassal and a low rank member of the imperial household. Leaning on servers of Rudolf's chamber would become one of the main trends during this reign.⁴⁴ Juan de Borja was trying to react to a generational crisis: Empress Mary was secluded and obsessed with a retirement in Spain, Dietrichstein also desired to abandon the management of affairs and returning to his lands, and the Spanish embassy resented the lack of experienced officials in his embassy. Apart from Flaminio Garnier, Borja did not count with German experts and asked for them in the Low Countries.⁴⁵

leg. 680, n. 142, fol. 2v. See also Lothar Gross, *Die Geschichte der deutschen Reichshofkanzlei von 1559 bis 1806* (Wien: Selbstverlag des Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs, 1933), 5-22.

⁴² Juan de Borja to Philip II, Bratislava, 5 April 1578, AGS, E, leg. 685, s. n.; *Lista de los ministros del Emperador y oficiales de su cancellería a los quales parece se podrá o habrá de dar alguna gratificación de parte de su Md. Catca.*, s. d., AGS, E, leg. 685, s. n.; Ernst Laubach, *Der Reichsvizekanzler Georg Sigmund Seld im Dienst der Kaiser Karl V. und Ferdinand I.* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verl.-Haus, 2010), 60-61, 69-70.

⁴³ Juan de Borja to Philip II, Vienna, 21 December 1577, AGS, E, leg. 680, n. 90, fos 2r-2v; Idem, Prague, 14 May 1579, AGS, E, leg. 687, s. n., fol. 2r.

⁴⁴ Idem, Bratislava, 5 April 1578, AGS, E, leg. 685, s. n., fol. 2r. Juan Saravia de la Riba († ante 1596) was *ayuda de cámara* of Rudolf II since his stay in Spain. In 1571, Saravia joined Rudolf to the Empire, where he married Leonor de Guzmán, lady-in-waiting of Empress Mary. In spite of Borja's request, Saravia lamented in 1583 that he had not received yet any reward. Valerianus Meysztowicz, ed., *Elementa ad fontium editiones VIII. Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas. I Pars* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1968), 77-79; Ruiz de Azagra to Maximilian II, Madrid, 26 January 1572, HHStA, SDK, 7/32, fol. 26r; Guillén de San Clemente to Philip II, Vienna, 21 June 1583, AGS, E, leg. 691, s. n.

⁴⁵ Juan de Borja to Philip II, Prague, 27 February 1580, AGS, E, leg. 688, n. 53; Idem, Prague, 17 September 1580, AGS, E, leg. 688, n. 68.

Meanwhile, a new solution was searched for the conflict in Flanders: the implication of the Imperial princes and the peace mediation of Rudolf II through the Conference of Cologne (1579).⁴⁶ This failed negotiation was encouraged in Madrid by pro-imperial ministers (the ambassador Khevenhüller, the High Steward of the Queen Marquis of Vélez, and the former ambassador in Vienna, Monteagudo) while Juan de Borja tried to include in the imperial delegation in Cologne a loyal pro-Spanish minister. Secret counsellor Harrach was opportunely appointed, but he never travelled to the conference, which ended without success.⁴⁷ Notwithstanding, Philip II was well aware of the necessity of powerful allies in the imperial space to keep the Low Countries. This warfront became his first priority after securing the throne of Portugal in 1581. Once the Portuguese Courts of Tomar were under control, he announced his will to concede new collars for the prestigious Order of the Golden Fleece. The negotiations developed between 1581 and 1585, and an important imperial representation was included. Philip II granted this honour to his nephews Rudolf II and Archduke Ernest, and to his cousin Archduke Charles of Styria. Furthermore, the Spanish King was eager to accept the recommendations of Rudolf and Empress Mary and enlarge the circle with the allegedly most important aristocrats of Austria and Bohemia: Leonhard von Harrach and Wilhelm von Rosenberg.⁴⁸

V. The lonely Ambassador: the new Management of Guillén de San Clemente

In spite of her relative isolation, Empress Mary was still a crucial mediator for Spanish interests in the Empire. After five years of insistent pleas, in 1581 both Rudolf II and Philip II agreed to her request of returning to Spain. The question was solved due to the premature death of Queen Anne of Austria on 26 October 1580. Philip II remained widower in charge of his minor children, thus he needed his sister Mary in case of a regency, to substitute him in the government of the recently acquired crown of Portugal, and to mediate for the marriages of the next generation of the dynasty. Mary travelled to Spain in the summer of 1581 escorted by a large retinue under the direction of Juan de Borja. The ambassador also desired to return to Spain and linked his fortune to Mary's, whom he served since then as her High Steward.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Peter Limm, *The Dutch Revolt 1559 – 1648* (London: Routledge, 2014), 52.

⁴⁷ Juan de Borja to Philip II, Prague, 24 February 1579, AGS, E, leg. 687, s. n.; Idem, Prague, 23 February 1579, AGS, E, leg. 687, s. n.

⁴⁸ Philip II to Juan de Borja, Tomar, 14 May 1581, AGS, E, leg. 688, n. 182; Idem, Lisboa, 25 September 1581, AGS, E, leg. 688, n. 188; Alfonso Ceballos-Escalera y Gila, ed., *La insigne Orden del Toisón de Oro* (Madrid: Real Sociedad Económica Segoviana, 2000), 312-317; Marek, *La embajada española*, 64, 71-72.

⁴⁹ Rubén González Cuerva, "Anne, Margaret and Marianne of Austria: Queens of Spain, Archduchesses of Austria and dynastic Links," in *Kaiserinnen in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Katrin Keller and Matthias Schnettger (Wien: Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 2015), in press. For the correspondence of Borja as High Steward of Mary, see BL, Add. Ms, 28426-7.

Borja and Mary's anxiety for leaving Prague led to a lumbering transition similar to Monteagudo's retirement in 1577. On this occasion, as Philip II did not find a suitable ordinary ambassador, an interim representative was sent in the meantime. Borja advised against such a provisional solution, even more if the appointee was an inexperienced Spaniard: he preferred a well-rooted member of the Spanish faction as the Castilian Juan Manrique, brother-in-law of the secret counsellor and chancellor of Bohemia Wratislav von Pernstein.⁵⁰ Borja was not listened to: his successor would be Guillén de San Clemente y Centelles, a Catalan knight whose mission was successively prorogued until his death in 1608.

San Clemente arrived to Prague on 13 July 1581 as Borja was finishing the preparations for leaving the city and found no time to properly instruct and advise his successor. San Clemente was in despair: he soon realised the difficulty of negotiating at the imperial court especially since Mary's absence meant the curtailing of the Spanish system. The remaining strength was not the embassy, where only two secretaries stayed, but the network of affectionate courtiers led by Dietrichstein, Rumpf and Pernstein. San Clemente faced a grave challenge, which is to say to efficiently coordinate such a group without the authority and backing of Empress Mary.⁵¹

The day after the departure of Mary and her household, San Clemente found himself with a slight idea of the political line to follow, and neither enough money to enhance his authority nor the formal title of ambassador, which had negative ceremonial repercussions.⁵² San Clemente encountered the same limitations as Borja: Dietrichstein and Rumpf were his safest supporters but they were out of the Secret Council, where the general political decisions were taken. Only the third column of the faction, Pernstein, was a member of the Secret Council, but paradoxically had to moderate his positions in order not to become more suspicious to his peers in the council. Furthermore, Pernstein was old and frequently ill; he was progressively retiring and died on 27 October 1582.⁵³ In this moment of necessity, San Clemente tried to please Dietrichstein mediating actively for his children claims of graces.⁵⁴

Philip II's order of raising a regiment of Bohemian sappers for Flanders in early 1582 offers a good example of San Clemente's early management of affairs. Without previous experience on these commissions, he obtained Rudolf's permission thanks to Dietrichstein and Rumpf's pressure. Thereafter, San Clemente successfully executed the order because Wilhelm von

⁵⁰ Juan de Borja to Philip II, Prague, 27 April 1581, AGS, E, leg. 688, n. 130.

⁵¹ Guillén de San Clemente to Philip II, Prague, 25 July 1581, AGS, E, leg. 688, n. 90; Idem to Juan de Zúñiga, Prague, 25 July 1581, in *Correspondencia de Guillen de San Clemente, embajador en Alemania de Felipe II y III*, ed. marqués de Ayerbe (Zaragoza: La Derecha, 1892), 292.

⁵² Guillén de San Clemente to Juan de Idiáquez, Prague, 17 October 1581, AGS, E, leg. 688, n. 111; Idem to Philip II, Vienna, 16 January 1582, AGS, E, 689, n. 4, fos 2r-2v.

⁵³ Guillén de San Clemente to Philip II, Vienna, 2 November 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 95; Idem, Vienna, 23 November 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 94, fol. 1v.

⁵⁴ Idem to Juan de Idiáquez, Bratislava, 6 February 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 29; Idem to Philip II, Vienna, 3 April 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 165.

Rosenberg, High Burgrave of Bohemia and Pernstein's ally, fully assisted him.⁵⁵

The first important task he had to deal with was the Imperial Diet of Augsburg of 1582. At the end, San Clemente defined this assembly as a ruthless market of pensions and bribery in which the French side of the Duke of Alençon took full advantage.⁵⁶ The ambassador struggled to maintain and finance a good staff of informers and agents in the Empire to improve the management of imperial affairs. He searched for a new German secretary for the court of Madrid, remunerated the Bavarian counsellor Ludolf Halver and attracted Johann Barvitius.⁵⁷ This last case is a good example of the patient and efficient work of San Clemente: Barvitius, a loyal Dutch vassal, was first employed as Spanish informer in Cologne (1582). In 1588, Barvitius entered Rudolf II's service as his Latin secretary. After a distinguished career in which he gained Rudolf's trust and kept being San Clemente's informer, he was promoted to the Secret Council in 1608.⁵⁸

VI. Conclusions

Without Mary of Austria, San Clemente had lost many subtle means of mediation and more extensive tools of patronage through the integration in the Empress's household. The ambassador needed a privileged interlocutor with Rudolf II, someone destined to concentrate the biggest share of the Spanish graces. Dietrichstein seemed to be the ideal candidate at the beginning of the 1580s and consolidated his leading position in the Spanish faction. However, as Dietrichstein grew old and Rudolf II focused his favour on Wolfgang Rumpf, this server became the main protégé of Philip II. Around 1590, Rumpf moved that step forward that Dietrichstein refused to take, by passing from household servant to minister. This double role homologated him with a favourite, a condition Philip II and San Clemente had supported and partially promoted. Counting on a propitious favourite seemed a dream had come true, but soon thereafter became a nightmare: Rumpf had conquered an autonomous position and, while continuing to demand Spanish patronage, he followed a more independent political line. The rest of ministers resented San Clemente's favour towards Rumpf and showed more reluctant to Spanish interests.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Guillén de San Clemente to Philip II, Vienna, 6 March 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 35; Idem, Vienna, 27 March 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 49; Gonzalo de Redondo to Guillén de San Clemente, Prague, 26 April 1582, AGS, E, 690, n. 19.

⁵⁶ Guillén de San Clemente to Philip II, Augsburg, 8 August 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 114.

⁵⁷ Philip II to Guillén de San Clemente, Lisbon, 14 June 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 71; Guillén de San Clemente to Philip II, 1582, AGS, E, leg. 690, n. 22; Idem, Vienna, 17 September 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 80; Friedrich Edelmayer, *Söldner und Pensionäre: das Netzwerk Philipps II. im Heiligen Römischen Reich* (Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 2002), 136-137, 141-142.

⁵⁸ Philip II to Guillén de San Clemente, Lisbon, 16 July 1582, AGS, E, leg. 689, n. 77; Guillén de San Clemente to Philip II, Vienna, 4 October 1583, AGS, E, leg. 691, n. 12; Baltasar de Zúñiga to Philip III, Prague, 25 May 1611, AGS, E, leg. 2497, n. 60.

⁵⁹ Guillén de San Clemente to Philip II, Prague, 19 January 1593, AGS, E, leg. 700, n. 41; Idem to Juan de Idiáquez, Graz, 26 April 1593, AGS, E, leg. 700, n. 76, fol. 1v.

The other troubling factor was Rudolf II's erratic attitude. Along the 1590s, it was evident that his mental illness meant a serious burden for the Empire's government and the dynasty's continuity. While in Madrid, Mary of Austria attempted to keep her role as a match-maker, but Rudolf's lack of support and unwillingness to accept the conditions for marrying his cousin Isabella, Philip II's daughter, caused his final isolation.⁶⁰ Rudolf's paranoia against his ministers, who he blamed to serve the Spanish King rather than himself, in part led to Rumpf dismissal in 1599. Due to the Emperor's complicated communication with his councils, the imperial chamber remained as the most effective space of political communication, and San Clemente resorted to gratify the lower servers who actually could mediate with Rudolf.⁶¹ The ambassador proved to be flexible and attentive to adapt his patronage capacities to the voluble context of the Prague court.

⁶⁰ Johann von Trautson to Empress Mary, Prague, 1586, HHStA, SDK, 11/4, fol. 83; Rodríguez-Salgado, "Philip II's relations", 386-390.

⁶¹ Guillén de San Clemente to Philip III, Prague, 19 August 1600, AGS, E, leg. 706, s. n., fol. 2v; Ayerbe, *Correspondencia de Guillen de San Clemente*, 315-399; Heinz Noflatscher, "Regiment aus der Kammer? Einflußreiche Kleingruppen am Hof Rudolfs II.," in *Der Fall des Günstlings. Hofparteien in Europa vom 13. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jan Hirschbiegel and Werner Paravicini (Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke, 2004), 216-229.

ORATORIAN SPIRITUALITY IN THE ROMAN COURT AND ITS INCIDENCE ON THE PRO-SPANISH FACTION *

Por Esther Jiménez Pablo
(Universidad de Granada -IULCE)

ABSTRACT

One of the most interesting and fruitful approaches for the study of the parties or factions at court is that of the spirituality shared by the members of each political group. In this study, the analysis of the spiritual influence of charismatic reformer Philip Neri draws not only on his spiritual but also political connotations, in view of his commitment to the interests of the Papacy. This article, therefore, centres on the influence that Neri exercised over the Roman curia, especially over Clement VIII (1592-1605) and his circle of cardinals, and on how his counsel affected the evolution of the pro-Spanish faction. Furthermore, with the support of later popes, such as Urban VIII (1623-1644), the spiritual influence of the Oratorians extended to other courts. Their religious practices were in fact imposed at Philip IV's court, which resulted in Madrid having a greater dependence on Rome's interests.

Key words: Clement VIII, Oratorians, pro-Spanish faction, Philip II, Philip IV

ESPIRITUALIDAD ORATORIANA EN LA CORTE ROMANA Y SU INFLUENCIA EN LA FACCIÓN PROESPAÑOLA

RESUMEN

Uno de los acercamientos más interesantes y enriquecedores para el estudio de los partidos o facciones en la corte es el de la espiritualidad compartida por los miembros de cada grupo político. En este estudio, el análisis de la influencia espiritual del carismático reformador Felipe Neri nos lleva necesariamente a pensar no solo en las connotaciones espirituales sino también políticas, a la vista de su compromiso con los intereses del Papado. Por lo tanto, este artículo se centrará en la influencia que Neri ejerció sobre la Curia romana, especialmente con Clemente VIII (1592-1605) y su círculo de cardenales, y como su consejo afectó a la evolución de la facción española o proespañola. Además, con el apoyo de papas posteriores

* Abbreviations: AGS (Archivo General de Simancas); ASV (Archivio Segreto Vaticano); E (Estado); FB (Fondo Borghese); RAH (Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid); SS (Segreteria di Stato).

como Urbano VIII (1623-1644), la influencia espiritual de los oratorianos también se extendió a otras cortes. Así, sus prácticas religiosas se impusieron en la corte de Felipe IV, con el resultado de que Madrid tuvo una dependencia mucho mayor de los intereses de Roma.

Palabras clave: Clemente VIII, oratorianos, facción proespañola, Felipe II, Felipe IV

ORATORIAN SPIRITUALITY IN THE ROMAN COURT AND ITS INCIDENCE ON THE PRO-SPANISH FACTION

Por Esther Jiménez Pablo
(Universidad de Granada -IULCE)

I. Clement VIII and Philip Neri: same Spirituality, same Political Goals

When Philip III succeeded his father in 1598, Ippolito Aldobrandini was holding the papal seat under the name of Clement VIII (1592-1605).¹ Ippolito had known the Madrid court very well since Pius V named him *legato a latere* in 1571.² He had arrived there at a critical moment, the 1570s, in the midst of the courtly disputes between the *Ebolist* and the *Castilian* parties. The Ebolists—with whom he had better relations—were about to lose power due to the passing of some among their main members, such as Joanna of Austria and the prince of Eboli.³ At that time, Ippolito gained a degree of experience that would have come useful later, when becoming Pope. Such experience allowed him to understand the moods at the court of Madrid and enlist to his cause the members of the Ebolist party who were most faithful to him and proved useful not only on the spiritual sphere but also in the realm of politics.⁴

After the passing of Sixtus V in 1590, Ippolito Aldobrandini's name was put forth as a candidate in the following three conclaves (in which the elected popes were, respectively, Urban VII, Gregory XIV and Innocent IX). However, due to Aldobrandini's support towards the Grand Duke of Tuscany and

¹ Maria Teresa Fattori, *Clemente VIII e il sacro collegio (1592-1605). Meccanismi istituzionali ed accentramento di governo* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2004), *passim*; Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa. Nome, riti e conflitti* (Rome: Viella, 2013), 339-366; Wolfgang Reinhard, "État et Eglise dans l'Empire entre Réforme et Absolutisme," in *État et Église dans la genese de l'État Moderne*, eds. Jean-Philippe Genet and Bernard Vincent (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 1986), 175-185; Ricardo de Hinojosa, *Los despachos de la diplomacia pontificia en España* (Madrid: B.A. de la Fuente, 1896), I, 347-423.

² Luciano Serrano, *Correspondencia diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede durante el pontificado de S. Pio V* (Madrid: Impr. del Instituto Pio IX, 1914), IV, 375-376, 522 n. 1; Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "Burocrazia, mobilità sociale e patronage alla corte di Roma tra Cinque e Seicento," *Roma moderna e contemporanea* 3 (1995): 11-55; Idem, *Roma papale e Spagna. Diplomatici, nobili e religiosi tra due corti* (Rome: Bulzoni, 2010), 93-171; Agostino Borromeo, "Istruzioni generali e corrispondenza ordinaria dei nunzi: obiettivi prioritari e risultati concreti della politica spagnola di Clemente VIII," in *Das Papsttum, die Christenheit und die Staaten Europas 1592-1605. Forschungen zu den Hauptinstruktionen Clemens VIII*, ed. Georg Lutz, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1994), 119-204.

³ James M. Boyden, *The Courtier and the King. Ruy Gómez de Silva, Philip II, and the Court of Spain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 7-11; José Martínez Millán, "Grupos de poder en la corte durante el reinado de Felipe II: la facción *ebolista* (1554-1573)," in *Instituciones y elites de poder en la Monarquía Hispana durante el siglo XVI*, ed. José Martínez Millán (Madrid: Universidad Autónoma, 1992), 137-197; José Martínez Millán, "Familia Real y grupos políticos: La princesa doña Juana de Austria (1535-1573)," in *La corte de Felipe II*, ed. José Martínez Millán (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1999), 80-84.

⁴ Ministers such as Cristobal de Moura, García de Loaysa, the Count of Chinchón, Juan de Idiáquez or the Count of Miranda were the main contributors of Rome during the pontificate of Pope Clement VIII, as the *nuncios* pointed out in their correspondence with Rome: ASV, SS, Spagna, 49 and 52; Serrano, *Correspondencia diplomática*, 375-376.

because of his open pro-French views, Philip II—who held sway over the vote of numerous cardinals and had the support of the Spanish or pro-Spanish faction—never backed his claims.⁵ Indubitably, in the three conclaves that preceded his election as Clement VIII, the Spanish Monarchy under Philip II had shown its power to tilt the papal election in favour of a candidate of its choice: the three previous popes had been the candidates favoured by the King, while Aldobrandini's still unlikely candidacy was bypassed.⁶

Finally, when the 1592 conclave was called, after Innocent IX's brief papacy, the election of the new pope was centred on two candidates: the Neapolitan Cardinal Santori, preferred by the Spanish King,⁷ and Cardinal Aldobrandini, the candidate from the Papal States backed by the Grand Duke of Tuscany Ferdinand I. This antagonism led to a contentious conclave. During the days preceding the election, Santori was the candidate with the greatest chances. After a few confused days, on 24 January 1592, Aldobrandini received the same number of votes as Santori; on 28 January, he had seventeen more votes than any other candidate; and he was finally elected by unanimous vote on 30 January.⁸

The 1592 conclave, therefore, ended with Aldobrandini's victory, as well as with a strong opposition against Cardinal Santori, who was harshly accused of simony.⁹ In addition, the rejection of the Spanish influence in the College of Cardinals became evident in the *animus* of many cardinals.¹⁰ Starting with the election of Clement VIII in 1592, this antagonism caused the popes to seriously attempt to change the rules of conclaves in order to stop, or at least reduce, external political influence. The biggest culprit for having disrupted the normal development of the conclave in 1592 was, in the eyes of the College of Cardinals, the Spanish King.¹¹

A good number of tracts and memorials accused the Spanish ambassador in Rome, the Duke of Sessa, of dreadful diplomatic practice when he spoke publicly of one of the candidates who, in his opinion, had to be excluded. Precisely one of the first changes promoted by Clement VIII for papal elections was regarding *jus exclusivae*, the right to exclude, used by the great powers, especially the Spanish Monarchy, to veto the election of a specific candidate.¹²

⁵ Agostino Borromeo, "Clemente VIII, papa," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 26 (Rome: Treccani, 1982), http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/papa-clemente-viii_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/ (consulted on 20 December 2014).

⁶ Fattori, *Clemente VIII e il sacro collegio*, 2.

⁷ Saverio Ricci, *Il Sommo Inquisitore. Giulio Antonio Santori tra autobiografia e storia (1532–1602)* (Rome: Salerno, 2002), *passim*; Idem, "Santoro, Giulio Antonio," in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione* 3 (Pisa: Edizioni della Scuola Normale Superiore, 2010), 1370-1376.

⁸ Fattori, *Clemente VIII e il sacro collegio*, 1-7.

⁹ Visceglia, "Morte e elezione del papa", 353.

¹⁰ Borromeo, "Clemente VIII, papa".

¹¹ Visceglia, "Morte e elezione del papa", 352-354.

¹² Paolo Prodi, *El soberano pontífice. Un cuerpo y dos almas: la Monarquía papal en la primera mitad de la Edad Moderna* (Madrid: Akal, 2010), 164; Silvio Pivano, "Il diritto di veto *jus exclusivae* nell'elezione del pontefice," in *Studi in onore di V. Scialoja* (Turin: UTET, 1905), 59.

The first to make use of this right was Charles V as the heir to the imperial tradition whereby emperors, starting with Constantine, confirmed the papal election and had the right to veto a candidate. Philip II appropriated this right, claiming that his military might and world supremacy made him the legitimate heir to it. Nevertheless, during the time of Clement VIII this right was questioned. In 1594 the duke of Sessa, who was still the ambassador to Rome, tried to maintain and justify the Spanish King's right by appointing a commission of theologians made up of Dominican vicar general Juan Vicente, Jesuit José de Acosta, and Rota auditor Francisco Peña.¹³

The three doctors met at Santa Maria Sopra Minerva and drafted a document that affirmed that the Spanish King's right of exclusion was justified as legitimate as long as it was exercised by persuasion and not by coercion, and therefore it should remain a prerogative of the Spanish Monarchy, which upheld and defended the Catholic Church with its armed forces. It was licit, therefore, to try to stop the election of a cardinal with little affection toward the interests of the Spanish Monarchy, although this could not be done through unworthy means. Therefore, the Spanish King should avoid giving out privileges or pensions, especially the concession of Neapolitan fiefdoms, and should limit himself to wait for cardinals to act in full liberty and in favour of Spain should they feel allegiance to the Spanish King.¹⁴

In Rome, as could be expected, this document was not seen with good eyes, let alone heeded. A few years later, in 1604, the matter was again taken up in Madrid, discussed in the *Junta del Pontificado* meeting. Then a renewed pro-French party appeared at the papal curia and claimed in the name of the French monarch the imperial right of exclusion passed on to the king from Charlemagne; such a claim certainly endangered Spanish influence on papal elections.¹⁵

In this sensitive context it is necessary to highlight the fundamental role played by somebody who collaborated closely with Clement VIII to counter Spanish influence in the College of Cardinals. This was Florentine reformer Philip Neri, founder of the Congregation of the Oratory, who has been undeservedly overlooked by historiography. Neri arrived in Rome in 1533 and worked there for the remainder of his life. He managed to increase piety, devotion and charity in the streets, and to reform the image of the papal curia in accordance to the Tridentine decrees.¹⁶

Neri manifested on several occasions his rejection of the supremacy shown by Charles V and Philip II in the Italian territories, especially over the Papal States. At the same time, he kept alive the memory of the 1527 Sack of

¹³ AGS, E, leg. 1870, n. 32, cfr. Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "Fazioni e lotta politica nel Sacro Collegio nella prima metà del Seicento," in *La corte di Roma tra cinque e seicento: "teatro" della politica europea*, eds. Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Rome: Bulzoni, 1998), 50-51.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, 51.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, 52.

¹⁶ The best study about Felipe Neri is: Antonio Cistellini, *San Filippo Neri, l'Oratorio e la Congregazione oratoriana* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1989), 3 vols.

Rome and the threat of a new attack that was avoided by the peace treaty of Cave, in 1557.¹⁷ Indeed, after Clement VIII was elected, the new Pope wanted Oratorian Philip Neri —his confessor since he was young— to be always beside him as his spiritual guide.¹⁸

In similar manner, other important cardinals in the Roman curia began to confess with Neri and formed a circle of cardinals¹⁹ that came to be known as the Oratorian wing of Clement VIII's Papacy. Among them were Francesco Maria Tarugi,²⁰ Federico Borromeo,²¹ Silvio Antoniano, Gabriele Paleotti, Agostino Valier,²² Alessandro de' Medici,²³ and Neri's most active disciple in the papal curia, Oratorian Cardinal Cesare Baronio,²⁴ who would later become Clement's confessor. None of them ever hid concerns about Spanish hegemony in Italian territory.

It is of interest, therefore, to study the cardinals' factions from a spiritual point of view and not exclusively insofar as they served one nation or another. In this case the Oratorian cardinals did not show themselves openly favourable to the French monarchy, although they did try to counter the influence of the Spanish Monarchy over the Papacy.

From 1592 to 1595 events forced a complete turnaround against the influence of the Spanish Monarchy in Roman conclaves. In 1592, Henri de Bourbon was proclaimed King of France and he declared his intention to convert to Catholicism, which became effective in 1594, the papal absolution being delivered in September 1595.²⁵ The return of France to Catholicism and

¹⁷ Ibidem, I, 50-53.

¹⁸ Louis Ponnelle and Louis Bordet, *Saint Philippe Néri et la société romaine de son temps (1515-1595)* (Paris: La Colombe, 1958), XLIV-XLV.

¹⁹ Vittorio Frajese, "Tendenze dell'ambiente oratoriano durante il pontificato di Clemente VIII. Prime considerazioni e linee di ricerca," *Roma moderna e contemporanea* 3 (1995): 57-80.

²⁰ Antonio Cistellini, "Il Card. F. M. Tarugi, arcivescovo di Siena," *Bollettino Senese di Storia Patria* 2 (1943): 88-109; Idem, "Appunti per la vita del cardinale Francesco Maria Tarugi," *Memorie Oratoriane* 6 (1977): 6-12.

²¹ Giovanni Incisa della Rocchetta and Nello Vian, eds., *Il primo processo per san Filippo Neri* (Vatican City: BAV, 1960), III, 420-425; Nello Vian, "Biglietto del cardinal Federico a san Filippo," *Vita e Pensiero* 47 (1964): 188-194.

²² About Antoniano, Paleotti and Valier see Frajese, "Tendenze dell'ambiente oratoriano", 60-74.

²³ Matteo Sanfilippo, "Leone XI, papa," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 64 (Rome: Treccani, 2005), http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/papa-leone-xi_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/ (consulted on 28 December 2014)

²⁴ Agostino Borromeo, "Il cardinale Cesare Baronio e la corona spagnola," in *Baronio storico e la Contrariforma*, eds. Romeo De Maio, Luigi Gulia and Aldo Mazzacane (Sora: Centro di Studi "Vincenzo Patriarca", 1982), 55-165; Manfredi Merluzzi, "Cesare Baronio e la Spagna, tra controversia politica e ricezione erudita," in *Cesare Baronio tra santità e scrittura storica*, eds. Giuseppe Antonio Guazzelli, Raimondo Michetti and Francesco Scorza Barcellona (Rome: Viella, 2012), 341-365.

²⁵ Olivier Poncet, *La France et le pouvoir pontifical (1595-1661): l'esprit des institutions* (Rome: École française de Rome, 2011), 239-242; Fattori, *Clemente VIII e il sacro collegio*, 93-96; Bernard Barbiche, "Clément VIII et la France (1592-1605). Principes et réalités dans les instructions générales et les correspondances diplomatiques du Saint-Siège," in Lutz, *Das Papsttum*, 99-118; Idem, *Lettres de Henri IV concernant les relations du Saint-Siège et de la France (1595-1609)* (Vatican City: BAV, 1968), XXIV-51; José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, "La

the absolution by the Holy See were two decisions taken under the influence of the cardinals of the Oratorian group, always following Philip Neri's counsel, who died shortly after attaining his goal.²⁶

The most striking aspect of this was that Philip II's Spanish Monarchy agreed to the absolution of the King of France without causing a break in its relations with the Papacy, whereas previously any intromission by the Pope that had incidence on the Spanish King's interests would have caused him to interfere diplomatically and, if necessary, to threaten use of force. This apparent passivity on the part of Philip II regarding such an unprecedented event as the reconciliation of a heretic monarch can only be explained by the rise to government positions in the Spanish Monarchy, during the late 16th century, of a group of courtiers who were in the orbit of Rome and who backed the political decisions of the Pope. Thus, from the final part of Philip II's reign, influent members of the court, such as Juan de Idiáquez²⁷ and Juan de Zúñiga, Count of Miranda,²⁸ maintained a close relationship with Clement VIII and his nephew Pietro Aldobrandini, both of whom were kept up to date on the political events of the Spanish Monarchy so that they could act upon them, if they deemed it necessary.

In this new climate, after Henry IV's conversion, the time was considered appropriate for Clement VIII to rebuild the French faction in the College of Cardinals, which had become diluted after years of heretical kings and wars of religion.²⁹ Among the new cardinals that were appointed, were two official representatives of the French King who had negotiated his pardon, Arnauld d'Ossat, appointed on 3 March 1599, and bishop Jacques du Perron, named cardinal on 9 June 1604.³⁰ However, although there was an increase in the numbers of Frenchmen, most cardinals appointed by Clement VIII were Italian. The trend toward a more italianised College was therefore accelerated while the different factions among cardinals were increasingly neutralised.

absolución de herejía de Enrique IV de Francia por Clemente VIII: Un caso moral, canónico y político conflictivo," *Revista española de derecho canónico* 58/150 (2001): 51-93.

²⁶ Ludwig von Pastor, *Historia de los Papas*, XIV (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1927), 184-185.

²⁷ «Yo no soy el que menos desseo que cessen estas disputas y querria que los ministros apostolicos y los reales se contuviesen en sus limites, cada uno poniéndose vaya y contentándose con lo que justas y derechamente les toca, pues assi se debe hazer entre tal Padre y tal hijo como son Su Santidad y Su Magestad, y esta creo que es la intención de ambos, mas quanto más lo siento, assi menos puedo dexar de hablar con esta llaneza y claridad especialmente con V. S., a quien tengo por tan señor y amigo». Juan de Idiáquez to the papal nuncio in Spain, 28 September 1597, ASV, FB, Serie III, 81a, fol. 589v.

²⁸ Since the end of the reign of Philip II was very beloved in Rome and «reconocido con gracia particular por la gran devoción que mostraba siempre hacia Su Santidad.» Therefore, from the Holy See tried to keep him «afectuoso y obligado, porque se ve, que va creciendo en autoridad y, con el paso del tiempo, se reducirá en su persona la suma de todas las cosas de Italia.» The papal nuncio in Spain to Cardinal Aldobrandini, Madrid, 8 February, 1595, ASV, FB, serie III, 81a, fos. 96r-96v.

²⁹ Gaetano Cozzi, "Gesuiti e politica sul finire del '500. Una mediazione di pace tra Enrico IV, Filippo II e la Sede apostolica," *Rivista Storica Italiana* 75 (1963): 475-537; Romeo De Maio, "Alessandro Franceschi e il card. Pierre Gondi nella riconciliazione di Enrico IV," in *Mélange Eugène Tisserant* (City of Vatican: BAV, 1964), VI, 313-356.

³⁰ Barbiche, "Clément VIII et la France", 99-118.

This gave the Pope the means by which to balance the different parties and powers.³¹

Between 1592 and 1623 there was a change of course in the College of Cardinals that would increasingly undermine the influence of the Spanish faction in the Roman curia. We can cite as an example the complaints written to Philip III by Juan de Idiáquez in 1610, concerning the difficulties in the conclaves caused by the scarcity of appointments of Spanish cardinals. Likewise in 1620, Cardinal Giovanni Doria, archbishop of Palermo, had no choice but to hastily leave Sicily in order to attend the conclave in Rome in which Gregory XV was elected. He wrote a letter to the Madrid court in which he explained his sudden departure, which he blamed on «the scarcity of Spanish cardinals present at that court».³²

While politically the Congregation of the Oratory supported a Papacy able to counter Spanish power by boosting the French Monarchy, spiritually Philip Neri had established in Rome an atmosphere of piety and certain religious practices —especially the Forty Hours' Devotion—would spread to other monarchies and years later be adopted by Philip IV's devout court.

II. Oratorian influence in the Spirituality of Philip IV's Court

If 1575 marked the foundation of the Congregation of the Oratory, Clement VIII's Papacy was the time of consolidation for Neri's followers in Rome and their expansion throughout Italian lands with the support of leading cardinals who were *bona fide* disciples of Philip Neri. Even so, it was not until the middle of the 17th century that Oratorian spirituality became firmly established outside the Italian territories. In this light, the analysis of the imposition of Oratorian-endorsed religious practices in the territories of the Catholic Monarchy³³ —the name usually given to the Spanish Monarchy at the time— is essential to better understand the change in political course and this monarchy's greater compliance with Roman rulings.³⁴

³¹ Antonio Menniti Ippolito, *Il governo dei papi nell'età moderna: carriere, gerarchie, organizzazione curiale* (Rome: Viella, 2007), 120-140; Paolo Prodi, *El soberano pontífice. Un cuerpo y dos almas: la Monarquía papal en la primera mitad Edad Moderna* (Madrid: Akal, 2010), 153.

³² AGS, E, leg. 3478, n. 9; Alexander Koller, "Le rôle du Saint-Siège au début de la guerre de Trente ans. Les objectifs de la politique allemande de Grégoire XV (1621-1623)," in *L'Europe des traités de Westphalie. Esprit de la diplomatie et diplomatie de l'esprit*, ed. Lucien Bély (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France-PUF, 2000), 123-133.

³³ José Martínez Millán and Esther Jiménez Pablo, "La Casa de Austria: una justificación político-religiosa," in *La dinastía de los Austrias. Las relaciones entre la Monarquía Católica y el Imperio*, eds. José Martínez Millán and Rubén González Cuerva (Madrid: Polifemo, 2011) 9-58.

³⁴ Ángel Alba, "El Oratorio de San Felipe Neri en Alcalá de Henares (1694-1729)," *Anales del Instituto de Estudios Madrileños* 14 (1977): 123-196; Elena Carmona Medeiro, "El antiguo Oratorio de San Felipe Neri en Córdoba: aproximación histórica y análisis artístico," *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia andaluza* 3 (2010): 177-195; Manuel Martín Riego, "El Oratorio de San Felipe Neri de Sevilla (1698-1893)," *Isidorianum* 7-14 (1998): 483-546; Manuel Martín Riego, "El Oratorio de San Felipe Neri de Sevilla (1698-2002)," in *Órdenes y Congregaciones Religiosas en Sevilla*, eds. Enrique Barrero González and Ismael Martínez Carretero (Seville:

In the Spanish kingdoms the support of Oratorian spirituality by the various family lines of the high nobility and their financing of new temples dedicated to Philip Neri proved to be fundamental for the expansion of the congregation. Then again, it is evident that these families had maintained relations with the papal curia long before. Among them was the Borja family, especially Luis Crespí de Borja,³⁵ who founded the Oratory of Saint Philip Neri in Valencia, and the Marquises of Recaño, who supported the Oratory in Cádiz. There were other nobles, like the Counts of Altamira and the Marquises of Aitona, who gave financial support.

Doubtlessly, the spread of Oratorian spirituality was made possible by the patronage of this high nobility for the founding of new temples, and also by the backing of important members of the high ecclesiastical hierarchy, such as archbishops and bishops, who established in their own dioceses this form of spirituality that was already consolidated in Rome. Nevertheless, the success of the Oratorians in Philip IV's court in Madrid came about through the foundation of the so-called *Schools of Christ*, which followed Neri's method.

A good number of these were started in Madrid. They were congregations of laymen and clerics who met to improve spiritually and fulfil the divine will. In short, they sought a path to perfection and non-attachment to worldly concerns through obligations, penance, mortification of the senses, continual prayer, frequent reception of the Sacraments, and works of charity taught and practiced as a group.³⁶ Members had to practice mental prayer and Eucharistic Adoration every day and receive communion at least once a week. Likewise, they must visit prisons at least three times a year.

The founder of these spiritual groups was Oratorian Giovanni Battista Ferruza, from the Oratory of Mesina. He created the first of these small institutions with the approval of Pope Alexander VII in 1655. That same year, Ferruza founded a similar group in Rome when he went there to take possession as bishop of Trivento, in Naples. From that start, the Schools of Christ spread quickly throughout the Spanish monarchy, to the point that in Spanish territory during the 17th century, there were more than 400 such institutions.³⁷

The spirituality of these groups, focused on the devotion to the Body of Christ and the Eucharist, took as a model the group solidarity and shared

Ateneo de Sevilla and Fundación Cajasol, 2008), 411-448; Martín Martínez Martínez and Gemma Quintana Llamas, "La Escuela de Cristo y Oratorio de San Felipe Neri en Astorga," *Astórica: revista de estudios, documentación, creación y divulgación de temas astorganos* 15-17 (1998): 91-142.

³⁵ Emilio Callado Estela, "El Oratorio de San Felipe Neri y la controversia sobre las comedias en la Valencia del siglo XVII," *Hispania Sacra* 63 (2011): 133-153.

³⁶ Manuel Moreno Valero, "La Escuela de Cristo. Su Vida, organización y espiritualidad barroca," in *La religiosidad popular. III. Hermandades, romerías y santuarios*, coords. León Carlos Álvarez Santaló, María Jesús Buxó i Rey and Salvador Rodríguez Becerra (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1989), 507.

³⁷ Mario Martínez Gomis, "Las escuelas de cristo de Elche y Orihuela: Un aspecto de la enseñanza espiritual y ascética en la España de los siglos XVII y XVIII," *Revista de historia moderna: Anales de la Universidad de Alicante* 20 (2002): 339-340.

religious practice of Philip Neri's Oratories in Rome.³⁸ This saint was considered the father and teacher of the Schools of Christ. Just like the Oratorians, the members of the Schools of Christ had to lead a renewed Christian way of life far from all sorts of vices.³⁹ They were very select groups, their religious activity was very reserved, and each group was limited to 72 members (only 24 could be ecclesiastics and the rest had to be laymen), echoing the number of the disciples of Jesus according to the Holy Scriptures. Membership carried with it special distinction and great social influence, due to the prestige of these associations. It also implied the sharing of political ideas and direct obedience to Rome.⁴⁰

In Madrid, a number of important figures from the court of Philip IV were members. These were linked in their network of patronage by a common thread: the close ties of each one with the Papacy. Among the important nobles that belonged to the Schools of Christ were the Counts of Altamira, the Marquis of Viana and Gillem Ramón de Moncada, Marquis of Aitona, High Steward of Queen Mariana of Austria and Viceroy in Catalonia, who was a patron of the School of Christ in Barcelona. Furthermore, there were members of the high ecclesiastical hierarchy, such as Cardinal Baltasar Moscoso y Sandoval, Archbishop of Toledo; the influential bishop Juan de Palafox y Mendoza;⁴¹ Cardinal Pascual, regent of the Supreme Council of Aragón, ambassador in Rome and finally Viceroy in Naples; and Nicolás Antonio, from Seville, who was an agent of the Spanish monarchy to the Papal court.⁴² All members of the Schools of Christ were obliged to have a spiritual director who would guide their virtue and act as their confessor. Jesuits were often chosen to perform this function and promote devotion toward the Eucharist.⁴³

It is not surprising that the Jesuits helped consolidate and extend the Schools of Christ in the Spanish Monarchy, as the general of the Company of Jesus, Muzio Vitelleschi (1615-1645), was acquainted with Oratorian piety well before he entered the Company, as he had been trained in Philip Neri's spiritual circle and kept very close ties with the founder of the Congregation of the Oratory.⁴⁴ Thus, when Vitelleschi was elected general of the Jesuits he had already assimilated some Oratorian practices, such as ascribing great value to the sacrament of the Eucharist. Consequently, he did not hesitate to adopt this defence of the Eucharist as a priority of the Company.⁴⁵ In fact, it was the Jesuits who supported most strongly the entry of the Blessed

³⁸ Moreno Valero, "La Escuela de Cristo", 509-527.

³⁹ Ibidem, 507-512.

⁴⁰ Francisco Sánchez-Castañer, "Aportaciones a la biografía de Nicolás Antonio," *Revista de Filología Española* 48 (1965): 1-37.

⁴¹ Fermín Labarga García, *Don Juan de Palafox y la Santa Escuela de Cristo*, in *Varia palafoxiana. Doce estudios en torno a don Juan de Palafox y Mendoza*, ed. Ricardo Fernández Gracia (Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra, 2010), 193-229.

⁴² Gemma García Fuertes, "Sociabilidad religiosa y círculos de poder. Las Escuelas de Cristo, de Madrid y Barcelona, en la segunda mitad del siglo XVII," *Pedralbes. Revista d'Història Moderna* 13/II (1993): 323-326.

⁴³ Moreno Valero, "La Escuela de Cristo", 510.

⁴⁴ Robert Bireley S.I., *The Jesuits and the Thirty Years War. King, Courts, and Confessors* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003), 22.

⁴⁵ Ponnelle and Bordet, *Saint Philip Neri*, 454-455.

Sacrament into the royal chapel at the Royal Alcázar during the lent of 1639 and, shortly thereafter, backed the implementation of the Forty Hours' Devotion in all the kingdoms of the Spanish Monarchy.

Pope Urban VIII's involvement in favour of the establishment of the Forty Hours' Devotion at Philip IV's royal chapel, with the display of the Blessed Sacrament, is quite evident. The documentation from the Vatican shows how popes, starting with Clement VIII and throughout the 17th century, granted indulgences to those subjects of the Spanish King who venerated the Blessed Sacrament, which shows Rome's interest in introducing this form of devotion as well as the disposition of the Kings in favour of the veneration of the Holy Host.⁴⁶ In addition, in his letters to the nuncio in Madrid, Urban VIII recommended that the King show even further his piety and devotion to the Holy Host if he wanted to increase his estate, placate the Catalanian and Portuguese revolts, which were seriously undermining the unity of the Spanish Monarchy, and reverse the unfavourable course of the wars in which the monarchy was involved.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ The indulgence of Paulo V said: «Para perpetua memoria. El Sacro Santo Sacramento de la Eucaristía, en el qual el unigénito Hijo del eterno Padre, Dios de Dios, Dios verdadero de Dios Verdadero, Redentor de la humana generación, Iesu Cristo nuestro Señor, está presente, al qual se debe honrar con todo culto, y veneración, como méritamente professa la Iglesia Católica. Assi nos, a quien el mismo Señor (aunque sin merecello) nos ha encargado la dicha Iglesia para gobernar, quando se ofrece alguna ocasión de veneralle con algún debido servicio y culto, de buena gana la recibimos, y abraçamos, consintiendo a los piadosos desseos de los fieles Cristianos, que lo piden. Por tanto inclinados a los ruegos a nos humilmente hechos del carissimo en Cristo hijo nuestro Filipe, Catolico Rey de las Españas, confiados en la misericordia del omnipotente Dios, y por la autoridad de los bienaventurados san Pedro, y san Pablo sus Apostoles, a todos los fieles Cristianos, hombres, y mujeres, que están en los Reynos y señoríos sujetos al dicho Rey Filipe, que oyendo nombrar el Santissimo Sacramento, le veneraren con alguna manifiesta señal de honor, y reverencia, todas las vezes que esto hizieren, les relaxamos cien días de las penitencias a ellos impuestas, otramete en qualquiera manera devidas, en la forma acostumbrada de la Iglesia: y estas presentes duren perpetuamente en los tiempos venideros. Dado en Roma en San Pedro, debaxo del anillo del pescador, a diez y siete dias del mes de Abril de mil y seiscientos y doze años, año séptimo de nuestro Pontificado.» RAH 9/3718 (13): *Indulgencia concedida por nuestro muy santo Padre Paulo V a los que veneran el nombre del Santissimo Sacramento. Paulo Papa Quinto.*

⁴⁷ Fernando Castillo Cáceres, "El providencialismo y el arte de la guerra en el siglo de Oro: la *Política Española* de Fray Juan de Salazar," *Revista de Historia Militar* 37/75 (1993): 136-137; María Rosa González Peiró, "Los predicadores y la revuelta catalana de 1640. Estudio de dos sermones," in *I Congrés d'Història Moderna de Catalunya* (Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 1984), II, 435-443; John H. Elliott, *La rebelión de los catalanes (1598-1640)* (Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1977), 193-221; Stuart John Wolf, "La crisi della monarchia spagnola: le rivoluzioni degli anni 1640-1650," *Studi Storici* IV/3 (1963): 433-448; Enrique Solano Camón, "Respuesta de los aragoneses ante los acontecimientos del Principado catalán: Datos de una crisis (1640-1641)," *Estudios de Historia Moderna* 85-86 (1986): 187-192; Rafael Valladares, *La rebelión de Portugal (1640-1680). Guerra, conflicto y poderes en la monarquía hispánica* (Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León, 1998); Rene Vermeir, *En estado de guerra: Felipe IV y Flandes, 1629-1648* (Córdoba: Universidad de Córdoba, 2006); Hugo de Schepper, "Los Países Bajos separados y la Corona de Castilla en la década de 1640," in *1640: La monarquía hispánica en crisis*, eds. John H. Elliott, Rosario Villari, Antonio Manuel Hespanha et alii (Barcelona: Crítica, 1991), 212-258; Alicia Esteban Estríngana, "Deslealtad prevenida, deslealtad contrariada: la obediencia de Flandes en la década de 1640," in *La declinación de la monarquía hispánica. Séptima Reunión Científica de la Fundación Española de Historia Moderna*, ed. Francisco José Aranda Pérez (Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2004), 69-84; José Alcalá-Zamora, *España, Flandes y el Mar del Norte (1618-*

In view of the Spanish Monarchy's delicate situation, Cardinal Barberini, Urban VIII's nephew, also warned the nuncio in Madrid that Philip IV was being subjected to a well-deserved «divine punishment» for so many years of arrogance and lack of respect for the Papacy by his ancestors —meaning Charles V and Philip II— and for the aggressive attitude shown by his prime minister, the Count Duke of Olivares. He placed Castile at the head of a monarchy that was continually embarking in wars without either listening to any advice that came from Rome, or respecting Urban VIII's decisions. The only way in which God would restore the Spanish Monarchy was for the King to show himself more pious and obedient to the Pope. The response was not long in coming: Philip IV ordered the transfer of the Holy Sacrament to the royal chapel at the Alcázar and instituted the Forty Hours' Devotion just like it was practiced in Rome.

But what relation did the installation of the Forty Hours at the royal chapel have with Oratorian spirituality? The continual prayer that accompanied the display of the Holy Host at the altar, that is the Forty Hours' Devotion, symbolised the triumph of Rome's ideology at the Madrid court, as it meant the entry into the royal chapel of this radical practice which had been extended by Philip Neri in the papal court.⁴⁸

The origin of this devotion was the practice of the *Quarantore* that was adopted by Italian churches starting in 1527 after the Sack of Rome. As Charles V's troops marched from northern Italy on their way to humiliate Pope Clement VII in Rome, in several Italian cities passed by the imperial and Spanish armies, clergymen preached against Charles V and warned of the destruction about to be wreaked by the murderous Spanish troops who were causing terror throughout Italian lands.⁴⁹ The only way to counter this fear was to resort to continual prayer to avert disaster. The plan was to move the display of the Holy Host to different churches and pray in each one for forty hours straight, day and night.⁵⁰ Philip Neri, who as a child in Florence had seen the devastation brought about by the troops of Charles V, assimilated the Forty Hours' Devotion and, years later, when he moved to Rome and was working to extend his pastoral method, he propagated this devotional practice in the Roman churches. Forty hours was a symbolic period of time that recalled the time that Christ was dead before he resurrected, so it represented

1639): *la última ofensiva europea de los Austrias madrileños* (Barcelona: Editorial Planeta, 1975), 340-343; Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, "Técnica de un golpe de estado: el inquisidor García de Trasmiera en la revuelta siciliana de 1647," in Aranda, *La declinación*, 129-153; Giuseppe Galasso, *Alla periferia dell'imperio. Il Regno di Napoli nel periodo spagnolo. Secoli XVI-XVII* (Turin: Einaudi, 1994), 271-277.

⁴⁸ Pablo Lorenzo Rodríguez, "Música, devoción y esparcimiento en la capilla real (siglo XVII): los villancicos y tonos al Santísimo Sacramento para las Cuarenta Horas," *Revista Portuguesa de Musicología* 7-8 (1997-1988): 31-45; Luis Robledo Estaire, *Tonos a lo divino y a lo Humano en el Madrid barroco* (Madrid: patrimonio musical español, 2003), 16; Nicolás Álvarez Solar-Quintés, "Panorama musical desde Felipe III a Carlos II," *Anuario musical* 12 (1957): 169-170; José Subirá, "La música en la Real Capilla madrileña y en el colegio de Niños Cantorcitos," *Anuario musical* 14 (1959): 209-213.

⁴⁹ Gianmarco Burigozzo, "Cronica milanese di Gianmarco Burigozzo Merzaro, dal 1500 al 1544," *Archivio Storico Italiano* 3 (1842): 421ss.

⁵⁰ Angelo di Santi, "L'orazione delle Quarant'ore e i tempi di calamità e di guerra nel secolo XVI," *La civiltà cattolica* 68/2 (1917): 476-478.

a long period of suffering prior to a special grace, the end of a calamity—originally the sack of Rome.

Therefore the Forty Hours' prayer, born out of fear and opposition to Charles V's troops, was adopted by the popes, who declared it an official practice in Italian lands.⁵¹ But they did not stop there. Rather, they managed to introduce this devotion, born out of the rejection of Spanish power, into Philip IV's royal chapel, obviously without warning the Spanish King of the anti-Spanish tinge hidden beneath its origin. The reception by Philip IV of this ritual that was widespread in Rome, was so keen that the King himself did not hesitate to impose this continual prayer in all the churches of Madrid starting in 1643. It was applied to different purposes, from seeking a victory in battle to appeasing internal revolts or forestalling the death of a relative of the royal family.⁵² The religious practices implemented in Rome by Philip Neri thus arrived at Madrid. These practices had contributed to the development of the Oratory in Italian lands and arose out of the deep scars left by the 1527 Sack of Rome, which were still felt in Rome several decades later.⁵³

⁵¹ Ibidem, 470-476; Idem, "L'orazione delle Quarant'ore e i tempi di calamità e di guerra nel secolo XVI," *La civiltà cattolica* 68/3 (1917): 34-44 and 222-237; Jose Maria Iraburu, *Oraciones de la Iglesia en tiempos de aflicción* (Pamplona: Fundación Gratis Date, 2003), chapter 7 and 8.

⁵² «A primero de este partió S. M. de Madrid para Tarazona, y las jornadas las hace mayores de lo que primero se entendió. Va á la ligera; créese hay alguna inteligencia secreta, si bien los enemigos obran lo que pueden. Deja órden para que el tiempo que estuviere ausente esté el Santísimo descubierto continuamente, haciendo Cuarenta Horas en todas las iglesias y conventos de Madrid, por su tumor, conforme al papel que va con esta. La diligencia en acudir á Dios siempre es útil, y la primera que se debe hacer, mas no deben omitirse las demás.» Sebastián González SJ to Rafael Pereyra SJ, Madrid, 7 July 1643, in Pascual Gayangos y Arce, "Cartas de algunos PP. de la Compañía de Jesús sobre los sucesos de la Monarquía entre los años de 1634 y 1648," in *Memorial Histórico Español: colección de documentos, opúsculos y antigüedades, que publica La Real Academia de la Historia* (Madrid: Imprenta Nacional, 1863), XVII, 145-146.

⁵³ Cistellini, *San Filippo Neri*, 50-53.

***THERE IS NO FRENDSHIP AMONG PRINCES BUT FOR THEIR OWNE
INTERESTS.
THE SPANISH FACTION AT JAMES I'S COURT, 1603-1625***

Por Valentina Caldari
(University of Kent)

ABSTRACT

After the peace treaty between England and Spain was signed in 1604, the 'Spanish faction' at the English court had reasons to feel emboldened. King James I, immediately following the peace, attempted to make the agreement binding by negotiating a dynastic marriage with the Spanish Habsburgs initially for his son Henry, then, after Henry's untimely death, for his son Charles. This contribution aims to assess the extent to which the position of the 'Spanish faction' shifted during James I's reign. The very lack of a dynastic union between England and Spain merely exacerbated the growing tensions between the English King and his political nation, leading to the decline of the 'Spanish faction' at the English court and to the outbreak of war between England and Spain in 1625.

KEYWORDS: James I, Charles I, Infanta Maria Anna, Anglo-Spanish Match; Spanish Faction; Parliament

***THERE IS NO FRENDSHIP AMONG PRINCES BUT FOR THEIR OWNE
INTERESTS.
LA FACCIÓN ESPAÑOLA EN LA CORTE DE JACOBO I, 1603-1625***

RESUMEN

Una vez se firmó en 1604 el tratado de paz entre Inglaterra y España, la "facción española" en la corte inglesa tenía razones para el optimismo. El rey Jacobo I, inmediatamente después de la paz, intentó afianzar el acuerdo mediante la negociación de un matrimonio dinástico con los Habsburgo españoles. En primer lugar se destinó a su hijo Enrique pero, ante su prematura muerte, pasó a su otro hijo, Carlos. La presente intervención pretende evaluar en qué grado evolucionaron las posiciones de la "facción española" a lo largo del reinado de Jacobo I. La ausencia de una unión dinástica entre Inglaterra y España exacerbó la creciente

tensión entre el Rey y los miembros del Parlamento, lo que condujo al declive de la “facción española” en la corte inglesa y al estallido de la guerra entre Inglaterra y España en 1625.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Jacobo I, Carlos I, Infanta María Ana, Boda angloespañola, Facción española, Parlamento

***THERE IS NO FRENDSHIP AMONG PRINCES BUT FOR THEIR OWNE
INTERESTS.
THE SPANISH FACTION AT JAMES I'S COURT, 1603-1625***

Por Valentina Caldari
(University of Kent)

In an anonymous pamphlet published in the 1640s and entitled *The anatomie of the French and Spanish faction*, the author stated that during James I's reign (1603-1625) «although hee was a most wise and knowing Prince, the Spanish faction found a greater power to act their designes.»¹ The writer continued by asserting that such a faction was so prevalent at court, that it induced King James to condescend to agreements and conditions that were detrimental not only to him but also to his progeny, to peace, and to the Protestant Religion.²

In the sixteenth and seventeenth century a common and broad hostility towards Spain was one of the few issues on which the English Parliament and political nation frequently agreed.³ Nevertheless, two Tudor monarchs had married a Spaniard, Henry VIII in 1509 and Mary Tudor in 1554. At the beginning of the seventeenth century it was believed that a Spanish marriage was also decided for James I's successor. There was no precedent, however, for a Protestant heir to the throne to marry a Spanish Catholic as «there was never this case before, all in those times being papists.»⁴

Historians of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, among them Samuel R. Gardiner and J.R. Tanner, stressed the opposition between Crown and Parliament/Court and Country, and argued for a necessary

* I would like to thank Prof. Kenneth Fincham and Dr Glyn Redworth for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this contribution. I am very grateful for Dr Ruben Gonzalez Cuerva's invitation to participate in a panel on "Las facciones españolas: ¿quintacolumna o partido político en las cortes del Antiguo Régimen?" sponsored by IULCE. The panel was held at the Association for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies's Conference in Modena in June 2014 where a shorter version of this paper was first presented. Abbreviations: AGS (Archivo General de Simancas); BL (British Library); BNE (Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid); BPR (Biblioteca del Palacio Real, Madrid); E (Estado); FSL (Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC); ODNB (*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885-1901, 63 vols.); SP (State Papers); TNA (The National Archives, Kew).

¹ [Anon.], *The anatomie of the French and Spanish faction* (London: 1644), 5.

² *Ibidem*, 6.

³ On the hostility towards the Church of Rome as one of the key factors holding the monarchy together, see Kenneth Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church 1603-1642* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993) and Robin Clifton, "Fear of Popery," in *The Origins of the English Civil War*, ed. Conrad Russell (London: Macmillan, 1973), 144-67. See also Peter Marshall, "The Other Black Legend: the Henrician Reformation and the Spanish People," *English Historical Review* 116 (2001): 31- 49. According to Marshall the Counter-Reformation in Spain and the Henrician Reformation in England represented «a prelude to decades, if not centuries, of mutual mistrust and misunderstanding.»

⁴ Sir Robert Phelps, 3 December 1621, "The Notes by Sir Thomas Barrington of the House of Commons in 1621," in *Commons Debates 1621*, ed. Wallace Notestein, Helen Relf, and Hartly Simpson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), III, 493.

connection between the parliamentary clashes of the 1610s and 1620s and the outbreak of the Civil Wars.⁵ It is certainly not up to me, as many historians have already demonstrated, to reaffirm the futility of making teleological history that seeks in the past the causes of events that are known to have occurred in the future. From the 1970s, revisionist historiography was instead more interested in the presence of factions within the Parliament rather than the alleged manichean opposition between the King and his subjects, and demonstrated that the same MPs could change sides from one Parliament (or even from one session) to the other.⁶ This was very much the case when one looks in detail at those who could be defined as being part of the Spanish faction at during James's reign.

The traditional historiography on the Spanish faction and the complex association of the English Catholics with Spain during James's reign originates from Albert J. Loomie's seminal work on the subject. Loomie is still unsurpassed in his attention to detail and the significance of the sources he has collected. He analysed the figure of the Spanish ambassador Gondomar and his influence on King James and the hispanophiles at his court. By doing so, Loomie has shown the extent to which the loyalty of some members of the Spanish faction shifted in time and reflected the heterogeneous relationship between James and his House of Commons.⁷

As argued by other contributions in this volume with regard to various early modern European courts, the term 'Spanish faction' was used with a pejorative meaning at the English court as well.⁸ The most common accusations charged to the Spanish and 'Romish' faction were that they had tried to blow up the King and Parliament in 1605, and had *pretended* friendship with the King by signing a peace treaty with the only purpose of waging «a war [...] with the Protestants of Germany, to their utter overthrow».⁹ After the Treaty of London was signed between England and Spain in 1604, the Spanish faction at the English court had reasons to feel emboldened. King James, immediately following the peace, attempted to make the agreement binding by negotiating a dynastic marriage with the Spanish Habsburgs, initially for his son Henry, and then, after Henry's untimely death in 1612, for his son Charles. This was the one recurring *leitmotiv* in relations between England and Spain during James's reign: the protracted and eventually unsuccessful marriage negotiations for a union between King James's heir

⁵ For example, Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the accession of James I to the outbreak of the civil war 1603-1642* (London: Longmans, Green, 1895).

⁶ See Kevin Sharpe, ed., *Faction and Parliament. Essays on Early Stuart History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978); J.F. Merritt, ed., *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁷ See Albert J. Loomie, ed., *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics, 1613-1624* (London: The Catholic Record Society, 1978).

⁸ In the Oxford English dictionary, the term 'faction' is defined as «a party in the state or in any community or association», and it conveys «the imputation of selfish or mischievous ends or turbulent or unscrupulous methods».

⁹ [Anon.], *To Xeiphos ton martyron, or, A brief narration of the mysteries of state carried on by the Spanish faction in England* (The Hague: 1651), 1.

and an Infanta of Spain.¹⁰ The very lack of a dynastic union between England and Spain merely exacerbated the growing tensions between the King and the political nation, leading to the decline of the Spanish faction at court and the outbreak of war between England and Spain in 1625. This essay aims to assess the extent to which the position of this faction shifted and its influence decreased from the beginning to the end of James I's reign.

Some of the most important names within the Spanish faction at James's court were people such as Queen Anne, Thomas Howard, Earl of Northampton, Robert Ker, Duke of Somerset, the Earl and Countess of Arundel, the Earl and Countess of Suffolk, members of the Villiers family, Sir John Digby, Endymion Porter, Thomas Lake, and to a certain extent his successor as Secretary of State George Calvert.¹¹ As the Spanish sympathisers, whose names were known as supporters of an alliance with the Catholic monarchy and criticised widely in contemporary pamphlets, have already been studied in quite some detail with regard to the English court, I avoid focusing on individual figures, and instead, I address specific periods in the reign of the first Stuart King of England when one can see clear alterations in the position of the Spanish faction. First, I will look at the beginning of James's rule, the period 1603-1605; second, I will discuss the absence of the Spanish ambassador Count of Gondomar from England in 1618-20; and lastly, I will consider the significant changes between the parliaments of 1621 and 1624 at the end of James's reign. The purpose of this contribution is to prove that the Spanish faction was more complex and heterogeneous than it is often recognised and it is misleading to believe that James was a weak ruler subservient to the hispanophiles at his court.

I. Peace and Marriage

Following his accession to the English throne, King James signed a peace with Philip III in 1604 that ended the long years of war between Queen Elizabeth and Philip II. A contemporary commentator strongly opposed to any alliance with the Spanish, Sir Walter Raleigh, considered the peace treaty with Spain as the greatest affair that any King of England ever had to deal with, because of its many and crucial consequences. Significantly, Raleigh stressed how the King would have been observed and judged not only by the whole of the nation but by «the eyes of all the world» in his choice to ally with the Catholic Monarchy.¹² The judgement of the Protestant nation on the Anglo-Spanish peace was not clement as they maintained that the agreement generated many disadvantages for England.¹³ Moreover, the Spaniards could not be trusted in their intentions since they had lied on previous occasions, for

¹⁰ See Glyn Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

¹¹ Loomie, *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*, XVII-XVIII.

¹² Walter Raleigh, "A Discourse Touching a War with Spain, and of the Protecting of the Netherlands," in *The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh*, ed. William Oldys and Thomas Birch (Oxford: The University Press, 1829), VIII, 314.

¹³ For example «no English were permitted to trade into the West Indies, and if any did adventure so to do, he was to be hanged and tortured with no mercy», [Anon.], *The anatomie*, 6-7.

example by covering the preparations for the Armada in 1588 with peace overtures.¹⁴

In 1605, shortly after the signing of the peace, a group of Catholics were charged with the Gunpowder plot. The Protestants could not believe that «such a desperate [...] a designe, upon King, Peers, Kingdome and people» had not resulted in «the execution of some Law, for the utter extirpation of all Papists, and their Iesuiticall adherents.» The author's reason for the absence in England of strong anti-Catholic laws was precisely «the interest with forraign Princes and the King of Spain».¹⁵ The political nation indeed created a link between the Spanish monarchy and the Catholics of England as the King of Spain was accused of wanting to create a «fifth monarchy to the universall disquiet and disturbance, not only of his bordering Neighbour, but of all the Christian Regions through Europe.»¹⁶ Any agreement with Spain was thus seen as giving leverage to the Pope in his efforts to restore Catholicism in England. James, however, tried to prevent such a connection being made mostly because of his essential dislike of persecution and war and his strong diplomatic awareness, as Wormald above all has shown.¹⁷ In fact, in a speech to Parliament following the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, the King stated that:

*For although it cannot be denied, That it was the onely blinde superstition of their errors in Religion, that led them to this desperate device; yet doth it not follow, That all professing that Romish religion were guiltie of the same.*¹⁸

II. Gondomar and the Spanish Faction

At the beginning of 1615, the Dominican Friar Diego de la Fuente reporting in Madrid concerning the situation in London focused on the strength and influence of the anti-Spanish faction. He argued that his efforts to prove to the English King that an alliance between Spain and England was more necessary and crucial for England than it was for Spain, had been in vain.¹⁹ Discussion concerning the pros and cons of the alliance was widespread and articulated through public debate as well as the written word, in both England and in Spain. In *Considerations vpon the Treaty of Marriage between England and Spain*, the anonymous author of the pamphlet pragmatically considers

¹⁴ See Robert Cross, "To Counterbalance the World. England, Spain, and Peace in the early 17th century" (Unpublished doctoral thesis, Princeton University, 2012), 86.

¹⁵ [Anon.], *The anatomie*, 6.

¹⁶ BL, Add. Ms. 34219: "A Discourse against the Peace with Spaine presented to the King in the first yeare of his Raigne over England," fos 1-10v.

¹⁷ Jenny Wormald, "James I," *ODNB*.

¹⁸ James I, "A Speach in the Parliament Hovse [9 November 1605]," in *King James VI and I. Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 152.

¹⁹ Loomie, *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*, XVI.

that «the essential poynts seem to be the advantages, and disadvantages and whether both weighed in equall balance».²⁰

By 1616-17, however, both the English political nation and foreign observers were convinced that the Spanish match was nearing a successful conclusion, given that John Digby had been sent to Madrid with the purpose of agreeing on the conditions and concluding the negotiations. In a letter addressed to William Trumbull, John Beaulieu stated that the Spanish match was being strongly pursued by «the favorers of the same [i.e. the Spanish Faction], who are the most powerfull in credit and number that the opponents [who] are much discomforted in the hope of their endeavors.»²¹ And by 1618, before leaving England, Gondomar was optimistic concerning the possibility of an Anglo-Spanish match and convinced of the importance of such an alliance with England, which was to be cultivated according to Charles V's maxim «guerra con toda la tierra y paz con Inglaterra.»²² Indeed, at the time of his departure from England, Gondomar presented jewels as a gift to many of the people considered to be part of the Spanish faction: Buckingham, Hamilton, Lennox, Calvert, Endymion Porter, and the Countess of Arundel.²³

By the end of 1616 and early 1617, Gondomar had already asked the Spanish King for permission to return to Madrid due to his bad health.²⁴ However, Philip III had often ordered his departure from England to be postponed as the Spanish ambassador was a key intermediary in the marriage negotiations with England.²⁵ In fact, still at the end of 1617, although he was assigned the title he had requested, that of Count of Gondomar,²⁶ he was still not given permission to go back to Spain; he was only able to return in 1618. In his place, a special agent, Juan Sánchez de Ulloa, was at James's court for two years. The Spanish ambassador's absence from London between July 1618 and March 1620, however, did threaten the Spanish cause and the strength of the Spanish faction at James's court; as Ruiz Fernández has noted in his doctoral thesis, in this period the money sent from Spain to England - to be used for pensions and gifts from the Spanish envoy to members of the English court - was drastically reduced.²⁷ Shortly after Gondomar's arrival, Ulloa wrote to Madrid stating that there was urgent need for Gondomar to return to England in his place, since he was the only one who knew England well enough and the best placed to manage «these important negotiations» while maintaining the King of England's friendship.²⁸

²⁰ [Anon.], *Considerations vpon the Treaty of Marriage between England and Spain* (London: 1617). See also, for example, BNE, Ms. 10794; AGS, E, leg. 2518.

²¹ Jean Beaulieu to William Trumbull, 31 January 1616-17, in *Papers of William Trumbull the Elder September 1616-December 1618*, ed. G. Dyfnallt Owen and Sonia P. Anderson (London: Historical Manuscript Commission, 1995), 103-4.

²² Count of Gondomar to Juan de Ciriza, Madrid, 28 March 1619, quot. in Loomie, *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*, XVII.

²³ BPR, 2108, fol. 68, quot. in Loomie, *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*, XV.

²⁴ AGS, E, leg. 2514, n. 69, 84.

²⁵ AGS, E, leg. 2514, n. 84: «importa tanto alli su asistencia para la platica de casamiento».

²⁶ BPR, II/2107, docs. 15-25, 27, 37, 38, 45, 46; II/2124, doc. 212; II/2134, doc. 126.

²⁷ Óscar Ruiz Fernández, "Las relaciones hispano-inglesas entre 1603 y 1625. Diplomacia, comercio, y guerra naval" (University of Valladolid, Unpublished PhD thesis), 184.

²⁸ AGS, E, Leg. 845, n. 131.

Upon Gondomar's return to London in 1620, the ambassador stated that only King James and John Digby were left as supporters of a Spanish alliance as the Puritan anti-Spanish faction, strongly opposing the Catholic cause, was growing in numbers and power.²⁹

III. War and Marriage

As Conrad Russell has argued, two elements dominated the political scene between 1621 and 1624: war and marriage.³⁰ In a letter addressed to Buckingham, written in the 1620s, Thomas Alured begged the Duke to reconsider the Spanish Match as no marriage between England and Spain had ever led to anything good in the previous 120 years. Moreover, according to the author, nothing useful was ever accomplished by trusting foreign enemies to solve the Crown's problems and needs.³¹ On 13 November 1621 Samuel Phillips, Minister of St. Mary, Staines, and Lecturer at St Paul's was examined for having preached against marriages between Protestants and Catholics. Not only did he defend his doctrine stating that in his sermon he proved it to be against the word of God, but also he did not deny that his preaching was not only referring to common people, but instead, «it was not lawful for any Protestant Prince to marry wth any of ye Romain Religion».³² In *Vox Populi*, a well-known satirical pamphlet set in Spain and written by Thomas Scott in 1620, the author made the Spanish ambassador Gondomar say that the greatest achievement in his role as envoy at the court of King James had been to worsen relations between the King and his House of Commons, to the point that the sovereign would not want to ever convene a Parliament again, even he were to be in need. According to Scott's Gondomar, because it was very unlikely that another parliamentary assembly would ever be summoned, the only possible way for the King of England to repay his debts was that of a Spanish marriage for his son, Prince Charles.³³

In 1619, however, Frederick V of the Palatinate, husband of James's daughter Elizabeth and therefore son-in-law of the King of England, accepted the Bohemian crown, despite James having warned him against it.³⁴ By 1620, Emperor Ferdinand's allies had invaded not only Bohemia but also Frederick's territories in the Palatinate. King James found himself in 1620-21 reluctantly forced to convene Parliament even though ambassador Gondomar was strongly against it because he feared that enemies of Spain would gather in the assembly. The reason behind the King convening the Parliament was that

²⁹ Ruiz Fernández, *Las relaciones hispano-inglesas*, 184.

³⁰ Conrad Russell, "What was New in the 1620s?," in *King James VI and His English Parliaments. The Trevelyan Lectures Delivered at the University of Cambridge 1995*, ed. Richard Cust and Andrew Thrush (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 177-88 (180).

³¹ [Thomas Alured], *The Coppie of a Letter written to the Duke of Buckingham concerning the match with Spaine* (London: 1642), 7-8.

³² TNA, SP, 14/123, fol. 158. In the State Papers there are many examples of examinations against those who touch upon matters of state, especially from the pulpit. See also Jeanne Shami, *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2003), 42-45.

³³ Thomas Scott, *Vox Populi* (London: 1620).

³⁴ TNA, SP, 94/24, fos 46-52.

he needed to be able, in the eyes of his subjects and those of other European monarchs, to finance a war. Despite not wanting to intervene in what it was soon becoming a war of religion, James also realised he could not remain a spectator. To make himself credible as a mediator, and persuade the other European powers that he was going to intervene in favour of his son-in-law if his possessions were not restored, he needed the promise of financial support from his Parliament. Therefore, in November 1620 James issued a summons for Parliament to meet the following January in order to obtain subsidies for a potential war against the Habsburgs, if diplomatic means, which he still preferred and hoped to employ, were to fail. On 6 January 1622 King James issued a proclamation to dissolve that very same Parliament. The reasons for the dissolution, as stated by the King's Proclamation, were that he had needed subsidies to solve the difficult situation of Christianity in Europe and restore his children, Frederick V and Elizabeth, to what was rightfully theirs.³⁵ Some MPs, however, had instead taken the liberty not only to discuss issues that were a matter of royal prerogative but also «to speake with less respect of foreign princes our allies than were fit for any subject to do of any anointed King.»³⁶

Instances of discussions within the political nation involving the role of the Parliament combined with notions of foreign policy and royal marriages were by no means isolated cases and indeed they intensified strongly in the early 1620s, despite James's proclamations in December 1620 and again in July 1621. The King wrote against «excesse of Lavish and Licentious speech of matters of State» and protested that

*Wee are given to understand, that notwithstanding the strictnesse of Our commandement, the inordinate libertie of unreverent speech, touching matters of high nature, unfit for vulgar discourse.*³⁷

As heir to the throne, Charles's marriage was of fundamental interest and concern for the entire commonwealth.³⁸ These proclamations were therefore meant to send to Parliament and the political nation a clear message about what they were allowed to discuss and what was instead «matter above their reach and calling». Indeed, both the Commons in Parliament and the wide political nation believed that royal marriage was an issue on which they could express their opinions through the written word. Some MPs were convinced that the King needed advice on certain matters to prevent him from being misleadingly influenced by the Spanish faction at court. For example, Thomas Wentworth stated in that «for the marriage, wee are the members of

³⁵ Joseph Robson Tanner, *Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 289-295; James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes, eds., *Stuart Royal Proclamations. Vol. I. Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 527-34. On «this time of miserable distraction throughout Christendom» as defined by James in his proclamation, see also FSL, ms.V.b.207 "Mirabilia Huius Anni".

³⁶ Tanner, *Constitutional Documents*, 293.

³⁷ Larkin and Hughes, *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, 495-96 and 519-20 (520).

³⁸ Peter Lake, "Constitutional Consensus and the Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match," *The Historical Journal* 25 (1982): 805-25 (815).

the bodie, the kinge the head; wee must take care to keepe the head from hurt.»³⁹ James, however, thought it necessary to control the «lavish and licentious speech», as he considered the marriage of his heir to fall within the *arcana imperii* and therefore his royal prerogative. In the early 1620s, when the political nation seemed to be more opposed than ever to the Spanish marriage, King James and the Hispanophiles at his court continued to pursue a policy in favour of an alliance with the Habsburgs. Those who spoke ill of the King of Spain, or of his ambassadors, were severely punished.⁴⁰

Another important item in James's list of priorities was religion. The King was eager to demonstrate to his subjects that he would neither abandon his own nor his kingdom's religion for the sake of a union with Spain nor he would allow English Catholics or the Spanish faction at court to grow powerful in the hope for a marriage with the Catholic power. Despite King James's assurance that he would only agree to a marriage for the Prince if the union promoted the glory of God and the welfare of the kingdom, the MPs and the political nation remained doubtful, as they felt that there was «no Security at Home, whiles the Papists, half Subjects, increase so much in Number and Confidence.»⁴¹ Indeed, in the words of Edward Gyles in one of the most animated foreign policy debates in November 1621:

*Our King the Chief of true Religion, the King of Spayne of the other. Either of these will do his best for their Religion. How can these two great Kings agree in Peace, and yet have Wars?*⁴²

A crucial question, which admitted no easy solution, was placed in front of the Parliament: how could King James continue to pursue a Spanish marriage at a time when the Habsburgs were imperilling Frederick V and Elizabeth's territories?⁴³ As part of a broader petition that asked James to write to the King of Spain not to help the Emperor either directly or indirectly because if he did, the King of England would declare war against Spain, there was one more issue raised by the House in the second session that deserves attention. James was petitioned by the Commons for his son and heir to be «timely married to one of our own religion».⁴⁴ On hearing news of such a petition, the King was enraged: not only was the marriage of his heir exclusively a matter of royal prerogative, but also it was not in the power of the MPs to speak concerning against whom the King were to declare war. Among the *arcana imperii* not to be touched upon, James mentioned in his answer to the Commons, were the Spanish match, the conduct of the war, the King of Spain or any other foreign Prince. Concerning the war, they had been called to grant supplies, not to usurp his powers, and regarding the Match with

³⁹ «The Belasyse Diary», December 3, 1621, in *Commons Debates in 1621*, V, 229.

⁴⁰ TNA, SP, 94/24, fol. 160.

⁴¹ Sir Robert Phelips, «House of Commons Journal Volume 1: 26 November 1621,» *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 1, 1547-1629* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1802), 644-647.

⁴² *Ibidem*.

⁴³ Tim Harris, *Rebellion. Britain's First Stuart Kings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 187.

⁴⁴ *Commons Debates in 1621*, IV, 440 and III, 457.

Spain, «yt was so far proceded in on his part, that yf those conditions and covenantes he hath propounded may be accepted and kept, there is no more speach to be used in yt» and it was therefore purposeless that «they should busie themselves and entermeddle so much in this mariage».⁴⁵ At the end of 1621, before James dissolved the Parliament, in reporting to Philip IV in Madrid on the adjourning of the assembly before Christmas, Gondomar said that despite the fact that the King of England had assured the MPs that Parliament would meet again on 8 February 1622, he was convinced that he «would never summon the Parliament again in his life, and especially with such people as those ones»,⁴⁶ which is to say strongly opposed to any alliance with Spain.

In 1623, Charles and Buckingham went to Madrid and stayed there for several months without reaching any conclusions with the marriage negotiations. In England, the House of Commons complained that the Spaniards abroad and the Spanish faction at home was growing insolent and «[they] call us the Protestant faction». After the failure of the mission that was supposed to bring about Charles's marriage to the Infanta and their return from Madrid in October 1623, the Prince and the Duke of Buckingham pushed for the convening of Parliament as soon as possible.⁴⁷ The Parliament met in February 1624 and James, in his opening speech, invited the two Houses to advise him on the issue of breaking off the marriage negotiations. Yet, although the King had given Parliament permission to address his son's match, the Commons, mindful of the rough debate of 1621, were reluctant to discuss the matter. The Lords instead followed promptly the appeal of the King and declared themselves in favour of a Spanish war.⁴⁸ I believe that although the topics discussed were almost the same, there was a noticeable difference between 1621 and 1624: the Lords had not addressed at all the question of foreign policy in 1621 yet in 1624 they were the first to do so. When the Commons began debating relations with Spain, Charles and Buckingham pushed to obtain the subsidies to support a war that in their opinion had already been decided «by your entreaties, your engagements».⁴⁹ What made the Parliament of 1624 different from the previous one was the internal conflict between members of the royal family: Charles and indeed his father's favourite, Buckingham, were hoping for a rapid declaration of war against Spain, while James was seeking an assurance that he would receive the necessary financial support were such war to be declared.

In fact, when the Prince and the Duke had returned to London without bringing with them the Infanta, they had decided it was time to reverse

⁴⁵ Chamberlain to Carleton, 15 December 1621, TNA, SP, 14/124, fos. 92-93.

⁴⁶ Count of Gondomar to Philip IV, 2 Jan. 1622, AGS, E, leg. 2558, n. 6.: «este Rey no le juntará mas en su vida, a los menos con tal gente como la que havía». For an excellent discussion concerning «tal gente» whom Gondomar often defined as «Puritanos», see Glyn Redworth, *Gondomar and Parliaments* (forthcoming, 2016), 4-7.

⁴⁷ Wormald, «James I», *ODNB*.

⁴⁸ Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621-1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 163.

⁴⁹ Quoted in G. L. Harriss, «Medieval Doctrines in the Debates on Supply, 1610-1629», in *Faction and Parliament. Essays on Early Stuart History*, ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 73-103 (95).

James's policy and look for a war instead of a marriage with the Spanish Habsburgs. This was easier said than done as the Spanish match, which continued to be viewed negatively by the political nation, was instead still supported by the majority of the King's privy councillors. From the end of 1623 till 1625 Charles and Buckingham worked tirelessly to create a 'patriot' coalition that would work for a common cause against the Spanish faction: the support of the Dutch and the restoration of Elizabeth and Frederick. In 1621 James had asked for supply, but in 1624 it was the Prince who needed the support of Parliament to finance a war against Spain. The difference was that in 1624, as in 1621, King James was still hoping to solve the intricate situation of central Europe without bloodshed, while Prince Charles was, from the time of his return from Madrid, trying to radically change the course of foreign policy by declaring a war against the Habsburgs.⁵⁰

In constructing this 'patriot' and anti-Spanish coalition at court and in Parliament, Charles and Buckingham eliminated those who were pro-Spanish and therefore against declaring a war on the Catholic Monarchy. For example, the Earl of Bristol, the English ambassador in Madrid, was accused of giving false hope to King James concerning the development of the proceedings for the match with Spain. Bristol was therefore recalled from Madrid on 22 January 1624. Upon his return to England, Buckingham made sure to keep him as far away from the King as possible to prevent the Earl from convincing the sovereign that he had acted in the best English interest and always followed his orders.⁵¹ Furthermore, the Prince and the Duke encouraged the Commons to impeach the pro-Spanish Lord Treasurer Lionel Cranfield on charges of bribery when he expressed his opinion that a war would undermine all his efforts to reform the royal finances.⁵² The same fate (i.e. impeachment) would befall the Earl of Bristol two years later. In 1625, the patriot anti-Spanish coalition included, but was by no means limited to, Essex, Southampton, Oxford, Pembroke, Warwick, Coke, Eliot, Phelips, and Sandys; what was uniting them was shared anti-popish and Hispanophobic sentiments.⁵³

According to the House of Commons in 1621 and 1624, King James's position had been inconsistent since, though the King had repeatedly emphasised the benefits of peace, he also admitted not only that «warres upon iust quarrels are lawful» but also that a «iust warre is more tollerable then a dishonourable and dis-advantageous peace».⁵⁴ Therefore, some of the MPs encouraged a Spanish war not only out of fear that English Catholics could act as fifth column for a potential foreign invasion, but also because they

⁵⁰ See Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution. English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 78.

⁵¹ Samuel R. Gardiner, ed., "The Earl of Bristol Defence of his Negotiations in Spain," in *The Camden Miscellany*, VI (London: Camden Society, 1871), V-VI.

⁵² On Lionel Cranfield and his relationship with Buckingham in the 1620s, see John Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown. Finance under James VI and I, 1603-1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2002), 195-202.

⁵³ Harris, *Rebellion*, 220-22.

⁵⁴ James I, "Basilikon Doron," in Sommerville, *King James VI*, 32-33 and idem, "A Speach [1603]," 134.

considered unacceptable that it appeared as if «King James feares Spaine».⁵⁵ From an analysis of the pamphlets and books printed between 1623 and 1624, including numerous demonstrations of joy for Charles's return from Madrid without the Infanta, one can see that after 1623 political debate in the public sphere had strongly turned anti-Spanish. This, however, did not mean that the majority of the population agreed with Sir Edward Coke, according to whom «England never prospered so well as when at war with Spain».⁵⁶ Certainly there was a part of the political nation which considered Spain as the natural enemy of England as the elected Protestant nation. To these subjects James's diplomatic choices were deeply unpopular while Charles's new-found animosity against Spain aroused admiration. Yet it appears from the Commons' debates and from a careful reading of widespread pamphlets such as *Vox Coeli* or popular plays such as Middleton's *A Game at Chesse* that the attitude towards an anti-Spanish policy, while always entailing a breakdown of the marriage negotiations, rarely meant an unconditional support for a war against Spain.⁵⁷ Charles and Buckingham were victims of this contradiction as, in a sense, was James in 1621. As James had failed that year to convince the nation to pursue a Spanish match for Charles at a time when the majority was pushing for a war, so Charles and Buckingham failed in 1624 to pursue a war against Spain when the majority simply asked for the breaking of the marriage treaties.

Conclusion

At the end of the 1970s Russell pointed out that circumstances in Madrid, Brussels, and elsewhere in Europe «did more to determine the course of English foreign policy than events on the floor of either House of Parliament.»⁵⁸ Indeed, the events happening on the Continent in the period following 1618 were the motivating factors behind James's summoning of the Parliament in 1621, and certainly events in the Palatinate exacerbated the anti-Catholicism of the lower house and, in general, of the English political nation. Consequently, the Spanish faction found itself in an increasingly unpopular position. The idea, however, of a rigid dichotomy between on the one hand King James and the Spanish faction opposed to a conflict against the Catholic Monarchy, and on the other hand the Commons in favour of war is oversimplistic and misleading. In the 1624 House of Commons there was not a cohesive majority in favour of war. Not only many MPs were against military expenditure but also there were pragmatic considerations that bound England to Spain on the European trade chessboard.

Before Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham's trip to Madrid, it was not yet decided that the enemy had to be Spain. With France powerful again after the end of the competition between Maria de Medici and Louis XIII, and with the growing economic power of the Dutch it was not at all

⁵⁵ John Reynolds, *Vox Coeli* (London: 1624), 34 and Russell, *Parliaments*, 82. See BPR, II/2108, docs. 98, 102 and 106.

⁵⁶ Russell, *Parliaments*, 80.

⁵⁷ See Queen Anne [of Denmark] character in Reynolds, *Vox Coeli*, 41: «I could neuer accept the match of Spaine [...], well fore-seeing they would proue fatall and ruinous to England.»

⁵⁸ Russell, *Parliaments*, 1.

obvious that English interest was in alliance with one or the other. Following Charles's failed trip to Spain, however, those MPs against the Spanish Match and the Spanish faction and in favour of war strengthened their position. In fact, upon the return of the Prince and the Duke in October 1623, James's foreign policy was questioned by the overwhelming majority of the political nation.

King James was a king whose greatest pride was to have kept his country at peace during most of his reign, and his attitude towards war against Spain or any other country was always a pragmatic one: the King was not afraid of Spain as he was accused of by the MPs when he continued pursuing the Spanish Match, but was rather concerned about war itself. During the sermon for the King's funeral Bishop John Williams said that «like King Salomon, he died in peace».⁵⁹ His decision not to intervene against Spain at the end of the 1610s and up to his death in 1625 and to continue instead pursuing a diplomatic route was consistent with the policy he had followed up to that point. James therefore was guided by his own priorities, at times shared and at times conflicting with the Spanish (and the Spanish faction's) agenda. Not recognising this means to equivocate James's actions as subservient to Spanish interest embodied by the Spanish ambassador in London or by the Spanish faction at court, even when such actions were instead simply following his long-term policy. The English King was playing a mediating role between the pro- and the anti-Spanish faction both within his court and Parliament at home, and within Europe by positioning himself as equidistant from continental conflicts.⁶⁰

At James I's court, factions were concentrated in the two major directions that were guiding the King's foreign policy: either a pro-Habsburg or a pan-Protestant policy. From the beginning of his reign, the King of England was regarded as favouring a pro-Spanish foreign policy and accused of wanting to pursue an alliance with the Habsburgs and being indifferent to the needs of European Protestantism. James, however, unlike the factions in his own court, did not consider the two positions as self-excluding and instead hoped to use the dynastic marriages of his children to obtain peace in Europe. It is misleading to characterise the Spanish faction as a static phenomenon at the beginning of the 17th century, as much as it is challenging to trace the membership of such a faction with absolute certainty, due to the fact that some MPs and courtiers changed side from the beginning to the end of James's reign. The Duke of Buckingham is only the most obvious example of inconsistency. As with any political party in our own times, the Spanish faction during the reign of James I went through alternate fortunes between 1603 and 1625: it was strong and influential in 1603-5 when it was in the interest of Spain and England to obtain a peace agreement that was convenient to both. The faction lost most of its power between 1618 and 1620 due to ambassador

⁵⁹ Ibidem, 203.

⁶⁰ Richard C. McCoy, "Old English honour in an evil time: aristocratic principle in the 1620s," in *The Stuart Court and Europe. Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, ed. R. Malcolm Smuts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 133-155 (133).

Gondomar's absence from England, but again obtained significant influence between 1621 and 1623. The pro-Spanish returned to being in a minority when Charles and Buckingham returned empty-handed from Spain at the end of 1623 and remained so until the accession of Charles I, just as hostilities with Spain which King James had spent most of his reign trying to avoid were breaking out.

A FLUCTUATING ASCENDANCY: THE “SPANISH PARTY” AT THE IMPERIAL COURT OF VIENNA (1631-1659)*

Luis Tercero Casado
(Universität Wien)

ABSTRACT

With the arrival in 1631 of Emperor Ferdinand III's bride to Vienna, the *infanta* Maria Anna, the “Spanish party” at the Imperial court gained a remarkable momentum. At the time, Philip IV's interests found a key ally in the person of his sister, who, along with her influential confessor Diego de Quiroga, exerted an indisputable influence over the direction of Imperial issues for the following decades. Nevertheless, the empress's untimely death, as well as the consequential return of Quiroga to the Peninsula, seriously undermined Spain's interests and had a negative impact on the outcome of the Peace of Westphalia. In addition, the situation was further exacerbated by a sharp drop in the means to fund a long list of pensioners and collaborators of the Spanish Crown. With a weakened party lacking leadership, the Spanish ambassador, within his recovered prominence, promoted the rise of a new figure as guarantor of Madrid's interests: the count of Auersperg, a powerful minister which would hold a leading position in Ferdinand III's government. Madrid, however, risked a great deal by focusing his support on a too ambitious a candidate with plenty of enemies. The rupture in 1656 between Auersperg and the Catholic ambassador implied a serious jeopardy for the Madrid's position, in a very sensitive period regarding the survival of the Spanish Monarchy.

KEYWORDS: House of Habsburg, Imperial Court, Faction, Party, Diplomacy

UNA ASCENDENCIA FLUCTUANTE: EL “PARTIDO ESPAÑOL” EN LA CORTE IMPERIAL DE VIENA (1631-1659)

RESUMEN

La llegada en 1631 a Viena de la esposa de Fernando III, la infanta María, propició que el “partido español” en la Corte imperial cobrara un inusitado impulso

*Abbreviations: AGS (Archivo General de Simancas), AHN (Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid), AHN-SN (Archivo Histórico Nacional, Sección Nobleza, Toledo), AVA (Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Vienna), BNE (Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid), *CODOIN* (*Colección de documentos inéditos para la Historia de España*), CSyC (Colección Salazar y Castro), E (Estado), HHStA (Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna), OÖLA (Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv, Linz), RAH (Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid), SDK (Spanien-Diplomatische Korrespondenz).

respecto a épocas anteriores. Los intereses de Felipe IV hallaron por entonces un inmejorable aliado en su hermana, la cual, junto a su influyente confesor, Diego de Quiroga, ejerció un indiscutible ascendiente en la dirección de los asuntos imperiales durante los siguientes decenios. Sin embargo, la prematura defunción de la emperatriz y el consecuente regreso de Quiroga a la Península minaron seriamente las conveniencias de España y ello se dejó sentir de manera aguda en el desenlace de los tratados de Westfalia. A ello se añadió una abrupta reducción de los medios para costear una larga lista de pensionados y colaboradores de la Corona española. Con un partido debilitado y sin liderazgo, el embajador español, dentro de su renovado protagonismo, fomentará el ascenso de una nueva figura como garante de los intereses de Madrid: el conde de Auersperg, un poderoso ministro que pasaría a ocupar una posición preeminente en el gobierno de Fernando III. No obstante, Madrid arriesgó mucho al centrar su apoyo en un candidato demasiado ambicioso y rodeado de enemigos, ya que la ruptura en 1656 entre Auersperg y el embajador católico comportó un serio riesgo para la posición española en un momento extremadamente delicado para la supervivencia de la Monarquía Hispánica.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Casa de Habsburgo, Corte imperial, facción, partido, diplomacia

A FLUCTUATING ASCENDANCY: THE “SPANISH PARTY” AT THE IMPERIAL COURT OF VIENNA (1631-1659)

Luis Tercero Casado
(Universität Wien)

Leaving aside the ongoing, complex and much interesting debate on the concept of Spanish "party" or "faction" at Early Modern courts,¹ I wish primarily to point out that, in the absence of a consolidated definition in current historiography, the use of those concepts here will be simply related to the group of influential individuals eager to provide services to the Spanish crown, either for free, or in exchange for favours of various types. During the 16th and 17th centuries, these lobbyists were often a spearhead, which helped Catholic ambassadors to introduce the policies of the kings of Spain at the court of the other branch of the *Casa de Austria*. The Czech court researcher Pavel Marek has recently stressed the heterogeneity of the individuals belonging to these networks. In one of his latest studies, he highlighted the difficulty of standardizing within the same group the circumstances and manifold reasons of those involved in meeting the interests of the Catholic King.² Since the beginning of bilateral relations between the Habsburg branches, we can distinguish two main groups of actors influencing the emperor's advisory bodies on behalf of the Spanish king: on the one hand, his diplomats, and, on the other, clergymen or courtiers of varying rank. Exceptionally, there was a third circumstantial group within this rule. Whenever Austrian princes married a Spanish *infanta*, ambassadors did not only rely on individuals belonging to the abovementioned second group, but could count on the support of these female members of the dynasty. As a whole, individuals belonging to these two last groups were extremely heterogeneous and had very different motivations when it came to intercede for the Spanish crown.

I. A Golden Era? The “Spanish Party” under Empress Maria Anna and her Confessor

The evolution and composition of the Spanish faction throughout the 17th century was thus extremely heterogeneous. Its highly fickle nature was evident during the Thirty Years' War in virtue of its mutable composition, which was very liable to the epoch's capricious political-economic fluctuations. Faction members belonged mostly to the patronage networks of Spanish

¹ On the current debate around the controversial concept of “Spanish faction”, see the leading studies of Rubén González Cuerva and Pavel Marek, whose conclusions have lately been presented at several European congresses and will soon appear within the Internet forum “La facción española”, <http://faccion.hypotheses.org/> (consulted on 26 April 2015), launched in 2013. The scholarly blog, focused on the last developments in this field of research, aims to boost and promote new methodological and thematic discussion on the idea of pro-Spanish lobbies at the Imperial court, as well as to function as a working database of bi-bibliographical notes.

² Pavel Marek, *La embajada española en la corte imperial (1558-1641). Figuras de los embajadores y estrategias clientelares* (Prague: Karolinum, 2013).

ambassadors. However, this was not the general rule as evidenced by the role of members of the dynasty within these lobbies. Their high condition undoubtedly placed them far above mere network members since their motivations were related to family solidarity rather than to a clientage relationship. This argument is consistent with the composition of the "Spanish party" at the imperial court in Vienna following the arrival of the *infanta* Maria Anna of Austria in 1631 to marry future Emperor Ferdinand III. As had happened with Maximilian II's consort, Empress Maria, the newcomer would emerge –with the enthronement of her husband in 1637– as the main agent of Philip IV's interests in Vienna. Maria Anna shared this function with her trustful confessor, the influential Capuchin friar Diego de Quiroga.³ The cleric's wide experience in diplomatic missions, along with the relevance of Maria Anna, made it an unbeatable combination in the government of Ferdinand III and exerted its influence in favour of a strong link between the two lines of the House of Austria.⁴

The long-lasting conflict later known as Thirty Years' War generated a close military alliance between both courts eager to strengthen Habsburg authority and the Counter-Reformation in the Holy Roman Empire. Then the figure of the Catholic ambassador in Vienna had started to lose autonomy due to internal dissensions in the government of the Count-Duke of Olivares.⁵ In such a context, Maria Anna and her confessor managed to steer skilfully – despite not always in agreement with the envoys– the wishes of Philip IV, either in the palace chapel or at the Imperial Privy Council. Nevertheless, their intervention alone was not enough to channel the crown's interests. The embassy undoubtedly relied on the invaluable assistance provided by the influential and extensive patronage network that the envoys were building-up since the 16th century. Family names such as Eggenberg, Lobkowitz, Dietrichstein, Harrach or Trautson were among the various lineages of defenders of Catholic orthodoxy, and therefore were supporters of the self-proclaimed guarantor of the Roman confession, namely, the king of Spain. The Protestants had threatened the interests of these noblemen, who were deeply rooted in Bohemia and strongly tied to Habsburg loyalty. These bonds of clientele, encouraged by rewards of different kind, were reinforced through marriages with women belonging to the Spanish nobility. Furthermore, their descendants were also considered vassals of the Spanish crown.⁶ This whole network became Madrid's outpost against any policy contrary to its schemes at the Viennese court. While some of these aristocrats held key influential

³ See, on this figure, Buenaventura de Carrocera, "El Padre Diego de Quiroga, diplomático y confesor de reyes (1574-1649)," *Estudios Franciscanos* 50 (1949): 71-100; Henar Pizarro Llorente, "La elección de confesor de la infanta Maria de Austria en 1628," in *La dinastía de los Austria. Las relaciones entre la Monarquía Católica y el Imperio*, ed. José Martínez Millán and Rubén González Cuerva (Madrid: Polifemo, 2011), II, 759-800; John Reeve, "Quiroga's paper of 1631: A Missing Link in Anglo-Spanish Diplomacy during the Thirty Years War," *The English Historical Review* 401 (1986): 913-926.

⁴ Cf. Hildegard Ernst, *Madrid und Wien 1632-1637. Politik und Finanzen in den Beziehungen zwischen Philipp IV. und Ferdinand II* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1991), ch. 2, and Mark Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III. (1608-1657). Eine Biographie* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2012), 91-92, 130-131.

⁵ Marek, *La embajada española*, 128-139.

⁶ *Ibidem*, 40.

positions, however, none were equated to the then favourite of Ferdinand III, Count Maximilian von Trauttmansdorff, so-called “member” of the “Spanish party”.⁷ Under his leadership, the unquestionable preponderance of this faction was assured until 1646, time when the first signs of fissures within the dynastic union emerged. In fact, the crisis that began to afflict the faction had its origins in the military defeats of the Imperial war coalition one year earlier. This reverse came as a turning point, which brought the emperor to a more serious stance at the negotiating table of Westphalia.⁸

The premature death of Empress Maria Anna in 1646 was a harsh blow to both courts. This misfortune was to undermine Spanish influence at the Imperial court in the long-term, not least due to the departure from Vienna of the bulky and influential Iberian entourage of the deceased sovereign. Thus, the arrival of the second Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo to the embassy coincided with a slow –albeit progressive– decline of this ascendancy. In addition to these adverse events, the pro-Bavarian court party, under strong pressure by France, sought to force the emperor to give in.⁹ The Spanish embassy had been unable to stop the course Ferdinand III was embarking on, which is to say towards the signing of the armistice with Sweden and France excluding Spain from the general peace in the Westphalian treaties.

The pressure of the Imperial States in favour of peace was not solely responsible for this decline in influence. The long-lasting conflict between the Spanish Monarchy and France was leaving the embassy coffers devoid of financial resources. The reduction of monetary remittances, to fund rewards necessary to grease the patronage network’s machinery or bribe recalcitrant ministers in advisory bodies, was seriously undermining the effective

⁷ Maximilian von Trauttmansdorff (1584-1650). For a long time, the Imperial court’s most influential minister had been identified by the Papal nuncio as a member of the «partito spagnuolo», a point of view shared by many contemporary observers. The count rather loyally followed the wishes of his master, inclined to the wishes of his brother-in-law Philip IV, for who his espouse interceded. Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III.*, 101. On Ferdinand III’s powerful favourite, see Brigitte Lernet, “Maximilian von Trauttmansdorff: Hofmann und Patron im 17. Jahrhundert” (unpublished thesis, University of Vienna, 2004) and Konrad Repgen, “Maximilien comte de Trauttmansdorff, négociateur en chef de l’empereur aux traités de Prague et de Westphalie,” in *L’Europe des traités de Westphalie. Esprit de la diplomatie et diplomatie de l’Esprit*, ed. Lucien Bély and Isabelle Richefort (Paris: Presses Paris Sorbonne, 2000), 347-361.

⁸ Not only Cardinal Mazarin’s pressure on the Imperial States to exclude Spain from the peace, but negotiations held in 1646 between Trauttmansdorff and France –focused on the transfer of the occupied Habsburg territory of Alsace–, featured as the primary source of division between the Spanish and Imperial commissions. Jean Bérenger, “Ferdinand III et la France de Mazarin,” in Bély and Richefort, *L’Europe des traités de Westphalie*, 177; Konrad Repgen, “Über den Zusammenhang von Verhandlungstechnik und Vertragsbegriffen. Die kaiserlichen Elsaß-Angebote vom 28. März und 14. April 1646 an Frankreich,” in his *Dreißigjähriger Krieg und Westfälischer Friede. Studien und Quellen* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998), 643-676; Michael Rohrschneider, *Der gescheiterte Frieden von Münster. Spaniens Ringen mit Frankreich auf dem Westfälischen Friedenskongress (1643-1649)* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2006), 307-313.

⁹ *Papel del duque de Terranova sobre la determinación de franceses y suedeses en procurar la vengança del Duque de Baviera separándole de S. M. C.*, Prague, 17 November 1647, BNE, Mss. 913, fos 216-217; Count of Peñaranda to Philip IV, Münster, 16 January 1648, in *CODOIN*, LXXXIV, 94-95; Consultation of the Council of State, Madrid, 25 February 1648, *ibidem*, p. 57.

functioning of pressure measures.¹⁰ Furthermore, the envoys' negotiating skills were also important to attract support, and this was not the main merit of the conflicting embassy of the Duke of Terranova since 1646. Terranova's management had profound echoes in the following years. Despite being considered as one of the emperor's most valued councillors, his erratic performance, characterised by a controversial procedure and difficult temper, set him against the majority of the court while reaping discredit for Spanish interests among the ranks of Imperial nobility.¹¹ Although father Quiroga had continued "co-leading" the Spanish lobby as adviser to Ferdinand III, his return to Spain in 1648 –the year which saw the separation between both lines resulting of the Münster treaties– not only left the king's interests bereft of its main driver but revealed a lack of support to Spanish politics. Mainly, the pressure of the pro-Bavarian faction, which repeatedly sought to force the emperor to separate from his Spanish ally, successfully imposed the idea of claudication among Austrian councillors.

II. The Westphalian Turning Point: A Faction in Crisis

The era emerging from the treaties of Westphalia would inaugurate a marked fluctuation of Spanish influence, as the "party" related to these interests was to suffer a striking crisis of uneven level of impact from which it would never recover. It was a phenomenon taking simultaneously place at the Papal court.¹² As had been happening since the most immediate years, the decade following the 1650s, key period to the survival of the Spanish Monarchy, was mainly characterised by the concentration of the embassy's support on very few individuals –albeit very powerful. On the contrary, the exercise of this ascendancy had undergone a greater atomization in earlier times. This was an obvious consequence deriving from the sharp drop in resources to attract new supporters, as the ambassadors had to face a prioritisation of the allocation of scarce means in a few candidates. As a result, diplomats witnessed a significant reduction in the cohort of courtiers prowling around and seeking their favour. However, despite lacking monetary assets, they managed to use other effective channels to attract the collaboration of the most influential nobility.

During the first half of the 1650s, the Spanish ambassador, the third Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo,¹³ mediated for granting several important positions

¹⁰ Count of Lumiares [later III Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo] to Count of Peñaranda, Vienna, n.d. (around October 1648), AHN-SN, Frías, C.54, D.1, fos 277-281; Ibidem, 6 January 1649, AHN-SN, Frías, C.56, D.1, fos 754-762.

¹¹ Count of Lumiares to Count of Peñaranda, Vienna, 10 June 1648, AHN-SN, Frías, C.50, D.2, fos 50-56; Ibidem, 23 September 1648, AHN-SN, Frías, C.49, D.1, fos 37-40.

¹² On the initial appointment by mid-1648 of the Count of Peñaranda as ambassador to Rome, the king's favourite Luis de Haro confessed: «I experience an overwhelming solitude with your absence in Rome, since much is at stake in matters of reputation and what happens in that court can neither be referred nor thought without great pain». Luis de Haro to Count of Peñaranda, Madrid, 5 October 1648, AHN-SN, Frías, C.52, D.1, fos 312-330.

¹³ Francisco de Moura Corterreal y Melo (1610-1675) was 1st Duke of Nocera, 2nd Count of Lumiares and –since 1651– 3rd Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo. At his father's urging, the

for his clients in the Imperial court.¹⁴ But he also had an ace up his sleeve; he made use of an unbeatable although scarce prize: the Golden Fleece. The interest that the granting of this exclusive award woke among potential candidates had effectively contributed to stimulate or arouse inclination towards the cause of the Catholic king since the 16th century.¹⁵ This distinction not only symbolised a bond with the Habsburgs' counter-reformative ideals, but tied in theory the individual to the interests of the Spanish Monarchy and lined him up within the sovereign's sphere of power. Considering the reputation that the fleece offered, it is hardly surprising that Austrian noblemen insistently requested the admission to the order. But these requests, understandably, had to pass through the filter of the Spanish Council of State, which judged the candidate's eligibility according to their own merits in support of Spanish interests.¹⁶

Nevertheless, the tireless efforts related to these ingenious –albeit non-innovative– initiatives, not necessarily diagnosed a decrease in the pre-eminence of the envoys. The absence of Friar Diego de Quiroga undoubtedly stressed the ambassador's figure by restoring the leading role that the representative previously had to share with the confessor. However, this factor was not the primary reason behind the survival of Castel Rodrigo's preponderant position. Ferdinand III's great eagerness to reunite the two branches of the House of Austria by linking his son to the heiress of Philip IV –always with a view to the succession of the Spanish throne–, continued to promote the primacy of the Catholic resident at the Imperial seat. While this position was not enough by itself to attract new supporters, or pin ministers down, yet it significantly influenced the decisions of the emperor himself.

In either case, the inherited crisis from Terranova's controversial management required –since 1649– the reconstitution of the Spanish faction. The absence in the Imperial decision-making bodies of an ecclesiastical figure with broad ramifications of influence as Quiroga, was partially resolved by the

influential royal councillor Manuel de Moura, the then Count of Lumiares was appointed Spanish ambassador to the emperor in 1648, a position he held until mid-1656.

¹⁴ Among other cases, Castel-Rodrigo managed to obtain the post of President of the Imperial Council of War for Wenzel Eusebius von Lobkowitz in 1650. The ambassador fervently supported his candidacy in virtue of Lobkowitz's «affection serving the *Augustissima Casa*». Consultation of the Council of State, 14 May 1650, AGS, E, leg. 2355.

¹⁵ For example, the embassy recommended winning through this award over the hostile councillor Maximilian von Wallenstein –nephew of the famous general– for the sake of the Spanish faction. In another case, the ambassadors used for many years the lure of the fleece to stimulate the continuous service of the ambiguous Count of Leslie. Consultation of the Council of State, Madrid, 30 April 1654, AGS, E, leg. 2362; Count of Lumiares to Philip IV, Vienna, 24 November 1649, AGS, E, leg. 2355; Count of Lamberg [Imperial ambassador] to Luis de Haro, Madrid, 18 September 1659, HHStA, SDK, 45/4, Nr. 3, fos 80-81. See, on the links of Holy Roman Empire nobility to the Burgundian order, Pere Molas Ribalta, "Austria en la orden del Toisón de Oro, siglos XVI-XVII," *Pedralbes* 26 (2006): 123-152; Lothar Höbelt, "Der Orden vom Goldenen Vlies als Klammer eines Weltreiches," in *Das Haus Österreich und der Orden vom Goldenen Vlies*, ed. Kanzlei des Ordens vom Goldenen Vlies (Graz: Leopold Stocker, 2007), 37-52.

¹⁶ See, i.e., the deliberations of the Council of State on the eligibility of the candidacy of diverse Austrian noblemen: Consultation of the Council of State, Madrid, 15 April 1656, AGS, E, leg. 2365; *Idem*, Madrid, 14 October 1659, AGS, E, leg. 2369.

employment of the Archbishop of Prague, Cardinal Harrach.¹⁷ Although his influence was considerably smaller than that of the confessor, the relevance of his family at the Imperial court and his bonds with the Spanish clergy of Central Europe made him very useful to Philip IV. Harrach, which soon placed his services at Madrid's disposal and became a king's pensioner, played however a limited and specific role in Vienna, characterised by social mediation between the ambassadors and the Austrian nobility. Due to his influence in the Catholic clerical world, his services were yet more valuable at the College of Cardinals in Rome.¹⁸

III. All Bets on a single Horse: Johann Weikhard von Auersperg

Notwithstanding, the best interlocutor that the Spanish ambassador could find was the young emperor's heir Ferdinand (IV)'s tutor, the Count Johann Weikhard von Auersperg.¹⁹ Castel-Rodrigo found in this Trauttmansdorff's protégé an ambitious courtier versed in diplomatic affairs that showed a passionate inclination toward everything "Spanish".²⁰ At the time, no one questioned the certainty that the minister was well on track towards a meteoric career at the apex of political power within the House of Austria. Auersperg was undoubtedly a key person to consider since he retained almost absolute control over the emperor's son.²¹

Initially, the outcome of the Westphalian treaties seemed to foretell that the path towards a Spanish service would be hindered. After the crown's exclusion from the peace, the Council of State had seen no reason in allowing the son of Ferdinand III to accompany her sister –Philip IV's new spouse, Mariana of Austria– to Spain. Young Ferdinand, considering the occasion, could hardly conceal his intention to marry his cousin and royal heiress Maria Theresa. By striking to force the way of his pupil, Auersperg had inevitably confronted the Spaniards.²² However, the embassy had no other alternative but to employ Auersperg as its main advocate in the Privy Council given the lack of support to Spain among courtiers after the separation. From the beginning of his diplomatic mission, Castel-Rodrigo relied on his support for most of the political issues. Initially, his assistance was urgently needed for the supply of Imperial troops to restrain French onslaught in the battlefields of

¹⁷ Ernst Adalbert von Harrach (1598-1667). On his links with the Spanish crown, see the recent published diaries: *Die Diarien und Tagzettel des Kardinals Ernst Adalbert von Harrach (1598-1667)*, ed. Katrin Keller and Alessandro Catalano (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), vols I-VII.

¹⁸ Entry of 3 November 1647, Prague, in *ibidem*, III, 77.

¹⁹ Johann Weikhard von Auersperg (1615-1677), later appointed first Prince of Auersperg, Imperial Prince of Tengen and Duke of Münsterberg. See on his figure, Grete Mecenseffy, "Im Dienste dreier Habsburger: Leben und Wirken des Fürsten Johann Weikhard Auersperg (1615 - 1677)," *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte* 114 (1938): 295-509.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, 300, 329-330.

²¹ Following the Venetian ambassador's words in 1654, Auersperg was regarded as «master of his master» («Padrone del suo Padrone») at the Court. Joseph Fiedler, ed. *Die Relationen der Botschafter Venedigs über Deutschland und Österreich im siebzehnten Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Aus der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1866), I, 401.

²² Luis Tercero Casado, "La jornada de la reina Mariana de Austria a España: divergencias políticas y tensión protocolar en el seno de la Casa de Austria (1648-1649)," *Hispania* 239 (2011): 635-660.

the Spanish Netherlands and Milan. This emergency made him the best possible choice Madrid could have in Vienna. In the medium term, this confidence would prove very successful, but eventually revealed itself as a risky strategy, as the Austrian count was in very bad terms with much of the court nobility, due to an undisguised careerism. After some initial reluctance, the Council of State confirmed the trust placed upon Auersperg by awarding him in 1650 with the fleece.²³ The trigger behind this move was no other than the expectation of seeing the ambitious and influential nobleman occupy the position of favourite after the death, that same year, of Trauttmansdorff.²⁴ Although this prediction did not fully materialise, Auersperg increasingly began to be entrusted with key responsibilities at the government in view of the trust young Ferdinand granted him.²⁵ The now powerful pairing of influential minister and Spanish ambassador was respected and feared. This alliance, however, did not find a path free of obstacles. During the Imperial diet of 1653 to crown young Ferdinand as King of the Romans, their initiative was severely tested by Bavarian influence.²⁶ Even though Castel-Rodrigo significantly contributed in carrying out the coronation of the emperor's heir,²⁷ their opponents had succeeded to shake it by sweeping away the support of the Spanish sovereign's cause.²⁸ These critical circumstances left the ambassador no choice but to continue focusing his full support on Auersperg.²⁹ With Ferdinand IV's successful election, the ambitious tutor was appointed as Imperial prince in honour of his well-earned merits.³⁰ The Spanish government's forecasts seemed to be fulfilled.

The unexpected death of the young Imperial successor of smallpox by 1654 came as an immeasurable blow to Auersperg, casting a shadow of uncertainty over his future: the main occupation of the Imperial heir's tutor had disappeared. The new juncture appeared to give way to a worsening of the minister's service following a consequent loss of relevance. The minister's leadership was jeopardised by the quandary of his future. Nevertheless, Ferdinand III's confidence in his son's most loyal servant did not quite seem to decline. As a means to protect him from his enemies, the emperor appointed Auersperg on 16th November 1655 as his *Obersthofmeister* (Lord Steward).³¹ Contrary to expectations, the minister had reached a surprising high position

²³ Secretary Ruiz de Contreras to Marquis of Grana [Imperial ambassador], El Pardo, 16 January 1650, HHStA, SDK, 38/8, Nr. 8, fos 3-4; Höbelt, "Der Orden vom Goldenen Vlies", 50.

²⁴ Consultation of the Junta de Estado, Madrid, 22 July 1650, AGS, E, leg. 2357.

²⁵ By autumn 1651, Auersperg was already attending regular consultations on the forthcoming Imperial diet. Mecenseffy, "Im Dienste dreier Habsburger", 368.

²⁶ Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo to Philip IV, Regensburg, 30 January 1653, AGS, E, leg. 2361; *Ibidem*, 25 February 1653, AGS, E, leg. 2361.

²⁷ Cf. Alfonso Falcó y de la Gándara, Príncipe Pío, *La elección de Fernando IV, Rey de romanos. Correspondencia del III marqués de Castel-Rodrigo, Don Francisco de Moura durante el tiempo de su embajada en Alemania (1648-1656)* (Madrid: Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1929).

²⁸ Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo to Philip IV, Regensburg, 15 February 1653, AGS, E, leg. 2361; *Idem*, 25 February 1653, AGS, E, leg. 2361; *Idem*, 15 May 1653, AGS, E, leg. 2361.

²⁹ Castel-Rodrigo confided to his agent in Madrid that Auersperg was the only member at the Imperial Court he could trust. Castel-Rodrigo to Tomás López de Andrada, Regensburg, 13 February 1653, in in Falcó y de La Gándara, *La elección de Fernando IV*, 368-370.

³⁰ Mecenseffy, "Im Dienste dreier Habsburger", 388.

³¹ *Ibidem*, 399.

at court. Indeed, this quite considerable award, based on the trust placed in his undeniable skills and capability, should have sufficed to restrain his ambition, but instead it was not enough. In regards to Philip IV's interests, Auersperg truly believed that the Spanish government had not quite acknowledged his mediation. From 1654, a possible disaffection of Auersperg towards Spain loomed due to the embassy's limited means to reward his loyalty after the costly election of the emperor's deceased son.³²

This underlying tension finally burst by the end of 1655 with the alienation between Auersperg and Castel-Rodrigo. The private cause behind the confrontation among former close friends was no longer disguisable. Auersperg's resentment had been triggered by a lack of endorsement from the Spanish envoy for his own claim as new tutor of the now Imperial heir Leopold Ignatius. Nevertheless, this post had already been received by the Count of Portia –former ambassador in Venice–³³ from the emperor in 1652.³⁴ Such collision could not come at a worse time. The position of a weakened Spanish Monarchy against a burgeoning France had worsened due to England's entry into the conflict. Madrid, more than ever, required a determined military cooperation to break the impasse, but Vienna showed hesitations and awaited a clear commitment concerning the marriage between Maria Theresa and Leopold Ignatius. This vacillation would indeed remain constant upon bilateral relations until the peace with France in 1659.³⁵

Such stagnation could only be overcome with the arrival of a new ambassador to replace Castel-Rodrigo. The most urgent matter though, was to reactivate the channels to funnel levies to the fronts of Flanders and Milan.³⁶ The way to break this deadlock came from an unlikely candidate: the Marquis of La Fuente,³⁷ a certainly undervalued diplomat.³⁸ This replacement

³² Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo to Tomás de Sarria [Spanish agent], Rothmühle, 28 October 1654, RAH, CSyC, K-9, fos 87-88; *Idem* to Philip IV, Vienna, 26 July 1655, AGS, E, leg. 2953.

³³ Johann Ferdinand von Portia (1605-1665). See on Leopold I's prime minister, Günther Probst-Ohstorff, *Die Porcia. Aufstieg und Wirken eines Fürstenhauses* (Klagenfurt: Geschichtsverein f. Kärnten, 1971), 123, and Stefan Sienell, "Die Ersten Minister Kaiser Leopolds I.: Johann Ferdinand von Portia und Wenzel Eusebius von Lobkowitz," in *Der zweite Mann im Staat. Oberste Amtsträger und Favoriten im Umkreis der Reichsfürsten in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Michael Kaiser and Andreas Pečar (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2003), 317-330.

³⁴ Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo to Philip IV, Vienna, 15 December 1655, AGS, E, leg. 2365.

³⁵ Philip IV to Marquis of La Fuente, draft instruction, Madrid, 22 December 1656, AGS, E, leg. 2953; Marquis of La Fuente to Philip IV, Vienna, 18 April 1657, AHN, E, libro 125. On the marriage negotiations between Madrid and Vienna around Philip IV's daughter, see Lothar Höbelt, "«Madrid vaut bien une guerre? » Marriage Negotiations between the Habsburg Courts 1653-1657," in Martínez Millán and González Cuerva, *La dinastía de los Austria*, III, 1421-1436.

³⁶ Consultation of the Council of State, Madrid, 24 January 1656, AGS, E, leg. 2365.

³⁷ Gaspar Teves Tello de Guzmán (1608-1673), first Marquis of La Fuente de Torno, after a long term of service leading the diplomatic mission in Venice, was initially appointed ambassador in Poland but ended leading the embassy in Vienna between 1656 and 1661. On his subsequent career during the difficult embassy to Louis XIV, see Isabel Yetano Laguna, *Relaciones entre España y Francia desde la Paz de los Pirineos (1659) hasta la Guerra de Devolución (1667). La embajada del Marqués de La Fuente* (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 2007).

³⁸ Consultation of the Council of State, Madrid, 31 May 1656, AGS, E, leg. 2365.

had partially been the result of Auersperg's scheming, which had managed to send a message to Haro with this aim.³⁹ His demand was soon satisfied. New envoy La Fuente avoided repeating the same mistake of his predecessor and thus managed to maintain a balance between Portia and a rehabilitated Auersperg,⁴⁰ while breathing some life into the dejected "Spanish party". Indeed, under the then seemingly close promise to give Leopold Ignatius the *infanta's* hand, he succeeded to propel the faction by obtaining the craved levies.⁴¹ In his renewed prominence, the ambassador reinforced ties with the usual Bohemian-rooted clans of Lobkowitz, Harrach, Dietrichstein, Martinitz or Kolowrat.⁴² Whereas several courtiers belonging to such prominent pro-Spanish families had previously shared the role of informal collaborators, they –as well as many clients– were now once again sidelined by the imposing figure of Auersperg. However, some of them, as the noble Wenzel Eusebius von Lobkowitz, would come to play a leading role in the Imperial government during the second half of the 17th century thanks to their promotion by the Spaniards.⁴³

IV. Crisis Reborn: A Faction amid Uncertainty

What seemed a promising future for the faction suddenly saw his reawakening cut short with the death in 1657 of Emperor Ferdinand III. A new government under the regency of his brother Archduke Leopold Wilhelm – back in Vienna after many turbulent years as Spanish governor in Flanders– was then established. There are no doubts that the archduke held bad memories of the Spaniards.⁴⁴ The Catholic king could barely replace the

³⁹ Auersperg had entrusted this covert mission to Spanish sergeant major Jacinto de Vera. He had been sent to Madrid by the Imperial court with the official commission to inform the king on the emperor's need to rearm in light of dangers arising from the Polish-Swedish war. Höbelt, "Madrid vaut bien", 1431-1432; Marquis of Castel-Rodrigo to Philip IV, Rothmühle, 12 September 1655, AGS, E, leg. 2363; Jacinto de Vera to Philip IV, 6 November 1655, AGS, E, leg. 2363; Francisco López de Ulloa to Tomás López de Andrada, Rothmühle, 15 September 1655, in Falcó y de La Gándara, *La elección de Fernando IV*, 401-403.

⁴⁰ La Fuente had benefited from the advantage of knowing well Portia as a friend since his time as ambassador in Venice. He had also met Auersperg during Queen Mariana's crossing through Italy on her journey to Spain.

⁴¹ Ferdinand III to Marquis of La Fuente, Vienna, 9 July 1656, AGS, E, leg. 2365; Marquis of La Fuente to Luis de Haro, Vienna, 11 July 1656, AGS, E, leg. 2365.

⁴² La Fuente's frequent social gatherings with prominent members of these clans give a reliable account on these efforts. See, for instance, entries of 18 and 24 September 1656, Prague, and 21 May 1657, Vienna, in Keller and Catalano, *Die Diarien*, VI, 221, 223 and 319; Giuseppe Corte [Cardinal Harrach's steward] to Marquis of La Fuente, Prague, 26 October 1656, AVA, Familienarchiv Harrach, Kart. 139.

⁴³ Wenzel Eusebius von Lobkowitz (1609-1677), Prince of Lobkowitz and Duke of Sagan. Cf. footnote nr. 14; Stefan Sienell, *Die Geheime Konferenz unter Kaiser Leopold I. Personelle Strukturen und Methoden zur politischen Entscheidungsfindung am Wiener Hof* (Frankfurt: Lang, 2001), 91-93; Ivo Cerman, "«Kabal», «Parthey», «Faction» am Hofe Kaiser Leopolds I.," in *Der Fall des Günstlings. Hofparteien in Europa vom 13. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jan Hirschbiegel and Werner Paravicini (Ostfildern: J. Thorbecke, 2004), 244; Miguel Ángel Ochoa Brun, *Historia de la diplomacia española. La edad barroca II* (Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, 2006), VIII, 92-93. See also on his figure, Sienell, "Die Ersten Minister Kaiser Leopolds I".

⁴⁴ See on this Renate Schreiber, „ein Galeria nach meinem Humor“. *Erzherzog Leopold Wilhelm* (Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum, 2004), 67-87; *Idem*, "Entre dos frentes. El

absence of a superior authority and a discretionary power following the emperor's death. By virtue of his position as head of the dynasty, the Catholic king set himself up as counterweight to the Viennese court's decisions.⁴⁵ The clash of factions led by the archduke, his *Hofmeister* Schwarzenberg and the pro-Bavarian minister Kurz,⁴⁶ on one hand, and the other led by the heir Leopold Ignatius, Portia and Auersperg, in no way promised a harmonious regency. Both uncle and nephew showed manifest differences deriving from divergent expectations for his own candidacy in the next election to the Imperial throne.⁴⁷

The faction that supported Spanish interests received a particularly severe jolt by the ambitious secretary Schwarzenberg, through whose hands passed now all state affairs.⁴⁸ This assault on the union of the two branches had also an impact on the network of Spanish ecclesiastics in charge of important abbeys located in the Austrian hereditary provinces. Leopold Wilhelm, knowing about the influence of these clerical agents subject to Philip IV's guidelines, tried fruitlessly to prevent the occupation of vacancies by Spanish subjects.⁴⁹ Moreover, this hostile faction was fully supported by the Dowager-Empress Eleonora Gonzaga Nevers, opponent of Madrid's plans.⁵⁰ The seriousness of the Spanish position for the next Imperial election urgently required an astute and fearless diplomat to channel all support to Philip IV's nephew, as it was suspected that the Habsburg patrimonial lands could be divided if the crown fell into the hands of Leopold Wilhelm.⁵¹ The Count of Peñaranda, leading signatory of the 1648 peace treaty between Spain and the Netherlands, would be in charge of placing the crown on the young Leopold

archiduque Leopoldo Guillermo como gobernador en Bruselas," in Martínez Millán and González Cuerva, *La dinastía de los Austria*, I, 609-630, and René Vermeir, "Un austriaco en Flandes. El archiduque Leopoldo Guillermo, gobernador general de los Países Bajos meridionales (1647-1656)," in *Ibidem*, 583-608.

⁴⁵ Archduke Leopold Wilhelm to Philip IV, Vienna, 9 April 1657, AHN, E, libro 713.

⁴⁶ Johann Adolph von Schwarzenberg (1615–1683) and Ferdinand Sigismund Kurz von Senftenau (1592-1659), Leopold Wilhelm's high steward and the Imperial Vice-Chancellor respectively. See on them Henry Frederick Schwarz's classic work, *The imperial Privy Council in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943).

⁴⁷ All signs point to the archduke's devious secretary Schwarzenberg as the primary driver of his master's candidacy and being largely responsible for inducing him to that opportunity. It seems that Leopold Wilhelm could count on the approval of a large part of the Electoral College and the invaluable support of the influential minister Ferdinand Kurz, pro-Bavarian minister opposed to Spain's designs. Marquis of La Fuente to Luis de Haro, Vienna, 9 May 1657, AGS, E, leg. 2366; *Idem* to Philip IV, Vienna, 30 May 1657, AHN, E, libro 125; *Idem* to Luis de Haro, Vienna, 13 June 1657, AGS, E, leg. 2367; (?) to Luis de Haro, Vienna, 28 July 1657, AGS, E, leg. 2367.

⁴⁸ Schwarzenberg decidedly endeavoured to boost his master's candidacy by building on ties with the Rhenish and Cologne prince-electors, fierce opponents of the Spanish-Austrian alliance. Mecenseffy, "Im Dienste dreier Habsburger", 419-420.

⁴⁹ Marquis of La Fuente to Philip IV, Vienna, 23 June 1657, AHN, E, libro 125.

⁵⁰ In the words of La Fuente, the «triumvirate» composed by Empress Eleonora, the archduke and his secretary offered a «tough opposition» reinforced by «increasing streams which will be nearly impossible to divert». Marquis of La Fuente to Philip IV, Vienna, 23 April 1659, AHN, E, libro 126.

⁵¹ Marquis of La Fuente to Luis de Haro, Vienna, 13 June 1657, AGS, E, leg. 2367; Count of Portia to Philip IV, Vienna, 11 July 1657, AGS, E, leg. 2367; Consultation of the Council of State, Madrid, 4 November 1657, AGS, E, leg. 2367.

Ignatius.⁵² The articulation and joint efforts around Peñaranda's person to achieve this goal certainly provided a temporary cohesion to the Spanish party. Nevertheless, it was not exempted from suffering a grievous isolation within the decision-making bodies led by the archduke, a situation that was unprecedented concerning the consideration of Spanish interests.⁵³

The rise to the Imperial throne of Ferdinand III's son as Leopold I in 1658, despite its promising echo did not bring continuing stability to this faction. If Portia's assignment as Leopold's *Obersthofmeister* by mid-1657 had thrown cold water on Auersperg's expectations,⁵⁴ now his consolidated role as "favourite" had widened more acutely the differences between both ministers. However, there was also room for improvement within the Spanish "sphere": in view of his merits and efforts, La Fuente's reputation had earned him the incidental designation of ambassador ordinary. In any event, the election's euphoria had proven again short-lived since it was no longer a secret that the two courts were pursuing different goals. While Madrid was pleading for military cooperation in exchange for Spanish aid given during the Imperial election, newly crowned Leopold I persisted on demanding Maria Theresa's hand before violating the ban on the assistance to Spain, as it had been stipulated within the election's capitulation.⁵⁵ King Philip certainly knew about this impossibility and hoped only to make his already assumed decision –of giving Maria Theresa to Louis XIV– seem fair given the Imperial Privy Council's hesitancy.⁵⁶ To the perpetuation of this status quo had contributed the work of Schwarzenberg, Kurz and Empress Leonor, but also were involved the highly influential Jesuits, who wished to see Leopold married to the Elector of Saxony's daughter as a means to reintroduce Catholicism in that State.⁵⁷ Consequently, the time factor ended up bringing Madrid and Paris' stances closer before resulting in the 1659 treaty of the Pyrenees and an engagement between the French king and Maria Theresa.

The Spanish court had kept such peace negotiations secret not only to the impatient Leopold I, but also to La Fuente himself, whose management the Council of State still did not fully trust.⁵⁸ The frustration with which the young emperor received the disappointing news, which reached him shortly after deciding in favour of a significant reinforcement of the levies, led the

⁵² Gaspar de Bracamonte y Guzmán (1595-1676), Count of Peñaranda, had been in charge of peace negotiations in Münster between 1645 and 1648. See on the mission related to Leopold's election, Alastair Malcolm, "La embajada del conde de Peñaranda a Praga y a Fráncfort del Meno en 1657-1658," in Martínez Millán and González Cuerva, *La dinastía de los Austria*, III, 1437-1462.

⁵³ Fiedler, *Die Relationen der Botschafter Venedigs*, II, 21.

⁵⁴ Mecenseffy, "Im Dienste dreier Habsburger", 416.

⁵⁵ Count of Lamberg to Philip IV, Madrid, 8 October 1658, OÖLA, Herrschaft Steyr, Familienarchiv Lamberg, Kart. 1223, Fasz. 22, Nr. 370; Marquis of La Fuente to Philip IV, Vienna, 6 November 1658, AHN, E, libro 713; *Idem* to Philip IV, Vienna, 8 January 1659, AHN, E, libro 126; *Idem* to Philip IV, Wiener Neudorf, 14 May 1659, AHN, E, libro 126.

⁵⁶ Alfred Franz Pribram, "Die Heirat Kaiser Leopold I. mit Margaretha Theresia von Spanien," *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte* 77 (1892): 332-333.

⁵⁷ Marquis of La Fuente to Philip IV, Vienna, 9 July 1659, AHN, E, libro 126; Pribram, "Die Heirat", 338-339.

⁵⁸ Consultation of the Council of State, Madrid, 15 July 1659, AGS, E, leg. 2369.

Spanish faction to hang by a thread.⁵⁹ However, the succession to the Spanish Monarchy was a lure too strong to ignore. It was not therefore long before Leopold I gave head and accepted Philip IV's new offer to marry the then child *infanta* Margarita.⁶⁰ Although the acceptance of the proposal contributed to appease the emperor's clique, the upheavals suffered throughout the decade by the pro-Spanish lobby consolidated a situation of instability that would set the tone for the following decades. These marked fluctuations constituted the general trend until the twilight of dynastic relations between both lines.

V. Conclusion

This current study aimed to stress the influence fluctuation of the so-called "Spanish party" at the Imperial court in the mid-17th century. In this regard, several key points have tried to provide answers to this group's twist and turns. The members of this lobby, of highly mutable structural nature, shared as common denominator a privileged close proximity to the sovereign, either as members of the dynasty or as first-rank courtiers. In the case of the latter, their initiative had to be frequently boosted by motivating means of varying kinds. Hence, there is no doubt that the crisis of the Spanish faction from the end of the 1640s was closely linked to the sharp drop in remittances from Madrid to the Viennese embassy to meet this need, owing to emergencies arising from the long-lasting war with France. Nevertheless, the prominence of the Spanish ambassador was kept alive and his strong influence in Imperial state affairs was ensured thanks to the expectation of the Imperial family with regard to the succession of the Spanish Monarchy. More specifically, Vienna sought to bring this aim to life through a marriage bond between one of Ferdinand III's sons and Philip IV's heiress. However, the ambassadors' use of this outstanding ascendancy had to be partially channelled through the support of reliable confidants close to the emperor. The fragmentation in earlier times of the distribution of Spanish influence at the Imperial court, gave way from the mid-17th century onwards to a concentration in a very few individuals. Besides, in the absence of financial means to strengthen the Spanish faction within a hostile environment, ambassadors used their initiative to introduce other means to reward their clients, as was the case from 1648 with Imperial posts or the effective lure of the Golden Fleece. Thus, the strong fluctuations that characterised the influence of the Spanish party during the analysed decade of the 1650s would set the general tone until the late 17th century revealing an unprecedented crisis of the ambassadors' authority. This, however, did not lead to a replacement in their supremacy at the Imperial court as long as Vienna's hope of inheriting the Spanish Monarchy was kept alive.

⁵⁹ Marquis of La Fuente to Philip IV, Vienna, 31 May 1659, AHN, E, libro 126.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, 2 July 1659, AHN, E, libro 126; Philip IV to Marquis of La Fuente, Madrid, 27 August 1659, AGS, E, leg. 2993. The proposition was not only blessed by the Spanish party, but also by the Papal nuncio. Pribram, "Die Heirat", 339.

SERVICE TO THE KING AND LOYALTY TO THE DUKE: THE CASTRO FAMILY IN THE FACTION OF THE DUKE OF LERMA *

Giuseppe Mrozek Eliszezynski
(University of Teramo)

ABSTRACT

The Castro family, Counts of Lemos since the Middle Ages, reached the zenith of its power and prestige during the reign of Philip III. The political link generated by the marriage between the sixth Count of Lemos and one of the Duke of Lerma's sisters allowed the sons of the couple to play a leading role within the faction led by the favourite of the King. The article aims to compare the work of the seventh and the eighth Count of Lemos, especially during their viceregal mandates in the Italian lands, highlighting the way in which they were able to contribute to the faction's objectives and strategies. This comparison will show how, in the factions of early modern Europe, characters of very different abilities and ambitions could act together, being used each and every time according to their own skills and the needs of their families and allies.

KEYWORDS: Duke of Lerma, Favouritism, Counts of Lemos, Faction, Spanish Italy

SERVICIO AL REY Y LEALTAD AL DUQUE: LA FAMILIA CASTRO EN LA FACCIÓN DEL DUQUE DE LERMA

RESUMEN

Los Castro, condes de Lemos desde la Edad Media, tuvieron su época de mayor poder y prestigio durante el reinado de Felipe III. El vínculo político generado por el matrimonio entre el VI conde de Lemos y una de las hermanas del duque de Lerma permitió que los hijos de la pareja jugaran un papel importante dentro de la facción liderada por el favorito del rey. El artículo tiene como objetivo comparar el trabajo del VII y del VIII conde de Lemos, especialmente durante sus mandatos virreinales en tierras italianas, poniendo de relieve de qué manera fueron capaces de contribuir a los objetivos y estrategias de la facción. Esta comparación mostrará

* Abbreviations: ADA (Archivo Duques de Alba, Madrid); BNE (Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid). I would like to thank Nicoletta Bazzano and her suggestions during our discussions about Francisco de Castro and his political career.

cómo, en las facciones de la Europa moderna, personajes de muy diferentes capacidades y ambiciones podían actuar juntos, siendo utilizados cada vez de acuerdo con sus propias habilidades y con las necesidades de sus familias y sus aliados.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Duque de Lerma, Valimiento, Condes de Lemos, Facción, Italia española

**SERVICE TO THE KING AND LOYALTY TO THE DUKE:
THE CASTRO FAMILY IN THE FACTION OF THE DUKE OF LERMA**

Giuseppe Mrozek Eliszezynski
(University of Teramo)

The diplomatic and political careers of the two generations of the Castro family who served King Philip III of Habsburg are an ideal tool for understanding some of the mechanisms which governed factions in the European monarchies of the early modern age. Their ascent at court and the different stages of their careers in the Italian possessions of the Habsburg Monarchy can show how the sixth Count of Lemos, and after him his sons, the seventh and the eighth Count of Lemos, gave their service and loyalty to the Duke of Lerma in different ways. Through their example, this paper aims to explain the extent to which various levels of fidelity and independence towards the directives of the faction's leader and his closest associates could exist within a faction. Furthermore, when the faction almost completely coincided with one's family, even if powerful and prestigious, the need to use any human resource available meant that even men not so deserving could be repeatedly assigned complex and important tasks.

The branch of the Castro family who served the *Rey Piadoso* and his most important favourite was the only to survive after the crisis that the whole Castilian nobility had gone through in the second half of the Middle Ages.¹ In fact, both the Castilian branch of the family, settled in Castrojeriz, and the Galician one disappeared between the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries. The family inheritance was thus collected by the bastard branch, which was also located in Galicia. Organising their power around Monforte de Lemos and immediately standing by the nobility sided with the Trastámara, the Castros were at the service of the various Kings of Castile, participated in war efforts, and obtained titles and assignments. The genealogy of the family, rebuilt following the will of the Counts of Lemos of the seventeenth century and enriched, as frequently happened,² with mythical or entirely *invented*

¹ The history of the Counts of Lemos' family during the Middle Ages has been analysed in many chronicles and critical studies. In addition to the biographies, mentioned below, of some members of the clan, one can recall the research of José García Oro, *La nobleza gallega en la Baja Edad Media. Las casas nobles y sus relaciones estamentales* (Santiago de Compostela: Bibliófilos Gallegos, 1981); idem, *Galicia en los siglos XIV y XV* (La Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 1987); Germán Vázquez, *Historia de Monforte y su tierra de Lemos* (León: Editorial Evergráficas, 1990); Ermelindo Portela Silva, *De Galicia en la Edad Media: sociedad, espacio y poder* (Santiago de Compostela: Consellería de Relacions Institucionais e Portavoz do Goberno, 1993); Eduardo Pardo de Guevara, *Los señores de Galicia. Tenentes y condes de Lemos en la Edad Media* (La Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 2000). Among the chroniclers, Felipe de la Gándara, *Historia de Galicia. Armas y triunfos de los hijos de Galicia* (Madrid: Pablo de Val, 1662); ADA, C-15: Malaquías de la Vega, *Cronología de los jueces de Castilla, antecesores de la familia de los Castro, conde de Lemos, Andrade y Villalba, marqueses de Sarriá*; Vasco de Aponte, *Relación de algunas casas y linajes del reino de Galicia* (Buenos Aires: Editorial nova, 1945).

² For an analysis of the phenomenon, typical of the early modern age, of the rewriting of family genealogies, often interwoven with mythical and fantastic elements, see the study of

elements, passed through the dynastic struggles of the fifteenth century, with the granting of the title of the first Count of Lemos to Pedro Álvarez Osorio, husband of Beatriz de Castro, the daughter of an illegitimate heir of the Galician Castros. The struggles at court and those to defend and enlarge the family heritage led the Castros to play an increasingly leading role in the political events of the Castilian, first, and then the Habsburg monarchy. Some members of the clan, such as the second Count of Lemos, made unwise choices by placing himself, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, on the side of Philip the Fair in the complicated years that followed the death of Isabella of Castile. Others, like the fourth Count of Lemos, were important players in the court competition: he was in fact *mayordomo mayor* of Princess Juana, sister of Philip II, an important member of the Prince of Eboli's faction and was rewarded for his service with the title of Marquis of Sarriá.

The real turning point in the destiny of the family, however, arrived with Pedro de Castro, the fifth Count of Lemos, and the careful marriage policy that he was able to arrange for himself and his heir. He organised his second marriage with the daughter of the Count of Chinchón,³ one of the most powerful men at court during the last years of the Philip II's reign and a protagonist, along with Cristóbal de Moura and Juan de Idiáquez, of the powerful juntas, especially the *Junta de Noche*, which effectively ruled the Spanish monarchy then.⁴ Those *juntas* anticipated some of the elements that were typical of the *validos'* government: the bypassing of the woolly system of the *consejos*, the loss of power of secretaries and counsellors, the trust placed by the King only on a small number of courtiers, always present in the various extraordinary committees created to address many and different issues.⁵ For his eldest son, born by his first marriage to the daughter of the Duke of Albuquerque, the fifth Count of Lemos opted instead for a union with Catalina de Zúñiga y Sandoval, sister of the fifth Marquis of Denia. Head of a family in financial difficulties and breathlessly in search of the titles and estates lost during the dynastic struggles of the fifteenth century, Francisco Gómez de Sandoval, fifth Marquis of Denia, built the redemption of his entire clan in the same years, earning the affection and trust of the heir, the future

Roberto Bizzocchi, *Genealogie incredibili. Scritti di storia nell'Europa moderna* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1995).

³ Santiago Fernández Conti, "La Nobleza Cortesana: Don Diego de Cabrera y Bobadilla, Tercer Conde de Chinchón," in *La corte de Felipe II*, ed. José Martínez Millán (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1994), 229-270.

⁴ On Cristóbal de Moura, see Santiago Martínez Hernández, "«Ya no ay Rey sin Privado»: Cristóbal de Moura, un modelo de privanza en el Siglo de los Validos," *Librosdelacorte.es* 2 (2010): 21-37; on Juan de Idiáquez, the old study of Fidel Pérez Mínguez, *Don Juan de Idiáquez embajador y consejero de Felipe II* (San Sebastián: Imprenta de la Diputación de Guipúzcoa, 1935). More in general, on the court of the last years of Philip II, see the studies cited in the footnote 8.

⁵ For a more detailed description of this system of government, typical of the *validos*, see Antonio Feros, "Lerma y Olivares: la práctica del valimiento en la primera mitad del seiscientos," in *La España del Conde Duque de Olivares*, eds. John H. Elliott and Ángel García Sanz (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1990), 195-224; Francesco Benigno, *La sombra del rey. Validos y lucha política en la España del siglo XVII* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1994).

Philip III.⁶ After the death of the *Rey Prudente*, the government of the first *valido* in the Iberian history, universally known by his title of Duke of Lerma, granted in 1599, began. Within the Ministerial faction, made up of family members, allied aristocratic families and the different *hechuras* of Lerma, the Counts of Lemos played a leading role, becoming essential figures in strengthening the power of their patron, and being largely rewarded by the *valido* for their loyalty and their service.⁷

In the last two decades of the sixteenth century, the fifth Count of Lemos and his successor, Fernando Ruiz de Castro, were repeatedly called by Philip II, by virtue of the location of their Galician possessions, to intervene in Portugal – annexed to the Habsburg crown in 1580 – or to defend the peninsular coasts from English attacks.⁸ Fernando, who succeeded to his father in the 1590s as sixth Count of Lemos, was not very present at court until the succession to the throne, when the family relationship with Lerma opened the way to an important political and diplomatic assignment: the viceroyalty of Naples. Lemos replaced then the Count of Olivares, a man linked to the previous group of power under Philip II, at the head of the most important among the Italian possessions of the Monarchy, easy source of profit for the viceroys but also an insidious step in a personal political career, considering the presence of a heavy economic situation and an aristocracy increasingly difficult to control. Since 1599, the sixth Count of Lemos proved his loyalty to Lerma and the merits and prestige of his family and himself. He was also sent as extraordinary ambassador to Rome in order to pay obedience to Pope Clement VIII in the name of Philip III, a mission that gave him great prestige, but did not produce the desired political effects.⁹ This was indeed a period of great tension between the Holy See and Madrid dictated by international politics – for example the issues raised by the Peace of Vervins and the war of Saluzzo – and the defense of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the specific context of Naples. However, Lemos's government lasted very little: his death, in 1601,¹⁰ gave way to the rise of his sons and perhaps marked the start of the brightest phase, even if brief, of the family history.

⁶ On the rise of the fifth Marquis of Denia and first Duke of Lerma in the court of Philip II, I have already discussed it in my article «La hora de la mudanza». L'ascesa del marchese di Denia e il dibattito culturale sul favorito nella corte di Filippo II,» *Società e Storia* 144 (2014): 219-247.

⁷ About Lerma and his government, see Bernardo J. García García, *La Pax Hispanica. Política exterior del duque de Lerma* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996); Antonio Feros, *Kingship and Favoritism in the Spain of Philip III, 1598-1621* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Patrick Williams, *The great favourite. The Duke of Lerma and the court and government of Philip III of Spain, 1598-1621* (Manchester – Nueva York: Manchester University Press, 2006); Alfredo Alvar Ezquerro, *El Duque de Lerma. Corrupción y desmoralización en la España del siglo XVII* (Madrid: Esfera de los Libros, 2010).

⁸ Antonio Eiras Roel, ed., *El reino de Galicia en la Monarquía de Felipe II* (Santiago de Compostela: Xunta de Galicia, 1998).

⁹ BNE, Mss. 6150: *Jornada a Roma de Fernando Ruiz de Castro, VI conde de Lemos y virrey de Nápoles*, fos 81r-96v; Isabel Enciso Alonso-Muñumer, "La embajada de obediencia del VI conde de Lemos: ceremonial diplomático y política virreinal," in *Roma y España. Un crisol de la cultura europea en la Edad Moderna*, ed. Carlos José Hernando Sánchez (Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Acción Cultural Exterior, 2007), I, 471-514.

¹⁰ For a general description of the sixth Count of Lemos's political career: Isabel Enciso Alonso-Muñumer, "Filiación cortesana y muerte en Nápoles: la trayectoria política del VI conde de Lemos," in *Felipe II y el Mediterráneo*, ed. Ernest Belenguer Cebrià (Madrid:

From the marriage to Catalina de Zúñiga y Sandoval were born three sons: Pedro, who inherited the title of seventh Count of Lemos, Francisco and Fernando, all born in Monforte de Lemos and equipped, thanks to their studies at the local Jesuit College,¹¹ with a fine cultural preparation and a keen sensitivity to the arts and letters. Leaving aside here the youngest of the brothers, to whose descendants is due the confluence of the titles of Lemos in the house of Berwick and Alba in the eighteenth century, here I address the careers of two older brothers, summarising their essential steps and comparing the different contributions that they were able to give to the faction and power of the Duke of Lerma.

Pedro Fernández de Castro, born in 1576, could count from the beginning on a privileged relationship with the powerful uncle. This link was further strengthened by the marriage, in 1598, to his cousin Catalina de la Cerda, one of Lerma's daughters.¹² The seventh Count of Lemos was involved since young age in the government of the monarchy and the internal dynamics of the ruling faction, counting on the esteem of Lerma but also on the support of his mother. Widowed, the powerful Countess of Lemos had returned to Madrid, called by his brother to fill the delicate role of *camarera mayor* of the Queen, a big opponent of the Sandovals, left vacant after the death of the Duchess of Lerma. In 1603, just 27 years old, Pedro was appointed President of the Council of Indies and then, starting from 1610 and for two consecutive three-year terms, took the place that had been of his father as viceroy of Naples. Lemos returned to the court in 1616, at the end of his Neapolitan period, following the advice of his mother and of the Duke of Lerma, whose power was declining in favour of his son, the Duke of Uceda, and the King's confessor Luis de Aliaga. There, he took up the position of President of the Council of Italy, thanks to which he could take revenge on his opponents in Naples and try to counteract the action of the Duke of Osuna, his successor in Naples linked to the Uceda-Aliaga group. Furthermore, Pedro tried to secure his own and his family's future by approaching the heir to the throne, the future Philip IV. Their shared passions, especially the love for theatre, helped Lemos in gaining the confidence of the Prince and his young wife. However, the opposition of his cousin Uceda and the men connected with him in the *cámara* of the King's son – among them Gaspar de Guzmán, Count of Olivares – produced the so-called "revolution of the keys", one of the most famous and significant episodes in the period of decline of the Duke of Lerma and the rise of his opponents. Already alone and conscious of the imminent fall of his uncle – who in fact was soon dismissed from the court on Philip III's orders – Lemos retired to his estates in Galicia and remained there until his death without heirs in 1622.¹³

Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 1999), III, 515-561.

¹¹ Evaristo Rivera Álvarez, *Galicia y los Jesuitas: sus colegios y enseñanzas en los siglos XVI al XVIII* (La Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 1989).

¹² Manuel Hermida Balado, *La condesa de Lemos y la Corte de Felipe III* (Madrid: Paraninfo, 1950).

¹³ About the figure of the seventh Count of Lemos, many studies have been written. Among them, Alfonso Pardo Manuel de Villena, *Un mecenas español del siglo XVII. El conde de Lemos* (Madrid: Imprenta de J. Ratés Martín, 1911); Manuel Hermida Balado, *Vida del VII conde de Lemos (interpretación de un mecenazgo)* (Madrid: Editorial Nos, 1948); Eduardo

The political and personal path of the second brother, Francisco de Castro, was instead very different. Unlike Pedro, who remained at court near the Duke of Lerma and at the centre of power, Francisco followed his parents to Naples in 1599. After the death of his father, he was appointed viceroy *interino* by the *valido*, and was in charge of carrying out the mandate of his father until the appointment of a new viceroy. After the arrival of the Count of Benavente in Naples in 1603, Francisco returned only occasionally to the court of Madrid, preferring instead to spend long periods in Italy, at Rome and Gaeta. The choice of marriage seemed to follow such a predilection for Italy as he married Lucrezia Lignana Gattinara, a descendant of the Grand Chancellor Mercurino,¹⁴ related to some important families of the Italian Peninsula, such as the Colonna, the Acquaviva and the Caracciolo. The *cursus honorum* of Francisco continued with a number of prestigious positions: extraordinary ambassador to Venice in 1606, immediately after the Interdict launched against the Venetian Republic by Paul V; ordinary ambassador to the Holy See from 1609 to 1615; finally, viceroy of Sicily from 1616 – when his brother left Naples to take part in the political struggle at court – to 1622, for a total of two terms. After the death without heirs of Pedro in the same year, Francisco inherited the title of eighth Count of Lemos, but did not become a leading figure in the court of Philip IV. In fact, even being a member of the Council of State and the Council of War, he was for a long time an impalpable presence at court, upset by his wife's death in 1623, and perhaps unwilling to take a position in the changed factional balances. He waited the majority of his eldest son to leave him titles and assets and, in 1629, entered the Benedictine monastery of Sahagún, and died in Madrid in 1637.¹⁵

By comparing the careers and personal events of the two brothers, some elements in common certainly emerge. Both in fact enjoyed prestigious offices and a great power thanks to their adherence to the *lermista* faction, to whose leaders they were linked until the end of their careers. Another point in common was the passion for the arts and letters, and the ability to build around them flourishing intellectual circles which they protected and supported. The grand cultural politics promoted in Naples by Pedro, the seventh Count of Lemos, is well celebrated: in addition to surrounding himself of figures like the brothers Argensola, Villamediana, Lope de Vega, Góngora and Cervantes, he founded in 1611 the Academy of the *Oziosi* (idles) and was served by a writer of the caliber of Diego de Saavedra Fajardo as his agent in Rome.¹⁶ The activity in the same field of Francisco is less known, but

Pardo de Guevara, *Don Pedro Fernández de Castro, VII conde de Lemos (1576-1622)* (Santiago de Compostela: Xunta de Galicia, 1997); Isabel Enciso Alonso-Muñumer, *Nobleza, poder y mecenazgo en tiempos de Felipe III. Nápoles y el conde de Lemos* (Madrid: Actas, 2007).

¹⁴ Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, *Gattinara. Carlos V y el sueño del Imperio* (Madrid: Sílex Ediciones, 2005).

¹⁵ On the eighth Count of Lemos, see the recent research of Valentina Favaro, *Carriere in movimento. Francisco Ruiz de Castro e la monarchia di Filippo III* (Palermo: Associazione Mediterranea, 2013).

¹⁶ Gaetano Sabatini, "Roma, Nápoles, Venecia, Milán: la etapa italiana de Saavedra Fajardo en el gran teatro de la diplomacia barroca (1610-1633)," in *Pensar Europa en el siglo de hierro. El mundo en tiempos de Saavedra Fajardo*, ed. José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez (Murcia:

nevertheless significant: in Sicily, he favoured the creation, in 1621, of the Academy of the *Bell'ingegni e letterati palermitani* (great minds and writers of Palermo) and the Academy of *Notomia* (anatomy) at the Great Hospital of Palermo.¹⁷

The differences, however, in the contribution that the two men were able to give to the success of Lerma's faction and to the more general political competition that spread from the court to the Monarchy's Italian possessions were many and perhaps even more significant: firstly, the relationship that the two brothers had with the Duke of Lerma and the other members of the faction. Pedro enjoyed from an early age the esteem of the *valido* of Philip III, to the point that some of the contemporary witnesses indicated him, and not the first-born of Lerma, as the true heir in the favour of the sovereign and the head of the family. Considering this, it is easy to understand the aversion that the Duke of Uceda always showed towards his ambitious, sophisticated and brilliant cousin,¹⁸ which did not diminish even after Lemos's marriage to one of the sisters of Uceda. The good relationship that always bound him to the other son of Lerma, the Count of Saldaña, was not sufficient to ensure the political survival of don Pedro: Lemos's withdrawal from the *cámara* of the Prince and his subsequent departure from the court were indeed the decisive blows against the power of the Duke of Lerma, and until the death of Philip III, Uceda did not allow the return to court of his cousin. The behaviour towards Francisco was instead very different: his political rivals did not show the same fear and the same desire for revenge, as proved by the renewal of his viceregal mandate in Sicily in 1619, when Lerma and Lemos were already far away from the court.

Furthermore, the two brothers did not react in the same way to the solicitations and requests from the court and the leading figures of the faction. While remaining faithful to Lerma, Lemos claimed, as his father had done, his independence of action and judgment. For example when he complained about the work of the *juntas* wanted by his powerful uncle, which made the proceedings of the Councils he presided more difficult.¹⁹ In 1616 he listened

Ediciones del Año Saavedra Fajardo, 2008), 41-74. On the cultural politics of the seventh Count of Lemos see, among others, the studies of José María Asensio, *El conde de Lemos, protector de Cervantes* (Madrid: Imprenta Hispano-Filipina, 1880); Vittor Ivo Comparato, "Società civile e società letteraria nel primo Seicento: l'Accademia degli Oziosi," *Quaderni storici* 23 (1973): 359-388; Amedeo Quondam, "La politica culturale del conte di Lemos," in id., *La parola nel labirinto. Società e scrittura del Manierismo a Napoli* (Rome-Bari: Laterza, 1975), 247-269; Girolamo de Miranda, *Una quiete operosa. Forme e pratica dell'Accademia napoletana degli Oziosi, 1611-1645* (Naples: Fridericiana Editrice Universitaria, 2000); Isabel Enciso Alonso-Muñumer, "Política y cultura en Nápoles," in *La monarquía de Felipe III*, eds. José Martínez Millán and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Madrid: Fundación Mapfre, Instituto de Cultura, 2008), IV, 466-518.

¹⁷ Favarò, *Carriere in movimento*, 142-144.

¹⁸ On this rivalry between Uceda and Lemos, see Bernardo J. García García, "Honra, desengaño y condena de una privanza. La retirada de la corte del cardenal duque de Lerma," in *Actas de la IV Reunión Científica de la Asociación Española de Historia Moderna*, ed. Pablo Fernández Albaladejo et al. (Alicante: Universidad de Alicante, 1997), 679-695; Regina M. Pérez Marcos, "El Duque de Uceda," in *Los validos*, ed. José Antonio Escudero (Madrid: Dykinson, 2004), 177-241.

¹⁹ Enciso Alonso-Muñumer, *Nobleza, poder y mecenazgo*, 227-231.

to the directions of Lerma and his mother who called him back to the court in order to fight to become heir of the family and head of the faction. His brother behaved in an opposite way: at the end of the period in Naples, in 1603, Francisco was in fact encouraged by Lerma and his mother to return to Madrid, in order to consolidate his position at court and act on the side of his brother in the service of the King and the royal family. The repeated denials of Francisco forced the *valido* to use him in other ways, leaving him in the Italian context that he always showed to prefer. The six years in Naples were only one step in the career of Pedro, who pointed to the power at court; Francisco, instead, spent his entire career in the Italian peninsula, never giving the impression, both to the contemporaries and to the scholars of later ages, to be able or willing to aspire to more prestigious goals.

Another difference is in the concrete results they obtained during their governments and also the motivation behind the subsequent appointments. The excellent account of himself he had given in the previous years at the Council of Indies, motivated the choice of sending Lemos to Naples. This viceroyalty was in a serious economic crisis but Madrid demanded it a substantial contribution to cover the costs of the monarchy. In the six years he spent at the feet of Vesuvius, Lemos carried on a vigorous program of government, which caused him the enmity of an important part of the Neapolitan aristocracy, led by Carlo Caracciolo, Marino Caracciolo, Prince of Avellino, and his son, the Duke of Bovino, the Princes of the Riccia and Conca. To stop them, the Viceroy tried to prevent the departure to Madrid of an ambassador of the *Seggi*, Jerónimo de Guevara. Once arrived in Spain, Lemos denied Guevara a mediator who could introduce him in the Council of State. While one has to avoid the misleading dichotomy proposed with insistence by the Neapolitan historiography between the period of reform desired by Lemos and the season of revolt and almost revolution coincided with the viceroyalty of the Duke of Osuna,²⁰ there is no doubt that the Lemos's period of government was an important stage in the evolution of the history of the kingdom.²¹ The leading role played in the political struggle at court in the years 1616-1618, when the Duke of Lerma showed to be nearing the end of his power, confirms the importance of Lemos in the general political situation of those years and his ability to consistently and conscientiously pursue his goal, then failed, to become the new King's *valido*.

The motivations behind the personal choices of Francisco de Castro and the decisions made for him by his referents in Madrid are instead less clear. The brief period of government in Naples following the death of his father should probably be read in the light of the young age and inexperience of the

²⁰ See for example Giuseppe Galasso, "Il Regno di Napoli. Il Mezzogiorno spagnolo (1494-1622)," in *Storia d'Italia UTET*, ed. Giuseppe Galasso (Turin: UTET, 2006), XV, 932-1025.

²¹ About the Neapolitan government of Lemos, see the studies of Giuseppe Galasso, "Le riforme del conte di Lemos e le finanze napoletane nella prima metà del Seicento," in id., *Mezzogiorno medievale e moderno* (Turin: Einaudi, 1965), 199-231; Giuseppe Coniglio, *I vicerè spagnoli di Napoli* (Naples: Fausto Fiorentino, 1967), 173-192; Raffaele Colapietra, *Il governo spagnolo nell'Italia meridionale. Napoli dal 1580 al 1640* (Naples: Storia di Napoli, 1972); Enciso Alonso-Muñumer, *Nobleza, poder y mecenazgo*, 278-550. About the book by Enciso, see also the reflections expressed by Francesco Benigno in his review in *Hispania* 232 (2009): 583-586.

viceroys *interino*, unable to deal effectively with the many problems that his office presented. His appointment as extraordinary ambassador to Venice, just after the Interdict, took him to a diplomatic-political situation of great tension, which he did not appear to have either the experience nor the knowledge to solve. The intricate situation was in fact overcome with difficulty, primarily thanks to the initiative of the French Cardinal François de Joyeuse, representative of Henry IV.²² However, despite this and the lack of satisfaction shown by Pope Paul V towards him, Francisco was then appointed as ambassador to the Holy See. In the six years he spent in Rome, the nephew of Lerma once again showed his inability to influence the diplomatic games and to intervene in events of great importance, such as the expulsion of the *Moriscos* from Spain (1609) and the outbreak of the War of Monferrato (1613).²³ After the clash with the Cardinal Gaspar de Borja y Velasco, who replaced him in the embassy *ad interim*, however, another appointment followed for Francisco. According to a quite common process among Spanish diplomats and soldiers who served the Catholic King in Italy, the embassy in Rome was usually followed by the viceroyalty of Naples. The Duke of Osuna was preferred for that position, left vacant by the Count of Lemos, a clear sign of how the faction led by Uceda and Aliaga had got the upper hand at court and in the favour of the King.²⁴ Francisco, certainly supported by Lerma and the Countess of Lemos for the post, was instead chosen for the viceroyalty of Sicily, vacated by Osuna: an assignment that was certainly prestigious but relegated him in a region of marginal importance within the Habsburg Monarchy, certainly not comparable to the government of Naples. As a further confirmation of the secondary role of Francisco de Castro during his years in Sicily (1616-1622), he observed as a spectator the moves of other Spanish governors in Italy, especially the Marquis of Villafranca in Milan and the Duke of Osuna in Naples, who overturned the anti-war foreign policy orchestrated by Lerma until then, setting the stage for the imminent outbreak of the Thirty Years' War.²⁵ Moreover, Osuna had brought with him to Naples the galleys which he had set up during his years in Sicily, leaving the new viceroy, despite his protests, devoid of most of the fleet. As for the government of the island, Francisco tried in vain to give Madrid the contribution of men and money required for the battlefields of Europe, trying at the same time to return to normality a political and institutional situation became precarious after the six agitated years of Osuna's rule.²⁶

²² Favarò, *Carriere in movimento*, 46-56.

²³ *Ibidem*, 57-96.

²⁴ Giovanni Muto, "Dal Lemos all'Osuna: strategie e stili di governo di due viceré," in *Cultura della guerra e arti della pace. Il III duca di Osuna in Sicilia e a Napoli (1611-1620)*, ed. Encarnación Sánchez García (Naples: Tullio Pironti Editore, 2012), 169-195. On the figure of the third Duke of Osuna, an excellent soldier, a faithful ally of the Duke of Uceda and a fundamental protagonist of the political struggle during the second half of the reign of Philip III, a vast bibliography can be consulted. For a good synthesis, see Luis M. Linde, *Don Pedro Girón, duque de Osuna: la hegemonía española en Europa a comienzos del siglo XVII* (Madrid: Encuentro, 2005).

²⁵ García García, *La pax hispanica*; Feros, *Kingship and favoritism*; Paul Allen, *Philip III and the Pax Hispanica, 1598-1621. The Failure of Grand Strategy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); Williams, *The great favourite*.

²⁶ Vincenzo Auria, *Historia cronologica delli signori viceré di Sicilia, dal tempo che mancò la personale assistenza de' serenissimi re di quella, cioè dall'anno 1409 sino al 1697 presente* (Palermo: Per Pietro Coppola, 1697); Giovanni E. Di Blasi, *Storia cronologica dei viceré*,

As mentioned, the end of the Duke of Lerma's government did not prevent Francisco to complete his two terms, probably because he was not particularly feared or unwelcomed by his cousin Uceda. But in the same way, even after the death of Philip III and the end of power of the entire Sandoval faction, while the leading figures of the previous kingdom were put on trial and, as in the famous case of Rodrigo Calderón, executed,²⁷ Francisco de Castro continued his career at court, even if in a minor role, as had always happened throughout his life. Inheriting the title from his brother, he passed it to his eldest son, surviving also to his mother, the powerful Countess of Lemos, who died in 1628.

In conclusion, the political and personal trajectories of the seventh and eighth Count of Lemos suggest that in the factions of early modern Europe figures with very different skills, ambitions and personalities could live together. Pedro, the seventh Count of Lemos, clearly emerges as a more important protagonist of the period, but Francisco, the eighth Count, was also able to build a political and diplomatic curriculum, passing unscathed two momentous changes in the court of Madrid, as the departure of the Cardinal-Duke of Lerma from the court and, in 1621, the end of the Sandoval government. In his case, the family relationship with the *valido* was more decisive than the modest results achieved in his various positions and the lack of ability to manage the dynamics of the court and power. Francisco was a part of a faction that, especially in the second half of the reign of Philip III, lost some key pillars²⁸ and increasingly ended up coinciding with the Sandovals and their immediate relatives. Into the faction Francisco became a pawn moved where it was needed, where an office was vacant or where nobody

luogotenenti e presidenti del regno di Sicilia (Palermo: dalla Stamp. Oreetea, 1842); Favaro, *Carriere in movimento*, 97-177. For a more general idea of Sicily during the reign of Philip III, see Francesco Benigno, "Aristocrazia e Stato in Sicilia nell'epoca di Filippo III," in *Signori, patrizi, cavalieri nell'età moderna*, ed. Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Rome-Bari: Laterza, 1992), 76-93; Idem, "Tensiones sociales y dialéctica política en Sicilia: de Felipe II a Felipe III," in *Las sociedades ibéricas y el mar a finales del siglo XVI*, eds. Luis Antonio Ribot García and Ernest Belenguier Cebrià (Madrid: Sociedad Estatal Lisboa '98, 1998), III, 445-466; Lina Scalisi, *La Sicilia dei Moncada. Le corti, l'arte e la cultura nei secoli XVI-XVII* (Catania: Domenico Sanfilippo Editore, 2006); Vittorio Sciuti Russi, "Sicilia: noblezza, magistratura, inquisición y parlamentos," in Martínez Millán and Visceglia, *La monarquía de Felipe III*, IV, 538-563; Domenico Ligresti, "Sicilia", in *ibidem*, IV, 564-592.

²⁷ Santiago Martínez Hernández, *Rodrigo Calderón, la sombra del valido. Privanza, favor y corrupción en la corte de Felipe III* (Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2009). On the trials held immediately after the death of Philip III against the main members of the Sandoval government, I would like to indicate my book *Bajo acusación. Procesos y discursos sobre el valimiento en el reinado de Felipe III* (Madrid: Polifemo, forthcoming).

²⁸ The reference is to some expert ministers and counsellors who, after the death of Philip II, had been able to adapt themselves to the change of government and to enter the power system of Lerma: it is the case of Juan de Zúñiga, Count of Miranda, dead in 1608, or Juan de Idiáquez, dead in 1614. Furthermore, other *Iermistas* had aligned themselves with Uceda and Aliaga, such as Juan de Acuña and Fernando Carrillo, who were both President of the *Consejo de Hacienda*. Still others instead had left the political scene because of some controversial trials, as in the case of the secretaries Alonso Ramírez de Prado and Pedro Franqueza. On everything, see the bibliography already cited. About the last two trials, more details are in my article "Las culpas del Rey y de su Favorito. El proceso a Alonso Ramírez de Prado (1607-1608)", *Librosdelacorte.es* 6 (2013): 27-49.

else wanted to go. His limits permitted not only his career within the faction of Lerma but also his political survival under other Kings and other *validos*.

POWER MANAGEMENT AT THE ROMAN COURT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 17TH CENTURY: THE CASE OF CARDINAL GIOVANNI GARZIA MILLINI*

Silvano Giordano
(Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Roma)

ABSTRACT

At the beginning of the 17th Century the court of Rome was caught in a tug-of-war between various pressure groups. In addition to the Cardinals' factions, which were especially active when there was a conclave or at times of crisis, there were more permanent power blocks which looked towards the Catholic monarchs and the great families of Rome and Italy. In this broad dynamic, however, key individuals, leading actors on the great world stage, emerged.

KEYWORDS: Roman Curia; Factions; Paul V; Giovanni Garzia Millini; 17th Century

EL MANEJO DEL PODER EN LA CORTE ROMANA A COMIENZOS DEL SIGLO XVII: EL CASO DEL CARDENAL GIOVANNI GARZIA MILLINI

RESUMEN

A principios del siglo XVII, la corte de Roma estaba recorrida por una vivaz dialéctica entre distintos grupos de presión. Aparte de las facciones cardenalicias, activas sobre todo con ocasión de los cónclaves y en particulares momentos de crisis, operaban centros de poder permanentes que tenían a su cabeza a los soberanos católicos y a las grandes familias romanas e italianas. Sin embargo, en las dinámicas colectivas emergían personalidades de relieve, protagonistas en la escena del gran teatro del mundo.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Curia romana; facciones; Paulo V; Giovanni Garzia Millini; siglo XVII

* Abbreviations: ACDF (Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede, Città del Vaticano); AGS (Archivo General de Simancas); ASPF (Archivio Storico di Propaganda Fide, Città del Vaticano); ASV (Archivio Segreto Vaticano); BAV (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana); E (Estado); Sec. Brev. (Segreteria dei Brevi); Urb. Lat. (Urbinate latino).

POWER MANAGEMENT AT THE ROMAN COURT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 17TH CENTURY: THE CASE OF CARDINAL GIOVANNI GARZIA MILLINI

Silvano Giordano
(Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Roma)

I. Men and Factions

In a famous essay published in 1988, entitled *Fazioni e lotta politica nel Sacro Collegio nella prima metà del Seicento*, Maria Antonietta Visceglia outlined a detailed scenario concerning the coordinates within which the political discourse moved in the early seventeenth century.¹ References to Leopold von Ranke, used by the distinguished scholar to begin her text, as well as the subsequent quotes from Petruccelli della Gattina and Ludwig von Pastor, clearly define the scope of the narrative. The College of Cardinals and its dynamics in the first half of the seventeenth century are truly expressed in a period of *sede vacante* and in the conclave. That is to say, when, in the absence of his supreme moderator, the *Senatus Divinus*² unfolds the entire range of its strategies.

The theme of the factions, which characterised the life of large and small courts, was marked in Rome by a peculiar feature, linked to the intrinsic structure of the papal court. Indeed, the recurring change of rulers, if did not affect a basic underlying continuity, did however favour the change of tones and repositioning of people, in a constant search for structure and balance that proceeded hand in hand with the evolution of the situation. It has been observed how groupings and alliances were defined in specific circumstances, i.e. in conclaves and in times of crisis of the papacy, and then destroyed and eventually reconstituted in different ways according to the changing of the situation. In the more specific sense of the term, however, the factions of cardinals were organised during conclaves.³

The process of composition and recomposition at all levels was strongly influenced by the strategies of individual players. Thus it appears from the long and significant statement attributed to Cardinal Pier Donato Cesi, transmitted in a document of uncertain origin placed chronologically in Innocent X's pontificate. Maria Antonietta Visceglia quotes it at the end of her essay:

¹ Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "Fazioni e lotta politica nel Sacro Collegio nella prima metà del Seicento", in *La corte di Roma tra Cinque e Seicento, "teatro" della politica europea*, eds. Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 1998), 37-39. The study was translated in Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "Factions in the Sacred College in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", in *Court and politics in papal Rome 1492-1700*, eds. Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Cambridge: University Press, 2002), 99-131.

² Christoph Weber, *Senatus divinus. Verborgene Strukturen im Kardinalskollegium der frühen Neuzeit (1500-1800)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996).

³ Olivier Poncet, *La France et le pouvoir pontifical (1595-1661). L'esprit des institutions* (Rome: École française, 2011), 252.

I am not ungrateful otherwise to Barberini, having his uncle promoted me to a [cardinal] hat, the memory of which I keep with the gratitude and obligation that I hold and that a Roman knight owes and from a house that in the time of only a hundred years has received four times the honour of the porpora [cardinalate], without including mine in the present. Furthermore, having exercised the most rewarding charges with big cheers and purchased offices at stricter prices, it follows that I am free of myself, and as a result I may dispose of myself in whatever way I like.⁴

Pier Donato Cesi,⁵ born of a noble family, which belonged to the branch of Pier Donato, reached the zenith of his career during the pontificate of Urban VIII. Cleric of the Apostolic Camera and prefect of the port of Civitavecchia, in 1634 he became general treasurer, replacing Stefano Durazzo then raised to the Cardinalate, and in 1641 Cesi became Cardinal himself. In the 1644 conclave, he sided with the Spanish party, thus contributing to the failure of Giulio Sacchetti's candidacy,⁶ supported by Barberini; since then he offered a constant support to the Spanish. To the accusations of ingratitude made by the French Ambassador, the cardinal felt compelled to respond with a letter to Luis de Haro, minister of Philip IV. His story, as one can gather from the words of the protagonist, is indicative of the freedom that those who were given the opportunity had at the court of Rome to pursue their own personal objectives, rather than a more or less abstract idea of loyalty.⁷

II. To Represent the Interests

The concept of faction automatically invokes the space of the court. In recent years, research related to the court of Rome in the early modern period, both in its internal dynamics and in its relations with the main Italian and

⁴ *Istruzione per gli ambasciatori che assisteranno alla Corte di Roma per il re Cristianissimo*, attributed to Henri d'Étampes, Bailiff of Valençay and French ambassador in Rome (1649-1653). Cit. in Visceglia, "Fazioni e lotta politica", 91.

⁵ Marco Palma, "Cesi, Pier Donato", in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 24 (Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1980), 266-267, [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pier-donato-cesi_res-9eff2316-87ea-11dc-8e9d-0016357eee51_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pier-donato-cesi_res-9eff2316-87ea-11dc-8e9d-0016357eee51_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (consulted on 9 May 2015).

⁶ On Giulio Sacchetti, see Irene Fosi Polverini, "Illusioni e delusioni: l'immagine della Spagna nelle lettere del nunzio a Madrid Giulio Sacchetti (1624-1626)," *Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica* 2 (1995): 91-109; Irene Fosi, *All'ombra dei Barberini. Fedeltà e servizio nella Roma barocca* (Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 1997); *La legazione di Ferrara del cardinale Giulio Sacchetti (1627-1631)*, ed. Irene Fosi in collaboration with Andrea Gardi (Città del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 2006); Lilian H. Zirpolo, *Ave Papa Ave Papabile. The Sacchetti family. Their art patronage and political aspirations* (Toronto, Centre for reformation and renaissance studies, 2005).

⁷ Silvano Giordano, "Il Colloquio delle Volpi. Lealtà al Papa, alla Chiesa, a sé stessi?," *La doble lealtad: entre el servicio al rey y la obligación a la iglesia*, eds. José Martínez Millán, Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, Gloria Alonso de la Higuera, Koldo Trápaga Monchet, Javier Revilla Canora (Madrid: IULCE-UAM, 2014), 91-106, <http://sigecahweb.geo.uam.es/ojs/index.php/librosdelacorte/article/view/69> (consulted on 9 May 2015).

European courts, has increased. These two areas are difficult to separate, given the structure of the court itself and the convergence in Rome of the most diverse interests. Olivier Poncet, in a recent essay, highlighted the polysemy, but one could also say the indefiniteness of the term: no one among those who referred to it took care to clarify what they actually had in mind when referring to 'the court of Rome.' Certainly it could not be assimilated, except partially, to other European courts, such as those of France or Spain, characterised by the presence of courtiers, specific administrative structures, and a certain etiquette. What in the seventeenth century distinguished Rome were its historical Roman heritage, a major cultural reference, and its quality of capital of Catholic Christianity, which far exceeded its function as capital of the Papal States. Its effective internationalism, which made it a real world metropolis, was testified by not only the massive influx of "foreigners", the composition of the staff of governing bodies, the interests represented, the diversified world of ambassadors, agents and procurators, but also by a myriad of small local courts: the cardinal courts,⁸ the central organs of government of the religious orders, the palaces of the great aristocratic Roman families.⁹

In contemporary language the term "faction" was recurring and to be applied, with the necessary clarifications, to the variable geometry of the College of Cardinals. Notwithstanding, the factionary arena was not the only space where political discourse, developed by the interaction between a multiplicity of subjects, unfolded. The people and the relationships they weave, therefore, have to be considered as the raw material, the foundation from which networks and factions are articulated, as demonstrated by studies that use the category of *Mikropolitik*, applied by Wolfgang Reinhard to the Roman case.¹⁰

France returned to play a central role in the Roman scenario following the resumption of diplomatic relations that ensued Henry IV's acquittal to defend the interests of the Most Christian King and counterbalance the influence that the Catholic Kings had exercised over the papacy in previous decades. It seems therefore better to talk of influence groups, rather than a party or faction. The French king took care to send qualified representatives, ambassadors and cardinals, who closely presided over Roman decisions touching the interests of the kingdom: political issues dealt with by the various congregations, in the first place by the Holy Office, assignment of benefits through the Chancellery and the Dataria, granting of pardons and dispensations to compatriots. The lobbying work carried out by the ambassadors and the cardinals reached the pinnacle of publicity when a cardinal "declared" in favour of the King of France, by displaying the French coat of arms at the main entrance of his palace and accepting a pension. Equally important was the daily work of uptake of Curia officials who could in

⁸ Gigliola Fragnito, "Le corti cardinalizie nella Roma del Cinquecento," *Rivista Storica Italiana* 106 (1994): 5-41.

⁹ Poncet, *La France et le pouvoir pontifical*, 231-233.

¹⁰ The results of several decades of research on this topic are summarised in Wolfgang Reinhard, *Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621). Mikropolitische Papstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2009).

various ways influence the decision-making process or the support given to compatriots to obtain the vacant seats in the administration of the curia.¹¹ Figures considered as less important are however also significant, despite the fact that it is more difficult to reconstruct their movements. It is the case, for instance, with auditors of the *Rota*, clerks in the curia, princes' or bishops' agents, clergy of various nations, merchants, and intermediaries. On the same level and with the same operating procedures, one can place the Spanish group, larger and more solid than the French, while a group representing the interests of the Emperor could not find continuity and adequate visibility.¹²

Lastly, in the Roman scenario it is necessary to consider the well-established large local families, able to lay their own policy developed in its long and very long term. To them, in more recent times, were added the families of the new papal nobility and the princely Italian houses, expression of interests and relationships complementary with those of the papal court.¹³

III. The Aldobrandini System

The general lines of politics were dictated by the reigning pope and his closest collaborators. It is by now well established that Pope Clement VIII's Pontificate represents, not only chronologically, the crossing point between two centuries, in its internal relations as well as those with the Catholic courts. Pope Aldobrandini was the last pontiff to refer effectively to the Tridentine programme, at least in the first decade of his government, and to formulate a positive proposal of political mediation and stabilisation between the two Catholic powers. The creation of cardinals in 1596 and 1599, in which men were promoted from the curia, who did not belong to noble families or princely rank, accentuated the neutrality of the College of Cardinals or, if you will, its dependence on the Pope. This trend was underlined by the fact that those newly promoted in 1596 were forbidden to accept pensions from the King of Spain.¹⁴

The inclusion of the new cardinals at the head of the main congregations increased the political weight of the Cardinal-nephew Pietro Aldobrandini,¹⁵ who, in the meanwhile, was gaining space in the Curia at the

¹¹ Bernard Barbiche, "L'influence française à la cour pontificale sous le règne de Henri IV," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 77 (1965): 277-299; Guido Metzler, *Französische Mikropolitik in Rom unter Papst Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621)* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2008), 41-68; Poncet, *La France et le pouvoir pontifical*, 251-259.

¹² Alexander Koller, "La rappresentanza imperiale a Roma intorno al 1600. Una panoramica," in *Papato e Impero nel pontificato di Urbano VIII (1623-1644)*, eds. Irene Fosi and Alexander Koller (Città del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 2013), 105-126.

¹³ Marco Pellegrini, "Corte di Roma e aristocrazie italiane in età moderna. Per una lettura storico-sociale della curia romana," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 30 (1994): 543-602.

¹⁴ Maria Teresa Fattori, *Clemente VIII e il Sacro Collegio 1592-1605. Meccanismi istituzionali ed accentramento di governo* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2004), 329-331.

¹⁵ Klaus Jaitner, ed., *Die Hauptinstruktionen Clemens VIII. für die Nuntien und Legaten an den europäischen Fürstenhöfen 1592-1605*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984), vol. I, XCVI-CXXV.

expense of his cousin Cinzio Passeri, although the Pope was trying to maintain a balance between his two nephews. The devolution of Ferrara (1598), as well as the delegation of 1600-1601 to Florence for the wedding of Maria de Medici with Henry IV, the mission to Turin for the negotiations between Spain and Savoy, and to Chambery and Lyon for the peace between France and Savoy, marked the pinnacle of Pietro Aldobrandini's political career and allowed him to forge relationships with the authorities of Venice, Milan, Savoy and with the French court. The conclusion of the Treaty of Lyon in 1601 coincided with a stalemate in the pontificate of Clement VIII: Cardinal Robert Bellarmine reproached the Pope for having abandoned his reform mission of the previous years,¹⁶ while also his support to the anti-Turkish league, much for financial troubles as for the difficulty of mobilising the Catholic sovereigns, was becoming less convinced. In the following years a policy meant to consolidate the social and financial position of his family prevailed, through important assignments of church property to nephews.

The measures adopted by Pope Aldobrandini regarding the management of the curia shaped the system in the early decades of the seventeenth century, both in terms of structures, as well as with regard to the people who were called to hold positions of responsibility. In particular, in addition to changes to the system of the congregations, organised a few years earlier by Sixtus V, it should be noted the division of powers between the two nephews, Cinzio and Pietro, which produced to a certain extent a parallel run, a sort of split, in the central government. This split was supported by their trusted men, who organised themselves as heads of office with their respective employees and associates. One should remember Minuccio Minucci,¹⁷ Cinzio's creature and collaborator, who in 1596 was appointed bishop of Zadar and replaced by Lanfranco Margotti,¹⁸ while Pietro introduced Erminio Valenti, secretary of State from 1597, and created cardinal in 1604.¹⁹ A case of particular interest for its *carsicità*, which is to say capacity for action at different levels, is embodied by the Bolognese Giovanni Battista Agucchi, nephew of Cardinal Filippo Sega, who entered the orbit of Pietro Aldobrandini after his uncle's death (1596). Released by the Curia in 1605, he remained in the service of his patron until 1621, when his countryman Gregory XV put him in charge of the Papal Secretariat, from which he was dismissed by Urban VIII, who sent him as nuncio to Venice in the end of 1623.²⁰

¹⁶ Klaus Jaitner, "De officio primario Summi Pontificis. Eine Denkschrift Kardinal Bellarmins für Papst Clemens VIII (Sept./Okt. 1600)," in *Römische Kurie. Kirchliche Finanzen. Vatikanisches Archiv. Studien zu Ehren von Hermann Hoberg*, ed. Erwin Gatz (Roma: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1979), 377-403.

¹⁷ Alexander Koller, "Minucci, Minuccio," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 74 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2010), 710-714; *I Codici Minucciani dell'Istituto Storico Germanico. Inventario*, eds. Alexander Koller, Pier Paolo Piergentili and Gianni Venditti (Roma: Istituto Storico Germanico, 2009).

¹⁸ Marco Maiorino, "Margotti, Lanfranco," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 70 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2008), 180-183.

¹⁹ Jaitner, *Die Hauptinstruktionen Clemens VIII.*, XLII-LIX.

²⁰ Ilaria Toesca and Roberto Zapperi, "Agucchi, Giovanni Battista," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 1 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960), 504-506; Klaus Jaitner, ed., *Die Hauptinstruktionen Gregors XV. für die Nuntien und Gesandten an den europäischen Fürstenhöfen 1621-1623* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1997), I, 191-221.

The second factor of bipolarity, in the broader sense, was due to the new French presence, originating from the absolution of Henry IV and the subsequent resumption of diplomatic relations. Probably this new situation has some relationship with the diplomatic incidents that broke out in Rome and Madrid in the final year of the Aldobrandini pontificate. These had resulted in the distancing of Spain from Cardinal Pietro and certainly influenced the first conclave of 1605, which was favourable to the French side.²¹ In the same context, it should be read the incident that took place in August 1604 between the Cardinal Odoardo Farnese and Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini. Farnese was supported by the Spanish Ambassador Juan Fernández Pacheco, Duke of Escalona and Marquis of Villena, while Cardinal Prieto was closer to France after his recent diplomatic mission, which had earned him a pension of 10,000 crowns paid to him by the royal treasury. The episode, which brought to light the rivalry between the old Roman nobility and the new papal family, went together with a defeat of the Cardinal-nephew and urged him to move even closer to France.²² Simultaneously, in Madrid the contrast between the court and the nuncio Domenico Ginnasi, created cardinal in June 1604, took place as he risked being expelled as a result of one of the many conflicts of jurisdiction. Disagreements about the successor, Tommaso Lapi, a creature of Aldobrandini, rejected by Spain because Florentine and of humble origins, left the main nunciature in a precarious situation for around one year.²³

IV. The Borghese System

The Pontificate of Paul V, created Cardinal by Clement VIII, began in the sign of continuity. The Pope confirmed as Commissioner General of the Apostolic Chamber Laudio Zacchia²⁴ and as prefect of the Dataria Pompeo Arrigoni,²⁵ who also became secretary of the Inquisition.²⁶ Cardinal Erminio Valenti and Lanfranco Margotti, who from 1597 held up the two sections of the Secretariat of State, were kept in their place together with the secretary of the Cipher, Matteo Argenti, in office since 1591.²⁷ The first signs of change were manifested in the appointment of Cardinal-nephew Scipione Borghese and the subsequent resignation of Cardinal Valenti, with whom the ambassadors of the princes, particularly that of Spain, refused to deal with as he was

²¹ Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa: norme, riti e conflitti. L'Età moderna* (Roma: Viella, 2013), 356-359.

²² Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "La reputación de la grandeza. Il marchese di Villena alla corte di Roma (1603-1606)," *Roma Moderna e Contemporanea. Numero monografico: Diplomazia e politica della Spagna a Roma. Figure di ambasciatori*, ed. Maria Antonietta Visceglia 15 (2007): 136-141.

²³ Silvano Giordano, "Tra Roma e Spagna all'inizio del XVII secolo: La nunziatura di Giovanni Garzia Millini (1605-1607)," in *Centros de Poder Italianos en la Monarquía Hispánica (siglos XV-XVIII)*, eds. José Martínez Millán and Manuel Rivero Rodríguez (Madrid: Polifemo, 2010), I, 380-382.

²⁴ ASV, Sec. Brev., Reg. 396, fol. 35rv, 26 May 1605. Zacchia was confirmed in his office by Leo XI.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, fol. 1r-2r, 21 May 1605. Arrigoni was confirmed in his office by Leo XI.

²⁶ *Avviso*, 21 May 1605, BAV, Urb. Lat., 1073, fol. 270v.

²⁷ Jaitner, *Die Hauptinstruktionen Clemens VIII.*, XLV-LIX.

considered as a man of Pietro Aldobrandini.²⁸ In his place, as second secretary, Marzio Malacrida was hired, who had been dismissed by Leo XI. Thus began the structuring of the system, described in detail by Birgit Emich, which was centred on the Cardinal-nephew Scipione Borghese. Although with varying intensity depending on the age of the Pope, Borghese was in charge at the same time of the Secretariat of State, the administration of the Papal States and foreign policy, patronage strategies and the administration of a personal and family patrimony in consolidation.²⁹

Like his predecessor Clement VIII,³⁰ Paul V firmly held the reins of government and worked to prevent that alternative centres of power would form in the curia. This was done firstly to fight the legacy of his predecessor, embodied in Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini; so it appears from the diverse tasks assigned to Cardinal Scipione Borghese and the many changes that occurred in those years among the staff of the Secretariat of State. Interesting in this regard is the choice of Giovanni Garzia Millini as head of political and ecclesiastic affairs in parallel with the Cardinal-nephew, with an institutionally different profile, but with considerable influence in decision-making. With his presence in the curia a new hub was created, capable of modifying the existing balance to his advantage.

Paul V chose Millini³¹ as he was an expert official, whose work in the curia unfolded for almost forty years, from Gregory XIV's until the early years of Urban VIII's pontificate. Of Florentine origins, he was a distant relative of the Pope,³² but could claim blood ties with Cardinals Girolamo and Fabrizio Verallo, Gaspare Paluzzi degli Albertoni and his mentor Giambattista Castagna, who had become pontiff in 1590 for a few days under the name of Urban VII. After entering the prelature under Pope Sixtus V, he obtained the office of auditor of the Rota in 1591 under Gregory XIV and from there he built his career. During the pontificate of Clement VIII he accompanied Cardinal Enrico Caetani's legation to Poland (1596-1597). In the following years he accompanied Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini to Ferrara, Florence and Lyon and lastly, from 1604, along with colleagues Francisco Peña and Alessandro Litta, took up the cause of Carlo Borromeo's canonization.³³

In his trajectory during Paul V's pontificate one can distinguish two major strands: the diplomatic phase, which saw him busy in Spain and at the imperial court from 1605 to 1608, and the period of his stay at the curia, which developed along two lines. On the one hand, the Congregation of the Holy

²⁸ Reinhard, *Paul V. Borghese*, 307-308.

²⁹ Birgit Emich, *Bürokratie und Nepotismus unter Paul V. (1605-1621). Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen Mikropolitik in Rom* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2001).

³⁰ Helmut Jaschke, "Das persönliche Regiment Clemens VIII. Zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Staatssekretariats," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 65 (1970): 133-144.

³¹ Silvano Giordano, "Millini, Giovanni Garzia," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 73 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2009), 339-342.

³² Christoph Weber, *Genealogien zur Papstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1999), II, 615.

³³ Angelo Turchini, *La fabbrica di un santo. Il processo di canonizzazione di Carlo Borromeo e la Controriforma* (Casale Monferrato, Marietti, 1984).

Office, of which he became secretary on 20 October 1616, but that he was *de facto* running since 1608,³⁴ and on the other the government of the diocese of Rome, to which he was appointed vicar on 14 August 1610.

After 1621 his influence decreased; he was confirmed, however, until his death to the government of the diocese of Rome and in 1622 was ascribed to newly created Congregation of Propaganda Fide and charged with the two colleagues Ottavio Bandini and Roberto Ubaldini to draw the constitutive Bull. Lastly, despite his reservations concerning the reform of the papal election promulgated by Pope Gregory XV, in the conclave of 1623 he received 26 votes out of 52, supported by Scipione Borghese's faction.

V. To Choose Collaborators

Millini's nunciature in Madrid reveals peculiar traits.³⁵ The manner in which it took place, aside from the exceptional conjuncture with the conflict between Paul V and Venice that resulted in the Interdict and the subsequent pacification, was common practice. It is significant, however, because it manifested the Pope's intention to promote him, in view of his effective intervention in the power balance at the curia to free himself from Pietro Aldobrandini's tutelage. In an audience with the Spanish ambassador Marquis of Villena on 22 May 1605, a week before being crowned, Paul V finally dismissed the candidacy of Thomas Lapi, supported by Cardinal Aldobrandini, and expressed his intention to appoint Millini «deudo suyo y aficionado a las cosas de esa Corona».³⁶ The following day the appointment was made public, along with the injunction to leave immediately.³⁷

One can already consider this appointment as a break with the Aldobrandini Papacy, which anticipated what would have happened a few months later in the Curia. Millini was sent to Spain not only to restore relations between the Catholic King and the Holy See, but also to establish a special relationship between the Crown and the Borghese family. Such special relation would develop throughout his pontificate not only with regard to political issues, but also for the social and economic consolidation of the Pope's family. Among the four ordinary nuncios that Paul V sent to Spain, Decio Carafa and Antonio Caetani owed their appointments to the fact that they belonged to great hispanophile families, while in the embassies of Millini and Francesco Cennini, personally linked to the Pope, one has to consider the promotional aspect for the Borghese family. The achievement of the title of Grandee of Spain for Marcantonio Borghese, Prince of Sulmona, was Cennini's specific task; a considerable number of benefits and graces were also obtained for affiliates to the Borghese clan.³⁸

³⁴ Miguel Gotor, "Millini, Giovanni Garzia," in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, ed. Adriano Prosperi, II (Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2010), 1045.

³⁵ Giordano, "Tra Roma e Spagna all'inizio del XVII secolo", 375-414.

³⁶ The Marquis of Villena to Philip III, Rome, 22 May 1605, AGS, E, leg. 980.

³⁷ *Avviso*, 25 May 1605, BAV, Urb. Lat., 1073, fol. 279v.

³⁸ Hillard von Thiessen, "Außenpolitik im Zeichen personaler Herrschaft. Die römisch-spanischen Beziehungen in mikropolitisch-er Perspektive," in *Römische Mikropolitik unter*

During Millini's nunciature, it became evident in Madrid the rivalry that in the meantime had broken out in Rome between the Borghese and the Aldobrandini, both interested in winning Philip III's favour. The rivalry was taken care of prudently in the Spanish court, as the two families obtained almost simultaneously their desired feuds in the Kingdom of Naples (Sulmona and Rossano respectively, in 1610). The court observed the war that Millini and, after him, the auditor Cesare Ventimiglia of Morra fought on behalf of the Borghese against the *fiscale della collettoria* Niccolò Benigni, Pietro Aldobrandini's man in Madrid. Benigni was virtually unmovable as Aldobrandini was *Camerlengo* of the Holy Roman Church from 1599 to 1621.³⁹

The promotion to the Cardinalate, the second of his pontificate, appears unusual for its speed; it took place on 11 September 1606,⁴⁰ a year after Millini's departure to Spain. To return to Rome he had to await the conclusion of the dispute with Venice; the rapid elevation, however, testifies to Paul V's design to give the chosen person the possibility of gaining international experience to justify the cardinal's hat and the subsequent central place that he would occupy in the curia. In the same direction should be considered the legation to Emperor Rudolf II and his brother Matthias, between May and September of 1608. While the mission was unsuccessful, it was nevertheless significant for its political value, as part of the larger project shared by Spain, the Holy See, the House of Austria and Catholic princes in general to preserve the Catholic character of the Imperial dignity.⁴¹

In the period between the two diplomatic missions came Millini's Roman "enthronement": he arrived to the City in early December 1607, he was given the cardinal's hat in the consistory on 15 December, and on 19 December, during the meeting *in feria quarta* of the Holy Office, gathered in the palace of Cardinal Pinelli, he took the usual oath *de silentio servando*.⁴²

Papst Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621) zwischen Spanien, Neapel, Mailand und Genua, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004), 48-50; Hillard von Thiesen, *Diplomatie und Patronage. Die spanisch-römischen Beziehungen 1605-1621 in akteurszentrierter Perspektive* (Epfendorf/Neckar: Bibliotheca academica Verlag, 2010).

³⁹ *Hierarchia catholica medii et recentioris aevi*, IV: *a pontificatu Clementis PP. VIII (1592) usque ad pontificatum Alexandri PP. VII (1667)*, ed. Patritius Gauchat (Monasterii: Sumptibus et typis Librariae Regensbergianae, 1935), 58.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, 10. Maffeo Barberini was promoted at the same time than Mellini. Barberini was sent in 1604 as nuncio in France by Clement VIII and remained at his post some months more than Millini.

⁴¹ *Iohannis Garziae Millini ad cardinalem Burghesium Epistulae e legatione apud imperatorem a. 1608 datae*, ed. Milena Linhartová (Pragae: Ministerium Scholarium et Instructionis Publicae, 1946); Jan Paul Niederkorn, "Papst, Kaiser und Reich während der letzten Regierungsjahre Kaiser Rudolfs II. (1605-1612)," in *Die Außenbeziehungen der römischen Kurie unter Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621)*, ed. Alexander Koller (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2008), 83-99.

⁴² ACDF, Decreta 1607, fol. 274r.

VI. To Govern the Administration

With the arrival of Millini in Rome, following his mission to the Imperial court, there was a major change in the curia as in the promotion of 24 November 1608 Michelangelo Tonti and Lanfranco Margotti were elevated to the Cardinalate.⁴³ The promotion of Margotti was not painless, because it meant the departure from the Secretariat of State of his colleague Marzio Malacrida,⁴⁴ as it has been stated above. Malacrida was also a man of Pietro Aldobrandini, dismissed by Leo XI and replaced with the Florentine Pietro Strozzi, but reinstated by Paul V upon the request of his patron as a collaborator and then successor of Erminio Valenti.⁴⁵ Michelangelo Tonti, client of Cardinal Camillo Borghese and tutor of his nephew Scipione, was appointed in 1605 as auditor of the Cardinal-nephew, but in fact, rather than dealing with legal issues, he was appointed to liaise with the Borghese clients.⁴⁶ This led to a new structure in the leadership, as Margotti remained solely responsible for the Secretariat of State and Tonti was appointed as datary, succeeding Cardinal Pompeo Arrigoni.⁴⁷

The expulsion from Rome of Arrigoni, who in 1607 was appointed Archbishop of Benevento,⁴⁸ was part of the policy of weakening the power group headed by Pietro Aldobrandini. Probably it was voluntary rather than enforced upon him, given the working relationship established between Arrigoni and Cardinal Camillo Borghese during the Clementine pontificate. This enabled a smooth transition of his responsibilities to Cardinal Millini. The two had entered the Court of the Rota almost at the same time⁴⁹ and they shared a special relationship with Cardinal Federico Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan,⁵⁰ for whom Arrigoni was the Roman referent through his agent Antonio Seneca. Immediately after the election of Paul V, Cardinal Borromeo had pleaded for Millini for the nunciature in Spain, considering him the most

⁴³ *Hierarchia Catholica Medii et Recentioris Aevi*, IV, 11.

⁴⁴ Filippo Crucitti, "Malacrida, Marzio," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 67 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2007), 707-710.

⁴⁵ *Avviso*, 4 June 1605, BAV, Urb. Lat. 1073, fol. 324v.

⁴⁶ Ludwig von Pastor, *Storia dei Papi dalla fine del Medio Evo. XII: Storia dei Papi nel periodo della Restaurazione cattolica e della Guerra dei Trent'Anni. Leone XI e Paolo V (1605-1621)* (Roma: Desclée & C. Editori pontifici, 1962), 241-242; Emich, *Bürokratie*, 134-135.

⁴⁷ ASV, Sec. Brev., Reg. 595, fol. 582rv, 3 December 1608.

⁴⁸ *Hierarchia Catholica Medii et Recentioris Aevi*, IV, 113; Gaspare De Caro, "Arrigoni Pompeo," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 4 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1962), 320-321; Maria Teresa Fattori, "Arrigoni Pompeo," in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, I, 101.

⁴⁹ Millini became auditor of the Rota on 26 June 1591 and Arrigoni on 20 December 1591. Hermann Hoberg, "Die Antrittsdaten der Rotarichter von 1566 bis 1675," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 48 (1953): 211-224.

⁵⁰ The relationship between Borromeo and Millini is documented thanks to around 300 letters written by Millini to Borromeo between 20 June 1592 and 18 December 1626. Currently they are at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano. Federico Borromeo, cardinale arcivescovo di Milano, *Indice delle lettere a lui dirette conservate all'Ambrosiana. Appendice. Opere manoscritte e a stampa del card. Federico esistenti all'Ambrosiana* (Milano: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 1960), 228-230.

suitable candidate to settle conflicts of jurisdiction, particularly virulent in Milan between the governor and the archbishop.⁵¹

At the end of 1608 it was then established a new balance in the governance of the Curia on the level below that of the Cardinal-nephew. Margotti controlled the Secretariat of State, Tonti the Dataria and Millini, though not officially, the Inquisition, taking the place of Cardinal Arrigoni, normally absent from Rome.

This situation, which was settled further in 1610, when Millini was appointed as the Pope's vicar for the diocese of Rome, did not last long. In late 1611, Michelangelo Tonti, who had acquired the confidence of Paul V but also the reputation of being a strict minister, accused the Cardinal-nephew of dishonesty. Tonti perhaps felt threatened in his position by Domenico Rivarola, who had succeeded him as auditor of Cardinal Borghese and had recently been raised to the Cardinalate (17 August 1611). However, Tonti was in turn accused of corruption and sent to his diocese of Cesena to remove him from the curia. Contemporary accounts indicate as the main protagonists of the "coup" Scipione Borghese, the Cardinals Millini, Giovanni Battista Leni, Luigi Capponi and Domenico Rivarola, all linked in various ways to the Borghese.⁵² On 30 November 1611, Cardinal Margotti died suddenly and the Secretariat of State acquired a new structure: Porfirio Feliciani,⁵³ that during the last year had become Margotti's main collaborator, was responsible for the Secretariat of State, while Giovanni Battista Confalonieri, significant until 1610, took his leave. A few days after his appointment, Feliciani was joined by Giovanni Battista Perugini, in order to restore the division of the office into two sections. When the process was complete, starting from 1 May 1612, Francesco Cennini, auditor of Cardinal Borghese, although he was not part of the Secretariat of State, played an important role there until 1618 when he was sent nuncio in Spain. Thus Cennini was the one controlling, on behalf of the Cardinal-nephew, the daily activities of the office. It is to be noted, at it shows the political role played by Cardinal Millini, that Cennini was given two general instructions, the second of which prepared by his predecessor in the nunciature, concerning Spanish issues.⁵⁴ In the office of datary, instead of Michelangelo Tonti, known as the Cardinal of Nazareth from the name of his diocese, Paul V appointed in late 1611 Marco Aurelio Maraldi,⁵⁵ to whom a few months earlier the Pope had granted the office of subdatary.⁵⁶ In this way, the Pope took precautions against the excessive power that the leaders of the main offices could acquire. The real beneficiary of these measures, however,

⁵¹ Julia Zunckel, "Handlungsspielräume eines Mailänder Erzbischofs. Federico Borromeo und Rom," in *Römische Mikropolitik unter Papst Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621) zwischen Spanien, Neapel, Mailand und Genua*, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004), 490-491.

⁵² Ibidem, 515-517; Julia Zunckel, "Come la testa dell'Idra. La politica milanese di Paolo V fra problemi giurisdizionali e Sacro Macello," in Koller, *Die Außenbeziehungen*, 331.

⁵³ Franco Pignatti, "Feliciani, Profirio," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 46 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996), 79-82.

⁵⁴ *Le istruzioni generali di Paolo V ai diplomatici pontifici 1605-1621*, ed. Silvano Giordano, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2003), I, 242-243; instruction's text: II, 1095-1107.

⁵⁵ ASV, Sec. Brev., Reg. 474, fol. 194rv, 1 December 1611.

⁵⁶ ASV, Sec. Brev., Reg. 472, fol. 161r, 19 September 1611.

was Cardinal Millini, who became for the remaining ten years of his pontificate the main interlocutor of the Pope next to the Cardinal-nephew.

In his case he was not, however, a sort of *éminence grise* because as well as being a member of the Congregation of bishops and rites, he was also appointed prefect of the Congregations of the Council and the Index. Millini exercised great influence on the curia thanks to his direct relationship with the Pope, which developed in a parallel fashion than that between Paul V and the Cardinal-nephew, also for business that normally passed through the Secretariat of State. Birgit Emich has briefly studied this aspect of the administration and management of power in the second decade of the seventeenth century at the court of Rome, by roughly distinguishing between the political responsibilities entrusted to Scipione Borghese and the religious matters handled by Giovanni Garzia Millini.⁵⁷ Probably such distinction remained quite nuanced, as shown by the extant traces of contemporary internal correspondence. From the Fondo Borghese at the Vatican Secret Archives comes a volume of *Biglietti diversi mandati da Palazzo per ordine del Papa dal Pavoni, da Mons, di Foligno, Memmoli, Cobelluccio e dal S. Card. Borghese a diversi, e per lo più al S. Card. Millino*, which also contains letters from Cardinals Millini and Bellarmino to the Pope and from Cardinal Ludovisi to Cardinal Millini.⁵⁸ It is a volume of 332 sheets that preserves original letters, in the period between November 1608 and 1626, corresponding to the time in which Millini was in power. A few individuals were responsible for the central government and all the affairs passed through their hands: Pietro Pavoni, secretary of the memorials; Porfirio Feliciani, bishop of Foligno and secretary of State; Decio Memmoli, serving Millini from 1608, secretary of State from 1611 and two years later Feliciani's collaborator; and Scipione Cobellucci, secretary of Briefs from 1606 and Cardinal of Santa Susanna in 1616. In particular, Pavoni's letters show that a number of issues were solved directly between the Pope and Millini, without the Cardinal-nephew's mediation. The volume *Ordini diversi dati di sua propria mano dalla s. m. di Paolo V per diverse materie passate per Segreteria di Stato. 1612-1619*⁵⁹ is of the same kind. The volume has 285 sheets and from f.126, contains notes written by Millini to Porfirio Feliciani, where there are also memorials addressed directly to the Pope. Internal notes within the Secretariat of State can be analysed in conjunction with the correspondence preserved in the archives of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, especially since 1616, when Millini was given the seal and began to correspond officially with the nuncios and the local ecclesiastical authorities.

Lastly, one should remember Millini's constant presence in consultative and deliberative committees. Miguel Gotor has calculated that between 1608 and 1629 Millini participated in 75% of the sessions that the Congregation of the Inquisition held on Wednesdays and 84% of those held on Thursdays.⁶⁰ Similar percentages can be found for the Congregation of Propaganda Fide,

⁵⁷ Emich, *Bürokratie*, 250-255.

⁵⁸ ASV, Fondo Borghese, serie I, vol. 2.

⁵⁹ ASV, Miscellanea, Arm. XI, 55.

⁶⁰ Miguel Gotor, "Millini, Giovanni Garzia," in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, II, 1045.

in which Millini actively intervened up to early August 1629,⁶¹ two months before his death.

VII. Parallel Experiences

The case of Giovanni Garzia Millini testifies to a management of power coexisting with the factionary model but essentially different in nature, since it was based on his integration in the administrative apparatus, with characteristics of permanence and stability that shift over time. In this specific case, the origin of this integration is to be found in the personal relationship with Camillo Borghese, later Pope Paul V, corroborated by the *virtue* demonstrated in carrying out various tasks and offices entrusted to him, which helped to further strengthen his position and authority. His biographer-hagiographer, Decio Memmoli, once his secretary, described him as a man not prone to factions, but rather averse to them. Indeed, by envisaging that the provisions for the conclave prepared by Gregory XV would strengthen the role of factions at the time the papal election, he endeavored to obstruct the introduction of the new legislation.⁶²

The story of Millini can be compared to the following one of the Barberini,⁶³ a sort of family saga that had as protagonists Urban VIII, the three nephews Francesco, Antonio and Taddeo, the Capuchin Cardinal Antonio, brother of the pontiff, and the brother-in law, the secretary of State and Cardinal Lorenzo Magalotti. To this saga also actively participated some of their collaborators, such as the Pope's High Steward and then secretary of State, Francesco Adriano Ceva, Pietro Benessa, and Antonio Ferragalli. During Barberini's times, dynamics developed that went beyond the management of power, arriving instead to its total occupation. A system defined by Markus Völkel as «sfera padronale» was created, which was characterised not only by an active presence at the top of government institutions, but also by the participation in all the groups that could have an influence on society in both its civil and religious aspects.⁶⁴

Both experiences, the story of Giovanni Garzia Millini and the Barberini saga, are two illustrations, among many possible others, of the strategies put in place at the court of Rome to control power, in different contexts and with different goals than the well-known factions of cardinals. The two models are not self-excluding, but rather coexisted and emerged when appropriate conditions occurred.

⁶¹ ASPF, Acta 6, fos. 310v-318v, 7 August 1629.

⁶² Decio Memmoli, *Vita dell'eminentissimo signor cardinale Gio. Garzia Mellino romano* (Roma: Per Gio. Paolo Rocchetti, 1644), 44-46.

⁶³ Andreas Kraus, "Amt und Stellung des Kardinalnepoten zur Zeit Urbans VIII.," *Römische Quartalschrift für Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte* 53 (1958): 238-243; Andreas Kraus, "Der Kardinal-Nepote Francesco Barberini und das Staatssekretariat Urbans VIII.," *Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 64 (1969): 191-208.

⁶⁴ Markus Völkel, *Römische Kardinalhaushalte des 17. Jahrhunderts. Borghese - Barberini - Chigi* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1993), 413-415.

Who could afford it, would have certainly agreed with the words of Pier Donato Cesi, «I am free of myself, and as a result I may dispose of myself in whatever way I like.»

CONTINUITY AND IDENTITY AT THE COURT OF FRANCE: PARTIES AROUND QUEEN MARIE DE MEDICI AND QUEEN ANNE OF AUSTRIA*

Frédérique Sicard
(ERLIS, University of Caen)

ABSTRACT

At the court of France, the party leaders were those court members who were closest to the royal circle. The evolution of these parties was particularly significant during regencies, politically a pivotal time. The factors of continuity and identity within parties have a recurring importance as the parties' evolution determined the development of the monarchy itself as an institution. Marie de Medici and Anne of Austria maintained variable relationships with the parties. Complacent towards opponents when they were politically isolated, they became intransigent when they had the responsibility to exercise the power as regents. At the time of Marie of Medici, divisions in the Bourbon family served the development of courtesan factions. Richelieu's actions and the hardship of civil war allowed the policy of Anne of Austria to triumph, and the parties were lastingly subjected to royal power.

KEYWORDS: Factions, queens, regencies, clientelism, 17th century

CONTINUIDAD E IDENTIDAD EN LA CORTE DE FRANCIA: PARTIDOS ALREDEDOR DE LA REINA MARIA DE MEDICI Y LA REINA ANA DE AUSTRIA

RESUMEN

En la corte de Francia, los líderes de los partidos cortesanos estaban entre los individuos más cercanos al círculo real. La evolución de estos partidos era especialmente significativa durante las regencias, un tiempo políticamente clave. Los factores de continuidad e identidad de los partidos tienen un amplio recorrido porque la evolución de los partidos determinó la de la monarquía misma como institución. María de Medici y Ana de Austria mantuvieron relaciones variables con los partidos: complacientes hacia los oponentes cuando estaban políticamente aisladas, se volvían intransigentes cuando tenían la responsabilidad de ejercer el poder como regentes. En tiempos de María de Medici, las divisiones en la familia

* AAE (Archives diplomatiques du ministère des Affaires étrangères, Paris); AGS (Archivo General de Simancas); AHN (Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid); BNF (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris); E (Estado).

Borbón sirvieron al desarrollo de facciones cortesanas. Las acciones de Richelieu y la dureza de la guerra civil permitieron triunfar a la política de Ana de Austria, y los partidos se sometieron duraderamente al poder real.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Facciones, reinas, regencias, clientelismo, siglo XVII

CONTINUITY AND IDENTITY AT THE COURT OF FRANCE: PARTIES AROUND QUEEN MARIE DE MEDICI AND QUEEN ANNE OF AUSTRIA

Frédérique Sicard
(ERLIS, University of Caen)

I. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to analyse the factors of continuity and identity in the parties around Queen Marie de Medici and Queen Anne of Austria in the period between 1600 and 1666. During the first half of the 17th century, the evolution of the parties around the queens varied significantly according to their status (queen consort, mother of the heir or regent).¹ Recent historiography by Jean-François Dubost,² Chantal Grell³ and Fanny Cosandey considered how, as early as the time of their weddings, women rulers intervened in politics:

*The woman ruler has a duty to be present in the very places of power, within a court which is also the centre of a political world, over which any power is forbidden to her, but which she is not spared from attending. Already tricky in itself, this situation is made more difficult for her by the place which she occupies at the side of the King given that her matrimonial bonds turn her into a major component of the political exchequer.*⁴

While their work is mostly focused on the Spanish world, the research of Jean-Pierre Dedieu⁵ and José Martínez Millán⁶ allowed a better understanding of the clientelist functioning of factions at the court. The same can be said of Alain Hugon's analysis of Spanish diplomacy's role over this period.⁷

Over a reasonably continuous timeline, both Marie of Medici and Anne of Austria directed regencies for a minor King. They came from two different dynasties: the Medici of Florence and the Habsburg of Spain, and therefore approached their respective regencies in different ways.

¹ About the parties, Norbert Elias, *La société de cour* (Paris: Flammarion, 1985), 189. See also Jacques Heers, *Les Partis and la vie politique dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris: PUF, 1981). About the evolution of queens in politics, Fanny Cosandey, *La reine de France, symbole et pouvoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 2000), 271 and 295.

² Jean-François Dubost, *Marie de Médicis, la reine dévoilée* (Paris: Payot, 2009).

³ Chantal Grell, ed., *Anne d'Autriche, Infante d'Espagne et Reine de France* (Paris: Perrin, 2009).

⁴ *Ibidem*, 379.

⁵ Jean-Pierre Dedieu, *Réseaux, familles et pouvoirs dans le monde ibérique à la fin de l'Ancien Régime* (Paris: CNRS éditions, 1998).

⁶ José Martínez Millán, *Instituciones y elites de poder en la monarquía hispánica durante el siglo XVI* (Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1992).

⁷ Alain Hugon, *Au service du roi catholique: « honorables ambassadeurs » et « divins espions », représentation diplomatique et service secret dans les relations hispano-françaises de 1598 à 1635* (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2004).

This contribution aims to answer the following questions: what are the factors of similarity and continuity of parties at the court of France? What kind of relationship did these parties have with the two queens, Marie de Medici and Anne of Austria? To what extent did these parties have any influence on French politics?

These questions are of great importance because the progress of parties at the court determined not only the development of the monarchy itself as an institution, but also France's foreign policy in the first half of the 17th century.

II. The Parties at the Court of Marie de Medici (1600-1642)

II.1. 1600-1610: Rivalries and Political Clientelism around the Household of Marie de Medici

As highlighted by David Hume's analysis,⁸ divisions between parties in the 17th century were not founded so much on differences of opinion as on personal hostility, carried over several generations by the great families of the nobility. Each of the houses wanted not so much to monopolise the king's power but rather to share it with him in the manner of great vassals.⁹

At the court of Paris in 1600, rivalries between courtesans were not determined by religious issues (for instance the Duke of Guise, a Catholic, was a great friend of Protestant Sully¹⁰) but on clannish rivalries, inherited from the Wars of Religion. This is what Alain Hugon calls the «deconfessionalization of nobiliary strategies».¹¹ Indeed, since the beginning of religious tensions between Catholics and Protestants in the 17th century, two noble clans had opposed each other at the court: the princes of Condé, leaders of the Protestants, and the Dukes of Guise, leaders of the Catholic Party. Henri, Prince of Condé and his uncles, Louis of Bourbon and the Prince of Conti, were declared opponents to the marriage between Henry IV and Marie of Medici because such marriage meant for them to lose their inheritance rights.¹² For this very reason, the Guises were favourable to the union.¹³

⁸ David Hume, "Of parties in General," (1742), in his *Essay, Moral and Literary*, Part I, essay VIII (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund INC, 1987), <http://www.econlib.org/library/LFBooks/Hume/hmMPL.html> (consulted on 4 May 2015). Also see Dedieu, *Réseaux, familles et pouvoirs*, 50-51.

⁹ On that subject see Elias, *La société de cour*, 189-190.

¹⁰ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 314.

¹¹ Hugon, *Au service du roi catholique*, 324.

¹² Despite indecision and political and religious about-turn of the head of the family Antoine de Bourbon, the Condé distinguish themselves as the leaders of the Protestant parties during the religious wars, thanks to Antoine's younger brother, Louis of Condé, and later to Condé's son, Henry of Condé. See Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 785.

¹³ Marie of Medici was thus encouraged to carefully cultivate her own dynastic links with the house of Lorraine. That strategy was greatly facilitated by the affinity, which grew due to a simple question of age, between Louise-Marguerite of Guise and Marie of Medici. Ibidem, 115.

When Marie of Medici arrived in France in 1600 on the occasion of her wedding, she learned about the parties within the court, as well as about the members of her household. The choice of the court members was Henry IV's decision, but his ministers and mistresses could also express their views. Marie of Medici's household was composed of four hundred and twenty people, riddled with army officers, who owed their nomination to her rival, Henriette of Entragues, the former mistress of the King, whose intrigues had led to two plots involving Spain over two years.¹⁴

This particular context raised for Marie of Medici the alarming question of her children's safety.¹⁵ Indeed, Henry IV had a broad sense of family: he chose to have all his children, legitimate and illegitimate alike, brought up at Saint-Germain castle. The Queen feared that the royal mistresses would poison her children, as evidenced by her correspondence with their governess, the Baroness of Montbazou.¹⁶

Marie of Medici's survival instinct was crucially important at court in the context of conflicts between factions that put her and her descendants at risk. For that reason, the Queen had to position herself as a patron at the head of a network of men and women devoted to her service. Until 1609 there was not any real 'party of the Queen' in the political sense of the term, because the Queen did not have any political autonomy, but she endeavoured to patiently conquer significant spaces of influence. Thus, Marie of Medici did not have the right to directly appoint the members of her household but at least had succeeded in obtaining the power to nominate substitute members in case of an officer's death or resignation.¹⁷ Marie of Medici did not rely on the conventional groups of the nobility and the clergy, which were more autonomous and consequently less reliable. She selected from her staff some agents of modest origin whose promotion she personally made possible. Denis Barbot presented La Fontaine as an example. He began as a cabinet servant and fourteen years later became an usher in the cabinet. When Marie of Medici was held prisoner in Blois in 1617, La Fontaine proved sufficiently discreet to be entrusted with various courier missions in Paris.¹⁸ In 1618, most likely to reward him for his services, La Fontaine was a table companion, eating at the tables of the household.

¹⁴ In 1602, Henriette of Entragues plotted with several powerful men: the Duke of Montmorency, the Duke of Espernon, the Duke of Bouillon, and the Prince of Joinville, the Duke of Guise's younger brother. The project was to assassinate the King and then to dismantle the kingdom to the profit of both the great nobles and Spain. In 1604 Henriette of Entragues returned to her intrigues with Spain and was supported by the Count of Auvergne, who was her half-brother and the natural son of Charles IX. Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 113-114; Hugon, *Au service du roi catholique*, 174, 318-319.

¹⁵ In eight years (from 1601 to 1609), Marie of Medici gave birth to five children (Elisabeth, Louis, Gaston, Christine and Henriette), which reinforced her prestige at court.

¹⁶ BNF, ms 3811: *lettres de Marie de Médicis à ses enfants*.

¹⁷ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 249.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, 158.

In order to establish her clientele, the Queen also carefully chose the godparents for the baptism of her protégées.¹⁹ She also endeavoured to create unions between families of Italian origin and from the French elite, as with the Bonsis and the Bartolinis.

In order to gain the support of the financial circles, Marie of Medici entrusted her income to two among the top families of the Parisian gentry: the Potiers and the Harlays.²⁰ For ecclesiastical appointments, the Queen favoured the officers and families of her household.²¹

When the King was murdered in 1609, Marie of Medici was appointed Regent of the kingdom. At that time, she had an important clientele among her staff, the financial, and the judiciary circles. However, her political line regarding the parties of nobility was yet to be defined.

II.2 1610-1617: The Regency: Marie of Medici against Henri, Prince of Condé

The status of regent is politically fragile, as noted by Fanny Cosandey.²² The transference of regency essentially relied on the political context,²³ that is to say, on the balance of power between the pretenders to the throne and the historical precedents.²⁴ The political weakness of the Regent did not lie in the powers granted to her, but in the balance of power which she had to maintain, operating within the limits of governance. This situation led her to act as a party leader, seeking alliances and creating new loyalties. The regency's mission in itself demanded the transmission of an unimpaired inheritance to the future King.²⁵ The political direction usually defining regency was a conservative one which involved the pursuit of both interior and exterior peace.

¹⁹ Such as that of Ginevra Rinuccini, and a daughter of the Duke of Bouillon named Marie. Ibidem, 256.

²⁰ Three sons of Nicolas Potiers of Blancmesnil presided over the Court of Auditors and at the Queen's Council between 1610 and 1616. Achille de Harlay, the Marquis of Bréval, was the favourite intermediary of the Queen in her correspondence with the House of Lorraine. Marie obtained the archbishopric of Rouen for a Harley. Ibidem, 262.

²¹ In 1604 she obtained from the Curia that her *premier ecuyer*, Bréhaut, Sieur de la Roche, could run an abbey in Brittany. Because she was a Medici princess, the Queen's patronage could reveal efficient and both the Cardinals Sourdis and Joyeuse got closer to her, certainly for that reason. On that point see Bénédicte Lecarpentier, "La reine diplomate: Marie de Médicis et les cours italiennes," in *Femmes et pouvoir politique, les princesses d'Europe, XVe-XVIIe siècle*, ed. Isabelle Poutrin and Marie-Karine Schaub (Paris: Bréal, 2007), 183-192.

²² Cosandey, *La reine de France*, 317-318.

²³ A decree from 1407 established the rule of male transmission and recalled the custom to grant the regency to the Queen mother in order to guarantee against the risk of usurpation. It limited the Regent's power and the duration of her mission to the King's fourteenth year, that is, to his majority. Despite that decree, the Queen mother needed the support of the parliament and of the princes of the blood to govern. See Gérard Sabatier and Sylvène Edouard, *Les monarchies de France et d'Espagne, 1556-1715* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2001), 152.

²⁴ On that point see Pierre Dupuy, *Traité de la majorité de nos Rois et des régences du Royaume* (Paris: 1655), 268-269, as well as Félix Olivier-Martin, "La Régences et la majorité des rois (1060-1375)" (Doctoral Thesis, University of Paris, 1931).

²⁵ Cosandey, *La reine de France*, 309.

Thus Marie of Medici sought to neutralise the monarchies which had traditionally been enemies of France - Spain, England - in exchange for alliances with her daughters, and in order to tighten the bonds with the Curia.²⁶ With regard to internal politics, the Queen mother provided some guarantees to both Catholics²⁷ and Protestants,²⁸ but civil peace was compromised by the opposition which the Prince of Condé led between 1610 and 1614. Like any monarch invested with power, the Queen had both political and personal preferences, which prompted her to favour some Grandees over others. From 1613, Marie of Medici offered her trust to her servant Leonora Galigai as well as to her husband, Concino Concini.²⁹

The Prince of Condé, however, refused to be kept aside from power by the Regent. He disputed the project of the double Spanish marriages, which had been planned for Louis XIII with the infanta Anne of Austria, and for Elisabeth of Bourbon with Prince Philip.³⁰ Jean-François Dubost states that between 1610 and 1616 Condé would have snatched away over three million of *livres* from the crown.³¹ Condé gathered around him the Duke of Nevers, the Duke of Vendôme – who was the half-brother of Louis XIII –, the Duke of Bouillon, and the Duke of Longueville. The coalition looked like an unsatisfied family clan.

While proclaiming the majority of Louis XIII in October 1614, Marie of Medici obtained from Parliament the right to continue to govern as the Council's Chief. The Spanish weddings took place in 1615. Her authority came out reinforced, but she nonetheless decided to get Condé arrested on 1 September 1616. This decision proved a strategic error that precipitated the kingdom a step further into civil war. The oldest noble families (the Guises, the Gondis, Eperons and Montmorencys) abandoned the court of the Queen mother. The new war resulted in the edict of Loudun in 1616, compelling Marie of Medici to share the power with Condé, who became the new head of

²⁶ Marie of Medici's three daughters guaranteed her strong alliances in Europe: Elisabeth in Spain, Christine in Savoy and Henriette in England. The alliance with England counterbalanced the Spanish alliance and allowed to buy a temporary 'diplomatic peace'.

²⁷ The Catholics were Marie of Medici's allies because they saw her as the instrument to definitely bring the King to support the Catholic cause. Such was the position of the State Secretary Villeroy, of historiographer Pierre Matthieu and Jesuit Poussevin, of the Gondis, and of the Guises. Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 265.

²⁸ Ibidem, 316.

²⁹ If Henri IV let Marie of Medici exercise her influence on the function and the naturalisation of Leonora Galigai Concini in the court, it was because of an agreement between Marie of Medici and Henriette of Entragues. In exchange, the royal mistress would be tolerated in the court. Ibidem, 480. About Concini, see Hélène Duccini, *Concini: grandeur et misère du favori de Marie de Médicis* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1991).

³⁰ See Hugon, *Au service du roi catholique*, 354.

³¹ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 431. Norbert Elias states in his study that the growing number of revolts among the nobility in the first half of the 17th century was also due to social changes. Imports of metals from overseas and the increase in the means of payment resulted in considerable depreciation of the currency and a decrease in purchasing power. This situation affected the nobility, compelling them to find other means of subsistence on top of their annuities. Elias, *La société de cour*, 161.

Finance in the kingdom. At that time, the party of Condé seemed to have won over that of the Queen.

In 1617, the assassination of Concini ordered by Louis XIII, changed radically the French political chessboard. From that time on, Marie of Medici no longer had the King's favour and lost much of her political autonomy.

II.3. 1619-1622: the Wars between the Mother and the Son

The Queen's household, the court and the parliaments were purged by the Duke of Luynes, Louis XIII's new advisor. Luynes logically chose to rely on the main opponent to Concini and Marie de Medici: the Prince of Condé. Marie of Medici was sent into exile to Blois. She had lost her power but she kept her money, her servants and her status.³²

Consequently, the relationship of Marie of Medici with the great nobles changed radically because the Queen mother had to position herself as the leader of the discontents in order to return to power. According to Jean-François Dubost, she supported

*their financial interests, their ideology and their rhetoric, by positioning herself as the "natural adviser" to the King: a vast scope because the progress of parties at the court determined the progress of monarchy as an institution.*³³

In 1617 the Queen mother defended the participation of the great nobles in the government.³⁴ In 1619, she escaped from Blois with the complicity of her personal staff: La Mazures, Rucellais, Chanteloubes.

Between 1619 and 1620 the three wars called 'of the mother and the son' took place. Marie of Medici was supported by the Western half of France, that is, the provinces where the Queen mother had most developed her networks and her financial interests.³⁵ This series of wars resembled the many conflicts opposing the aristocrats to a Regent. Every episode ended up in a treaty in which the King granted his forgiveness and the rebels gained significant advantages. The last episode in July 1620 ended up with the submission of Normandy to Louis XIII and the success of the negotiations reconciling mother and son.

³² Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 586.

³³ Ibidem, 604.

³⁴ In order to justify the 'unnatural' character of their opposition to the King, Marie of Medici's propagandists, such as Mathieu of Morgues, sought models of shared power between the mother and the son and of the advisory role of the Queen mother. They found their main inspiration in Blanche of Castille. Mathieu de Morgues, *Diverses pièces pour la défense de la reine mère du roy tres chrestien Louis XIII* (s.l.: n.d.), 16.

³⁵ Her supporters included the Dukes of Bouillon and of Epernon, the Count of Soissons and his mother Anne of Montafié, the Duke of Mayenne as well as Retz, Roannez, Rohan, Montmorency and Coligny-Châtillon, then the Duke of Nemours, and the Knight of Vendôme. She also relied on the support of Protestants like Rohan, La Trémoille, Roquelaure, Coligny. Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 612.

Jean du Plessis, who was the bishop of Luçon, became the Queen mother's protégé as she considered that she owed him her reconciliation with the King. To thank him, she obtained for him the cardinal's biretta and since then he was known as Cardinal Richelieu.³⁶ The departure of Condé for Italy gave a free hand to Marie de Medici's supporters at the court.³⁷ However, this reconciliation had a price: Marie of Medici returned to the Council but only as a member and after the death of Luynes in December 1621. What's more, she was compelled to abandon her main supporters in 1622: Villesavin, Chantelouble and La Marks, as well as the Count of Braine, Rucellai and the Maulny brothers.³⁸

II.4. 1622-1630: New Struggles between Factions and New Factions: The Accession of Richelieu

The divisions between members of the royal family suited the court factions. Richelieu became the chief minister in 1624. In order to bring back political stability, he applied himself to slashing the power of factions by using his own clientele and implementing extraordinary measures.³⁹ In 1626 it seemed that the Queen mother's chamber had returned to being the central nerve of power, but in reality her dependence to Richelieu was growing. At that time, Spanish diplomacy was compromised, along with the Queen Anne of Austria, in the conspiracy of Chalais, which aimed to have the cardinal assassinated.⁴⁰ In 1626 Richelieu obtained the executions of Chalais and the Count of Montmorency. He also allied himself with Condé, allowing him to make his return into the good graces of the court. In 1627, the European courts witnessed the reconciliation between Marie of Medici and the devout Catholics Pierre de Bérulle and the Marillac brothers.⁴¹ The Queen mother also allied herself with her daughter-in-law Anne of Austria, and repositioned herself as the leader of the discontents. After the King's illness in August 1630, both queens tried to arrange for Richelieu to be dismissed. But on 11 November 1630, the day after the meeting between Louis XIII and Marie of

³⁶ Thanks to the intervention of his faithful ally, Father Joseph. See Benoît Pierre, *Le père Joseph, l'éminence grise de Richelieu* (Paris: Perrin, 2007), 174. On Richelieu, see Philippe Erlanger, *Richelieu* (Paris: Perrin, 2006).

³⁷ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 641.

³⁸ The reconciliation obliged her to support those intransigents defending the submission of the great nobles. This position was at odds with the consensus which would have served her interests and also unfavourable to the Protestants. They had supported her consistently and saw in her the widow of Henry the Great, who cared for the heritage of a political balance. According to Dubost, she did not seem to have perceived the drawback of this new political position. *Ibidem*, 745, 760.

³⁹ Richelieu placed Claude Bouthillier as Secretary for command, his sister Nicole du Plessis as lady-in-waiting, and in 1625, his niece Mme of Combalet in the place of Nicole du Plessis. *Ibidem*, 685-686.

⁴⁰ In addition to this, the delay of the Spanish help in support of the siege of La Rochelle, which in 1627 had been promised to the French by Olivares, seemed to have heavily influenced the radicalisation of the Cardinal Richelieu. Cardinal Richelieu to Bérulle, 20 October 1627, in *Les papiers de Richelieu, section politique intérieure. Correspondance et papiers d'état*, ed. Pierre Grillon (Paris: Pédone, 1975-1979), II, 586.

⁴¹ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 751.

Medici, the latter's supporters, including Michel of Marillac, were arrested: it was the Day of the Dupes.

II.5. 1631-1642: The Factions in Exile, the Reinforcement of the Royal Power

Marie of Medici was arrested in Compiègne, on 19 February 1631. She subsequently made a strategic error by fleeing to reach the Spanish Netherlands⁴² with the complicity of her domestic clientele: La Mazure, Bernard Potier and Maupas du Tour. As she intended to wage a war against her son from abroad, Marie of Medici destroyed her political image in France.⁴³ Her supporters were declared guilty of lese-majesty on 12 August 1631.⁴⁴ Exile struck the princesses who had encouraged the Queen mother: the Princess of Conti, and the duchesses of Elbeuf,⁴⁵ Ognano and Roannez. These three joined Marie of Medici in the Netherlands together with the Duke of Vendôme. The Duke of Guise left for Italy, where he died in 1640.

According to Jean-François Dubost, the Queen mother was in the Netherlands «suspect in the eyes of every party».⁴⁶ Olivares was informed that Marie of Medici's followers included many spies, paid by Richelieu.⁴⁷ Marie of Medici suggested some new conspiracies to Spain,⁴⁸ but she was often betrayed by the nobility in exile, who used these plots to negotiate their return to France.⁴⁹ Without money, the Queen mother was no longer a major political force and therefore many nobles turned away from her.

France declared war on Spain on 19 May 1635. In the context of a war, Marie of Medici could prove a significant asset for Spain in the course of the negotiations, all the more as she had found an ally who was a real war leader: the Count of Soissons. In addition, after the storming of Corbie in August 1636, Philip IV demanded openly to Louis XIII that the Queen mother would be reinstated in her office in France. But the death of the Count of Soissons in 1641 tipped the balance of power in favour of the French King. Even the Potiers returned to France.

⁴² As for them, the Spanish diplomats seemed totally taken aback by Marie of Medici's arrival, such as shown by Council of State and the archdukes' messages. Count-Duke of Olivares to Philip IV, Madrid, 1638, AHN, E, leg. 869, fos 166-170v; *Consulta sobre si la Reina de España había de responder a la carta de su madre la Reina de Francia*, 1638, AGS, E, K1644-D9.

⁴³ Her belongings and her dower were held: she relied financially only on Philippe IV's generosity. Ibidem.

⁴⁴ Marillac and Montmorency were executed in 1632. Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 792-793.

⁴⁵ Catherine of Bourbon, daughter of Gabrielle d'Estrées.

⁴⁶ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 837.

⁴⁷ Ibidem, 831.

⁴⁸ Marie de Medici thus suggested taking Calais as well as a revolt in the Languedoc. She also sought to negotiate her return to France, playing the card of ecclesiastical mediation by Mazarin in July 1635. But the latter torpedoed any request. Ibidem, 821.

⁴⁹ Between 1632 and 1635, Marie de Medici lost the support of the Princess of Phalsbourg, of Thomas de Savoy, of the Duchess of Ognano and of the Duke of Elbeuf. Ibidem.

Spanish diplomacy neglected the Queen mother, who decided to go the United Provinces in August 1638.⁵⁰ But for the Dutch as for the English who welcomed her in 1641, the Queen mother had become *persona non grata*, politically of no use, or even embarrassing, because she was heavily in debt. The Grand Duke of Tuscany Ferdinand II was the only one who accepted to receive her, in 1642. She died on the road from Cologne, before setting foot on Italian ground.

Marie of Medici ceaselessly shifted her alliances: as a queen first and then as a regent; as party leader, she even went as far as to threaten the royal power of her son. Her progress illustrated how the game of factions at the court did not solely operate around the female sovereigns. The next Queen of France, Anne of Austria, was no exception to this.

III. The Parties at the Court of Anne of Austria

III.1. 1615-1638: The Party of the Victims of Richelieu

In 1615, the Princes of the Blood' opposition to the Spanish marriages impeded the triumphal arrival of Anne of Austria to the court. Her position at court was also weakened by the infertility of the royal couple, which Anne of Austria harshly experienced.⁵¹ The King's hostility towards his spouse was also promoted by her too numerous trail of Spanish servants and the privileges she had granted the Spanish ambassador – while Princess Elisabeth in Madrid was not allowed to guarantee the same privileges.⁵² Anne of Austria also proved reckless as she compromised her reputation because of the Duke of Buckingham's affair and was involved in the Chalais conspiracy.⁵³ Marie of Medici's jealousy and distrust also meant that the new Queen could not easily find her place at the court of France.⁵⁴ In 1615 the opponents to the Queen mother had their leader, Condé, and sporadically Gaston of Orléans. The others, such as Luynes, woo the King with the hope of obtaining Concini's fall. At that time, Anne of Austria was at the margin of the struggles between factions.

It was only with the assassination of Concini and the exile of the Queen mother to Blois in 1617 that Anne of Austria's rank at court was truly

⁵⁰ John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn* (London: Everyman, 2006), 39.

⁵¹ Her miscarriage in 1622 created tensions in the couple. Laurent Avezou, "Les deux reines. Anne d'Autriche au miroir de son temps," in Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 325.

⁵² Philip III to Duke of Monteleón, AGS, K1454, fol. 78; Marquis of Mirabel to Philip III, Paris, 14 November 1620, AGS, K1454, fol. 148; Philip III to Louis XIII, 24 November 1620, AGS K1455, fol. 190. See also María José del Río Barredo and Jean-François Dubost, "La présence étrangère autour d'Anne d'Autriche (1615-1666)," in Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 120-121.

⁵³ Jean-François Dubost, "Anne d'Autriche, reine de France: mise en perspective et bilan politique du règne (1615-1666)," in Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 45.

⁵⁴ Instead of enjoying the first rank after her husband in monarchical ceremonies, she must surrender that place to her mother-in-law. See Dubost, "Anne d'Autriche", 43.

recognised. In 1620 Louis XIII entrusted her with regency *in absentia*,⁵⁵ while he waged the latest war against his mother. The reconciliation between mother and son sent Anne of Austria back to absolute «political nothingness» among the French elites until 1628.⁵⁶ Her incapacity to give an heir to the King was the main factor: indeed, who would have invested in a potentially repudiable Queen?

Nonetheless, from 1628 common hostility against Richelieu reconciled Anne of Austria and Marie of Medici.⁵⁷ In 1631, following the Day of the Dupes, the exile of the Queen mother and then of Gaston of Orléans, made Anne of Austria appear as a suitable leader for the opponents to Richelieu. This perspective was summarised by La Rochefoucauld: «To me, the domination of Cardinal of Richelieu was unfair. I thought that the Queen's party was the only one that was honest and that one could follow».⁵⁸

Behind the word “unfair” is the idea of a strong preoccupation among factions to find a new opposition’s leader and the fear to disappear from the chessboard of Court’s power. Thus, the Queen was at the head of a party by default and not because of any personal effort on her part: this was a major difference from Marie of Medici. Anne of Austria also enjoyed a narrower margin of manoeuvre at the court than her mother-in-law: in 1626, Richelieu ensured that she could neither nominate anyone in her household nor promote any servant; her financial autonomy was also more limited than Marie de Medici’s.⁵⁹ The Duchess of Chevreuse was her main ally: she acted under the pseudonym of «la Chevette»⁶⁰ as a spy inside and outside the Court with all the opponents to the Cardinal. Richelieu arranged for the duchess to be exiled to Touraine in 1631. In 1637, Richelieu disclosed to the King the secret correspondence between Anne of Austria and the Duchess of Chevreuse as well as and with her brothers, Philip IV and the Cardinal-Infant, at the very time when France had been at war against Spain for two years.⁶¹

⁵⁵ The regency *in absentia* of 1636 was purely symbolic: Louis XIII, at war against his mother, did not have anyone else to whom he could entrust the kingdom. The Queen was under the supervision of a council of ministers. *Ibidem*.

⁵⁶ Alain Hugon highlights that the Spanish ambassador, Mirabel, no longer had the possibility to access her rooms. In addition, her diplomatic correspondence gives an account of the court's hostility towards the Queen and rumours of marriage's cancellation in the absence of an heir. Hugon, *Au service du roi catholique*, 194. See also the letters of Marquis of Mirabel and Navaz, March-April 1629, AGS, K1437, fol. 75.

⁵⁷ The irony is that this reconciliation had been wanted and initiated by the cardinal, to bring back harmony among the royal couple, solve the issue of the conception of an heir and put an end to any claim of Gaston of Orléans to the throne. Dubost, "Anne d'Autriche", 45.

⁵⁸ Duke of La Rochefoucauld, *Mémoires*, in his *Œuvres complètes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1964), 46.

⁵⁹ According to Jean-François Dubost, what made the revolts of Marie of Medici possible were the financial opportunities which she could dispose of. The income from her dower and annuities increased her solvency and allowed her to borrow money at favourable terms. Richelieu will not forget it to later neutralise Anne of Austria. Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, 253, 616.

⁶⁰ Duchess of Chevreuse to the Count-Duke of Olivares, n. d., AAE, Correspondance diplomatique, Espagne, vol. 6, leg. 3.

⁶¹ Dubost, "Anne d'Autriche", 49.

III.2. 1638-1651: The Regency: the Regency and the Fronde

Fortunately for the Queen, the birth of Louis Dieudonné on 5 September 1638 at last established Anne of Austria in her role and status as Queen of France. The birth of Philippe, two years later, sanctioned the naturalisation of Anne of Austria in the eyes of the French. From that moment onwards, her political positioning progressed towards the defence of her son's interest and therefore she reconciled with Richelieu. In 1642 the conspiracy of Cinq-Mars projected the assassination of the cardinal and involved Gaston of Orléans, the Duke of Bouillon, Cinq-Mars and La Rochefoucauld, with the backup of Spain. La Rochefoucauld suspected the Queen to have transmitted to Richelieu a copy of the Madrid treaty which revealed the scope of the conspiracy:

The circumstances which led to the disclosure of that terrible Spanish treaty remain uncertain and, without limiting myself to the various suspicions which hung over the loyalty or the silence of those who knew about it, it is preferable to choose an innocent opinion and believe that this treaty was found in the mail suitcase from Spain, which is nearly always opened when it travels through Paris.⁶²

After Louis XIII's death on 14 May 1643, Anne of Austria became the regent of the kingdom.⁶³ The deceased King had organised the regency according to the model of regency *in absentia* by placing the Queen under the ministers' political supervision.⁶⁴ Anne of Austria did not agree that the King's power, which she exercised in his name, should be shared: on 18 May 1643, she had Louis XIV hold his first *Lit de Justice* in order that he would revoke his father's will and restore the absolute power of the queen in her capacity as regent.

The rivalries between factions had changed in comparison to Marie de Medici's regency. At that time rebellions were a good business: Henri, Prince of Condé, negotiated at a high price the balance of power with the royal power. By contrast, under Richelieu rebellion resulted in decapitation, as that of the Count of Montmorency. Richelieu had consequently raised both a strong opposition and great loyalties, including that of the Prince of Condé, in 1626-27.⁶⁵ The Guises supported Anne of Austria, because she came from the Habsburg house and they were favourable to a political line which promoted both peace between Catholics and the stability of the kingdom. Thus, thanks to the intransigence of Richelieu to submit the factions to the State, Anne of

⁶² La Rochefoucauld, *Mémoires*, 56-57.

⁶³ Gaston of Orléans had discredited himself in the eyes of Louis XIII by his repeated rebellions. Dubost, "Anne d'Autriche", 55.

⁶⁴ The Council was composed by Gaston of Orléans, Henri Prince of Condé and the men in government, Mazarin, Séguier, Bouthillier and Chavigny, all allies of Richelieu. Ibidem, 56.

⁶⁵ On that point, see the studies of Arlette Jouanna, *Le devoir de révolte. La noblesse française et la gestation de l'Etat moderne (1559-1661)* (Paris: Fayard, 1989) and Katia Beguin, *Les princes de Condé: rebelles, courtisans et mécènes dans la France du Grand Siècle* (Seysse: Champ Vallon, 1999).

Austria began her regency under good auspices as she could rely on the support of the two main rival clans at court.

Initially, the Queen sought a consensus and called back the exiled who were the former opponents to Richelieu: Marshal Bassompierre, the Marquis of La Vieuville, the Duke of Elbeuf, the Duchess of Chevreuse, the Duke of La Valette, Fontrailles. Their leader was the Duke of Beaufort, the son of the Duke of Vendôme.⁶⁶

As highlighted by Jean-François Dubost,⁶⁷ while Marie of Medici wanted to identify her action with the defence of peace, Anne of Austria established hers on dynastic defence, which compelled her to continue Richelieu's politics. In a favourable context to the French⁶⁸, the Regent took the decision to continue the war against her own family, the Habsburg.⁶⁹ But the pursue of this political line also compelled Anne of Austria to support the next minister nominated by Louis XIII, Cardinal Mazarin.⁷⁰ This decision was particularly misunderstood by her exiled supporters, who tried to plot so that Mazarin would fall. Anne of Austria responded by arresting the Duke of Beaufort, on 2 September 1643. Here is a new difference of reaction: where Marie of Medici tried to buy the opposition, Anne of Austria chose intransigence following the manners of Richelieu.⁷¹ As a consequence, the group of discontents could unify their complains: ingratitude was consequently the reason for the former allies of the Queen - La Rochefoucauld and the Duchess of Chevreuse - to rebel against her.

From the beginning of the conflicts, the political legitimacy of Anne of Austria was openly contested by the *mazarinades* (5500 pamphlets written in five years).⁷² The Regent also suffered from the bad image of Marie of Medici due to the propaganda organised by Richelieu to discredit female power but, unlike Marie de Medici, Anne of Austria decided not to fight the propaganda war and refused to justify her action.⁷³ She did not have the same finances available to Marie de Medici in order to build a clientele, so she tried to resort to a multiplicity of honours. Between 1648 and 1652 she created twenty duke-

⁶⁶ Dubost, "Anne d'Autriche", 65-66.

⁶⁷ Ibidem, 86.

⁶⁸ Indeed, in 1648, peace in Westphalia freed France of a war with the Emperor. Louis XIV had obtained the recognition of French sovereignty over the three bishoprics which had been occupied since 1552 and of his feudal rights over the landgraviate of lower Alsace. However, Spain refused to deal with France. Ibidem, 69.

⁶⁹ The famous sentence uttered by Anne of Austria when she joined Philip IV on the occasion of Louis XIV's wedding in 1660, followed naturally in the wake of this political line: «May your Majesty forgive me for being such a good French woman, I owed it to the King, my son and to France». According to Fanny Cosandey, beyond the humility of the wording, the real office of the queens of France was summarised: to devout themselves to the kingdom and to the King, whether he was a spouse or a son. Fanny Cosandey, "Reines de France, héritières espagnoles," in *Les cours d'Espagne et de France au XVIIe siècle*, eds. Chantal Grell and Benoît Pellistrand (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2007), 61-76.

⁷⁰ See also the biography by Claude Dulong, *Mazarin* (Paris: Perrin, 2010).

⁷¹ Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 66.

⁷² Ibidem, 82.

⁷³ Avezou, "Les deux reines", 342.

peerages (a dignity hereditary in the masculine line) and one simple duchy,⁷⁴ which opened access to the duchy to certain families originating in the nobility of the robe, such as the Potiers and the Villeroy.⁷⁵ In times of crisis, the Marshal's baton was another way to reward outstanding war leaders such as Turenne in 1643 and Plessis-Praslin in 1645.⁷⁶

Between June 1648 and 1649 the Fronde essentially concerned political and administrative claims made by members of the Parliament.⁷⁷ It consisted of rebellions with little organisation or structure that were repressed by the Prince Louis of Condé, who successfully led the siege of Paris between January and March 1649. The strategy of civil war which was adopted in 1649 proved efficient to rally urban financial circles to the Queen's party, seen that the rebels were engaging in systematic looting.⁷⁸

The second phase of the Fronde (March 1649-1651) was called «the Fronde of the princes» and relied on the discontentment of the Prince of Condé, who felt insufficiently rewarded for his efforts.⁷⁹ Once again, ingratitude was the cause for important changes in the political chessboard. Indeed, Mazarin had begun to build a network of loyal followers and he exercised his patronage above all in the military to the detriment of Condé's influence. Condé succeeded in gathering behind him various powerful social groups of opponents: the parliaments, the state nobility, the towns' corporations and the representatives of the high nobility. During that time, part of the allies engaged in negotiations, betrayed the alliance, struggled against their former allies and occasionally joined them.⁸⁰ Each of these groups was animated by the desire to weak the King's position but at the same time each feared to reinforce the position of a rival faction.

In January 1649, the royal family left Paris to flee to Saint-Germain-en-Laye: it was the eve of Twelfth-Night. Condé defeated the royal army in the Faubourg Saint-Antoine and the bourgeois of Paris opened him the city's doors. When he entrusted his friends and supporters with some important posts, some divisions emerged. The parliament of Paris split between the «jusqu'aux-boutistes» and the moderates who were favourable to negotiating with the Regent. In January 1650, Anne of Austria got Condé arrested as well as his brother Conti and their brother-in-law, the Duke of Longueville. In January 1651, Gaston of Orléans joined the party of the princes and Mazarin went away to Cologne, from where he continued to advise Anne of Austria.⁸¹ The political crisis of that second phase was played between various parties:

⁷⁴ Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 83.

⁷⁵ The quarrels of precedence which resulted at the court of Anne of Austria were mocked in the *mazarinades*. BNF, mss Clairambault, 718, fol. 159. See also Fanny Cosandey's analysis about this episode: Fanny Cosandey, "Les préséances à la cour des reines de France," in Poutrin and Schaub, *Femmes et pouvoir politique*, 267-278.

⁷⁶ Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 83.

⁷⁷ See the studies of Robert Descimon and Christian Jouhaud, *La France du premier XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Belin, 1996), ch. 6.

⁷⁸ Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 85.

⁷⁹ Ibidem, 67-69.

⁸⁰ Elias, *La société de cour*, 190.

⁸¹ Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 74.

the parliament, the Cardinal of Retz, the princes, and the party of Anne of Austria/Mazarin. The Cardinal of Retz believed that he could supersede Mazarin; the Prince of Condé claimed that he had no intention to reform the state but as a prince of the blood he intended to replace Mazarin as regent.⁸² Mazarin presented his party as the King's and that of political legitimacy even though he acted like a great noble, by defending his interests and his clientele.

Each party sought to triumph in order to impose their vision of the power and for that purpose they did not hesitate to compromise yesterday's alliances. The strategy of Anne of Austria's party was to save time until Louis XIV would come of age and approve the Regent's measures.

III.3. 1651-1666: the Triumph of the Queen's Party and of Mazarin

In order to avoid for Louis XIV to become hostile to them as Louis XIII had been towards Concini, Mazarin and Anne of Austria chose very early to initiate Louis XIV to the affairs of the kingdom. In December 1651, Louis XIV reached his majority and agreed with Anne of Austria to recall Mazarin. The consequence was named «the Union of both Frondes». The opposition was this time directed against Louis XIV.⁸³ Paris's Hôtel de Ville was ransacked by the supporters of the Prince of Condé in July 1652, but the war was unpopular and, without financial support, the rebels divided: Condé, Gaston of Orléans and the parliament were competing for power while the countryside was plundered and beggars flowed into towns.⁸⁴ The King's support to Mazarin, the lack of popularity of rebellions and the faltering support from abroad – Spain itself was at war against France and its poor finances did not allow providing much help to the opposition – forced Condé to exile. On 13 October he travelled to the Spanish Netherlands in order to join the service of Philip IV, who immediately promoted him *generalissimo* of his troupes in the Netherlands.⁸⁵ The population of Paris gave in to the sovereigns and Mazarin recovered his position at the head of the government in February 1653.

The same year, Mazarin called all his family from Rome to naturalise them French and one of his nieces married the Prince of Conti. Conti had seemed to draw the lessons from the failure of his brother Condé and declared his allegiance to Mazarin.⁸⁶ Anne of Austria obtained the ratification from the parliament for the naturalisation of Mazarin and his role as the protector of the state during the Fronde. The party of Mazarin and Anne of

⁸² According to Guy Joly, Condé «only aims to make himself the absolute master of the cabinet and business». Ibidem, 80

⁸³ The *Lit de justice* held on 22 October 1652 by the King in the Louvre in front of the parliament cancelled all legislation passed during the Fronde. Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 82-83.

⁸⁴ Christian Jouhaud, "Révoltes et contestations d'Ancien Régime," in *Histoire de la France, l'État et les conflits*, ed. André Bouquieres and Jacques Revel (Paris: Seuil, 1990), 44.

⁸⁵ The parliament of Paris declared Condé guilty of lese-majesty, condemned him to capital sentence *in absentia* and confiscated all his properties and offices to the King's profit. Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 86.

⁸⁶ As a reward Conti was nominated governor of Champagne, generalissimo of the King's army in Languedoc and at the death of Gaston of Orléans in 1660, he took over after him as the governor of Languedoc. His wife was chosen in March 1661 to the office of superintendent of the House and Finances of Anne of Austria. Grell, *Anne d'Autriche*, 87.

Austria had triumphed not only by arms but also by law, since it had succeeded in asserting itself as the party of the State.⁸⁷ Indeed, this party succeeded in shifting the contractual relationship uniting the King and his subjects from «financed compliance» with the power towards «privilege which was purchased by the subjects and which included granting compliance and financial support to the King».⁸⁸

The unity of the Bourbon family was reinforced by the latest diplomatic triumph of Anne of Austria: the marriage between Louis XIV and the eldest Spanish infanta, Maria Theresa of Austria, in 1660.⁸⁹ Anne's withdrawal from politics in 1661, when Mazarin passed away, allowed her to revive her image as the ideal regent, who withdraws from politics as soon as her mission of transfer has been accomplished. She died of breast cancer on 20 January 1666.

IV. Conclusions

The grand nobles, a limited circle linked to royalty,⁹⁰ were those who set themselves up as the protectors of the nobility⁹¹ and determined the interactions of the political parties at court, including the Queen's party. What characterised the identity of these parties at the court were their motivations regarding personal interest, lineage or faction. At the same time, these family networks were not immutable or closed, because they participated in the process of historical changes: the key to their continuity resided in their capacity to adapt to changing circumstances. Thus, in most cases, as for the princes of Condé, the opposition could choose to become loyal to royal power.

Ingratitude was the reason put forward by many rebels or spies for changing party and/or to become an ally of Spain. Nonetheless, the many troubles or internal revolts were neither organised nor thought out in the long term, but they tested the balance of power and reminded to the Crown what it owed to the nobility.⁹² If it is true that the term of loyalty implied the notion of allegiance, the religious origins of the nobility's acceptance compelled it to duties towards the King. The aristocrats who plotted with Spain failed their duty of vassalage in order to form «factions composed of clientele»,

⁸⁷ Ibidem, 88.

⁸⁸ Ibidem, 93.

⁸⁹ According to Jean-François Dubost, Anne of Austria then experienced the satisfaction to marry her son in her own house which in her eyes was the only alliance worthy of the King, the one which paved the way for France to seize the Spanish inheritance. The alliance with Cromwell's England, in 1655, compelled Philip IV to sign the Pyrenees peace treaty, to the advantage of France. This peace was ratified by the marriage of the eldest infanta Maria-Theresa with Louis XIV, in 1660. Ibidem.

⁹⁰ Elias, *La société de cour*, 189.

⁹¹ Ibidem, 193.

⁹² Gaston of Orléans's words in a letter to the King of Spain, accurately summarised the position of the nobles on that point: the Spanish support was accepted but in case the armies of the Catholic King entered France «all will turn against him and himself [Sir], while being so obliged to V.M. will be forced to oppose him because if he does not do it, this will outrage all of France against the Duke of Orléans.» Consultation of the Council of State, March 1632, AGS, E, K1421, fol. 4.

according to the expression of Yves Durand,⁹³ unlike at the time of religious wars. The period studied here reveals how the sense of treason was still under-developed among top nobles of the kingdom and the royal family if one considers Marie of Medici: they claimed to act out of a duty of rebellion against a supposed tyranny. Yet, the question of the boundary between tyranny and monarchy was not well defined. For the nobility, ingratitude and the hogging of honours by a minister were elements of despotism.⁹⁴

Marie de Medici and Anne of Austria maintained extremely variable relationships with the parties at court. Complacent towards opponents when the queens were politically isolated, they became intransigent when they had the responsibility to exercise their power as regents. At the time of Marie of Medici, divisions in the Bourbon family eased the development of court factions. Richelieu's actions and the hardship of civil war allowed the policy of Anne of Austria to triumph. As a consequence, the Bourbon family became more united and the submission of the parties to royal power was ratified against pensions and honours which granted its protection against socio-economical changes. At the end of these regencies, rivalries between factions remained, but the balance of their power compared to royal authority was deeply transformed into the basis for an absolute monarchy.

⁹³ Yves Durand, "Clientèles et fidélités dans le temps et dans l'espace," in *Hommage à Roland Mousnier. Clientèles and fidélités en Europe à l'époque moderne*, ed. Yves Durand (Paris: PUF, 1981), 3-24.

⁹⁴ Nonetheless the high nobility was rarely condemned for high treason, because royal power needed them for its own prestige. The same was not true for their servants. Hugon, *Au service du roi catholique*, 350-357.

