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Introduction: On Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia across Time and Space

Yolanda Rodríguez Pérez

Abstract
This introductory chapter puts the case studies presented in this edited volume into a broader historical and theoretical context. It exposes the triangular literary, cultural and political relationship between Britain, the Low Countries and Spain in two very different – though strongly interconnected – historical periods, the early modern period and the nineteenth century. It contends that to fully understand how cultural representations of Spain and its cultural legacy have been forged, it is essential to expose the intricate historical dynamics of Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia. Furthermore, it exposes and problematizes certain historiographical biases regarding the cultural role of Spain and the historical asymmetry in the representation of Spain.

Keywords: Hispanophilia/Hispanophobia, Black Legend, national images, Anglo-Dutch-Spanish relations, early modern period, nineteenth century

Spain has been a fruitful locus for European imagination for centuries, having been mostly perceived in black-and-white oppositions, either as the tyrannical and fanatical force behind an empire in search of universal dominance in the early modern period or as an imaginary geography of a ‘Romantic’ Spain, veiled in a haze of exotic and appealing authenticity. Although the Napoleonic wars certainly played a role in a new and internationally widespread positive appreciation of Spain, the idea that this change at the turn of the nineteenth century represented a paradigm shift should be nuanced. The image of Spain, its culture and its inhabitants did not evolve inexorably from negative to positive, from a Black Legend of Spanish tyranny to a rosy myth of Romantic Spain. It historically responded from
the early modern period onwards to an ambiguous matrix of conflicting Hispanophobic and Hispanophilic representations. Just as in the nineteenth century lingering or latent negative stereotypes continued to resurface even in the Romantic heyday, in the early modern period appreciation for Spain was equally undeniable. When Spain was a political and military superpower, it also enjoyed cultural hegemony with a literary Golden Age producing internationally hailed masterpieces. Spanish works were translated, imitated and emulated, sometimes harnessed with a discrediting propagandistic agenda but also out of sheer admiration and as creative inspiration.

This book explores the protracted interest in Spain and its culture, and it exposes the co-existent ambiguity between scorn and praise that characterizes its Western historical perceptions, in particular in Britain and the Low Countries, two geographical spaces with a shared sense of historical connectedness and an overlapping history regarding Spain. It is the contention of the volume that from the early modern period onwards Hispanophobic and Hispanophilic narratives co-existed in a continuous interplay and that to fully understand how cultural representations of Spain and its cultural legacy have been forged, it is essential to expose the intricate historical dynamics of Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia. Furthermore, recognizing the dual role of Spain as a mighty cultural model and political rival is essential to understanding the Low Countries’ and Britain’s cultural and political self-definition, since anti-Hispanism can be considered central to the process of European proto-national development.

Although the title of this volume uses as its geographical delimitation the terms ‘Low Countries’ and ‘Britain’ (with related adjectives such as Dutch, Netherlandic, English and British), it must be stated that it mainly focuses on Anglo-Dutch relations with Spain. Terminological accuracy when defining states whose borders have evolved over time requires the use of these broader terms to avoid anachronisms. For the early modern period the adjective ‘Netherlandic’/‘Netherlandish’ will also be employed when references imply the whole conglomerate of territories. For the British case, (Great) Britain is the overarching term employed since the 1707 Act of Union, whereas England/English was the dominant geographical definition in earlier days. For most national historians during the nineteenth century,

---

1 See Haley, The British and the Dutch; Dunthorne, Britain and the Dutch Revolt; Helmers, The Royalist Republic.
2 Schmidt, Spanische Universalmonarchie, p. 446.
England and Britain were synonymous, and these terms will alternate accordingly.  

To engage in this diachronic study, the structure of the volume revolves around two closely related temporal axes: the early modern period and the nineteenth century, when national identities and literary canons consolidated the Golden Age as the key period in the national-historical consciousness. The idea of a ‘Golden Age’ played an essential role in the construction of British and Dutch (and Belgian) national historical and literary canons, and in both cases this Golden period coincided with a past shared with the Spanish, as enemies and as source of inspiration. Following Barbara Fuchs’s notion of ‘occlusion of influence’, by which English authors in the early modern time would have ‘piratized’ and absorbed into their works Spanish materials while occluding their origin, this book extends this line of thought temporally and geographically into the nineteenth century and the Netherlandic context, to trace how this possible ‘denial’ or ‘alteration’ of influence can be observed and how it overlaps in different historical, literary and political discourses.

The volume explores thus the triangular literary, cultural and political relationship between Britain, the Low Countries and Spain in two very different – though strongly interconnected – historical periods. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, arch-enemy Spain politically and culturally held centre stage in Europe. Maybe one of the most intense moments of intersection between these territories was in the 1550s, when young Philip II arrived in the north, as heir to the realms of his father Charles V in the Low Countries and as the new husband of Mary Tudor, queen of England. This close encounter was of brief duration, leaving in the end these territories to confront the Spanish monarchs. Furthermore, both England and the Dutch Republic were to experience a process of self-definition by enmity, which heavily leaned on the Hispanophobic Black Legend. In the words of John Elliott, the Black Legend ‘etched itself into the English national consciousness’. This remark holds even truer for the Low Countries, especially for the


4 Fuchs, The Poetics of Piracy, pp. 57-78.

5 Elliott, Spain, Europe and the Wider World, p. 27. For the Black Legend, see the classical studies: Maltby, The Black Legend in England; Swart, ‘The Black Legend during the Eighty Years War’; García Cárcec, La Leyenda Negra and ‘Reflexiones sobre la Leyenda Negra’; Thomas, ‘De heropleveng van de “Zwarte Legende’; Hillgarth, The Mirror of Spain. For the shaping of anti-Hispanic views during Mary Tudor’s time and its continuation across time until the nineteenth century, see Samson, ‘A vueltas con los orígenes de la Leyenda Negra’.
Dutch Republic, where Hispanophobia figures prominently in the narrative of national identity.\(^6\) As a result of the Dutch Revolt and its continuation in the Eighty Years’ War against King Philip II of Spain, the legitimate overlord of these territories, the modern states of the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg would emerge. The conflict with the Spanish monarchy was to be instrumental in the definition of the (proto-)national identity of these provinces. The Dutch Revolt was presented from within as an example of heroic rebellion against a ‘foreign’ oppressor, as the struggle for liberty and freedom of religion of a ‘united’ population.\(^7\)

This constructed image of unity and inspiring resistance was deployed by rebel (mostly Protestant) partisans with the assistance of a highly effective propaganda machine, and it would become over time the founding myth of the Dutch nation. In England, the revolt in the Low Countries was closely followed and eventually supported by Queen Elizabeth. War with Spain prompted, just as it did on the other side of the North Sea, a spate of national narratives, theatrical pieces and intense circulation of pamphlets. The heroic Armada victory of 1588 against Spain has resounded through the centuries up to the present day, becoming one of the most defining historical episodes for the development of English identity.\(^8\) Religion was also to play a palpable role in the development of both northern nations, who branded themselves as ‘Protestant’ versus a ‘Popist’ Spain, crusading for Catholicism. Admiration for the Dutch struggle against ‘Spanish tyranny’ was widely expressed in early modern Europe, especially by those who viewed Spain as a threatening force attempting to achieve a Monarquia Universalis or by those sympathetic to Protestant inclinations or republican models of political organization.\(^9\)

The historical context and relation to Spain strongly varied in the Dutch Republic and what came to be defined as the ‘Southern Netherlands’ (and would become the nucleus of current Belgium). The southern territories were to encounter an eventful future, first under Habsburg rule with the

---

\(^6\) As Lenarduzzi remarks, anti-Hispanism constitutes ‘the backbone of the Dutch Revolt canon’ (“De oude geusen teghen de nieuwe geusen”, p. 68). The terms ‘Dutch Republic’ or ‘United Provinces’ are often used interchangeably.

\(^7\) Pollmann, ‘Eine natürliche Feindschaft’, pp. 73-93. To bridge religious differences, a trope of ‘secular martyrdom’ was deployed, by which the people of the Low Countries were presented as victims of ‘Spanish tyranny’ rather than of Catholic oppression. See Pollmann, ‘The Cult and Memory of War’, p. 90.

\(^8\) Other canonical moments were for instance the Battle of Hastings (1066), the Battle of Agincourt (1415), and the Battle of Waterloo (1815).

\(^9\) For the intertwining between Dutch and English monarchical and republican discourses, see Helmers, The Royalist Republic.
Archdukes Isabella and Albrecht as the Catholic ‘Spanish Netherlands’ and later on as the ‘Austrian Netherlands’. Napoleon’s interventions in the geopolitical sphere would bend the history of the Low Countries in a new direction, since they became reunited into a single polity between 1814 and 1830 as the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. In 1830, after the Belgian Revolution and consequent independence, the three modern states as we know them today came into existence. The centrality of the revolt against Spain and the rise of the Dutch Republic continued to stimulate the imagination of historians in the nineteenth century. In the case of the Low Countries, this historical episode became a favourite among Dutch intellectuals with a nationalist agenda. Belgian historians and writers would prioritize other episodes of their medieval past as well, like the Burgundian period, or the Battle of the Golden Spurs in 1302 against the French. ‘Shared’ figures of the Netherlandic past like the counts of Egmont and Horne, who were executed in 1568, will be placed on different pedestals: whereas William of Orange was clearly the Dutch founding father, Egmont as a political hero of freedom will be forged into one of the founding figures of the young Belgian nation. Obviously, the existence of different political ideologies and separate spheres in Britain (socialist, imperialist) and in the ‘pillarized’ Dutch society (Calvinist, Catholic, liberal, socialist) determined a different use of the past in certain national discourses.

The history of all these nations is, as in the case of their European counterparts, one of constant shuffle and re-shuffle of alliances and enmities, by which the rhetoric of ‘natural alliances’ and ‘natural oppositions’ was dusted off or stowed away depending on the circumstances. During the first phase of the Dutch Revolt, for instance, William of Orange and his partisans stressed the idea of an inborn ‘natural opposition’ with Spain, whereas the Spanish discourse strongly emphasized the idea of an inborn ‘natural opposition’ with Spain, whereas the Spanish discourse strongly emphasized the historical

10 The case of Luxembourg is more complicated, but we will not dwell on that in the present context.
12 By around 1810 Egmont had evolved from representing the ideal of inner freedom to becoming a traditional political hero of freedom (Rittersma, Mytho-poetics at Work, p. 332). The clear historical and historiographical differences within the Low Countries at the beginning of the nineteenth century come to the fore with King William I of the Netherlands’ invitation to historians in 1826 to produce a new, ‘unifying’ history of the Northern and Southern Netherlands that linked and legitimized the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. The history was never realized (Ingelbien and Waelkens, ‘A Twice-told Tale’, p. 39).
and dynastic natural connection between the two territories.\textsuperscript{14} In this way, the English and the Dutch were in the early modern period much attuned in their positions against Spain, building on a ‘tradition of hostility to Spain’.\textsuperscript{15} However, they were also each other’s opponents during four Anglo-Dutch wars, the first starting in 1652, the fourth ending in 1784. During these moments of mutual hostility the triangular relation with Spain obviously altered, also because of Spain’s decline in geopolitical influence and Anglo-Dutch rivalries in Atlantic waters. In the nineteenth century a remarkable change took place when Spain itself became a theatre of war as a result of the Peninsular War (1808-1814), or ‘La Guerra de la Independencia’, to use the Spanish name. Spanish resistance against French occupation and the defence of liberal values would contribute to a new perspective towards Spain, prompting a strong revival of interest in things Spanish, especially in Britain.

The war created a ‘new mythology of Spain’ turning the country into a ‘crucible of liberty’ that provided an inspiring example for further liberation struggles like those of Greece and Italy.\textsuperscript{16} Thousands of British soldiers fought in the peninsula between 1807 and 1813, and the effect on Britain’s culture and politics was significant. The \textit{Annual Registers} for 1808 evinces Iberia’s topicality: ‘[I]n the history of 1808, the great object of attention is Spain. Spain is the centre around which we arrange all other countries in Europe and we take more or less interest in them, according to the relation in which they stand to the theatre, on which the contest between liberty and tyranny is to be determined.’\textsuperscript{17} For their part, the Low Countries, occupied by Napoleon, had to cope with a new invasion and wave of resistance against an external oppressor, re-evaluating the old enemy image of the Spaniard in different ways, as we shall later see. As subjects of the emperor, the Dutch had to participate in Napoleon’s army’s battles in Spain, which positioned them as enemies of the English, and, of course, the Spanish again. It is an almost forgotten episode in Dutch history that the ‘Hollandse Brigade’ fought during 1808-1813 with 3000 men in Spain. No wonder that the excruciating circumstances in the guerrilla war made many a Dutch soldier speak of

\textsuperscript{14} Rodríguez Pérez, ‘The Pelican’, p. 289. For the ‘special relationship’ or ‘most natural alliance’ between Britain and the United Kingdom of the Netherlands during the period from 1813 to 1831, see Van Sas, \textit{Onze Natuurlijkste Bondgenoot}. For an analysis of Anglo-Dutch and Dutch-Spanish representations around 1650, see Meijer Drees, \textit{Andere landen}.

\textsuperscript{15} Haley, \textit{The British and the Dutch}, p. 49.


\textsuperscript{17} The yearly published \textit{Annual Registers} record and analyse the year’s major events (Saglia, \textit{Poetic Castles in Spain}, p. 33).
Spain in rather unromantic terms as ‘vervloekt’, an accursed land. When the United Kingdom of the Netherlands was created after the fall of Napoleon, the old neighbour became again a key ally in Britain’s European policy.

**Historiographical biases**

One of the main objectives of this volume is to expose and problematize certain historiographical biases. Although Anglo-Saxon scholars have in recent years argued that, despite anti-Hispanic sentiments in early modern England, there existed a sustained cultural interest in and enduring fascination about Spanish literary production, the ramifications and nuances of this influence are not yet fully underscored or charted. Furthermore, in the Dutch context the entrenched assumption that historical enemy Spain was only negatively perceived in the early modern period and therefore culturally or literarily irrelevant has started to be contested only very recently. This literary exclusion/occlusion/downplaying was also partly motivated by the enthronement of France as the beacon for European literature in the seventeenth century. It is undeniable that by the 1640s France would play the leading literary role in Europe, especially regarding drama, but before that time, Spanish drama had already achieved ‘global’ fame and had influenced the shaping of early modern theatre, not to speak of its pioneering contribution to other genres like chivalric novels, picaresque narratives, and the modern novel through *Don Quixote*. The fact that many models of Spanish literature spread over Europe through French translations and adaptations has further effaced the Spanish origin of these works distorting the true

---

18 De Moor and Vogel, *Duizend miljoen maal vervloekt land.*
21 Simon Vosters’s seminal work *Spanje in de Nederlandse literatuur* (1955), like Van Praag’s pioneering study *La comedia espagnole aux Pays-Bas* (1922), never permeated Dutch scholarly discourse. This rationale lies at the heart of the research project that informs the basis of this volume: ‘Mixed Feelings: Literary Hispanophilia and Hispanophobia in England and the Netherlands in the Early Modern Period and in the Nineteenth Century’, funded by NWO (Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research). Instrumental in unearthing the essential role of Spanish drama in seventeenth-century Amsterdam has been Frans Blom’s and Olga van Marion’s research; see their ‘Lope the Vega and the Conquest of Spanish Theatre’; see also Rodríguez Pérez, “Neem liever een Spaans spel” and Frans Blom’s chapter in this volume.
extent of Spanish influence. The diachronical approach of this volume is of further significance in this context, since many of these historical and literary biases find their origin in nineteenth-century scholarship, whose role was paramount in forging historical and literary national interpretations of the past that have remained ingrained in our minds until the present. Connecting the early modern period with the nineteenth century helps us to better understand how certain unbending and resistant stereotypes and interpretations originated and persisted over time.

Another historiographical bias we should take into account concerns the role of Spain in nineteenth-century culture. One example is the idea that Spain ceased to be culturally important after the Peninsular War. As Saglia and Haywood have convincingly argued, this was not the case. Not only was interest in Spanish matters strong in the 1820s in Britain, but Spain also played a more significant role within Romanticism than so far assumed. 22 Interestingly, Britain and the Low Countries, especially the Dutch portion, differ strongly in their relationship to Romanticism as a cultural movement. Whereas in Germany and England the first Romantic expressions are to be perceived from the 1790s onwards, the movement never gained a strong foothold in the Netherlands. Dutch scholars still debate whether certain Romantic traces can be detected in different genres such as literature or painting, expanding and reshaping the boundaries of its definition. However, the most dominant historiographical trend underscores its marginal role. Despite interest in German and English literary production, the Romantic flame never really blazed in the Netherlands as it did in those nations. 23 Loyalty to their own national forms of expression, after French foreign domination and the lack of a sounding board for what was perceived as a display of un-Dutch extremism, contributed to the underrepresentation of Romanticism. 24 If, and how, Spain was nonetheless filtered through the Romantic sift of other European countries is a topic that will be further scrutinized in future publications. Despite this Dutch Romantic marginality, some literary authors engaged in literary Romantic figurations of Spain, like the well-regarded Nicolas Beets, who wrote a Byronic romance titled *José, a Spanish Story* (1834), where the unmistakable words come to the

22 Saglia and Haywood, ‘Introduction’, pp. 9-10. Continental European traditions, past and present, including Spanish, were in close dialogue with what has been so far interpreted as rather an insular British Romanticism. See Saglia, *European Literature*.
24 A much repeated argument at the time was that Romanticism was kept at arms’ length as ‘the follies and extravagances of an inflated imagination’. Krul, ‘Het raadsel van de Nederlandse Romantiek’, pp. 185-201, p. 195.
fore: ‘O Spain, Spain, beautiful Romantic land! / Thou most fertile place of the sultry and lovely South.’\(^{25}\) Although this verse does not do justice to Beets’s abilities as a writer, what matters is that it evinces a negotiation of received ideas of Spain.\(^{26}\)

The aforementioned reassessment of Spain in the Romantic context links with another well-known narrative regarding Spain’s imaginary: that of Spain as an ‘authentic’, thus anti-modern nation. Although we shall not dive into this historiographical debate, its inherent exclusionary perspective does relate to the dynamics of Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia and to the historical asymmetry in the representation of Spain. As Michael Iarocci has stated, Spanish culture was systematically purged from a master narrative of European modernity.\(^{27}\) Furthermore, Spanish culture tended to circulate primarily by means of the representation of others, becoming an object rather than a subject of representation. In this way, for instance, Spain itself could not be considered as a producer of Romantic literature, since the country itself was Romantic. Over time, based on the conception that modernity only radiated outward from northern Europe and that only Protestant countries could achieve (economic) progress, Catholic Spain was pushed into a marginal position, like other southern countries.\(^{28}\)

Attitudes towards Spain intersect here with broader nineteenth-century European discourses, like that of North-South polarities. In the process of cultural nation-building in Europe the North-South opposition played a more comprehensive and formative role.\(^{29}\)

Spain, viewed as a ‘Southern’, ‘Oriental’ and ‘racialized’ ‘Other’ through the Romantic lens, was thus to be placed in a ‘subaltern’ position typical of exoticist discourse. Representations of an authentic, Oriental, and exotic Spain are subsequently tinged with other connotations. Beneath these ‘positive’ interpretations of Spain lies a negative undercurrent, since authentic

---


\(^{26}\) In a genre such as travel writing, the Romantic gaze can be clearly perceived (Coenen, *The Image of Spain in Dutch Travel Writing*).

\(^{27}\) Iarocci, *Properties of Modernity*, pp. 103, 204. We can also note that Spanish ‘agency’ seems to have been reduced. As stated by Torrecilla, the images that constitute the idea of ‘Romantic Spain’ were actually forged by the Spaniards themselves, but integrated and instrumentalized by the Romantics outside Spain (*España Romántica*, p. 180).

\(^{28}\) Think of Max Weber’s theory as explicated in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905). Dainotto speaks of the South as a ‘defective bottom’ (*Europe (in Theory)*, p. 114). Eurocentric processes thus take place also within Europe itself, with a South ‘Other’ in its midst.

\(^{29}\) Arndt, ‘North/South’, p. 388.
implicitly means anti-modern (linking it in some ways with despotism and religious intransigence). In comparison to the plethora of negative Black Legend images, like cruelty, bloodthirstiness, fanaticism, religious bigotry, greed, pride, and untrustworthiness, this Romantic turn could be considered positively at first glance. However, closer analysis reveals that it cannot be simply considered as an example of pure Hispanophilia, since this image re-evaluation also contains implicitly, if not always explicitly, strongly negative perceptions, and condescending and patronizing views of Spain and its culture, as argued in this volume. From a historical perspective, it is important to note that the perception of Spain as an exotic or Oriental nation, or as ‘a space marked by Moorishness’ within Europe, was not an invention of the Romantics, but was already unmistakably present in the early modern period. What is of paramount relevance is the strategic characterization of Spain as Moorish ‘at a time of striking political and religious upheaval’. This orientalizing discourse clearly animates the Black Legend.

To fully gauge and deconstruct the arsenal of images, tropes and narratives about Spain it is necessary to scrutinize the malleable interplay between Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia over time at a meta-level as well. This implies exposing the frequent separation of the two narratives, which constitutes another historiographical bias. The well-trodden ground of Black Legend scholarship has received in the past, and in recent years, considerable attention, with a wide range of publications that continue to shed new light on the topic, exposing the ideological utility for other European powers of this legend. Enrenched images about Spain’s arrogant silence or inactivity in its own defence have also been recently contested, evincing that Spaniards also went on the offensive, in historical and literary contexts. On the other hand, fascination about Spanish

---

30 See Fuchs, _Exotic Nation_, p. 4. The author explores the paradoxical uses of ‘Moorishness’ in early modern constructions of Spanish national identity, by Spaniards themselves and by others in Europe. Both have to cope with the tension regarding Spain’s cultural debt to Al-Andalus. The concept of ‘literary maurophilia’ has been inspiring for this volume’s outset.

31 Fuchs, _Exotic Nation_, p. 10.

32 Greer, Mignolo and Quilligan, _Rereading the Black Legend_; Villanueva, _Leyenda Negra_; Villaverde Rico and Castilla Urbano, _La sombra de la Leyenda Negra_; García Cárcel, _El demonio del Sur_; Martínez Luna, _Een ondraaglijk juk_.

33 Rodríguez Pérez, Sánchez Jiménez and Den Boer, _España ante sus críticos_; Rodríguez Pérez and Sánchez Jiménez, _La Leyenda Negra en el crisol de la comedia_; Sánchez Jiménez, _Leyenda Negra_. In the nineteenth century, Spanish authors were also aware of foreign Romantic images of their country, accepting, contesting and renegotiating them, especially on the literary field. See Andreu Miralles, _El descubrimiento de España_.

---
culture and materials has been also the object of recent illuminating research. Nonetheless, the two strands do not tend to be interwoven, nor connected in a wider chronological span. Positive and negative representations about Spain (or for that matter about all nations and ethnotypes) are obviously not contained in sealed vessels, but in porous ones that form together a broad reservoir of generalized images and prejudices about the other. Therefore, representations can sink or re-emerge at particular moments in time. According to imagologist Joep Leerssen, ‘latency is always a default state for ethnotypes and prejudices’. This accounts for the ‘rebooting’ of certain representations over time. Figurations of Spain thus fluctuate within a broad spectrum of phobia and philia. The position within the spectrum is obviously dependent on the genre, the historical period, the author, ideological or commercial agendas etc. Moreover, the two narratives can coalesce in the same work, as well as in one and the same author, as we shall see further on in the case of Lord Carteret, or Thomas Scott. It goes without saying, but it may be mentioned for the sake of clarity, that cautiousness is required when analysing representations of Spain and its culture in individual authors and works. They cannot simply be equated with the Dutch or the English outlooks since they all embody complex identities. Nonetheless, a multilayered mosaic of images comes to the fore through the combination of a variegated selection of authors, works and genres that coincide and differ in their appraisal. Of course, the reservoir of Hispanophobic or Hispanophilic images of both nations would be shaped over time into different ‘cultural grammars’, that nonetheless are deeply historically entangled, as this volume aims to expose. Future research will further elucidate how the Dutch and the British influenced each other in their Spanish perceptions and how they instrumentalized Spanish tropes.

34 See note 20.
35 Leerssen, ‘Imagology’, p. 25. Leerssen uses the formulation ‘dormant frames’. The term employed within imagology (the discursive study of ethnotypes or stereotypical attributions of national character) for an image in all its implicit, compounded polarities, is imageme (Leerssen, ‘Image’, p. 344).
36 I borrow the term from Raphaël Ingelbien’s contribution in this volume.
37 See, for instance, Fagel, ‘Gascoigne’s The Spoyle of Antwerpen’. In Polyglot Poetics, Nigel Smith embarks on a transnational history of early modern European literature, away from the lens of nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century nationalism. Smith stresses the need of a broad picture of how different vernacular literatures influenced each other, for example, in the case of the little-known field of Anglo-Dutch literary relations. As a result of the research project ‘Mixed Feelings’ two comparative PhD dissertations on the early modern period by Rena Bood and Sabine Waasdorp will be defended at the University of Amsterdam in 2020.
Equally important for understanding the dynamics of representations of Spain is the malleability offered by the prime example of Hispanophobia: the Spanish Black Legend. The Low Countries, as a nodal point in the transmission of culture in the early modern period, also became a major European hub in the making and circulation of political propagandistic texts that were frequently translated and experienced a second printing life abroad. The role of these territories in the forging and spreading of the Black Legend was instrumental.38 Regarding one of the most effective Hispanophobic tropes, Spanish actions in America, the New World would offer an extremely profitable historical model for the Dutch. In an exercise of ‘Americanization of the revolt’, the Indians, as innocent victims of the bloodthirsty and cruel Spaniards, mirrored future harrowing scenarios for the people of the Low Countries.39 Bartolomé de las Casas’s defence of the rights of the Indian population in America, Brevíssima relación de la destrucción de las Indias (1552), was not only successfully published in Dutch translation in 1578 (the first vernacular translation, before the well-known 1579 French translation), but also reworked for a younger target group from 1614 onwards in Mirror for the Young, or Spanish Tyranny (Spiegel der Jeught, of Spaansche tyrannye).40 These books would be published until well into the eighteenth century. This highly effective template of ‘the’ Spanish enemy will be fruitfully recycled and instrumentalized in the Dutch Republic for later enemies: against the French in pamphlets like the New Mirror of Youth or French Tyranny in 1674, reminiscent of the popular translations of Las Casas’s The Mirror of Spanish Tyranny (1578), and in 1781, during the fourth Anglo-Dutch war against the English (English Tyranny). In this anti-English adaptation of the original Spanish Tyranny, King William IV was even presented as a new King Philip II.41 Conversely, the English were also aware of this useful enemy model, inverting the Spanish Black Legend into a ‘Dutch Black Legend’ articulated this time by an undercurrent of ‘Hollandophobia’.42 Last but not least, all these discursive and visual perceptions of Spain arose and took shape

38 See the canonical work by Swart, ‘The Black Legend during the Eighty Years War’. For a remarkable example of how the Black Legend moved from the Low Countries to England (the illustrated anti-Hispanic broadsheet Aerdt ende eygenschappen van Seignor van Spangien [Nature and Qualities of the Signior of Spaine, 1598]), see Rodríguez Pérez, “‘The Spanish Signior’”.
39 Schmidt, Innocence Abroad, p. 111.
40 Veldhuyzen-Brouwer, La Brevíssima relación, pp. 1-14.
41 Pamphlets published in 1781 alluded to the Dutch Acte van verlatinghe (1581) that is considered as ‘the act of independence’ of the Dutch Republic against Philip II, for instance, in the canonical pamphlet Aan het volk van Nederland (To the people of the Netherlands). See Leemans and Johannes, Worm en donder, p. 679.
42 Nocentelli, ‘The Dutch Black Legend’.
in a transnational context both in the early modern period and beyond and spread over Europe in a fruitful process of cross-fertilization, also dependent on neighbouring and influential visions from France and the German territories.

**A chronological remark**

The chronology employed in this book requires further clarification. The reader may wonder why the eighteenth century has been ignored in our diachronical survey. Indeed, reflections on Hispanophobia cannot overlook the strong anti-Hispanic discourse of the French Enlightenment *philosophes* and encyclopedists. Had not Voltaire and Masson de Morvilliers dismissed the role and importance of Spain and its culture in the development of European civilization? Was Spain in that sense not a ‘nation of pygmies’, in words of the latter? Had Spanish literature not contaminated good taste in Europe? Recent scholarship has contested the deep-rooted vision of eighteenth-century intellectual France as exclusively a bulwark of anti-Hispanic prejudices. According to Checa Beltrán, Spanish cultural legacy was not only underestimated, since many instances of curiosity and positive evaluation are to be found in a variegated array of sources like travelogues, letters, encyclopaedias, geographical or scientific treatises etc. Even Montaigne’s and Voltaire’s critical utterances on Spain, which were to become so canonical, can be nuanced if more broadly contextualized and examined against the light of their whole oeuvre. However, the anti-Hispanic French...

---

43 This unfavourable opinion of Spanish culture was also present in the sixteenth century. In 1588, Marc Antoine Muret had blamed the Hispano-Latin writers Seneca, Lucan and Martial for the corruption of Latin letters (Dainotto, *Europe (in Theory)*, pp. 113-114). In the eighteenth century, Italian literary polemicists also put the blame on Spain for the deplorable Baroque taste that spread across Europe. It is particularly interesting that Italian critics negatively link Spanish literary influence with Spain’s military occupation of Italy. See Profetti, ‘Para la fortuna de Lope en el siglo XVIII’, pp. 728-741. Furthermore, the hegemony of the French discourse had helped Italian intellectuals to blame Spanish influence for their own faults. See Dainotto, *Europe (in Theory)*, p. 114.


45 As Françoise Étienvre has argued, the anti-Hispanic discourse in Voltaire and Montesquieu has to be placed in a broader political and economical context where criticism of Spain is sometimes deployed as a point of departure for a rhetorical ploy where all nations are attacked. In his historical works Voltaire’s stance regarding Spain is well-informed and impartial, in contrast to the most-well known entries of the *Encyclopédie*. The same holds for Montesquieu’s caustic letter LXXVIII in *Lettres persanes*, which provoked furious Spanish replies (Étienvre, ‘Montesquieu y Voltaire’, pp. 67-101).
discourse is the one that became dominant and canonical in Enlightenment historiography and on discourses on modernity. The proposed nuance for the eighteenth-century French context by Checa Beltrán coincides with our contention of a wide spectrum of co-existent Hispanophobic and Hispanophilic discourses.\textsuperscript{46}

Also for eighteenth-century England it is undeniable that a clearly positive appreciation of Spain can be traced in various genres before the Romantic turn. Such is the case for early English travel writers visiting the Iberian Peninsula in the second half of the century, who already anticipated Romantic figurations of Spain.\textsuperscript{47} Think of politician and writer Sir John Talbott Dillon (1739-1805) and poet William Hayley (1745-1820) who can be considered pioneers in the study of Spanish literature, preceding Southey, the renowned Hispanophile and expert on Lope de Vega.\textsuperscript{48} But still, Spain remained largely unknown and ignored until around 1800.\textsuperscript{49}

Regarding the eighteenth-century Dutch Republic, hardly any research has been undertaken so far to chart a panorama of Hispano-Dutch literary relations.\textsuperscript{50} We know that drama was, numerically speaking, the most influential genre in the eighteenth century, and at the beginning of the century there still existed a 'Spaansche Schouwburg', a Spanish playhouse, in Amsterdam, where once a week Portuguese Jews performed a Spanish play.\textsuperscript{51} Spanish plays and anti-Spanish historical plays continued to be performed throughout the century.\textsuperscript{52} In the historiographical context, for instance, regarding literary histories, it is undeniable that certain processes of assessment and evaluation of the Spanish literary legacy had already started to take shape in England. Although no studies exclusively dedicated to Spanish letters had been produced, early examples of English literary history (such as Thomas Wharton's \textit{History of English Poetry} [1774]) display a comparative character and include reflections on Spain.\textsuperscript{53} In the Netherlands, the first reflections on a national literary canon are also to

\textsuperscript{46} Also relevant in this context is Checa Beltrán, \textit{La cultura española en la Europa Romántica}.
\textsuperscript{47} Peers, \textit{A History of the Romantic Movement}, vol. 2, pp. 390-391. Interestingly, English authors will positively influence German perceptions on Spain that eventually will enter the German Romantic mould (see Hönsch, \textit{Wege des Spanienbildes}).
\textsuperscript{48} Comellas and Sánchez Jiménez, ‘El Lopismo Inglés del siglo XVIII’, pp. 247-285. The first comments on Spanish drama are to be found in Edward Clarke’s \textit{Letters} (1763), p. 249.
\textsuperscript{50} Vosters, \textit{Spanje in de Nederlandse literatuur}, pp. 43-48.
\textsuperscript{51} Leemans and Johannes, \textit{Worm en donder}, p. 270.
\textsuperscript{52} See the digital repertoire of Amsterdam Schouwburg in \textit{ONSTAGE}.
\textsuperscript{53} In the preface Wharton claims to present ‘a comparative survey of the poetry of other nations’.
be discerned in this century, but histories of Dutch literature started to be programmatically written only after 1800. Interest in Spanish materials has to be traced indirectly through comparative utterances regarding national literary production that start to get off the ground in the nineteenth century. From a broader European perspective, these trajectories fit in with the increased interest in philology, history writing and historical literature that developed between 1780 and 1840, and in the surge of literary historicism in general. Gradually, with the rise of the discipline of comparative literature with its reaction against ‘the false isolation of national literary histories’, a new way of considering (world) literature will emerge.

There are thus also examples of coalescing Hispanophilia and Hispanophobia in the eighteenth century and of expressions of national thinking. The idea of a national literary canon was also budding in this century, but it is in the nineteenth century when literary history truly ‘expanded range and connected to national enterprises’. It is this very national dimension that informs the focus in this volume on the early modern period and the nineteenth century as a dyptic, interlocked by their parallels regarding the forging of (proto-)national identities and of a national past against the backdrop of old enemy Spain. Not for nothing has the nineteenth century been described as ‘the age of history’ when all nation states were framing and defining their national master narratives. The past thus became a point of identification, and progressively also part of the growing sense of nationality as the premier organizing criterion of the European landscape. In the Netherlands, the seventeenth-century Golden Age became nostalgically the ‘touchstone of national pride’. The same holds for England, where the

54 According to Leemans and Johannes, ‘eighteenth-century authors themselves are responsible for the “invention” of national literary histories’ (‘Gnawing Worms and Rolling Thunder’, p. 24). An extraordinary example of one of the first examples of national canon formation in ‘material’ form is the ‘Panpoëticon Batavûm’, an eighteenth-century cabinet that housed the portraits of over 300 Dutch writers, the first portraits date from around 1700 (Van Deinzen, Literaire erflater). For an explanation of the cabinet in English, see Leemans and Johannes, ‘Gnawing Worms and Rolling Thunder’, pp. 21-24.

55 Kloek and Mijnhardt, 1800, p. 492. For the development of Dutch literary history in the context of the cultivation of culture, the institutional rise of Dutch Studies (Neerlandistiek) and the main historical actors involved, see Honings, Rutten and Van Kalmthout, Language, Literature.


heroic past of Elizabeth I was viewed as an inspiring age of exploration and expansion when, to top it off, literature had flowered in a glorious manner with Shakespeare as, not only England’s, but Europe’s creative pinnacle. The comparison between Elizabeth I’s era and Victoria’s was also duly exploited.\textsuperscript{60} Of course, Napoleon and the Peninsular War had reshuffled national rivalries in Europe, which meant that not only the past, but also the present, the ‘new order of things in Spain’\textsuperscript{61} was instrumental for the definition of each country’s national character and of ‘Spanishness’.

One exception has been made regarding engagement with the eighteenth century. Since Cervantes’s \textit{Don Quixote} was already by then considered as one of the two centrepieces of the Spanish literary canon, the second being Spanish Golden Age drama, it is impossible not to refer to the particular branding of the work and its author in the pre-Romantic first half of the century, especially on English soil. Lord Carteret’s 1738 luxury edition of \textit{Don Quijote} is probably the most well-known example of a positive appraisal of Spanish literature in general, and of \textit{Don Quixote} in particular, before Romantic interpretations started to shed new light on Spain’s literary legacy. As we shall see, in Carteret’s enterprise, we can detect both Hispanophilic and Hispanophobic tendencies, which render his figure and political agenda particularly illuminating. Illustrative for the relevance of Cervantes’s masterwork in the Dutch Republic is the fact that although not much is known about Spanish influence in the eighteenth century, \textit{Don Quixote}’s peregrinations also reached Dutch territories. Two editions of the 1657 translation by Lambert van den Bos were published in 1707 and 1732 (the sixth and seventh, respectively). Van den Bosch’s translation was the first complete Dutch translation of the novel, and, more importantly, the first illustrated edition of the book. In this way, the Dutch significantly contributed with their ‘iconographic model’ to the visual imagination of \textit{Don Quixote} in Europe.\textsuperscript{62} This fact has not frequently been acknowledged in European literary history and underlines once more the constant cross-fertilization in the Republic of Letters and the

\textsuperscript{60} Valladares, \textit{Staging the Peninsular War}, p. 104. ‘The age of Elizabeth saw England overcome the Spanish Armada and establish itself against the competing claims of Spanish imperialism. The call to arms in 1803 […] resulted in a propaganda effort that united Sheridan’s broadsheet with imprints of Queen Elizabeth’s speech to the troops at Tilbury […], [showing the] topical pertinence of the Elizabethan plays staged between 1808 and 1814.’ We will not delve into it, but empire-building processes were obviously instrumental to define the nation in the nineteenth century.
\textsuperscript{61} See Valladares’s chapter in this volume.
\textsuperscript{62} Lucía Megías, \textit{Leer el Quijote en imágenes}, p. 194.
fluid way in which national representations spread. Probably influenced by Lord Carteret’s edition, Jacob Campo Weyerman published in 1746 a new free translation or adaptation, richly illustrated, also including for the first time in Dutch translation Mayans’s life of Cervantes from the 1738 English edition.\(^\text{63}\) The exceptional role of *Don Quixote* is also strongly present in the realm of Dutch (political) imagination as references to his figure re-emerge in the midst of political polemics between Orangists and Patriots at the end of the century, by which the former accuse their opponents of unworldliness (and thus, political quixotism).\(^\text{64}\) Undoubtedly, Cervantes is an exceptional case when it comes to foreign reflections on Spanish national literature and *Volksgeist*, since in the nineteenth century he was declared to be the Spanish novelist par excellence, but also a universal genius.\(^\text{65}\) The process of renegotiation and appropriation of Cervantes’s novel in the British context is something that renders this work exceptional in comparison to the rest of Spain’s cultural legacy. The unique way in which *Don Quixote* was paired with Spain, and at the same time dissociated from it, informs our decision to give thought to the moulding of its perception in the eighteenth century.\(^\text{66}\)

**Genres and topics**

Against the background of the cross-cultural interactions between Spain, Britain and the Low Countries an attempt will be made to offer a kaleidoscopic range of chapters on the multifarious figurations of Spain and its discursive presence in two historical moments when this malleable matrix of national representations was also relevant for British/Netherlandic national development. The focus of the volume is, as the title testifies, literary. While pamphlets and political treatises in the early modern period show a predominantly anti-Hispanic image,\(^\text{67}\) literature, as an alternative

---

\(^\text{63}\) These were the sixth and seventh editions. Van den Bosch’s edition was the first (Arents, *Cervantes in het Nederlands*, pp. 11-15, 33).

\(^\text{64}\) Arents, *Cervantes in het Nederlands*; Rodríguez Pérez, ‘Un Don Quijote anabaptista’. It would be interesting to chart examples of ‘political quixotism’ and its transnational ramifications in Europe. See Javier Pardo’s chapter in this volume.

\(^\text{65}\) Pérez Isasi, ‘The Limits of “Spanishness”’, p. 183.

\(^\text{66}\) In the 1770s, Lope de Vega had been acknowledged in England as a dramatical genius comparable to Shakespeare (Comellas and Sánchez Jiménez, ‘El Lopismo Inglés del siglo XVIII’, p. 252). Nonetheless, his international reputation did not match that of Cervantes, certainly not in the Dutch Republic.

vehicle for contemporary perceptions, preoccupations and national images,\textsuperscript{68} subtly evinces ambiguity towards Spain. Furthermore, literature is an important means for the cultural retrieval, appropriation and transmission of the past by a contemporary audience.\textsuperscript{69} Historical novels and drama are some of the most pregnant examples of this category. Both are central to the construction of national identities, of the self and the other. Nonetheless, due to the juxtaposition of the political and the literary, some political texts like pamphlets will be included in our case studies. Pamphlets were instrumental in the dissemination of prejudices and criticism of political rivals. On closer scrutiny they can also reveal an admixture of conflicting representations and can reflect telling intersections with the literary sphere.

In order to illustrate the dynamics and rhetorical strategies of Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia, a selection of different genres has been made: mirrors for princes, pamphlets, reviews, poetry, novels, drama and literary histories. Some essays concentrate on a discrete cultural moment, whereas others span a broader period, ranging from micro-history to case studies. It is, of course, impossible to encompass the full range of possible literary genres that mirror Spain and its culture. This implies that some relevant genres that employ literary techniques, such as travelogues or egodocuments, are not included in this book. However, attention will be paid to other genres that are not literary in essence but engage with literary representation and prejudices, like reviews and literary histories, considered as two of the most powerful media for shaping opinion in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{70}

Because of its relevance both in the early modern period and the nineteenth century, drama is the most represented genre in this volume. Spanish Golden Age theatre was considered as the ‘mother lode’ of European drama by many European dramaturgs and literary historians, but it was also contested and downplayed on different grounds. The dramatical continuity in the nineteenth century of certain stock plays with a Spanish theme or stereotypical Spanish characters reveal the close interplay and negotiation of Golden Age topoi. Think of the \textit{dons} or the \textit{duennas} that populate English drama at the turn of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{71} To fully understand the evolution of certain

\textsuperscript{68} Bloemendal, Dixhoorn and Strietman, \textit{Literary Cultures and Public Opinion}; Mathijsen, \textit{De mythe terug}.

\textsuperscript{69} Leerssen, ‘Retro-fitting the Past’, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{70} London, \textit{Literary History Writing}, pp. 6, 11. Literary history as a discipline at the service of national unity was further perceived to have potential to enact political change and to offer alternatives to national decadence (Leemans and Johannes, \textit{Worm en donder}, p. 42).

\textsuperscript{71} For Dutch plays with historical themes regarding Spain (1800-1850), see Jensen, \textit{De verheerlijking van het verleden}, pp. 219-221.
plays that were to become main ‘national dramatical pieces’ like Pizarro by Richard Brinsley Sheridan about the Spanish conquest in Peru (1799), the plays have to be contextualized synchronically and diachronically.72

In what follows an attempt will be made to highlight and tie together some of the more salient points emerging from the various chapters in relation to the central theme of this volume. The book is divided into two sections, one dealing with the early modern period, the other the modern era. The first part of the volume opens with Alexander Samson’s chapter ‘Being Spanish in the Early Modern World’, which reflects on the elasticity of the term ‘Spanish’, both as understood and constructed within the Habsburg Empire and as seen from the outside by enemies and allies. Differing visions of legitimacy and belonging over time caused alterations in what was perceived as ‘Spanishness’. Samson reminds us of the elastic self-fashioning of rulers in the early modern period, such as Charles V and Philip II, who engaged in a well-thought-out process of ‘multivocal’ self-fashioning to persuade subjects to identify with the ruler’s interests. In this way, Philip II consciously attempted to cultivate his ‘English’ persona while married to Mary Tudor (or to strengthen the close bonds with his Netherlandic subjects through presenting himself as their natural overlord). The flexibility of such practices was considerable and, of course, is true for other nations as well. From an outward perspective, a progressive Hispanization of the Habsburg monarchy took place, and a progressive conflation of Castile with Spain. In the end it was empire that came to define the nation, an observation that also obviously applies to the English/British case. This imperial enterprise was connected from the outside with the alleged universal intentions of the Spanish monarchy and was further indelibly linked to a limited and caricatured view of religion. Catholicism became a defining aspect of Spanishness. Against the backdrop of this terminological question and its implications, essential for this volume, Samson also contends that from a cultural and literary perspective phobias can in fact be philias in disguise.

The following chapter, ‘Spanish Exemplary Rulership? Antonio de Guevara’s Relox de Príncipes (1529) in English (1557) and Dutch (1578) Translation’ by Sabine Waasdorp, engages with the field of historical translation studies and offers a Dutch-English comparative case study. Thanks to Peter Burke and others, it has become obvious that translations are constitutive of cultures and that studying the life of texts in translation can illuminate

72 Valladares, Staging the Peninsular War, pp. 15-16. The aim of Valladares’s book is to elucidate how the Peninsular War related to the longer history of the representation of Spain in English theatres, stressing in this way the importance of diachronical analysis.
the history of interaction and transmission of cultures. The Spanish empire made use of translations as an imperial instrument to propagate official political and religious ideologies in its territories. The propaganda machinery of their Dutch and English adversaries functioned likewise. In the context of this volume we could state that translation can be employed for ‘philic’ or ‘phobic’ purposes: as a sign of interest and acknowledgement of the work in question, but also as an instrument of a ‘conspiracy of translation’, to use Peter Burke’s words: to support ideas, assumptions or prejudices already present in the culture. Waasdorp focuses on translations of Antonio de Guevara’s European bestseller Relox de príncipes (1527) in England and the Low Countries. Guevara’s ‘mirror for princes’ aimed to highlight the exemplarity of the princes of Spain, particularly that of Charles V, an ‘Hispanophilic’ message difficult to digest in certain historical moments. Waasdorp analyses the negotiation of ‘Spanishness’ and most particularly ‘exemplary Spanishness’ in both English and Dutch translations/adaptations, scrutinizing the different translation strategies deployed to transform the original narrative. In order to match the expectations and/or ideological agendas of the different recipient cultures, strategies will lean sometimes towards universalizing the Relox, whereas at other times they will turn the new target text into an effective vehicle for Hispanophobic propaganda.

Ernesto E. Oyarbide Magaña focuses in ‘Between Love and Hate: Thomas Scott’s Puritan Propaganda and His Interest in Spanish Culture’ on the interplay between the political and the literary and in particular on the Protestant preacher Thomas Scott, an active writer of anti-Spanish propaganda. Scott aptly embodies the closeness of the English-Netherlandish-Spanish connection in the early modern period, since he also lived in the Low Countries and partook in the intense traffic of translated pamphlets between the Low Countries and England. Scott is the author of the popular anti-Hispanic

73 Burke and Po-chia Hsia, Cultural Translation; Hermans, The Manipulation of Literature; Hermans, ‘Sprekend ’n vertaling’; Schmidt, Elizabethan Translation. In the early modern period, the import/export translation ratio strongly differed between Spanish, Dutch and English. Most works were translated from Spanish, few into Spanish. Before 1650-1700 translations from English were very scarce, but remarkably enough 50 per cent of the export in this period was translated into Dutch (see Burke, Ik vertaal, dus ik ben, pp. 27-28).
74 Gruzinski, ‘Babel en el siglo XVI’.
75 Burke and Po-chia Hsia, Cultural Translation; pp. 17-20. For the co-existence of Hispanophilic/phobic strands in one and the same translator, see for the Dutch case: Rodríguez Pérez, ‘The Adventures of a Spanish Amsterdammer’.
76 In the decade 1622-1632, between 60 and 70 per cent of the news materials in the English periodical press originated from the Low Countries, mainly Amsterdam (Hayley, The British and the Dutch, p. 48).
**Vox Populi, or Newes from Spain** (1620). This pamphlet decisively interacted with the literary sphere, strongly influencing the image of Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, first count of Gondomar, Spanish ambassador to London from 1613 to 1622. The *Vox* was used by Thomas Middleton in his satirical blockbuster *A Game at Chess*, staged in London in 1624 in the wake of the troublesome negotiations around the ‘Spanish Match’ between Prince Charles and the Infanta Maria. Gondomar would become a sort of ‘mythical’ fictional Spaniard, almost as famous as Hyeronimo from Thomas Kyd’s *Spanish Tragedy* (c. 1582), the most popular play of the English Renaissance. Despite the connection between Scott and such an Hispanophobic canonical play as *A Game at Chess*, Oyarbide Magaña contends that behind Scott’s animosity towards Spain and Gondomar, his thorough argumentation and knowledge of Spain evinces an almost ‘obsessive’ form of interest in Spanish culture and hegemony, and in things Spanish.

In ‘Enemy Treasures: The Making and Marketing of Spanish Comedia in the Amsterdam Schouwburg’, Frans Blom debunks the long-existing historiographical bias that Spanish cultural capital played little role of relevance in the Republic during the early modern period, due to the pervasiveness of the Hispanophobic Black Legend narrative. Exploring what he defines as the ‘paradox of Spain’s triumph in the heart of Dutch culture’, he shows that despite the protracted war with Spain, Spanish theatre revealed itself as a ‘powerhouse’ for thrilling plots and characters at a moment when the Amsterdam Schouwburg (city theatre), founded in 1638, was in great need of successful theatrical material. Blom not only charts the first budding interest in Spanish drama at the beginning of the century through cultural agents such as Theodore Rodenburgh (who also lived in England and translated and imported English works), but he also traces the transfer route of Spanish materials from the Southern Netherlands to the Dutch Republic, highlighting the instrumental role of the Brussels contact zone and that of the Amsterdam Sephardic community in the whole literary process of acquisition, transfer and adaptation. Blom’s analysis also attests to the cultural interconnectedness among all territories in the Low Countries during the war and bears witness to the transnational character of literary exchange in the early modern period. Particularly revealing is the way in which in this ‘Hispanophilic turn’ the Spanishness of the plays and authors like star playwright Lope de Vega is negotiated over time, ranging from a process of looting or plundering, in line with what Barbara Fuchs observed for the English Renaissance stage, to a trademark of artistic device and appealing drama for the Amsterdam theatre crowds.
Continuing with the dramatic setting, in “The Barke Is Bad, but the Tree Good”: Hispanophilia, Hispanophobia and Spanish Honour in English and Dutch Plays (c. 1630-1670), Rena Bood engages with the way figurations of Spain and its inhabitants were employed, reworked and negotiated on stage in the seventeenth century, but she does it in a comparative framework, in both the Dutch Republic and England. Her essay seeks to renegotiate the way in which the term ‘honour’ and the cultural stereotype of the ‘Spaniard’ are linked on stage, proposing that it is to be understood not only as an exponent of a vengeful nature. Through the analysis of paratextual material and text analysis the existence of gradations in the qualification of Spanish characters can be exposed. Particularly interesting is the fact that her corpus is formed by the same original Spanish play translated and adapted in both England and the Dutch Republic: the internationally successful *The Cid* (c. 1600) by Guillén de Castro. In this way she focuses on Joseph Rutter’s *The Valiant Cid* (1637), and Johan van Heemskerk’s *De verduytste Cid* (The Dutchified Cid, 1641). Remarkably enough, in the Dutch Republic the Cid is harnessed to the cause of their liberation struggle against Spain. Her chapter also provokes an interesting question regarding the dynamics of selection when comparing cultural exchange in the early modern period. Sometimes different countries display overlap when it comes to certain international bestsellers, but they mostly reveal different selection patterns.

The first part on early modern discourses closes with Antonio Cortijo Ocaña’s ‘James Salgado: Anti-Spanish Sentiment and the Popish Plot’, where the author engages with the close relationship between politics and religion through the works of James Salgado, a purportedly Spanish convert to Protestantism who produced several works of anti-Catholic (and/or anti-Jesuit) propaganda in England in the 1670s-1680s. Anti-Catholicism and anti-Hispanism are sometimes overlapping discourses in the early modern period and beyond. As in the case of Thomas Scott, Salgado also stayed in the Low Countries, making tangible the Anglo-Dutch-Spanish triangulation. However, Salgado’s Spanish identity is not to be taken at face value, but as a nom de plume. Cortijo questions his autobiographical works and interprets them as a literary game with the genre of the ‘convert’. This genre, together

---

77 For the Dutch and English context there is not much overlap in the Spanish plays that were translated for both stages. Choices are sometimes eyebrow-raising. Rena Bood looks into this issue in her PhD thesis. This selection difference can also be detected in the translation of prose, as in the case of Cervantes’s *Novelas Ejemplares* (1633) in Dutch and English. Although in both contexts six novels were translated, there is only one case of overlap: *El celoso extremeno*. Further research can be done to try to ascertain the possible selection criteria behind these corpora.
with that of the ‘critical Spaniard’ who attests to the cruelty and wrongdoings of his own nation, are well-known and effective rhetorical procedés within the Black Legend narrative. Canonical examples of the instrumentalization of this narrative are Bartolomé de las Casas’s *Brevíssima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* (1552), respectfully addressed to King Philip II, but turned into a denunciation of Spain, or Antonio Pérez’s *Relaciones* (1591), Philip II’s (in)famous secretary whose works would also become instrumental in the discourse of Spanish criticism ‘from within’. Although Salgado’s works relate to a long-existing tradition of Hispanophobic polemics connected to the Protestant faction at Elizabeth’s court, there is an obvious tension between Salgado’s negative perception of everything Catholic and his opinion of Spain, Spaniards and Spanish manners and customs. This can be observed in some of his unpolemical works, such as *An Impartial and Brief Description of the Plaza* (1683), where the Oriental dimension of Spain comes to the fore, or in *The manners and customs of the principal nations of Europe* (1684) a thrilling example of an early taxonomy of European nations, like the *Völkertafel* (1720-1730) or *Table of nations*, that will later link this anthropological content to visual representations.

Part two, on modern discourses of Spain, opens up with the eighteenth century and *Don Quixote*, as mentioned above. The chapter functions as a temporal hinge between the two parts of the volume. Pedro Javier Pardo’s analysis in ‘From Hispanophobia to Quixotephilia: The Politics of Quixotism in the British Long Eighteenth Century’ scrutinizes the fluctuations in the dynamics of Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia regarding this emblematic Spanish work that came to be inextricably paired with Spain, contributing to further reflection on the boundaries of these concepts. Pardo ascertains a ‘Cervantine/philquixotic turn’ in the appreciation of the classic and his author in Britain and examines the conflicting strands of literary admiration and political antagonism, ranging from dissociation and association with Spain to the full naturalization of the novel in the Victorian age. His wide chronological scope, from the seventeenth century until the beginning of the nineteenth century, exposes the alternation in perception from an Hispanophobic classic in the seventeenth century (and recurrent until the first half of the eighteenth century), to a later extremely favourable perception of *Don Quixote*, perfectly in tune with the future figuration of Romantic Spain. This evolution from Hispanophobic to Hispanophilic does not underscore a predictable black-and-white interpretation in accordance with a nineteenth-century paradigm shift, since Pardo exposes a curious paradox: ‘the political denigration of Spain goes hand in hand with the literary exaltation of Cervantes and his work’. The simultaneity of praise
and scorn illustrates the possible interplay between Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia in different and similar contexts, and also in one and the same individual. This paradox is embodied in Sir William Temple’s and Lord Carteret’s double identities as men of letters and politicians. Temple was campaigning for war against Spain, and Lord Carteret, despite his key role in the canonization of Don Quixote, represented the most antagonistic position against Spain in contemporary English politics.

The following essay, ‘Spanish Politicking in British Periodical Reviews, 1808-1814’ by Susan Valladares, illustrates the importance of Spain in British nineteenth-century culture. Valladares delves into the genre of periodical reviews, exposing the interplay between the political and the literary. She embarks on an analysis of a genre that has received less attention than other literary media, but proves equally fruitful for the cultural projection of ideas on Spain. The essay examines the role of reviews in both prophesizing and memorializing Britain’s military interventions in Spain, focusing on two politically opposed reviews: the Edinburgh and the Quarterly. As a result of the Peninsular War, the vision of Spain had undergone a considerable change, turning not only into a synonym of freedom and reform but also into an inspiring example for Europe at large. These ideologically rival reviews reflected and manipulated British public opinion about Spain, negotiating between inherited and newly forged narratives of Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia for their own political ends. The influential position of reviews in the framing of the unstable discourse of Anglo-Spanish prejudices and sympathies advanced during the Peninsular War, and posed questions about the responsibilities of periodical reviewers. Reactions were also forged in literary form. Indeed, poet laureate and the most prominent Hispanist of his age, Robert Southey will launch his most forceful attack on the Edinburgh’s appropriation of Spanish politics from the paratexts of his laureate ode Carmen Triumphale (1814). As Valladares sharply concludes, ‘[i]n the heady world of early-nineteenth-century print culture, Spain was not only a political, but also an aesthetic and ideological, battlefield’.

The next chapter, ‘Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia in the Netherlands: Continuities and Ruptures in the Nineteenth Century’ by Lotte Jensen, relates early modern perceptions of Spain to the nineteenth century and the rise of Dutch nationalism, distinguishing two ruptures in the dominating Hispanophobic Dutch narrative: the Napoleonic era and the Catholic emancipation from the 1840s. Debates and promises of emancipation for Catholic subjects also played a role in Britain from the beginning of the century. Dutch Catholics advocated for a national historiography of the Dutch Revolt where Protestant interpretations were not the ‘default’ discourse. Both ruptures
contributed to a sometimes cumbersome renegotiation of anti-Spanish stereotypes and canonical episodes and heroes of national history. Although there was a dominant discourse in which Spanish evilness was instrumental in shaping a positive Dutch self-image, counter-narratives, in the shape of positive images and alternative representations of Spain, circulated as well. Both literary and historiographical sources attest to these shifts. In Dutch resistance literature a narrative of a ‘united Dutch people’ was deployed, as in the early modern period, but this time with a French enemy, which implied adaptations in the ‘Spanish’ enemy template that remind us of early modern renegotiations. Poems like Helmers’s canonical De Hollandsche natie (1812) or the historical play Montigni (1821) by the Amsterdam poet H.H. Klijn, based on the Netherlandish nobleman executed in Philip II’s time, reveal the way authors moulded the past and Spanish historical antagonists according to their own political needs. For their part, Catholic intellectuals criticized the one-sidedness of Dutch historiography with regard to the Eighty Years’ War and offered their own versions of Dutch literary history and with it created new Catholic heroes, seeking their roots in a different part of Dutch history, the Middle Ages.

Fernando Durán López’s contribution, ‘From Azoteas to Dungeons: Spain as Archaeology of the Despotism in Alexander Dallas’s Novel Vargas (1822)’, links to some of the thematic threads exposed in this volume, namely the interconnection between the literary and the religious. Interestingly, this novel had been long attributed to the Anglicized Spanish exile Joseph Blanco White, positioning this work into the dialectic of a Spanish Catholic who had converted to Protestantism. As in the case of James Salgado, Alexander Dallas’s attitude towards things Spanish is determined by the entrenched religious rivalry between Protestantism and Catholicism. However, Dallas’s (literary) career is not consistently Hispanophobic. As one of the first soldiers fighting in Spain, he was widely acquainted with Spanish culture and manners, and in his novels he displayed Hispanophilic visions of Spain. His later conversion to Anglicanism will make him connect Catholic Spain with superstition, bigotry, despotism and, in a word, with the Inquisition. Nonetheless, the transition is not clear-cut, and a complex dialogue between Hispanophilia and -phobia is latent in his last novel, Vargas, a Tale of Spain (1822), published anonymously. To analyse Dallas’s articulation of Spain in Vargas, Durán places the novel against the backdrop of Walter Scott’s historical-novel model, foregrounding the pioneering role of Vargas as first Spanish historical novel. While in previous novels like Felix Alvarez Dallas expanded with fascination on the peculiarities of Spanish life, landscape and manners, in Vargas he limits himself to a small number of scarce and
contained mentions of Spanish culture, favouring the old Hispanophobia inherited and rooted in discriminatory national and religious identities. The epitome of his Hispanophobic turn is the assimilation of the main Spanish character Bartolomé Vargas to the sixteenth-century Protestant ‘martyrs’ who fought for the Reformation. With this intervention, Vargas actually becomes the literary embodiment of those Spaniards critical of Spain ‘from within’ we have referred to previously, in accordance with the Black Legend narrative.

Diego Saglia’s chapter ‘Discordant Visions: Spain and the Stages of London in 1823’ concentrates on the stage as a major site for the production and dissemination of Romantic-era constructions of Spain as a conflicted cultural geography, oscillating between fascination and attraction, anxiety and hostility. Through a prismatic focus on a discrete cultural moment, 1823, the year of the fall of the liberal regime in Madrid, Saglia interconnects not only the substantial number of ‘Spanish’ works performed in the London patent theatres, but also images of Spain in parliamentary debates and the ‘Spanish Fete’ at Covent Garden (July 1823). Interestingly enough, all of the Spanish-themed plays performed in 1822-1823 were tried and tested favourites that confirmed the long-term hold over British audiences of repertoire drawn from Spanish imagination, such as Thomas Otway’s *Venice Preserv’d* (1682), Richard Brinsley Sheridan’s *Pizarro* (1799) or George Colman’s *The Mountaineers* (1795). Although there were only two original Spanish-themed productions of that year, *Cortez; or, The Conquest of Mexico* and *Spanish Bonds; or, Wars in Wedlock*, Saglia makes tangible the way in which they engage with and respond to conflicting political and cultural questions relevant to British, European, and more global contexts. With his attention for these transatlantic offshoots, Saglia evinces a continuous fascination not only for Spain, but also for its former American colonies, interesting geographies for Britain and its European competitors. In this way, *Cortez*, a reworking of John Dryden’s 1665 *The Indian Emperour*, plays repeatedly with ambivalences, conjuring up a peculiarly distinct figuration of empire. The Black Legend and Hispanophobia are present in it, but also kept in check. This variety of theatrical forms and spectacular modes exposes an admixture of dissonant representations and uses of Spain, marked by continuity and discontinuity, by Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia.

Raphaël Ingelbien’s chapter ‘Historical Fiction, Cultural Transfer and the Recycling of the Black Legend between the Low Countries and Britain: A Nineteenth-Century Case Study’ gauges the different priorities of British and Netherlandic novelists who recycled the Black Legend in the 1820s, evincing
the selective character of its revival and the interplay with the era's political reconfigurations. Ingelbien compares two historical novels set during the Dutch Revolt: *The Heiress of Bruges: A Tale of the Year Sixteen Hundred* (1830) by Anglo-Irish writer Thomas Colley Grattan, who settled in Brussels and became a resident British expert on the Low Countries, and his possible source of inspiration: *Le Gueux de Mer* (1827), a pioneering 'Belgian' historical novel by Henri Moke. Ingelbien engages in an imagological survey of the portrayal of Spanish character and an analysis of the recurrence or absence in the novels of various motifs central to the Black Legend: Catholicism and the Inquisition, Spanish colonial abuses in the New World, and the Spaniards' miscenagnated African or Moorish origin, source of historical disparagement for English and Dutch authors. Both Moke and Grattan are cautious not to use the legend to denounce Catholicism as a whole, which can be explained by their Belgian and Irish origins and the complexity of the Catholic question in both united kingdoms in the early nineteenth century. Furthermore, the influence of Romantic Orientalism also create nuances in their portrayal of Spanish and Moorish characters. Ingelbien demonstrates that nations like England and the Low Countries that had jointly forged anti-Spanish images in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries followed asymmetrical trajectories on opposite sides of the North Sea, but could also coincide in nuancing Hispanophobia.

The last chapter, “Covering the Skeletons with Flesh and Blood”: Spanish Golden Age Drama in English and Dutch Nineteenth-Century Literary Histories’ by Yolanda Rodríguez Pérez, reconstructs perceptions of Spain and its cultural legacy through the prism of literary histories. The renewed interest in Spain at the turn of the nineteenth century was further stimulated by the philological boom and the consolidation of the discipline of literary history as a key agent in the forging of narratives of nationhood and national canons. Writing literary canons implied charting and evaluating different literary traditions, national and foreign. In the particular case of such a landmark genre as national drama, British and Dutch literary historians had to reflect and renegotiate Spanish influences. How could Golden Age Spanish literature have influenced them at the time when their own budding national literatures were at their zenith? How is it possible to acknowledge influence and appreciate cultural legacy in a period when Spain was the arch-enemy, tainted by such a negative reputation? Literary histories reveal distinctly the ambivalent, Hispanophobic/philic attitudes towards the legacy of Spanish drama and, indirectly, towards Spanishness. The author offers a comparative analysis of four literary histories/treatises composed between 1800 and 1846 by Charles Dibdin, Abraham Louis Barbaz,
Willem de Clercq and George Henry Lewes. Although it is obvious that both British and Dutch authors regarded literary canons from a rather ethnocentric perspective, they display both similarities and differences regarding perceptions towards Spain, sometimes through occlusion or downplaying, but mainly evinced through a rhetoric of literary or historical opposition.

_Literary Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia in Britain and the Low Countries (1550-1850)_ contends that to gauge and fully understand the discursive presence and literary functionality of Spain in Britain and the Low Countries Hispanophobic and Hispanophilic narratives have to be considered in interplay. From their position as ‘special friends’ across history, the British and the Dutch have not always related in similar ways to Spain while forging their own national identities. Reconstructing their attitudes to Spain over time reveals certain peaks and troughs in their cultural exchange, and both entrenched and new figurations of Spain can be better interpreted in their historical (dis)continuity. In the middle of the nineteenth century the Spaniard may no longer be the bugbear of anybody’s imagination, but, under new transgender reconfigurations like _Carmen_, dark and dangerous depths kept simmering.
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PART I

Early Modern Discourses on Spain
1. **Being Spanish in the Early Modern World**

*Alexander Samson*

**Abstract**
This chapter explores the limits and frontiers of Spain and Spanishness in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries from temporal, political and geographical perspectives. The global displacements and mobility of the peoples who came to be described as ‘Spanish’ across this period, their state of estrangement and motion as a structuring condition of identity, formed a crucial driver of the negotiations, political, cultural and linguistic, which came to define ‘Spain’. From the racial politics of Latin America to the states of the Hispanic monarchy whose link to Spain was mediated by foreign Habsburg dynasts, the foreign/other was always a fundamental part of the web of exchanges and interchangeability that made Spain different, an object of envy and admiration from within and without.

**Keywords:** Spanish, identity, Hispanophilia, Hispanophobia, exomorphism

This chapter seeks to explore what it meant to be Spanish in the early modern period, both for those defining themselves in this way and those describing others as such. It explores how ‘Spain’ emerged from tensions between cosmopolitan and rooted accounts of belonging, from broader or narrower geographical or political frames, differing understandings of allegiance as territorial, civic or dynastic, and attempts to circumscribe and police religious, political, linguistic and cultural limits. These tensions expressed themselves in the contradiction between a desire to engage with the world and the fear of contaminating difference, seen most notably in relation to the anxieties concerning Spain’s religious minorities. Raising Spanishness as a question in this period immediately runs the risk of anachronism, employing a category whose modern meaning is ultimately
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rooted in the system of nation states that emerged in the nineteenth century as Europe was distilled from 500 discrete political entities into just 25 or so nation states by the dawn of the twentieth century. Beyond presupposing and so reifying the object of enquiry, a series of historical elisions with important contemporary implications also lurk at the heart of the term ‘Spain’, imprecisions and generalizations like, for example, its conflation with Castile, glossing over important internal divisions and differences of language and culture apparent in regional ‘nationalisms’ from the Basque country to Catalunya. The mixed feelings evoked by Spain when it sat at the heart of the Hispanic monarchy three centuries ago reflect both the extent to which its various subjects embraced the imperial project that came to define the monarchy especially in the eyes of others, and how they responded to the inevitable opprobrium that this global reach and power brought. At the heart of what came to define Spain was a tension between inclusive and exclusionary ideas about those who should or should not be dubbed ‘españoles’.

Borders and frontiers between states in the early modern period emerged locally from custom and collective memory, expressed in myriad quotidian interactions between individual subjects tracing and retracing their situation in sanctioned behaviours. On the other hand, abstract mathematical and cartographic methods for measuring space, the rise of surveying and chorography, came to influence how divisions were conceptualized. Natural frontiers like rivers or mountains could be as much routes of transmission and circulation, linking and bridging, as barriers dividing. Multiple, competing jurisdictions overlaid mosaics of land ownership, ecclesiastical jurisdictions, and overlapping dues, rights, privileges and acts of obeisance. By reaching across territorial divisions, these relations of a personal rather than political nature blurred and confused definitions of place. These processes were part of a broader territorialization, by means of which measure and control coalesced, combining technical and legal competencies to produce land, as opposed to people, under the dominion of a single ruling authority.

The variegated nature of Iberian territory even in the sixteenth century is well illustrated by the bitter complaint of John Brierton, on the border between Aragón and Castile on 23 June 1537. Travelling in the company of Henry VIII’s ambassador Thomas Wyatt the elder to the imperial court, he recounted in a letter to Thomas Wriothesley from Valladolid that:

1 Elliott, ‘A Europe of Composite Monarchies’, p. 49.
2 Herzog, Frontiers of Possession.
3 Elden, The Birth of Territory, pp. 322-323.
we came into a Citie called Seragoza, where we were extremely handled as though we had been Jews. All our caringe was had home to the serch house, where al my Master's apparail and the gentlemens, with the rest of the servaunts were searched to th'uttermost. They made us pay for all things that were unworne. They be the spitefulllest people in the world.4

To Wyatt's pleas of diplomatic immunity the customs officials responded that ‘if Christ or Sanct Fraunces came with all their flock they shuld not eskape’.5 Briertonne then related that the empress had sent by post in a little box to Barcelona a silk flower she had made for the emperor and that Zaragoza's customs officials had not allowed it to pass unsearched, even for the hundred ducats offered to them by the messenger: they ‘set as much by th'Emperor lettres as they doo by myne’.6 Despite the awesome power Charles V enjoyed, apparent in the fears of rivals like France, he was still subject to the jurisdictions, privileges and customs of each and every one of the territories he ruled. Land became a political entity only as monarchies developed centralized, representative strategies that enabled effective control over extended space, an evolution in which cities, as in the example here, were fundamental underlying structures of ‘empire’ both in Spain and the Americas.7 Most of the area ruled by Spain consisted of ‘vast expanses of administratively empty space’, lying between urban nodes bound together in loose networks where authority was largely ‘interpersonal, non-territorial’.8 Personal fealty to the king lay at the heart of belonging, and while this was the case, Habsburg dynasts were forced to confront and contain the multifarious tensions between the constituent territories that made up their ‘empire’.9 Tellingly, the Habsburg dynasts are referred to in Spain today as ‘los Austrias’, in a peculiar gesture of geographical self-estrangement. The year 1640 saw a powerful reassertion of local identities as against imperial claims, with the Revolt of the Catalans and Portugal’s successful reassertion of sovereign independence, both reacting against Olivares’s attempts to enforce greater unity and homogeneity through the mutual defence pact, dubbed the Union of Arms.10

4 Muir, Life and Letters of Sir Thomas Wyatt, p. 44.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 See Espinosa, The Empire of the Cities.
8 Biedermann, (Dis)connected Empires, pp. 25 and 36.
9 This is itself merely a convenient shorthand. There never was a ‘Spanish empire’ as Anthony Pagden has said, rather ‘a confederation of principalities held together in the person of a single king’ (see Pagden, Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination, p. 3).
10 Feros, Speaking of Spain, p. 49.
Shortly after Philip II married Mary I on 25 July 1554, the feast day of Spain’s patron saint, Santiago, adding yet another major dynastic union to the bewildering conglomeration of states that had already come into Habsburg hands as a result of the miraculous inheritance of his father Charles V, the Earl of Westmorland, Henry Neville, asserted ‘I am and shall be a Spaniard to the uttermost of my power’. His imagined transcendence of patriotic localism through allegiance to his new king reflected the universalist idealism implicit in dynastic politics. It underlines the elasticity of the term ‘Spanish’, where it is invoked exclusively in relation to personal allegiance to a ruler. Philip playfully began signing himself king of England before he had even set foot there. He consciously cultivated an English persona when he did and was soon hailed by his English subjects as English and not Spanish. The queen’s chaplain John Christoferson suggested in similar terms:

> the Quenes grace taketh no straunger to marry wyth, but such one as both by father and mother cometh of the royall bloode of Englande, and nowe at lengthe is called home, as it were to hys natyue countrye, insomuch that no true Englishe man hath any cause to grudge at the matter, but great cause hath he to merueyle at the wonderfull prouidence of god therin, and hartely to thanke him to, that he of hys goodnes both hath so auauanced the noble bloode of Englannde abroad in the worlde.¹²

Mary I’s reputation and place in Tudor history is forever tainted by her Spanish heritage. On the one hand, she was accused by opponents of being too ‘Spanish’ and overly attached to Spain, while, on the other, her supporters claimed Philip II for England. The association with Spain, however, over time posthumously extended to her the cruelty and tyranny with which their empire came to be associated, and was incarnated ultimately in her epithet, Bloody. The Anglo-Spanish alliance illustrates two opposing responses to difference, its transcendence by underlining plasticity and multiplicity, or its erasure through annihilation or assimilation. Philip’s conscious self-fashioning in England built on lessons his father had learnt in Spain, where his Burgundian advisors’ tactless handling of his accession and assumption of power had provoked a major revolt. The gifting of important offices, lack of access and attempt to impose taxes to pay for bribes for the imperial electors fomented the perception of his Flemish and Burgundian advisors as venial, predatory interlopers damaging the interests of native-born subjects. Fray

---

¹² Christopherson, An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion, sig. M1v.
Alonso de Castrillo’s *Tractado de república* (1521), published as the revolt was brought to an end by a fragile coalition of royal and landed aristocratic interests, blamed foreigners for the civil conflict:

novelties and the most scandalous counsels seem to them the most meet, and these are not natural born, but strange and foreign men, enemies of our republic of our people, because as such like enemies they provoke others to damage, burn and set houses on fire, not so much with a zeal for justice as the greed of theft.13

The final phrase alluded to the sack of Medina del Campo, an attack carried out under orders of the Royal Council headed by Adrian of Utrecht using native forces under Antonio de Fonseca. Initially, Castile’s Cortes had refused to render homage to their new king until he had sworn to observe the laws of the kingdom, promised to learn Castilian, and admit ‘castellanos y españoles’ to his court and retinue. Language, respect for the rule of law and representation through inclusion within the king’s household were key conditions for his and later Philip’s acceptance. That ‘castellano’ and ‘español’ were not synonymous at this point is clear from the dual formulation throughout the document, implying that while Aragonese, Valencian or Andalusian subjects might be generalized in this way, the Castilian still warranted a specific denomination. Castrillo emphasized: ‘What could be more worthy of marvel than strange people with diverse languages, who divinity divided due to man’s pride, to see them in harmony brought together for the good conversation of men!”14 Civic, republican accounts of power rooted in *natio* represented a significant challenge to international dynastic politics, which the *comuneros* clearly understood as abrogating sovereignty and compromising indigenous liberties.15 The geographical scale of Habsburg authority depended on allegiance to a bloodline increasingly alienated from its territorial origins. Personal fealty and allegiance were made to do more and more ideological work, as the figure of the monarch increasingly

13  Castrillo, *Tractado de república*, pp. 7-8: ‘las novedades y los consejos más escandalosos les parecen más saludables, y estos tales no son nuestros naturales, sino hombres peregrinos y extranjeros, enemigos de nuestra república y de nuestro pueblo, porque como tales enemigos provocan a las otras gentes a dañar, a quemar y encender las casas, no tanto con celo de la justicia como con cubdiçia del robo’ (emphasis added).
14  Castrillo, *Tractado de república*, p. 21: ‘¿Que cosa puede ser mas digna de maravilla que las gentes extrañas y de diversas lenguas, las cuales dividio la divinidad por la soberbia de las gentes, verlas concertadas por la buena conversacion de los hombres!’
disappeared into invisibility; the itinerant monarchies of Ferdinand, Isabella and Charles V gave way to the static rule of Philip II and then retreated into the courtly worlds of Philip III and IV, hemmed in by the great favourites, Lerma and Olivares. In the New World, obeisance was done to the monarch’s portrait as proxy, depicted in Juan Bautista Maino’s famous 1635 painting of the recapture of Bahía (1625).

All early modern states experienced tensions between centralizing, idealizing versions of power rooted in natural, quasi-familial relations and the realities of the jealously guarded privileges and customs of local elites. The centre needed to appeal simultaneously to multiple audiences, signalling their particular interests’ favoured status, while avoiding stimulating common cause between groups on the periphery, for example, in shared religion or oppression. Multivocal communication and the attempt to appeal to different groups simultaneously, to be all things to all people, placed increasing strain on the centre, as the balance of power between different groups on the margins shifted and changed. In this period, universal appeal, an appealing universality even, became increasingly difficult to sustain in the face of growing tensions and rivalries between groups competing for favour and recognition from a solitary centralized monopoly on economic rewards or mercedes. Mutual dependence, interconnection and shared interests between the centre and local ruling groups created incentives for cooperation and collaboration, while competition, disconnection and divergent interests among those groups and the centre, between them and the areas they controlled or between each other stretched the centre in different directions. An endemic tension between centrifugal and centripetal forces bedevilled attempts to create either greater unity or devolution. Jurisdictional conflicts could be reassuring signs of the importance of local interests to the monarchy. However, they occupied much of its energies and distracted from a grand strategy, which would have inevitably had winners and losers.

One area where these competing interests were often keenly felt was trade. Transnational but often key to local prosperity, it was at times crucial in order to access skills and resources, while at other times it signified foreign competition. A ban on trade with England did not stop John Hawkins from trading with everywhere from the Isle of Margarita to Cartagena in the late 1560s, selling the shipload of black slaves he had acquired with Portuguese help. In 1545, Robert Reneger’s piratical seizure of the silver ship,
San Salvador, goaded Philip into imposing an embargo on English trade. His officials in Seville, however, quickly reminded him that this would be counterproductive:

if the said Englishmen’s goods are embargoed they will not come and trade as they have been accustomed to do because it is they who principally buy the greater part of the wines and oils from these areas and in order not to cause great damage, which will affect your majesty’s royal income as much as your subjects and these towns who live from and wholly depend on their harvests, your highness might best be served by ordering its suspension.17

Local Andalusian interests outweighed the affront and violation of political treaties between England and Spain. The functionary underlined the identification of the region’s economic interests with Philip’s own over and above any wider power struggle, political or strategic interest. Here the locale exploited tension between economic and political self-interest to persuade the monarch that protectionist policies would be damaging to his own finances.

Different visions of belonging flowed from constructions of political groups as either civic or ethnic. On the one hand, cities were the principal locus of vecindad, neighbourhood or community, associated with the enjoyment of certain freedoms or rights. The urban was porous, as a destination and itinerary, linking spaces together. On the other hand, the body of the commonwealth was an abstraction from place, locating identity transhistorically in bloodline or birth. For Annabel Brett, the city exposed:

a critical early modern tension between the commonwealth as a situated space and as a body that of its essence defies situation. It is here that the two senses of civitas, a city like Paris and a commonwealth like France, collide. The first kind of city is firmly situated with the walls of the urbs. It welcomes or excludes strangers at its gates, and travel is primarily perceived as being between cities in this sense.18

17 Transcribed in Appendix D of Connell-Smith, Forerunners of Drake, p. 244; original at Archivo General de Indias, Contratación, leg. 5103: ‘como se enbargan los bienes de los dichos yngleses no vienen a contratar como solian porque ellos principalmente compraban todos los mas de los vinos y azeytes de todos estos pueblos y al no hazerse el mucho daño que se recibe asy en las rentas reales de su magestad como sus subditos y los destos pueblos que biben y se valen de sus cosechas y si vuestra alteza fuese seruido podria mandar suspender el enbargo’.
18 Brett, Changes of State, p. 7 (emphasis in the original) and see pp. 35, 118, 168.
The rights to travel and discourse were critical in the philosophical justifications for Spanish possessions in the Americas. Francisco de Vitoria's lecture on the 'Indies' dismissed all the arguments for the conquest one by one, returning at the very end to suggest that the *ius communicandi* or *ius peregrinandi*, the right to travel, use harbours and rivers, trade and settle 'unoccupied' territory were the only possible grounds for the Spanish presence in the Americas beyond the subsequent right of self-defence. In discussing the proposition that 'the Spaniards have the right to travel and dwell in those countries, so long as they do no harm to the barbarians, and cannot be prevented by them from doing so', Vitoria elaborated on a series of propositions, including that the 'Spaniards may lawfully trade among the barbarians', that 'if there are any things among the barbarians which are held in common both by their own people and by strangers, it is not lawful to prohibit the Spanish from sharing and enjoying them', that 'if children born in the Indies of a Spanish father wish to become citizens of that community, they cannot be barred from citizenship or from the advantages enjoyed by the native citizens born of parents domiciled in that community'. In his conclusion to the whole essay, Vitoria wrote, 'Look at the Portuguese, who carry on a great and profitable trade with similar sorts of peoples without conquering them.' Their maritime (trading as opposed to territorial) empire offered an alternative model, one in which tribute and symbolic overlordship stood in for territorial control.

The controversial nature of this right upon which Vitoria built his argument is apparent from the disagreement that erupted amongst his pupils surrounding poor relief and schemes that made charity a public or civic duty. State-controlled poor relief sought to control and limit subjects' right to travel. Supporters averred that vagabondage was purposeless travel, movement for its own sake, existing in the interstices between civic spaces, in a wilderness beyond the law, while opponents argued forcibly that tying individuals to the places of their birth enacted an enforced genealogical, bounded concept of community that ran counter to the universality of natural law and human nature. Domingo de Soto argued from this universal human community for a 'juridical cosmopolitanism', whose implication was a universal right to travel as well as the porosity of any bordered commonwealth and in this sense its spatial contingency. The rights of beggars to wander were part of a broader right to travel and traverse juridical spaces.

19 Vitoria, 'De Indis', pp. 279-281.
20 Ibid., pp. 291-292.
Debates about the law of nations and the law of nature revolved around the limits and extent of human sociability, the fundamental connectedness of all human society. Hugo Grotius’s work on the freedom of the seas and *de iure belli*, for example, constructed the pursuit of self-interest as logically prior to the love of others, from which flowed an insistence not only on free trade and travel but free migration and settlement.

These cosmopolitan ideas, along with growing levels of mobility and trade, challenged constructions of political communities rooted in *natio*. Legally, being a *natural*, to pick up on Castrillo’s term, could come about through birth, marriage, honorific title, inheritance or ten years’ residence. Sometimes even the love of the community demonstrated in acts contributing to the common good were sufficient to evidence citizenship. Many of these modes of acquiring naturalized status had nothing to do with birth. The terms ‘*natural*’ and ‘*vecino*’ mediated in this sense between belonging to a community or people. In Castile being a *natural* was often invoked to distinguish between subjects born there and foreign-born subjects of the ‘Spanish’ king, such as Catalans, Aragonese, Italians or even at some points Englishmen. As a dynastic state, Spain was composed of many nations and the formation of a Spanish people, involved ‘the superimposition of a “Castilian” identity on distinct regional identities’. However, the desire to retain distinctions amongst Iberian peoples remained strong, surfacing in the great jurist Juan de Solórzano Pereira’s *Politica Indiana* from 1647, which asserted that ‘we should classify the Aragonese as foreigners, just as we do the Portuguese, Italians and Flemish’. Only Castilian subjects were in principle permitted to settle and trade with the Americas. Nevertheless in the context of emigration to the New World, Spaniard came to encompass all Iberians and often subjects from beyond the peninsula. The progressive conflation of Castile with Spain led to what has been described as the Castilianization of the Spains, a process that paralleled the Hispanization of the Habsburg monarchy and the Catholicization of the Iberian Peninsula.

If there were internal pressures bubbling up from the dominance of Castile in Iberia, the conflation from outside of all Philip II’s subjects as Spaniards reinforced the undiscriminating confusion implicit in the term. ‘Spain’ and the ‘Spanish’ were defined from outside with little distinction.

---

21 De Soto, *Deliberación en causa de los pobres*.
22 Herzog, ‘Communities Becoming a Nation’, pp. 153-156.
made between the various peoples who made up the Hispanic monarchy. As Henry Kamen has suggested, the empire came to define the nation. The image of Spain and the Spanish that evolved often revolved around understandings of its empire and colonialism, antagonistic readings of competitors who had a stake in attributing its bloody genesis and inevitable decline to backward, superstitious and hypocritical religiosity and its secular counterpart, corrupt and tyrannical, absolutist rulers. This anti-Spanish mythology constructed from the outside is elegantly captured by the term ‘exomorphism’ and is an integral part of the complex and controversial historiographical processes that coalesced in the late nineteenth century as the Black Legend. The dialogue between self-image and the reflections of others has been a major, distinctive feature of Spanish historiography since the early modern period.

Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia were both integral to this tradition. Spain’s power made her the inevitable target at which the whole world shot her arrows. What critics took Spain to be frequently inflected the nature of both their admiration and anxiety. The example of Spain, as the preeminent Catholic power in Europe, was a model for emulation and a power to be feared and fought. A central aspect of both Spain’s self-image and its perception from outside, especially in religiously hostile Reformed parts of northern Europe like England, the rebellious provinces in the Netherlands and parts of Germany, was, of course, Catholicism. In a contribution to a recent popular collection of essays titled Histories of Nations, Enric Ucelay-Da Cal posits ‘crusading religion [as] a strong unifying element’ and concludes that apocalyptic mortality in the Americas gave Spain a reputation for ‘fierceness and cruelty’ and ‘an inflated sense of their own importance and valour, which sadly they have never outgrown’. Such a construction albeit found in a work of general history is revealing about how far Spanish identity continues to be constrained and contained within a limited and caricatured view of religion’s particular importance in defining early modern Spain. The land of convivencia, even taking into account the tendency to romanticize what living together actually looked like, did not move from being a multifaith, multiethnic and multicultural society to one of homogenous Catholic hegemony, even in the century that concerns us here. In his book Neighboring Faiths, David Nirenberg drew attention to ‘the importance of

26 Henry Kamen, Imagining Spain, pp. 21-24.
27 Rodríguez Pérez, Sánchez Jiménez and Den Boer, España ante sus críticos. See the superb and comprehensive consideration of this phenomenon in Sánchez Jiménez, Leyenda Negra.
28 Ucelay-Da Cal, ‘Spain’, p. 77.
group identity formation in constant relation to neighboring communities, in which Christians, Muslims, and Jews define their own identities through acts of measuring, distancing, and sometimes appropriating aspects of other communities’ formations, arguing that the persecution unleashed in 1391 would ‘produce a revolution in the social and theological understanding of what it meant to be Christian’. Here he makes an argument that entirely uniform religious communities experience their faith in submerged and less conscious ways, difference producing a more sharply defined sense of being Christian, but also a contextual one that produced potential points of contact with other faiths. Diversity produced a sharpened awareness of difference and its importance, while simultaneously foregrounding threatening similitude. This sense deepened through the crucial role of evangelization in the justifications for Spanish incursions into the Americas and the fracturing of religious consensus in Europe.

Crusading Catholicism became an integral part of the image cultivated by Habsburg monarchs and provided a rallying point for myriad subjects, although not others. While intended to provide a unifying element to far-flung kingdoms separated in space and time, it glossed over religious wars in its European territories and essential religious divisions at home. Evangelical polemicists, picking up on earlier Italian insults, taunted Spaniards for their ‘racial’ impurity. In The Coppie of the Anti-Spaniard, Philip II was described as a ‘demie Moore, demie Jew, yea demie Saracine’, a ‘Saracin Castilian’, while the Spanish were of ‘Mauritanian race’, who the rest of Europe should ‘with one breath to goe and abate the pride and insolencie of these Negroes’. The use of the term ‘race’ in this example underlines how different early modern conceptions of it were. Here it is understood in a religious sense, a concomitant of faith rather than geography. Free black Spanish subjects underlined in legal depositions their status as cristianos viejos and thus their membership of the political community, something the authorities confirmed by respecting their status as naturales of Castile. One freed black Spanish subject, who had served in a convent, argued against discrimination based on colour, contending that ‘beneath a black pelt an ennobled spirit can be found’ and ‘that there is no white person, no matter how beautiful who is not capable of offending his Lord and black no matter how ugly

30 The Coppie of the Anti-Spaniard, sigs. B2r, D2v, E1r and F1r. See discussion of this in Fuchs, Exotic Nation, esp. p. 123.
31 See the fascinating article on this by Ireton, “They Are Black of the Caste of Black Christians”, p. 609.
who is unable to please and appease him with his good service and work'.

Religion's transcendence of blood also had profound implications for the social order more broadly.

Obsession with bloodline, embodied by the notorious *estatutos de limpieza de sangre* and their exclusion of anyone with a taint of non-Christian blood in their ancestry from royal posts, the military orders and certain ecclesiastical roles, were paradoxically often used to undermine aristocratic patronage networks and privilege. These divisive exclusions have too frequently and simplistically been seen as symptoms of intolerance, when in fact they were often invoked only in specific factional struggles in order to bypass class hierarchy. This was certainly the case for one of the best known instances, that of Cardinal Juan Martínez Silíceo in the Cathedral chapter of Toledo.

It is hard not see the persecution of religious minorities, forcible conversions and subsequent inquisitorial pursuit of Judaizers and crypto-Muslims along with the somewhat ineffectual *estatutos* as symptoms of attempts to white-wash Spain's international reputation, creating the proper imagined unity and religious homogeneity of its crusading imperialism. Their reputation for religiosity was perhaps embraced even more after the great era of religious renewal was already over. Religion's role as a defining aspect of Spanishness in this sense always flowed from troubled political relations. England and Spain had slipped into open war as confessional divides hardened in the wake of Trent, culminating in the series of naval expeditions in the 1580s and 1590s.

Looking back over this troubled relationship the translator Francis Rivers asserted in his dedication of Antonio Ortiz's *Relation* concerning the visit of Philip III and Margarita de Austria to the English College in Valladolid, a training seminary for priests for the glorious reconversion of England, that:

> [T]he assurance of good meaninge, and knowne continuance of good will in them that were wont to be our best frends, though of late prouoked to be our enemie, should encorage vs much to Peace, and to renew the old confederations which our forefathers with so great wisdome procured so many ages, with so great benefit of the land, especially with those in whom yet vnnder the profession of hostility and exercise of war, wee fynde

---

32 This intriguing document was transcribed, analysed and published by Glyn Redworth: ‘debajo de negro pellejo se encierra ennoblecido animo’, ‘que no ay blanco, por hermoso que sea que no pueda ofender a su Señor y negro por feo que no le pueda aplazer y agradar con sus buenos serviuicios y obras’ (‘Mythology with Attitutde?’; pp. 63 and 66).

far better harts and more true affection to our Country and Countrymen (as in this occasion may be sene) then in others, whom with great care and cost we labor (I feare in vayne) to make of old enemies, new frends.34

His argument that the signs of favour shown to English Catholic fugitives in Spain was a symptom of true affection aimed to persuade Elizabeth I’s Lord Chamberlain, just a few years before the Treaty of London did indeed renew old confederations, that in the great strategic balance of power in Europe, England would always be better off siding with Spain. Despite anti-Spanish propaganda like *The Coppie of the Anti-Spaniard*, the famous satirical scene in Ben Jonson’s *The Alchemist* (1610) made clear that English admiration for everything Spanish could verge on the gushingly embarrassing:

Kastril. To be a Countess, say you?
Face. A Spanish Countess, sir.
Pliant. Why? Is that better than an English countess?
Face. Better? ‘Slight, make you that a question, lady?
Kastril. Nay, she is a fool, Captain, you must pardon her.
Face. Ask from your courtier, to your Inns of Court-man,
To your mere milliner: they will tell you all,
Your Spanish jennet is the best horse. Your Spanish Stoop is the best garb. Your Spanish beard
Is the best cut. Your Spanish ruffs are the best
War. Your Spanish pavan the best dance.
Your Spanish titillation in a glove
The best perfume. And, for your Spanish pike,
And Spanish blade, let your poor Captain speak.35

The passage moves from status symbols, synecdoches of courtly sophistication, to allusions to Spanish military dominance. The sycophantic admiration, however, is undercut by the comic, satirical context. These images of fine horses, clothes, grooming and dancing sit paradoxically alongside popular literary translations from the period highlighting picaresque poverty and the deprivation and degradation of Spanish subjects.

The picaresque genre dramatized the temporal and spatial mobility of early modern subjects, their existence beyond patriarchal surveillance and control, moving across boundaries and borders, vagrant and journeying.

34 Ortiz, *A Relation*, Dedication, sig. A2v.
Beyond productive, dignifying labour lay a freedom and leisure associated with power. The literature of the picaresque was a fiction of counter-exemplary journeying, a dark reflection of imperial crossing. Restless travel became a defining feature of Spain in the light of the global, interconnected world it had brought into being. This development transformed the peregrino or pilgrim from being a figure invoking Christian concepts of charity and enjoined hospitality into a symbol of threatening foreign otherness. Vagrancy and poor laws banned foreign pilgrims from courts, just as they placed the fundamental moral obligation of charity into the hands of the state, making municipal authorities responsible for regulating begging, the impoverished and starving. Stifling bureaucratic attempts to control movement, police borders and frontiers, and to assert political claims concerning where one place began and another ended countered a spirit of adventure and freedom dramatized in literary fiction. If errancy is a defining element of modernity, Spain's most famous novelistic character, Don Quijote incarnates those travails that go nowhere, a meditation on the local inhabiting the global, a self-conscious parochialism reflecting comically on the universalism firing global empire. This toothless, poor and deluded social climber from a decaying backwater incarnates a new form of elusive subjectivity, defined by novelistic narrativity the ‘movement towards’ characteristic of desire. This iconic economic migrant, travelling to put his free-lance to good use in service of the king, reflected all the problems of global scale and the neglect of home.

In an exploration of the connected and disconnected history of early modern Portugal's encounters with Sri Lanka, Zoltán Biedermann points to the importance of scale, not just from the perspective of distance, pointing out that ‘in an era of material-based communications the global and the local tend to inhabit different temporalities’.36 For Spain, periods of restless expansion and mobility brought open, universalist ideas to the fore, even as they struggled to abolish internal division and difference. Pluralism competed with Castilianization. Attempts to enforce religious conformity addressed jibes circulating in Italy, Germany and the Low Countries about the Semitic taint infecting the Spanish natio, but also competed with the very instability of this category in the face of porous and ill-defined borders. As we have seen, what fell inside/outside the purview of Spain shifted and changed across the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Until 1612, many Spanish subjects (the moriscos) displayed behaviours that could be characterized as culturally Islamic and there were even a small number of

36 Biedermann, (Dis)connected Empires, p. 13.
Spanish Muslims remaining in the peninsula into the 1580s. These exotic features were remarked on by European travellers throughout the period.

The notion of the polycentric implies centres interlinked and interacting with each other. However, they were grouped and conjoined in different ways, with different levels of spatial and political interconnectedness, and greater or lesser extents of internal integration and homogeneity. The tendency to monumentalize Spain skates over this de facto complexity. The paradox was that as the ‘empire’ grew it became less and less Spanish, leading as arbitristas frequently noted to the depopulation of Castile, exhausting the stock of this gens. The political compromises underlying Spain’s creation as a territorial state involved the centralization of power in the hands of the monarchy and the marginalization of its representative cities. A backlash against this process is still present in the tensions between centralizing and devolution. These relations between the universal and the particular, between the global and the local, define the necessary and yet contested cosmopolitanism that made Spain’s ‘empire’ possible. Early modern Spain was at once defined by the universal and global, by a cosmopolitanism that moved beyond the local and particular, but simultaneously celebrated that same locality and particularity in the process of erasure. The Viaje de Turquía opens with just such an image of rooted fixity, situating the beginning of the journey at the shrine of Spain’s patron saint, Santiago, where one of the three interlocutors recounts that “The most delightful way out of the city and the most pleasing one for me, greatest for recreation is the French road, as much for the freshness of its groves as for the enjoyment of the diversity of peoples, variety of nations, multitude of languages and dress that Saint James makes our guests on this his pilgrimage.” The scene is one of egress, on the way to France, celebrating multiplicity of dress, language and peoples, human diversity in this one place. The problem of inclusion/exclusion is typified by the contrast between Nicolás Antonio’s

37 Although the evidence is problematic, the so-called young man from Arévalo was collecting funds in Zaragoza to undertake Hajj in the mid-sixteenth century (see Harvey, Muslims in Spain).
39 The key bibliography in this field includes Hillgarth, The Mirror of Spain, and Fuchs, The Poetics of Piracy.
40 Villalón, Viaje de Turquía, fol. 11r.: ‘La más deleitosa salida y más a mi gusto de toda la ciudad y de mayor recreación es ésta del camino francés, así por la frescura de las arboledas, como por gozar de la diversidad de las gentes, variedad de naciones, multitud de lenguas y trajes que señor Santiago nos da por huéspedes en este su peregrinaje’.
Biblioteca Hispana Nueva, a grandiose bibliographical project to underline the status of Spanish culture that listed amongst the nations figuring in the literary treasury Alavans, Asturians, Canarians, Cantabrians, Catalonians, Portuguese, and Brazilians and estatutos de limpieza de sangre that sought to find the defining quality of identity in distant, genealogical pasts. 41

Phobias can often be philias in disguise. Filiation between Spain and its critics can be gauged from the scale of translation and the appropriation of its culture, an intercultural traffic that has been consistently marginalized in the literary histories of many countries, including England. 42 The partial truths of the Black Legend that reflect the genuine brutality of conquests in the Americas but are used as universal condemnations of all ‘Spaniards’ are the hardest to combat because they wrap truth in packets with fiction, exaggeration, generalization and fabrication. By lashing falsehoods tightly to indisputable facts, complex work is necessary to disentangle the two, darker elements inevitably staining and tainting the whole. Being Spanish in the early modern period was trapped between conflicting axes of political compositeness and integration, movement and mobility, fixity and rootedness, pride and shame. Visions of movement veered between contamination and cosmopolitanism, rejection and expulsion, emulation and admiration, as Barbara Fuchs has argued in relation to England’s disavowed emulations of Spain. The composite monarchy sat at the crossroads where vernacular literary cultures coalesced in this period, in transnational flows across borders and boundaries, both religious and political, that were simultaneously being constructed. Being Spanish in the early modern world meant, on the one hand, mobility, the ability to evade singular definition, a transnational melange of influences, trade and exchanges, counterbalanced by an intense localism. Criollos like Juan de Espinosa Medrano would soon challenge the centre’s interest for and in the periphery: ‘Belatedly it seems I undertake this enterprise: but we criollos live very far away and the wings of interest do not convey them, Spanish things visit us lazily.’ 43 Tensions between centre and periphery are apparent in his defence of Spain’s prince of poets, the belatedness of this response and the interest that covers and bridges the distance, an

41 Feros, Speaking of Spain, pp. 64-65; Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispana.
42 See my English-Spanish translations database: http://www.ems.kcl.ac.uk/apps/index.html. See also Rodríguez Pérez’s contributions in this volume.
43 Espinosa Medrano, Apologético en favor de Don Luis de Gongora, ‘Al lector’, sig. d2 r.: ‘Tarde parece que salgo a esta empresa: pero vivimos muy lejos los criollos y, si no traen las alas del interés, perezosamente nos visitan las cosas de España’.
interest that is both self-interested and about what is interesting. Even in the seventeenth century, it proved easier for the municipal authorities in Seville to buy grain from North Africa than to import it from Castile. Spain was first and foremost conceptualized as an empire, self-confident in exactly the same measure as it was critical and reflective about the costs of empire. From the outside, its identity seemed self-evident, erasing internal differences, the multicultural, plurilingual, yet its actual political differences were never, as for so many other nations, fully resolved. Being Spanish in the early modern era was at once expansive and open, jealous and closed. Competitors and imitators who saw themselves reflected and transformed by Spain, dissolving in their Hispanophilia, rescued themselves only by transforming this into Hispanophobia.
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2. Spanish Exemplary Rulership? Antonio de Guevara’s *Relox de Príncipes* (1529) in English (1557) and Dutch (1578) Translation

*Sabine Waasdorp*

**Abstract**

The mirror-for-princes *Relox de príncipes* (1529) by Antonio de Guevara (1481-1545) compared Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain Charles V (1500-1558) to the celebrated stoic Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius, with the two being equal in wisdom, sense of justice and clemency, and exemplary rulership. Thereafter, royal and higher-class Spaniards fashioned themselves as contemporary Aurelii, making the book a symbol of the superiority of Spaniards and Spain. However, countries where the *Relox* was read in translation had more nuanced or negative perspectives on Spaniards. This chapter delves into how proto-national attitudes towards Spaniards are decisive for the English (1557) and Dutch (1578) translations of the *Relox*, fashioning Aurelius as an exemplar for their own non-Spanish rulers and negotiating Hispanophilic and Hispanophobic Spanish representations.

**Keywords:** Marcus Aurelius, Antonio de Guevara, early modern translation, Thomas North, Johan Baptista Houwaert

Although largely forgotten now, in the sixteenth century Antonio de Guevara (1481-1545) was possibly the best-known Spanish chronicler and moralist in Europe. His first work alone, the *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio* (1528), enjoyed immediate massive popularity with five more editions in Spain over the next two years and Spanish editions in Antwerp and Paris (1529).
and Rome and Venice in 1531 and 1532. Translations quickly followed into French (1531), English (1535), Italian (1543), Dutch (1565), German (1599), Latin (1601), Hungarian (1610), Swedish (1616) and even Armenian (1738). His second work, the *Relox de príncipes* (1529), received similar acclaim. By 1593, 102 editions and translations of the *Relox* were in circulation, making it slightly less popular than the *Libro áureo*, which counted 130 editions and translations at that time. By 1700 Guevara’s oeuvre of eleven works was represented by no fewer than 300 editions and translations.

Particularly the *Relox*, Guevara’s second bestseller, was influential as it was used to elevate princes of Spain, Spanish nobles and Spain as a whole. The *Relox* was a *specula principum* or mirror-for-princes treatise, a genre which focused on the behaviour, role and worldly position of the ideal prince. *Specula principis* listed proper virtues to possess and sinful vices to avoid, and described one or more historical kings who functioned as models for their successors. The *Relox* focused on the ideal behaviour of Christians, husbands, fathers and rulers through the fictionalized biography of the celebrated stoic, Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius (121-180 AD). Guevara argued that Aurelius’s sense of justice and clemency, his continual concern for the well-being of the state, his love of learning and his many ‘*obras de virtud*’ (‘works of virtue’), which surpassed those of most Christians, made him the ideal exemplar for Guevara’s ruler, the Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain Charles V (1500-1558). Guevara dedicated the book to Charles V and encouraged him to take Aurelius ‘as a master in your youth, as a father in your government, as a guide in your wars, as a friend in your labours, as an example in your virtue, as a master in your learning, as a clear light for

---

1 This work was pirated and published without Guevara’s authorization in Seville. Mezzatesta, ‘Marcus Aurelius’, p. 625; Vosters, *Antonio de Guevara y Europa*, p. 682.
3 One-third of the *Relox* was based on his earlier *Libro áureo* (De la Fuente Merás, ‘Antonio de Guevara’, p. 12).
7 Each role was discussed in a separate section in the *Relox*. The first section discusses the necessity for a prince to be a good Christian, the second the way a husband and father should deal with his wife and children and the third the correct governance by a ruler of the state with a special emphasis on justice and the maintenance of peace. For more on the fictitious nature of the *Libro áureo* and its successor *Relox de príncipes*, see Anderson, *Anatomy of the Libro aureo*; Del Valle, ‘La prosa novelizada del Relox de príncipes’.
8 Guevara served Charles V as a royal preacher from 1523 and as royal chronicler from 1526 (Blanco, ‘Fray Antonio de Guevara’, p. 103).
your desires, and as a competitor in your undertakings'.\textsuperscript{9} Charles V took this encouragement seriously: under his guidance the image of Aurelius and symbols that alluded to the Roman emperor were used in triumphal arches, portraits and statues to foreground his similarity with the Roman emperor, Charles V’s exemplary moral and political leadership being regarded as synonymous with that of Aurelius. Charles’s son Philip II (1527-1598) and important Spanish noblemen and generals such as the Duke of Alba (1507-1582) used the same imagery to elevate their own status, imagining Aurelius as the perfect ancient ‘Spaniard’ to whom any member of the Spanish elite was ideally connected. Marcus Aurelius thereby became an important part of the royal image of the Habsburg Empire and the \textit{Relox} a valuable symbol of the exemplarity of the princes of Spain and Spain as a whole.\textsuperscript{10}

The \textit{Relox} was also a popular \textit{specula principum} outside of Spain, Aurelius’s exemplary life being useful to any prince in Europe according to Geoffrey Baldwin.\textsuperscript{11} Yet, most countries which enjoyed a translation must have taken issue with the identification of Aurelius as a Spaniard in the book as well as with the exaltation of Spaniards in general, since they were also familiar with the Black Legend narrative which depicted Spaniards as bloodthirsty, cruel and tyrannical, especially at certain moments in history.\textsuperscript{12} The dedicatees of the Dutch and English translations of the \textit{Relox} had a complicated relationship with Spain through their personal ties to the country and because of the strong Hispanophobic discourse of some factions in England and the Low Countries. In the case of the English translation (1557) by Thomas North (1516-1668), the elevation of Spaniards in the \textit{Relox} seems less problematic as at the time England was on good terms with Spain. Moreover, the dedicatee of the translation, Queen Mary Tudor (1516-1558), had recently married Prince of Spain Philip II on 25 July 1554 and was partly Spanish herself, being related to the original Aurelian Prince Charles V through her Spanish mother Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536). Yet, her inherent Spanishness was also perceived as irreconcilable with her position as prince of England: multiple critics of her reign argued that she would favour foreign Spaniards over native

\textsuperscript{9} Grey, \textit{Guevara}, pp. 1-2; Mezzatesta, ‘Marcus Aurelius’, p. 624; Guevara, \textit{Relox de príncipes}, p. 44 (‘por ayo en su mocedad, por padre en su gobernación, por adalid en sus guerras, por guión en sus jornadas, por amigo en sus trabajos, por exemplo en sus virtudes, por maestro en sus ciencias, por blanco en sus deseeos y por competidor en sus hazañas’).

\textsuperscript{10} Mezzatesta, ‘Marcus Aurelius’, pp. 630-632.

\textsuperscript{11} Baldwin, ‘The Translation of Political Theory’, p. 112.

\textsuperscript{12} In the ‘Comiença el Prólogo’, Guevara argues that Aurelius is a native of Spain. Guevara, \textit{Relox de príncipes}, p. 44 (‘Tomé también motivo de escrevir deste Emperador Marco Aurelio, a causa que su naturaleza fue de España’).
Englishmen and would allow her Spanish husband to seize control because as a woman she was inferior in power to a man. The elevation of Spaniards seems even less logical in the Dutch translation (1578) of the Relox by Johan Baptist Houwaert (1533-1599), published ten years into the Dutch Revolt (1568-1648). As the revolt was started by people who were dissatisfied with the rule of Spaniards in particular, regarding them as Aurelian seemed out of the question. Besides, the dedicatee of the Dutch translation, William of Orange (1533-1584), had positioned himself as the revolt’s leader and the orchestrator of an extensive anti-Spanish propaganda campaign that cast his legitimate king Philip II and other high-ranking Spaniards as tyrants who had nothing in common with Aurelius.

Therefore, using the Relox de príncipes as a specula principum was not self-evident for these two dedicatees, as this would imply they also imitated princes who in varying degrees threatened their own rulership and/or country. In this chapter I will focus on how the specific ‘Spanishness’ of Marcus Aurelius was downplayed in translation, showing the various methods the translators used to transform Guevara’s mirror for princes of Spain into a more appropriate mirror for rulers of England and the Low Countries. The relationship each ruler had with actual Spanish princes influenced the way in which the translators appropriated the original Hispanophilic message of the Relox, questioning it by universalizing the audience of the Relox from princes of Spain to counsellors of princes in general or, more radically, overturning it completely by transforming the text into Hispanophobic propaganda.

*The Diall of Princes* (1557): A mirror for Mary’s English-speaking Privy Council

When Thomas North’s English translation of the Relox, the Diall of Princes, was published in December 1557, the dedicatee, Mary Tudor, had been prince of England for over four years. Still, her legitimacy as queen regnant of England continued to be under pressure after her accession in July 1553 due to the simple fact that she was a woman and therefore not educated to rule. Mary was raised with the idea that she was subordinate to men,

---

14 See Geurts, *De Nederlandse Opstand*; Harline, *Pamphlets, Printing*; Swart, ‘The Black Legend during the Eighty Years War’.
15 North’s dedication to Mary ends with the date ‘20 of Decembre’ (*North, Diall of Princes, Av*).
with silence and obedience as a women's ideal virtues. Her teacher Juan Luis Vives (1493-1540) deemed her male counsellors responsible for the government of the realm in the unlikely chance Mary would accede to the throne because state matters should be of no concern for women. When she did accede to the throne, Mary immediately made sure her power was equal to that of her Protestant predecessor Edward VI (1537-1553) in *The Act Concerning Regal Power* (1554), which declared that the imperial crown could be invested in both men and women. Yet, the extent of the imperial power of women was still under debate as well as the consequences of a queen regnant marrying an imperial power such as Spain. As marriage, a necessity for any monarch, traditionally made women subordinate to men, it was feared that by marrying Philip II, Mary would lose her claim to the crown and Philip would replace her as prince of England. To prevent this, it was carefully stipulated in the marriage contract between Mary and Philip that Philip would fulfil a subordinate role in the governance of England as a king consort. He was barred from appointing foreigners to positions in the English government, from drawing England into a war with France and from inheriting the English crown should Mary predecease Philip. *The Act Concerning Regal Power*, moreover, ensured that she wielded the same political authority over her husband as she did over her subjects. A final measure was Mary's continuous stress on the benefits of the match for both England and Catholic Christendom in general, fashioning Philip as powerless king consort whose main aim was the re-Catholicization of England and the fathering of an English heir to the throne. He was a fellow Englishman as the descendant of John of Gaunt (1340-1399) and therefore unable to be identified as a foreign tyrannical usurper.

Yet, on 7 June 1557, Philip defied these marriage stipulations by drawing England into the Italian War of 1551-1559 against the French king Henry II (1519-1559). He thereby took on the role of military leader of England, a masculine aspect of kingship Mary could not fulfil as a woman. Although

---

17 Whitelock, “A Queen, and by the Same Title, a King Also”, pp. 94-95; Duncan, *Mary I*, pp. 54, 58-59.
19 In pageants honouring Mary's mother, Catherine of Aragon (1501), and Mary's uncle, Charles V (1522), the shared descent of John of Gaunt, the fourth son of King Edward III of England (1327-1377), was also used to stress the familiar ties between English and Spanish royals. Richards, ‘Mary Tudor as “Sole Quene”’, p. 91.4, n. 101; Samson, ‘Changing Places’, p. 766; Streckfuss, “Spes Maxima Nostra”, pp. 145-157.
20 In martial sports, tournaments and ceremonies surrounding the Order of the Garter and the creation of knights in the first years of the Anglo-Spanish marriage, Philip also assumed
Philip's request was initially met with fierce opposition by Mary's Privy Council in March 1557, his war enjoyed widespread support amongst the nobility of England, and on 5 July 1557 Philip crossed the Channel with a force of 1200 horses, 4000 foot soldiers, 1500 pioneers and 200 minors. Men who previously had opposed Philip's accession as king consort of England by fighting in the Wyatt Rebellion (November 1553-February 1554) now rallied behind him to seek pardon and display their loyalty, accepting him as king of England. Yet, fears that Philip would no longer be satisfied with his role as king consort and would seize the English crown and usurp control of English government also emerged in 1557 after a 1555 rumour started circulating again that Mary was planning to crown Philip as her equal. In response, Protestant exile Thomas Stafford (1533-1557), who had earlier defied Mary's rule and the Spanish marriage by participating in the Wyatt Rebellion, invaded Scarborough Castle in April 1557 with a force of English and French rebels to depose Mary. He denounced the Spanish marriage, proclaimed Englishmen would be enslaved by Spaniards and argued that Mary was the ‘unrightful and unworthy Quene of England’ who showed herself ‘a whole Spanyarde, and no Englyshe woman, in loving Spanyardes, and hatinge Inglyshemen, inrichinge Spanyardes and robbinge Inglyshemen’.23

In 1557 therefore, Mary and Philip were princes of England, although their double nationalities as both English and Spanish and the division of female and masculine rulership in their shared reign obscured who was actually in charge. I argue that Thomas North's translation of the Relox as The Diall for Princes responded to this confusion by allocating the governance of England to a third, more trustworthy, party: Mary's Privy Council. The Privy Council, composed of experienced English male councillors who had served under her Protestant predecessor Edward VI (1537-1553), had been given the task to control Mary in Henry VIII's will and were considered by many to be the true princes of England.24

the masculine role of king regent and Mary the more passive role of queen consort. Duncan, “He to Be Intituled Kinge”, pp. 65, 69-70.


22 Duncan, Mary I, p. 136.

23 Hicks, 'Stafford, Thomas'; Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 516; Whitelock, “A Queen, and by the Same Title, a King Also”, p. 99.

24 Paul, ‘Sovereign Council or Counseled Sovereign’, p. 139.
The *Relox*, that was in fact known to advocate the importance of wise counsellors in the guidance of princes to virtue, stressed this even more profoundly in its English version. On the title page, in his dedication to Mary and the slightly altered following prologues by Guevara to Charles V, North emphasized that Guevara’s doctrine was not the exclusive property of princes but rather a useful guide to subjects who could improve England, his translation being both a ‘pledge of my bounden duty towards’ Mary as well as ‘a perpetual memory of the fervent zeale I beare to my country’. The title page stressed this sentiment by using a print of a monarch taking advice from his counsellors (see fig. 2.1) and by claiming that the book was ‘Ryght necessary and pleasaunt, to all gentylmen and others whiche are lovers of virtue’.26

North is even more explicit in his dedication to Mary, not including her in his intended audience. Although he does hope that Mary will accept Guevara’s ‘most profound and pleasaunt’ work and will encourage him to ‘attempt the like enterprise’ in the future, North argues that the ‘highe doctrine’ and ‘grave sentences’ of the book are meant for counsellors, historians, gentlemen and common people in general27:

![Figure 2.1](image_url)

Considering therefore (most gracious soveraigne Ladye) that this worke maye serve to hygh estates for counsell, to curious serchers of antiquityes, for knowledge, and to all other vertuous gentlemen for an honest, pleasaunte, and profitable recreation, and finallye that it maye profite all, and can hurte none: I (according to my small knowledge and tender years) have reduced it into oure vulgare tongue, and under your graces name have published it for the commodity of many.28

Finally, North also altered two prologues by Guevara, which originally argued the *Relox* was exclusive to princes and Charles V, in particular. In the title of the ‘Generall Prologue’ for instance, the translation of the ‘Prólogo General’, North added a sentence, making the *Diall* useful for princes and noble men who did not hail from Spain:

Comiença el *Prólogo General* sobre el libro llamado *Relox de príncipes, dirigido a la Sacra, Cessárea, Cathólica Magestad del Emperador y Rey*

26 Ibid., title page.
27 Ibid., p. Av.
28 Ibid.
Nuestro Señor don Carlos, Quinto deste nombre, por el Muy Reverendo y Magnífico Señor don Antonio de Guevara, Obispo de Guadix, Predicador y Coronista de Su Magestad. 29 (Emphasis added)

29 Guevara, Relax de príncipes, p. 8.
The Generall Prologue upon the Booke entytled, the *Diall of Princes*, with the famous booke of Marcus Aurelius. Compyled by the reverende Father in God, *Don Antony of Guevara*, Byshop of Guadix, Confessor, and Chronicler, of Charles the fyfte, Emperour of Rome, to whome, and to all other Princes and noble men, this worke was directed.\(^{30}\) (Emphasis added)

The ‘Argumento sobre la obra’ was altered as well. Whereas the original ended with a paragraph in which Guevara stressed his loyalty towards Charles V and the Spanish monarchy, North’s version removed that paragraph, ending the book with a short description of the three parts of the *Diall* in which the use of the *Diall* for princes in general is foregrounded.\(^{31}\)

It is important to note that North did not regard Mary as one of these princes. He addresses her as ‘Mooste hyghe and vertuouse Princesse’ in his dedication, thereby foregrounding that she, as a woman, was not included in North’s intended male audience of ‘princes’, counsellors, ‘noble men’ and ‘gentlemen’\(^{32}\). By not calling her a ‘prince’, he implied that the governance of her country was not solely in Mary’s hands, her counsellors being the main rulers of England instead. The same narrative is visible in *The castle of knowledge* (1556) by Robert Recorde, who also specifically called Mary a ‘princesse’ instead of prince in his dedication to her.\(^{33}\) He argues that Mary is ‘ayded with such prudent Councellars’, being only able to fulfil her role as first female monarch of England with the proper guidance.\(^{34}\) Perhaps this was one of the reasons why North was not successful in obtaining patronage from Mary for the *Diall*. Whereas people like James Cancellor, John Christopherson and John Proctor were richly rewarded by Mary with leases of land, bishoprics and high political positions when they called her ‘prince’ in their dedications and argued that she as sole monarch was both king and queen of England, North spent most of his life in Cambridge far away from court, standing accused of plagiarizing English translation (1535) of Guevara’s *Libro áureo* by John Bourchier (1467-1533).\(^{35}\)

\(^{30}\) North, *Diall of Princes*, p. Ar.


\(^{32}\) North, *Diall of Princes*, p. Ar.


\(^{34}\) Recorde, *The castle of knowledge*, p. A2v.

\(^{35}\) See *The Pathe of Obedience* (1553) by James Cancellor, *The historie of wyates rebellion* (1554) by John Proctor, and *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware rebellion* (1553) by John Christopherson. Bourchier’s translation was called *The Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius* (1535) and had reached its ninth edition in 1557 when North published his *Diall of Princes*. Samson, ‘Culture under Mary I and Philip’, p. 165; Schutte, *Mary I*, pp. 52-61; Underhill, *Spanish Literature*, pp. 118-119.
Nonetheless, the other prince of England, the Spanish Prince Philip II, was also not regarded as part of North’s audience. North does not mention the prince anywhere in the text, although, given the relationship of the prince to the origins of the book and North’s father, he would have been a more logical prince to dedicate the book to. Not only was the *Diall* the only Spanish work that North translated during the joint reign of Mary and Philip, but North had a personal connection with Philip II as well through his father Edward North (c. 1496-1564), who waited upon Philip II when he arrived in Southampton on 19 July 1554.36 The translation of a well-known Spanish book that venerated both Philip’s father Charles V and Philip II would therefore have been the perfect way for North to get into the new king’s good graces. That it could be profitable to translate Spanish books during Mary’s and Philip’s joint reign was in fact proven by Richard Eden (1521-1576) and his translation of Pedro Mártir de Anglería’s *De Orbe Novo Decades* (1511), *The Decades of the Newe Worlde or West India* (1555). He was appointed to a prominent position in Philip’s English treasury through the help of some Spanish nobles while he was working on the translation and showed his thanks in the Latin dedication of the final product, praising Philip and his Spanish predecessors extensively.37

In total, only five dedications were directed to Philip, always jointly with Mary. According to Valerie Schutte, who analysed all book dedications Mary received during her life time, this meant that Philip lacked power, having no revenue to distribute for patronage.38 Yet, Philip did have significant power when it came to Mary’s council, the Select Council to be exact, which was a separate institution formed after Mary had married Philip with the explicit purpose to involve her husband in the governance of England. The Select Council was headed by Philip II and had the exclusive rights to decide in ‘causes of great importance touching the honour, dignity, and status of the Crown’.39 After both Mary and Philip had been consulted about the decisions of this counsel and a course of action had been chosen, their decisions would finally reach parliament, meaning that the most important decisions fell to a council highly influenced by the decisions of a foreign king. Less momentous business was discussed by the Privy Council, who

38 Schutte, *Mary I*, pp. 113-114.
were also instructed to include Philip in their decisions, obliged to write notes in Latin or Spanish on all matters of state, which were delivered to the non-English-speaking king of England.40

Foregrounding that the text was ‘Englyshed’ and was reduced ‘into our vulgare tongue’ for the ‘commodity of many’ demonstrated that North had only English-speaking readers in mind for his book, excluding Philip II as well as those counsellors who willingly or unwillingly reported to the foreign king and made him part of the state’s decisions.41 England ought to be ruled by Englishmen and be free from Spanish intervention. This message became immediately evident from the engraving on the title page as well since the print alluded to a time in which Mary with her Spanish nature was regarded as unfit to rule England. The print was first used on the title page of The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancaster and Yorke (1548) by Edward Hall (1495-1547), popularly known as ‘Hall’s Chronicle’.42 The book argued that Henry VIII’s union with Mary’s Catholic mother Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536) had been legally invalid and that Mary was a bastard without any rights to claim the English crown.43 In this view Edward VI was the only legal successor of Henry VIII and was imagined as the ideal Protestant prince who would continue the Henrician Protestant reformation of England. Mary immediately banned the book when she acceded to the throne due to its strong Protestant content and the attack on her own legitimacy and burned it as seditious and heretical.44 Although we do not know whether she recognized the print used in the Diall, selected by her own royal printer, the connection with her Protestant predecessor and his counsellors would probably be clear to the attentive reader. The overall print suggested that control of the country should ideally rest in the hands of the English-speaking Privy Council and not in those of the Spanish-speaking Select Council ruled by a Spaniard, which Mary particularly approved.45

40 Paul, ‘Sovereign Council or Counseled Sovereign’, pp. 140-143.
41 North, Diall of Princes, p. Av.
42 It also appeared in the 1549 and 1552 editions of the Boke of common prayer by Richard Grafton, James Peele’s account book The maner and fourme how to kepe a perfect reconyng after the order of the most worthie and notable accompte (1553), the 1555 and 1559 edition of Annis Regis Henrici Septimi Quibus accesserunt and in the 1561 edition of The workes of Geffrey Chaucer.
Milenus Clachte (1578): An Aurelian rebel leader as judge of tyrannical Spanish governors

North took his chances when he presented his view of the correct governance of England to Queen Mary Tudor. Although he retained the original form of the Spanish specula principum, he changed the framing of the book, making the wisdom of Marcus Aurelius especially appropriate for counsellors of princes instead of princes of Spain. Not the queen, the ‘princesse’ of England, but those men who counselled her in the ‘vulgare tongue’ were the new Marcus Aurelii. North therefore had no problem with the content of the Relox or the Spanish author himself, praising both extensively in his dedication to Mary. ‘Don Antony of Guevara’ should be rewarded with the greatest fame for his ‘holsome doctrine’ as:

there is no Auctor (the sacred letters set aparte) that more effectuously setteth out the omnipotencie of God, the frailty of men, the inconstancie of Fortune, the vanity of this worlde, the miserie of this life, and finally that more plainly teacheth the good, whiche mortal men ought to pursue, and the evil that al men ought to flye.

North therefore translated the Relox faithfully when he ‘Englysed’ it, changing only the passages in which solely the prince of Spain Charles V was regarded as Marcus Aurelius. In contrast, Johan Baptista Houwaert did anything but treat the material of the Relox faithfully, using only a selection of the original Relox in his Milenus Clachte (Milenus’s complaint, 1578). This selection envisioned Marcus Aurelius not as a good Christian, husband or father but solely as a responsible ruler who listened to his subjects when they complained about tyrannical governors who ruled in Aurelius’s name. In this guise, Aurelius was irreconcilable with the previous Marcus Aurelii of the Relox, the princes of Spain Charles V and Philip II, who in the eyes of their subjects in the Low Countries had not paid heed to requests for relaxation of the severe anti-heretical laws or ‘bloody statutes’ (‘bloedplakkaten’). After the nobility of the Low Countries had offered a smeekschrift (plea of mercy) in 1566 to their current governor, Margaretha of Parma (1522-1586), as a last peaceful resort to stop this suppression of the Protestant faith in the Low

46 North, Diall of Princes, p. Ar.
48 North, Diall of Princes, title page.
Countries, Philip II sent a new governor to the Low Countries together with a Spanish army. This governor, the Duke of Alba, quickly became known for his tyrannical governance through the establishment of the Council of Troubles or ‘Bloody Council’ ('Bloedraad') in 1567 and through the drastic fiscal reform of the Low Countries by the plans to impose new taxes such as the ‘tenth penny’ ('tiende penningh'). In pamphlets and prints vices such as cruelty, haughtiness, ambition and tyranny were attributed to Alba, and he was portrayed as the destroyer of the peace of the Low Countries through his pillaging of the countryside and the raping and murdering of its inhabitants with his Spanish soldiers.49

Alba was also characterized as a tyrant who deemed himself the equal or even superior to his Spanish king, taking the throne of the Low Countries for himself.50 This image was particularly inspired by the life-size statue of himself that Alba commissioned from Jacques Jonghelinck (1530-1606) for the Antwerp citadel. The statue (see fig. 2.2), erected in 1571, was a war trophy, being made from ‘the bronze of the cannon captured by Alva in his victory over the rebel troops led by count Louis of Nassau (1538-1574), William of Orange’s brother, in the battle of Jemmingen in July 1568’.51 It depicted Alba both as general of the Spanish troops – trampling the Dutch rebels represented as a two-headed heretical monster – and as the legitimate governor of the Low Countries, using Aurelian symbolism to foreground his wise rulership.52 It was Alba who safeguarded the peace and justice of the realm by crushing the Dutch heretical rebels, fashioning himself as a ruler instead of a servant to a ruler.53

Of course, in the eyes of the rebels, he did the exact opposite, tyrannizing the Low Countries with cruel anti-Protestant policies. Spanish contemporaries also condemned the statue, deeming it inappropriate for Alba, a mere servant of the king, to glorify himself as a ruler like Marcus Aurelius. As a result, the statue, symbolizing Alba’s proud and tyrannical nature, was quickly removed after Luis de Zúñiga y Requesens (1528-1576) succeeded Alba as governor and was satirized in Dutch anti-Spanish propaganda.54

49 Luna, Een ondraaglijk juk, pp. 103-106. See also the cover illustration of this volume with Alba as Tyran devouring children.
52 He is portrayed with the well-known Aurelian gesture of extending the right arm with the palm held downwards.
54 It is not clear what happened exactly to the statue after Requesens removed it. It was probably melted down although there is also a story that the rebels heroically demolished it when they conquered the Antwerp citadel. Becker, ‘Hochmut kommt vor dem Fall’, pp. 86-87; Horst, ‘The Duke of Alba’, p. 134.
Figure 2.2  Seventeenth-century engraving of the statue of the Duke of Alba

Courtesy the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam
In a print of 1572, for instance, the Alba statue, encouraged by Death and a devilish Pope, no longer tramples a monster but 'justice' (‘gherechticheyt’), ‘truth’ (‘waerheyt’), ‘widows’ (‘wedewe’) and ‘orphans’ (‘weese’) while praising himself for his valour and wisdom. It foregrounded Alba’s hypocrisy, his self-attributed guise as the wise Marcus Aurelius being nothing but a sham to oppress the innocent.55

As Houwaert himself had experienced Alba’s tyrannical oppression in 1568 when he spent a year in the prison of the castle of Brussels for his sympathy for the Reformed Protestant faith, he could not reiterate a narrative in which Spanish princes like Philip II, who had installed this tyrannical governor, would be identified with Marcus Aurelius.56 He therefore offered this role to William of Orange, the rebel leader of the Dutch Revolt who actively opposed the tyrannical rule of the Duke of Alba. Orange received the first copy of the *Milenus Clachte* on New Year's Eve of 1576, a version with beautiful calligraphy, which is now kept in the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Bremen.57 Orange was quite possibly also the patron of the *Milenus Clacht* as no fewer than 1600 exemplars were printed and distributed in 1578.58 In Houwaert’s dedication to Orange, he was branded as a second Aurelius who could free the Low Countries from the tyrannical Spanish rule, restoring the peace in the Low Countries as Aurelius had restored the laws and policies in the Donau:

In the way Aurelius the laws and policies,
Restored in the Donau,
Will you destroy here this tyranny,
O illustrious Count of Nassouwen,
And will you through wisdom, and virtue full of loyalty
Triumph over your enemies,
And will you banish those who oppress us,
And will this land flourish in peace.59

55 *Spotprent op het standbeeld van Alva.*
56 It is during this confinement that Houwaert probably became familiar with the work of Guevara and started to prepare his adaptation. Bock, *Johan Baptista Houwaert*, p. 6; Vosters, *Antonio de Guevara y Europa*, p. 276.
59 Houwaert, *Milenus Clachte*, p. Aiiir (‘Soo Aurelius die Wetten en Policije / Redresseerde in Danubij landouven, / O doorluchtighe Grave van Nassouwen, / En sult door u wijsheyt, en deught vol trouwen / Over u vyanden triumpheren, noch, / En van hier verdryven die ons benouwen, / En in ruste des landen doen floeren, noch’).
This framework of tyrannical Spaniards whose behaviour had to be punished is embedded in the entire adaptation of the *Milenus Clachte*, which in fact has so little resemblance to the original *Relox* that it should be defined as an adaptation rather than a translation. Although in total 78 per cent of *Milenus Clachte* was based on the original Spanish *Relox*, the changes were so significant that the text became almost unrecognizable. First of all, Houwaert changed the title of the work, presenting the book not as a mirror for princes but as a complaint about tyrannical rulership. The work now focused on ‘the great tyranny of the Romans’, on ‘how destructive the tyrannous governors are’ and on diverse ‘classical scenes, in which the godless governments of tyrants are clearly described, together with the right means to govern a land in prosperity’.\(^{60}\) The analogy with current times was obvious. Secondly, the three prologues to Charles V were replaced by a dedication to William of Orange and a dedicatory poem by Willem van Haecht (1530-1612) to Houwaert, completely obliterating the name of Charles V. The book was divided into three parts, and the original prose of the *Relox* was transformed into verse, expressed in 24 poems. Four of these poems focused on Marcus Aurelius, in particular.\(^{61}\) In addition, seven poems were originals by Houwaert.\(^{62}\) The total of 31 poems discussed various examples of both exemplary and tyrannical rulers and the necessity of being faithful to the former.\(^{63}\) Furthermore, neither the original author, Antonio de Guevara, nor the original title of Houwaert’s Spanish source are mentioned anywhere in the book. Although Houwaert does admit that his work is not completely original, arguing that William of Orange possibly has read the book already in a different language, it is still recommended by Orange’s main advisor, Philips Marnix of Saint-Aldegonde (1540-1598), as a cure for depression.\(^{64}\) Chances that William of Orange was in fact familiar with the original book were quite high since he was educated at the court of Charles V in Brussels from 1545 until 1551 and was friends with Henry of Brederode (1531-1568),

\(^{60}\) Ibid., title page (‘Milenus Clachte, Waer inne de groote tirannye der Romeynen verhaelt, ende den handel desen tegenwoordighen tyt claerlijck ontdect wordt. Met ghelijcke Clachte, Vanden Ambassadeur der Hebreen vermelende hoe schadelijck, de tirannighe gouverneurs sijn. D’Antijcke Tafereelen, Daer in men claerlijck gheschildert ende beschreven siet de godloose regeringe der tirannen, midsgaders den rechten middel om dlant in goeden voorspoet te gouverneren’).

\(^{61}\) I started counting from the poem ‘Milenus’s Complaint’. He appears in poems 1, 4-5 and 28.


\(^{63}\) Poems which are critical of rulers are poems 1-7, 9-13, 15-18, 21, 23, 25-26. Poems 8, 14, 19, 24 and 27-31 are about exemplary rulers while poems concerning religion are poems 20 and 22.

who possessed the French translations of Guevara's *Relox de príncipes* and *Libro áureo* in his library in his castle at Vianen, a place Orange frequently visited with other nobles.\textsuperscript{65}

The various tyrants in the *Milenus Clachte* all resembled the Duke of Alba, sharing his occupation as governor or his vices. The first tyrant is a tyrannical governor, installed by Marcus Aurelius to govern the Donau in his place. His tyrannical rule is exposed in the poem ‘Milenus's Complaint’ by a simple farmer from the Donau named Milenus who has travelled to Rome on behalf of his people. The poem follows the storyline of the Spanish original closely, with the distinction that Houwaert attributes more vices to the Romans than Guevara, who primarily concentrates on the arrogance of the Romans.\textsuperscript{66} They are not only arrogant but also exhibit Black Legend traits like bloodthirstiness, greediness and tyranny, destroying every country they conquer. Their leaders, governors who act like evil judges, destroy the ‘privileges’ (‘*privilegien*’) and ‘country laws’ (‘*t’slandts prejuditie*’) in the process.\textsuperscript{67} Although Alba's name is not mentioned anywhere in the poem, the complaints made against him and his soldiers are similar to those made by Milenus to Aurelius about the governor, who is accused of constantly violating the laws and privileges of the people of the Low Countries.\textsuperscript{68} Not for nothing was the poem introduced as ‘a beautiful example in these worrisome times’ (‘een schoon exempel in dees benauwe tijen’), allegorically describing the Netherlandish struggle against the Spanish enemy.\textsuperscript{69}

The other poems had to be read in a similar vein and imbedded allusions to the Dutch Revolt. The poem ‘The Hebrew Ambassador’, for instance, like the poem ‘Milenus's Complaint’, closely followed the Spanish original and focused on an oppressed subject (a Hebrew ambassador from Judea) who pleads to the senate of Rome for the removal of his tyrannical governor (Valerius Graco) and argues that this governor has installed ‘Statutes that are impossible to endure, and enacted with violence’.\textsuperscript{70} Houwaert alludes here to the severe anti-heretical laws or ‘bloody statutes’ (‘*bloedplakkaten*’) as they were popularly called, punishing those who


\textsuperscript{66} Guevara, *Relox de príncipes*, pp. 634-651.

\textsuperscript{67} Houwaert, *Milenus Clachte*, pp. 27, 34, 37.

\textsuperscript{68} Duke, ‘The Use of “Privileges”’, pp. 18-19.


\textsuperscript{70} Guevara, *Relox de príncipes*, pp. 676-680; Houwaert, *Milenus Clachte*, p. 68 (‘Placcaten die onmogelijk zijn te verdragen, / En diemen met fortsen observeren doet’).
violated the laws with imprisonment and/or execution. Yet, the most direct allusion to the Dutch Revolt can be found in one of Houwaert’s original poems, ‘The Complaint of Belgica’, which depicted the Spanish Fury of 4 November 1576 in Antwerp.\textsuperscript{71} Although this poem was not based on Guevara’s \textit{Relox}, the same theme as discussed in ‘Milenus’s Complaint’ and ‘The Hebrew Ambassador’ is used: the oppression of a country by a ‘bloodthirsty tyrant’ (‘\textit{bloetghierich tyrant}’).\textsuperscript{72} In the poem, Antwerp, allegorized as the virgin Belgica, speaks up about her current misery. While she previously was living a prosperous life, she is now suffering from ‘innumerable plagues’ (‘\textit{ontallijke plaghen’}), and being torn apart by her enemies:\textsuperscript{73}

\begin{quote}
The country destroyers have devoured my heart,
And her adherents my intestines.
Destruction has taken my body with multiple cuts,
My enemies steal all with deceitful tricks,
So that I cannot hold on money, goods, jewellery or house.
And there is also a bloodthirsty tyrant,
Who wants to rip me apart to the bone with violence.\textsuperscript{74}
\end{quote}

To further emphasize these cruelties, Houwaert added a woodcut by Antwerp printmaker Antoni van Leest (c. 1545-1592), which showed how Antwerp was pillaged, raped and murdered by Spanish soldiers.\textsuperscript{75} The burning city of Antwerp showed the cruel and destructive nature of the Spaniard.

Therefore, all the poems taken together showed that the prince of Spain and Spaniards in general could no longer be considered as Aurelian exemplars. They had become tyrannical governors instead, whom the new Aurelian exemplar, William of Orange, had to destroy. Orange was even considered to be superior to Marcus Aurelius if we believe Houwaert’s account of Orange’s reception by the locals in Brussels in 1579. Houwaert compared his reception with that of Aurelius, Scipio and Julius after they returned to Rome, claiming in \textit{Declaratie van die triumphante Incompest}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{71} Houwaert, \textit{Milenus Clachte}, pp. 133-136; other original poems are poems 12, 19-22, 27 and 29.  
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., p. 135.  
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid. (‘T’slants verdervers hebben verslont mijn herte, / En haer adherenten mijn inghewant. / Destructie hout my in t’lijf menighe kerte. / Mijn vijanden roovent al met loose perte, / Dat ick en behouwe ghelt, goet, juweel noch pant. / En dan esser noch een bloetghierich tyrant, / Die my met ghewelt totten been wilt verscheuren’).  
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., p. 133; Waterschoot, \textit{Schouwende fantasye}, p. 124.
\end{flushright}
vanden Prince van Oraingien that the many tears of happiness which were shed at Orange's arrival proved that his reception was superior to those of these Roman emperors.\textsuperscript{76}

No one's property: Aurelius as universal exemplar

Antonio de Guevara's bestseller \textit{Relox de príncipes} presented its readers with a wise ruler and an ideal exemplar, inspiring for anybody who wanted to improve himself or his country. As shown by both translators, Aurelius's wisdom was not exclusive only to princes or to the country in which his wise deeds were written down. He could be useful for counsellors, rebel leaders and even people who did not occupy prominent positions as rulers, as becomes evident from the later Dutch translation of the \textit{Relox}.\textsuperscript{77} In the same vein, in \textit{Den vorstelijken last-hof ende Morghenwecker} (1617) translated by D.W.C., all inhabitants of the Dutch Republic were advised to use Guevara's book as a source to improve their virtue, thereby elevating the Dutch Republic in general. Together with Maurice of Orange (1567-1625), William's son and the dedicatee of the translation, they had to establish 'the tranquillity, peace and unity of our common fatherland' and free it once and for all from Spanish rule.\textsuperscript{78}

As a universal figure, therefore, Aurelius could be employed by anyone, including those who might not completely agree with the identification of Aurelius with Spanish rulers. His Spanish guise did not influence the appropriation of the Aurelius figure itself and did not deter narratives in which the initial Hispanophilic imagery was transformed into a more neutral or less positive imagery which was more appropriate to its adopting country. Whether the text was neutralized by transforming it primarily into a book for counsellors, thinking it no harm to acknowledge the original author of the text and the circumstances in which it was produced, or whether it was turned upside down by transforming it into anti-Spanish propaganda, changing it so significantly that almost no connection could be made to the Spanish original, we can say that the wisdom of Aurelius and that of his author Guevara were deemed as no one's exclusive property. In this way, the \textit{Relox}

\textsuperscript{76} Houwaert, \textit{Declaratie van die triumphante Incompst}, pp. 53-54 (‘Tot vele plaetsen daer [...] zeer beghierden Prince’).

\textsuperscript{77} This translation was in fact a translation of the \textit{Relox} and not an adaptation like Houwaert’s \textit{Milenus Clachte}. It was based on the German translation of the \textit{Relox}, the \textit{Fürstlichen Weckuhr und Lustgartens} (1599) by Aegidius Albertinus (1560-1620), Vosters, \textit{Antonio de Guevara y Europa}, pp. 547-553.

\textsuperscript{78} D.W.C., \textit{Den vorstelijken last-hof}, vv.
could have Hispanophilic and Hispanophobic interpretations, exemplifying foremost how versatile the afterlife of Spanish literature in Europe could be.
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3. **Between Love and Hate: Thomas Scott’s Puritan Propaganda and His Interest in Spanish Culture**

*Ernesto E. Oyarbide Magaña*

**Abstract**

In 1612 Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, first count of Gondomar, was appointed Spanish ambassador to London, where he proved essential for the fostering of Anglo-Spanish relations and promoted the marriage negotiations between the Prince of Wales and the Spanish Infanta. However, when in 1623 these negotiations failed, popular animosity reached a high point. This chapter focuses on some of the most poignant anti-Spanish propaganda produced against Gondomar by the Protestant preacher Thomas Scott (d. 1626). [...] Nonetheless, premodern propaganda did not lack interpretative complexity. Behind the hateful disparagements, a dash of admiration for Sarmiento’s diplomacy is tangible. Moreover, one can also appreciate Scott engaging with Spanish culture.

**Keywords:** Propaganda, Thomas Scott, first Count of Gondomar, Anglo-Spanish relations, print culture

**Introduction**

In 1659, the clergyman John Rowland published a tract based on some historical events from the times of King James. The pamphlet bore the

---

*This chapter was written with the support of the I + D + i Research Project ‘Poder y representaciones culturales en la época moderna: agentes diplomáticos como mediadores culturales de la Edad Moderna (siglos XVI-XVIII)’ funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (MICINN) (Reference: HAR2016-78304-C2-2-P).*
name of *A Choice Narrative of Count Gondamor* [sic].¹ It was presented as an unpublished work by the late great antiquary, Sir Robert Cotton, and denounced all the ‘evil plots’ undertaken by Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, first count of Gondomar, who was Spanish ambassador to London from 1613 to 1622.² *A Choice Narrative* makes accusations against Gondomar’s role in the case for Catholic toleration and denounces the pro-Spanish policies of the early Stuarts. More than 30 years after his embassy, the Spaniard was still remembered in England.

When Rowland’s tract is analysed more closely, one discovers that this text is, in fact, a version of a work written by the Protestant preacher Thomas Scott. The original pamphlet was published in 1620 as *Vox Populi, or Newes from Spain*.³ Even though Rowland’s tract shows small alterations from the original, it remains faithful to its predecessor in spirit. Among the many concerns presented in Rowland’s revival of old political wounds, one stands out for its peculiarity. The text presents a Gondomar who brags about his book-collecting activities:

> Besides, I have made it a principall part of my imployment, to buy all the manuscripts & other ancient and rare Authors out of the hands of the Heretiques, so that there is no great Scholler dies in the land, but my Agents are dealing with his bookes. […] [F]or I would labour what I might this way or any other way to disarme them, and eyther to translate their best authors hither, or at least to leave none in the hands of any but Romane Catholiques who are assuredly ours.⁴

These lines are not original, as they were first published in Thomas Scott’s *Vox Populi*. During the early 1620s, the Protestant preacher was very concerned about Gondomar’s collecting practices; and even though it was more difficult to connect this activity with a direct threat to England, he transformed what might have seemed like a private pastime into a political matter. Considering that *A Choice Narrative* was a revised version of the original text, published decades after the events, it is noteworthy to see John Rowland replicating Scott’s apprehensions about a private practice after

---

¹ Scott, *A Choice Narrative of Count Gondamor’s Transactions*.
² Sarmiento was given the title of first count of Gondomar by Philip III in 1617. However, for the sake of clarity, and because that is how he came to be known, this chapter will refer to him either as Sarmiento or Gondomar, regardless of the year.
³ See Scott, *Vox Populi, or Newes from Spayne*.
⁴ Scott, *A Choice Narrative of Count Gondamor’s Transactions*. 
so many years. Still, as is the case with most effective propaganda, both *Vox Populi* and *A Choice Narrative* used facts that were true. Even though it would be an exaggeration to claim that Gondomar managed to obtain all of England's books, he did come to see his library as an invaluable tool for statesmanship.

Once deemed by John Elliott as Spain's 'greatest specialist in English affairs', Gondomar became one of the most important conduits of English news to Madrid during the Anglo-Spanish peace of the early seventeenth century. Gondomar's diplomatic skills made of him a notable figure in England. However, this same prowess also gained him many enemies. Whilst in London, he collected different types of English sources as part of his information-gathering strategy: portraits and maps, intercepted letters, manuscript reports and printed books. In other studies, I address how the Spaniard collected English documents and used his library within the context of his diplomacy. For the moment, suffice to say that during the period contemporary observers noted their surprise regarding Sarmiento's remarkable knowledge about English matters. The letter writer John Chamberlain, for instance, would claim that 'no man knowes the length of our foot so well as he'. On a similar note, the writer Alexander Leighton would express how the Spaniard 'had so easily entered into the cabinet of our secrets, where he lay so long like an old rat, feeding on a parmisan'. However, in this chapter, I aim to look at the other side of the coin. If manuscripts and printed documents played an important part in the Spanish ambassador's diplomatic strategy, those who opposed King James's pro-Spanish policies also used visual and textual media to advance their causes. These authors produced a series of publications against Gondomar and used this slander campaign to warn the English public about the perils of associating with

---

5 John Rowland was an English clergyman who was very active in the intellectual debates of the last years of the Interregnum (1649-1660). He also contributed to the defence of the Church of England against Puritan dissenters and other opponents before and after the Restoration of the monarchy in the British Islands in 1660. It is quite telling that Rowland decided to publish a pamphlet that criticized the pro-Spanish policies of James I during a period when the restoration of the Stuart monarchy was being discussed. For more information about Rowland, see Neilson, 'John Rowland'.


7 See Oyarbide, 'Embodying the Portrait of the Perfect Ambassador', pp. 157-185.


Spain and tolerating Catholicism. Rowland’s republishing of attacks against Sarmiento is only one example of a negative view that remained firmly set in the English imagination for centuries, to the point that in Gardiner’s History of England, written at the end of the nineteenth century, one can still see echoes of Gondomar’s alleged Machiavellian scheming against England and Protestantism, an idea greatly popularized by Scott’s publications.  

Much as with the case of the English King Richard III, interpretations about the Spaniard underwent considerable reassessment during the second half of the twentieth century. However, one can still learn a great deal about this interpretative shift, especially in the context of the Black Legend. 

This chapter will focus on influential anti-Spanish propaganda produced by the Protestant preacher Thomas Scott. It will analyse how his Vox Populi pamphlets rendered a negative view of the Spanish ambassador during the 1620s and, in the process, provided inspiration for Thomas Middleton’s A Game at Chess, one of the most successful plays of the Jacobean period. Both play and pamphlets produced a negative image of Gondomar and Spain that would prove pervasive. Nonetheless, as this chapter will show, the literary and historical obsession against the Spanish ambassador did not lack interpretative complexity. After all, behind the hateful disparagements of these works, one can observe a dash of admiration for Gondomar’s political prowess. What is more, in a similar strategy to the one deployed by Gondomar during his embassy, one can appreciate that Scott also engaged with Spanish culture.

Thomas Scott the pamphleteer

In 1612, Diego Sarmiento de Acuña was appointed Spanish ambassador to London. During the following ten years, Gondomar proved essential for the

10 Gardiner, History of England. For more information about early modern historiographical accounts on Gondomar, see Sánchez Cantón, Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña. Also see Carter, The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, pp. 120-133.
11 Among the scholarly works produced during the past hundred years, Mattingly’s study, Renaissance Diplomacy, and Carter’s book, The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, proved to be very efficient in conveying a new reading of Gondomar and Spanish diplomacy that did not fall prey to the tendency of vilifying this Spanish ambassador. Subsequent scholars have also held this alternative interpretation in their studies. See Loomie, Spain and the Early Stuarts; Tobío, Gondomar y Los Católicos Ingleses; Hillgarth, The Mirror of Spain; Bouza, Corre Manuscrito; Redworth, The Prince and the Infanta.
12 For an up-to-date study of the Black Legend, see Rodríguez Pérez et al., España ante sus críticos.
protection of English Catholics and the prevention of piracy in the Americas. He also succeeded in keeping England initially neutral during the Thirty Years’ War through the promise of an Anglo-Spanish royal match between Prince Charles and the Infanta, María.13 However, during the early 1620s, as the Palatinate crisis gradually escalated, anti-Spanish sentiment grew. In 1623, after years of tedious negotiations, the Spanish Match finally reached a dead end, following Prince Charles’s return from Madrid. Animosity reached a high point in London. During these crucial years, English streets were filled with denunciatory pamphlets.14 Thomas Scott’s *Vox Populi* series are among the most influential literary productions that resulted from these political events.

While Scott has often been seen as the foremost polemicist of the 1620s, the details surrounding his life are mostly obscure.15 Born somewhere around the 1580s, he was possibly the son of a Norfolk cleric, though at times he is also referred to as Scottish. His first appearance in any record is in Scotland in 1618, when he enrolled at St Andrews to study theology. During the first half of 1619, Scott had already written *Vox Populi*. He managed to publish it in November 1620.16 The pamphlet tried to pass as a translated report delivered by Gondomar to the Council of State in Madrid in 1618, just after he returned from his first London embassy. In this document, Scott plays with the stereotypes of the times by presenting Sarmiento as a boastful Spanish figure. His fictional ambassador recounts the efforts to subvert the English government and describes in great detail how crowds would flock to mass in his London chapel. In the text, one can also see the Spaniard bragging about his role in the relaxation of anti-Catholic laws, the bribing of the king’s ministers, the banning of decent Protestant preaching and the creation of Popish propaganda. Most notably, the Spanish ambassador reports his success in procuring the execution of Sir Walter Raleigh. Scott’s pamphlet then explains how, as a result of all these accomplishments, Gondomar is congratulated by Spanish authorities and praised for contributing to the realization of a Hispanic

---

13 Redworth, ‘Sarmiento de Acuña’.
14 See Álvarez Recio, ‘Pamphlet Literature’.
15 Up-to-date information about Thomas Scott is scarce. This chapter is greatly indebted to Alec Ewing’s study of Thomas Scott’s life and writings, which provides valuable information that is not included in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Ewing’s study gives a list of works that can be attributed with certainty to Scott, and it has allowed me to select the pamphlets where the Spanish ambassador takes centre stage. See Ewing, *A Tongue-Combat betweene Two English Souldiers*.
16 Kelsey, ‘Thomas Scott’.
universal monarchy. In this way, the Protestant preacher played with the fears shared by many European powers about the possibility of Spanish political supremacy.

Apparently taken for a true report, *Vox Populi* caused outrage and prompted an energetic hunt for its then anonymous author. At some point the printing of the pamphlet was halted, but it was still distributed in manuscript to the public. The author’s identity was discovered only at the beginning of 1621, but by that time Scott had already gone into hiding. He then reappeared in the Netherlands, and in 1622 he became a minister in Utrecht. Scott appears never to have returned to England.\(^{17}\) Some decades later, John Rowland would also have to take refuge in the Netherlands for his political opinions.\(^ {18}\) Thus, in both cases, these authors contributed to the English Black Legend through active pamphleteering carried out from the safety of the United Provinces. In the case of Thomas Scott, both the first *Vox Populi*, published in 1620, and the subsequent *Second Part of Vox Populi*, published in 1624, showcase the Protestant preacher’s strong anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish feelings. These works are presented to the reader as true accounts extracted and translated from high-profile council deliberations held at the Spanish court. There are some differences, however, in the use of images and the tone of the news. The first *Vox Populi* used few engravings and was written in a worrying tone that warns against Spanish threats to England amid a political environment concerned about the upcoming break of the Spanish Truce with the Dutch and the beginning of the Palatinate Crisis. *The Second Part of Vox Populi*, on the other hand, was written after Prince Charles’s return to London, marking a definite failure for the Spanish Match and pro-Spanish policies. The tone of this second libel is therefore more triumphant for the anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish causes.\(^ {19}\) It is within this more optimistic attitude that the content and iconography of the second pamphlet can be best understood. In contrast to the sober presentation of the first version, the title page in *The Second Part of Vox Populi* provides a full-body portrait of Gondomar.\(^ {20}\)

A laudatory reading of this diplomat could be inferred from that depiction, were it not for the presence of a chair with a hole. Gondomar was known to suffer from rectal fistula, making it necessary for him to have

\(^{17}\) Ibid.
\(^{18}\) Neilson, ‘John Rowland’.
\(^{19}\) See Scott, *The Second Part of Vox Populi*.
\(^{20}\) Ibid., frontispiece.
Figure 3.1  Portrait of the first count of Gondomar by Willem de Passe (1622)

Courtesy the Biblioteca Nacional de España. ER/244, f. 1
access to special seating. Two Latin inscriptions accompany the illustration, and both can either be taken at face value or be understood as sardonic remarks: *Gentis Hispanae decus* (Distinguished ornament of the peoples of Spain) and *Simul Complectar omnia* (roughly translated to ‘I will successfully accomplish everything’). Within this pamphlet, another image portrays a gathering of Church officials and Spanish eminent nobles or *grandes*, among whom Gondomar is included. They meet in Seville in order to hold a ‘Spanishe Parliament’. A small, smiling devil takes centre stage in the seat where the king should have been expected to preside. Another Latin inscription reads *Ingentibus exidit ausis* (Fallen in the execution of bold deeds).²¹

Both the first and second *Vox Populi* became well known in London’s underground world. The connection between these pamphlets and Middleton’s *A Game at Chess* has been widely studied.²² This drama satirizes the unhappy outcome of the Spanish Match by telling the story of the White Knight (Prince Charles) and his voyage to the Black Kingdom (Spain), where he cleverly uncovers the plots of the Black Knight (Gondomar). Middleton could have drawn his very first inspiration for *A Game at Chess* from a quote in the second *Vox Populi*. Certainly, at the beginning of the pamphlet, Scott describes Prince Charles as a ‘pretious a pawne’ that managed to escape from Spanish hands.²³ In addition, passages from the play are almost a literal copy from the second *Vox Populi*, such as when the Black Knight boasts about his knowledge of England:

> Pray what use put I my summer recreation to?  
> But more to inform my knowledge in the state  
> And strength of the White Kingdom! No fortification,  
> Haven, Creek, landing-place ’bout the White coast  
> But I got draught and platform, learned the depth  
> Of all their channels, knowledge of all sands,  
> Shelves, rocks, and rivers for invasion prop’rest,  
> (4.2.58–64).²⁴

²¹ Ibid., p. 1.  
²³ Scott, *The Second Part of Vox Populi*, p. 2.  
²⁴ I use Harper’s 1966 edition of Middleton’s *A Game at Chess*, which relies heavily on the Trinity College and Bridgewater-Huntington manuscripts. Spelling and capitalizations have been modernized, following the decision of the published edition. See Middleton, *A Game at Chess*. 
Thomas Scott’s Gondomar gives an almost identical account:

I had perfect knowledge of the estate of the whole Land: for there was no Fortification, Hauen, Creeke, or Landing place about the Coast of England, but I got a platforme and draught thereof, I learned the depth of all their Channels, I was acquainted with all Sands, Shelves, Rocks, Rivers that might impeach or make for invasion.25

According to Spanish sources, A Game at Chess was first performed in August 1624 for an unprecedented nine days in a row with an average audience of around 3000 per enactment. After learning about the play’s plot, Spanish authorities strongly protested against it and King James ordered its removal. A contemporary account by the then Spanish ambassador, Carlos Coloma, leaves no doubt about the true identity of Middleton’s Black Knight:

The subject of the play is a game of chess, with white houses and black houses. [...] [T]he Count of Gondomar, who, [is] brought on to the stage in his little litter almost to the life, and [is] seated on his chair with a hole in it (they said), confessed all the treacherous actions with which he had deceived and soothed the king of whites.26

It is in this context that I wish to emphasize how Middleton’s Black Knight was rhetorically indebted to Thomas Scott. Contemporary accounts reveal to us that the performance of A Game at Chess followed almost systematically the characterization already provided not only by the texts of the Vox Populi pamphlets but also its iconographic rendering of Gondomar through his clothing, the chair with a hole, the litter, etc. The importance of this decision should not be underestimated. Indeed, as Stallybrass has remarked, during the early modern period clothes could be imagined as retaining the identity and form of the wearer.27 The association of the Black Knight with the Spanish ambassador was carefully executed through dramatic props and imagery, along with textual cues. With the appearance of early

25 Scott, The Second Part of Vox Populi, p. 15.
quarto editions of *A Game at Chess* a year later, one can appreciate how the negative image originally created by Thomas Scott gradually become part of English popular memory.\(^{28}\) Nonetheless, as previously mentioned, these literary and visual characterizations had their own interpretative complexity. Just as previous scholars have remarked about Middleton’s *A Game at Chess*, the figure of Gondomar proves too central to the play to deem it a mere satirical target. As theatre specialists have long known, villains can sometimes steal the show, and satirical caricatures, too, can sometimes unintentionally offer a figure worthy of admiration.\(^{29}\) Shakespeare’s Richard III is a perfect contemporary parallel example of this unexpected dramatic effect. In the end, Middleton’s villain ends up becoming larger than life and a complete disapproval of his deeds becomes impossible in the drama. A similar situation comes into play when one considers Scott’s second *Vox Populi* pamphlets where the Protestant preacher eventually calls Gondomar a *grande* of Spain.\(^{30}\) In addition, if one takes the time to analyse the print culture of the period, one is bound to realize that Scott made use of an originally laudatory portrait in order to subvert the image of the Spanish ambassador. In 1622 the London-based Dutch artist Willem de Passe produced an image of Gondomar. This engraving showcased a dignified half-body profile of Sarmiento, who appeared with a medal bearing the cross of the Spanish order of Calatrava. One of its most noteworthy aspects is its accompanying Latin text: *Deo fidelis, Principi, hominibus: simul complector omnia?* (Will I accomplish everything successfully?) and *Gentis Hispana Decus* (Distinguished ornament of the peoples of Spain).\(^{31}\)

Thus, in the original rendering of the Latin quote, one can appreciate a laudatory observation that is nonetheless accompanied by an interrogation about the sitter’s capacities that brings a more humble reading into the portrait. And yet, this pictorial representation also demonstrates Gondomar’s exceptional position at the English court. Certainly, from the research carried out in the archives, and after the examination of similarly styled English engravings of Spanish kings and the Spanish Infanta that circulated in London, it appears that Sarmiento was the only non-royal Spanish figure to be portrayed during the early Stuart period. What is more, in 1622 Willem de Passe’s brother, Simon, produced another

---

28 For two different editions with a characteristic iconography of Gondomar, see Middleton, *A Game at Chess*; Middleton, *A Game at Chesse*.

29 See Darby, ‘The Black Knight’s Festival Book?’, pp. 173-188. Also see Fuchs, *The Poetics of Piracy*, pp. 55-78.

30 Scott, *The Second Part of Vox Populi*, p. 58.

31 Willem de Passe, *Portrait of Diego Sarmiento de Acuña*. 
Figure 3.2  Front page of Thomas Scott, *The Second Part of Vox Populi, or Gondomar Appearing in the Likenes of Matchiauell* (1624)
engraved portrait of the count in similar format. According to Griffiths, this circumstance is quite exceptional, and clearly Sarmiento established a relationship with the two Dutch engravers. The image was reprinted many times and was sold at the London market. It appears, therefore, that the count’s image became a well-recognized hallmark in English public life. Moreover, Sarmiento’s notoriety at the English court seems to have been so prevalent so as to inspire some print sellers to use his portrait for commercial advantage.

As it is, the *Vox Populi* pamphlets were in great part successful thanks to the poignancy of their political comments. However, it is also true that these texts found a favourable print market because of their able manipulations of previous laudatory characterizations in print. What is more, an examination of the texts evinces an exceptional knowledge of Gondomar’s personality and a careful monitoring of his activities (including his collecting practices), leading one to wonder if the Protestant preacher ever had access to the ambassador’s letters. What remain for sure is that, in the writing of his diatribes, Scott reveals that he had to engage with Spanish culture. There is evidence of this in Scott’s writings, where he shows a good knowledge of Spanish names, Spanish places and Spanish historical references. Curiously, these subjects would not have come naturally to someone who studied theology at St Andrews, at least when compared to other disciplines that were more germane to divine matters. Knowing about these things, therefore, required special motivation.

### Playing the role of the Hispanist

One can see further proof of this in the first *Vox Populi*, where the Protestant preacher portrays a special meeting of the Council of State held in the Aragonese town of Monzón. The choice of place could be less innocent that it appears at first sight. Monzón was known for its important role in the establishment of the *fueros*, or prerogatives, of the kingdom of Aragon. Thanks, in good part, to the writings of the notorious Spanish exile Antonio Pérez, Philip II’s erstwhile secretary and one of the main collaborators in the Spanish Black Legend, English wits from the early Stuart period knew about the altercations that transpired between the Spanish king and Aragonese authorities during the 1590s. They were also very aware about the heated

---

32  Simon de Passe, *Portrait of Diego Sarmiento de Acuña*.
constitutional debates that resulted from these events.\footnote[34]{For more information about Antonio Pérez, see Marañón, \textit{Antonio Perez}. Also see Pérez, \textit{A Spaniard in Elizabethan England}.} After all, Pérez published one edition of his \textit{Relaciones} in 1594 while living in London.\footnote[35]{Bravo, ‘Las \textit{Relaciones} de Antonio Pérez’. Also see the introduction by Sánchez Molledo to Pérez, \textit{Relaciones}.}

Thus, during the fictional Monzón meeting described in \textit{Vox Populi}, Scott brings together the presidents of the counsels of Castile, Aragon, Italy, Portugal, the Indies, the Treasury and the affairs of war, including in this group a representative of the Inquisition, the Papal nuncio, the Duke of Lerma and, of course, Gondomar. In doing so, he seems to show some awareness of the political constitution of the Hispanic monarchy, which was run by a series of deliberative councils with different prerogatives.\footnote[36]{Parker, \textit{Imprudent King}, pp. 64-67.} This was not the situation in England, where government decisions were usually taken by the king with the help of only one deliberative body: the Privy Council.\footnote[37]{During the period, the Spanish diplomat Juan de Vera already addressed the particularities of the English council system. See Juan Antonio de Vera y Figueroa, \textit{El Enbaxador}, Discurso Cuarto, f. 95r.} In the second \textit{Vox Populi}, Scott depicts a Spanish parliament of \textit{grandes} in Seville, the Hispanic monarchy’s main gateway to the Indies, and this time, the \textit{dramatis personae} are sometimes mentioned by their Spanish noble title:

there came as truest and old friends to her estate [Spain], the Archbishop of Toledo, the Dukes of Medina Coeli, of Braganza, of Ville Hermosa, of Hijaz, D. of Infantado, D. of Cea, D. of Sesa, D. of Veragua, Marques of Malagon; Count de Pennafiore, Count de Monterey, Count de Sanstephano, &c. Escalona, the Marques of Castello, Rodrigo the Admirant and Constable of Castile, Count Olivares, Count Gondomar, Pedro de Toledo, Gonzales de Cordua, Lewes de Velasco, with sundry others of remarke and note, of the chiefest Nobility.\footnote[38]{Scott, \textit{The Second Part of Vox Populi}, p. 2.}

In his search for verisimilitude, Scott provides many details about places and enumerates some of Spain’s most powerful statesmen. Moreover, in an effort to provide the texts with more Spanish local colour, Scott’s \textit{Second Vox Populi} introduces many Spanish expressions into the English text, like ‘\textit{Fey [sic] de Spagna}, ‘Pues vos, nos’, ‘[Spaniards considered to be] Moros Blancos'}
and *Nuevos Christianos*, ‘Signior Gondomar’, ‘Lady Maria la Infanta’, etc.\(^{39}\) All in all, even if the meetings mentioned in the *Vox Populi* pamphlets could never have taken place under the circumstances presented by Scott, one cannot deny that it is exactly because of his attention to detail, and the use of local colour, that the publications gained an aura of credibility. This effect is further strengthened by the brief mention of episodes in Spanish history, like the embassy of Bernardino de Mendoza to Elizabethan England and the discovery of the ‘Indies’ by Christopher Columbus.\(^{40}\) On some occasions, Scott even touches on the grandeur of the Spanish empire by reflecting about the copious resources in South America: ‘For of all his Maiesties Kingdoms in Europe, Asia, or America, Peru is the prime and Soueraigne, being aboue any other in the World, most abounding in gold, siluer, and pearle.’\(^{41}\) Still, even if the text sometimes conveys details of praise, these remarks are oftentimes complemented in the pamphlets by a Black Legend narrative that gained new momentum during the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ Wars (1618-1648). In a report about Spanish military campaigns against the United Provinces discussed in the second *Vox Populi*, there is a moment that recalls the injustices previously denounced by Bartolomé de las Casas when a Spanish agent says, rather implausibly:

> Crueltie (replied Gonzales) is naturall and inhaerent to our Nation, for except our victories be drowned in blood, we cannot tast them. It is most true that he gaue way to his Souldiers in the depth and greatest bitternes of the frost and snow this last winter, to turne men and women starke naked out of their houses, to shift for themselues in the open fieldes, to rauish yong girles not aboue eight or ten yeares of age, wilfully to beate out the heads of their wine and beere vessells, that they might drinke only water in that extremitie of cold weather, that many infants (their parents flying away for feare) at their returne, were found either starued for food, or frozen to death with the cold, hauing neither fire, nor clothing.\(^{42}\)

In recent decades, scholars specializing in early modern Anglo-Spanish interactions have identified a great deal of ambivalence in the way the English public approached Spanish culture. As John Elliott once commented, the Hispanic monarchy exercised great political supremacy

\(^{39}\) Respectively, see Scott, *The Second Part of Vox Populi*, pp. 5, 13, 21.
\(^{40}\) Ibid., p. 2.
\(^{41}\) Ibid., p. 43.
\(^{42}\) Ibid., pp. 26 and 29.
during the period. It was a source of great suspicion for other European polities. But at the same time these feelings of distrust were complemented by some admiration, if not envy.\textsuperscript{43} Certainly, English statesmen had to make peace with their misgivings about Spain and accept that a good command of Spanish was essential for the surveillance of an ever-expanding power. It was useful, too, for emulating its strategies. Therefore, Spanish became an extremely fashionable language to learn, and more dictionaries began to be published. Spanish works from the Iberian Peninsula were highly esteemed by English courtiers. Spanish books were also sought by writers of fiction for providing the material for many admirable stories and acquired by sailors and natural philosophers for information on the new world overseas. From William Cecil and John Donne to Francis Drake and Richard Hakluyt, courtiers collected Spanish documents.\textsuperscript{44} It is from this perspective that the figure of Thomas Scott should be understood. In his efforts to provide a negative view of Gondomar, Spain and Catholicism, the Protestant preacher had to play the role of the amateur Hispanist (if not a fully fledged one like the Englishmen James Mabbe and Leonard Digges).\textsuperscript{45} This should come as no surprise, though. In a parallel case, it is a common belief that one of the most avid readers of John Foxe’s \textit{Actes and Monuments} was the Jesuit Robert Parsons. During his life, Parsons meticulously studied Foxe’s writings in an attempt to write books that could more effectively discredit the English Protestant’s arguments.\textsuperscript{46}

To an external observer, the dynamics of hate can sometimes overlap with those usually found in love (the unrequited kind, at least), leading to mixed feelings on how to read the intellectual profile of some early modern polemicists. Sure enough, they often had to become well-versed in the history and culture of their enemies in order to provide a more effective diatribe. In the case of the Protestant preacher Thomas Scott, one can see an additional interpretative complication arising from his \textit{Sir WValter Ranyeights Ghost}, published in 1626 after the failure of the Cadiz expedition.\textsuperscript{47} Very probably the last pamphlet Thomas Scott ever wrote, this tract aimed to further vilify Spain and the first count of Gondomar. Still, it ended up being something

\textsuperscript{43} Elliott, \textit{Spain, Europe and the Wider World}, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{44} Stoye, \textit{English Travellers Abroad}, pp. 233–259.
\textsuperscript{45} For more information about these early modern Hispanists, see Yamamoto-Wilson, ‘Mabbe’s Maybes’, pp. 319-342.
\textsuperscript{46} For more information about Parson’s engagement with Foxe’s writings, see Houliston, \textit{Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England}.
\textsuperscript{47} Scott, \textit{Sir WValter Ranyeights Ghost}. 
completely different. In this work, Sarmiento is confronted by Raleigh’s ghost while he considers new plots in the gardens of El Retiro. The count is presented as the most ruthless and vicious spy the world has ever seen, always concocting new schemes to further Spanish aspirations:

how euery minute hee produced new and vnnaturall Cocks-egges, brooded them from the heat of his malice, hatche them with the deuillish-nes of his Policie, and brought forth Serpents able to poyson all Europe.48

With a good number of quotes in a similar spirit, Sir Walter Ravvleighs Ghost provides the usual malediction to the Spanish ambassador. However, a remarkable thing in this case is that the comparison of Gondomar to a cockatrice was first advanced by the playwright Thomas Middleton (5.3.113). Moreover, in contrast to the Vox Populi pamphlets, Sir Walter Ravvleighs Ghost does not offer new information about current European affairs. The reader can appreciate how the influence of A Game at Chess may have dramatically changed Scott’s prose, which now concentrated on providing an elaborate mockery of Gondomar, Spain and Catholicism. Political information has turned into theatrical entertainment that has more in common with Shakespeare’s Richard III than a political commentary on contemporary affairs, the genre by which Scott came into prominence. This can be better appreciated in how the fictional Spaniard reacts to the visit of Raleigh’s ghost, according to the pamphlet:

[And seated thus alone by himselfe, onely guarded by his two choyse friends Malice and Mischiefe, he [Gondomar] had not cald vp many euill thoughts to appeare before him, when on a sodaine (according to the weake|nesse of his apprehension) there shined round about him a most glorious and extraordinary light […] the poore Don was become altogether a peece of yce or marble; he had no spirit to remember there were spirits, his crossings and blessings, his holy water and his Agnus Dei, his Monks charmes, and his Iesuites coniurations were all now turnd to quaking and trembling […] there appeared or seemed to appeare before him the Ghost of Sir Walter Rawleigh Knight, a Noble famous Englishman and a renowned Souldier: at this appariotion the Earle fell downe flat to the earth vpon his face (for backeward he durst not, least he might giue an offence to his Surgion).49

48 Ibid., p. 6.
49 Ibid., pp. 8-10.
As it is, *Sir VValter Ravvleghs Ghost* differs from the *Vox Populi* pamphlets in that it lacks any attempt to discuss European policy and contemporary affairs. It ends with the promise of another pamphlet that would provide the politically involved reader with more information about Gondomar’s evil plots and the ongoing Spanish threats to the Protestant cause. However, this promise is never fulfilled, given that Thomas Scott was killed in June 1626 by an English soldier and eventually buried in Utrecht. The assassin was tortured but consistently denied acting at the behest of anyone but himself. He was eventually executed.  

As a result, Thomas Scott’s career ended abruptly. Still, this early modern polemicist substantially contributed to the development of the Black Legend in England through his pamphlets. His interpretations of Gondomar and foreign affairs successfully permeated English publications of later decades, as shown by Rowland’s edition of Scott’s *A Choice Narrative of Count Gondamor* (1659) and further political and historical works that continue to appear until the end of the early modern period, such as William Petty’s *Summary review of the kings and government of England since the Norman Conquest* (1698). On a similar note, the printing of derisory images of Gondomar continued decades after the Spaniard left England. Moreover, the historiography of the next centuries was also influenced by Scott, as shown by Gardiner’s use of the Machiavellian reading for explaining Gondomar’s actions in his *History of England*.

In many respects, the Protestant Preacher Thomas Scott played an important role in making Gondomar for the English into what the Duke of Alba became for the Dutch. Still, as this chapter wants to suggest, in order to create highly effective anti-Spanish propaganda, Scott had to use Spanish culture, and perhaps even resort to Spanish sources, in order to provide more credibility to his fictional reports. In doing so, one can only wonder if he did not become secretly enthralled by the Spanish empire’s grandeur. What remains more certain, in any case, is that Scott followed the Spanish ambassador’s activities in great detail. This can be appreciated in the pamphleteer’s appropriation of originally laudatory iconography produced around Gondomar, but can also be observed in his decision to report about Gondomar’s more private endeavours, like his collecting practices.

This chapter has mentioned just a few examples among a great number of instances, but these already suggest that by exploring the prose and images

---

50 Kelsey, ‘Thomas Scott’.
of literary pamphlets like those published by Thomas Scott, the scholar can obtain important evidence about the intellectual sources that buttressed English popular animosity against Spain. In the process, we can better grasp the cultural background that eventually led to a break of the Anglo-Spanish peace in 1625 with the Cadiz expedition. This type of endeavour also brings further evidence that, during the early modern period, print culture and politics were deeply entangled. Reading and seeing, assembling words and collecting documents were not only closely intertwined practices in early modern scholarship, but also an essential part of early modern statesmanship and, in this particular case, lobbying for an anti-Spanish stance. Indeed, even though this approach is not necessarily new, it is not less true that, still today, there remains a need to more systematically interrogate the intellectual origins and rhetoric of the premodern propaganda that contributed to the Black Legend. This task becomes rather pressing in the case of a series of publications that not only shaped the period’s political discussions, but also coloured national historiographies and popular media for centuries.
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4. **Enemy Treasures: The Making and Marketing of Spanish *Comedia* in the Amsterdam Schouwburg**

*Frans Blom*

**Abstract**

The establishment in 1638 of Amsterdam's first public theatre venue, the Schouwburg, caused a major enhancement and upgrading of local stock repertory. Spanish *comedia* was the new fuel. With Lope's drama first, Spanish plays and playwrights were brought to the Schouwburg stage in a serial production. Crowds gathered for anything Spanish, and Spain's victory over Dutch theatre life was complete even before the war was over in 1648. The paradox of Spain's triumph in the heart of Dutch culture is centre stage in this contribution, exploring both the transfer route through Amsterdam's Sephardic community, which facilitated so much successful import of enemy treasures, and analysing the public presentations that framed the Spanishness of the plays and playwrights as a new trademark for the Amsterdam crowds.

**Keywords:** Amsterdam Schouwburg, Spanish *comedia*, branding, Lope de Vega, Pérez de Montalbán, Calderón

**A Spanish play in Haarlem (1656)**

In July 1656, when the Amsterdam Schouwburg was closed for the summer break, the company of actors left the municipal home theatre to go on a tour in the region. On their visit to the nearby city of Haarlem, word spread that they were bringing the very best from Amsterdam.¹ Printed in folders and

---

¹ The Amsterdam company's posters and leaflets in Haarlem and Heemstede are kept in the Noord Hollands Archief, coll. Heerlijkheid Heemstede, inv. nr. 144. Quote from Haarlem flyer: 'de peirel aller Comedien,'tis die, die in Hispagnien de prijs ghestreken heeft van de seven Comedien.

---
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flyers, their menu, indeed, reflected what was in vogue in the Schouwburg: an attractive play list that included some canonical titles of Dutch theatre history, and partly also boasted plays that may come as unexpected surprises to us now. For amusement and laughter, as they announced, they brought P.C. Hooft’s classic comedy *Warenar* and also Bredero’s *Moortje*. Those who loved horror and cruel revenge were invited to see *Aran en Titus*, in the unabbreviated version, as the posters stressed, featuring the shocking final scenes of eating cooked human body parts and the onstage burning of the Moorish general Aran. The Dutch adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* was one of the home theatre’s super hits, maintaining, after a grandiose premiere of fourteen subsequent performances in 1641, an extremely high performance rate of five shows per year.\(^2\) For local taste, on the other hand, the company brought *Gerard van Velsen*. Featuring North Holland medieval history, P.C. Hooft’s theatre play was especially recommended ‘to give the people of Harlem contentment for its regional taste’. This part of the menu listed titles by prominent Amsterdam-based playwrights, which had a good performance record in the Schouwburg and, for that matter, still pop up in surveys of Dutch theatre history and in literary handbooks. However, that is not the case for the greatest treasure the Amsterdam actors brought to Haarlem in 1656. On Friday 9 July, they programmed, as they said, the pearl of all theatre plays. People were called to gather in great numbers and see the best of all Spanish comedies and the most brilliant of jewels. This referred to the play about Sigismundus, the Polish prince, entitled *Het Leven is maer Droom* (*Life is only a dream*):

the Pearl of all Comedies. The very one that in Spain has taken the prize of the Best of the Seven Comedies. In which Juan Pérez de Montalbán shows that all that happens in the world is just a dream. Hence the name of this extraordinary gem. Come and join to see our great Polish Sigismundus, or *Het Leven is maer Droom*. And extract, like noble bees, useful wisdoms from its profound lessons.

\(^2\) *ONSTAGE* s.v. *Aran en Titus.*
For all the grotesque presentation and circus-like selling points, the Haarlem posters are a vivid testimony to theatre life on tour, demonstrating that the world of stage performance was a life of illusion and exaggerations meant to catch and keep the people’s attention. It also shows that cultural entrepreneurship was required to find a good match between art and audience: whether they were in the Schouwburg or on tour in the region, the Amsterdam actors did their very best to meet the people’s taste and expectations by offering popular repertory. Part of their business secret was their reliance on domestic plays, created by local celebrities such as the Amsterdam-born playwrights Bredero, Hooft, Jan Vos and Joost van den Vondel. But these were not the only ones. As successes in the Schouwburg, plays derived from the great European theatre traditions in Spain, England and France went on tour, too – hence the company’s choice to bring this particular play to Haarlem, proudly presented as the best of the seven best comedias in Spain. It was the Dutch version of La vida es sueño by Pedro Calderón de la Barca. On the Schouwburg stage of Amsterdam it had premiered only two years before, in May 1654, when Spain and Spanish import plays were enjoying tremendous success there.

Both in Amsterdam and in the region, large parts of the seventeenth- (and even eighteenth-) century audiences must have been thrilled by the new Spanish material. That is what the performance numbers for these plays tell us, and what the revenues indicate as well. This is additionally confirmed by the litany of printed play texts in several editions over time. Moreover, some voices from seventeenth-century Amsterdam even reveal a popular preference for Spanish drama over domestic productions. Young authors, for example, at the beginning of their career were advised to put their efforts in practicing the Spanish comedia, as these plays were ‘most popular among the people’. Even the city’s leading poet, Joost van den Vondel, according to

---

3 ONSTAGE, s.v. Sigismundus, prince van Polen, of ‘t Leven is een droom. Bly-eyndigh treur-spel.
4 Performance dates and revenues of Amsterdam’s entire Schouwburg repertory are digitally available through ONSTAGE.
5 Quote in English translation by the author: ‘Neem liever een Spaans spel’ / ‘Die woelen uit de natuur, en gevallen het volk wel’, from Act 3 in the drama play Gelukte list of bedrooge mof by the classicist and anti-Spanish vogue playwright Andries Pels (printed in 1689 in Amsterdam, but of earlier composition). His play advocated French-classicist theatre, putting the quoted lines in the mouth of a young and unskilled poet. The introductory preface also signals (in remorse) the popularity of Spanish plays, ‘those wild and badly arranged plays, that nonetheless attract more people’ (‘die wilde en wanschikkelijke Spaansche stukken, niettegenstaande die meer volk trekken’). See Holzhey, Als gy maar schép wordt’. Andries Pels’s famous theoretical work on theatre, Gebruik en Misbruik des tooneels (Amsterdam, 1681) also comments on the Spanish vogue. The examples of Spanish top hits in the Schouwburg he mentions by name are
his contemporary biographer, suffered seriously since ‘foreign plays, mostly translated from Spanish, introduced a kind of drama that was so eventful and full of alterations, that, even though they were lacking in artistry, they captured the crowds’.\textsuperscript{6} Quotes like these leave little doubt that just as much as the comedias had conquered the Spanish world, the adaptations in Dutch made them, indeed, the people’s plays in Amsterdam, too.

The Spanish plays that were brought on stage in Amsterdam’s Schouwburg would catch people’s eyes by featuring majestically dressed-up characters in

\textit{Het verwerde hof, Dolheyt om d’eer and Don Louis de Vargas en Veranderlik geval.} Even though they fall short in arrangement, in his view, the whole world loves them (‘maar all’ de waereld pryst de stőf’, vss. 1066–69).

\textsuperscript{6} Quote from Vondel’s biography by his contemporary and friend Gerard Brandt (Vondel, \textit{Poëzy}, Amsterdam, 1682, p. 68): ‘[dat] men met der tijdt andere speelen, meest uit het Spaeensch vertaelt, invoerde, die door’t gewoel en veelerley verandering, hoewel’er somtydts weinigh kunst en orde in was, den grooten hoop (zich aan ’t ydel gezwets en den poppentoevelt vergaapende) zoo behaagden, dat men kooper boven goudt schatte, en Vondels treurspeelen achter de bank wierp.’
foreign courts. Kings, princes and princesses, and other aristocratic figures like counts and dukes crowd the scenes, making a most unfamiliar setting for Dutch burghers in a civic society. Women, both the attractive and heroic types and the dangerous divas, play a prominent part. Acting and speaking in sublime registers, they make a tremendous contrast to some farcical characters with both physical and mental deformations and low pleasures (the typical graciosos). They speak in the words of ordinary people and act on the basis of ignoble motivations, such as lust, hunger or fear. As most of them are court plays, the central element of many successful Spanish comedias in Amsterdam is the throne and the question of its legitimate heir. Ambitious and self-declared crown princes tend to fall, while the changes of fortune make honest or ignoble people come out of the shadow of simple rural life and rise to power. The Spanish cornucopian plots are famous for their mudanzas or, in Dutch, veranderinge van staet, packed with dramatic changes and sustaining the people's attention through a cascade of events rather than requiring the utmost concentration. Particularly popular for this high degree of action and alteration (which the Dutch audience combined in the word 'woelingen', which may be translated as 'changes'), they shift scenes from one place to another and leap in time like modern movies can do. Moreover, Spanish theatre is the theatre of the passions par excellence. Protagonists fail to control themselves and fall victim to various kinds of emotions, resulting in outrageous tempers, erroneous observations, and false judgements. In most of the plots, it is the emotions caused by love or the ambition to power that bring characters to the summits of Fortune only to fall steeply down, or vice versa. A key instrument of the basic principle of misjudgement by blurred and failing senses is the motive of concealing and revealing, of betrayal and fraud. Perception is hard to rely on, whilst things are not what they seem to be. Thus, disguise is a frequent device, sublimated in the character of the mujer varonil or the heroic girl dressed up in male clothing and duelling 'as a man' against a male adversary. While chaos and disorder rule the plot, the Spanish plays of Amsterdam in general end happily with the exposure of evil and good, and the king's ultimate restoration of order, mostly crowned by sacred bonds of matrimony and cheerful celebrations. And so, with Spanish drama on the stage, people in the audience experienced a hurricane of events and emotions, with the promise of reaching a cheerful safe harbour in the end.

As soon as they were brought to the Dutch public in Amsterdam's Schouwburg, Spanish plays gained great popularity, becoming as successful there as they were in other parts of Europe. In a wide geographical range, the comedias of the Siglo de Oro were by no means limited to the Spanish-speaking world. Studies on transnational theatrical transmission
have recently challenged traditional, nation-biased histories on theatre, and brought Spanish drama in various modes of translation and adaptation centre stage in their respective national narratives. Moreover, they also demonstrate that the distribution and appreciation of comedias throughout Europe were not confined to regions and countries dominated by the Spanish Empire. Even political antagonists would turn to Spain and delve the cultural resources of the enemy. Through various kinds of transmission mechanisms, theatre makers in France and England, for example, were well connected to the Iberian Fundgrube and eager to integrate Spanish material into local productions. They were creating foreign, if not to say enemy, art works for local consumers. In doing so, they devised metaphors of capture and warlike framing to negotiate their literary art in the home market. Imagery of loot and piracy, as Barbara Fuchs demonstrates in The Poetics of Piracy, is a frequent motif for creative writers working in the paradox of martial opposition and cultural fascination.

If anywhere, military aggression and political opposition determined the Spanish connection in the Northern Netherlands. Eighty years of revolutionary warfare (1568-1648) kept both parties opposed in bitter struggle and fighting, both in the Low Countries and in the maritime territories of the West Indies. The revolt aimed at just one thing: independence from the empire and the expulsion of what the Dutch people called the Spanish tyranny. When the arch-enemies were brought to peace at the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, the southern provinces remained a part of the Spanish Empire, while the northern parts achieved their independence and gained autonomy as the Republic of the United Provinces.

Most strikingly, however, Spain was at that time gaining tremendous momentum in Dutch theatre. The Spanish drama tradition of the Siglo de Oro was becoming so popular that it proved a kind of Hollywood to Amsterdam's Schouwburg even before war had come to an end. It is worth questioning how Spanish comedia became the new vogue and how, particularly in the Northern Netherlands, people dealt with the Spanish origins of the novelty. After all, when Lope de Vega started garnering a popular reputation in the Netherlands with new productions on the Schouwburg stage in 1645, Spain still was the United Provinces' arch-enemy. This chapter will therefore explore how the Amsterdam Schouwburg bridged the gap with the

7 See Fuchs, 'Introduction', and The Poetics of Piracy; Samson, 'A Fine Romance' and 'Epilogue Exchange'.
8 ‘Pirates and piracy are everywhere in the corpus I present here' (Fuchs, The Poetics of Piracy, p. 7).
expelled opponent and re-established the connection. What was the lure of enemy products in staging the new drama? What kind of framing did the Schouwburg productions use to present and negotiate a ‘hostile’ culture, and to reconcile the Dutch military and political triumph of independence with the contemporary cultural victory of Lope, in the first place, and other playwrights from Spain, such as Pérez de Montalbán and Calderón? For Amsterdam, the city’s community of Jewish refugees from the Iberian Peninsula provided a unique and crucial Hispano-Dutch connection.

The popularity of Spanish plays

As far as we have been able to identify the international plays shown at the Schouwburg, the Spanish theatre tradition of the Siglo de Oro is strongly present in Amsterdam’s repertoire of the seventeenth century, with a total of 60 comedias. Of these, 20 plays are by Lope de Vega. They rank among the most popular Spanish adaptations as well as the earliest ones. The transfer history indicates that Lope’s success in the Netherlands was just waiting there to cross borders as soon as military confrontations stopped. Significantly, the first transmission took place during the temporary ceasefire of the Twelve Years’ Truce of 1609-1621. This time frame, indeed, offered a chance for cultural transfer when the Amsterdam diplomat Theodore Rodenburgh – who, as a poet and playwright, was also a pivotal figure in the city’s cultural life – travelled the Iberian Peninsula for business purposes in 1611-1613. He must have witnessed the popularity of the comedy performances on the spot. Upon his return to Amsterdam, seismic events were taking place in the city’s theatre life. Economic prosperity in the rapidly expanding merchants’ town allowed for the rise of middle-class entertainment. As a consequence, the art of theatre was becoming a profitable enterprise. Small-scale cultural institutions would develop into professional public theatre. In these years, the private chambers of rhetoric, where theatre was traditionally performed among friends and peers, started to open their doors to the general public. The quest for audiences caused a major rupture in the artistic direction of the city’s dominant chamber, called the Eglentine. On the one hand, key figures in the Eglentine’s art of drama, including P.C. Hooft, Samuel Coster and G.A. Bredero, decided to leave the chamber and establish the new cultural institution, the

9 For a list of Spanish plays in the Schouwburg, see Jautze, Álvarez Francés and Blom, ‘Spaans theater’; see also Van Praag, La comedia espagnole, and Te Winkel, ‘De invloed der Spaansche letterkunde’.
Nederduytsche Academy. This was Amsterdam's first public theatre venue, advocating for classically oriented drama based on ancient plots in a new local Dutch context, and programming classicist art, supplemented by some of the pieces they had delivered previously in the chamber. Theodore Rodenburgh, on the other hand, put his faith in the Eglentine and responded to the critical setback in the chamber's repertory by introducing an alternative course there, too. In contrast to the Academy's classicist programme, the traveller and diplomat opted for an international orientation towards major drama successes from the contemporary European stages. Thus, Rodenburgh was the first Dutch playwright to rework Lope de Vega material in Amsterdam, adapting four of his plays to suit the Dutch stage practice.\(^{10}\)

Despite Rodenburgh's innovative activities and their public presentations in print, Spain itself, however, did not actually take centre stage; the playwright published the new productions as works of his own. Without a single reference to the Spanish author or to Spain, the paratextual introductions to the play texts concealed any foreign import. The war, which was resumed in 1621, does not seem to have affected any performances of the Spanish adaptations by Rodenburgh: Lope's *El Perseguido*, for example, which Rodenburgh dissimulatingly produced as his own *Casandra en Karel Baldeus* during the truce, was reprinted during the war in 1632. Produced to bring in larger crowds, Rodenburgh's adaptations, and Spain itself, remained pretty much in the shade for the subsequent three decades. But that all changed dramatically when in, in 1638, the commercial initiatives of the past decades merged into one theatre company based in the city's new permanent public venue of the Schouwburg. From then on, the art of theatre was a most vital part of the city's public entertainment industry, as it today. In starting up, the Schouwburg's weekly scheduled shows on Monday and Thursday demanded that the domestic repertory, which mostly derived from the chambers and the academy, to be strongly enhanced in quantity, diversity and quality. Translating and producing popular drama from Spain now was a necessity to the theatre's entrepreneurship. In the 1640s, Spain climbed up in the repertory ranks and started to take centre stage in the Schouwburg. Within a decade the theatre's season was fertilized and packed with Spanish material. By 1655 nearly 50 per cent of Schouwburg shows were Spanish import plays, remaining the theatre's main attraction for three decades.

\(^{10}\) For Theodore Rodenburgh's adaptations of Lope de Vega plays, see Vergeer and Van Marion, 'Spains Dramatic Conquest of the Dutch Republic'. For Lope de Vega in the Amsterdam Schouwburg, see Blom and Van Marion, 'Lope de Vega'; Sánchez Jiménez, 'Acotaciones en las adaptaciones neerlandesas'.
Spanishness in the Southern Netherlands

Compared to Theodore Rodenburgh’s ‘silent’ introduction of Spanish theatre in the previous period, the new productions in the Schouwburg publicly marketed Spain and everything Spanish, stressing the provenance so much and so positively that it didn’t take long for Spain to become a unique selling point in theatre business. In this respect, it is significant that the Haarlem poster, despite announcing La vida es sueño with Juan Pérez de Montalbán as the author, used the notion of Spanishness to say that it was the summit of drama: the best of the seven best comedias of Spain. No one, it seems, could care less about the name of the playwright. In the city that had perhaps most traumatically suffered from Spain’s military aggression, the Spanish provenance of the theatre play was the relevant point for the popular announcement. How could this all have happened? In order to answer that question, it might be helpful to have a comparative perspective and first assess the presence of Spanish drama in the Southern or Spanish Netherlands.

With Spain omnipresent in the Southern Netherlands both physically and by means of frequent political, economic and cultural contacts, the comedia was as present there as it was all over the empire. On a regular basis, Spanish theatre companies visited the Brussels court and the merchant cities of the South.11 Play texts were largely available in print, with several collections or partes by Calderón and Lope de Vega and other playwrights. Moreover, Spanish theatre was also alive through adaptations and imitations in the local Dutch or Brabant language.12 Spain’s dominant status as a theatre powerhouse was evident in the way local Brabant playwrights adopted Spanish nicknames. They would present themselves in a kind of Spanish-Dutch blend, and preferred quasi-Spanish names such as, for example, Frederico Antonio de Conincq, Petro Antonio Kimpe and Antonio Francisco Wouthers. So typical of the Southern Netherlandish-Spanish contact zone, a trend like Hispanisizing one’s playwright name up North, in the revolting part of the Low Countries, was totally inconceivable. With Spain’s ubiquitous presence, the local attitude towards Spain, the open contacts with the Iberian Peninsula, and the cultural dominance of Spanish drama, theatre transfers were relatively easy in the South. Calderón’s La vida es sueño, for

12 Sanz Ayán, ‘Echoes of Comedy’; Sullivan, Calderón in the German Lands, pp. 32-46; Van Eemeren and Meeus, Genres in het ernstige renaissancetoneel.
example, arrived in Brussels soon after its Madrid premiere of 1635. Within a decade, by 1645, it was also known to Brussels audiences. The local version in Brabant dialect was produced by the theatre company of Vrije Liefhebbers der Rijmer-konste, a non-professional group of local theatre lovers highly engaged with Spain. Spanishness was an artistic device among the Vrije Liefhebbers, too. As one of the most prominent members, for example, Willem van der Borcht chose the translated name of Guillermo a Castro, strikingly close to the well-known Spanish playwright Guillén de Castro.

As so many people involved in theatre in the South, the Vrije Liefhebbers were well-educated persons with knowledge of the Spanish language. In theatre making, they worked with Spanish originals just as much as they used French intermediaries. At the same time, however, they strongly advocated the use of the Brabant mother tongue, especially for staging. In this way, Southern Netherlandish theatre groups and companies like the Brussels Vrije Liefhebbers were perfect conduits for Calderón and Lope de Vega to enter into the Dutch-speaking realm. With conditions favouring Spanish plays to naturally blend in, it is understandable that it took just a single decade for a top hit like Calderón’s *La vida es sueño* to be staged in Brussels and to be published in the local Dutch version as *Het leven is maer Droom* (Brussels: Mommaert, 1647)

**Little Spain in Amsterdam**

Compared to the ‘loyal’ South, the revolting United Provinces in the North, which had expelled the Spanish presence, provided circumstances and facilities that made it less evident for *comedias* to enter into local culture. Especially when it came to the transfer, theatre employees and producers for the Schouwburg did not speak a word of Spanish. Theodore Rodenburgh, who as an exception had been able to adapt Lope from the Spanish source, died in 1644. Some people on the theatre’s board knew French, but among the Amsterdam actors’ company (most of them of rather humble descent) the only language they mastered was the mother tongue.

The first new Spanish production to enter the stage in 1645 is revealing for the difficulties the Schouwburg had to overcome to connect to Spain. It was Lope’s *Laura Perseguida*, in the Dutch version of *Vervolgde Laura*. Although the title similarity suggested a direct transfer, it had been a long and winding...

---

road for the play to end up in the Schouwburg, changing from the Spanish original first into the French version of *Laura Persecutée* by Jean Rotrou, then into a Dutch prose text by the professional Amsterdam translator Jan Hendrik Glazenmaker, and from there, finally, into the metrical and rhyming verses of iambic hexameters or alexandrines, so typical for Dutch theatre texts at the time, by the Schouwburg’s favourite actor Adam Karelsz van Germez. Along the transfer way, the name of the Spanish author had virtually disappeared. The Schouwburg print edition did not display Lope on the title page, nor did it refer to any Spanish source at all. In fact, the work as it was presented appeared to be a creation by the Schouwburg actor, with the name of Adam Karels displayed capitalized above the title. When people complained about the error, Adam Karels was happy to admit that his Laura ‘was born in Spain and, thus, a child of our arch-enemy’. His faux pas, however, was precisely that he had not mentioned the Spanish author. This he blamed on the intermediaries: ‘The arrogance of putting my name alone on this work, I have learnt from my example Rotrou, when he made this play in French out of the Spanish original by Loopes de Veego [sic].’

French playwrights working in the Spanish tradition, as the case of *Laura* demonstrates, were instrumental to the Schouwburg producers in closing the gap with far away Spain. From 1645 onwards, however, the Spanish tradition truly came into focus when the Iberian migrant community of Sephardic Jews entered into the theatre’s network and facilitated a direct exchange. When the Schouwburg started operating, the city of Amsterdam harboured a considerable population of about 2000 souls from Spain and Portugal. Living in and around the eastern city area of Vlooijenburg, they were a conspicuous group in society, as evident, for example, in Rembrandt’s paintings, etchings and drawings of local Jews. Because they mostly spoke Portuguese, the native Amsterdammers would refer to them as the *Portugese joden*, and to their magnificent temple, built in 1675 and still standing and functioning today, as the Portuguese synagogue. Contrary to the stereotypical image of refugees, the Sephardim in Amsterdam were mostly well-to-do people,
thrive in profitable international business networks and keen on high education. Self-confident and proud of their origin, they tended to keep Iberian names and dressed in a Spanish way. Displaying Spanish manners and cultural practices, and with Southern facial features, they were definitely a colourful and distinct group in the city. In writing, literature and the arts, Spanish culture was their point of reference. They possessed Spanish books and libraries. And given their place of origin, they were also great lovers of theatre. Many book collections of Sephardim in Amsterdam included copies of Spanish drama works, particularly by Lope de Vega.17

The connection to contemporary Spanish theatre is obvious, for example, from the wedding celebrations of Isaac de Pinto and Rachel de Pinto Rodríguez in July 1648. As wealthy migrants, their marriage was an impressive display of Iberian aristocratic life, and concluded with a special drama performance. Celebrated ‘com muita festa e muita gente de Amsterdam’, as Pinto wrote in his memoirs, everyone was invited on the last day for the performance of a comedia, ‘bem representada’.18 The play performed at the wedding was one of Spain’s current top hits in theatre, Calderón’s La vida es sueño. Perhaps the first staging ever in the Northern Netherlands, contemporary to the Brussels premiere – but six years earlier than the 1654 premiere in the Amsterdam Schouwburg, the Pinto performance of La vida es sueño testifies to the direct link the Sephardim in diaspora kept with theatre life in Spain. Therefore, if anywhere in the Northern Netherlands, Spanish drama in those years was certainly to be found among the Portugese joden in Amsterdam. Even though expelled from their place of birth, the migrant community was well connected to the Iberian Peninsula. Not unlike the Italian community in nineteenth-century New York, the Sephardim lived in a kind of Little Spain in seventeenth-century Amsterdam, holding the one and only place in the Northern Netherlands with Spanish presence and thus creating a unique contact zone there.

After Van Germez’s play Vervolgde Laura, which was based on the French intermediary of Rotrou, the introduction of Spanish drama in the

18 ‘D[it]o meu despozerio se celebrou com muita festa e m[u]ita gente de amigos que veo de Amsterdam, e m[u]ita da cidade, a qual toda se alborotou con as festas que ouue. Ao 20 dia ouue comedia, La Vida es Suenho, bem representada.’ The attestation of the La vida es sueño performance at De Pinto’s house in Rotterdam dates from 1671, in the De Pinto family book; quote taken from Salomon, ‘The “De Pinto” Manuscript’, p. 60. See also Bodian, Hebrews of the Portuguese Nation, p. 93.
Schouwburg owed much to one individual person in Amsterdam’s Sephardic community: Jacobus Barocas.\(^\text{19}\) Like quite a number of Iberian Jews, he migrated to France first, and from Rouen went on to Amsterdam. There, he arrived in 1640, only two years after the opening of the Schouwburg. Living in the Korte Houtstraat on Vlooijenburg, Barocas had mastered the Dutch language and, as a connoisseur and great lover of drama, he uniquely reached out to the newly opened public theatre in the city. At least eight play texts that were added to the Schouwburg repertory in these years pay tribute to his transmission work in the paratextual introductions. Some of these, quoted at length in the following paragraphs, indicate that it was Barocas who suggested plays from Lope’s oeuvre to the employees of the Schouwburg. Moreover, as a talented polyglot, he provided prose translations of the Spanish sources, which the Schouwburg actors adapted into a five-act structure in the Dutch theatre language of verses and rhyme to suit the local staging tradition.

**Making Lope’s *comedia famosa* famous in the Netherlands**

The first Sephardic-Schouwburg co-production in Amsterdam was Lope de Vega’s *El amigo por fuerza*. With the Dutch title of *Gedwongen Vrient*, it premiered on the Schouwburg stage in the 1645-1646 season, on 3 May, with five shows, and it maintained its status as a popular repertory piece with four shows in the subsequent season. From Spain, through the Sephardic network, *Gedwongen Vrient* had come to stay in Amsterdam, not leaving the Schouwburg stage until a century later. The play’s successes definitely contributed to Lope’s reputation as the people’s playwright in the Dutch Republic, and also to Barocas’s qualities as his local agent. Innovative as it was, the print edition of *Gedwongen Vrient* displayed the name of the Spanish playwright on the title page where Lope de Vega Carpio starred in the header above the play’s title, only followed by the name of Isaac Vos, the local actor-playwright, in smaller font underneath. None of the previous Lope drama plays produced by Rodenburgh had boasted the name of its Spanish author on the front cover, nor had the *Vervolgde Laura*, which Van

Germez had brought to the Schouwburg the previous year on the basis of a French intermediary. Therefore, the public presentation of *Gedwongen Vrient* cannot be overestimated: with the prominent mention of Lope de Vega Carpio, for the first time in history, a contemporary non-domestic author’s name appeared on a Schouwburg play text.

Just like Lope’s name on the front page, the introductory section of the booklet also explicitly aimed at presenting the new author and the new drama vogue from Spain. The preface to the play text credited the creative genius of the *Gedwongen Vrient* as ‘Madrid’s Apollo’ and as ‘the great Spanish playwright’. Furthermore, the transfer process was highlighted, referring to Jacobus Barocas as the cultural messenger. It was only due to his personal initiative to come up with *El amigo por fuerza* in a Dutch prose translation that the Dutch Schouwburg actor had been able to appreciate the special qualities of Lope’s play and to rework the Spanish source into a new production for the Schouwburg:

My [i.e. Isaac Vos’s] eyes met with the spirit of the deceased but ever to be remembered Apollo of Madrid, the great Spanish poet Lope de Vega Carpio. Resurrected and brought to life by the art-loving and hard-working
sir Mr. Jacobus Baroces and while gliding on Dutch wings he appeared and stirred up and forced his friend of the same tongue to hand over the Dutch translation to me, in order to bring it to life in Dutch verses for the Amsterdam Schouwburg. 20

With Gedwongen Vrient, the Amsterdam Schouwburg produced the first Spanish comedia directly adapted from the source and introduced as a product from Spain to the local audience. The paratextual ornaments marked this epic moment. In the next Lope play a similar Spanish branding was devised. As the Sephardic-Schouwburg co-production had proved successful, the import experiment continued with the Dutch premiere of El palacio confuso just one year later. Under its Dutch title of Verwarde Hof, it premiered in 1647 with nine performances and subsequently built up a respectable performance track record of over 110 years. Verwarde Hof followed the same import route and featured the same public presentation strategy as the previous Spanish production. With Lope as its generally accepted author at the time, a Spanish name, again, dominated the front cover, giving only a secondary position to the Dutch author adapting the play. The preface to Verwarde Hof hailed Lope even more emphatically, as ‘the great Spanish poet’ and the ‘God of Poets’ who won the applause of ‘the highest monarch in Europe’, referring, of course, to his position as the Spanish king’s favourite playwright. 21 And just as the previous co-production had, this one, too, mentioned the intermediary work of Jacobus Barocas as the indispensable go-between who, through his translation, brought the exotic cornucopia of Spanish drama to the Netherlands:

I offer the noblest fruits from the genius of the great Spanish poet Lope de Vega Carpio. They won the applause of Europe’s highest monarch who cherished them so much, that they became well known all over the civilized world. And when, still inexperienced thereof, I heard them, they moved me and touched me so much, that I took the courage to follow the

20 Quote (in English translation by the author) from the dedication of Isaac Vos’s Gedwongen Vrient (Amsterdam: Jan van Hilten, 1646): ‘my [is] de Geest van den verstorven doch eeuwigh in heughnis levenden Madritsche Apoll, en grooten Spaensen Poëet Lope de Vega Carpio, opgewekt en herschapen door den kunst-lievenden en yverigen Heer Iacobus Baroces zwevende op Nederduytze wieken, voor mijne oogen verschenen, en al prikkelende zijn taalgenuot, en rust-besnijdende vrient, gedwongen, deeze zijne Gedwongen vrient mij over te dragen, om op onze Amsteldamsche Schouburgh in Neder-duytse Vaarzen te doen herleeven.’ I owe this observation to my former student, Leonor Álvarez Francés, in her University of Amsterdam MA thesis, The Phoenix Glides on Dutch Wings.

21 Wright, Pilgrimage to Patronage.
footprints of that God of Poets, as to practice myself in the qualities of his genius. Mr Barocas then helped me on the way and brought me so far that I could restyle and render him into Dutch verses, so that art lovers here may taste and enjoy, and now garner what other regions have yet been garnering.22

After *Gedwongen Vrient* and *Verwarde Hof*, it took one year, again, for the Amsterdam theatre to introduce and add another specimen to the Spanish import series: *La Fuerza Lastimosa*. Although Lope’s name was not mentioned, the play text book of the *Beklaaglyke Dwang* (1648) stressed the Spanish provenance as before, mentioning Barocas for his intermediary prose translation. At the same time, the third play in the series also testified to the growing confidence in producing Spanish successes on stage in the Schouwburg:

You will see a play here, that, if I am not wrong, will please you, all the more because the creator has kept an eye on the times of his life, rather than on the ancient rules of theatre. In my opinion, when writing drama plays for our own times, it does not make sense to stick to times foregone, now that the eyes want their share of what is on show, just as much as the ears. This play was translated from Spanish by Mister Barocas, and composed by me in Dutch rhyming verses.23

Even if Lope was not credited as the author, the confident and provocative Dutch voice echoed Lope’s revolutionary ideas on new theatre, as stated in the *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias*. Rejecting the ancients, readers and

22 Quote (in English translation by the author) from the preface by Leon de Fuyter to *Verwerde Hof* (Amsterdam: Johannes Jacot, 1647, fol. *1v*): ‘de eelste vruchten der harssenen van den grooten Spaenschen Poëet Lope de Vega Carpio, diese in geen kleyn aansien hebben ghebracht by den grootsten Staf-drager van Europa, die de selve zoo gekoestert heeft, datse bekent en geroemd zijn in al de redelijckste deelen der werelt, daarse my noch onkundigh zijnde, door het gehoor zoo vervoert, en doorgriet hebben, dat ik my heb derven verstouten, dien Godt der Poëten op de hielen te volgen, om my te oeffenen in de eygenschappen syjner wijsheden, ende eyndelijcke door den Heere Barokus soo veel te wege gebracht, dat hy de selve heeft hervormt, en gestelt in Nederduytsche vaarzen; op datse onse konstlievende (doch voornamelijck U E.) mochten smaaken en behagen; op dat wy hier door moogen plucken, het geene andere ghepluckt hebben.’

23 Cited (in translation by the author) from the introduction to the play text of *Beklaaglyke Dwang* by Vos (Amsterdam: Saeghman, 1648, fol. *A2v*): ‘U sult hier een spel sien, en, soo ick my niet bedriege, sal het u behagen, te meer, also de maker meer gesien heeft na de tijd daar in hy leefde, als wel op de oude Toneel-wetten; en het dunkt my ook ongerijmt, in het rijmen van Toneel-speelen, voor de tegenwoordige tijd, te letten op de voorledenen; nu het oog neffens de oren wil aandeel hebben in hetgeen haar vertoond werd. ’t Is uyt het Spaans overgeset door den Heer Barokes, en van my op Neerduyts Rijm gebragt.’
attendees were invited to come and, assuredly, enjoy this play as a spectacular treat for both the ears and the eyes. Posing the rhetorical question of why one should hold on to classical principles or ancient rules when modern audiences wanted modern drama, the preface challenged every classicist theatre maker in the Netherlands, in favour of the new popular drama from Spain.

The arch-enemy’s treasures

With three Spanish productions supplementing the Schouwburg repertory in three subsequent theatre seasons, Lope de Vega and his drama were firmly stepping into the light of Amsterdam’s stage. And performance frequencies kept up with the pace of the productions and public branding. To quantify the impact of the new Lope de Vega-vogue, a simple calculation for the year 1648 says it all. Lope’s *Beklaaglyke Dwang* scored nine premiere performances in the Schouwburg, the *Verwerde Hof* had seven shows and *Gedwongen Vrient* four, adding up to a total of 20 shows of that year’s 120 total shows. On average, once every three weeks a Lope play was on show that had been imported directly from Spain and labelled as such. The year 1648, therefore, may be considered as the historic year in Hispano-Dutch relations, not only for the peace treaty that formally ended Spain’s territorial claims in the United Provinces, but also for the glorious victory of Lope de Vega on the Schouwburg stage. This leads to the pressing question: apart from the artistic (and financial) successes, was there any reflection on the paradox of the arch-enemy’s triumph in the heart of Dutch cultural life? Preliminary poems in the series’ first two flagships do, indeed, reveal a hostile framing for the imported material.

As demonstrated, Isaac Vos’s *Gedwongen Vrient* edition of 1646 was the first Schouwburg text book ever to display a foreign, Spanish author’s name on the front cover, stressing his Spanishness in hailing qualifications of Lope as the ‘Apollo of Madrid’ and the ‘Great Spanish author’. The preliminary poem to the edition, composed by the Schouwburg actor Leon de Fuyter, equally professed admiration. Entitled ‘Roemvaarzen op de Gedwongen Vrient van Isaak Vos’, the laudatory poem’s opening scene pictured Spain in a state of mourning, not for the losses of war, but for the untimely death of its greatest author, whose pen contributed so much to ‘Madrid’s fame and to that Royal Throne of the West’ (‘om dat Atrops u ontydig heeft ontbraagen Dien VEGA die Madril, en d’Avondt-Vorst zyn stoel Vereerden door zyn Pen, zo hebt gy recht te klagen’). After this opening view of Spain, however, the
point of focus turned towards the Dutch playwright. Isaac Vos’s first point of praise was that, by rhyming the play in Dutch metrical verses, and thus presenting the Spanish original in a local fashion, he ensured that Lope was not dead but coming to life in Amsterdam:

Time is here that from his ashes is reborn
A Sun, as radiantly shining as the first one,
And bravely following in his heavenly course
To honour Vega, whom no time will ever darken.

Hailing the author and referring to Spain in every positive way, the laudatory poem so far is in line with the general agenda of the play text booklet: Vos’s *Gedwongen Vrient* reflected Lope’s radiance, fulfilling the poem’s pun on Lope’s nickname of the Phoenix and Sun of Madrid, of Spain’s Apollo. The suggested equilibrium is twisted, however, in the poem’s final part, where Vos is credited for his appropriation of Lope:

Even Oblivion passes on to his [Vos’s] lips
The almost forgotten name of his leader.
Will any time in the future not revere this reborn Raider
Or garland his head with well deserved laurel?

The poem’s image of the Dutch author as a predator capturing prey (‘Rover’) was inspired by the author’s name Vos, since ‘vos’ means ‘fox’ in Dutch. However, framing the Lope appropriation in terms of a laudable act of stealing, deservedly crowned with honour and laurel, may have activated the image of a victorious plundering among contemporary Dutch readers, alluding to a common phenomenon of Spanish-Dutch warfare. Cunningly stealing and looting, after all, were regularly praised Dutch strategies for weakening the formidable opponent’s resources just as much as in strengthening one’s own position. Spot-on topical puns and metaphors hailed the Dutch playwright

24 Quoted in English translation by the author, from Leon de Fuyter’s ‘Roemvaarzen’ in *Gedwongen Vrient* (Amsterdam: Jan van Hilten, 1646) fol. A2v: ‘De tydt genaakt dat uit zyn asse wordt herbooren / Een Zon, die in de glans van d’eerste ziels verlust: En zoekt dat zelve spoor, kloekmoedig na te spooren / Tot eer van Vega, die geen eeuw zyn glory blust.’
25 Quoted from Leon de Fuyter’s ‘Roemvaarzen’ in *Gedwongen Vrient* (Amsterdam: Jan van Hilten, 1646) fol. A2v: ‘Zelfs de vergeetelheid geeft aan zyn lippen over / Den schier verwelkte naam van zynen voedtster-heer. / Wat eeuw verpligt zich niet aan dees herbooren Rover. / Of vlegt geen kranssen voor zyn welverdiende eer?’
26 On Anglo-Spanish adaptations as piracy, see Fuchs, *The Poetics of Piracy*. 

who ‘stole’ and produced his Spanish play for the Schouwburg, and similar inventions were echoed in the introductory poem for the Spanish production of *Verwerde Hof* in following year's theatre season (1647). The name of the Dutch playwright, Leon de Fuyter, provoked an even more explicit use of the war-metaphors. Just as Vos had an association with the cunning fox, Leon invited a connection to the animal renowned for its bravery, the lion:

> And so this young Lion  
> In our times of confusion  
> Ripped off from the Spanish laurel crown  
> The very best of its leaves,  
> The most precious treasure  
> Ever in possession of Madrid.  
> He is bringing it as if in triumph to display  
> Attaching it to his crown of honour.

Bravery and well-deserved honour were the key elements in this laudatory poem, which for its victorious voice was explicitly entitled 'Triumphal Song' (‘Triumphlied’). Surpassing even Vos’s bravery in the previous poem, the young Lion, at the age of 25, had deprived Madrid of its glorious treasure by taking Lope’s play as a war loot and triumphantly presenting him on stage to the people in Amsterdam. To contemporary readers in the United Provinces, the metaphor of the brave young lion also alluded to the *Leo Belgicus* and the Dutch Lion’s triumph in the revolt against Spain. And so, in the year before the completion of the Peace and Spain’s recognition of the independent United Provinces, the ‘Triumphal Song’ introducing the Spanish play *Verwerde Hof* reached a climax in the rejoicing voice of the ultimate victory, bringing Lope de Vega from Spain in Leon de Fuyter’s captivity:

> You, Lope, be happy  
> To follow in swift pace  
> Your conqueror, who with you

---


28 Final part of the laudatory poem by Isaac Vos in Leonard de Fuyter’s *Verwerde Hof* (Amsterdam: Johannes Jacot, 1647, fol. *2v and *3r): ‘Nu Lopes zijt te vreen, / En volght met fluxe schreen / Uw’ winnaar, die met uw’ het lof / Sal deelen, van ’t verwarde Hof. / O! vega uw’ verblijt, / Die sijn gevanghen zijt.’
Will share the praise of Court in Confusion;
O Vega, rejoice
To be his prisoner.

With the *Verwerde Hof* text book published in 1647, the introduction of Spanish theatre reached its zenith in terms of topical allusions to the war. After the Peace of Westphalia was concluded, presentations of Spanish drama for the Schouwburg immediately dropped the aspect of Spain as the arch-enemy. From then on, the focus was on Spain's great drama tradition only, as the Lope production of *Beklaaglyke Dwang* in 1648 stressed the provenance in the preface, just as it amplified some of Lope's artistic ideas on modern theatre. The tone of the next Spanish play to appear on the Schouwburg stage, *Vorsichtige Dolheit* (Prudent insanity, 1649) by Joris de Wijse, was explicitly peaceful. Based on Lope's *El cuerdo loco*, this piece about a king who faked insanity in order to save his kingdom, was playfully introduced as a Spanish insanity (*Spaanse dolheit*). War was definitely over, and with it the triumphant tone of appropriation in the presentation of a Lope production: rather than plundered booty from Madrid, it was 'borrowed from Spain' as it said in the preface, 'in times of peace'.

**More Spanish authors entering the Schouwburg**

With the Spanish vogue firmly grounded, the Schouwburg widened the window on Spain and added a second Spanish playwright to the repertory. Surprisingly, the new author to be imported and marketed was not Calderón, but Juan Pérez de Montalbán, who, at the time, held a reputation in the Netherlands for his translated novels.²⁹ Produced for the Schouwburg in 1651, Montalbán's play *La más constante mujer* premiered in February 1652 under its Dutchified title *Stantvastige Isabella* (The constancy of Isabella). Another product of the successful Sephardic-Schouwburg co-operation, it shared the same provenance, derived from Spanish through the prose intermediary of Barocas into Dutch rhyming verses by the actor Leon de Fuyter.

For the new Spanish playwright, however, the play text booklet showed renewed efforts at product placement. The public presentation of *Stantvastige Isabella* featured a visual innovation. As the very first Dutch visualization of import drama from Spain, the frontispiece illustration of *Stantvastige Isabella* showed the play's heroine fighting as a virtuous and brave Pallas Athena to

---
²⁹ Rodríguez Pérez, ‘The Adventures of an Amsterdam Spaniard’. 
rescue her lover Carel, unjustly sentenced to death. Moreover, the preface to the work connected her brave and radiant appearance to the people's appreciation in Spain: 'her virtuous bravery was admired throughout all Spain' (‘wiens stantvastige fierheit gantsch Spanjen kost verwonderen’). Consistent with the earlier Spanish import series, Stantvastige Isabella also publicly described the transfer route: for its captivating plot and brilliant changes, the preface said, the Spanish play had been a favourite of the renowned Amsterdam patron and theatre lover (and Schouwburg director) Marten Kretzer, who facilitated the transfer by commissioning Barocas to make a prose translation. Isabella thus proved to be a direct Spanish import product.

I have fought like a Pallas, and with boldness
I saved my Carel's blood by shedding my own.
That's how I attacked his murderers. Are you surprised
That in a woman you see such bravery? (Stantvastige Isabella (1651), frontispiece and quote from Act 5. Courtesy University Library, University of Amsterdam)

In addition to the Spanishness of the source, the play text book made the most of presenting the new author. Montalbán’s name appeared prominently on the front page, with the Dutch playwright Leon de Fuyter clearly in second position. Just as the Lope editions had done before, Stantvastige Isabella hailed the playwright in the preface as ‘that great Spanish author’ (‘dien grooten Spaenschen Poëet’) and as ‘the praiseworthy Juan Pérez de Montalván, who gave Isabella her immortal name’ (‘den roem-waarden Ian Pérez de Montelvan, dieze een onsterfelijke Naam heeft doen bekomen’). Ultimately, two laudatory poems worked to promote the new author. One was in praise of Leon de Fuyter, addressing him as the adaptor of the play and predicting he would be honoured

---

30 The play's lines related to illustration, read: ‘Ick heb als een Pallas my gedragen; en met moet / Verdedigt Carels bloet; door ’t storten van mijn bloet. / Ick vloog hun in […] En ghy verwondert niet / Datge hier in een vrouw zoo’n grooten kloekheyt siet’ (Stantvastige Isabella, Act 5). Illustrated play text books in the Schouwburg were available since the groundbreaking edition of Jan Vos's Aran en Titus in 1641. Van Germez's Vervolgde Laura (1645), based on Jean Rotrou's translation of Lope, included one.

31 Leonard de Fuyter, Stantvastige Isabella (Amsterdam: Lodowijk Spillebout, 1651), fol *3r.

32 Paraphrase of Leonard de Fuyter's preface to Stantvastige Isabella (Amsterdam: Lodewijk Spillebout, 1651, fol *3r): ‘Deze Isabella neemt haren oorspronk van den roem-waarden Ian Perez de Montelvan, dieze een onsterfelijke Naam heeft doen bekomen. Deze comedia scheen geduurigh te speelen op de tongh van den seer konst-lievenden Marten Kretzer, zoo door de onvergelijkelijke reden, als uytsteeckende veranderingh, die eyndelik zoo veel te wege heeft gebracht, datze door den Heere Barocus is over-gezet, en door My in duytsche Vaarzen gerijm’t.’
Figure 4.3  *Stantvastige Isabella* (1651), frontispiece

![Image of the frontispiece of *Stantvastige Isabella*]

For his Dutch-speaking Isabella just as much as ‘the wise Montalván’ was celebrated for the play in ‘Mighty Spain’33 In contrast, the other poem addressed the deceased Spanish playwright directly (‘Aen Juan Peres de Montalvan’), predicting the fame of the ‘illustrious Montalbán’ (‘Doorluchte Montalban’) to reach even further, as stressed by the image in the final stanza of a Spanish Phoenix coming to life again on the Amsterdam stage34:

To Juan Peres de Montalvan
on his *Stantvastige Isabel*

33 ‘Aan Leon de Fuyter, op de vertaalde Isabella’ by Gillis van Staveren in *Stantvastige Isabella* (Amsterdam: Lodowijk Spillebout, 1651, fol. *4r): ‘De eer die Isabel den wijsen Montalvan In’t machtig Spanje gaf.’

34 ‘Aen Juan Peres de Montalvan’ by D. Lange in *Stantvastige Isabella* (Amsterdam: Lodowijk Spillebout, 1651, fol *3v): ‘Aen Juan Peres de Montalvan / Op zijn Stantvastige Isabel / Gerijmt door Leon de Fuyter. / Zoo ziet men noch u roem uyt d’overblevenassen / Ô Spaansche Fenix hier ten hoogen hemel wassen / En gy verdient by ons, als Spanje om dees stof / Geen minder dichters roem, maar vry veel meerder lof.’
as rhymed by Leon de Fuyter

And now you may witness your fame rising from remainders and ashes
O Spanish Phoenix, as high as the skies above
And here with us, you garner as you did in Spain
Not less, but rather even much more glory

The extraordinary case of Calderón

In contrast to the loud and overwhelming presentations of Lope and Pérez de Montalbán, the Schouwburg audience had a relatively late and modest way of getting to know Pedro Calderón de la Barca. As an exceptional case in the general transmission and marketing scheme of Spanish drama, Calderón's appearance in Amsterdam will be the final part of this analysis. Almost ten years after the Schouwburg's publicity campaign for Spanish plays started off with Lope, Calderón made his first appearance in Amsterdam's theatre in 1654. For this production, it was Schouwburg actor Leon de Fuyter, once more, who made the adaptation. However, compared to the Spanish series that he had been producing until then with his fellow actor Isaac Vos and in cooperation with Jacobus Barocas, this was a distinct case. On the one hand, the preface recommended the Don Jan de Tessandier by 'the great Calduron' in the usual Schouwburg marketing terms, as a play which had 'so much pleased the great scepter-holder of Spain that he had honored the theatre by his presence and royal tapestries'. On the other hand, however, the title page did not bring up the name of the Spanish author, nor did the name of the polyglot Barocas occur anywhere in the preface. In that sense, the Don Jan de Tessandier did not really follow the vogue, and until this day scholars have not been able to solve the mystery of identifying any Calderón play as its the source. Moreover, the plot of this play was not what audiences expected from Spain. Far from being a happy-ending comedia, the Don Jan was an utterly cruel story of revenge, its horrors, according to the single preliminary poem, even more terrible than those of Medea, cruelty's paradigm. And so they were: revengeful love, in this play, led to a patricide first, and to suicide in the end.

Calderón's Don Jan was a Fremdkörper in the Schouwburg. This Spanish play, typified as a tragedy (treur-spel) on the title page, did not win the hearts of the Amsterdam crowds nearly as much as the Spanish plays

35 Sullivan, Calderón in the German Lands, p. 448, n. 18 and 19.
already in the repertory. The problem was not the utter cruelty; crowds in the Schouwburg loved such plots in plays derived from the English tradition. After all, one of the crowd's favourites was Aran en Titus (Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus), which featured rape, mutilation, cannibalism, burning and a dozen killings in a row. Spanish theatre, in contrast, had built up a different image and reputation by then, and Don Jan did not meet those expectations. With only one-third of the theatre occupied on average, the new production had the poorest premiere ever for a Spanish play. The play was discordant for the Schouwburg. Calderón deserved a better start.

A second chance was given with his masterpiece La vida es sueño which premiered in the Schouwburg during that same theatre season of 1654. Undoubtedly, this was a production in line with what people in Amsterdam regarded as Spanish theatre. In fact, it was the most Spanish of all Spanish plays ever produced for the Schouwburg in terms of Spanish ingredients. The Dutch version even maintained the typical Spanish division into three jornadas, not adapting it to the Netherlandish theatre structure of a five-act play. This Calderón play, indeed, enjoyed booming success in the Schouwburg. One of the top hits in the repertory, Sigismundus, Prince van Poolen of't Leven is een droom, kept two-thirds of the theatre’s places occupied on average, with two or three shows per year during a performance history of over 130 years.

But the sad thing was that no one in Amsterdam, or in the Low Countries, knew that Sigismundus, Prince van Poolen of't Leven is een droom, was a play by Calderón. The Schouwburg text book was a skinny edition, lacking any information about the Dutch adaptor or the Spanish source. No preface, no laudatory poems, nothing but the summary of the plot and the Dutch verse translation appeared. That the latest treasure from Spain was introduced so differently from the ones produced in the Sephardic-Schouwburg co-operation, reveals another transmission for this play. La vida es sueño had entered the Dutch-speaking realm in the Brussels Hispano-Dutch contact zone. The Brabant dialect version, by an unknown member of the Vrije Liefhebbers, arrived in Amsterdam as a fine Spanish play text, but without any reference to the original author. In the first Schouwburg production nothing was altered or added, except for some minor replacements of dialect Brabantisms. For the Haarlem tour of 1656, the Amsterdam company fixed the lacuna by falsely inserting the name of Montalbán, just to make the announcement for ‘the best of all

36 For details on the adaptation, see Sullivan, Calderón in the German Lands, pp. 39-40.
Spanish comedies’ sound even more Spanish by using a playwright who had recently (and rightly) been praised in the new Schouwburg production of *Stantvastige Isabella*. In later times, the popular *Sigismundus, Prince van Poolen of ’t Leven is een droom*, was reissued in at least fifteen more editions, but the link between the masterpiece and Calderón, missing since Brussels, was never restored.

Only by 1668 did the name of Calderón emerge successfully in Amsterdam’s theatre life, due to a pair of plays that had been produced through the Sephardic-Schouwburg collaboration. One was done by the Amsterdam peripheral poet Dirck Heynck, a fervent fan of Spanish theatre. He introduced his play *Don Louis de Vargas* as a play ‘once brought to the Spanish stage in two parts by Don Pedro de Calderón’ (*eertijts in twee delen, door Don Pedro de Calderon, ten Spaensen Toneele gevoert*). A play of passion, abuse of power, intrigue and justice restored, also including actresses in male costume and duelling scenes, *Don Louis* was as Spanish as the people craved in Amsterdam – and performance statistics only underline its lasting Schouwburg popularity until the nineteenth century. The source, however, was *El tejedor de Sevilla*, a Spanish *comedia* by Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y Mendoza. We can only guess why the Dutch adaptor wanted the audience to believe it was Calderón’s; at the very least, it surely mattered that Alarcón had never been introduced as a playwright in the Schouwburg at all.

The other new play in 1668 mentioning Calderón as its source was done by the Schouwburg actor Adriaan Bastiaensz de Leeuw, in an alleged collaboration with Jacobus Barocas. Based on *El mayor encanto amor*, the Dutch version of *Toveres Circe* (1670) featured the classic love story of Ulysses and the witch Circe in a Spanish intrigue of emotions and bravery, passion and deceit, happily ending with the final victory of good over evil, including many alterations and changing fortunes. For all the *mudanzas* or changes or *veranderinge van staet*, the Schouwburg production of *Toveres Circe* went even one bold step further: it featured live metamorphosis on stage. Ulysses’s men, transformed into weeping trees and howling animals in the enchanted

---

37 In 1663, Dirck Heynck also produced the Spanish super hit *Veranderlyk geval* for the Schouwburg, based on *Las Mudanzas de la Fortuna* by Cristóbal de Monroy y Silva.

38 See ONSTAGE s.v. *Don Louis de Vargas*.

39 Calderón’s *El mayor encanto amor* has a unique double Hispano-Dutch transfer record. Almost simultaneously with the Schouwburg production, it was also produced in another adaptation by Claude de Griek, member of the Vrije Liefhebbers and published there in 1668. Just like the version of Calderón’s *La vida es sueño*, the Brussels translation of *El mayor encanto amor* was published anonymously and without reference to any Spanish source.
woods, were turned back into the beloved flesh-and-blood comrades in the play’s final act. With Circe’s witchcraft unbound in the performance, even the typical *gracioso* made a metamorphosis by changing, before the audience’s eyes, into a ridiculous monkey.

*Toveres Circe* was recommended in the preface as a play ‘made by the famous Spanish playwright Don Pedro Calderón, and translated into Dutch by the polyglot J. Barocas’ (‘gemaeckt door den beroemden Spaenschen poet Don Pedro Calderon, en vertaelt in Nederduytsch door den taalkundigen I. Barokes’), indicating once more the direct and high-quality transfer route that had brought so many theatre hits to Amsterdam’s crowds. *Toveres Circe* was, however, the final co-production of Amsterdam’s theatre with the Sephardic connoisseur of Spanish drama, Jacobus Barocas, who died one year later, in 1671. Bold as it was, the Schouwburg version of *El mayor encanto amor* finally introduced Calderón by name to the Amsterdam audiences and credited him as a great playwright from Spain’s endless drama resources.

**End**

By the time *Toveres Circe* was brought to stage, Amsterdam’s ever-changing theatre life was changing, yet again. The French-classicist vogue was entering now, to take over the course and programme in the Schouwburg. Artistically, the Spanish plays were under attack, exactly for the multiple changes in the overabundant plots and for the variety of characters, features with which Lope, and his local evangelists in the frontline, had deliberately challenged classical principles and rules. But intellectual opposition was not fierce enough to break a strong and popular tradition, and amidst the new élan for Corneille, Racine and Molière, many Spanish *comedias* remained on the stage, especially during peak moments such as the Amsterdam Fair (*Kermisweek*) in September, when the Schouwburg was open every day of the week and people would gather in masses. During the first three decades of the Schouwburg’s operations and even before the war with the arch-enemy had ended, Spanish treasures had come to stay and to become the backbone of Amsterdam’s popular repertory. Due to connoisseur selections, quality productions, and effective public marketing, the Spanish plays – plundered and stolen as war loot or borrowed in times of peace – dominated the theatre’s programming lists and emerged as the people’s plays in Amsterdam.
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5. ‘The Barke Is Bad, but the Tree Good’: Hispanophilia, Hispanophobia and Spanish Honour in English and Dutch Plays (c. 1630-1670)

Rena Bood

Abstract
In the seventeenth century, Spain featured prominently on the English and Dutch stages. Although this foreign influence has been overlooked in the past, especially in the Dutch context, scholars have recently broadened the scope of their analysis to Spain, but the tendency to focus on the image of the Spaniard in predominantly Hispanophobic terms remains widespread. This ‘Black Legend Spaniard’, demonizing the Spanish as the enemy, shows only one side of the coin. Taking the ‘typically Spanish’ characteristic of ‘honour’ as an example, this chapter explores how Spanish characters are presented on the English and Dutch stages, evincing that ‘honour’ was not only an exponent of a vengeful Spanish nature and that such characters could also be viewed as a source of inspiration.

Keywords: Spanish honour, seventeenth-century drama, El Cid, stereotypes, image (re)negotiation

In the first season of the animated series Archer (2009-present), Malory Archer exclaims: ‘Oh all Hispanics look roguish’;¹ and in the popular PC game Sid Meier’s Civilization 6 (2017) players are encouraged ‘to unite the world under one faith and one empire, making you truly the Most Catholic king’ as Philip II, and Spain is further given the ability to build ‘fleets and

¹ Reed, ‘Honeypot’.

Rodríguez Pérez, Y. (ed.), Literary Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia in Britain and the Low Countries (1550-1850). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2020
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armadas’ at an earlier stage than other nations in the game.⁴ These recent examples from popular culture find their roots well before the twenty-first century. In the seventeenth century, rogue narratives hailing from Spain were translated, imitated, emulated, and adapted in both England and the Dutch Republic,³ and the fear that Spain truly aspired to world domination, uniting all under the Catholic faith, was legitimately present.⁴ The persistence of the cultural stereotype of the Spaniard has largely been investigated with a focus on the negative aspects of the image, the ‘Black Legend’ narrative, in such seminal studies as William Maltby’s *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558-1660*, and K.W. Swart’s ‘The Black Legend during the Eighty Years War’. However, this focus on the Black Legend narrative paints an incomplete picture of the role Spain and the Spaniards played in seventeenth-century literary works and play texts, in particular. This chapter aims to bring to light the tension between the co-existing Hispanophilia and Hispanophobia in English and Dutch play texts and their paratextual materials between c. 1630 and 1670. It argues that the ‘blackness’ of the Black Legend can be further renegotiated to include ‘shades of grey’.

A stereotype, or a nation’s ‘inherent personality blueprint’, does not need to be empirically verifiable since it is the result of a process of cultural construction. In fact, Joep Leerssen notes that ‘their strongest rhetorical effect lies in [the] familiarity and recognition value rather than in their empirical truth value’.⁵ Thus, regarding Spain, we find that the image of the Spaniard as cruel, bloodthirsty, and violent amongst other things, stems from a time when Spain was a dominating force in Europe.⁶ As a reaction to the perceived threat from the Catholic Habsburg Empire, both England and the Dutch Republic carried out propaganda campaigns demonizing the Spanish whilst casting themselves as the ‘good’ counterpart.⁷ This Spanish Black Legend narrative was later adapted to target other countries, as for example in its shift from Spain to France in the Dutch Republic, and from Spain to the Dutch in England.⁸ However, throughout the seventeenth century, Spain would continue to be depicted negatively more often and with

---

² Firaxis Games, ‘Spanish Empire, Philip II’.
⁴ See Griffin, ‘New Directions’.
⁶ As reviewed by López de Abiada in ‘Spaniards’.
⁷ See the previously mentioned studies by Maltby and Swart, as well as Fuchs, *The Poetics of Piracy*.
⁸ See the introduction of this volume and Nocentelli, ‘The Dutch Black Legend’.
greater emphasis than any other nation. What we find, then, is a continuous cycle where a particular image of the expansive repertoire of anti-Hispanic images is affirmed and reinvented to offer the audience a well-known point of reference whilst ensuring that the slightly ‘new’ take is still appealing and the image does not grow stale. For inspiration, both England and the Republic often turned to Spain for source material, for as Barbara Fuchs notes, Spain was ‘not just a rival but an irresistible source’. The result, which Fuchs terms ‘piratical translation’, finds most of its strength ‘in its versatility, its ability to take from what is beyond the nation’s experience, and to yoke together the projects of poetry and empire’. In other words, whilst continuously recycling certain anti-Hispanic images, playwrights simultaneously used Spanish plays to reinvent these images. As such, variations between the same ‘type’ co-exist and thrive at the same time. To assume that these variations are all equally negative would be incorrect, as would be the assumption that no Spaniard in a play text could potentially be anything but a vehicle for ridicule, or cruelty, or any other characteristic commonly associated with a ‘Black Legend Spaniard’.

To illustrate the potential versatility of this sort of Spaniard on the English and Dutch stage, this chapter will examine the characterization of the Spaniard in three plays with a specific focus on the honour motif. Honour, as a trait often associated with the Spaniards, is frequently used by playwrights as the driving force behind a plot intent on revenge and vengeance. However, Joseph Rutter’s *The Valiant Cid* (1637), Johan van Heemskerk’s *De verduytste Cid* (The Dutchified Cid, 1641), and Dirck Pietersz. Heynck’s *Don Louis de Vargas of edelmoedige wraek* (Don Louis de Vargas, or honourable revenge, 1668) show that honour in a Spaniard is not necessarily or exclusively negative. The English and Dutch Cid were based on Corneille’s adaptation of Guillén de Castro’s *Las Mocedades del Cid* (c. 1600, printed 1618). The French *Le Cid* (1637) was the first non-Spanish treatment of the legend of the Spanish hero and was almost immediately followed by Rutter’s translation. It is not self-evident to make use of the same original Spanish play translated and adapted in both England and the Dutch Republic as is the case for this play, because of the differing requirements for the Amsterdam and London stages, with the former being a more centralized, commercial institution, and the latter housing multiple, competing theatre companies. Of course, taste

10 Ibid., p. 38.
11 For more information on the Amsterdam Municipal Theatre as a commercial institution, see Blom and Van Marion, ‘Lope de Vega’.
and the accessibility of plays could have also played a role in the selection criteria of theatrical material.

‘I hate your Spanish honour ever since it spoil’d our English plays’, Wildblood exclaims in John Dryden’s popular play *An Evening’s Love; or, The Mock-Astrologer* (1668). It is precisely this ‘Spanish honour’ which is the focus of this essay as it is one of the foremost motifs of the Black Legend, and, as Jorge Braga Riera notes, it is ‘one of the pillars of the Spanish plays that were triumphing in London’ in the seventeenth century. Braga Riera likewise points out that overall, in seventeenth-century English translations/adaptations of Spanish plays, the word ‘honour’ occurs more often than it did in the source texts though the English made no distinction between the ‘Spanish honor (social category) and honra (reputation) […] in the English comedies, “honour” covered both concepts’. Nevertheless, ‘honour’ was, as shown by Donald Larson, a key ingredient in Spanish Golden Age plays. Thus, considering the sheer quantity of Spanish Golden Age plays imported into the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth century, we can safely assume that this theme is equally present on the Dutch stage. Although ‘honour’, as part of the Black Legend, has primarily been considered for its negative attributions, it is a characteristic which holds the potential to be applied positively as well. This chapter seeks, therefore, to renegotiate the association between ‘honour’ and ‘Spaniard’ and to problematize the existing gradations in the attribution of this Spanish trait on the seventeenth-century stage. Despite the abundant Hispanophobia, there is a continued and co-existing current of non-Hispanophobic features that sometimes even appear to lean towards a certain Hispanophilia.

**Paratexts and Spain**

It is essential to take into account paratextual material when reconstructing how national images were perpetuated, or altered, in certain contexts. It offers the bridge between the literary work and the ‘real’ world, between the reader and the writer. It is the place where authors,
translators, printers, and other people involved in the process of producing and selling a book have the space needed to reflect upon the work at hand. Often, this space is used for dedications – usually addressed to patrons – and for convincing the reader of the work’s quality or interest. Additionally, it is the place where authors, printers, and booksellers can express their view on the work’s origins, on the changes they made, or on socio-political events taking place at the time. Paratexts offer more liberty for such observations than the literary text itself.18 Admiration for Spanish artistic endeavours, truly meant or as a commercial strategy, could also be expressed in paratexts.19 A telling example of English negotiation between co-existing Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia in a paratext is clearly on display in James Mabbe’s *The Spanish Bawd Represented in Celestina; or, The Tragicke-Comedy of Calisto and Melibea* (1631), from which I took my title. The *Celestina* (1499) has been a major influence on literature in Western Europe, and in both England and the Netherlands this influence is clearly visible. The Spanish edition was printed in Antwerp, which made it easily accessible in the Low Countries where the Dutch translation would go through several editions.20 Though the story of the *Celestina* was well-known in England, most other plays or editions have been lost. Thus, besides the 1525 edition printed by John Rastell, Mabbe’s translation of 1631 is the only remaining one until Captain Stevens’s rendition in 1707 as *The Bawd of Madrid*.21 Writing about the character of Celestina in the preface, Mabbe notes:

> Her life is foule, but her Precepts fair; her example naught, but her Doctrine good; her Coate ragged, but her mind inriched with many a golden Sentence; And therefore take her not as she seems, but as she is, and the rather, because blacke sheepe have as good Carcasses as white. […] The barke is bad, but the tree good.22

18 See Belle and Hosington’s *Thresholds of Translation*, which discusses both textual, material and cultural transfer in early modern books and the translation and cultural use of paratexts.
19 For the device of Spanish branding, see the prefaces in Blom’s contribution in this volume. For instance, from 1645 onwards, Lope de Vega’s authorship was emphatically praised.
20 The *Celestina* was printed in Dutch in 1550, 1574, 1580, and 1616. There are different versions of these latter two editions, which still raises the question of authorship and source text for these translations. See *Celestina: An Annotated Edition*. It was likewise printed in Antwerp where it went through eight editions between 1539 and 1601. See Geers, ‘De studie van Spaanse invloeden’.
21 See Murillo ‘Love and Chastity’ and ‘Cultural Transfer’.
Here the author renegotiates the original ‘corteza/moello’ argument made by Teresa de Cartagena, justifying her authorship of her theological work *Arboleda de los enfermos*. As Elizabeth Howe explains, ‘Sor Teresa employs an image drawn from the natural world. A tree’s bark or *corteza* is “very robust and strong and resistant to the weather”, while the core or *moello* “is weak and delicate”.’²³ Mabbe reapplies this metaphor – which was initially intended to signify the strength of men and how it protected the weakness of women – to translation by specifically using it along with the ‘redressing’ analogy commonly employed to signify early modern translation practices. Here the Spanish and English ‘Carcasses’ (i.e. the bare bones), Mabbe argues, are equally good in quality. In other words, the outward appearance of the Spanish black wool and bad bark does not hinder the fact that the story itself is ‘inriched with many a golden Sentence’. Once stripped of the bad bark and the black wool, Celestina’s core is like that of the English. The reader is advised not to take her at face value, for her outward appearance is Spanish, but to see beyond her looks and perceive her true character, one with a good ‘Doctrine’, and fair ‘Precepts’.²⁴ What Mabbe means to say here is not that Celestina is virtuous or selfless, but rather he refers to her role as discreet mediator between Calisto and Melibea, the two illicit lovers in the story. Celestina is known, according to Mabbe, for her extraordinary understanding of what drives the other characters and is eloquent and fair in her dealings with them.

Mabbe observes that the ‘bones’ of the Spanish work are like the ‘bones’ of an English literary work, and a similar though different take on this is offered in a dedicatory remark in the extremely popular play *De verduytste Cid* (1641), where its author claims to have found a ‘Hollands hart in een Spaanse boesem’. The dedicatory remark in *De verduytste Cid*, reads as follows:

> I let myself think that I found a Dutch heart in a Spanish bosom; that is, an unmovable proponent of Patriotic freedom, and a dauntless opponent of the imposed foreign supremacy: which this Cid repels with words right worthy to be spoken by a free Dutchman against the imperiousness of

²³ Sor Teresa was forced to defend her work publicly when ‘after its appearance, a number of people questioned whether a woman, especially one who was deaf, could have written a work that drew on Scripture and religious sources as this one had’ (Howe, *Education and Women*, p. 25).

²⁴ González Echevarría suggests that because of her wanton ways, Celestina ‘could hardly be touted as the expression of national identity, as was Don Quixote’. Nevertheless, Celestina’s Spanishness was not a source of debate (see *Celestina’s Brood*).
the present-day Spaniard: And the more remarkable because the Cid was given these words to speak by the pen of a Spanish Jesuit (severe amongst the severe). This, dear reader, I did not want you to be unaware of.25

Here the author/translator, Johan van Heemskerk, shares with the reader how, upon reading the source text, he found a kinship between the Dutch people and the Spanish protagonist Roderigo, otherwise known as the Cid. Van Heemskerk does not inform his readers that the Cid is a medieval hero who fought against the Moors, which suggests that either the figure of the Cid was so well-known that he required no introduction, not even in the Dutch Republic, or that Van Heemskerk himself was unaware of the cultural importance of the Cid in Spain. The history of Don Rodrigo Diaz de Vivar, the Cid, and his celebrated deeds against the Moors in eleventh-century Spain, continued to grow throughout the Middle Ages and expanded into an impressive body of epic literature, including El poema del Mio Cid (c. 1140). Even in the opening chapter of Don Quixote he is lauded as a praiseworthy champion. His story became a legend and would attain over time the status of a myth, as he was placed on a pedestal as the example of Spanish heroism in the nineteenth century.26 The fact that he was actually more a ‘mercenary’ collaborating with Christians and Moorish masters is something nuanced by twentieth-century historiography at a later stage. Within the Spanish context he is to be compared to Arthur, Roland or Siegfried, as a national hero whose destiny is inextricably linked to that of his country. Since he is remembered as a heroic commander fighting on the Spanish side against the Moorish conquerors, it is not surprising that the figure of the Cid came to be used as a symbol in the fight against oppression and tyranny.27

25 Van Heemskerk, De verduytste Cid, preface: ‘ick my liet duncken een Hollandts hert in een Spaenschen boesem ghevonden te hebben; dat is een onoversettelijcken voorstander der Vadderlandsche vryheyt, en een oversaeght teghenspreecker van den opdrangh der uytheemscher heerschappy: Die dese Cid afweert met woorden recht weerdigh om door een vryen Hollander tegen den heersch-sucht der huysendaegsche Spanjaerden uytghesproocken te sijn; En des te aenmerckelijkker om datse de Cid door de penne van een Spaenschen Jesuit (heftigh onder de hevige) inde mondt ghegeven weren. Dit wilde ick niet, billicke Leser, dat u onbewust soude sijn.’
26 See Davies, who argues that the Cid became Spain’s national hero when ‘Romanticism collided with Nationalism in the nineteenth century’ (Europe, p. 348).
27 See Stubbs, The Constitutional History of England, where he argues that ‘In Spain too the permanency of the Germanic or of the kindred Visigothic influences is a fact of the first historical importance. Here, upon the substratum of an indigenous race conquered, crushed, re-created, remodelled into a Roman province more Roman than Rome itself, is superinduced the conquering race, first to ravage, then to govern, then to legislate, then to unite in religion, and lastly to lead on to deliverance from Moorish tyranny’ (p. 4).
This play, celebrating Spanish military success of all things, was evidently judged to resonate with the Dutch rhetoric of freedom and rebellion against a ‘foreign supremacy’. Van Heemskerk finds this all the more remarkable as the author of the original is said to be a severe Spanish Jesuit. So, whilst an originally Spanish play, about Castilian/Spanish military success against the Moors, with Spanish characters, is here commended, the antagonism towards the ‘present-day Spaniard’ is simultaneously present, represented by such words as ‘imperiousness’, a trait often included in the Black Legend. It is a point Van Heemskerk finds important to make, but not in defence of his decision to translate a Spanish play but rather to ensure that the reader is aware of the incredible feat of finding that ‘Dutch heart in a Spanish bosom’. His Cid is not only ‘Dutchified’ because he is translated into Dutch, but also because the deeds and laudable character of this Cid make him seem to display Dutch virtues and endeavours.

The Cid cloaked in English and Dutch

The noticeable tension between dislike of Spain and admiration for Spanish authors/source texts is tangible in English and Dutch drama. To see how this tension functions in the play texts themselves, we will now turn to both the Dutch and English versions of the Cid, compared side by side below, and the Dutch tragedy Don Louis de Vargas. The selection of this last play serves to show that even within the tragic genre, which allows for most of the representations of Spaniards as cruel and bloodthirsty, honour is not necessarily used to highlight a negative aspect of the Spaniards, and the play’s popularity (with 142 performances) attests to the audience’s willingness to embrace this different perspective on a familiar motif.28 Spanish honour, besides often being the cause of the cruel and bloody actions in a (revenge) tragedy, can be employed in a more positive way when it is used as a vehicle of praise (for the Cid), and as proof of the justifiable motivations behind the character’s actions (as is the case with Don Louis), bloody though they still might be.

The Dutch and English Cid are strikingly similar in their translated forms. Both works were translated from the French translation by Pierre Corneille, which is considered to be a remarkably faithful one of Guillén de Castro’s original Las Mocedades del Cid. Though Joseph Rutter’s translation appeared earlier (1637), the only information about its performance available to us

28 See ONSTAGE.
stems from the second half of the seventeenth century. From this information, however, we gather that it was not a popular play on stage, unlike its Dutch counterpart, which was performed no fewer than 230 times in the Amsterdam Municipal Theatre between 1641 and 1768, earning it the fifth place in the overall ranking of most frequently performed plays. The story of the Cid is driven by honour, and from the onset it shows all the signs of developing into a typical revenge tragedy. When Roderigo defends his family’s honour from the insult committed by Cimena’s father, he kills the father and thus forces Cimena to seek justice for her loss. Despite the fact that the two are deeply in love with each other, Cimena adheres to custom and remains steadfast in her quest for redemption of her father’s honour. However, this is the point where the play steps away from the revenge-tragedy genre as it sidelines Cimena’s quest for vengeance: a new, more imminent danger requires Roderigo’s attention, and rather than offering up his life uselessly to satisfy Cimena’s desired justice, he joins the military to defend Castile against the Moors. Roderigo returns a hero, and the king, aware of Cimena’s love for Roderigo, finally forces her to let go of her desire for vengeance.

Even without knowing the plot, it is not difficult to pick up on its main theme. The word ‘honour’ is used no fewer than 60 times in the English translation, and ‘valiant’ follows with another 34 mentions. Terms such as ‘revenge’, ‘avenging’ or ‘dishonoured’ are used intermittently as well. Thus, on the basic lexical level, there is a noticeable link between ‘Spain’ and ‘honour’, which steers the audience towards perceiving this connection. However, as mentioned before, in the original El Cid, ‘honour’ has a double meaning as in Spain the concept is twofold. On the one hand, there is honra, a type of honour bestowed upon one by a superior and often ‘associated with the idea of surplus, ambition, property, wealth, power, high office, war, and culturally-specific masculine values’. This ‘honour’ could be acquired or won, but above all, it needed to be recognized by those superior in the social hierarchy. On the other hand, there is the concept of honor, which revolves around the honourableness of one’s heart, soul, and mind. Essentially, honor cannot be acquired for it is present in the inherent goodness of a person. Although this might sound like a more ‘noble’ form of honour, it directly relates to fame and reputation and it thus requires outward recognition of the goodness of character. However, because the terms were used synonymously, it allowed playwrights to sometimes create ‘twists’ in their works which had

29 See Van Lennep, The London Stage.
30 See ONSTAGE.
31 Lauer, ‘Honor/Honra Revisited’, p. 79.
'to do with the ambiguity in the use of the terms'. This is likewise the case in *The Cid* where Roderigo’s acquisition of *honra* on the battlefield ensures that the king will forgive his ‘honour debt’ to Cimena, and thus delivers a happy ending.

In the original Spanish *Cid*, the distinction between *honor* and *honra* is particularly relevant because even though Roderigo is already in possession of *honor*, it is the additionally won *honra* which saves his life and love in the end. But unlike Spanish, both English and Dutch only have one word to describe ‘great respect, esteem, or reverence received, gained, or enjoyed by a person or thing; glory, renown, fame; reputation’ namely: ‘honour’ or ‘eer’.

One question that arises, then, is whether or not the English and Dutch playwrights were aware of these two different types of Spanish honour. As I argue elsewhere, in early modern English plays, the double meaning of Spanish honour is at times used to contrast Spanish characters as well as to create intrigue. In Dutch plays, however, the meaning of Spanish honour remains primarily lodged in the realm of the physical world, thus embodying the meaning of *honra*. In the light of the historical circumstances, it is plausible that Spanish characters could with difficulty be perceived as in possession of inherent, positive *honor*, but more in connection with *honra*, which implied in some cases the deployment of strategies involving vengeance.

However, though the Dutch theatrical traditions tend to perceive Spanish honour as *honra*, the concept of *honor* is still present in the play. *The Cid* has a couple of built-in moments in which there is a reflection upon this inherent honour. For example, in Rutter’s edition, Roderigo is introduced to us by Cimena’s father as follows:

> But above all, in Roderigo’s face  
> There’s not a line which speaks not a brave man;
His family has been fruitfull still in souldiers,
As if they had beene borne ith' midst of lawrels.
His fathers valour, in his time, unequall'd,
[...]
And Roderigo's person seemes to promise
The vertues of his father.36

And in the Dutch translation as:

Roderigo above all has no line in his face which does not uncover his
courage
and that does not show the knightly deeds
of his house's lineage, overladen with laurels
His father's bravery was without equal
[...]
His son promises no less.37

Here, the emphasis is on Roderigo's inherent qualities such as bravery,
courage and virtue. Because these qualities stem from his lineage and
Roderigo himself has not yet done anything to enhance them (though
he is expected to do so in the future), the honourable reputation here
described is part of Roderigo's honor. It is, in fact, his honor which causes
the initial conflict in the play as Roderigo challenges Cimena's father to
a duel for having offended his family's honour. In the duel, Roderigo kills
Cimena's father. Cimena then (in keeping with custom) seeks justice for the
loss of her family's honour, a loss which may be rectified only by blood.38
However, as Roderigo acquires honra in battle, the king forgives this
'honour debt' in order to find a 'temperate way' to resolve the conflict.39
As a captain in the army, Roderigo devises a plan to derail the Moors’
surprise attack. In his capacity as soldier, Roderigo shows exemplary
skill, talent and bravery. This is recognized first by the Moors, who hail
him as ‘the Cid’ (or, ‘the Lord’), and it is then acknowledged by the king

36 Rutter, The Valiant Cid, Act 1, Scene 1, ll. 17-23.
37Van Heemskerk, De verduytse Cid, Act 1, Scene 1, ll. 1-71. ‘Roderigo boven al en heeft niet eenen treck / in ’t aensicht, die sijn moet ten vollen niet ondeckt / En die niet uyt en beelt de Ridderlijke daden / Van sijn manhafte huys, met Lauwer overladen. / Sijn Vaders dapperheydt was sonder weder-paer, [...] Zijn Zoon belooft niet min.’
38 This is made explicit in Rutter’s The Valiant Cid, Act 3, Scene 5, and Van Heemskerk De verduytste Cid, Act 3, Scene 6, ll. 1-64.
which allows the honour gained on the battlefield to add to his honour as a nobleman:\footnote{Rutter, \textit{The Valiant Cid}, Act 4, Scene 3, ll. 9-16. In Corneille’s edition, from which both Rutter and van Heemskerk translate their plays, this passage reads: ‘Mais deux Roys, tes captifs, feront ta recompense, / Jls t’ont nommé tous deux leur Cid en ma presence, / Puis que Cid en leur langue est autant que Seigneur, / Je ne t’enuieray pas ce beau titre d’honneur. / Sois de sormais le Cid, qu’ace grand nom tout cede, / Qu’il deuienne l’effroy de grenade & Tolede, / Et qu’il marque a tous ceux qui vivent sous mes loix / Et ce que tu me vaux & ce que ie te dois.’}

\begin{verbatim}
But the two captiv’d Kings which thou hast taken,
Shall give thee thy reward, they both have nam’d thee
Their CID before me; which in their tongue sounds
As much as Lord in ours, and this faire title
I will not envy thee; from henceforth be
Their CID, that at thy name the Moores may tremble.
And that my Subjects hearing it may know
Thy value, and how much to thee I owe.\footnote{Rutter, \textit{The Valiant Cid}, Act 4, Scene 3, ll. 13-20.}
\end{verbatim}

And in Van Heemskerk’s edition it reads:

\begin{verbatim}
Two kings, whom you have brought me here yourself, captured
They will give you the reward for this service:
They have called you their CID, that is their lord,
And I do not begrudge you that high name of honour.
Be from now on the CID for whom all must make way
Who brings fright and fear to the Moorish kingdoms
And that by this name my whole country knows
What you are worth to me, and what I owe you.\footnote{Van Heemskerk, \textit{De verduytste Cid}, Act 4, Scene 3: ‘Twee Koningen, die ghy my selfs hier brenght gevangen / Die sullen u doen ‘t loon van desen dienst ontfangen: / Sy hebben u ghenemt haer CID, dat is haer Heer, / En ik misgun u niet dees hoogen naem van eer. / Segt nu voortaen DE CID, voor wien het al moet wijcken, / Die schrik en anghst brenght aen de Moorse Coninghrijcken, / En dat by desen naem mijn gatnsche landt beken / Wat ghy my waerdigh zijt, en ick u schuldgigh ben.’}
\end{verbatim}

As Lauer argued, \textit{honra} had to be recognized by a superior, and in plays this was often the king. Without this recognition, none of Roderigo’s military honours would enhance his status at court. But in the passage above, spoken by the king, he clearly intends for the honorary title ‘the Cid’ to be used in reference to Roderigo throughout Spain. Roderigo’s honourable behaviour is not limited to the battlefield, for despite all the extra \textit{honra} gained by his
victory over the Moors, he would end his life if his love Cimena demanded it (to restore her family’s honour). This conflict is typical for honour comedias of the Spanish Golden Age, and such conflicts may be resolved only by ‘the arbitration of a king’. In The Cid, this is exactly what happens as the king forgives Roderigo’s ‘honour debt’ to Cimena’s family in the end, not because of Roderigo’s inherent honor but because of his acquired honra.43 The Cid, who acquires personal honour through defending his country against the Moors, likely resonated with the Dutch audience on two levels: the plot firstly recalled their own fight against a ‘foreign oppressor’, and secondly, the hero was endowed with a highly inspiring sense of noble ‘honour’. An English audience, however, would not have experienced a kinship with the hero fighting against oppression. The different contexts in which the play appeared may therefore account for the discrepancy between the reception the play received in the Dutch Republic and how audiences responded in England.

Don Louis, the avenging Spaniard

Adhering more closely to the genre of the revenge tragedy is Don Louis de Vargas, of Edelmoedige wraek (1668) by Dirck Pieterszoon Heynck. It is a complicated play, with a quickly developing plot, whose 142 performances proved to be very popular. It is a translation from the Spanish El tejedor de Segovia (1619) by Juan Ruiz Alarcón y Mendoza, which was first performed in 1668, generating €24,583 in revenue for eight performances in its first year.44 It became a stock play for the Amsterdam Municipal Theatre, being performed regularly up until 1788. Like a typical revenge tragedy, the play emphasizes honour and vengeance and, being a tragedy, it is not afraid to show the audience the bloody results. Don Louis’s father, accused of treason, is innocently executed, jump-starting a chain of events which leads Don Louis to seek revenge on the two conspirators who provided the king with false information upon which he based his judgement. Julian and Suërito, the guilty

43 Lauer argues that ‘honour comedias of the Spanish Golden Age are capable of stirring emotions not because they deal with something familiar but, on the contrary, precisely because they do not. […] Some of these twists have to do with the ambiguity in the use of the terms honor/honra. […] Other turns have to do with the irresoluble clash between these two concepts. […] Other developments deal with the resolution of honourable conflicts in a temperate way.’ This last resolution is exemplified in The Cid (Lauer, ‘Honor/Honra Revisited’, p. 86).
44 See Blom’s contribution in this volume and the ONSTAGE online database for original revenue in gilders, which I converted to today’s currency using the tools provided by the International Institute of Social History, ‘Value of the Guilder/Euro’ (http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/calculate.php).
parties in question, conspire with the Moors to assassinate the king, a plot which is revealed to the king by Don Louis as he finally exacts his revenge.

When we look at Don Louis de Vargas, for example, the focus is decidedly on honra. As such, the king says, ‘And we, according to your services, raise you up with honour, rise, Count, we make you Stadholder in Madrid.’ By bestowing a new title upon the count, the king increases the honra the count already possesses. That ownership is a constant theme in relation to honour in the play becomes equally clear when, after their father is tried and executed for treason of which he is innocent, Louis has the following conversation with his sister:

Louis: You will have to miss me, if you want to find me again, 
Otherwise your honour as well as mine would both be spilt.
Lizandra: What do you want me to miss, to then win you again, 
I pray you, brother, say?
Lizandra: Life!
Louis: Yes, our honour is worth that much to us.
Lizandra: And who will take it from me?
Louis: Even the honour, now so unearthed.
Lizandra: The executer, who will it be?
Louis: Me.
Lizandra: You, how would it concern you?
Louis: Me myself, I have full power, it is my own business.
[...]
Louis: You must permit the punishment.
Lizandra: Why?
[...]
Louis: The Count, who does not shy away from evil nor horrors, 
Wants to enjoy your chastity, either voluntarily given or by force taken.

---

45 Sullivan notes that, although the play was initially believed to be originally by Calderón, it was actually a source text by Juan Ruiz de Alarcón (El tejedor de Segovia), which inspired Dirck Pieterszoon Heynck. Furthermore, ‘in the original, the hero is named Don Fernando Ramírez and his father’s and sister’s names are also different, but Heynck’s translation otherwise conveys the pruned Spanish text with uncanny accuracy’ (Calderón in the German Lands, p. 55).
46 Heynck, Don Louis, Act 2, Scene 9, ll. 85-110: ‘En wy na diensten u met eer verheffen mogen / Rijst Graef, wy maken u Stadhouder in Madrid’. In the Spanish text, this reward with a title does not occur as he is already a count at the onset of the play.
As the last remaining male of the family, Louis assumes ‘ownership’ of his sister and demands her death in order to preserve the family honour they have left. Her chastity still belongs to the family, but as Louis points out, the count wants it, either voluntarily or by force. Legally, Louis’s statement, ‘I have full power, it is my own business’, holds true. His judgement – that her life is worth less than their honour – therefore becomes Lizandra’s death sentence.

Don Louis is the avenger in this play, but this is not shown in a negative light. Rather, Louis’s justification as expressed by his fellows on stage inspires the audience to root for him. ‘Your deeds / O brave Don Louis deserve our mercy’,48 says the king, and even Julian, who is on the receiving end of the vengeance exclaims as he is dying, ‘O heaven! I have suffered my righteous punishment. [...] I pray, forgive me’,49 just as Suërto’s dying words are ‘now be satisfied / O Vargas! Because you have taken your desired revenge. [...] I Pray, forgive me, like / I forgive you for my death.’50 All surviving characters agree that the course of action Louis followed was not only justifiable; it was the right thing to do. Besides, Louis takes no pleasure in seeking revenge. In fact he notes, ‘I then sadly fulfil (though by necessity) this’.51 Even though Don Louis exists for the sole purpose of avenging his family – appearing on stage at the onset of the revenge with the play concluding immediately after this revenge is satisfied – he is not the Black Legend ‘avenging Spaniard’ since the play goes out of its way to convince the audience of the righteousness of his pursuit. From the king to those whose blood satisfies his revenge, Louis is acknowledged to be in his full right, his family’s honour once again restored, by the highest authority in the play: the king.


48 Heynck, Don Louis, Act 5, Scene 5, ll. 178-183: ‘Uw daden / O dapp’ren Don Louis verdienen ons genaden.’ The Spanish original is lengthier but conceptually similar: ‘Fernando, á vuestro valor / Y al de vuestra gente, debo / La vitoria, que hoy alcanzo; / Y cuando fueran los vuestros / Delitos, y no venganzas / Tan justas, les diera, en premio / De hazaña tan valerosa, / En mi gracia.’

49 Heynck, Don Louis, Act 5, Scene 8, ll. 42-43: ‘O hemel! ’k heb mijn straf regtvaardig hier geleden, [...] ’k bidt, wilt het my vergeven.’ Original Spanish: ‘¡Muerto soy! ¡Cielo! Justo es el castigo / De mis culpas, escucha, ya que muero.’

50 Heynck, Don Louis, Act 1, Scene 15, ll. 121: ‘Weest nu te vreën, [...] Ik u mijn doot vergeef.’ The Spanish original differs slightly: ‘Muerto soy, tente, Fernando / Y pues ya muero, confieso / Que á ti y a tu noble padre / La vida y honor os debo.’

51 Heynck, Don Louis, Act 5: ‘Volvoer dan (doch uit noot) dit Treurspel al te droef.’
Don Louis’s character is all the more remarkable when we consider other tragedies where Spanish honour plays a part. One of the best-known and most popular tragedies showing the cruelty and extreme vengeance that the Spaniards are capable of is undoubtedly *Don Jeronimo, Maerschalk van Spanjen* (Don Hieronimo, marshal of Spain, 1621) by Adriaen van den Bergh, freely translated from Thomas Kyd’s *The Spanish Tragedy* (1592). In Van den Bergh’s play there is no room for a nuanced approach to vengeance. Jeronimo, like Don Louis, is the avenger, and though somewhat justified, he famously pushes his vengeance too far and turns it into one of the bloodiest spectacles displayed on the early modern stage. Although this very popular play is a translation from an English play, and not an original Spanish work, *The Spanish Tragedy* was seminal in the forging of vengeful Spanish characters, sometimes driven by honour, on the Dutch stage.\(^{52}\) Employed very differently, yet presented as one of the reasons for trying, judging, and executing the main characters, is ‘honour’ in *De dood van de graaven Egmont en Hoorne* (1685).\(^{53}\) In this historical play it is suggested that the Dutch in their revolt, where the Count of Egmont and the Count of Horne played a key part, dishonoured Governor General Margaret of Parma, and thus ‘it is the right of the king’s honour’ to persecute and execute the two noblemen.\(^{54}\) Though only one of the motivations in the play, the injury to the Spanish king’s honour, is consistently alluded to. The president of the Blood Council declares, for example, ‘Teach them to hold their tongue, these reproaches, if allowed to continue, hurt us, and injure the king’s honour.’\(^{55}\) However, unlike in *Don Louis*, the vengeance needed to restore the injured honour is presented to the audience as completely unjustified and is definitely not celebrated. Thus, the character of Don Louis offers us a unique though clearly popular take on Spanish honour, one which is justified and not taken to the extremes.

To conclude, though ‘honour’ and ‘Spain’ are closely linked, and frequently connected in a negative manner in early modern drama, the representation of Spanish honour on the Dutch and English stages takes on different forms. In *The Cid*, an original Spanish play, the Spanish concepts of *honor* and *honra* are used to create the tension in the plot, and though neither Rutter nor Van

---

52 See Hoenselaars and Helmers, *The Spanish Tragedy*.
53 The play was performed 122 times and was thus a hit on the Amsterdam stage. Considering it conveys the story of two heroic Dutch counts who died as martyrs for the Dutch Revolt, this popularity is perhaps not surprising.
54 Asselijn, *De dood van de graaven Egmont en Hoorne*, Act 2, Scene 2, l. 86: ‘Dit ’s recht des Konings eer.’
55 Ibid., Act 2, Scene 3, ll. 72-74: ‘Men leerd hun eens de tong te snoeren / Al deez’ verwytingen, indien men verder ga, / Die kwetzen ons, en gaan des konings eer te na.’
Heemskerk explicitly names the two distinct concepts, their faithful rendition of them into English and Dutch exposed their respective audiences to them, making them aware of the Cid’s virtues. Equally closely associated are the concepts of ‘revenge’ and ‘Spaniard’, which we find in relation to ‘honour’ in Don Louis de Vargas. Don Louis’s loss of honra (for it is the honour of worldly goods, such as titles and status, which is lost) drives him to exact his justified revenge. Because of its association with revenge, ‘honour’ is placed in a more negative light in this particular case. The success of The Cid in the Dutch Republic as opposed to its tepid reception in England shows us that, as mentioned by Van Heemskerk in the preface, the play resonated with the Dutch struggle for liberation. The main liberator in the play is the Spanish Roderigo, his character exemplifies honour – both as inherent goodness and as a justified reward. What is more, the Dutch could mirror themselves in this brave and exemplary hero who could have very well had a Dutch heart.

This chapter has shown that honour, though closely linked to Spain, was not necessarily presented as a negative attribute and that ‘shades of grey’ are to be traced within the Black Legend narrative. Furthermore, it is remarkable that the Dutch Cid enjoyed the success that it did as it was performed at the same time as famous Hispanophobic plays like Beleg ende Ontset der Stadt Leyden (The siege and liberation of the city of Leiden, 1644) by Reinier Bontius, featuring the extreme cruelty of the Spanish army in the Low Countries. This play, performed 304 times between 1645 and 1766, employs the Black Legend narrative to its full – or ‘darkest’ – extent whilst the Cid offers audiences a more positive – or ‘gradated’ – counterpart. It seems that the Dutch public did not have any problems watching Spaniards on stage embodying such different roles, some encouraging Hispanophobia, others inviting admiration for their Spanish traits.

Works Cited

Primary sources

Asselijn, Thomas, De dood van de graaven Egmont en Hoorne (Amsterdam: Erfgenamen van Lescailje, 1668).


56 ONSTAGE.

Heemskerk, Johan Van, *De verduytste Cid* (Amsterdam: D. van der Stichel, 1641).


**Secondary sources**


Firaxis Games, ‘Spanish Empire, Philip II’, in *Sid Meier’s Civilization 6* (2K Games, 2017).


ONSTAGE, the Online Datasystem of Theatre in Amsterdam from the Golden Age to Today, ed. by Frans R.E. Blom, Harm Nijboer and Rob van der Zalm, http://www.vondel.humanities.uva.nl/onstage/ (last accessed: 16/08/19).

Reed, Adam, ‘Honeypot’, in Archer, season 1, episode 5 (First aired: 4 February 2010 on FX, 2009-present).


About the Author

Rena Bood is a PhD candidate in the VIDI project ‘Mixed Feelings: Literary Hispanophilia and Hispanophobia in England and the Netherlands in the Early Modern Period and the Nineteenth Century’ at the University of Amsterdam. The title of her thesis is ‘Between Hisponophobia and Hispanophilia: The Spanish Fascination in 17th-century English and Dutch Literature’. She holds a BA in English language and culture, and a research MA in literary studies from Leiden University. Her main areas of interest are John Milton, translation studies, imagology, and Anglo-Dutch-Spanish cultural exchanges.
6. James Salgado: Anti-Spanish Sentiment and the Popish Plot
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Abstract
The case of James Salgado, the Romish priest turned Protestant, is extremely interesting in the context of the Spanish Black Legend. Writing in the 1670s and 1680s, Salgado claims to be a Spanish ex-priest who was imprisoned by the Inquisition, served time rowing as a galley slave, escaped to Europe (France, the Low Countries), and finally arrived in England. Although his works contain anti-Spanish propaganda, his treatise-description of bullfighting in particular includes numerous laudatory commentaries about Spanish culture that envision Spanish mores in a positive (or at least neutral) light. The ambiguity between the ideological and propagandistic purpose of his work and the author’s origins reflects the nature of much pamphlet literature about Spain as both the land of romance and religious fanaticism.

Keywords: James Salgado, anti-Spanish propaganda, convert narratives, Popish Plot, Spanish manners

The case of James Salgado, ‘the Romish priest turned Protestant’ to use the title of one of his books,1 is extremely interesting for what it represents in the context of the Spanish Black Legend. James Salgado wrote in England several works of varied content in the late 1670s and mostly the 1680s.2 These works belong to three distinct groups: religious tracts of a doctrinal nature, including an autobiographical account of

1 Usoz y Río and Wiffen (Reformistas antiguos españoles) are the first to refer to Salgado, see also Ménendez Pelayo, Historia de los Heterodoxos, vol. IV, pp. 195-198. See also Salgado, The Romish priest turn’d protestant with the reasons of his conversion.
2 See the ‘Works Cited’ for a complete list of his works.
his sufferings at the hands of the Inquisition, in which he extols the virtues of Protestantism and exposes the fanaticism of Catholicism; secondly, accounts of Spanish customs and mores that fluctuate between the festive and the ethnographical, centred among the major topics of the Inquisition and bullfighting, and lastly, more fanciful work of a literary nature that includes narratives whose main characters are Catholic priests and nuns. According to his autobiographical accounts, Salgado claims to be a Spanish ex-priest (Dominican) who was imprisoned by the Inquisition, served his time rowing as a galley slave, escaped to Europe (France, the Low Countries) twice, and finally made his way to England during a time span that covers some 20 years around 1660-1680. In his *The Slaughter-House*, a description of the Spanish Inquisition, he writes about himself:

A Spaniard by Birth and with my Mothers Milk I suck’d in the Romish Religion; and at length was Ordained Priest. Discerning at last the vanities and multitude of the Superstitions of the Roman Faction, thro’ the healing influence of the heavenly Illumination, I was cured, and came to the Reformed.  

Once in the free Albion, Salgado devotes his life to writing about his experiences, either proclaiming his new (Protestant) faith (abjuring Catholic practices and superstitions) or explaining to his English audience the barbaric customs of the Spanish nation (Inquisition, bullfighting, etc.). His views offer his readers the interesting opinion of the convert, modelled in great part after the example of Saint Paul. But more interestingly, they provide credibility, reliability and objectivity because he is a first-hand witness of Spanish atrocities: a Spaniard who knows intimately well the topic he writes about. His descriptions of Spanish mores are supposed to not be tainted by foreign misunderstandings or partial knowledge of another country’s traditions. In sum, Salgado offers his accusations as unimpugnable testimony.

Nevertheless, things are not that simple. First, scholars have not been able to find any documentation whatsoever pertaining to ‘James Salgado’. Second, his life experiences have the familiar taste of other biographical accounts (some of them purportedly imaginary), such as those of Juan de Nicolás, Melchor Román y Ferrer, and Fernando de Tejeda (real name Tomás

3 Salgado, *The Slaughter-House*, p. 2  
Carrascón), which could lead us to believe that his writings belong to a genre and are not entirely an autobiographical account. Finally, his decidedly anti-Jesuit penchant and the English context in which to place it point to the fact that 'James Salgado' might well be a nom de plume utilized by someone to write anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish propaganda from England. Against this backdrop, this chapter will delve into some of Salgado's works and his attitudes towards things Spanish. Although his works are clearly part of anti-Spanish propaganda, in particular his treatise-description of bullfighting contains numerous laudatory commentaries about Spanish culture that envision Spanish mores in a positive (or neutral, at least) light. The ambiguity between the ideological and propagandistic purpose of his work and the author's origins reflects the nature of much pamphlet literature about Spain as both the land of romance and religious fanaticism.

**Salgado's biographical account**

The beginning of the 20th short narrative included in *The Fryer* (London, 1679) makes Salgado's anti-Jesuit inclinations clear to the reader:

> We have been long enough Expatiating in the Gardens of several Countries, and Collected many Flowers (though not altogether well smelling) for our Pastime and Diversion; now leaving off to transport them any more at present out of Forreign parts, will see if there be none of our own Plantation here in England, which may be as delightful as the rest. And indeed should tend to the prejudice of Jesuits and Fryers, if they should exempt only England from their deluding Tricks, a Country so plentiful, and having store of all, to the very Superfluity. Therefore to free them from such a Scandalous Aspersion, I'le [sic] relate to the kind Reader, a History, which not long since hapned here in England, and above the rest, in the Famous City of London. And it is about two Priests, the one being a Jesuit, and the other a Carmelitan Fryer. (Emphasis added)

---

5 Centro de Estudios de la Reforma, ‘Protestantes’.
6 We can remember that Miguel de Montserrat, another famous Spanish convert, uses excerpts of Casiodoro de la Reina's account in his own narrative, as pointed out by Menéndez Pelayo: 'Montserrat era un insolente plagiarist; trozos hay en su dedicatoria copiados ad pedem litterae de la Amonestación que puso Casiodoro al frente de su Biblia' (Montserrat was an insolent plagiarist; there are parts of his dedicatory taken ad pedem litterae from the Amonestación written as a prologue to his Bible by Casiodoro de la Reina). See Menéndez Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*, vol. 2, p. 159.
As we will later contend, *The Fryer* (more than any other of Salgado’s works) must be understood in a moment of anti-Catholic anxiety and portrays for English society the embodiment of the evil nature of Catholicism. In particular, Catholic priests and Jesuits, according to the book, can jeopardize the political integrity of the nation as *milites Christi*. In their connection with Spain, they are an extension of this country’s fanaticism and the religious counterpart to Spain’s desire for universal domain. The political and the religious are thus inextricably entwined in the Jesuit order, which must be combated at all costs.

Salgado’s works present at times a devastating picture of Spain. They seem to offer English readers a faithful representation of Spanish customs and traditions, although they are nothing more than partisan pamphlets. Salgado’s confession stands as a case in point. Following in the footsteps of previous Spanish converts (such as Juan Díaz, Francisco de Enzinas, Antonio del Corro, Casiodoro de la Reina or Cipriano de Valera), Salgado, the Dominican priest, experiences an episode of religious doubt or conversion motivated by a biblical passage that makes him see his faith in a new light. As he expresses in *A Confession of Faith* (1681):

’Tis very true, that the Romanists debat the Common People from reading the Holy Scriptures, as from the Food of Life; but yet those of the Clergy (and that especially in Spain, my Native Country) as well as other Roman Catholicks are wont more Religiously to exercise themselves in Reading the Sacred Scriptures. The same thing happened to me also; and while I was Reading Gods Holy Book, I lighted upon those words of the Apostle, *2 Tim. 3:16*: *All Scripture is given by Divine Inspiration, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, and for Instruction in Righteousness: That the Man of GOD may be perfect throughly furnished unto all good Works.*

According to Salgado, upon this revelation following the reading of *2 Tim. 3:16*, he feels that he is not free to exercise the power of his reason within the strict constraints of Spanish religious, Catholic fanaticism. Obliged to leave Spain and once in the safe haven of England, after stays in France, the Low Countries

---

and possibly in Italy, Salgado provides the academic senate members of the University of Oxford with ‘AN / ACCOUNT / OF MY / LIFE & SUFFERINGS / Since I forsook the / ROMISH RELIGION; / IN A / Letter to Dr. H.S.’ The document encapsulates some of the major themes of Salgado’s discourse: Spanish fanaticism (represented by the Inquisition); Spanish cruelty (represented by the American conquest); Spanish *Islamicism* (represented by bullfighting), etc.9:

SIR,

[...]

The first thing that startled me, and made me withdraw from the Covent, in which I had lived in Priests Orders three years, was the dissention betwixt the Popish Doctors themselves, and that in such things as themselves say Salvation depends upon: for whilst some of them make it necessary to Salvation to believe that the Church is (infallibly) govern’d by [2] the Holy Ghost, and therefore the ultimate Resolution of Faith must be the Determinations of the Church: I found others did doubt of this and dispute against it.

Whilst I was thus laying things together in my mind, & under great dissatisfaction, I resolved to leave Spain (my Native Country) and go into France where I hoped for greater freedom of speech: for at home I found it most dangerous to move any thing (how modestly soover) against received Points. Coming then to Paris, I had many hot Disputes with those of my own Order, with as little satisfaction, as in Spain. But at last I betook my self to some of the Ministers of the Church at Charenton,10 by whom I was very Christianly entertained, and amongst them the Reverend Monsieur Drelincourt, took great pains to answer my doubts, and I came forward to close with the Truths of the Reformed Religion, and he was concern’d for my safety, and advised me forthwith to go into the United Provinces: But first I had in their Consistory renounced Popery, viz. anno, 1666.11

When I was come to the Hague, I had a most courteous reception by that Excellent Person Monsieur Samuel Maretz12: he used his endeavour

---

9 To all the Singular Members of the University of OXFORD. To the Reverend, and most Excellent, Mr. Vicechancellour. To the Reverend and Eminent Heads of Colledges. And to the Worthy Fellows of the fame.
10 See, for instance, The generall and particular acts and articles of the late national synod of the reformed Churches of France (1644).
11 Charles Drelincourt was a Calvinist pastor at Charenton, 1595-1669. See his Les dernières heures de Mr Drelincourt, decédé à Paris le 3. Novembre 1669.
12 Samuel Desmarets was born in Picardie and ordained as pastor in the Netherlands (Groningen). He was the author of a book attacking the Pope and the Jesuits.
to settle me there, and for my livelihood put me upon the teaching the
Spanish Tongue: But when that could not succeed, because of my ignorance
of the Dutch Language (although I was well enough able to teach those that
understood Latin, French, or Italian), he gave me advice to return to Paris.

There I was forced to lye privately amongst the [three] Members of
the Reformed Church, being afraid to be known to others: But the Queen
of France, a Spaniard by Birth, had brought over with her many of her
Country men, who too well knew me, and narrowly enquired after me.
By their means I was taken, sent back into Spain, put into the Inquisition
in the Province of Estremadura, and the City of Llerena: there I lay a year,
and was monthly examined, but at last made an escape.

When I had gone almost a hundred Leagues, as far as Origuela, I was
laid hold on by the Fryers of my own Order, and sent by them to Murcia,
where I lay five years in Prison, having neither Books, nor Society, except
of tormenting Priests.

I was at last brought before the Bishop, and other Officers of his
Court, where for the Scandal, as they call’d it, I had given, I was sentenced
to the Galleys. When they had publickly read my Crime, during which
time they made me hold a Black Candle in my Hand, the Sentence was
executed upon me.

In the Galleys, for a year’s space, I endured the miseries that attend
Slaves at the Oar, Chains, Nakedness, Stripes, Thirst, Hunger, Vermine,
and Sickness, which they termed a Leprosie, till at length the Chyrurgion
and other Officers of the Galley where I was, interceded with the Inquisi-
tor General for me, as a person not only useless, but noysome to them
and the other Slaves. He hereupon sent me into the Hospital at Murcia;
after my Cure, I stayed some months, in the Convent, but never returned
to my Habit, because my Impenitence, as they termed it, hindered my
Absolution.

From thence I made a second escape into France, and after I
had stayed about a year at Lion, not finding my self safe, I came into
England: what assistance I have had here both to establish me in the
Reformed Religion, and for my subsistance you well know. Other pas-
sages Historical which are in my Confession I here omit; Likewise what
thoughts it pleased God to comfort me with, in my distresses, what
temptations I endured, and how through the Grace of God, I overcame

13 María Teresa de Austria y Borbón (1638-1683) was the daughter of Felipe I of Spain and
Elisabeth of France (Bourbon). She became queen consort of France in 1660 after marrying
Louis XIV of France.
them, I cannot in the narrow room of this Leaf set down; neither had thus much of me ever come in Print, but at your request: and if any doubt be made of these things, you, or any others, that have Correspondent about Murcia, may please to satisfie your selves as to a considerable part of them: To this then I refer you, and am, Sir, Yours. James Salgado. FINIS.

In a serious vein Salgado produced a theological tract entitled The true church of Christ exposed to the view of all sober Christians, from the Word of God, sound reason, and the ancient fathers / by James Salgado, a Spaniard, a converted priest (London, 1681). To some extent, this work must be read together with his previous autobiographical account. In it, the ex-priest rejects the Catholic claim to the universality of the Roman Church and the assertion of papal infallibility, as well as their accusation of Protestants as schismatic and heretical. He concludes by thanking almighty God for making him see the truth and beseeching his readers to reject Catholic abomination and ‘embrace the true Protestant Religion, which is pure in Doctrine, holy in manners, and faithful to God and the King’.

While a study of Salgado’s works must begin with his confession of faith, a self-justification of his religious discontent and defection from the Catholic creed, his oeuvre as a whole strikes multiple chords. For instance, his books are interspersed with numerous references to and anthropological and cultural comments on Spanish traditions, character, and mores, making them rather unusual. We perceive in many of them an attempt to conflate religion and politics, showing the inescapable parallels between the tenets of the Protestant Reformation against Catholicism and the European political situation with regard to the theory of dominium mundi of which the Spanish Empire was accused. Thus, he claims, in the same way that there is no Universal Church, for all churches are parts or members of the body called Christendom, he also argues that no empire (that is, the Spanish Empire) can claim universal dominium over Europe (and the world). If the church at Rome is only one among many, then the Spanish Empire, by the same logic, should be only one among several. The Spanish desire to dominate other nations can be conflated with the Roman Church’s desire to dominate the Christian world. But let us remark once again, while this could be the ultimate raison d’être of Salgado’s oeuvre, he touches here and there upon numerous topics and genres in his diatribes against Spain which go beyond what we could term exclusively religious criticism.
Spanish manners and customs

That is the case with the next two works we will be dealing with: The manners and customs of the principal nations of Europe (London, 1684) and An Impartial and Brief Description of the Plaza, or sumptuous Market Place of Madrid, and the Bull-fighting there (London, 1683). The manners and customs of the principal nations of Europe gathered together by the particular observation of James Salgado [...] in his travels through those countries; and translated into English by the authors care, was published in London by T. Snowden in 1684 (reprinted in 1685 in Edinburgh by Josua van Solingen and John Colmar, with minor variants). Adopting an ironic and humorous tone, Salgado compares Germans, Italians, French, English and Spaniards. In this comparison, Spaniards stand always at the losing end, as they are characterized by negative traits such as their precaution, silence and deceitfulness, their short size, grandiloquence, vengeance, pride, blind obedience, hypocrisy, cruelty and tyranny. It is nothing but distorted satire, nonetheless interesting because it feeds the English imagination with its own biases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Counsel</th>
<th>In Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The German’s slow but sure, not froth nor flash; the English resolute; the French are rash; the Italian’s subtle, politik and wise; the Spaniard cautious, wary to advise. [...]</td>
<td>The German is religious throughout; zelous the French; the English are devout; th’Italian every superstition try; the Spaniard’s lust with grave hypocrisie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Feasting</strong></td>
<td><strong>In Marriage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The German drowns in wine his wits and might; in various plenty th’English do delight; Moun[i]car [sic] for kick-shaws delicate, fine knacks; th’English are austere; the French are courteous, kind, and debonair; the Italian’s in his carriage very civil; the scournful Spaniard proud as any devil.</td>
<td>The German’s lord and master of his wife; the English with them lead a slavish life; the French like yoke-fellows keep to the Law of their estate and equally do draw; th’Italians wives may them their jailors call; the Spaniard’s cruel and tyrannical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Courage and Mind</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Women</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough like a bear the Germans seem to us; like lions the English, great and generous; quick piercing eagle-like the French; no less th’Italian fox-like, thrives by craftiness; the Spaniard bears an elephant-like state, majestic, slow, grave, and deliberate. [...]</td>
<td>The German women are good, chast, and cold; in England they are queen, free, headstrong, bold; the French are noble madams but (all know’t) they’re wanton and lascivious like a goat; th’Italians they are wicked though confin’d; in Spain they’re handmaids of an amorous mind. [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This taxonomy presents us with a puzzling question about its degree of anti-Spanish sentiment. While many of the traits that characterize the Spaniard are negative, some others are rather positive or neutral, or at least should be put in the context of other negative traits mentioned for the other nations. What is curious is that the composition reads almost like a typical contemporary joke in which a nation or persons from a particular region are derided as unlearned, unsophisticated, or utterly stupid in comparison with people from other regions/countries. As the structure suggests, the region/country ridiculed is left as the last term of the comparison, as if a logical corollary were to be deduced from the syllogism suggested by the joke. The fact that the composition resembles this typical satirical structure seems to indicate that the main purpose of the piece is to present a negative view of Spain/Spaniards. In any event, we should take into account that there is also a festive attitude that permeates the whole composition, which could be seen as a rhetorical exercise rather than a piece of anti-Spanish propaganda. We must also bear in mind that this type of composition, based on a comparison of national characters or on a description of the characters of a single nation, began to develop in the last decades of the sixteenth century and in the early seventeenth century. Ultimately, the genre derives from the late medieval humanist discourses in praise of national character, which included compositions commending cities and countries. It then moved
on to literary pieces that compared nations. While some of these works were rather festive and humorous, others were in a serious vein, as was the case of John Stephens’s *Essayes and Characters* (1615) – in line with the famous *Characters* by Sir Thomas Overbury (1614-1616), which dealt with the national English character and included as part of his description of a farmer a rather puzzling mention of his hatred of Spain: ‘He cannot therefore choose but hate a Spaniard likewise, and (he thinks) that hatred only makes him a loyal subject.’

In any event, in the context of Salgado’s entire production, the work could be read as part of his varied sets of strategies to criticize Spain or comment negatively on the Spanish character, which will later also adopt a fanciful and literary form in *The Fryer* (see below). While we could perceive some anti-Spanish zeal in *The manners and customs*, moderated by the fact that humour permeated the entire composition and that it was intent on extolling English virtues more than criticizing others’ faults, the second work is of a very different nature: *An Impartial and Brief Description of the Plaza, or sumptuous Market Place of Madrid, and the Bull-fighting there* (London, 1683), addressed to King Charles II.

Again, the fact that it was addressed to a Hispanophile monarch leaves us with some pressing questions. Under the guise of offering an objective description of bullfighting, Salgado provides his readers with a tainted interpretation of a custom he considers barbaric and representative of Spain’s ‘Islamic’ past, which he does not want associated with ‘Romantick Novelties’ (‘in regard that I hear no liking to disingenuity, or the forging of Romantick Novelties and Fictions’) but with the people who have previously inhabited Iberia (‘Romans, Vandals, Goths and Saracens’, ‘of the frequent, and noisome In-roads of many Cruel Adversaries of different Languages, Laws and Constitutions, so that some Vestigias [sic] of the one must be supposed to remain, as well as the other’). And he adds further: ‘The Saracens obtaining the latests Conquest, their Laws and Language leave the deepest Impression.’ The spectacle in the stands mimics the spectacle in the arena, an affair based on the ideas of honour and danger that befits the primitive and Orientalizing nature of the Spaniard. ‘Cruel and Barbarous Recreation’ is to be expected from ‘such a Barbarous Rable as the Turks were and are to this day’:

15 Salgado, *An Impartial and Brief Description of the Plaza*, p. 2.
16 Ibid., p. 3.
It's a thirsting desire after some imaginary Honour that sets such Bold Fellows upon the exposing of themselves to those dangerous circumstances, rather than the advantage of getting the Beasts which they have Killed, or Wounded to purpose.\(^{17}\)

The book also includes references to Charles I’s visit to Madrid as Prince of Wales in 1623, the many comedies, plays and festivals performed in his honour and the *toros*. His general and perfunctory assessment of the entertainment is that ‘it is a recreation scarcely beseeming Christian’ and that Christian humility and nobility should forbid it. Nonetheless, participants must be graceful and agile, and while Roman spectacles were designed to satisfy ‘the Bloody and Vindictive Humours of the people, who rejoiced in such

\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 9.
lamentable experiments’, in bullfighting nobody is obliged to fight nor are criminals punished: ‘but Masculine and Noble Minds desire an occasion of this kind, whereby proof may be given of their Agility and Undaunted Courage’. His conclusion is that he is only intent on describing, not criticizing it (‘which is judg’d in Spain a most Noble Recreation’). If the festive intention characterized the The manners and customs as well as a sporadic penchant for a fair description, this positive light of things Spanish also appears in An Impartial and Brief Description. We have perceived in the latter an intent to go beyond the anecdotal. Although the final message is clear (a depiction of the Spanish custom of bullfighting as ‘scarcely beseeming Christian’), Salgado strikes a more nuanced view of this and other Spanish customs.

A negative view of the Spanish character is further reinforced in Salgado’s description of the practices of the Inquisition in The Slaughter-House; or, A brief description of the Spanish Inquisition, in a method never before used in which is laid open the tyranny, insolence, perfidiousness, and barbarous cruelty of that tribunal (London, 1682). The work follows the tradition of writings about the Spanish Inquisition by Spanish converts, which started with the Confesión de fe cristiana (hecha por ciertos españoles, los cuales, huyendo de los abusos de la Iglesia Romana y la crueldad de la Inquisición de España, dejaron su patria para ser recibidos de la Iglesia de los fieles por hermanos en Cristo) by Casiodoro de la Reina (London, 1560) and particularly Sanctae Inquisitionis Hispanicae artes aliquot detectae, ac palam traductae (Heidelberg, 1567) by Reginaldus Gonsalvius Montanus, that is, Antonio del Corro. Salgado provides an autobiographical account of his suffering at the hands of the Inquisition, his escapes and his time as a galley slave. He offers a detailed description of an auto-da-fé, including the contributions of familiars, sergeants, consultors, qualificators, notaries, secretaries and

18 Ibid., p. 17.
19 Roldan-Figueroa, ‘Antonio del Corro’.
20 Salgado, The Slaughter-House, pp. 7-8: ‘After one years Imprisonment, weary of it, and earnestly desirous of liberty, I attempted to get loose by flight; but after I was gotten near one hundred Leagues from Lerina, and had reached the City Origneleno, the Officers of the Inquisicion seized me again, and sent me into the Inquisition at Murcia. Here for a new Crime, which was my Escape from the holy Inquisition, I was five years imprisoned, where I had neither Books, nor any Light, nor company of any man, but the bloody Inquisitors, and their Slaugther-men.’ As for the galley slave, he claims that there is no punishment ‘more grievous than these toils are to any man unaccustomed to them. In the effect appeared the cruelty of their usage, for it soon made me a Leper, and unfit for labour. I was extremely pined, and consumed away, and (which I blush to speak) so great a multitude of Lice swarmed about me, that I might be excused, if I thought I felt one of Egypt’s Plagues. And though I was kept in greatest scarcity of meat and drink, which ordinarily cause sweat, yet a perpetual sweat fell from my whole Body, which (if it offended not your Ears) turned into most stinking worms.’
fiscals of the tribunal, and of the lack of procedural warranties for the accused:

First they apprehend a man as a Jew, a Mahumetan, or Reformed, thrust him into Prison, without telling him who, or how many accuse him: Next he suffers the miseries of this Imprisonment six or eight, or ten years; if at last the man, to get put off their hands, confesseth all deposed against him to be true; and implores their mercy; then the Inquisitors proceed to enquire whether he knew his Accusers. The poor man (as is truth) answers he knows them not; hereupon (though he confess, and sue for mercy) yet he is burnt, because he knows neither persons, nor names of his Accusers. Here oftentimes it happens, that the man, because he will not die unrevenged, and without company, accuseth a whole Village or Town, that amongst them he may hit the Persons that accused.21

References to the Inquisition abound in Salgado’s work, for the institution represented the main accusation for the case of Spanish fanaticism and cruelty. In this work, Salgado concludes by listing several inquisitorial cases of the 1640s-1660s and calling the Inquisition a ‘Devil’s villainy’ that cries out for vengeance to destroy ‘those murthers’. While the atrocities of the Inquisition resemble what had been published previously in many works, the list of inquisitorial cases adds a documentary element to Salgado’s book. As with his description of bullfighting, Salgado seems intent on proving his assertions either by referring to his first-hand experience as a Spaniard or by utilizing documentary evidence that points towards his self-construction as an objective narrator. Salgado’s work as a whole represents a conscious attempt to build a case against Spain. In doing so, the author uses a variety of genres and registers, from the comic and festive to the serious, documentary, and doctrinal. It almost seems as if nothing escaped his interest in trying to depict Spain and Spanish customs to an English audience, building almost element by element a solid and robust case against his nation of origin.

The Fryer

Very different in nature is The Fryer; or, An historical treatise wherein the idle lives, vitiousness, malice, folly, and cruelty of the fryers is described: in two parts, tragical and comical, published in 1680, a collection of novellas of Boccaccian taste centred around the figures of dissolute and deceitful friars,

21 Salgado, The Slaughter-House, pp. 16-17.
nuns and priests. Most of the stories in The Fryer are translations from the Decameron, Margarite of Navarre’s Heptameron or François de Rosset’s Histoires tragiques de nostre temps, as well as Céspedes y Meneses’s El español Gerardo. Particularly relevant is the latter title, for it shows a knowledge of Spanish literary fashion at the time. While many of the works utilized as sources for the composition had a wide dissemination in Europe, it is possible that the author learned about them in Spain, where these narratives enjoyed a particular relevance. While true religion, he says to the Duke of Monmouth and Buclough to whom he addresses his work, ‘ought to have the highest Encomium’, the opposite should be predicated of the characters that follow, whose actions represent ‘cunning knavery’, which should serve as a caution to Catholics because they ‘hazard themselves in the power of such Persons’. Throughout the work we meet a wide variety of friars and priests, many of them related to the Inquisition, all of whom could represent Salgado’s dealings with this institution in Spain. Nevertheless, the Jesuits bear the weight of the invective and criticism, a fact that we could use to further analyse the motivation behind Salgado’s writings.

The Fryer has a rather unique status among Salgado’s works. It shows a superb knowledge of popular and successful narratives with wide circulation throughout Europe, already anticipated by the History of Placidus in his The Slaughter-House. It could also be posited that Salgado uses the wide dissemination of these types of narratives in Spain (and the fact that many of them had been translated into English) in order to offer a rather tendentious selection of these narratives with the ulterior motive of painting a devastating picture of the religious group as hypocritical, deceiving and inauthentic.

Who is then James Salgado? Although his work is full of biographical data, on a closer look none of the facts he mentions allows us to identify a single relevant aspect of his life from a documentary point of view. His details about life in Spain are of a general character, accessible to anyone who

---

22 This penchant for Italianate narrative work had already been anticipated by the History of Placidus, a novel introduced in the second part of The Slaughter-House. There, Salgado recounts the story of Placidus, which takes place between Italy and Spain. The relationship between the description of bullfighting and Placidus is somewhat tenuous. Placidus, upon his arrival in Spain, finds himself fighting a toro. Maybe more interesting is the description of the many cloak-and-dagger adventures in which he engages (in Venice, Madrid, etc.) and which are somewhat reminiscent of some of the events described in the accounts of the Prince of Wales’s visit to Spain in 1623. See, for instance, the anonymous The High and mighty prince Charles, Prince of Wales, &c.; and a translation of Juan Antonio de la Peña’s work, entitled A relation of the royall festiuities and jogo de cañas (a turnament of darting with reedes after the manner of Spaine) made by the King of Spaine at Madrid.
lived in Spain during his time or had access to people or publications from this country. His descriptions of bullfighting and of the Inquisition do not reveal anything new or reflect an exclusively autobiographical perspective. Even his reference to the persons that welcomed him in France and the Netherlands do not imply that he had personal knowledge of them because the details or facts about their lives that he mentions in his writings are rather vague. Finally, a work like *The Fryer*, composed of translations of previously existing material, points to the same reality. Could we be facing then a literary persona as opposed to a real author? Could Salgado be a nom de plume behind which we might suspect a person or persons cognizant about Spain, possibly even a Spaniard or Spaniards living in England at the time? And if so, what could be the reason behind this procedure? The latter question might have a possible answer. While it is true that we could suspect that the real author(s) behind Salgado’s name might have feared repercussions should his identity become public, it is possible to think that an autobiographical device could lend credibility to a detailed account of Spanish life, as does the fact that Salgado claimed to have been a priest. Would it not be understandable that an ex-priest knew religious life in Spain in all its details? Would it not make sense that, fearing the Inquisition, he tried to hide his real identity? Would it not make sense that he tried to caution his English readership about the deceitfulness of Catholic hypocrisy because he has known it first-hand?

Nonetheless, the historical context might allow us to shed some light on the Salgado conundrum. Between 1678 and 1681 England endured one of the frequent sixteenth-century rebirths of anti-Catholic sentiment, a recurring fact since Elizabethan England.\(^{23}\) In particular, Titus Oates (who had studied in a Jesuit seminary) and Israel Tongue devised the so-called Popish Plot. As a result, more than 500 Jesuits were denounced to the Privy Council, as well as countless members of the Catholic clergy and nobility (in particular, William Herbert, Henry Arundell, William Petre, William Howard and John Belasyse). The death in 1678 of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey under suspicious circumstances gave credibility to Oates’s accusations. Turmoil ensued. The memory of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 reminded people of the danger of Catholic and Jesuit conspiracies. According to Claude de la Colombière, who was then residing in London ‘the name of “Jesuit” is hated above all else – even by priests both secular and regular, and by the [C]atholic layfolk

---

as well, because it is said that the Jesuits have caused this raging storm’. Indeed, the Pope-burning procession of 1680 claimed that ‘a Jesuit can do nothing but what’s ill’. The Popish Plot provoked a rebirth of English anxiety about both Catholicism as treason and Spain as the arch-enemy of England. While some monarchs might have entertained Hispanophile tendencies, it is clear that anti-Spanish sentiment ran deep.

Catholics endured several punishments as well as imprisonment, and were forbidden from participating in the Parliament (a measure somewhat reduced in 1788 with the Papist Acts but not abolished until 1829 with the Roman Catholic Relief Act). As a direct consequence of the Popery Act (‘Act for the Further Preventing the Growth of Popery’) there were numerous acts of vandalism directed towards Catholics in 1698-1700 as well as protests against the act, including a march of 60,000 people on Parliament. Menéndez Pelayo suspects the authenticity of the writings of several Spanish Protestant authors (such as those of Sacharles, Román y Ferrer, etc.). It would be advisable to consider Salgado a fictitious name, for now. As a pamphleteer whose books focus on denigrating Spain and Catholicism, and the Jesuit order, in particular, Salgado’s views are reinforced by the fact that he claims to be a Spanish ex-priest persecuted by the Inquisition and who fled to the safe haven of Protestantism in England. His (pseudo)autobiographical works serve as a cautionary account that explains to his English audience the danger of Papist practices and beliefs and warns them of the brutality and fanaticism of the Spanish Empire. The Popish Plot, in this context, could be seen, in the internal logic of Salgado’s works, as just one more proof of his statements, which required immediate and swift action on the part of authorities lest the English body politic should be permanently infected. In fact, a brief review of the many anti-Jesuit books published in England around the time or as a direct consequence of the Popish Plot makes clear that the threat was felt as very real by many.

24 Maguire, ‘Factionary Politics’, p. 82.
25 The rather large number of books and pamphlets published in England about Jesuits or the Jesuit Plot between 1679 and 1681 (we have identified over a hundred titles) is symptomatic of the threat felt by English society. For instance, we could mention the anonymous The true narrative of the proceedings [sic] at the Sessions-House in the Old-Bayly; or, The trial and condemnation of six notorious popish priests & Jesuites, for high-treason viz., William Russel alias Napper, James Corker, Lionel Anderson alias Munson, Charles Parry, and Alexander Lunsden, at a commission of Oyer and Terminer there held, on Saturday the 17th of this instant January 1679 (London, 1679); E.G., The horrid, direful, prodigious and diabolical practice of the Jesuits discovered fully laying open the means, manner and circumstances whereby they inveigle and seduce inhumanely some unwary Protestants to the utter ruine and damnation of their souls (London: Printed for A.C., 1679); Anon., A Full Narrative; or, A discovery of the priests and Jesuites; together with their intrigues
Salgado’s work is thus part of a very concrete context, that of the England of the second half of the seventeenth century and the power struggle among different factions. His works might have been mostly motivated by the real or imaginary Popish Plot supposedly organized by Jesuits (or at least masterminded by them). This was nothing new, because ever since the end of the sixteenth century Jesuits, in their connection with Rome and in particular with Spain, were constructed in England as a political concern regarding the interference of a foreign power in English affairs. Catholicism became thus a crime of political treason. In the context of Salgado’s works, this sixteenth-century historical construction is re-utilized to demonize a seventeenth-century political opponent, appealing to the connection between Jesuits and Spain. Nevertheless, his work also reflects at times a more neutral tone regarding Spain that might make us suspect that we are dealing with a rhetorical device more than a truly heartfelt attitude. Of course, identifying the real identity behind Salgado’s name would help us resolve the puzzle.

In sum, although anti-Spanish sentiment in England underwent many changes and nuances after the time of Queen Elizabeth, for many, Spain never ceased to represent in the English imaginary a threat to the nation’s...
independence. This threat was mainly associated with Spain's Catholicism and its connection with the Jesuit order. Throughout the seventeenth century, this anxiety comes to the surface on numerous occasions. One of them was the Popish Plot, during which time an author called Salgado wrote many books that centred around Spain. For now, and while the precise identification of Salgado awaits confirmation, what is most relevant about his work is the enormous variety of registers and genres he utilized. And while the total of his production can make sense only insofar as it deals with Spanish matters depicting Spain in a rather negative vein, on many occasions his descriptions of Spain are not only accurate but betray the very likely Spanish origin of the author. That is to say, Salgado cannot help but show pride in his country of origin by depicting at times the Spanish land and its inhabitants in a rather positive light.
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PART II

Modern Discourses on Spain
From Hispanophobia to Quixotephilia: The Politics of Quixotism in the British Long Eighteenth Century

Pedro Javier Pardo

Abstract
This chapter explores the reception of Don Quixote in the British long eighteenth century in the context of the tension between traditional political Hispanophobia and emerging literary Quixotephilia. It first speculates on how the former may have influenced the negative conception of Don Quixote dominating the seventeenth century, epitomized by Edmund Gayton's Hispanophobic Quixote. It then focuses on political appropriations by Sir William Temple and Lord Carteret and how they negotiated this tension in the eighteenth century: through reinterpretation and canonization they turned Don Quixote into a classic, but, in so doing, they separated it from its national background and turned the text and even Cervantes against Spain. Finally, the chapter briefly considers a later, Romantic means of resolving the tension, Lord Byron's Hispanophilic Quixote.
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Introduction

1. Edmund Gayton and the Hispanophobic Quixote

It has often been noted that the publication of Edmund Gayton's Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot in 1654 signals the nadir of the most negative
interpretation of Don Quixote in England. Gayton’s book-length commentary on Cervantes’s work, the first ever published in any language, transforms the hero into a ‘sly coward’, ‘an unabashed liar’, ‘a vagabond’, ‘a hypocritical thief’, a ‘sly fox’, or a ‘meanly-mouthed courtier’, to use the words quoted from the text by one of the best-known experts on the English reception of Don Quixote, Edwin Knowles.² What is not usually remarked is that this commentary was published when England was a republic ruled by Oliver Cromwell, after the Civil War in which the Puritans, or Roundheads, defeated the Royalists, or Cavaliers. According to the Oxford Companion to British History, cavalier stems ‘from the Spanish word caballero’ (Latin caballarius, French chevalier) and ‘it was meant to connote Catholicism, foreignness, and immorality’, since it originated as a term of abuse coined by the Puritans for the Royalists: ‘Parliamentary propagandists accordingly disseminated an image of the typical cavalier as a rakish individual consumed by the pursuit of illicit pleasure and personal gain, a man devoid of moral principles.’³ It is noteworthy that the image summoned by the term and prevailing at the time of the Puritan Interregnum coincides with Gayton’s negative description of the Spanish Don. We could say that, in a certain way, in his extremely negative presentation of the Manchegan knight-errant, Gayton is turning the caballero into a cavalier, which is reinforced by the satire against knight-errantry running throughout the book and based on the double meaning of errant as wandering and erring, as Colahan has pointed, a term also applicable to the erring because defeated and wandering because banished Cavaliers.⁴ The resulting image of the Cavaliers as Quixotic errant knights is never openly stated and hence the connection cannot be proved. As a matter of fact, Gayton’s royalist allegiance in the Civil War makes it improbable, to say the least, that he meant to write a

² Knowles, ‘Cervantes and English Literature’, pp. 270-271. He draws attention to the disappearance of any trace of idealism or seriousness in Gayton’s farcical and distorted version of the book, as Wilson does to the process of animalization undergone by the original character: ‘A pig, a snake, a goose, an ass, […] a hare, and a toad: these are the animals Don Quixote conjured up for Gayton. The Knight’s appearance and character are consistently demeaned and debased. […] Gayton’s Quixote is a caricature’ (Wilson, ‘Cervantes’, pp. 32-33). See also Wilson, ‘Edmund Gayton on Don Quixote’.

³ Gentles, ‘Cavaliers’.

⁴ Colahan, ‘Knight-Errantry’, pp. 160-161. The possibility of considering the Cavaliers an anachronistic expression of outmoded chivalry, and in this sense as Quixotic, is also suggested by Colahan when he writes that ‘by the middle of the seventeenth century Britain had come to see its own moribund chivalric roots, perceived as still alive in Spain when Cervantes had satirized them, as typical of an outdated and even alien culture’ (p. 169).
satire on the Cavaliers, but the connection could have been in the mind of contemporary readers, particularly Puritan ones.\textsuperscript{5}

This is just one example of how juxtaposing the political and the literary, even in this speculative way, opens up appealing prospects and suggests tantalizing convergences. Gayton's political significance for us, however, does not lie in how his commentary on \textit{Don Quixote} could have been fuelled by hatred or phobia against the Cavaliers, which is very dubious, but against Spain. It is true that Gayton's view of the Don is anchored in the farcical and burlesque interpretation of Cervantes's book dominant in the seventeenth century, but he takes it to such an extreme of degradation and debasement that it can also be contemplated as one more symptom of the Hispanophobia still reigning in England in the mid-seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{6} The Treaty of London (1604) and the ensuing peace, a landmark in the new Hispanophilic policy of James I, which was supposed to culminate in the marriage of Prince Charles and the Infanta, had certainly done something to abate this feeling, which the memory of the not-so-far-removed Spanish Armada (1588) kept very much alive. But then the Gunpowder Plot and its Catholic roots (1605), the 'explosion of anti-Hispanic propaganda' and theatre caused by the Spanish Match – comparable only to that of the Elizabethan era in the wake of the Armada\textsuperscript{7} – together with its eventual abortion (1623), and the war with Spain in the United Provinces of the Netherlands (1625-1630) put things...

\textsuperscript{5} As the entry of the \textit{Oxford Dictionary of National Biography} on Gayton explains, he was a proud and staunch royalist, who served as a captain in the Duke of York's company during the royalist occupation of Oxford, where he was a fellow of St John's College and had been appointed superior beadle in arts and physic to the university (McLellan, 'Gayton, Edmund'). Smith emphasizes this ideological dimension in his discussion of the \textit{Pleasant Notes}, detecting anti-Puritan sentiment in certain passages and thus justifying his thesis that the work belongs in a group of Spanish narratives which are politically subversive through rebellious humour and marginal characters. Gayton's work is thus related to Thomas Shelton's (a Roman Catholic Irishman) and James Mabbe's (thought to be a Roman Catholic spy) well-known translations of Spanish masterpieces, namely, \textit{Don Quixote}, \textit{Guzmán}, and \textit{Celestina}: 'When Gayton came to write his \textit{Pleasant Notes} he wrote in this tradition. What was once Spanish translated into English in the service of Roman Catholic agendas becomes commentary as a means of keeping alive a defeated royalist cultural heritage. Dissidence by errantry was the name of the game' (Smith, 'Windmills over Oxford', p. 114).

\textsuperscript{6} For an overview of the reception of \textit{Don Quixote} in English literature, and particularly in the seventeenth century, see, in addition to the articles by Knowles and Wilson already cited, Randall and Boswell, \textit{Cervantes}, and Pardo, 'Reino Unido'. The classic study of Hispanophobia in England is \textit{The Black Legend in England}, by William Maltby, but a more modern approach with extremely useful bibliographical updating can be found in Rodríguez Pérez et al., \textit{España ante sus críticos}.

\textsuperscript{7} Griffin, 'Dramatizing the Black Legend', p. 220.
on the old track. Spain was still the domineering colonial power to reckon with for any aspiring contender and, more importantly, was associated with the absolutism of the Stuarts leading to the Civil War and with the Catholicism constantly denigrated in propagandist pamphlets ever since Tudor times. This religious antagonism could only be stronger under the Puritan regime, a foregone conclusion if one reads the anti-Spanish tracts by the Puritan Thomas Scott in the 1620s. In this context, it is difficult not to see Hispanophobic overtones in Gayton’s brutal disfigurement of Don Quixote: the prevailing negative interpretation of the character is not just in tune with, but undoubtedly intensified by, the negative perception of Spain and the Spaniards.

This seems to be confirmed by the reappearance of this disfigured version of the Spanish hero in the major English Quixotic figure of the seventeenth century, the protagonist of Samuel Butler’s narrative poem *Hudibras* (1663, 1664, 1678), whose Cervantine affiliation has long been recognized and studied by scholars. As a matter of fact, Hudibras is closer to Gayton’s Quixote in his hypocrisy, cowardice, and dubious behaviour than to Cervantes’s insane but noble Don. This denial of the quintessence of quixotism, which we can call *anti-quixotism*, recurs in other contemporary texts that exploit the Quixotic trope in figures who are debased and distorted beyond quixotism in order to demolish the ideologies they embody. Before *Hudibras*, a pamphlet entitled *Don Pedro de Quixot* (1660) and targeting Hugh Peters, a Puritan cleric and preacher who had been executed that very same year of the Restoration, represented him not just as Quixotic but also as lacking any conscience and honesty. And, after *Hudibras*, the same kind of anti-quixotism is now turned against the Royalists in the anonymous *Don Quixot Redivivus Encountering a Barns-Door* (c. 1673), a short account of an attack against peaceful Puritans in Andover on 7 September 1673 under the leadership of a captain of the Anglican militia who is represented as a Quixote, although in a very sketchy and rudimentary way. Cervantes’s hero is thus drawn into the political arena and engaged on both sides of the religious strife, as Randall and Boswell have aptly documented in their review of the term ‘ecclesiastical quixotism’.

From the earliest stages of his reception in Britain, Don Quixote is intensely immersed in politics and ideological conflict. What matters for our purpose, however, is not that in the seventeenth century both Puritans and Royalists – and, later on, Tories and Whigs,
Jacobins and Loyalists – were represented as Quixotic by their adversaries, that is, political quixotism, but that this latter implied an extremely negative or distorted version of the Don, who was soaked in fanaticism, hypocrisy, or pernicious ideologies, and deprived of any redeeming qualities. Gayton proves that this view is not just a question of the ideology attributed to the Quixotic figure, since he did not write a satire against the Cavaliers, but a commentary on Don Quixote. The anti-quixotic virulence of that commentary can perhaps better be explained by anti-Spanish prejudice than by political satire. My hypothesis is that Hispanophobia may justify the extremely negative representation as well as the welcoming reception of the most famous Spanish character on English soil, since he is seen as an ideal playground to project the hostility that defined Anglo-Spanish relations at that time.\footnote{This hypothesis could be supported by a cursory comparison with the less negative Quixotic figures abounding in seventeenth-century French narrative, which, unfortunately, we don’t have the time or space to undertake here. I mean the protagonists of novels such as Charles Sorel’s \textit{L’Anti-Roman, ou le Berger extravagant} (1627), Paul Scarron’s \textit{Le Roman comique} (1651–57), or Antoine Furetière’s \textit{Le Roman bourgeois} (1666). Even if partaking in the prevailing seventeenth-century comic view of Don Quixote as a fool to be derided, the heroes of these works lack the extreme debasement and anti-quixotism of their English counterparts.}

The negative views of both Spain and Don Quixote thus coalesce in the initial stages of that reception and produce an interpretation of the Quixotic figure that I will call the Hispanophobic Quixote. This does not spring from political quixotism, but from the politics of quixotism (or quixotics), which can be subsumed under the larger category of the politics of reception.

By this I mean the part politics play in how foreign literature is received in any national literature because of how they condition – or at least participate in fashioning – the horizon of expectations of both authors and readers. The Hispanophobic Quixote is an exemplary case of those politics, and this gives a new turn to the paradox underlying Spanish influence on early modern England, which Barbara Fuchs has so aptly thrown into relief: ‘Early modern English writers turned frequently to Spain for literary models, even at times of greatest rivalry between the two nations.’\footnote{Fuchs, \textit{The Poetics of Piracy}, p. 1.} Fuchs draws attention to how this tension between cultural fascination and political enmity was resolved through ‘occlusion’ of influence or debt, which she detects even in later literary historians and details in the operations of ‘domestication, disavowal, or occlusion of Spanish sources, efforts to overgo or trump the original, and freeze-framing of Spain into stereotype or allegory’.\footnote{Ibid., p. 6. As Fuchs explains, ‘the English turn to Spain appears paradoxical, given the religious and political enmity between the two nations [...]’, and more important, the early modern English rivalry with Spain has largely coloured our own cultural and intellectual histories,}
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The degradation or even denigration of Don Quixote to the point of disfigurement can be seen as one more of those efforts, and the eighteenth century will add other possibilities when the increasing appreciation of Cervantes redeems first the book and then the character. The new esteem cancels the previous Hispanophobic approach to the Quixotic figure, but it collides with the lingering Hispanophobia: even if this latter may be abating as Spain loses its hegemony, it retains enough force through political rivalry to keep prejudice alive. It is no surprise then if new strategies to cope with the Hispanophobic paradox still lurking in the ever-growing reputation of Don Quixote are devised. We are now going to see how two politicians who took an active part in that rivalry but were also admirers of Don Quixote negotiated this tension in new ways, thus adding further possibilities to Fuchs's inventory. And we will conclude by going beyond the time span of the sources she examines and showing how the emergence of a new interpretation of Don Quixote and its fortunate coincidence with a most rare bout of English Hispanophilia put an end – no matter how inconclusive – to this ambivalence at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Eighteenth-century Quixotists

The reception of Don Quixote in the eighteenth century is well known for a change in the interpretation of the Quixotic figure from an object of ridicule to one of admiration. This is epitomized by Henry Fielding's Joseph Andrews (1742) and Corbyn Morris's Essay towards Fixing the True Standards of Wit, Humour, Railley, Satire and Ridicule (1744, 1758), both of which transform the Quixotic madness into whim or foible and idealism or innocence. Fielding does so through the most famous English avatar of the Spanish Don, Parson Adams; Morris through his alignment of Don Quixote with Falstaff and Sir Roger de Coverley. Either in fictional or essayistic form, both provide the antidote to Gayton and Butler by proposing a benevolent and good-natured although eccentric and obsessive Quixote, which results in a new character type, the so-called amiable humorist. This new interpretation of the Quixotic figure originates a surging tide of what we can call philoquixotism (sympathy for the character), which is a limiting our view of the Spanish connection' (p. 4). The paradox is that Spanish hegemony in politics produces cultural hegemony and results in irresistible fascination, imitation and literary traffic, but political antagonism prevents acknowledging it, thus creating a dynamics of emulation and occlusion.
part of the larger tide of Quixotephilia (appreciation of the work). Its later landmarks include Jarvis’s translation (1742), Lennox’s The Female Quixote (1752), Smollett’s translation (1755) and imitation (Sir Launcelot Greaves, 1760-1761), and John Bowle’s annotated edition in Spanish (1781).14

The rise of philoquixotism reverses the situation of the seventeenth century, when the negative interpretation of the Quixotic figure chimes with a pre-existing one of the country where he was born, and places us at the crux of the paradox defining the eighteenth century, when remaining Hispanophilia goes hand in hand with emerging Quixotephilia. This Cervantine turn to the old paradox between political hostility and literary admiration is best expressed by two representatives who attempt to minimize it in two different though related ways: (i) the reading of Don Quixote as a satire and, more specifically, as a satire against Spain, which provides further justification for Hispanophobia, particularly because this negative view of Spain is voiced by a most eminent Spaniard, Cervantes; (ii) the canonization of Don Quixote as a classic, which both legitimizes that Hispanophobic view encoded in it and severs the work from its Spanish original soil by promoting it to a privileged place in the universal canon, beyond Hispanophobia. Unsurprisingly, these two attitudes are embodied by two politicians of the utmost importance in English history: perhaps their political activity made them aware of the ambivalence between the literary and the political I am describing; so they tried to mitigate it and strike a compromise.

2. William Temple: The politics of (mis)reading

Sir William Temple (1628-1699) was an active statesman and diplomat during the English Restoration period. He was throughout his political career a friend and defender of the Dutch cause, which made him a temporary ally of Spain in the common fight against France, now the hegemonic power that had already conquered part of the Spanish possessions in Flanders and meant to take the rest of them. Indeed, Temple, who was the English ambassador to The Hague for many years, had been offered the post of ambassador to Spain, but he declined it, and was even appointed as such, but never took up the post. This detail indicates where his personal allegiances lay and reminds

us that England and the Netherlands had been traditionally allies against Spain and remained so, united in their eagerness, as emerging maritime and commercial powers, to break the Spanish monopoly in American trade through piracy and attacks against the Spanish colonies. But Temple was not only a politician but also a man of letters, particularly after 1681, when he retired from public life, first to his country estate at Sheen (Ireland) and then in 1686 to Moor Park (Surrey), where Jonathan Swift was his secretary from 1690 to his death in 1699. If, as a politician, he was still at odds with Spain, as a man of letters his knowledge of Spanish language and culture (he had travelled in Spain as well as other countries in his youth) put him in contact with Cervantes. We know from his essays of his admiration for *Don Quixote*, and what he wrote there was both prophetic and symptomatic of the change in the interpretation of Cervantes's masterpiece described above. In this way, his mediating position between evolving views of Spain can be correlated to one between evolving views of *Don Quixote*, which places him at the crossroads of Hispanophobic quixotism and Quixotephilia.

In his famous ‘An Essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning’, Temple introduces *Don Quixote* as an example of the dangers of ridiculing activities which are in themselves serious and praiseworthy:

An ingenious Spaniard at Brussels would needs have it that the history of Don Quixot had ruined the Spanish monarchy; for before that time, love and valour were all romance among them; every young cavalier that entered the scene, dedicated the services of his life, to his honour first, and then to his mistress. They lived and died in this romantic vein. [...] After *Don Quixot* appeared, and with that inimitable wit and humour, turned all this romantic honour and love into ridicule, the Spaniards, he said, began to grow ashamed of both, and to laugh at fighting and loving, or at least otherwise than to pursue their fortune, or satisfy their lust; and the consequences of this, both upon their bodies and their minds, this Spaniard would needs have it pass for a great cause of the ruin of Spain, or of its greatness and power.\(^{15}\)

The passage is significant for two reasons. On the one hand, there is a new literary interpretation which transforms what was initially understood as a comic parody or burlesque of chivalric romances into a very serious satire on chivalry and chivalric values: the butt is not a genre of literature but a way of life – honour, valour, love, i.e. fighting and loving – and hence

---

\(^{15}\) Included in his *Five Miscellaneous Essays*, p. 70.
a whole country, Spain, that lived by those values. This implies, of course, the ridicule or derision of the character representing them, Don Quixote, which is in tune with the prevailing view at the time. On the other hand, there is a political interpretation, since Temple blames the work and the manner it discredits that way of life and those values for the decadence of Spain and the ruin of the Spanish monarchy, thus endowing literature, as Fuchs has argued, with an enormous as well as devastating power.\textsuperscript{16} This political reading is somehow legitimized by invoking a Spanish source, a Spaniard at Brussels (the capital of Flanders and hence Spanish territory), as if protecting himself from the charge of Hispanophobia by making clear that this anti-Spanish reading of \textit{Don Quixote} has Spanish origins.

The political bias underlying this new interpretation is even clearer if we turn to an earlier example of it which might have triggered Temple’s view, as Burton has elucidated.\textsuperscript{17} In his \textit{Reflexions sur la poétique d’Aristote et sur les ouvrages des poètes anciens et modernes} (1674), translated into English the very same year by Thomas Rymer, René Rapin wrote:

\begin{quote}
[\textit{Don Quixote} was] compos’d by Cervantes, Secretary to the Duke of Alva. This great man having been slighted, and received some disgrace by the Duke of Lerma chief Minister of State to Philip III, who had no respect for Men of Learning, writ the Romance of \textit{Don Quixot}, which is a most fine and ingenious Satyr on his own Countrey; because the Nobility of Spain, whom he renders ridiculous by this work, were all bit in the head and intoxicated with Knight-errantry.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

In this view, which was spread throughout Europe because it was included by Louis Moréri in \textit{Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique} (1683), translated into several European languages,\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Don Quixote} is not just a political satire, but one against one particular politician or aristocrat and the Spanish aristocracy in general. The interpretation is an obvious expression of French resentment against the former hegemonic power now on the wane and replaced by France after the Peace of Westphalia (1648), the Duke of Lerma being the valido or chief minister of the king of Spain in Cervantes’s times, and hence representing the Spanish monarchy. This Hispanophobic flavour is

\textsuperscript{16} ‘Cervantes, by deflating those heroic ideals, leaves nothing but the base motivations of fortune and lust, which can only lead to the decadence of Spain. Literature is thus granted an enormous power to destroy rather than to shore up the nation’ (Fuchs, ‘Golden Ages’, p. 323).
\textsuperscript{17} Burton, ‘Cervantes the Man’, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{18} Quoted in Burton, ‘Cervantes the Man’, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{19} Burton, ‘Cervantes the Man’, p. 3.
intensified in a later English variation. In his *Serious Reflections during the Life and Strange Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1720), Daniel Defoe makes Crusoe declare that the satirical butt of *Don Quixote* was not the Duke of Lerma, but the Duke of Medina-Sidonia. He is thus turning *Don Quixote* into a disguised portrait or emblem of the commander-in-chief of the Spanish Armada, and hence bringing into the picture the episode that could be considered the original sin of English Hispanophobia. The implication is that the duke was a Quixote, and so were the Spaniards attempting to conquer England, as Paulson has argued, but also that, even more than one century later, the memory of that episode remains vivid in the English imaginary to the point of allegorizing it in *Don Quixote*.

Defoe makes obvious what is implicit in Rapin and Temple: the projection of Hispanophobia onto the character through an anti-Spanish reading of the novel, so the Quixote is still Hispanophobic, but in a more openly and unmistakably political way than in Gayton. This is even more the case if we take into account that Temple is usually accorded the merit of having placed Cervantes in the literary Parnassus by including him on a list of the great modern classical authors: ‘Of the *Italians*, Boccace, Machiavel, and Padre Paolo; Among the Spaniards, Cervantes (that writ *Don Quixot*) and Guevara; Among the French, Rabelais, and Montagne.’ The new status granted to Cervantes may be the true rationale behind importing this political reading of his masterpiece into England: to make this new prestige as a classic, which the work acquires in the eighteenth century, not just compatible with England’s traditionally hostile view of Spain, but even palatable to English readers. Perhaps that is why there are so many echoes of this political reading in the initial decades of the eighteenth century, for example in Peter Motteux’s ‘An Account of the Author’, which precedes the third volume of his influential translation of *Don Quixote* (1700-1703); in the newspaper articles by Richard Steele, who testifies to the connection of this view to Whig politics studied by Paulson in his *Don Quixote in England*; or in the *Memoirs of Captain Carleton* (1728) by Daniel Defoe. And, even later, we can still find allusions or references to this interpretation in the authors listed by Burton: William Warburton in 1737, William Collins in 1747, and Horace Walpole in 1774.

---

20 Paulson, *Don Quixote in England*, p. 34.
22 Motteux, ‘An Account of the Author’.
23 See Burton, ‘Cervantes the Man’, p. 4.
24 Walpole expressed it in a very synthetic way when he wrote in a letter to Sir Horace Mann of 10 July 1774 that ‘Cervantes laughed chivalry out of fashion’ (quoted in Burton, ‘Cervantes
Temple thus inaugurates a new view of *Don Quixote* as what may be termed the Hispanophobic classic, which will predominate in the first half of the eighteenth century. The character representing Spanish noblemen and Spain is still implicitly denigrated, as in Gayton and his Hispanophobic Quixote, but the work is now explicitly exalted through the new neoclassical seriousness of satire that Temple's commentary bestows on *Don Quixote*. The novel is thus seen in a quite different light from the seventeenth-century view of it as a comedy of low humour or a farcical burlesque of chivalric romance. The paradox now is that the political denigration of Spain goes hand in hand with the literary exaltation of Cervantes and his work. William Temple's half-way position between these two spheres, the literary and the political, placed him in a privileged vantage point to negotiate this ambivalence and to integrate the political animosity against a rival nation with the appreciation of its most outstanding masterpiece. This he does by identifying the Quixotic character with Spain through a deliberate and political (mis)reading of *Don Quixote*, and then turning Cervantes against Spain through a satirical reading of the work (not very different, in this respect, from the one applied to *Lazarillo de Tormes*), or, in other words, by turning Cervantes into a political ally, since his masterpiece contributed to the desirable – to English eyes – decline of Spain. Hispanophobia thus adopts a new guise, perhaps the most sophisticated or insidious one: Quixotephilia. If it had turned from occlusion to denigration with Gayton, now it is disguised under the new interpretation and canonization with Temple. This will be the path to be followed by another eminent British politician and man of letters.

3. **Lord Carteret: The politics of canonization**

The satirical interpretation first formulated in England by Temple certainly paved the way for the canonization of the work, which materialized in the deluxe edition sponsored by another diplomat and politician, Sir John Carteret, Earl of Granville (1690-1763). It was published in 1738 by the London publisher Jacob Tonson with the title *Vida y hechos del ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*, and this is its first remarkable feature: it is an edition in Spanish published in England. What makes it a landmark in
the English reception of *Don Quixote*, though, is not the language, but the fact that it makes visible the new status of *Don Quixote* as a classic. This is highlighted by these further features:

(i) the care taken by Peter Pineda, a teacher of Spanish, in establishing the text through consultation of the first Spanish editions;
(ii) the luxurious presentation of its four volumes: the large size and prime quality of paper, print type, and binding;
(iii) the new set of illustrations (68: an unprecedented number), most of them by John Vanderbank, including the allegorical frontispiece representing ‘Cervantes as Hercules Mussagetes liberating Mount Parnassus from the monstrous invaders of fantastic literature’ – a visual emblem of Cervantes’s accession to the status of classic – and the first portrait of Cervantes ever engraved (by George Vertue after William Kent’s original);
(iv) the first biography of Cervantes ever written, by Gregorio Mayans y Siscar, librarian of the Spanish Crown, commissioned by Lord Carteret through the English ambassador to Spain, Benjamin Keene;
(v) the dedication by Carteret to the Contessa de Montijo, the wife of the Spanish Ambassador in London and a friend of Carteret’s, in which he adopts Temple’s satirical view by referring to the salutary effects of Cervantes’s work (of course, salutary for English interests).

For all these reasons, Carteret’s is considered the first monumental edition insofar as, using Schmidt’s description, it is ‘the first monument to the novel’s author’ in any European language, antedating the Spanish deluxe edition of the Real Academia (1780) by more than 40 years. But it is also

26 Carteret declares that he admires Cervantes as ‘one of those inestimable figures who [...] by the fertility of his immortal genius, has produced (albeit through burlesque) the most serious, useful, and salutary effects that can be imagined’ (quoted in Paulson, *Don Quixote in England*, p. 47). Paulson’s remarks on these words provide an insight into the connection of the satirical interpretation of *Don Quixote* to home politics and not just foreign or Spanish affairs: ‘Carteret’s politics were Whig. [...] The Whigs continued to associate *Don Quixote* and Quixote’s madness of knight-errantry with the Jacobite-Tory nostalgia for the Cavaliers. There may be some significance in Carteret’s undertaking his edition of the Quixote following the Jacobite uprising of 1715 and the Atterbury “plot” of 1722’ (p. 47). Paulson is pointing to the same association of quixotism with the Cavaliers that we tentatively posited in Gayton.
27 Schmidt, *Critical Images*, p. 49: ‘The publication of the first Cervantine biography and portrait, as well as the sheer size and physical sumptuousness of the book, paper, binding, print type, and illustrations, mark the edition as a physical and intellectual venture intended to launch Cervantes from the realm of popular literature on to the ethereal heights of Parnassus’.
the monument to English Quixotephilia, since it was a physical as well as intellectual landmark in the incorporation of *Don Quixote* into the literary canon.

This overt will to canonize *Don Quixote* goes hand in hand not just with the satirical interpretation suggested by Lord Carteret’s dedication, but also with a further change within this interpretation, which transfers the newly gained seriousness of the work to the character himself. This is carried out in the illustrations, which, as Martínez Mata has aptly explained, involve an important shift in the iconographic model that had previously been dominant.28 Unlike the model followed by Charles-Antoine Coypel in his illustrations dating from 1724 and published in England in 1725, which reinforce the lowliness and comicality of the Quixotic figure and the work as a whole, Vanderbank’s images invest character and book with a new seriousness and decorum.29 Two facts point to the deliberate nature of this change: firstly, the comparison with the illustrations prepared for the same edition by William Hogarth, of which only one was accepted and six were rejected; this rejection shows, secondly, how iconography responded to a clear idea and plan on the part of Carteret and, particularly, his collaborator John Oldfield, who instructed the artists and chose the scenes to be represented – excluding the most farcical and grotesque ones – in accordance with a more respectful conception of the Quixotic figure.30 This latter, even if still the butt of satire, was now invested with a dignity that redeemed him from the degradation of the Hispanophobic Quixote and put him on the way to becoming the admirable figure that emerged only four years later with Fielding. Or, in other words, the iconographic model goes beyond Quixotephilia to anticipate the philoquixotism that defines the second half of the eighteenth century and the subsequent rise of the Romantic Quixote.31

The disappearance of the Hispanophobic Quixote in the illustrations does not mean that the prejudice against Spain has vanished from the edition: it simply has been transferred from the character and the work to the writer and his life. By this I do not mean that Cervantes is presented under disadvantageous light in Mayans’s biography, assembled from the

30 Ibid., p. 48.
31 This is best observed in the initial illustration representing Don Quixote reading in his tidy, English-style library, which emphasizes his gentility instead of his madness and captures him in a very dignified pose connecting him with previous representations of melancholy, as Martínez Mata, whose comparison between Vanderbank’s and Hogarth’s images I am following here, has argued (‘El cambio de interpretación del Quijote’, p. 204).
information the author had provided about himself in the prefatory materials of his books. On the contrary, from the very beginning the *Life* stresses two significant facts: his youthful heroism in Lepanto (from the prologue to *Novelas Ejemplares*) and his poverty in old age (from the dedication of *Don Quixote* II), as Martínez Mata explains.\(^{32}\) If we put them together, we get a narrative of a hero as well as a great writer rewarded with poverty and neglect by his country, and hence a representation of the ingratitude of a Spain unable to appreciate either talent or bravery (arms and letters). This is precisely what Mayans also emphasizes in the dedication of his *Life* to Lord Carteret and what the latter throws into relief in his dedication of the edition to the Contessa of Montijo, when he writes of Cervantes that ‘los hombres más poderosos de su tiempo no se avergonzaban dejarle en la suma pobreza’.\(^{33}\) There is no better proof of how quickly and how deeply this Hispanophobic image will be imprinted on the English imaginary. It will set the tone for later biographies, for example that produced by Smollett for his translation of *Don Quixote* (1755), in which the author is glorified in inverse proportion to the denigration of the country. This creates an implicit contrast between a Spain that did not recognize Cervantes’s genius, and a Britain that does. Or, put another way, Britain makes amends to Cervantes for Spanish mistreatment: he will find in England the position he did not in Spain, as Lord Carteret’s edition itself proves.\(^{34}\)

This very subtle Hispanophobia underlying Cervantes’s canonization becomes more apparent when the political circumstances in which the book was produced are examined. Lord Carteret was extraordinarily learned both in literature and languages, including Spanish, and hence his interest in Cervantes, but he represented the most antagonistic or even belligerent position against Spain in contemporary English politics. As Álvarez Faedo explains, the same year that this edition of *Don Quixote* appeared, Carteret was leading the Whig opposition in Parliament and manoeuvring for a declaration of war against Spain in order to defend the

\(^{32}\) Ibid., pp. 205-206.

\(^{33}\) ‘The most powerful men of his time were not ashamed of leaving him in sheer poverty’, quoted in Ibid., p. 206.

\(^{34}\) Of course, this negative representation of Spain is even more damaging because it comes from a Spaniard, recalling Temple’s citing of a Spaniard in Brussels – Martínez Mata (ibid., p. 206) even suggests the possibility of Mayans’s identification with Don Quixote in the lack of appreciation and alienation he felt at court. The fact that this first biography is written by a Spaniard certainly clears all later English biographers of any suspicions of Hispanophobia, even if Mayans’s representation of Cervantes is conceptualized in nationalistic terms through the implicit contrast with England.
English right to trade in South America without Spanish interference (in the indirect form of tribute paid or in the direct hindrance by the Spanish coast guards preventing English ships from reaching the harbours of Spanish colonies). He eventually succeeded, and the War of Jenkin’s Ear (La Guerra del Asiento) started in 1739 and lasted until 1748. Furthermore, Álvarez Faedo points to the possibility that Carteret’s edition was meant as a gift for Queen Caroline in an unashamed attempt at pleasing her and gaining her esteem. If we consider the queen’s influence on all political decisions and appointments made by her husband, George II, it is evident that this was a political move on Carteret’s part designed to increase his influence and further his ambitions against Prime Minister Robert Walpole, who, unlike Carteret, was reluctant to declare war on Spain. In this light, the edition of Don Quixote can be described as the means to enable Carteret to pursue his anti-Spanish policy. We see how, once more, Cervantes is turned into a sort of political ally against Spain and his book becomes anti-Spanish, but now with an additional personal touch, for the sake of Carteret’s political career, which the edition was intended to promote.

As with Temple, Carteret’s double identity as a man of letters and a politician creates a tension between political antagonism and literary admiration, but the underlying ambivalence in Temple now becomes an open paradox: the edition that turned Don Quixote into a classic was sponsored by somebody who was also campaigning for war against Spain, in an effort to place himself in a position to make that war happen. The paradox is resolved, not just through the satirical interpretation implied in the dedication and learned from Temple, which endows the novel with the neoclassical seriousness of satire and vilifies the country exposed in it: here the canonization initiated by Temple is more decisive because fully accomplished. Canonizing Don Quixote cuts off the ties of nationality by making it the property of the world and not of a particular country, and this is reinforced by the biography which alienates Cervantes from Spain. But the biography also points to appropriation, since it implies that Britain is giving Cervantes the recognition his own country denied him, by producing the first monumental edition and thus naturalizing him as English. In addition, by removing the farcical and burlesque view of the Quixote figure, at least in visual form through the illustrations, the last obstacle for the English

---

35 See Álvarez Faedo, ‘Lord Carteret y Cervantes’.
36 Curiously enough, Carteret had intervened as a diplomat in the peace treaty of 1721 which ended the 1719 war between the two countries in Italy. We see here, as in Temple’s case, the ambivalence between the political and the literary within the political relations with Spain.
appropriation is removed: once fully freed from Hispanophobic negativity, he can become an English character, as Fielding and Morris will realize just a few years later. The ensuing wave of philoquixotism represents a new landmark in the reception of *Don Quixote* in England: from now on the new amiable English Quixote, and not the anti-quixotic and Hispanophobic one, mediates the interpretation of Cervantes’s masterpiece for English readers and explains its adoption as an English classic.

**Conclusion**

4. The Hispanophilic Quixote and Lord Byron

Temple and Carteret are key figures in the political reception of *Don Quixote*, a reception anchored in or at least mediated by their political activities and hence by the antagonism between England and Spain. Their interpretation of Cervantes’s novel and its promotion to the status of classic alleviates the ambivalence and tension between political phobia and literary philia presiding over Anglo-Hispanic relations ever since the sixteenth century, but there is another possibility of relief of this tension: a radical change in those political relations. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Napoleonic invasion of Spain and the uprising of the Spanish people against the French invader, Britain’s archenemy, suddenly turned Spain and England into unexpected allies. The Peninsular War (La Guerra de la Independencia, 1808-1814) marked a turning point in Anglo-Hispanic relations and created in British public opinion a tide of sympathy for Spain, now transformed into the champion of oppressed peoples in the struggle for freedom against Napoleon.

Richard Hitchcock has provided ample evidence of how the Peninsular War created a vogue for Spain in Britain, which he extends to 1850. Hitchcock also explains that it was fostered by the accounts of Spain written by English combatants who, in their turn, encouraged a flood of English travellers who converted Spain into an alternative to the Grand Tour routes to France and Italy. This combined with the new Romantic interest in Spain and the Mediterranean – already visible in the Gothic romance, but more evident in some Romantics such as Scott, Southey, and Byron. The war also contributed to a new romanticized and positive image of Spain in the form of the English war poetry anthologized by Agustín Coletes and Alicia Laspra.37 Perhaps

37 Hitchcock, ‘Reflections’; Coletes and Laspra Rodríguez, *Libertad frente a tiranía*. 
the most famous and representative poem is Felicia Hemans’s *England and Spain* (1808), whose subtitle, *Valour and Patriotism*, perfectly epitomizes the exalting and patriotic light shed on Spain. If we take into account that Spain was also in the course of losing most of its American colonies in South America and ceasing to be a competitor for Britain in that last battleground of its former supremacy, it is not far-fetched to argue that Hispanophobia turns now into Hispanophilia, or at least into a more muted or soft form of Hispanophobia, condescending and patronizing because Britain is now the empire that Spain once was (as Fernando Durán also suggests in his contribution to this book).38

What is interesting is that this turn coincides with a parallel one in the reception of *Don Quixote* in Britain, making this new view of Spain chime with the extremely favourable one of the Quixote figure. The Romantic interpretation, which originated in Germany but found in English philoquixotism the ideal conditions for acclimatization, sees the Don as a champion of the ideal and views the book in heroic and tragic terms, as the story of a hero doomed to failure by a prosaic and debased world and producing tears instead of laughter. Don Quixote is no longer associated with satire or his original Spanish soil but has become a universal symbol in the larger struggle of the ideal against the real, imagination against reality, poetry against prose. Thus Cervantes becomes an essential asset of the European or Western heritage, as his usual pairing with Shakespeare proves, and his novel reaches the climax of Quixotophilia. This view was formulated in English quite late, in John Lockhart’s preface to the 1822 edition of Motteux’s translation and in the *History of Spanish and Portuguese Literature* (1823), a translation by Thomasina Ross of volume III of Bouterwek’s *Geschichte der Poesie und Beredsamkeit seit dem Ende des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*

---

38 As a matter of fact, we should talk of mixed feelings, as confirmed by Mª Eugenia Perojo Arronte in her examination of Coleridge’s writing on Spain, where she detects traces of the Black Legend coexisting with the new patriotic and heroic vein (‘Coleridge and Spanish Literature’, p. 96), which justifies her assertion that ‘Coleridge is one of the British Romantics who held conflicting views of Spain’ (p. 95). Coletes also detects the same ambivalence with regard to Byron, in whose *The Bronze Age* one can find the poet ‘resorting to a time-honoured stereotype, the Spanish black legend’, but ‘this was compatible for the British Romantics with a very recent re-birth for the old “heroic Spain” image’ (‘Spain and Byron’, p. 123) as a result of the Peninsular War, when ‘the Spaniards were newly seen by their British allies as fierce freedom fighters [...] Walter Scott and Robert Southey, among others, had combined both views of Spain in their Peninsular War writing, and so does Byron’ (p. 124). Consequently, ambivalence between Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia is no longer a tension between the literary and the political but is incorporated into this latter to produce what we could call condescending Hispanophilia or soft – because Hispanophilic – Hispanophobia.
(1801-1809). But it had been in the air earlier, with Samuel Taylor Coleridge as one of its main advocates and publicists.  

I am not suggesting a causal relationship between the change in the perception of Spain and that of Don Quixote but pointing out that they profit from each other and are mutually beneficial. The bout of Hispanophilia I have just described undoubtedly helped to popularize the exaggerated sympathy with which Don Quixote was seen in the new German Romantic vein. And it may have worked inversely too: the new Romantic view of Don Quixote should have increased the sympathy for Spain. Indeed, Spain was frequently seen through Cervantes’s masterpiece, as attested by the many references to the work Esther Ortas has compiled in her very informative account of travel literature in Spain from 1701 to 1846, and particularly by Henry D. Inglis’s Rambles in the Footsteps of Don Quixote (1831, 1837). What is beyond contention is that the pairing of Don Quixote with Spain has been rebuilt in harmonious instead of conflictual terms, as had been the case with Gayton’s Hispanophobic Quixote, but now in Hispanophilic instead of Hispanophobic fashion. After the troubled times of ambivalence caused by the conflict between literary admiration and political antagonism, there is again full agreement in the perception of Don Quixote and Spain, but in positive instead of negative terms. The integration of both in a sort of Romantic matrix puts an end to the paradox I have been exploring.

The new Hispanophilic Quixote is best seen in a major figure like Lord Byron. His judgement on Don Quixote in the first line of stanza xi, canto XIII,

39 Coleridge had embarked on a ten-month journey to Germany on 16 September 1798 and had studied at the University of Göttingen for four months in 1799. He was well read in German literature and philosophy, as his frequent plagiarisms of so many ideas from German authors in his writings prove. Of his ideas on Don Quixote, we have the evidence of the three lectures he gave (in 1814, 1818, and 1819, see Perojo Arronte, ‘Coleridge and Spanish Literature’, pp. 107-108), although there are earlier references in his writings, particularly the notes he took for the second one and the report on it appearing in the New Times (23 February 1818), where we can find an excellent introduction to the Romantic approach to Don Quixote. In addition to the lectures, he could disseminate his ideas in private conversations with intellectuals and poets of his circle, as Hazlitt’s remarks on Don Quixote in his often quoted ‘Standard Novels and Romances’ (1815) suggest. For an exhaustive account of Coleridge’s ideas on Cervantes, see Perojo Arronte, ‘Samuel Taylor Coleridge on Don Quixote’.

40 As I have explained elsewhere (Pardo, ‘Henry David Inglis’), this is a fictional Quixotic travelogue – an account by a traveller following the Quixotic trail – in which Don Quixote is seen through Spain and Spain through Don Quixote, but, of course, this means the Romantic version of the work, not Cervantes’s, in the same way as Spain is Romantic Spain. Inglis’s book shows how the new view of the novel perfectly suits that of the country and testifies to the transformation of Spain from potential threat to Romantic other.
of Don Juan (1821) has been quoted repeatedly: ‘Cervantes smiled Spanish chivalry away’. The idea sounds deceptively similar to Temple’s reading (through Walpole’s rephrasing of it): Don Quixote was a satire on chivalry which erased the latter from Spain through burlesque. Less frequently quoted are the preceding stanzas (viii to x), which reveal the differences with Temple:

I should be very willing to redress
Men’s wrongs, and rather check than punish crimes,
Had not Cervantes, in that too true tale
Of Quixote, shown how all such efforts fail.
[ix]
Of all tales ‘tis the saddest – and more sad
Because he makes us smile. His hero’s right
And still pursues the right: to curb the bad
His only object, and ‘gainst odds to fight
His guerdon. ‘Tis his virtue makes him mad.
But his adventures form a sorry sight;
A sorrier still is the great moral taught
By that real epic unto all who have thought.42

These lines clearly articulate the Romantic positive interpretation stressing Quixotic heroism in the face of a hostile reality and the tragedy of its failure. The oft-quoted line may have seemed the same idea, since it implies the view of Don Quixote as a satire against chivalry resulting in the disappearance of heroism, but Byron does not rejoice in it. He regrets it because he supports chivalry and quixotism, which is described as heroic idealism. Unlike Temple, he is on the side of Don Quixote rather than Cervantes, and this can be extended to Spain, since he obviously considers the effects of his work as damaging rather than salutary.

This is confirmed by the view of Spain Byron provided in a former poem, the one that made his name famous overnight all over Europe, Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage, the first canto of which (1812) recounts his experience as a traveller in Spain in 1809. There are two famous stanzas where he voices his Hispanophobia in the context of the Peninsular War, as displayed in their first lines: ‘Oh, lovely Spain! renowned, romantic land! / Where is that standard which Pelagio bore’ (xxxv); and ‘Awake, ye sons of Spain! awake! advance! / Lo! Chivalry,
Byron is calling the Spanish people to arms against foreign oppression, and his invocation of Spain's glorious and chivalric past represented by Don Pelayo is a clear correlate to his evocation of lost chivalry represented by Don Quixote in *Don Juan*. Indeed, one line in stanza x of *Don Juan* XIII (following those on Cervantes previously quoted and preceding the one containing the famous dictum), which reads ‘From foreign yoke to free the helpless native’, rings the bell of the Peninsular War and links Don Quixote to the struggle for freedom in Spain formerly invoked at length in *Childe Harold*. The lines from this latter thus provide an additional context to Byron’s interpretation of Cervantes’s work: the poet is not the political enemy of Spain satisfied by the salutary effects of satire on that country, but rather the sympathetic ally who feels nostalgia for Spain’s heroic past – pre-imperial, leaping back to a time before Anglo-Hispanic antagonism – and promotes its renewal in the fight against the foreign tyrant.

In short, Temple’s interpretation is now tinged by Hispanophilia instead of Hispanophobia. Byron’s political as well as literary ideas, in this case his identification with the Spanish people and Don Quixote, colour his reading of Cervantes, although the Hispanophobic view of the novel as anti-Spanish satire is still ingrained in Byron’s view. This persistence, in conjunction with the survival of the Black Legend alongside Spanish heroism in the writings of the Romantics on Spain, reveals the resilience of Hispanophobia at the heart of Hispanophilia. As the latter wanes, the paradox lying at the core of Britain’s...

43  These are the two complete stanzas: [xxxv] ‘Oh, lovely Spain! renowned, romantic land! / Where is that standard which Pelagio bore, / When Cava’s traitor-sire first called the band / That dyed thy mountain-streams with Gothic gore? / Where are those bloody banners which of yore / Waved o’er thy sons, victorious to the gale, / And drove at last the spoilers to their shore? / Red gleamed the cross, and waned the crescent pale, / While Afric’s echoes thrilled with Moorish matrons’ wail’ (p. 35); [xxxvii] ‘Awake, ye sons of Spain! awake! advance! / Lo! Chivalry, your ancient goddess, cries, / But wields not, as of old, her thirsty lance, / Nor shakes her crimson plumage in the skies: / Now on the smoke of blazing bolts she flies, / And speaks in thunder through yon engine’s roar! / In every peal she calls – ’Awake! arise!’ / Say, is her voice more feeble than of yore, / When her war-song was heard on Andalusia’s shore?’ (Byron, *Byron’s Poetry*, p. 36).

44 Stanza x of *Don Juan* XIII reads as follows: ‘Redressing injury, revenging wrong, / To aid the damsel and destroy the caitiff, / Opposing singly the united strong, / From foreign yoke to free the helpless native. / Alas, must noblest views like an old song / Be for mere Fancy’s sport a theme creative, / A jest, a riddle, fame through thick and thin sought? / And Socrates himself but Wisdom’s Quixote?’ (p. 1138). For the presence and importance of Spain in Byron’s poetry and life, see Saglia, *Byron and Spain*. Saglia also studies Byron in his *Poetic Castles in Spain*, specifically in one section of chapter 1 (‘Patriotic Knights and Matadors in Byron’s *Childe Harold*’, pp. 125-143) and in the last section of chapter 2 (‘Spain in Ottava Rima: Byron’s *Don Juan* and Barry Cornwall’s *Diego de Montilla*’, pp. 238-243).
relationship with Cervantes must return to the beaten track and *Don Quixote* needs to be dissociated from Spain again. In this light, the canonization of Cervantes starting in the eighteenth century and culminating in Romantic criticism is but preparation for the final blow to be dealt by the Victorian age: full appropriation through a process of naturalization and *Don Quixote*’s metamorphosis into a recognizably English character and of the novel into an English classic. This process can be seen as an extension to the literary field of the politics of colonization, which will turn Britain into an empire in the nineteenth century. With this outcome in view, we can conclude that, in the long love story between Britain and *Don Quixote*, Spain was first a nuisance to be disposed of through occlusion or denigration; then a hindrance to be overcome by misreading or canonization; later an officious helper or go-between in the wings of short-lived Hispanophilia; and finally, after consummation in wedlock – that is, appropriation – a silent observer to be witness, if not an annoying in-law to be tolerated.
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8. Spanish Politicking in British Periodical Reviews, 1808-1814

Susan Valladares

Abstract
This chapter explores the imbrication of literary and political ideologies that rendered periodical reviews such as the Edinburgh Review and Quarterly Review powerful – if combative – organs of political opinion during the Peninsular War. Covering the period 1808 (the year of the Anglo-Spanish alliance against Napoleon) to 1814 (the first year of Ferdinand VII’s post-war regime), it explores the tensions inherent in acts of both prophetizing and memorializing the outcomes of the war, and how rival reviewers negotiated inherited and newly forged narratives of Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia. It also examines the political and aesthetic threats levelled against the Edinburgh by Robert Southey’s Carmen Triumphale (1814), and asks to what extent periodical reviews afforded a unique medium for shaping the unstable discourse of Anglo-Spanish prejudices and sympathies advanced during the Peninsular War.

Keywords: Edinburgh Review, Quarterly Review, Carmen Triumphale, Peninsular War, print culture

The first British troops deployed to assist the Portuguese and Spaniards in what would become known as the Peninsular War landed in Mondego Bay in August 1808. Expectations were high in Britain, and support for the war effort widespread. The following month, when news spread of the embarrassing terms agreed to under the Convention of Cintra, the popular response of moral outrage attested to an acute interest and investment in Britain’s newest military campaign, notwithstanding its shaky start.1 It was not long,
however, before public opinion began to polarize. In October 1808 there appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* an essay on the war so contentious that it caused Sir Walter Scott and at least 25 other prominent readers to cancel their subscriptions to the *Edinburgh*, and for Daniel Stuart’s daily newspaper *The Courier* to claim, pointedly, that ‘Thomas Paine never published any thing [sic] more seditious’. The offending (now (in)famous) essay was co-written by Francis Jeffrey and Henry Brougham (the *Edinburgh*’s editor and one of its most prominent contributors, respectively). It constituted a review of *The Exposition of the Practices and Machinations Which Led to the Usurpation of the Crown of Spain, and the Means Adopted by the Emperor of the French to Carry It into Execution* (1808) – a slim book written by the Spanish first minister, Pedro Cevallos, detailing the enforced abdication of the Spanish monarchy.

The *Edinburgh* was known – and by many readers appreciated – for what Marilyn Butler has described as the ‘seductively readable style of “slashing” criticism’ fostered by Jeffrey and his team of writers. But this review was different. As Diego Saglia neatly summarizes:

> Whilst reviewing the book [...] Jeffrey and Brougham launched into a revision of Spanish affairs that culminated in ‘Jacobinal’ overtones, advocating peace with France and reform at home, waving terms such as ‘constitution’, ‘liberty’ and ‘people’, and referring to the revolt as ‘the Spanish revolution’. Advancing an even more scandalous argument, the *Edinburgh* critics claimed that the war in Spain was a useless effort because, though heroic, the Spaniards would eventually be defeated.

In quick response, the *Quarterly Review* – which had, in fact, been in planning since 1807 – opportunistically fixed upon the ‘Spanish question’ in order to better establish its Tory credentials as the *Edinburgh*’s latest and most formidable rival. But what is often left out of this now relatively well-known their return to France. Once the terms of the treaty were made public in Britain, it was met with public outcry. A Board of Inquiry into the conduct of the British generals involved was held at the Royal College at Chelsea (14 November–27 December 1808). At the end of the inquiry, the generals were exonerated. See Valladares, “For the Sake of Illustrating Principles”.

2 *Courier*, 2 December 1808, as quoted in Christie, The *Edinburgh Review*, p. 84.

3 This work had first been published anonymously in *The Times* on 10 October 1808 before appearing in book form.


6 The timeliness of the *Quarterly*’s appearance should not disguise the fact that it had long been in planning. As Jonathan Cutmore has demonstrated, the idea of creating a conservative
story is that the flames of contention continued to be fanned as late as 1814, when, from the margins of his first New Year’s Ode, Robert Southey, the nation’s recently appointed poet laureate, provocatively cited Jeffrey and Brougham’s essay only to disprove its political predictions.

Focusing on the distance between 1808 – the year that saw the cementing of the Anglo-Spanish alliance – and 1814 – the first year of Ferdinand VII’s rule following his restoration the preceding December – this chapter examines the role played by British periodical reviews towards both prophesizing and memorializing Britain’s military interventions in Spain. It argues that while inherited prejudices against Spain remained strong in early-nineteenth-century Britain, the Peninsular War helped open up a new spectrum of Hispanophilia, the full breadth of which could be registered within the pages of the Edinburgh and Quarterly (because, rather than in spite, of their diametric politics). Privileging questions of genre, this chapter explores how, through the framing of topical but also highly polished debates, periodical reviews offered opportunities for cultural projection that were distinct from those afforded by other literary mediums (such as the theatre or the Gothic novel, for example), in which Spain also featured prominently. It explores the political anxieties unleashed by Britain’s ever more expansive print culture, the suspicions attached to the dissemination of ‘news’ during wartime, and the ways in which the political interplay between the Edinburgh and the Quarterly contributed to continual revisions of the Hispanophilic narratives associated with Britain’s involvement in the Peninsular War.

‘Perfidious and deceitful arts’

As made manifest by his choice of title, Cevallos considered Charles IV’s abdication at Bayonne to represent the ‘perfidious and deceitful arts by which the emperor has made the progress we have seen’. It was not, therefore, without a sense of humour that in their review essay Jeffrey

riposte to the Edinburgh’s success can be traced back to the summer of 1807 when Stratford Canning presented to his cousin George Canning (who was then foreign secretary) plans for a new periodical. Attacks on the Edinburgh were plentiful following the Cevallos review. ‘Mentor’, the pseudonymous author of the epistolary pamphlet entitled The Dangers of the Edinburgh Review (1808), claimed, for instance, that the Edinburgh represented ‘infidelity in Religion; licentiousness in Morals; and […] seditious and revolutionary principles in Politicks’ (p. 4). On the origins of the Quarterly Review, see Cutmore, Contributors, pp. 5-19.

7    Cevallos, An Exposure, p. 74.
and Brougham promptly accused Cevallos of the same selfishness and hypocrisy that he had assigned to Napoleon Bonaparte. By the time of his book’s publication, Cevallos was claiming political exile in England. Previous to this, he had paid allegiance to Charles IV and then to his son Ferdinand (El Deseado, or the desired one), before accepting an offer to serve under Napoleon’s brother, Joseph Bonaparte, who was granted the title of king of Spain in August 1808. Jeffrey and Brougham take full advantage of these facts, exposing Cevallos’s failure ‘to vindicate his own honour and consistency’ as a pretext for reflecting, instead, upon the recent successes achieved in Spain, independently of its government. Contextualizing their remarks with reference to Brougham’s earlier review essay, ‘A Letter from Mr Whitbread to Lord Holland, on the Present Situation of Spain’ (which had been published in the Edinburgh’s July 1808 issue), Jeffrey and Brougham celebrate ‘the surrender of Dupont’s army – the general retreat of the enemy towards the Pyrenees – and the flight of Joseph from Madrid’. But they also warn against investing too much hope in these victories, pointing out that the Spanish people had resisted a detachment of the French army, not its full force: ‘[T]he Spaniards have not yet tried their strength against their formidable adversary. They have attacked him unawares, and beaten him by surprise. [...] The whole battle is still to begin. [...] Army after army will be poured through the Pyrenees, and all Spain must become a field of blood.’ This was a dire forecast for the recently cemented Anglo-Spanish alliance by which Britain had agreed to send soldiers, arms and money to the Iberian Peninsula.

Interestingly, during the course of their review, Jeffrey and Brougham twice underline the ‘melancholy’ nature of their ‘forebodings’, describing Spain as a nation composed of the ‘most gallant people’, for whom the effects of liberation would be nothing short of ‘glorious’. Recognizing that the Spanish resistance to France had worked its way from the ground up, they take pains to stress that it was the masses who led the resurrection: ‘the very odious, many-headed beast, the multitude – the mob itself’, as they sarcastically put it. Jeffrey and Brougham here cash in on symbolism that linked the exploits of Hercules to the new French Republic. As Lynn Hunt explains, in the public celebrations for August 1793 (held in Paris to mark the

9 Ibid., p. 218.
10 Ibid., pp. 215, 219.
11 Ibid., pp. 219, 220.
12 Ibid., p. 220.
first anniversary of the end of monarchy in France), Jacques-Louis David's representation of Hercules's defeat of the Hydra served as an allegory for the end of federalism. By conflating the victorious multitude with the 'many-headed beast', Jeffrey and Brougham exploit the British government's repressive backlash against the French Revolution in order to archly hint at the still gaping distance between political desire and realization. Georgina Green thus compellingly argues that one of Jeffrey and Brougham's chief aims for their Cevallos review was 'the salvation of the word “people” from the wreckage of 1790s' alarm about sedition'. But they also worked hard to align recent French and Spanish histories, and to make their lessons immediate to a British readership. Identifying 'the Spanish revolution' with 'all those feelings of liberty and patriotism which many had supposed extinguished since the French revolution', Jeffrey and Brougham unambiguously located the Spanish and French examples within the same ideological continuum.

The Francophile of 1789 and Hispanophile of 1808 could walk hand-in-hand, they effectively argued.

By the start of the Peninsular War the movement for constitutional reform within Britain had acquired considerable momentum. William Cobbett had been publicizing the issue from the pages of his Political Register since 1806, while Francis Burdett – the independent MP who, in 1807, was elected (against the odds) to the City of Westminster – became an ever more popular figure. Jeffrey and Brougham could thus turn the tide of support for the Spanish patriots to their particular advantage by arguing that Spain would be able to advocate for 'the cause of freedom and reform' within Britain and, significantly, Europe at large, even more successfully than France had been able to in the early days of its revolution. In their essay they reason, first and foremost, that 'the country, government and people, are committed with the Spanish patriots, which they never were with those of France'; that the lessons of recent history would be heeded; that the degree of national rivalry that had worked against the popularity of the French revolution would not interfere; and that France, 'in its present state of despotism and power', would be motive enough to invest in the 'new order of things in Spain'. A history of Anglo-Spanish enmity dating back to at least the days of the Spanish Armada is here eclipsed by the 'national rivalry' associated with Anglo-French politics; Jeffrey and Brougham's carefully
couched Hispanicophilic narrative at once revising the Hispanophobia of the past and exploiting the ‘francophobic patriotism’ described by Stuart Semmel in his book *Napoleon and the British*.

The *Edinburgh’s* Hispanophilia was thus nurtured in the service of a specific cause (reform in England) even though, as the *Quarterly Review* would later point out, the largest proportion of Spanish patriots were fighting for the restoration of the monarchy and church, not political reorganization. The authors of the Cevallos review nevertheless insisted that Englishmen of all descriptions supported the revolution in Spain, the exception being ‘a few intriguers’ in the British government, who were silently opposed, not to the revolution itself, but its larger consequences. In an extended character sketch, these (anonymous) ministers are imagined to have ‘shuddered in secret at the overthrow of the worst government in Christendom’ and to have ‘offered up their prayers that the reform of abuses might be nipt in the bud by the success of the French arms [...] those horrible reforms which had well nigh purified and overwhelmed us eighteen years ago’.17 Turning the nightmare on its head, it is with unmistakable relish that Jeffrey and Brougham proceed to picture once more how the Spanish example of reform might spread across the Continent and arrive in England.

Jeffrey and Brougham’s review essay stressed that not only Cevallos and Napoleon, but the British government itself needed to be held to account for hypocrisy. Lamenting that the British army had spread itself too thin across the Continent, and indeed the globe (with troops also stationed in Egypt and the West Indies), the authors approach the conclusion to their essay by lamenting Britain’s inability to offer any real assistance to the Spanish cause. Still smarting from the terms agreed to by the Convention of Cintra, they unflinchingly assert that ‘we have done all that lies in our power for the ruin of our allies’.18 Astutely pre-empting that they might also be accused of appropriating the war in Spain for their own political ends, Jeffrey and Brougham take care to differentiate their narrative from the examples of hypocrisy indexed within their essay. This makes it easier for the *Edinburgh*’s readers to move from a position of complicity (implied by the first-person plural) to one of reformatory zeal (as characterized by Jeffrey and Brougham’s energetic prose). Indeed, it is by alarming readers into a recognition of their own submission to poorly handled ministerial actions that Jeffrey and Brougham get away with some of their most provocative statements: ‘With phrases of justice and generosity on our lips, our hearts

---

17 Ibid., p. 224.
18 Ibid., p. 232.
have been filled with coldness and selfishness. With the cry of helping to put out the fire on the Continent, we have been caught in the act of pilfering for ourselves. Not only the Spanish, but also the British national character was in need of urgent address.

‘Chiefly filled with abuse’

When the Quarterly Review emerged in March 1809 as a political rival to the Edinburgh, the poet Robert Southey was approached by William Gifford, the Quarterly’s new editor, to write a reply to the Cevallos essay. Southey enjoyed impressive knowledge of Spanish politics and culture; he was proficient in Spanish (a decided advantage since it was a translation of the Exposition that had been reviewed in the Edinburgh); and he had already crossed paths with Jeffrey (to the point that in a letter to John Taylor Coleridge, he wrote that he was ‘strongly moved by the spirit to make an attack upon Jeffrey and his whole line, beginning with politics’). But not everyone agreed that he was the man for the job. Significantly, the Quarterly’s publisher, John Murray, remained suspicious of Southey’s earlier political sympathies and, ultimately, it was George Ellis who took it upon himself to write the reply, freeing Southey to answer Sydney Smith on the topic of evangelical missions.

Yet, if Southey did not contribute the lead essay for the Quarterly’s first number, his views on Spain still featured prominently. With Spanish affairs both opening and closing the Quarterly’s first issue, at its heart was Scott’s review of Southey’s poem on Spanish medieval history, The Chronicle of the Cid (1808). There were also instances of more direct engagement in 1810, when, for example, Southey wrote a review essay on the Portuguese Observer that condemned the French occupation of Portugal. In addition to his contributions to the Quarterly, Southey continued to write directly on the Peninsular War for the annual retrospectives on Europe that he submitted to the Edinburgh Annual Register. But these interventions were not, it seems, enough and in 1814 Southey thereby launched his most forceful attack on the Edinburgh’s Spanish politics, not from the pages of the Quarterly, as might be expected, but from Carmen Triumphale, a laureate ode with a chequered composition history as Lynda Pratt, Daniel E. White, Ian Packer,

19 Ibid., p. 232.
20 As quoted in Cutmore, ‘Founding’.
21 On the Quarterly’s religious agenda, see Cutmore, ‘A Plurality’, pp. 73-85.
Tim Fulford and Carol Bolton – the most recent editors of Southey’s later poetical works – have carefully detailed. 23

The poem *Carmen Triumphale, for the Commencement of the Year* (1814) is but a censored version of what Southey initially entitled *Carmen Annuanum*. It was censored because, as John Wilson Croker and John Rickman judiciously advised, the original poem’s final stanzas (urging the French people to murder Napoleon) were incompatible with government policy – and, as poet laureate, Southey could not, therefore, publish them. This did not, however, prevent Southey from seeing through the anonymous publication of his stanzas in the *Courier*, Stuart’s pro-government newspaper. On 3 February 1814, the *Courier* published ‘Ode Written during the Negotiations with Buonaparte in January 1814’, a nine-stanza poem built upon the rejected stanzas.

Southey’s laureate ode (or ‘Carmen Castratum’ as the poet nicknamed it at the time) remained exceptional nonetheless. 24 Whereas most laureate odes were published in newspapers or the annual registers, Southey’s was issued as a poem of 30 pages printed in expensive quarto form. The measure of the Pindaric ode that he adopted was also unusual, not only for its length (of nineteen stanzas) but for its irregular lines (ill-suited for the laureate ode’s traditional musical setting). Most exceptional of all, however, were the several pages of vituperative ‘Notes’ appended to *Carmen Triumphale*. 25 Southey’s Notes lambasted the *Edinburgh* for its erroneous predictions on the war, focusing, unsurprisingly, on the reviews of Whitbread’s *Letter* and Cevallos’s *Exposition*. The former essay, written in response to the politician Samuel Whitbread’s publication of an anti-war pamphlet, had begun to question the likelihood of Spanish success, while the latter advanced unambiguous answers. Southey also quoted from other topically themed essays published in the *Edinburgh*, including reviews of the *Lettre aux espagnols-americains* (January 1809), *Narrative of the Siege of Zaragoza* (April 1809) and *Orders in Council and the American embargo* (July 1809). As Pratt et al. conclude, the cumulative effect of this was to provide ‘a clear sign of how the poem’s subject was a continuation in verse of his prose writings on contemporary events in the *Edinburgh Annual Register* and *Quarterly Review*’. 26

25 For a fuller account of *Carmen Triumphale*’s composition and publication history, see Pratt et al., ‘Introduction’, pp. 1–7.
Southey’s laureateship had been openly – and hotly – debated in the press, making inevitable the rigorous public scrutiny given to his first official ode. In realizing such a radical departure from convention, Southey threw the gauntlet to his critics – and the *Edinburgh*’s reviewers most of all. In his review of the poem for the *Edinburgh*’s January 1814 issue, Jeffrey half took the bait:

If Mr Southey has been contended with getting up an ode of ordinary length, and, after having set it to music, had printed it, in a quiet way […] we should have let him slip down the smooth descent to oblivion. […] But when the Annual Ode is swelled to nineteen strophes, garnished with an ostentatious title, and printed in a four shilling quarto, with mottoes, notes, and other accompaniments of pretension, the case assumes a more serious aspect, and seems to call imperiously for our interposition.  

Whereas Southey had taken pains to define his laureateship as a position that established his lineage with Edmund Spenser and John Dryden, the *Edinburgh* placed him, instead, in the company of Thomas Shadwell and Colley Cibber, the laureate poets lambasted in Alexander Pope’s *The Dunciad* (1728; 1743).  

Jeffrey acknowledged that the Notes to *Carmen Triumphale*, ‘chiefly filled with abuse of the *Edinburgh Review*’, were ‘no doubt intended to make us very angry and very ridiculous’. His initial claim that he did not propose ‘either to vindicate or explain’ the *Edinburgh*’s ‘supposed errors’ in political prediction was, however, contradicted by the self-defensive reflection that followed: ‘That the course of events has not corresponded in all respects with what we at one time considered as probable, is no more, we suppose, than may be said of every one fallible being who has dealt in the hazardous trade of political prediction’. Likening the practice of political prediction making to a trade, Jeffrey implicitly acknowledges the ethical responsibilities common to both forms of profit-driven traffic. But lest this be taken as an admission of defeat, he concludes with the unequivocal statement: ‘[W]ith regard to

---

27 See, for instance, William Hazlitt, in the pages of the *Morning Chronicle* (esp. 18 September 1813, issue 13844), and Leigh Hunt in the *Examiner* (15 August 1813, issue 294).
29 Although not an official holder of the laureateship, Edmund Spenser’s receipt of a royal pension for *The Fairie Queene* (1590) meant that he was commonly regarded as being one of the first poet laureates.
31 Ibid., p. 452.
Spain, however – and the degree of praise which that nation is entitled for its efforts against its oppressors, we unquestionably retain our original opinion'. There are two issues at stake here: firstly, political predictions and to what extent (if any) these should be considered within the remit of reviews; and secondly, Anglo-Spanish politics more specifically. While Jeffrey’s comments suggest that he wavered on the first issue, his editorial commitment to the second was expressed not only in the Edinburgh’s direct response to Southey’s attack, but in subsequent numbers that year.

The opening essay for the Edinburgh’s April 1814 issue – an ostensible review of William Sotheby’s ‘A Song of Triumph’ (1813) – advances a long discourse on the state and prospects of Europe. Jeffrey, who assumed authorship of the essay in his 1843 Contributions to the Edinburgh Review, therein asserts that ‘though we do not pretend to have foreseen or foretold the happy events that have so lately astonished the world […] of Spain we think as we have always thought’ (whereas, ‘Of Russia’, he concedes, ‘we are most willing to believe that we have spoken somewhat rashly’). What Jeffrey meant by this is complicated by the fact that his review of Carmen Triumphale had maintained that the war in Spain had been ‘entirely’ the result of ‘British valour and British enterprize’. Indeed, he had argued that ‘though Spain has been the theatre of great and glorious exploits against the common foe, the Spaniards have in general been found in the place not of actors, but spectators’. With approximately 200,000 soldiers sent to the Iberian Peninsula during the course of the war, Jeffrey’s claim was evidence-based. But it marks a considerable shift from the earlier Cevallos essay wherein he and Brougham had openly celebrated the Spanish patriots and mocked the inadequacy of the military support provided by the British government. If the Hispanophilia put forward by Jeffrey and Brougham in 1808 had been qualified, in 1814 it was muted by yet another degree.

‘Judex damnatur com nocens absolvitur’

Southey may have ridiculed the Edinburgh for its inconsistencies but he was not, as the Scourge pointed out, immune from similar accusations. The poet laureate had, after all, been ‘one of the most enthusiastic advocates for reform’ whose ‘tone and sentiment’ had undergone its own ‘extraordinary

---

32 Ibid., p. 453.
33 Ibid., p. 9.
34 Ibid., p. 453.
35 Daly, The British Soldier in the Peninsular War, p. 2.
revolution’ in recent years. Unconvinced by Southey’s apparent reformation, the Scourge capitalized upon the ironic situation whereby Southey ‘ridicules the mistakes and inconsistencies of the Edinburgh Review, while he has himself been an example of the most enthusiastic ardor in a cause which he now acknowledges to be bad!’36 Southey’s choice of a ‘novel’ stanza form and irregular lines seemed to smack too much of his youthful radicalism. The Notes to Carmen Triumphale were intended, as the Scourge observed, ‘to expose the futility of certain predictions respecting the issue of the war, advanced by the Edinburgh reviewer’. But as the Scourge also added: ‘if the reviewers have sometimes prophesied fallaciously, Mr Southey’s school have been for a long series of years the dupes of sanguine expectation’ and, furthermore, ‘previous to the invasion of Russia there could be no solid foundation for anticipating the early deliverance of the Peninsula’.37 The Anti-Jacobin Review and True Churchman’s Magazine sided more firmly with Southey, however. In January 1814, it included an essay entitled ‘Reviewers Reviewed’ (in continuation of a longer-running series) that employed similar methods to those used by Southey in his Notes to Carmen Triumphale.38 Referring readers back to past numbers of the Edinburgh, the reviewer concluded that ‘happily for mankind’, Spain’s fate proved ‘the opposite of that which the Edinburgh Reviewers so confidently anticipated, and so foolishly foretold’.39 This was followed in April 1814 by a letter to the editor, signed ‘Piso’, which defended Southey from Jeffrey’s acerbic review of his laureate ode.40

Piso’s letter, which achieved wide circulation thanks to its re-printing in the Gentleman’s Magazine that same month, mockingly describes Jeffrey as ‘the police magistrate of Parnassus himself’, working by the Edinburgh’s flaunted but inflexible maxim of ‘Judex damnatur com nocens absolvitur’ (‘The judge is condemned when the guilty are acquitted’).41 ‘Every writer, in prose or verse’ was thus not only put on trial but, contrary to the Edinburgh’s liberal sympathies, ascribed ‘the character of a culprit’ (and thus deemed

36 Scourge (February 1814), p. 122.
37 Ibid., p. 129.
38 As Mark Schoenfield explains, the Anti-Jacobin Review’s ‘Reviewers Reviewed’ amounted to ‘an irregular column [...] frequently directed at undermining the Edinburgh’ (British Periodicals, p. 80).
40 The choice of pseudonym was probably intended as an allusion to the reputedly short-tempered roman statesman Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, governor of Hispania c. 7 BC, whose father and grandfather, of the same name, had been involved in the Catiline conspiracy to overthrow Marcus Tullius Cicero and Gaius Antonius Hybrida.
41 ‘Piso,’ Southey’s Carmen Triumphale’, p. 401.
guilty before proof). ‘The poem itself’, Piso argues, was ‘culpable’: ‘it told “the old story of the war in the Peninsula” – bound to offend because of its abuse of the French. Piso’s use of direct quotation attests to his implicit exasperation with the language employed by the Edinburgh. As he goes on to argue, ‘by the words France, and the French, he invariably means nobody but Buonaparte and his adherent’. If Jeffrey’s views on France were thus branded as one-dimensional, so too, by extension, were his views on Spain. In retaliation, Jeffrey characterized Southey’s poem as prosaic rather than poetic; a point he underlined by translating Southey’s verse ‘into plain prose’, while accusing Southey of employing the ‘dullest style and meanest diction of a newspaper’. Jeffrey thus reduced eight lines of the poem to the following prose transcription:

The heroic Spaniard first awoke from his trance. He broke his chains; and casting the treacherous yoke off his neck, he called on England, his generous enemy. For he knew well, that wherever wise policy prevailed, or brave despair, the succours of Britain would flow, and her arm be present.

By including Southey’s original lines for comparison (on the following page) and stressing that with ‘scarcely any exception’, Southey’s words alone had been used and none ‘insidiously substituted’, Jeffrey insisted his methods were transparent. As Matthew Sangster has argued, it was not unusual for reviewers for the periodical press to indulge in adaptations, ‘remak[ing] their subjects’, in order to inscribe their own critical and institutional authority over them. Piso’s letter implicitly recognizes this, turning the tables on the Edinburgh

42 Ibid., p. 401.
43 Ibid., p. 401.
45 Ibid., p. 449. Cf. Southey’s original verse:

V.
First from his trance the heroic Spaniard woke;
His chains he broke,
And casting off his neck the treacherous yoke,
He call’d on England, on his generous foe:
For well he knew that wheresoe’er
Wise policy prevailed, or brave despair,
Thither would Britain’s succours flow,
Her arm be present there.
(Southey, Carmen Triumphale, ll. 44-51, pp. 26-27).
with the wry statement: ‘Sure I am, that if the metamorphosed stanzas are to be denominated prose, they are some of the best prose I ever read in the *Edinburgh Review.*’ Piso then follows Southey’s lead, taking the *Edinburgh* to task for its opinions of the war in Spain by providing a detailed, year-by-year, account of the *Edinburgh*’s political commentary on the campaign. Whereas Southey’s Notes to *Carmen Triumphale* also cited recent history in order to invalidate the *Edinburgh*’s predictions, Piso goes a step further, suggesting that the reviewers had failed to recognize history as it unfolded.

In response to the *Edinburgh*’s July 1808 issue – an issue Southey also singled out in his Notes – Piso writes:

> [B]efore the Review for October appeared [i.e. the Cevallos essay], the glorious triumph at Baylen had taken place, and a large army of the ‘best soldiers in the world’ had surrendered to the despised insurgents. Still the Reviewers (who in July has delivered an opinion that ‘in a few months,’ the fortunes of France would prevail) persisted in saying ‘we can discover no good cause for changing that opinion.’ Still they ridiculed ‘the romantic hopes of the English nation’. Still they spoke with awe, of that ‘consummate statesman’, Buonaparte. Still they indulged in ‘melancholy forebodings that the combat would lead to the subjugation of the most gallant people in the world’.

Piso, quoting directly from the *Edinburgh,* seems eager to contain its inflammatory sentiments within the safety of inverted commas. Both Southey and Piso insist, through repetition, that the *Edinburgh*’s reviewers were doggedly determined to defy Spanish success. What Piso here gleefully adds is that this so blinkered Jeffrey and his fellow contributors that they failed to comprehend not only probable consequences, but proven ones also. Piso’s anaphoric ‘still’ emphatically locates the *Edinburgh* within a stagnant political history.

‘Seasoned for the most vitiated palate’

During the course of the Peninsular War, Spain became a recognized test case for the political work conducted by the *Edinburgh.* Yet the topicality of the war ensured that Spain remained of critical concern not only for the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly,* but a host of other periodicals, including ladies’

49 Ibid., p. 404.
magazines, such as *La Belle Assemblée* and the *Lady’s Monthly Museum*, which continued to promote fictional prose with Spanish themes; the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, the *Literary Panorama* and the *Satirist*, which frequently printed poems on the war in Spain, such as John Gwilliam’s ‘The Campaign’; *The Eclectic Review* and *The New Monthly Magazine*, which featured reviews of topical biographies and histories, such as *The Life of Cardinal Ximenes*; the *Monthly Review* and *British Critic*, which, in response to Ferdinand VII's restoration of the Inquisition, offered variant readings of Fitzgerald's ‘Spain Delivered’; and the *Theatrical Inquisitor*, which printed short stories such as ‘The Dean of Badajoz’ and reviewed Spanish dramas. It was, therefore, because, rather than in spite of the periodical press's continued interest in Spain, that Southey was so keen to ensure that his narrative of the war, as advanced in *Carmen Triumphale*, attracted headline notice. His correspondence, the organization of his poem, and even its early reviews suggest that for Southey, claims of poetical and political authority had become indissolubly bound.

*Carmen Triumphale*’s attacks on the *Edinburgh’s* false predictions allowed Southey to vindicate his own views on the war, and to answer back to the pointed criticisms that he had received on account of his radical past (criticisms that would reach their peak with the *Wat Tyler* scandal of 1817). Although his mode of attack was easily mocked by the *Edinburgh* – Southey’s New Year ode, as Jeffrey pointed out, looked beyond the requisite year in order to narrate the British army’s last five years of campaigning in Spain, while his Notes lacked the decorum expected of a laureate – Southey had asked, provocatively, that the *Edinburgh’s* Spanish politics be scrutinized not in the pages of another review – as the *Anti-Jacobin* would do in Southey’s defence – but a different context altogether. It was in this respect that Southey was arguably most successful in inflicting injury.

Although by 1814 the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* were both established periodicals that enjoyed high circulation figures, they were also struggling to assert their identity within an ever more competitive marketplace.50 Indeed, the *Quarterly* had not been the only new publication to engage explicitly with Spanish politics in order to market itself as a competitor to the *Edinburgh*. In 1808 Cevallos’s *Exposition* had also piqued the interests of a reform-driven publication then still in its first year of print: *The Examiner*. A weekly newspaper

---

50 John Clive quotes a letter from Jeffrey to Thomas Moore, estimating circulation of the *Edinburgh* at nearly 13,000 copies in 1814, with several readers per copy. See *Scotch Reviewers*, 134-135. For circulation figures for the *Edinburgh, Quarterly* and other contemporary periodicals, see Hayden, *Romantic Reviewers*. 
co-founded by Leigh and John Hunt, the *Examiner*’s 16 October 1808 issue opened with its own ‘Review of the Exposition of Don Pedro Cevallos’, which openly questioned Cevallos’s involvement in ‘a series of hypocrisy, lying, and violated oaths’. Whether intentional or not, the effect here, as in the *Edinburgh*, is to associate Cevallos with the negative characterizations of the Spaniard promulgated by the Black Legend. But if Cevallos’s pride, deceit, and untrustworthiness might thus be read as emblematic of a familiar national stereotype, the *Examiner* rejects the associated rhetoric of Hispanophobiosis. Instead, it brings the Spanish question ‘back home’ by asking how the public would respond if the British Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger had acted in the manner of Cevallos. In fact, the article goes so far as to suggest that ‘our “good Queen Bess,” with all her “golden memory,” practised the very same meanness and want of feeling as BONAPARTE has exercised toward the Spanish Family, when she kidnapped the Queen of SCOTS under a shew of regard, and with tears in her eyes pursued her to destruction’. By thus providing the agents and victims of ‘Golden Age’ and contemporary diplomacy with such unexpected analogues, the *Examiner* issued a forceful call for readers to reassess their first impressions.

The *Examiner*’s radical content was not, however, its only point of contact with the review essay authored by Jeffrey and Brougham. Also notable was its explicit use of the label ‘Review’ and the article’s conclusion, which sarcastically claimed that ‘upon the whole, the Exposition is an entertaining, sensible, and very seasonable performance’ of potentially ‘incalculable service on the Continent, provided it’s [sic] readers place charitable confidence in the author’s veracity’. This kind of signposting was typical of the strategies employed by the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* which, because of their shared tendency to privilege ideological commentary rather than strict reviewing per se, often offered only brief concluding sentences on the specific books they purported to analyse. The Hunt brothers’ newly established weekly thus enjoyed – and took advantage of – some generic common ground with the quarterly periodicals. The *Examiner* had already quoted (without commentary) the *Edinburgh*’s views on Spain in an earlier number and would remain alert to the periodical’s attempts to influence public opinion. Without being a periodical review nor a daily newspaper,

---

52 Ibid., p. 659.
53 Ibid., p. 659.
54 The *Examiner* had earlier quoted the *Edinburgh*’s controversial review essay of Whitbread’s *Letter*. See *Examiner* 35 (28 August 1808), p. 554.
the *Examiner* placed itself somewhere in between, using the war in Spain as an effective peg for its evolving brand identity.

The anonymous *Short Methodical Abstract, Calm Consideration and Consequent Appreciation of the Edinburgh Review on the Exposition of P. de Cevallos* (1808) also exploited the war in Spain in order to challenge the authority enjoyed by the *Edinburgh*. In its deconstruction of Jeffrey and Brougham’s essay into 34 paragraphs, the *Short Methodical Abstract* begins by arguing:

> When the reviewer sinks into the pamphleteer of faction, there are men, to whom he is no longer an agreeable companion or useful monitor; while those of another description, for whom mere literature had no allurement, now perhaps hurry to partake of the ollio [sic], which is seasoned for the most vitiated palate.  

The choice of gastronomical metaphor is significant not only because it allows for a pun on the ‘olio’ (as a miscellaneous collection, as well as the anglicized word for ‘olla podrida’, a spiced stew originating from Portugal and Spain) but because it reminds us that there were urgent questions about the ‘consumption’ of politics through print of any kind. Indeed, in the subsequent complaint that paragraph 16 of Jeffrey and Brougham’s Cevallos review was wholly unnecessary, the author argues, by extension, that the *Edinburgh* had indulged in ‘a burst of that species of newspaper eloquence, which we may have the gratification of tasting twice a day, without being subjected to the long and painful fast of a tedious quarter of a year’. This kind of accusation continued to haunt the *Edinburgh* in 1814. Piso, for instance, sought to dismiss the *Edinburgh* as ‘neither more nor less than a political pamphlet’.

In his April 1814 review of Sotheby’s poem, Jeffrey made uneasy attempts to respond to these attacks, reflecting upon Napoleon’s likely legacy by arguing that ‘history will not we think class him [Napoleon] quite as low as the English newspapers of the present day’. He then concludes with the observation:

> We have had the satisfaction of listening to various witty sneers on the mixed simplicity and extravagance of supposing that the kingdom of the

---

55 Anon., *Short Methodical Abstract*, p. 3.
56 Ibid., pp. 7-8.
Poles was to be re-established by a dissertation in an English journal [...] but we must beg leave to observe, that such dissertations are humbly conceived to be among the legitimate means by which the English public both instructs and expresses itself.\textsuperscript{59}

Jeffrey thus defines the \textit{Edinburgh}'s ability to make reliable ‘predictions’ in contradistinction to the short-sightedness of the newspapers.\textsuperscript{60} Most persuasively of all, however, he ensures that the \textit{Edinburgh}'s leading essay for April 1814 closes not only with a manifesto for Polish independence, but also with what amounts to a defence of the independence of the \textit{Edinburgh} itself.

There is something undeniably poignant in Jeffrey’s determination, throughout this later review essay, to respond to Napoleon’s unforeseen abdication by searching for lessons. ‘The liberty of the people is necessary to the stability of the throne’ is posited as the first important lesson.\textsuperscript{61} This is soon after developed into the ‘grand moral’ that ‘in an enlightened period of society, no government can be either prosperous or secure, which does not provide for expressing and giving effect to the general sense of the community’.\textsuperscript{62} But his ‘grand moral’ is, notably, wrapped in qualifications; defined as what ‘may be gathered from the whole eventful history’ and ‘seems therefore to be’ (emphasis added). There is less confidence here than in 1808 when lessons were also pointedly provided: seeming is, after all, only a small step away from potential deception. Had Southey’s criticisms hit the mark?

\begin{quote}
\textit{‘A journal of record’}
\end{quote}

Southey attacked the \textit{Edinburgh} for trading in false auguries, but this was nothing new. As early as 1808, the author of the \textit{Short Methodical Abstract} had raised similar concerns about the \textit{Edinburgh}’s ability to ‘prophetically anticipat[e]’ the course of events in Spain.\textsuperscript{63} Interestingly, despite modelling itself on the \textit{Edinburgh} by adopting its form of quarterly publication, selectivity in the choice of reviews and even its spirit of independence, the \textit{Quarterly} specifically instructed its contributors to avoid issues of temporary interest and to focus instead on developing the periodical’s reputation as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{59} Ibid., p. 39.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Jeffrey describes ‘common newspapers’ as ‘those light straws that best show how the wind sits’ (‘Article I’, p. 32).
\item \textsuperscript{61} Jeffrey, ‘Article I’, p. 25.
\item \textsuperscript{62} Ibid., p. 29.
\item \textsuperscript{63} Anon., \textit{Short Methodical Abstract}, p. 8.
\end{itemize}
a ‘journal of record’. But ultimately, no periodical was immune from the kinds of accusation that Southey levelled against the *Edinburgh* – and some recognition of this likely informed the *Scourge*’s absolute objection to the precedent established by Southey’s Notes to *Carmen Triumphale*. In the heady world of early nineteenth-century print culture, Spain was not only a political, but also an aesthetic and ideological, battlefield. As such, while periodical reviews reflected and manipulated British public opinion on Spain they also looked beyond the war itself, in order to pose anxious questions about the responsibilities and expectations entailed by any form of topical address. During the Peninsular War, the difficulties of distinguishing between process and event, possible and probable outcomes, or the competing claims of ideology and pragmatism may often have been linked to a mobile Hispanophilic discourse but they were not bound to it. Within British periodical reviews, the discussion of Spanish politics almost always served as a means towards an(other) end.
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Abstract

The celebration of the revolt against the Spaniards during the Eighty Years’ War (1568-1648) was central to the rise of Dutch nationalism. Authors depicted triumphant scenes, exaggerating the wicked nature of the Spanish, while reinforcing a positive self-image. This chapter shows that at least two ruptures can be witnessed in the Dutch perception of the Spanish. The first took place during the Napoleonic era, in particular after the successful uprising of the Spanish against Napoleon in 1808. This led to an ambiguous representation of the Spanish in Dutch resistance literature. A second shift occurred when Catholics started to emancipate themselves from 1840 onwards. In their literary and historiographical writings, Catholic authors presented an alternative view of the revolt and the Reformation.

Keywords: Nationalism, Napoleon, Peninsular War, Catholic emancipation, Floris of Montmorency (Baron of Montigny)

In the nineteenth century the cultivation of national sentiment reached a high point: everywhere in Europe nations emphasized their superiority by celebrating their founding myths and fathers. Narratives about the heroic past were pivotal in constructing a positive self-image of the nation. As is shown in Mythen der Nationen: ein Europaïsches Panorama (1998), European nations largely followed the same patterns in selecting their Gründungmythen, or founding myths. They all showed a preference for stories of revolt and liberation, which proved their strength and supremacy.
over other nations. The English, for instance, celebrated the victory over the Spanish Armada (1588), the Spanish in the liberation of Granada (1492), and the Belgians in the Battle of the Golden Spurs (1302). These narratives were based upon historical sources, but mythical and fictional elements played an important role as well: the stories were told in a spectacular and convincing way, appealing to the emotions of the audience. Historical accuracy was often considered less important than the storytelling power of miraculous events that had happened in the past. These ‘founding myths’, disseminated through poems, novels, historiographies, treatises, and paintings, were to demonstrate the invincibility of the nation and its inhabitants.

The celebration of the revolt against the Spaniards during the Eighty Years’ War (1568-1648) was central to the rise of nineteenth-century Dutch nationalism. Authors depicted triumphant scenes from this period, exaggerating the wicked nature of the Spanish, while reinforcing a positive self-image. Episodes like the Siege and Relief of Leiden (1573-1574) or the Capture of Breda (1590), circulated in many versions through poems, novels, theatre plays and children’s books. Visual imagery, such as paintings, engravings and illustrations, stimulated the imagination of the audience. The way authors and artists represented the course of events could vary, but one thing remained stable: the characterization of the Catholic Spanish as the evil enemy in contrast with the morally superior Dutch. A telling example is a children’s book about the Relief of Leiden from 1873, where ample attention is given to the cruelties committed by the Spanish soldiers and characterized by the narrator as ‘the most screaming barbarity’.

However, it has hardly been recognized that the Dutch perception of the Spanish changed under the influence of actual political and religious developments, and that positive images, alternative representations, or even counter-narratives circulated as well. In this chapter I will argue that at least two ruptures or ‘paradigm shifts’ took place during the nineteenth century. The first shift occurred after the successful uprising of the Spanish against Napoleon in 1808. This led to an ambiguous representation of the Spanish in Dutch resistance literature. A second shift can be witnessed when Catholics started to emancipate themselves from 1840 onwards. In

1 Flacke, Mythen der Nationen. I would like to thank Johan Joor and Bart Verheijen for providing me with useful information.
3 Jensen, De verheerlijking van het verleden, pp. 18-19.
4 For a discussion of the five founding myths of the Dutch nation, including the Siege and Relief of Leiden, see Slechte, ‘Nederlande’.
5 ‘Schreeuwendste onmenselijkheid’. Cited in Meijer, De vrijbuiters van Leiden, p. 88.
their historiographical and literary writings, Catholic authors presented an alternative view of the revolt and the Reformation which suited their own religious emancipatory cause. These counter-images of the Spanish demonstrate that one should be careful in speaking in terms of the Dutch perception of the Spanish in the nineteenth century: although there was a dominant discourse in which Spanish evilness was instrumental in shaping a positive Dutch self-image, counter-narratives circulated as well.

The Napoleonic era and the Dutch

The first moment in the nineteenth century in which another, more positive, image of the Spanish appeared was the Napoleonic era. At the same time the negative image of the Spanish, who were represented as the oppressors of the Dutch in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, flourished as never before. This seeming paradox can be explained by the Dutch political situation. The regime of Napoleon Bonaparte played an important role in the emergence of national sentiments in the Netherlands (and elsewhere in Europe). His rise to power in 1799 was initially met by many with great enthusiasm, in particular when he ended the war with Great Britain with the Peace of Amiens in 1802. A new period of prosperity seemed to commence after the lifting of all trade embargos. Dutch authors cheered the ending of hostilities and predicted the dawning of a new Golden Age. However, things rapidly changed, when Britain declared war on France on 18 May 1803. This marked the start of a long series of bloody wars and battles, within and beyond Europe. During the next years, Napoleon managed to extend both his military and dynastic power over large parts of Europe. He, for example, appointed his brother Joseph as king of Naples and Spain (respectively in 1806 and 1808), his brother Jérôme as king of Westphalia (in 1807) and his sister Elisa as grand duchess of Tuscany (in 1809).

In the case of the Dutch nation, the Napoleonic rule went through several stages. Napoleon considered the Batavian Commonwealth (as it was officially called after 1801) to be nothing more than ‘a satellite’ of the French ‘planet’ and a ‘rocket that would be carried along by the whirlwind of France’. Napoleon suited his actions to these words by first appointing the Dutch diplomat Rutger Jan Schimmelpenninck as pensionary of the Batavian

---

6 The popular reactions to the Peace of Amiens are discussed in Jensen, *Celebrating Peace*, pp. 146-161, and Verheijen, *Nederland onder Napoleon*, pp. 41-56.

7 Cited in Hagen, *President van Nederland*, p. 165.
Commonwealth in 1805. Only one year later he was replaced by Napoleon’s brother Louis, who was made king of Holland. Being unsatisfied with the way his brother fulfilled his duties, Napoleon forced him to abdicate in 1810, and annexed the country to the French Empire. In November 1813 the country was gradually liberated from the French, a process that took several months and was accompanied by violent outbursts and local revolts.\(^8\)

The years of the kingdom of Holland and the French annexation belong among the darkest in Dutch history. Napoleon not only imposed huge taxes, which sucked the economic life out of the country, but also forced the local authorities to supply his army. Furthermore, he established strict censorship, which meant that publishers and authors had to seek illegal ways to spread printed material that criticized French rule. The severe French regime aroused national sentiments, which, on the one hand, were directed against Napoleon’s tyranny and, on the other hand, led to the articulation of the nation’s unique qualities, which had to be protected from foreign oppression. The search for the nation’s cultural roots now became part of the political agenda of authors, poets and intellectuals as well, who, by showing their nation’s particular culture, resisted French influences.\(^9\)

A key element of the protest publications and resistance literature was the celebration of the Dutch national past.\(^10\) Episodes of the Dutch revolt against the Spaniards were particularly popular. The idea behind describing these victorious moments was threefold: first, the audience was encouraged to draw parallels with their current situation. Just as the Dutch had been able to conquer a superpower in the past, they would be able to do that in the present situation as well. Second, by sketching events from the past, authors could escape censorship. Strictly speaking, they were not engaging with contemporary politics but with past events only. Finally, the negative characterization of the Spaniards was functional in painting a positive image of the Dutch. The behaviour of the Spaniards contrasted in all respects with that of the virtuous Dutch, who outclassed their enemy in military and virtuous acts.

**Negative images of the Spanish during the Napoleonic era**

Illustrative examples of the negative characterization of the Spaniards include the theatre plays *Het ontzet der stad Leiden* (The relief of the city of

\(^8\) See Uitterhoeve, *Haagse bluf*.


\(^10\) On Dutch resistance literature in the years 1806-1813, see Jensen, ‘The Dutch against Napoleon’. 
Leiden, 1808) by Marten Westerman and *Het turfschip van Breda* (The peat barge of Breda, 1812) by Cornelis van der Vijver. The first play contrasted the cruelties of the Spaniards with the bravery of the honest Dutch, who were willing to sacrifice their lives for the cause of justice. The ultimate example of bravery was Mayor Van de Werff, who was prepared to offer his arm for the starving people of Leiden. Another heroic episode about the capture of Breda was staged a few years later. The troops of Prince Maurice of Nassau staged a surprise attack on the Spanish soldiers by hiding themselves in a peat barge, and entering the city. Words like these could hardly be misunderstood by the audience: ‘Courage, and you will triumph. [...] The enemy will pay for his hubris.’

It remains remarkable that the play could be published and that local authorities gave permission for its performance. In a later version, several concluding songs were added to the text, which emphasized the patriotic message: ‘We triumphed on this day, for the Dutch nation with the Orange flag, may this be a lesson to Spain.’

Another well-known example of resistance literature in which the Spanish were portrayed as the evil party in order to render a positive self-image of the Dutch is *De Hollandsche natie* (The Dutch nation) by the Amsterdam poet Jan Frederik Helmers. He started writing the poem around 1802, but it was first published only in 1812. Helmers had to make several changes before the authorities approved publication. The uncensored version was published after the liberation from the French, which makes it possible to compare the two versions. One of the forbidden fragments dealt with the Spanish king Philip II, who dared to challenge the people of the Netherlands and who uttered extremely violent threats. Even for the censors it must have been obvious that Philip II in fact represented Napoleon Bonaparte, which explains why the fragment had to be deleted before publication:

> The Spanish tyrant Philip, proud of his gigantic powers,  
> Dares to challenge and despise the people of the Netherlands.  
> What! Will a poor bunch resist my omnipotence?  
> Me? Who sees the East and West bending at my knees?

11 ‘Moed, en gij zult de zege halen [...] Het uur is daar uw vijand zal / Zijn overmoed betalen’ (Van der Vijver, *Het turfschip van Breda* [1812], p. 90).
12 *Het turfschip van Breda* was performed in 1812 in The Hague and on 1 February 1813 in Leiden. See Ruitenbeek, *Kijkcijfers*, p. 375; Bordewijk, Roding and Veldheer, *Wat geeft die Comedie toch eene bemoeijing!*, p. 130.
13 ‘Wij zeggepraalden op deez’ dag / Voor Nêerland met de Oranjevlag; Dit zij een les voor Spanje.’ Cited in Van der Vijver, *Het turfschip van Breda* (1835), p. 100.
Do these despicable people rave about liberty, justice and law, 
And stand up against me? Well, I will crush them.\textsuperscript{14}

Many other examples, in which the Spanish are portrayed negatively, can be added to this list. Historical accuracy was less important than poetic imagination: it was all about arousing patriotic feelings amongst the Dutch. Just as in the early modern period, a narrative of a ‘united Dutch people’ was deployed. One of the most extreme examples is a patriotic romance by the resistance poet Hendrik Tollens, in which Philip II personally addresses a Dutch woman, Kenau Hasselaar. She defended the city of Haarlem in 1572-1573 with an armed group of women, by throwing oil on the Spanish soldiers. Tollens’s romance is a concatenation of hyperboles, which culminates in these words spoken by Philip II to Kenau: ‘My empire is about to fall; A woman raised from the Dutch swamp / Embarrasses world leaders!’\textsuperscript{15} The heroic deeds of Kenau were also celebrated and contrasted with the cowardice of the Spaniards in a theatre play by Adriaan Loosjes in 1808, which was meant to demonstrate that Dutch women could also act as heroines, when the nation was endangered.\textsuperscript{16} The comparison between the current French and former Spanish oppression was so common, that the lawyer Jacobus Scheltema on the occasion of the liberation from the French in 1813 published a treatise in which he compared the rule of Philip II during the summer of 1572 with Napoleon’s tyranny in 1813.\textsuperscript{17} Thus, the Black Spanish Legend was used as a model for describing contemporary French atrocities.\textsuperscript{18} We find the same mechanism at the end of the seventeenth century, when successful anti-Hispanic works such as The Mirror of Spanish Tyranny and New Mirror for the Young were remoulded into The Mirror of French Tyranny.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{14} ‘De Spaansche dwingland Philips, trotsch op zijn reuzenkrachten, / Dorst zich vermeten ‘t volk van Neêrland te verachten. / ‘Hoe! zal een schaamle hoop mijn almagt weêrstand biên! / Mij! die het Oost’ en West’ gebukt zie aan mijn kniên? / Deweept dat verachtlijk volk van vrijheid, regt en wetten, / En zet zich tegen mij? Welaan, ik zal ’t verpletten’ (Helmers, De Hollandsche natie, p. 142).
\textsuperscript{15} ‘Daar neigt mijn rijk ten val: / Een vrouw, uit Hollands dras geteeld, / Zet wereldheersers pal!’ (Tollens, Gedichten, p. 28).
\textsuperscript{16} ‘Dat Hollands Vrouwen, hoe bedaard heure aard ook schijn’, / Is ‘t lieve Vaderland in nood, Heldinnen zijn’ (Loosjes, Kenau Hasselaar, p. 90).
\textsuperscript{17} Scheltema, Vergelijking van de afschuuding.
\textsuperscript{18} The use of memories of the Dutch Revolt in 1812 is discussed in Lok, “Een geheel nieuw tijdvak van ons bestaan”.
\textsuperscript{19} Original titles: Den Spiegel de Spaensche Tyrannye gheschiet in West-Indien [...] (Amsterdam, 1596, based on Las Casas’s Brevíssima relación de la destrucción de las Indias [1552]) and its
Positive images of the Spanish during the Napoleonic era

However, notably in these years, the Spanish nation could also function as a positive example. This new image emerged when the former allies, France and Spain, got entangled in armed conflicts in 1808. It resulted in the Peninsular War, referred to by the Spaniards as ‘La Guerra de la Independencia Española’ (The Spanish War of Independence), which started with the uprising of 2 May 1808. Hundreds of Spaniards rebelled against French oppression in the streets of Madrid. They were slaughtered or taken prisoner, and executed the next day. Napoleon reinforced his grip by placing his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne in June 1808, which aggravated the protests against French rule.20 Napoleon also sent a large army, the ‘Armée d’Espagne’, with recruits from the allied powers (including Dutch soldiers) to the area to take control over the situation; the Spanish, in the meantime, vigorously resisted French rule by using guerilla tactics.21 It would take more than five years before the French were defeated, and Spanish independence was restored. These events did not go unnoticed in the rest of Europe.

In Dutch resistance circles the Spanish uprising was referred to as a source of inspiration. The clandestine writings that refer to the Spanish events can be divided into two groups: those with a general message of resistance, and those with an Orangist political statement. The writings of three authors, Willem Cornelis van Campen, Joan Melchior Kemper, and Maria Aletta Hulshoff belong to the first group. They have in common that they acknowledge the former negative image of the Spanish, but emphasize the need for a more positive image. Their arguments to prove this point seem rather artificial to the present-day reader, but were instrumental to their message of political resistance.22

sequent Spieghel der Spaensche Tyrannye (Amsterdam, 1625), and Nieuwe Spieghel der Jeught, of Fransche Tyrannie (Amsterdam, 1674). These books and similar publications and prints were reprinted many times. On the Spanish and French ‘mirror books’, see Breen, ‘Gereformeerde populaire historiographie’, pp. 272-273; Meijer Drees, Andere landen, andere mensen, pp. 87-95. On the recycling of the Spanish Black Legend in different contexts, see Nocentelli, ‘The Dutch Black Legend’ (on English perceptions of the Dutch) and Schmidt, Innocence Abroad (on Dutch adoption of indigenous Americans’ position towards the Spanish in the sixteenth century). See also the introduction of this volume.

20 On the Peninsular War, see Esdaile, The Peninsular War.
22 Another interesting poem was published by the minister Gebrand Bruining, who reflected upon the second siege of Zaragoza, which took place from 20 December 1808 to 20 February 1809.
Van Campen studied in Leiden until 1809 and was very well informed about the revolt in Spain. During the period of French rule he wrote several resistance poems, which he published after the liberation from the French.23 One poem discusses the beginning of the war of the French against Spain in 1808. He explicitly addresses his altered view of the Spanish. Once, he states, he despised the proud nature of the Spanish people, but now he can only admire their bravery. He is even willing to applaud their former atrocities against the Dutch, to that extent that they have contributed to strengthening their national character. The last strophe consists of a celebration of the Spanish:

Carry on, o brave Spain, your attempt might seem to have failed
Perhaps your courage might load all the irreconcilable wrath
Of the taunted executioner on your persistent head!

[...]
And if you cannot (o regret!) liberate your neck from his beam,
Then you will bow: but still great and satisfied with this glory:

_Europe bent down; but Spain dared to resist._24

The last verse can be read as fierce criticism of those who willingly submit to Napoleon. A handwritten version of the poem – slightly different from the original – is kept in a collection of satirical poems and writings that belonged to Diderik van Leyden Gael, who fulfilled several executive functions in the administration of Leiden during the French regime. This suggests that this clandestine poem circulated amongst citizens in Leiden.25

He advised the Spanish people to capitulate as quickly as possible in order to avoid further losses. His poem is filled with negative references to the earlier atrocities of the Duke of Alba and King Philip II. He claims that Napoleon would have conquered Zaragoza much quicker had he behaved more like these Spanish rulers. Bruining also states that the Spanish should not count on any help from the English side because they are even more barbarous, given their behaviour in the colonies. Bruining praises Louis Napoleon for having protected the Dutch people from such misery. See Bruining, _Dichterlijke uitweiding._

23 Van Campen, _Mijne verontwaardiging._

24 ‘Houd vol, ô moedig Spanje! Uw poging schijn’ verloren / Ligt gaart slechts al uw moed den onverzoenb’ren toren / van den getergden Beul op uw onwrikbaar hoofd! [...] / En kunt Ge (ô spijt!) uw hals niet van zijn juk bevrijden, / Dan buigt Gij: maar nog groot, met dezen roem voldaan: / Europa boog zich nêer; maar Spanje dorst wêerstaan’ (Van Campen, _Mijne verontwaardiging_, p. 12; emphasis in the original).

25 Verheijen, _Nederland onder Napoleon_, p. 126 assumed the handwritten poems in the collection were written by Van Leyden Gael himself, but the published version proves that Van Campen was the author.
A second example can be found in the work of Joan Melchior Kemper, a professor of law at Leiden University. He was a member of the Friday Society (they met on Fridays), where the members exchanged ideas about the future of their nation. Having heard about the latest losses of the French in the war against the Spanish in 1812, he wrote the following verses: “The courage of our forefathers broke the Spanish slavery / Now you bend your knee as a slave for foreign opponents / While France is trembling for Spanish courage.”26 Again, the former Spanish oppression and their current bravery are mentioned in one breath, turning a negative image into a positive one.

A final proof of positive reference to the Spanish uprising is offered by Maria Aletta Hulshoff, one of the few female authors who publicly protested against the French regime. She became known for her Call to the Batavian People (Oproeping aan het Bataafsche volk), published in 1806, in which she encouraged her fellow countrymen to join forces to resist French rule non-violently. She was arrested, and spent two years in prison. When she was released, she immediately continued her illegal activities. In April 1809 she published Warning against the Requisition (Waarschouwing tegen de Requisitie), in which she strongly criticized the conscription imposed by the French. She suggested all sorts of ways to escape conscription, and hoped things would not escalate. According to her, Napoleon did not want a revolt in the Netherlands, because he needed all his troops in Spain, where the revolt had reached a new peak. His prospects looked very bad.27

Hulshoff wrote from a republican perspective: she despised not only the idea of a foreign regime, but also the fact that the former Dutch Republic had been transformed into a monarchy. Her republican view was certainly not shared by all resistance authors. In the second group of writings, the Spanish uprising was explicitly linked with the efforts to restore the House of Orange. Since 1795, when Stadtholder Willem V fled the country, Orangists had worked for his return. After his death in 1806, they put their hopes on his son, whom they referred to as ‘Willem VI’. They saw him as somebody who could replace King Louis Napoleon, either as stadtholder or as monarch. This was, for instance, the case in an anonymous lampoon, which was found in the stable of the cabman Benjamins in The Hague in September 1808.

26 ‘Der Vadren moed verbrak de Spaansche slavernij / Nu buigt hij slaefs de knie voor vreemde tegenstanders / En voor der Spaanschen moed heeft Frankrijks dwinglandij.’ Quoted in Verheijen, Nederland onder Napoleon, p. 218.
27 ‘Bonaparte begeert hier geen opstand. Hij heeft de handen steeds rijkelijk vol, en komt troepen te kort. Spanje is weder op nieuw in vollen opstand, en het gaat Bonaparte daar ten uitersten slecht.’ Quoted in Monitor (1809), p. 3. For more information about the illegal writings of Maria Aletta Hulshoff, see Joor, De Adelaar en het Lam, pp. 291-294.
The text celebrates Willem VI (‘Live long, Willem VI!’) and criticizes those who bow to the French king (‘slaves of the king’). It ends with a verse in which people are encouraged to follow the example of the Spanish people.28

A linkage between the Spanish uprising and Orangism can also be found in an anonymous pamphlet, found in Amsterdam and The Hague in August 1809.29 It was entitled To the People of the Netherlands and was very outspoken in encouraging the Dutch to take up weapons against French tyranny. They had to follow the examples of the Spanish and the Austrians: ‘Don't hesitate to take up weapons, let us stand up as one man, just like the Spanish and Austrian people, and those blood thirsty who destroy our traitors.’30 The author emphasized the illegitimacy of Louis Napoleon’s rule, and saw only one solution to the current misery: the restoration of the House of Orange.

All the above-mentioned writings, whether they include Orangist statements or not, mention the Spanish uprising as an example to be followed. However, there was also a more indirect and subtle way of representing the Spanish in a positive way, as can be seen in an epic written by the Haarlem bookseller Adriaan Loosjes. He was one of the most productive Dutch authors during the Napoleonic era, and protested against the foreign rulers in a wide range of novels, poems, plays and letters. In many of his writings he celebrated heroic moments of the Dutch during the Eighty Years’ War, drawing a parallel between the evil French and the wicked Spanish. In his epic poem, De laatste zeetogt van admiral De Ruiter (The last voyage of Admiral De Ruyter), he represented the Spanish in a very different way. This poem, published in 1812, dealt with the last battle of the seventeenth-century Dutch sea hero Michiel de Ruyter. He was sent by the Dutch government to Sicily in 1676, where he had to assist the Spanish fleet against the French. Throughout the lengthy poem the Spanish are referred to as allies in a joint fight against the French oppressors. It must have been a deliberate choice on the part of Loosjes to pick out this particular scene from the Dutch past: against the background of the Spanish uprising against Napoleon, it made his appeal to Dutch compatriots to stand up against Napoleon even more convincing.31

28 For more information on this clandestine writing, see Verheijen, Nederland onder Napoleon, pp. 130-132.
29 On this pamphlet, see Joor, De Adelaar en het Lam, p. 480; Verheijen, Nederland onder Napoleon, pp. 171-173.
30 ‘Schroomt niet de wapens te vatten, laten wij als een man opkomen, gelijk de Spanjaard en de Oostenrijkers, en die bloedsuchtige ons verraders verdelge.’ Cited in Verheijen, Nederland onder Napoleon, p. 313.
Catholic emancipation and the image of the Spanish

A second shift in the perception of the Spanish can be witnessed around 1840, when Catholics started to emancipate themselves. Between 1815 and 1830, when the Northern and Southern parts of the Netherlands emerged in a united kingdom under King Willem I, Catholics were in the majority. After the Belgian Revolution (1830-1832), Catholics still formed one-third of the Dutch population. Nevertheless, this group was marginalized in political, social and cultural life.32 This is mirrored in the ‘founding stories’ that were told about the Dutch nation and the celebration of ‘founding fathers’. The Protestant voice was omnipresent. Protestantism found its national roots in the revolt against Spain, which was represented as a struggle of a young, Protestant nation against the evil Catholic Spanish oppressor. Nineteenth-century Protestants also emphasized the unbreakable bond with Orangist rule: in their historical view, a straight line could be drawn from ‘father of the fatherland’, William of Orange, to the kings of Orange, who ran the country from 1815 onwards.

For Catholics, this one-sided representation of Dutch history was problematic. They had difficulties identifying with the celebration of heroic episodes of the revolt against Spain with inherently negative imagery of the Catholics. They made this clear by protesting against festivities celebrating highlights from the Eighty Years’ War.33 Generally speaking, they used four strategies to make themselves more visible and liberate themselves from these oppressive images. Firstly, they criticized the one-sidedness of Dutch historiography with regard to the Eighty Years’ War. Authors like J. van der Horst, W.J.F. Nuyens, H.J.C. van Nouhuys and J.A. Alberdingk Thijm shed new light on the Dutch Revolt by re-interpreting historical sources from a Catholic perspective. They not only created a more positive view of the Spanish rulers, but also relativized the existing imagery of the courageous and virtuous Dutch. In their view Philip II could also be considered a kind-hearted monarch whose hard measures could be justified up to a certain extent. William of Orange and his rebellious troops, in particular the Geuzen (the confederacy of Calvinists who opposed Habsburg rule in the Netherlands from 1566), on the contrary showed loathsome behaviour in many respects. Nuyens published eight volumes on the Dutch Revolt in the years 1865-1870, which can be seen as a Catholic counter-narrative.

32 For a general outline of Catholic emancipation and their search for a Dutch national identity, see Raedts, ‘Katholieken op zoek’; Raedts, De ontdekking van de Middeleeuwen, pp. 227-276.
of the well-known *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* (1856) by the American author J.R. Motley, who upheld strongly anti-Hispanic views. In his book on the marriage between William of Orange and Anna van Saxen, the Amsterdam pastor Van der Horst elaborated on the less pleasant aspects of William’s character. The poets Nouhuys and Alberdingk Thijm together edited the *Volks-almanak voor Nederlandsche Katholieken* (The people’s almanac for Dutch Catholics), which was established in 1852 and explicitly promoted Catholic emancipation. In the first volume King Philip’s reign was called fair and just, and his political advisor, Cardinal Granvelle, a noble man.

Secondly, Catholic intellectuals and teachers created their own versions of Dutch literary history. They produced anthologies and literary overviews, which included more Catholic authors and avoided anti-papist authors. In his dissertation, *Lezen door een Roomse bril* (Reading through Catholic eyes), Bram Noot describes which authors and texts Catholics taught at schools, and how they deliberately changed the Protestant canon. Thirdly, Catholic authors sought their roots in a different part of Dutch history, the Middle Ages. Alberdingk Thijm, in particular, contributed to the rehabilitation of the Middle Ages in his many novels, poems and treatises. Although the Catholics claimed particular ownership of the Middle Ages, Protestant writers also wrote about this period. Think only of the medieval poems and historical novels situated in the Middle Ages, written by acclaimed authors such as Willem Bilderdijk, Jacob van Lennep and Geertruid Bosboom-Toussaint. There was, however, one crucial difference: the latter consequently represented the Catholic characters as bad and full of vices, while Alberdingk Thijm created new Catholic heroes. A telling example is his story about the Catholic boy Dirck Dircxen Bommer, son of a rich merchant, who is about to be executed after the reconquering by the Geuzen of Gorinchem in 1572. Thijm contrasts the negative image of the cruel Geuzen with the noble character of the Catholic protagonist. The well-known story of the martyrs of Gorinchem (the nineteen clergymen, who were killed by the Geuzen and canonized in 1867) resonates in the background.

34 On Nuyens’s historical works, see Van der Zeijden, *Katholieke identiteit*.
35 *Volks-almanak voor Nederlandsche katholieken*, p. 93.
36 See the chapter by Yolanda Rodríguez Pérez in this volume.
38 Leuker, *Künstler als Helden und Heilige*.
39 On the representation of Catholics in the historical novels of Van Lennep, see Jensen, *De verheerlijking van het verleden*, pp. 55-56.
Finally, Catholics celebrated their own heroes from the past, in particular, after the re-establishment of the episcopal hierarchy in the Netherlands in 1853. The Catholic Church in the Netherlands had produced a wide range of great saints, such as Lidwina of Schiedam, Geert Grote and Thomas à Kempis, and a pope: Adrian VI. Those were persons to be proud of, and true Dutchmen as well. Furthermore, they celebrated the Dutch seventeenth-century poet Joost van den Vondel, who converted to Catholicism in 1641. Thijm played an important role in the re-appraisal of Vondel as a Catholic author, both as an editor and organizer of the large festivities, held in 1867 to honour the poet.

A case study: Montigny

The Catholic emancipation brought about a more positive image of the Spanish, which also had its influence on literary works about the Dutch Revolt. An illustrative case study is the literary representation of Floris of Montmorency, Baron of Montigny (1528-1570). He was a convinced Catholic, but much opposed to the persecution of heretics. Remarkably enough, he was represented in the early nineteenth century as a Protestant hero, who stood up against Spanish tyranny. In the second half of the nineteenth century, however, Catholic authors adjusted this image, and emphasized his Catholicism. The representation of the Spanish was ambiguous: generally speaking, their bad sides were elucidated, but some characters were portrayed positively, in particular Don Carlos, son of Philip II and the crown prince of Spain. The story of Don Carlos, allegedly murdered by his father, had been very well-known in Europe since the end of the seventeenth century, and it constituted one of the pillars in the Black Legend around Philip II. Although little positive imagery of the Spanish is to be found in the play (except for the romanticized figure of Don Carlos), the reception of the play shows that the representation of the past led to heated debates. It reveals the tension between Protestant and Catholic views of the past, and a need for exposing ‘the truth’ about the Spanish rulers.

Montigny took part in the delegation of Dutch nobles that handed over a petition to Margaret of Parma, governess of the Netherlands, in which they asked for more benevolence towards the Dutch. He ended up in a Spanish prison, where he died under mysterious circumstances. According to some

42 Leuker, Künstler als Helden und Heilige, pp. 145-211.
historians, he was poisoned, while others asserted he was beheaded at the behest of Philip II. Montigny and his mysterious death reached the Spanish stage as early as the seventeenth century. In Dutch historiography, Montigny remained a marginal figure. Far more attention was paid to the counts of Egmont and Horne, who became symbols of resistant noblemen. However, Montigny became a hero in the nineteenth century, mainly due to a theatre play, published in 1821 by the Amsterdam poet H.H. Klijn: Montigni.

The play focuses on the imprisonment of Montigny in Madrid. When Montigny hears that the counts of Egmont and Horne have been beheaded in Brussels, he becomes very angry towards Cardinal Granvelle and is sentenced to death. The noble-hearted Don Carlos proposes to Montigny that he will help him escape from prison, but he refuses. Montigny’s wife also tries to talk him into escaping, but he sticks to his principles. Before he is beheaded, Montigny hints at the future deeds of William of Orange, the ultimate saviour, and predicts a prosperous future for the Dutch nation. The play became a huge success, and was performed many times in Amsterdam and elsewhere in the country. In the 1860s it was still being performed by amateur groups. The patriotic message appealed to a wide audience that recognized a spirit of freedom and patriotism in the character of Montigny. This nobleman was prepared to die for his country, even though the crown prince of Spain was prepared to help him flee. His refusal symbolized his infinite love for his fatherland. He embodied all the characteristics of the virtuous hero of a French-classicist tragedy: by sacrificing himself and showing magnanimity, his honour remained intact.

With regard to the representation of the Spanish, it is noteworthy that not all Spanish people behave badly. While Granvelle and Philip II are driven only by their ambition for power, Margaret of Parma and Don Carlos show much understanding for the situation of the Dutch and Montigny, in particular. Don Carlos plays a key role as a mediator between the Spanish and the Dutch and is portrayed as a benevolent, wise man. He knows how rulers and princes should behave, and when rebellion is allowed: ‘He may only pursue the salvation of all people: / the law, that is his will, the more the people loves him, and trust in his virtuousness, the more his freedom is restricted.’ Klijn might have been inspired by Don Carlos (1787), a well-

43 Jensen, De verheerlijking van het verleden, p. 64. This case study is based upon Jensen, De verheerlijking van het verleden, pp. 63-90.
44 Rodríguez Pérez, ‘Inversiones y reinversiones’.
45 Jensen, De verheerlijking van het verleden, pp. 73-75.
46 ‘Hij mag geen ander heil, dan ‘t heil van allen, kennen: / De wet, ziedaar zijn’ wil: hoe meer hem ‘t volk bemint, / En zich zijn deugd vertrouwt, hoe meer ‘t zijn vrijheid bindt’ (Klijn, Montigni, p. 99).
known play by the German author Friedrich Schiller about the supposed rebellion of an heroic and romantic Don Carlos against his tyrannical father, which was also translated into Dutch several times.

Klijn was not only praised for his play, but received fierce criticism as well. The most extensive critique came from the teacher Tielman Olivier Schilperoort, who in 1822 published a treatise of almost 200 pages in which he summed up the many flaws of the play. He in particular objected to the fact that such a marginal figure had been turned into a hero by abusing historical sources. By quoting many historical sources Tideman tried to show that this figure was not worth a play at all. His criticism was also directed against the representation of Montigny as a true Protestant. In reality, Montigny was a Catholic, who, in the last hours before he died, was assisted by a priest. In Klijn's play, however, Montigny acted as a spokesman of a Protestant nation, which was not in keeping with the historical truth. Olivier Schilperoort was not the only one to reject Klijn's version of the past: Alberdingk Thijm also ridiculed Klijn for casting his hero in a Protestant mould. Paradoxically enough, the massive critique only added to the long-lasting fame of the play and its author. In 1850 a critic noted that no other play in Dutch history had been as celebrated and despised as Montigni.

The play also caused a wave of historical publications on Montigny, in which his role in the nation's history was re-assessed. The Catholic emancipation caused heated debates about how the behaviour of the Spanish rulers should be judged, in particularly after the revelations of the Belgian archivist Louis Prosper Gachard. His edition of the correspondence of Philip II, Correspondance de Phillipe II, revealed that Montigny was strangled to death at Philip's behest, and that Philip II pretended that Montigny had died of natural causes.

The historical debates also led to new literary works about Montigny's life and death, and consequently to new representations. In 1855, for instance, the Belgian author Frans van Geert published a theatre play in prose about Montigny. He turned him into a Flemish, deeply religious Catholic hero. The emphasis on Montigny's love for Flanders and his Catholicism had no influence on the portrayal of the loathsome Spanish, who brutally kill Montigny in the last scene. Just as in Klijn's play, Don Carlos is soft-hearted, while Philip II and Granvelle embody evil. In 1860, the Dutch poet Samuel van den Bergh published a play about Montigny, entitled In den kerker.

47 Jensen, De verheerlijking van het verleden, p. 79.
48 Ibid., p. 79.
49 Ibid., p. 80.
50 Van Geert, Montigny.
van Simancas (In the prison of Simancas) in which he also used the latest historical insights. Although he was a Protestant himself, he deliberately represented Montigny as a true-hearted Catholic, only to emphasize the evilness of the Spanish rulers, who direct their anger against people of their own faith. In contrast with the other works, Don Carlos does not play any part in the story: any positive references to the Spanish are erased in this way.51

A third literary representation came from a woman writer, Agatha (pseudonym of Reinoudina de Goeje), who wrote a youth novel about the two nephews of Montigny: De pages van den baron de Montigny (The pageboys of the Baron of Montigny, c. 1862). One of the boys accompanies Montigny to Spain, while the other remains in the Netherlands. After the death of Montigny, the boy in Spain returns to his fatherland, where he meets the Prince of Orange. The brothers are reunited on board a ship of the Geuzen, who are about to liberate Den Briel from the Spanish. As the summary indicates, the patriotic and Orangist message is dominant, and the Spanish characters stand in sharp contrast to the loyal character of Montigny and his nephews. Only Don Carlos is portrayed as a reasonable Spaniard, albeit too weak to stand up to his father.52

Conclusion

The portrayal of the Spanish as evil, unfaithful and imperious was commonplace in Dutch nineteenth-century patriotic texts. However, under the influence of political and religious societal changes, two ruptures can be witnessed in the Dutch perception of the Spanish. The first took place in 1808 after the Spanish uprising against Napoleon and the second around 1840, when Dutch Catholics started to emancipate themselves and offered alternative representations of the past.

On both occasions authors struggled with how to reconcile the new, positive imagery with the omnipresent negative view of the Spanish. Their juggling with arguments might seem artificial to the present-day reader; take, for example, the very unlikely suggestion that the bravery of the Spanish in 1808 was rooted in their fighting experience in the sixteenth century against the Dutch. This rationale, however, only reinforced the positive self-image of the Dutch, who could now claim to have contributed

51 Van den Bergh, In den kerker van Simancas.
52 Agatha, De pages van den baron de Montigny.
in an indirect way to the Spanish uprising as well. Similar patterns can be
witnessed in the Catholic revision of the past, which led to a re-appraisal
of the rule of King Philip II. This shift can, in particular, be seen in the
works of Catholic historians, who re-adjusted the image of Philip II. The

case of Montigny shows a more complicated attitude towards the Spanish.
The reception of Klijn’s tragedy was less about generating a more positive
image of the Spanish than a vindication of the Catholics via Montigny. The
representation of Montigny illustrates how authors constantly moulded the
past according to their own needs: his character and the Spanish antagonists
were used to pursue Protestant, Flemish and Catholic goals.

Both shifts in the nineteenth-century perception of the Spanish, around
1808 and 1840, illustrate show the process of rewriting the past is always
marked by change and adaption, alteration and integration, and obliteration
and reconciliation.53
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10. From Azoteas to Dungeons: Spain as Archaeology of the Despotism in Alexander Dallas's Novel Vargas (1822)

Fernando Durán López

Abstract
Alexander Dallas, ex-combatant in the Peninsular War, wrote books on Spanish-related themes with great affection for Spanish life and culture. However, there was one limit to this admiration: the rivalry between the Protestants and Catholics. Dallas's move into the Anglican clergy goes some way to explaining why in his last novel, Vargas, a Tale of Spain, published anonymously in 1822, his Hispophilia gave way to immersion in the attitudes, opinions and central themes related to the so-called Black Legend. The evocation of customs and landscapes is thus wrapped in an argument from the sixteenth century, the Inquisition and religious superstitions assuming a protagonist role and flipping the way he approaches Spanish reality. This complex dialogue between Hispanophilia and Hispanophobia reveals their strong common foundation: condescension.

Keywords: English historical novel, Alexander Dallas, Spanish Inquisition, Peninsular War, Religious rivalries

Alternately assuming the characters of a Spaniard and of an Englishman, he had an opportunity of following the current of that most interesting portion of the Modern History of Spain, with advantages that were possessed by few.

– [Alexander Dallas], Vargas, 'Preface', I, viii

1 All quotations of Vargas are drawn from the anonymous original edition of 1822, indicating volume and page number. There was also a Dutch translation in 1840 and two Spanish translations (attributed to Joseph Blanco White) in 1995 and 1997.

DOI 10.5117/9789462989375_CH10
The novel *Vargas* occupies a problematic space in the literary studies of the period, because it is written in English but was attributed consistently, though without substantial proof, to the Anglicised Spanish exile Joseph Blanco White. The erroneous attribution was maintained for the most part by those specializing in the work of the Sevillian writer, with the notable exception of Vicente Llorens, and this mistake led to two translations under Blanco White’s name and numerous studies that inserted the novel’s vision of Spain into the parameters of the work and thought of Blanco, the liberal Spanish exile, and into the dialectic belonging to a Catholic who had converted to Protestantism. For this reason, the text was situated in a no man’s land between English literature in the narrow sense and literature not strictly ‘Spanish’, but rather the literature ‘by Spaniards’ exiled in England, which meant it was in an area of criticism that researchers of neither English nor Spanish literature considered their own. This novel could not represent the English vision of Spain, because the author was Spanish; neither could it represent an authentically Spanish view, because it was written in English for an English public by a Spaniard who had voluntarily left his homeland in order to embrace a critical conception of his former country that was extremely harsh in the religious, political and cultural sense.

This position is important to note, as several years ago I was able to demonstrate conclusively that *Vargas* was not written by Blanco White, but rather by the Englishman Alexander Dallas, the latter offering a suggestive ensemble of divergences, symmetries, and convergences with the former. The authorship of Dallas has been proven by three factors: a direct declaration by the author, in which he clearly claims authorship in a late autobiography\(^2\); abundant material evidence, including the manuscript of *Vargas* in a collection of papers from Dallas in the Biblioteca Nacional de España; and various sorts of textual evidence found within the novel itself.\(^3\) The objective of the present study is to reinterpret the content of *Vargas* in light of its true authorship and its indisputable placement within English literature, particularly with respect to its representation of Spain. To this end, it would be worth doing a reinterpretation of the criticism of *Vargas* that had begun with its false attribution to Joseph Blanco White, although here I will prioritize the internal analysis. A later step in the analysis would include reintegrating *Vargas* into the rich and complex development of the topic of Spain in British Romanticism, demonstrating its similarities with

\(^2\) [Dallas], *Incidents*, p. 167.

\(^3\) Durán López, ‘Limiando un borrón’ and ‘Algo más sobre la infundada atribución’.
and differences from other contemporary readings in English letters, an analysis better left to specialists in that literary field.

A dissected map of Spain

The English writer Alexander Dallas was one of the first British soldiers in the Peninsular War to write about Spanish matters. He did so with great admiration and extensive knowledge of the life, language and culture of Spain, in a poem about guerrillas (Ramírez, 1817), a semi-autobiographical novel about war (Felix Alvarez; or, Manners in Spain, 1818) and a historical novel set in the sixteenth century (Vargas, a Tale from Spain, 1822). These books explain to his compatriots the reasons behind this admiration for and curiosity about a country that they neither knew nor understood, sometimes battling against their prejudices and sometimes interpreting them. His very conception of the fictional genre – based on variety rather than unity – highlights this intention: for him, the argument is a thread from which to hang elements whose purpose is always to present the history and character of Spain. The first page of Vargas demonstrates this by showing Dallas’s doubts when starting a book:

I had chosen my subject, and sketched out my plan – nay more, I had actually written several detached portions, which are to be dovetailed into certain parts of the work, and which lie upon my table, like stray counties belonging to a dissected map.  

A map of Spain scattered in fragments on a table, or on printed pages: a good description of Dallas’s literary works. His most Hispanophilic work is Ramírez, focused on the courage and primitive ferocity of the guerrillas who fought against brutal French invaders. However, this sympathy has limitations, and in two areas Dallas maintains the traditional European Hispanophobia, known by its inaccurate name, the Black Legend: the rivalry between Protestants and Catholics, and British patriotism.

In Felix Alvarez, we find an abundance of attacks against ‘papist superstitions’, the Catholic clergy and the Catholicism that permeates Spanish

---

4 See the essay by Diego Saglia in this volume.
5 Vargas, I, p. 2.
6 That brief formula saves explanations, but it is a problematic concept subject to revision and even to denial. See Villanueva, Leyenda Negra; Durán López, ‘Felipe II’.
society, but it is a minor element, mentioned sporadically with condescension or reproach. This contempt for the religion does not prevent him from reflecting on, with fascination, the landscapes, folklore, culture and surprising customs of the Spaniards, barely European for eyes avid for exoticism and authenticity. And on the other hand, the British view of the Peninsular War is widely accepted: that the Spaniards were undisciplined and ill-directed soldiers who were saved by an effective British army. However, the peoples’ suffering during the war, the cruelty of the French army and the indomitable ferocity of the guerrillas tip the balance on the side of Hispanophilia, and turn that novel into one of the more favourable accounts of Spaniards amongst English texts about the war.

This leaning shifts though when Dallas turns to faith and the clergy, converting him into an activist and fanatical Anglican clergyman. In Vargas he is fully immersed in the attitudes, opinions and central themes of the Black Legend, giving prominence to the cruelty of Philip II, the torments of the Spanish Inquisition and the persecutions of the Protestant ‘martyrs’. Vargas amplifies the argument of Cornelia Bororquia, the famous anti-clerical novel by the afrancesado author Luis Gutiérrez. This study will analyse the dialogue in Dallas’s works – and by extension in British society – between the recent Hispanophilia motivated by both the war and Romanticism, and the old Hispanophobia inherited and rooted in discriminatory national and religious identities.

Exoticism and history

Cornelius Villiers, Dallas’s alter ego who acts as the narrator in Vargas, boasts of a love for Spain, cultivated during his several years of residence there before the Peninsular War. In the prologue, Villiers longs for the landscapes of the Pyrenees, Guadarrama and Sierra Morena, but he also made note of ‘the pleasant flat roofs of Seville or Cadiz’ (I, 5), and went on to then praise ancient Spanish literature, unknown, he says, by the English. Mena, Feijoo, Argensola, Lope, Calderón, and of course Cervantes are just some of the literary glories mentioned in the book. In the first few pages he also praises the Spanish habit of eating late and having a siesta. So we have, from the outset, the ingredients that go into the recipe of what Spain is: landscapes, culture and popular customs. Walter Scott had established at the time a historical novel genre designed to show the Scots and the English their own past in an attractive way. In the same way Cornelius Villiers says:
I feel almost inclined to turn historian myself; to cull the flowers with which the extensive garden of Spanish history abounds, that I may present them as a rare bouquet of exotics to my countrymen.7

Dallas defines his objective on two levels: rarity and exoticism. And here lies his main difference with Scott, who serves his readers fragments of their own world, recovered from oblivion, but, after all, familiar and understandable. Dallas is processing an alien world, and therefore has to explain it and align it with the nineteenth-century values of the British Protestants. And the way it becomes interesting lies in the strange and exotic, which has ties to the new notion of Romanticism and with the Hispanophilia of Ramirez and Felix Alvarez. But the novel’s opening lines also reveal its central themes: the ‘baneful Upas tree’ of the Inquisition and ‘the iron hand of despotism’ (I, 5). At the moment of truth, in Dallas’s view, the idea of Spain is substantiated as a struggle between his love for the azoteas bathed in the sun and his disgust for intolerant Catholicism; this struggle upsets the balance.

Vargas combines, in the style of Scott, actual historical events with a fictitious storyline that is, at the same time, representative of general historical developments. What is historical and what is fictitious must maintain a close relationship for the formula to work. The first and key decision of the novelist, who reveals his inversion of priorities on the Spanish theme, is to choose that combination of history and storyline. The narrator affirms that the English have ignored many a treasure in Spanish history such as the medieval chronicles of López de Ayala, Álvaro de Luna or Pero Niño:

Charles V is indeed known, but he is principally talked of in his imperial character. Everybody has heard of his son Philip; but they have heard of him only as a bigot who opposed the Reformation in Flanders, and invaded England. A history of his reign has been published, which is a very excellent history of the Netherlands during that period, but nothing more.8

However, in his own choices, Dallas does not resort to those unknown parts of Spanish history, but stays within the conventions that were already familiar to his British readers. He turned to the fanatic Philip II, setting out his novel to be an in-depth and contemporary look at the Black Legend, where the Inquisition and the material, moral and sexual corruption of the clergy would play a key role. The most curious thing, then, is that the novel

7 Vargas, I, p. 8.
8 Ibid., p. 7.
delves into key territories of Hispanophobia, but justifies this by taking a Hispanophilic approach. This is reflective of the change that has occurred in Dallas since the publication of *Felix Alvarez*: five years had passed, but he had undergone a conversion to evangelism.

The historical event that frames the plot was the rise of the Aragonese against Philip II in 1590, on the occasion of the persecution of his Secretary of State Antonio Pérez. The conflict is outlined just as it was usually interpreted in the early nineteenth century: a struggle between monarchical despotism and inquisitorial tyranny, on the one hand, and, on the other, the freedoms guaranteed by old Aragonese laws. In the early modern period, this opposition between ancient freedom and oppressive tyranny was also deployed by English and Dutch authors writing about Antonio Pérez and about the Dutch Revolt in general. Philip is depicted as a vengeful, treacherous and vile despot. This episode in Spanish history evokes an event known throughout Europe and that was fundamental in conveying a negative image of Spain across the continent. But it is covered in only two chapters (the second and the third), which serve as a link to the fictitious plot. Then, the last three chapters return to the events in Zaragoza, which thus act as a general frame into which the specific story of the characters is inserted. A large part of the story is set in Seville, where the evil archbishop has kidnapped the virtuous maiden Cornelia Bohorquia and has incarcerated her in premises used by the Inquisition in an attempt to force her to submit to his libidinous desires. The entire story takes place between Seville and Extremadura, territories Dallas travelled through during the military campaigns of 1812 and 1813.

**Vargas, a figure divided between two identities**

My approach to *Vargas* focuses on the articulation of an image of Spain, but it will also be beneficial to address another point of interest: its similarities with and divergences from Walter Scott’s historical-novel model, first beginning in 1814 with *Waverley*, and therefore close in time to Dallas’s novels. *Vargas* links for the first time Scott’s model with Spanish historical material, since it predates the five novels written in English between 1825 and 1834 by the exiles Valentín de Llanos and Telesforo de Trueba. Dallas’s novels have points of convergence with Scott’s, especially in the conception of local colour, the search for a certain descriptive lyricism in their styles,

---

9 In reality it was in 1591.
the combination of real historical events with romantic storylines, the conception of history as a struggle between tradition and progress embodied in divided communities, the extensive use of humour, etc. Moreover, we should also list what separates Dallas from Scott: in Scott’s work, we find solid structural unity centred around a principal plot, while Dallas’s novels are characterized by a disperse and cumulative structure, which tends to combine disparate and sometimes disjointed elements: digressions, poems, subplots, and so on. Nevertheless, this disconnection of elements is much more evident in Felix Alvarez than in Vargas, which results in an advance towards a more cohesive narrative.

Similarities to Scott are evident in the articulation of the characters: the ‘middle hero’ (Bartolomé Vargas), the romantic hero (Diego Meneses), the persecuted lady (Cornelia, a barely developed, very flat and functional character), and the evil nemesis (the archbishop), as well as the popular comic figures that offer local colour, dramatic distension and humour (Perico, Father Cacafato, the muleteers and innkeepers, the servants of the Count of Alange, the Gypsy Churipample, etc.). The central character is Vargas. Dallas addresses the religious conflict through a figure divided between two identities, as is often the norm in Scott’s work: a ‘middle hero’ who is not a representation of any actual historical figures, but who represents the society of his time; he has no great personal peculiarities or heroic virtues, but his vicissitude places him in the midst of the crises and changes experienced by the nation, partially participating in the new and the old.

The protagonist in Felix Alvarez is a young, forward-thinking Spaniard, who joined the British army in the war against Napoleon, going on to become the liaison between the two countries: a Spanish patriot who sees his country from the perspective of an Englishman, which allows the public to identify with him. In Vargas, there is also a change in identity: Bartolomé Vargas is a Spaniard who converted to Protestantism in England, a friend and defender of the secretary of state, Antonio Pérez, during the events called the Alteraciones de Zaragoza (Zaragoza Riots). An orphan of noble birth, he had been raised in Seville by the Marquis of Bohorquia, thus, from his very beginnings, an outsider. He grew up with Cornelia, the marquis’s daughter, whom he infected with his thirst for knowledge and a leaning towards reasoning, as he was studying in a Sevillian school in order to later be ordained. In all his studies, Vargas could not find answers to his questions. He came to recognize the inconsistencies in Catholic theology, which made him lose his faith, while the Marquis of Bohorquia was a fanatic ruled by the Archbishop of Seville. Vargas then decided not to be ordained into the Church, but the marquis
forced him to choose between being ordained or being denounced to the Inquisition as a heretic. Vargas and Cornelia declared that they were in love, but he then fled from Seville to England. There he attended Anglican services so as not to appear Catholic, and to avoid any hostility. He was moved by the austerity of the services almost immediately, the simplicity of the liturgy and the solemnity of its Christian message, as opposed to:

the pompous decorations, and what he now looked upon as ridiculous emblems, which crowded the chapels of the cathedral at Seville, and to which he had been so long accustomed and enslaved.10

The reading of the Bible and the teachings of a theologian did the rest: ‘[H]e became in a short time a sincere and earnest Protestant upon the conviction of his reason’ (I, 261). He returned to Seville to convert Cornelia to the faith he now believed to be the one true faith and they married in secret. When Vargas asked the Archbishop of Seville – the novel’s villain – for help, the archbishop convinced Vargas that he was actually the marquis’s biological son, and so Cornelia’s brother. Thus, the archbishop managed to rid himself of a rival in his desire to secure the young woman for himself. Vargas flees and the archbishop orchestrates Cornelia’s arrest by the Inquisition. In Zaragoza, Vargas’s story will converge with that of Antonio Pérez; returning from Aragon to Seville he meets Diego Meneses in Extremadura, who will help him with the task of freeing Cornelia, an event which takes place in the second half of the novel, with melodramatic and implausible plot twists that are not worth mentioning. Meneses had been the husband chosen for Cornelia by the marquis, and, unlike Vargas, he was not a middle hero, but a romantic and idealistic gentleman, fully integrated into the values of Spanish society, which he carries out with a sense of honour and justice. This duplication of the hero is also frequent in Scott’s novels.

Spanish manners

While in Felix Alvarez Dallas was eager to tell his readers of the peculiarities of Spanish life, in Vargas, he limited himself to a small number of these, and almost never extended his ‘ethnological’ commentary. As such, it is easy to list what was noted: the habit of siesta and its influence on daily schedules (I, 18); the consumption of chocolate (I, 109); the habits and loquacity of

10 Vargas, I, pp. 256–257.
mozos de posta (grooms) (I, 128) and arrerios (muleteers) (I, 297); bunk cars pulled by mules (II, 120)\textsuperscript{11}; the length and shape of women’s petticoats (I, 182); the reference and explanation of sayings and phrases; the transporting of wine in borrachas (pig skins) (I, 202); a bizarre feast featuring melon, watermelon, salad and olla (pot), stewed birds, olives for dessert, as well as the corresponding wines, of which Dallas praises the quality and the moderation of the Spaniards in their consumption (II, 15); the homes with bars over lower-floor windows and flat roofs (azoteas) (II, 266); the characteristics of the Spanish Gypsies and their skills as metedores or smugglers (III, 37); the fandangos and dances of the Sevillian Gypsies (III, 65); the popularity of ‘pine nuts’ (III, 133); a party in Zufre with rural sports (III, 167).\textsuperscript{12} Sometimes these elements were combined in larger sequences. In the style of Scott, much more present as a model in Vargas than in Felix Alvarez, Dallas constructs long scenes that evoke the liveliness of everyday life: buildings, furniture, food, conversations and a lot of local colour. Examples include a banquet in the castle of the Count of Alange (Chapter XI), the description of the Master Rock Inn (Chapter XV) and the vivid narration of the San Marcos festival in Llerena and a procession in Montemolín (Chapters XIX-XX).

Poetic interludes and descriptions of picturesque landscapes are another feature of Dallas’s style, endowing the storyline with local colour: a poem to the Ebro River (I, 121); a description of the Campo de Alange, with its mountains, valleys and castles (I, 138); the short verses in English or translated from Spanish that serve as the motto of each chapter; the wild landscape of the Saracen’s Scymitar, where the hermitage of Father Lawrence stands; a number of songs inserted in the subplot related to this anchorite (Chapter XVI), which include a tirana and a burlesque song against the Discalced Carmelite friars; allusions to flamenco dancing (Chapter XXIV); a sailors’ song that was sung during the escape down the Guadalquivir River after Cornelia’s rescue (III, 105); the landscapes of Sierra Morena when heading

\textsuperscript{11} Dallas often presents, as amusing examples of popular customs, anecdotes about the muleteers, grooms, etc., and tells of actual events at the inns and on the roads, with mules and horses. As an officer of the Commissariat Department of the Treasury in the British Army, his daily duties in Spain consisted of buying and transporting supplies, and he had to deal with that class of people on a continuous basis.

\textsuperscript{12} Sometimes a comparison makes the task easier for English readers. When a herald sounds a ridiculous bugle to announce the arrival of his master, it is reminiscent of an Oxfordian custom: ‘An Oxonian reader will have the identical tone in his imagination, if he only remember the scaring sound which startles the students at Queen’s, as its cracked dissonance echoes along the cloisters to call them to battel’ (Vargas, II, p. 7). And the bunk cars are also compared, due to their unsafe nature, to ‘one of the new opposition London coaches when it is loaded four inside and fourteen out, and whirling over ten miles in a hour’ (Vargas, II, p. 120).
upstream on the Rivera River in Huelva (III, 127); and the peasants’ songs in Zufre (III, 170). Once again, these interludes are much more infrequent in Vargas than in Felix Alvarez.

Exoticism is not decidedly favourable and does not always have to create a positive image of the country, and it frequently does not do so. However, in Dallas, local colour corresponds to his fascination for the shape of Spanish life, and in a certain way to the memory of an adventuresome youth, from which he already felt distanced in 1822. Although more coloured in Vargas with condescension towards a society he considers inferior, the view of national customs continues to express his unqualified Hispanophilia, as when in Felix Alvarez he describes the Spanish fondness for festivals, songs, and celebrations, which he does not depict as the softness of a decadent community, but instead declares that ‘the Englishmen could not comprehend the unextinguishable gaiety of the Spaniard’ (II, 190). Nevertheless, in Vargas, all these favourable and empathetic mentions of Spanish culture and territory, scarcer and more rationed than in Dallas’s previous books, are unable to offer opposition to the other less favourable elements of the image conjured of Spain, which I will analyse next.

A shadow of chivalry

There is no shortage of derogatory tales concerning the Spanish nobility that had held free reign in England during the two previous centuries, and that were very blurred in Felix Alvarez. The character of Félix Dávila is linked to a satirical study of a ‘Spanish Don’, a petulant nobleman with an exaggerated sense of both honour and self-importance, full of ridiculous features that often appeared in caricatures, engravings and English literary works. This image of the vain and haughty Spaniard was a well-known stereotype in early modern Europe: Dávila had a poetic affliction, courted a number of ladies in Madrid and had fought a duel for a petty reason. His pedantry matched his vanity as an aristocrat, so when his uncle, the Count of Alange, asks him to announce his visit to Vargas, who is under his hospitality, he replies:

Bid your herald precede me, Señor Conde, that I may go upon a knightly message in a knightly manner. Send forth thy cracked clarion’s shrill voice, sir herald, that it may set my wit on edge to compose an oration equally befitting my character for eloquence, and the Conde’s for courtesy.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} Vargas, II, p. 6.
The snobby parliament and Dávila's outlandish ways – Vargas believes he is standing before a ‘mockery’ (II, 9) – would be the satirical side (Hispanophobic) of the Spanish knights, but Dallas also falls into the opposite side (Hispanophilic), seeing in Spain the preservation of a medieval knightly spirit. Thus, Spain is conventionally qualified as ‘the country of chivalry’ (I, 148-149). Vargas and Meneses are the embodiment of these noble values; and in this way, both swear to free Cornelia:

Then taking off his sword, he continued, ‘With this sword my father’s father fought the enemies of the Catholic religion and the Catholic country, under the Great Captain at Grenada at an Naples; with this sword my father defended the same cause, by the side of Alva in France, and in Flanders: in the hands of their descendant it has done nothing but defend his own honour and his life [...].’

Vargas immediately reached his sword [...]; and, kissing the cross of it, he handed it to Meneses; who, placing it to his lips as he received it, presented his own to Vargas. The age of chivalry was over, and the chivalrous feeling which had gradually dwindled from the reigns of Alphonso the Wise, and John of Aragon, through those of Ferdinand the Catholic, and Charles, was almost extinct in that of Philip; a shadow of it was indeed kept alive in the warm imaginations of the youth of Spain, through the forced medium of romance, until Cervantes appeared to banish it altogether, by the power of common sense armed with the arrows of wit. At the time when Vargas and Meneses met, however, [...] the power of chivalry had still a perceptible effect upon the society of the country in which it had so long held its court.14

And if Cervantes is conventionally mentioned as the rational mind that put an end to chivalry, there is no shortage of the literary references that represent its permanence:

Meneses [...] was one of those high spirited cavalleros of whom Lope and Calderon have given so many portraits, who make the point of honour the strict rule of conduct, deriving its principal zest from the scenes of intrigue and danger into which it most frequently leads them.15

14 Ibid., pp. 82-83.
15 Ibid., pp. 84-85. For the connection between Cervantes and criticism on chivalry as a Spanish way of life, see Pardo’s contribution in this volume.
Similarly, when detailing the medieval castle in Alange where a part of the action in the first volume of the novel takes place, the seductive oriental image of Spain appears:

The old Moorish castle, said to have been one of the earliest built after the fatal battle of Xeres, had long been chosen by the framers of imaginary records as the scene of many legendary horrors. Its time-coloured turrets rose high above the thick-set trees that partially clothed the acclivity upon which they stood, and suggested a sombre idea in perfect keeping with the dark deeds that were said to have been perpetrated within them.16

Dallas only suggests a version of the wars of Moors and Christians, without endorsing those imaginary chronicles made up by writers. In other parts of the tale he mentions stories of ghosts or enchantments, but always in a satirical tone that makes it clear that only irrational beings with little culture believe in them. He does not seek out the exoticism that Gothic or Moorish imagery provides, unlike many of the European writers in those decades, because he did not want to deviate from a realistic and credible narration, removed from fantasy.17 And this is why throughout the novel, Dallas claims to be an historian, insisting on the veracity of what is narrated and, therefore, on its effectiveness so that the reader is exposed to the truth of Spain, and not mere legends. Dallas emphasized this in one of the most extensive excerpts, when the plot takes Vargas to a festivity in Llerena that combines religious superstitions and bullfighting, a conflation of Spanish customs, manners and ideology:

Having said thus much, to secure my character from the suspicion of being tinctured with a traveller’s talent, I will leave my industrious readers to examine my authorities, promising them beforehand that their reward will amply recompense the trouble; and my indolent readers to take my correctness for granted, assuring them that they may do so with safety.18

From this notion, the supposed miracle of San Marcos where each year a fierce bull is tamed turns out to be a deception carried out by the local

---

16 Vargas, I, p. 184.
17 As will be indicated later, the Gothic element in Vargas is very present in regard to what surrounds the Inquisition and the description of its halls, but it barely appears in other aspects of the novel, although López Santos, who includes the work in his list of ‘Gothic Spanish novels’, maintains the opposite.
18 Vargas, II, pp. 243-244.
clergy, who had gotten the animal drunk beforehand. His Spain, then, is not a country of legends or a space for fantasy. This allows him to draw a more deliberate critical analysis of Spanish life, especially in regard to the religious aspect.

The recesses of the Inquisition

The central part develops the main mechanism of the old literary Hispanophobia: the evils of the Inquisition, without which no evocation of Spanish history would seem complete or credible. So begins Chapter XIV:

While Meneses is making the best of his way to Seville, the reader shall get there before him, and be admitted into the recesses of the palace of the Inquisition, by means of the powerful master-key of an historian.19

With that supposed key, one can enter the secret prisons and the courtroom, in the judicial paraphernalia described in a way that is as exhaustive as imaginative.20 The court acts as an instrument at the service of the passions of the Archbishop of Seville, who ‘had early fallen into the hands of the most degraded of the degraded clergy at that unhappy period of the history of Christianity’ (II, 107). All vices and sins, even atheism, can be found in this evil character.

In Chapter XVIII, Dallas, speaking through Cornelius Villiers, goes over the tortures carried out by the Inquisition in great detail, offering a historical lesson of the evils of Catholicism. The novelist unabashedly transforms

19 Ibid., p. 89.
20 In his account about the mysteries of the Inquisition, Vargas includes elements, such as the masked judges, who have no support in the Inquisitorial literary tradition, but which Muñoz Sempere believes is taken from The Italian, by Ann Radcliffe: ‘En Vargas existe ya una voluntad estilística cercana a la presente en la ficción gótica inglesa. La representación inicial de los inquisidores es mucho más terrorífica que en la Cornelia Bororquia, la deshumanización mucho más extrema y el elemento erótico-sádico de una brutalidad chocante’ (La Inquisición, p. 141; my translation: ‘In Vargas a stylistic attitude close to that of the English Gothic fiction is to be perceived. The initial representation of Inquisitors is much more terrifying than in Cornelia Bororquia, the dehumanization much more extreme and the sadic-erotic element brutally shocking’). Comparisons of the two novels are frequent in their own critical bibliography, founded on Vargas’s wrong attribution; for a reading assuming the real authorship, see Meyer: ‘I want to show how Vargas adapts this grim, late-Enlightenment roman à thèse to revive interest in Spain for a late Romanticism English public, ignorant and dismissive of Spain after the Peninsular War’ (‘Vargas’, p. 4).
himself into a Protestant apologist, into a preacher who persuades his readers that such crimes are not the fictions of sensationalist writers, but truths that harbour an important teaching:

Scenes have been acted in the Palace of the Inquisition which, Heaven be praised, cannot be re-acted now; and the possibility of which it may at first perhaps be difficult to conceive, but which, alas, are neither untrue nor exaggerated. Some of the crimes recorded of the Inquisition even so far exceed the common depth of the depravity of our nature, wretched as it is, that we might be allowed to doubt the best authenticated historian, if there were not existing undeniable indications of their truth, in the convincing remains of that monstrous engine of fanaticism which have been handed down to us. Praised be Providence, by the light which the Reformation has shed over the whole Christian world, either direct or reflected, the growth of religious despotism, which thrives in darkness, has been stunted; and it is only by the instruments of torture which still exist in the dungeons of the Inquisition, that we are able to form an idea of the magnitude to which the monster had grown during the dark days. 21

These are the dungeons and torture rooms of the Inquisitorial Court of Seville that Cornelius Villiers (that is, Alexander Dallas) personally visited during the Peninsular War. Although the novel takes place in the sixteenth century, proof of the conviction that nothing is false or exaggerated lies in its perseverance into the nineteenth century. Thus, contemporary Spain is a sort of open-air archaeological site of the history of religious despotism, which in civilized Europe had been defeated by the Reformation.

‘I have been in Seville, good reader, and I have walked through the palace of the Inquisition there’ (II, 213). Cornelius Villiers's visits to the premises used by the Inquisition in 1812, and the meticulous descriptions of their torture devices, links historic Spain to contemporary Spain, which at that point become identical. This journey through time unites Dallas's experiences during the war and the story of Bartolomé Vargas in 1590 – it is the raison d’être of the novel, its justification as a literary act and as an ideological manifesto. Ultimately, aside from Hispanophilia, from the people, literature, weather, music and customs, for Dallas, Spain once again ends up as the country of the Inquisition, which the English can use to show pride in their own society.

21 Vargas, II, pp. 211-213.
Superstitions

In Vargas, not only does a degraded vision of the Church emerge through its prelates and inquisitors, but also that of popular religiosity and the most quotidian customs. This range of religious censure is displayed in three figures respectively representing the high clergy and the Inquisition (the Archbishop of Seville), the low secular clergy (Father Cacafuto) and the regular clergy, those secluded from the world (Father Lawrence). Thus, the reader finds sharp satires about the cult of saints and miracles, such as in Chapter XIX, dedicated to the narration of – with ethnological interest and religious reprobation – the festival of the ‘bull of San Marcos’, with its ‘miraculous’ rites, which he has documented in texts by Feijoo and other authors. This episode is one of the few times in which both the narrator and the character adopt a moralistic tone, spewing fiery anti-Catholic speech. The storyline moves off-topic for a moment to denounce, in a timeless rather than historical way, the ‘errors’ of the religious cult in Spain. The three following chapters include the narration of a procession in Montemolín, with profuse examples of idolatry towards the friars and hermits, funerary customs, worship of miracles, the sacrament of confession, etc., constituting a long sequence on popular religious customs. The reflection the character makes could not be more categorical:

Nor could he forbear pitying the incurable blindness of the degraded minds around him there and every where else in his unhappy country. Everything acted from one spring – superstition; every thing not tangible was miraculous; every misfortune was by diabolical agency; nothing was too monstrous to be believed; nothing was too idolatrous to be practised.22

These references to Catholic ‘superstitions’ are scattered throughout the novel, where passages can be found about the way names are given to children (I, 168), or about the effect of the viaticum on the streets of Seville (III, 68). In the house of the Count of Alange, there is no shortage of wives disturbed by religious obsessions and dominated by a confessor, and a good-natured chaplain who represents the vices of the lower clergy.23 Everything that surrounds Father Cacafuto is an example of anti-clerical humour, highlighting

22 Ibid., p. 296.
23 Another character very much in the vein of Scott: ‘He was a good-natured round little man, a good Catholic, a good priest, and a good fellow; for he believed every thing, he absolved every thing, and he eat and drank every thing’ (Vargas, I, p. 167).
the corrupt and mistaken customs that Protestants attribute to Catholic countries. The breach of the vows of chastity, the obsession with miracles, the small and great superstitions of the cult, the belief in the intercession of the saints as a remedy for all ills, and the clergy's gluttony and ignorance are all brought to light; there are even veiled sexual allusions, which serve as a humorous correlate to the central theme around the archbishop's lust.24

Father Lawrence serves to condemn the asceticism and mortification of monks and anchorites, as well as the belief in miracles and the custom of erecting crosses where crimes have occurred (II, 40-77, 162-ss), the sale of indulgences (II, 169) and the safe refuge that criminals find in temples (II, 167). When Lawrence hears Vargas express Protestant ideas, he confuses him with the devil and sprinkles him with holy water, pronouncing an exorcism. The misguided foolish anchorite is thus characterized as an ‘inflamed and bigoted priest’ (II, 191). In reality, his tiny hermitage on the steep cliffs of the Alange Crag (Peña de Alange), like the dungeon of the Inquisition in Seville, operates as a metaphor for Catholic Spain: superstitious, crazed, removed from reality and time, almost inaccessible to outsiders and trapped by its own mistakes. When a foreigner – and Vargas is as foreign in that Spain as any Englishman – challenges him, he reacts with a scandal bordering on madness.

Phobias and philias

The selection of material on Spanish manners and customs, both in quantity and in quality, and its scattering amongst the more critical ideological aspects, articulate a vision of Spain that is much more negative than in Dallas’s previous books, which allows Lawless to affirm:

His lengthy, and, as far as plot is concerned, irrelevant, descriptions of sixteenth-century Spanish life create an impression of a corrupt, ridiculous, tyrannical, and often dirty, society, with filthy posadas, corrupt officials.25

Thus, what in Felix Alvarez produced a certain result, once placed in a different context and with a different frequency, produces the opposite result.

24 Vicente Llorens has pointed out that this anticlerical criticism is radically different in tone and content from that made by Blanco White (Durán López, ‘Algo más sobre la infundada atribución’, p. 487).
Because on this occasion, these customs are linked to the underlying ills of society and not only to a superficial exoticism. In a passage from Vargas, he describes with notorious contempt the position adopted by women and friars in Spain to pray the rosary in such a way as to feign suffering while being comfortable at the same time. The narrator’s comment serves to explain almost all the Spanish customs mentioned throughout the text:

This half-sitting half-kneeling posture conveniently quiets the conscience and relieves the muscles, and has therefore been adopted by all the indolently pious people in the Catholic country, who, being the majority, it has become characteristic.26

On this plane, any kind of sympathy Dallas once had for Spain disappears: what he sees is an indolent people, dragged along by routine and unable to rationally critique their customs and beliefs. Everyone follows the majority, and the majority is dominated by an error that they are not even able to understand. Therefore, whoever becomes a censor or an agent of progress is condemned to act from outside the Spanish identity, fighting against society and not in complicity with it. This is illustrated when Vargas accuses Lawrence of practising a corrupt piety, and is stripped down to his essential truth by the narrator:

Vargas imprudently permitted his feelings to carry him far beyond what any man in his senses, and who valued his liberty and his life, dared to have uttered, between the peaks of the Pyrenees and the shores of the Atlantic.27

Vargas, then, is an impossible Spaniard, because between the Pyrenees and the Atlantic, there was no Spaniard who could think and speak as he did. In Felix Alvarez, the hero, to be able to be so, had to metamorphose into an anglicized Spaniard. Here too, the hero can be a true Christian only by fleeing Spain. That dilemma comes to a head when, in Chapter XIX, the protagonist comes face to face with a crowd in the midst of the festivities of San Marcos in Llerena. He attempts to persuade them of the religious deception being perpetrated on them, but finds himself barely able to save his own life: ‘Vargas’s last words were lost in the clamours of the people, and the curses of the priests: a hundred zealous Estremeñas [sic] rushed

26 Vargas, III, p. 214.
27 Vargas, II, pp. 187-188.
towards him’ (II, 266). Dallas has turned Bartolomé Vargas into an activist, assimilating him to the Protestant ‘martyrs’ who fought in the sixteenth century to introduce the Reformation in Spain. A noble struggle impossible to win. This is why Vargas, in the end, has to take refuge in Protestant Europe, renouncing his Spanish rights, since ‘after what had taken place at Seville, no corner of Spain was secure to him’ (III, 274).

Now, Vargas’s rebelliousness and true faith had been born entirely in England. Had he not lived in London, he would not have abandoned his inherited mistakes and he would have remained somewhere between superstition and atheism, the only alternative that the Protestant view admits for a Catholic society. This is not just a religious change, but also a political one:

He [Vargas] had acquired a just idea of liberty in England, and had been fond of speculating upon the possibility that his countrymen might throw off the yoke of despotism and bigotry which bowed them down. 28

It is England and Protestantism that lend to Vargas the idea of freedom and allow him to distance himself from religious fanaticism. From a European point of view, any salvation of Spain can come only from the outside, from the assimilation of the progress already experienced in more advanced countries. At that point, there is a convergence between Hispanophilia (the faith in the possibility of change) and Hispanophobia (the conviction of the toxic character of the Spanish identity), and both share the systematic awareness of the superiority of northern countries with respect to Spain. This is worth highlighting, because often the discussion about the image of Spain revolves too much around the axis of sympathy-antipathy, love-hate, while in fact, there is a broad common foundation of paternalism in regard to the favourable and unfavourable views of Spain. This is why the dialogue between what provokes either love or hate for Spain is so fluid and so complex. The work of Dallas is a magnificent example of how Hispanophobic and Hispanophilic elements can be combined or alternated, and if this is so, it is because these elements share much more than may be visible at first glance. After all, in the image of the Spain of those decades – centuries? – the philias and phobias merge in the same attitude: condescension. 29

28 Vargas, I, p. 302.
29 Vargas had moderate critical reception. A brief note in The New Monthly Magazine. Historical Register (vol. VI, no. XXII [1 October 1822], p. 461) highlights that it ‘delineates the manners of Spain, and is connected in its subject with Spanish history’, and criticizes the author’s fictional
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11. Discordant Visions: Spain and the Stages of London in 1823

Diego Saglia

Abstract
This essay focuses on the presence of Spain on the London stage in 1823, the year of the French invasion that brought about the end of the liberal regime in Madrid. It specifically examines parliamentary debates (the theatre of politics), the Spanish Fete at Covent Garden, and ‘Spanish’ works performed in the patent theatres, especially the only two original Spanish-themed productions of that year – the operatic melodrama Cortez; or, The Conquest of Mexico and the farce Spanish Bonds; or, Wars in Wedlock. As these different spectacular manifestations reveal, British Romantic-era culture delineated Spain (and its former American colonies) by combining dissonant, ideologically charged materials which brought into focus conflicting political and cultural questions relevant to British, European and global contexts.

Keywords: Spain, Spanish America, theatre, politics, empire, finance

Reporting to the Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool, from Villa Fermosa in Portugal on 7 May 1811, in the midst of the anti-Napoleonic Iberian campaign, the then Viscount and future Duke of Wellington insisted that, while Portugal should constitute ‘the foundation of all […] operations in the Peninsula’, Spain should be ‘the theatre of them’.1 If the phrase ‘theatre of war’ was common enough in the language of warfare, Wellington’s use of it in relation to Spain has specific connotations, since early-nineteenth-century British culture insistently perceived and imagined the country, its history and its culture through a variety of forms of theatricality and spectacularity. During the

1 Gurwood, Dispatches, vol. 7, p. 511.
Peninsular War (1808-1814) Spain was a theatre in the military sense, as well as in a more generally cultural and imaginative one; it continued to be so in the later period of 1815-1823, characterized by Ferdinand VII’s restoration and repressive rule, the trienio liberal, and the onset of the década ominosa. Throughout this extended phase, Spain emerged in Britain as an object of scrutiny, debate and (cultural, diplomatic and military) intervention. As conveyed by Wellington’s interlinking of ‘theatre’ and ‘operations’, it was a space of observation (a theatre in the etymological sense of a ‘space for seeing’) and agency coalescing a wide range of images and tropes, old and new, that made up a multiformal and uneven construct.

Oscillating between fascination and attraction, anxiety and hostility, Spain in Romantic-era British culture was a contradictory cultural geography threaded through with lines of continuity, discontinuity and transhistoricity gathering momentum around specific moments or episodes. In addressing this nexus, the present essay examines representations and uses of Spain in different moments of 1823. Through this micro-historical lens, it traces a web of dissonant manifestations of Spain within a variety of spectacular modes and theatrical forms crucial to the development and consolidation of discourses about it in early-nineteenth-century Britain. This essay therefore also contends that, far from limiting its scope to the local and ephemeral, the micro-analytical focus instead highlights wider-ranging phenomena, with single dates significantly illuminating longer historical phases, and local events functioning as indices of global trends.

The stage was a major site for the production and dissemination of images of Spain as a conflicted cultural geography in the period between 1808 and the end of the constitutional monarchy decreed by the Holy Alliance at the 1822 Congress of Verona. As Susan Valladares has noted in relation to the Peninsular War years, the stage ‘capture[d] the range of contemporary responses’ to the conflict, a fact utterly consonant with a cultural context saturated by theatre and spectacle such as the Romantic age. In Gillian

---

2 On Spain as a locus of intervention, see Saglia ‘Iberian Translations’; on the thematic continuities between the Peninsular War and events of 1820-1823, see Saglia and Haywood, ‘Introduction’; and for in-depth examinations of British political, literary and cultural engagements with Spain in the década ominosa, see Beatty and Laspra-Rodríguez, Romanticism, Reaction and Revolution.

3 In his exploration of nineteenth-century French historical fiction and the ‘formation of the spectacular historical imagination’, Maurice Samuels discusses the process whereby ‘the spectacle […] fixate[s]’ on the past, ‘rendering it as a static image that is then offered for consumption as entertainment’ (The Spectacular Past, p. 13). While the cultural phenomena examined in this essay largely conform to this process, their theatrical nature does not produce static but rather highly mobile representations.

4 Valladares, Staging the Peninsular War, p. 3.
Russell’s words, the age was generally ‘preoccupied to the point of obsession with the theatre as an institution and with the theatricality of social, political, and personal behaviour’, while political life in particular was fundamentally ‘shaped by theatrical models’. In light of this inclusive notion of theatre and spectacle, what follows addresses constructions of Spain within a spectacular continuum in which its multiple valences were reworked into a discursive mixture of philia and phobia, a conflicted body of knowledge involved in networks of power and authority, fascination, and speculation.

Spain on the Westminster stage

The Iberian country was a focal point in Britain’s international politics from early April to late September 1823. In October 1822 the leaders of the Holy Alliance at the Congress of Verona had authorized France to invade Spain, where a civil war between liberals and absolutists had been raging in several regions, suppress the constitutional regime, and restore the crown’s full powers. The Duke of Angoulême and his army of ‘One Thousand Sons of St Louis’ crossed the border on 17 April 1823. Catalonia and the Basque country were soon ‘liberated’ and San Sebastián taken. Madrid capitulated on 23 May. By then, government had already moved to Seville, and in June it sought shelter in Cadiz, which would then be besieged by the French as in 1810-1812. On 31 August the invaders captured the bay fort of Trocadero, an event which paved the way for the city’s surrender on 23 September and the end of the war.

As the spectacle of liberal Spain’s downfall concentrated the gaze of Westminster in mid-to-late 1823, the role of stage manager devolved upon George Canning, who had succeeded Robert Castlereagh as foreign secretary after the latter’s suicide in 1822. The beginning of his mandate was variously involved with the Hispanic world. At the Congress of Verona he took measures to protect British commercial interests in Spanish America, while a couple of months later, in December 1822, he refused to grant recognition to the Spanish American colonies that were gradually gaining independence, while making sure that British commercial agents were present in those territories. If Canning’s official intention was not to embarrass Spain, it

---

6  On Spain as spectacle in Peninsular War poetry, see Saglia, ‘El gran teatro’.
7  Stites, Four Horsemen, p. 109.
was clear that Britain’s interest in these markets was as strong as ever. The 1823 invasion of Spain complicated this transatlantic picture even further. Angoulême’s campaign and the fall of Cadiz could bring about a French expedition to the New World aimed at subduing the rebellious colonies and putting Bourbon princes on new thrones there. Seeing any extension of French influence as a danger, Canning kept events in the Peninsula under constant scrutiny.⁸

Shortly after the French army crossed the border on 7 April, the question of Spain was brought up in Parliament. On 10 April the Spanish Royal Family arrived in Seville followed by government and the Cortes, which resumed session on 23 April. The next day King Ferdinand VII declared war on France. On 28 April 1823 Canning gave a lengthy speech in the House of Commons in response to a motion advanced by members of the opposition criticizing the government’s lack of intervention in the affairs of Spain to prevent or mitigate French action, as well as decrying the fact that governmental envoys ‘advised the Spanish government [...] to alter their Constitution, in the hope of averting invasion’.⁹ In his reply and vindication of government proceedings, the foreign secretary presented the details of the case, retraced diplomatic contacts and shifts in the political debate, and dramatized the plight of Spain by placing it on a geo-political and cultural stage which, as his speech unfolded, acquired both Continental and global dimensions.

Canning carefully treaded the fine line between the non-interventionism consonant with Britain’s post-Waterloo foreign policy and indirect intervention in the affairs of Spain. The latter position appears distinctly in such remarks as ‘We quitted Verona [...] with the satisfaction of having prevented any corporate act of force or menace, on the part of the alliance, against Spain’ (p. 368) and ‘I think it will be conceded to me, that we should have incurred a fearful responsibility, if we had not consented to make the effort, which we did make, to effect an adjustment between France and Spain, through our mediation’ (pp. 368-369). Highlighting Britain’s mediating role, the foreign secretary cast Spain as an arena with high geo-political stakes. In geo-cultural terms, instead, what emerges most significantly from his minutely detailed, defensive account is the progressive widening out of the sphere of relevance of the Spanish question. Whereas some diplomats and politicians believed that ‘the quarrel with Spain’ is a ‘French quarrel’ (p. 373),

---

⁸ For a detailed account, see Ward and Gooch, Cambridge History, vol. 2, pp. 64-68.
⁹ Canning, Select Speeches, p. 358. Subsequent references, by page number, are in brackets in the text.
the foreign secretary stressed how French ministers saw it as a much more general problem, and René de Chateaubriand, the representative of France at Verona, defined it a question ‘toute Française, et toute Europeenne’ (p. 374). For Canning, the consequences of the affairs of Spain were Continental in the widest sense, since their effects ‘would touch even Great Britain’ and be felt ‘to the very extremities of Europe’ (p. 379). Expanding his scope further, he observed that the situation in Spain bore on ‘the general state of the world’ (p. 383). As Canning gradually increased the relevance of the Iberian country as a geo-political and diplomatic theatre, he awarded it global proportions which, from Britain’s perspective at this juncture, primarily concerned Spanish America.

A year after the conclusion of the French campaign in Spain, in December 1824 Canning predicted that the South American countries of the Spanish Empire would eventually be ‘free and English’. On 12 December 1826 he famously returned to this question in a speech on the ‘Affairs of Portugal’, where he recalled his intervention of 28 April 1823 before delivering one of his most memorable pronouncements. Reminding his audience of how the invasion of Spain three years before had dealt a serious ‘blow to the feelings of England’ (p. 466), he now vindicated the fact that, instead of seeking immediate redress to this ‘affront’ and ‘disparagement’ (p. 466), he had aimed to render Spain ‘harmless in rival hands’ and ‘valueless to its possessors’ (p. 466), the French. He then linked the events of 1823 to the new contexts of 1826 by declaring: ‘I sought materials of compensation in another hemisphere [...]. I resolved that if France had Spain, it should not be Spain “with the Indies”. I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old’ (p. 467).

In light of the developments of 1823, these well-known words throw into relief a construction of Spain and Spanishness filtered through a panoramic geo-political vision endowed with theatrical and spectacular features. Illuminating an intersection of national concerns and international interests, they stress the global impact of the affairs of Spain over a time span ranging from 1808 to 1823 and then 1826, within a frame in which earlier ancien régime conditions of a dynastic and diplomatic nature interweave with the concerns dictated by mutating political and economic conditions. In his perorations Canning delineated Spain as an object of scrutiny and observation (in his 1823 speech, he enjoined his audience to ‘Look at the state

---

10 Cain and Hopkins, British Imperialism, p. 246.
11 On Canning and the process of recognition of the Spanish American republics, see Ward and Gooch, Cambridge History, vol. 2, pp. 73-78.
of Spain’, p. 379) and as a site of intervention. In the process he decisively, if implicitly, cast it as a pawn in the game conducted by Britain and the main Continental powers. Viewing the country in terms of amity and support, on one hand, and self-interest, on the other, Canning extolled its heroic resistance against Napoleon’s grande armée, while at the same time hinting at Britain’s aspirations over its former American colonies. Exploring and debating diplomatic, political, military, and economic questions, his speeches of 1823 and 1826 convey the status of Spain as a moving show or a mobile spectacle requiring a wise blend of action and inaction, intervention and non-intervention. By the same token, these speeches fully participate in contemporary modes of constructing Spain as they turn it into a global spectacle through repeated oratorical performances in the theatrical space of Westminster.

Spain in the playhouses

Moving across London, from the stage of Westminster to the nearby theatres, reveals further performative and spectacular manifestations of Spain. The 1822-1823 seasons of the patent houses of Covent Garden, Drury Lane and the Haymarket presented a variety of works on Spanish themes or with Spanish features, which offered a wealth of contrasting images of the Iberian country. The same was true of occasional entertainments that were part and parcel of the continuum of production and consumption of the visible typical of early-nineteenth-century London.

A revealing instance of these entertainments was the ‘Spanish fete’ held at Covent Garden on 4 July to gather funds in support of the effort of the Spanish government against the French invasion. On 30 April, the Cortes in Seville had decreed the creation of a ‘Liberal Foreign Legion’ made up of units, in each army, composed of foreigners present in Spain and willing to fight for the legitimate cause.12 In the spring of the same year a Spanish Committee was created in London by a group of mainly Whig and radical politicians, including John Cam Hobhouse, Joseph Hume, John Bowring, Thomas Moore and Thomas Perronet Thompson. The committee started to collect funds for the Spanish patriots and the ‘Liberal Foreign Legion’ by organizing different initiatives, among which was the ‘Spanish fete’ at Covent Garden.

12 Stites, Four Horsemen, p. 108; for the decree in English translation, see Vaudoncourt, Letters, pp. 411-412.
Initially intended to be given at Almack’s, and then moved to Covent Garden given its political character, the fancy ball was presented by the *Theatrical Observer* as a means to channel sympathy and raise funds for Spain’s ‘just and noble’ cause against France. In advertising the event, this periodical sought to increase the enthusiasm of prospective participants and donors by inviting them to imagine their reaction to ‘foreign interference with our own liberties’. It also anticipated that the fete would offer the ‘grandest scale of magnificence’ and be graced by the ‘nobility, beauty, and fashion of the metropolis’.

On the evening, the interior of Covent Garden presented an impressive *coup d’oeil*: it was profusely hung with banners; the pit was boarded over on a level with the stage, while the stage area was occupied by a tent supported by pillars; between the pillars was a picture ‘representing the King’s excursion to Scotland’ (in 1822); two bands were in attendance and space was set aside for quadrilles. The *Edinburgh Annual Review* confirmed that ‘everything was well and theatrically arranged’. And yet, the overall effect was not particularly Spanish. Advance publicity specified that ‘pains [were] taken’ by the organizers ‘to give this entertainment a political character’, and so it was expected to be a grand Spanish display in a theatre decorated with ‘emblems of “the Spanish cause”’, ‘soul-stirring mottos’, and ‘filled with a throng of “the friends of the Spaniards”’. In the end it was no such thing. The venue, which was hardly full, did not feature specific ‘mottos, inscriptions, emblems, or allegories’ about Spain, so that, as the commentator in the *Edinburgh Annual Register* lamented, attendees ‘forgot the Spanish cause altogether’. The picture of George IV’s trip to Scotland was conspicuously unrelated to ‘the country for which the profits of the Fete were intended’. The masquerading, too, was not particularly Spanish in character. Few people wore disguises and, mixed among the usual Persians, Chinese, and sailors, were only a few ladies wearing Spanish costumes or adorned with Spanish-inspired accessories (such as a ‘*chapeau* or veil, suspended from the crown of the head, and gracefully flowing down the shoulders’).

15 Ibid.
16 ‘The Spanish Fete’, p. 2
17 ‘Spanish Fete – Covent Garden’, p. 2.
19 Ibid., p. 262.
20 Ibid., p. 262.
21 ‘Spanish Fete – Covent Garden’, p. 2.
22 Ibid.
Among the men, there were only ‘a few Spaniards in full costume’. To be sure, some real Spaniards attended the event, but they and their nation’s plight were lost in the general merry-making: ‘Admiral Jabat (the Spanish Ambassador) and the Duke of San Lorenzo [...] appeared to feel that their cause was completely forgotten by the gay and animated groups by whom they were surrounded’. A half-hearted staging of Spain to gather support for its effort against the return of absolutism, ‘[a]s a measure of finance’ the fete was ultimately a ‘miserable failure’, though, as an entertainment, it gave ‘general satisfaction’.

However disappointing both ideologically and financially, the fete at Covent Garden is a relevant episode in the context of 1823 because of its interweaving of spectacle, fashion, and politics, as well as for promoting a supportive intervention in the affairs of Spain through fund-raising. From a cultural perspective, it highlights the importance of spectacle and theatre to the formation of conceptions of Spain in early-nineteenth-century Britain. Support for the country is mobilized through a kind of spectacular entertainment in which Spain traditionally featured as an inspiration for masquerade costumes, which were themselves based on conventional stage costumes for Spanish dons, donnas and duennas – mostly drawing on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century attire, as with the (male) cloak, ruff, and slashed doublet. Yet the fete did not merely feature masquerade costumes: the fact that some women wore items of fashion associated with Spain may be linked to the politically motivated vogue for Spanish dress styles and accessories inspired by the Spaniards’ exploits during the early years of the Peninsular War. Therefore, as staged at the Covent Garden fete, the country is visually connected to age-old clichéd costumery as well as to contemporary fashion and consumer practices: in both cases, support for the cause of Spain is ostensibly carried out by ‘wearing’ it. This support, however, is also hollowed out by the playfulness implicit in the costumes and fashionable items themselves, and by the traces of hostility attached to the male ruff-and-doublet attire harking back to long-lived stereotypes of Spanish haughtiness and braggadocio, as well as diplomatic deviousness and conquistador-style ruthlessness.

---

24 Ibid., p. 263.
25 Ibid., p. 263.
27 See the fashion plates and descriptions in the issues of Rudolf Ackermann’s Repository of Arts, Literature, Commerce, Manufactures, Fashions, and Politics published during the Peninsular War.
In other words, in the performative space of Covent Garden on 4 July 1823, wearing Spain and donating to its cause became ways of showing solidarity for, as well as taking part and intervening in, its current plight. At the same time, these actions reduced the country to an ephemeral show, an unstable collage pieced together through an ambivalent cultural operation in which unfriendly stereotypes clashed with good intentions, and spectacularity and consumption invalidated political awareness and effective engagement.

If we now turn to consider what Covent Garden, Drury Lane and the Haymarket staged between late 1822 and late 1823, there emerges a steady succession of Spanish-themed plays. By way of example, the listings in John Genest’s 1832 Some Account of the English Stage testify to the presence of a significant number of works from the repertoire – from Thomas Otway’s Venice Preserv’d (1682) and Richard Brinsley Sheridan’s Pizarro (1799) to Susannah Centlivre’s Wonder! A Woman Keeps a Secret (1714) and George Colman’s The Mountaineers (1795).29 This preponderance of tried and tested favourites confirms the long-term hold of repertoire over the Spanish imagination of British audiences, since all of the Spanish-themed plays performed in 1822-1823 tended to reinforce conventional images of the country and its people. There were only two new offerings with a Spanish theme in the period in question: the farce Spanish Bonds; or, Wars in Wedlock and James Robinson Planché and Henry Bishop’s operatic melodrama Cortez; or, The Conquest of Mexico. Neither contributed to challenging or correcting long-established images of Spain.

First performed on 2 August, Spanish Bonds ran for only one night: the audience damned it by hissing so loudly that its final part was completely inaudible. While reporting on its failure, the play’s earliest commentators also remarked on the familiarity of this kind of Spanish fare: ‘we expected a good deal of humor – some allusions to passing events – plenty of good situations, with a reasonable proportions of equivoque’.30 Utterly predictable, the farce proved to be an unimaginative rehash of the well-worn ingredients of ‘Spanish’ comedies of sentiment and intrigue. As the London Magazine remarked: ‘Love and jealousy, the inseparables in Spanish plots, made up the two acts.’31

The production boasted some of the best comic performers of the period – among them John Liston in the role of an old Spanish father, ‘frilled like a

29 Genest, Some Account, vol. 9. For details, see the appendix to this essay.
bantam’, and John Harley as a servant. The plot revolved around a Spanish couple whose daughter, Isabella, is in love with the young and handsome Don Felix, yet also the object of the unwelcome attentions of an unpleasant older suitor. Intrigue is provided by a miniature of Isabella, lost by Felix and found by the older man. After some contrivances devised by the latter, who is favoured by Isabella’s mother in her running battle against her husband, and thanks to the decisive intervention of the servant played by Harley, the old man’s artifices are unmasked and the young lovers united. In reality, the plot was so complicated, indeed so excessively convoluted, as ‘to defy unravelling’.

Commentators did not miss the opportunity of linking this expendable entertainment to contemporary political and economic events. The *London Magazine* compared the failure of the play to the dwindling fortunes of Spain’s liberal regime: ‘The plot was Spanish – and the Spanish are not in luck just at this time.’ Critics also hinted at the financial meaning of ‘bonds’ and, particularly, the unreliability of the bonds issued by Spain. The *London Magazine* noted that, as with the interest rates of Spain’s bonds, the farce ‘rose but to fall’, while for the *Literary Gazette* those bonds were ‘mere waste-paper’ and the play a waste of time. These witticisms drew upon the fact that, inevitably, the bonds of the liberal Spanish government were hard hit by the events of 1823 and rapidly lost their value. The *London Magazine* documented this inexorable descent in its issue for December 1823: ‘SPANISH BONDS of 1821, which were 37 in June, have been as low as 22; and November 18th, 25 ¾; Spanish Bonds of 1820, in June, at 47, were at 36 on the 8th of November.’ Similarly, the subtitle ‘Wars in Wedlock’ itself did not merely refer to the marital or sentimental tensions so common in Spanish-themed comedy, as in Sheridan’s *The Duenna* (1775) or Hannah Cowley’s *A Bold Stroke for a Husband* (1783). It also represents a none too subtle attempt to capitalize allusively on the condition of the Iberian country and the immediate associations which audiences would have drawn between ‘Spain’ and ‘war’.

First performed on 5 November, *Cortez; or, The Conquest of Mexico* was more successful and, as a mainpiece, the product of an entirely different kind of theatrical speculation. With music by Henry Bishop and a text by

32 Ibid., p. 322.
33 ‘Haymarket Theatre’, p. 22.
34 ‘The Drama’, p. 321.
35 Ibid., p. 322.
36 ‘Drama’, p. 527.
37 ‘The Funds’, p. 673.
James Robinson Planché, it was a mixture of melodrama and opera acted twelve times in its full form, then reduced to two acts and acted five more times.\textsuperscript{38} In fact, this relatively short run was a financial failure for what had been conceived as a lavish production meant to rival W.T. Moncrieff's melodrama \textit{The Cataract of the Ganges}, which had debuted at Drury Lane on 27 October as an accompaniment to that evening's new mainpiece, Henry Hart Milman's tragedy \textit{Fazio}, and had proved a major success running to 54 performances during its initial season.\textsuperscript{39}

In early November, the situation of Spain was very different from that in early August, as the subjugation of the country by the French was by then complete. In its issue of 8 November 1823, the \textit{Literary Gazette} remarked that ‘the gradual subsiding of the storm in Spain has left the Newspapers almost newsless’.\textsuperscript{40} This ironic comment was printed just a few paragraphs after an extensive account of \textit{Cortez}, yet another play in the history of English drama and theatre about the Spanish conquests in America, presented to the readers as ‘a sort of Musical Melodrame, not altogether devoid of interest, but at the same time not entitled to rank above mediocrity’.\textsuperscript{41}

Though not set in Spain, \textit{Cortez} was fully part of the discursive investments that had been accreting around the country during the year, and was thus highly pertinent to the transatlantic concerns central to Canning's foreign policy and parliamentary interventions. In this respect, the play is a manifestation of that nexus of circum-Atlantic performativity defined by Joseph Roach as a locus of operations of displacement, refashioning and transference aimed at ‘self-definition by staging contrasts with other races, cultures, and ethnicities’.\textsuperscript{42} In \textit{Cortez}'s initial run, the dazzling mise en scène, colourful scenery and new music made strikingly present its figuration of imperial aspirations in the New World, which, in turn, re-echoed and reinterpreted Britain's draw to Spanish America as repeatedly debated in Parliament and the press.

The main plot centres on Hernán Cortés – here Cortez – and his expedition from Cuba to the coast of Mexico and, then, inland to Montezuma's capital. The first contact with the locals is followed by the episode of Cortez's burning of the fleet to prevent his men from abandoning the enterprise. In his advance into Mexican territory, the conquistador is accompanied by

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{38} Genest, \textit{Some Account}, vol. 9, p. 249.
\item \textsuperscript{39} On this competition, see ‘Covent Garden’, p. 718.
\item \textsuperscript{40} ‘Politics’, p. 718.
\item \textsuperscript{41} ‘Covent Garden’, p. 178. More generally, see Sánchez, \textit{Hispanic Heroes}.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Roach, \textit{Cities}, p. 6.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Marina, the Mexican woman also known historically as Doña Marina and La Malinche, who acted as his translator (in the play, Cortez passionately loves Marina, who reciprocates his feelings). When the Spaniards are attacked by the Tlascalans, the latter are defeated and accept the Europeans’ superiority. Marina, however, is abducted and destined for a human sacrifice in Cholula, and is then rescued by Cortez and his men who attack and subjugate the sacred city. The action also features a subplot about the love of the brothers Xocotzin and Acacix for the beautiful Amazitli, who promises her hand to the more heroic and patriotic of them. After Acacix wins the contest, Xocotzin vows revenge, even threatening to rape Amazitli, but is eventually neutralized. The play concludes with the arrival of Cortez at Mexico City and his meeting with Montezuma, who bows to the Spaniards’ power and accepts them as the new masters of the country.

A composite theatrical product, Cortez was devised so as to activate all possible attractions for contemporary audiences. Planché reworked John Dryden’s 1665 The Indian Emperour (which provides the subplot of the brothers’ love contest), as well as drawing on historical sources on the conquest of Mexico in line with his own promotion of accuracy in costumes and settings (the printed text abounds with explanatory notes). The performance also capitalized on spectacular grandiosity, exotic touches, equestrian acrobatics, and some of the most outstanding performers of the period, among whom Thomas Potter Cooke, John Fawcett, and the first equestrian artist of the age, Andrew Ducrow. Musically, it featured original compositions by Bishop, as well as adaptations from Mozart and Rossini. Though audiences appreciated Bishop’s efforts and one piece in particular became extremely popular (the ‘round ‘Yes, ’tis the Indian drum’, Act I, sc. 1), the critical reception of the play’s music was decidedly mixed.

Inevitably, this major investment in spectacularity was an ideologically loaded operation. If ‘its gaudy and attractive neighbour’, Moncrieff’s Cataract of the Ganges, was about empires clashing in the East, Cortez dealt with imperial expansion in the West, and in highly topical and alluring Spanish America at that. However, its engagement with the theme of empire presents unexpected complexities, as it is built around the situation of an aspiring empire confronting an established one. The two groups of characters – the Europeans and the Americans – embody these clashing imperial trajectories. The Spaniards are moved by ‘avarice and enthusiasm’,

---
44 Fenner, Opera, pp. 467-468.
45 ‘Covent Garden’ p. 718.
their greed conveyed by the generic, mythological image of a land whose ‘rivers [...] have waves of silver rolling over sands of gold’, while the natives are presented as devoted to ‘the immolation of human victims’ to the ‘monstrous idols’ held up by their ‘sanguinary and ignorant priesthood’. This encounter and collision of empires is in full view from the outset. Whereas Montezuma’s subjects enter bearing gifts symbolic of peace and plenty, the Europeans distribute trinkets and glass necklaces, as well as an ‘ominous offering’ – a sword for the emperor (p. 7). The contrast is then reprised in the exchange of ritualized performances. As the Mexican women dance and the Spanish soldiers react with undue arousal, Cortez orders the latter to give the natives a taste of the ‘Spanish mode of salutation’ (p. 8). Accordingly, the foot soldiers take up their weapons and undertake military manoeuvres; the cavalry then rushes on stage at a gallop, terrifying the Mexicans, who break into a chorus:

O, sight of wonder! – sight of fear!
What monsters to our eyes appear?
Half men, half beasts. – The earth with dread,
Trembles, beneath their thundering tread!47

The Spaniards subsequently ‘discharge their muskets in the air which completes the alarm of the Mexicans, who fly in disorder from the scene’ (p. 8). Two tribal leaders or caciques stay behind and answer this provocation with threats aimed at Cortez:

The guardian divinities of Mexico will avenge this mockery of their power!
Fly from their wrath, while yet thou mayest! Fly, ere their invincible servants, Montezuma and his countless warriors, are compelled to propitiate them with thy blood, and that of thy presumptuous followers! (p. 9)

The clash of empires has started, and neither side is presented as weak or guiltless.

As the play concludes with Montezuma’s acceptance of the invasion, it stops just before the actual conquest of Mexico, unlike Dryden’s Indian Emperour, which ends with the Spaniards’ complete subjugation of the country and Montezuma’s suicide. In Act III, sc. 5, when Cortez and his

46 Planché, Cortez, pp. 14, 16, 18. Subsequent references, by page number, are in brackets in the text.
men come within sight of the capital, the emperor meets them with an impressive procession on the causeway leading to the island where the city rises. This is a long parade of the kind that was extremely popular in theatres at the time, and re-echoes the relevance of such moments for spectacles with epic aspirations.\textsuperscript{48} The lengthy sequence develops through a succession of ‘Mexican girls, strewing flowers’, ‘Nobles of Mexico, in rich dresses’, ‘Warriors, bearing standards, ensigns, &c.’ among which are ‘the arms of Montezuma – a griffin, with a tiger in its talons’, ‘three Lords bearing golden wands’, and finally Montezuma himself, leaning on two subject kings ‘under a canopy of green feathers ornamented with gold’, while the rear is brought up by ‘warriors, inhabitants of Mexico, &c.’ (p. 49). When the procession comes to a halt, Montezuma addresses the Spaniards with words expressing submission to their power:

I accept the embassy of the King who sends you, and lay my empire at his feet. Since from the signs we have observed in the Heavens and what we have seen of you the period seems to have arrived when the predictions of our ancestors seem to be fulfilled – namely that there should come from the earth men different in person and in habit from ourselves to rule over this country.\textsuperscript{49}

Cortez replies with an amicable speech, saying that the king of Spain ‘desires to be your friend and confederate, not by virtue of those ancient rights to which you have alluded, nor for any reason than to open a communication between the two monarchies, and join in lasting amity their respective rulers’ (p. 50). He then invites his followers to rejoice in unison: ‘Let one joy reign in all bosoms, and celebrate this glorious and happy union of the Old and New Worlds’ (p. 50).

Putting forward ideas of transcontinental cooperation based on a transatlantic confederation, these words unexpectedly come at the climax of a play that has been developing along different lines. In actual fact, they revise Cortez’s much more ominous declarations in Act I. There, addressing his soldiers to strengthen their determination, he tells them: ‘The eyes of the old world are upon you; the new one is in your grasp’, while reiterating that his aims are ‘glory’ and ‘wealth’ (p. 16). Placed at opposite ends in the play, these contrasting depictions of the encounter of the ‘old’ and ‘new’ worlds encapsulate a significant portion of its ideological import.

\textsuperscript{49} Planché, Cortez, p. 50.
As it departs from historical record and the precedent of Dryden’s *Indian Emperour*, where Montezuma fights the Spaniards, is imprisoned and tortured, and dies, *Cortez* conjures up a peculiarly distinct figuration of empire. Mexicans and Spaniards are neither good nor bad per se: if Spanish ambitions are reprehensible, the Mexicans are a violent and imperializing people, too; an overreaching imperialist, Cortez is heroic and magnanimous, as well as passionately in love with Marina. A far from straightforward text, *Cortez* plays repeatedly with ambivalences. The Black Legend and Hispanophobia are present in it, but also kept in check; and so is the figuration of Mexican barbaric rituals, since not all Mexicans conform to the stereotype of the bloodthirsty barbarian. In fact, the play seems to centre on the representation of a land available for conquest, indeed even awaiting conquest as its own historical fulfilment. *Cortez* depicts the collision of two worlds which eventually turns into a fated encounter leading to a mutually beneficial confederation. Yet, since the story of Cortés and Montezuma was well known to audiences, this encounter also reads as a narrative of the inevitability of imperial conquest and subjugation. In turn, the idea of an imperial *pax hispanica* imposed through, and accepted because of, the conquerors’ technological and military superiority effects a union of the old and new worlds which allusively reworks the key terms of Canning’s South American doctrine. The play’s use of ‘old’ and ‘new’ in a context of conquest and expansion, though also of cooperation and exchange, significantly condenses British designs over Spanish America.

The conclusion of *Cortez* effectively chimes with Britain’s policies towards Spain’s crumbling American empire: Castlereagh had promoted measures that would cast the British as auxiliaries and protectors rather than as conquerors in the eyes of the would-be independent South American territories; and Canning continued in this line, favouring persuasion rather than coercion, involvement through commerce, capital, and culture rather than conquest – an approach that was all the more expedient after the short-lived occupations of Buenos Aires and Montevideo in 1806-1807 had shown the difficulties of formal imperial involvement in these territories. Thus, the play advances a view of informal empire that would reach its climax with Britain’s gradual recognition of independent Spanish American countries during the 1820s.\(^50\)

Moreover, as Rebecca Cole Heinowitz notes, *Cortez* is a ‘thinly veiled allegory of contemporary British speculation in Spanish America’, which

---

was a hotly debated question at the time of the play’s premiere. Tellingly, in the issue of the *Weekly Register* for 22 November 1823, William Cobbett published a ‘Letter to Canning’ about his South American policies, and Mexico, in particular. There he takes the foreign secretary to task for refusing to acknowledge the independence of the former Spanish colonies and accuses him of secretly organizing military preparations to force them (especially Mexico) to return to the Spanish fold. He also denounces the fact that these states had raised loans in London and, since the global ‘money mart’ of the capital’s stock exchange unscrupulously encouraged investors to ‘buy and sell the stock’ of these countries, the ‘Jews and Jobbers of London would very soon be the owners of all South America’. The first Spanish American bond was advertised in the British press in 1822 and, whereas Spanish bonds declined in value over the same period, Spanish American ones rapidly became the object of a widespread craze. A mere few days after the premiere of *Cortez* the press announced that the first Mexican loan, to the amount of £5 million, would soon be available for subscription. (Interestingly, therefore, both new Spanish-themed plays of 1823 were in some way connected with bonds.) As Heinowitz points out, the play’s finale, with its stress on mutually beneficial relations between Spain and the New World, declares that ‘the conqueror’s success implies that of contemporary investment in Spanish America’ and, in turn, of Britain’s informal imperial practices. At the same time, though, the conclusion leaves open the question of the more aggressive and destructive kind of conquest represented by Cortés’s later, and unstaged, change of tactics.

Offering an exotically spectacular recreation of the origins of Spanish colonialism in America, Planché’s and Bishop’s *Cortez* gestures allusively to current interests in Spain and its American colonies, and especially their relevance to geo-political and geo-cultural discourses and practices in and about 1823. It reveals a continued fascination with Spanish history and its transatlantic offshoots, while transfiguring British geo-political projections

51 Heinowitz, *Spanish America*, p. 206
52 ‘To Mr. Canning’, pp. 464, 472.
53 Leask, *Curiosity*, p. 301.
54 Heinowitz, *Spanish America*, p. 185.
55 Ibid., p. 208.
56 A contemporaneous spectacularization of Mexico, also linked to financial speculation and explicitly connected with Cortés’s expedition, was the exhibition on ‘Ancient and Modern Mexico’ organized by the entrepreneur William Bullock at the Egyptian Hall on Piccadilly in April 1824 (see Leask, *Curiosity*, pp. 300-314; Heinowitz, *Spanish America*, pp. 208-209).
both at a European and a global level. In the process, it testifies to a constant 
interplay of positive and negative images of Spain that take on contextually 
specific meanings within the rapidly shifting international panorama of 
the early to mid-1820s.

More generally, Cortez confirms that the different performances of 
Spain examined in this essay draw a variegated picture of the country 
as a space of (actual or possible) intervention and thus a playing ground 
for British diplomacy, military power, or financial investment; but also as 
the receiver of funds for its ‘patriots’, and as the metropole of a dissolving 
American empire focusing the attention and interests of Britain and its 
European competitors. Within this prismatic focus, Spain becomes a site 
of cultural construction in which the visual plays a central role: it is an 
imaginative geography delineated through highly effective visual modelling 
and experienced visually in different locations – from Westminster, the 
Haymarket, and Covent Garden, to the periodicals and playtexts – all of 
which are pervasively spectacular and spectacularizing.

From a methodological point of view, concentrating on a discrete 
cultural moment, such as a significant year, reveals the advantages of 
micro-historical analysis as a way of throwing into relief localized and 
strategic practices within the wider-ranging process of imagining Spain 
in Romantic-era British culture. It makes visible the Spanish construct 
as a mosaic of discourses, objects, texts, performances, and modes of 
subjectivity, all ideologically and politically charged within a context of 
specific developments and transformations. More widely, this approach 
teaches us how to look at this process from a multiple perspective and 
to deal with Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia from suitably contextu-

talized vantage points. The value of the theatrical and spectacular 
angle lies in that it highlights how Spain is not merely present on the 
page or in visual depictions, but also functions through performative, 
‘moving’ figurations – both in the sense of moving before an audience 
on a stage and of affecting them. The benefits of this approach for our 
interpretations of constructions of Spain are considerable. Reading the 
theatrical and spectacular manifestations of the Iberian country through 
a restricted focus such as that offered by London in 1823 discloses once 
again a multiple and discordant image, an eminently unstable script 
made up of dissonant, old and new, materials, and a moving performance 
which throws into relief conflicting political and cultural questions, the 
import of which ranges from the British sphere to wider European and 
global panoramas.
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## Appendix: Spanish-themed plays in London's patent theatres (1822-1823)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Reference in Genest</th>
<th>Play information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 October</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Venice Preserved. Jaffier = C. Kemble : Pierre = Abbott : Belvidera = Miss Lacy from Dublin, her 1st app. in London</td>
<td>Thomas Otway, Venice Preserv’d; or, a Plot Discover’d (1682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 October</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>Rolla = Young: – with Giovanni in London</td>
<td>Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Pizarro (1799); W.T. Moncrieff, Giovanni in London; or, The Libertine Reclain’d (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 November</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Don John. 2nd Violetta = Miss M. Tree, 1st time</td>
<td>Thomas Shadwell, The Libertine (1676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>Venice Preserved. Jaffier = Kean : Pierre = Young : Belvidera = Mrs W. West</td>
<td>Otway, Venice Preserv’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 December</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Macready acted Pierre.</td>
<td>Otway, Venice Preserv’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 December</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Brother and Sister. Pacheco = Meadows</td>
<td>William Dimond, Brother and Sister (1815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 December</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>Busy Body. Marplot = Harley : Sir Francis Gripe = Munden : Sir George Airy = Cooper : Miranda = Mrs Davison</td>
<td>Susannah Centlivre, The Busy Body (1709)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 January</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>Revenge. Zanga = Young : Alonzo = Cooper, 1st time : Leonora: Mrs W. West</td>
<td>Edward Young, The Revenge (1721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>Never acted there, Marriage of Figaro. Count Almaviva = Elliston : Figaro = Liston : Antonio = Harley : Cherubino = Mrs H. Hughes, 1st time : Susanna = Miss Stephens : Countess = Mrs Austin</td>
<td>W.A. Mozart, The Marriage of Figaro (in Henry Bishop’s adaptation, first performed at Covent Garden in 1819)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Never acted. Julian […] this T. was written by Miss Mitford</td>
<td>Mary Russell Mitford, Julian, A Tragedy in five acts (1823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Reference in Genest</td>
<td>Play information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 1823</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Never acted. Vision of the Sun, or the Orphan of Peru – this Melo-dramatic tale of enchantment (as it is called) was acted 40 times – it is founded on the Peruvian Tales – the songs, with some description of the scenes, are printed</td>
<td>Charles Farley, <em>The Vision of the Sun; or, The Orphan of Peru</em> (1823) [actually set in pre-conquest Peru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April 1823</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Duenna. Father Paul = Bartley</td>
<td>Richard Brinsley Sheridan, <em>The Duenna</em> (1775)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 1823</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>Young's bt. [benefit] Venice Preserved, with Marriage of Figaro (compressed) and Devil to Pay. Jobson = Dowton : Nell = Mrs Davison</td>
<td>Otway, <em>Venice Preserv’d</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 1823</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Miss F.H. Kelly acted Belvidera, and Lady Racket for her bt. [benefit]</td>
<td>Otway, <em>Venice Preserv’d</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 1823</td>
<td>Haymarket</td>
<td>Marriage of Figaro. Almaviva = Vining</td>
<td>Marriage of Figaro (in Henry Bishop’s adaptation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 1823</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Mountaineers. Octavian = C. Kemble : Floranthe = Miss Foote, 1st time : Agnes = Miss Love, 1st time</td>
<td>George Colman the Younger, <em>The Mountaineers</em> (1793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 October 1823</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Much ado, and Rosina</td>
<td>Shakespeare, <em>Much Ado about Nothing</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Reference in Genest</td>
<td>Play information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 October 1823</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Venice Preserved. Pierre = Young</td>
<td>Otway, Venice Preserv’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 November 1823</td>
<td>Covent Garden</td>
<td>Never acted, Cortez, or the Conquest of Mexico</td>
<td>James Robinson Planché, Henry Bishop, Cortez; or, The Conquest of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December 1823</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>Pizarro. Elvira = Mrs Bunn, 1st time</td>
<td>Sheridan, Pizarro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: John Genest, Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830, 10 vols (Bath: H.E. Carrington, 1832), vol. 9, pp. 159-250.
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12. **Historical Fiction, Cultural Transfer and the Recycling of the Black Legend between the Low Countries and Britain: A Nineteenth-Century Case Study**

*Raphaël Ingelbien*

**Abstract**
This chapter compares Henri Moke’s *Le Gueux de Mer* (1827) and Thomas Colley Grattan’s *The Heiress of Bruges* (1830), two historical novels set at the time of the Dutch Revolt and written in the final years of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. The comparison provides insights into the respective priorities of British and ‘Netherlandic’ writers who dealt in images of Spain in the early nineteenth century. Beyond some clear differences in the ideological urgency of their work, the authors’ liberal politics, their sympathy towards Catholicism and the influence of Romantic Orientalism create important nuances in their versions of the Black Legend, which are ultimately denunciations of bigotry and tyranny rather than expressions of wholesale Hispanophobia.

**Keywords:** historical novel, cultural transfer, Dutch Revolt, Catholicism, liberalism

The rise of the Black Legend in Renaissance Europe was partly a result of intense interactions between the Low Countries and England. A shared hostility to Spain was reinforced by Protestantism, geographical proximity and commercial ties that facilitated intellectual and cultural exchanges. In the decades of the Dutch Revolt, various forms of Dutch anti-Spanish propaganda were translated and/or disseminated on a large scale within
England. In later centuries, however, the anti-Spanish images that nations like England and the Netherlands had jointly forged in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries morphed into topoi that belonged to increasingly separate cultural grammars.

By the early nineteenth century, the close cultural bonds that had once enabled the circulation of the Black Legend in a Protestant Anglo-Dutch sphere had loosened to the point where British commentators on the Netherlands claimed to enlighten readers who were generally ignorant about their neighbours across the North Sea. In the preface to an 1824 anthology of Dutch poetry, the English editor wrote: ‘There is a country almost within sight of the shores of our island, whose literature is less known to us than that of Persia or Hindostan.’ The cultural traffic between the Netherlands and Britain was then at a low ebb, at least as far as Dutch exports were concerned. The still comparatively new influence of British culture across Europe was duly making itself felt in the Netherlands, but literary histories of Romanticism suggest little in the way of reciprocity. However, a handful of now forgotten British writers sought inspiration in the Low Countries: among them was Thomas Colley Grattan, an author of Irish origin who settled in Brussels (in what was then the United Kingdom of the Netherlands) around 1827/1828, and soon set out to become a resident British expert on the Low Countries. The work of this cultural mediator will help us gauge the extent to which nineteenth-century trajectories of the Black Legend actually diverged on both sides of the North Sea.

Grattan wasted little time in turning to ‘Netherlandic’ material – the adjective will here sometimes be preferred to ‘Dutch’ in order to reflect the context of a united kingdom that combined the Northern and Southern Low Countries into a single polity. A History of the Netherlands (which encompassed the Southern provinces as well) by his hand was first published in 1830, and two historical novels followed in quick succession: The Heiress of Bruges (1830) and Jacqueline of Holland (1831). In a foreword to the latter, the Anglo-Irish author confirmed the exotic nature of his subject matter when he remembered ‘venturing on ground so unexplored as the countries I have chosen for the scene of this and my last novel’ (p. vi). Grattan already had a reputation as a purveyor of literary images of the European continent: his

---

1 See, particularly, Dunthorne, Britain and the Dutch Revolt, pp. 4-29.
2 Bowring and Van Dyk, Batavian Anthology, p. 1.
3 Background information on Grattan is based on the entry in the Oxford Dictionary of British Biography (Boase and Vance, ‘Grattan, Thomas Colley’) and on the contemporary sketch in Anon., ‘Our Portrait Gallery’.
*Highways and Byways; or, Tales Picked up in the French Provinces* had earned him some success in 1820s. His finances, though, were often precarious, which prompted him to maintain a steady output of writing. In Brussels, Grattan saw an opportunity to adapt local material for British consumption. His transformation of those sources and of their anti-Spanish motifs affords an insight into the different priorities of British and Dutch/Belgian novelists who recycled the Black Legend in the 1820s.

At the same time, the complex identities of Grattan and of one of his key ‘Netherlandic’ sources will qualify any sense in which their works could be simply equated with contemporary British or Dutch outlooks. Grattan may have been trying to please a British audience, but for all his opportunism he was also an Irishman, a moderate Protestant, and a principled Whig. As for one of the ‘Netherlandic’ authors who probably inspired Grattan, Henri Moke was a francophone writer who produced the first ‘Belgian’ historical novel. 

4 *Le Gueux de Mer* (1827) was significantly set in the period of the anti-Spanish rebellion, and its conclusion looked forward to the newly formed United Kingdom of the Netherlands and its ruler, King William I of Orange-Nassau, of whom Moke was then a fervent supporter. The novel closes as the Duke of Alba leaves the Low Countries and, in a remarkable change of heart, prophesies a time when Belgians, ‘united under Nassau, will only remember the foreign yoke, the better to cherish the rule of a king whom they will able to call their compatriot with a justifiable pride’.5 Moke was furthermore a moderate Catholic and a liberal in his politics. If broad differences between Britain and the Netherlands in the early nineteenth century had an impact on how Grattan and Moke each reworked the Black Legend, so too had the variegated forms of ‘British’ and ‘Netherlandic’ identities that both authors represented.

*Le Gueux de Mer* set the template for later and now better known fictional treatments of the anti-Spanish rebellion in Belgian literature, such as Charles De Coster’s *Légende d’Ulenspiegel*.6 It was most probably also noticed by the Irish writer who set up shop in Brussels within a year of the publication of Moke’s novel. Grattan read up extensively on historical sources on the Low Countries, from luminaries of European historiography like Tacitus,

4 Background information on Moke is based on Varendonck, *Henri Moke*.
5 ‘Réunis sous un Nassau, il ne se souviendront du joug étranger que pour chérir le gouvernement d’un Roi, qu’ils pourront, avec un juste orgueil, nommer leur compatriote’ (Moke, *Le Gueux de Mer*, I, p. 281). English translations from Moke’s *Le Gueux de Mer* provided in the main text of the article are mine. Moke’s original is provided in endnotes; his sometimes archaic French spelling has been preserved.
6 For a survey of the theme, see Quaghebeur, ‘The Sixteenth Century’.
Voltaire, Robertson and Schiller to more local sources such as Vandervynckt and Van Meteren. These are all mentioned in his *History of the Netherlands*, which is a competent synthesis of existing treatments of the history of the Low Countries from antiquity to the early nineteenth century.\(^7\) Grattan was concurrently working on the first of his 'Netherlandic' historical novels: *The Heiress of Bruges: A Tale of the Year Sixteen Hundred*. Its plot, while partly inspired by Grattan's historiographical research, also owes something to the fictional formula used by Moke.

In both novels, the main plot revolves around the complicated love between a daughter of the Flemish elite and a heroic figure of the anti-Spanish revolt in the late sixteenth century. The female protagonists are in turns courted, kidnapped and freed by (pro-)Spanish and rebel figures, all against the backdrop of various battles between the two camps. Needless to say, the Flemish rebel hero eventually carries the girl off, much to her own delight, even if in Grattan's case the couple will have to live happily ever after by moving to the United Provinces. The ideological dimension of that sentimental plot is obvious and is also a generic feature of many historical novels, including the influential work of Walter Scott,\(^8\) but other similarities suggest that Grattan lifted some elements directly from Moke. To mention but two: in both novels, the heroine is accompanied by a chaperone whose old-fashioned ideas provide comic relief in various scenes, and both plots feature Moorish/African characters who are part of the household of a Spanish commander, but who develop sympathy for the local rebels.

Whether such similarities amount to a mild form of plagiarism need not concern us here; cases like this were not rare in the rapid spread of the historical novel in the Romantic era.\(^9\) Rather, our focus will be on Moke's and Grattan's respective treatments of the Black Legend, and on what the comparison reveals about the ideological motives behind both authors' representations of Spaniards for their Dutch/Belgian and British audiences. After an imagological survey of the portrayal of Spanish character in both works, the essay will dwell on the recurrence or absence in the novels of various motifs that are central to the Black Legend: Catholicism and the Inquisition, Spanish colonial abuses in the New World, and the African

---

\(^7\) On Grattan's relation to Low Countries historiography, see Ingelbien and Waelkens, 'A Twice-told Tale'.

\(^8\) On the allegorical significance of sentimental plots in Romantic-era historical fiction, see, for example, Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, pp. 128-157.

\(^9\) On Grattan's unacknowledged debts to contemporary 'Netherlandic' literary models, see Ingelbien and Eelen, 'Literaire bemiddelaars in bewogen tijden'.
or Moorish strains within Spanish identity that were historically used by English and Dutch authors ‘to denigrate Spain as the black other of [their] northern European self’. 10

The Black Legend created enduringly popular caricatures of Spaniards as, among other traits, fierce, cruel, brooding, haughty, jealous and passionate. 11 Moke’s portrayals of Spanish character run the gamut of that stereotyped temperament. He liberally applies the adjective féroce (fierce) to various Spaniards, and pairs it with other expressions or attitudes that typify the villains of his novel. To give a few examples: one episode features a ‘fierce Spaniard smiling disdainfully’, others show how Spaniards mistreat a captive woman as ‘fierce soldiers brutally pushed her back and laughed at her tears’, or how ‘the fierce Jean de Vargas started laughing with a hard and sinister laugh’. Only once in the novel is the adjective applied to other characters, namely some of the gueux rebel sailors whose rugged looks are fierce enough to frighten the ladies. 12

Grattan also shows a fondness for the adjective ‘fierce’, notably in descriptions of his Spanish arch-villain, the brooding Don Trovaldo:

Trovaldo, whose dark mind had been in a state of constant ferment since the discovery of Beatrice’s flight, now hurriedly paced the cabinet [...] while the Venetian mirror [...] showed him his gaunt figure as he strided past, and the fierce play of his features, which were moved with no common excitement. 13

Trovaldo gazed with straining eyes. An occasional movement of compassion struggled with his fierce enjoyment. Had Gaspar but winced, he might, perhaps, have snatched him from the open jaws of destruction – but his unflinching bearing irritated and inflamed his cruel master, the worst feelings of whose nature crushed every rising effort of remorse. 14

10 Those motifs are identified as key elements in the main studies of the Leyenda Negra, starting with Juderías (La Leyenda Negra). On the ‘persistence of Moorishness within Spanish self-identity’ and its role in Hispanophobia, see Greer, Mignolo and Quilligan, Rereading the Black Legend, p. 18.
11 For a summary of the imagological traits attributed to Spaniards, see López de Abiada, ‘Spaniards’.
12 In Moke’s original words: ‘le féroce espagnol souriant avec dédain’ (Le Gueux de Mer, I, p. 165); ‘les féroces soldats la repoussoient brutalement, riaient de ses larmes’ (I, p. 57); ‘Le féroce Jean de Vargas se mit à rire, d’un rire dur et sinistre’ (I, 203); ‘la jeune fille effrayée de leur voix rauque et de leur air féroce’ (I, p. 84).
14 Ibid., III, pp. 253-254.
However, Grattan sometimes uses the same adjective to describe rebels – and with much greater regularity than its exceptional use in Moke’s *Le Gueux de Mer*. He thus writes of how ‘their duties went on in gloomy anxiety for the hour that was again to let loose their fierce passions, and see them quenched in blood’ (III, 247). The rebel commander Bassenvelt’s rousing speech to his besieged and starving soldiers meets a ‘fierce murmur of applause and [a] ferocious and cannibal grin’ (IV, 43); Bassenvelt himself elsewhere shows ‘a fierce pride in the intention of revealing himself to [his beloved] and claiming her for his own’ (IV, 85). Grattan’s characterization of his rebel leader may be explained by the fact that Bassenvelt was educated in Spain and served the Spanish king before switching sides, but it certainly complicates the novel’s imagological contrasts. Grattan further blurs distinctions between the opposing factions by having some Spanish mercenaries fight in Bassenvelt’s regiment of Black Walloons, even after he enlists them in the service of the anti-Spanish rebellion. One Spanish soldier declares that he will remain faithful to his commander unto death: ‘“Corazon del fuego! Yo vos seguire a la muerte!” [sic]’ (I, 267): the passionate nature of Spanish character can thus be a force for good in *The Heiress of Bruges*.

Even if Moke’s humoral characterization is more Manichaean than Grattan’s, *Le Gueux de Mer* is not relentless in its demonization of Spaniards. The latter include an inquisitor who shows gratitude to the rebels for helping him get rid of his worst enemy within the Spanish camp, and who is torn with remorse when he discovers that a girl he had persecuted was actually his own daughter (II, 175-176). Elsewhere, a Spanish priest begs a rebel hero to believe that ‘there are in Spain ecclesiastics who suffer as see they so-called defenders of religion behave more ruthlessly and barbarously than the most odious monsters who have been recorded in history’.

All in all, Grattan’s fictional portrayals still appear more nuanced than Moke’s in their imagological contrasts. The most damning assessment of Spanish character that flowed from the Anglo-Irish writer’s pen is arguably a passage from his *History of the Netherlands* which describes how the ‘dark, vindictive dispositions of the [Spaniards] inspired a deep antipathy in those whom civilization had softened and liberty rendered frank and generous; and the new sovereign [Philip II] seemed to embody all that was repulsive and odious in the nation of which he was the type’ (p. 81). Grattan’s *History* was heavily indebted to Schiller, whose portrayals of Philip II are considered

by Juderías and others as a prime mover in nineteenth-century revivals of the Black Legend. *The Heiress of Bruges*, however, is a *Tale of the Year Sixteen Hundred*, which situates the plot two years after Philip’s death: most of Grattan’s Spanish characters are fictional ones. The subtitle of *Le Gueux de Mer*, by contrast, is *La Belgique sous le Duc d’Albe*. Moke shows us both the Duke of Alba and Philip II in person, and brings out every repulsive feature that the Black Legend had attached to the king and to his representative in the Low Countries. Of Alba, Moke writes: ‘His high forehead; his piercing eyes, overshadowed by large eyebrows blacker than ebony; his hooked nose resembling the beak of a bird of prey: all his features betrayed pride, ambition and bloodthirstiness.’ Grattan’s decision to shift the plot of his novel to a later period than the dark years of Alba’s command blunts the edge of the anti-Spanish sentiment that animates Moke’s pages.  

In the early modern period, the Black Legend had thrived in two Protestant countries that cast Spain not just as a political threat to their interests or survival, but as the leading Catholic power in a deeply divided Europe. By the early nineteenth century, anti-Catholic prejudice still had some traction in Britain and in the Netherlands, but punishing Armadas no longer loomed on the horizon. Moreover, Britain and the Netherlands were undergoing reconfigurations that called for the inclusion of new Catholic elements within their respective polities. The 1800 Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland had held out the promise of emancipation for Catholic subjects. This had been slow in materializing – it was only passed in 1829, with the support of liberal Irish Protestants like Grattan himself, who was then at work on *The Heiress of Bruges*. After Napoleon’s defeat, European powers had decided to merge the Catholic Southern Low Countries with the largely Protestant Netherlands, and to entrust the House of Orange-Nassau with the successful completion of that union. Although many Catholic Southerners baulked at King William I’s policies, some francophone liberal Catholics like Moke still kept faith with the United Kingdom of the Netherlands.  

Those considerations explain why Moke’s and Grattan’s versions of the Black Legend do not attack Catholicism as such: most of the Southern

---

16 ‘Son front élevé; ses yeux perçants, ombragés par de grands sourcils plus noirs que l’ébène; son nez recourbé comme le bec d’un oiseau de proie: tous ses traits révéloient l’orgueil, l’ambition et la soif de sang’ (ibid., I, p. 244).
17 For Britain, see Wheeler, *The Old Enemies*; for the Netherlands, see Lotte Jensen’s contribution to the present volume.
19 On Moke’s political manoeuvring in those years, see Varendonck, *Henri Moke*, pp. 53–84.
rebels they cast as heroes are Catholics who naturally invoke or worship the Virgin Mary. The rigours of Spanish Catholicism, on the other hand, are represented as a foreign and fanatical imposition on the innocent faith of the Southern Netherlands. Moke suggests that the Spanish Church itself is actually divided between fanatics and good-natured pragmatists: a priest thus describes how in the Spanish countryside ‘men are to be wet with […] who do not make loathsome the doctrine they profess: ministers of peace and of charity, they try all they can to bring solace to the afflicted, and not to fill them with fear’. The Protestant Grattan likewise draws a distinction between the benign superstition of his Flemish protagonists and the bigotry that animates their rulers. Of his heroine’s father, the Bruges alderman Van Rozenhoed (whose very name means ‘rosary’), he writes:

His character was one of those which mark strongly the difference between superstition and bigotry, and seem to prove them incompatible with each other. [...] Van Rozenhoed looked with awe on the mysteries of his religion; he honoured its agents and obeyed its forms, but his veneration went no farther. He could fix no creed for himself on the needle points of sectarian distinctions, nor hate another for his incapacity to comprehend them, any more than for his disability to count the stars.

The institutions of the local Church are occasionally criticized in references to ‘the ravings of Francis Coster, of Mechlin, called by his admirers “the Hammerer of the Heretics,” or some burst of bigotry from the Jesuits of Louvain’ (I, 96). But Grattan’s pragmatic and enlightened bourgeois heroes have no share in the bigotry whose low cunning can win over the multitude to the side of the Spanish oppressor, as when rebellion finally fails in the Southern Netherlands: ‘The true patriots were broken, imprisoned, and powerless – the rabble were all the creatures of priestcraft and tyranny – and Bruges was lost!’ (IV, 254).

The arch-bigot of both novels is, unsurprisingly, Philip II – though only a memory in Grattan’s novel, he is still remembered for his ‘bigotry and gloom’ (II, 295). The Spanish monarch’s reputation in Dutch popular memory was closely connected to an institution that became another central motif of the

20 See e.g. Le Gueux de Mer, I, p. 217; I, p. 231; II, p. 47; and The Heiress of Bruges, III, p. 139.
21 ‘Il se rencontre des hommes [...] qui ne rendent point odieuse la doctrine qu’ils professent: ministres de paix et de bienfaisance, ils s’efforcent de consoler les malheureux et non de les effrayer’ (II, p. 201).
22 Grattan, The Heiress of Bruges, I, p. 79.
Black Legend: the Inquisition. The tribunal of the Holy Office features in extended scenes in both Le Gueux de Mer and The Heiress of Bruges. Moke thoroughly exploits its terrifying potential. His scene is actually set in Spain, with King Philip himself attending a trial. Before the king arrives, a Flemish envoy is puzzled by noises in the palace. A Spaniard tells him: ‘[W]e hear that music all day long: those are the cries of wretches to whom blows are administered in order to mortify the flesh.’ A footnote then mentions that Philip enjoyed watching heretics being tortured above all other spectacles: ‘having travelled to Valladolid in 1560 in order to abet the sentencing of a large number of heretics […] he wanted to be present at their death, and showed a horrible joy while they expired in the flames’. Moke also renders in graphic detail the moment when an old Franciscan friar is put to the question. The interrogators are ‘men covered with a black veil and resembling funereal spectres: some prepared the instruments of torture, others boiled water and melted lead’. The friar is then quartered, and even though the text stresses that quartering was a comparatively mild form of torture by the standards of the Inquisition, the reader is not spared any detail: ‘his shoulders […] were dislocated, and the joints came apart with a horrible cracking noise’, and ‘his bulging veins traced thick black or purple lines all over his body, his eyes left their sockets, his lips were covered with foam, and excessive pain gave to his figure an air of horrible laughter’. Towards the end, the king is seized by an awful suspicion that the tortured monk may have been innocent, but after examining the corpse and hearing from the judges that the friar’s death confirms his guilt, the sovereign kicks the dead man away from him and pronounces in a frightening tone: ‘He is well and truly dead.’

Although local tribunals existed in the Low Countries, the opponents of Spanish rule often spread rumours that Philip II wanted to bring the provinces under the direct jurisdiction of the Spanish Inquisition – rumours that later histories sometimes conflated with local realities. See Thomas, ‘De Mythe van de Spaanse Inquisitie’.

Nous entendons cette musique toute la journée: ce sont les cris des pauvres diables auxquels on inflige des coups de discipline pour mortifier la chair’ (II, p. 168), ‘en 1560 s’étant rendu à Valladolid pour y presser la condamnation d’un grand nombre d’hérétiques […] il voulut être témoin de leur mort, et montra une horrible joie pendant qu’ils expirèrent dans les flammes’ (II, p. 171).

Grattan also includes a scene in which a heretic (in this case, a Morisco woman) is tried by the Holy Office. But although Gothic elements are clearly present, the scene is less terrifying than Moke’s. The elements of menace in Grattan’s scene alternate with mockery of the Inquisition:

Dom Lupo was not one of those imbecile brothers who obtained admission under the title of Inquisitor of the Faith, avowedly because they were deficient in reason, whose ignorance gave rise to the well-known proverbial question and answer:

Qu. Que cosa es Inquisicion?
Ans. Un santo christos, dos candeleros, y tres majaderos. [sic]

He was a learned monster, who prostituted powerful talents to the worst purpose. 26

After her arrest, the heretic is made to spend the night in a monastery. There, she falls prey to nightmarish visions where fleshless skeletons encased in statues crowd around her. Owing to her mental confusion, the reader is left to doubt the reality of the ghastly Catholic paraphernalia that fill the scene – instead of the graphic physical horror that Moke chose to present, Grattan prefers a mode of psychological terror associated with Ann Radcliffe’s Gothic and its so-called explained supernatural. 27 The next day, the female heretic is sentenced to be buried alive – ‘many executions of the kind had varied by their bloodless atrocity the horrid butcheries committed all through the Low Countries during the tyranny of Alva’ (IV, 150). As the last bits of earth are about to close off on top of her, the defiant heretic is rescued by her brother, who dispatches one of the inquisitors into the freshly dug grave instead: ‘the mound of earth thus hastily thrown up [...] were [sic] long marked by shuddering superstition as “the grave of the Mahommedan girl”’ (IV, 158-159). Although Grattan exploits the dramatic and anti-Romish potential of the Inquisition, his adaptation of that key motif of the Black Legend differs from Moke’s in that he does not dwell on the horrors perpetrated by the institution and other representatives of Spanish rule. In The Heiress of Bruges, Alba’s gory tortures are alluded to, but not described.

26 Grattan, The Heiress of Bruges, IV, pp. 134-135. The Spanish that is very occasionally used in the novel is often ungrammatical. Grattan obviously was not fluent in the language, but neither he nor his printer apparently thought that many British readers would notice or mind.
27 See Miles, ‘Ann Radcliffe and Matthew Lewis’.
In the Black Legend, the tortures that the Inquisition inflicted on Dutch heretics vied for gruesomeness with the atrocities that Spaniards perpetrated on the native populations of the New World. The motif features in two scenes from Moke’s novel, which echo the famous descriptions of Spanish colonial abuses in Bartolomé de las Casas’s *Brevíssima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* (1552). A Belgian rebel who had visited the Americas remembers how the Spaniards terrorized the natives:

They attacked the peaceful tribes [...] and seized their warriors, snatched away women and children, and dragged them into the mines. [...] Huge dogs [...] were trained to devour the men. Lackeys and harlots who followed the troops, and were more cruel than those fierce animals, cut the throats of the poor Indians without any reason or advantage. Their monks [...] my God, what tigers those monks were! They preached slaughter in the name of the gospel, and tainted with blood the emblem of heavenly misericord.

This, then, is apparently the treatment that the Spanish general Don Sandoval would reserve to the Dutch rebels’ wives and children, as he only plans to spare their lives in order to send them to toil in American mines (I, 43). Grattan, on the other hand, does not use the motif at all – which may appear somewhat surprising, given the fact that he had once planned to join Bolivar’s forces in fighting the last vestiges of Spanish colonial power in South America. New World elements could have added contemporary relevance to the novel: as Diego Saglia notes elsewhere in this volume, the 1820s had seen Britain gradually recognize newly independent states in Latin America, and the expansion of British influence in the region was a subtext in contemporary works set during the Spanish conquest. Spanish imperialism, at any rate, plays no part in *The Heiress of Bruges*. Its denunciation by Moke underscores the importance of nationalist motives in *Le Gueux de Mer*. As the Belgian novelist primarily intended his work to rouse patriotic feelings in favour of the United Kingdom of

28 On the uses to which Spanish colonial abuses were put in Dutch patriotic discourse, see Schmidt, *Innocence Abroad*.


30 See Boase and Vance, ‘Grattan, Thomas Colley’.
the Netherlands, he reminded readers of the horrors of foreign occupation, which he equated with the darkest episodes of Spanish overseas domination. The urgency of that ideological work in the ‘Netherlandic’ context of the 1820s was of course not shared by Grattan in his relation to his British readers.

While the Black Legend harped on Spanish ill-treatments of non-European populations, it sometimes also used Spain’s proximity to Africa and its Moorish heritage to portray Spaniards as half-barbarians whose behaviour put them beyond the pale of European civilization. It has been argued that the ‘blackness’ of the legend is not just metaphorical, but that it ‘often refers in unambiguous terms to Spain’s racial difference, its essential Moorishness’: Spain’s opponents wanted to ‘render Spain visibly, biologically black’. Indeed, ‘even as Spain goes to great pains to contain the influences of al-Andalus by racializing and othering conversos and moriscos [...] rival European states busily construct Spain as precisely the racial other of Europe’. Some argue that it was precisely ‘the appeal to this racialized Hispanic otherness that gave the Black Legend much of its rhetorical force’.31 Whatever purchase that argument may have on Renaissance or later versions of the Black Legend, it does not apply to either Moke’s or Grattan’s texts. Both novels actually feature Moorish or African characters,32 but far from hinting at Spanish degeneration through miscegenation, both Moke and Grattan use those exotic others as positive foils for Spanish moral and spiritual decay.

*Le Gueux de Mer* features a mulatto called Don Alonzo, who serves the Duke of Alba. He turns out to be an illegitimate son whom the Spanish general engendered with the daughter of an African chief from the Atlas mountains. The beautiful girl had unleashed the Spanish Duke’s darkly passionate side, as he first loved and then murdered her. Their mulatto son remembers how

at times that proud Spaniard wanted to challenge all the prejudices of his nation and share his greatness with a daughter of the deserts; at times, grown indignant at the power that a negress had acquired over his heart, he tried in vain to break his shackles, and mistreated her in order to get used to hating her. A mad jealousy led him to a paroxysm of fury. [...]
I saw the gleam of the dagger, I saw the blood of my mother spurt upon me; ... and the murderer, ... was my father!

Don Alonzo still desperately loves his Spanish father, but the Spanish blood that runs in his veins is countered by the noble African side of his character. He thus fraternizes with the rebels and eventually dies defending the female heroines from their Spanish goalers. Moke's portrayal of Don Alonzo does not imply sympathy for Africans in general, as the mulatto dissociates his mother from black slaves: 'S]he did not resemble that degraded race that your merchants traffick in: although black, she had those noble and graceful features that are admired in the handsomest nations of Europe.' Still, the half-breed emerges as morally superior to virtually all Spanish characters in the novel, thanks to his African blood and despite his Spanish genes.

Grattan's The Heiress of Bruges features a pair of Morisco siblings whose mother was killed by Don Trovaldo during an expedition in the Alpujarra mountains of Andalusia, a Morisco stronghold after the Reconquista. Although officially converted to Catholicism, both Beatrice and Gaspar (also called Aben Farez) remain Muslims at heart and resent their subservience to Don Trovaldo; both eventually turn against their Spanish masters to side with the rebels’ cause. Grattan's liberal pleas for religious toleration apparently extended to the rights of non-Christian minorities; as for the racial otherness embodied by the Morisco, it represented a ‘blackness’ that Grattan's text contrasts positively with the literally and symbolically darker elements of Spanish physiognomy. A confrontation between the Morisco servant Gaspar and his master Don Trovaldo gives a fascinatingly complex illustration of that opposition:

[Gaspar’s] pale olive complexion looked mean in comparison with the bronzed face [i.e. Trovaldo’s] that confronted him. [...] His stature was of the middle size, but it looked diminutive beside his master’s commanding height; and the large and swarthy features of the latter were markedly

33 Moke, Le Gueux de Mer, I, p. 232: ‘Tantôt ce fier Espagnol vouloit braver tous les préjugés de sa nation et partager ses grandeur avec une fille des déserts; tantôt, s’indignant du pouvoir qu’une négresse avait pris sur son cœur, il faisait de vains efforts pour rompre sa chaîne, et l’accabler de mauvais traitements pour s’exercer à la haine. Une folle jalousie mit le comble à ses fureurs [...] j’ai vu briller le poignard, j’ai vu le sang de ma mère rejaillir sur moi; [...] et l’assassin, [...] c’était mon père!’

34 ‘Elle ne ressemblait point à cette race dégradée dont trafiquent vos marchands: quoique noire, elle avait ces traits nobles et gracieux qu’on admire dans les plus belles nations de l’Europe’ (I, p. 230).
opposed to the thin-edged outlines which were presented by Gaspar’s profile. Yet his aquiline nose, curved nostrils, and well-cut mouth, spoke a firmness and decision more than common: his eye looked piercingly bright in its dark tranquillity; and his high clear forehead bespoke a mind, far keener and stronger than that of the personification of power and passion who stood before him, and whom he held in awe.35

The Morisco’s face looks paler than his Spanish master’s, yet Trovaldo’s bronze, swarthy complexion does not betray any African blood. Instead, it betokens his sinister nature. The Morisco siblings proudly see themselves as ‘warm and glowing as the climate of [their] birth-place, and by very instinct of the faith of [their] fathers’ (I, 99-100). It is the Spaniards’ treatment of racialized others that blackens them, not the taint of Moorish or African blood that is supposed to run through Spanish veins in some versions of the Black Legend. This survey of Black Legend motifs in Le Gueux de Mer and The Heiress of Bruges suggests that while literary Hispanophobia still had its obvious appeal in Britain and in the Low Countries in the 1820s, its revival was selective. Both Moke and Grattan thus appear careful not to use the legend in order to denounce Catholicism as a whole, which can be explained by their Belgian and Irish origins and the complexity of the Catholic question in both united kingdoms in the early nineteenth century. Neither author depicts Spain as tainted by North African and/or Moorish influences; instead, they contrast Moors positively with Spaniards. The reasons for this are less obvious, but could be related to the historical novelists’ use of sixteenth-century Dutch sources that showed sympathy for the Moriscos’ plight under Spanish rule,36 as well as to a broader ambivalence within Romantic Orientalism, which occasionally produced frankly positive portrayals of Moorish subjects.37

Moke’s and Grattan’s recyclings of the Black Legend are also asymmetrical. Moke includes some references to Spanish colonial abuses, partly to denounce parallel forms of oppression in the Low Countries, but Grattan glosses over this theme entirely. The cruelty of Spanish tyranny and the evils of the Inquisition are predictable motifs in novels set at the time of the Dutch Revolt, but Grattan is less graphic in his representations than Moke: the Flemish writer’s insistence on the atrocities of Spanish rule was in keeping

---

37 Another Romantic text that denounced the oppression of Moriscos under Philip II was Coleridge’s 1813 play Remorse (see Valladares, Staging the Peninsular War, pp. 71-72, 84). For studies that bring out sympathetic strains in Romantic representations of Oriental subjects, see Leask, British Romantic Writers and the East; Sharafuddin, Islam and Romantic Orientalism.
with the Orangist nation-building purpose of his novel, while the author of *The Heiress of Bruges* primarily sought to entertain British readers with a tale set in an eventful period of Low Countries history. Grattan possibly also wanted to educate readers about the Low Countries at a time when the Netherlands were a key British ally in post-Napoleonic Europe,38 but his work betrays less ideological urgency than Moke’s; its exotic concerns would remain peripheral in a nineteenth-century British culture that ultimately found more use for other villains than Spanish tyrants and inquisitors. Though no longer widely read now, *Le Gueux de Mer* remains a seminal work that influenced much of nineteenth-century Belgian historical fiction dealing with the Dutch Revolt.39 *The Heiress of Bruges*, by contrast, ranks among the many British novels inspired by the fame of Walter Scott that lapsed into oblivion after enjoying some success upon publication.

Given their respective backgrounds, Grattan and Moke may have been ultimately conflicted and unsure about the rhetoric of national identity of which the Black Legend partakes. Both, however, were fairly consistent in their liberal principles. And in Grattan’s case at least, this liberalism had an international dimension that informed various British authors’ support for Spanish liberals in the 1820s.40 The 1827 instalment of Grattan’s travel tales *Highways and Byways* had included ‘The Cagot’s Hut’, set in a Pyrenees village on the border between France and Spain. This location is the secret meeting place between lovers whose families are divided by the political quarrels of post-Napoleonic Spain. Grattan’s narrator voices dismay at the failure of liberal hopes in Spain after Louis XVIII’s armies had invaded to support the reactionary monarchists: ‘the forces of Spain were paralyzed under the withering influences of bigotry, and her patriots were scattered before its baneful breath’; the execution of one such patriot left ‘the hearts of all that were liberal in Europe sickened with sorrow’. The defeat of Spanish liberalism eventually causes the Spanish lovers to emigrate to ‘regenerated Colombia’.41 Bolivar’s new nation here functions as an alternative liberal homeland, much in the same way that the United Provinces provide a refuge for the Flemish patriot heroes at the close of *The Heiress of Bruges*. Grattan’s sympathies and antipathies were not ultimately determined by nationality, but by a liberal outlook that cut across borders, and that could

38 On the closeness of Anglo-Dutch political ties after the Congress of Vienna, see Van Sas, *Onze Natuurlijkste Bondgenoot*.
40 On British expressions of support for Spanish liberals in the 1820s, see various essays in Saglia and Haywood, *Spain in British Romanticism*.
41 Grattan, *Highways and Byways*, vol. 2, pp. 126, 128.
as easily be projected back onto the Low Countries in the year 1600 as it was applied to Grattan's reading of Spanish politics in the 1820s. Grattan's revival of Black Legend themes was unsurprising given his indebtedness to local 'Netherlandic' sources, but its nuances show that it was directed against 'bigotry' and 'tyranny', rather than against Spain as such.
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Abstract

Many current views about the early modern period are still determined by nineteenth-century interpretations. In this period national identities and historical and literary canons started to get forged, consolidating the Golden Age as the key era in the national-historical consciousness. The Spanish Golden Age was identified as the core of the Spanish literary canon and singled out by foreign scholars as the perfect mirror of Spanishness, in all its Hispanophilic and Hispanophobic connotations. This chapter delves into the legacy of Spanish cultural influence at the time of the forging of national dramatic canons. It explores how Spanish Golden Age literary influence is negotiated within England and the Netherlands and linked to their own national dramatic traditions.
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The richness of the Spanish Drama is proverbial; yet it has occupied the attention of students and critics less than the drama of almost any other nation. [...] The Spaniards have had the honour of supplying Europe with plots, incidents, and situations.1

1 Lewes, The Spanish Drama, p. 5.
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With these words, literary critic George Henry Lewes overtly praises Spanish drama and its role in the development of European theatre at large. The argumentation in this opening fragment of *The Spanish Drama: Lope de Vega and Calderón* (1846), considered by many the first full-length study of Spanish theatre in English, is further developed thusly:

After such luxuriance of dramatic invention as it supplied, there was but little need for more; accordingly succeeding writers were for the most part content in this respect to translate, imitate, and improve that which Spain had so prodigally thrown forth; covering the skeletons with flesh and blood of their own creation.  

Lewes's initial laudatory appraisal of Spanish drama, described as ‘luxuriant’ and ‘prodigal’, is somehow downplayed afterwards since it is up to (English) authors to climb the translatio-imitatio-aemulatio rhetorical ladder and ‘improve’ the ‘bony’ or ‘sketchy’ Spanish materials, providing them with what they seem to lack: flesh and blood. Even the term ‘luxuriance’ is tinged in its contextual interpretation with a certain negative connotation, as we shall see. Lewes’s assessment reflects the ambivalence in nineteenth-century literary historiography regarding the literary legacy of the Spanish Golden Age: admiration and recognition, on the one hand, and critique or disavowal, on the other. In this disavowal coalesce long-existing perceptions on Spain’s historical role. This is particularly the case not only for English discourse, but also for Dutch.

In the age of cultural nationalism, when national literary and historical canons were being forged, a new way of studying literature emerging from the end of the eighteenth century started to solidify, producing a shift from an antiquarian mode to a philological one. The first literary histories played an essential role in charting interpretations and evaluations of different literary traditions through distinctive patterns of selection and organization. These narratives dealt with, among other aspects, what made nations distinct and unique. Since writing national literary histories implied constructing a canon of national literature that was ‘superior’ to others, nations attempted to profile themselves as exceptional in comparison to others, engaging in a process of what has been called ‘exceptional universalism’. Immersed in a ‘game of ranking’, critics pondered questions like

---

2 Ibid.
3 For the impact of modern philology on the study of modern languages and literatures, see Momma, *From Philology to English Studies*. 
whose literature and literary legacy could be considered as foremost within Europe, and whose could not and why. From the late 1820s, with Goethe’s term *Weltliteratur*, a new perspective on national literatures would develop. Despite the variegated employment of the term, Goethe’s seminal concept did not seem to imply the end of discrete national literatures, but envisioned a process of interaction and literary reception amongst men of letters in diverse nations that would lead to a greater literary and critical balance worldwide. However, most of the authors dealt with in this essay wrote before these new ideas spread throughout Europe. Intellectuals writing these first literary histories were furthermore imbued in the Romantic theory of national literature as the genuine expression of the character of a nation. In this way, it was problematic for the acknowledgement of Spanish influence that the Golden Age was considered as the core of the Spanish literary canon and that it was therefore singled out by foreign scholars as the perfect mirror of Spanishness. How could Golden Age Spanish literature have influenced English and Dutch literature at the time when their own budding national literatures were at their zenith? Especially in a period when Spain’s reputation was so blackly hued? Barbara Fuchs’s term ‘occlusion of influence’, as explained in the introduction of this volume, is particularly useful to describe how certain literary histories dealt with the influence of Spanish materials on their own national theatre.

In order to conceptualize the literary past and to map literary influences, it is essential to expose the underlying practices of literary histories and their specific national styles with their own distinctive features and trajectories, as Ansgar Nünning contends. Therefore, a first attempt will be made here to expose and interrogate the presence of descriptive and/or prescriptive statements in a selection of literary historiographical sources (English and Dutch) composed in the first half of the nineteenth century. The focus lies on a reduced corpus of what we can broadly consider as ‘literary histories’ or ‘literary treatises’, two by English and two by Dutch authors who delved into Spanish theatre. We are partially dealing with

4 Pizer, ‘Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’, pp. 5-6. Obviously, as Pizer remarks, Goethe’s paradigm was determined by a Eurocentric perspective.
5 Gradually, the discipline of comparative literature will develop, emerging in the nineteenth century as a countermovement to methodological nationalism in the philologies. See Leerssen, *Comparative Literature*.
7 Nünning, ‘On the Englishness’, p. 163.
8 I will be further deploying this topic in a monograph that will deal more extensively with this Hispanophobic/philic ambivalence, also in other literary genres.
forerunners in the development of literary history who can be associated with antiquarian criticism and whose academic approach to literary criticism could be contested, but they are nonetheless influential in the further development of the discipline.9 The selection of authors is further informed by Richard Schoch’s claim that to truly fathom theatre history the overlooked scholarship undertaken by a wide array of individuals (not only professional historians) must be taken into account, such as theatrical insiders.10 How is the legacy of Spanish Golden Age drama negotiated within English and Dutch drama and how is it linked to the national dramatic traditions of these countries? What terms do literary critics deploy to define and nuance the character of Spanish Golden Age drama and its influence?

Regarding the Anglo-Dutch geographical selection of this essay, it is obvious that it embodies two different European literary traditions with a different degree of canonicity in the nineteenth century. The Dutch were practically at the margins of European literature, due to the linguistic limitations of Dutch literature abroad, whereas English literature, with William Shakespeare at the top of its canon, took a privileged and central position at the heart of European/global literature.11 What is more, this English author (Shakespeare) had even managed to become the ultimate European representative of early modern theatre. For their part, in the Dutch discourse the question of literary decline since the Golden Age played an important role within national borders, with literary historians and authors reflecting on the present lethargic state of the nation and on the need for cultural renewal to regain the level of the glorious Golden Age.12

In the Dutch case, in particular, a tangible tension is felt when it comes to analysing the literary history of Netherlandish-Spanish relations. The Spaniards were the historical enemy who stood at the cradle of the creation of the Dutch national founding myth. Despite renegotiations of the vision of the Spaniards at several moments, as in the context of the Napoleonic wars and the new French enemy, or in the mid-nineteenth century against the backdrop of the Catholic emancipation and its contestation of a dominant Protestant interpretation of Dutch national history,13 nineteenth-century

9 Leerssen, Comparative Literature, p. 24.
10 Schoch, Writing the History, p. 3. I expand Schoch’s geographical demarcation to the Dutch case.
11 The project ‘Circulation of Dutch Literature’ (CODL) studies the international dissemination of Dutch literature through translations and adaptations. See http://www.codl.nl/ (last accessed: 26/7/19).
12 Johannes, ‘Zoo is overdrijving’, p. 28.
13 See Jensen’s contribution in this volume.
literary historians were extremely ambivalent as to what to do with the Spanish cultural legacy. Admitting having learnt and ‘absorbed’ something from the enemy did seem an uncomfortable notion. Although early modern playwrights in the Low Countries were greatly influenced by Spanish drama, this fact was frequently by-passed in literary histories even up to the present day. Recent research on Amsterdam’s key position as a European theatre hub rightfully emphasizes the importance of Spanish drama and attempts to add this chapter to state-of-the-art Dutch and European literary historiography.14

The first author we will engage with is Charles Dibdin (1745-1814), the author of *A Complete History of the English Stage, Introduced by a Comparative and Comprehensive Review of the Asiatic, the Grecian, the Roman, the Spanish, the Italian, the Portuguese, the German, the French and Other Theatres*, published in London in 1800 in five volumes. He was a unique figure in British entertainment. Described as the first singer-song writer, he was a prolific author of plays and sea songs and operas, an actor, and theatrical manager.15 The second English author is the above-mentioned George Henry Lewes (1817-1878), called ‘probably the most highly-trained thinker who ever applied himself to the study of theatrical art in England’.16 He was not just an armchair scholar, since his passion for drama made him attempt to become an actor in the 1840s. Particularly in Lewes we find a critical way of looking at theatre from the principles and taste of contemporary audiences. His name is inextricably linked to his life partner, Marian Evans, alias George Elliot, whom he devoutly encouraged and supported.17 His *The Spanish Drama: Lope de Vega and Calderón*, preceded George Ticknor’s (1791-1871) canonical *The History of Spanish Literature* by three years (1849). This classic work by the American professor of French and Spanish at Harvard is considered the first comprehensive study of Spanish literature.18

As to the two selected Dutch authors, one is Abraham Louis Barbaz, author of the *Overzigt van den Staat des Schouwburgs, in ons Vaderland* (Overview of the state of our theatre in our fatherland, 1816). He was an

14 See essays in this volume by Blom and Bood.
15 Gillaspie, ‘Charles Dibdin’. It is remarkable that his literary historiographical epos, *A Complete History*, is not explicitly mentioned in his biography, just as a mere bibliographical note. Despite possible questions about Dibdin’s academic approach, his views on European literature and especially on the Spanish legacy are relevant in reconstructing British perceptions.
17 Ashton, ‘George Henry Lewes’.
18 For an analysis of latent anti-Hispanic stereotypes in Ticknor’s *History*, see Vélez, ‘La hispanofobia en el hispanismo’.
accountant, and a moderately accomplished poet and dramatist, but his *Overzigt* is one of the first overviews of Dutch drama.\(^{19}\) The second author is Willem de Clercq, a commercial agent and leader of the Dutch Protestant Réveil. He was also a well-known improvisator and a literary scholar who interacted closely with the most important literary intellectuals of his time. As an entry in an essay prize competition in 1821 he wrote his *Verhandeling ter beantwoording van de vraag: welken invloed heeft vreemde letterkunde, inzonderheid de Italiaansche, Spaansche, Fransche en Duitsche, gehad op de Nederlandse Taal- en letterkunde, sints het begin der vijftiende eeuw tot op onze dagen?* (Treatise in response to the question: What influence has foreign literature, in particular, Italian, Spanish, French and German, had on Dutch language and literature, from the beginning of the fifteenth century up to today?) Although he does not specifically focus on drama, his work is particularly valuable because it is considered as one of the first examples of comparative European literary studies.\(^{20}\)

These works appeared in different eras. Dibdin lived at the watershed of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He wrote his literary history before the Napoleonic wars turned the Spaniards into courageous people revolting against Napoleon and siding with the British, before Spain was to be contemplated with increasing sympathy and admiration. Dibdin wrote before the most influential works on Spain were published by the first Hispanists *avant la lettre*, like Bouterwek, Simonde de Sismondi, Southey or Lord Holland.\(^{21}\) Barbaz was writing when the Napoleonic conflict was coming to a close, after a period of French occupation, also determinant for the development of Dutch identity. De Clercq and Lewes take up the pen in a changed world, when the multifarious image of Romantic Spain had long spread all over Europe and some of the most influential literary histories and other works dealing directly or indirectly with Spain and its literature had already been published.

All these authors engage in their works with a wide array of characteristics that defined ‘Spanishness’ in the nineteenth century. The most prominent traits were a vague Orientalism (obviously connected to Spain’s

---

\(^{19}\) For Barbaz’s biography, see Barbaz, *Overzigt*.

\(^{20}\) Schenkeveld, *Willem de Clercq*, p. 75. The treatise was published in 1824 with an epilogue; a second edition followed in 1826 (Brandt Corstius, ‘Willem de Clercq’, p. 482). It was also De Clercq who acquainted the Dutch public with the story of El Cid in his De Cid, voorgesteld als het ideaal van den held der Middeleeuwen (El Cid as heroic ideal in the Middle Ages, 1823). How his views on Spain and Spanish literary legacy relate to his evaluation of El Cid is a matter I shall further analyse in a future monograph.

\(^{21}\) Bouterwek, *Geschichte*; Simonde de Sismondi, *De la littérature*. 
rich Muslim-Arab past), a strong sense of chivalry and an intense feeling for piety or religiousness. Nonetheless, the analysed English and Dutch authors do not always connect the Spaniards and their dramatic Golden Age production to these mainly Romantic characteristics, and they certainly do not do it with the same rhetoric. Neither do they acknowledge Spanish influence in the early modern period in the same manner. Furthermore, anti-Hispanic ethnotypes are often encountered in both geographical contexts in ‘occluded form’ or as ‘dormant frames’. To use Leerssen’s words: ‘Latency is always a default state for ethnotypes and prejudices.’ In this latency the ambivalence, the tension between Hispanophilia and Hispanophobia, comes to the fore. The prominent characteristics of Spanishness crystallize in the different historiographies through different concepts or metaphors that reflect particular attitudes towards Spanish materials and Spanish cultural legacy. The metaphor of luxuriance in the English context is a telling example, whereas a different literary discourse is deployed by Dutch authors, who voice a long-standing historical narrative marked by national opposition. The Spaniards were the historical enemy par excellence, who shaped Dutch national self-definition, and this entrenched natural opposition lies at the very heart of their relations. During the Napoleonic wars the French were indeed to fulfil a comparable role in the forging of the Dutch national identity, but the virulence towards the Spanish enemy is without doubt the most historically persistent.

Spanish luxuriance in English eyes

In his autobiography, The Professional Life of Mr. Dibdin, Written by Himself, published in four volumes in 1803, Charles Dibdin stresses the importance of his A Complete History of the English Theatre: ‘I determined to leave nothing undone that might elucidate a subject of such infinite importance to the interest of every nation, and to civilization in general.’ Dibdin’s historiographic objective mirrors the preoccupations of his time as to how – and why – to conceptualize the literary past. In his history, after having dedicated a whole volume to other theatres, he finally explains his objective

22 Pérez Isasi, ‘The Limits of “Spanishness”’, p. 179.
23 See also Raphaël Ingelbien’s chapter in this volume on the different ‘grammars’ deployed by British and Netherlandish authors.
24 See introduction.
25 Jensen, ‘The Dutch against Napoleon’.
to his public: ‘The English reader will now see that I have so long kept him at a distance from his native country only that it may be the more dear to him on his return. [...] I have done this to prove, upon a comparative review, the superiority of our theatre at home.’

The assertion of writers from other countries that ‘the dramatic art arrived to no perfection in England till it had been perfected by all its neighbours’ and the fact that ‘our own writers have very tamely acquiesced in this calumny’ inspired Dibdin to take up the pen.

With this remark he aligns himself with the tradition of eighteenth-century poets and critics who utilized foreign literature to vindicate the superiority of English literature and to show ‘how the native literature could be enriched by judicious imitation of foreign literatures’. This point of departure implies placing other literatures in an inferior position. Nonetheless, in comparison to other European literatures, he strongly stresses in several passages the importance of Spanish drama and acknowledges its influence: according to him, Spanish plays have been plundered, and ‘have served like a rich mine for the French, and, indeed, the English at second hand to dig in’.

He further adds that Spanish plays ‘have furnished some very rich material which the French and English theatrical chymists have ingeniously extracted to ornament their own productions’. But not everybody was capable of accomplishing this extraction successfully. Dibdin objected to how the Dutch imitated Calderón’s curvettes and caprioles: ‘As awkwardly on the stage of Amsterdam, as a guinea pig imitates a squirrel’. To prove the superiority of English drama, Dibdin embarked on a long trip, starting in Asia, and on arrival at European shores he openly states that he wondered ‘at the astonishing fertility and redundancy of the Spanish drama, like a tree too luxuriant to be pruned, and charged with too much fruit to ripen’. The negative undertone is undeniable here, since abundance thwarts the maturity of the result. That the value of Spanish plays was relative had been stated before by the author: ‘Their wit, however, like

28 Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 221-222. ‘I shall, for the first attempt of this kind, begin my task by endeavouring to rescue the English stage from so much obliquity, and shew that we are in everything antecedent to the French, and, perhaps, every other people but the Spaniards; and that there are vestiges of the dramatic art traceable in this country long before the fall of the Roman empire’.
29 Peter Leithmann quoted in Leerssen’s *Comparative Literature*, p. 20.
30 Dibdin, *A Complete History*, vol. 1, pp. 131, 139. According to Barbara Fuchs, Dibdin characterizes the use of Spanish sources as ‘plunder’, voicing ‘a fantasy of appropriation by which the Spanish New World wealth of minerals is transmuted into a literary lode available for English extraction’ (‘The Black Legend’, p. 223).
their hard dollars, can never be considered as staple, but a useless mass of no intrinsic value till manufactured into literary merchandise by the ingenuity and labour of other countries.\(^{33}\) This opinion echoes Lewes’s metaphor of the skeleton, the bones and the flesh. ‘Spanish materials’ are not enough.

Although Lewes does not expressly mention Dibdin in his work (whereas he does engage in dialogue with many other literary scholars), the resemblance in their discourse is unmistakable.\(^{34}\) Lewes’s initial citation at the beginning of this essay on the proverbial richness of the Spanish drama can be found in the very beginning of his introduction, and it contains several aspects that are essential for the reconstruction of nineteenth-century literary imagination regarding Spanish drama. Particularly subtle is the way he further elaborates on the limits of imitation and exploitation of literary models. He admits that the debts to Spanish sources include incident and intrigue of the plays, but ‘character, passion, wit, or poetry own no such parentage’.\(^{35}\) Both Dibdin and Lewes acknowledge openly the undeniable influence of Spanish Golden Age drama on the English, but they underscore the literary achievements of their countrymen and the exceptionality of English literature. On the fuzzy lines between imitation and originality, Lewes disagrees strongly with the German critic August Wilhelm Schlegel. He rebuts Schlegel’s perspective: ‘Ingenious boldness, joined to easy clearness of intrigue, is so exclusively peculiar to the Spaniards, that Schlegel considered himself justified in suspecting every work in which these qualities were apparent to have a Spanish origin.’\(^{36}\) Lewes seems to imply that a dramatist can adapt a certain plot, but what he further does with it (Dibdin’s ‘literary merchandise’), does not impugn his creativity, since the resemblance between the original play and the new product is simply that of form.

Furthermore, according to Lewes, English and Spanish dramas are opposed in spirit, object and construction and Shakespeare and Calderón de la Barca are the playwrights who best embody these two distinctive

\(^{33}\) Ibid., vol. 1, p. 131.

\(^{34}\) Dibdin did not inspire other contemporaries like Thomas Campbell, who turned to August Willem Schlegel as a model. According to Leerssen, Dibdin’s antiquarian approach vs the latter’s philological and Romantic approach could explain this development (Leerssen, Comparative Literature, p. 20).

\(^{35}\) Lewes, The Spanish Drama, pp. 6, 8.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., p. 6. Lewes is critical of Schlegel on other occasions, see Greenhut, ‘G.H. Lewes’s Criticism’, p. 366. Lewes’s analytical approach collided with Schlegel’s penchant for ‘synthesis’. In The Spanish Drama Lewes defines the German intellectual as ‘a striking rhetorician not reliable as critic’ (p. 174) and laments the lack of concrete examples in his argumentation (p. 175).
– and opposing – tendencies. Their aims and audiences were different; the English poet wishes to illustrate character and passion, the Spanish poet, on the contrary, sets himself the task of representing an interesting and complicated story, to this purpose he uses character as the instrument and plaything of the story. Lewes echoes here the idea that Spanish comedias were plot-driven whereas English drama, the Shakespearian one especially, revolved around character development. He then concludes rather mercilessly: ‘In the high sense of the word, the Spanish poets are not dramatists, they are only ventriloquists.’ Despite offering some negative views, Lewes is also openly appreciative towards Spanish drama, especially when it comes to Lope de Vega, whom he highly values (in contrast to Calderón), and whose dramatic exceptionality he wishes to expose. Lope is, according to Lewes, unfairly ‘written down’ in literary historiography, and what is more, he contests Lope’s reputation as a ‘slapdash writer whose sole merit is fecundity’, adding: ‘In spite of criticism, Lope remains one of the most extraordinary writers in the annals of literature.’ For his part, Dibdin is clearly less sympathetic to Spanish dramatic achievements than Lewes, since he finds Lope’s irregularity and his ‘licentious abuse of the ancient rules’ problematic. His judgement can probably be related to still prevailing aesthetic mores of neoclassicism that rejected Spanish baroque profusion.

Luxuriance seems to be the key word when describing Spanish Golden Age drama for these two English authors writing at two different historical moments. Lewes even points to the importance of the concept of ‘luxuriance’ not only for drama, but for everything in life, expanding the vegetal metaphor: ‘In the drama, as elsewhere, the primary condition is luxuriant life; pruning, polishing, and refining will come afterwards.’ And then he adds, in his effort to silence prejudiced critics: ‘Pedants never saw this’. One would think that luxuriance, in its intrinsic connotation of abundance, lavishness and proliferation should be positive, but it can also turn into a negative overgrowth. There is therefore a downside to this Spanish creative and formal profusion and exuberance. Luxuriance makes Spanish plays

37 Ibid., pp. 100-107.
38 Ibid., p. 107.
39 Ibid., p. 88. And later on: ‘I have thus endeavoured to fetch out the merits of Lope de Vega as a writer, because he has been inconsiderately decried; and have laid stress upon his literary qualities, because it has been the fashion to attribute to him only those of quick and fertile invention of plots and situations’ (p. 96).
41 Lewes, The Spanish Drama, p. 19
too overwhelming and over the top.\textsuperscript{42} This luxuriance is also related to irregularity, which in Dibdin’s eyes, untouched by Romantic principles, was a dreadful dramatic pitfall. He admits to his readers that ‘no nation was ever so fertile in invention, or so wide of regularity as Spain’.\textsuperscript{43} In his diachronic approach he connects Spanish fertility in invention and irregularity with an older tradition: ‘Their manners are derived originally from the Moors, and are tinged with a sort of African taste, too wild and extravagant for the adoption of other nations, and which cannot accommodate itself to rule of precision.’\textsuperscript{44}

These ‘racialized and genealogical terms’\textsuperscript{45} connect Dibdin to the discourse of Spanish Orientalness. He was writing more than a decade before Charles Léonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842) in his famous De la littérature du Midi de l’Europe (1813) would define Spanish literature as quintessentially Oriental, and, therefore, not European, banishing it to a peripheral and marginal status.\textsuperscript{46} According to the Swiss scholar, the Oriental dimension was the most typical element of Spanish literature, distinguishing it from other Romance languages. This Oriental essence was tangible in the role of rhyme, the overwhelming imagination (origin of the strong baroque character of Spanish literature), its individuality and isolation, and a certain idea of ‘stagnation’.\textsuperscript{47} Elements such as love for invention and discovery of knowledge, and also for vain pomp and florid embellishment, all came to the fore in Spanish literature, seasoned by an element of ardour. Although Simonde de Sismondi drew on Juan de Andrés, an eighteenth-century Spanish Jesuit author considered by many as the founding father of comparative literature, the Swiss scholar altered ingeniously Andrés’s narrative, shaping the idea that Europe contained within itself its own Oriental other. Furthermore, Simonde de Sismondi also agreed with his friend Madame de Stäel on the existence of two completely distinct literatures, a Northern and a Southern one.\textsuperscript{48} This

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} Dibdin compares the Spanish stage to ‘a crowded garden, overrun with weeds and interspersed here and there with flowers of rare and peculiar beauty’ (\textit{A Complete History}, vol. 3, p. 10).
\item \textsuperscript{43} Ibid., vol. 1, p. 140.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Ibid., vol. 1, p. 132.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Fuchs, ‘The Black Legend’, p. 223.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Simonde de Sismondi, \textit{De la littérature}, 3, p. 100: ‘Les literatures don’t nous nous sommes déjà occupées, celles que nous avons reserves pour un autre temps, sont européennes: celle-ci est orientale. Son esprit, sa pompe, le but qu’elle se propose, appartiennent a une autre sphere d’idées, a un autre monde.’
\item \textsuperscript{47} Andreu Miralles, \textit{El Descubrimiento de España}, p. 83.
\item \textsuperscript{48} Dainotto, \textit{Europe (in Theory)}, pp. 162-163.
\end{itemize}
polarity between North-South would complicate the literary balance within Europe, transcending nation-based arguments and giving impetus to an idea of opposing European literatures in the context of modernity. Spanish literature (as Southern) was obviously to be categorized as premodern and over time as backward. In Dibdin’s case, it is probable that he was acquainted with Thomas Warton’s pioneering *History of English Poetry, from the Close of the Eleventh to the Commencement of the Eighteenth Century* (1774-1781), considered to be the first narrative English literary history. Warton points already at the Arab roots of Spanish literature, and the related ‘exuberance of invention’, ‘variety of imagery’ and the unusual pompous style and affected diction. However, he does not indulge into taxonomies or theories on North-South dichotomies or superiorities or further criticism.49

For his part, Lewes writes with the Schlegels’s, Bouterwek’s and Simonde de Sismondi’s visions in mind, and he also picks up the thread of Simonde de Sismondi’s Oriental argumentation.50 In this way, he remarks not very enthusiastically that ‘Spanish comedies are uniformly written in florid verse. Closets are in perpetual requisition. Pursuits and concealments, equivoques and quarrels, are thick as leaves in Vallombrosa. The “bustle” of the stage is incessant.’51 It is noteworthy that comparable vegetal/luxuriant metaphors are also used by other contemporary authors. Mary (Wollstonecraft) Shelley, when writing on Spanish poetry in the 1830s resorts to similar metaphors to describe what might be deemed a defective Spanish ‘writing style’. Lope de Vega, in particular, embodies for Mary Shelley what she defines as diffuseness,52 an extremely digressive rhetorical form comparable with ‘tangled underwood and uncultivated interminable wilds’ where a poem ‘reminds a pathless jungle’.53 Although Lewes does not refer to this so-called ‘national defect’, he can also be very irritated by Calderón’s prodigality with

50 Lewes, *The Spanish Drama*, pp. 115-116. Lewes mentions Simonde de Sismondi about seven times, Bouterwek five times. He generally agrees with these critics’ perspectives. He is very critical of the Schlegels, whom he mentions almost 20 times, using terms of disagreement, such as ‘high-flown eulogies’ (p. 164) and ‘panegyrics’ (p. 178) when writing about Calderón. He is especially critical of Wilhelm August: ‘his inaccuracies, prejudices, and want of precise conceptions are exhibited’ (p. 174).
51 Ibid., p. 122.
53 Ibid., p. 34.
adjectives, which produces a comparable impression of overgrowth. In his eyes, Spaniards are addicted to a particular species of poetry, the *glosa*, that consists in taking up a proverb or poetical thought and varying it in every imaginable way. He also complains: ‘While the reader is anxious to get a clue to the mystery of the plot, he has to wade through these terrible displays of rhetoric.’

However, when dealing with his admired Lope de Vega, Lewes presents the dramatist as an example of Oriental prodigality, referring to ‘his taste for Oriental pomp of language’, but he will further enthusiastically praise Lope’s literary qualities. This prodigality was frequently connected to Lope’s well-known prodigious fertility, which made him the very embodiment of literary abundance already in the early modern era. Both Dibdin and Lewes inextricably link Lope de Vega’s productivity and the quality of his plays with the term ‘luxuriance’ as well. The quantity/quality dichotomy will become over time the crux of the comparison between Lope and Shakespeare and the affirmation of the latter’s superiority. Whereas Lewes fights with his ambivalence towards Spanish drama, Dibdin is less sympathetic on this front. Not to be forgotten is the fact that both authors happened to be dramatists themselves, and experts on the performative side of theatre which makes them very critical of the (im)possibilities for success on the stage of a given play. For Lewes it was in any case certain that Lope could be a very good example for ‘aspiring dramatists’.

---

55 Ibid., p. 74.
56 Ibid., pp. 92-93. ‘But if without wrong standards, prejudices, and critical canons, you take up the volume, you will find it difficult to set it down unread. There is an endless charm in Lope – his gaiety. His unflagging animal spirits, playful irony, and careless gaiety, keep your mind in a constant smile, which gently curls about the lips.’
57 Lope was called in his time, ‘el copioso’, the ‘proliferous’. Admiration for his ‘perennial fountain’ was predominant, but criticism on the tension between quantity and quality was also voiced in Spain. On Lope’s abundant writing and a comparison with Shakespeare, see Amelang, *Playgrounds*, p. 150.
58 On the wrong way Beaumont and Fletcher attempted to imitate Lope: ‘Most of the plots are Spanish, and seems as if they thought that when they had lopped off part of the luxuriance of Lopez de Vega, they had done enough, whereas they should not have left a twig, but have let the new shoots have gained their strength by springing at once from the stock’ (Dibdin, *A Complete History*, vol. 3, pp. 205-206).
59 ‘Lope was no prodigious “unactable unacted” boasting of a barren rapidity’ (Lewes, *The Spanish Drama*, pp. 73, 88-91).
60 Ibid., p. 92.
On inherent national oppositions

Through the luxuriance metaphor a clear literary opposition is charted between Spanish and English drama. The opposition lies in distinct national differences in literary form and expression, and not in a historical conflictive past, at least in the authors under review. In the Netherlands, the attitude towards Spain was particularly complex in the early modern period, which is reflected in the nineteenth century. In the narrative on the development of Dutch Golden Age culture an oft-repeated discourse in the nineteenth century connects the growth of the Dutch Republic to the war with Spain. Indeed, the Golden Age was practically coterminous with the Dutch Revolt. One of the main forefathers of Dutch literary history, Jeronimo de Vries, whose approach to literature transcended the mere antiquarian interest in Dutch literary past, stated in 1810 that ‘the transition from Spanish oppression to Dutch freedom endowed all arts in our Fatherland with a flexible elevation, especially regarding Poetry’. De Vries is actually openly referring to the words of the renowned sixteenth-century man of letters and historian P.C. Hooft, who had stressed the connection between freedom from Spain and literary prosperity. As a consequence, Spanish influence is explained predominantly as a (negative) motor or a backdrop for original national production, not as a form of inspiration at the cradle of literary/dramatic development. One could say that Spain is merely seen as a ‘facilitator’ of Dutch cultural grandeur. In this vein, nineteenth-century authors struggle with what position to give to Spain’s literary production. Matthijs Siegenbeek, the first professor of Dutch in the Netherlands, appointed in 1797, referred in 1826 to ‘the wrestling fight against powerful Spain’ and to the ‘feeling of freedom and independence, the tension, flexibility and mental elevation that it caused and that is to be found in the poetry and other products of the time’. However, further than that, the authors under scrutiny do not delve into charting oppositions (or similarities) according to literary premises.

61 Schenkeveld, Willem de Clercq, p. 78, p. 84.  
63 Ibid., p. 75.  
64 Siegenbeek, Beknopte geschiedenis, p. 343: ‘de worstelstrijd tegen het magtige Spanje […] een gevoel van vrijheid en onafhankelijkheid, eene spanning, veerkracht en geestverheffing te weeg gebracht, waarvan de dicht-en andere voortbrengselen van dit tijdperk, als ’t ware, het zichtbaar afdruksel dragen.’
Within Dutch Golden Age literature, drama and the Amsterdam theatre, the Schouwburg, play a special role in literary historiography. As Barbaz in his early Overview of the State of the Theatre (1816) forcefully asserts at the very beginning: ‘There is no other institution that endowes us with more glory and splendour than the Amsterdam theatre [...] the real temple of our Dutch Fatherlandish poetry.’ Barbaz, who does not forget to mention that most Dutch plays are not the result of own invention, since they had been transposed from other languages (and frequently maimed as a result), nuances that these plays have been transplanted into the national ground and there ‘further nationalized and cultivated’. However, although Barbaz acknowledges the existence of foreign influences on Dutch drama, he quickly proceeds to underscore the assimilation of works from abroad into national products. His avid interest in reconceptualizing foreign theatrical influence takes a remarkable direction with his complete negation of Spanish influence. Barbaz is a prime example of the ‘occlusion of Spain’.

He acknowledges French influence (which is undeniable in the late seventeenth century and during the eighteenth century), but he does not pay any attention whatsoever to the previous phase when Spanish drama widely inspired French and other European drama. The Spaniards are only indirectly present in his work, as a rhetorical instrument in the context of the stereotypical topos of oppression of the Dutch Revolt. In this way, Barbaz informs his readers that through the continuous translation of French little tragedies (treurspelletjes), ‘our dramatical poetry lost almost completely its national character’ and that crazy theatre-tyrants forced the freed Dutchmen, those who had curbed mighty Spanish tyranny, to put onto the stage anything but the true and useful reflection of nature. Spanish tyranny in the political dimension is transformed by Barbaz into French tyranny in the literary one, thus reflecting the recent political circumstances regarding the Napoleonic incorporation of the Low Countries. Barbaz’s Francophone Swiss family came originally from the canton of Vaud, occupied by Napoleon in 1795; it is not improbable that this fact might account for this bellicose literary comparison.

65 Barbaz, Overzigt, p. 1: ‘Geen stichting verstrekt onze Nederlandsche glorie tot meer luister dan den Amsterdamse Schouwburg [...] de wezenlijke tempel onzer vaderlandsche dichtkunst.’ This idea had already been expressed in the seventeenth century by the reputed writer and historian P.C. Hooft.

66 Ibid.: ‘W]ant hoewel onze meeste tooneelstukken juist geen eigenvindingen zijn, maar veelal voortbrengsels uit vreemde talen overgenomen, zyn ze echter, door dezelve inkleeding in Nederduitschen vaerzen, het eigendom en de schatten onzer poëzy geworden.’

67 Barbaz, Overzigt, p. 4.
A telling example of a vision of the interaction between Spanish and Dutch literature in the Golden Age is Willem de Clercq's treatise on foreign influence on Dutch literature and language, written as an entry in an essay prize competition, devised by Jeronimo de Vries. Although he won the prize, it must be said in fairness that he was the only one to submit an entry.\textsuperscript{68} De Clercq has been praised by twentieth-century scholars for his ‘nuanced contribution to the fatherland debate’,\textsuperscript{69} but the question is whether he was indeed that nuanced, since a wide array of historical stereotypes regarding the Spaniards colour his narrative. In his introduction, De Clercq defends the importance of ‘literary history’ and remarks that to evaluate ‘our literature’ in the correct manner it has to be considered ‘at the same time with that of other peoples’.\textsuperscript{70} Despite this original approach, the prize commission had some criticism on the actual contents. They found that French and German literature had been partially dealt with, but the Spanish not at all. In fact, the scanty references to Spanish literature reveal his biased perceptions. Already at the very beginning he refers in passing to the ‘faint impressions that Spanish literature has left on ours’, stating further on that although one would expect a rich harvest because of the many relations with Spain, those expectations are deceitful.\textsuperscript{71} The author was obviously overlooking the strong Spanish influence on European early modern drama, something foreign authors of literary histories had already mentioned before 1800. This cannot be related to his linguistic background. De Clercq was a polyglot who wrote his own diary in French, and spoke Italian and Spanish, among other languages.\textsuperscript{72} He was also acquainted and used in his treatise not only national, but the most recent foreign literary histories by Simonde de Sismondi, Eichorn, Bouterwek, Schlegel and Madame de Staël's \textit{De l’Allemagne}.\textsuperscript{73}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Schenkeveld, \textit{Willem de Clercq}, pp. 75-77.
\item Van den Berg, ‘Verbeelding van het vaderland’, p. 328.
\item De Clercq, \textit{Verhandeling}, pp. 1-2; ibid., p. 12: ‘Men zal mij misschien beschuldigen, te veel over de vreemde en vroegere Letterkunde uitgeweid te hebben, doch ik begreep, dat, om onze Letterkunde juist te beschouwen, men op dat standpunt gesteld moest worden, waarop men deze, tegelijk met die van andere Volken, kan overzien.’
\item He writes in his diary that during certain Spanish literary occasions, he did not like ‘the manner in which Spanish was pronounced’. He also refers to the Meerman family's impressive collection of Spanish writers in original volumes. He is referring to what would become the oldest book museum in the world, the Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum. See De Clercq, \textit{Diary}, \textit{Vol. n}, pp. 32, 97.
\item Schenkeveld, \textit{Willem de Clercq}, pp. 80-81.
\end{enumerate}
That he downplays Spanish influence is not surprising, given his views on the core problem of Dutch-Spanish relations during the Dutch Revolt:

An aversion, grown from religious and political difference, kept these people separated from each other in such a way that, during eighty years great difficulty overshadowed the possibility of any sort of relation between Spain and the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{74}

De Clercq echoes here early modern propaganda views that attempted to present the Dutch and the Spanish as diametrically opposed in nature and character.\textsuperscript{75} Furthermore, when it comes to placing the successful playwright Lope de Vega within the Dutch context, his own religious background impedes any rapprochement or recognition: ‘A Lopez de Vega, familiar of the Inquisition, could never be a loved Poet for the Reformed/Protestant Dutch.’\textsuperscript{76} Lope de Vega is here equated with his connection to the Inquisition, rendering him an ‘unfit’ playwright who could have never appealed to a Dutch public on religious grounds. De Clercq was a staunch Calvinist who became a member of the Walloon Church in later years. It is interesting that Lewes draws a clear religious difference between Calderón, whom he considered the poet of the Inquisition, and Lope de Vega, whose background as a priest and his function within this religious institution go unmentioned.\textsuperscript{77} De Clercq’s Protestant perspective, dominant in Dutch and Anglophone scholarship until the mid-nineteenth century, would gradually be deconstructed by Catholic (literary) historians writing from another perspective.\textsuperscript{78}

\begin{itemize}
\item De Clercq, \textit{Verhandeling}, p. 180: ‘Een afkeer, uit verschil van godsdienstige en staatkundige begrippen ontstaan, hield de Volken zoodanig van elkanderen gescheiden, dat, gedurende tachtig jaren, er eene grootere moeijelijkheid tot onderlinge toenadering dan met eenig ander volk heerschte.’
\item Rodríguez Pérez, ‘“Un laberinto”’, p. 153. See also this volume’s introduction.
\item De Clercq, \textit{Verhandeling}, p. 180: ‘Een Lopez de Vega, de familiaar der Inkwisitie, kon nimmer een geliefd Dichter voor den hervormden Nederlander worden.’
\item Lewes agrees with Simonde de Sismondi, who sees Calderón as ‘the true poet of the Inquisition’, Lewes, \textit{The Spanish Drama}, p. 179.
\item See Jensen’s essay in this volume. Nonetheless, the so-called ‘Prescott’s paradigm’, after the famous American historian William H. Prescott (1796-1859), would prove resistant and pervasive for the appraisal of Spanish history (and literature). According to Prescott, Spanish history was to be understood as a consequence of Spanish decadence and the tyrannous nature of Spanish Catholicism. This interpretation can be considered as a ‘latter-day version’ of the Black Legend. See Burguera and Schmidt-Nowara, ‘Introduction’, p. 279. On these matters in Britain, see Yates, ‘Anglican Attitudes’.
\end{itemize}
According to some contemporary critics, De Clercq’s attitude towards foreign influence relates to his idea of an existing connection between imitation and the possibility of undergoing some sort of ‘psychic assimilation process’. In this light it is quite understandable that he wished to draw a strong line between the Dutch and the old Spanish enemy and everything connected to them. The limits of foreign influence preoccupy him. It should never dominate national literature, as he added in a later epilogue in 1824. In this context of foreign influence, a discourse on ‘degeneration’ and negative impact from abroad (inherited from the eighteenth century) was widely spread in the Netherlands. To fight decadence and to regenerate national identity, a broad set of initiatives was deployed. For instance, the role of learned societies was of particular importance, since they brought citizens together who were interested in revitalizing Dutch culture and in fighting decline. It was a widespread notion at the time that a particular language and literature were a close reflection of the moral health of the nation in question. The search to remedy decline even extended to the economic dimension of the nation, with societies and poets engaging in the process of singing the praises of trade and its history. Gradually, Dutch (literary) historians will take increasingly greater distance from the ‘monumentalization’ of the Golden Age and plead for a search for new literary ways to wake up the slumbering nation.

Despite this impression of overpowering disavowal, appreciation for Spanish materials in the nineteenth-century Netherlands is also present, however low key. Scholars like Jacob Pieter van Walrée, interested in Southern literatures, would delve in 1838 into the connection between the Spanish national character (volkskarakter) and its early literature. Although he does not particularly reflect on drama, his views are useful to shed light on perceptions of ‘Spanishness’. Despite the fact that his treatise starts with references to Romantic perceptions of Spain as an exceptional (in the negative sense) and anti-modern nation in the nineteenth century,

80 De Clercq, Verhandeling, p. 326.
82 Johannes and Leemans, “O Thou Great God of Trade”. Between 1770 and 1830 around fifteen remarkably lengthy poems were published engaging in this discourse.
83 Van den Berg, ‘Verbeelding van het vaderland’, pp. 317-318 and 333. De Clercq argues that nineteenth-century Dutch writers should not slavishly follow Golden Age authors nor foreign authors, since the needs of their century are different: ‘De Schrijvers en Dichters der negentiende eeuw moeten even min de slaafsche navolgers onzer groote mannen uit de zeventiende, als die van de Letterkunde der Vreemden zijn. Ons tijdvak heeft nieuwe behoeften, en er zullen nieuwe vernuften verrijzen, geschikt om dezelve te bevredigeri’ (Verhandeling, p. 329).
Van Walrée manages to present Spain and its literary production without negative prejudices. The most important aspect in his positive assessment of Spain is the country’s unanimous resistance to foreign oppressors, be it the Muslim conquerors or Napoleon’s invasion. Thanks to the Napoleonic Wars, and the French enemy, the Spaniards had for the first time the chance to be viewed as the rebellious party bravely fighting an oppressor, a complete reversal from their image in the Dutch Revolt. Some Dutch authors even give a twist to the shared narrative of national opposition, stating that, thanks to the struggle against the Dutch, the Spanish strengthened their own national character. Van Walrée, as a child of his time, cannot resist some old prejudices regarding Spain, mainly regarding well-known Black Legend traits, such as religious bigotry, or very en passant cruelty in America, but in his main discourse, he is positive. He refers to Spaniards’ religious intensity, a strong sense of independence and respect for honour, for their monarchs and for the feminine sex. All these Spanish national traits could be interpreted in a negative light, if placed against the Dutch Revolt narrative, but he does not do this.

**Negotiating Spain in literary histories**

The articulation of literary histories in the nineteenth century is highly relevant for the reconstruction of ambivalent attitudes towards the legacy of Spanish Golden Age drama. Although it is obvious that both English and Dutch authors regarded literary canons from a rather ethnocentric perspective, underlining the superiority of their own national literary heritage, we encounter both similarities and differences regarding perceptions towards Spanish materials. Through descriptive and prescriptive statements a clear negotiation of Spanish cultural legacy is visible, sometimes through occlusion, but mainly evinced through a rhetoric of opposition.

The English authors under scrutiny articulate a narrative of intrinsic literary opposition through the use of the luxuriance metaphor, whereas Dutch authors seem impaired in their appreciation of Spanish materials by a troubled historical common past. The historical opposition seems to block, at least in the first half of the century, literary comparisons on

---

85 Such as Willem Cornelis van Campen in 1814. See Lotte Jensen’s essay in this volume.
86 Van Walrée, *Proeven*, p. 174. There are more Dutch authors who, outside the genre of literary histories, appreciate Spanish literary production.
grounds of contents and influence or style. However, in both geographical cases, literary Hispanophobia and Hispanicophilia are to be found hand in hand, in different degrees and expressions. Despite the fact that Spanish productions are in Dibdin’s eyes ‘strange farragoes’, ‘mad frolics’ or ‘a strange heterogeneous jumble of jarring atoms’, one thing remains undeniable for him: ‘Spaniards have left something behind worth imitating, whereas from the Roman authors we have nothing but a Greek filtration, tasteless and insipid.’ 87 For his part, and despite formal criticism, George Lewes is very positive on the qualities of the standard-bearer of Spanish theatre, Lope de Vega. Dutch literary historians, marked by the national narrative of early modern Spanish oppression, will gradually come to evaluate Dutch-Spanish literary relations in a more nuanced light in the nineteenth century.

Nevertheless, it will not be until the second half of the century, in 1881, that literary historian and professor of Dutch Jan te Winkel would fully stress the undeniably close connection to Spanish literature. 88 Professor Te Winkel, ‘the grand old man of Dutch literary history’, 89 is described as a rationalist and liberal scholar with a penchant for scientific objectivity. 90 His academic interest extended beyond his chair in Dutch and old-Germanic literatures, and during his study he followed lectures by the renowned Arabist Reinhart Dozy, specialized in Islamic Spain. He was the son of a Protestant minister, but his views on Spain were not coloured by religious difference. According to him, Spanish influence was not limited to translations, but included a ‘Spanish spirit’ (‘Spaansche geest’) present in many Dutch works. 91 He also strongly contended: ‘If an explanatory history of Dutch literature in general is attempted, and in particular regarding Dutch drama, one should not overlook Spanish influence, neither Latin one, nor the influence of Lope de Vega or Seneca.’ 92 Did he wish to emphasize the importance of Spain’s

88 Te Winkel, ‘De invloed’.
89 By the renowned literary historian Wisse A.P. Smit in his ‘Het Nederlandse Renaissance-toneel’, p. 169 (emphasis in the original).
91 Te Winkel, ‘De invloed’, p. 113: ‘De invloed van het Spaansch toneel kan dus allesbehalve gering genoemd worden, te minder wanneer men bedenkt, dat ook in vele niet vertaalde stukken de Spaansche geest heerscht, en vele andere geput zijn uit romans, die oorspronkelijk ook weder uit Spanje hierheen overkwamen.’
92 Ibid., ‘Wanneer het dus geldt eene verklarende geschiedenis te geven van de Nederlandsche letterkunde in het algemeen, en het Nederlandsch tooneel in het bijzonder, mag men den invloed van het Spaansch evenmin over het hoofd zien, als dien van het Latijn, den invloed van Lope de Vega evenmin als van Seneca.’
literary legacy with his reference to Seneca, also born in Spain? In any case, Te Winkel's words seem to suggest that Spanish influence was not only a matter of skeletons or of flesh and blood, since it could also be intangible and present in 'spirit'.
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