FROM *REINOS* TO *MONARQUÍA*: POLITICAL ASSOCIATION IN LATE 16TH CENTURY SPAIN

De los *Reinos* a la *Monarquía*: la asociación política a finales del siglo XVI en España

I.A.A.Thompson

Emeritus Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, London (Reino Unido)

Abstract

This essay argues that the term, the *monarquía de España,* commonly used by historians as a designation for the complex of territories ruled by the kings of Spain throughout the early-modern period, was, in fact, an innovation of the late-16th Century. It then goes on to examine some of the reasons, implications and consequences of the terminological shift from the particularism of "Reinos y estados" to the unitary concept of *Monarquía*, a term which gave concrete expression to the felt need, in the words of Baltasar Alamos de Barrientos, for "some other form of State which would unify the kingdoms".

Keywords: Monarchy of Spain, Baroque kingship, composite states, castilianization, political discourse.

Resumen

Este ensayo propone que la locución, *Monarquía de España*, empleada en la historiografía para designar todo el complejo territorial sujeto a los reyes de España durante la totalidad de la época moderna, fue en realidad una invención de los años finales del siglo XVI. Sigue por investigar las razones, implicaciones y consecuencias del cambio terminológico del particularismo de "Reinos y estados" hacia el concepto unitario de *Monarquía*, concepto que concretizaba la conciencia de la necesidad de hallar, en palabras de Baltasar Alamos de Barrientos, "otra manera de estado para unir los reinos."

Palabras Clave: Monarquía de España, Monarquía Barroca, estados compuestos, castellanización, el lenguaje político

The emergence of a new terminology, or a new use of language, is not something casual, or empty of significance. Language signifies; new language usage signifies a new signified, or it gives the signified a new signification. The historical importance of that signification is a function of its socialization, that is, its use and penetration. As Quentin Skinner writes, "The clearest sign that a society has entered into the self-conscious possession of a new concept is, I take it, that a new vocabulary comes to be generated, in terms of which the concept is then articulated and discussed."[1]

What interests me in this paper is the linguistic turn that points to the socialization of one such new concept, or rather the new socialized conceptualization of an old concept, the concept of "monarquía".

---

[1] Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Vol. 1 (Cambridge University Press, 1978), 10

By "socialization" I mean the unselfconscious articulation of that concept in ordinary political discourse by means of a new verbal formulation.

My starting point is the perception that the employment by historians of the terms "Monarquía de España", "Monarquía Hispánica", "Monarquía Católica", as a designation for the complex of territories ruled over by the kings of Spain, indiscriminately for the entire duration of the early-modern period from the reign of the Catholic Kings onwards, cannot be justified in the documentation of the period. In other words, the "Monarquía", in that specific **territorial** sense, is a neologism whose invention at a particular moment was a response to a felt need for, and hence the invention of, a new political concept.

In the seventeenth century the terms "monarquía" and "monarquía de España" are extremely common in ordinary political discourse, in the acts of the Cortes and municipal councils (*ayuntamientos*), in the *consultas* of the royal Councils, and in letters and memoranda, as well as in works of learning and theology, in treatises, tracts, pamphlets and other political writings. Yet, in the non-polemical documents and papers of the second half of the previous century these terms are very uncommon, and in this territorial sense hardly to be found at all. In other words, the common use of "monarquía" - in its territorial sense – seems to be an invention of the last years of the sixteenth century. How that innovation came to be "socialized" I have not been able to determine, either as to the source of the new usage, or to the process of its propagation (ascending or descending – from below, or from above), key questions for an understanding of the etiology of any linguistic innovation and of the motives behind it[2].

That said, perception is not proof, and I have to confess that I do not have a methodology fully adequate to translate that perception into proof. A methodology that could pinpoint the emergence and trace the development and frequency of such a new linguistic usage in ordinary, one might even say reflexive, political discourse would require the textual analysis of a homogeneous, long-run, continuous (without significant gaps) and relevant series[3]. The options available are not numerous. They include such sources as the *consultas* of the Councils, the acts of the *ayuntamientos municipales*, and the various types of popular periodical literature of the time, newsletters, *avisos*, *relaciones*, and so on. For reasons

---

[2] The historians who have recognized this innovation are few, and even fewer have examined its chronology, even in general terms. There is much to be gained from: María José Rodríguez Salgado, "Patriotismo y política exterior en la España de Carlos V y Felipe II", in *La proyección europea de la Monarquía hispánica,* coord. Felipe Ruiz Martín (Madrid: Universidad Complutense, Editorial Complutense 1996), 49, 86-89; José María Jover and María Victoria López-Cordón Cortezo, "La imagen de Europa y el pensamiento político internacional", in *El Siglo del Quijote 1580-1680,* vol.1, ed., Ramón Menéndez Pidal (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1996), 467-691, at 493; John M. Headley, *Church, empire, and world: the quest for universal order, 1520-1640* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997); "Ehe Türckisch als Bäptisch': Lutheran Reflections on the Problem of Empire 1623-28," *Central European History* 20 (1987): 7; "The Burden of European Imperialisms 1500-1800," *International History Review* 18 (1996): 879, 882; *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 200.

[3] For this reason it is important to limit ourselves to the language and political culture of Castile. We cannot assume that the force of language and its inner resonances are unconnected to cultural and socio-historical differences. For example, it is undeniable that from Dante to Campanella the idea of "world monarchy" has an exceptional place in Italian political thinking, both in its Utopian and in its hegemonic sense, and that for reasons entirely understandable in the context of Italian history, see J. H. Burns, *Lordship, Kingship, and Empire. The Idea of Monarchy, 1400-1525* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Rodolfo de Mattei, "Il Mito della Monarchia Universale nel pensiero politico italiana del Seicento," *Rivista di Studi Politica Internazionale* 32 (1965): 531-550.

of accessibility and my own familiarity with the documentation, I have used the *Actas* of the Cortes of Castile, beginning with the *Proposición Real* of the second Cortes of Philip II on 16 February 1563. These are the first Cortes for which the published documentation takes the form of what can properly be called "actas", that is to say a word by word register of proposals, votes and formal resolutions such that makes possible an analysis of the language used by the *procuradores* in their ordinary, everyday discourse.

Although the Cortes were concerned essentially with the "good of the kingdom", that is only that which concerned the kingdoms of the Crown of Castile, the national and international policies of the reign of Philip II, which the kingdoms of Castile were increasingly called upon to support, involved the *procuradores* of the Cortes in the discussion of matters of a much wider nature, concerning the financing of war and defence and their justification in terms of Castilian as well as more general interests. Such matters necessarily raised questions about the relationship of Castile to the rest of that complex of territories that was to come to be called the "Monarquía".

However, going through the volumes of the *Actas de las Cortes* word by word, no instance of the word "monarquía" can be found until the very last Cortes of the reign. It is necessary to examine 14 volumes, nearly 7,000 pages, covering 32 years, before there is a single instance of the word "monarquía". In the "Memorial del encabezamiento" of 28 February 1587 the Cortes address the sovereign as "Rey y Señor y monarca tan católico y que con sus fuerzas y sustancia [those of Castile] vuestra Magestad y sus antecesores de tan gloriosa memoria han conquistado y sustentado tantos reynos"[4]. But the first actual instance of the word "monarquía" does not appear until 18 September 1595, when the *procurador* for Burgos, Gerónimo de Salamanca, says in his vote, "de la conservación destos Reynos pende el ser y sustancia de toda la monarquía y corona de su Magestad"[5]. That same phrase is repeated almost word for word by Rodrigo Sánchez Doria, *jurado* of Seville, on the following 4 April 1596. From then on, the term "monarquía", with twenty-five appearances in the 1592-98 and the next three Cortes up to 1608, is found increasingly frequently, until during the course of the following reign its use has become commonplace. Simply to set an end-point, and taking a text of the greatest relevance, in the Conde-Duque de Olivares' *Gran Memorial* of 1624, there are no fewer than twenty-three instances of the word "monarquía" in its 51 printed pages[6].

In official government papers, *consultas* of the Councils for example, I have not come across instances prior to the reign of Philip III. "Las dichas fronteras son los cimientos de la monarquía de Vuestra Majestad", insisted the Council of War in a *consulta* of 4 November 1599[7]. Three months later,

---

[4] *ACC* 8, p.282
[5] *ACC* 14, p.247
[6] John H. Elliott and José F. de la Peña, *Memoriales y Cartas del Conde Duque de Olivares* (Madrid: Alfaguara, 1978), 49-100.
[7] AGS GA 553.

the same Council warns of the disastrous condition of the frontier fortifications, "de cuyo remedio depende totalmente el ser y conservación de la monarquía de Vuestra Majestad"[8], and on 4 July 1600 the Council of State gave its opinion on "lo que es menester para el ordinario y la conservación de su real monarquía."[9] I cannot be absolutely certain that these references are really the first - that would require a meticulous review of all the *consultas* and other documentation of the various secretariats - only that they are the first that I have come across in the notes that I have accumulated over the years.

Clearly, this understanding of "monarquía" did not come out of the blue. Perhaps the first clear case of the use of "monarquía" in a territorial sense that I have seen in more general correspondence is to be found a little earlier from the pen of that inveterate memorialist, Bernardino de Escalante. In the dedication of his *Diálogos del Arte Militar* (Seville 1583), Escalante writes, "considerando la monarquía tan grande de nuestro Rey Católico, y quan divisa y extendida esté por todo el mundo"; and, in a letter to Don Juan de Idiáquez in February 1587, he writes of the need for the king to "asegurar su monarchía que en tanto peligro está de resbalarse y disminuirse por ser de naciones y provincias tan diferentes y tan divididas"[10]. There are no doubt other examples prior to the 1590s, but unless I am completely mistaken, it does seem that we are confronted here with a vocabulary different, at the very least quantitatively, from what is to be found prior to the last decade or so of Philip II's reign, a vocabulary that will come to be the common coin of political language in subsequent years.

Further indication of the increasing use of "monarquía" from the last years of the century can also be found in literary and academic sources, though not necessarily always in a clearly territorial sense. A search for "monarquía" in the digitalized title-catalogue of "libros antiguos" in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, comes up with 147 titles, none of them pre-dating 1601 (apart from the *Licenciado* Gregorio López Madera's *Excelencias de la Monarquía y Reino de España*, which appears only in its 1625 edition, though issued with a royal licence in 1593 and first published in 1597)[11]. In the 165 pages of the British Museum's *Short-Title Catalogue of Spanish, Spanish American and Portuguese Books printed before 1601* there are only four titles. López Madera appears in the 1597 edition, together with Bernardo de Brito's *Monarchia Lusytana* (Alcobaça, 1597) of the same date. The other two titles are dated 1581 and 1588, neither of them relevant[12]**.** In the *Cuaderno Bibliográfico* of the *Relaciones de Sucesos* for the years 1477-1619, the first title containing the word "monarquía" dates (probably) from 1600[13]. However, an

---

[8] 4.2.1600, AGS GA 569.

[9] Mariano Alcocer y Martínez, ed., *Consultas del Consejo de Estado*, vol. 3 (Valladolid: "Poncelix", 1931), 25.

[10] José Luis Casado Soto, ed., *Discursos de Bernardino de Escalante al Rey y sus Ministros (1585-1605)*(Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, 1995), 72, 147.

[11] José Luis Bermejo Cabrero, ed., *Excelencias de la Monarquía y Reino de España* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1999). The first edition is dated 1597. Also in 1597, Cristóbal Pérez de Herrera drafted a "Discurso a la católica y real majestad del rey d.Felipe nuestro señor, en que se le suplica, que considerando las muchas calidades y grandezas de la villa de Madrid, se sirva de ver si convendria honrarla, y adornarla de muralla, y otras cosas que se proponen, con que mereciesse ser corte perpetua, y assistencia de su gran monarquía". See Michel Cavillac, "El Madrid utópico de Cristóbal Pérez de Herrera (1597-1600)", *Bulletin Hispanique* 104, no.2 (2002), 627-644, at p.631.

[12] London, 1966. The earliest title is Thomás Cerdán de Tallada's *Verdadero govierno desta Monarchia* of 1581, for which see below, note 16. The other is Juan de Pineda, *La monarchía ecclesiástica* of 1588.

[13] CSIC, Madrid, 1966, no.372.

even earlier, if somewhat ambivalent, use of *Monarchia* in what could be a territorial sense can be found in the Portuguese, Lorenzo de San Pedro's *Diálogo llamado Phillipino*, of c.1580, where he writes of the "Monarchia cumplida en su Magestad" and illustrates his theme with a drawing of four fingers, corresponding to the four ancient kingdoms of León, Castile, Aragon and Navarre, the fifth clenched middle finger representing Portugal because "todos cinco reynos estén en un señorío"[14]. It may well be then that the incorporation of Portugal and the Portuguese empire into Philip II's dominions was an important trigger for a rethinking of the relationship between the Iberian kingdoms and what might be an appropriate way of describing it.

I would not, of course, want to suggest that in the treatises, position papers, correspondence and memoranda of Philip II's reign the word "monarquía" is never to be found before the 1590s, only that - to repeat - as far as I can see it was extremely uncommon[15]. Moreover, insofar as there are instances of "monarquía" before the 1590s, they are overwhelmingly the output of the litterati and the intelligentsia, and their meaning is fundamentally different from the way "monarquía" is being used in everyday political discourse in that decade and beyond[16].

The term "monarquía" has a long and rich history. On the one hand, in its simplest Aristotelian politological sense, it signifies the supreme rule of a single ruler. This is how Covarrubias defines it in 1611: <*Monarca*> "El señor absoluto y príncipe solo, sin reconocimiento a otro, antes todos se le tienen a él. De aquí se dixo Monarquía." In the same vein, Gregorio López Madera, in chapter 2 of his *Excelencias de la Monarquía y Reino de España*, writes: "Nuestros doctores en derecho llaman también con mucha razón monarcha a aquel príncipe que, en quanto rey y señor temporal no reconoce superior alguno. Y esta es aquella común conclusión que este tal es monarcha en su reyno... De las quales maneras es el Reyno de España Monarchía, sin superior en lo temporal."[17]

At the same time, "monarquía" also had a more visionary sense, one perhaps hinted at by López Madera in the above quotation, a sense ultimately deriving from the four biblical Monarchies of the Book

---

[14] Fernando Bouza, *Imagen y propaganda. Capítulos de historia cultural del reinado de Felipe II* (Madrid: Akal Ediciones, 1998), 74.

[15] Among the best known Castilian treatises are Fernando Vázquez de Menchaca [ob.1569], *Controversiarum Illustrium*, ed. Fidel Rodríguez Alcalde, (Valladolid: Talleres Tipográficos Cuesta, 1931); Thomás Cerdán de Tallada, *Verdadero govierno desta Monarchia* (Valencia: Vendense en casa de Miguel Borras..., 1581); and an interesting anonymous manuscript of c.1570, on the rise and decline of empires, entitled, "Consideraciones de como suben y baxan las Monarchias y Reynos del mundo", BNM Ms 1029; there are also odd references in the "Memorial del Contador Luis de Ortiz a Felipe II" of 1558, in Manuel Fernández Alvarez, *Economía, sociedad y corona (Ensayos históricos sobre el siglo XVI)* (Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1963), 379; and some further examples in Ricardo del Arco y Garay, *La Idea de Imperio en la política y la literatura españolas* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, s. a., 1944), 256, 273, 321. e.g. Luis Valle de la Cerda (1583), Bartolomé Felipe (1584), Ribadeneyra (1588).

[16] A notable example is *Verdadero govierno desta Monarchia* of Thomás Cerdán de Tallada, published in Valencia in 1581, where "esta monarchia" does not mean Spain, but the whole earthly world, "el mundo todo" - "esta Monarchia temporal", see 34v, 2v, 3v, 11. In a similar category is the manuscript of a Doctor of Salamanca, Juan de Garnica, "De Hispanorum Monarchia et caeteris ab Adam", BNM Ms.7382. Its dedication is dated Naples, 10th of August 1595, "Ad Serenissimum Philippum tertium, Hispaniarum Principem maximum", which casts some doubt on the dating of the partial version published by E. Luque, "La misión del imperio español en una carta política del siglo XVI" *Revista de Estudios Políticos* I (1941), 713-728.

[17] Bermejo Cabrero, *Excelencias*, 27.

of Daniel: monarchy universal, millenarian and providentialist; the Monarch as *dominus mundi*, the messiah of a Christan universe, of a single law and universal peace - the "*fiet unum ovile et unus pastor*" of John x.16. It is this programmatic vision that is associated with the revival of the Dantean concept of universal monarchy by Mercurino Gattinara, grand chancellor of the young Emperor Charles V, inspired by the bringing together of the Holy Roman Empire, the Virgilian myths of the House of Burgundy, and the Spanish conquests in the old and the new worlds[18]. It is this aspirational, para-political, universalist connotation of "monarquía" which predominates throughout most of the 16th century[19], and which is given poetic and rhetorical expression by (among others) Hernando de Acuña (1541), Hernando de Herrera (1571), and Juan Rufo (1584)[20].

There is, however, another variant of "monarquía" which, though not without precedent in the traditional language of politics, is what seems to be emerging in Spain in the final years of the century. This is essentially descriptive. It is neither messianic nor universalist, but territorial and specific, applied to a state made up of a number of separate dominions. Here "monarquía" meant much the same as "empire" does now, the monarch combining the notions of *imperator in regno suo* and *rex regnorum*. In the words of López Madera: "llamávase por excelencia Monarchía, el reyno más poderoso y que más reynos y provincias tuviese subjetas."[21] In the *Diccionario de Autoridades* (1732): <*Monarchia*> "Es un estado grande gobernado por uno solo, que se llama Monarcha, con independencia de otro Señor: como es la Monarchia de España, tan extendida en el antiguo y nuevo mundo."

This sense of "monarquía" – political, territorially defined, hegemonically neutral – was not simply different, it was in effect a complete rejection of the concept of universal monarchy. For Bodin, for example, this ancient idea of monarchy, which he called "germanic", was an absurdity[22]. Vázquez de Menchaca had denounced it in 1564 as an impossibility and outside the order of nature[23]; and López Madera also rejected it: "Tiene este nombre de monarcha diferentes significaciones, pero alléganse tanto las unas a las otras que paran en una misma, respecto de la composición del vocablo, que en griego quiere dezir príncipe único y solo. Y así, haziéndole indefinito y tomándole en general, quieren algunos que el nombre de monarcha sea de un señor universal del mundo; pero no sé para quién se aya inventado tal nombre sino es para Dios, nuestro señor, o, en lo espiritual, para el sumo pontífice... Pues en lo temporal

---

[18] Marie Tanner, *The Last Descendant of Aeneas. The Habsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 98; Victor Frankl, "Imperio particular e Imperio universal en las Cartas de Relación de Hernán Cortés", *Cuadernos Hispánicos* (1963): 443-482.

[19] José Antonio Maravall, *Carlos V y el pensamiento político del renacimiento* (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1960), 97; and for older examples, José Antonio Maravall, *El Concepto de España en la Edad Media* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1981), 470.

[20] Milhou's attribution of the occasion of Acuña's sonnet to the Algiers expedition in 1541, seems more likely than its traditional association with the battle of Mühlberg in 1547, Alain Milhou, *Pouvoir royal et absolutisme dans l'Espagne du XVIe siècle* (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 1999), 90.

[21] Bermejo Cabrero*, Excelencias*, 26. See also Franz Bosbach, "The European Debate on Universal Monarchy", in David Armitage, ed., *Theories of Empire 1450-1800* (England: Ashgate, 1998), 81-98, for the development of this concept of "monarchy".

[22] Jean Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, (New York: ed. B. Reynolds, 1945), 293.

[23] Menchaca, *Controversiarum Illustrium*, libro 1, cap. 20.

nunca ha avido tal príncipe"[24]. Pedro Salazar de Mendoza recognized the novelty of this new locution in his *Monarquía de España* of 1622. In the prologue the author begins by excusing himself for his very title: "Muy contra mi voluntad se ha hecho llamar Monarquía estos borrones, pues con otro cualquier título, por humilde que fuera, ellos y yo quedaríamos honrados. También, porque el riguroso significado de esta dicción importa *Señorío universal del mundo*: atributo que propiamente no puede pertenecer a otro que a Dios, y en lo espiritual al Sumo Pontífice Romano... Mas ha sido fuerza que se obedezca a quien lo pudo querer y mandar, y por estar introducido se llamen Monarcas los Príncipes Soberanos, que en lo temporal no reconocen superior."[25]

However, we need also to distinguish between the "monarquía de España" as a purely politological term, denoting the monarchical regime in or over Spain, an adjectival usage which goes back at least as far as the 14th century[26], and a possessive sense in which the "monarquía" is not **over** Spain, it **is** Spain's - the "monarquía de los españoles" of Juan de Garnica, for example. With the translation of "reinos y estados" into "monarquía" there is also a change of mood, from the passive to the active, from "monarquía" as an attribute ("la monarquía de Vuestra Magestad") to "monarquía" as an actor - "andando ya esta Monarquía dando traspiés" (8.4.1604). This conception of the "Monarquía" as an active, substantive, even corporeal entity[27] is something very different, though sometimes textually difficult to distinguish, from the sense of "monarquía" as just the sovereignty, authority, or rule that a monarch exercises over a given territory, or territories. Conceptually at any rate, the *Monarquía* assumes the political attributes of the old *Reinos* as a separate entity distinct from, and even counterpoised to, the monarch - "ansi se han de reconocer entre Rey y Reino, como entre monarca y monarquía, un concierto y pacto."[28]

The instances of "Monarquía Católica", on the other hand, are very much less common. Fray Juan de la Fuente, in 1612, denounced Holland as "isla rebelada de la Monarquía Católica", for example, and the term is occasionally found in Olivares's papers, among a far greater number of instances just of "monarquía"[29]. A more extensive search further into the 17th century might well uncover the more

---

[24] Bermejo Cabrero, *Excelencias*, 26. <Monarcha, qué significa>.

[25] Cited by José María Jover, "Sobre los conceptos de monarquía y nación en el pensamiento político español del XVII", *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 13 (1950): 101-50, 108: n10.

[26] Maravall, *Concepto de España*, 466 - "monarchiam Hispaniae" 1312; 467 - Diego de Valera 1476 "la monarchía de todas las Españas". Menchaca also refers to the creation of the "Hispanicam monarchiam" in the time of Alaric, Menchaca, *Controversiarum Illustrium*, Libro 2, cap.22, para. 15.

[27] Among many others, Martín de Castrejón, in the Cortes of 1619, "esta Monarquía es un cuerpo", cited by Christine Aguilar-Adan, "Métaphores du corps politique malade autour des années 1620", in Augustin Redondo, ed., *Le corps comme métaphore dans l'Espagne des XVIe et XVIIe siecles* (Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne nouvelle, 1992), 61-71,

[28] ACC 18, p.461, Melchor de Avila de Vargas (Toledo), 4.12.1599.

[28] Elliott and de la Peña, *Memoriales y Cartas*, I, 129

[29] Furthermore, one should not necessarily understand the epithet "católica" in a strictly religious sense, rather than as referring to the "Rey Católico", in the same way that the French forces in the Catalan War were spoken of as "el ejército cristianísimo", see Francisco de Melo and Jaime Tió, *Historia de los movimientos y separación de Cataluña* (Barcelona: Ed. 7 1/2, 1981), 2, "Llamo á los soldados del ejército del rey don Felipe algunas veces católicos, como á su rey… Otras veces los nombro españoles, castellanos ó reales; siempre entiendo la misma gente"; and p.6 "Progresos de las armas católicas y cristianas".

frequent presence of the term in general usage, but that is not something that at present I am able to demonstrate[30]. Nevertheless, the impression I get from the public documents is that the concept of "monarquía" was being used in ordinary discourse in an overwhelmingly political and secular way. The religious and messianic dimension, so prominent in the literature, was, if not completely absent, very much of a secondary order[31].

Up to a point, the generalization of the new usage of "monarquía" from the end of the 16th century could be seen to be little more than the expression of old concepts in a new, or revived, vocabulary, although it would not for that reason be without interest. However, what was different and important about the meaning it was given around 1600 was the territorialization of the concept, what Jover has called "la estatificación de la Monarquía"[32], the objectification of its ancient politological sense, and the use of "monarquía" as a designation for the complex of the patrimonial estates of the king, shorn of its universalist and hegemonic resonances. It is in this way that it was used by the *procurador* for Burgos in the Cortes of 1602: "los muchos apartados reinos y estados de que consta y está compuesta esta gran monarquía"[33]; or by Baltasar Alamos de Barrientos when he spoke of Portugal, Aragon and Italy as "tres partes tan principales de esta monarquía"[34]; or, again to quote the Conde-Duque de Olivares, in his summing up of the *Gran Memorial*, "Este papel será la recopilación del dictamen que tengo en la materia de estado de todos los reinos de V.Magd, de cada uno de ellos por mayor, y después, de toda la Monarquía junta."[35] As Calixto Ramírez insisted in his *Analitycus Tractatus* of 1616 (as glossed by Pablo Fernández Albaladejo), "Más que la dinastía eran los territorios los que constituían materialmente la monarquía."[36]

What significance then should be given to the emergence of this new usage of "monarquía" in the political vocabulary of Spain from the last years of the 16th century? Without being able to establish a political etiology, we cannot safely attribute its origin to any direct propagandist motive, either on the part of the régime, or of any other interested party. However, it seems to me that the political and ideological implications of these linguistic changes are clear enough, and they were to be vividly exposed in their

---

[30] Furthermore, one should not necessarily understand the epithet "católica" in a strictly religious sense, rather than as referring to the "Rey Católico", in the same way that the French forces in the Catalan War were spoken of as "el ejército cristianísimo", see Francisco de Melo and Jaime Tió, *Historia de los movimientos y separación de Cataluña* (Barcelona: Ed. 7 1/2, 1981), 2, "Llamo á los soldados del ejército del rey don Felipe algunas veces católicos, como á su rey… Otras veces los nombro españoles, castellanos ó reales; siempre entiendo la misma gente"; and p.6 "Progresos de las armas católicas y cristianas".

[31] See Jover & López-Cordón, "La imagen de Europa", 508, and Pablo Fernández Albaladejo, "Imperio de por sí: la reformulación del poder universal en la temprana edad moderna", in *Fragmentos de Monarquía* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1992), 168-184, 176.

[32] Jover, "Sobre los conceptos de monarquía y nación", 119

[33] *Ldo* Gil Ramírez de Arellano, *procurador* de Burgos, *ACC* 20, 577 (31.10.1602).

[34] Baltasar Álamos de Barrientos and Modesto Santos, *Discurso político al rey Felipe III al comienzo de su reinado* (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1990), 26, 86, "todos los reinos de VM de que está compuesta su monarquía"; 77, "quebrantamiento de la monarquía española"; 97, "todas las lenguas de su monarquía".

[35] Elliott and de la Peña, *Memoriales y Cartas del Conde Duque de Olivares*, I, 95.

[36] Pablo Fernández Albaladejo, "*Lex Regia Aragonensium*: Monarquía compuesta e identidad de reinos en el reinado de Felipe III", in *España y Suecia en la época del barroco (1600-1660)*, ed., Enrique Martínez Ruiz and Magdalena Pi Corrales (Madrid: Consejería de Educación y Cultura, 1998), 51-72, 68.

underpinning of the reform projects of the 1620s. The real significance of any new terminology derives not only from its own intrinsic connotations, but also from that which it is displacing. Before the 1590s, there was no language to designate the entirety of the territories subject to the king of Spain (patently, "España" by itself was partial and inadequate) other than terms like "los reinos y estados de SM", "todos los reynos de SM", "todos mis reinos, estados y señoríos", "los reynos que están sujetos a su real señorío y Corona". It is the language of atomization, of individual parts without lateral bonds, without any sense of the corporate. With the passage from "reinos y estados" to "monarquía" we are moving from political solipsism to political community.

The normalization of the concept of "monarquía" as the common designation for the multiplicity of territories subject to the king of Spain implied an ideological restructuring of the relationship between those territories. The terminology of "monarquía" worked first to counter the disaggregation of those separate territories by articulating their integration into a new conceptual entity, a new body politic, secular and territorial. That is not to say that this new concept of "monarquía" eliminated the language of "reinos y estados", which was often used alongside, or in opposition to it; neither did it do away entirely with the universalist and providentialist dimensions of the past. It could not fail to retain some echoes of all its historical connotations, but, leaving aside its intellectualized, academic and literary manifestations, at the ordinary, non-intellectualized, functional level of political usage those resonances were very much attenuated, and, if anything, tacit rather than explicit[37]. What was created, then, was a vocabulary appropriate, perhaps even indispensable, for the expression of a new sense of association and reciprocity among the various territories, kingdoms and states, something that could not be done by either the concept of "corona", as too local and nationalist, or that of "imperio", as too imperialist and hegemonic.

The transformed concept of "monarquía", or "la monarquía de España", by its very nature implied a new articulation of its component parts. It meant a hispanization, but at the same time both a castilianization and a de-castilianization of the "aggregated" monarchy, a way of giving Castile a recognizable precedence within that body[38], whilst simultaneously, as Jover and López Cordón have suggested, extending the ownership of the *Monarquía* to all its members, within the Peninsula and outside it[39].

The question is, why should it have been precisely in the final years of the 16th century that the need for such a conceptual restructuring, or re-identification, should have arisen? In order to put the emergence of this new political vocabulary into its proper context we need to set it within a more general

---

[37] This vote of the *procurador* for Zamora, Atilano de Obeso, is the only one in the Cortes of the first years of Philip III to give expression to a universalist concept of *monarquía*: "dixo, quel está bién certificado de la gran necesidad que tiene su Magestad de ser servido y socorrido con hazienda suficiente y bastante para poder acudir a tantas y tan grandes obligaciones precisas y forçosas como tiene, y defensa de la religión cristiana y aumento della, por ser monarca del mundo y de quien depende", *ACC* 19, p.222, 12.4.1600.

[38] Equating the notion of the *Monarquía de España* with the "dominio de Castilla sobre todos", as Jover does, goes too far in my opinion: "Sobre los conceptos de monarquía y nación", 102.

[39] Jover and López-Cordón, "La imagen de Europa", 546-547.

revival of the ideas of *monarchy* and *empire* at a European level related to the quasi-apocalyptic, *fin de siècle* psychological climate of the so-called General Crisis of the 1590s. A preoccupation with the state of Europe and Christendom, sundered by protracted civil wars and threatened again by Ottoman aggression, is manifest in the writings of Andrea Vico, Ammirato, Botero, Campanella, and various others, leading to the contemplation of universal monarchy as the only salvation[40]. At the same time, though coming from a different direction, as John M. Headley argues in his study of Tomasso Campanella, by the beginning of the 17th century the extraordinary recovery of the Counter-Reformation Papacy, the rapid expansion of the Spanish Monarchy as a global power, and of the Habsburgs as a force in Central Europe combined to give the idea of universal monarchy a new, wider and more existential salience[41], which from the viewpoint of the independent Italian states, Lutheran Germany, and France was both threatening and alarming[42].

The European political climate also had its impact upon Spain, though in a rather different way. The challenge to Spain's predominance from a France, reunited and resurgent under a Catholic king, from a Papacy determined to sustain a counterweight to the overwhelming power of Madrid, and from the Imperial branch of the House of Habsburg, wanting to take an independent position in what Robert Evans has called a "three-sided antagonism"[43], created a crisis for the leadership of Spain within the Catholic world and for her claim to be the authentic protector of Christendom. The idea of "monarquía" with its connotations of sovereignty, resonances of the *Monarchía Sícula*, and rejection of a Universal Monarchy, responded to the need to contest the pretensions of the Most Christian King, the ambivalence of Papal policy, and the preeminence of the German Holy Roman Emperor without competing nominally with the imperial dignity, to which, given the incapacity of Rudolf and the ambitions of Henri IV, it seemed at one time that Philip III himself might lay claim. The application of the label "monarquía" to the diverse territories of the king of Spain, to which the worldwide possessions of the Portuguese empire had so recently been added, thus served to lend a sort of parallel supra-national authority to the Spanish Habsburgs, while, at the same time, avoiding the Tacitean overtones of conquest, violence and decadence inhering in "empire"[44].

That is to say "empire" sounded more like domination and dominion than community[45], whereas

---

[40] Robert John Weston Evans, *Rudolf II and his world*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 276, "The years around 1600 - most of all those immediately preceding the turn of the century - were among the classic ages of chiliasm"; Anthony Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 49; Headley, "The Burden of European Imperialisms", 879. In the same way, the growth of the idea of universal monarchy in the middle decades of the 15th century has been linked with a similar crisis of Christendom, Burns, *Lordship, Kingship, and Empire*, 100.

[41] Headley, *Tommaso Campanella*, 198.

[42] Headley,"`Ehe Türckisch als Bäptisch", 6-7; *Tommaso Campanella*, 198; Bosbach, "The European Debate on Universal Monarchy", 91; Henry Mechoulan, "La Critique de l'Espagne par Campanella à partir d'une réfutation manuscrit en français de sa *Monarchie espagnole: La Monarchie des nations*", in C.Mazouer, ed., *L'Age d'Or de l'Influence Espagnole. La France et l'Espagne à l'époque d'Anne d'Autriche 1615-1666* (Mont-de-Marsan: Interuniversitaires, 1991), 125-135, at 128.

[43] Evans, *Rudolf II*, 13.

[44] Headley, "The Burden of European Imperialisms", 882.

[45] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 292: "Melanchthon says that a monarchy seems to him that sovereign power of a state which can subjugate the riches and resources of others. In that case, we should use the

"monarchy", along with the defence of Christendom, connoted peace, tranquillity, and good order[46]. It is no coincidence that López Madera should have been defending the position that "The Emperor is not superior to kings", and arguing for the lawful plurality of states and the historic independence of Spain from imperial jurisdiction. Neither is it any surprise that the response to an incipient crisis of national self-confidence should have been the invention of a new national self-image.

The conviction that the international situation was making necessary, in the words of Jover and López Cordón, "la exaltación de la Monarquía como razón de Estado y como símbolo de cohesión interior y de presencia en la realidad internacional"[47], is shared by such other historians as Lisón Tolosana, Anthony Pagden, John M. Headley, and Mia Rodríguez Salgado[48]. However, it seems to me that the reconceptualization of "monarquía" in Spain was at its roots much more immediately a response to internal problems, that is to say to questions of domestic politics, and in particular the growing alienation of Castile from the policies of the Habsburg Court and the financial burdens they constituted.

Government spending, much more than an economic problem, was more than anything a political one. Conflict between Crown and Cortes is mistakenly seen as a question of taxation. But the granting of aid to the king was not usually the issue. The issue was the nature of the expenditure for which that aid was required, and the insistence on sufficient controls to ensure that such aid would not be diverted to purposes other than those for which it had been granted. There was a deep-rooted and universal belief that revenues should be spent only for the benefit of the people from whom they had been raised, and, for almost the entirety of the 16th century, regardless of whatever the academic theorists of "Hispania" might have been writing, there was no feeling of unity among the various patrimonial possessions of the king of Spain, nor any language, beyond such expressions as Anuestros reinos y estados@, with which to express it.

It was inevitable then that the spending programmes of the Crown would meet with serious opposition within Castile: opposition to involvement in the concerns of the Holy Roman Empire in 1520; opposition to Ainternecine@ war with France in the 1530s, 1540s, 1550s, and again in the 1590s; opposition to the haemorrhaging of resources in order to hold on to the Netherlands after 1567. Even the expenditures against the Acapital enemy of Christendom@ in the Mediterranean, which helped cement

---

word 'empire'"; Antonio Pérez et al, *Suma De Preceptos Justos, Necesarios Y Provechosos En Consejo De Estado Al Rey Felipe III, Siendo Príncipe* (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1991) dedicated to the future Philip III, "el Imperio que posee VA sobre tan poderosos y ricas naciones", cited by Arco, *La Idea de Imperio*, 247.

[46] Antonio de Nebrija, in the eulogistical dedication of his Castilian grammar to Queen Isabella (1492), speaks of monarchy and peace as if they were two sides of the same coin: "la monarchía e paz de que gozamos", Pedro Sáinz Rodríguez, *Evolución de las ideas sobre la decadencia española* (Madrid: Ediciones Rialp, 1962), 51-52.

[47] Jover and López-Cordón, "La imagen de Europa", 547.

[48] Carmelo Lisón Tolosana, *La imagen del rey. Monarquía, realeza y poder ritual en la Casa de los Austrias* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1991); Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World. Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c.1500-c.1800*, (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995); Headley, *Tommaso Campanella*; *Church, empire, and world*, esp. cap. XIV, "The Burden of European Imperialisms", 882, and cap. IV, "`Ehe Türckisch als Bäptisch': Lutheran Reflections on the Problem of Empire 1623-28", passim; Rodríguez Salgado, "Patriotismo y política exterior", 49, 86-89.

Naples and Sicily into the Monarchy, were welcomed in Castile with an enthusiasm which decreased rapidly with the easterliness of the actions they were funding. The disproportionate burden asked of Castile therefore required justification - Asufficient cause@ - both to legitimize the fiscal demands and to make them acceptable. From their very accession, therefore, faced with the persistent reluctance of the Castilian political classes to embrace the international projects of their monarchs, the Habsburgs had to seek to create an ideology that would associate Castile with the rest of the king's possessions. From the speech of Bishop La Mota at La Coruña in 1520 onwards, royal propaganda, repeated to the point of satiety in the discourses of the Crown to the Cortes of Castile, sought to emphasise the value of the "estados de fuera" for Castile=s trade and as a bulwark for its protection. But even more fundamentally, it sought to attribute to the Spanish Crown an ineluctable duty for the defence and promotion of the faith, and to assign to Castile a primacy among the states of the Crown commensurate with its monetary contributions. Hence the repeated insistence on the needs of the king, responsible Apara muchos reinos y estados@ and for the Abién y beneficio destos Reinos y de todos los otros sus reinos y señoríos, was also intended as a paradigm for the obligations of Castile, an obligation as Asilla y cabeza y parte principal de todos sus reinos@, both to its king and to his other kingdoms.

All in vain. In the 16th century at the height of Spanish power, and despite the apparent advantages for the Castilian ruling classes of the offices and rewards of empire, the propaganda offensive was a failure. Moreover, the retreat of the Turk and the conversion of France created an ideological vacuum at the end of the century, only incompletely filled by the conflict with England. Throughout the last decade of the 16th century and the first quarter of the next, as the general economic situation worsened and the burden of the fisc came to weigh ever more heavily, a significant sector of Castilian opinion, with increasing vociferousness, wanted nothing to do with any foreign expenditure that was not directly related to the immediate defence of the Iberian peninsula and to the formation of an Atlantic fleet for the protection of Spain=s coasts and the trade with the New World. For those who mattered in terms of voting the monies the king needed, the ideology of a putative Hispanic Monarchy, headed by Castile, with a divinely ordained imperial mission to defend and propagate Catholicism everywhere, was not only subordinated to the immediate requirements of the defence and economic interests of Spain, but it was by some explicitly repudiated as a duty in any way specific to Spain. Not only did Castilians call for greater equity in the sharing of the international burdens of the Crown, but many also demanded that each nation should not be required to pay for anything but its own[49].

There is apparent at the end of the 16th century a palpable crisis of association among the realms of the Spanish king, with both the Iberian and the Italian states little disposed to contribute to Acauses not their own@ and unconvinced by the efforts of royal propagandists to persuade them that Philip II=s wars

---

[49] I have dealt with this issue in the two final paragraphs of my "Oposición política y juicio del gobierno en las Cortes de 1592-98, *Studia Histórica. Historia Moderna* 17 (1997): 37-62, and in "La respuesta castellana ante la política internacional de Felipe II", in *La Monarquía de Felipe II a debate*, ed. Luis A Ribot García, (Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 2000), 121-34.

were not secular and hegemonic, but defensive and unavoidable[50]. What was needed to overcome this crisis was a total ideological revolution which would replace the web of separate connections between each individual territory and the Crown, with a new and greater body politic, a corporeal community of parts, unequal in size, wealth and contribution, but existentially interdependent, with each contributing to and benefiting from its participation in the whole.

A key element in this reformulation was the emergence and consolidation of the new concept of "monarquía". The implications and the consequences of that revolution were profound. The concept of the *Monarquía* as a political entity implied not only a re-ordering of the relationship between the different kingdoms and states, but also of the basis of the authority of the king and the grounds of loyalty and obedience of the subject. The *Monarquía*, as it was now conceived, was a corporate entity, but a corporation unknown to the law. In the words of Lisón Tolosana, it was a unitary political system without memory, without history and, we might add, without legal constitution[51]. In this *Monarquía* taken as a whole, as a corporate community, there was neither legal nor customary foundation for the exercise of royal authority. The legal mind did not comprehend it. The feudal, seigneurial, and regional rights and duties which defined the mutual obligations between each particular kingdom and its king, within what historians have now come to call (misleadingly) "composite monarchies", as succinctly expressed in the opinion of the notable jurist, Gilimón de la Mota, "El rey de dos reinos está tenido como si fuese dos reyes... y cuando en una misma persona concurren dos derechos, dos dignidades, dos reinos, se lo juzga de la misma manera de como si cada dignidad o reino estuviera poseido por un señor y dueño distinto"[52], had no constitutional existence in the *Monarquía* conceived as a single entity, rather than as an aggregation of separate monarchies (which is what the so-called composite monarchies actually were). That, it needed the Bourbons in Spain (and in Britain the Act of Union) to create.

In order to adjust to the implications of this new political entity it was necessary, in Weberian terms, to transform the basis of royal authority from legal-rational to charismatic, or, as Lisón Tolosana puts it, from the "plano de la monarquía propio de los politólogos" to "la dimensión místico-espiritual y sinbólico-sagrada de la realeza, propia del antropólogo". In the Baroque, the king, therefore, is magnified into an arch-king, "superfigura mágica", "rey planeta", "el Grande"[53]. This was, to be sure, a European phenomenon, but its development in Spain – from the non-sacral, personal asceticism of Philip II to the institutionalized sacralization of Charles II – was disordinate.

---

[50] Ernest Belenguer Cebria, "La Monarquía Hispánica vista desde la Corona de Aragón" *Estudis 20 (1994):* 57-81 *En torno al XVII Hispánico*, at 60-65; Helmut G. Koenigsberger, *The Government of Sicily under Philip II of Spain* (London: Staples Press, 1951), 55-56: "A more comprehensive theory of empire was now needed to justify demands for contributions no longer used for the immediate and obvious benefits of Sicily."
[50] Lisón Tolosana, *La imagen del rey*, 50.

[52] Jean-Frederic Schaub, *Le Portugal au temps du Comte-Duc d'Olivares (1621-1640): le conflit de juridisctions comme exercice de la politique* (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2001), 73, and in the same sense, 96, Salgado de Araujo, "le roi a en lui autant de personnes qu'il y a de différences entre ses Royaumes".
[53] Lisón Tolosana, *La imagen del rey*, 54; Headley, "The Burden of European Imperialisms ", 882.

A new basis of authority required a new ground of obedience, which can be described as a shift from vassalage to affinity, from pact to affect. "El régimen de los Reyes de España tiene más de paternal que de señorial", wrote Serafín de Freitas, in his *De justo imperio* (1625)[54]. For Damián López de Haro, author in 1625 of a tract on the *Donativo Real*, the *donativo* was an obligation due to the king not as "señor natural" but by "ley de amistad", as "padre amoroso de la patria", "pastor vigilante de sus ovejas", or "amigo fiel de sus vasallos"[55]. It is not that the insistence on mutual love between king and vassal was anything new in itself, so much as that the affective language of obligation found in the 17th century seems to me to be of a degree beyond the normal parameters of the previous century to an extent that all the other dimensions of royal authority were relegated to a secondary level: thus the President of Castile, addressing the Cortes in 1617: "Oyendo a un Rey, el mayor del mundo y más digno de ser amado y servido, representar necesidades, qué corazones, por estrechos que sean, no quedan rendidos a servirle con alientos ... El corazón de S.M. es tan grande que cabe en él toda su monarquía; pero los vasallos que principalmente son de sus entrañas y llevan lo fino de su cuidado y voluntad, son los que están aqui representando el reino."[56]

The relocation of the grounds of obedience went hand in hand with a displacement of the grounds of loyalty. The *Monarquía* implied, indeed even required, the delineation of a new and more extended frontier of identity that went beyond loyalty to *patria* or nation. As Palafox said: "En las Monarquías y Reinos, el buen vasallo no nace en su patria, sino en el corazón de su Rey y a él se ha de ir todo su amor."[57] An exemplary statement of this position, exalting loyalty to the prince over loyalty to the *patria*, though from a non-hispanic perspective, can be found in "La Clemencia Reale" of the Sicilian, Francesco Strada. Addressed in 1682 to the king, Charles II, it reveals how the person of the king has become in effect merely the representation of a new and more extended *patria*[58].

The shifting of loyalties was reinforced by social forces, among them the steady growth of a multi-national aristocracy and the need for new channels of interest, both economic and political, for groups of powerful new-men in the localities, whose social and political rise left them only weakly rooted in their communities and so dependent on the Crown for support and advancement. It goes without saying that to see the multi-national and multi-legal state in terms of a "monarquía", a concept in historical and theoretical terms redolent of a "descending" authority, either directly from God or indirectly through His

---

[54] Arco, *Idea de Imperio*, 143.

[55] José Ignacio Fortea Pérez, "Los donativos en la política fiscal de los Austrias (1625-1637: ¿Servicio o beneficio?", in *Pensamiento y política económica en la Época Moderna*, ed. Luis Antonio Ribot García and Luigi da Rosa, (Valladolid: Actas Editorial, 2000), 31-76, at 41.

[56] *ACC* 29, 423 (29.5.1617). Note the importance Campanella places on "amor" as a bond of community, as against Machiavellian fear, and his emphasis on universal love as the force to unite all Christians within the Monarchy, Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism*, 58, 62.

[57] Jover, "Sobre los conceptos de monarquía y nación", 108: n.12.

[58] Luis Ribot García, "`La Clemenza Reale...' de Francesco Strada, una exaltación absolutista de la Monarquía de España en la Sicilia de 1682" in Maria Helena da Cruz Coelho, et al., *Pueblos, Naciones y Estados de la Historia* (Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1992), 77-95.

Apostolic Vicar, could not but strengthen absolutist tendences at the expense of an "ascending", or compactual, concept of royal power derived from the theory of a supposed "lex regia". The *Monarquía* could free the king from the law.

Envisioning the *Monarquía* as a single unit permitted the relationship between its diverse parts to be seen in a new way. It enabled the traditional language of the "body politic" to be applied to the aggregate of the separate components with all the connotations of an organic functional ordering and reciprocal interdependency. With respect to the position of Castile within the new entity, the effect of the metaphorical power of the terminology is evident, if not entirely unambivalent, insofar as the representation of Castile as *cabeza* and *corazón* of this body politic gave it, at the same time, a natural primacy, but also a greater responsibility. To quote, on the one hand, the intervention of the President of Finance in a *junta* of 1623: "No se puede valer VM, ni se vale, sino de solo el reino de Castilla, porque Aragón, Valencia, Cataluña y Nabarra no ayudan a cosa destas, ni de los estados que VM tiene en Italia se aprovecha para estas necesidades... Y no le parece que puede ser buena materia de estado consumir y acabar la substancia destos reinos de Castilla que son la rayz y corazón desta monarquía"[59]; and, on the other, that of Don Juan Rodríguez de Salamanca, in the Cortes of 1617, supporting the grant of the 18 Millones to defray the king's military expenses in Italy and Germany, on the grounds that they were undertaken "a causa de sustentar la reputación de estos reinos de Castilla, que por ser cabeza de los Estados incorporados en su Corona redunda todo en beneficio suyo."[60] The acceptance of Castile's demand for fiscal equality meant the abandonment of the attempt to finance the *Monarquía* on the back of Castilian supremacy. That ultimately resulted in a greater recognition on the part of Castile of the need for its participation in and obligation towards the multi-national community.

At the same time, the emphasis on the paternal authority of the king paralleled a new perception of the *Monarquía* as a political family, without which Olivares's policies and the language of "hermanarlos a todos" would have been incomprehensible. The entire policy of "Union", so widespread in the early decades of the century as the essential remedy for Spain's "decline", took its essence, its meaning and its justification from this concept of the *Monarquía* as a body, a community and a family in which each of its members had the same rights as any other, however great it may have been. As Olivares insisted in his proposal for the Union of Arms in 1625, "hoy puede el vulgo ciego de cada uno de los otros [reinos] que no son de Castilla, considerarse por feudatarios de Castilla y sujetos a ella, y con este medio cada reino destos efectiva y asentadamente tiene por feudatario no solo a Castilla sino toda la Monarquía de su Magestad, y no solo cada reino, sino cada lugar dél se halla dueño igual de toda la Monarquía."[61]

As to the decisiveness of that appeal, the events of 1640 in Catalonia and Portugal, a year which for Jover Zamora is symbolic of the "crisis de la idea monárquica"[62], are comment enough. The ideal of

---

[59] 23.10.1623, AGS GA 1305.
[60] *ACC* 30, 365.
[61] Elliott and de la Peña, *Memoriales y Cartas*, I, 145.
[62] Jover, "Sobre los conceptos de monarquía y nación", 109, 112.

"monarquía" by itself did not solve the problem of a *Monarquía* aggregated of juxtaposed but disunited kingdoms. In effect, with Jover, "1640" can be understood as a tension, exacerbated by Olivares's project of Union, between the idea of "monarquía" and a deep-rooted sense of nation. Indeed, neither was Castile in the first decades of the reign of Philip IV easily seduced by what the *Monarquía* had to offer. Nonetheless, despite the separatist revolts in Portugal and Catalonia, and, indeed, partly as a consequence of them, in the middle years of the century the *Monarquía* came to function with a greater degree of political and fiscal cohesion than it ever had in the previous century. In the 1630s, all parts of the *Monarquía*, Sicily and Naples, Biscaya, Navarre and Aragon, as well as Castile itself, were contributing to an unprecedented degree to the common defence. Between 1630 and 1643, Sicily and Naples together contributed nearly as much to military expenditures in the Milanese as Castile. Naples remitted forty times more to Milan *pro rata* as it had in the reign of Philip II, and even in Castile the bitter and widespread complaints against the intolerable fiscal burden were directed not against royal policy, as they had been in the previous century, but against inequity, waste and corruption. Crucial for promoting this new feeling of association was the military crisis of the middle decades of the century. The greater recognition of the reality of the *Monarquía* and the increased commitment that can be seen in the second half of the century were essentially the creation of the imminent threat to its very existence. It is striking how often "monarquía" is associated with the far from hegemonic notions of "conservación y defensa". One has only to substitute "la conservación y defensa de esta monarquía" with "la conservación y defensa de los reinos y estados de su Magestad" to recognize the integrative power that it carried[63].

Finally, we need to raise the key question of the role of language in history and politics, the relationship between the word and the act, the part played by language in making and delimiting the framework of what is politically possible. Is a new use of language a reflection or a vector of change? Is language the antecedent of policy, essential for its conceptualization, or merely the necessary means for its articulation? In the case of "monarquía", policy could be seen as the programmatization, concretely in Olivares's case, of certain concepts and metaphors, already in common use, without which his programme could not have been articulated intelligibly. But as for its realization, much more than that was needed.

I am very aware of how much there is still to know and to do. The reality of a linguistic turn in the final years of the 16th century articulating a new political concept of a territorialized "monarquía" needs confirmation from a much greater variety of sources. More consideration is needed of the evolution of the different concepts of "monarquía", "monarquía de España", "monarquía católica". The same terminology

---

[63] Nine of the first 25 instances of "monarquía" in the Cortes were associated with the concepts of "conservación" and/or "defensa". See also Francisco Xavier Gil, "`Conservación' y `defensa' como factores de estabilidad en tiempos de crisis: Aragón y Valencia en la década de 1640", in John H. Elliott, et al., *1640: La Monarquía Hispánica en Crisis* (Barcelona: Crítica, 1992), 44-101. There are anticipations of this argument with supporting evidence in my "Public Expenditure and Political Unity: Spanish Monarchy and European Union", in Antonio M. Bernal, ed., *Dinero, moneda y crédito en la Monarquía Hispánica* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2000), 879-88.

must have carried different weight or meaning in the different kingdoms. We need to ask how the concept of the *Monarquía* as an entity was understood and spoken of in the non-Castilian, or non-Hispanic parts, in Italy, Flanders, Portugal, and the Americas. What was the reaction to a *Monarquía* labelled as Spanish, or Catholic? Did the change in terminology follow the same chronology and the same channels everywhere? We can hypothesise as to the interests served by the integrative function of the idea of "monarquía", but we lack a clear understanding of how the new nomenclature entered the language and by what agency it came to be normalized in ordinary political discourse. Nonetheless, and leaving these unknowns aside, it is important to remember that the *Monarquía* is not just an anodine label. It is ideology, a political construct with a historical function in a specific situation. To be able to identify the moment of that linguistic turn is, therefore, to identify an ideological shift which leads us once again to the last decade of the 16th century as a decisive moment in the history of early-modern Spain.

**I should like express my gratitude to Xavier Gil for his acute observations on the original version of this article. I have tried where I have been able to take account of his comments in this present text.

Sources
ACC: Actas de las Cortes de Castilla, Madrid, Imprenta Nacional, 1861
AGS, GA: Archivo General de Simancas, Sección Guerra
BNM, Ms: Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, Manuscritos

Bibliography
AGUILAR-Adan, Christine. "Métaphores du corps politique malade autour des années 1620." In *Le corps comme métaphore dans l'Espagne des XVIe et XVIIe siecles,* edited by Augustin Redondo, 61-72. Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne nouvelle, 1992.

ÁLAMOS de Barrientos, Baltasar and Modesto Santos. *Discurso político al rey Felipe III al comienzo de su reinado.* Barcelona: Anthropos, 1990.

ALCOCER y Martínez, Mariano, ed. *Consultas del Consejo de Estado*, vol. 3. Valladolid: "Poncelix", 1931.

ARCO y Garay, Ricardo del. *La Idea de Imperio en la política y la literatura españolas.* Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, s. a., 1944.

BELENGUER Cebria, Ernest. "La Monarquía Hispánica vista desde la Corona de Aragón." *Estudis 20 (1994):* 57-81.

BERNAL, Antonio M. *Dinero, moneda y crédito en la Monarquía Hispánica.* Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2000.

BERMEJO Cabrero, José Luis, ed. *Excelencias de la Monarquía y Reino de España.* Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1999.

BODIN, Jean. *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*. New York: ed. B. Reynolds, 1945.

BOSBACH, Franz. "The European Debate on Universal Monarchy." In *Theories of Empire 1450-1800,* edited by David Armitage. England: Ashgate, 1998.

BOUZA, Fernando. *Imagen y propaganda. Capítulos de historia cultural del reinado de Felipe II.* Madrid: Akal Ediciones, 1998.

BURNS, James H. *Lordship, Kingship, and Empire. The Idea of Monarchy, 1400-1525.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992

CASADO Soto, José Luis. Ed. *Discursos de Bernardino de Escalante al Rey y sus Ministros (1585-1605).* Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, 1995.

CAVILLAC, Michel. "El Madrid utópico de Cristóbal Pérez de Herrera (1597-1600)." *Bulletin Hispanique* 104, no.2 (2002): 627-644.

ELLIOTT, John H. and José F. de la Peña, *Memoriales y Cartas del Conde Duque de Olivares.* Madrid: Alfaguara, 1978.

EVANS, Robert John Weston. *Rudolf II and his world.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

FERNÁNDEZ Albaladejo, Pablo. *Fragmentos de Monarquía.* Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1992.

_____. "*Lex Regia Aragonensium*: Monarquía compuesta e identidad de reinos en el reinado de Felipe III." In *España y Suecia en la época del barroco (1600-1660).* Edited by Enrique Martínez Ruiz and Magdalena Pi Corrales. Madrid: Consejería de Educación y Cultura, 1998.

FERNÁNDEZ Álvarez, Manuel. *Economía, sociedad y corona (Ensayos históricos sobre el siglo XVI).* Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1963.

FORTEA Pérez, José Ignacio. "Los donativos en la política fiscal de los Austrias (1625-1637: ¿Servicio o beneficio?" In *Pensamiento y política económica en la Época Moderna.* Edited by Luis Antonio Ribot García and Luigi da Rosa, 31-76. Valladolid: Actas Editorial, 2000.

FRANKL, Víctor. "Imperio particular e Imperio universal en las Cartas de Relación de Hernán Cortés", *Cuadernos Hispánicos* (1963): 443-482.

GIL, Francisco Xavier. "`Conservación' y `defensa' como factores de estabilidad en tiempos de crisis: Aragón y Valencia en la década de 1640." In *1640: La Monarquía Hispánica en Crisis.* Edited by John H. Elliott, 44-101. Barcelona: Crítica, 1992.

HEADLEY, John M. *Church, empire, and world: the quest for universal order, 1520-1640.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997.

_____ "Ehe Türckisch als Bäptisch': Lutheran Reflections on the Problem of Empire 1623-1628." *Central European History* 20 (1987): 3-28;

_____. "The Burden of European Imperialisms 1500-1800." *International History Review* 18 (1996): 875-887

_____. *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

JOVER, José María and María Victoria López-Cordón Cortezo, "La imagen de Europa y el pensamiento político internacional", in *El Siglo del Quijote 1580-1680,* vol.1. Edited by Ramón Menéndez Pidal, 469-691. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1996.

_____. "Sobre los conceptos de monarquía y nación en el pensamiento político español del XVII", *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 13 (1950): 101-150.

KOENIGSBERGER, Helmut G. *The Government of Sicily under Philip II of Spain.* London: Staples Press, 1951.

LISÓN Tolosana, Carmelo. *La imagen del rey. Monarquía, realeza y poder ritual en la Casa de los Austrias.* Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1991.

LUQUE, E. "La misión del imperio español en una carta política del siglo XVI." *Revista de Estudios Políticos* I (1941): 713-728.

MARAVALL, José Antonio. *Carlos V y el pensamiento político del renacimiento.* Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1960.

_____. *El Concepto de España en la Edad Media.* Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1981.

MATTEI, Rodolfo de. "Il Mito della Monarchia Universale nel pensiero politico italiana del Seicento," *Rivista di Studi Politica Internazionale* 32 (1965): 531-550.

MECHOULAN, Henry. "La Critique de l'Espagne par Campanella à partir d'une réfutation manuscrit en français de sa Monarchie espagnole: La Monarchie des nations." In *L'Age d'Or de l'Influence Espagnole. La France et l'Espagne à l'époque d'Anne d'Autriche 1615-1666.* Edited by Charles Mazouer. Mont-de-Marsan: Interuniversitaires, 1991.

MELO, Francisco de and Jaime Tió. *Historia de los movimientos y separación de Cataluña.* Barcelona: Ed. 7 1/2, 1981.

MENCHACA, Fernando Vázquez de, *Controversiarum Illustrium*, edited by Fidel Rodríguez Alcalde. Valladolid: Talleres Tipográficos Cuesta, 1931.

Cerdán de Tallada, Thomás. *Verdadero govierno desta Monarchia.* Valencia: Vendense en casa de Miguel Borras..., 1581.

MILHOU, Alain. *Pouvoir royal et absolutisme dans l'Espagne du XVIe siècle.* Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 1999.

PAGDEN, Anthony. *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

_____. *Lords of All the World. Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c.1500-c.1800.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995.

PÉREZ, Antonio et al. *Suma De Preceptos Justos, Necesarios Y Provechosos En Consejo De Estado Al Rey Felipe III, Siendo Príncipe.* Barcelona: Anthropos, 1991.

RIBOT García, Luis. "`La Clemenza Reale...' de Francesco Strada, una exaltación absolutista de la Monarquía de España en la Sicilia de 1682." In *Pueblos, Naciones y Estados de la Historia.* Edited by María Helena da Cruz Coelho et al, 77-96. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1992.

RODRÍGUEZ Salgado, María José. "Patriotismo y política exterior en la España de Carlos V y Felipe II", in *La proyección europea de la Monarquía hispánica,* coord. Felipe Ruiz Martín, 49-106. Madrid:

Universidad Complutense, Editorial Complutense, 1996.

SÁINZ Rodríguez, Pedro. *Evolución de las ideas sobre la decadencia española*. Madrid: Ediciones Rialp, 1962.

SCHAUB, Jean-Frederic. *Le Portugal au temps du Comte-Duc d'Olivares (1621-1640): le conflit de juridisctions comme exercice de la politique.* Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2001.

SKINNER, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978

TANNER, Marie. *The Last Descendant of Aeneas. The Habsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

THOMPSON, Irving A.A. "Oposición política y juicio del gobierno en las Cortes de 1592-98." *Studia Histórica. Historia Moderna* 17 (1997): 37-62,

_____. "La respuesta castellana ante la política internacional de Felipe II." In *La Monarquía de Felipe II a debate*. Edited by Luis A Ribot García, 121-136. Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 2000.