

## INTRODUCTION

---

### I

In 1690, the Savoyard state (comprising the Duchy of Savoy, the Principality of Piedmont, the Duchy of Aosta and the County of Nice) was a minor European power, a satellite of its more powerful neighbour across the Alps, the France of Louis XIV, whose troops (garrisoned in the imposing fortresses of Pinerolo in the Val Chisone and of Casale in the Monferrato) threatened the Savoyard capital, Turin, and it was widely regarded as a satellite.<sup>1</sup> However, this would change with Savoyard participation in the Nine Years War (1688–97) and the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–13). In the summer of 1690, the duke – whose territories were going to be caught up in the escalating Nine Years War whether he liked it or not<sup>2</sup> – joined the Grand Alliance powers ranged against Louis XIV by means of treaties with Emperor Leopold and with Spain, England and the Dutch Republic, all of whom promised to help him in his struggle against the French king, and to secure for him Pinerolo. Thereafter, Victor Amadeus II's states became more familiar to informed opinion in Europe as one of the theatres of war. The duke was twice defeated by Louis XIV's forces (at the battles of Staffarda, 1690, and Marsaglia, or Orbassano, 1693) and came close to the complete loss of his

<sup>1</sup> The diplomat, Ezechiel Spanheim thought the Savoyard state less important than the Swiss cantons in 1690: see J. Mathiex, 'The Mediterranean', in J. S. Bromley, ed., *New Cambridge Modern History, vol. VI: The rise of Great Britain and Russia 1688–1715/25* (Cambridge, 1970), 559. In late 1689 troops from Pinerolo supplemented the ducal forces countering the Vaudois and others who had entered Piedmont in the so-called 'Glorieuse Rentrée', see G. Symcox, *Victor Amadeus II: absolutism in the Savoyard state 1765–1730* (London, 1983), 102.

<sup>2</sup> The Grand Alliance was preparing, in the spring of 1690, an expedition of Protestant irregulars who were to cross Victor Amadeus' territories (with or without his consent), relieve the remnant of the 'Glorieuse Rentrée' and enter France, see C. Storrs, 'Thomas Coxe and the Lindau Project', in A. de Lange, ed., *Dall'Europa alle Valli Valdesi* (Turin, 1990), 199 ff.

states (particularly in the spring and summer of 1691). But his remarkable steadfastness, and occasional successes – in 1692 he led a brief invasion of Dauphiné, the only allied incursion into France during this war – ensured that he remained one of the great hopes of the anti-French coalition.<sup>3</sup> In 1695, anxious that the war was allowing the emperor to become too powerful in north Italy, Victor Amadeus did a secret deal with Louis XIV who surrendered Casale (which was besieged by the allies) to its immediate lord, the Duke of Mantua, rather than to the emperor.<sup>4</sup> In the summer of 1696, after further secret negotiations with Louis XIV's agents, Victor Amadeus (who increasingly despaired of his allies' commitment to recovering Pinerolo, his main war aim) concluded a separate peace with the French king. This, the treaty of Turin, not only secured Pinerolo but also the recognition by Louis XIV of Victor Amadeus' right to send envoys to, and receive envoys from, other courts (which Louis had effectively vetoed before 1690), a prestigious marriage between his eldest daughter, Marie Adelaide, and Louis' grandson, the Duke of Burgundy (and possible future king of France), and the 'royal treatment' at the French court.

The treaty was a clear measure of the importance attached by Louis XIV to the war in Piedmont, and his desire to end it in order to concentrate his forces elsewhere (above all, on the Rhine and in Flanders). It also held out for Victor Amadeus the prospect of the conquest of the Milanese if his allies rejected peace in Italy. In the late summer of 1696, the duke, now a subsidy-receiving ally of the French king, led a Franco-Savoyard invasion of the Spanish Milanese. This effectively forced his erstwhile allies, led by Spain and the emperor, to agree at last to the neutralisation of Italy in the treaty of Vigevano (October 1696). The emperor's envoy even held out the prospect of Victor Amadeus' mediation of the general peace. This latter prize was denied the duke but within a year the treaties of Turin and Vigevano had been incorporated in the general peace concluding the Nine Years War (the treaty of Rijswijk, 1697), which had itself been hastened by the ending of the war in Italy. The acquisition of Pinerolo, the first accession of territory by the Savoyard state in half a century, increased its security and

<sup>3</sup> In 1693 Carlos II's queen argued that Victor Amadeus' imminent capture of Pinerolo (and the French retreat from Catalonia) meant that this was no time for talk of peace: Mariana of Neuburg to the Elector Palatine, 2 Sept. 1693, in duke of Maura and Adalbert of Bavaria, eds., *Documentos ineditos referentes a las postrimerias de la Casa de Austria*, 3 vols. (Madrid, 1927–31), II, 128.

<sup>4</sup> For the recreation of *Reichsitalien* in north Italy in this period, see K. O. Freiherr von Aretin, 'Kaiser Joseph I zwischen Kaisertradition und Österreichischer Grossmacht-politik', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 215, 1972, 529 ff. and C. Ingrao, *In Quest and Crisis: Emperor Joseph I and the Habsburg monarchy* (West Lafayette, 1979). Developments in the 1690s remain largely unexplored.

## INTRODUCTION

3

independence. That state had also been catapulted, as a result of its crucial role in the Nine Years War, from relative obscurity to one of European prominence. In the summer of 1696, with justifiable exaggeration, Victor Amadeus was seen by some of his own subjects as the arbiter of Europe.<sup>5</sup>

Within a few years, however, the Savoyard state seemed doomed again to Bourbon satellite status (and to the abandonment of all hopes of territorial expansion in north Italy), following the accession to the Spanish throne in 1701 of Louis XIV's grandson, Philip V, squeezing the Savoyard state between Bourbon France and Bourbon Milan. Victor Amadeus, who later argued that the position of the Savoyard state was worse in 1701 than when Louis XIV had held Pinerolo,<sup>6</sup> was obliged to make the best of a bad job. He joined the Bourbon monarchs in an alliance which provided for the marriage of his younger daughter, Marie Louise, to Philip V and which promised him subsidies and the supreme command of a Bourbon–Savoyard army in a war against the emperor (which, whether he wished it or not, would inevitably be fought in and across his territories, as had the Nine Years War). Not surprisingly, in 1701 Victor Amadeus' imperial suzerain, Leopold, ordered the duke and his ministers to appear before the imperial Aulic Court, in Vienna, to answer a charge of felony against the empire and perhaps to hear sentence stripping him of his imperial fiefs (and freeing all imperial vassals of obligations to him). This threat was underpinned by the despatch to Italy of an imperial army commanded by Victor Amadeus' cousin, Prince Eugene. Good relations with Vienna and imperial grants of one sort and another had contributed enormously hitherto to the emergence of the Savoyard state. All that had been achieved now seemed threatened.

Once again, however, Victor Amadeus transformed an unfavourable situation by means of a diplomatic *volte-face* at the expense of Louis XIV (and Philip V). In secret negotiations, only concluded after Victor Amadeus had broken with his Bourbon allies in October 1703, the emperor and the Maritime Powers promised the duke military and financial aid and territorial gains in north Italy. In subsequent years, again as in the Nine Years War, the duke obstinately held on, despite the fact that the Bourbon powers overran the greater part of his territories. In the summer of 1706 Victor Amadeus was obliged to send his immediate

<sup>5</sup> C. Contessa, 'I regni di Napoli e di Sicilia nelle aspirazioni italiane di Vittorio Amedeo II di Savoia (1700–13)', in *Studi su Vittorio Amedeo II* (Turin, 1933), 15. For attitudes elsewhere in Italy in 1696, see L. Muratori, *Annali d'Italia*, ed. G. Falco and F. Forti, 2 vols. (Turin, 1976), II, 410 ff.

<sup>6</sup> D. Carutti, *Storia della diplomazia della Corte di Savoia*, 4 vols. (Turin, 1875–80), III, 300.

## 4 WAR, DIPLOMACY AND THE RISE OF SAVOY

family for refuge to Genoa and was himself hunted by the enemy across his own territories (taking refuge briefly in the Vaudois valleys). He seemed about to be expelled, possibly for good, from his states. However, Europe was again astonished as Victor Amadeus denied the Bourbons his capital, Turin, and from the autumn of 1706 turned the tide of the war in Italy.<sup>7</sup> As in 1696, northern Italy was largely neutralised in the spring of 1707, this time at the insistence of the emperor, who (having secured the Milanese), wished to secure Naples. However, that same year Victor Amadeus led an abortive attempt on Louis XIV's great naval base at Toulon; and in subsequent years successful campaigns in and about the Alps secured him a number of invaluable frontier fortresses (including Exilles and Fenestrelle) and the Pragelato valley. In the meantime, the emperor had invested (1707) Victor Amadeus with various territories of the Milanese (Alessandria, the Lomellina, Val Sesia) and (1708) with the Mantuan Monferrato, confiscated from its Gonzaga Duke; and had also confirmed Victor Amadeus' right to acquire limited suzerainty over the imperial feudatories of the Langhe, in accordance with their treaty of 1703. However, his failure to fulfil all the terms – above all regarding the cession of the Vigevanasco (or an equivalent) – embittered relations between Turin and Vienna henceforth. These successes, Victor Amadeus' vital contribution to the defeat of the Bourbons,<sup>8</sup> and the goodwill towards him of Queen Anne and her ministers, stood him in good stead at Utrecht in 1712–13. Victor Amadeus recovered his lost territories (Savoy and Nice), kept most of his conquests (although he was obliged in return to surrender the Barcelonette valley to Louis XIV). Against the wishes of the emperor, he also secured Sicily (which he had not conquered and which was at the disposal of British naval power), and with it elevation to true royal status. Victor Amadeus was promised the greater prize of Spain and its overseas empire, if Philip V died without heirs.

By 1713, then, the Savoyard state had been transformed, in a variety of ways. The state and its ruler had freed themselves from French tutelage, secured substantial territorial and other gains (including a more defensible

<sup>7</sup> For one English politician, this (along with Ramillies and negotiation of the Union with Scotland) was 'one of the great victories' of 1706, G. Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, 2nd edn. (London, 1987), 85. For changing English perceptions of the duke from c. 1690, see S. J. Woolf, 'English public opinion and the Duchy of Savoy', *English Miscellany*, 12, Rome, 1961, 211 ff.

<sup>8</sup> According to intelligence received from Berlin in 1708, six Scots exiles at the Court of James II planned to assassinate Victor Amadeus for this reason, A. Segre, 'Negozianti diplomatici della Corte di Prussia e colla Dieta di Ratisbona', in C. Contessa *et al.*, eds. *Le campagne di guerra in Piemonte (1703–08) e l'assedio di Torino (1706)*, 10 vols. (Turin, 1907–33), VI, 316 (hereafter *CGP*).

## INTRODUCTION

5

Alpine barrier against France and, most strikingly, the distant island kingdom of Sicily). Victor Amadeus had also won an enduring European reputation for skilful (even duplicitous) manoeuvring between the greater powers to secure these.<sup>9</sup> By that date, too, it has been suggested, the duke of Savoy – whose ancestor Charles Emanuel I (1580–1630) had unsuccessfully attempted to exploit the French Wars of Religion to expand into southern France – had largely abandoned any lingering hopes of conquests in France. Henceforth the Savoyard state would see its future in Italy.<sup>10</sup> The prospects there were the more promising because that state was now also more clearly distinguished from its Italian neighbours, many of which had merely exchanged the dominion of Habsburg Spain for that of Habsburg Austria. At the end of the War of the Spanish Succession, many observers anticipated a glorious future for what just a generation earlier had been a minor power.<sup>11</sup>

Subsequently, however, the Spanish conquest of Sicily (1718–19) and the decision of the Quadruple Alliance (Austria, Britain, the Dutch Republic, France) that Victor Amadeus must exchange Sicily for the much inferior island kingdom of Sardinia – finalised in August 1720 when Victor Amadeus' first viceroy took possession of Sardinia, completing the transformation of the 'risen' Savoyard state into the newly independent kingdom of Sardinia, by which name it would be known until the creation of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861 – revealed that the Savoyard state was weaker than many observers realised in 1713. Nevertheless, that state had expanded substantially and enhanced its standing, and did not revert after 1713 to its earlier obscurity, while later commentators could justifiably see Victor Amadeus II as the re-founder of his state. Many of those who have taken this view have in mind both the territorial and the domestic transformation of the Savoyard state which occurred after 1713, notably the overhaul of the army, the administration and the finances –

<sup>9</sup> That Victor Amadeus soon acquired a reputation for treachery and machiavellianism is clear from the work of one of his admirers, the Genoese Paolo Mattia Doria: see F. Torcellan Ginolino, 'Il pensiero politico di Paolo Mattia Doria ed un interessante profilo storico di Vittorio Amedeo II', *BSBS*, 59, 196. A host of references could be cited to demonstrate the extent to which Victor Amadeus II remains a byword for 'Machiavellian' manoeuvring on the international stage: see G. M. Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne, 1: Blenheim* (London, 1930), 314–15 and (in the sphere of international relations theory) M. Wight, *Power Politics* (Harmondsworth, 1979), 263.

<sup>10</sup> A. Lossky, 'International relations in Europe', *NCMH*, VI, 159. Victor Amadeus had hopes in 1690 of gains in France, C. Storrs, 'Machiavelli dethroned. Victor Amadeus II and the making of the Anglo-Savoyard alliance of 1690', *European History Quarterly*, 22, 3, 1992, 361.

<sup>11</sup> Typically, the Tuscan representative at the peace congress at Utrecht thought the Savoyard state the only one in Italy of any independent importance there: A. Bozzola, 'Giudizi e previsioni della diplomazia Medicea', in *Studi su Vittorio Amedeo II*, 145.

## 6 WAR, DIPLOMACY AND THE RISE OF SAVOY

above all the so-called *perequazione* and the revocation of fiefs held by the nobility.<sup>12</sup> These were important developments, and have attracted substantial historical attention. They were also, in part at least, forced by the need to protect and maintain the enlarged and reshaped state (and the new status) won between 1690 and 1713 without the foreign support which had been so important in their acquisition. Indeed, one of the contentions of the present study is that the overhaul of 1717 was in part a response to the threat to Victor Amadeus' enhanced territory and status. However, as the present study also hopes to show, by 1713, and largely because of the need to wage war, the 'unreformed' Savoyard state had in fact experienced important domestic changes. Many of these anticipated the reforms of post-1713 and were the domestic counterpart of the Savoyard state's transformation on the international stage.<sup>13</sup>

The transformation of the Savoyard state after 1690 was clearly related to the larger European picture, and above all to the struggle over the Spanish Succession and the desire of many of France's neighbours to restrain and reduce Louis XIV. It is no coincidence that Victor Amadeus, descended from a daughter of Philip II, was one of the claimants to that succession and therefore due some increase in territory (and dignity) after the death of the last Spanish Habsburg, Carlos II. However, this is not the only explanation for Victor Amadeus' success. Also important was the fact that the Savoyard state straddled the Alps between Louis XIV's France and Habsburg Lombardy. In wars in part fought over the latter, Victor Amadeus might facilitate the conquest of Lombardy by the forces of Louis XIV. Alternatively, he might ensure a successful allied invasion of southern France, and perhaps trigger a Huguenot revolt. Naval operations, particularly against the recently developed French naval base at Toulon, might make use of the duke's one important harbour, Nice. For the Grand Alliance, then, Victor Amadeus' states seemed to offer the opportunity for a decisive breakthrough denied them on other fronts. Indeed, following the invasion of Dauphiné in 1692, William III even

<sup>12</sup> See G. Quazza, *Le riforme in Piemonte nella prima metà del Settecento*, 2 vols. (Modena, 1957) and Symcox, *Victor Amadeus*, passim. For G. Ricuperati, 'L'Avvenimento e la storia: le rivolte del luglio 1797 nella crisi dello stato sabauda', *RSI*, 1992, 349 ff., a long reform era began in 1696. For V. Ferrone, 'The Accademia Reale delle Scienze: cultural sociability and men of letters in Turin of the Enlightenment under Vittorio Amedeo III', *Journal of Modern History*, 70, 1998, 528–9, the elevation from ducal to royal status was a crucial stimulus in the ensuing reconstruction of the Savoyard state.

<sup>13</sup> See Storrs, 'Savoyard diplomacy in the eighteenth century', in D. Frigo, ed., *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge, forthcoming). For later perceptions of Victor Amadeus, see Foscarini's *relazione* (1743), in L. Cibrario, *Relazioni dello stato di Savoia negli anni 1574, 1670, 1743, scritte dagli ambasciatori veneti Molini, Bellegno, Foscarini* (Turin, 1830), 89 ff.

## INTRODUCTION

7

thought of himself taking troops to north Italy to launch just such an attack.<sup>14</sup> For his part, Louis XIV was obliged to divert (to a border hitherto considered safe) forces which might otherwise be used to decisive effect elsewhere – in Flanders, on the Rhine or in Catalonia – in order to deny his enemies the strategic advantages against himself which Victor Amadeus' states offered, and to exploit those they offered him for intervention in Italy.<sup>15</sup> However, despite a recognition by historians of a new importance of Italy in international relations in the half century and more after 1680,<sup>16</sup> the military struggle there continues to be overshadowed by that in Flanders, on the Rhine and (at least during the War of the Spanish Succession) in Spain and by the war at sea.<sup>17</sup> This focus, admittedly, reflects contemporary military and political priorities. Both Louis XIV and the allies invariably made their greatest efforts in the Low Countries, fielding there armies of 100,000 and more during the Nine Years War. But the inevitable stalemate in Flanders (at least in the 1690s) underpinned the view that a decisive breakthrough could and should be effected elsewhere.<sup>18</sup> It is hoped that the present study, besides contributing to a fuller understanding of the development of the Savoyard state during the Nine Years War and the War of the Spanish Succession, will also enhance knowledge and understanding of the war in Italy (and its importance) in both these conflicts.

<sup>14</sup> C. Storrs, 'Diplomatic relations between William III and Victor Amadeus II 1690–96', Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1990, 160 ff. Perhaps the best assessment of the strategic role of the Savoyard state, as a guardian of the Alpine passages, although dealing with the later war of the Austrian Succession, is S. Wilkinson, *The Defence of Piedmont 1742–1748: a prelude to the story of Napoleon* (Oxford, 1927), 3–5.

<sup>15</sup> In 1704, Victor Amadeus justified his requests for military help from his allies as his own situation deteriorated on the grounds that the diversion of French troops to Italy had contributed to the recent Allied victory in Germany, VDM to Fagel, 12 Sept. 1704, Turin, ARAH/EA/VDM/29, 159.

<sup>16</sup> A. Lossky, 'International relations', 159 ff.; G. Quazza, *Il problema italiano e l'equilibrio europeo 1720–1738* (Turin, 1965), passim.

<sup>17</sup> In an otherwise excellent study, for example, David L. Smith, *A History of the Modern British Isles 1603–1707: the double crown* (Oxford, 1998), 308 notes that the peace of 1697 reflected stalemate in the Nine Years War, but makes no mention of the contribution of the war in Italy or Victor Amadeus' separate peace of 1696, and also ignores the war in Italy in the following conflict. Symptomatic of this neglect is the fact that many accounts incorrectly conflate the Casale deal of 1695 and the *volte-face* of 1696: see G. Clark, 'The Nine Years War 1688–97', *NCMH*, VI, 250.

<sup>18</sup> See the figures in Clark, 'Nine Years War' and A. J. Veenendal, 'The War of the Spanish Succession in Europe', *NCMH*, VI. In the winter of 1695–6 William III refused Victor Amadeus additional troops (for his intended siege of Pinerolo) from Flanders because Louis XIV was believed to be planning to put into the field in the Low Countries in 1696 30,000 more men than in 1695. William believed that Louis could only do this by weakening his forces in other theatres, including Piedmont, making the diversion unnecessary, DLT to VA, 20 Dec. 1695, London, AST/LM/GB, m. 8.

Cambridge University Press

0521551463 - War, Diplomacy and the Rise of Savoy, 1690-1720

Christopher Storrs

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Whether the duke of Savoy could exploit these advantages was another matter. Other lesser princes with a claim on the Spanish Succession – including Victor Amadeus' cousin, the Wittelsbach electoral prince of Bavaria, Max Emanuel – might have been expected to do well in these decades. Indeed, with his appointment as governor of the Spanish Low Countries from 1691, the elector seemed to be making more headway than Victor Amadeus. But Max Emanuel did disastrously in the War of the Spanish Succession. On the other hand, other lesser princes, without any claim on the Spanish Succession, did well. These included the Hohenzollern electoral prince of Prussia (elevated to King in 1701) and the duke of Hanover, promoted ninth elector in 1692 and elevated to the throne of Britain in 1714. In part the difference between success and failure between 1690 and 1713 depended upon good decisionmaking. But Victor Amadeus' success also rested upon his ability to mobilise effectively the necessary resources (essentially men and money). This, in turn, depended in part upon the extent to which an effective state structure of sorts – and political and social cohesion – existed, or could be developed, to mobilise those resources.<sup>19</sup>

## II

The experience of the Savoyard state between 1690 and 1713 largely conforms to a larger European pattern of successful state formation – the emergence of a territorially well-defined sovereign unit, whose independence was in part underpinned by the development of institutions mobilising its resources in favour of its prince or government – by contrast with, for example, the 'failure' (and disappearance) in this period of the Gonzaga Mantuan state, hitherto one of the Savoyard state's rivals in north Italy. The question of state formation has recently come back into fashion among historians.<sup>20</sup> But the issue is not a simple one, not least because of the many different conceptions of the state. For some time, the early modern state in process of formation has been conceived of as approximating to the modern state: characterised by all-powerful, centralised, bureaucratic government of the sort specified by Max Weber, whose view that 'the state is that agency in society which has a monopoly of legitimate force' underpins that of many subsequent historians.<sup>21</sup> Not

<sup>19</sup> See G. Symcox, *War, Diplomacy, and Imperialism 1618–1763* (London, 1974), 1 ff.

<sup>20</sup> See E. Fasano Guarini, "'Etat moderne" et anciens états italiens. Eléments d'histoire comparée', *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, 45, 1, 1997, 15 ff.

<sup>21</sup> Cited in T. C. W. Blanning, *The French Revolutionary Wars 1787–1802* (London, 1996), 30. See C. H. Carter, *The Western European Powers 1500–1700* (London, 1971), 28 ff. For a simple schema of the distinguishing features of 'modern' states and societies,



## INTRODUCTION

9

all historians share this view, which is increasingly recognised as too stark for early modern Europe,<sup>22</sup> where the ‘proprietary dynasticism’ identified by Herbert Rowen seems at least as convincing an interpretation of the relationship between princes and their states.<sup>23</sup> In fact, these differing perceptions of the state are not necessarily wrong, because the state is in a constant process of formation, undergoing (or in need of) constant ‘modernisation’ (a concept which poses at least as many problems as it seems to solve).<sup>24</sup> Indeed, the nature of statehood and the institutions of the state have varied over the centuries, so that the typical state – if there was such a thing – of the Renaissance differed from that of the Baroque and that of the age of Enlightenment from that of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>25</sup> The present study takes the view that there was a Savoyard state, one conforming to the definition of state used by John Brewer (and which more or less approximates to that given at the start of this paragraph),<sup>26</sup> and one contemporaries clearly recognised. It also assumes that that polity experienced a recognisable phase of state forma-

see T. C. W. Blanning, *Joseph II* (London, 1994), 20–1. For Blanning, Joseph II’s ‘Enlightened despotism’ was essentially about the creation of an Austrian Habsburg state.

<sup>22</sup> See G. Chittolini, ‘The “private”, the “public”, the state’, in J. Kirshner, ed., *The Origins of the State in Italy 1300–1600* (Chicago, 1996), 545. (This collection was originally published as a special supplementary issue of the *Journal of Modern History* in 1995.) Modern historians are more likely to accept the criticisms of Weber’s approach and definitions associated with, for example, Otto Brunner: see H. Zmora, *State and Nobility in Early Modern Germany: The knightly feud in Franconia 1440–1567* (Cambridge, 1997), 6.

<sup>23</sup> H. H. Rowen, *The King’s State: proprietary dynasticism in early modern France* (New Brunswick, 1980).

<sup>24</sup> See the critical discussion of ‘modernisation’ concepts in H. G. Brown, *War, Revolution and the Bureaucratic State: Politics and army administration in France 1791–1799* (Oxford, 1995), 265 ff.

<sup>25</sup> See F. Chabod, ‘Y a-t-il un état de la Renaissance?’ *Actes du Colloque sur la Renaissance* (Paris, 1958), English translation in H. Lubasz, ed., *The Development of the Modern State* (New York, 1964); W. Barberis, *Le armi del principe: la tradizione militare sabauda* (Turin, 1988), which is informed by a sense of a distinct ‘baroque’ state; and M. Raeff, *The Well-Ordered Police State: social and institutional change through law in the Germanies and Russia 1600–1800* (New Haven, 1983). Blanning’s perception of Joseph II (above) is founded in part upon an acceptance of Robert Evans’ compelling argument that until at least 1700 the Habsburg monarchy was not a monolithic state characterised by powerful central institutions, but a highly successful alliance of dynasty, nobility and Church, R. J. W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550–1700* (Oxford, 1978), *passim*.

<sup>26</sup> ‘a territorially and jurisdictionally defined political entity in which public authority is distinguished from (though not unconnected to) private power, and which is manned by officials whose primary (though not sole) allegiance is to a set of political institutions under a single, i.e. sovereign and final, authority’, J. Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: war, money and the English state 1688–1783* (London, 1989), 252 n. 1.

tion, defined as a twin process of asserting itself as an independent player in the European power system, which was in turn founded (in part) upon the development of more effective means to mobilise its own resources – what Ricuperati still prefers to call ‘modernisation’ – between 1690 and 1713.<sup>27</sup>

Seen as process, state formation comprised a number of distinct developments. Firstly, there is territorial expansion. This is possibly the simplest aspect. Nevertheless, growth of this sort meant, on the one hand, a great increase in the potential resources of the state (armed manpower, tax and other revenues), and might represent a distinct and conscious alternative to state-building by administrative centralisation.<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, territorial expansion posed problems of integration. Secondly, there is the assertion of the state’s independence on the international scene, which was increasingly the preserve of not just sovereigns but of sovereigns of a certain resource and standing.<sup>29</sup> As we have seen the Savoyard state effectively threw off its satellite status in and after 1690. But that achievement must be qualified in two important respects: firstly, by the extent to which Victor Amadeus depended upon his allies for the resources to combat the French and Bourbon threat; and secondly, by the extent to which the Savoyard state was juridically part of the Holy Roman Empire and subject to the (Austrian Habsburg) emperor, whose authority in those parts of north Italy which were traditionally subject to the empire, *Reichsitalien*, was reasserted in this period. This could create problems for the duke of Savoy. However, as member of the empire, he could also expect imperial protection, while as agent of the emperor he could seek grants (office, fiefs). Indeed, the rise of the House of Savoy (and most of its titles) since the middle ages – as ducal ministers were well aware when they debated how to react to the developing crisis in north Italy in 1690 – had been founded on a close association with empire and emperor.<sup>30</sup> Thus, the sovereignty of this small state might at the same time be underpinned and qualified by its imperial status.

<sup>27</sup> ‘L’Avvenimento’, 349.

<sup>28</sup> This notion is articulated by Paul Sonnino in an e-mail review (H-France, 2 Apr. 1998) of J. Lynn, *Giant of the Grand Siècle: the French army 1610–1715* (Cambridge 1997). On frontiers, see P. Sahlins, *Boundaries: the making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees* (Berkeley, 1989).

<sup>29</sup> Lucien Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1990), 215, discusses the abortive efforts of the cardinal de Bouillon and the princesse des Ursins (who sought an independent princely sovereignty) to have the Utrecht congress deal with their private concerns and ambitions.

<sup>30</sup> See *mémoire* regarding the policy Victor Amadeus must adopt as war threatened in north Italy, Feb. 1690, AST/Negoziazioni/Austria, m. 4/24. Against the pressure from Louis XIV to declare for him it was pointed out that no duke of Savoy in recent history had fought the emperor.