

Historiopoiesis in Early Modern Spain:
Remembering Anglo-Spanish Encounters

By

Kelsey J. Ihinger

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Spanish)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2019

Date of the final oral examination: 12/11/2018

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Steven Hutchinson, Professor, Spanish

Mercedes Alcalá-Galán, Associate Professor, Spanish

David Hildner, Professor, Spanish

Elizabeth B. Bearden, Professor, English

© Copyright by Kelsey J. Ihinger 2019
All Rights Reserved

For my family, especially the two doctors who led the way,
Grandma Mel and Grandpa Irv;
and for Paco—we did it.

Acknowledgements

It's hard to imagine after seven and a half years of graduate work that I will be able to properly thank all those who have helped me along the way. Yet in this attempt to do so, I think there is no better place to begin than with my adviser, Professor Steven Hutchinson. From the application interview, to coffee in Madrid's *Círculo de bellas artes*, he has been a part of my journey since before it even began. I appreciate the time he has spent teaching me as a student and as a scholar. I have always felt the entirety of his support behind me, and I am grateful for his guidance.

I have been truly fortunate to bring together for my dissertation committee a group of early modern scholars that I greatly admire, and that I hope to someday emulate. To Mercedes Alcalá-Galán, thank you for your honest observations and for your enthusiasm for the young scholars you support. To David Hildner, thank you for your thoughtful comments and for your never-failing attendance at the events we graduate students organize. Your presence is so appreciated. To Elizabeth Bearden, thank you for sharing in my excitement in bringing Anglo-Spanish studies greater attention. I am grateful for your mentorship, encouragement, and guidance through the winding roads of graduate school life and thankful for the time I got to work as your PA.

Within the Department of Spanish and Portuguese's early modern section, I have been honored to form a part of such a strong community of scholars and students brought together by our dedicated professors. Thank you to the *siglodoristas* who formed a part of this community.

I would not have made it through this process if not for the amazing friends I have made along the way. I especially want to thank Brianna and Margaryta, whose strength and passion

continually inspire me. To the many other inspiring women that surround me, I am grateful: Caitlin B., Caitlin Q., Emma, Emi, and Gina. During my doctoral work, I was fortunate also to find community outside my department. Thank you to the members of GEMSS, and particularly to Emily and Leah, for both your intellectual and personal support. I am also thankful to those who began this journey ahead of me, who have been both mentors and friends: Priya, Catherine, Michael, and Micah. And finally, to those of the next generation, good luck! To Lizzie, I owe a special thanks: your excitement has the power to bring new light to this journey in times when it seems it may be dwindling.

I am grateful for the financial support that I have received over the course of my doctoral work, from the Graduate School at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, from the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, from the Newberry Library, the MLA, and Mellon-Wisconsin. Most impactful among those institutions that have supported me was undoubtedly the Institute for Research in the Humanities. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to grow among so many amazing scholars and for creating such a rich environment for humanists to come together in a shared community. Ulrich Langer, thank you for your constant support of graduate students. Ann, thank you for your warmth and constant encouragement. Our conversations always brightened up my day.

Finally, and most importantly, to my family I owe my sincerest thanks. I have been fortunate to have a family that not only supports me in every way but also has always seen the value in education. I am thankful to the academics who came before me—Uncle Silliest, Tricia, Grandma Mel, and Grandpa Irv—who have provided an understanding ear and shared in the joy of both the toughest and most exciting parts of this process. To Isabel and my Spanish family, your love from so far away never fails to reach me. To my sister, thank you for constantly

inspiring me in all you do. To my parents, I truly don't know how to express my gratitude. Your support is something I treasure above all else. And lastly, to Paco, I can't quite believe we're here. Thank you for sharing this journey with me, every step of the way.

A Note on Spelling and Names

Throughout this dissertation, spelling has been modernized from printed texts that were consulted in their original versions. I have maintained early modern practices of capitalization, however, as well as grammatical conventions that are no longer used today. When consulting modern editions of the early modern texts studied in this dissertation, I have respected the editor's decision to maintain original spelling, punctuation, and accentuation.

I have chosen, in most cases, to use the names of Spanish monarchs and Spanish cities in their English transcription when convention exists within English-language scholarship to do so. Thus Felipe IV is Philip IV, Sevilla is Seville, and Fernando and Isabel are Ferdinand and Isabella. In some instances, in order to avoid confusion, I keep the Spanish name. For example, I refer to Don Carlos (son of Philip II) and Carlos II in order not to confuse these Spanish royals with English monarchs discussed in the same chapter.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
A Note on Spelling and Names	v
Introduction	1
Part One. A Queen Martyred: Mary Stuart’s Execution Retold and Reinterpreted from the Peninsula	39
Chapter One. Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas: The Queen of Scots’s Spanish Historian	57
Chapter Two. Lope de Vega’s Return to the Queen of Scots: Reimagining Mary Stuart in <i>La corona trágica</i> (1627)	90
Chapter Three. Foreign Queens on the Spanish Stage: Juan Bautista Diamante’s <i>La reina María Estuarda</i> (1660) and José de Cañizares’s <i>Lo que va de cetro a cetro y crueldad de Inglaterra</i> (c. 1713–18)	122
Part Two. An English Prince Comes to Madrid: Charles and the Portrayal of the Young Philip IV	167
Chapter Four. Assimilating the English: Charles’s Visit to Madrid in Pamphlet Literature (1623)	177
Chapter Five. Favorable Comparisons: Philip IV and the Prince of Wales on Stage (1623–1633)	219
Epilogue. Reconsidering Irreconcilable Differences	260
Bibliography	265

INTRODUCTION

In 1623, Charles, Prince of Wales, made an unprecedented journey. He traveled in disguise, with only the duke of Buckingham and two servants, to Madrid, where he hoped to win the hand of the Spanish Infanta María in marriage. Charles would spend six months in the Spanish capital, regaled with ostentatious celebrations, before returning to England without his bride. Some thirty-five years earlier, the Spanish crown had demonstrated its support for his Catholic grandmother, Mary Queen of Scots, after her execution at the order of Elizabeth I of England. In 1588, Philip II sent the famously failed Gran Armada to England, according to contemporary reports, to avenge the martyr's death. A poem written in celebration of Charles's arrival in Madrid described the connection between these two foreign sovereigns as follows:

Nieto sois de Reina mártir,
y así se tiene sospecha
que os han de hacer Rey y santo
la sangre de aquellas venas.
Ojalá pluguiera al cielo
vos heredárades della
las coronas del martirio
porque en el cielo os dijeran:
Príncipe de Inglaterra
vengáis muy en hora buena. (qtd. in Iglesias, *La visita* 95–96).¹

¹ Iglesias suggests that this poem may have been written by the Capellán de San Ginés but is uncertain of this attribution (*La visita* 93).

Such words addressed to a Protestant English prince evince Spanish hopes for the reemergence of Catholic devotion at the highest levels of a monarchy that more than half a century earlier saw the death of its last Catholic monarch. This author's acknowledgement of Charles's personal connection to Catholicism—through his paternal grandmother—and his optimistic belief in England's return to the Catholic Church were, in hindsight (and perhaps even in 1623 itself), far from realizable. Yet beyond its surface, this poem further reveals two aspects of Spain's early modern worldview that are central to the concerns of this dissertation. In this poem, we witness Spain's active construction of a foreign country's historical narrative as well as its own self-construction in the process. These two layers—compacted below the surface of Spain's imperial mission and its eternal devotion—attest to the relevance of considering the Anglo-Spanish relationship in the exploration of Spain's early modern identity. In my analysis of Spanish texts that represent England, I question the assumption that Spanish literary production unfolded in isolation from English political personages and political ambitions. Through my analysis of texts that represent Charles and his grandmother, the Queen of Scots, I suggest that repositioning our consideration of Anglo-Spanish contact and influence will demonstrate the way in which Anglo-Spanish political and diplomatic relations permeated the early modern Spanish literary and imperial imaginations.

Among hispanists who study early modern Spain, England has not often been seen as a major player in Spain's imperial trajectory. The island nation had ceded its continental ambitions during the Tudor period, and neither its land nor sea power was sufficient to fully protect its borders.² Though for most of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries England did not manage to rival the most powerful states in Europe, its position in the political game of chess in this period

² For England's sixteenth century imperial ambitions, see Wernham.

was strategically significant. Between France and Spain—Europe’s two most powerful rivals—England’s alliance was ever-essential to victory.³

England’s place in early modern politics meant that its presence seeped into Spain’s imperial strategies and thus the nation’s imperial imagination. The English theme, like a weed whose presence sprouted through the cracks of Spain’s early modern literary monolith, appeared with insistence throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. English characters—both historical and invented—cropped up in the works of Spain’s most famous authors. Miguel de Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Pedro Calderón de la Barca, Francisco de Quevedo, and Luis de Góngora all wrote about England. The fact that these luminaries of Spain’s Golden Age took to the page or stage to write about England signals an awareness of this northern nation, stemming from Spain and England’s constant political contact, which is greater than that which scholars acknowledge today.

“Historiopoiesis in Early Modern Spain: Remembering Anglo-Spanish Encounters” seeks to draw attention to the impact that the Anglo-Spanish relationship had on Spain’s early modern literature, politics, and identity. English characters appeared in plays, fighting against Spanish soldiers in Flanders. They appeared in Cervantes’s last novel as company for the adventuring Persiles and Sigismunda. And at times English characters, such as María de Zayas’s unfortunate Beatriz, seem to have been given their patrimony for the purpose of invoking some distant, far-away place.⁴ But England most frequently appeared in Spain’s early modern literary production in the form of real, historical personages, reinterpreted for a Spanish audience. English monarchs

³ England’s geographical position made it essential to both France and Spain. For Spain, an alliance with England meant continued access to the Netherlands through the English Channel. For France, an Anglo-Spanish alliance meant greater vulnerability on its northern coasts. Both countries were concerned with what an English alliance with the other might mean for their conflict in northern Italy (Wernham 16).

⁴ In Zayas’s ninth *desengaño*, Beatriz is the princess of England. Her native land, however, is referenced only once, and it does not hold any significance for Zayas’s characterization of this protagonist.

and English events became the subject not just of plays and poetry, but also of news pamphlets and extensive historical treatises. Each chapter of this dissertation explores the reappearance of England in different genres and across time in order to consider the significance of this subject within early modern Spain. Why did Spanish authors continue to tell stories with an English theme long after their historical characters had occupied a central place in public memory? What can be deduced from the ways in which Spanish authors portrayed the history of England? And how does their depiction of this foreign nation reveal not just what Spain thought of England, but also how the conceptualization of Spain's own identity emerged and transformed? In this dissertation, I explore these questions within texts that represent the historical figures that most vividly captured continental Europe's attention: Charles and Mary Stuart are accompanied by Elizabeth I, the duke of Buckingham, and at times also their historical predecessors of previous generations.

I investigate the potential and the complexity of the representation of history in the early modern period via the conceptual umbrella of "historiopoiesis." This term, which I have invented for the purpose of my study, draws attention to the interdependence and, at times, conflicting relationship between historical and poetical (or fictional) modes of representation in early modern Spanish texts, especially those that represent England. I employ "historiopoiesis" to refer to the creation, or making, of history through the imaginative retelling of real-life events. While the historical and poetical were separated into two distinct generic categories, their stylistic modes of representation often overlapped and intermingled. In this sense, I look beyond predetermined categories of genre in order to focus on the ways in which historical characters are reimagined for a Spanish audience. These reimaginings, I aver, embody and reveal elements of the early modern Spanish imagination in its process of recreation and redefinition.

Employing the methodological framework of historiopoiesis permits an examination of the combination of history and fiction spanning boundaries typically imposed by genre. This approach thus can be employed to recuperate bodies of texts that had previously been rejected due to their marginalized generic categories or their seeming lack of literary merit. Putting these texts in dialogue with one another reveals aspects of identity creation, linked intimately to the depiction of history, that would have otherwise been obscured, and it is for this reason that a historiopoetic approach to early modern texts should be employed. Using this approach, I examine texts such as Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas's historical treatise on the life of Mary Stuart not for its historical accuracy or its literary merits but instead for what it reveals about Spain's imperial ambitions following the failure of the Gran Armada's expedition of 1588. This and other texts like it are brought back to life when examined through the lens of historiopoiesis thanks to this method's focus on the active process of historical recreation.

I use historiopoetic methods to draw attention to the way in which the representation of history and historical characters in different genres combines with a literary sensibility that is determined by the author's motivations and environment. These texts have the potential to provide us, as modern readers, with a window into the consciousness of early modern imperial Spain. In my analysis, I place particular emphasis on the significance of both space and time. I consider how the geographical space that separated Spain and England affects the author's representation of both his foreign and native characters. And I interrogate the ways in which the passage of time between a historical event depicted in a text and its moment of composition affect an author's manipulation of his historical subject. I place the texts I study within the historical moment in which they were written and within the context of Spain's imperial growth, struggle, and decline.

I consider placing a text within the cultural and political environment in which it was produced essential to its interpretation, and thus my critical analysis of the texts that appear in this dissertation is supported both by the knowledge of the historical characters represented and the context in which they are reconsidered textually. Through this process of contextualization, I seek to establish the way in which Spanish representations of England reflect, reconsider, and renegotiate Spain's own imperial identity. Though a unified Spanish nation rarely existed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in exploring the presentation of Spain in relation to England, the idea of "Spanish" identity, be it national or imperial, comes up in many of the texts I analyze. This identity emerges, I believe, precisely because the texts studied in this dissertation place Spain in contrast to an exterior other. The identity of early modern Spain emerged from the dual conceptualization of Spain's status as a monarchy that united diverse nations and as an empire implicated in the European and global struggle for power. This process of examining Spain's identity and my study of historiopoiesis as it relates to Spain's national and imperial imaginations can thus be placed within the context of recent studies in transnationalism.

Transnational and inter-imperial studies have emerged within recent decades to push scholars beyond the disciplinary boundaries that have limited our understanding of the global systems and relationships of early modernity. Laura Doyle has asserted that "[t]he 'composition' of nations occurs within a co-emergent and often competitive 'schema' of other nations" ("Towards a Philosophy" 11). Her emphasis on "inter-imperiality" seeks to de-centralize our conception of the nation and broaden our appreciation of international interaction and competition, especially as it relates to the creation of identity.⁵ This dissertation contributes to a transnational and inter-imperial approach to early modern studies in focusing not primarily on

⁵ In addition to "Towards a Philosophy," Doyle discusses these ideas in her article "Inter-imperiality."

how Spain's depictions of England changed over the course of the early modern period, but instead focusing on what Spanish depictions of England reveal about Spanish identity in the early modern period. While Mediterranean studies has offered a long history of demonstrating the way in which relationships across, between, and beyond national boundaries enriched Spanish identity, culture, and literature, I hope to rethink our study of Anglo-Spanish relations by introducing this practice with our perspective turned northward. This project, in the words of Barbara Fuchs, "challenges the self-sufficient histories of the nation and empire" ("Another turn" 412) with the goal of exploring Spain's early modern identity and England's place within it.

Theorizing Historiopoiesis

Underlying this study of Anglo-Spanish relations is a consideration of genre; specifically, the two generic categories that we would today divide as "fact" and "fiction," or perhaps "fiction" and "non-fiction." In the Renaissance, these delimitations would have been guided by the Aristotelian differentiation of poetry and history. If we consider, for a moment, these two categories as distinct and opposite, as we might be led to believe, let us think of history as a pile of black pebbles and poetry as a pile of white ones. When the ground is still, these piles may remain separate. Yet when it begins to shake, the piles will bleed together, creating a grey hue that blurs the boundary between categories. The grey hue created by the mixing of black and white pebbles constitutes the driving force behind my study of "historiopoiesis." The ground's quivering in the early modern period, I suggest, was brought about by fictional authors' borrowing from history's characters, from historians who recognized the impossibility of presenting the barest facts, and from political motivations that influenced both kinds of writers. Throughout "Historiopoiesis in Early Modern Spain," I pay close attention to the way in which

Aristotelian poetics and classical ideas of history were reinterpreted and renegotiated at this time. By employing a historiopoetic methodology, I foreground the slippery distinction between what we today consider fact and fiction with the intention of recovering the way that the texts I study existed within their contemporary moment, both in terms of genre and the greater political environment.

In employing the term “historiopoiesis” I refer to the textual representation of history in its broadest sense. I allude to the Greek origins of the word “poiesis,” which can mean either “to make” or “to create,” as I am interested in the many ways in which history is interpreted and fabricated by the authors I study. I also use this term, however, because I wish to expand the generic scope of the work that I include in my analysis of early modern texts. I do not suggest that early modern authors failed to believe in the distinction of history as a genre, with motivations that differed from those of poetry, as I will shortly discuss in greater detail. I believe, however, that historiopoiesis has the power to call attention to the emergence of a consciousness of the fallibility of that which early modern literary and historical philosophers considered history. Without ignoring the fact that the texts studied here were still constrained by generic expectations, a historiopoetic approach pays particular attention to how authors confronted and stretched such constraints. This approach allows for the study of all historically motivated texts together, blurring—while still aware of—the boundary between texts written by historians and poets alike. Studying Quevedo’s theatrical depiction of the Prince of Wales alongside news pamphlets that announced his arrival, for example, elucidates the way in which multiple genres were employed to promote and question Spanish imperial ambitions at the start of a new king’s reign. In concert, these texts consider the ways in which two public-facing genres meant for mass

consumption, but in the poetic and historic categories respectively, functioned in differing ways while representing the same historical events.

Historiopoiesis is an attempt to reconcile the complexity of the interdependent and at times conflicting relationship between the historical and poetical modes of writing in the early modern period. Historiopoiesis does not describe a genre itself, but refers instead to the conflation of Aristotle's two seemingly distinctive genres which occurs within the texts that I study. This approach to early modern texts—not eliminating the boundary between history and poetry but recognizing its porosity—encourages the consideration of a text not based on its literary or artistic merit but instead on its manipulation of history itself, considering conjointly the motivations lay behind its representation.

In addition to the emphasis I place on the early modern approach to genre, my conceptualization of historiopoiesis is influenced by the ideas of theorists such as Hayden White, Rosalie Colie, and William Nelson. Hayden White's transformational study of nineteenth century trends in history writing has come to define the way we think about history today. In *Metahistory*, White describes the changing consciousness of twentieth century historians who began to view their discipline according to its dependence on narrative. I believe this same transformation of understanding can be productively applied to the early modern period as well. In both the twentieth century and during the Renaissance, philosophers began to rethink the nature of artistic and scientific disciplines. As White suggests, the transition from the nineteenth to the twentieth century saw the transformation of history writers, from those who were previously interested in proving history's scientific origins to those who constructed history according to narrative. These historians constructed an argument that had political implications,

whether applied intentionally by the author or not.⁶ White thus calls for those of us who study history and historiography today to pay greater attention to the historians' "*poetic act*" (*Metahistory* x).

The following question is posed by White as central to his considerations in *Metahistory*: "What does it mean to *think historically*, and what are the unique characteristics of a specifically *historical method* of inquiry?" (1). This same question, I aver, can not only be asked of early modern literary philosophers, but it was also asked *by* them. Thinkers such as Luis Cabrera de Córdoba, Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas, and Sebastián Fox Morcillo theorized definitions of history and considered the methods that should be used to produce historical texts. These methods were debated by historians and poets alike, demonstrating the existence of a historical consciousness in the early modern period that in many ways mimics White's investigation. That is, White's emphasis on the necessary coexistence of poetic and scientific disciplines within the historical genre would not have seemed foreign to the early modern thinkers whose ideas I will shortly expound.

According to White, poetic construction invades history. Unlike annals or chronicles, the narrativized account of past events—a historical treatise in early modern Spain—must necessarily be fictionalized, for the world does not "come to us already narrativized, already 'speaking itself' from beyond the horizon of our capacity to make scientific sense of it" ("The value" 24–25). The cross-contamination of history and poetry that White theorizes is thus one of style but not necessarily of subject matter, and for White, it is poetry which invades the purified body of history. Reading White's work alongside that of Rosemarie Colie foregrounds the possibility of such a contamination moving in both directions. The mixing of genres is discussed

⁶ See White, *Metahistory* 7–29.

by Colie as it relates to the Renaissance specifically. Unlike White, Colie approaches her study of Renaissance “kind” (the word she employs for genre) from the perspective not of history alone but from the many different forms of text that emerged in the Renaissance. Her study of kinds ranging from histories, to dialogues, philosophical poems, or prose fictions emphasizes the fluidity of genres that would “melt into one another” in this era (116). She denotes texts such as Cervantes’s *Don Quixote* and Rabelais’s *Gargantua* “books of books” due to the way that they consciously use, mock, and modify expected forms of literature. Her study brings to light a clear sense of play or experimentation amongst the many forms that were emerging and continually morphing into one another in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This fluidity is one that emerges continually in the texts studied in this dissertation, and it is one that historiopoiesis seeks to capture within its consideration of genre.

William Nelson studies the question of generic types in the early modern period from the specific perspective of “fiction.” The rise of “fictionality” has been studied with fervor by those who wish to discover whether or not fiction has historically played a part in every culture or whether a conscious attitude towards fiction as a separate genre of literature emerged in a specific moment of modern cultural consciousness.⁷ Nelson considers this question as it relates to the Renaissance. In the same year that White’s *Metahistory* appeared, Nelson published *Fact or Fiction: The Dilemma of the Renaissance Storyteller*. In his book, Nelson argues that by the Renaissance, there existed a clear understanding of the difference between history and non-historical genres, which he calls “fact” and “fiction.” Based primarily on the study of English examples, Nelson describes the poet’s, or fictional author’s, defense of his work as evidence of this awareness. Fiction was not frivolous or deceitful, according to its defenders, but told the

⁷ Gallagher and Fludernik are among those who consider this question in depth.

truth while providing moral lessons in delightful and memorable ways.⁸ Yet while Nelson draws attention to the distinction between the historical and the fictional, he also exemplifies the many ways in which these seemingly distinct modes of writing merged and contaminated one another. Nelson describes the various ways in which “storytellers,” those who wrote fictional texts, claimed the historicity of the events or characters they represented. In early modern Spain, authors did so both mockingly and with complete sincerity.⁹

Nelson’s considerations ultimately signal a similar approach to the study of genre as that of White and Colie. All three examine the ways in which the factual and the fictional, historic and poetic, coalesce. As Colie and Nelson have demonstrated, early modern authors were aware of both their distinction as well as their contamination. Historiopoiesis permits the study of both of these phenomena simultaneously. An understanding of contemporary discussions of genres will inform the effectiveness of taking a historiopoetic approach to early modern texts. As I have mentioned, early modern authors, especially historians themselves, were aware of the fallibility of the distinctions made between the black and white pebbles of history and poetry.

Studies of genre in the early modern period often begin with Aristotle. Due to the reemergence of classical philosophy in Renaissance Europe, Aristotle’s division of history and poetry gained renewed meaning among humanist scholars. For Aristotle, and the neo-Aristotelians who followed him, the division between the two genres was clear: history retold events that had occurred; it dealt with particular truths. Poetry, on the other hand, even when using historical characters in its plot, told stories based on probability, what could or should

⁸ See Nelson 49–50, 56–60. As Nelson explains, the truth that these stories told was either “truth to life” (verisimilitude) (50–51, 108) or universal truth (108–15).

⁹ Nelson refers to both Cervantes and Thomas More in discussing those fictional authors who mock the difference between their texts and histories. Examples of writers who made a historical claim for their fictional works, or false histories, can be found in Olds and Gaylord.

happen based on the personal qualities of those involved. Poetry represented universal truths and was for this reason considered superior by Aristotle.¹⁰ Renaissance authors writing in defense of their craft would often repeat this praise of poetry. As the neo-Aristotelian philosopher Alonso López Pinciano put it in his *Filosofía antigua poética*: “porque el poeta trata más la universalidad, dice el Filósofo [Aristotle] en sus *Poéticos* que mucho más excelente es la poética que la historia; y yo añado que porque el poeta es inventor de lo que nadie imaginó, y el historiador no hace más que trasladar lo que otros han escrito” (152).

The subject matter of poetry was limited only by that which exhibited verisimilitude, or imitated real life, but this did not preclude the poet’s use of history. According to Aristotle, “[e]ven if in fact he [the poet] writes about what has happened, he is none the less a poet; there is nothing to prevent some of the things which have happened from being the kind of thing which probably would happen, and it is in that respect that he is concerned with them [historical events and characters] as a poet” (16–17). In other words, the subject matter of a poet’s text does not determine its categorization. He may indeed choose to write about history, but his elaboration of historical events or characters will not be based upon what actually happened. Rather, his text will be guided by what could or should have happened. When López Pinciano comes back to these ideas, he reiterates this same concept, reminding his reader first, “puede muy bien un poeta escribir verdades y quedar poeta” (175). Yet the poet, he goes on, will, from a single truth, elaborate, create, and invent:

porque la prestancia de la Poética sobre la Historia en eso consiste; que el poeta escribe lo que inventa y el historiador se lo halla guisado. Así que la Poética hace la cosa y la cría de nuevo en el mundo, y por tanto, le dieron el nombre griego que

¹⁰ See *Poetics* 16.

en castellano quiere decir *hacedora*, como poeta *hacedor*, nombre que a Dios solamente dieron los antiguos; mas la Historia no nos da la cosa, sino sólo el lenguaje y disposición de él. (176)

The fluidity of subject matter that a poet may choose to write about allows history to bleed into its counterpart within Aristotle's generic dichotomy, which Pinciano repeats for Renaissance poets. It is this challenge to the seeming simplicity of such an Aristotelian dichotomy that interests me here, and it is one that was recognized by poets and historians of early modern Spain alike.

The grey area that exists between history and poetry is the space that this dissertation occupies. It was space that not only Aristotle's poets, or 'fictional' authors, took advantage of, but it was also one that concerned early modern historians who sought to distance themselves from the probable in order to focus on relaying the objective truth of their subject matter.

Early modern historians who wrote about their methods in treatises and *memoriales* were influenced by the work of classical historians like Herodotus, Thucydides, and Livy. Their primary motivation was, in all instances, to represent Truth. As Herrera y Tordesillas put it, citing Juan Antonio Biperiano as the source of his memorable metaphor,

el que escriviere Historia la a de mirar como a una virgen libre e incorrupta que no sirva al apetito de nadie sino que honrre la verdad, que sea grave de costumbres, de sana sustançia, de suave color, cumplida con proporcionada grandeza de nombres y composición, no dada a cosas ligeras y vanas, sino aplicada a cosas graves y grandes, procediendo con mediocre y decente ornamento o exquisito, no para deleyte sino para una honestidad conveniente a

matrona y no a manera de aquel afeito de ramerás que es propio de los poetas.

(“Discurso sobre los provechos” fol. 107v)¹¹

In this analogy, the *doncella*’s virginity is likened to history’s truth; each is the fundamental and defining characteristic of that which they describe. The *doncella*’s tasteful dress is compared to the style with which a historian should write his treatise. He should not treat vain subjects nor write with overly elaborate diction. Yet unlike the truly dogmatic control of female chastity in early modern Spain, historians—even those who used this metaphor—recognized the impossibility of attaining this standard.¹²

The failure of historians to achieve the perfection of a purely true, or virginal, history came in many forms. Humanist historians from the early modern period who wrote about their craft worried about the reliability of their sources, the ability of the historian to remain impartial, and the historian’s need to craft a coherent narrative. In many of their concerns, Spanish historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries sound eminently modern.

The conceptualization of the historical genre in Spain and across Europe changed from the medieval to the early modern period.¹³ We may trace its trajectory from the classical predecessors already mentioned, who influenced humanist historians of early modern Europe. According to Juan Carlos Conde, medieval historiography differed from its Greek and Roman predecessors in two concrete ways: first, in the medieval period it was necessary to write a universal history, rather than a narration of local and recent events. This change occurred within the historical genre because it was believed that all things formed a part of God’s larger plan and

¹¹ Cabrera also uses this same metaphor (16, 30).

¹² See Cabrera, esp. 70–73.

¹³ Though many of the insights I outline in this section are applicable to other parts of Europe, the examples I study come from early modern Spanish historiography. For the historiographical tradition in England, see Smith Fussner, Levy, Woolf, and Metzger.

history must reflect this reality (179–80). Second, because history was a part of God’s design, the historian lacked the same critical capacity to determine the correctness of his sources (Conde 182). In the sixteenth century, this medieval Christian historiography gave way to humanist models that returned to classical ideas of history writing. Where medieval histories relied almost entirely on other written documents to create their universal histories, humanists once again returned to the importance of the eyewitness.¹⁴ They also increasingly wrote histories focused on national heroes and included more recent events.

Among historians who wrote treatises of kings or of the history of the nation, the reliability of their sources was of principal concern. One anonymous author of a seventeenth century news pamphlet, understanding the need to defend even his historical text’s veracity, brashly provided his readers with this closing statement:

Todo lo dicho (lector amigo) he recopilado de diversas cartas de personas graves y de crédito desta ciudad. [. . .] La verdad te decimos en sustancia, de cualquier suceso, y cree que ninguna relación que se imprime es inventada, sino adornada, deja de murmurar, y entretente en leer lo que yo dispongo con harto trabajo.

(*Victoria* fol. 2v)

This author plays to generic expectations as he addresses his reader. As a proper historian, he explains, he has done his research and his sources are trustworthy. He distances his news from that which may be heard through rumors because he has put in the work to ensure that he conveys “la verdad [. . .] en sustancia.” At the same time, however, while exhorting his reader to believe the truth of any such printed *relación*, this author also admits that his account includes some adornment (“[no] es inventada, sino adornada”), and he alludes to the motivations behind

¹⁴ For a recent study that explores the importance of the eyewitness especially within early modern legal contexts, see Frisch.

this kind of embellishment: entertainment. In these remarks, cheeky as they may be, the author recognizes real concerns that plagued the early modern historians tasked with the more difficult job of writing extensive treatises on wide-ranging subjects rather than short pamphlets like the one this author penned.

When writing about historical events that had occurred long ago, it was the humanist historian's job to compare sources to determine which description of events was most likely to have occurred.¹⁵ When writing about more recent events, the best and most reliable source was the eyewitness. Belief in the validity of the eyewitness as the most reliable source for historical knowledge was, as Conde has emphasized, among the many humanist history writers' modifications of medieval historical practices.¹⁶ Sixteenth-century historian Luis Cabrera de Córdoba, alluding to the classical practices of history writing, explains that the genre itself emerged from eyewitness accounts "porque antiguamente no tenían por historia sino la que fue hecha de quien había visto las cosas que ponían en escrito" (23). The fallibility of the eyewitness is, however, continually recognized as Cabrera continues his treatise. Cabrera mentions difficulties in relying on eyewitness testimony due to the discrepancies among those who witnessed the same event (23–24, 72). The testimony of a single witness can also not be fully relied upon because it is often doubted by the witness himself years after the event took place (61). Thus even an account taken simultaneous to an event may not be entirely factual. Perhaps, Cabrera further considers, the historian should wait to write down an account of what he or another witness recalls so that the witness will be "más libre de las pasiones" (73). Among these various qualifications and considerations of eyewitness testimony made by Cabrera lies the historian's ultimate concern: discovering history's absolute truth. This was, after all, what

¹⁵ See Cabrera 72–73; Herrera, "Discurso sobre los provechos" fols. 106v–107r; and Fox Morcillo 229.

¹⁶ See Conde 177–81.

separated the historian from his poetic counterpart.¹⁷ Despite the difficulties inherent in truth-telling, Cabrera strives to maintain the metaphorical virginity of his genre.

The reliability of eyewitness testimony was not among the early modern historians' only concerns. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, chronicle histories—extensive historical narratives—were most often written by an official court historian, named by the king. As Richard Kagan has explained, in agreement with Conde's observations, the histories that these official chroniclers wrote from the fifteenth century onward were often written about recent events, rather than the universal histories such as Alfonso X's *General Estoria* (*Clio* 30).¹⁸ These official treatises were written either in favor of the king or in celebration of Spain in what Kagan calls a “vogue for patriotic history” (*Clio* 107). Yet in the humanist treatises of Spain's early modern historians, impartiality was uniformly declared a necessary quality of the writer of histories. Despite the fact that Páez de Castro begins his *De las cosas necesarias para escribir historia* describing the imperative of a patron in writing history, he goes on to say that the historian should demonstrate “siempre ánimo libre y sereno de toda pasión” (609).¹⁹ Páez, like many others, does not *directly* address the inherent conflict that may exist between patrons—whether royal or noble—and the author of history. It is Cabrera, once again, who acknowledges these concerns outright. When writing about contemporary history, Cabrera explains, one must be favored by the royals he writes about in order to learn their secrets. This position “puede ser

¹⁷ For Cabrera's discussion of the relationship between history and poetry, see especially Discurso IV, “De las partes y definición de la historia” (23–28).

¹⁸ Smith Fussner notes a similar trend in England where early modern historians also turned to national subjects rather than universal ones (12–13).

¹⁹ This sentiment is echoed by Herrera y Tordesillas (“Discurso y tratado” fol. 111v) and Navarra (44, qtd. in Montero Díaz 20–21). In his discussion of an unbiased historian, Cabrera goes as far as considering the superior objectivity of a foreign historian, pointing to the well-known Polydore Virgil as evidence (32–33).

peligroso” (70), according to Cabrera, who later states that writing about the recent past “tiene peligro y dificultad” (73). The truth, after all, would not always be flattering.

In addition to addressing the issue of the fallibility of sources and, in certain circumstances, the conflict between patron and author, early modern historians also considered the kind of information that should or should not be included in a historical text. The historian had to decide on exactly what information to conceal and what to reveal. Cabrera compares a historian to a painter when considering this question: his job is to bring out the best qualities in his subject (91–93). A historian should not reveal his prince’s secrets not only because he may find himself without a job in the future, but also because the prince’s enemies could use that information against him (Cabrera 82). Herrera y Tordesillas equally describes the historian’s task of determining “cuáles cosas se han de decir y cuáles callar” (“Discurso sobre los provechos” fol. 106r). It is only Fox Morcillo who emphasizes the importance of a tell-all style of history. He argues that if a historian knows the truth, he should include it without reservation in his text. The only reason to censor historical truth, suggests Fox Morcillo, is if the detail is so insignificant that it should not matter to leave it out (214–15).

Within the treatises of these historians of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain, the nature of the historical genre is continually placed in contrast with that of poetry. In analyzing their description of history, however, we begin to see the ways in which each writer recognized—subconsciously or consciously—the reality of compromise that was necessitated by the situational reality of composition: that is, the history writer’s position vis-à-vis the crown and the inescapable lack of purely objective sources.

Thus we begin to see the invasion of the poetic mode within the early modern historian’s craft. The independence of history was further destabilized in this period thanks to the

publication of false histories and other texts that called themselves “verdaderas historias” while in fact existing far from the reality of this label. These texts document the playfulness of ‘poetic’ authors who claimed historical resonances with no concern for the truthfulness so prized by historians. Mary Gaylord has described four different types of text that used the label of “verdaderas historias” in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, only the first of which includes factual histories written about contemporary events. The second set of categories designated by Gaylord includes three different kinds of texts claiming the label “verdaderas historias” though their genre was more clearly poetic. These categories included fictional or false histories that claimed to be true, histories in verse “grounded more or less firmly in historical events known to have taken place,” and fictional texts that alleged truth behind their events in what Gaylord considers “the central metaphor” of the narrative (217). Based on these categories, Gaylord describes what she calls the “border-crossing” that was typical in early modern Spanish literary style. Her analysis of texts such as *Don Quixote* and the *Historia verdadera del Rey don Rodrigo* support Colie’s observations of Renaissance contaminations of kind. As we have seen, such blurring between history and poetry impacted the historian’s concern for his craft, yet in recognizing the futility of seeking to attain absolute truth the historian still falls into the grey area he so desperately wished to avoid. It is both the playfulness of poets and historians’ frustrated reality that are encompassed within and explored by historiopoiesis.

Historiopoiesis in its Historical Context

I have stated previously that my analysis of the texts that I study is heavily influenced by an understanding of the moment in which that text was produced. For this reason, before beginning the textual analyses that comprise Part One and Part Two of this dissertation, I provide

historical context for Spain and England's relationship surrounding Mary Stuart's execution and Charles's visit to Madrid. These two events, however, make up only a small portion of the constant contact that existed between Spain and England over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Thus, in order to better orient my reader to their extended historical contact, I will provide here a brief overview of Anglo-Spanish relations through the early modern period. I do so also because I believe that it is partially due to the volatile nature of this relationship that in the past many scholars have overlooked the literature discussed in this dissertation.²⁰

Marriage alliances between Spain and England date back to the twelfth century, yet their most famous early modern union took place in 1509, when Catherine of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile, married Henry VIII.²¹ Their marriage would end famously in divorce, but it would be followed by one other successful Anglo-Spanish match in the sixteenth century and other attempted agreements in the early seventeenth century meant to unite the two countries against Spain's constant rival: France. In 1554, Charles V, the aging Holy Roman Emperor, negotiated a match between his son, Philip, and the newly anointed Catholic queen of England, Mary Tudor. Their marriage would last only four years, during which Philip spent a significant amount of time across the channel in the Spanish Netherlands. Philip's influence as king of England has been debated by historians such as Redworth, Samson, and Kelsey, but despite the many restrictions placed on his power as king, towards the end of his

²⁰ For more detailed information from Hispanic scholars' perspective, see Sanz Camañes; Benavides. English historians have addressed the early modern Anglo-Spanish relationship most often as it relates to the origins of the Black Legend (see Maltby) and the Armada of 1588 (see Hillgarth, Wernham, McDermott). See Rodríguez Pérez, Sánchez Jiménez and Den Boer (eds.) and Rodríguez Pérez and Sánchez Jiménez (eds.) for recent responses from hispanists regarding the Black Legend.

²¹ The marriage took place some eight years after her marriage to Henry's older brother Arthur, who died in 1502.

tenure as such he did manage to convince the English Parliament to reluctantly approve of English involvement in what was primarily a Spanish attack on northern France, near Calais.²² Kelsey also points to Philip's participation in council meetings and the regular audiences he held while living at court as evidence in favor of his active role in England, but in general historians agree that it was during Philip's reign as king of England that popular sentiment against Spain gained traction. Philip's marriage to Mary Tudor ended without issue in 1558, at which time Elizabeth became queen, returning the monarchy to its former Protestant allegiances.

Immediately following the succession of Elizabeth and England's subsequent transition to Protestantism, diplomatic relations remained mostly amicable between England and Spain. Philip was motivated to maintain his alliance against France and was especially concerned with maintaining access to the Netherlands, where Protestant revolts had begun in the late-1560s, via the English channel. Through the 1560s and 1570s, relations between England and Spain swayed steadily back and forth between tensions, provoked commonly by English pirates who attacked Spanish ships returning from the Americas, and peace treaties. The last of these signed by Elizabeth and Philip was the Treaty of Bristol in 1574. This particular peace would last only three years, until Francis Drake pillaged Spanish ships returning from Chile and Peru in 1577.²³ Worsening relations between Spain and England were motivated by English fear of Spain's support for Catholic rebels in Ireland, the deployment of English troops in support of Protestant rebels in the Netherlands, continued pillaging of Spanish ships by English pirates, suspected

²² Kelsey is among the most avid believers in our modern underestimation of Philip's influence in England. Kelsey emphasizes the invasion of France, which Philip himself led in 1557, as one piece of evidence for the sway he held in Parliament, though in this particular case Mary was his firmest ally (see esp. 127–31). For further perspectives on the relationship between Philip and Mary, see Redworth, “‘Matters impertinent to women’”; Prescott; and Samson, “Power Sharing.”

²³ See Pazzis Pi Corrales for a detailed summary of the naval tensions that existed between Spain and England during the reigns of these two monarchs.

Spanish involvement in plots to kill Elizabeth, and direct naval warfare made by both countries, beginning with the English attack on Cádiz in 1587 and followed by the Armada of 1588. Naval warfare continued until the end of Philip and Elizabeth's reigns, but with the ascension of their successors peace was reestablished in 1604.

In the seventeenth century, Spain and England would continue to maintain a volatile relationship, though James I and Philip III's peace of 1604 succeeded in preventing open conflict for the duration of their reigns. The conflict that emerged between Spain and England from 1625 to 1630 and again during the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell (1655–60) was less sustained than tensions had been between Philip II and Elizabeth in the last two decades of the previous century. Each country dealing with its own internal divisions, direct contact between Spain and England lulled in the last quarter of the seventeenth century and would not resume again until after the last Habsburg monarch had died, leaving Spain submerged in a succession crisis in which England would play a crucial role. By the early years of the eighteenth century the Habsburgs and Spain's empire had both seen their demise, and England had assumed a more powerful position in European politics. Although England allied in the Spanish War of Succession with the unsuccessful challenger to Philip of Bourbon, they would come out of the conflict on top, playing a large role in negotiations for peace. As Kamen has claimed, the Treaty of Utrecht "was fundamentally an English peace, and England emerged with all the honors" (*The War* 24). The balance of power between Spain and England had flipped and their dependence on one another for protection and survival no longer remained.

The question of Spain's religious mission in England emerges as a central topic in many of the texts studied in this dissertation, yet it did not consistently guide Spanish diplomacy there. Discourse revolving around Spain's relationship to England, be it literary, historical, or political,

was often characterized in regard to the empire's mission to protect Catholicism. It is possible that in Spain, England was seen as a country whose entrenched Catholic population was always on the verge of returning England to the side of the one 'true' Church.²⁴ When Philip II launched his English Enterprise in 1588, motivations were undoubtedly political and economical, but the mission's face was presented as firmly religious. As Pazzis Pi Corrales describes it, "[t]he enterprise was thus imbued with a divine character: its participants were on a religious and political crusade. Philip II was convinced that the undertaking had received God's blessing and that he was destined to fulfill it" (26). While some of the texts explored in this dissertation provide evidence in favor of this religiously focused Spanish reading of England, my goal here is not to discover what Spain thought of its firmly Protestant—after the death of Mary Tudor—neighbor to the north. Despite discourse, what remains a fact is that Spain often made peace with England's Protestant sovereigns when it was politically advantageous. Rather than discovering how Spain's perception of England changed over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, my goal is instead to discover what Spanish depictions of England reveal about Spanish identity in times of crisis or decline.

Debating the Decline and the Spanish Nation

In a manner, although not entirely, removed from the consideration of Spain and England's relationship in the sixteenth century, I feel it is necessary to comment briefly on Spain's own political reality as the seventeenth century progressed. The question of Spain's decline is one that historians have debated heartily in the last half-century. Skeptics of the

²⁴ See Loomie for further information regarding Spain's religious mission in England. Cruickshank refers to Philip II's belief in England's Catholic majority late in his reign ("Lisping" 206). In the seventeenth century, Ambassador Gondomar's letters attest to strong Catholic allegiances in Jacobean England (Redworth, *The Prince* 15–16).

decline-logic vision of Spain's early modern history, such as Henry Kamen, have argued that the view of Spanish decline in the seventeenth century has been greatly influenced by foreign perceptions of this time period. Historians of early modern decline, Kamen argues, have been unsuccessful at pinning down the moment in which Spain's decline began because they have too often conflated Castile with the rest of the Spain or because they have conflated Spain and its empire.²⁵ Richard Kagan, on the other hand, has pushed for a change in paradigm, from one that blames Spain's decline on its religious and monarchical dogmatism to one that considers the larger perspective of European economic downturn. This broader outlook, Kagan argues, will divert attention away from the biases of Protestant historians and those who have followed in the deep historical trenches dug by the Black Legend in the early modern period itself. In escaping from these long-established biases, we create a more objective view of Spain's early modern fate.²⁶ My concern does not primarily lie with the precise motivating factors of Spain's decline or its specific origins; instead, I focus on the Spanish empire's position in the European struggle for power. As Kamen admits, as the early modern period progressed "we cannot question the obvious fact that there was an undeniable decline in [Spain's] imperial and military power" ("The Decline" 32). As Spain endeavored to maintain its imperial influence and engaged in hawkish international policy, there existed a need to define that which Spain was fighting for. Thus the question I ask is as follows: in response to exterior pressure—whether or not you call it decline, crisis, or conflict—how did Spain represent its own identity?

History, as the subject matter of many genres, has long been implicated in the consideration of identity, the formation of which is especially salient in times of transformation. Speaking of one historic genre, Kurt Spang states, "[I]as épocas de crisis política, filosófica y

²⁵ See Kamen, "The Decline of Spain: A Historical Myth?"

²⁶ See Kagan, "Prescott's Paradigm."

religiosa suelen ser las épocas en las que la novela histórica experimenta un cultivo y una popularidad notable” (9). The same could be said of histories written in various genres in early modern Spain. Such texts played a part in creating and reflecting the nation’s changing identity. History’s relevance in times of crisis was especially impactful due to the fact that it often represented, as we have seen, national heroes and their victories. Thus the nation and history are intrinsically linked.

What the nation, history, and poetry share is their dependence on ideology. Whether factual or fictional, a nation’s shared mythologies—from the Cid’s conquest of the Peninsula to George Washington’s cherry tree—form a key component of its members’ shared identity. Equally essential to the creation of a nation is the definition of its limits, both physical and social. The establishment and consideration of Spain’s early modern identity can thus be seen to be doubly defined in the history of a foreign nation: these stories at once use history to recall Spain’s shared past (or even present), and they establish the boundaries between the Spanish nation’s members and those who were external to this denomination, the English.

Similar to the discussion of Spain’s decline, the existence of a Spanish nation in the early modern period elicits debate among scholars. Studying the emergence of a unified Spanish nation—far from the discussion of Spanish nationalism today—is admittedly complex.²⁷ During the entirety of the period under consideration in this dissertation the Spanish monarchy was plagued with challenges not only from within its peninsular territory but also within the more

²⁷ Nation must not be confused with nationalism, which Ernest Gellner defines as follows: “Nationalism is primarily a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent” (1). Nations, on the other hand, are described by Geller as the product of either shared will or culture between men who recognize their similarities (7). Gellner later expands upon the relationship between these two concepts and concludes, “[i]t is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way around” (55). Their relationship is undoubtedly complex and one that I will not expand upon here, suffice it to say that I am more inclined to agree with those theorists of nation who believe that this existed before the purported rise of nationalism in the nineteenth century. Ryjik’s discussion of these ideas is especially enlightening in the consideration of Spain’s case in particular (3–16).

expansive borders of its empire. As Xavier Gil Pujol has demonstrated in his extensive essay on “*patria y nación*” in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain, there existed constant and unresolved tension between ideas of unity and division within the Peninsula. While Spain shared its history of the Reconquest, for example, numerous local heroes that emerged from battles fought between Christians and Muslims (58–59). There existed conjointly a sense of duty to the greater “*patria*,” the monarchy, its empire, and its Catholic mission, but legal rights were granted based on regional laws of citizenship.²⁸ Despite these legal and cultural divisions among those residing in the Peninsula, the king’s identity was made up of “*varias naturalezas*” and thus in his person all nations of Spain found their similarity (52). Though Gil Pujol recognizes the same tendency to conflate the Spanish nation with Castile as does Kamen in the history of Spain’s decline, the separation of Castile from the idea of Spain is not of imminent concern in my consideration of the early modern Spanish creation of identity.

The existence of internal cultural and legal divisions within early modern Spain seems ultimately undeniable. What exists palpably, however, in many of the texts studied here is a *sense* of Spanish identity, one that assumed the unified identification of its consumers. Veronika Ryjik has shrewdly described the existence of a *national consciousness* in early modern Spain in the following terms: “[es] un proceso de comunicación de contenidos culturales dentro de una cultura que se pretende común, con un énfasis especial en un mito fundacional, asociado con un territorio concreto, que diferencie esta cultura de otras. Como resultado de este proceso, se consigue la construcción de unos intereses comunes en el imaginario colectivo” (15). Thus the real, historical existence of this unification matters less to my analysis than the imagined collectivity in relation to other cultures (in this case, that of England). In referring to the early

²⁸ For Gil Pujol’s discussion of the relationship between nation and legal rights, see 49–55.

modern “Spanish imagination” what I instead wish to conjure is the image represented in these texts that emerges from a unified goal or a shared problem in need of remedy. In this sense, I believe, a drama may be considered ‘national’ as it confronts problems that face the declining empire’s transition of power. In this sense, a ‘national’ history may emerge from the story of a foreign queen’s demise. And in this sense, news pamphlets may convey a shared ‘national’ goal in the imperial assimilation of territories that previously sat comfortably beyond its borders. My belief is that this kind of consideration of Spain’s identity emerges from the study of its relationship to its external allies and enemies. Once again, a transnational approach to empire reshapes our consideration of identity formation. And the study of the relationship that existed between empires is especially fruitful, as I have suggested, when considering its connection to history, in its diverse early modern forms.

Scholarly Approaches to the Early Modern Anglo-Spanish Relationship

The role that Spain played in the formation of England’s early modern identity has received increased attention over the last quarter century. Studies such as James McDermott’s *England and the Spanish Armada* give pride of place to the defeat of the Armada in the construction of England’s national identity. Unfortunately, scholarship on the early modern Anglo-Spanish relationship in general may lead an outside observer to believe that their influence was far from mutual. This is due to the fact that most research conducted on Spain and England’s early modern contact has tended to focus on English literary and cultural production. Most scholarly criticism on this relationship has centered on the admittedly intriguing paradox of England’s relationship to Spain during the period which was characterized, on the one hand, by the conflicting negative public opinion of Spain and the influence of its literature on English

authors and, on the other, by the conflicting relationship between the same negative public perception of Spain and the English crown's desire to promote policies of peace with Spain after James I's ascension. Hispanists have discovered no such patterns formed in the opposite direction. I believe that the greater significance given to the Anglo-Spanish relationship by scholars of English literature can be largely explained by historical circumstance, which has made it more difficult to discover a consistent attitude towards England in Spain. The volatile historical relationship between these two nations—which in Spain was not attended by consistency in public opinion—is accompanied by minimal permeation of English culture in Spain, especially compared to that which occurred in the opposite direction.

The search for a pattern or for consistency in mutual early modern understanding between Spain and England is easier to pin down in England than in Spain. This results from the fact that beginning around the time that Philip II became king of England, popular sentiment was determinedly hispanophobic. Even when English kings forged peace with Spain, popular sentiment, reflected in literature, was negative. Eric Griffin's work has been revelatory in our search to understand this relationship. He traces a transformation in the English perspective of Spain, which he describes as one that transitioned from *ethos* to *ethnos*. Prior to the Armada, Griffin explains, even Protestants in England focused their negative characterizations of Spain on *ethos*; that is, on Spain's moral and religious failings. After the Armada struck, English fears of Spanish invasion increased and English representations of Spain began to take on an ethnic tenor. After 1588, Spain was disparaged not principally due to its moral discrepancies but rather to its ethnic heritage, the mixing of Spanish blood with Moors and Jews. This pattern illuminates

a consistently negative understanding of Spain in England, though the reasons for English contempt changed over time.²⁹

The negative stereotype of Spain that emerged in England fed off what later came to be known as the Black Legend of Spanish Cruelty. Maltby has elucidated the longevity of these stereotypes in England specifically. The Black Legend, he explains, appeared in anti-Spanish propaganda long after Spain posed any real threat to English sovereignty. Scholars such as Maltby, McDermott, Griffin, Fuchs, and others have suggested that such a fixation on the Spanish empire within early modern England proves Spain's place within the formation of early modern English identity itself.³⁰ As McDermott points out in his analysis of the Armada confrontation, “[i]t was the first, inspiring episode in England’s essentially defensive journey to empire; the founding weave in a reluctantly assumed mantle of greatness” (x).

The consistently negative sentiment expressed towards Spain in early modern public opinion in England was augmented by the physical circulation of literature and culture from Spain into England at the time. The circulation of books particularly has been studied by Fernando Bouza, who describes early modern cultural exchange between these two nations as follows: “In contrast to all this activity [translations from Spanish to English], the offerings were much scarcer on the Spanish side which, as stated earlier, was interested primarily in neo-Latin authors such as Barclay, Owen, Conn and Gibbes” (71; trans. Jenny Dodman). Once again, we see a clearer pattern emerging from one side of this equation. Barbara Fuchs has also published on specific Spanish texts that influenced early modern literature in England. In her *Poetics of Piracy*, she posits a paradoxically antagonistic and hispanophilic attitude towards Spain during

²⁹ Griffin outlines these ideas in “From *Ethos* to *Ethnos*” and later expands upon them in *English Renaissance Drama and the Specter of Spain*.

³⁰ Although Fuchs touches upon this idea in a number of her publications, I especially recommend “Spanish Lessons” to the reader interested in imperial borrowings of the Spanish model in England.

the sixteenth and, particularly, the seventeenth century in England. She suggests that English authors were greatly influenced by Spanish texts that made their way across the continent or overseas, but in a metaphorically piratical way, they pillaged from Spanish sources what they liked best and transformed them to suit their own purposes, denying, in almost all cases, the importance of the original Spanish text. The collection that Fuchs edited in 2010 with the *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* also includes a number of articles in which similar instances of literary borrowing, or instances of cultural influence on English literature are exposed.³¹

Another subset of Anglo-Spanish scholarship has come out of the direct comparison of historical circumstances and literary themes in the cultural environment of these two nations. This scholarship comes from both hispanists and English academics who find fruit in the similar realities of England and Spain from whence they derive comparison. Recent studies in this area have compared the emergence of early modern theater, such as David Amelong's work comparing the physical structures of the *corral de comedias* and the Blackfriars and their impact on the crowd's play watching experience. A. A. Parker's study is one among those that compare the treatment of a similar literary theme. His work, as well as that of George Mariscal, has analyzed representations of Henry VIII in both Calderón and Shakespeare. Others, such as Teresa Kirschner, choose to explore broader themes, such as the mob, in Shakespeare and Lope. Many such essays, comparing themes ranging from revenge to romance appear in the collection edited by Louise and Peter Fothergill-Payne, *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama 1580–1680*. While these studies in many cases illuminate similarities and differences

³¹ From this special issue, see Bearden; Griffin, "Spain is Portugal"; and Lockey for discussions of such influence on England's early modern literature.

within early modern cultural environments, they do little to determine what each country thought of the other or how their relationship influenced each nation.

Apart from those hispanists who have chosen to take a comparative approach to the literatures of Spain and England, there is a small but growing group of scholars who have placed their focus on Spanish texts, primarily drama, that represent English characters.³² The work of these academics serves to combat a belief that had previously emerged among scholars of early modern Spain which argues that Spain simply cared little about England at the time and for this reason English influence in Spain was negligible. Unfortunately, for many years this idea seems to have been entrenched among scholars of early modern Spain, and we are only now slowly climbing up the ladder and out of the crevice this belief had created. Among those who respond dismissively to Spain's representation of England is Donald Cruickshank, whose overview of English characters in Spanish drama has led him to conclude that

Spanish dramatists tended to portray the English as no different from themselves, and, when historical facts in the plot obliged them to refer to religious differences, they showed considerable tolerance. They say that we only tolerate what we do not care about, and the fact is that few Spaniards knew or cared much about a small country on the fringe of northern Europe. ("Lisping" 203)

Maltby, too, though focusing on the English dissemination of the Black Legend, comes to a similar conclusion regarding Spain. He suggests that despite England's passionate dislike for Spain, "no complementary Anglophobia seems to have developed in Spain, where reporting was

³² See essays such as those published by Pablo Ávila, María Cristina Quintero, Alejandro García Reidy, Deborah Forteza, and Esther Fernández. Esther Fernández was kind enough to share her article on Coello's drama with me prior to the publication of her edited volume, which I have unfortunately not been able to consult for this dissertation. To date, I am not aware of any single monograph or edited collection that limits its discussion of the Anglo-Spanish relationship to Spanish literary and cultural output.

much more subdued, though surely the Spaniards had every reason to be as vexed with the English as the English were with them” (135). One of the goals of my dissertation is to continue to dismantle this dismissive belief in Spain’s complacent “toleration” of the English.

I do not wish to suggest that previous dismissal or lack of interest in Spanish texts with an English theme is entirely unwarranted, nor will this dissertation reveal long-hidden stereotypes of the English that mimic those of Spain represented in English texts. I believe, rather, that the relatively smaller focus on England in Spanish scholarship can be accounted for based on the very same circumstances which I have suggested *encouraged* English scholars to consider the influence of Spain in England during this time period. Though I have argued that England and Spain maintained constant contact throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, their individual historical circumstances very much differed. The first and most obvious difference to be acknowledged is that at this time the Spanish crown was concerned with the rule of a vast empire. England, while present among the empire’s political affairs, was simply not as high on Spain’s list of concerns as Spain was on England’s. What’s more, the nature of Spain’s volatile relationship with England meant that stereotypes did not emerge in Spain as they did in England. Literary representations of English characters, instead, were much more influenced in Spain by monarchical policy. That is, we do not see in Spain a consistently held public opinion of the English that developed independently of the crown’s relationship to this northern nation. Finally, and as has been pointed out, textual circulation—or the physical consumption of culture—did not have the same reach in Spain as it did in England.

These historical circumstances thus may account for the relative lack of scholarship on the Anglo-Spanish relationship from the Spanish side of the equation. Other than those who have analyzed Spanish texts in thematic comparison to their English counterparts and those who have

begun to explore certain Spanish representations of the English in isolation, the recent emergence of Black Legend studies has shown Spain's pre-modern awareness of negative opinions coming from the outside. In the two collections recently edited by Yolanda Rodríguez Pérez and Antonio Sánchez Jiménez, scholars consider Spain's consciousness of the developing anti-Spanish sentiment in Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They address Spain's awareness of and response to both native criticism of the empire and also that which developed within foreign nations. Though studies in this area do not tend to focus on England specifically, they point to an external awareness in Spain that had not previously been recognized. They draw attention to Spain's concern in the sixteenth and especially the seventeenth century of other nations' opinions of the empire. The work collected in these volumes has expanded the comparative study of empire, pushing beyond Spain's insular tendencies in order to think about how Spanish authors responded to other nations in Europe and beyond.

Some of the texts studied in this dissertation, as well as others written in Spain about England, have received increased attention over approximately the last ten to fifteen years. Plays like Antonio de Coello's *El Conde de Sex*, Calderón's *Cisma de Ingalaterra*, and Cervantes's "La española inglesa" have been explored in numerous articles and collected volumes. Most of these studies have focused on drama, for it is in this genre that the English theme most consistently appears in early modern Spanish texts. This study differs from those that have been conducted to date because it provides a comprehensive study of genres and texts over time, and in certain cases it explores texts that have been almost entirely neglected by scholars to date. Rather than focusing on how a single text represents England, this study considers what may be gleaned from an understanding of Spain's sustained interest in and relationship with England.

Chapter Outline

“Historiopoiesis in Early Modern Spain: Remembering Anglo-Spanish Encounters” is divided into two sections, each of which focuses on texts that represent a significant moment of contact between Spain and England during the early modern period. The first three chapters together comprise Part One, entitled “A Queen Martyred: Mary Stuart’s Execution Retold and Reinterpreted from the Peninsula;” they examine texts written about Mary Stuart which largely concentrate on retelling the moments of the Queen of Scots’s life that led up to her execution by the Protestant queen Elizabeth I. These texts therefore place the two queens in contrast to one another, in print as they were in life. The chapters in this section explore texts written both immediately after the Queen of Scots’s execution and more than one hundred years later. Together, they show how the adaptations of Mary’s story by Spanish authors in differing genres use this historical character and her English rival both as a means of celebrating Spain’s religious identity and in order to question the empire’s strengths and weaknesses. The last two chapters of this dissertation, which together form Part Two, entitled “An English Prince Comes to Madrid: Charles and the Portrayal of the Young Philip IV,” explore the sensational events that brought the disguised Prince of Wales to Spain with the goal of winning the hand of the Infanta María in marriage. The chapters in this part examine early modern news representations of the events that took place during Charles’s stay in *relaciones de sucesos* and a series of historical dramas that were written about the match in roughly the decade following Charles’s departure. Together, these two events find Spain and England in moments of high tension, on the one hand, and desired peace—however fleeting—on the other. They form a part of a much longer narrative of history than their roughly thirty-five year span encompasses, attested to by their reappearance in Spanish texts long after their presence had initially attracted public interest.

Chapter One, “Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas: The Queen of Scots’s Spanish Historian” opens the dissertation with an exploration of Herrera y Tordesillas’s historical treatise *Historia de lo sucedido en Escocia e Inglaterra en quarenta y quarto años que bivió María Estuarda, Reyna de Escocia* (1589). Written in response to George Buchanan’s inflammatory history of the Queen of Scots, this treatise defends the Catholic queen who immediately upon her death became a martyr whose death the Gran Armada sought to avenge. Although Herrera maintains the factual pretenses of the historical genre, I argue that his history engages in the task of nation building by molding Mary Stuart’s story to emphasize Spain’s commitment to its Catholic identity following the Armada’s failed return. This chapter explores the question, how can the retelling of a foreign martyr’s death serve in the process of rebuilding an empire’s reputation after suffering a humiliating defeat?

Chapter Two, “Lope de Vega’s Return to the Queen of Scots: Reimagining Mary Stuart in *La corona trágica* (1627)” takes up the often-disparaged or ignored epic poem that Lope wrote about the Scottish queen’s final weeks. *La corona trágica* (1627) was written when Lope sought favor at court; his desired post was specifically that of royal chronicler. While focusing on his chosen historical theme in this epic poem, Lope adopts the liberties associated with the poetic representation of this historic rivalry, creating a captivating Scottish martyr who is given determined historic significance in contrast to her maligned English counterpart. In doing so, Lope’s desire to prove himself an able chronicler and historian demonstrates the potential for historiopoetics in epic form.

Chapter Three, “Foreign Queens on the Spanish Stage: Juan Bautista Diamante’s *La reina María Estuarda* (c. 1660) and José de Cañizares’s *Lo que va de cetro a cetro y crueldad de Inglaterra* (c. 1713–18)” explores two historical dramas written about Mary Stuart’s execution

decades after the event occurred. In contrast to earlier Mary Stuart texts, these dramatists transform the relationship of Mary and Elizabeth into a means of critical reflection of the Spanish nation in crisis or decline. The combined use of history and both geographic and temporal distance from the events represented on stage, in this case, provided two early modern Spanish playwrights with the opportunity not only to comment on another nation's past but also to transform a foreign history into a distinctively national drama.

Chapter Four, "Assimilating the English: The Prince of Wales in Pamphlet Literature (1623)" demonstrates popular excitement and direct involvement in the seventeenth century Anglo-Spanish match. This chapter takes up a body of short news pamphlets, or *relaciones de sucesos*, that were published during Charles's visit to Madrid in 1623. How might this Protestant prince fit into the plans of Spain's new monarch, Philip IV, who along with his *valido* Olivares wished to reinvigorate Spain's commitment to its Catholic empire? This chapter investigates the response to this question in a marginal genre that, despite the little attention it has received from scholars, was among those that most effectively reached the public of early modern Spain.

Chapter Five, "Favorable Comparisons: Philip IV and the Prince of Wales on Stage (1623–1633)" returns to the genre of historical drama, this time analyzing history plays that were written about events only recently passed. Focusing primarily on Francisco de Quevedo's *Cómo ha de ser el privado* (1629), I examine the characters he portrays on stage to analogously represent the Spanish king and his guest during the 1623 visit. By paying particular attention to the character meant to represent Charles, a character who has largely been ignored by critics of this play in the past, I demonstrate the ways in which Quevedo uses the English prince to criticize his own monarch's failings. Written at a time when the glimmer of Philip IV's early

reign was beginning to fade, this play—much like those examined in Chapter Three—exhibits concerns for Spain's future in the character of a foreign prince.

Together, the texts studied in this dissertation make up only a small portion of those of an English theme written in Spain over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Their shared focus on the English historical characters who piqued the interest of international audiences and their consideration of Spain's imperial position, however, illuminate England's relevance to our understanding of Spain's early modern identity. It is in the reflection of this foreign nation's past, in the historical genres that reinvent and reinvigorate its foreign characters, that we find new places to explore this transnational relationship and the part it played a part in Spain's imperial imagination.

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

A Queen Martyred: Mary Stuart's Execution Retold and Reinterpreted from the Peninsula

On a rainy morning in February of 1587 in a castle located just to the north of London, a Catholic queen was executed on charges of treason by her fellow sovereign, cousin, and queen. Mary Stuart's death after almost twenty years spent in exile and imprisonment in England seemed anything but inevitable. Elizabeth I had long delayed sentencing the Queen of Scots, and in the sixteenth century it was internationally understood that one sovereign did not possess the right to try and judge another. Whether or not it was thanks to the scandal of her death or the many that dotted her life, Mary Stuart's story would for centuries motivate artists and authors to recreate her tragedy. In the century following her death, Mary was depicted numerous times on stage in France, Italy, and Spain. At the turn of the nineteenth century, she was famously reimaged by Friedrich Schiller. And in the twenty-first century, she has continued to captivate viewers in her own television melodrama and most recently a blockbuster film set to release just days before the defense of this dissertation. The Queen of Scots's story has proven timeless, though modern reinterpretations unsurprisingly stray significantly from the elements of her life that remained the focus of her early biographers. In Catholic Europe after her death, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was Mary's religion and her Protestant executioner that transformed a queen of Scotland into a martyr. It was with her death and the bestowal of this distinguished religious nomenclature that Spain's interest in this tragic character was incited, as it never had been while she lived.

Part One of "Historiopoiesis in Early Modern Spain" examines four texts written in Spain in the century and a half that followed Mary's execution. It explores various transformations and

reinterpretations of Mary and Elizabeth's shared story to reveal the way in which these changing depictions in turn embody changes within the Spanish empire itself. Taking a historiopoetic approach to various Spanish representations of these two monarchs, I determine how the creation of historical accounts of Mary's life relate to Spain's changing national identity. In doing so, I consider how the representation of England's past may be interpreted as a reflection of Spain's contemporary moment.

Mary and her cousin queen were represented in a series of texts in a wide variety of genres in Spain during the country's Golden Age, and in these texts their story remained essentially unchanged in its most basic element; that is, the struggle between Catholics and Protestants.³³ Yet various elements of their characterization and that of their relationship were constantly reinterpreted, changed by their creators to reflect contemporary political concerns of the Spanish nation. In the texts analyzed in Part One, I examine how the manipulation of these two protagonists and the events and people that connected them reveals their newfound relevancy to Spain's shifting imperial identity through the seventeenth and into the early eighteenth centuries.

The first textual reinterpretation of Mary and Elizabeth's story analyzed in Chapter One is Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas's *Historia de lo sucedido en Escocia e Inglaterra en quarenta y quatro años que bivió María Estuarda, Reyna de Escocia* (1589). This biography of Mary Stuart, written in the early years of the career of a man who would later be named official chronicler to the king of Spain, demonstrates complicity in the creation of Spain's imperial imagination. In this lengthy historical treatise, Herrera engages in the task of nation building by

³³ In this dissertation, I will not discuss texts written in Spain that represent only Elizabeth, for they tend to represent an entirely different perspective of the English queen. Both Miguel de Cervantes's "La española inglesa" and Antonio Coello's *El conde de Sex*, for example, present arguably sympathetic representations of Elizabeth I.

emphasizing a commitment to Spain's Catholic identity after the Armada's failed return from England. His historical text is meant to correct the misconceptions fomented by the Queen of Scots's Protestant detractors, but the biography Herrera produces in the process presents a reexamination of the two queens that demonizes the former and defends the latter, confounding historical methodology with the patriotic desire to displace Spain's blame in the tragedy of this martyr's death.

Chapter Two analyzes Lope de Vega's epic poem *La corona trágica* (1627). When Lope returns to the subject of these two historical characters almost forty years after Herrera's biography was published, Spain's political relationship with England remained remarkably similar. Despite an attempted match between the Prince of Wales and the Spanish Infanta, Spain and England once more found themselves in open naval conflict. As time had passed, however, and as Lope made his choice of genre, he was admitted liberties with the queens' story that Herrera had not taken. In his epic poem, Mary is dramatized in her role as martyr, telling her own story with the help of a narrator who maintains no sense of historical impartiality. Elizabeth, in this text, is stripped of all speaking privileges and embodies the evils of the Protestant English nation against whom Spain continued to fight in the year this epic was printed.

Finally, in the two plays that further dramatize the story of these rival queens in the second half of the seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries, factual or historical pretense is left by the wayside. Discussed in Chapter Three, both Juan Bautista Diamante, in *La reina María Estuarda* (c. 1660), and José de Cañizares, in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro y crueldad de Inglaterra* (c. 1713–18), reinterpret Mary's story in a way that emphasizes its relevance to contemporary Spanish politics and identity. Diamante and Cañizares are influenced by the current state of the Anglo-Spanish relationship at the time they composed their dramas; they also, however, use

Mary's story to reflect upon a changing Spanish empire. In these *comedias*, each author manipulates his protagonists, plot, and secondary characters to elicit a didactic message for Spain's contemporary monarchs. Although all of the texts that I study come from varying genres, they have in common an interpretation of the Scottish and English queens that is motivated by the contemporary political and national contexts in which they were written. Their reconstructions of Mary and Elizabeth's story, rooted always in their historical relationship, enter in each case into the grey area that historiopoiesis embodies. It is due to their contemporary relevance that we witness these texts' participation in the process of either the manufacture or interrogation of Spain's imperial identity, the latter principally in the century of the empire's decline.

Tumultuous Times: Mary Stuart's Life from Birth to Death

In order to understand why the Queen of Scots has managed to entertain for so many centuries, and in order especially to comprehend her relevance to Spain in the early modern period, it is first necessary to understand the basics of her story.³⁴ Mary inherited the crown of Scotland from her father, King James V, when she was only seven days old. Her young age meant that Scotland would be ruled by the longest regency in its history, and from the beginning deeply divided noble factions competed for power at court. Those who wished to take control were separated by religious and political affiliation: Protestants sought an English alliance for Scotland and Catholics hoped to ally themselves with France. Despite the "Rough Wooing" by Henry VIII, a three-year war that attempted to 'convince' Scotland to send Mary to England to

³⁴ While this introduction provides a brief biography of Mary Stuart and more concretely her place within Spanish foreign policy, for further reading I suggest the modern biographies by Rosalind K. Marshall, John Guy, and Alison Plowden.

wed the young prince Edward, the young queen's mother, Marie de Guise, managed to broker an alliance with her French relatives in the early years of the regency. According to the terms of this alliance, the now five-year-old queen was sent to France to be protected there as the future wife of the sickly young dauphin, Francis. Little comment is often made about Mary's life in France, but there she was well educated in French and Latin as well as Italian and possibly Spanish. She was brought up with the French *enfants* in the Roman Catholic religion and was described by one admiring nobleman as "charming and intelligent as to give everyone who sees her incomparable joy and satisfaction" (qtd. in Guy 44). Her ability to impress and to relate to people around her of all stations, classes, and religions would become a part of Mary's highly esteemed character in adulthood. At sixteen, Mary became queen of France when her husband Francis ascended the throne, but not more than two years after his coronation and three after their wedding, Francis died, making Mary a widow for the first time.

With the death of Francis in December of 1560, it was decided that Mary would return to Scotland, but in her absence Protestant lords had gained control of Parliament. Despite the efforts of Mary's Catholic mother, who remained in Scotland while her daughter was away in France, the country was by Mary's return plagued by religious tension common to northern Europe at this time.³⁵ When Mary returned home she was accompanied by her half-brother, James Stewart, the illegitimate child of James V, and some ten years Mary's senior. James would become one of Mary's trusted advisers, but in her absence, he had converted to the Protestant religion and had found his place among the leaders of the Protestant faction at court. Upon her return to Scotland, Mary agreed to a conciliatory religious policy that acknowledged the continued prominence of

³⁵ In August of 1560 Protestants cemented their control in Scotland. Parliament passed acts authorizing Protestant Confession of Faith, abolished the Pope's jurisdiction over Scotland and made hearing and taking Mass illegal (Marshall 48).

the reformed religion but guaranteed her right to practice her Catholic faith in private. The seven years that Mary spent ruling in Scotland were filled with religious tension and personal scandal. Protestant lords, led by James, named earl of Moray by his sister in 1562, made a series of wars upon those that backed Mary and favored Catholic policy.³⁶ The most vigorous clashes began after Mary chose to take Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, as her second husband. Lord Darnley was a young nobleman, a member of the powerful Scottish Catholic house of Lennox and descendant of the English King Henry VII through his maternal grandmother, Margaret Tudor. He had grown up in England and was well educated in the ways of court, but unfortunately for Mary, Lord Darnley would prove to be a liability, thanks in large part to his choleric temper and to the conflict that existed between his family and the house of Hamilton, the most powerful Protestant house in Scotland.³⁷

Within two weeks of Mary's second marriage, Protestant lords entered into open revolt against the queen, who they claimed would reverse policies favorable to the reformed religion. After the famous Chaseabout Raid, in which Mary herself participated, pursuing the lords that fled capture and trial for their rebellion, those who had fallen out of favor found themselves prepared to take desperate measures. Mary's detractors saw the opportunity to take advantage of her young and insufferable second husband and with his help plotted the murder of Mary's favorite Italian secretary, David Rizzio, and the kidnapping of the queen.³⁸ In March of 1566,

³⁶ During the first couple of years that Mary ruled in Scotland, her half-brother James was among her principle advisers. Thanks to the early support he showed towards Mary, the queen gave him the title Earl of Moray (Marshall 71–74).

³⁷ Darnley's inappropriate and unruly behavior has become infamous. As Alison Plowden describes the young king, who was eighteen when he married the Queen of Scots, Mary "did not guess that beneath the surface of this tall handsome princeling, with his pretty manners and courtly accomplishments, lay a spoilt, loutish, unstable youth with all the makings of a vindictive bully" (94).

³⁸ Most contemporary historians explain Darnley's involvement in this crime not for religious reasons but based on the ability of Protestant lords to manipulate his feelings of jealousy, pride, and paranoia. These

Mary was six months pregnant and dined with a small party at Holyrood house in Edinburgh when a group of the same lords previously implicated in the Protestant rebellion and Chaseabout Raid attacked the queen and her dinner party, killed Rizzio—according to some accounts in front of the queen herself—and took Mary prisoner. The queen, fearing for her life, escaped Holyrood with her repentant husband and after quick negotiations for peace among her noble factions (during which she also forgave her half-brother for his participation in the initial revolts), Mary gave birth to a healthy son, James, at Edinburgh Castle.

Despite further reconciliations with those involved in the murder of Rizzio, peace did not last long in Mary's court. Shortly after Rizzio's murder, Mary's imprisonment, escape, and the birth of her son, the same plotters organized the murder of Lord Darnley in what would become one of the most infamous assassinations of the British Isles for its mysterious circumstances and the Queen of Scots's own possible involvement. Darnley was murdered on February 10, 1567 after an explosion occurred at his lodging. The king was found strangled alongside one of his servants in the garden at Kirk o' Field, where he had been staying in recovery of an illness that was most likely syphilis.³⁹ Immediately following the death of the king, his body was buried in James V's vault at Holyrood and pamphlets were posted throughout the city accusing the earl of Bothwell, at the time one of Mary's closest advisers, of the crime.⁴⁰ Mary herself was later

aspects of Darnley's character are usually cited to explain his alliance with Protestant lords because, as Guy puts it, "Darnley was not a devout Catholic. He was certainly not a Protestant, [. . .] but was cynically exploiting religion for his own political purposes" (226). Other scholars are even less clear regarding Darnley's religious beliefs. Although he came from a prominent Catholic family, Marshall explains that during the Catholic wedding ceremony "[t]ogether, they knelt before the priest and prayers were said. Because Darnley claimed to be Protestant, he did not wait for the rest of the service" (96).

³⁹ See Plowden 114, Guy 278–80, or Marshall 102 for a description of Darnley's promiscuity and likely contraction of syphilis as a result.

⁴⁰ As early as the first of March, Mary was depicted on one of the pamphlets posted in Edinburgh as a mermaid, representative of a prostitute, alongside a hare, symbol of Bothwell's family crest. "From then onwards," explains Marshall, "there was a growing storm of rumor to the effect that the Queen and her lover had murdered her unfortunate husband" (151).

accused of involvement, beginning as early as March of 1567, and would eventually be tried and acquitted for her participation in the plot while in exile in England.⁴¹

Just a few days past the three-month anniversary of her second husband's death, Mary wed the earl of Bothwell in a modest Protestant ceremony in the Great Hall at Holyrood. Bothwell had been cleared of any involvement in Darnley's murder in a farcical trial that did little to shed truth on the murder plot. The circumstances of Mary's marriage to Bothwell are still shrouded under some mystery. As the story goes, their marriage took place after Bothwell and his party of some four hundred horsemen abducted the queen and brought her forcibly to Dunbar Castle. Mary's complicity in this kidnapping was generally believed by her contemporaries and continues to be accepted today.⁴² Feeling that Bothwell had too much control over the queen, Protestant nobles, who with the birth of James found the timing right for another regency, once more began to campaign against their queen. Mary was slandered publicly for both her involvement in Lord Darnley's murder and her marriage to Bothwell, and after a series of confrontations, she was taken prisoner at Lochleven Castle. There she was forced to abdicate in

⁴¹ Twentieth-century historians continue to demonstrate varying opinions regarding Mary's involvement in the murder of Lord Darnley. In her 1986 biography, Marshall explains that while Mary may have been fed up with her husband's general lack of decorum and while she may have considered a Catholic divorce, Mary ultimately reconciled to stay married to Darnley for lack of another viable solution (132–33). Furthermore, according to Marshall, “[i]t is also fairly obvious that even had the Queen acted completely out of character and participated in the plan, she would have plotted something far more effective and far less crude than the blowing up of an entire building. Poison in a cup of wine would have been much easier and would not have involved the uncertainties of the Kirk o’ Field scheme” (149). Plowden, on the other hand, believes that Mary must have been in some way complicit in the plot to kill her husband. The Queen of Scots, according to Plowden, would have been the only person able to convince Lord Darnley to move to Edinburgh, where the murder plot was to be carried out (116). Plowden reasons “[t]hat she knew, or wanted to know, the details of the murder plan is unlikely; that she knew a murder was intended seems an inescapable conclusion. It is stretching credulity beyond reasonable limits to believe that she did not realise, when she signed the pardon for Riccio's murderers, that she was also signing her husband's death warrant” (122).

⁴² For a more detailed description of the kidnapping, see Marshall 153–55 or Plowden 123–26.

favor of her thirteen-month-old son, who was crowned James VI of Scotland shortly thereafter.⁴³ After seven years in Scotland, at the age of twenty-five, Mary was forced to flee her jail at Lochleven and ultimately her country in the cover of night, dressed in the clothes of a washerwoman.

The queen made one final attempt to gather her Catholic supporters, but her forces lost against Moray's men, and Mary fled south to Dundrennan. At this point, her advisers suggested she make contact with her French relatives and seek assistance from the continent, but the Queen of Scots had also received a promise of refuge and troops to reclaim her rightful throne from her cousin and fellow female sovereign, Queen Elizabeth I of England. Mary's decision to flee to England is still not well understood, for an escape to France would have seemingly been the more logical alternative. In France, she maintained the title of dowager queen and there she would receive an annual income from her property holdings.⁴⁴ It is not surprising that Mary's Catholic supporters were reticent to see her seek help from Elizabeth, given the long history of bad relations between Scotland and England. Although Mary could clearly not have known of her cousin's activities before her flight south, Elizabeth had secretly provided financial support to the Protestant nobles' cause against Mary over the course of her short reign.⁴⁵

Once in England, Mary was welcomed into the house of the earl of Shrewsbury, from whence she was not permitted to continue to London to be received at court by her cousin until her name was cleared of any involvement in the murder of her second husband, Lord Darnley.

⁴³ Bothwell escaped imprisonment with his new wife by fleeing first to Norway, then to Denmark. Abroad he met with unkind creditors, spent time in prison, and reportedly died insane some eleven years later (Marshall 170).

⁴⁴ See Plowden 138–39 for more information on Mary's options for escape from Scotland.

⁴⁵ In a rare move of overt intervention, Elizabeth sent English troops into Scotland to support the Protestant faction's rebellion in 1560 while Marie de Guise still ruled as regent (Guy 106). A few years later, in 1565, Moray sought Elizabeth's support after the Chaseabout Raid (Plowden 100).

Elizabeth claimed she did not wish to tarnish her own reputation in receiving her. This was the first great blow dealt to the Scottish Queen, for never had a king or queen been forced to present herself before the court of another sovereign in trial. Despite the evidence brought against Mary by Moray, who had traveled to England to participate in the trial, it was concluded that there was not enough proof to implicate the queen in the death of her husband. Yet Mary would remain a prisoner in England for the next nineteen years, during which time she was connected to a number of plots to gain her liberty, overthrow the English queen, and reinstate the Catholic faith in England. It was not until 1586, however, that she was brought to trial for the second time in England, this time on charges of treason. Thanks to a letter-trafficking scheme set up by Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth's intelligence minister, evidence against the Queen of Scots was finally definitive.⁴⁶ Two laws had been passed by Parliament in 1585 that meant Mary could finally be sentenced to death legally in England. She was beheaded on the morning of February 8, 1587 in front of a crowd of approximately three hundred onlookers inside the walls of Fotheringhay Castle, some one hundred miles north of London.⁴⁷

Throughout her lifetime, Mary played the role of an important pawn in the delicate balance of European alliances and the struggle for power between Protestant and Catholic nations. As was made apparent by Henry VIII's desire to wed her to his son Edward, the English saw her first as a game piece that would permit the subjugation of the Scottish monarchy under the English crown. Later for Elizabeth, she became a Catholic threat whose claim to the throne of England proved too dangerous to ignore. Understandably, Mary's place within European politics,

⁴⁶ Plowden describes the elaborate 'secret' post that Walsingham arranged with the help of Mary's jailer, Amyas Paulet, which began functioning in January 1586 (202–08).

⁴⁷ As Wilkinson points out, Mary's execution is often dated February 8, 1587 because this was the date that the event took place according to the traditional calendar. England had not yet adopted at this time the New Style or Gregorian calendar proposed by papal decree in 1582 (124).

along with the many scandals that dotted her short lifespan, provoked interest among the people of Scotland, England and France—all countries where she lived for a time—from the beginning of her life and beyond its tragic end. Spain, however, became interested in Mary only after her death. The Queen of Scots was of much more use to Philip II as a symbol, a Catholic martyr who died for her faith at the hands of her Protestant cousin. While she was still alive, Mary's close ties with France meant that in Spain's eyes she remained a threat.

Aversion, Plots, and Intervention: Spain's Historical Political Relationship with Mary Stuart

Spain's relative lack of interest in Mary during her lifetime must be recognized in order to highlight the change in Spanish sentiment towards the Scottish queen after her death. While Mary lived in France as the intended and later wife of Francis, Spain maintained an alliance with England cemented by Philip II's marriage to Mary Tudor in 1554. The year of Mary Tudor's death, 1558, was extremely significant for the relationship between England, France, and Spain. In this year, Elizabeth ascended the English throne as its third Protestant sovereign, France and England found themselves still engaged in a war that Philip II had begun while wed to Mary Tudor, and Mary Stuart had made her own claim to the English throne as its rightful queen. Throughout Mary Tudor's reign as queen of England, while Philip reigned at her side, the Spanish king supported Elizabeth's claim to the throne should his wife not bear children; he did so despite the fact that Mary Stuart would guarantee the return of the Catholic faith to England. As Plowden puts it, "Hypocrite, heretic and bastard though she might be, [Elizabeth] would still be an infinitely preferable alternative to Mary Stewart from the Habsburg point of view" (34), the reason for this being that if England and Scotland were to fall under the French sphere of

influence with Mary Stuart's rule, Spain risked losing its power in northern Europe and its access to the Netherlands through the English Channel.

Two years after Elizabeth ascended the throne, Mary was already in search of her second husband. Although she would ultimately settle on marrying Lord Darnley, her initial desire had been to forge an alliance with Spain. Mary had decided she would marry prince Don Carlos, son of Philip II and his first wife Maria of Portugal. The match, she believed, would provide the support she needed against the English, who had joined forces with the Protestant Scottish lords that rebelled against Mary's mother in March of 1560. The match was not officially rejected by Philip until August of 1564 and thus for a short time it seemed as though Mary Stuart would play a part of Spanish politics while still alive. Once this alliance was rejected, while Mary struggled to maintain control in Scotland, Philip continued his support of Elizabeth in England and refrained from intervening in Scottish affairs.⁴⁸

Within the context of the Anglo-Spanish relationship, Mary's nineteen-year imprisonment provoked little cause for overt action. In the early 1570s, however, when religious tensions reached a breaking point in France, Spain made its first covert attempt to depose Elizabeth in favor of Mary. The Ridolfi Plot, organized by the Italian merchant Roberto Ridolfi in 1571, meant to place Mary on the throne with the duke of Norfolk as her consort and thus restore the Catholic religion in England. The plan, sent to Philip II for approval but never signed, was to include some six thousand Spanish troops led by the duke of Alba from the Netherlands. Before the plot could be carried out, William Cecil, Elizabeth's secretary and spy, discovered the plot and imprisoned the duke of Norfolk. The Spanish ambassador, who had been

⁴⁸ The marriage alliance between Mary Stuart and Don Carlos was rejected for what Marshall summarizes as "a variety of diplomatic reasons," including Catherine de Medici's desire to keep Mary out of the Spanish court, where her daughter had become queen as Philip II's third wife. Also by this time it was exceedingly clear that Carlos was not fit to marry (81).

communicating with the plotters on behalf of Philip II, left the country following allegations of his involvement. As James Emerson Phillips explains it, “[a]t crucial moments—during the Northern Rebellion and the Ridolfi conspiracy, for example—France, Spain and even the Papacy had failed to act in the cause that Mary represented” (*Images* 100). Shortly thereafter, until almost the end of Mary’s imprisonment, Spain and England resumed cordial diplomatic relations and for this reason Philip would not intervene on Mary’s behalf. The Queen of Scots instead maintained close relations with her French relatives and with the Pope.

By the time Mary’s execution drew near in the late 1580s, the relationship Philip maintained with Elizabeth floated on much rougher waters. Once more the Spanish ambassador, now Bernardino de Mendoza, became involved in a plot to overthrow the English queen and put Mary in her place. In 1581, a group of English Catholic noblemen, with the support of the Guise family from France and of Philip from Spain, manufactured the Throckmorton Plot. The plot’s goal was not unique, nor was its outcome. Elizabeth’s new spy master, Francis Walsingham, discovered the planned invasion of England’s southern border by troops from both the Pope and Philip II, and as a result he had Sir Francis Throckmorton tortured and sentenced to death before the event could take place. Mary was in close contact with Mendoza during the plotting and at the time wrote to him expressing her desire to convert her son to Catholicism and forge an alliance with the king of Spain. The result, however, was that once more the Spanish ambassador would leave England.

Some three years later, Walsingham had set up what Mary believed to be her own ‘secret’ post. Through this post Mary would receive letters regarding the Babington Plot, leading ultimately to her final trial and execution. Some of the letters that came to the Queen of Scots were indeed from Spanish contacts on the continent. By the mid-1580s, tensions between

England and Spain had culminated in an all but openly declared war. After the discovery of the Throckmorton Plot, Mendoza had traveled from London to Paris, from whence he continued to correspond with the Queen of Scots. In a letter to Mendoza, Mary lamented her son's heresy and offered to disinherit him in favor of the king of Spain if he refused to embrace the Catholic Church.⁴⁹ Unfortunately for Mary, Walsingham's intelligence operation effectively cut off the Scottish queen's lifeline before a new plan could be put into action. He had sufficient evidence from the letters he had intercepted to arrest the plot's leader, his accomplices in London, and the Queen of Scots herself. Once Mary was arrested and put on trial, Spain failed to intervene. Paradoxically, successfully placing Mary on the throne would have resulted in the reduction of Philip's European influence:

While she lived, Philip of Spain was likely to go on hesitating about launching the much discussed Holy Enterprise against the Protestant island and its anathematized Queen. The success of such an endeavor might well store up treasure in heaven for the Most Catholic King, but he would still be lavishing earthly treasure (always in painfully short supply) on elevating the half-French, half-Guise Mary to the English throne. Once that had been achieved, it was not to be supposed that either she or the Duke of Guise would remain so devoted to Spanish interests and the end result would be the close Anglo-French alliance which the Hapsburg family had laboured for generations to prevent. (Plowden 214)

It was, it turns out, always more logical for Philip to hesitate before the possibility of helping Mary to the English throne. But once she was dead, her faith could be used even more effectively

⁴⁹ For information on this and previously mentioned correspondence between Mary and Mendoza, see Plowden 205.

as a weapon against the enemy that by 1587 Philip had been waiting to attack for almost a decade.

Immediately following Mary's execution, the Catholic leaders of continental Europe failed to take joint action against Elizabeth, as the English queen had feared they would. As in 1571, differences between Philip II and the Pope prevented them from mounting a coordinated attack, and the Spanish king also refused to invade England with France at his side. Philip would instead plan his own revenge, for it was upon Mary's death that Spain was able to capitalize on the political message this Catholic martyr had the power to convey. Not two months after receiving the news of her execution, preparations had begun to send the Gran Armada north in order to avenge the Queen of Scots's death. She not only provided an excuse for political action, but after her execution Mary also began to appear in various texts published in Spain from the end of the sixteenth and throughout the seventeenth centuries. It was a turning point for Anglo-Spanish relations, for now Philip had the excuse and the symbol he needed to take action. Mary would appear for the first time in print in Spain just before the Armada set sail.

When the Spanish Armada was sent north in 1588, Mary Stuart's execution was seen to be one of its motivating factors. Spain was to take vengeance on the heretical queen who had ordered the death of the Queen of Scots, and the sailors aboard the duke of Medina Sidonia's ships headed for England were supposed to find solace in the help they would receive from the "servants of the Lord" that would accompany them. Among these servants would be "the blessed and innocent Mary queen of Scotland, who, still fresh from her sacrifice, bears copious and abounding witness to the cruelty and impiety of this Elizabeth" (*CSP* no. 293). Although political propaganda was quick to expel the painful memory of the Armada's journey to England—only Cervantes was willing to take up the cause after the news of its defeat reached Spain—Mary

Stuart's story would be retold shortly after its painful return. Thanks to Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas, Mary would transform into a conduit of vindication for the Spanish empire, still flying its banner under the auspices of its old identifier, Defender of the Faith.

Before the Armada had set sail for England, only one account of Mary's execution and her final weeks of imprisonment had been published in Spain. This was in contrast to many other European countries where pamphlets were published that reproduced ambassadors' accounts of her death told in letters they sent back to court.⁵⁰ It was not until May of 1588, more than a year after the execution, that Pedro de Ribadeneyra published the first account of Mary Stuart's execution in his *Historia eclesiástica del cisma de Inglaterra*.⁵¹ While news would have circulated in manuscript form before this date, Ribadeneyra's text was the first account to reach print. The account of Mary's execution makes up the last four chapters of the extensive and extremely popular historical treatise that describes in detail the ascent of the Protestant faith to prominence in England. In the final chapter of his *Historia*, Ribadeneyra calls for the many Marian Catholic princes to take action and highlights Mary's unwavering devotion to the 'true' faith. Echoing many other Catholic texts published at this time, Ribadeneyra emphasizes Mary's

⁵⁰ For a description of the Italian, Dutch, German and French texts that made public an account of Mary's execution, see Phillips *Images*, especially Chapter Six. Phillips makes no mention of Spain beyond the letter that Mendoza sent to Philip II.

⁵¹ The first news of Mary's death to reach Spain came in a letter dated March 7, 1587 to Philip II. It was written by his former ambassador to England, Mendoza, who resided in Paris at the time of Mary's death. In his letter, Bernardino de Mendoza wrote to Philip of Mary's devotion to the Catholic faith at the hour of her death, of her confession—that she had undertaken means to gain her liberty but never taken action against the life of the Queen—and of her taking of the holy sacrament thanks to a priest who had accompanied her in disguise. Mendoza also described the English refusal to provide Mary with a Catholic bishop before her execution and of the excessive celebrations that followed the event in London (*CSP* no. 35). This account, explains Phillips, was informed by a letter that the French ambassador in London sent to the king and includes the typically Catholic additions to the account of Mary's execution (*Images* 150).

persecution based on her religious beliefs.⁵² When she is denied confession from a Catholic priest before her death, Ribadeneyra's Mary declares, "Yo soy católica, y católica tengo de morir, y por ser católico muero, y téngolo por muy gran merced de Dios" (1179). Ribadeneyra closes his book that traverses the history of the English schism with contemporary events that justify Spain's action against this heretical foe. The conclusion of *Historia eclesiástica* suggests exactly what should be learned from the events it relates:

Pero ellos [los ingleses protestantes] son enemigos capitales del género humano, y la herejía, como fuego infernal y incendio abrasador y pestilencia destruidora del universo, debe ser de nosotros aborrecida más que la propia muerte. Para esto nos aprovechará esta historia, y no menos para despertar y avivar en nuestros corazones un santo y encendido celo de la honra de nuestro Señor y del bien del reino de Inglaterra [. . .]. ¿Con qué podemos nosotros los españoles servir a nuestro Señor la merced que nos hace en conservar estos reinos en nuestra santa fe católica, sanos, limpios y puros de herejías, sino con el celo de la misma fe católica y deseo de su gloria, y que se conviertan o se destruyan los herejes? (1197–98)

The powerful language in this call to arms coincides with the mission of Philip's English Enterprise as it prepared to send its powerful Armada to England. Eusebio Rey, in his edited compilation of Ribadeneyra's work, attributes the popularity of the first part of the *Historia eclesiástica* directly to such incendiary pre-war rhetoric (866). In 1588 alone, almost

⁵² Catholic interpretations of the execution of the Queen of Scots that followed in the years after her execution describe, according to Phillips, "her willingness to die solely for the cause of her religion" (*Images* 178).

simultaneously, the first and second edition of Ribadeneyra's text were published in Madrid, along with editions in Valencia, Zaragoza, Barcelona, Lisbon, and Antwerp.

When the next Spanish author would pick up Mary's story, news of the Armada's failure had already reached the Peninsula. By 1589, when Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas's *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* was published, Spain had suffered two embarrassing naval defeats at the hands of the English both at home and abroad. Though theoretically written from a position of historical impartiality, Herrera's text was conditioned by the political events that surrounded it. He would be the first Spanish author to give protagonism to both the English and the Scottish queens in the events that transpired during Mary's lifetime in a way that emphasized Spain's continued role as defender of the Catholic faith despite its recent losses, and his treatise would present a religious rivalry that would influence many authors that followed.

CHAPTER ONE

Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas: The Queen of Scots's Spanish Historian

Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas was among the most influential historians in Spain during the reigns of both Philip II and Philip III at the end of the sixteenth and during the first quarter of the seventeenth century. He is best known for his *Historia general de los hechos de los castellanos en las Islas y Tierrafirme del mar océano* (also referred to as *Décadas*), which chronicles the history of the Americas and is considered today, as it was by his contemporaries, among the most complete works of history ever compiled about the New World.⁵³ The year he began composing *Décadas*, Herrera was named official Chronicler of the Indies, and two years later he received the title of Chronicler of Castile.⁵⁴ *Décadas* was completed at the height of Herrera's work as royal chronicler, but before he received these prestigious positions at court, he began his career as a historian by writing a biography of Mary Stuart. *Historia de lo sucedido en Escocia e Inglaterra en quarenta y quarto años que bivió María Estuarda, Reyna de Escocia* was published in two editions between 1589 and 1590 and was the first of Herrera's eleven historical works. Cuesta Domingo considers it a "historia monográfica" for, unlike *Décadas*, this history focuses on one principal historical figure. It was also the first extensive biography of Mary Stuart published in Spain and the only one in all of Europe that included a complete history of her life.⁵⁵

⁵³ Herrera's *Décadas*, the first volume of which was published in 1601, should not be confused with those written by Peter Martyr, who worked as chronicler in service of the Spanish crown some seventy years earlier. The secondary title of these works, chosen by Herrera himself, according to Cuesta Domingo (43), was likely meant to recall the work of Spain's earlier chronicler.

⁵⁴ See Cuesta Domingo 10–11 for the trajectory of Herrera's career at court.

⁵⁵ Phillips describes a number of histories and biographies of the Queen of Scots published at the end of the seventeenth century. These biographies, according to Phillips, focused on the last days of Mary's life

Herrera's *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* has not been published in a modern edition, nor has it been republished since it was originally printed in its first and second editions in the late sixteenth century. Perhaps for this reason, or for its dense reproduction of religiously tainted historical detail, it has received no scholarly attention to date of which this author is aware. While scholars such as James Emerson Phillips, Alexander Wilkinson, and John D. Stains have published insightful monographs that detail the evolution of European discourse on Mary Stuart through the sixteenth and into the seventh centuries, their work focuses minimally on Spain's participation in this body of literary production.⁵⁶ I believe that viewing Herrera's text and those that followed in Spain through the lens of historiopoiesis will demonstrate why it should no longer be neglected. It will reveal within this treatise a window into Spain's process of nation building after a traumatizing defeat.

This chapter begins my exploration of early modern historiopoiesis with an author who considered himself firmly nestled within the black pebbles of history. I will for this reason begin my discussion of Herrera with his own considerations of the historic pretenses and methods that guided the composition of his treatise. In *Historia de . . . María Estuarda*, Herrera presents the history of the Scottish queen's life, as well as that of her ancestors, and of Scotland itself. But while Herrera approaches this text with historical methodology, his treatise shifts silently and

and on her implication in the murder of her second husband. Phillips mentions Herrera's text in a footnote, but does not discuss it in any detail (*Images* 187–88).

⁵⁶ In his seminal study *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth-Century literature*, James Emerson Phillips describes the representation of the Queen of Scots from birth to the years immediately following her death. He divides his study into different phases of Mary's life: the time she spent in France, the short but tumultuous years she spent ruling in Scotland, the time she spent in England leading up to her execution, and the years that followed. Alexander Wilkinson focuses his attention on the way in which the French Catholic League effectively used Mary as a symbol in their Wars of Religion in his book *Mary Queen of Scots and French Public Opinion, 1542–1600*. John D. Stains is the only one of these three authors to extend his study beyond the end of the sixteenth century. His book, *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560–1690: Rhetoric, Passions, and Political Literature*, examines the depiction of the Scottish Queen from her lifetime through the Restoration, exploring the relationship between propaganda, literature, and the historical genre.

unknowingly into the grey area of intermingling pebbles, where history is touched by the elaboration and invention of poetry. Herrera's text proves inextricably linked to the religious identity of Spain, and it transforms to reveal its own Catholic nationalism as it proposes a correction to Protestant history. For this reason, though the genre of this biography of the Queen of Scots was entirely historical in its outlook, taking a historiopoetic approach to its contents gives us the tools necessary to reveal its depiction of the Spanish imperial imagination, preoccupied with its religious identity immediately after the Armada's defeat. I analyze these tendencies as they relate specifically to Herrera's characterization of Mary and Elizabeth, as well as the depiction of Spain's involvement both in Mary's tragedy and the history of the Scottish nation. While thoroughly deriding the English queen in the process, the *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* simultaneously defends the good name of the Queen of Scots, removes Spain's blame in her downfall, and signals hope for the continued dominance of the Spanish empire in Europe.

Herrera's History

Herrera was among the handful of early modern historians who, in addition to writing histories, also wrote about the genre. In his theoretical *discursos*, Herrera fits comfortably into the mold of humanist historian: he prized truth as history's ultimate goal, he believed in the historian's capacity to negotiate the veracity of his sources, and though he acknowledged the differences between "quáles cosas se han de decir y cuáles callar" ("Discurso sobre los provechos" fol. 106r), he also believed the historian should attempt to remain impartial when confronted with the task of writing what might upset certain noblemen.⁵⁷ *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* was the first historical treatise that Herrera wrote, and it was thus likely written before

⁵⁷ See the Introduction to this dissertation for a detailed discussion of Herrera's theoretical output. His historical *discursos* have been edited by P. Gan Giménez.

his *discursos*. Irrespective of chronology, however, his biography of Mary Stuart represents Herrera's attempt to put into practice the methodology he would later describe.

In constructing *Historia de . . . María Estuarda*, Herrera describes, often meticulously, the research he has undertaken to compose this narrative of Mary's life. He not only names his sources but also describes the process by which he sought out further documents to corroborate the claims he makes in his *Historia*. Herrera's sources for this treatise are varied and multiple. In addition to citing Ribadeneyra as a principal source for his work, Herrera also mentions the famous English Jesuit, Nicholas Sanders, who spent a number of years in Madrid (n.p.).⁵⁸ "Sanderó" wrote the Latin *De origine ac progressu schismatis Anglicani* sometime before his death in 1581, from which Ribadeneyra created his *Historia eclesiástica del cisma de Inglaterra*.⁵⁹ Other historians ranging from "David Chambre Escocés" to George Buchanan are also mentioned by Herrera throughout his text. The first serves as a source for Scotland's ancient history and geography, whereas Buchanan was among the most famous contemporary Scottish detractors of Mary Stuart. Over the course of his *Historia*, Herrera will work to correct "al más falso y mentiroso historiador del mundo, el grandísimo hereje Buquinan" (n.p.) in an effort to elucidate the true history of the life of "aquella Católica Reina [que] goza en el cielo su gloria" (n.p.). The rejection of Buchanan's version of Mary's life was essential in Herrera's quest to represent Truth. What I will suggest in my subsequent analysis of Herrera's *Historia*, however, is that despite his unbiased pretenses, our Spanish historian in fact created a biography that

⁵⁸ In citing Herrera's text, I will refer to the pages as they are given in the 1589 edition of *Historia de lo sucedido en Escocia e Inglaterra*, printed in Madrid by Pedro Madriral. This edition does not include page numbers for the introductory material, including the *tasa*, errata, letters to the king, to Don Diego Fernández de Cabrera y Bobadilla, and to his reader, and finally the printing approval. Upon beginning the content of this treatise, pages are numbered sequentially on the recto side.

⁵⁹ Rey provides a very detailed description of the dissemination of Sanders's text and argues that Ribadeneyra likely read this text after it had been edited both by the "padre Eduardo Rishton, en la edición de Colonia de 1585" and the "padre Roberto Persons, en la edición de Roma de 1586" (855–60).

presented not only a clearly Catholic reinterpretation of the Queen of Scots but also one specifically relevant to Spain's position in Europe after the humiliating defeat of the Gran Armada.

Herrera outlines the purpose of history in his “Discurso sobre los provechos de la historia” and *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* in parallel fashions, recognizing in both the dual potentiality of this genre for political and religious ends. In said *discurso*, Herrera describe the benefits of history as follows:

Y no es la Historia provechosa solamente para el gobierno político y doméstico, sino que con mucha razón se puede decir que es rústico el que no se exercita en ella porque, demás de muchos vienes que por ella se consiguen, es gran ayuda para los teólogos contra los enemigos de nuestra santa fe católica porque se pueden sacar della muy grandes argumentos para el uso de la Teología. (fols. 105r–105v)

The political and religious dividends to be garnered from the historical treatise would come from its didactic lessons. According to Herrera, the study of history was especially beneficial for kings, for it provided them with opportunity to learn from the written word much more than they could learn from their own lived experiences.⁶⁰ This was indeed commonly believed to be one of the most important benefits to the study of history. What Herrera does not acknowledge in the cited passage, however, is the impossibility of separating the religious from the political in the

⁶⁰ Herrera outlines what he considers to be the benefits of the historical genre in his “Discurso y tratado, que el medio de la historia es suficiente para adquirir la prudencia.” In this treatise, Herrera refers to the virtue of prudence that he believes can be learned from histories. “Para formar enteramente esta joya tan preciosa,” he states, “se requieren tres cosas. La primera, la memoria de las cosas pasadas. La segunda el conocimiento de las presentes. La última el hechar de ver las venideras, en lo cual muestra principalmente la prudencia su fuerza” (fol. 112r). It is important to compare the past to the present, Herrera explains, in order to learn from their differences what will come of the future. A king must undertake this learning since the life of one man is not sufficient “espacio para conseguir la perfección de esta virtud” (fol. 112v).

early modern empire that he served. As we will see in the *Historia* that retells Mary Stuart's life, these two aspects of history were inextricably linked.

Though Herrera recognized the dual potentiality of history—both religious and political—his history of Mary Stuart will, he explains, fall into the latter categorization of the historical genre. This text is meant to entertain, but it will also, Herrera hopes, provide political support for the monarchy. In his dedication to Don Diego Fernández de Cabrera y Bobadilla with which he begins his treatise, Herrera describes the purpose of his work as follows:

[S]emejantes ejemplos [los de Isabel y María] son de gran gusto para los hombres, y de gran provecho para el gobierno de las cosas humanas. [. . .] Y pues los lectores quedarán bien informados dellos, así con lo espiritual del padre Ribadeneyra como con las materias de estado que aquí se tratan; yo quedaré con mucha satisfacción, porque parte de mis trabajos sean de algún fruto para la República. (n.p.)

The contradiction in Herrera's aims is immediately apparent to a modern reader. They need not be so, however, for Herrera. Whether or not a true separation of these two kinds of history was feasible or even what Herrera aimed for is less important for my purposes than Herrera's declaration that he will place a renewed focus on the events already told by his predecessor, Pedro de Ribadeneyra. In my analysis of this text, I will focus specifically on this renovation and reinterpretation of historical fact. It is essential to consider not only Herrera's understanding of the historian's profession but also the way in which his contemporary political and religious environment influenced the historian's product. In the case of Mary Stuart, as we will see, it would not have been possible to write her story from the same perspective pre- and post-Armada.

Through his denial of the Protestant account of Mary Stuart's history, his portrayal of

England's involvement in Mary's downfall, and the references he makes to Spain throughout *Historia de . . . María Estuarda*, Herrera demonstrates his text's promotion of Spain's imperial identity; that is, immediately following the disastrous defeat of the Armada, this text played an active role in healing the empire's open wounds. *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* engages in the task of nation building, which foments the union of Spain's Catholic identity as it reflects with vehemence the negative feelings that Spain harbored for the English, and particularly Elizabeth, at the time this treatise was written. In addition to the political profit to be gained from this treatise, Herrera's also writes "para mostrar al mundo cuánto puede el demonio vestido en un cuerpo humano" (n.p.). The devil here, Herrera clarifies, is Elizabeth. Mary is represented in diametric opposition to her fellow sovereign, for the Scottish queen "siempre fue perseguida de la fortuna contraria" (fol. 19r) and upon her death became a martyr for her suffering. The dichotomy that Herrera establishes between these two queens is essential to his position as historian, which in this particular moment in Spain's history was transformed into that of Defender of the Faith and of Mary's good reputation. As his role and his text transform, Herrera creates and foments his own uniquely Spanish characterization of Elizabeth and Mary, one that will influence the Spanish representations of these two queens throughout the early modern period.

Revising Protestant History: Casting Mary as Martyr

By the time Herrera sat down to write his biography of the life of Mary Stuart, contemporary Protestant propaganda had already mounted its campaign against the Queen of Scots. George Buchanan led the charge, his attack on Mary focusing primarily on her unsuccessful relationships with Darnley and Bothwell. Recorded in both *History of Scotland* and

A Detection of Actions of Mary Quene of Scots, Concerning the Murder of her Husband, Buchanan describes Mary as the cruelest of women: she is said to have poisoned Darnley herself and she is compared to Prometheus's eagle in her daily visits to her second husband while he was sick.⁶¹ She is lustful and licentious; according to Buchanan, James may be the son of Rizzio, Darnley, or Bothwell, "which of these may have hit luckiest may be well doubted" (*Detection* fol. 5r). It is from this narrative that much of Herrera's reconstruction of Mary's good name begins. In order to dismantle the Protestant representation of the Queen of Scots, Herrera focuses primarily on the reinterpretation her relationships with the three men implicated by Buchanan, and in doing so he recreates the Queen of Scots in the image of devoted wife, ideal ruler, and ardent Catholic. Thus she transforms into a martyr worthy of the support of Spain. Yet as most tragic heroes are wont to have, Herrera's protagonist does possess one significant character flaw. Mary's credulity and trust in the schemers that surround her plays an important role in her downfall. This flaw, I aver, is successfully employed by Herrera in order, on the one hand, to remove Spain's blame in the Queen of Scots's tragedy, and on the other, to implicate England and Elizabeth I even further in her ruinous end. Significantly, Herrera is alone among Catholic apologists at the end of the sixteenth century in this directed attack on the English, further demonstrating his commitment to fortifying Spain's perceived contribution to the fight against the spread of the new religion throughout Europe.

In depicting Mary's relationships with the men closest to her, Herrera's particular brand of Catholic historical revisionism first becomes apparent in the narrative of Rizzio's murder. Herrera dispels any potential for temptation between the queen and her secretary in his physical description of Rizzio, who, according to Herrera, "era hombre de edad madura, feo, negro y de

⁶¹ See *Detection* 39–60 for Buchanan's narrative of Mary's involvement in Darnley's death.

mal gesto, pero [la reina] estimábale por su mucha fidelidad, bondad, y prudencia, y por otras buenas partes de que era dotado” (fol. 62r). In the plot to murder this cherished secretary, Mary transforms into the innocent victim of those who wish to take control of her country and ensure its firmly Protestant future. She escapes her imprisonment after the murder thanks to her ability to sway the allegiances of her wayward husband, who had participated willingly in the plot. She does so via her own devotion when she brings Darnley back to the Catholic faith: “le aconsejaba, y persuadía que con mucho arrepentimiento se volviese a su divina Majestad” (fol. 69v).

Repentant of his betrayal, and in a religious act of contrition, Darnley succeeds in convincing his former allies to let him stand guard at Mary’s chambers, leading to their mutual escape from the queen’s captors. In this first instance of revising Mary’s story, Herrera emphasizes both Mary’s chastity and her religiosity.

The relationship between Mary and Darnley that Herrera portrays following this murder plot continues to build the Queen of Scots’s unblemished characterization. Despite his many flaws, Mary constantly forgives her husband and plays the role of doting wife with aplomb. In his description of the loving relationship between husband and wife, Herrera directly confronts Buchanan’s narration of the events that led up to Darnley’s murder, focusing on the queen’s clemency towards her husband following Rizzio’s death. According to Herrera, Mary forgives her husband because she recognizes that he is a “mozo de poca discreción y recato” (fol. 74v). The pardon Mary grants her husband for his involvement in the plot to kill her secretary is evidence, according to Herrera, of Mary’s dedication to her husband: “en lo cual [el acto de perdonar] claramente echaron de ver los ciegos la sinceridad del amor conyugal que la Reina tenía a su marido, sin fraude ni disimulación” (fol. 72v). Although historical consensus has determined that Mary and Darnley were *not* on amicable terms and were often separated

following Rizzio's murder, Herrera's principal concern, as he clearly states, is to refute the "falsas y mentirosas historias" that Buchanan presents in his account of the history of Scotland (fol. 73r). Herrera thus positions himself as the righter of historical wrongs committed by Protestants, and he will use this position to further his defense of the Catholic faith in Europe and Spain's place in this fight.

Herrera's narration of Mary's marriage to the earl of Bothwell is significant for its depiction of Mary in her capacity as queen, capable ruler of Scotland. In further negation of Protestant propaganda against the Queen of Scots—which harshly condemned her heartlessly rapid remarriage to Bothwell—Herrera provides an alternate explanation of her third nuptials. Rather than marrying Bothwell to satisfy her lust, Herrera explains that she was forced to do so under duress. She married him not because she had fallen in love with him while still married to Darnley, as her detractors argued, but rather because she did so by her Scottish nobles. In Herrera's narration of Mary's third marriage, the Scottish lords convince the queen that taking a husband from outside of Scotland would provoke too much internal division in a country already suffering from excessive turmoil (fol. 85r). When their suggestions seem as though they might prove insufficient, Mary is taken prisoner and forced to sign a marriage document:

Viéndose la pobre señora presa y importunada de tantos ruegos y combatida de tantos peligros, persuadida de todos los grandes de su Reino, y espantada con las muertes del Marido y del Secretario, y no pudiendo resistir la fuerza de tantos que se habían firmado, y conjurado para este matrimonio, hubo de conceder, aunque contra su voluntad por dar lugar a la fuerza, y a la necesidad, tomando el consejo de la nobleza de su Reino por saludable, pareciéndole que no se le podía imputar por yerro, y que si alguno hubiese, caería sobre los que habían sido autores, y no

sobre ella que jamás había pensado en tal cosa. (fols. 86r–86v)

As this excerpt demonstrates, Herrera's Scottish queen did not decide to marry Bothwell of her own accord but did so because she believed it would prevent further conflict. In this act she thus places the needs of the realm above her own personal feelings. Mary is shown to be a capable ruler who is guided by her concern for Scotland. The portrayal of Mary as a victim to the plots and ploys of the Protestants who have usurped power in Scotland, as she is represented here, is one of the queen's defining characteristics within Herrera's *Historia*. It serves to ingratiate the character his biography defends.

As we have seen, the timing of Mary's execution was especially convenient for Spain. Mary's death came at just the right moment to transform her into the religious symbol behind which Spain would rally to defend the Catholic cause in England, for in the late 1580s Philip II's northern adversaries continued to fight against the 'true' faith with no sign of ceasing. It is thus unsurprising that Mary's religion was one of the most heavily emphasized qualities portrayed first by Ribadeneyra and later repeated by Herrera. Despite the fact that the Armada had failed when Herrera wrote his biography, Mary's symbolic importance as a Catholic martyr had not disappeared. Rather, her dedication to the Catholic faith becomes one of the most important aspects of her characterization in Herrera's *Historia*, for it places her in opposition to Elizabeth, Spain's true enemy circa 1589.

Herrera's description of Mary's devotion weighs heavily in the depiction of her relationships with Rizzio, Darnley, and Bothwell; this aspect of her character, however, is described as one of the queen's most salient characteristics also in her early life, from the time of her childhood spent in France. While living in France, Herrera explains, Mary was well educated and especially apt in her lessons; she additionally "[tenía] por natural inclinación grandísimo

celo de la religión” (fol. 30r). Mary’s mission as queen in Herrera’s text is always focused on supporting Catholicism within Scotland, but Herrera’s spotlight on Mary’s religion narrows particularly as he ends his *Historia*. It is in this moment that Mary’s faith becomes the driving force behind the narrative of her execution. Herrera is not unique in portraying these motivations of Mary’s enemies, but the details he includes in his narration are strikingly relevant to the post-Armada Spanish empire in which he composed his text.⁶²

As he does with other events in *Historia de . . . María Estuarda*, Herrera begins his account of Mary’s trial and execution by citing his historical sources, which in this case are primary documents supposedly located by Herrera himself. He takes great care in this episode, as in many others, to faithfully reproduce documents he has collected; here, he copies Mary’s legal sentence, which he claims to have found with difficulty “porque la han tenido escondida por contener secretos misterios que no quieren que se publiquen” (fol. 143r). Herrera painstakingly searched for this document and copied it directly into his biography, yet his subsequent analysis of the reasons that led Elizabeth and the English Parliament to present this sentence are based entirely on his perceptions of the religious fear and persecution that drove them to such extreme actions. Directly alongside this historically focused research methodology, Herrera’s interpretation of events is tinged by the religious bias present throughout his treatise.

Such Catholic prejudice is of course to be expected, and as modern readers we are aware of the grey area that Herrera enters as a historian when influenced by such personal interpretations of history. We cannot expect Herrera to comprehend this bias as such, however.

⁶² Herrera follows Ribadeneyra in his placement of the origin of Mary’s mistreatment in her faith. As Ribadeneyra explains, “Al principio, aunque estaba presa, tratáronla con más blandura y respeto; después, viéndola tan constante en la fe católica, fueron siempre estrechándola y afligiéndola cada día más” (1170). Ribadeneyra does not go on to mention the instance that Herrera details, which is quoted here, but he does state that “no la dejaron oír misa ni tener un sacerdote que se la dijese ni la administrase los Sacramentos” (1171).

Rather, his historiopoetic tendencies appear in this instance due to his concern for the “provecho político” of this treatise that becomes apparent in the narrative of Mary’s death sentence. In this moment, details especially relevant to Spain’s contemporary political situation are brought forward. Herrera explains that Elizabeth was determined to kill the Queen of Scots (her legal heir) despite her innocence, for if she were given the chance to inherit the throne she would have the support of her son in Scotland, the king of France, and all other Christian (that is, Catholic) kings. This would create problems for England, according to Herrera’s interpretation of the preoccupations of the English queen, but Mary was also dangerous because

también se les representaba [a Isabel y al Parlamento] la confusión que en aquel Reino se vio, cuando la otra María, hermana mayor de Isabel, mujer del Católico Rey don Felipe, como tan Católica y temerosa de Dios, dio la obediencia a la Sede Apostólica Romana, y restituyó la religión Católica, desterrando la herejía de Inglaterra, restaurando los templos, volviendo los bienes Eclesiásticos que estaban incorporados en la corona, castigando a los resistentes en la confiscación de sus haciendas, y en la pena del fuego. Y teniendo muy presentes estas cosas, que con industria les hacía significar Isabel, y dándoles a entender que nación Inglesa de tal condición, que siéndola, fácilmente abraza la religión de sus Príncipes, fácilmente saldría María [Estuardo] con su intención. (fols. 149r–149v)

This passage should not be taken for granted. It describes Elizabeth’s fears of Mary Stuart as religiously motivated, and it establishes Spain’s awareness of England’s Catholic heritage, which many authors after Herrera will return to. Here, Herrera explains that if Mary Stuart were to reign in England, it would provoke the same confusion that arose when Mary Tudor declared national allegiance to the Church of Rome. What’s more, not only could the English people be

easily persuaded to re-convert to Catholicism should Mary Stuart inherit the throne from Elizabeth, but the nobles in Parliament also feared that if the country were to return its allegiance to the Catholic Church, they would have to surrender the property they had received in the conversion of the country to Protestantism. Surely, intimates Herrera, this second Mary would have no trouble accomplishing that which the Mary before her had succeeded in carrying out. Now supported by France, her relatives, the Christian princes of Europe, and her son (who Herrera believed would side with his mother despite being raised as a Protestant), Mary Stuart posed an even greater threat than Mary Tudor once had (fol. 150r). By describing the international alliances that existed while Mary was alive, Herrera establishes a position from which Spain may hope for victory against Elizabeth; it is a situation that may be repeated even after Mary's death if Spain continues its fight.

The use of Mary Tudor as a symbol of the possibility of Catholicism in England is repeated throughout Herrera's biography, and was especially significant in Spain. Mary Tudor, in this and subsequent Spanish texts, becomes the mother of English Catholicism. Even long after Mary Tudor's death, she remained a symbol of hope for England's future throughout the sixteenth and into the seventeenth centuries. She had saved England once from heretical misguidance and proved it could be done. Even more significantly, in Mary Tudor's success Spain also played a direct and active role. Philip II's marriage to Mary Tudor announced the expansion of Spanish influence in England and the return of the heretical island to Catholicism. Herrera's description of Mary Queen of Scots's sentence and the reference he makes to Mary Tudor thus encapsulates and reveals the blending of history and poetry that lies behind his text. He demonstrates at once the skill and precision that he considers essential to the historian, yet at the same time interprets the facts he presents in a way that validates hope for Spain's religious

mission in northern Europe. It is Herrera's emphasis once more on the importance of Catholicism in Mary's story that leads to the bleeding of genres between history and poetry. Here, though his interpretations are seemingly historically based, Herrera creates a narrative that implies a future relationship between the two nations in which Spain once again reasserts its dominance. If England decided to execute Mary based on their concerns for the religious future of a fickle nation, they have equally proven that England may still just as easily return its allegiances to the Catholic Church.

Herrera recounts Mary's final hours with precision, and it is once more the small details that distinguish his description of Mary's life from other Catholic apologists, hinting at his specifically Spanish interpretation of events. When Mary is finally notified of her execution, she is denied a Catholic confessor and forced to listen to a Protestant prayer while awaiting her sentence. The Scottish Queen, however, reacts "con una increíble constancia" (fol. 154v). During the night before her execution, Mary writes a letter to Elizabeth recommending her return to God, she confesses her sins in a letter to the Pope, and spends the rest of the night in prayer. It is in his description of the last moments of her life, when Mary is criticized by a Protestant priest for carrying the sign of the cross with her, that Herrera demonstrates his propensity for nationalistic interpretation of events. He describes Mary's treatment as

[c]osa por cierto bárbara [. . .], porque los Turcos que son tan grandes enemigos del nombre Cristiano y bárbaros, no impiden a los Cristianos sus esclavos que confiesen y comulguen y o[ig]an Misa: antes los Reyes de Fez, y el Turco, y otros grandes Príncipes infieles en el baño, que es el lugar a donde tienen recogidos los esclavos, permiten públicos altares con imágenes de Dios, y de nuestra Señora, y de sus santos, a donde se alaba y glorifica a nuestro Señor y se administran los

Sacramentos. (fol. 159r)

The comparison of English cruelty to that of the Turks, Spain's longtime religious enemy, would have been especially significant to Herrera's Spanish audience. If the English are even crueler than the Turks, they are an enemy that Spain must combat. In addition to this comparison, Herrera also explains here, nearing the end of his treatise, that Mary's now adult son James failed to act against Elizabeth based on the lack of support he received from Catholic sovereigns across Europe. When James grew tired of waiting for this support, with the promise from Elizabeth that he would be named her successor, and in order to avoid war with England, he decided to continue in the Protestant faith in which he had been educated during his mother's imprisonment (fols. 167r–168r). Without any further action from Spain, Herrera subtly seems to suggest, it is clear that England will remain Protestant when James ascends the throne.

In this last scene of Mary's life, Herrera declares the martyrdom of this "inocente Reina de Escocia" based on the desire to reinterpret the queen's image as presented by her Protestant detractors. He does so in a way that not only demonstrates her symbolic weight for the Catholic faith, but also with specific reference to Spain's national identity. Spain had worked to bring England back into the arms of the Church with Philip's marriage to Mary Tudor, and they had done so again with the Armada—purposefully, I would argue, not mentioned in this treatise due to the open wounds it would surely irritate. As continued defenders of the faith, Herrera suggests, Mary's is not a cause that should be forfeited. Elizabeth's cruelty and the Protestant prosecution of Catholics is worse than that of the Turks, and now, rallying behind the martyred Queen of Scots, Spain would have its chance to maintain its position within Europe despite its recent defeat.

Mary's one clear character flaw also betrays the political and religious motivations that

guide Herrera's *Historia*. As we have seen, Mary displays admirable characteristics as a wife, devout Catholic, and ruler. She is a "mujer de buena, y santa intención, bien inclinada," but unfortunately "de su natural condición era fácil y crédula" (fol. 51r). There are two characters in this story that work to bring about Mary's downfall, and they do so in part thanks to Mary's willingness to believe their schemes. Upon her return to Scotland, Mary immediately turns to her half-brother, James, earl of Moray, for help: "La pobre reina," declares Herrera, "dejándose persuadir del falso hermano; y dándole crédito en todo, siguió su consejo" (fol. 49v). Moray subsequently works against his sister to plot Rizzio's murder, followed by Darnley's, finally absconding with his sister's crown when she is taken prisoner at Lochleven. As he narrates each of these events, Herrera emphasizes Mary's difficult position, but in each instance, Mary is outmaneuvered by her brother, who has behind him one especially powerful ally: Elizabeth I, Queen of England.

Implicating England and Elizabeth I

Elizabeth is represented as Herrera's anti-hero, the figure that silently machinates his martyr's downfall. She becomes a character that provides a compelling argument for any nation to dedicate its resources in the fight against the "cruelísima mujer [que en fin] verificó el dicho de aquel sabio que probaba que aunque la piedad era afecto común, y propio al sexo de las mujeres, no se podía hallar más cruel animal que una mujer vieja que hubiese gastado el curso de su vida en maldades y disoluciones" (fol. 131r). Herrera's condemnation of the English queen is harsh but effective. It reflects sentiments prominent in a nation just defeated by its heretical enemy, and in the end his description of Elizabeth transforms the queen into the perfect antagonist for his *Historia*. The English queen is characterized by her heresy; she is described as

a master manipulator, and as a captor who is excessively cruel to her innocent Catholic cousin. These qualities together represent a depiction of Elizabeth that is tainted by Herrera's national bias; he creates in the English queen the enemy against which the Spanish empire must unite its resources.

The prominence of Elizabeth within Herrera's text cannot be understated. Indeed, *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* refers in its first sentence not to the Scottish queen but to her rival. In the story of Mary's life, death, and ancestry, Elizabeth plays an ever-active role, involved somehow "en todos estos sucesos, y no habiendo, como hubo, jamás ninguno en que ella no se haya entremetido, fuese en Francia, o en Escocia" (n.p.). Elizabeth's involvement in Mary's story is defined by her cruelty, and her skills in manipulation are employed not only to take advantage of her fellow sovereign but also to meddle in the affairs of continental Europe.

Herrera illustrates Elizabeth's cruelty towards Mary Stuart in his depiction of their relationship itself. Over the course of the *Historia*, Herrera redefines not only the political relationship that existed between our two queens but also the familial one. Herrera describes Elizabeth as a compatriot to Mary, a fellow female sovereign that should protect her own kind; she is at times labeled both Mary's sister and aunt.⁶³ While these labels may seem arbitrary, the description of Mary's relationship to Elizabeth holds real significance both here in Herrera's text and in later texts that represent the two queens. Elizabeth was, in fact, more akin to Mary's cousin (Henry VII's sister was Mary's grandmother) and only nine years older than the Queen of Scots. The relevance of their familial relationship becomes apparent when considering the

⁶³ Herrera is not the first to refer to Elizabeth as Mary's aunt. Ribadeneyra also establishes this relationship between the two queens, and he too places an emphasis on this familial relationship at the root of Mary's misplaced trust in Elizabeth: "Fióse la engañada señora, como mujer de mujer, como Reina de Reina, como sobrina de tía, como sucesora y heredera del reino de Inglaterra de aquella quien pensaba suceder, pareciéndole que cualquiera de estos títulos bastaba para asegurarla" (1169).

specific episodes in Herrera's text in which it is mentioned.

When Mary and Elizabeth are referred to as sisters, Herrera employs this terminology as would have been common between women of this time period. That is, he describes the way in which both queens referred to each other in their letters as "hermana (que así se llamaban)" (fol. 51r) in order to communicate a sense of closeness, which was clearly meant sincerely by one queen but not the other in Herrera's estimation. The closeness Mary feels based on Elizabeth's letters is augmented by the exchange of tokens and the belief that Mary holds in her "aunt's" desire to protect her wellbeing. The first of two episodes in which Elizabeth is referred to as Mary's aunt take place when Mary decides she will escape to England after fleeing from her final imprisonment by the Scottish rebels at Lochleven. As Herrera searches for Mary's motivations for choosing England as her refuge and communicates the reservations of her closest advisers, he turns to the familial relationship that existed between Mary and Elizabeth as one possible reason behind of Mary's final decision. He describes the process in the following manner:

Santandres Primado del Reino de Escocia, varón anciano y de mucha experiencia, siempre reprobó esta determinación de la Reina, como quien conocía la poca fe del consejo de Inglaterra, y claramente puso delante de la Reina el ejemplo de muchos que por haber fácilmente creído a los Ingleses, y fiándose de sus promesas llegaron a extrema necesidad. [. . .] Díjola el Arzobispo otras muchas razones, mostrando el odio mortal que tenía Isabel con cuyo consejo habían hecho sus enemigos tantas maldades en Escocia, y con todo esto nunca la pudo traer a que conociese la poca seguridad que tendría en Inglaterra de su tía. (fol. 107v, 108v)

As Herrera goes on to point out, when Mary crosses the border into England, her “aunt” will not permit her to travel to London to meet her. Instead, she is forced into a trial in which she must defend her innocence in the murder of Darnley. The references made here to their close familial relationship serve to highlight Elizabeth’s betrayal and Mary’s naive belief in the English queen’s desire to protect her niece. The second instance in which Elizabeth is referred to as Mary’s aunt is during her final trial. Herrera makes three separate references to Mary’s wish to cause no harm to either her aunt or her aunt’s kingdom. In describing Elizabeth as aunt rather than cousin, Herrera establishes a relationship in which the English queen is expected to take on a role more like that of a mother and protector, a role that Elizabeth fails to fulfill. Although at other times Herrera refers to Mary as Elizabeth’s closest living relative and thus the rightful heir to the English throne, he makes no other references outside of these episodes to their exact familial ties. Thus, the personal relationship described between these two queens becomes most relevant to Herrera in the moments of Mary’s greatest need for protection from Elizabeth.

The depiction of Elizabeth in the role of misguided mother figure is representative of Herrera’s coherent characterization of the English queen. The close relationship that Mary perceives between herself and Elizabeth provokes an acute sensation of pity when Herrera’s readers learn of the cruelty with which Elizabeth treated her innocent prisoner. Unlike previous publications on Mary’s life, both Catholic and Protestant, Herrera defines Elizabeth’s role as that of cruel foil in Mary’s downfall, reflecting the animosity that existed in Spain toward England and its queen when this text was composed.

Herrera systematically recalls the cruelty demonstrated towards Mary in each stage of her life after her return to Scotland, and in *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* Elizabeth plays a significant role in the victimization of the story’s hero. The cruelty that the English queen

demonstrates towards Mary is at times both physical and psychological. On two separate occasions Elizabeth uses illicit tactics with the hope of causing Mary's death by forcing her to endure extreme emotional trauma. The first is the murder of Rizzio, which was planned in part by Elizabeth in Herrera's version of the events. He explains her motives thus:

El principal fin de Isabel Reina de Inglaterra, cabeza destas hazañas, y que había aconsejado la muerte deste Secretario por ser fiel a su señora, fue procurar que se ejecutase en tal ocasión, y delante de la misma Reina, porque con aquel espanto, y alteración malpariese, y muriese[n] juntamente la madre y la criatura; y que cuando esto no sucediese, que quedase la Reina en tanta enemistad con su marido, que no pudiese haber esperanza de poderse reconciliar en ningún tiempo, de lo cual sucedería la destrucción de entreambos. (fols. 66v–67r)

Elizabeth's treatment of her cousin is described in this instance as something akin to psychological warfare. If she does not manage to kill the Queen of Scots or cause her to miscarry due to the shock of seeing her secretary murdered in front of her, at the very least she will achieve the destruction of Mary and Darnley's relationship. Elizabeth's plan is well thought out, according to Herrera, and though neither Mary nor her unborn son died as a result of this plot, Elizabeth would return to use the same tactics many years later. In 1582, employing her "acostumbradas inteligencias con los rebeldes" in Scotland, Elizabeth ordered her men to kidnap the young prince. The English queen's goal was to "afligilla de nuevo en la persona de su hijo" after Mary had rejected her latest peace offering, but fortunately for Mary "no quiso Dios permitir cosa con que este gran enemigo de su santísimo nombre recibiese tanto contento" (fol. 129r). Herrera's adherence to historical fact in this series of events is incomplete. While James was, in fact, kidnapped in 1582 in order to remove him from the influence of the Catholic duke

of Lennox, Herrera's claim of Elizabeth's involvement is here, as in many cases throughout his treatise, historically unsubstantiated.⁶⁴ What is significant is Herrera's recourse to God, which signifies His support of the Queen of Scots and proves her innocence in the face of her Protestant attackers. Once more we observe the way in which Herrera builds his case for Spain's involvement on the side of the one 'true' faith. As God had proven himself to favor Spain's mission in the past, in this traumatic event, He favored Mary, and so too should Spain favor her Catholic cause. Herrera, in his relation of Mary's continued perseverance and survival is calling for unified Spanish identification with the Catholic martyr, against her Protestant foe.

Unlike Mary Stuart apologists who came before him, Herrera brought religion to the forefront of his representation of the English queen's character. She was not only cruel and manipulative, but she was a heretic and thus enemy to the Spanish crown. When Herrera refers to Elizabeth's religion, he does so alluding to Catholic figures that would have been familiar to his Spanish audience. As we have seen, Mary Tudor is used by Herrera in order to recall Spain's hope for returning England to the Catholic Church. While Mary Tudor represented Spain's past ambitions for England, during the time when Philip II sat on the throne as its king, Mary Stuart, and Philip II in her defense, were meant to symbolize hope for its future, even now after her death as a martyr. The belief in England's Catholic potential that both the Scottish and the English Maries symbolize in Herrera's text and the determination of Philip II to protect Catholic interests there contrast directly with Elizabeth, who symbolizes her own nation's damnation.

Two comparisons of Elizabeth to her Catholic half-sister bookend Herrera's *Historia* as if to serve as a reminder of what England could be or could have been with Spain's successful campaign. As has been mentioned, Elizabeth, and not Mary Stuart opens Herrera's dedicatory

⁶⁴ Guy, for example, discusses James's imprisonment by Scottish Protestants but does not implicate Elizabeth in the plot (457–58).

letter, which he begins in the following manner: “Mucho despertó los ánimos de los hombres el término que Isabel Reina de Inglaterra tuvo en el principio de su gobierno para ponerse de propósito a considerar los hechos: el no abrazar la Religión Católica, como lo hizo su hermana la Reina María, puso admiración” (n.p.). He continues this letter reminding his readers of the “variedad que en Inglaterra ha habido en las cosas de religión” and of the “persecuciones contra los Católicos tan terrible” (n.p.). These and other “marañas” are what led Herrera to write this treatise. The first comparison that Herrera makes between the late wife of Philip II and the current queen of England is followed by accusations of her mistreatment of Catholics living in England. They thus recall Spain’s defensive position in protection of the Catholic faith. Contrast between the two English queens would have been stark and easily recognizable for Herrera’s audience. It reminded his readers of Spain’s mission to bring the Catholic religion back to England. When Herrera describes Elizabeth’s determination to execute her Catholic cousin at the end of *Historia de . . . María Estuarda*, he returns to the subject of Mary Tudor, as seen in the passage quoted above, yet he closes his treatise with an even more forceful comparison.

Herrera dedicates the very last paragraph of his biography to a comparison between Elizabeth and Philip II that transforms religious imagery into classical mythology. In closing his treatise, Herrera highlights the contrast between these two rulers in a forceful justification of Spain’s own moral and religious superiority:

Placerá pues a nuestro Señor que se llegue la hora del castigo deste monstruo de Isabel que no solamente ha revuelto a la gran Bretaña, pero extendiendo fuera della su diabólico furor ha desasosegado sus vecinos, con los cuales si pudiera hubiera hecho lo mismo que hizo con María; por lo cual la debemos comparar con Busín que recibía en su casa y hospedaba a los hombres, para después

sacrificarlos, y con Diomedes que mostró a sus caballos a comer carne humana, para que despedazasen a sus huéspedes: y al fin le castigó Hércules, y vengó el Sacrosanto hospicio violado: y así se debe esperar que para Isabel que ha sido con María otro Diomedes permitirá la divina justicia, que sea Hércules el invictísimo Felipe segundo, Rey de España, a quien nuestro Señor guarde muchos años para mayor aumento de su santísimo nombre. (fols. 168r–168v)

In this final passage of his treatise, Herrera's use of mythological symbolism reaffirms Spain's identity as Defender of the Faith. The powerful attack on Elizabeth's violation of ancient laws of hospitality reminds Spain after its painful defeat that the English queen is a danger that the empire must combat. She has proven inhospitable to her royal guest and will continue to perpetrate further acts of cruelty if she is not stopped. As Hercules managed to defeat the giants who appeared stronger than he, so too will Spain be capable of quelling the spread of Elizabeth's "diabólico furor."

In addition to establishing Elizabeth in the role of religious antagonist to both Mary and Spain itself, Herrera also places great emphasis on her ability to manipulate those around her. The arenas in which Elizabeth demonstrates her colluding acumen abound, and for this reason I will mention only a few of them in detail. Her plots include everything from employing "doctos" to find legal justification to kill Mary, to sending Mary's own half-brother on a mission to assassinate the Scottish queen immediately after presenting her with a peace treaty. Elizabeth is furthermore implicated, according to Herrera, in the publication of slander after the murder of Mary's second husband when she hires George Buchanan to compose texts that defame the Scottish queen. Elizabeth works to manipulate her impressionable niece and the public of both Scotland and England, but perhaps most importantly, she succeeds in manipulating politics on an

international scale. In his descriptions of Elizabeth's machinations, the English queen proves to be a formidable antagonist, not only for the Queen of Scots but also, in the end, for Spain.

According to Herrera's relation of Mary's life, Elizabeth begins flexing her manipulation muscles while the Scottish queen still lives in France. His narration of a conspiracy to kill Mary and her first husband, King Francis II, reveals Elizabeth's ingenuity, at the same time criticizing her moral rectitude. While Mary is still in France, explains Herrera, Elizabeth plans the Amboise Conspiracy (fols. 42r–42v). Historically, this was a coup led by a small group of Protestant nobles who planned to kidnap the young French king in order to force him to remove the powerful Catholic Guise family from their position at court. In Herrera's version of these events, Elizabeth is the mastermind behind the plot, for she promises to marry James Hamilton, duke of "Castelalto," if he will declare himself against the French king (fol. 47v).⁶⁵ When the plot fails, Hamilton flees to Scotland, but upon making his request for the English queen's hand in marriage, as she had promised, "quedó burlado de Isabel, como lo han sido otros nueve o diez, a quien ha mantenido esta misma esperanza; teniendo ella firme propósito de jamás casarse, por no sujetarse a ningún hombre" (fols. 47v–48r). In his brief relation of the Amboise Conspiracy, Herrera misinterprets historical fact, but the detail he provides in his description of the English queen is illuminating. Here, Herrera explains that it was common practice for Elizabeth to offer her hand in marriage in exchange for political favors, and in such behavior she stands in stark contrast to her pious niece. What's more, she proves capable of manipulating international

⁶⁵ Herrera refers to "Jacobo de Amilton Duque de Castelalto, [. . .] gobernador de Escocia, y [. . .] el más próximo a la sucesión del Reino" (fols. 47r–47v). Based on this description, the most likely historical referent is James Hamilton, Duke of Châtellerauld and Earl of Arran, who served as regent to Mary just after her father's death. He stood next in line to the Scottish throne after Mary and converted to Protestantism—"largely for cynical reasons" (Guy 105)—but he did not retreat into exile in France until after the murder of David Rizzio. Herrera may also conflate the father and son, second and third Earls of Arran. The son, James Hamilton, did not serve as 'gobernador' or Regent in Scotland, nor did he ever hold the title of Duke of Châtellerauld, but he did serve Mary in France, in command of the Scots Guards, and would have been there at the time of the Amboise Conspiracy.

politics for her own gain.

When Mary returns to Scotland, Elizabeth continues to interfere with her rule, though Herrera makes no further reference to any false promises of marriage in her plans to do so. Instead, Elizabeth employs the services of the queen's half-brother to undermine Mary's position at court. Elizabeth sends her own English spies into Scotland and is so successful in her plotting that, Herrera explains, "todo andaba en mucha confusión por las mañas de Isabel Reina de Inglaterra, a quien por lo que queda dicho parecía que esto convenía" (fol. 48v). Elizabeth often, it turns out, found it politically expedient to distract her rivals with sly tricks. Of particular concern to Spain at the end of the sixteenth century was her involvement in continental Europe.

It is in the ability to manipulate international politics that Spain's true interest in Elizabeth lies. Once Scotland was safely under the control of Protestant lords, Elizabeth turned her attention towards the rest of Europe, and here specifically Herrera describes the way in which she undermined Spain's foreign policy in the Netherlands in order to avoid open conflict with Philip II. Elizabeth incited unrest on the continent, explains Herrera,

no olvidándose del cuidado que las fuerzas del Católico Rey don Felipe la podían dar; por lo cual con sus tramas amarañando lo que se ha visto en los estados de Flandes, que aunque en un tiempo en estas cosas procedía de callada, dejando que otros se mostrasen descubiertamente contra los dichos estados, como lo hizo el Príncipe de Oranje, y después el Duque de Alansón; cuando vio que estos faltaron, y que la potencia del Rey había de oprimir y poner en sujeción a sus rebeldes, y al final traerlos a su obediencia, se quitó la máscara, y se determinó de favorecellos abiertamente, estimando en más tener al Rey ocupado en aquella guerra que libre y descansado porque no la pudiese castigar. (fols. 45r–45v)

Historically, English troops were present in the Netherlands beginning in 1585 when England officially declared its allegiance with Flanders in the Protestant revolt against Spain. As Herrera suggests, however, Elizabeth's influence in the Netherlands was felt before any outright declaration of war between the two nations was made. In demonstrating Elizabeth's illicit political strategy in this way, Herrera would have managed to strike a chord with his Spanish audience. The English queen had been manipulating policy in Spanish territories in the fight against Protestants long before the death of Mary Stuart.

Elizabeth's presence permeates Herrera's text, ostensibly concerned primarily with the Scottish martyr. Her cruelty, her ability to manipulate those around her, to influence politics on an international scale, and her persecution of English Catholics all stand out in Herrera's description of Mary's antagonist. It is in the exploration of Herrera's descriptions of these two contrasting sovereigns that Herrera's national bias is revealed. His depiction of Mary and Elizabeth evokes Spain's sense of duty to defend and disseminate the Catholic faith in Europe. His text furthermore uniquely delves into deeper roots of Mary's biography in order to clarify Spain's role in this story, told in such tumultuous times.

Removing Spain's Blame and Re-telling History

Herrera's particular brand of historical revisionism, mediated by the recent defeat of the Armada, seeps into certain curious aspects of his presentation of Scotland's long history and the history of the Stuart line. In a move that proved his dedication to the task of historian and unique among early modern biographers of Mary Stuart, Herrera begins *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* with a detailed description of not just Mary's life, but also the history of her country and her family line. When these aspects of the biography are explored critically, they too reveal a

particularly Spanish interpretation of this foreign nation's history. In this treatise, ancient connections between Scotland and Spain serve to establish a sort of religious kindred between the two nations. Geographical realities of the island and inherited tragedy combine in this *Historia* to rewrite Spain's position in Mary Stuart's homeland, while at the same time removing their blame in her downfall.

After his dedicatory letter, Herrera begins his treatise by immediately placing his text within the historical genre in which he plans to demonstrate his skill. For his Spanish audience, Scotland was a land whose history, customs, and geographical terrain were unfamiliar. He thus describes the ancient history of Scotland, in addition to its climate and geography, to begin his treatise. Such contextualization, while informative for the uninstructed reader, is presented in such a way as to provide an excuse for Spain's inaction on Mary's behalf during her lifetime; it also foments animosity towards the northern Protestants who mistreated her.

Herrera begins his history of Scotland long before even the birth of Christ, and he describes in detail how Catholicism first came to the northern nation. Spain plays a significant role in this story.⁶⁶ In fact, the settlement of Scotland has its roots in Spain itself. According to Herrera, Gatelo and Escota, son of the first king and founder of Athens and daughter of the

⁶⁶ Herrera's stated sources for this historical portion of *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* are "David Chambre Escocés, consejero en el parlamento del Demburg en su tratado de cosas de Escocia, autor muy grave" (fol. 10v), "los Anales de Ector Boecio" (fol. 12r), and "las historias de Inglaterra [de] Polidoro Virgilio" (fol. 12r). Herrera is likely here referring to David Chambre d'Ormont (or David Chalmers, of Ormond), a Scottish refugee in France, who wrote *Histoire Abbregee de tous les Roys de France, Angleterre et Escosse, mise en ordre par forme d'Harmonie; contenant aussi un brief discourse de l'ancienne alliance & mutual secours entre la France & l'Escosse*, published in Paris in 1579. For more information on Chambre, see *The Scottish Historical Review*, vol. 7, ed. James Maclehorse, "The Franco-Scottish League in the Fourteenth Century," footnote 120–21. Hector Boece was a Catholic historian and philosopher that published the *Historia Gentis Scotorum* in 1527, a history of the Scottish people up to the year 1438. John Lesley later expanded this work in his *De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gentis Scotorum*. Polidoro Virigilio refers to the Italian historian Polidoro Virgili, or Polydore Virgil, who spent most of his life in England, and wrote the influential *Anglica Historia*, drafted in 1513 and printed in 1534.

Egyptian King Faraón respectively, left their homes to settle in Portugal and later Galicia, where they founded the city of Brigante, later known as Compostela. Their oldest son, Hiberno, was sent to discover new territory for the family, and on his northward journey he found the island of Ireland, which he conquered and where he left his brother, Hemenco, to reign. When Hemenco died without issue, Simonbrech, “hijo del Rey de los Escotos de España” was named king, and he extended his territory to include “la parte de Escocia que llaman Salvaje” (fol. 7r). Thus Scotland in its most ancient history is connected to the founders of the Spanish city where the most important Catholic pilgrimage of sixteenth century Europe ended. And yet the connections between Spain and Scotland’s past do not end there. These first Scottish people are led by ancient Egyptian beliefs (fol. 8r), but in the year 45 A.D., “a persuasión de dos Filósofos Españoles,” the Scottish king led his people to the adoration of a singular God, and some 150 years later the first Scottish king accepted the Catholic faith, having been instructed by vassals of the Pope (fols. 8v–9r). The Catholic faith continued to expand until finally James IV of the Stuart dynasty was named Protector of the Faith by Pope Julius II (fol. 10r). In this presentation of the history of Scotland, the country’s Catholic roots thus connect the Stuart dynasty and the Spanish nation, establishing a religious kinship that would reappear in later Spanish texts.

As Herrera had done upon recalling the symbolic significance of Mary Tudor and Philip II’s marriage, by presenting Spain and Scotland’s shared Catholic history, he establishes hope for the island’s religious future. Although Spain did little to intervene in Mary Stuart’s favor while she was alive, once her narrative became a part of Spanish discourse surrounding the Armada, it was necessary to rewrite the relationship that existed between Scotland and Spain. By recalling the influence Spain had in Scotland’s history, Herrera suggests Spain’s responsibility in ensuring Scotland’s Catholic future. Though Spain did not intervene on Mary’s behalf, they should not

deny their duty to intercede in Scotland's future.

As a martyr, Mary's persecution was not suffered in vain, yet Herrera cleverly uses his description of Scotland's physical geography and Mary's heritage in order to remove any blame Spain may have carried in her tragic end. In the *Historia*, Mary is shown to be the victim of forces that lay well beyond the control of even the most powerful foreign ally. In his "Discurso sobre los provechos de la Historia," Herrera wrote of the historical genre that "la Historia nos represente qualquier suceso no simple ni desnudo, sino vestido de sus causas y de todos aquellos accidentes que le acompañaron, porque sin la causa de tales particulares no se puede llegar a la universal conclusión que es el verdadero principio de obrar con razón cierta" (fol. 115r). Herrera will carefully and thoroughly outline the causes for Mary's tragedy over the course of his text, but in order to express them completely, he begins by establishing the geography of Scotland and England. He does so, he states, "porque los lectores en el discurso de esta obra lleven la luz que conviene para inteligencia de lo que se trata en ella" (fols. 1r-1v). His detailed account of the provinces and rivers on the island demonstrate extreme depth of research and preparation for a position as royal court chronicler, but the proximate geographical relationship of England and Scotland described by Herrera also plays a part in the unfortunate occurrences of Mary's life. Geography takes on symbolic importance beyond that of its objective historical significance. First, Herrera demonstrates the interconnectedness of Mary and Elizabeth's fates. As they are queens on one island, Mary cannot escape the plots of her conniving cousin. What's more, the abundance of bodies of water on and surrounding the island take on religious significance when Mary is imprisoned by rebels in Scotland. Herrera establishes that the island "es abundantísimo de pescados de lagos, y de ríos, y de mar" (fol. 2v). Thus, when Mary is taken prisoner at Lochleven and denied fish during Lent, her captors demonstrate their excessive cruelty. The

Queen of Scots not only suffers from extreme cold while imprisoned and is denied proper garments according to her station, but more importantly

en lo que toca a la comida, queriendo como Católica ayunar la Cuaresma, no pudo conseguir que se le diese otro mantenimiento, sino anguilas saladas, no embargante que el pescado, y la mucha abundancia que hay dello en Escocia, no es la menor riqueza de aquel Reino; tanto que en muchas de las islas más cercanas a Escocia, de ninguna otra cosa se sustentan las gentes sino de pescado, del cual usan hacer pan, secándolo, y convirtiéndolo en polvos. (fols. 94v–95r)

This description of Mary's treatment would have evoked concern in Spain for Catholics living in the British Isles, as it was well known that Protestant policy towards Catholics had only grown more intolerant in intervening years. Despite what seems to encourage Spanish resentment towards Mary's captors, Herrera mentions a curious detail regarding Scotland's borders that would have made direct intervention on the queen's behalf difficult: "[t]iene este Reino por todas partes, muchos puertos cómodos, pero pocos capaces para recibir grandes armadas" (fol. 2r). There is no explicit reference made at any point in the *Historia* to the Armada that Spain sent north in 1588. However, providing this description of the Scottish ports makes one thing clear: had Spain wished to make such a gesture of support while Mary faced religious persecution and imprisonment by these men who refused her fish during Lent, the act would have proven futile. Mary's unfortunate destiny, thus, is inextricably linked not to Spain's inaction but to the geography of her own country.

Another driving factor in Mary's tragedy is her family line. The Scottish queen inherits tragedy as the Hapsburgs inherited their iconic chin. Before beginning his narration of Mary's life, Herrera describes the Stuart line of kings from which she is descended in great detail. They,

like the Queen of Scots, have all suffered from poor fortune and passed this cursed gene down to their youngest member. Mary's tragic trait is visible from the time of her birth until her death. Only a few days after the Queen of Scots was born, writes Herrera, "murió Jacobo quinto su padre, y ella fue heredera de su Reino, y de la desdicha de su casa juntamente, porque con un cierto hado acabaron con sangriento y violento fin la mayor parte de sus antecesores" (fol. 18r). Herrera lists the fateful deaths of all of Mary's predecessors: James I died at the hands of his servants, the second by a piece of artillery in a battle against the English, the third at the hands of his own son, the fourth also in battle against the English, and the fifth by "mal no conocido de los médicos que se entendió después que fue tosigo" (fol. 18v). Mary is doomed to repeat the destiny that plagued the Stuart kings that came before her. By focusing on the historical origin of Mary's tragedy, Herrera successfully removes any possible blame from Spain in her unfortunate fall.

Conclusions

Herrera transforms Mary's life into a predetermined martyrdom from birth, and in doing so he precludes any residual criticism of Spanish inaction during her lifetime. The lesson to be learned here thus functions as a means of legitimizing Spain's action after her death in the continuation of its fight against heresy as Defender of the Faith. The characterization and qualities of Mary as an adult that are emphasized in Herrera's text create the dichotomy that is reflected in Spain's contemporary views of the English monarchy, for they emphasize Mary's innocence and underscore Elizabeth's evil. The detailed description that Herrera provides of Mary Stuart's life, on the one hand, may be understood as a means of communicating to his audience his adroit ability in the historical genre. On the other hand, however, the forceful

defense of Mary and the dismantling of her Protestant detractors serve also to reinvigorate a Catholic narrative that would have been pertinent to Spain after the Armada's failed return. Herrera may have been a historian, writing about a foreign queen with the noblest intentions to right the wrongs of Protestant inaccuracy, but if we read his text as a product of a post-Armada national identity, his interpretations and descriptions of these two cousin queens reveal alternative motivations. Mary Queen of Scots transforms at the hands of this Spanish historian into an excuse to continue to fight for the Catholic cause after a humiliating defeat at sea, and Elizabeth is proof that her cruelty will continue to spread if Spain does nothing to stop it.

In his narrative of this foreign nation's past and the decapitation of a martyr by order of the Queen of England, Herrera participates in the process of rebuilding Spain's reputation and redefining its mission. As a historian, he molds his characters into the archetypes that will directly influence later Spanish representations of this pair of foreign queens. When Lope de Vega returns to their story, he will transform this historian's unhappy victim into his epic's dynamic hero.

CHAPTER TWO

Lope de Vega's Return to the Queen of Scots: Reimagining Mary Stuart in *La corona trágica* (1627)

Nearly forty years of silence followed Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas's biography of the life of Mary Queen of Scots. Although authors throughout the rest of continental Europe would continue to capitalize on the Scottish martyr's image, no Spanish text returned to her story until Lope de Vega dedicated his pen to her service in epic form. In the intervening years, Spain's relationship with England fluctuated dramatically. Like many of the current events discussed in broadsides and pamphlets during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, proclaimed one day and tossed aside the next, it seemed that interest in Mary's fate would quietly descend into the annals of history. Herrera's attempt to reinvigorate Spain's Catholic identity with Mary's story did not survive through the tumultuous final decade of the century nor did it make an impact early in the next. Rather, and perhaps somewhat curiously, Elizabeth returned alone to the Spanish page with Cervantes's exemplary novel, "La española inglesa." In this story, likely written shortly after Spain and England signed a peace treaty in 1604, the English Queen is presented as a benevolent figure. She behaves compassionately towards a young Spanish Catholic girl who is brought to her court, having been kidnapped years earlier during an English attack on Cádiz. This Elizabeth contrasts starkly with Herrera's. And if peace with England had lasted, perhaps that this kinder image of the English queen would have prevailed. Thanks, however, to another negative turn for Anglo-Spanish relations in the second decade of the seventeenth century and to Spain's most prolific early modern writer, Mary would

return to the eyes of the Spanish public in epic form nearly half a century after her execution. Her Protestant foe would return with her.

In 1627, Lope de Vega published *Corona trágica* recounting Mary's life, imprisonment, and execution in England. At this time, Herrera's religiously motivated interpretation of Mary and Elizabeth, which was meant to appeal to Spain's post-Armada desire to vindicate its position as defender of the faith, was relevant once more. The religious divide that Herrera created in his characterization of Elizabeth and Mary would influence Spanish representations of these two queens for the next 150 years, but it would be supplemented with allusions to contemporary issues, providing renewed relevance to Mary and Elizabeth's shared relationship. Lope's text was published with the hope that it would earn its author the patronage of Pope Urban VIII, but it also brought Mary and Elizabeth—who at this point has been succeeded by Mary Stuart's son and grandson—back into the Spanish imagination. Combined with Lope's desire for patronage, contemporary political events that brought England and Spain together on the international political stage inspired a renewed interest in the Scottish Queen's tale. In the *Corona trágica*, Lope dramatizes Mary's story in order once again to highlight the importance of the Catholic faith and Spain's position as its defender. In doing so, he represents Mary as a religious symbol held in contrast to the evils of Protestantism. What separate Lope's and Herrera's texts are the strategies they use to relay their extremely similar messages.

Among Lope's vast literary cannon, the *Corona trágica* has received scant critical attention from modern scholars. It was published for the first time in a modern edition in 1982 by Michael G. Paulson and Tamara Álvarez-Detrell and finally printed by Cátedra in 2014, edited by Antonio Carreño-Rodríguez and Antonio Carreño.⁶⁷ After its original publication in 1627, the

⁶⁷ C. Giaffreda also published an annotated edition of Lope's epic poem in 2010 that includes an Italian introduction and notes.

poem did not see another printed edition until 1776. Despite what we may understand of the text's minimal popularity from this lack of reprinted editions, Lope did achieve the personal goals that lay behind his composition of this text. As Rozas explains, “[p]or su correspondencia sabemos que el Papa le contestó a la dedicatoria del libro con una carta afectuosa, [a Lope] le hizo doctor en Teología y le concedió el título de Caballero del Hábito de San Juan” (7). Modern editors of Lope's epic poem acknowledge that this work is not among the *Fénix*'s best, but it demonstrates an important development in the peninsular texts that represent Mary Stuart's story.

When Felipe Pedraza commented on Lope's oeuvre, he suggested that the epic genre was not among Lope's strongest, explaining that this *Monstruo de la Naturaleza* “no llegó a cuajar como poeta narrativo” (591). Pedraza describes the *Corona trágica* in a few short sentences, in which he summarizes the epic with this pithy remark: “Se trata de otro intento fallido” (594). Yet Pedraza is willing to admit that the best parts of Lope's epic poetry “se erigen momentáneamente en protagonistas de un conflicto dramático” (591). In *Corona trágica*, Lope uses dialogue and develops a narrative voice that elicits pity for the Scottish queen while promoting animosity towards her Protestant enemies. Throughout his poem, he provokes emotion in his reader for a religious martyr killed forty years before its publication. Whether or not modern critics find Mary's lengthy speeches persuasive or rather too long, their presence is significant for they give the queen a dramatic weight that she did not have in Herrera's *Historia*.⁶⁸ Mary becomes an active defender of the faith rather than a passive victim of her circumstances. Elizabeth, on the other hand, is denied dialogue completely and Bothwell is transformed into a potent symbol of

⁶⁸ Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell find the length of this epic poem to be its primary downfall: “Como ya se ha dicho, el largor excesivo del poema es su principal defecto; el lector moderno desfallece ante la labor ‘interminable’ de casi 5000 versos” (“Introduction” 20).

the dangers of the reformed faith, rather than merely an imprudent match for the Queen of Scots, as he was rather briefly characterized in Herrera's text. In his Catholic and Protestant characters, Lope thus creates drama from history that would appeal to Spain's national consciousness as the Thirty Years' War began to take shape.

Lope's poem is guided by the same religious principles and biases that influenced Herrera's text. As Paulson explains, Lope's interpretation of events is "based on two equations: that which is English equals Protestantism, heresy and treason and is *ipso facto* evil; that which is Spanish or Catholic must by opposition be equated with good" ("Lope's vision" 43).⁶⁹ Again, based on both the historical time period in which Lope wrote and published this poem and based on its dedication to Pope Urban VIII, this heavy-handed Catholic bias will not come as any sort of surprise. Yet what I will explore in this chapter are the ways in which Lope's approach to writing this history distinguishes his text from Herrera's. Mary is recreated as the protagonist of her own story and through dialogue and the narrator's support, she becomes a figure to reinvigorate Spain's fight for Catholicism in northern Europe. Although Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell do admit that Elizabeth's influence is often felt throughout the *Corona trágica* despite her physical absence from the action, in Lope's poem, unlike in Herrera's *Historia*, Mary is the clear protagonist. Mary appears in "319 de las 623 octavas reales, o sea, aparece en 51,2% del poema" while Elizabeth only appears in 13% (Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell, "Introduction" 22). Rather than focus on Mary's appearances, I will look to the dialogue she is given and how the narrator responds to her character in order to demonstrate the way in which in her speeches throughout

⁶⁹ Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell repeat the same sentiment in the introduction to their edition of Lope's epic: "En cada libro [del poema] se manifiesta el prejuicio del veterano de la Invencible contra Isabel e Inglaterra; la fórmula siguiente resume sus ideas: lo bueno es lo español o lo católico, lo malo equivale a lo inglés o a lo protestante" (21). Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño also share a similar interpretation of the queens' dichotomous representations (27).

the poem the Queen of Scots is transformed into the Catholic symbol that Lope declares her to be in his prologue.

Lope separates the *Corona trágica* into five books, each of which depicts a part of Mary's story, beginning with her escape from Scotland and ending with her execution. Mary remains the primary focus of the poem throughout, and she is frequently transformed into a character that narrates her own tragic story, focusing on the loss of Scotland thanks to the betrayal of her half-brother, the earl of Moray, and Elizabeth, who had promised her protection with the invitation to take refuge in England. Throughout the poem, Mary speaks passionately about the tragedies she has experienced, from the death of her first husband, to the assassination of her secretary and of her second husband, about her third forced marriage to Lord Bothwell, and finally about her need to flee from Scotland. Despite these tragedies, what Mary continually maintains is her faith. She fights for Scotland in order to defend Catholicism, and she refuses to submit to Elizabeth when she offers to save her life in exchange for the promise of conversion. Based on Lope's treatment of the two rival queens, Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño state in their introduction: "Ya habían pasado cuarenta años desde la ejecución de la reina de Escocia, y aún era palpable la intensa anglofobia que se agrava con la visita de Príncipe Carlos a Madrid en 1623" (20).

Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño rightfully, I believe, emphasize the importance of placing Lope's text within its own historical moment, but they oversimplify the Anglo-Spanish relationship, which during the forty years they reference was anything but consistent. During the 1620s, in the climate in which Lope wrote, there was rather a resurgence in anti-English feelings than a continuation of a consistent 'Anglophobia' in Spain.⁷⁰ The last decade of the sixteenth

⁷⁰ I believe it is problematic to think about a Spanish attitude of Anglophobia in the early modern period. There is little evidence for such intense dislike coming in any consistent form from the public, as existed

century, which followed the publication of Herrera's text, saw only heightened tension between England and Spain. This was the result of a series of naval conflicts that included a second attack on Cádiz (the first made in 1587 and led by Sir Francis Drake), another Spanish Armada sent to England in 1597, and constant confrontations in the Atlantic. When Philip II died in 1598, his son appeared to be open to defining a new relationship with Spain's pesky northern foe, but no agreement would be made until after Elizabeth I died in 1603. The following year, James I and Philip III signed a peace treaty in Valladolid. It is believed that at the signing of this treaty, negotiations began for the infamous Spanish Match. The Match was meant to marry the Spanish Infanta to James's son, the Prince of Wales. Good relations between England and Spain lasted relatively few years, as Spain had negotiated a double marriage alliance with France by 1609 and entered into the Thirty Years' War against Protestant rebels in northern Europe by 1618. England and Spain would, of course, fight on opposite sides of this long war. Yet in 1623 England would make one final attempt to broker peaceful relations with Spain, the details of which will be discussed at length in Part Two of this dissertation.

It was in 1623 that the Prince of Wales traveled incognito to Madrid through France to meet the Infanta whom he hoped to win as his future bride. Marriage negotiations for this Spanish Match had effectively ended more than a decade earlier, but thanks to the influential Spanish ambassador the count of Gondomar and England's financial problems in the early 1620s, Charles decided that Spain was England's last hope, and he would make a last-ditch effort to bring the proposed alliance to fruition.⁷¹ The visit ended with Charles's return to England

in England, and such statements ignore the many years that Spanish monarchs preferred to seek peaceful relations with England.

⁷¹ Sanz Camañes explains the political and economic advantages that the match would have meant for England (77–78). As Alexander Samson states in his introduction to his edited volume on the Spanish Match, "He [Charles] now seemed convinced that the marriage was the only way to solve her father's

unwed and to the further deterioration of the Anglo-Spanish relationship. Following his return to England and his ascension to the throne after his father's death in 1625, one of Charles's first actions as king was to attack once more the port of Cádiz. According to historian Porfirio Sanz Camañes, this attack marked the beginning of a five-year Anglo-Spanish war (83).⁷² This time, however, and unlike the attacks made during Elizabeth's reign, Spain effectively defeated the English fleet. Policy had once again shifted, and 1625 would turn out to be an extremely positive year for Spain's foreign policy. It was called the *annus mirabilis*, for the Spanish naval fleet and armies won victories against their rivals not only in Cádiz, but also in France, Italy, Brazil, and Flanders. Though the Thirty Years' War was in its early stages when Lope wrote his epic about Mary, the Catholic League, with Spain as its leader, appeared to be unbeatable and tensions between England and Spain ran high.⁷³

Military victory, however, came at a high cost. In January of 1627, after years of devaluation of the Spanish coin, Philip IV was forced to declare bankruptcy and Olivares's planned invasion of Ireland was indefinitely postponed. Poverty rose in Spain and the popularity of the war against heresy was low despite the religious victory and renown that it could bring back to the Spanish empire. Sanz Camañes describes the "panorama tan desalentador" that resulted from the increased costs of war in Europe and the Americas and the lack of funds the monarchy received for its efforts (97).⁷⁴ In many ways, the political situation of 1627 mimicked

financial worries and unify the religious divisions threatening to destroy England and the rest of Europe" (12).

⁷² After a series of military and naval conflicts in 1625, the next five years of the Anglo-Spanish war were, according to Sanz Camañes "más simbólica que real" (86).

⁷³ The state of Anglo-Spanish relations after the failed marriage alliance is discussed by Sanz Camañes (67–79).

⁷⁴ For more information on the financial crisis that the Spanish monarchy suffered in the 1620s, see Martín and Lynch 243–58.

that which existed when Herrera wrote his *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* in 1589. But in order to reinvigorate Mary's story in support of the Catholic cause, Lope used the tools most readily available to him. In writing *Corona trágica*, he transforms himself into a poet-historian who will combine both professions to create a more dynamic representation of the Scottish Queen than Herrera had done before him. Where one author proposed a retelling of Mary's story, the other reimagined her.

Lope's reimagination of Mary Stuart emerges from his own ideas on how to define the difference between history and poetry, and here we must recognize one of Lope's important personal motivations for writing this epic poem. As Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño explain, his motivations to write *Corona trágica* included "circunstancias literarias, personales, históricas y no menos religiosas" (11). At various stages throughout his career, Lope attempted to earn a position at court as a royal chronicler, just as Herrera attempted (ultimately successfully) to do when he wrote *Historia de . . . María Estuarda*. Henry N. Bershas describes two cycles of Lope's push for a royal appointment, one from 1611–1614 and another around 1620 (117). Bershas focuses on a series of historical dramas written by Lope that functioned as a sort of application for the job that Lope never received. Though *Corona trágica* was written some years after this second attempt at royal patronage, Rozas recognizes this epic poem as one that "recuerda sus viejas pretensiones de cronista real" as well as "un nuevo capítulo de su lucha por conseguir mecenazgo" (5). This time, however, Lope would look to the church rather than the Spanish court for support. He wrote *Corona trágica* after the visit of Cardinal Barberini, nephew of Pope Urban VIII, to Spain. Barberini had traveled to Madrid in 1626, and Lope felt that the Mary Stuart theme would appeal to the new Pope's sensitivities since he, many years before, had

dedicated a Latin elegy to the Scottish Queen.⁷⁵ Thus, imitating the Pope's poetic interpretation of the Queen of Scots and his Latin source text *Vita Mariae Stuartae*, written by George Conn and published in 1624, Lope combined the task of historian and poet. In doing so, his more dramatically forceful presentation of the Queen of Scots presents a figure who the Pope could admire and who the Spanish empire could look to in their renewed mission to defend the Catholic faith abroad.

Lope as Author of the Historical Epic Poem

Lope did not view his position as historian in the same way that Herrera had conceived of his. Lope's poem is the first example of a dramatized Mary reimagined for the seventeenth-century peninsular audience. While it is true that Mary had been represented at this point throughout Europe not only in Latin school dramas but also for the popular stage, Spain, as we have seen, had yet to return to her story.⁷⁶ She had not yet been depicted on the Spanish stage and despite his success in this medium, Lope choose not to reinvigorate her story in the genre with which he was most familiar. In my analysis, however, I refer to the Fénix's "dramatization" of the Scottish queen. I use this term to refer to the narrative strategies that Lope uses to give his historical character a sense of action and liveliness that she lacked in Herrera's text. Lope's movement away from the historical genre and towards the poetic permits the invention of dialogue between characters, and his narrator pronounces judgment on those he describes in

⁷⁵ See Rozas 5–6 and Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño 15–21 for more information on Lope's relationship to Pope Urban VIII.

⁷⁶ In addition to Bordes's *Maria Stuarta Tragoedia* (c. 1590), a number of plays representing Mary's tragedy were performed in Italy and France in the years following her execution. Among possible sources for Lope's poem Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño list *Stuarta Tragoedia*, written in Latin by Adrián de Roulers (1593, translated to Italian in 1598), *La Reine d'Escosse* (c. 1600) and *L'Escoccoise ou le desastre* (1601) by Antoine de Montchrestien (24–39).

ways that would not comply with Herrera's idea of the unbiased historian. Lope's elaboration of Mary's story takes advantage of the liberties that his chosen genre provides in order to supply the accolades which her Catholic cause deserved.

Whether due to the mere passage of time or to early modern authors' recognition of the potential that Mary's story held, after Herrera's *Historia*, textual focus on the Queen of Scots's tragedy did not remain historical. Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño observe a shift in the treatment of Mary Stuart's story after the turn of the century when, they suggest, her tale was no longer represented as "un ardiente problema político"; rather, "se había convertido en material literariamente histórico y [. . .] los hechos empezaban a ser narrados literariamente" (46). Echoing the rhetoric of other scholars who have taken up the study of European representations of the Queen of Scots, Paulson describes how Mary came to serve "in part as a propagandistic figure in the war against heresy" ("Scope" 65). The queen is transformed into a symbol, used as a "pawn" by poets and dramatists alike to represent that which her authors desired from her (Paulson, "Scope" 62). I believe it is difficult to pinpoint the moment in which Mary's story became symbolic. Indeed I personally see Herrera's historical treatise as an exploitation of the Queen of Scots's symbolic potential, as I have suggested in the previous chapter. Viewing texts through the historiopoetic lens permits our interpretation of them without making this precise distinction. Lope's text represents a transformation of authorial approach, but he sees his mission also as a historical one.

We may begin our attempt to understand Lope's approach to history in the *Corona trágica* by observing his adherence to the historical facts of the Queen of Scots's life that were available to him. Lope directly references Conn's text as a source for his epic poem in his prologue, where he first presents his task: "Leíle [el libro de Conn] con tanto gusto de su

elegancia y erudición, y asimismo de la verdadera narración de esta tragedia, que me dispuse a escribirla en verso, en partes refiriéndole y en partes adornándole con lo que permiten los preceptos de la poesía en verdadera historia de nuestros tiempos” (123).⁷⁷ Here, Lope recognizes the freedom that poetry allows in the representation of history—it may be “adorned”—but this does not mean that Lope wishes to present a completely falsified version of the events he depicts. His “poesía en verdadera historia” will instead at times refer the events of Mary’s life as they happened while in other moments expanding poetically upon them. Demonstrating his inclination towards history, Lope, like Herrera, also recognizes the historians who have misrepresented Mary’s story, and he asks his readers to ignore these false accounts, “conociendo el peligro de las falsas historias que tanto daño han hecho a los reyes y reinos como provecho las verdaderas” (125). From his prologue, then, we see Lope’s negotiation of the grey area between history and poetry which his text will occupy. Although Lope does not often in his epic stray too far from historical fact, he also does not believe his narrative should be constrained by it.⁷⁸

Throughout his oeuvre—both dramatic and epic—Lope negotiates the relationship that exists between history and poetry. Stephen Gilman attempts to respond to the possible contradiction in terms such as “la poesía en verdadera historia.” He points to the long-ignored historical dimension of much of Lope’s work, and argues that although Lope is not a “historicista arqueológico,” his historical corpus represents “verdades humanas duraderas” just as Calderón’s historical dramas are often praised for doing (20). Lope comments on his own representation of history in his dedicatory letter to don Fernando de Vallejo, which accompanied his *La campana de Aragón*:

⁷⁷ In citing from Lope’s *Corona trágica*, I use Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño’s Cátedra edition of the poem.

⁷⁸ Paulson seems surprised by this aspect of Lope’s epic when he comments, “What is particularly interesting is the fact that much of the information contained is actually based on history” (“Scope” 62).

La Fuerza de las historias representada, es tanto mayor que leída, quanta diferencia se advierte de la verdad a la pintura, y del original, al retrato: porque en un cuadro, están las figuras mudas, y en una sola acción las personas, y en la Comedia hablando y discurriendo, y en diversos afectos por instantes, cuales son los sucesos, guerras, paces, consejos, diferentes estados de la fortuna, mudanzas, prosperidades, declinaciones de Reinos, y periodos de Imperios, y Monarquías grandes. (fol. 208r)

Lope here picks up on Aristotle's own argument: that is, poetry may, in fact, be a more suitable medium for displaying truth than a historical text. Or perhaps more concretely, that the universal truths displayed in poetry are of greater value than the particular truths of history. Curiously, Lope here argues that drama is the preferable medium for communicating this historical but universal truth to his audience, and yet for Mary Stuart's story he ignores his own suggestion. Despite such oversight in this particular historical case, his epic poem falls still within the genre of poetry, rather than history, just as drama would have. Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño's discussion of Lope's choice of genre in their introduction is comprehensive and illuminating. Lope, they explain, was well aware of the Aristotelian distinction between poetry and history, imagination and reproduction, but "[a]mbos, pese a su disparidad, están íntimamente entrelazados en el relato de *La Dragontea* como, años más tarde, en la *Corona trágica*" (52). As Rozas explains, at this late stage in his life, Lope began a new project, "el proyecto literario de no seguir escribiendo para los corrales, sino de ocuparse de una literatura culta y grave" (3).⁷⁹ Yet I would argue that Lope did not leave behind his propensity for the *comedia*. Using the epic form allows Lope to focus on the characters in Mary's story in a way that Herrera was unable to

⁷⁹ Rozas explains that this project was described by Lope in a letter that he wrote to his patron the Duque de Sessa in 1630, but argues that it began with the composition of *Corona trágica* in 1627.

do based on the constraints he placed on his own historical genre. Lope transforms Herrera's Queen of Scots by employing his dramatic skill in *Corona trágica*, creating a queen whose speeches promote a greater emotive response from readers.

Lope's Dramatization of Mary Queen of Scots

Lope emphasizes Mary's role as a Catholic symbol from the beginning of his poem. In his letter to Pope Urban VIII, he describes the Queen of Scots, "en cuya vida compitieron igualmente la adversidad y la paciencia desde la cuna al cuchillo" (120). And in his prologue that follows, Mary becomes "único ejemplo de constancia en la fe, obediencia a la soberana cabeza de la Iglesia, paciencia en las adversidades y modestia en los agravios" (124). When he begins his epic, Mary's protagonism is established within the first book of the poem. After a brief introduction, the narrator cedes his story to Mary Stuart herself, who recounts her life from birth to the murder of Rizzio (I.213–856).⁸⁰ Mary's narration of her own story, up until the assassination of her secretary thus makes up more than three quarters of the first book.

The description that the Queen of Scots provides of her own tragedy serves to place her within the fight against heresy that took place in both Scotland and England. Where Herrera focused on Mary's predestined misfortune in detailing the tragic deaths of the many Stuarts that reigned before her, Lope's dramatic reincarnation of the Scottish Queen focuses on her Catholic heritage. She establishes the fight that occurred between Henry VIII and her father, James V of Scotland, as the moment when Scotland fell to heresy:

'Nunca a mi padre pudo el fiero Enrique
por más que lo intentaba cauteloso,

⁸⁰ Passages quoted from the *Corona trágica* are cited by book and line numbers as provided by Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño. In this text, verse numbers begin again at the start of each book.

ya blanda paz, ya guerra injusta aplique
 mudar la fe del pecho generoso.’ (I.313–16)

Unfortunately, when Mary’s father died, leaving her mother to act as regent for the infant queen, Marie de Guise could no longer hold back the threat of Protestantism

‘que aunque mi madre tanta diligencia
 puso en la fe con valerosa mano,
 cuanto a la luz Penélope tejía,
 tanto de noche Enrique deshacía.’ (I.341–44)

In this narrative, Mary’s mother and father are implicated in the fight to defend Catholicism in Scotland against Henry VIII’s Protestant incursions. She goes on in this opening monologue to describe her own coronation, her childhood in France, and her return to Scotland after the death of Francis.

It is in this monologue that Mary establishes the Catholic devotion that will be central to her characterization in what remains of the epic, and it is she herself who corrects the errors that false historians had made in depicting her story. What’s more, in her discourse, Mary recognizes her own faults, as Herrera had previously recognized in her:

‘La nobleza me dio doce varones,
 mas sólo del Bastardo [Moray] me fiaba,
 sin entender que todas sus acciones
 al pretendido reino encaminaba.
 Esta facilidad en opiniones
 puso la integridad que profesaba,
 pero si el darle crédito me culpan,

la sangre y los engaños me disculpan.

Del reino los católicos le infaman,
y yo ignorante apruebo sus maldades;
cuán tarde, ¡ay cielo!, y más si temen o aman,
a las coronas llegan las verdades.’ (I.697–707)

Mary was a Queen too quickly trusting of her half-brother and later of Elizabeth. But when she recognizes these flaws in her own character, she becomes more than a passive victim, as she had been in Herrera’s *Historia*. Here, Mary transforms into a conscious and active defender of the faith for which her enemies will attempt to punish her.

In the second book of *Corona trágica*, after establishing Mary’s symbolic importance for the Catholic faith, Lope further elaborates his sympathetic yet forceful interpretation of the Scottish queen. In this book, Lope presents his own reinterpretation of Mary’s relationship with Darnley, but whatever errors Herrera felt he corrected with historical evidence, Lope defends here with dialogue between husband and wife. Mary shows Darnley her pain at his gullibility, for the young king has allowed himself to be deceived by her enemies, who have told him his wife seeks to keep him from garnering any sort of power in Scotland. “‘Si tú gozas el reino y yo el cuidado,’” Mary asks Darnley after Rizzio’s murder, “‘¿qué envidia de mis brazos te divierte? / Si en más alto lugar te constituyo, / tú eres el rey, y yo privado tuyo’” (II.141–44). Her lamentations lead to Darnley’s repentance and the reconciliation between husband and wife that the Catholic version of Mary’s story necessitates. The narrator exclaims the beauty of their love as Mary and Darnley escape the conspirators together, but as the story must turn dark, “la Noche descendió de horror vestida” (II.243). Lope’s use of such figurative language and dialogues such as this one between husband and wife emphasize the dramatic quality of the tragedy he tells.

Mary had placed too much confidence in her half-brother following the murder of Rizzio and a long digression on the perils of jealousy, which the narrator connects directly to the reign of women especially, leads us to the plot conceived of by both Moray and Bothwell (here mentioned for the first time in *Corona trágica*) to murder Darnley. Especially when compared to Herrera's proof of Mary's sorrow—a stoic list of the public demonstrations Mary made of such—Lope's representation of Mary's reaction to Darnley's murder gives much more dramatic weight to her character. In *Corona trágica*, Mary's dialogue conveys her emotion:

‘¡Ay!, —dice— mi dulcísimo Darleo.
 ¡Ay!, mi querido Enrique; ¡ay, mi querido
 Darleo!; ¡ay dulce bien de mi deseo!,
 desde que fuiste bien, fuiste perdido.
 ¡Ay!, mi segundo venturoso empleo,
 crédulo como yo. ¿Quién habrá sido
 el agresor de este delito infando,
 que no le creo aunque le estoy mirando?’ (II.737–44)

As Carreño-Rodríguez and Carreño explain in their footnote, these lamentations echo the classical rhetoric of a tormented lover (258). Here, rather than using historical investigation to demonstrate evidence for Mary's feelings towards her husband, Lope instead finds recourse in his dramatic skill. As Herrera had, Lope presents a Catholic interpretation of Mary's story, but he does so by providing Mary with discourse that provokes compassion from his readers rather than focusing on denying the evidence brought forth by Protestant detractors.

Finally, when Mary is sentenced, her monologues combine her symbolic appeal and dramatic reinterpretation in a way that Herrera's Mary would never have been able to

communicate. In moments when Mary has lost control of her own destiny, she continues to employ a strong rhetorical style that provokes sympathy for this tragic character. The reader's first glimpse of Mary's self-defense comes when the Scottish Parliament has decided she shall take the earl of Bothwell as her third husband. Mary delivers a powerful speech in which she asks her audience to explain to her what she has done to deserve such trials. In her oration, the Scottish queen compares herself to Elizabeth, who has not suffered such rebellion from her own people:

‘Y si tanta verdad no os desengaña,
¿qué griega, persa ni romana historia
como Isabel, que goza felizmente
porque da libertad, reino obediente?

A mí fieros apóstatas me inquietan,
hieren, murmuran, roban, matan, prenden,
y a Jezabel idólatra respetan
y en públicos sermones la defienden.
Mis costumbres traducen e interpretan,
y con mi deshonor el reino encienden,
porque dejando a Dios, en odio mío,
siga los pasos de su error impío.’ (II.813–24)

Elizabeth is compared to queens who have come before her—mentioned in the lines immediately preceding those cited—who have successfully reigned without husbands at their sides. Female rule is thus not the problem for Mary; instead it is religion. The abrupt change in subject, from female rule to religious division, makes our reading of the “libertad” that Elizabeth gives here

somewhat difficult. Historically, Mary Stuart allowed religious freedom of worship to Protestants in Scotland while Elizabeth often persecuted Catholics in England. Yet it appears here that Mary is suggesting that Elizabeth's "reino obediente" is instead that which gives the English queen freedom. In contrast, Mary lacks this same freedom; her Protestant citizens persecute their queen. Later in this speech Mary even acknowledges the fact that she does not argue theologically with these "apóstatas" who so fiercely challenge her reign (II.833–34). Lope gives Mary the opportunity to defend herself in a situation that once more lends to the reimagining of the Queen of Scots as an active participant in her own story.

During her trial at Fotheringhay, the second of Mary's two trials in England, her defense is again transformed by Lope into a powerful speech. Her argument is impassioned and well reasoned and entirely invented by Lope, since historically Mary was not allowed to appear in person at the trial for her involvement in the Babington Plot. In her defense before the court, Mary explains that Elizabeth bares the blame for bringing her to trial when she had no legal right to do so; what's more, she loved Darnley and already proved her innocence in one false trial she was forced to endure. Finally, Mary asks, why would she want to rule in England if she cannot even maintain control of Scotland? Mary is not a threat to Elizabeth; she has neither power nor an army. At the end of her defense, she is left with nothing else but to commend herself to God.

When news of Mary's execution is finally related to her, she pronounces a pious lamentation. The Queen of Scots admits that in other circumstances she would have felt horror when facing such a sentence, but as she has been in prison for twenty years, death will be welcome. After the long night in prison, she will finally see the light of Heaven:

‘Agora que ya veo a luz tan clara
llegar mi fin, carísimos amigos,

donde la vida en sólo un golpe para
 y de mi fe tendré tantos testigos,
 mi firme aspecto lo interior declara,
 y libre de asechanzas y enemigos
 la muerte esperaré; mejor dijera
 que esperaré la vida cuando muera.' (V.321–28)

All her life, she continues, God has guided her, first in France and then in Scotland. And she is certain, as she declares in this speech, that one day God will guide England back to the Catholic Church. Elizabeth may have led England into “perdición eterna” with her “engaño,” but she will someday be punished for her sins. As Herrera and the other Catholic accounts of the death of the Queen of Scots would make clear, the heretical queen of England punished Mary for no reason other than her faith. And Mary herself recognizes this in her penultimate speech in Lope’s epic as she speaks to her servants:

‘Esta firmeza, esta constancia fuerte
 la causa ha sido de mi muerte, amigos,
 bien lo sabéis; y así me alegra tanto
 que os pido que volváis en risa el llanto.’ (V.717–20)

Throughout his text Lope uses dialogue in order to give the Queen of Scots a dramatic weight that she did not have in Herrera as she transforms into an active, vocal defender of the faith—as Spain was meant to be—rather than a passive victim of her circumstances. The Protestant foe that Spain was fighting in 1627 exists in the dark underbelly of Mary’s story, but rather than providing the Protestants in *Corona trágica* with the same discursive weight that Mary is given,

Lope chooses to allow the narrator to comment upon their actions, admitting them very little dialogue through which they might otherwise be humanized.

The Protestant Enemy Depicted by Lope

Elizabeth is the most prominent Protestant figure in Mary's tale, but as we have seen, she appears relatively little named over the course of five books. Unlike the Queen of Scots, Elizabeth is not once given leave to defend herself with speech in *Corona trágica* and thus the impression the reader receives of this Protestant queen is mediated only by the narrator and what other characters say of her. Lope's characterization of Elizabeth does not differ greatly from what Herrera had presented some forty years prior. The narrator informs his readers of the English queen's machinations that lead to Mary's downfall and rebukes her reputed virginity by referring directly to the scandals that dispute the image Elizabeth wished to portray of herself.

Lope's representation of Elizabeth's involvement in Mary's tragedy begins while she is ruling in Scotland. The English queen of *Corona trágica* seems to hold an invisible sway over Scottish politics much like she did in Herrera's text, for when Mary tries to convince her Parliament that she should not marry the Protestant Lord Bothwell, who had planned the murder of her second husband, they instead are influenced by the heretics living to their south: "con esto [la cismática Herejía] a Escocia Inglaterra ardía / rebelde a sus legítimos señores" (II.933–34). In other words, it is due to England's influence in Scotland that Mary's lords insist on this third match. Our narrator's comments tell about Isabel's further machinations while Mary is locked up in Lochleven Castle:

Nueva Tomiris, Isabel airada,
Átropos fiera, inexorable y dura,

la cabeza católica traslada
 a la de Ciro envuelta en sangre pura;
 María de estas nuevas lastimada
 no hallaba libertad ni fe segura,
 y en tanta mar de confusión en medio,
 ni fe en lealtad, ni en amistad remedio.

En Francia sus cuidados refería
 el Bastardo a los Guisas, que engañaba,
 y a Escocia a los rebeldes escribía
 que su muerte cruel solicitaba.
 Desta impiedad se viera infausto día,
 pero secretamente procuraba
 Isabel, cautelosa, que no hiciesen
 que Italia, España y Francia se ofendiesen. (III.801–16)

Here again we see a clear echo of Herrera’s representation of Elizabeth, who manages to avoid confrontation with foreign Catholic powers thanks to her underhanded dealings that avoid outright blame. Once Mary seeks refuge in England to escape her rebels, Lope shows Elizabeth soliciting George Buchanan himself, “cronista mordaz,” to compose libels against the Queen of Scots. When Mary is finally brought to trial for her involvement in the Babington Plot, Elizabeth recognizes that as a fellow sovereign she cannot exact Mary’s sentence, but she declares that the Senate will convene “en que se juzgue y vea / que tiene culpa, aunque imposible sea” (IV.271–72). As it was in all Spanish representations of her story, Mary’s sentence is decided—in this case by Elizabeth—before her trial begins.

Like Herrera, Lope also questions Elizabeth's reputation. From the very beginning of his epic poem, before even passing the narration on to Mary in book one, Lope's narrator gives his explanation for the English queen's choice not to marry:

Esta Lamia cruel, mujer gallarda
y en la crueldad león, viendo a María,
honor de la real sangre estuarda,
que en el ánglico reino sucedía,
no se atreviendo a sucesión bastarda
ni a casarse el temor de que podía,
nombrando rey, perder el solo imperio
dejando espada libre al adulterio,
en la crueldad y el miedo pareciendo
al impío Herodes, que de Cristo santo
el reino temporal juzgó, cubriendo
de sangre a Elía y a Raquel de llanto. (I.137–48)

Elizabeth's character is thus presented and developed by the narrator according to her schemes and unsavory behavior. Once more at the beginning of the fifth and final book of *Corona trágica*, Lope's narrator makes reference to the "nombre injusto" of "honesta virgen" that Elizabeth claims for herself, this time making reference to specific lovers that Elizabeth was believed to have kept (V.49). His description of the English queen just before Mary's sentence is read compares her cruelty to that of Nero and Abimelec—greater than that of Talia, Irene, Amastris and Atalia—and her persecution of faith is compared to that of the emperor Julian (V.62–67). The narrator's description of Isabel serves to discredit the only words that are read in

her voice in the entirety of *Corona trágica*, although not by the queen herself. Isabel's words are read in the publicly proclaimed sentence of Mary Stuart:

‘y por el gran peligro que ha corrido
por su detenimiento nuestra vida,
y el Evangelio y la Religión que ha sido
por tanta dilación tan ofendida,
de tantas quejas mi temor vencido,
debiendo ser mi vida preferida
a mi piedad y natural blandura,
hoy la [muerte de María] consiento por vivir segura.’ (V.97–104)

Elizabeth's seeming reticence to execute Mary, the result of her “piedad y natural blandura,” is immediately discredited by Lope's narrator. This declaration, written in the voice of though not pronounced by Elizabeth, is mocked in the narrator's use of rhetorical questions following its pronouncement: “¿Cabeza de la Iglesia y defensora / se llama de la fe (Vicario santo, / cuyo divino pie la tierra adora) / ebria mujer que la persigue tanto?,” he retorts (V. 129–32). Such a reaction serves to ingratiate the reader even further with Mary's cause, the narrator serving as the Scottish queen's defense.

Lope denies Elizabeth the right of speech that he so graciously bestowed upon the Queen of Scots, and yet there is one Protestant figure in the *Corona trágica* that is given an unconscionably large amount of discursive weight. Lord Bothwell, Mary's third husband, a Protestant forced upon her by the members of her own Parliament according to the Catholic narrative of her life, demonstrates in his dialogue the dangers of the heretical faith in the center of Mary's tragedy and of Lope's epic poem. In the second and third books of the *Corona trágica*,

Bothwell first demonstrates the persuasive danger of Protestantism in a scene in which he convinces Parliament that Mary should be his wife, and then of its violence when he is shown with his wife Judit, who he murders in order to permit his marriage to the Queen of Scots.⁸¹

Bothwell's first speech is placed directly after the narrator's digression on jealousy in the second book of *Corona trágica*. In this speech, Bothwell admits that he has been blinded by Mary's beauty and will stop at nothing to marry her. He plans to seek Moray's help in the matter and is willing to kill both Darnley and his own wife should either of them get in his way:

‘Si para que mi frente digna sea
Enrique, tu marido, se interpone,
y Judit, mi mujer, ninguno crea
que la vida si puedo les perdone.’ (II.465–68)

Once Darnley has been murdered, Bothwell is brought to trial before the Parliament and here his speech will be paralleled by Mary's defense mentioned earlier. Bothwell explains his actions as a crime of passion, provoked by jealousy and Mary's extreme beauty. He is declared innocent thanks to his “retóricas razones,” which the narrator recognizes while at the same time describing his speech with a clear warning: “Habló, mintió, juró, movió, previno / leyes, testigos, fábulas, y donde / la muerte mereció salió seguro” (III.148–50). Mary's response that she cannot wed a married man does little to convince Parliament that Bothwell would be an unfit husband, and at this point in the story, the readers are taken to a short digression in which they witness first hand the relationship between Bothwell and Judit, his wife.

⁸¹ It should be noted that Lope invents this name for Bothwell's wife, who was mentioned in Herrera's *Historia*, but not by name. Bothwell was, in fact, married when he courted Mary Stuart and divorced his wife in order to wed the Queen of Scots. The liberties Lope takes with historical fact in this story are many, but the name he chooses for Bothwell's wife certainly holds religious significance. Unlike the Biblical Judith, in the *Corona trágica*, Bothwell's wife does not manage to behead the heretical enemy. She does, however, represent a woman steadfast in her faith, willing to risk her life in order to save Mary, and by extension the Catholic faith in Scotland.

The scene which depicts the interaction between husband and wife is written almost entirely in the form of a dialogue between spouses with little interruption from the narrator. It demonstrates Bothwell's violent desire, in addition to placing further emphasis on the danger of his persuasive abilities. In this digression, Judit accuses her husband of killing Darnley out of pure ambition for power and not because he loves Mary. Bothwell, in turn, accuses Judit of jealousy rather than love and explains to her that Scotland needs a Scottish king and not a foreign prince to marry the queen. He will be the one to take on this role. When Judit then threatens to convince Mary, as a good Catholic, that she cannot marry Bothwell, her husband strangles her to rid himself of his problem. When Judit is murdered, Lope's narrator waxes poetic about her death:

‘Aquí veré, Judit,—prorrumpe [Bothwell] airado—
 si dices a la Reina mis defetos,’
 y echó las manos al marfil nevado,
 enseñadas a hacer tales efetos.
 Judit, el rostro en lágrimas bañado,
 los brazos le pensó tener sujetos,
 mas fueron de los dos (y así no pudo)
 las manos lazo y la garganta nudo.
 Quéjase en ronco acento, y por los bellos
 ojos centellas vierte y rayos de ira,
 mas como va faltando el alma en ellos,
 con medio heladas lágrimas le mira.
 Revueltos a las manos los cabellos,

vertiendo espuma y roja sangre, espira:
 así tendió Cleopatra el cuerpo hermoso
 con las ansias del áspid venenoso. (III.441–54)

Lope's use of imagery is powerful. Judit's white skin denotes her beauty and innocence; the emotion she emits through her eyes as she is being strangled is made vivid by the description of their "centellas" and "rayos de ira." And she, like Cleopatra, chooses death as a sign of her faithfulness, here to Catholicism instead of the man she loves. Judit's death will contrast with Mary's at the end of this epic poem, for when the narrator arrives at his finale, he finds himself at a lack for words before Mary's execution that he does not suffer here. Once free of his wife, Bothwell gathers his men to leave in pursuit of the queen, who, upon finding herself with no other option, agrees to marry once more if Bothwell will accept the condition that Scotland return to Catholicism. This agreement obviously strays from historical fact, but it again demonstrates Mary's active fight for her faith in Scotland and gives evidence of the transformation of her character in Lope's *Corona trágica*. Before leaving the epic, Bothwell is given one final soliloquy in which he declares his fall to be the result of Mary's extreme beauty, his own ambition, and punishment for the assassination of Judit.

Together, the dialogue and speeches—both those pronounced and those conspicuously absent—that Lope adds to his story demonstrate his focus on the character of Mary Stuart. This could, on the one hand, relate back to Lope's desire for patronage from Pope Urban. However, by examining the historical context within which this epic was written, I have also argued that Lope's choice of protagonist holds direct relevance for the kingdom of Spain in the late 1620s. *Corona trágica* presents Mary as the symbol of Catholicism. She triumphs over Elizabeth in the way that Philip IV should triumph over the heretics that both attack Spanish borders and ships at

sea and against whom Spain at the same time also fights abroad in the midst of the Thirty Years' War.

Placing Spain within Mary's Story: Lope's Praise Bestowed in *Corona trágica*

In addition to establishing the stark contrast between the Protestant and Catholic faiths in his *Corona trágica*, and beyond the praises he sings of Pope Urban VIII, Lope on many occasions throughout his epic connects Mary's story and the struggle for Catholic dominance in England and Scotland to Spain. Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell criticize the "gran número de digresiones y alabanzas innecesarias" in *Corona trágica* (21), but they do not connect this directly to the "patriotismo del autor" that they demonstrate quantitatively.⁸² In multiple digressions and comments made by the narrator, Lope signals a desire to connect Philip IV's Spain in 1627 to that of his grandfather, Philip II, declared defender of the faith when Mary was executed in 1587.

Lope directly references Philip II in a context that clearly identifies Spanish antagonism towards the Protestant England of queen Elizabeth. Philip II's one mistake, Lope explains both through the voice of his narrator and of Mary Stuart, was that he missed the opportunity to kill Elizabeth when it was presented to him. As Mary laments in her monologue of book one,

‘Reinó Felipe, y tuvo Inglaterra
con el rey español la fe romana,
luego Isabel les hizo oculta guerra,
mas descubriose la traición tirana.

⁸² Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell provide a detailed list of the number of times each Spanish king, historical event (e.g. the Armada), or simply "la historia gloriosa de España en general" are referenced. They conclude, "La frecuencia de las alusiones históricas marca el interés o el odio de Lope; la España gloriosa requiere tanta mención como los enemigos de la religión católica" (23).

¡O, cuánto la piedad a veces yerra!,
 pues no es divina en toda acción humana,
 si en librarla Felipe del castigo
 a la Iglesia dejó tal enemigo.’ (I.585–92)

In addition to this reference made to the time Philip spent as king of England, Lope also mentions the defeated Gran Armada on multiple occasions in *Corona trágica*. He reinterprets its journey, however, as a sacrifice of Spain’s most illustrious nobles—who he lists in extensive detail—in defense of the Catholic faith. Employing violent imagery to describe the atrocities committed by the English queen, Lope writes of her conflict with Felipe:

Felipe mira al sol en forma breve,
 y obliga a la defensa a toda España
 contra la Bestia que las aguas bebe
 del Támesis, que en sangre mártir baña. (III.33–36)

Lope’s imagery is again powerfully evocative, as he imagines Elizabeth indirectly drinking the blood of the executed Mary Stuart, this (as depicted here) having run into the Thames. In this way, though it was defeated, the Armada should be remembered for its noble mission and may still be seen to make up a part of Spain’s religious national legacy.

Spain’s history is further rewritten by Lope when, in book five, his characters explain Philip II’s inaction at the time Mary was sentenced in England before she was executed. In this scene, we may consider the dramatic effect that Lope gives his story by adding characters and scenes that vivify Herrera’s historical retelling of events. In *Corona trágica*, the French ambassador comes to Elizabeth’s court to threaten the English queen if she carries out her sentence, and the references he makes to Spain’s inaction is intriguing. Philip II hasn’t taken

action because Elizabeth has kept him busy at sea; but, be warned, the ambassador says, for if he sees France go to war, so too will he:

‘Si Felipe español no trata desto,
 es por la enemistad y causas de ira
 en que le habéis con sinrazones puesto
 por todo el mar que su corona gira;
 pero si tiene el ánimo dispuesto
 y al gallardo francés airado mira,
 haciendo de las dos una corona,
 a tanto Marte, ¿qué podrá Belona?’ (V.209–16)

At the end of the French ambassador’s speech, Elizabeth is reminded once more—this time directly—that Philip saved her life when Mary Tudor was queen. Elizabeth thus not only demonstrates her cruelty and injustice in the execution of her cousin but also her ingratitude towards the Spanish king who once defended her.

At other moments throughout *Corona trágica*, Lope compares Spain and England directly, demonstrating the former’s divine support and describing the latter with apocalyptic imagery. At the beginning of book two, Lope uses striking language to portray the chaos of Elizabeth’s England and Spain’s entire empire as a gift from God:

Hasta en las aguas que le dan asiento
 parece a Babilonia, madre infame
 del lascivo furor, por cuyo intento
 permite que la sangre se derrame;
 pero decienda ya del firmamento

con voz de trueno el ángel que la llame
 habitación de espíritus impuros,
 abrasando sus mares y sus muros.

¡Cuán justamente el nombre glorioso
 de Católicos Reyes tiene España,
 que ya el divino aragonés dichoso
 le confirmó con tan ilustre hazaña!
 En premio, Nuevo Mundo y cielo hermoso
 por cuanto el mar del Occidente baña,
 y desde la Florida hasta Quivira,
 las dos columnas de Hércules admira. (II.33–48)

Lope continues in this preliminary digression of book two to describe the good deeds of the Spanish kings through Felipe IV:

Darán a tres Felipes las historias
 por tanto derribar monstruos deformes,
 tal nombre que a los siglos extendido
 se olvide de olvidársele al olvido. (II.61–64)

In this opening digression of his second book, immediately after Mary's extended narrative, Lope recalls Spain's glorious past and its religious and moral superiority over England. Philip IV, the narrator suggests, will naturally follow the august history of those Spanish kings that came before him and will continue to fight against the Protestant enemy that his grandfather combated following Mary Stuart's execution.

Spain and England are once again placed in firm contrast in a dream that Mary has in book four, the night after her second trial has taken place. Mary dreams first of her ascension to heaven, where she sees the old Spanish monarchs from Charles V to Catherine of Aragon and Philip II. In heaven she also sees figures that recall the martyrs that have died in England for their faith and serve as a premonition of Mary's soon-to-be-realized death. She is then guided into hell where the Protestant nobles of England reside. Upon passing into hell, Mary first sees John Huss and Calvin. Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII are also there, for

Allí pagó los daños cometidos
 contra la santa reina Catalina,
 cuyos trabajos por su bien sufridos
 la corona mortal vieron divina.
 ¡Oh, Enrique, a quien cegaron los sentidos
 lascivia y ambición, qué muerte indina
 de un hombre a quien dio siempre amor injusto
 años de infamia y átomos de gusto! (IV.641–48)

The dream ends with a demonstration from the angel that guides Mary to the seat where Elizabeth will one day sit in hell:

‘Vuelve los ojos, y en la parte opuesta
 a Enrique mira, aquel dosel ardiente
 que con la silla en cuatro gradas puesta
 en él espera que Isabel se siente.’ (IV.657–60)

Elizabeth's proper place, as here depicted in Mary's dream, many years before the English queen's death in the timeline of Lope's epic, would ultimately be beside her heretical father. The

vacant throne beside his awaits her. As Mary will predict in her final speeches, Elizabeth's England will one day fall, and Lope seems to suggest in 1627 that this day will not be long to come. His entire epic reimagines Mary's story for a seventeenth century audience through the dramatic recreation of Herrera's characters and the reinterpretation of Spain's place as the world's continued defender of the faith. This position, at a time when Spain found itself engaged in naval warfare with England and in conflict with much of Protestant Europe on land, reverberated the imperial policies of Philip IV and Olivares, recuperating the symbol of a foreign queen in support Spain's monarchical policy.

CHAPTER THREE

Foreign Queens on the Spanish Stage: Juan Bautista Diamante's

La reina María Estuarda (1660) and José de Cañizares's *Lo que va de cetro a cetro y crueldad de Inglaterra* (c. 1713–18)

The scandals and tragedy of Mary Stuart's life, and the religious message of her martyrdom, seem as though made for the stage. But in Spain, her story would not be adapted for the theater-going public until shortly after Lope's epic poem had been published. From the year following *Corona trágica*, Mary would become the subject of a number of Spanish dramas that brought the life of the Queen of Scots and her English cousin to the stage. As time progressed, the religious emphasis that previous authors had placed on the relationship between Mary and her cousin queen diminished and was replaced by more relevant political issues that Spain would confront over the course of the century that followed. In the seventeenth century, at least two peninsular playwrights and one more in the early eighteenth century brought the story of Mary and Elizabeth to the Spanish stage. Portuguese dramatist Manuel de Gallegos was the first to do so with his *La reina María Estuarda*, performed at the court of Philip IV in 1628. Unfortunately, this play has since been lost, but an analysis of the remaining two Mary Stuart dramas, Juan Bautista Diamante's work by the same name (c. 1660) and José de Cañizares's *Lo que va de cetro a cetro y la crueldad de Inglaterra* (c. 1713–18), will make up the remainder of this chapter.⁸³ Once again, these plays provide a fascinating look at the story of our two rival

⁸³ Ann Mackenzie provides the date of composition for Diamante's play based on its first recorded performance on July 27, 1660 at the royal palace in Madrid (203). Mackenzie provides a detailed analysis of the uncertain authorship of this play. As she explains, it was attributed to both José de Cañizares and Don Pablo Rodríguez Osorio. It appears, however, that most commentators have settled on Cañizares as the likely author because of the frequent attribution of this play to this author over the course of the eighteenth century. Although both the date of composition and author of this play have been disputed,

monarchs, not necessarily for the high quality of their characterization—in fact, the small amount of twentieth century criticism that acknowledges these plays has often harshly commented upon their lack of artistic merit—but because of their relevance to contemporary Spanish politics and identity. Paradoxically, as I will argue in what follows, it is in Elizabeth’s characterization, rather than that of the Catholic martyr Mary, that we will find the most relevant commentary on the Spanish monarchy and Spain’s national identity in the mid-seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.⁸⁴

When Diamante and Cañizares bring Mary and Elizabeth to the Spanish stage, they, like Lope and Herrera before them, display Mary’s story as one of Catholic martyrdom. Both authors focus not only on creating a pair of queens whose diametrical representations demonstrate the superiority of the Catholic faith, but also on recreating them within a context that reflected pertinent affairs of the political atmosphere in which they were performed. Once more we can look at Spain itself to see how this representation of the British Isle’s most famous monarchical duo, by now familiar to the Spanish audience, reflects upon contemporary politics of the empire. When these plays were written, Spain was not necessarily directly engaged in with war England; instead, these plays confront the internal struggles of a changing monarchy and an empire facing decline.

Mackenzie makes an argument for the composition date of Cañizares’s play before 1713, arguing that “an unusually intense degree of hostility expressed towards England and the Englishmen in the drama might indicate that it was completed while Spain and England were still engaged, on opposing sides, in the War of Spanish Succession” (203). The first recorded date of performance of *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*, however was in Barcelona on November 21, 1718 (Mackenzie 203).

⁸⁴ Although she does not discuss Diamante’s characterization of Mary and Elizabeth focusing on their historical context, Mary Parker also considers his depiction of Isabel more captivating than that of María: “Isable tiene la innegable energía, el coraje y el brío que le dan mayor colorido y más interés dramático del que tiene María Estuardo” (134).

When Juan Bautista Diamante wrote *La reina María Estuarda*, the reign of the promiscuous and politically inept king Philip IV was nearing its close. Some sixty years later, when José de Cañizares returned to tell the story of Mary and Elizabeth in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro y crueldad de Inglaterra*, Spain had only recently finished a decade-long war of succession, which brought an entirely new royal family to the country after the last Habsburg king, Carlos II, died without an heir. Politically, these two moments have little in common, and yet at such times both playwrights found relevance in the story of rival sovereigns. The question thus arises, why did Spanish authors keep returning to Mary and Elizabeth's story, especially when Spain itself was not truly an actor on this specific political stage? One might suggest, as I also believe, that Mary and Elizabeth's story holds intrinsic interest, for it is one that places two female sovereigns—still a novelty in the sixteenth century—at odds. It furthermore presents in a perfect package the religious tension, highlighted especially by Herrera and Lope, that raged in Europe both during and for a long time after the reigns of both queens. When presented in Spain, these qualities and a continually fraught political relationship with England may have provided reasons enough for Mary and Elizabeth's consistent reappearance. Yet interpreting these Spanish Mary Stuart dramas based only on what they say about the early modern Anglo-Spanish relationship, I believe, obscures the full value of their historical merit. By examining the adaptation of Mary and Elizabeth's relationship in Diamante's *María Estuarda* and Cañizares's *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*, I will argue that the story of these cousin queens in fact goes beyond the representation of English history, and notably acts as a mirror that reflects Spain's own contemporary political moment. The foreign façade that this tale provided gave Spanish playwrights the opportunity at once to provide a didactic lesson to their reigning monarchs and also to consider the recreation of a changing Spanish identity as the empire approached the end of its Golden Age.

In my study of both Herrera's and Lope's texts, I have considered each author's relationship to the history he represents. As a historian, Herrera maintained that his task was to reproduce the true story of Mary's life, correcting the wrongs of her Protestant detractors. Some forty years later, despite the fact that Lope's genre allowed him more artistic freedom in his representation of the Queen of Scots's tragedy, he too remained almost surprisingly faithful to both the good and bad aspects of Mary's complicated history. In the case of Diamante and Cañizares, we will find that neither playwright felt it necessary to constrain his drama with historical fact. Rather, both authors reimagined Mary and Elizabeth as new characters. The story of the former was miraculously uncomplicated by these two Spanish playwrights who created a Scottish queen whose piety reigned supreme. The latter queen transformed, however, into a figure defined less by her religious identity and more by the political interests and preoccupations of contemporary Spain.

In general, early modern historical dramatists were little concerned with accuracy, for plays often were guided by very different motivations than was, for example, a historical chronicle. Inaccuracy was, as Herbert Lindenberger suggests, the norm rather than the exception in early modern historical drama (3). Rather than the reproduction of truth, dramatists used their freedom to distort historical fact in order to promote didactic lessons in their history plays. History itself was seen at this time as a sort of manual for kingship and was heavily relied upon to teach the art of government. Thus, history represented on stage may be seen as an effective way to impart such didactic messages. According to Lindenberger, "[w]ithin dramas centered in the historical world the education or reeducation of the audience's consciousness is often overtly part of the play's intent" (146). In the context of Diamante's and Cañizares's plays, we must

consider that the audience was in the first case known to be the king himself while the second play was most commonly performed in *corrales* for a broader popular crowd (Mackenzie 211).

Apart from the goal of imparting a didactic lesson, historical drama was also uniquely suited for the task of eliciting feelings of national unity. As Veronika Ryjik, who studies Lope's historical dramas, explains: "la manipulación de los datos históricos por parte del dramaturgo dentro del proceso de reescritura de la historia patria se debe estudiar en estrecha relación con la idea nacional que surge de esta reescritura" (43). Representing the nation's great triumphs or heroic historical figures on stage was unsurprisingly turned to in times of national crisis or decline, and in Spain the genre reached its zenith in the tumultuous first half of the seventeenth century. Unlike the plays that Ryjik studies, however, Diamante's and Cañizares's plays elicit national sentiment and promote didactic messages not through Spain's own history, but rather through that of two foreign nations. Yet one further difficulty lies in the analysis of both Diamante's and Cañizares's texts that existed less for Herrera and Lope given their adherence to historical fact; that is, to determine the origin of the recreation of history that they either invent themselves or reproduce.

Unlike Herrera and Lope, and unsurprisingly given their genre, neither Diamante nor Cañizares acknowledge their source texts. Thankfully, however, the number of texts that either author could have drawn from is minimal. After Mary Stuart's execution, Catholic authors began almost immediately to represent her tragedy on stage. Jean de Bordes's Latin school drama was the first play to represent Mary's story; the play was written by 1589, produced twice in Italy before May of the subsequent year, and it was followed in the sixteenth century by at least one other drama of the same genre (Phillips "Jean de Bordes" 45). Mackenzie lists two further plays, written in the vernacular, that were published between the late sixteenth and the first half of the

seventeenth centuries: *Tragedia della Regina de Scozia: Per Spagna contra Inghilterra* by Campanella (c. 1598) and *La reina María Estuarda* by Gallegos (1628). Both of these plays have since been lost. Paulson has compiled the three existing French vernacular plays written about Mary Stuart in the seventeenth century, which include Antoine de Montchrestien's *La reine d'Ecosse* (c. 1596–1600), Pierre Regnault's *Marie Stuard* (1639) and Edme Boursault's drama by the same name (c. 1684).⁸⁵ While it is possible that Diamante drew from any of these plays given their chronology, with the exception in this case of Boursault's, both Paulson and Mackenzie provide further information regarding the most probable sources for this playwright. Mackenzie suggests that Diamante likely relied heavily on Gallegos's lost play as well as Lope's *Corona trágica* for the composition of his drama. Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell suggest that Diamante may also have drawn from Regnault's play, although it is not certain he was able to read French (*A critical edition* 8). Cañizares's play, according to Mackenzie, was inspired by Diamante's, but he also includes information about Mary and Elizabeth's story that cannot be found in this earlier Spanish drama. Thus, it is likely that Cañizares also drew from Boursault's *Marie Stuard*, in addition to other "Roman Catholic histories" or "certain foreign dramatic versions of Mary Stuart's tragedy" (Mackenzie 204). It is important to recognize these source texts in order to determine how Diamante and Cañizares's stories of Mary and Elizabeth diverged from those of their predecessors. In my analysis, I will focus especially on the way in which both authors simplified their representation of Mary when compared to Lope's and Herrera's previous iterations of the Queen of Scots and, in my discussion of their representation of Elizabeth, I will focus primarily on her changing depiction as time progressed.

⁸⁵ Very little is known about Pierre Regnault. However, Paulson discusses the likely identity of this somewhat mysterious author in *The Fallen Crown* (27–28).

I do not tout my ability to read the minds of the early modern dramatists I study, nor do I hope that I will successfully be able to determine the deliberate motivations that lay behind Diamante's and Cañizares's Mary Stuart plays. It is especially difficult to determine what deliberate decisions either playwright made on his own regarding the characters of Mary and Elizabeth because neither playwright wrote about his task as a historical dramatist, as both Lope and Herrera had done with regard to their perceptions of their respective professions. Rather, in my analysis I will explore the ways in which Diamante's and Cañizares's history plays differ from previous representations of Mary and Elizabeth, and I will discuss the implications of these changes, desiring not to determine overt political opinions of either author but rather the significance of their reimaginings of these two queens within the context of the political moment in which they composed their dramas.

The Queen of Scots Represented by Diamante and Cañizares: Continuing the Myth of Mary the Martyr

Juan Bautista Diamante's and José de Cañizares's representations of the Queen of Scots do not differ greatly from one another. Both playwrights create a character that is transformed into a symbol of the Catholic faith, a "type of historical character" or a "symbolic figure" that "stands for 'La Fe Católica'" as Paulson and Mackenzie consider her characterization respectively (Paulson "Scope" 67; Mackenzie 210).⁸⁶ Indeed any rough edges of Mary's

⁸⁶ In their introduction to the only modern edition of Diamante's play, Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell propose a re-categorization of this *comedia*. They argue for its similarities to the autosacramental genre, and while they note that this play does not include many elements found in the traditional *auto* (such as allegory or the one act structure), they also believe that it follows the same basic parameters (rivalry between competing faiths, perfection of martyred character, etc.). For this reason, they propose the category of *comedia-auto* for Diamante's play (18–22). Mackenzie recognizes Cañizares's play as "an unusually extended *auto*," but denies this quality in Diamante's play (210). As my focus in this chapter is primarily on Elizabeth's characterization, I will not contribute to this debate in my analysis.

historical character were smoothed out by our Spanish playwrights. Unlike Herrera and Lope, Diamante and Cañizares omit the most controversial aspects of Mary's biography from their plays, and in doing so, they pander to their Catholic audience while at the same time presenting a more nuanced representation of this martyr's executioner. While my analysis of their plays will focus primarily on their characterization of Elizabeth, or Isabel, I wish to begin my discussion by focusing on an important instance of historical inaccuracy, one with which both playwrights open their dramas. I will thus comment briefly on their characterization of Mary, María for Diamante and Cañizares.

Both Diamante's and Cañizares's plays begin with María's escape from two years of imprisonment by Scottish Protestant rebels who had taken her captive after framing her for the murder of her second husband. In the opening scene, María tells her story in a way that is remarkably similar in both plays and mimics, in many ways, the narration that Lope's Queen of Scots provides at the end of book one of *Corona trágica*. The speech María delivers, in the first case before a wandering *campesina* and in the second directly to Isabel's secretary (sent to Scotland to offer the English queen's aid), demonstrates one of the various instances of Diamante's direct influence on Cañizares's later play.⁸⁷ In both Cañizares's and Diamante's plays, María narrates her "trágica historia" from the beginning. Three men that she loved were taken from her prematurely: her father; her first husband, Francis; and her second husband, Lord Darnley. In both plays, María's autobiographical speeches focus primarily on the death of her second husband. She describes in vivid detail how her husband was taken from her while they lay in bed together and how she, in shock, watched his murder in silence:

Introdujo seis cobardes,

⁸⁷ See Mackenzie for a detailed outline of the instances in which Cañizares borrows from Diamante.

no digo mal, seis traidores
 en nuestra estancia, y llegando
 al lecho en que yo, y el Conde
 estábamos, con violencia
 le arrastraron, despertóme
 la atrocidad, y del susto
 al embargo apoderóse
 un yelo de mis palabras,
 un pasmo de mis acciones,
 una niebla de mis ojos,
 un silencio de mis voces (Diamante vv. 314–325)⁸⁸

The sympathy this speech evokes is likely something one would expect from a Catholic author, yet her narrative of Darnley's brutal murder is significant for the glaring liberty it takes with historical fact. Mary's emotional reaction to her husband's assassination conflates the two murders that historically tainted the Scottish queen's reputation, that of her secretary David Rizzio and that of her second husband. Rizzio was assassinated while he was with Mary; he was either stabbed to death in front of her or in a nearby room. Darnley's murder did not take place while Mary was with him. He was strangled while she was away from his lodgings. In these plays, however, after the scarring murder of her husband occurs in the fictionalized María's narration, the queen explains that the traitors who killed him brought his body back to her chambers and accused her of the crime before taking her prisoner in the country she was meant to rule.

⁸⁸ Line numbers for Diamante's play are cited from Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell's edition of *La reina María Estuarda*, which numbers each act consecutively.

The scene María describes in her passionate account provides a perfect example of the way in which Diamante and Cañizares present a remarkably purified version of the Scottish queen. The return of Darnley's body to Mary's bedchamber reinterprets historical fact. In effect, this change belies all of the rumors that implicated Mary in his murder, proving them false with categorical evidence provided by the queen herself in this narrative. Whether or not Diamante and Cañizares wished to recall the charges historically brought against the Queen of Scots—for which she was later tried and acquitted in England—they both demonstrate her innocence in this narrated episode as well as the cruelty of those who plotted against her. The scene María recounts is also an effective rhetorical device that establishes the queen as not only innocent but also pitiable. Sympathy for María is aroused due to her physical presence at the scene of the crime. What's more, María's presence during the murder of her beloved (according to the Catholic narrative) husband does not appear in either Montchrestien's or Regnault's plays. Thus, this part of María's speech appears to have been invented by Diamante and later copied almost directly by Cañizares.⁸⁹ The result of such reimagination and willful historical inaccuracy is clear: María is presented from her first appearance as an admirable future-martyr and, thanks to our playwrights' omissions, the audience is not reminded of the rather more controversial aspects of her character that may detract from her ability to symbolize the Catholic faith on stage.

In another move to modify historical fact, both playwrights also exclude any mention of Mary's secretary and her third marriage to lord Bothwell from this initial narration of her life

⁸⁹ Both Montchrestien and Boursault begin their plays with a speech from the Queen of Scots, pronounced for one of her advisers or counselors. In Montchrestien's play, however, the Queen of Scots focuses largely on her tragic circumstances after having been exiled to England. She laments her fate and the support she lost from her people, but she does not list the three early deaths she suffered that marked her tragedy from the beginning of her life. Boursault does include this list, which corresponds to the same three deaths mentioned by Diamante and Cañizares, but he does not describe Darnley's death in any sort of detail. Rather, he focuses on the Earl of Moray's involvement in the murder and on clearing Mary's name of any blame and her reputation from any negative speculation (both plays are reproduced in Paulson's *Fallen Crown*).

story.⁹⁰ The modification of historical fact in María's initial narration is especially significant when compared to the texts that appeared in Spain before Diamante's and Cañizares's plays. In Herrera's and Lope's texts, Mary's real historical misdeeds were not as blatantly hidden. In his biography, Herrera describes Mary's extremely loving and caring relationship with Darnley—a characterization echoed by Lope—which is presented as a form of evidence that proves Mary could have had nothing to do with his murder. What's more, both Herrera and Lope acknowledge Mary's third marriage to lord Bothwell in their respective texts, and both admit to his alleged implication in Darnley's assassination. Herrera's goal to refute any connection Mary had to these plots is evidenced in his blatant denial of the case Protestants had presented against her and in the presentation of Mary's third marriage as a union forced upon her by Scottish Protestant nobles.⁹¹ In Lope's epic, a lengthy and very memorable scene calls direct attention to Bothwell's cruelty towards his first wife, and this scene has a direct impact on Lope's depiction of Mary, who attempts to confront Parliament directly when they tell her to take Bothwell for her third husband. Given the weight of this episode in *Corona trágica*, a likely source text for both playwrights, its omission by Diamante and Cañizares is all the more significant. All of the events that were omitted by both Diamante and Cañizares—the murder of Mary's secretary, her possible involvement in the murder of her second husband, and her marriage to his assassin—created serious stains on Mary's reputation that Catholic authors fought tactfully to deny. By omitting these events from their plays, Diamante and Cañizares create a martyr untouched by carnal sins, and furthermore are free to use their precious three thousand lines to focus on their

⁹⁰ The name of the Barón de Brieste is mentioned in Diamante's narration of these events. As and Paulson and Álvarez-Detrell point out in the footnotes, this likely refers to Lord Bothwell. Mary does not, however, describe any further contact she had with this character.

⁹¹ See Herrera y Tordesillas, Chapters 15–22 for his description of the events that surrounded the death of Rizzio, the assassination of Lord Darnley, and Mary's third marriage.

development of the character of the English queen. Neither Diamante nor Cañizares is, in this case, interested in defending Mary's reputation, as Herrera had meant to do with his *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* and as Lope did also in his *Corona trágica*. Rather, María will be used as a figure that provides contrast to a much more developed reconfiguration of Elizabeth.

The Promiscuous Monarch, Consumed and Beguiled: Diamante's Elizabeth I and Felipe IV of Spain

When Juan Bautista Diamante wrote his *María Estuarda* in 1660, political climate in both England and Spain was intensified. In the preceding decade, Spain and England had once more gone to war in what Sanz Camañes calls “[los] peores momentos [de las relaciones entre ambos países] desde el desastre de la *Invencible*, en 1588” (179). England had been ruled for twelve years by Oliver Cromwell's protectorate after the execution of king Charles I in 1648, and in January of 1660, after the death of Oliver Cromwell left the Protectorate in the less capable hands of his son, the English Parliament had decided to restore the monarchy to Charles II, son of Charles I, grandson of James I, and great-grandson of Mary Stuart. By 1660, Philip IV had been king for almost forty years and by this time he was approaching the end of his life. History has remembered Philip IV as a king ruled by his advisers and in his early reign driven to the delights of female company, which he preferred to the obligations of the crown that he inherited at age sixteen. The crises Philip faced at the end of his reign did little to change this perception. As John Lynch puts it, “[l]a experiencia no enseñó lección alguna a Felipe IV” (359). Although Philip IV had attempted to exercise greater control over and responsibility within his own government after Olivares fell from favor in 1643, little had changed in the intervening years.

Diamante's play, and especially his characterization of the English queen, reflects this political climate of 1660. My analysis of Isabel will focus on two distinct aspects of her characterization in *María Estuarda* that demonstrate her contemporary relevance. I will first explore her characterization as a jealous queen who fails to maintain control of her emotions, resulting in damning political action. Unlike other Catholic Mary Stuart apologists who rewrote Mary's story, Diamante positions the catalyst for Isabel's hatred for María within a love triangle plot. In doing so he diminishes the importance of religious intolerance in a move that highlights a didactic lesson relevant in the mid-seventeenth century Spain of Philip IV, that of a king misguided by his penchant for pleasure. Additionally, Diamante establishes a unique relationship in his play between Isabel and her advisers. Three invented characters guide Isabel's actions throughout *María Estuarda* in a way that reflects once again the governance of Philip IV, whose dependence on highly placed advisers was often recognized. Through the reinterpretation of history and with the addition of fictitious secondary characters, Diamante successfully employs the history play and the English example in order to represent in front of the king himself the very problems that confronted the Spanish monarchy.

As we have seen, *María Estuarda* begins with a scene that would have quickly provided Diamante's audience with the clues necessary to understand the play's historical context. Before she delivers her biographical narrative, María is alone on stage and awakens from a dream that she interprets to depict her flight to England and her tragic end at the hands of a "sacrilego puñal" (v. 54). Expectations of a plot based on the Protestant persecution of a devout Catholic queen are well-established, yet the reasons María initially fears the treatment she will receive in England differ from those that will ultimately lead to her downfall. Although *María Estuarda* opens with a religious plot familiar to Diamante's Spanish audience, both their expectations and

those of María are for a short time subverted when Isabel's secretary, Eduardo, arrives to offer María aid in her escape. In what follows of Diamante's play, his characterization of Isabel subtly and slowly begins to reveal her complete consumption by jealous emotions that will lead to the famous execution his audience expects.

Isabel's emotions are put on display in *María Estuarda* from the moment she meets the Queen of Scots at her court in London.⁹² The scene, which ends act one, contains providential and symbolic importance. When María approaches Isabel to greet her fellow sovereign, the Scottish queen falls and is helped to her feet by Eduardo, who is both in love with María and the object of Isabel's secret infatuation. In this moment, Isabel is confronted with the first test of her emotional restraint. She admits upon this meeting with her cousin,

pasión rara
 es la que mi pecho engendra,
 pues me avergüenza al decirla,
 y al callarla me atormenta. (vv. 963–66)

And yet, keeping her feelings quiet is exactly what Isabel must do. As we will see, however, Diamante's English queen will prove wholly incapable of controlling the jealousy she feels. In this moment, however, Isabel acknowledges in two further asides the importance of hiding this emotional reaction to the relationship between Eduardo and María that she witnesses taking shape. Act one closes with various reactions by the characters that participated in this fateful meeting. Their words underscore the scene's symbolic significance:

MARÍA. ¡Qué temor!

⁹² Paulson discusses the historically inaccurate meeting of Mary and Elizabeth in his article "The Genesis of Anachronism: The Mary Stuart Plays of Diamante and Boursault." Diamante, he concludes, was in fact the first author (both dramatic and narrative) to represent this meeting, although other works that came before his *comedia* had suggested a meeting between the two queens without depicting it directly.

ISABEL. ¡Qué sobresalto!

ENRIQUE. Ya mi esperanza se alienta.

EDUARDO. Ya mi susto se acobarda.

ALBERTO. Ya mi duda se quieta.

ISABEL. Yo mi peligro busqué.

MARÍA. Yo cautivé mi inocencia.

EDUARDO. Llegó a Londres Estuarda,

plegue a Dios que por bien sea. (vv. 999–1006)

Here, the only two characters that react favorably to this interaction, Enrique and Alberto, are Isabel's advisers who stand to gain from any animosity that arises between these two queens. Isabel herself recognizes the danger that will arise from inviting María to London, and the audience is led to understand that which history has already shown them would come to pass: both queens will suffer from their mutual interactions. This moment, which indicates the downfall of both Isabel and María, and includes the symbolic fall of María, positions their conflict not as one of religious tension but as one propelled by an English queen who struggles to control her own jealousy.

Act two reveals Isabel's continued submission to the strength of her emotions. It opens with a scene that directly confronts the sovereign's duty to disregard personal feelings in the process of political decision-making. When Isabel receives contradictory letters detailing the plans of María's supporters in Scotland, she uses the occasion to test Eduardo's loyalty to the crown. Yet what begins as a lesson in statecraft quickly dissolves into a critique of the English queen, who ineffectively hides the emotions that lay behind her actions. Although Isabel states that she has asked Eduardo to read the letters to observe his capabilities in political reasoning, it

becomes clear that the motivations behind her interrogation are not political but personal. When the queen leaves, Eduardo exclaims,

¿Qué mujer es esta, Cielos?
 Cielos, ¿qué mujer es esta,
 que en las pasiones que oculta,
 y en los afectos que muestra,
 disimulando, o fingiendo,
 cuanto para mis sospechas,
 pronuncia como celosa,
 contradice como Reina? (vv. 1207–14)

Once alone on stage, Eduardo questions Isabel's claimed ability to adhere to her political duties with due decorum, in the process pointing out her lack of control over her emotions. This subject of decorum appeared in manuals of state, aimed at the education of princes in the early modern period. And we may assume that Diamante's original audience, as they were the court and the king himself, would have been familiar with these lessons and thus able to judge Isabel's actions based on the correct behavior proscribed for kings and queens.

When Isabel returns to the stage after this conversation, any composure she may have displayed in the last scene has disappeared. The English queen enters, and abruptly declares without further explanation, "La muerte violenta / [. . .] daré a Estuarda" (vv. 1521–22). The subsequent conversation reveals that Isabel has been made aware of the plan of María's ally, count Arnesto, to invade England on behalf of the Scottish queen. As a result, Isabel will poison María, but not before submitting her to prolonged suffering:

Porque más violenta sea,

porque mi enojo discurra,
 si es que puede la venganza,
 igualarse con la injuria. (vv. 1877–80)

In this instance it appears that Isabel's motivations for vengeance stem from the political actions of María's Scottish allies, yet Isabel's overly emotional response betrays further impetus behind her animosity. At this point in time, the audience is already familiar with Isabel's equivocation; she has demonstrated once before a thinly veiled political façade that is unsuccessfully used to mask more personal motivations. What's more, the subsequent actions Isabel takes demonstrate the origin of her animosity in the relationship that she witnesses between Eduardo and María. The English queen later admits that she can no longer control her own "celosa rabia" (v. 2240) when she overhears Eduardo's plans to free María from imprisonment. At this moment, any control that Isabel may have maintained has been lost. "No la llames / crueldad," she exclaims when speaking to her adviser about María's punishment, "o ya que la llames, / haz que la acción se parezca / al nombre ya ejecutada" (vv. 2243–46). When María is again taken prisoner after her last escape attempt, the English queen betrays the motivations behind her cousin's execution to Eduardo, the man she claims not to love, who has just attempted to free her rival:

Ea, callad, que no quiero,
 que te apartes de la vida
 tú para que más tormento
 tengas, con que tus sentimientos
 fundo toda mi venganza;
 pena al duro embate fiero,
 de ver morir lo que adora. (vv. 2725–31)

Consumed by her emotions, Isabel admits that her desire to punish María stems from the feelings that Eduardo has displayed for the Scottish queen. Isabel sentences not only her cousin but also her formerly loyal servant to endless suffering because of his betrayal. His suffering shall come from María's execution, and the English queen will only recognize the error in such rash actions after she is confronted with the Queen of Scots's decapitated head in the last scene of the play.

In order to fully understand the emphasis that Diamante places on Isabel's jealousy, we must briefly return to his characterization of the Queen of Scots, for here his representation of Mary Stuart differs from that of other Spanish authors. Diamante, unlike Cañizares and unlike the texts he likely used as sources, places great emphasis on María's beauty. Before Isabel and María meet, María's beauty is commented upon by various characters that come into contact with the Scottish queen. And shortly after meeting the Queen of Scots, Isabel, speaking to Eduardo, directs harsh criticism at those who have fallen victim to María's good looks. Making reference once again to the decorum expected of a courtier, Isabel declares,

mejor fuera que María
 Estuarda se [coronase]
 en mi Reino, y publicase
 la guerra, mejor sería
 ver mi gente tan mal segura,
 solicitando los modos
 de mi fee, mas no son todos
 esclavos de la hermosura,
 que hay quien galán de su fama
 funda su honor en su interés,

y se [acuerda] de quién es,
 primero que de quién ama. (vv. 1083–94)

The queen's hyperbolic sarcasm here makes a point. If all were to fall victim to María's beauty as Eduardo has, England would risk falling not only into war but also back into the hands of the Catholic faith. Thus, the Scottish queen's beauty endangers not only Eduardo but also the nation itself.

Even Isabel's closest advisers are enchanted by María's extreme beauty. When Enrique is sent by the queen to arrest her cousin, his response to María's inquiry about his arrival is stunted upon the sight of her:

Esta es pregunta
 a que debo respuesta,
 y haberla de dar me turba,
 que no sabe la nobleza
 ultrajar la hermosura. (vv. 1748–52)

After Mary is taken prisoner and stripped of her royal gala, her attraction does not appear to diminish. In the final scene of *María Estuarda*, the Scottish queen's allure is highlighted alongside her faith as one of her two most prominent characteristics. Eduardo describes her as a "bella deidad perseguida" (v. 2489), and after she has been decapitated, when her head returns to the stage, he is still mesmerized by María's "hermosos luceros" (v. 2766), the enrapturing eyes that led him to the true faith. In the last scene of this play, her beloved thus leaves Isabel plagued by one final rejection. Whereas texts written by other Mary Stuart apologists throughout the early modern period tended to personify the English queen's reasons for executing Mary based on religious conflict, here Diamante chooses to focus instead on a lesson his king would have

benefitted from hearing repeated. In this sense, the characterization of England's jealous queen, using the power of geographical distancing, manages to provide a didactic lesson for Philip IV in front of his very nose.

Isabel's decline into a monarch completely unable to manage her own emotions begins with her initial meeting with María, yet it is the presence of Isabel's advisers that often instigates her downward trajectory. Isabel's advisers are frequently present during the scenes discussed thus far in *María Estuarda*, and focusing on how they manipulate Isabel illuminates further reasons behind the poor political decisions that lead to María's execution. Reassessing these scenes will demonstrate yet another parallel between Diamante's Spain and Elizabeth's England—that of a monarch's dependency on influential advisers—once again employing another nation's history to comment upon Spain's political reality in the mid-seventeenth century.

Diamante introduces Isabel's advisers to his audience before they meet the English queen herself. Enrique, Alberto, and Federico have discovered Isabel's plans to assist María in her escape from Scotland and have traveled there to learn more. In this first presentation of these advisers, characters that Diamante invents, our Spanish playwright inverts the historical paradigm that his audience would have expected of the English queen. Here, Isabel's advisers spy on her whereas the historical Elizabeth I was well known throughout Europe for her extensive spy network. Eduardo also joins in on the spy game, for he has sent Clotaldo to spy on Isabel's advisers. It appears that all of the English characters that surround Isabel demonstrate a greater propensity for covert behavior than the queen herself, and ultimately their cunning serves to emphasize Isabel's lack of political control. When the three spying noblemen discover Isabel's

plans to bring Mary to England, they decide to send Clotaldo—who has successfully tricked them into believing he is on their side—to London ahead of the Scottish queen

. . . a intento
de desunirlas, y el arte
sea hacer público en Londres,
que María el dictamen,
es, conspirar atrevida
contra Isabel. (vv. 823–28)

Here, Diamante cleverly plays with his genre. Mary Stuart was famous during her lifetime for her execution and sordid love affairs, but also for her involvement in a number of plots to overthrow Elizabeth. At the time, Spain was covertly involved in these plots through their ambassadors present in England and for this reason Diamante’s audience would have at least been tangentially aware of them. It was, after all, Philip IV’s grandfather who had approved the illicit actions of these ambassadors. Using his audience’s knowledge of these events, Diamante manipulates history in *María Estuarda* to invent his own origin for Isabel’s animosity towards María. He uses history not to consider the danger of a political plot, but rather to represent the danger that such scheming advisers meant for monarchs caught unaware.

The personal ambitions of both Alberto and Enrique, the two advisers whose characterization is most developed by Diamante, are made clear by the end of act one. In asides, Alberto declares his ambition to turn Isabel against María so that he may “ver Rey a mi hijo” (v. 867). Enrique, on the other hand, admits that his feelings stem from a position of loyalty to his queen, but he equally feels he must take action into his own hands. By 1660 in Spain, the country had suffered a long history of kings ruled by their *validos*. Since the turn of the century,

moralists such as Juan de Mariana had warned Spanish kings of overdependence on such advisers.⁹³ Despite the fact that Philip IV had shed the influence of his most prominent *valido* more than a decade prior to the composition of Diamante's play, his dependence on powerful political advisers remained a defining characteristic of his reign.⁹⁴ The overt declarations made by Isabel's advisers thus serve to warn not only of the *valido* that places his own personal ends above those of his queen but also of the adviser who appears to remain loyal to the crown. In the end, both Enrique and Alberto will work together to guide Isabel towards the decision to execute Mary.

As we have seen, act two begins with two contradictory letters that provoke a distressed reaction from the English queen and Eduardo. It is at the end of this scene that Isabel refers to her desire to see her cousin cruelly punished, but what needs to be understood is the role that Isabel's advisers slyly play behind the scenes of the decisions Isabel makes. They were not only responsible for sending one of these letters, but when Isabel bursts onto the stage and declares her desire to poison María, Enrique is the one who suggests that the queen should attempt to execute her plans under the guise of justice, or rather, "crueldad disimulada" (v. 2242). In this scene, Isabel's actions reveal the moment of her demise. The audience no longer witnesses a queen with good intentions nor one able to maintain the decorum that her office demands. It is this moment in which Isabel first loses complete control of her emotions, and Enrique demonstrates his ability to successfully manipulate the queen when she is most vulnerable.

The responses by those who surround Isabel in this scene are telling, as Isabel is not only manipulated emotionally, but is also physically led around the stage. The stage directions

⁹³ Mariana cites the famous historical example of the courtier Álvaro de Luna as a warning to monarchs that may bestow too much power upon a single courtier, II.9.210–11.

⁹⁴ For more on the transformation of the position of *valido* under the count-duke of Olivares, see Thompson; for more on *validos* after Olivares's fall from favor, see Chamorro 141–45; Lynch 335–42.

provided by Diamante demonstrate how Isabel is physically guided by the male characters that accompany her. First, as soon as Eduardo learns that Isabel plans to poison María, the stage direction indicates that he takes the queen from behind her back. Eduardo uses his hand to move the queen around the stage as he attempts guide her decision away from such rash action. But as Eduardo speaks with Isabel, Alberto interrupts him in the middle of his defense of María, symbolically cutting his octosyllabic line in half. “*Sale Alberto y aparta a Isabel,*” reads the stage direction in this scene, as Alberto interjects:

Señora advierte,
que será mejor que prendas
a María, antes de darla
el veneno, porque entienda
Londres, que desesperada
se dio la muerte a sí misma,
con que la venganza encubres,
y la justicia demuestras. (vv.1564–71)

Alberto’s attempt to determine Isabel’s treatment of her cousin here is accompanied by physically taking possession of the queen’s body. The physical movement is suggestive of the ease with which the noblemen that surround the queen exert control over both her physical body and her political decision-making.

Diamante’s characterization of Elizabeth as a vengeful queen, ruled concurrently by her advisers and her emotions, is prominent in his representation of María’s death sentence. In most European and Spanish representations of Mary’s punishment, Elizabeth is careful to remove blame from herself, as she did historically, by demonstrating deference to the decisions made by

the English Parliament. In *María Estuarda*, however, spectators do not witness a trial for the Scottish queen, as those familiar with her story would expect. Rather, Isabel alone, and not the English Parliament, sentences María to execution, a punishment that Enrique and Alberto will carry out. As Enrique says to Alberto: “Así queda asegurada / nuestra intención y segura / la corona a mi esperanza” (vv. 2260–62). María is in the end executed off stage, and when her head returns, Isabel, Enrique and Alberto react in unison upon facing the outcome of their plans:

ÁNGELES. Te Deum Laudamus, etc.

ISABEL. Al apacible rumor.

ENRIQUE. Al blando, y sonoro acento.

ALBERTO. A esta armonía agradable.

ISABEL. Me ofrecí.

ENRIQUE. Me acerqué.

ALBERTO. Llego.

LOS TRES. Dudando el misterio grave. (vv. 2758–63)

The three characters merge symbolically in the last set of verses that they speak. None pronounces a complete line that another does not finish, and together they declare their awe at what has been done. In this final execution Isabel and her advisers act as one though Isabel's jealous motives vary greatly from those of her scheming secretaries. “¡Qué tiranía!” “¡Qué pena!” the English queen laments in her last fragmented lines, as finally Isabel is shown to recognize the error in her decisions and ineffectual rule as queen. This moment of anagnorisis provides a powerful lesson for a Spanish audience watching the reenactment of the tragic martyrdom that occurred more than seventy years prior. Yet the lesson put forth by Diamante is not religious; rather, his emphasis falls on the dangers of monarchs whose personal desires come

before political duty and on the rule of advisers rather than kings. In his adaptation of Mary and Elizabeth's story, Diamante successfully employs the foreign English example in this history play in order to represent his own nation's political reality. Examining the second play that retold the same events will further inform us of the way in which England was once again reinterpreted to reflect the political realities of contemporary Spain. In the early eighteenth century, Cañizares brought our two cousin queens back to the stage, but this time their characterization is explored in a completely different light.

Promoting Peaceful Succession: Cañizares's Elizabeth in the Midst of Political Turmoil

More than fifty years after Diamante's *María Estuarda* was first performed before the court of Philip IV, Mary Stuart and her cousin made their way back to the Spanish stage, this time accompanied by a different cast of secondary characters and entirely new political problems. José de Cañizares's *Lo que va de cetro a cetro y crueldad de Inglaterra* was likely written sometime between 1713 and 1718, nearing the end of or just after the War of Spanish Succession. The war had begun in 1700 when the last Habsburg king, Carlos II, died without leaving an heir. It pitted England, Austria and the Dutch Republic, among others, against Spain and France, who wished to confirm the Bourbon king Philip V, Carlos's chosen successor. After more than a decade of conflict, Philip V maintained his title, and it is in this atmosphere that Cañizares's play was first written and performed. The play was "performed with noteworthy frequency" in Madrid, Toledo and Valencia throughout the eighteenth century and likely reached not only a much larger number of people but also a more varied public than Diamante's play had previously (Mackenzie 211).

Unlike Diamante and the many other playwrights who came before him, Cañizares chose not to name his play for the woman whose death it represents.⁹⁵ Instead, the title of Cañizares's play reveals his focus on England, rather than the Queen of Scots herself. This choice could have been made due to the fact that Mary's name might not have evoked the same strong emotions for an early eighteenth-century audience as it did for seventeenth-century audiences, or it could be due to the interest England may have solicited from an audience who had fought against this northern nation in the War of Succession for more than a decade. Whatever the case for Cañizares's chosen title, his play in its most basic elements is reminiscent of Diamante's earlier Mary Stuart drama. Yet by turning a critical eye to Cañizares's manipulation of plot, secondary characters, and his reimagination of the two queens themselves, I will demonstrate how his depiction of Mary and Elizabeth is reinterpreted in order to promote a unified Spanish identity and lessons for a new king in times of national instability. In reading this play alongside Diamante's, the ability of these playwrights to mold foreign historical events to their own contemporary situation becomes striking. When we examine the two very different representations of the English queen, her characterization demonstrates the renewed political relevance with which yet another Spanish author imbued this story.

In order to better understand the subtle references made in this play to the contemporary political situation in Spain in the early eighteenth century, I will focus once more on the character of Isabel. In doing so, I will demonstrate first Cañizares's unique representation of Isabel as a queen not now ruled by her emotions, but politically skilled in the art of public rhetoric, which she uses to successfully hide the emotional conflict she feels due to María's

⁹⁵ Playwrights in France and Italy, where Mary Stuart was most often represented in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, exclusively named their plays for their protagonist, referring to her either by her given name or as the Queen of Scots. For a description of Mary Stuart plays written prior to *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* see Mackenzie; Philips, "Jean de Bordes."

presence in England. Unfortunately for this English queen, however, the instability that affronts her realm and her inability to produce a legitimate heir will lead to her downfall in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*. I suggest that this instability present in Cañizares's play, while historically accurate, most importantly mirrors Spanish politics when his drama was performed. Cañizares additionally includes a uniquely Spanish element in his story of our cousin queens. Examining the increased emphasis he places on the presence of Spain throughout *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* reveals Cañizares's nationally unifying—although in many respects historically apocryphal—message for his audience.

Lo que va de cetro a cetro follows the same basic plotline as Diamante's earlier play, and, in fact, Cañizares borrows in many instances directly from *María Estuarda*. Exploring only a broad outline of the two plays, of course, obscures the ways in which they differ from one another. Although the English queen continues to demonstrate romantic feelings for Eduardo in this play, Cañizares's Isabel is shown to maintain political control through the suppression of her emotions. She uses spies in diplomatic relations with Scotland, and employs public rhetoric that hides her personal motivations for the famous execution, which will ahistorically lead to her defeat at the end of Cañizares's play.

When Diamante opened his *María Estuarda*, he employed religious rhetoric in order to remind his audience of the historical events that guided his play and in order to present the characters that he would quickly reimagine. Similarly, Cañizares begins his play with María's escape from Scotland and a dream, which she interprets to represent the eventual return of her crown. Isabel, she believes, will help her regain power in Scotland, and as in the earlier play, Spanish audiences are led to believe that perhaps Isabel had kinder motivations than those history remembered. Yet in Cañizares's play, the characterization Isabel receives before she

comes on stage is even more developed than Mary's dream and Eduardo's presence in Scotland allows. In the opening scene of *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*, Cañizares's audience is also introduced to Isabel's spies, who together demonstrate a level of capability that Diamante's Isabel never managed to display.

Two separate characters, both added or embellished by Cañizares, make up Isabel's intelligence network. The first spy that the audience meets declares himself in the very first scene of the play. When Eduardo's page, Turpín, learns his master has fallen in love with María, he admits in an aside that he is eager to share news of Eduardo's infatuation because "Isabel mis chismes paga" (2).⁹⁶ In a later conversation between Isabel and one of her ladies-in-waiting, Turpín is referred to as an "espía secreta de su amor" (10), but he is not the only spy Isabel employs. Roberto, the duke of Northumberland, accompanies María in this play, "el único de mis Grandes / que es leal," as the Scottish queen describes him (3). But Roberto too, declares his intentions to pass along information to Isabel, for he is secretly Protestant and for this reason supports the English queen. Roberto will bring political intelligence to Isabel and shortly conveys to her news of María's intentions to convert England back to the Catholic faith (9). This presentation of the English queen is especially significant for Cañizares's audience because they witness the construction of her spy network even before the scene in which she and María meet. Isabel's character is carefully constructed in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* independently of her Scottish fellow sovereign.

The dichotomy between personal and public that Isabel's two spies epitomize is present throughout Cañizares's play as it was in *María Estuarda*. Yet here, Isabel's desire to execute her cousin does not stem from the love triangle plot Diamante cultivated with such effectiveness.

⁹⁶ Cañizares's play has not been edited in a modern edition. The page numbers referenced are taken from the 1795 publication of *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*, which does not include line numbers.

Cañizares's Isabel does not once blame María for Eduardo's disloyalty, but rather laments her own inability to win his love. When Isabel proclaims her vendetta against María, again only in asides, her motivations are revealed to be much more political than personal. The court scene that brings María and Isabel together for the first time on stage is remarkably similar in action to that of Diamante's earlier play, yet this is *not* the scene that forecasts María's doom. In a tone very different from the ominous end to Diamante's first act, Cañizares closes this scene with shouts from behind the stage, "Viva la invicta Estuarda, / viva la heroica Isabela" (12).

The moment in which Isabel first displays rancor towards María is instead an intensely political one. Act two of *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* begins with public celebrations of María's arrival in London. As a part of these celebrations Isabel plans to name María Princess of Wales and heir to the English throne (should she not marry and produce an heir herself, that is). María's response will be the seed from which all of Isabel's animosity towards the Scottish queen grows. Rather than accepting the crown, María proclaims that she will not rule in England except

a fin de sacaros
de las infaustas tinieblas
en que os tiene encadenados
el monstruo de la herejía. (18)

Such harsh condemnation provokes immediate division among the English crowd that attends the celebration. Shouts are now heard proclaiming either anger at the offense of the queen or supporting María's religious devotion. It is precisely this reaction that sparks Isabel's fears and desire for vengeance. "¿Qué opuestos bandos," she asks,

si entre mi sobrina y yo
(aunque de cólera rabio, *ap.*

disimule el corazón,
 el besubio en que me abraso)
 no hay más que una voluntad,
 un amor, un agasajo,
 una opinión y un deseo? (18)

In what remains of the play, direct interaction between Isabel and María focuses entirely on the question of succession. Here, Cañizares is inventing (as Diamante had done before him) the origin of Isabel's animosity towards María. Her animosity now lies within the instability that María has provoked, although she realizes that she cannot display this openly. When the two queens are together Isabel works to build a public rhetoric that hides her true reasons for wishing to see her cousin executed. As this first instance shows, Isabel declares her feelings only in asides, but when speaking to the public she carefully crafts a discourse that displays a clear understanding of the need to maintain appearances for politics' sake.

Whether in interactions with María or with Eduardo, the man who continues to reject her love, Isabel is extremely skillful at crafting a political rhetoric upon which to support her decisions. Although this rhetoric begins during the celebrations of act two, Cañizares's Isabel does not once falter in her public persona, letting her emotions take control of her actions as Diamante's English queen had. When her Archbishop suggests that María may have gotten the better of her in the dispute between religions, Isabel reprimands him, explaining her strategy thus:

¡Qué imprudente discurrís!
 ¿qué queréis que la dé el lauro
 de que por su Religión

padezca ansias y trabajos,
 fatigas y menosprecios?
 ¿No sabéis que he decretado,
 que si lidiar las dos
 resulta en mi sobresalto,
 muera Estuarda delincuente,
 en fe de procesos falsos,
 porque no la juzguen Mártir
 los Católicos Cristianos? (19)

The way in which Isabel manipulates her own discourse, dichotomizing faith in the judicial system and the process of judging a queen a martyr demonstrates her acuity and adept manipulation of the system in which she governs. As queen, she is well aware of the need to maintain the pretense of fair governance so that her cousin may not be claimed a martyr by her Catholic citizens. As Cañizares's audience would have been aware, even despite Isabel's political adroitness, historically she would be unable to prevent the perception of Mary's execution as anything but martyrdom.

Isabel builds her public rhetoric on two separate pillars. The first is her apparent reliance on Parliament to make the difficult decisions to imprison María and then to execute her. When the Scottish queen is taken prisoner in act two, after her public declaration against the Protestant faith, the Archbishop explains to her that she is being punished for committing *crimen laesae majestatis*, crimes against the crown. Unlike in Diamante's play, here Isabel crafts her attack on María skillfully, for she recognizes the need for legal prosecution. This again is made apparent when María's sentence is finally pronounced. Whereas Diamante's English queen declared the

execution of María herself, publicly and in a fit of emotion, Cañizares's later reinterpretation waits for Parliament to hand down its decision.

Despite the deference she appears to display to Parliament's decisions, Isabel had declared from her first scene on stage, "¡Temblaráme Inglaterra!" if her citizens deign to consider María's proposed return to Catholicism (9). It is in this same scene, just after Roberto has brought news of María's religious mission in England, that Isabel demonstrates her ability to bend the Courts and Commons to her will. Both her secretary Dobray and the Archbishop respond to her commands. The control she displays within her government would have served as a powerful lesson to Diamante's pliable English queen of half a century prior. When Isabel finally receives the official news of María's sentence, she feigns dismay and asks Dobray to read the sentence that Parliament has passed. It explains that María will be executed as a result of public judgment based on the crimes she has committed (29). Emphasis is placed in this official declaration of punishment on the political process. Isabel is not guided by jealousy to make her decision, but rather controls politics as she controls her own emotions. She is the one who ordered Parliament to demand María's execution but maintains the pretense of compassion, justice, and regret when the punishment is ordered. What's more, the declaration read by Dobray makes subtle references to the threat of foreign invasion that María's actions may provoke. The imminent possibility of war would have been significant circa 1713. Cañizares thus leads his audience to see Isabel's punishment of María as a tactic to avoid conflict, one that is not entirely misguided but one that will ultimately fail because the English queen has not provided her realm with a legitimate heir.

The compassionate façade and the maternal attitude Isabel presents outwardly towards María throughout the play is the second pillar on which she builds her public rhetoric. In each

major instance of María's punishment, first jail and then execution, Isabel maintains the outward appearance of deepest sympathy for her young fellow sovereign. In the moment María is taken prisoner, Isabel displays this conflict between her legal duty and the public persona she has adopted:

Ya que es fuerza que la llevéis,
con respeto, con blandura,
la tratad; ved que su pena
en mi corazón resulta.
(No hagáis tal, llevadla, muera *ap.*
de pesares y de angustias.) (23)

The contrast between Isabel's public discourse and her personal asides is, to say the least, alarming. Yet Cañizares's Isabel is able to manage her emotions, showing not even the slightest crack in her external façade. Despite her outward display of compassion, both María and other characters in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* recognize Isabel's public persona for the mask that it is. The Spanish ambassador, the Conde de Feria, warns his French counterpart of her capabilities: "Es Isabel muy astuta; / si no sabemos unirnos, / nos ha de burlar, Monsieur" (28). It appears that the English queen succeeds throughout the entirety of this play in doing just that. She has her way while at all times maintaining the impression of sincere concern for her fellow sovereign.

When considering the English queen as Cañizares thus presents her in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*, one would be tempted to believe that all might end well for this Isabel, whose political acumen and strength far exceeded those of Diamante's queen. Yet in this reinterpretation of history, Cañizares's audience will understand that Isabel's ending will not be happy, for she faces unprecedented national turmoil. The political instability that Isabel confronts, serves as the

basis for her vendetta against María in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*. But the audience is in fact made aware of the precarious political situation in England even before the two queens meet. Cañizares's play is incredibly unique among dramatic works that represent Mary's execution in the autonomy that it gives to the English queen. He is the only European playwright to give Isabel a parallel opening narrative similar to the one consistently afforded to Mary. Rather than presenting Isabel in her first scene alongside María—as she was presented in Diamante's play when the two queens met—Isabel first appears in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* accompanied by her court, amid cries from behind the stage that demonstrate the volatile state in which England finds itself:

DENT VOCES. ¡O Tirana Jezabel!

el Cielo vuelva por sí.

OTRO. ¡Ay triste Pueblo de ti!

DENT TODOS. Viva la Reina Isabel,

viva. (8)

These conflicting shouts demonstrate the instability of the England in which Isabel reigns, and the opening lines that she declares in response establish her insecurity and doubt: “¿Para qué [vivir], si muero / de un fiero dolor tirano?” (8). Religious tension underlies the action throughout the rest of the play and highlights the political instability of the realm. This religious hostility between Catholics and Protestants was preexisting, but María's arrival and disavowal of the title Isabel wishes to bestow upon her in the celebrations of act two worsen matters. It is in this moment that Isabel's animosity towards María is awakened and her need for public rhetoric arises. In the third act, the English people do not repeat their divided cries on stage, but the play ends with an ominous sign of England's extreme discord. After María has been executed,

Eduardo returns to London with an army of angry Catholics who successfully trap the English queen in her castle, with nowhere to run.

Adding to the instability caused by religious division in England, a new problem that also arises in Cañizares's play is that of Isabel's lack of an heir to the throne. This, I will argue, is truly the underlying problem for Isabel in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*, and it is also the lesson Spaniards would have connected with most circa 1713. The discussion of political succession is among the starkest contrasts between *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* and Diamante's earlier *María Estuarda*. In *María Estuarda*, Isabel the character does not once mention the historical dilemma Elizabeth faced, that of providing her country with a legitimate heir. As we have seen, she was much more focused on avenging her jealousy while her advisers seemed to be the only characters who considered, and even then quite minimally, the future of the English monarchy. Not so for Isabel in the early eighteenth century. Her need to provide England with a legitimate heir to the throne is essential to the conflict that emerges in Cañizares's play, and from the beginning it seems María will have to be the one to provide the solution, for she, unlike Isabel, has already produced an heir. I have previously discussed the similarities that exist between the biographical narrative María recites at the beginning of both Diamante's and Cañizares's plays, but there exists one significant addition to the latter's dialogue. Here, María laments leaving her son behind as she flees her kingdom:

. . . por mi asilo

vine a tomar este monte,
dejando a Eduardo en Escocia,
mi hijo, tan tierno joven,
que apenas a su edad breve

el primer albor conoce. (6)

Although, as I have mentioned, it was often not of great concern for the historical dramatist to adhere to the facts that drove his original story, here Cañizares returns a piece of Mary Stuart's story to his María that Diamante had omitted. While he is incorrectly named here, Mary Stuart did, in fact, leave her son behind in Scotland when she fled for England, and historically, after Elizabeth I's death, he would become the next king of England. Mary's son is mentioned here and on two further occasions throughout *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*. On both occasions, James (Eduardo for Cañizares) presents greater threat to Isabel. After years of María's imprisonment, he has become a potential ally for Isabel's Catholic enemies who wish to support the Scottish queen's mission in England. James is mentioned once by Eduardo and once by the French ambassador to England, who have reached out to him in order to seek his support in their defense of María against Isabel.

In addition to the focus that Cañizares places on María's inheritance of the English throne and the heir that the Scottish queen has already produced, he also reinterprets the familial relationship between Isabel and María, revealing further emphasis on Isabel's lack of effective governance. In *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*, Isabel is on multiple occasions referred to as María's aunt, rather than her cousin. This is a consistent, and I would argue deliberate, deviation from the usual portrayal of their relationship on stage.⁹⁷ This may seem like an insignificant detail, but Isabel's status as aunt rather than cousin places her in an entirely different phase of her life, and more importantly, reproductive cycle. Presenting Isabel as an aunt alongside a young and more

⁹⁷ None of the French plays that represent Elizabeth and Mary present their relationship as aunt and niece. In Spain, Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas and Pedro de Ribadeneyra are the only other authors to denote the relationship between Mary and Elizabeth as a relationship between aunt and niece. Herrera, however, in his *Historia de . . . María Estuarda* (1589), refers to them on various occasions as both sisters and as aunt and niece. Ribadeneyra, in his *Historia eclesiástica del cisma de Inglaterra* (1588), refers to their relationship as aunt and niece only once.

fertile niece plays directly into Cañizares's emphasis on Isabel's inability to produce a legitimate heir for her nation in a time when reproductive vitality meant dynastic vitality. Isabel and María refer to each other as aunt and niece respectively on eight separate occasions throughout *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*, and María refers to Isabel as such twice in the opening scene of the play, thus establishing their relationship early for Cañizares's audience. Although her senectitude is not directly referenced by Cañizares, Isabel is concerned throughout the play with the naming of an heir to the English throne and believes she must name a successor to provide stability in her realm.⁹⁸ Cañizares uses the relationship between Isabel and María to emphasize the possible crisis of leaving the realm without an heir to the throne. In this play, reproductive validity can be seen as a stand-in for national security. As Isabel is unable to provide her country with an heir born from her own womb, she will have to accept her young and fertile niece's son as a second choice. This situation had obvious implications not only for the future of Isabel's reign, but, importantly, would also have recalled the conflict from which Cañizares's Spanish audience had just recently emerged.

The problem that will arise for Isabel in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* is that María will not, in fact, prove to be a successful alternative. Isabel makes her need for an heir apparent in the speech she makes at the festivities that open act two:

Legítimamente usando
del derecho sucesivo
y del dominio heredado,
ya sabéis, que no le puede

⁹⁸ In the second act of the play, Isabel does say that she has reigned for ten years and admits the possibility of having children (16). Historically, this would have made Elizabeth thirty-five years old and feasibly still well within her childbearing years. It would not, however, have been a common age for a woman, let alone a queen, to reproduce especially for the first time.

dar un Rey triunfo más alto
a su imperio, más defensa,
más blasón ni más amparo,
que darle buen sucesor,
en quien viendo dilatado
el poder, las pretensiones
de los Príncipes Extraños,
confunda (riesgo a que viven
expuestos Imperios tantos)
quantos por miedo o lisonja,
conservan vivo este agravio.
Yo, vasallos, estos Reinos
ha que los rijo diez años,
sin que hasta ahora mi altivez
haya al yugo sujetado
del pretenso matrimonio,
que anhelan Príncipes varios
mi libertad; yo no os digo,
aunque no he admitido estado,
que dejaré de admitirle;
solamente me hago cargo
de que entre tanto está el Reino
o cayendo o vacilando,

sin tener quien por ser suyo
ponga el hombro a su reparo. (16)

The speech merits such lengthy reproduction based on its extreme relevance to the political situation of Spain following the War of Succession. Historically, Elizabeth I refused to name an heir because of the political danger it would have meant for her. With Mary Queen of Scots merely living in exile in England, always unnamed as heir to the English throne, the real Elizabeth faced constant plots against her life from those who wished to see a Catholic queen rule in England. Yet here, in a speech much more pertinent to contemporary Spanish politics than English history, Isabel sees the danger in *not* naming her successor. Cañizares thus ignores England's historical reality in order to convey a political situation much more akin to Spain's problems after the last Habsburg king died without an heir. It is as if Cañizares were making an argument for avoiding a war like the one through which Spain had just painfully passed, emphasizing the monarch's responsibility to guarantee succession as a vital part of his (or her) royal duties. Ultimately, the end of act three demonstrates that war will be the result of the lack of consensus in such a situation.

The possible threat of war is another significant addition to Cañizares's play that connects directly to his contemporary political moment in Spain but is only tenuously present in Elizabeth and Mary's historical relationship. I have suggested that Cañizares's audience would have been aware that Isabel's ending in this play would not be a happy one, yet in reality the consequences she suffered for this unprecedented execution of a fellow sovereign were minimal. The historical liberties that Cañizares takes in recreating this story with regard to the threat of war against England bring Spain onto center stage. They do so in a way that at once warns the empire of the danger of war in a country without an heir and also rewrites Spain's own place in

the historical tragedy of Mary Stuart's martyrdom. When Cañizares's play was first written and performed, the unification of Spain under a common identity in times of crisis would have been at the forefront of the nation's political concerns, and in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* this concern is demonstrated in added Spanish characters that serve to unite its audience.

Spain is uncommonly present in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro*. Mackenzie takes note of this divergence from Diamante's play, commenting upon Cañizares representation of the "dramatically forceful presence of Spain" in his Mary Stuart drama; yet she demonstrates harsh criticism for his "brazen disregard for historical accuracy" (209). I wish to propose a different interpretation of Cañizares's rewriting of history that demonstrates his desire to present a nationally unifying message for his Spanish audience, one that recalls memories of the nation's glory days as Defender of the Faith and the most powerful empire in Europe. Cañizares accomplishes this first in his addition of the Spanish Conde de Feria, ambassador to England and Scotland and vigilant supporter of the Queen of Scots, and also in his secondary character Edmundo, a clandestine Catholic priest who believes that María's true destiny is, in fact, to die a martyr in order to support the 'true' faith on a heretical isle.

The Conde de Feria's presence in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* promotes the unification of a Spanish identity in two concrete but opposing ways, through humor and the threat of war. Feria enters the action of *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* in its first scene when he arrives in Scotland to offer María the option to flee to Spain instead of England. His proposal imitates that which Eduardo made to the Scottish queen and both ambassadors begin to fight for María's favor. Feria's behavior upon arriving to greet María receives harsh criticism from the two English characters that have already shown up to demonstrate their support for her cause:

EDUARDO. ¡Con qué arrogancia

se portan los españoles!

Naturalmente me cansan.

TURPÍN. Suelen ser de mal humor. (3)

What effect would these censures of the Spanish ambassador have had on Cañizares's audience? Laughter, I would argue. Here, and in a further scene with which Cañizares opens act two, Feria and the English characters clash on matters of custom. At the celebrations for María's coronation, Feria attempts to pursue one of Isabel's ladies-in-waiting and is chastised for his overtly forward remarks and gestures. In response, the Spanish ambassador excuses himself but explains

ni se habrá visto en la vida

Español tan encogido

como yo, pues sois muy linda,

y hasta ahora no os he llamado

mi dueño ni vida mía,

como hiciera otro cualquiera. (13)

And the woman Feria attempts to woo responds pithily, "No en vano andamos remisas / con vuestra nación, que sois / osados en demasía" (13). Again, this scene would have provided necessary comic relief from the tragic plot that unfolds between two queens.

The use of the Spanish Feria to provide comic relief, I suggest, may be directly connected to the fomentation of united sentiment among Cañizares's audience. Although it is true that in *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* the fool, Turpín, already provides the audience with moments of humorous relief, as did Eduardo's page in *María Estuarda*, Feria provides a kind of comedy that the other two *graciosos* do not, one that unifies the nation around a specifically Spanish identity.

Cañizares uses cultural misunderstandings between English and Spanish characters to provide his audience with the opportunity to laugh together at English culture, so different from their own. The superiority theory of humor describes how the use of laughter has the ability to deride an inferior outsider and, according to Simon Critchley, can be used to unite communities with a sense of group identity. Critchley describes what he calls the “anti-rite” joke, which criticizes the rites or rituals of another culture in order to demonstrate the superiority of one’s own (10).⁹⁹ These humorous scenes in which Feria misunderstands English customs or is misunderstood by the English men and women he interacts with serve as a way to build community around the audience’s common Spanish identity. In 1713, after the War of Succession placed a foreign prince on the throne after ten years of disagreement at home, uniting in laughter against an outsider—in this case, the English—makes for an appealing source of entertainment.

Yet the Conde de Feria does not only provide comic relief. He also serves a darker purpose, that of highlighting the very real threat of war that Isabel’s unstable realm may have to face. Feria’s diplomatic mission is predicated on Philip II’s offer of military aid to María to reclaim Scotland from the heretical rebels who are forcing her to flee. This offer, it should be noted, is not historically accurate, although the threats that come from Feria when Isabel mistreats her niece upon her arrival in London more closely approximate historical reality. In the play, Feria follows María to London, and after Eduardo is wounded attempting to free María from imprisonment at the end of act two, he plans to write to his king, threatening,

quizá podrá ser que sea
la respuesta tan señuda,
que porque imprima el acero,

⁹⁹ See also Critchley 66–76 for more on the use of a foreign other as the subject in humor in order to unite a community around their common identity.

se bañe en sangre la pluma. (23)

Feria's strong metaphorical language, which alludes to both the blood and swords of war, was sure to stir up Isabel's fear, as it would also have roused a Spanish audience at this point very much in favor of María's favorable outcome and Isabel's demise. In the final scene of the play, these threats come to fruition. After María has been executed, Eduardo charges Feria with returning to Spain to collect an Armada that will fight the English Protestants and avenge the Scottish queen's death to defend the Catholic cause in England. Historically, Philip II did, of course, send the famously failed Invincible Armada to England for this very reason. In this case I agree with Mackenzie's interpretation of this move made by Cañizares: despite inaccuracies, the Armada's suggested victory at the end of *Lo que va de cetro a cetro* may be included "in the interests of [the audience's] perfectly patriotic enjoyment of the play" (207).

Cañizares's addition of another character, Edmundo, also serves as a means of unifying his audience around a common identity post-war. Edmundo is not Spanish. He is a French Catholic priest who has traveled to England to preach the true faith clandestinely. His character, however, is a figure with which Spaniards would have been well acquainted, since for more than a century Spain had also been home to many Catholic priests who, having escaped Protestant persecution in England, returned to the island to fight against monarchical oppression. Edmundo serves in this play, in a sense, as a historical revisionist, for when he meets María he explains to her that her destiny is to die a martyr. Every time María tries to escape—with the help of Feria, it should be noted—Edmundo explains to her,

Porque es causa Suya,
que estéis en Inglaterra
a ser basa, a ser columna

firmísima de la Fe,
 venciendo en mayores luchas
 a Isabel y a sus secuaces. (20)

The message this sends to a Spanish audience would have been clear: what God had destined for María, even the most powerful Spanish king would not have been able to change. This same religious scapegoat could be applied to Spain's Armada. Although in the play Catholics are left with the suggestion of the upper hand against the English queen, perhaps God's plan was not for them to win in this instance after all. Thus, Spain's actions, in this play represented by the valiant and comical Conde de Feria, turn from humiliating to heroic and serve to unify a Spanish nation caught not long before in a war that brought a new dynasty to an old nation.

Conclusions

Within Part One, I have argued that our interpretation of four different Mary Stuart texts written in Spain should be predicated upon an understanding not only of Anglo-Spanish relations during Mary's lifetime but also upon a close study of the contemporary political climate of the changing Spain in which their authors lived. It is via this contextualization that the richness of historiopoiesis, which explores the relationship between what happened and how what happened was reimagined, becomes apparent. Each of the authors whose texts have been explored in Part One intermingle among the mixing pebbles of history and poetry, revealing motivations that in various ways connect their work to the imperial imagination of a monarchy facing decline. After the defeat of the Gran Armada, and when Spain found itself at war with England, Herrera and Lope present a nationally unifying religious message within their depiction of Mary and her rival. Diamante's and Cañizares's plays, written later in the seventeenth and the early eighteenth

centuries, respond to important developments in Spain's political reality that would change the way the English theme is employed. Within their *comedias*, the English theme transforms to acquire political valances that are newly critical of the Spanish monarchy (though they are equally concerned for its imperial trajectory) as the balance of power between England and Spain slowly began to shift. The texts examined in Part Two will further attest to the potential of the English theme to serve these opposing functions. Exploring texts that portray Charles, Prince of Wales, during the early years of Philip IV's reign, they will consider how depictions of the elaborate reception of a foreign prince interact with a new monarch's redefinition of Spain's imperial mission.

PART TWO: INTRODUCTION

An English Prince Comes to Madrid: Charles and the Portrayal of the Young Philip IV

When Arturo Pérez Reverte published his inaugural book of the popular series *Capitán Alatríste* (1996), his protagonist's first contracted job after leaving jail was that of assassinating two Englishmen set to arrive in Madrid. The men were traveling in disguise and under false names, and international political crisis is only avoided when the elder traveler begs Alatríste to save the life of his young companion. Alatríste concedes, intervening in the fight that is simultaneously taking place between the younger Englishman and the Spanish captain's associate. Pérez Reverte's novel is based very loosely on the real historical events, perhaps slightly less sensational, that occurred in 1623.

The historical visit of the Prince of Wales to Madrid captured the attention not only of today's best-selling author but also of the early modern populace that was intrigued by the unprecedented theatricality of the Charles's journey. The Prince of Wales made the trip in disguise, traveling under a false name, and with the company of only one trusted minister, the duke of Buckingham, and two loyal servants. He arrived in Madrid likely to the surprise of the young king Philip IV, who for the next six months would honor his guest with sumptuous celebrations while negotiations for a marriage between Charles and the Infanta María, Philip's younger sister, took place. These celebrations would be among the most elaborate events thrown during the forty years Philip reigned.¹⁰⁰ Charles's time in Madrid was recounted in numerous

¹⁰⁰ While I will give a brief description of the history of the marriage negotiations that occurred between England and Spain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Redworth (*The Prince*) and Samson, ed. (*The Spanish Match*) for more information on the negotiations that occurred once James I and Philip III took the throne. These negotiations are referred to as the Spanish Match in England, but no analogous term was adopted in Spain, either by contemporaries or later historians. For the Spanish perspective in particular, see Sanz Camañes 41–55 and Puyuelo.

news pamphlets, or *relaciones*, and in poems over the duration of his stay, as well as in a handful of plays only a few years later. Unlike Mary Stuart's execution, popular interest in the English prince was not sustained over the course of a century. Rather, texts studied in Part Two of this dissertation were all written within the decade that followed Charles's unprecedented royal visit.

Negotiations for a matrimonial alliance between the royal families of Spain and England were not new to the early modern Anglo-Spanish relationship. In fact, one of the plays written for Charles's visit to Madrid, and performed for the prince himself, recalled the long tradition that brought the Spanish and English royal houses together. Calderón's *Amor, honor y poder* presents the story of Edward III on stage, and praises the medieval English king, ancestor of both Charles and Philip IV, in high terms:

Eduardo de Inglaterra,
de las tres brillantes Rosas
luz, norte, amparo, y defensa.
Tú, que en alas de la fama
siempre celebrado vuelas,
ocupando en tus memorias
voz, aplauso, trompa, y lengua. (39)

The play, set in England with a full cast of English characters, follows numerous tropes of the *comedia*. Questions of honor end in marriage, as the lustful English king properly takes the object of his infatuation as his bride. Such praise of the English king as that quoted above was undoubtedly meant to please Philip's guest, at the same time celebrating Spain and England's long history of alliances.¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹ The most prominent medieval match between Spain and England was that of Eleanor of Castile, daughter of Philip III of Castile, and Edward I of England, who married in 1254. In the sixteenth century,

The sixteenth century witnessed three successive marriages between the crowns of Spain and England. First, in 1501, Catherine of Aragon, daughter of the Catholic Monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella, was married to the English prince Arthur. Not a decade later, after the premature death of her first husband, she would be married to his brother, Henry VIII. Following these matrimonial alliances, Catherine's daughter Mary Tudor was married to prince Philip, who would become Philip II while married to his English bride. Although the marriage was largely unpopular in England, for Spain it meant bringing a heretical country back to the arms of the Catholic Church. In addition to this religious incentive, alliances with England functioned as a counterbalance for Spain against the Valois in both France and Italy throughout the sixteenth century. Yet with the turn of the century and two new monarchs on the Spanish and English thrones, an alliance between England and Spain meant not only continued benefits against Spain's French antagonist but also the end to nearly two decades of war and yet another opportunity to bring Catholicism back to the heretical island that Spain still believed to be populated with faithful believers.

As soon as Elizabeth I died in 1603 and James I became king of England, the new monarch sought to establish a policy of peace. Philip III, who had succeeded Philip II in 1598, sought the same. Initial considerations for a match between the English prince and the Spanish Infanta occurred as early as 1604, when the new monarchs signed a peace treaty which promoted trade, prohibited piracy, and stipulated that neither country would aid the other's enemies.¹⁰² The possibility of a match was rejected shortly thereafter, but would be seriously considered again in 1611, when James sent his ambassador to Madrid to discuss a marriage alliance. The third and

for the celebration of Philip II's arrival in London and his marriage to Mary Tudor, Edward III was depicted as the common ancestor of Philip and Mary (see Samson "Changing Places").

¹⁰² See Sanz Camañes n. 40 for details on the thirty-four clauses that made up this agreement.

final round of negotiations began in 1614, when the Spanish ambassador Diego Sarmiento de Acuña (later named count of Gondomar) traveled to London; Gondomar would become the match's firmest proponent as well as an influential figure in James's court.¹⁰³ From 1614 until 1623, negotiations would continue more or less uninterrupted, although factions existed in both Spain and England in favor and against the royal union. Objectively, the marriage alliance was considered mutually beneficial, although, as Glyn Redworth explains, "two sets of misconceptions were in order right from the start" (*The Prince* 15), both of them surrounded the likelihood or necessity of Charles's conversion to Catholicism.

Negotiations for a match thus took place on and off over the course of nearly twenty years, but it was not until 1621 that James began to consider an alliance with Spain his only hope for the freedom from his Protestant Parliament that he thought befit the king.¹⁰⁴ During the two parliamentary sessions that took place that year, James had hoped Parliament would approve of taxation that would support his son-in-law who fought to conserve his position as king of Bohemia and Elector within the Palatinate. Instead, MPs suggested war against Spain, citing England's growing Catholic problem as their rationale at the time when James was negotiating the match with Philip. Both Spain and England hoped that an Anglo-Spanish alliance would bring peace to the Palatinate, where early conflicts of the Thirty Years' War had begun in 1618. While James saw economic benefits in the presumably large dowry the Infanta would bring to

¹⁰³ The count of Gondomar served as ambassador to England from 1613–1618 and again from 1620–22. He was considered an extremely effective and able diplomat because of the close friendship he formed with James, but he was also despised in England for the same reason. Thomas Middleton's *A Game at Chess* is one of the most overt examples of criticism of Gondomar's influence in James's court. It was written in 1624, shortly after Charles and Buckingham returned from Madrid.

¹⁰⁴ For a detailed description of James's struggle with the English Parliament in 1621, see Redworth, especially chapters three and four.

England, the match was additionally deemed beneficial to Spain largely due to the fact that the alternative to a Spanish bride for Charles would likely be a French *dauphine*.¹⁰⁵

Perhaps the most attractive reason for an alliance with England, however, was the same one that propelled the marriage between Philip II and Mary Tudor in 1554. Spain still hoped that England would return to the Catholic Church, and Gondomar was first to suggest that should the match occur, English Catholics would heartily embrace a Spanish queen. He believed in the strength of English Catholics, their silent majority, and their ability to support the crown.¹⁰⁶ Especially after the failure of Parliament in 1621, Gondomar believed that “England was ripe for conversion,” and he was in fact the person to suggest initially that Charles might need to travel to Spain in order to push marriage negotiations to a successful conclusion (Redworth, *The Prince* 52). It was for this reason, suggests Redworth, that Charles traveled to Madrid in 1623. The prince believed that negotiations were all but settled, that his presence in Madrid would quicken the arrival of the Pope’s dispensation for the match (or perhaps negate its necessity), and that he would be able to return home with his Spanish bride. Even Philip IV “was mesmerized by the prospect of Charles’s conversion or, at the very least, by the expectation that his future English nephews and nieces would be raised as Catholics” (Redworth, *The Prince* 104). Ultimately, it was the demand for religious tolerance that would prevent the marriage between María and Charles from taking place. Charles left Madrid in November of 1623 after six months spent at court, the last of which were forced upon him after numerous requests to return home. Before he left, Charles signed an agreement of marriage to the Infanta that stipulated freedom of worship for English Catholics, permitted the freedom of the Infanta and all of her household to practice

¹⁰⁵ See Redworth, *The Prince* 65.

¹⁰⁶ Based on the estimates that Gondomar made when he first traveled to England, the number of potential Catholics in England—either those committed or those who were Catholic at heart but did not convert out of fear—made up approximately half of the English population at the time (see Lockyer 201–02).

their religion openly and outside of the bounds of English law, and also conceded that any children born of the match would remain with their mother until they turned nine years old, essentially consenting to their education in the Catholic faith. The Prince of Wales waited only until he reached Segovia before he nullified the arrangement.¹⁰⁷

Within two years of the failure of marriage negotiations, Charles had succeeded his father as king of England. One of his first acts as king was to declare war on Spain. Having contracted a marriage with the French Catholic Henrietta Maria, as well as an alliance with the Dutch, Charles prepared a float of ninety ships to attack the port of Cádiz in November 1625. The result was disastrous for the English, who lost a third of their fleet, 7,000 of the 12,000 men who fought in Spain, and who failed to destroy any Spanish ships of significance.¹⁰⁸ The year in which England was defeated at Cádiz would be Spain's *annus mirabilis*; this Spanish victory was one among many for the empire that year. Anglo-Spanish relations remained tense, and in 1627 Spain briefly considered an invasion of England before bankruptcy led Philip IV to reject any military action in England definitively. It was not until November 1630, however, that a peace treaty was officially signed in Madrid. This treaty addressed neither the future of the Palatinate nor English Catholics, central issues to Anglo-Spanish conflict throughout the early seventeenth century.¹⁰⁹

In relation to the strategic peace negotiations and marriage alliances such as those that took place between Spain and England in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, it is important to acknowledge once again Spain's wide-ranging imperial concerns. Upon reaffirming

¹⁰⁷ See Redworth, *The Prince* 123–31 for details of the agreement and 134 for Charles's subsequent nullification of this agreement.

¹⁰⁸ See Sanz Camañes 84–86.

¹⁰⁹ See Sanz Camañes 105.

Spain's commitment to its imperial mission, Olivares would push for the resumption of war against Dutch rebels, greater unification of the monarchy's peninsular governments under the central monarchy of Castile, as well as the reformation of governmental and mercantile practice in the Indies.¹¹⁰ In addressing the courts in September 1623, Olivares urged his listeners to take advantage of "la ocasión de sacar los imperios de nuestro rey de la última ruina y restituirlos a suma felicidad" ("Discurso" 61). Such ambitious projects and expansive concerns remind us of the benefits of studying Spain's imperial identity through a transnational lens. It was especially during the first decade of Philip IV's reign that England served a concrete political purpose for the Spanish empire, one that would bring about the reappearance of the English theme into the Spanish imperial imagination. After twenty-three years of the reign of Philip III, Spain was prepared for substantial changes. Philip III sought peace, something Spain had seen little of during Philip II's final years as king. Upon succeeding his father, Philip III signed treaties with France, England and the Netherlands, all within the first decade of the seventeenth century.¹¹¹ Unfortunately, this monarchical policy did not prove ultimately beneficial for the Spanish empire and by the time of his death, Philip III had become quite unpopular. His unpopularity lay not only in these peace-seeking policies, but was also largely due to his dependence on corrupt government ministers. The duke of Lerma and his successors were believed to exert unchecked control over Philip's political decisions and their greed was considered the root of Spain's financial precarity. Many satirical ballads written on the occasion of Philip III's death express the desire for change upon the ascension of his son. One of these ballads celebrates the end of government corruption:

¹¹⁰ Olivares outlines his proposal for such changes in his well-known *Gran Memorial* (1624). His discussion of Spanish government in the Americas is much less detailed in this proposed plan than is his concern for the empire's control on the European continent.

¹¹¹ See Allen for a discussion of the failure of Philip III's "pax hispanica."

*Dilín, dilón,
que pasa la procesión.*

No ha sido con gran concierto,
viendo hurtar tan excesivo,
remedie Felipe el vivo
lo que no remedió el muerto.
Todos tengamos por cierto
que no ha de quedar ladrón
que hoy hace Felipe Cuarto,
viéndose, así, sin un cuarto
y otros de casa y torreón. (qtd. in Egido 94)

Another expresses the desire to see a new king rule without the influence of his advisers:

Murió Felipe Tercero,
mas, un consuelo nos queda:
que murió Pablo de Uceda,
el Confesor y el Buldero.
Uno y otro majadero
se consuelen, que han tenido
un rey y reino oprimido,
y mejor diré robados;
que el poder de estos privados,
tan exorbitante ha sido. (qtd. in Edigo 85)

The combined policy of peace, which by 1621 had clearly negative effects for Spain, and Philip III's dependence on Lerma, later on the duke of Uceda, would be the building blocks upon which Philip IV would build his own monarchical image upon taking the throne. With the help of the count-duke of Olivares, Philip IV separated himself from the image of a king whose inaction led to the failure of Spain's great empire. At least early in his reign, Philip IV and Olivares were also aware of the need to demonstrate Philip's role as a proactive king, who unlike his father, did not cede power to his advisers.¹¹²

Based on my analysis of the news pamphlets and plays published during the first decade of Philip IV's reign, I posit in "Charles and the Portrayal of the Young Philip IV" that England played a key role in the development of the monarchical image Philip IV and Olivares created for a new regime. Texts examined in Part Two were written primarily between 1623 and 1633, in the decade that followed Charles's visit to Madrid and roughly the first decade of Philip IV's reign. Like the texts taken up in Part One, those considered here range in genre from the historic to the poetic but in the same ways slip into the grey area created by their subtle merger. Chapter Four, "Assimilating the English: Charles's Visit to Madrid in Pamphlet Literature (1623)," explores the *relaciones de sucesos* written during the six months Charles spent in Madrid. These texts were written as factual accounts of the Prince of Wales's visit, yet their content focused not on the royal visitor himself but rather on the luxurious celebrations thrown in his honor. In this way, they served the purpose of spreading news of Philip's wealth throughout Spain and the rest of Europe. The second chapter in this section, "Favorable Comparisons: Philip IV and the Prince of Wales on Stage (1623–1633)," examines the plays that represent the English prince some five

¹¹² Feros explains that, "A diferencia de Lerma, Olivares parece haber entendido muy bien que como primer ministro su deber era presionar a Felipe IV para que se mostrase como un monarca visible y activo, de forma que no se le comparara con su padre, a pesar de que ambos tuvieron y dependieron de favoritos" (475).

years after his visit and the failure of marriage negotiations between the prince and the Infanta. Written when Spain and England were at war, I argue that these plays rewrite the famous visit and the English prince (by then king of England) at times in order to confirm the righteousness of Spain's dominance in Europe and the superiority of Spain's young king over England's, but also as a means of questioning the king and his *valido* after the shimmer of Philip's early reign was beginning to wear off. Together, the two chapters that comprise Part Two demonstrate an increased awareness of England during the first decade of Philip IV's reign as well as the young king and his *valido*'s use of England to establish a favorable image of the new monarch who sought the popular support his father had lost.

CHAPTER FOUR

Assimilating the English: Charles's Visit to Madrid in Pamphlet Literature (1623)

At 11 o'clock on the evening of Friday, March 17, 1623, Charles, Prince of Wales, arrived in Madrid. He made his secret journey to the Spanish capital by land from London with the hope of marrying the Spanish Infanta María, sister to the young king Philip IV. The prince "quiso con aquella grande demostración y acción generosa merecerla," as one account writes. And whispers of this romantic gesture spread quickly throughout the city:

Aquella noche no se supo [de su llegada], pero el sábado se comenzó a entender, y rugir, y el domingo a divulgarse más. Y por ser cosa ya extraordinaria, se sospechaba, si el vulgo (amigo de novedades) fingía aquella fábula, y así no se daba entero crédito a verdad tan dudosa. Esta se publicó, y salieron todos de los miedos y recelos en que estaban, y dicho domingo a las cinco de la tarde se juntó [. . .] innumerable gente que estaba deseando ver el Príncipe. (*Relación* fol. 1r)¹¹³

This anonymous pamphlet writer describes the *madrileños'* desire to confirm the veracity of the Prince of Wales's visit. We read of the "fábula," or rumors, that announced the "verdad tan dudosa," and in this simple description a balancing act between fact and fiction is foregrounded. When confronted by such seemingly astonishing news, what kind of evidence should the public rely on to substantiate its truth?

¹¹³ In this chapter, I cite *relaciones de sucesos* using the first word of their title when their author is unknown and when they have not been printed in any modern collected edition of such pamphlets. In these cases, I reference their pagination beginning at fol. 1r unless their pages were otherwise numbered in the edition I have consulted. Many of the *relaciones* I cite in this chapter are collected by José Simón Díaz in *Relaciones breves de actos públicos celebrados en Madrid de 1541 a 1650*. Whenever possible, I cite from this collection, providing their corresponding page number. In these instances, I maintain the original spelling and punctuation, which is preserved by Simón Díaz.

The cited description of Charles's arrival enumerates various phases of knowing, or affirming, this significant political event. First, rumor ("fábula") begins to spread among the capital's residents. Then, a more official, more certain credence is given to the news as it is declared in some unspecified capacity ("se publicó"). Curious city dwellers may then confirm the prince's presence as eyewitnesses of his coach ride two days after his arrival. As the same pamphlet describes it, so many city dwellers turned out on Sunday to see Charles that he was nearly unable to leave the ambassador's house where he was staying to attend the orchestrated (though unofficial) first viewing of his desired future bride. Finally, for those who did not form a part of this crowd, and as early as only three days after Charles took residence at his ambassador's home, hundreds, if not thousands, of consumers may have read of these propitious events in *relaciones de sucesos* just like the one quoted here.

While presented and accepted as fact, the news pamphlets studied in this chapter also leave reason to doubt the truly impartial nature of their narration of the events that occurred during Charles's stay in Madrid. These *relaciones* depict real events for a large public audience. They describe in vivid detail the grandeur of the court celebrations organized in Charles's honor, yet their unfailingly positive portrayal of a Protestant prince who seeks to marry Spain's Catholic Infanta may leave today's modern reader—aware of what these religious differences meant in early modern Spain—at least somewhat perplexed. It is this portrayal of Charles, and his English subjects (or rather, future subjects) that will be the central concern of this chapter. I contend that via an amalgamation of factual delineation and fictional embellishment, the representation of Charles and the English people that appears in these pamphlets functions to promote an image of this potential ally that reflects the agenda being formulated in the early years of Philip IV's reign.

The English, these *relaciones* collectively suggest, will be easily assimilated within the Spanish imperial sphere of influence when this marriage alliance takes place.

During the approximately six months that Charles stayed in Madrid between March and September 1623, innumerable accounts that depicted his interaction with the Spanish court were printed and disseminated as *relaciones de sucesos*. *Relaciones de sucesos* were most commonly short pamphlets that related the news of a single event of import. And their presence in the life of urban early modern Spain was ubiquitous. As a genre, *relaciones* tended only to portray good news, and they tended not to challenge monarchical policy. Despite the ephemeral nature of this genre, we have access today to some three-dozen *relaciones* that relate news of Charles's visit alone. These pamphlets are accessible either via printed collections of *relaciones* or via digitized library collections. They were printed internationally and on the Peninsula in Madrid, Lisbon, Seville, Valencia, and Valladolid.¹¹⁴ In the largest part, the *relaciones* that reported on Charles's stay presented detailed descriptions of the events that were organized for the prince's entertainment. They depicted his arrival, his official ceremonial entry into the city of Madrid, a masque and banquet organized at court, two bullfights and celebrations of traditional games—the latter of which was organized to celebrate the agreed-upon nuptials—and finally, the prince's departure. A small number of additional pamphlets reproduced letters that were supposedly sent between parties integral to the match's negotiations. On one occasion, Spanish readers were also informed of events that took place in England while Charles remained in Madrid.

These news pamphlets have been used by historians to piece together the details of Charles's trip, and they have been interpreted as evidence of opulence and of Spain's belief in its

¹¹⁴ International presses in Italy, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and England also depicted these events in news pamphlets. Alexander Samson has conducted an excellent study of some contemporary English translations of Andrés de Almansa y Mendoza's letters (see "1623"). Although further studies in this area would make for a rich topic of future study, I will not discuss such translations here.

ability to convert Charles by putting on spectacular religious shows.¹¹⁵ These documents without doubt provide valuable historical evidence of the events that took place at court in 1623, but rather than sifting through them for facts, I will instead use them to consider what they can tell us both about Spain's perception of England and how the presentation of a match between Charles and the Infanta fits into the image of Spain's imperial identity early in Philip IV's reign. In this chapter, I will focus my analysis on the way in which these pamphlets present the Prince of Wales to the Spanish public, and I will also consider how their depiction of the prince and the English nation as a whole play a part in Spain's imperial project. By placing the *relaciones* studied here within the context of Olivares's political designs as discussed in the introduction to Part Two, I seek to establish the role that England played in the shifting imagination of Spain's imperial identity after Philip III's conservative international policy. My analysis of these pamphlets suggests that their depictions of Philip's foreign visitor and England as a nation serve to compose an image of the English that implies easy assimilation within the long-standing, but recently reinvigorated, Spanish project to spread and defend Catholicism in Europe and around the world.

My reading of the *relaciones* that report on Charles's time in Madrid is guided by continued considerations of the relationship between fact and fiction in various genres. I posit that unlike the other genres explored throughout this project, *relaciones* are a genre that bridges the gap between fact and fiction as a result of both their influence and reception. Similar to historical treatises like Herrera y Tordesillas's *Historia de . . . María Estuarda*, explored in Chapter One, the *relación* was understood to be a factual genre that depicted not "fábula" but "verdad," however doubtful this may at first appear. Yet like the less truthfully concerned

¹¹⁵ See Sánchez Cano 66.

historical dramas explored in Chapter Three (and later in Chapter Five), *relaciones* had the potential to reach an extremely wide-ranging public. In my analysis I will consider the literary mode of this factual genre, and contend that its depiction of real events and its ability to reach a large public combine to create a genre that affords a window into the Spanish imagination of the early seventeenth century. In other words, the depiction of England that appears in these pamphlets is molded both by a desire to truthfully represent events and by Philip and Olivares's hegemonic imperial agenda.

This chapter begins with a brief review of the work that has been done to better understand the *relación* as a diverse but coherent genre. Within this discussion, I consider the *relaciones*' simultaneous relationship with the public and with the power structure of the monarchy. Although these documents were not sponsored by the monarchy itself, it is important to consider them within the ideological system of Baroque Spain, for as Agustín Redondo has suggested, *relaciones* may be seen to constitute “otras tantas manifestaciones de una cultura orientada a partir del poder” (“Características” 81). Within this cultural context, we begin to witness the various elements that this genre adopts from both historical and fictional literary styles. After considering the genre itself, I will turn to pamphlets written about Charles, expounding first some of the general characteristics that connect the three-dozen *relaciones* I study. By focusing on the most salient descriptions of the English prince, his depiction as a potential future-partner for the Spanish Infanta who is both chivalric and devout will be illuminated. Finally, in my analysis of Spanish representations of the English nation—moving beyond those that consider primarily the English prince—I will explore the way in which particularly Charles's religious qualities are imprinted upon the British Isles as a whole, thus

placing them within the Spanish imperial project, which here imagines an easy assimilation of a devout England ready to accept a Spanish princess.

The Prince Is Here! Read All About It!

Today we study the emergence of the news as a genre with the publication of *relaciones de sucesos*, the first surviving example of which was published in Spain near the end of the fifteenth century, shortly after the first Spanish printing houses appeared in Segovia and Seville (Millard and Rueda 2–3).¹¹⁶ From the earliest printed pamphlet, through the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries, *relaciones* served as the primary format for disseminating information about current events. But it would not be until the publication of the *Gaceta Nueva* in Madrid in 1661 that news became available in Spain in periodical format. *Relaciones* derived from the Italian tradition of *cartas de aviso*, which were usually sent as manuscript documents between elite noblemen and politicians meant to inform those most concerned with the governance of Italy regarding religious and political matters. The goal of printed news pamphlets, which developed in Spain and elsewhere from this tradition, differed slightly from these *cartas*, however. *Relaciones* served primarily to reproduce stories that would pique public interest, but their content also reflected the monarchy's hegemonic agenda.

As Agustín Redondo explains, the desire to communicate news and its necessary counterpart—the public desire and/or ability to consume it—has always existed. But it was not until the invention of the printing press, combined with the demographic growth of urban

¹¹⁶ Some disagree with this classification, but Ettinghausen (“The News”) and Agulló y Cobo argue firmly for the direct influence of *relaciones* on the development of the news genre. As Agulló y Cobo states, “[l]as relaciones de sucesos son el más directo e inmediato antecedente del periodismo actual” (3). For a brief discussion about the debate that has emerged over the relation's place in the emergence of early journalism, see Mancera and Galbarro (25–30).

populations and Spain's own imperial expansion that we see the emergence of "una nueva sensibilidad y de un afán de saber, un deseo de enterarse de los sucesos ocurridos dentro y fuera de los reinos hispanos" ("Características" 81). Further demand for news emerged as the political situation in Spain became more convulsive under the reign of Philip III. Production and consumption of *relaciones* exploded in the seventeenth century and would reach its peak in the very decade that interests us here.¹¹⁷

Secondary research on *relaciones de sucesos* has begun to grow since the second half of the twentieth century, when Mercedes de Agulló y Cobo published the first catalogue of *relaciones* by compiling bibliographic information from a number of archives throughout Spain. Since then, efforts to expand our access to and knowledge of the *relaciones* corpus that has survived have been made by research groups such as the Grupo de Investigación sobre las Relaciones de Sucesos (S. XVI–XVIII) at the University of Coruña and those involved in the project "Relaciones de sucesos en la BUS: Antes de que existiera la prensa..." at the University of Seville.¹¹⁸ Monographs and collected editions published on *relaciones* in the last half-century have limited their focus to pamphlets published on specific subjects, during a limited timeframe, or to those collected in specific archives.¹¹⁹ The genre itself imposes these restrictions on scholars due to its vast quantity, ephemeral existence, and natural variation. When describing this multifaceted genre, Nieves Pena Sueiro provides the following definition:

¹¹⁷ Mancera and Galbarro distill their quantitative research into two tables that demonstrate these trends. Of the *relaciones* they analyzed between 1452 and 1900, 42.15% were printed 1601–1650; a more precise analysis, divided by decades, demonstrates that of all *relaciones* published between 1551 and 1700, 20.45% were printed 1621–1630 (33–34).

¹¹⁸ The Grupo de Investigación has put together an online catalogue which proves indispensable for anyone who wishes to make a study of the genre. The Sala del BUS has published a number of important studies about *relaciones* printed in Seville and have made some primary documents available digitally, though their aim was not to make the same kind of online searchable catalogue.

¹¹⁹ See Pena Sueiro for an extremely thorough overview of the work that was done on *relaciones* prior to 2001.

son textos, en su mayoría anónimos, que narran un suceso ocasional. Surgen en el siglo XV, pero se desarrollan sobre todo en el XVII y XVIII, perdurando hasta los primeros años del siglo XX. Presentan gran variedad en el contenido, modalidad de discurso (en prosa, verso o ambas) y formal (breves-extensas). Se trata de relatos circunstanciales con fines informativos y por ellos pueden ser considerados como los antecedentes de la prensa periódica actual. (3)

This definition succinctly compartmentalizes many different aspects of the *relaciones* genre: length, style, and content being its most varied elements.¹²⁰ According to Ettinghausen, the institutions that appeared most frequently in published news pamphlets were the monarchy, the military, and the church. Other subjects of interest include miracles and prognostications, natural disasters, monsters, and murders or other sensational stories (“The News” 4). For my purposes in this chapter, I limit the content of the pamphlets I study solely to Charles’s visit. All of the *relaciones* that I study are of the short variety of news pamphlets, which range from two to four folios in length. While many *relaciones* of this length were written in verse, all of the ones that I study were written in prose.¹²¹ The themes that appear in these *relaciones* comply with generic expectations: they present news both of a religious and royal subject matter.

Unlike some other forms of historical writing—such as historical drama, historical treatises or laudatory poems—*relaciones de sucesos* were not commissioned to promote the crown’s agenda. This does not mean, however, that they were not favorable to the crown. In Spain, unlike in England, pamphlets did not emerge as a genre of conflict and debate. They were

¹²⁰ For further definitions, see Ettinghausen, “Política” 86; Espejo, “El mercado” 1; Redondo, “Características” 81. Redondo defines this genre especially as it relates to the consumer.

¹²¹ This is not entirely surprising, given the fact that most *relaciones* written about politics or diplomacy were written in prose rather than verse. However, I have come across a couple of *relaciones* about the 1625 attack on Cádiz that were published in verse.

not published as a means of contradicting the crown's policy. Instead, they most frequently and almost exclusively celebrated the monarchy, providing a means of union rather than division. Ettinghausen describes their "Quixotic *triumfalismo*," noting that the only bad news published in Spain was that which related natural disasters, but never the mistakes or failings of the king ("The News" 14). Relations, he continues, "put out a consistently reassuring interpretation of reality," and they served as "guardians of the national purpose of Golden Age Spain" (15, 17). This positive reflection of Spanish court and society will become especially apparent in my analysis of the English-themed *relaciones* of 1623 that follows. We will see the way in which these documents form a part of the ideology put forth by Philip IV and Olivares, and how they contribute to the imperial myth that the monarchy hoped to promote.

Possible reasons for *relaciones*' support of monarchical hegemony are multiple but inconclusive. To me, they remain somewhat mysterious. As suggested at the outset of this chapter, Redondo considers *relaciones* a part of the larger Baroque system of "una cultura orientada a partir del poder." In other words, he would seem to suggest what may be viewed as almost a parallel occurrence in the *relaciones* genre as that which Maravall had suggested regarding Golden Age theater. Maravall's thesis, which viewed early modern theater as a support system for the crown, has since been challenged by many talented scholars. I have no doubt that the same may prove true for the *relaciones* genre as it continues to gain more academic share. We cannot discard the possibility, however, that inherent motivations existed for this positive bias: printers would be less likely to be restricted by censorship regulations if they printed news that was not polemical; they were also motivated to print and sell the news pamphlets they published quickly. Though we know little of the authors who composed *relaciones*, those we do

know of were often closely connected to the court.¹²² These authors would likely have had little motivation to disseminate bad press. Mancera and Galbarro have suggested that the surge in the printing of *relaciones* between 1621 and 1630 may have something to do with “el gobierno de un nuevo valido, autor de un giro copernicano en una política exterior encaminada desde entonces a mantener la hegemonía española en Europa” (34). Once again, however, I would like to point out that there is no evidence that Olivares initiated the publication of the *relaciones* by means of any overt or official policy.¹²³ Ultimately, it is difficult to determine the reasons that motivated the positive bias of this genre, whose theorization lies beyond the scope of this project.

Whatever reasons lie behind the lack of negative news printed in Spain, further motivations emerge to explain its great popularity. *Relaciones* were not only cheap to buy and thus a relatively accessible purchase for most city dwellers, but they were also inexpensive and quick to make for printers.¹²⁴ Those who needed capital could print and profit from *relaciones* in a short amount of time and the public for this genre was vast. Redondo and others have pointed to the existence of a divided public interested in consuming these stories: the first, “las capas superiores,” would consume “los de más enjundia” and the second, “las capas inferiores,” would have preferred “los de menos substancia pero más evocativos” (“Características” 81). Rather than focusing on the division of the public consumer of these documents, I believe that remembering the power these texts would have had to unite a diverse audience makes for a more compelling subject of study. Once again Ettinghausen reminds us, “it’s perfectly obvious that the

¹²² Two of those who signed their names to their *relaciones* were Andrés de Almansa y Mendoza and Gil González Dávila. Both were employed at court and would have thus witnessed the events they describe.

¹²³ According to Mancera and Galbarro, reasons for the increase in *relaciones* during this decade may include the fact that two significant events occurred right at its outset: the death of Philip III and the coronation of Philip IV in 1621. Another contributing factor may be the prohibition of printing novels and plays in Castile in 1625 (34). As this prohibition does not appear to have had lasting effect, it is not clear how large its influence may have been on *relaciones* publications as the decade in question continued.

¹²⁴ See Cruickshank “Literature” (n.p.) and Millard and Rueda 5–6.

relaciones did much more than just inform. They helped form, and they reflect, their readers' worldview and self-image. They provided instruments of social linkage beyond the immediate community" ("The News" 15).¹²⁵ That is, these news stories served to create an identity that was not locally but nationally based. We may not be able to answer exactly *why* relations represented the monarchy in its most positive light, but we can confirm, and will with the discussion of Charles, that *relaciones* indeed reflected a united Spanish vision of an English cultural outsider. In the pamphlets that depict Charles's visit to Madrid, Spanish actors stand in relief as the hosts and participants in these celebrations, and as brokers of this matrimonial alliance, which would further the empire's united goal of reestablishing Spain's power throughout Europe.

So far omitted from this discussion of the *relaciones* genre is the question of their narrative style. The subject of *relaciones* was always ostensibly rooted in an occurrence that maintained "una base histórica mínima" (Infantes 209). The authors of relations insist upon the veracity of the accounts they tell, and they often point directly to their own witnessing of the events in order to bolster their authority.¹²⁶ An agreement existed implicitly between reader (or listener) and writer that the former would believe that the latter informed of true events. In the origin of the *relaciones* genre we understand the necessity of this agreement. Before the publication of *relaciones de sucesos*, networks of professional informants sent political, economic, and religious news to an elite public involved in the political and religious power structure of the Italian government. Their *cartas de aviso* (or *cartas de relación*) were circulated in manuscript form and usually related a number of short, pertinent news items. Their purpose

¹²⁵ Millard and Rueda echo similar sentiments: "La mayoría de los pliegos sueltos y relaciones que han llegado hasta nosotros procuran transmitir noticias favorables a la Corona y reforzar la identidad del grupo, por lo que los textos eran objeto de vigilancia para evitar cualquier disidencia, tanto política como religiosa" (8).

¹²⁶ See Mancera and Galbarro 42; Agulló y Cobo 3.

was informative, their circulation was usually limited to a small number of professional consumers, and their style was often dry and lacked elaboration. Though the subject of printed *relaciones* often remained close to those that most often appeared in *cartas de aviso*, the transition from limited to mass consumption likely played a role in the changing narrative style of this later genre.

In describing the development of the *relaciones* genre, Carmen Espejo points towards a second origin that has its roots in popular, rather than elite, culture.¹²⁷ In addition to the debt *relaciones de sucesos* owe to the Italian *cartas de aviso*, the genre's origin also stems from the popular Spanish tradition of both the *copla* and the *romance* ("Los inicios" 2). Such poems, which emerge from oral tradition, were also printed and sold in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Their subject was historical and legendary, but the style of this genre also permitted elaboration on the part of the narrator, whether to promote a political agenda or capture the audience's attention. Redondo recognizes the influence of these narrativized poems on the *relaciones* printed in verse, meant to reach the "capas inferiores," as he calls them. Yet we should not assume that historical events were embellished solely for the benefit of these illiterate members of the public or that such narrativization occurred solely within the *relaciones* that were written in verse. Political relations, which were more commonly written in prose, also included "un narrador casi siempre innominado [quien] relata en clave interpretativa uno o varios acontecimientos relacionados por su intencionalidad discursiva y política" (Espejo, "El mercado" 1). The narrator of these pamphlets often related events with little explicit political motivation, yet his choice of detail and description of the interactions between the English and Spanish

¹²⁷ She is not the only one to discuss the influence of this genre, but she does so in a way that acknowledges its influence on the style of *relaciones* ("Los inicios"). See also Redondo ("Características").

players in *relaciones* on the subject of Charles's visit, for example, betray the motivations that drive their presentation of the English. Religious bias on the part of the narrators should also be considered when determining the existence of fictional embellishment within these pamphlets. In other words, the subject matter of these documents may have been factual, but we should not for this reason assume that they lack narrative embellishments that guide readers to a specific interpretation of the events they portray. Through their selective narration, the recurrence of certain popular literary tropes, and their emphasis on small details of religious observance, the pamphlets studied in this chapter depict a prince and country dedicated to the Spanish Infanta and ready to assimilate into the Spanish empire which Philip and Olivares sought to expand and protect.

Sharing Spain's Success

Relaciones de sucesos were not paid for by the monarchy, yet as we have seen, they generally supported the crown's policy and encouraged a unified identity among readers. The pamphlets published in 1623 regarding Charles's visit to Madrid are no exception to this unofficial rule. Authors recounting the events that took place between March and September often discuss in great detail the nobles who participated in official celebrations and games. We read of the clothing they wore, the livery of their horses, and on many occasions, of the gifts that were exchanged between royal parties and their retinue. All of these descriptions can be seen as evidence of the successful reception of Philip IV's first and most important royal visitor. As Redondo explains, "estas relaciones contribuían a la exaltación del Rey y de la monarquía española, así como a la del privado y sus alegados" ("Fiesta" 122). Detailed descriptions of the royal reception of Charles no doubt contributed to the depiction of a powerful and successful

Spanish monarchy, and thus analyzing them helps us to better understand the positive picture these relations painted of Philip's rule. I will for this reason describe briefly these aspects of the *relaciones* printed during Charles's stay before considering the way in which Charles and England were portrayed specifically.¹²⁸

Among the *relaciones* that take the greatest care to describe the celebrations that took place at court were those written by Andrés de Almansa y Mendoza. In Ettinghausen's estimation, Almansa was "the most important Spanish journalist" before the publication of Madrid's *Gaceta Nueva* ("The Greatest" 75). Between 1621 and 1627, Almansa wrote a series of seventeen numbered newsletters ostensibly with the intention of keeping his various patrons well informed of the happenings at court.¹²⁹ Among these newsletters, six refer to the prince's visit of 1623, five of which were published in multiple editions, at times without the consent of the author himself.¹³⁰ In his analysis of Almansa's fourth relation of 1623, Ettinghausen points out the author's "copiously minute descriptions of the decorations, the seating arrangements and the outfits sported by the chief participants and guests of honour" ("The Greatest" 85). Ettinghausen furthermore praises Almansa's unique coverage of the trip due to his overt discussion of its possible political implications, and he considers Almansa's sustained reporting on the prince's

¹²⁸ To supplement my general overview here, I remit the reader to Ettinghausen's thorough account of all of the relations printed in Spain about Charles's visit (see *Prince Charles*).

¹²⁹ In his most recent edited collection of Almansa's *Obra Periodística*, Ettinghausen separates Almansa's seventeen letters (written between 1621 and 1624) from his seventeen *relaciones* (written between 1623 and 1627). Among the letters and *relaciones* that relate news of Charles's journey to Madrid, the content varies little. Ettinghausen does not discuss in detail what Almansa's role may have been in the publication of these *relaciones* or how their content varied from the letters themselves.

¹³⁰ Ettinghausen notes that one of the six documents written by Almansa y Mendoza about Charles's visit survives only in manuscript form. He gives possible reasons for its lack of contemporary publication—principally its length in relation to other pamphlets—but he does not discount the possibility that it could have been published yet no copy survives to date ("The Greatest" 79).

visit a journalistic endeavor that “nowadays would be considered the outstanding candidate for a Pulitzer Prize” (“The Greatest” 75, 89).

Among those printed during the English visit, the *relaciones* written by Almansa y Mendoza have received the most scholarly attention. Almansa was one of only four authors to sign his name to the relations he wrote about the visit.¹³¹ The specific details that he conveyed regarding the Court’s celebrations, however, appear in many other *relaciones* as well. One such pamphlet, published by Francisco de Lyra in Seville, relates Charles’s official entrance into the city of Madrid with the following lengthy description:

A las cinco salieron de S. Geronimo en esta forma: delante de todos muchos atabaleros y trompetas con insignias Reales, a cavallo: y luego gran numero de Alguaziles de Corte, y de otros consejos, muy adereçados: seguianle los Alcaldes de casa y Corte; luego cavalleros y señores, y Grandes, sin quedar ninguno de los que estan en esta Corte, en gran numero, todos riquissimamente adereçados de camino, y a la brida: unos mejores que otros, de varios colores: y ellos, y criados, de pajes y lacayos, en gran numero, con mucha plumageria. [. . .] Seguiase luego el palio, que llevavan doze Regidores a pie, y descubiertos, cada uno con su vara, que se remudavan: el palio riquissimo de tela, debaxo del nuestro Rey, y el Principe a su mano derecha; los pajes de su Magestad junto del, a pie, en cuerpo, y descubiertos: su Magestad muy ricamente adereçado de camino, sombrero bizarro con mucha pluma negra, y el en todo muy gallardo y ayroso: a los estrivos suyos, y del Principe, dos Mayordomos de su Magestad a pie, y descubiertos, con

¹³¹ One other signed *relación*, which recounts the whole of the prince’s visit, was written by Gil González Dávila (discussed later). Another was signed by Hernando de Vallejo, printed in Seville by Juan Serrano de Vargas. And finally, Juan Antonio de la Peña signed an account published in Madrid by Juan González. All of these *relaciones* are included in José Simón Díaz’s edited collection.

sus bastones en las manos, insignia de su oficio: detras del Rey, y del Principe, el de Olivares, y el de Buquingan, muy adereçados, pero mucho mas el de Olivares, haziendo oficio de Cavallerizo mayor: tras ellos se seguia toda la guarda de acavallo con sus morriones, lanças, con vandoleras coloradas, y sus pistolas en los arzones de los cavallos, dentro de sus fundas. En resolucion todo fue de las cosas mas grandiosas que ha hecho Rey en su Corte. (201)

This description is fairly typical among those that appear in *relaciones* that relate Charles's entrance and other festivities thrown in his honor. The list of participants in the procession of Charles's entrance provides an idea of the grandeur and size of the festivities: everyone who was anyone was there. While here Lyra's account refers merely to the Grandes as "riquissimamente adereçados," wearing "varios colores," in many other accounts of this and similar events our *relacioneros* take care to describe the individual outfits of each noble participant, their servants' dress and their horses' liveries.¹³² On other occasions, long lists of names gave even more precise information regarding the noble men and women who played a part in the reception of this foreign prince.

Lyra's quoted *relación* additionally makes reference to diplomatic courtesies between the Spanish king and the English prince that bring to life the amicable relations being forged

¹³² See, for example, the following *relaciones* reproduced by Simón Díaz that relate the festivities held on August 21 to celebrate Charles and María's agreed-upon union: Almansa y Mendoza, Madrid *Relación de las fiestas reales de toros y cañas* (234–38); Anonymous, printed in Valladolid by Gerónimo Morillo, *Relación breve y verdadera, de las fiestas Reales de toros, y cañas, que se hizieron en la plaça de Madrid, Lunes, que se contaron veinte y uno de Agosto, por la solemnidad de los casamientos de los Serenissimos Señores Principe de Gales, y la Señora Infanta Doña Maria de Austria* (238–40); Juan Antonio de la Peña, printed in Madrid by Juan González, *Relación de las fiestas reales, y juego de cañas, que la Majestad Catolica del Rey nuestro señor hizo los vente y no de Agosto deste presente año, para honrar y festejar los tratados desposorios del serenissimo Principe de Gales, con la señora Infanta doña Maria de Austria* (241–47); Anonymous, printed in Seville by Gabriel Ramos Vejarano, *Relación de las fiestas reales de toros y cañas, que la Majestad Catolica de el Rey nuestro señor, jugó en la villa de Madrid, en 21 de Agosto, por festejar los felicisimos, y dichosos desposorios del Serenissimo Principe de Gales, y la señora Infanta doña Maria. En este año de 1623* (247–49).

between the two nations. In this instance, the pamphleteer refers to Charles's position on the right-hand side of the king ("a su mano derecha"). Philip's insistence on this courtesy is noted in many *relaciones* written about this and other events organized during Charles's stay. The king is depicted as an active participant in plans for Charles's entrance and in making sure the prince is well received both by Spanish courtiers and the church. A second relation published in Seville, this time by Juan Serrano de Vargas, outlines numerically the requirements for this event that the king himself set forward.¹³³

When Gil González Dávila, official chronicler for the Crown of Castile, wrote his relation of the events that took place from Charles's secret departure from England to his official entrance in Madrid, he reproduced at the end of his account two missives that Philip sent to his brother, the Cardinal Infante Carlos, and to his nobles.¹³⁴ In the first, the king asks his brother "que encomendéis y hagáis encomendar a nuestro Señor los negocios que con ocasión de esta venida se trataren, para que se sirva de encaminarlos, como más convenga a su servicio, y de su Iglesia" (Dávila 197–98). Philip wishes to see Charles treated respectfully, even regaled, by the church, which will play a central role in the celebrations and negotiations to come. To the nobles of Spain, Philip writes that Charles

ha venido a esta Corte, con deseo de estrechar amistad conmigo, y con esta Corona; la acción ha sido tan grande, como se deja considerar, y a mí, y a mis Reinos ha puesto en suma obligación; deseando hacer todas las demostraciones mayores de solemnidad y agradecimiento, y como a persona de tanta cuenta os lo he querido avisar, para que lo tengáis entendido, y sepáis mi voluntad, y en la

¹³³ See Simón Díaz 202–04.

¹³⁴ This account first appeared in 1623 as a part of Dávila's *Teatro de las Grandezas de la villa de Madrid*, from which document I cite here. Dávila's account was also reprinted on at least one occasion in Madrid in pamphlet form, a copy of which can be found in BNE Mss. 8719, fol. 187r–188v.

parte que pudiereis ayudéis a este intento. [. . .] También mando a los Presidentes de los Consejos, ofreciesen al Príncipe, que todo lo que su Alteza mandase en negocios de Gracia, se haría, que lo tuviese entendido, para que ordenase lo que fuese de su gusto. El príncipe es el segundo que ha venido de aquellos Reinos a estos; el primero fue, don Duarte Príncipe de Gales, que después fue Rey, y estaba en la ciudad de Burgos, cabeza de Castilla, y Corte del Rey don Alonso el Sabio por los años 1268 y el Rey le armó Caballero a la usanza de estos Reinos. (Dávila 198)

With these two missives the king seeks to ensure that Charles receives treatment from Spain's religious authorities and nobles in accordance with his rank. In doing so, he demonstrates his diplomatic concern for the foreign prince. At the same time Philip is shown in print to establish his commitment to forging this match in service of the Catholic faith. Yet Philip's second missive also points to the historical significance of this visit. Only one other English prince had visited Spain and thus the Court's reception of Charles holds great import. This moment, this second letter indicates, will be remembered, and thus it is vital to demonstrate Spain's ability to meet the demands of the challenge presented to them. In Dávila's *relación*, the author even cites his source for this historical information in the margin. "Historia del rey Alonso el Sabio, c[apítulo] 17," he writes, indicating at once both the veracity of this claim and also indicating that precisely these are the events that will appear when the histories of this current king are written. The reproduction of these two missives for the wide-ranging *relaciones* audience not only affirms Spain's commitment to this match, but it also simultaneously displays for the public the political identity that the monarchy wished to portray. The public was thus invited to adopt

the same attitude towards Charles and the match. They too participated in the celebrations described and formed a part of the community that these relations portrayed.

Another aspect of the diplomatic interaction between England and Spain that is commonly commented upon in these pamphlets is the exchange of gifts that occurred on various occasions throughout Charles's six-month stay. When Charles arrives at the palace to take his official residence there, for example, the queen offers him "un gran presente [. . .] en unos baules de carei, con guarniciones de oro; y otros de cuero de ambar bordados, llenos de ropa blanca, cueros de ambar para coletos, pastillas, pebetes, guantes de caçador y ordinarios, de todo gran cantidad" (203). Upon his departure, one relation provides a complete list of the gifts that were exchanged between Philip, Charles, and the courtiers that accompanied them; the relation's title signals the importance of this content: *Relación de la salida que hizo desta villa de Madrid, el serenissimo Principe de Gales a nueue de Setiembre deste año de 1623 acompañado del Rey nuestro señor y del Infante Carlos, y el Cardenal su hermano, hasta San Lorenço el Real del Escorial, donde se despidio su Alteza de su Magestad. Dase quenta de las joyas que su Magestad dio al Principe de Gales, ya los demás Cavalleros Ingleses. Y de las que repartio el Principe assi entre las personas Reales como entre otras muchas ilustres en sangre y estados.*¹³⁵ This typically long title obscures the weight that is given within its two short pages to the gifts themselves. More than three quarters of this specific pamphlet, published without indication of city or printer, is dedicated to reproducing a "memorial," or account, first of the gifts given by the king and then those by the prince.

Details such as the ones outlined here—enumerating gifts, describing clothing or decorations—are present in any account of events that took place during Charles's visit to

¹³⁵ See Simón Díaz 256–58.

Madrid. This emphasis suggests that not only Almansa, but also our other anonymous writers, saw the advantage in publishing accounts that provided “proof that Philip and Olivares had met the formidable challenge of the unannounced English visit with flying colours” (Ettinghausen, “The Greatest” 89). After all, whatever the outcome of these negotiations, the news that sold best was then—as now—that which presented sensational events in the grandest terms. These descriptions celebrate the Spanish monarchy, its opulence, and power, and foreign reporting on these elaborate festivities demonstrates the far-reaching impact that such a reception had throughout Europe. The expense was a burden incurred by the new monarchy in order to prove its strength to both national and international audiences. As Vila Carneiro notes regarding the visit, “la monarquía española cumplió uno de sus principales objetivos tras conocer el viaje del príncipe de Gales: dejar manifiesta en la Europa del siglo XVII su alta capacidad para organizar caras y ostentosas fiestas” (1084). *Relaciones* specifically, it must be recognized, played an important role in spreading the news of this success. Their dissemination throughout Spain and their translations into German, Italian, English, Dutch and French manifest their significance. Yet the depiction they present of Charles and England, I believe, reveals a different focus. As I will highlight in the remainder of this chapter, I see the portrayal of the English prince and his nation as an attempt to show how this sometimes-enemy and Protestant persecutor of Catholics might now be seen, as a result of this very visit, as a part of Spain’s empire. Until now, in examining the details of diplomatic exchange and celebratory liveries, the content of these *relaciones* appears almost exclusively enumerative. In my discussion of Charles, however, I will return to an exploration of the way in which literary devices and tropes begin to seep into the stories these pamphlets tell.

The Prince of Wales in Pamphlet Literature

Depictions of Charles within the pamphlets that relate the events of his visit describe the prince with two outstanding characteristics: his reverence before Catholic ceremony and his chivalric devotion to the Infanta. These qualities have been pointed out by a number of scholars who have studied Spanish depictions of the Prince of Wales's visit in pamphlets, poetry, and plays. As Redondo describes it, "[e]ntre fiestas, se iba elaborando una verdadera novela amorosa al uso" ("Fiesta" 123). Vila Carneiro echoes these sentiments and adds, "[e]l respeto y la admiración mostrados por los ingleses, quienes lloraron ante los penitentes de Semana Santa, fue lo más comentado de las ceremonias" (1078). What neither scholar considers, however, is whether these depictions of Charles represent reality or how they functioned as a narrative technique of the *relaciones* genre. In adding to this conversation, I will not only point out the instances in which these qualities become most apparent, but I will also question the function of such depictions. Though, as I have established earlier in this chapter, the *relaciones* were considered a truthful genre, it is important to consider the motivations that lie behind these depictions. When Charles is described as kneeling before the host, for example, should we take this to be a truthful account or a hopeful portrayal of the prince's actions written by a biased Spanish author? Those who study Charles's visit to Madrid have often noticed this genuflection. I will for this reason use it as a case study in order to demonstrate the utility of questioning the motivations that lie behind pamphlet literature printed during Charles's visit. I also wish, however, to give a sense of the larger corpus of *relaciones* in order to indicate that it is not merely in this one instance that Spanish pamphlets focus on Charles's relationship to Catholicism. Exploring further descriptions of Charles's observation of Catholic ceremonies

provides a clearer picture of the extent to which the prince's devotion served as a focal point in the Spanish imaginary.

Taken together, the *relaciones* that depict the events of Charles's time in Madrid leave no doubt about his sympathy for the Catholic faith. Through his reading of the *relaciones*, in fact, David Sánchez Cano argues that Spain's goal in organizing such elaborate religious festivities for the 1623 season was not to demonstrate its power but to convert the English prince. Spain would accomplish this goal with spectacles that would inspire awe in Catholic ritual and ceremony. This "campaign to convert Charles" failed, concludes Sánchez Cano (66). But his analysis stops short in its consideration of *relaciones* as literary artifacts. They may reveal the desire of the Spanish monarchy to influence Charles's religious allegiances and may be read in this way as historical evidence of such a campaign. They may also, however, reflect a Spanish understanding of this prince's Catholic potential. Charles's relationship to the Catholic faith becomes a ubiquitous topic in these relations, which betray a systematic belief in England's commitment to Catholicism, represented in the visit itself.

As we have seen, Philip's commitment to forging a match that would benefit the Catholic Church was exemplified in the missive he sent to his brother Carlos immediately after Charles's arrival in Madrid. Indeed, on numerous occasions since the beginning of James I's reign in 1603, Spanish pamphlets had portrayed England through a religious lens. Specifically, pamphlets printed in Spain commented upon James's treatment of his Catholic subjects and on the adherence of the English populace to the Catholic faith. It should thus come as no surprise that many of the pamphlets describing Charles's visit focus on its religious implications. Numerous pamphlets printed in 1623 allude to Charles's observation of the religious festivities that took place in Madrid during his time at court. In one particularly moving instance, on Good Friday,

five separate orders of discalced monks and nuns participated in a procession that led them through the streets of Madrid flagellating themselves near to the point of death. Such actions, we read, “causó a toda la Corte, y en particular a los Reyes, Infantes, y personas de Palacio, y al Principe y Caualleros Ingleses que lo estuuieron atentamente viendo y considerando, tan general compasion y edificacion, que todos se deshazian en llanto, pidiendo los Catolicos a Dios perdon y misericordia” (209). Though this last phrase separates the Catholic onlookers from those potentially non-Catholic viewers of the procession, the passage also unites Charles, his English gentlemen, and the royal family of Spain together in their astonishment and passionate tears before this show of religious devotion. Charles similarly witnessed other religious demonstrations, such as the Fiestas de San Juan, from a hidden vantage point.¹³⁶

The moment of Charles’s reverence that is most often commented upon by modern scholars who study the Prince’s visit occurred during the feast of Corpus Christi, in mid-June. While watching the procession on this occasion, both Francisco de Lyra’s pamphlet and Almansa y Mendoza’s twelfth letter describe the prince’s reverent kneel. Almansa characterizes Charles’s actions thus:

[el] Principe de Gales, que estaua con su gente en los valcones de su quarto, [juntos] hizieron grandes cortesias, y reuerencias a su Magestad, y grandes humillaciones, y adoraciones, adorando de rodillas al santissimo Sacramento quando passo: y algunos de los Caualleros que con el [Príncipe de Gales] han venido fueron en la procession, y se dize por cierto, que son Catolicos, y todos en

¹³⁶ In a *relación* published in Lisbon by Pedro Crasbeeck, one pamphleteer writes during the celebrations of the Fiestas de San Juan, “se tiene por cierto que vio este acompañamiento el Príncipe encubierto en una ventana” (*Relación* fol. 1v).

general hizieron la misma cortesia que su Principe desde donde estauan, quando pasaua la Custodia. (259)¹³⁷

This act of reverence received contemporary attention both in *relaciones* and in poetry. Antonio Hurtado de Mendoza dedicated an entire sonnet to this kneel in which Philip IV is celebrated as having achieved victory over “[el] fiero hereje, / del error germano” (qtd. in Robbins). Modern scholars seem to have similarly focused their attention on this religious act, believing the descriptions of this genuflection to be historically accurate but concentrating also on the ways in which it was interpreted by Spanish *relacioneros*. As Robbins explains, “it could be read as a sign of both Charles’ respect towards Catholicism and, hence, of his possible intent to convert” (113). Both Ettinghausen and Redondo provide similar interpretations of this action: in Spain, it was taken as evidence of Charles’s readiness to accept Catholicism.¹³⁸ Though today we can with relative certainty say, as historian Antonio Cruz Casado has pointed out, that the prince’s devotion “merece ponerse en duda [porque en] realidad, al príncipe no parecen interesarle mucho ni las procesiones, ni otros actos, como los juegos de toros y cañas, que se organizan en su honor” (205). What should stand in relief, then, is not the act itself, but rather how it was interpreted at the time. The prince was presented to the Spanish public as a supplicant and devoted Christian, moved by the sight of the sacrament. He, like the Spanish nobles and the Spanish people, respected religious ceremony. The space that separated the English prince and the Spanish populace is thus diminished.

¹³⁷ In Seville, Francisco de Lyra published a pamphlet that included a description of the same act: “El Principe de Inglaterra, y el Marques de Boquingan, su gran valido, estavan a la ventana de su quarto viendo la Procecion, do estuvo de rodillas mientras pasó el santissimo Sacramento. Fue un acto muy de ver, y que se dize, jamas visto otro semejante” (214).

¹³⁸ See Ettinghausen, *Prince Charles* 17; Redondo, “Fiesta” 128.

Charles's relationship to María is also depicted through the lens of both Charles's and Spain's Catholic commitment. At Easter, Almansa describes the prince's visit to the Infanta and the queen, accompanied by the king and the Infantes, Carlos and Fernando. Charles, Almansa writes, offered his Easter wishes with "grande acompañamiento" to the pair of women. His motivations for presenting his well wishes on this holiday are not described in religious terms, but further on in this *relación*, Almansa depicts another interaction between the then-betrothed couple which demonstrates María's trust in Charles's dedication to the Catholic faith. Upon parting with her future husband in September, María requests that Charles deliver a letter on her behalf to the Monja de Carrión, a mystic nun and confidant of Philip IV.¹³⁹ A second petition made by María of her betrothed is also described by Almansa: "y la Princesa le encomendo los Catolicos de Inglaterra, con dezirle, que por cada uno pondria su vida, para que infiriese quanto deuia estimar el mirar por ellos" (251). Similar to the depiction of Philip's Catholic motivations in these marriage negotiations, the relationship that is established between the Infanta and Charles in these pamphlets is also presented in religious terms.

Charles is entrusted with María's message as a mediator between Catholic parties, he is shown as sympathetic to Catholic ceremony in his reverent genuflection before the host, and he is depicted in other instances of Catholic devotion. These various allusions to Charles's piety may or may not have existed in historical fact. I believe it is correct for historians to debate the veracity of these accounts, but I also believe that this debate has the potential to obscure another way of reading these pamphlets. If we examine the construction of Charles's character as a narrative that presents political ideals, one that allows for embellishment and manipulation of the image presented to an audience, we can also begin to see in which ways the presentation of

¹³⁹ Samson explains that these details were omitted from the English translation of this *relación* ("1623" 103).

Charles reflects the monarchy's motivations. In order for the Spanish public that is consuming these texts to root for the Prince of Wales, he must be presented sympathetically. Further contributing to the depiction of Charles in the role of acceptable match for the Infanta are the many ways in which he is portrayed as the chivalrous hero and suitor of the beautiful María.

Charles as the Chivalrous Knight

In no place does the literary nature of these texts shine through as in their depictions of Charles's infatuation with María. Interspersed amongst ad nauseam details of dress and decorations, of religious fervor and dedication, we find images of the prince in the role of knight errant. From his dangerous journey to his passionate desire, the young prince is portrayed as the hero in this royal story of transnational matchmaking. Are these descriptions, perhaps, evidence that the literary mode of popular tales of chivalry began to invade this early news genre?

Admittedly, this question is once again difficult to answer, for as Ettinghausen put it, in 1623 “[f]act and fiction, literature and life, were in an exceptionally vigorous state of osmosis” (*Prince Charles* 9). Historians such as Redworth have additionally pointed to evidence of Charles's real infatuation with the Infanta. In his study of the match, Redworth reproduces letters that attest directly to Charles's attraction. From Charles himself, we read in the year before his journey,

But if you wonder how I can love her before I see her, the truth is, I have both seen her picture and heard the report of her virtues by a number of whom I trust, as her idea is engraven in my heart. (qtd. in Redworth, *The Prince* 48)

The Englishman and diplomat who accompanied Charles and Buckingham on their journey to Madrid wrote of Charles: “the Prince hath taken such a liking to his mistress that he now loves her as much for her beauty as he can for being sister to so great a king” (qtd. in Redworth, *The*

Prince 84). And in a much less flattering analogy, Olivares compared Charles's infatuation with the Infanta to a cat's obsession with his mouse (Redworth, *The Prince* 88). Olivares's pithy commentary was not repeated in pamphlets. Rather, these picked up on the language of tales of chivalry. The *relaciones* published over the course of Charles's visit worked in tandem to formulate a vision of the prince that, due to its origin in this popular literary genre, was particularly appealing to the Spanish public.

In the very first pamphlets published about Charles's arrival in Madrid, allusions to the literary chivalric hero were already apparent. In what was likely the first relation to publish the news of the Prince of Wales's surprise arrival, an anonymous pamphlet printed only three days later, indications of this trope begin to appear. This pamphlet focuses little on the reasons that led to Charles's secret journey, but the *relacionero* refers to Charles and Buckingham's excessive generosity during their travels:

Despues de entrados en España, se adelanto su Alteza y el Marques, como tengo dicho: A las pobres que les pedian limosna, en lugar de quartos, les dauan doblones, y en las Hosterias pagauan como quien eran, repartiendo doblones en lugar de reales, de suerte que todos dezian que eran algunos grandes Principes. Desta manera llegaron con salud a Madrid. Era cosa de ver la alegria con que el Principe passaua las malas camas y comidas por esos caminos. (198)

Similar to other epic heroes, here Charles's true identity shines through his humble disguise. And in the *relaciones* that appeared shortly after this one, we find references to the "amor harto grande" that led Charles to make the trip, with "riesgo y trabajo excesivo" (204).¹⁴⁰ Among the

¹⁴⁰ This same *relación* makes a curious observation regarding Charles's health, stating that he made this journey despite his young age and lack of "robusta salud" (204). No other pamphlet makes the same observation.

relaciones published about the prince, those written by Almansa stand out especially for their detail of the prince's infatuation with the Infanta:

Todos los quales exercicios y diuertimientos no han sido parte para que su Alteza lo tenga, del principal intento que lo truxo a España, pues en medio del poder de todos le boluia las espaldas, y brevemente los dexaua, por verse a los rayos de su Sol, que donde quiera lo abrasaua: y ansi a pocas partes procuraua, ni desseaua yr, donde la Infanta no estuuiesse. (260)

The Infanta's beauty here transforms her into the sun itself, imitating the well-established trope of love allegories. Charles is so attracted to the Infanta's light (or beauty) that even the elaborate festivities fail to distract his gaze. It is due to his devotion to the Infanta, continues Almansa, that Charles has agreed to the marriage accords set forth by Spain.

In one further instance, the Infanta's beauty led Charles to “[una] demostracion en su galantería” that mimics uncannily one of the most well known impertinences of courtly love (217). As did Calixto in *La Celestina*, Charles traverses the Infanta's garden wall when he hears she has been prescribed exercise there by her doctor. Fortunately for decorum's sake, Charles is prevented from meeting the Infanta and her ladies when he is intercepted by the “guardajoyas”—escorts or bodyguards—that protected María (217). By Easter, allusions that connected Charles to these chivalrous heroes had already been firmly established within these pamphlets.

The Sunday following Holy Week, a tournament was arranged in Charles's honor. At this tournament, two orders for challenges were hung on the doors of the palace. The first would be fought in defense of hopeless love and the second in defense of love that emerges in the country, because there, “pues no conociendo la esperança, acreditan su fee con silencio que enseñan montes y seluas” (212). Charles epitomizes both of these types of love, as becomes evident in

Almansa's description of him as follows: "el gran Principe de la Selua Calidonia, de quien los sabios hablan en figura y sombra, en los grandes hechos de Amadis de Gaula, y Lisuarte de la gran Bretaña" (212). Charles and María transform into the protagonists of Spain's most popular chivalric novel, and in this way their appeal for the public grows. The purpose of portraying Charles in this light is to present him as a desirable match for the Spanish Infanta. The Spanish public who reads of Charles's visit is not only assured of his religiosity in these *relaciones*, but they are also led to accept him as the hero of their much beloved romantic tales of chivalry.

Calling for Assimilation

The *relaciones* that I have discussed thus far relate news of specific events that occurred during the time Charles spent in Madrid. They present the Prince of Wales as a participant in or observer of celebrations, traditional games, and religious festivities, but they also focus on celebrating the grandeur of the Spanish court. In the *relaciones* of the events of 1623, the Spanish court can be said to be the protagonist of the accounts of Charles's visit as much as the prince himself. Some of these relations refer information about England in passing, but in large part they do not focus on the nation to which the Infanta would travel should the match reach a successful conclusion. When England is mentioned in these accounts, it is most often to describe their treatment of Catholics. For example, in Francisco de Lyra's pamphlet that relates news of the celebrations thrown in Madrid by the English seminary there, we read, "De Inglaterra escribe el Padre Planisan que el Rey de la gran Bretaña ha jurado solenemente de no ofender los Catolicos en sus personas, y bienes; ha quitado el gobierno a dos Luteranos, y lo a dado a Catolicos: en Palacio se haze una Capilla para la señora Infanta, y juntamente se reedifican las Iglesias de los Catolicos" (234). Similarly, Almansa notes,

afirman los dos Embajadores, que tenemos en Inglaterra la innumerable cantidad de Catolicos que se declaran cada dia, y la frecuencia grande que ay de los Sacramentos, y el agrado, y afabilidad con que son tratados del Rey, y sus ministros, y de toda la nobleza, y del comun, cierto es, que en lo de adelante se acrecentará a mejor estado, y para ella se estan labrando, y edificando Templos y Iglesias, y oratorios. (261)

Such comments, though they appear few and far between, demonstrate consciousness in Spain regarding the fate of Catholics in England. As we have seen, religion is foregrounded in the *relaciones*' depiction of these negotiations. In the remainder of this chapter, I will consider how the depiction of Charles's Catholic sympathies extends to the English nation as a whole.

The pamphlets I examine in this section are unlike those that I have considered thus far: rather than depicting events that took place at the Spanish court, this last, much smaller set of *relaciones* reproduced letters sent between parties implicated in these marriage negotiations, and in one case we also read a relation of the events that took place in England when the Marqués de Inojosa traveled there to see James I sign the marriage accords. As a group, these pamphlets reveal greater consideration for the fate of the English nation, connecting its religious past with hopes for its religious future should the Anglo-Spanish match take place. It is in these pamphlets where we see the English nation most clearly depicted, and I argue that their presentation of the English is one of a nation that is easily assimilated into the Spanish imperial project that Philip IV and Olivares wished to pursue.

The first set of letters that I will explore were those exchanged between Pope Gregory XV, Charles, and Philip IV. One pair of letters that was printed in 1623 was exchanged between the Pope and Charles between May and June of that year. These letters were translated from

Latin to Spanish and were published both in Spain and other countries in Europe (Ettinghausen, *Prince Charles* 10). The third letter was sent from Charles to Philip likely sometime in July, after the marriage negotiations had been agreed upon, and after which time Charles had also been informed that he would not be allowed to bring his bride with him back to England on his return journey. This letter survives in two editions today, one printed in Seville and the other without a place of publication indicated; it too was translated and printed outside of Spain. It was not unusual for letters to be made public at this time, especially when they addressed political or diplomatic concerns of the monarchy. Although it may be expected that these letters would present a more nuanced view of the religious complications of the match, what we find instead is further support of the Spanish monarchy's desired plan. In these letters, we see the portrayal of an England that is ready to accept the Catholic faith on the eve of this new marriage alliance.

When the Pope wrote to Charles in May of 1623, Philip had already begun consultations with a Council of Theologians, or Junta de Teólogos, regarding the religious significance of marrying his sister to a Protestant prince. In their response, these religious authorities demonstrated extreme concern for the union. As Redworth described it, the match was considered so undesirable that the Junta placed conditions upon Charles that they thought impossible from him to accept.¹⁴¹ Pope Gregory XV's letter did not touch upon these discussions, but rather focused on England's future as a result of Charles's visit. In his letter, the Pope presents his wish to see Charles, and his father the king, lauded as "Libertador[es] de la gran Britania" and urges Charles: "Traed, os ruego, a la memoria los tiempos antiguos" (*Breve* fols. 2r, 1v). It was not too long before Charles's lifetime that England had been ruled by Catholic monarchs, and in this letter Pope Gregory evinces his hope for England's return to the

¹⁴¹ See *The Prince* 89, 118, 122.

Catholic Church. This optimism seems rarely to have disappeared within the imaginary of those still fighting in defense of Catholicism in regions where heresy (in their estimation) had gained control. With Philip II's marriage to Mary Tudor and with Mary Stuart's Catholic presence in the British Isles, on various occasions throughout the sixteenth century the Catholic alliance had cause for belief in a renewed Catholic monarchy in England. Because Charles wished to marry the Infanta, "fácilmente se deja entender, que la antigua semilla de la piedad Cristiana" resides in the prince (*Breve* fol. 1v). For the Pope, Charles's visit brings renewed confidence in the strength of the Catholic blood that still runs through the English prince's veins. The Anglo-Spanish alliance thus prefigures England's return to the Roman Catholic Church.

Charles's response to the Pope was measured but reassuring. The prince pays similar deference to his ancestors, but instead of focusing on those who disseminated the Catholic faith, Charles mentions those who "arriesgaron muchas veces su hacienda, por dilatar más extendidamente la Fe, y Religión Cristiana" (*Copia* fol. 1r). Without suggesting his own conversion, Charles demonstrates that his desire as king is to bring "paz y unión" to England, avoiding tension between those who profess Christian faiths. He furthermore assures the Pope that he would not marry anyone whose faith he despised, and he closes his letter with the suggestion that as a result of his marriage to the Infanta, "así todos unánimes, vengamos a tener la misma Fe" (*Copia* fol. 1v). Such a statement appears equivocal. Previously Charles had referred to Christians—be they Protestant or Catholic—as similar in faith; here he expresses his belief that they may all come to practice together. Charles doesn't mention his Catholic predecessors, *per se*, but emphasizes his goal to see an end to persecution and disagreement. This language of pacification, and above all, Charles's concern for future religious division in

England, is intensified when the prince writes a letter to Philip regarding the terms of their negotiations.

When Charles writes to Philip with his wishes regarding the match, he gives some indication of, if not his own conversion, then at least of sincere concern for the fate of English Catholics, who he declares he wishes to protect. This letter, which was supposedly written by Charles, was translated in a much more irregular register than those exchanged between Charles and the Pope. The voice of the speaker in this translation changes, and the letter receives a small preamble which provides context for its composition. It was written, explains the preamble, in response to two documents, presented to the prince on the second and third of May by the Junta de Teólogos and the count-duke of Olivares. In these documents Charles is informed that he should conclude negotiations accepting a “matrimonio rato,” referring to the imposed restriction which stipulates that while Charles will leave with the agreement of marriage, their union will not be consummated before his departure and he will leave without bringing his bride back to England. The prince’s response is surprisingly moving and well reasoned. This letter, entitled *Respuesta que el Principe de Gales embió a su Magestad Filipino 4. . .*, is reproduced in third person, directed consistently to “V.M.,” with the prince’s complaints expressed throughout.

Three characteristics of the prince’s concerns emerge and are repeated over the course of this letter: the affront Charles feels based on such distrust in his royal word, his concern for what this delay will mean for the Catholics of England, and the reasons that Philip should not feel the need to comply with the decision recommended to him by his Junta de Teólogos. On the prince’s behalf, the composer of this translation begins the letter with an appeal to his readers’ sympathy. Charles has suffered “grandes trabajos y peligros” to earn the right to the hand of his beloved and to deny him her company on his return home would not only be “increíble mengua de reputación

[y] deshonra muy grande,” but it is also treatment that exceeds that which not even “[el] enemigo más cauteloso” would expect from the king (*Respuesta* fol. 1r). The affront to Charles, furthermore, is also an insult to James, for Philip proves unwilling to accept the English king’s word in the agreement they have signed.

Upon clarifying the injury that such a delay means for Charles, the first reason that the letter gives to encourage Philip to modify his demands is the fate of the Catholics in England.

The letter reads:

Y el interin daría alas y atrevimiento a los que llevan mal este casamiento dentro de los Reinos de Inglaterra, para, con ponerse a peligro de la indignación Real, hacer nuevas molestias a los Católicos con esperanza de estorbar; pero estando del todo concluido, nadie se osará, pues entonces verán ya derribados todos sus intentos. (*Respuesta* fols. 1r–1v)

This warning puts English Catholics in slightly different focus than in other *relaciones*. Here, the letter makes reference to their persecution with the hope that reminding Philip of this ugly piece of English history may convince him to sign more favorable accords. The letter refers back to English Catholics on three further occasions, commenting on the relief they will feel upon witnessing what would be interpreted as Spain’s show of support for their freedom to practice Catholicism, which had been agreed upon as a part of the marriage negotiations. Finally, if Philip heeds the suggestions of his Council of Theologians, the letter warns, he will put at risk “los bienes, que desta unión evidentemente resultarán a toda la cristiandad: el aumento de la Religión Católica” (*Respuesta* fol. 2v). Playing to the narrative that Philip and Olivares have constructed, this translated letter adopts their reasoning in order to argue for Charles’s right to bring his bride back to England with him. In the process, it also presents Charles as a future king who is

sincerely concerned with the Catholic people of England, who would otherwise be left unprotected.

The danger that English Catholics would face rests in the hands of Philip, according to this letter, which in a final attempt to convince the king of Charles's request suggests that he should agree to Charles's requests without being swayed by his council. If the king were to show faith in Charles and James, and in their ability to carry out the agreed upon changes in England by sending María with Charles, the council would be forced to accept Philip's determination. "Se dejarán persuadir," suggests the letter, appealing to Philip's sovereign right as king to sign the accords as he sees fit (*Respuesta* fol. 2r). Charles's letter is unique in its representation of a foreign prince's dissenting opinion, made available for the Spanish public. But the concerns expressed by Charles in this letter further emphasize his chivalric, reverent, and diplomatic behavior, which had been established in Spanish accounts of the festivities that were organized during his stay. In reading the words that supposedly come from the English prince's mouth, readers are given the impression that Charles's commitment to both the Infanta and his Catholic subjects in England remains firm.

Who Are the English?

Two of the pamphlets published during Charles's stay in Madrid provide an even closer look at the English nation. The first *relación* recounts the Marqués de Inojosa's journey to and arrival in London, where he witnesses the signing of the marriage accords. The second is comprised of two translated letters, the first sent by the Catholics of England to Charles and the second sent from those of Scotland to Philip. In these pamphlets, when the English nation is presented to the Spanish public, we witness the tendency to depict the nation's faith as its

defining characteristic, and in this way England is transformed into a nation that is thus ready to receive the influence of the Spanish empire.

Among the *relaciones* that were printed in Spain between March and September 1623, only one related news about what was happening in England while the prince was being hosted at Spanish Court. This pamphlet was printed most likely sometime in August, after marriage negotiations had been agreed upon.¹⁴² At that time, the Marqués de Inojosa traveled to England to witness James I approve the accords.¹⁴³ The printed account of his journey describes public jubilation in London upon the ambassador's arrival, which is connected directly to English Catholic fervor: "Después que el Marqués entró en Inglaterra, se han declarado más de veinte mil Católicos, con que los herejes están muy llenos de confusión, y más después que vieron que el rey confirmaba todas las Capitulaciones, y en Palacio se labraba Capilla para la señora Infanta" (*Entrada* fol. 1v). When news of England's new Catholic Princess of Wales spreads, "todos se holgaron mucho," this pamphlet declares. And in imitation of the descriptions of public excitement upon Charles's arrival in Madrid, the *relación* continues, "[l]uego volvieron a casa con infinitos coches, y las calles tan llenas de gente, que apenas podíamos pasar" (*Entrada* fol. 2v). The Marqués de Inojosa's account describes the banquets held in honor of the match, the songs sung at church "en alabanza de la paz y aumento de España e Inglaterra" (*Entrada* fol. 2r), and public celebrations of "luminarias, y invenciones de fuego" that took place in the streets of London after the accords were signed (*Entrada* fol. 2v). His description leaves no doubt as to the Catholic commitment that lies behind England's excitement as it is described in this pamphlet. In

¹⁴² The first sentence of this pamphlet references the ambassador's departure on May 13. Other events, dated July 20, are subsequently described, and the last date mentioned by this *relacionero* is August 3. This appears to be the date this note was sent to Spain.

¹⁴³ Ettinghausen references four surviving editions of this document, printed in Madrid, Seville, and Lima (*Prince Charles* n. 38).

the England where the Marqués de Inojosa is received, there seems to be no indication of popular resistance to the Spanish match. While there are distinctions made within the church ceremony between the English and Spanish guests, Catholics are shown to be a force in England that was both powerful and growing with the news of the marriage alliance.

The last pamphlet that I will discuss is the most curious. Its title, as usual, describes its contents: *Memorial, en el qual suplican los católicos de Ingalaterra al Serenissimo Principe de Gales, como por merced y don gratuito, despues de concludidos los casamientos, que su Alteza se sirva de dallos una Universidad en cada Reyno de los suyos. Poniendo por intercessores, a la Magestad Real del Rey y la Reyna, a los señores Infantes, al Nuncio, y al Conde de Olibares, por las razones siguientes. Y otro que dieron los Escoceses a su Magestad.* Unlike the translated letter that Charles sent to Philip, this pamphlet begins with no introduction to its content other than the title. It begins abruptly with the first collective-Catholic writer proclaiming, “En breves y claras razones propondré (Serenísimo Príncipe), las causas que mueven los Católicos a pedir licencia [. . .]” (*Memorial* fol. 1r). The next letter begins on the third page, and addresses the Spanish king: “Señor. El Padre Hugo Sempilio, Escocés de la Compañía de Jesús, y Procurador de la misión de Escocia dice, [. . .]” (*Memorial* fol. 2r). Hugh Semple was a Scottish Jesuit well known at the Spanish Court, for he had taught at the Colegio Imperial in Madrid. This reference is one of many that appear in these combined letters which highlight historical connections that unite Spain and England over a religiously fraught history that had often placed the two countries at odds.

In the first letter of this pamphlet, the English Catholics who write to Charles request that he build a Catholic university in each of his three kingdoms (“Reinos”)—Ireland, England, and Scotland. The writer of this letter lays out the detailed benefits that these universities would bring

to the crown, but they also very carefully provide a rebuttal in response to those that would oppose this petition. Among the seven benefits that are described by this Catholic petitioner is “paz y quietud en la República” that would emerge from the new generation of young men educated in “buenas costumbres civiles” (*Memorial* fol. 1r). The creation of these universities would calm the restless Catholics who feel they are being treated worse than their heretical fellow-Englishmen. The author demonstrates concern for civil unrest in his letter, and he alludes to the historical basis of this concern. In response to those who suggest that creating these universities would incite further unrest, our authors suggests,

que no juzgo que los Herejes se rebelarán, porque esos Reinos abrazan fácilmente novedades, como la experiencia testifica, pues Enrique VIII pudo hacerlos de Católicos Herejes, y su hija doña María con ser mujer sola, desheredada y casi encarcelada, hacerlos otra vez de Herejes Católicos, y su sucesor Isabela, de Católicos Herejes, y todo eso en poco tiempo, y sin rebelión de importancia. Pero demos que se rebelasen en todos tres Reinos; más de la mitad de la nobleza son católicamente inclinados. (*Memorial* fol. 1r)

Not only will these Catholic nobles support Charles in this hypothetical rebellion, but the Catholic writer goes on to explain that the English people may also be expected to fall in line should Charles implement policy favorable to his Catholic subjects. They will not rebel, he claims, because they owe their loyalty to the king or their noble lords. In their religious beliefs, these potential rebels are described as “no [. . .] muy celosos en su secta” (*Memorial* fol. 1v). The fact that their religious fluctuation is taken so lightly in a pamphlet published in a country that is so overzealously Catholic stands out. This minimization of religious flip-flopping would obviously not be expressed in these terms if it did not lead to these exact results; that is,

England's final repentance and a resolution to the nation's religious deviance thanks to the arrival of Spanish influence at court.

In the second letter copied in this pamphlet, supposedly written by the Catholics of Scotland to Philip IV, the speaker laments the near extinction of the Catholic faith in a nation that for more than a century had preserved its dedication to the Roman Catholic Church. In Scotland only "reliquias católicas" remain where even with freedom of religion this writer fears that few would convert. The small number of priests—"apenas veinte" in the whole of Scotland—are persecuted "con violencia increíble" and have insufficient doctrinal knowledge to serve properly (*Memorial* fol. 2r). For this reason, this Catholic interlocutor requests Philip's help. He first requests from the Spanish king a Scottish seminary in one of Spain's universities and references the success that both English and Irish priests who were trained in Spain have had upon their return home, where "se puede afirmar que la tercia parte dellos son Católicos; en tiempos que tan exorbitantes diligencias se han hecho para acabarlos" (*Memorial* fol. 2r). Philip should help in Scotland because only in Spain does Catholicism reign without the interference of heresy. What's more, fighting for the salvation of lost souls, explains this Scottish writer, is the greatest service that one may offer to God. But the Spanish king should furthermore feel obligated to intervene in Scotland, he continues,

porque los Escoceses son originarios Españoles, como lo muestran las Historias naturales, y externas de estos Reinos, y los debe España socorrer en ocasión tan precisa, no permitiendo la total ruina y perdición de su propia sangre. El tercero [fin de ayudarlos], porque los Escoceses de muy antiguo en todas sus necesidades temporales han hallado socorro y amparo en España, y en esta espiritual, y la

mayor que se puede ofrecer, no es justo que su esperanza desfallezca, ni que España pierda la gloria que se le seguirá de hecho tan heroico. (*Memorial* fol. 2r)

This quote recalls a long history of spiritual support lent by Spain to her northern allies and refers to a myth also mentioned by other historians of Scotland and in Spain by Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas in his history of the life of Mary Stuart, discussed in Chapter One. This legend of Scotland's original population and discovery, as we will recall, states that Scotland was populated by the descendants of Scota, an Egyptian princess, and Gaythelos, a Greek king, who left Egypt and traveled through Spain before arriving in Ireland and then Scotland. What we notice in this letter, however, is that in 1623, the Spanish pamphlet depicts Scotland as a nation that owes its lineage not to Greece or Egypt but to Spain, due to the fact that the royal explorers who traveled to Scotland had been living in Spain at the time. Scottish history, in this case, is subsumed within the early explorations and discoveries of Iberian royalty. What the writer of this letter is suggesting, then, is the erasure of any perceived distance between Scotland—kingdom of the English crown—and Spain. Any perceived distance, be it geographical or religious, is completely mitigated. Scotland is populated by descendants of Spain itself and for this reason it cannot be permitted to fall into heresy.

As this same Scottish writer continues to enumerate the reasons that should convince Philip of his duty to Scotland, he makes a unique historical reference to Spain's most infamous defeat, the Gran Armada's failure in 1588. At that time, this Catholic writer reminds Philip, Scotland sent troops to support Spain against England, as they did in Flanders. Their mutual support and obligation is finally sealed by the impending marriage between the Infanta María and Charles. "Sería descrédito de España que en tiempo de tan alta y Católica Princesa acabe de perder Escocia la Fe que por tantos siglos ha conservado," the anonymous author concludes

(*Memorial* fol. 2v). This series of motivations for Spanish intervention leads from Scotland's origin to its current monarchy, united with the crown of England and thus equally soon-to-be-ruled by the Spanish Infanta. As the English Catholics are depicted in the first half of this *relación* to desire their prince's support, the Catholics who inhabit the northernmost part of the British Isles openly request Philip's support as a result of his expanded influence. These two letters thus affirm the British Isles's smooth, and desired, assimilation into the Catholic mission of the Spanish empire.

Conclusions

For all of the hopeful rhetoric presented in these pamphlets, willfully pushing toward Spain's Catholic influence in England, it was never in fact likely that the proposed nuptials would reach a successful conclusion. Olivares was against the match from the beginning and ultimately the conditions that Spain imposed would insure its failure. What is captivating about the *relaciones* published during Charles's visit, however, is their insistence on presenting the English prince, and his nation's future, in such a positive light. Can we truly imagine that in 1623 Spain believed in the possibility of bringing England back into the arms of the Catholic Church? I think the answer to this question is in all likelihood no. What it points to, however, is the depiction of the English within Spain's seventeenth-century imperial imagination, promoted in the *relaciones* studied here. What they depict is not necessarily in any or all senses the historical diplomatic realities of Anglo-Spanish relations at this time. Instead what we observe is the active restructuring of Spain's newly reinvigorated imperial project.

In these pamphlets as a whole, what we discover is how Spain wished to present its relationship with England in 1623. The court's reception of the Prince of Wales demonstrates its

power and opulence, and depictions of the foreign visitor and his subjects presented a nation that would assimilate Spain's Catholic influence. Such a representation of England molds seamlessly onto the image that Philip and Olivares sought to display of the new monarchy. When Charles visited Madrid, Spain had declared its intention to regain control in the Netherlands, where they had operated for thirteen years under the conditions of the truce signed by Philip III. Olivares would declare not long after Charles's departure, in his "Unión de Armas," the new monarchy's plan to reestablish its power in Europe after years of perceived unsuccessful rule and the real unpopularity of Philip III. Charles's visit thus became a moment in which Spain could demonstrate its commitment outwardly to this renewed position, and in these pamphlets we witness a desire to present to the Spanish public the potential of such a mission. The news shared in the *relaciones* published throughout the Peninsula formed a part of the ideological system that the monarchy had set in place. England would form a natural and uncomplicated piece of their new European puzzle. When depictions of these same events appeared on stage following the match's failure and renewed hostilities between Spain and England, we will see how this positive use of the English theme, bent in support of the Spanish empire, began to transform.

CHAPTER FIVE

Favorable Comparisons: Philip IV and the Prince of Wales on Stage (1623–1633)

Both in the years leading up to Charles’s visit to Madrid and in the decade that followed his departure, English characters appeared and reappeared on the Spanish stage. Donald Cruickshank’s article, “Lisping and Wearing Strange Suits” (1991), remains to date the most comprehensive catalogue of Spanish plays that represented English characters between 1580 and 1680. In this essay, Cruickshank compiles a list of twenty-seven plays from some fifteen different playwrights who, he explains, wrote mostly “novelesque,” or non-historic, plots in which English characters appear. As Cruickshank points out, the *comedias* that he catalogues make up only 2.5% of the entire dramatic output of the authors he studies. This statistic, however, obscures an increased interest in the English theme during the decade following Charles’s visit to Madrid in 1623. Of the twenty-seven *comedias* catalogued by Cruickshank, at least eight of them were written during this ten-year time span, most of them following the English attack on Cádiz in 1625:

1623	<i>Amor, honor y poder</i>	Pedro Calderón de la Barca
1625	<i>El sitio de Bredá</i>	Pedro Calderón de la Barca
1625	<i>No hay peor sordo</i>	Tirso de Molina
1625–26	<i>La fe no ha menester armas</i>	Rodrigo de Herrera
1626	<i>El socorro de Cádiz</i>	Juan Pérez de Montalbán
1627	<i>La cisma de Ingalaterra</i>	Pedro Calderón de la Barca
1628	<i>La reina María Estuarda</i>	Manuel de Gallegos
1629	<i>Cómo ha de ser el privado</i>	Francisco de Quevedo ¹⁴⁴
1632–33	<i>El valiente más dichoso</i>	Juan Pérez de Montalbán ¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁴Neither Gallego’s nor Quevedo’s play is listed by Cruickshank. I have included them in this table for the sake of completeness, but I have not factored them into the calculations subsequently referenced.

1633	<i>El conde de Sex</i>	Antonio Coello
------	------------------------	----------------

If we consider only the dated plays on Cruickshank's list (six have neither a date of composition nor of performance), and exclude the plays he did not mention, the English-themed plays written from 1623–1633 constitute a full 33.3% of those written in the century Cruickshank studies. This statistic demonstrates that during the ten years in question, approximately the first decade of the reign of Philip IV, we witness Spanish interest in the English theme peak. We should for this reason consider what impact England may have had on the image that both Philip and Olivares attempted to create for the new monarchy.

I posit that the representation of English characters and events on stage during this decade played a crucial role in establishing the image that Philip IV wished to portray of himself as king, leader of the world's greatest empire. This is especially true in the plays that represented the Prince of Wales, of which three were written during Philip's early reign: Rodrigo de Herrera's *La fe no ha menester armas* (c. 1625–26), Juan Pérez de Montalbán's *El socorro de Cádiz* (1626), and Francisco de Quevedo's *Cómo ha de ser el privado* (1629).¹⁴⁵ In this chapter, I will specifically explore how the theatrical representation of Charles, his visit to Madrid, and his attack on Cádiz in 1625 were used to bolster a positive image of the young Spanish king. I will focus my attention primarily on the work of Quevedo, who in *Cómo ha de ser el privado* makes use of the English prince in order to establish a direct comparison between his character and the character meant to represent Philip IV on stage. Unlike Herrera's and Montalbán's plays,

¹⁴⁵ This play is not dated by Cruickshank and thus it is also excluded from subsequent calculations. Cruickshank, however, references Jack Horace Parker for further information, and Parker cites a performance of this play on April 10, 1633, suggesting a date of composition not long before this performance (192).

¹⁴⁶ Luis Vélez de Guevara's play, *El caballero del sol* (1617) also represents Charles and his courtship with the Infanta. Since it was not written during the reign of Philip IV, however, it does not fall within the purview of the current chapter.

Quevedo's *comedia* goes beyond the celebratory recognition of Spain's superior religious mission and military might. The recreation of the historical events that brought Spain and England together between 1623 and 1625 is instead used in Quevedo's play to create a parallel narrative for the two monarchs—Spanish and English—that is at once didactic, critical, and propagandistic.

I begin this chapter with a brief consideration of Herrera's and Montalbán's plays before turning my attention to the historical genre in which both these dramas and Quevedo's *Cómo ha de ser el privado* are situated. As history plays, the ones considered in this chapter differ from those that represented Mary Stuart and Elizabeth because they portray historical events only recently passed. In order to determine the significance of these coetaneous historical dramas, I will examine the role that history played within Olivares's regime, considering his utilization of the genre in conjunction with the humanistic practice of employing history for didactic purposes. As *valido*, Olivares recognized the power of history to create public discourse, as did Quevedo both in his political and historical treatises and in his *comedia*. Through a critical reading of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, I identify the way in which Quevedo first represents the construction of history in this play, developing a theory of history writing that at once mimics laudatory tendencies of the genre yet also provides space for criticism. Within this context of historical genres, I analyze how Quevedo, in what remains of the *comedia*, puts his theory into practice through the representation of the historical plot of Charles's visit to Madrid. History, for Quevedo, holds both didactic and propagandistic power, and in the parallel narratives that Quevedo creates for the characters that allegorize Philip IV and the Prince of Wales, I will demonstrate how the infamous Spanish satirist used historical events in order to demonstrate the paradoxical potential of the genre. In other words, I will explore the way in which Quevedo drew

from both the historical and poetic genres to create a contemplative depiction of Spain's contemporary reality on stage.

An Overview of Spanish Caroline Dramas

Just as poets and pamphleteers capitalized on the awe-inspiring visit of the Prince of Wales to Madrid in 1623, Spanish dramatists sought to take advantage of the theatricality inherent in Charles's escapades. In each play that recreates the events of the early 1620s, the depiction of Charles's time spent in Madrid and his later attack on Cádiz differs slightly, but they all have in common the representation of the English prince's tendency towards passionate infatuation. Indeed, his ardor was depicted on stage even years before marriage negotiations would culminate in his visit. In Luis Velez de Guevara's *El caballero del sol* (1617), the English prince Febo is presented as the epitome of knightly chivalry.¹⁴⁷ He describes his love for the recently-deceased Sol in the following terms:

Pasó el amor a locura,
que, con mis locas pasiones,
lloraba una vez desdenes,
pedía otra vez favores,
como si el retrato hubiese
de responder a mis voces,
mas en los ciegos amantes
todo es imaginaciones,
hasta que enfermé de amor. (vv. 297–305)

¹⁴⁷ See Lundelius's discussion of the creation of Febo in the chivalric image of knights such as those presented in Diego Ortúñez's novel *El espejo de príncipes y caballeros*.

Lovesickness was a disease common to the most well known knights of chivalry, from Amadís de Gaula to Don Quixote, and here the English character describes his feelings for his beloved in terms that would transform into uncontrollable passion, the prince's greatest weakness. In this initial scene of *El caballero del Sol*, Febo explains that he had fallen in love with Sol after seeing her portrait, and he was married to her a mere thirteen days before she fell ill and died. The English prince is only released from his chivalric duty to his deceased beloved later, when Sol appears as a spirit to grant him liberty: “Ya, Febo, mi sol pasó / . . . / reine en su ausencia Diana. / Dé a tu reino sucesión” (vv. 2637, 2641–42). Diana, an Italian princess, meant to analogously represent the Spanish Infanta in this play, has fallen in love with Febo but is pursued by various suitors who plan to violently fight to claim her hand before the play comes to its successful conclusion. After Diana's suitors kidnap her on a boat (which shortly thereafter capsizes in a storm), the English prince begins his hunt for the princess through a forest, where the two will finally find one another and declare their mutual adoration. Febo marries Diana and brings her back to England, where formal acceptance of the match is announced, performing the successful negotiation on stage of a match that would never occur historically.¹⁴⁸

Following Velez de Guevara's play, the next *comedia* to represent this Anglo-Spanish match on stage did not appear until around late 1625. Both Montalbán's and Rodrigo de Herrera's plays likely were inspired by the English defeat at Cádiz in November of that year and were written in order to celebrate the Spanish victory. Although I will not focus on them in this chapter, I believe it is important to explain briefly how the other two plays that represented Charles reimagine his visit in order to better situate my analysis of Quevedo's *comedia*. Both of

¹⁴⁸ John Loftis analyzes this play as one that, despite this ending, in fact was meant to discourage the match from taking place. In it, he sees “thinly disguised, jesting allusions to Prince Charles's long-range courtship of the infanta” (113). While I believe this interpretation is plausible, I do not believe that this play must necessarily be seen to criticize the potential nuptials.

these earlier plays praise Spain's commitment to the Catholic faith, confirm God's support of the crown, and celebrate Philip IV's active role in the fight against a heretical enemy.

Juan Pérez de Montalbán's *El socorro de Cádiz* was likely written and performed for Easter celebrations in Seville in 1626. In this autosacramental, the English prince is allegorically represented by Error while the Infanta is represented by Faith. When the Infanta rejects the prince's marriage proposal because in Faith there is no tolerance for Error, the prince attacks Cádiz with "la mayor armada / que han visto el mar y la tierra" (fol. 280r). Despite their apparent disadvantage, the Infanta explains to the prince that with Heaven on her side, all of the forces that Error has gathered will not serve to counter the strength by which she will be protected. The autosacramental ends with the Church's delivery of bread and wine, which will feed the Infanta and all of Cádiz until the siege is over. Yet it is when the prince witnesses the apparition of the host and the figure of Christ from a chalice that the heretic flees, declaring the Infanta's victory.

It is not clear whether Rodrigo de Herrera's *comedia* was represented for a similarly diverse public audience or for a more selective courtly performance. *La fe no ha menester armas* focuses on similar events and themes to its contemporaneous autosacramental and also highlights Spain's military victory against England. It presents these events and their historical protagonists without obscuring their names or locations. In Herrera's play, Felipe IV figures as the most prominent character, and supporting roles are given to Olivares, el Conde de Leste, la Infanta, el Príncipe de Gales, el Marqués de Boquingán, and various other historical figures. The first act of this *comedia* includes Charles's stay at Spanish court and presents the play's most important theme: the primacy of Spain's religious mission in all considerations of state. As the young Felipe IV himself declares in the play,

No por materia de Estado

anteponer es razón
 contra nuestra Religión
 el cortesano cuidado. (3)¹⁴⁹

The king's dedication to Catholicism is more important than the courtly reception he is expected to provide for the foreign prince who has come to visit, and Spain's defense of Catholicism continues to be emphasized in the action that drives the second and third acts of Herrera's play. Both acts represent the English attack on Cádiz, alternating from one scene to the next between the valiant Spanish soldiers, and the English armies, who are characterized by their lack of coordination, drunkenness, and vengeful pride, qualities that will ultimately lead to England's defeat, despite its numerical superiority.

The larger size of England's army is emphasized alongside multiple references to the historical figures who fought bravely against the English to defend the Spanish coastal city; together, they serve to glorify both Spanish nobility and the king that led them to victory. In the play, Felipe is concerned with rewarding those who fight for him, and initially he plans to join the fight himself. Despite Spain's perceived military disadvantage and because God is on their side, the king explains, "para vencer enemigos / la Fe no ha menester Armas" (28). Religion unites the Spanish king, soldiers, and nobles in a patriotic fight against heretical incursion. National sentiment and Spain's religious culture are especially recalled in moments when the old battle cry of the Reconquest, "Santiago, cierra España," is heard on stage.¹⁵⁰ For a king whose reign would be fraught with significant internal division, uniting against a common English

¹⁴⁹ Citations included for Herrera's *comedia* come from a digital copy of the edition printed in 1762 by the widow of Joseph de Orga. Pages are numbered consecutively from act one, but line numbers are not provided.

¹⁵⁰ This familiar call to arms is repeated during two separate battles that are recreated in the second act of this play (14, 15, 18).

enemy was politically very useful. The direct references that Herrera makes to the king, his closest allies, and the English enemies of state without obscuring their names and titles serve as further evidence for the propagandistic nature of this play. Rodrigo de Herrera's *comedia* unequivocally celebrates the reign of Philip IV and his religious mission to support and defend the Catholic faith. This play was written as a celebration of Spanish victory, yet exposing the ways in which both Herrera and Montalbán used real events to promote their king's positive image reveals only one of the ways in which the history play was employed in the early years of Philip's reign.

History in the Caroline Dramas of Spain

Although Cruickshank emphasized the “novelesque” nature of the English-themed plays he catalogued, I advocate paying close attention to the historical genre when analyzing Quevedo's *comedia* and the others that represent Charles's visit to Madrid. As a generic category, we should acknowledge that the history play is somewhat problematic. Although Cruickshank states that history is not “*central* to any of these plays,” this judgment of centrality points directly towards the complication of using history within a genre that is normally fictive (“Lisping” 197; my emphasis). Some of the English-themed plays written outside of the decade that followed Charles's visit to Madrid admittedly fall further on the side of fiction than fact, but all of the plays listed in the table provided at the start of this chapter include clear historical references. Describing these specific plays as “novelesque” thus obscures the significance of the historical characters and events that inspire them.¹⁵¹ The characters included in the plays I

¹⁵¹ Cruickshank does not categorize every play on his list as either historical or novelesque. Some of the plays he considers specifically to fall into the latter category, however, do include allusions to historical characters, such as Luis Velez de Guevara's *El caballero del Sol* and Lope's *El amor desatinado*. In Lope's play, Roberto, King of England, and his queen recall Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. In the case of

consider in this chapter were not nameless or common Englishmen; they were based on (and, as we have seen, at times also directly named as) concrete historical actors. In this way, the plays I study here are similar to those that represented Mary Stuart and Elizabeth, discussed in Chapter Three. What differs in the 1620s is the political situation in which the Spanish Caroline dramas were composed.

When Juan Bautista Diamante and José de Cañizares wrote their history plays about the execution of Mary Stuart, they wrote about historical actors who had long since died. They were for this reason able to employ the two historical queens as symbols that represented, in the case of the Queen of Scots, the Catholic values Spain meant to uphold, and, in the case of Elizabeth, a sovereign unable to rule according to the tenants of her position. In the figure of Elizabeth, both authors presented a monarch whose mistakes provided relevant didactic lessons for the kings of Spain who reigned when each play was written. As we will see, the use of history to present pointed didactic lessons remains valid in the analysis of Quevedo's historical drama, yet there exists one important distinction between the two later Mary Stuart dramas and those studied here. When Quevedo, Montalbán, and Rodrigo de Herrera wrote about Charles, they all brought to the stage monarchs that remained in power, and potentially formed a part of the public in front of whom their plays were performed.

By the time that Philip IV became king of Spain, historical drama was declining in popularity. The history play was most common, and in fact constituted the largest portion of Lope's corpus, between the years of 1599 and 1613–14.¹⁵² Veronika Ryjik has connected the popularity of this genre directly with the emergence of national sentiment when unification of the

Velez's play, the prince, who travels south and falls in love with a princess, was clearly meant to represent Charles.

¹⁵² See Ryjik 37; Usandizaga 15.

Iberian peninsula was needed most: “[e]l florecimiento del drama histórico en España a principios del siglo XVII coincide con las décadas de decadencia político-económica del imperio hispánico” (38). The history play, she explains, was used in the early seventeenth century, during the first decade and a half of Philip III’s reign, to bolster support for the monarchy. The same can be said of the history plays produced in the early years of Philip IV’s reign, yet distinctly, most of the plays produced in the 1620s were no longer written about Spain’s legendary or distant past. By representing heroic Spanish kings on stage, Ryjik argues that in the case of Lope, writing in the first wave of this genre’s popularity, the Fénix sought to “definir una identidad nacional fija e inmutable” (218). In the end, this proved an impossible task, as Spain’s position within Europe as the world’s most powerful empire continued to change. Yet the goal of the history play expressed by Lope persisted.

The desire to unite the Spanish nation in support of its king remained the central focus of history plays produced during the early years of the reign of Philip IV, but with the reemergence of this genre their subject matter changed. The history plays in question, frequently believed to be commissioned by Olivares himself, most commonly represented current events. Such coetaneous history plays were entirely unique to Spain in the seventeenth century.¹⁵³ They emerge when Olivares began as *valido* and initiated his plan to reinvigorate the image of the monarch. I believe that it is precisely the tradition of history plays that supported “la fe y el rey” that led Olivares to resuscitate the genre.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ In his study of history plays in England and Spain, John Loftis explains that these two countries “alone in the Renaissance produced important dramas of national history” (5), but only Spain wrote about recent national history.

¹⁵⁴ Usandizaga characterizes history plays using this apropos phrase in his discussion of Lope’s historical dramas. He explains, “[l]as comedias históricas de hechos contemporáneos permitían reconfortar a la sociedad en cuanto a la hegemonía de la Monarquía Hispánica y la rentabilidad del esfuerzo bélico, pero además sugerían la comunión de intereses de grupos privilegiados y pueblo, embarcados en la misma lucha por la fe y el rey” (290).

Olivarian History

As *valido*, Olivares worked to bolster Spain's weakening economy, unite its regions under Castile's central control, and defend its position as Europe's most powerful monarchy.¹⁵⁵ In the early years of Olivares's role as minister in Philip IV's court, he sought to separate himself and the monarchy from the damaging view of the idle sovereign that had led to the duke of Lerma's fall and Philip III's unpopularity. One of the ways in which Olivares sought to establish this distance between his role and Lerma's was by fomenting the public image of Philip IV (Feros 475). As John Elliot has asserted, the new *valido* possessed "an acute sense of the power of the pen, and was always alive to the opportunities for image-making" ("Quevedo" 231).

Historical texts played a crucial role in this process. At key moments throughout the twenty-two year *validimiento* of Olivares, his attempt to control historical output evinces its significance. As we have seen in the previous chapter, news pamphlets reinvigorated public support for the king surrounding Charles's visit by presenting images of grandeur that reminded audiences of Spain's imperial power. Shortly after the *annus mirabilis* of 1625, however, Philip's early popularity began to wane. By 1627, Philip was forced to declare bankruptcy and in the summer of 1629 overt criticism of Olivares's reforms circulated at court. It became increasingly necessary to control the publication of texts written about the king, and, following restrictions passed in 1625 on the printing of "comedies, novels and other works of this kind" not approved by the Junta de Reformación, a similar ban was placed in 1627 on "letters and relations, apologies and panegyrics, gazettes and newssheets, sermons, discourses and papers on affairs of

¹⁵⁵ For further biographical information on the count-duke of Olivares, see Elliot's *The Count-Duke of Olivares: The Statesman in an Age of Decline* and Marañón's *El conde-duque de Olivares: La pasión de mandar*. These are the most complete modern biographies of Olivares written in the twentieth century.

the state and government . . . *arbitrios*, verses, dialogues or anything else, even if short and of very few lines” (Elliot, “Quevedo” 231). This second ban targets the wide variety of historical genres with precision.

Some years later, Olivares would again seek to influence the production of historical texts when he broke with tradition and began to employ his own body of historians to write literature in defense of the Spanish crown. These “hired pens,” as Kagan has called them, formed a part of the Junta de Cronistas, established in 1635, the members of which were hired separately from the traditional position of the *cronistas del rey*. Those who wrote on this Junta served as a private propaganda machine, and Quevedo was a part of this venture from the beginning. Despite the fact that Elliot points to Quevedo’s doubts about the Olivares regime by the early 1630s, Kagan highlights his works among those that “helped launch the propaganda war with France during the summer of 1635” (*Clio* 217). Even though this official motor for propagandistic production was not running until years after the publication of Quevedo’s *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, I consider this play, along with the many others published in the first decade of Philip IV’s reign, to function similarly to those texts produced during Olivares’s later campaign to make the process of propagandizing history official.

While Olivares was concerned with the propagandistic power of history and the publication of texts in various historical genres, we must also remember that one of the primary functions of history, according to the humanist tradition, was didactic. Philip IV was well aware of the didactic purpose of history books, and his own education followed in this tradition. According to Kagan, more than one third of Philip IV’s royal library was made up of history books (*Clio* 209–10). Philip IV himself recognized the importance of reading histories and wrote around 1633, “These [works] are a true school in which a Prince or King will find examples to

follow, events worthy of note, and the ways to rule a Monarchy successfully” (qtd. in Kagan, *Clio* 211).¹⁵⁶ Quevedo too was aware of this humanist historical tradition. As I will demonstrate in my discussion of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, I believe that the potentially contradictory propositions, both to defend the king and to promote a didactic lesson through history, are present in Quevedo’s *comedia*. His play combines history and politics in a way that permits simultaneously defensive and modestly critical interpretations of the young king’s early reign, and both of these interpretations are especially relevant in his representation of the English theme that permeates texts of Philip IV’s first decade as king.

Quevedian History Presented in *Cómo ha de ser el privado*

History is both theorized in Quevedo’s *Como ha de ser el privado* and undergirds its plot. It is a *comedia* written about the king of Naples and his minister, the Marqués de Valisero. The play begins with the ascension of the young king Fernando to the throne and follows three principal plot arcs. One presents the everyday tasks of government that the minister performs; another, the king’s love for one of his sister’s ladies-in-waiting, Serafina; and the last, the visit of a foreign prince to Naples to request the hand of the king’s sister, the Infanta Margarita. The names of Quevedo’s characters hide only transparently the historical characters they were meant to represent. The king of Naples analogously portrays the young Philip IV; the anagram in Valisero’s name denotes the count-duke of Olivares, who he represents on stage. The prince of Denmark and the Infanta Margarita equally signify Charles, Prince of Wales, and the Infanta María, Philip IV’s younger sister. Other ministers at the king of Naples’s/Philip’s court include the Almirante, historically the duke of Medina; the Conde de Castelomar, or Diego Sarmiento de

¹⁵⁶ Kagan quotes this “Autosemblanza de Felipe IV” in English. Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate the original.

Acuña, count of Gondomar; and finally, the “ambassador” of Transylvania, who is really a second disguised prince that represents the king of Hungary, later Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand III, who married the Infanta María in 1629. As most scholars have come to agree, Quevedo’s play was likely written to be performed at the celebrations of these nuptials in 1629. The historical events that *Cómo ha de ser el privado* recreates took place between the ascension of Philip IV to the throne in 1621 and this wedding, depicted in the play’s final scene. It thus encompasses both Charles’s visit to Madrid in 1623 and his later attack on Cádiz in 1625, as Montalbán’s and Rodrigo de Herrera’s plays had before. Unlike these earlier Caroline dramas, however, Quevedo wrote after Spain’s economic downturn that followed the *annus mirabilis*. Such troubles, as well as Philip’s affair with the actress María Calderón, constitute an important factor in the play’s depiction of Fernando, king of Naples, who becomes a more complex character than his earlier counterparts.

Cómo ha de ser el privado begins with the ascension of Fernando to the throne of Naples, but before any of the above-mentioned plots develop, Quevedo starts his play with a discussion of history. In a conversation between Fernando and his advisers, Quevedo develops a theory of history writing that at once adopts humanistic didacticism and Olivarian propaganda. In this discussion, history is presented as a tool that has the potential to provide examples and encouragement for good behavior (a king will want later historians to speak well of him). It is also, however, treated with some skepticism, since interpretation and intent are constant variables in its construction. As we will see, the plot that recreates Charles’s visit to Madrid becomes a manifestation of this dual potential of the historical genre under the Olivares regime, which for Quevedo is on the one hand didactic, and on the other, propagandistic.

As the newly crowned king of Naples, the first question that Fernando asks of his advisers signals the importance that history plays in the actions of a sovereign: “Ora bien, ¿a qué renombre / es justo que aspire yo / de aquellos que mereció / por sus virtudes el hombre?” (vv. 57–60). In a play whose title primes the audience for the relationship between a king and his secretary, the response made by each adviser in this scene will carry significant weight. This is the question that ultimately determines the election of Valisero to the position of *valido*. Among the epithets considered by the men at Fernando’s court, history is recalled when the Marqués suggests either “el Sabio” or “el Prudente” in response to the king’s query. Despite an Italian setting, Quevedo’s Spanish audience would have immediately remembered kings Alfonso X and Philip II, two esteemed Spanish monarchs, the second of which was held in especially high regard by Olivares. Recognizing the names of two of Spain’s greatest kings would begin to connect the reign of the young Fernando, and analogously Philip IV, with the successful reign of his grandfather rather than his father, Philip III, who was known as Felipe “el Piadoso.”

When the conversation turns within the play to Fernando’s recently-deceased father, the same cast of characters consider the epithet by which the late king shall be remembered. Their considerations lead them to compare him with others who had come before him, demonstrating the power of historical narrative in the construction of contemporary events. History, according to some classical philosophers, was cyclical; for this reason, it was such a powerful teacher. When the Almirante and Valisero consider the late king’s legacy, they speak of his similarities to a historic king Don Juan:

ALMIRANTE. Igualó al gran rey don Juan
 en arrimarse a la ley
 y a lo justo.

MARQUÉS. Fue un gran rey
 el rey don Juan; mas le dan
 culpa todas las historias.

REY. ¿Cuál?

MARQUÉS. Haberse sujetado
 con extremo a su privado. (vv. 232–38)

The allusion to this king in *Cómo ha de ser el privado* is somewhat misleading. Rafael Iglesias has interpreted the description of “Don Juan” to refer Fernando’s father (“El imposible” 272).¹⁵⁷ It is not clear that the last king of Naples would have actually been called Don Juan, however; rather, it appears that the Almirante and the Marqués are comparing Fernando’s father to a historical king of that name. Whatever the case may be, it is likely that the Marqués’s final comment would have recalled images of Spain’s medieval king Juan II of Castile, elder half-brother of Isabella, the Catholic Queen.

The comparison between Juan II and Philip III would have been extremely relevant and recognized as such when Quevedo wrote his play. During his reign, Juan II was believed to be overly dependent on his adviser, Álvaro de Luna. In fact, in Juan de Mariana’s *La dignidad real y la educación del rey* (1598), which was dedicated to the future Philip III, the example that Mariana provides of a king that depended too much on his adviser was this fifteenth century monarch:

¹⁵⁷ Though Iglesias considers this Don Juan to refer to Fernando’s father, and for this reason he compares him to Philip III, Iglesias also notes similarities between Juan II of Castile and Philip III in a footnote: “No deja de ser significativo, por lo tanto, que el supuesto padre del Rey de Nápoles lleve el mismo nombre que Juan II de Castilla, que ha pasado a la historia por su tendencia a delegar funciones en ministros como el conocidísimo don Álvaro de Luna” (“El imposible” n. 23).

En Castilla, no hace muchos años, tuvimos a don Álvaro de Luna, que llegó a dominar tanto en palacio, que el rey no cambiaba sino por su voluntad de comida, de trajes o de criados: triste condición para el rey, para el reino y para ambos.
(210)

In a later passage, Mariana refers to Luna's selfish accumulation of wealth. A comparison with criticism of Lerma after Philip III's death would have been uncanny: "Un Rodrigo Dávila y un Álvaro de Luna, con sus inmensos tesoros y dominios, suscitaron contra sí el odio de los pueblos, y no se les acusó de otros crímenes que de haber usurpado la soberanía" (Mariana 402). Satirical poetry written following Philip III's death focused on this aspect of the late king's leadership.¹⁵⁸ During the early years of Philip IV's reign, the populace and court were worried that the young king would depend upon a single adviser as his father had depended on the corrupt and extremely unpopular duke of Lerma.¹⁵⁹ The first scene of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, in which both Fernando's and his father's historical legacies are discussed, serves both to remind Philip IV of the virtues for which a king should strive as well as the way in which history would remember him. Whether or not the Don Juan mentioned by the Almirante in Quevedo's play refers to Fernando's father or serves merely as a comparison for the deceased character, Quevedo's historical reference and warning are manifest. The scene itself theorizes history and recognizes its importance for a new king. If Philip IV wishes to be remembered well in the history books, Quevedo suggests in this opening scene, he must make sure not to commit the mistakes of those who came before him.

¹⁵⁸ See Egidio.

¹⁵⁹ Feros describes early concerns for Philip IV's reign (18–22). In 1626, Olivares himself reprimanded Philip for his lack of involvement in the government of his kingdom (see Hume 178–83).

In this discussion of epithets, history looms large as a remembrance of the great deeds or mistakes of past kings and as motivation for the exemplary performance of the new king. When Fernando declares his desire to earn the name “Justiciero,” another element of the historical genre is brought into play. This epithet, too, holds larger historical significance, for, as the king himself recalls,

Al rey don Pedro le dieron [ese nombre]
 los que, con causa, quisieron
 desmentir el de Cruel. (vv. 90–93)

The medieval king Pedro el Cruel was to reappear in many histories throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He ruled from 1350–1369 and received this unflattering epithet due to his brutal tactics in the wars he fought against Aragon and their French allies in the Mediterranean.¹⁶⁰ According to the reference made by Quevedo’s character, it appears that his audience would have recalled this infamous ruler’s legacy with little difficulty. What is additionally apparent in Quevedo’s historical reference, however, is the desire to rewrite history, one that was particularly present in the seventeenth century, when debate about this king specifically was of particular interest.¹⁶¹ For Quevedo, the allusion to Pedro el Cruel/Justiciero serves to emphasize the power of the historian to mold and interpret history’s facts. Throughout the remainder of the play, Quevedo uses his historical characters to participate in the process of writing Philip IV’s official history. When composing *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, Quevedo

¹⁶⁰ Pedro el Cruel provides an intriguing case for future analysis of the early modern Anglo-Spanish relationship. It was with his assassination that the longstanding alliance between England and Spain was broken, not to be reestablished until the marriage of Catherine of Aragon to Arthur in 1501. Pedro is even mentioned in Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*, and this famous English poet spent time in Spain during his reign.

¹⁶¹ Later in Philip IV’s reign, Vera y Figueroa would write *El Rey don Pedro defendido* (1647), defending Pedro el Cruel as Pedro el Justiciero by demonstrating the need for his violent policy due to the “difficult and dangerous times” in which he lived (Kagan, *Clio* 226–27).

reimagined Charles's memorable visit to Madrid in 1623 and Spain's victory against his armada in 1625, but he also employed the plot line that brought Charles back to the Spanish stage for the last time during Philip IV's reign to impart a didactic lesson for his king, as history was meant to do.

The English Prince's Passion: A Lesson for the Spanish King

In order to fully understand the didactic lesson that Quevedo displays in *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, we must look to the comparison he makes of the two sovereigns represented in the play. The plot line that brings together Carlos and Margarita and depicts the historical negotiations between England and Spain constitutes roughly one third of the play's dramatic action, yet it has received relatively little critical attention. Scholarly consideration of *Cómo ha de ser el privado* has instead focused on the play's historicity as it relates to the relationship between Valisero/Olivares and Fernando/Philip IV. Few academics have paid attention to the role England plays in this drama.¹⁶² In what remains of this chapter, I will turn my focus to Quevedo's dramatic portrayals of Carlos, prince of Denmark/Charles, Prince of Wales and Fernando, king of Naples/Philip IV of Spain. Carlos's dramatic presence in the play, I argue, represents a didactic lesson in kingship that paradoxically proves both propagandistic and critical of Philip IV's governance. By exploring the parallel representations of Carlos and Fernando, both of whom are embroiled in love plots, I will demonstrate the role Carlos plays in, on the one hand, the portrayal on stage of the Spanish king's capacity to overcome his English counterpart,

¹⁶² González Miranda and Iglesias ("El imposible"), who focus their analysis on Valisero/Olivares, mention the historical allusions present in the Prince of Denmark/Prince of Wales character, but they do not discuss his actions or characterization in any depth. Somers does not mention Carlos in her discussion of Quevedo's ideology. Urrutia dismisses the Carlos-Infanta plot as well as Fernando's love plot with little analysis, concluding that they "carecen de interés dramático, al resolverse desde el inicio" (184).

and, on the other, the lessons he should learn from witnessing the dramatic failures of this very same prince.

In order to establish his comparison with Fernando, I will begin my analysis of these two parallel royals by focusing on Quevedo's depiction of Carlos. Following Carlos's actions through each act of Quevedo's play, we witness the ways in which the Danish prince is consistently represented as an overly passionate future king who misunderstands the need to place political duty above his romantic feelings for Margarita. Within my analysis of Carlos's actions in each act of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, I will concentrate specifically on the depiction of both his emotions and his lack of diplomatic skill so as to compare this depiction later with Quevedo's representation of Fernando.

In the first act of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, from the moment they are presented to the audience, Quevedo establishes a direct comparison between his two historical monarchs. The marriage plot between Carlos and Margarita commences shortly after Fernando chooses Valisero as his *valido* and the above conversation about history concludes. Violín, the *gracioso*, mentions the potential union of Carlos and the Infanta when he shows a portrait of the Danish prince to Serafina and Porcia, two of the Infanta's ladies-in-waiting. The portrait, explains Violín, depicts one of Margarita's suitors, whose name he cannot remember, only that it starts with "Ca." A similar naming riddle, which here serves to introduce Carlos to the audience, had already been used by Quevedo in his presentation of the Neapolitan king. The Marqués de Valisero presents the king in the first scene as follows:

Cuando el pueblo te miró
debajo del palio entrar
entre tu pueblo, a reinar,

tantas veces te aclamó,
 que, como son Efe y E
 el principio de tu nombre,
 no se oía en ningún hombre
 sino Fe: todo era Fe. (vv. 29–36)

The riddle functions, quite obviously, not only for “Fernando,” in the play, but also for “Felipe.” The first two letters of his name allude directly to the Neapolitan and Spanish kings’ religious mission, but the characters’ interpretation of the first two letters of Carlos’s name is not spelled out the second time this riddle is used. “Buenas señas,” Serafina responds to Violín when she hears the first syllable of Margarita’s suitor’s name uttered by the *gracioso*. Her response could be facetious, fitting for any conversation with Violín, or “Ca” could also be presumed to signify something greater: “Can?” “Católico?” The possibility of considering Catholic implications for Carlos’s name would have held historical significance, for as we saw in the introduction to this section, many members of the Spanish court believed that Charles’s historical trip to Madrid meant that he was willing to convert in order to marry the Infanta. No one provides an interpretation of this wordplay, however, as the Marqués had previously. Instead, Violín almost immediately remembers that “Ca” stands simply for “Carlos.” Carlos’s name may not hold the same significance as Fernando’s, but the consonant introduction of the two characters initiates the parallel plots that will drive both of them through the rest of the *comedia*.

Carlos appears on stage shortly after this introduction. His first appearance clarifies two things for the audience: the historical events that inspired this part of the *comedia* and Carlos’s romantic characterization as an overly enamored foreign prince. The depiction of Charles’s trip to Madrid is eminently clear from the first lines that Carlos’s servant speaks in the play. The

servant reminds the audience of his arrival with Carlos at court “casi solo,” from a far-away kingdom, dressed in disguise, and he then asks Carlos to explain his purpose for making the journey. In his response, Carlos demonstrates the well-publicized infatuation that led him to make the trip:

Ser mi propio embajador
 con finezas de amor
 tan ardiente, que abrasado
 me turbó, vecino al Norte,
 y ser con ansia exquisita
 girasol de Margarita
 en los campos de esta Corte.
 Porque es mi amor sin segundo
 aunque cabe en estas salas,
 tan grande, que con sus alas
 puedo obscurecer el mundo. (vv. 579–89)

This kind of melodramatic declaration may have been common among young lovers on stage or in poetry, but throughout Quevedo’s play the emotions expressed here will lead Carlos to make poor political and diplomatic decisions, for he lacks the ability to control them. Carlos complies throughout the play with exactly the image Spaniards would have remembered of the English prince. He has come to court “en alas de su amor” (v. 928) and will later repay his gracious hosts with “fieras venganzas” (v. 2121) after he is rejected. This sequence of events, in which the English sovereign is represented as the resentful lover, was commonly retold. As Teresa Ferrer Valls explains, “[l]a versión más novelesca—y muy difundida entre los contemporáneos—sobre

las causas de este ataque [de Cádiz] era la que lo relacionaba con el despecho amoroso de Carlos, rechazado como marido por la infanta María” (111).¹⁶³ We see this interpretation of Carlos’s future actions foreshadowed in Quevedo’s play in the language that the prince of Denmark uses above. The imagery evoked by Carlos of fire, attraction, and darkness will be repeated when he meets the Infanta face to face in act two, comparing her to the sun that has power enough to make his cold, northern homeland feel like Ethiopia (vv. 1623–26).

The intense feelings that Carlos displays in act one of Quevedo’s *comedia* will quickly begin to hinder his understanding of the diplomatic situation into which he has inserted himself. When Carlos appears in Naples, he is unable to grasp the political implications of his arrival at court. The prince’s intense desire to see the Infanta has prevented him from considering the negotiations that are required to secure her hand. As Charles’s servant explains to him, he will not likely be able to marry the Infanta unless he converts to Catholicism, for “el rey no ha de ser vencible / en punto de religión” (vv. 631–32).

Carlos’s inability to comprehend the significance of his surprise appearance reflects historical reality for Philip IV, but it also gives Quevedo the opportunity to show Fernando in his best light. When the king of Naples later speaks with his sister after meeting Carlos, he remarks about the prince:

Efectos extraordinarios,
pretensiones nunca oídas,

¹⁶³ Unsurprisingly, when England wrote about these same events, the story was told rather differently. Blue describes the anger England displayed towards Spain upon the rejection of Charles and their near-immediate desire to declare war (although James I, still king at the time but nearing the end of his reign, was against such a declaration). Britland describes how the narrative of Charles and María was superseded in English texts by that of his previous infatuation with Henrietta Maria. Samson also describes a curious incidence of revision, in which all of the passages referring to Charles’s love for María were taken out of the English translation of *Almansa y Mendoza’s relaciones* when they were published (“1623”).

finezas de enamorado

nunca vistas son las tuyas. (vv. 697–700)

Carlos's appearance at court has placed Fernando in a difficult position because he must make sure to treat the royal visitor properly. The problem is that he, Valisero, and Margarita all recognize the insurmountable religious barrier that Carlos's servant had previously pointed out. Because the Infanta cannot wed a heretic, Valisero suggests throwing a celebration for the prince grander than any seen before (vv. 798–802). Historically, of course, this is exactly what happened. Yet in a play that was written in times of economic disparity, demonstrating the necessity of these celebrations can be seen as a way of rewriting Spain's recent past, justifying the extravagant spending of Philip IV's early reign. Fernando/Philip has organized such sumptuous festivities only in order to comply with his diplomatic duty to his fellow nobleman, but he will not let this duty supersede his religious devotion. Although Valisero is the one who first suggests the impossibility of the match between Carlos and Margarita due to religious differences, Fernando soon follows the Marqués's declaration with a prayer to God and a vow: "no me hiciera apartar / jamás del precepto sacro / que me ordena vuestra ley" (vv. 854–56). Fernando commits himself to the placement of religion above all reasons of State, and even in doing so he still favors positively in comparison to Carlos diplomatically. With the help of Valisero, Fernando understands how he might comply with his political duty to a foreign visitor. In contrast, it is Carlos who remains woefully unaware of proper royal comportment in these delicate political negotiations.

Carlos finally meets Margarita in the second act of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*. His excessive, romantic gestures in this encounter elicit an association with Amadís de Gaula, but

they do not garner even a glance from the Infanta. Carlos describes his feelings in response to this cold reception from him beloved by employing storm imagery:

(Gloria y tormento me ordena
 amor en sus ojos hoy.
 ¿Cómo, si en el cielo estoy,
 puedo padecer tal pena?
 ¿Cómo, si es cielo la infanta,
 glorias en mis ojos siento
 y en el corazón tormento?) (vv. 1612–18)¹⁶⁴

The torment of unrequited love expressed through metaphors of emotional tempests is not novel. Frederick de Armas's consideration of the use of storm imagery in this play helps to illuminate the relationships that exist between Quevedo's characters, but extending his work to consider Charles will illuminate yet another favorable comparison between the king and Carlos in this scene. In his article, de Armas analyzes Quevedo's use of storm imagery in both Fernando's and the Marqués de Valisero's descriptions of the trials they weather over the course of this play. The king must confront his tumultuous relationship with Serafina and the *valido* faces the death of his only son. Whereas Valisero suffers his trials with sober control, de Armas explains, Fernando succeeds in quelling his own storm only when Serafina "le promete no ser sirena y así no causar tormentas marinas de pasión" (117). In this sense, the character meant to represent Philip IV compares poorly to his stoic secretary, but what de Armas does not discuss in his analysis of Quevedo's *comedia* is Carlos's use of similar imagery. Building upon his work in this direction reveals a hierarchy of sorts, in which the three main characters of each plot may be compared

¹⁶⁴ Many of the quotes that follow from *Cómo ha de ser el privado* are spoken as asides. All asides quoted from this play are indicated by the use of parenthesis, as they are in Gentilli's edition.

based on their ability to weather their respective storms. Where the king fares poorly in comparison to Valisero and his storm-fighting ability, he fares equally well in comparison to the Danish prince. Although Fernando may require the support of Serafina in order to ultimately gain control over the emotions he must suppress, Carlos never manages to control the storm that brews inside. Carlos will be defeated at the hands of the metaphorical downpours of emotion that he is incapable of weathering but also by a literal storm at sea.

It is at the end of the second act that Carlos receives news of his adventure's frustrated conclusion, and in this moment the prince loses complete control of his emotions. The conversation that closes this act between Carlos and Valisero merits lengthy reproduction due to the gradual deconstruction of Carlos's princely decorum, which by the end of the scene he fails entirely to maintain:

PRÍNCIPE. (¿Cuándo

a un príncipe sucedieron
tales desaires? Ya paso
a mayores sentimientos;
disimulemos.) El caso
es digno de conferirlo
con mi padre y mis vasallos.
Iré allá. (¡Viven los Cielos,
que he de tomar con el brazo
de mi poder la venganza!)

MARQUÉS. Vuestra Alteza está enojado
sin razón.

PRÍNCIPE. Yo no me enojo.

(Bien dice, que estoy rabiando.)

MARQUÉS. Mal se encubre una pasión.

PRÍNCIPE. Ya este reino ha visto airado

mi poder. Taranto puede,
a quien algunos llamaron
Cádiz por la semejanza
que tienen mar y peñascos,
decirlo bien.

MARQUÉS. De mi rey

admiran los mismos astros
reinos y poder.

PRÍNCIPE. ¡Pues tiemblen

el Tirreno y el Océano
de mis bajeles! Venganza
me ha de dar el Cielo santo. (vv. 1887–1911).

In stark contrast to the advice given to young kings, Carlos here loses control of his emotions entirely. The distinction between Carlos's asides and his declared speech and Valisero's reactions to the prince's escalating frustration are telling. In this scene, Carlos's asides and his comments to Valisero should distinguish neatly between emotion and diplomacy. Carlos begins this conversation with the knowledge that Valisero is going to tell him he cannot marry the Infanta, and he attempts to restrain his emotions to asides, in this sense recognizing his duty to conceal such passionate outbursts. But the prince proves entirely incapable of doing so, as the

Marqués coolly points out. When Carlos is ultimately denied the Infanta's hand, he vows to bring a vengeful storm to Italy's coast, and the resultant attack on Taranto occurs in the time that lapses between the second and third acts of the play.

In the final act of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, Carlos no longer remains physically present at the Neapolitan court, yet his appearances punctuate the act continuously. First, the Infanta's second suitor imitates his arrival at court: the prince of Transylvania presents himself disguised as his own ambassador, mimicking Carlos's arrival at the beginning of act one. Shortly thereafter, we learn that just as Carlos was defeated by his emotional storm at the end of act two, his armada has equally been defeated by a literal storm at sea. Valisero reports:

Embarcáronse [los ingleses], y los vientos
soplaron con tanta furia,
que segunda vez tu injuria
vengaron los elementos. (vv. 2402–05)

Here, the storm that defeats Carlos manifests itself externally. As Valisero goes on to explain, the audience may interpret this storm as evidence of God's support for 'Naples' against the heretical king. Evidently, heaven has not provided Carlos with the vengeance that he thought it would.

The Danish prince makes one final appearance in the penultimate scene of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, when we are reminded of his love for the Infanta in a letter. Even as the Infanta's wedding approaches, historically some six years after Charles's visit to Madrid, Carlos continues to write to Margarita. Violín once again delivers news regarding the foreign prince. Carlos has sent a letter to the Infanta, written to the following *glosa*:

Estoy para me matar
pero no lo quiero hacer,

*sólo por daros pesar;
mas ¿cuál debo yo de estar,
pues no os quiero dar placer?* (vv. 2820–24)

This *glosa* reminds us again of the melodramatic representation of the English prince that was common in texts written during the first decade of Philip IV's reign. Yet further significance may be allotted to these verses when we consider their origin. These five lines are repeated exactly from Mira de Amescua's *Hero y Leandro* (c. 1628).¹⁶⁵ In Mira de Amescua's play, they appear as lyrics to a song that Hero sings to Leandro when she thinks he has forsaken her and betrayed their secret to Polidoro. The song of a jilted lover is germanely reproduced in Carlos's lamentations, yet further connections between his story and the classic tragedy emphasize the themes of the Danish/English prince's tale that are present in Quevedo's play. Leandro falls desperately in love with Hero, a priestess in the temple of Venus—a pious adherent of the faith she professes—and citizen of an enemy nation. To win her favor, he must travel across a dangerous sea, a journey that will ultimately prove fatal. Like Leandro, Carlos's passion overcomes his capacity for reason, and like Leandro, Carlos faces defeat at sea. Although, of course, the English prince does not die in the water, as did Leandro, I believe we can read in Quevedo's play a symbolic death at the end of Carlos's plot arc. His is a diplomatic defeat from whence it did not appear England would return. Spain's superiority in Carlos's defeat is asserted

¹⁶⁵ The exact date of composition of this play is unknown. But Karl Gregg states, "Mira's *Hero y Leandro* (*comedia*) must be prior to 1629, as evidenced by allusion to it in Pedro Calderón de la Barca's *La dama duende* (1629)" (19). Quevedo's citation of these lines, which do not appear to have any other source, also lends credence to this tentative date provided by Gregg.

in this classic mythological tale: for seeking an inappropriate bride, Carlos, like Leandro, was ultimately punished.¹⁶⁶

A Neapolitan Referent for the Spanish King

When compared to this tragic prince in both the provinces of love and diplomacy Fernando will surpass his foreign counterpart's capabilities. As we have seen, the king of Naples has just inherited his father's throne when *Cómo ha de ser el privado* begins, and his trajectory through the play centers on learning how to do his new job correctly. In order to be a good king, this play suggests, Fernando must choose an appropriate secretary. Once he chooses the Marqués de Valisero in the first scene of the play, the remainder of his plot arc concentrates largely on his relationship with Serafina, a former lover and lady-in-waiting to his sister, Margarita. This relationship will reveal the king's capacity for passion and jealousy; his struggle, similar to that of the Danish prince, will be to control these emotions.

We may once again follow Fernando through the three acts of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, as we followed Carlos, in order to conceptualize his didactic journey. As we follow the Neapolitan king, however, I will explore the representation of his relationship with Serafina via two separate metaphors: first, through the imagery and metaphor of war; and second, through that of sight. Fernando meets Serafina on four separate occasions throughout the *comedia* in scenes that depict a series of small battles that will ultimately comprise Fernando's battle to suppress the romantic feelings he harbors for the woman he courted before becoming king. His task will not be to defeat the Danish (English) enemy, however, but to "vencerse a sí mismo," a

¹⁶⁶ Quevedo wrote three poems about Hero and Leander, which I believe would make for intriguing further analysis in relation to the Carlos-Margarita plot of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*. Unfortunately, such a study does not fit within the scope of this chapter.

challenge early modern stoic philosophers would commonly describe and one particularly prevalent in the Golden Age *comedia*. Each time that Fernando and Serafina part, the Neapolitan king leaves with the understanding that he has successfully controlled his emotions, but it will not be until he confronts them directly in the final act that the king manages to win his war against passion. As Fernando fights each metaphorical battle, the imagery of sight and the power of love's gaze continually reappear. The temptation to which both his own eyes and those of Serafina lead him is the king's personal enemy in this war. The Neapolitan king's final triumph reveals his ultimate superiority over the Danish prince, yet it is also key to our understanding of Quevedo's didactic lesson for Philip. As we will see, Fernando consistently displays a greater propensity to rule than Carlos, but comparing the performance of royal restraint on the part of Fernando with Philip IV's historical relationship to the actress María Calderón also suggests the possibility of criticism of the reportedly overzealous Spanish king.

Love as a Battlefield: Fernando's Fight for Self-Control

Unlike the Prince of Denmark, Philip IV's analogous character in *Cómo ha de ser el privado* succeeds in controlling his emotions. The process, though difficult, is one that the king recognizes to be of utmost importance due to the responsibilities that have come along with his new position. As he states upon seeing Serafina for the first time: "príncipe la festejé / rey he de vencerme a mí" (vv. 484–85). This idea of a king's duty presents the war metaphor and a didactic message commonly presented to kings: Fernando must triumph over his own emotions; his kingly persona must succeed in suppressing them. Fernando will recall this inner struggle in later moments in which he contemplates his relationship with Serafina. Each time that the lovers

meet, the king addresses his performance with respect to his royal responsibility to control his emotions.

Like Carlos in his first meeting with Margarita, Fernando finds himself “turbado” when he sees his former lover for the first time in act one.¹⁶⁷ Their encounter is brief. Serafina wishes to congratulate Fernando on his ascension, but the king flees confrontation with the consolation that, at least, as he states in his aside: “(El principio de triunfar / es los peligros temer)” (vv. 514–15). Not long after this initial encounter, the king and Serafina meet again in what will be the final scene of act one. Serafina wishes to determine whether the king’s earlier flight should be interpreted as disdain. Fernando’s behavior towards Serafina in their conversation is evasive, and he states his true preoccupation in another aside: “(No debo poco a ser rey; / con mis afectos batallo)” (vv. 878–79). In order to avoid further contact with Serafina, he declares she must speak with Valisero regarding her concerns, and having reached this conclusion he is able to declare to the audience: “(No hizo más Alejandro: / vencedor soy de mi mismo)” (vv. 906–07). A victory compared to those of Alexander the Great is formidable indeed, but in our later exploration of the dangers of sight, we will witness the volatility and precariousness of this self-proclaimed triumph.

In the second act, Fernando is challenged again to control the feelings he has for Serafina; this time, he is tested by jealousy, for he sees Serafina sleeping with the portrait of another man in her arms. In this battle, the king is caught in flagrante as he attempts to steal the portrait that Serafina embraces. With quick wit, when Serafina awakes from her feigned sleep, the king explains to her that he had only planned to trade her portrait for another he carried because he thought she was Margarita. He had wished to play a trick on his sister in exchanging the portrait

¹⁶⁷ Upon seeing Serafina, Fernando admits in an aside, “(Turbado se ha, y yo también)” (v. 866). When Carlos meets the Infanta in act two, he similarly declares, “(Amor, turbado me siento)” (v. 1584).

of one suitor for another. Fernando once again provides self-assessment of his battle tactics, and he is able to declare victory when he convinces Serafina that he has not approached her due to any romantic feelings. He exits the scene abruptly, declaring on his way out, “(Valor, de victoria vamos.)” (v. 1548).

In act three, we witness the final scene of confrontation between Fernando and Serafina. This last scene is somewhat more extensive than their previous interactions, and in it Fernando imagines his personal battle as one of ships at sea. This battle takes on tangible weapons, enemies, and warships as Serafina confronts the king, describing the pain and confusion she feels having once been the object of Fernando’s affection and now despised. As king, Fernando explains, he must take control of the ships that he guides:

Cuando las alas despliega
 el bajel más atrevido
 por un mar no conocido,
 con la sonda se navega
 para ver a cuánto llega
 su profundidad; y así,
 cuando el piélago anteví
 de Amor, que es rey soberano,
 tomé la sonda en la mano
 para no perderme allí. (vv. 2664–73)

The imagery here stands out in contrast to Carlos’s ships, which he decided to employ in an act of vengeance and which he never managed to control. When Fernando describes his journey into the open sea of Love and his need to restrain the ship that guides him through it, it is in this

moment that Serafina recognizes her own voice as that of the Siren. She forgives the king's behavior in recognition of his monarchical duties.

In further contrast with the Danish prince, who continues to write love letters to Margarita even after his rejection, the Neapolitan king will reach a different accord with the woman he once loved. Fernando and Serafina exchange sonnets to end their final conversation, and in a declaration that imitates political reconciliation, the king asserts, "Consiento / que la amistad nos dé ley, / no el amor" (vv. 2756–58).¹⁶⁸ Though they may no longer be lovers, the two may continue as friends, and the king is able to pronounce his final victory: "¡Gracias a Dios que vencí!" (v. 2762). Fernando's constant repetition of the language of victory, his need to "vencerse a sí mismo," is finally resolved. The king is able to declare his victory as a past, completed action as he parts with Serafina on amicable terms.

Escaping the Temptation of Sight

Together with the language of war used to by Fernando to describe his fight to gain control over his feelings for Serafina, we witness the consistent use of the metaphor of sight and the importance of eyes. In the scenes that bring together the former lovers that have thus far been discussed, Fernando expresses fear that his eyes will betray him in battle. Just as Fernando's personal victory compares favorably to Carlos's defeat at sea, in Quevedo's use of sight imagery we will also see direct comparisons made between the two royals which leave the Neapolitan king's superiority in evidence.

¹⁶⁸ Hernández-Arraico posits a slightly different interpretation of the agreement that Serafina and the king arrive at: "le asegura al rey la posibilidad de continuar una relación amorosa que, restringida a la sutilidad de la poesía quedará como amistad a la luz pública" (467–68). She interprets within the ambiguous language of the sonnets an "erotismo latente" (467) that suggests that the former lovers plan to continue their relationship. Based on the political circumstances in which Quevedo presents his king, I prefer a straight forward interpretation of these lines.

In the Renaissance and through the seventeenth century, sight and love were inextricably linked. Theories of vision describe amorous rays that emanated from the eyes and would take hold of another, imprinting the beloved's image onto the soul of the enraptured lover. These rays of love are discussed in such popular texts as Andreas Capellanus's *The Art of Courtly Love*, and they reappear constantly in romantic poetry throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Fernando's preoccupation can thus be understood as completely logical, following scientific understanding of love as well as poetical precedent. As we will see, in his battles against his feelings, Serafina's eyes transform into one of the king's most formidable enemies.

The first time that the king and Serafina meet in act one, Fernando immediately admits that his fear of their interactions stems from the power his former lover's eyes wield: "(Si en mi ha presumido enojos," he ponders, "poco el interior penetra; / no es quien ocupa la letra, / sino el temor de sus ojos)" (vv. 510–13). When Serafina finds the king a second time, Fernando actively seeks to avoid the eyes that enthrall him and in this way cope with and control the emotions that he feels. If we continue to listen to the king's aside, cited earlier, we will see that Fernando reveals that this battle—the one whose victory is compared to that of Alexander the Great—is actually fought against his own eyes' desire to look upon Serafina:

(No debo poco a ser rey:
 con mis afectos batallo,
 los ojos quieren mirar,
 la razón los ha frenado.
 Ojos, no habéis de vencer.) (vv. 878–82)

Here, Fernando's eyes have agency; they become a thing or a part of himself that he must learn to control if he wishes to overcome his infatuation with Serafina.

In direct contrast to the Neapolitan king, Carlos seeks out Margarita's gaze upon their first meeting. "Viene a veros quien no tiene / ya más que ver" (vv. 1591–92), declares the prince when he first greets his desired future wife. Throughout their interaction, Carlos desperately seeks Margarita's approbation and her gaze, which she steadfastly denies him. It is in the Infanta's gaze that Carlos seeks the confirmation of his love, but she had already determined, "No he de miralle: los ojos / mi confusión mostrarán" (vv. 1580–81). Margarita proves firm in this determination and the prince is forced to part from her without having won a single glance.

Whereas the Danish prince failed to recognize the way in which his eyes may lead him astray, as his passions for the Infanta ultimately did, Fernando continually seeks to avoid Serafina's gaze. This solution will prove unsurprisingly unsustainable—Serafina, after all, remains at court—and at the end of act one in the battle previously described Fernando finds himself for a second time in flight when he captures a glimpse of Serafina and fears it will provoke his fall. Immediately after declaring his victory in this battle Fernando slips into the temptation of contemplating Serafina: "(Descuidéme y vila. ¡Ay, Cielos! / Venzamos, razón, venzamos)" (vv. 910–11). The king implores his own sense of reason, using the first person plural imperative, to guide him to future victory, which will elude him until he finds the strength to look directly into his former lover's eyes without falling victim to their dangerous gaze.

In the second act, when Fernando witnesses Serafina in feigned sleep, he believes that he will be free of danger, for sleep "sirve de nube a dos soles" (v. 1450). Unfortunately for the king, Serafina's concealed eyes do not prevent him from feeling jealousy upon witnessing the portrait she embraces. As we have seen, Fernando escapes danger in this scene by denying his knowledge that he had recognized Serafina.

The last scene in which the two lovers meet ends with Fernando's final declaration of victory in his war against passion, yet it is in the scene that immediately precedes his conversation with Serafina that we understand the key to his victory. The king's triumphant separation from Serafina is prefaced by a brief interaction between the king and his *valido*. As he sees Serafina approaching, Fernando asks Valisero for advice about how to behave around Serafina since he was once romantically inclined towards her and for this reason has pretended to be angry with her. How should he behave now, he asks, "ya que mis ojos / se ven libres y seguros" (vv. 2535–36). Returning to the metaphor of sight, Fernando has determined that he is now free of the romantic feelings he previously harbored for Serafina, and his eyes are thus no longer in danger of falling victim to her gaze. Valisero's advice is simple: if Fernando is free from his previous inclination, he should no longer pretend to be angry with Serafina, for there is no harm in "amores castos y puros" (v. 2339). It is thus precisely the freedom of Fernando's eyes that permits his final triumph.

As we have seen, Fernando and Serafina's final encounter in *Cómo ha de ser el privado* ends with their mutual agreement that friendship will define their future relationship. Now that Fernando's eyes are free from danger, he no longer has to fear Serafina's gaze nor how looking upon her may affect him. Before the former-lovers arrive at this conclusion, their exchange of sonnets reveals the intimate connection that exists between Renaissance ideas of love and sight. Each repeats the verb "ver" as a kind of refrain in the admission of their feelings:

REY.	SERAFINA.
Si viste verdes montes coronados de guirnaldas, de nubes y de velos; si viste las campañas de los cielos, si viste las esferas de los prados, y el mar de verde y azul, con matizados colores, de esperanzas y de celos, ya has visto por iguales paralelos	¿Viste de un monte las espaldas llenas de rizos ampos de la intacta nieve? ¿Viste una fuente, donde el alba bebe escondida en celajes de azucenas? ¿Viste en espumas, viste en las arenas reflejos del rubí, que el cielo mueve, o al cisne en su candor cuando se atreve

<p>lo inmenso de mi amor y mis cuidados. Dirás que es muy corto amor, pues ha cabido en breve corazón; que hermosa estrella, pulsando resplandores singulares, un átomo de luz no ha parecido. Llega cerca, y verás que una centella es mayor que los montes y los mares. (vv. 2724–37)</p>	<p>a competir la voz con las sirenas? Pues más puro, más blanco, más honesto, más limpio, más intacto, más brillante, es el amor que anima el alma mía. Poco lo encarecí, que poco es esto: sombras son de mi amor puro y constante, la nieve, el sol, la fuente, el cisne, el día. (vv. 2742–55)</p>
--	--

In each of these sonnets, the king and Serafina describe their love in terms of concrete landscapes or objects that one can see. Yet Fernando refers to his intangible emotions using metaphors of celestial images that remain just beyond the grasp of the human eye: “montes coronados de [. . .] velos,” “las campañas de los cielos,” “las esferas de los prados.” Serafina, meanwhile, refers to concrete objects that demonstrate the purity of her love: “nieve,” “una fuente,” “espumas,” “arenas,” “[el] cisne.” One may interpret these diverging depictions of romantic feelings, both employing the same repeated emphasis on the verb “ver,” as a gentle suggestion that the king—though firm in his duty—remains still somewhat vulnerable, unable to comprehend fully the power that love wields.

Contemporary Allusions: Self-Control and a King’s Affair

The king’s continued vulnerability complicates the victory over his emotions that he himself declares in the last act of *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, yet the control he finally succeeds in exerting over them would have been especially significant in 1629, when Quevedo’s play was first performed. At this time, it was widely reported that Philip IV was having an affair with the actress María Calderón, also known as la Calderona. In April 1629, la Calderona gave birth to Philip’s first son some six months before his wife would give birth to his first legitimate male heir. In this way, Fernando embodies a lesson from which the Spanish king might still have

learned. Within this historical context, our perspective of Fernando as a direct corollary for the Spanish king changes.

Fernando can be seen to dramatically represent a triumph in this play that Philip IV had not yet achieved. His affair with la Calderona in 1629 was widely known and Olivares was at the time criticized outright for distracting the king with inappropriate evening adventures.¹⁶⁹ As has been repeatedly pointed out by scholars whose focus has been on the Marqués de Valisero's comparison with Olivares, it is in the space that exists between reality and performance that the potential for criticism in this play lays.¹⁷⁰ If Valisero is presented as the perfect *valido*, the reasoning goes, Olivares fails in comparison. In their discussion of praise and criticism within in Quevedo's *comedia*, most scholars have tended to dismiss or overlook Fernando's love plot, describing it as merely an addition based on compliance with genre or as yet another plot meant to highlight Valisero's skill.¹⁷¹ It is only Iglesias who admits that Fernando's relationship with Serafina may contain "un elemento de consejo" ("El imposible" 279).

In this "consejo" we may find criticism of Philip IV's actions that relates to Quevedo's didactic message in this historical drama. If Fernando is shown to triumph over his emotions, might not Quevedo's audience expect the same of their king? As both Iglesias and de Armas have pointed out, this precise question leads us to discover the criticism of the Spanish king

¹⁶⁹ See Deleito y Piñuela *El rey se divierte* and *La mala vida en la España de Felipe IV*.

¹⁷⁰ Iglesias is the first to suggest that Quevedo's *comedia* includes implicit criticism of Olivares. He argues that *Cómo ha de ser el privado* reveals "una cierta forma de crítica debido a la obvia disparidad entre estas alabanzas y la realidad de la España del momento" ("El imposible" 269). Both González Miranda and de Armas follow Iglesias in their analysis of Quevedo's potential criticism.

¹⁷¹ Urrutia distinguishes Quevedo's play from other *comedias de privanza* because, unlike those typical of this subgenre, *Cómo ha de ser el privado* was written to defend Olivares, not depict his downfall (176–77). Somers (265) and Hernández-Arraico (467, 467–68), agree that Quevedo's Valisero is meant to flatter Olivares.

inherent in Quevedo's representation of Fernando. In this space between reality and fiction we witness Quevedo's humanist historical persona shine through in its clearest didactic capacity.

It is when we compare Fernando to Carlos, however, highlighting the importance of the English historical plot, that we begin to fully understand Fernando's favorable comparison. Their parallel plots reveal the Olivarian propagandistic slant that Quevedo also admitted within his historical writing. Carlos's presence in this play signals the capability of, and perhaps even encouragement for, the Spanish king to triumph over his English foe. Throughout *Cómo ha de ser el privado*, it is consistently and particularly in comparison with the English prince that the Spanish king shines. When the king of Naples is placed in comparison to the overly passionate prince of Denmark, the Spanish king's analogous stage character continually comes out on top.

Studying the relevance of this historical English character reveals the way in which Spain's northern foe was effectively used on stage in order to promote a positive comparison between the Prince of Wales and Philip IV. Even if Fernando's real-life counterpart had given into his baser corporeal desires in his affair with la Calderona, Quevedo's play performs his ability to overcome these passions in a way that the foreign prince could not. He thus rewrites the early history of Philip IV's reign as a story in which Spain triumphs over England, for the Spanish monarch's stage equivalent performs his duties as the English prince could not. The parallelism drawn by Quevedo between the king of Naples and the prince of Denmark—or rather, the king of Spain and the Prince of Wales—is essential to understanding not only Quevedo's political message in this play, but also the role that England played in Spanish politics during the decade that followed the marriage negotiations between Charles and María and the English attack on Cádiz two years later. In this way, by studying the relevance of history portrayed on stage, the historiopoetic approach to early modern texts of an English theme reveals

the place England held within Spain's process of self-conceptualization. Like the Mary Stuart plays that would subsequently remember an earlier moment of Anglo-Spanish confrontation, or like the pamphlets that depicted Charles's time in Madrid, examining Anglo-Spanish contact through the literary recreation of history demonstrates the relevance of the English theme—and transnational studies—in the conceptualization of Spain's early modern identity.

EPILOGUE

Reconsidering Irreconcilable Differences

In 1588, addressing himself to the personified Fama, Miguel de Cervantes wrote the following verses as Spain anxiously awaited news of its Armada's fate against England:

Di con firme verdad, firme y segura:
 ¿hizo lo que pudo la victoria vuestra?
 ¿sentenciado ha su causa el Padre eterno?
 ¿bañada queda en roja sangre y pura
 la católica espada y fuerte diestra?
 En fin, de aquel que asiste a su gobierno,
 ¿poblado ha el hondo infierno
 de nuevas almas, y de cuerpos lleno
 el mar, que a los despojos y banderas
 de las naciones pertinaces, fieras,
 apenas dio lugar su inmenso seno,
 del pirata mayor del occidente
 ya inclinada la frente,
 y puesto al cuello altivo y indomable
 del vencimiento el yugo miserable?

Di (que al fin lo dirás): “allí volaron
 por el aire los cuerpos, impelidos
 de las fogosas máquinas de guerra;

aquí las aguas su color cambiaron,
 y la sangre de pechos atrevidos
 humedecieron la contraria tierra.” (“Canción” vv. 16–36)

The images evoked in this poem, as well as the sense of desperation for good news, are potent. The narrator depicts the English enemy’s blood wetting Spanish swords and polluting the waters on English shores; he imagines the souls of Englishmen already populating hell. In this *canción* the “justa empresa” of Spain contrasts with the “injusta cerviz inglesa,” and in a companion poem written after the news of the Armada’s defeat had been confirmed, Cervantes demonstrates his continued belief in God’s support of Spain’s mission against its heretical foe.

The disdain for Spain’s English enemy depicted in the two poems written by Cervantes in response to the Gran Armada’s journey in 1588 and the firm belief in Spain’s Catholic mission that these poems display seem almost impossibly reconciled with the depiction that Cervantes later presented of the English queen in his *Novelas Ejemplares*. “La española inglesa” begins with an English attack on Cádiz, during which a young Spanish girl is abducted and brought back to England, where she will be raised with the clandestinely Catholic family of her kidnapper. When Isabel is finally presented to Elizabeth I at court, the English queen is caring towards the young Spanish girl. Upon meeting the girl for the first time, Elizabeth is immediately infatuated with her, proclaiming, “ya la estimo como si fuera mi hija” (250). Later, when one of her ladies-in-waiting complains that Isabel will not renounce her Catholic faith, Elizabeth responds “que por eso la estimaba en más” (268). How can such a drastic shift in perspective within the work of a single author occur over the course of less than twenty years?

This dissertation has demonstrated that such apparently irreconcilable differences in Spanish early modern representations of England need not necessarily be considered as such. In

this dissertation, I have shown that despite the lack of consistency in Spain's representation of England, the study of English-themed texts is found relevant when these texts are placed within their particular historical context. The laudatory poems Cervantes wrote surrounding the Armada's defeat show support for the crown when enthusiasm for its Catholic mission was lacking. Yet when writing "La española inglesa," Cervantes creates his English characters shortly after Spain and England had finally agreed to end decades of open naval conflict.¹⁷² Placing texts within their context and accepting the lack of a consistent pattern in Spanish representations of England permits an approach to their study that is not constrained by the search for patterns in either Spain's 'Anglophobia' or its 'Anglophilia.'

"Historiopoiesis in Early Modern Spain: Remembering Anglo-Spanish Encounters" explores texts that represent England within their unique historical contexts in order to demonstrate their relevance to the study of Spain's early modern imperial imagination. This dissertation explores the relationship that exists between history, with an eye turned towards its connection to the fomentation of national identity, and poetry, a genre primed for the exploration of universal truths. Together, as these two genres mix, as history is contaminated by the imaginative potential of poetry, or as poetry is inspired to invent based on historical events and characters, a process of creation and contemplation is revealed.

What is revealed in the Spanish texts of an English theme that I have studied in this dissertation is Spain's contemplation of self, its contemplation of the Spanish empire, and its relationship to an outsider. While cognizant of Spain's internal divisions over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this project has suggested that by turning our perspective outward, studying the empire transnationally, we see the ways in which Spanish authors

¹⁷² While the exact date of composition of "La española inglesa" is uncertain, I agree with those such as Carroll Johnson who posit its composition sometime shortly after 1604 (165–70).

responded to political transition and imperial decline. It is within this transnational context, and in the consideration of texts that presented Spain's historical realities, that I have argued that our study of the Anglo-Spanish relationship is productive. Shifting our focus to the transnational connections between England and Spain illuminates the ways in which a divided nation contemplated and criticized, but also promoted, a potentially unified identity.

This dissertation opened with the study of Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas's historical treatise on the life of Mary Stuart, and it closed with the historical drama Quevedo composed for the celebration of the Infanta María's marriage to the future Holy Roman Emperor, Ferdinand III. This trajectory shows the distance from unknown to well known, from historical to poetical, and from complimentary to critical that the texts studied in this project embody. What Herrera y Tordesillas's and Quevedo's texts have in common is their use of history and poetry. Both texts depict characters and events that connect Spain and England, yet in both cases the historical content with which an author begins is subtly transformed based on the desired purpose of each. What these texts also demonstrate is how the similar use of an English theme and the similar contamination of the black and white pebbles of history and poetry could be used to different ends. Like texts such as the Mary Stuart dramas studied in Chapter Three, Quevedo's *comedia* represents the potential for the English theme's employment in challenging the Spanish monarchy's administration. Herrera y Tordesillas's treatise, on the other hand, like Lope's epic poem and the *relaciones* of Chapter Four, support the empire's mission to defend and disseminate Catholicism's influence across Europe, in this way demonstrating Spain's own superior position.

This dissertation endeavors to bring greater awareness to the prevalence and relevance of the Anglo-Spanish relationship within early modern Spanish culture, politics, and literature. Yet

this project, I hope, will constitute only the beginnings of my own and others' future study of Anglo-Spanish relations in the early modern period and beyond. I have had the opportunity to discuss only two among many important moments of contact between these two nations: Mary Stuart's execution at the order of Elizabeth I and Charles's gallant journey to Madrid. Further research may be conducted surrounding Philip II's marriage to Mary Tudor, the Gran Armada's defeat in 1588, the peace treaty signed in 1604, or the Spanish response to England's Civil War and subsequent Protectorate. In Spain, these encounters were remembered in print throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but they have, in many cases, since been forgotten. Although differences in Spain's opinion of England through the early modern period may have previously seemed irreconcilable, suggesting no unified vision of this northern neighbor, I believe there is a case to be made for once again turning our gaze northward, towards this island nation that so consistently captured the attention of even Spain's most famous authors of the Golden Age.

Bibliography

- Agulló y Cobo, Mercedes. *Relaciones de sucesos I: Años 1477–1619*. Madrid: CSIC, 1966.
- Allen, Paul C. *Philip III and the Pax Hispanica, 1598–1621: The Failure of Grand Strategy*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.
- Almansa y Mendoza, Andrés de. *Obra periodística*. Eds. Henry Ettinghausen and Manuel Borrego. Madrid: Castalia, 2004.
- Amelong, David J. “Comparing the Commercial Theaters of Early Modern London and Madrid.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 71.2 (2018): 610–44.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. Malcolm Heath. New York: Penguin Books, 1996.
- Ávila, Pablo. “‘La Cisma de Inglaterra’ y ‘Ana Bolena.’” *Revista Iberoamericana* 27 (1948): 91–96.
- Bearden, Elizabeth B. “Sidney’s ‘Mongrell Tragicomedy’ and Anglo-Spanish Exchange in the ‘New Arcadia.’” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 10.1 (2010): 29–51.
- Bershas, Henry N. “Lope de Vega and the Post of Royal Chronicler.” *Hispanic Review* 31 (1963): 109–17.
- Benavides, José Ignacio de. *Las relaciones España-Inglaterra en los reinados de Felipe III y Felipe IV*. Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores y de Cooperación, 2011.
- Blue, William R. “Versions of the Battle of Cádiz, 1625.” In *Shakespeare and the Spanish comedia: Translation, Interpretation, Performance. Essays in Honor of Susan L. Fischer*. Ed. Barbara Mujica. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 2013. 105–14.
- Bouza Álvarez, Fernando J. *Anglo-hispana: Cinco siglos de autores, editores y lectores entre España y Reino Unido*. Trans. Jenny Dodman. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 2007.

Breve de la santidad de Gregorio Papa XV traduzido de Latín en Castellano. Al nobilissimo Principe de Gales, hijo del Rey de la gran Britania. S.l.: s.i., 1623. BNE ms. 8719.

Britland, Karen. "A Fairy-tale Marriage: Charles and Henrietta Maria's Romance." In *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles's Journey to Madrid, 1623*. Ed. Alexander Samson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. 123–38.

Buchanan, George. *A Detection of Actions of Mary Queen of Scots, Concerning the Murder of her Husband, and her Conspiracie, Adulterie, and pretended Marriage with the Earl Bothwell*. London: s.n., 1651.

Cabrera de Córdoba, Luis. *De historia para entenderla y escribirla* (1611). Ed. Santiago Montero Díaz. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1948.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. *Amor, honor, y poder*. Ed. Zaida Vila Carneiro. Madrid: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2017.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain 1587–1603. "Extracts from the 'General Orders,' issued by the Duke Of Medina Sidonia, to the men of all ranks on the Armada at Lisbon." No. 293 (May 1588): 294–95.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain 1587–1603. "Bernardino de Mendoza to the King." No. 35 (March 1587): 34–36.

Cañizares, José de. *Lo que va de cetro a cetro y la crueldad de Inglaterra*. Valencia: por los hermanos de Orga, 1795.

Carreño-Rodríguez, Antonio and A. Carreño. Introduction. *Corona trágica: Vida y muerte de la serenísima reina María Estuarda*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2014. 1–106.

- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. "Canción nacida de las varias nuevas que han venido de la católica armada que fue sobre Inglaterra." In *Poesías sueltas*. Ed. Florencia Sevilla Arroyo. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2001.
- . "Del mismo, canción segunda, de la pérdida de la armada que fue a Inglaterra." In *Poesías sueltas*. Ed. Florencia Sevilla Arroyo. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2001.
- . "La española inglesa." In *Novelas ejemplares*. Vol. 1. Ed. Harry Sieber. Madrid: Cátedra, 1992.
- Chamorro, Eduardo. *La vida y época de Felipe IV*. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta, 1998.
- Coello, Antonio. *El Conde de Sex*. Ed. Donald E. Schmiedel. Madrid: Playor, 1973.
- Colie, Rosalie L. *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance*. Ed. Barbara K. Lewalski. Berkeley: U California P, 1973.
- Conde, Juan Carlos. "Para una teoría de la historiografía de ámbito universal en la Edad Media: notas sobre su caracterización como relato." In *Teoría y práctica de la historiografía hispánica medieval*. Ed. Aengus Ward. Birmingham: U Birmingham P, 2000. 167–91.
- Copia de la respuesta del serenísimo Príncipe de Gales, a la carta de su Santidad, dada en San Pedro a 20 de Abril de 1623. Traducida de latín*. S.l.: s.i., 1623. RAH 9/1506(2).
- Critchley, Simon. *On Humour*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Cruikshank, Don W. "Lisping and wearing strange suits: English characters on the Spanish stage and Spanish characters on the English stage, 1580–1680." In *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama*. Eds. Louise and Peter Fothergill-Payne. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 1991. 195–210.
- . "'Literature' and the Book Trade in Golden-Age Spain." *The Modern Language Review* 63

(1978): n.p.

Cruz Casado, Antonio. “La polémica literaria con motivo de la visita del príncipe de Gales (1623) y la intervención de Mira de Amescua.” In *Mira de Amescua en Candelero: Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre Mira de Amescua y el Teatro Español del Siglo XVII*. Eds. Agustín de la Granja and Juan Anotnio Martínez Berbel. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1996.1: 201–15.

Cuesta Domingo, Mariano. *Estudio Crítico: Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas*. Madrid: Fundación Ignacio Larramendi, 2015.

Dávila, Gil González. “Entrada que hizo en la corte del Rey de las Españas D. Felipe Quarto el Serenissimo don Carlos Principe de Gales, jurado Rey de Escocia, hijo unico y heredero de los Reynos y Dominios de Jacobo Rey de la Gran Britania, Escocia, y Irlanda.” In *Teatro de las grandezas de la Villa de Madrid Corte de los Reyes Católicos de España*. Madrid: s.i., 1623. 195–98.

De Armas, Frederick. “Vientos contrarios: tempestades de pasión y poder en *Cómo ha de ser el privado*.” *La Perinola* 17 (2013): 107–19.

Deleito y Piñuela, José. *La mala vida en la España de Felipe IV*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1948.
—. *El rey se divierte (recuerdos de hace tres siglos)*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1964.

Diamante, Juan Bautista. *A Critical Edition of Juan Bautista Diamante's La Reina Maria Estuarda*. Eds. Michael G. Paulson and Tamara Álvarez-Detrell. Potomac: Scripta Humanistica, 1989.

Doyle, Laura. “Inter-imperiality: Dialectics in a Post-Colonial World.” *Interventions* 16.2 (2014): 159–96.

- . “Toward a Philosophy of Transnationalism.” *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 1.1 (2009): 1–29.
- Egido, Teófanés, ed. *Sátiras políticas de la España moderna*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1973.
- Elliot, John H. *The Count-Duke of Olivares: The Statesman in the Age of Decline*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.
- . “Quevedo and the Count-Duke of Olivares.” In *Quevedo in perspective: eleven essays for the quadricentennial. Proceedings from the Boston Quevedo Symposium*. Ed. James Iffland. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1982. 227–50.
- Entrada de Don Juan de Mendoza Marqués de la Inojosa Embaxador extraordinario, en Inglaterra*. Seville: Francisco de Lyra Barreto. Universidad de Sevilla: Fondos Digitalizados, A 109/085(110).
- Espejo Cala, Carmen. “Los inicios del periodismo en Sevilla: desde las cartas de aviso a las relaciones de sucesos.” In *Relaciones de sucesos en la BUS: Antes de que existiera la prensa....* Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2008. Web. 1–18.
- . “El mercado de noticias en Sevilla: de relaciones a las gacetas.” In *Relaciones de sucesos en la BUS: Antes de que existiera la prensa....* Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2008. Web. 1–19.
- Ettinghausen, Henry. “The Greatest News Story Since the Resurrection? Andrés de Almansa y Mendoza’s Coverage of Prince Charles’s Spanish Trip.” In *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles’s Journey to Madrid, 1623*. Ed. Alexander Samson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. 75–89.
- . “The News in Spain: *Relaciones de sucesos* in the Reigns of Philip III and IV.” *European History Quarterly* 14 (1984): 1–20.

- . *Prince Charles and the King of Spain's Sister: What the Papers Said*. Southampton: U Southampton, 1985.
- Fernández, Esther. "Unma(s)king the Queen: Elizabeth I on the Early Modern Spanish Stage." In *The Image of Elizabeth I Tudor in Early Modern Spain*. Eds. Eduardo Olid Guerrero and Esther Fernández. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 2019. Forthcoming.
- Feros, Antonio. *El duque de Lerma: Realeza y privanza en la España de Felipe III*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2002.
- Ferrer Valls, Teresa. "La historia contemporánea a escena: *La fe no ha menester armas de Rodrigo de Herrera y Ribera*." *Hispanofila* 175 (2015): 103–23.
- Fludernik, Monika. "The Fiction of the Rise of Fictionality." *Poetics Today* 39.1 (2018): 67–92.
- Forteza, Deborah. "Beasts, Harpies and Medeas: Tudor Representations in Lope and Calderón." *Anuario Calderoniano* 11 (2018): 81–99.
- Fothergill-Payne, Louise and Peter, eds. *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama 1580–1680*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 1991.
- Fox Morcillo, Sebastián. *Diálogo sobre la enseñanza de la historia*. Ed. and trans. Antonio Cortijo Ocaña. In *Teoría de la historia y teoría política en Sebastián Fox Morcillo: De Historiae Institutione Dialogus / Diálogo de la enseñanza de la historia*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá, 2000. 197–287.
- Frisch, Andrea. *The Invention of the Eyewitness: Witnessing and Testimony in Early Modern France*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2004.
- Fuchs, Barbara. "Another Turn for Transnationalism: Empire, Nation, and Imperium in Early Modern Studies." *PMLA* 130.3 (2015): 412–18.

- . *The Poetics of Piracy: Emulating Spain in English Literature*. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2013.
- . “Spanish Lessons: Spenser and the Irish Moriscos” *Studies in English Literature* 41.1 (2002): 43–62.
- Gallagher, Catherine. “The Rise of Fictionality.” *The Novel* 1 (2006): 336–63.
- Gan Giménez, Pedro. “Concepciones historiográficas del cronista Herrera.” *Chronica nova* 10 (1979): 209–29.
- García de Enterría, María Cruz, Henry Ettinghausen, Víctor Infantes, and Agustín Redondo, eds. *Las Relaciones de Sucesos en España (1500–1750): Actas del primer coloquio internacional*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 1996.
- García Reidy, Alejandro. “La construcción histórico-poética de Inglaterra en el teatro de Lope.” In *Europa (historia y mito) en la comedia española*. Eds. Felipe B. Pedraza Jiménez, Rafael González Cañal and Elena E. Marcello. Cuenca: Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, 2012. 67–80.
- Gaylord, Mary M. “The True History of Early Modern Writing in Spanish: Some American Reflections.” *Modern Language Quarterly* 57.2 (1996): 213–25.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983.
- Gil Pujol, Xavier. “Un rey, una fe, muchas naciones: Patria y nación en la España de los siglos XVI y XVII.” In *Monarquía de las naciones: Patria, nación, y naturaleza en la monarquía de España*. Ed. Antonio Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño. Madrid: Fundación Carlos de Amberes, 2004. 39–76.

- Gilman, S. "Lope de Vega dramaturgo de la historia." In *Lope de Vega y los orígenes del teatro español: Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre Lope de Vega*. Ed. Manuel Criado de Val. Madrid: Edi-6, 1981. 19–26.
- González Miranda, Marta. "Cómo ha de ser el privado de Quevedo: El 'eminente desinteresado' Marqués de Valisero." In *Cuatrocientos años del Arte nuevo de hacer comedias de Lope de Vega: Actas selectas del congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Teatro Español y Novohispano de los Siglos de Oro*. Eds. Germán Vega García-Luengos and Héctor Uráiz Tortajada. Valladolid: Olmedo Clásico, 2010. 574–83.
- Gregg, Karl C. "A Brief Biography of Antonio Mira de Amescua." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 26.1 (1974): 14–22.
- Griffin, Eric. *English Renaissance Drama and the Specter of Spain: Ethnopoetics and Empire*. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2012.
- . "From *Ethos* to *Ethnos*: Hispanizing 'the Spaniard' in the Old World and the New." *The New Centennial Review* 2.1 (2002): 69–116.
- . "'Spain is Portugal/And Portugal is Spain': Transnational Attraction in the Stukeley Plays and *The Spanish Tragedy*." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 10.1 (2010): 95–116.
- Guy, John. *Queen of Scots: The True Life of Mary Stuart*. New York: Mariner Books, 2005.
- Hernández Arraico, Susana. "Teatralización de estatismo: poder y pasión en *Cómo ha de ser el privado* de Quevedo." *Hispania* 82.3 (1999): 461–71.
- Herrera, Rodrigo de. *La fe no ha menester armas, y venida del Inglés a Cádiz*. Valencia: la imprenta de la viuda de Joseph de Orga, 1762.

- Herrera y Tordesillas, Antonio de. “Discurso sobre los provechos de la Historia, qué cosa es y de cuántas maneras, del officio del Historiador y de cómo se ha de inquerir la Fe y verdad de la Historia y cómo se ha de escribir.” In *Concepciones historiográficas del cronista Herrera*. Ed. Pedro Gan Giménez. *Chronica nova* 10 (1979): 214–20/fols. 105r–111r.
- . “Discurso y tratado, que el medio de la historia es suficiente para adquirir la prudencia.” In *Concepciones historiográficas del cronista Herrera*. Ed. Pedro Gan Giménez. *Chronica nova* 10 (1979): 221–25/fols. 111r–115v.
- . *Historia de lo sucedido en Escocia e Inglaterra en quarenta y quatro años que bivió María Estuarda, Reyna de Escocia*. Madrid: en casa de Pedro Madrigal, 1589.
- Hillgarth, J. N. *The Mirror of Spain, 1500–1700: The Formation of a Myth*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2000.
- Hume, Martin. *The Court of Philip IV: Spain in Decadence*. London: Eveleigh Nash, 1907.
- Iglesias, Rafael. “El imposible equilibrio entre encomio cortesano y la reprimenda política: hacia una nueva interpretación de *Cómo ha de ser el privado* de Quevedo.” *Perinola* 9 (2005): 267–98.
- . *La visita del príncipe de Gales a Madrid en 1623: Perspectivas nacionales y literarias*. 1999. Florida State U, PhD dissertation.
- Infantes, Víctor. “¿Qué es una relación? (Divagaciones varias sobre una sola divagación).” In *Las Relaciones de sucesos en España (1500–1750): Actas del primer coloquio internacional*. Eds. María Cruz de Enterría, Henry Ettinghausen, Víctor Infantes and Agustín Redondo. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 1996. 203–16.
- Johnson, Carroll B. “*La española inglesa* and Protestant England.” In *Cervantes and the Material World*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 2000. 153–93.

- Kagan, Richard. *Clio and the Crown: The Politics of History in Medieval and Early Modern Spain*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2009.
- . “Prescott’s Paradigm: American Historical Scholarship and the Decline of Spain.” *American Historical Review* 101 (1996): 423–46.
- Kamen, Henry. “The Decline of Spain: A Historical Myth?” *Past & Present* 81 (1978): 24–50.
- . *The War of Succession in Spain, 1700–15*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1969.
- Kelsey, Harry. *Philip of Spain, King of England: The Forgotten Sovereign*. New York: Taurus, 2012.
- Kirschner, Teresa J. “The Mob in Shakespeare and Lope de Vega.” In *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama 1580–1680*. Eds. Louise and Peter Fothergill-Payne. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 1991. 140–51.
- Levy, F. J. *Tudor Historical Thought*. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1967.
- Lindenberger, Herbert. *Historical Drama: The Relation of Literature and Reality*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1975.
- Lockey, Brian C. “‘Equitie to Measure’: The Perils of Imperial Imitation in Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*.” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 10.1 (2010): 52–70.
- Lockyer, Roger. *The Early Stuarts: A Political History of England 1603–1642*. New York: Longman, 1989.
- Loftis, John. *Renaissance Drama in England and Spain: Topical Allusions and History Plays*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987.
- Loomie, Albert J. *The Spanish Elizabethans: The English Exiles at the Court of Philip II*. New York: Fordham UP, 1963.

- . *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics, Volume I: 1605–1612*. London: Catholic Record Society, 1973.
- López Pinciano, Alonso. *Filosofía antigua poética*. Ed. D. Pedro Muñoz Peña. Valladolid: Imprenta y Librería Nacional y Extranjera de Hijos de Rodríguez, 1894.
- Lundelius, Ruth. “Vélez de Guevara’s *El caballero del Sol* and Calderón de la Barca’s *El Castillo de Lindabridis* (A Response to Professor Valbuena Briones).” In *Antigüedad y actualidad de Luis Vélez de Guevara: Estudios críticos*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1983. 52–57.
- Lynch, John. “La gran crisis: 1640 y después.” In *Los Austrias menores: cenit y declive*. Eds. John Lynch and Alberto Marcos Martín. Madrid: El País, 2008. 281–363.
- Mackenzie, Ann. “The ‘Deadly Relationship’ of Elizabeth I and Mary Queen of Scots Dramatized for the Spanish Stage: Diamante’s *La Reina María Estuarda* and Cañizares’ [?] *Lo que va de cetro a cetro, y crueldad de Inglaterra*.” *Dieciocho: Hispanic Enlightenment Aesthetics and Literary Theory* 9 (1986): 201–18.
- Maltby, William S. *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558–1660*. Durham: Duke UP, 1971.
- Mancera Rueda, Ana and Jaime Galbarro García. “Las relaciones de sucesos: un género editorial entre la literatura y el periodismo.” In *Las relaciones de sucesos sobre seres monstruosos durante los reinados de Felipe III y Felipe IV: Análisis discursivo y edición*. New York: Peter Lang, 2015. 15–42.
- Marañón, Gregorio. *El conde-duque de Olivares*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1980.
- Mariana, Juan de. *La dignidad real y la educación del rey/De rege et Regis institutione*. Ed. Luis Sánchez Agesta. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1981.

- Mariscal, George. "Calderón and Shakespeare: The Subject of Henry VIII." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 39.2 (1987): 189–213.
- Marshall, Rosalind K. *Queen of Scots*. Edinburgh: H.M.S.O., 1986.
- McDermott, James. *England and the Spanish Armada: The Necessary Quarrel*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2005.
- Memorial, en el qual suplican los católicos de Inglaterra al Serenissimo Principe de Gales, como por merced y don gratuito, despues de concludidos los casamientos, que su Alteza se sirva de dallos una Universidad en cada Reyno de los suyos. Poniendo por intercessores, a la Magestad Real del Rey y la Reyna, a los señores Infantes, al Nuncio, y al Conde de Olibares, por las razones siguientes. Y otro que dieron los Escoceses a su Magestad*. Seville: Matías Clavijo, 1623. Catálogo y Biblioteca Digital de Relaciones de Sucesos (siglos XVI-XVII): Biblioteca Colombina y Capítular de Sevilla, 33-4-27-017.
- Metzger, Marcia Lee. "Controversy and 'Correctness': English Chronicles and the Chroniclers, 1553–1568." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27.2 (1996): 437–51.
- Millard Álvarez, Natalia and Pedro Rueda Ramírez. "Sevilla en el mercado tipográfico (siglos XV–XVIII): de papeles y relaciones." In *Relaciones de sucesos en la BUS: Antes de que existiera la prensa....* Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2008. Web. 1–18.
- Mira de Amescua, Antonio. *Hero y Leandro*. Barcelona: Linkgua ediciones, 2011.
- Montalbán, Juan Pérez de. *El socorro de Cádiz*. Fundación Lázaro Galdiano. Manuscript. Signatura MC 6-10 [I. 15585]/Signatura antigua Olim, ms. 583.
- Montchrestien, Antione de. *La Reine d'Ecosse*. In *The Fallen Crown: Three French Mary Stuart Plays of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Michael G. Paulson. Washington, D.C.: UP of America, 1980.

Montero Díaz, Santiago. "La doctrina de la historia en los tratadistas españoles del siglo de oro." *Hispania* 1.4 (1941): 3–39.

Nelson, William. *Fact or Fiction: The Dilemma of the Renaissance Storyteller*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1973.

Olds, Katrina B. *Forging the Past: Invented Histories in Counter-Reformation Spain*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2015.

Olivares, don Gaspar de Guzmán, Count-Duke of. "Discurso en las Cortes de 1623 (16 de septiembre)." In *Memoriales y cartas del Conde Duque de Olivares*. Vol. 1. Eds. John H. Elliott and Fernando Negro del Cerro. Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2013. 57–62.

—. "Gran memorial (instrucción secreta dada al rey en 1624)." In *Memoriales y cartas del Conde Duque de Olivares*. Vol. 1. Eds. John H. Elliott and Fernando Negro del Cerro. Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2013. 77–123.

Páez de Castro, Juan. *De las cosas necesarias para escribir historia*. Ed. Eustacio Esteban. *La Ciudad de Dios* 28 (1892): 601–10.

Parker, A. A. "Henry VIII in Shakespeare and Calderón: An Appreciation of *La cisma de Inglaterra*." *MLR* 43.3 (1948): 327–52.

Parker, Jack Horace. "The Chronology of the Plays of Juan Pérez de Montalbán." *PMLA* 67.2 (1952): 186–210.

Parker, Mary. *Santas, reinas, mártires y cortesanas: La mujer en el teatro de Juan Bautista Diamante*. Potomac, MD: Scripta Humanistica, 1996.

Paulson, Michael G. and Tamara Álvarez-Detrell, eds. *A Critical Edition of Juan Bautista Diamante's La Reina María Estuarda*. Potomac, MD: Scripta Humanistica, 1989.

- . “Introducción.” *La corona trágica de Lope de Vega: Una edición crítica*. York: Spanish Literature Publications Company, 1982. 1–28.
- Paulson, Michael G, ed. *The Fallen Crown: Three French Mary Stuart Plays of the Seventeenth Century*. Washington, D.C.: UP of America, 1980.
- . “The Genesis of Anachronism: The Mary Stuart Plays of Diamante and Boursault.” *USF Language Quarterly* 21 (1983): 40–42.
- . “Lope’s vision of Elizabethan England: *La corona trágica*.” *The USF Language Quarterly* 22 (1984): 43–45.
- . “The Scope of Mary Stuart in Lope’s *La corona trágica* and in Diamante’s *La reina María Estuarda*.” *Language Quarterly* 30 (1992): 61–67.
- Pazzis Pi Corrales, Magdalena de, Jr. “The View from Spain: Distant Images and English Political Reality in the Late Sixteenth Century.” In *Material and Symbolic Circulation between Spain and England, 1554–1604*. Ed. Anne J. Cruz. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008. 13–28.
- Pedraza Jiménez, Felipe B. y Milagros Rodríguez Cáceres. “Lope de Vega: Épica y novela.” *Manual de literatura española*. Vol 3. Tafalla: Cénit Ediciones, 1980. 591–94.
- Pena Sueiro, Nieves. “Estado de la cuestión sobre el estudio de las Relaciones de sucesos.” *Pliegos de bibliofilia* 13 (2001): 43–66.
- Phillips, James Emerson. *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth-Century Literature*. Berkeley: U California P, 1964.
- . “Jean de Bordes’ *Maria Stuarta Tragoedia*: The Earliest Known Drama of the Queen of Scots.” In *Essays Critical and Historical Dedicated to Lily B. Campbell*. Berkeley: U California P, 1950. 45–62.

- Plowden, Alison. *Two Queens in One Isle: The Deadly Relationship between Elizabeth I and Mary Queen of Scots*. Phoenix: Sutton Publishing, 1999.
- Prescott, H. F. M. *Mary Tudor: The Spanish Tudor*. London: Phoenix Paperback, 2003.
- Puyuelo y Salinas, Carlos. *Carlos de Inglaterra en España: Un príncipe de Gales busca novia en Madrid*. Madrid: Escelicer, 1962.
- Quevedo y Villegas, Francisco de. *Cómo ha de ser el privado*. Ed. Luciana Gentilli. Lucca, IT: Agua y Peña, 2004.
- Quintero, María Cristina. "English Queens and the Body Politic in Calderón's *La cisma de Inglaterra* and Rivadeneira's *Historia Eclesiastica del Scisma del Reino de Inglaterra*." *MLN* 113.2 (1998): 259–82.
- Redondo, Agustín. "Características del 'periodismo popular' en el Siglo de Oro." *Anthropos* 166/167 (1995): 80–85.
- . "Fiesta y literatura en Madrid durante la estancia del Príncipe de Gales en 1623." *Edad de Oro* 17 (1998): 119–36.
- Redworth, Glyn. *The Prince and the Infanta: The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2003.
- . "'Matters Impertinent to Women': Male and Female Monarchy under Philip and Mary." *The English Historical Review* 112 (1997): 597–613.
- Relación de la entrada del Príncipe de Gales, único hijo, y heredero del Rey de Inglaterra en Madrid, como se avisa por carta de 22 de Marzo de 1623*. Lisbon: Pedro Crasbeeck, 1623. BNE VE/1466/12.
- Regnault, Pierre. *Marie Stuard*. In *The Fallen Crown: Three French Mary Stuart Plays of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Michael G. Paulson. Washington, D.C.: UP of America, 1980.

- Respuesta que el Príncipe de Gales envió a su Majestad Filipo 4 nuestro señor, sobre la junta que uvo, en que la Infanta no saliesse de España, dentro de el tiempo propuesto.* Seville: Gabriel Ramos Bejarano, 1623. Universidad de Sevilla: Fondos Digitalizados, A 109/085(012).
- Rey, Eusebio. “Introducción a la *Historia eclesiástica del cisma de Inglaterra*.” In *Historias de la contrarreforma*. Ed. Eusebio Rey. Madrid: Editorial Católica, 1945. 854–88.
- Ribadeneyra, Pedro de. *Historia eclesiástica del cisma del reino de Inglaterra*. In *Historias de la contrarreforma*. Ed. Eusebio Rey. Madrid: Editorial Católica, 1945. 893–1355.
- Robbins, Jeremy. “The Spanish Literary Response to the Visit of Charles, Prince of Wales.” In *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles’s Journey to Madrid, 1623*. Ed. Alexander Samson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. 107–22.
- Rodríguez Pérez, Yolanda and Antonio Sánchez Jiménez, eds. *La leyenda negra en el crisol de la comedia: El teatro del Siglo de Oro frente a los estereotipos antihispánicos*. Madrid: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2016.
- Rodríguez Pérez, Yolanda, Antonio Sánchez Jiménez, and Harm Den Boer, eds. *España ante sus críticos: las claves de la leyenda negra*. Madrid: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2015.
- Rozas, Juan Manuel. *Lope de Vega y Felipe IV en el ‘ciclo de senectute.’* Biblioteca Virtual Universal: s.i., 2003.
- Ryjik, Veronika. *Lope de Vega en la invención de España: el drama histórico y la formación de la conciencia nacional*. Rochester, NY: Tamesis, 2011.
- Samson, Alexander. “1623 and the Politics of Translation.” In *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles’s Journey to Madrid, 1623*. Ed. Alexander Samson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. 91–106.

- . “Changing Places: The Marriage and Royal Entry of Philip, Prince of Austria, and Mary Tudor, July–August 1554.” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 36.3 (2005): 761–84.
- . “Power Sharing: The Co-Monarchy of Philip and Mary.” In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*. Eds. Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. 159–72.
- Samson, Alexander, ed. *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles’s Journey to Madrid, 1623*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.
- Sánchez Cano, David. “Entertainments in Madrid for the Prince of Wales: Political Functions and Festivals.” In *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles’s Journey to Madrid, 1623*. Ed. Alexander Samson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. 51–74.
- Sanz Camañes, Porfirio. *Diplomacia hispano-inglesa en el siglo XVII: Razón de estado y relaciones de poder durante la Guerra de los Treinta años, 1618–1648*. Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2002.
- Simón Díaz, José, ed. *Relaciones breves de actos públicos celebrados en Madrid de 1541 a 1650*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Madrileños, 1982.
- Smith Fussner, F. *Tudor History and the Historians*. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- Somers, Melvina. “Quevedo’s Ideology in *Cómo ha de ser el privado*.” *Hispania* 29.3 (1956): 261–68.
- Spang, Kurt, ed. *El drama histórico: Teoría y comentarios*. Pamplona: Eunsa, 1998.
- Stains, John D. *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560–1690: Rhetoric, Passions, and Political Literature*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Thompson, Irving A. A. “El valido-arbitrista: el conde-duque de Olivares y el valimiento de su tiempo.” In *Los Validos*. Ed. José Antonio Escudero. Madrid: Dykinson P, 2004. 302–13.

- Urrutia, Jorge. "Quevedo en el teatro político." In *Homenaje a Quevedo: Actas de la II Academia Literaria Renacentista*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1972. 173–85.
- Usandizaga, Guillem. *La representación de la historia contemporánea en el teatro de Lope de Vega*. Madrid: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2014.
- Vega, Lope de. "Dedicatoria." *La campaña de Aragón*. In *Decimacuarta parte de las Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio*. Madrid: Juan Gonçalez, 1623. fols. 208r–236v.
- . *La Corona trágica de Lope de Vega: Una edición crítica*. Eds. Michael G. Paulson and Tamara Álvarez-Detrell. York, SC: Spanish Literature Publications Company, 1982.
- . *La corona trágica: Vida y muerte de la serenísima reina de Escocia María Estuarda*. Eds. Antonio Carreño-Rodríguez and A. Carreño. Madrid: Cátedra, 2014.
- Vélez de Guevara, Luis. *El caballero del Sol*. Eds. William R. Manson and C. George Peale. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2011.
- Victoria que el armada de Inglaterra alcançó con solos diez Galeones de diez y siete Naos de Turcos, a vista de Tarifa, tres dias después de la que alcançó nuestra Armada en el Estrecho de Gibraltar y assi mismo se refiere el daño que la dicha Armada hizo*. Seville: María Pérez, 1621. Universidad de Sevilla: Fondos Digitalizados, A 109/085(050).
- Vila Carneiro, Zaida. "Festejos y representaciones teatrales para agasajar a un príncipe de Gales." In *Actas selectas del XIV congreso de la Asociación Internacional del Teatro Español y Novohispano de los Siglos de Oro*. Eds. Germán Vega García-Luengos and Héctor Urzáiz Tortajada. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2010. 1076–84.
- Wernham, R. B. *Before the Armada: The Emergence of the English Nation 1485–1588*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1996.

- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*.
Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973.
- . “The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality” In *The Content of the Form:
Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.
1–25.
- Wilkinson, Alexander S. *Mary Queen of Scots and French Public Opinion, 1542–1600*. New
York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Woolf, D.R. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and ‘The Light of
Truth’ from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*. Buffalo: U Toronto P, 1990.