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2. **Spanish Exemplary Rulership?**

*Antonio de Guevara’s Relox de Príncipes (1529) in English (1557) and Dutch (1578) Translation*

*Sabine Waasdorp*

**Abstract**

The mirror-for-princes *Relox de príncipes* (1529) by Antonio de Guevara (1481-1545) compared Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain Charles V (1500-1558) to the celebrated stoic Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius, with the two being equal in wisdom, sense of justice and clemency, and exemplary rulership. Thereafter, royal and higher-class Spaniards fashioned themselves as contemporary Aurelii, making the book a symbol of the superiority of Spaniards and Spain. However, countries where the *Relox* was read in translation had more nuanced or negative perspectives on Spaniards. This chapter delves into how proto-national attitudes towards Spaniards are decisive for the English (1557) and Dutch (1578) translations of the *Relox*, fashioning Aurelius as an exemplar for their own non-Spanish rulers and negotiating Hispanophilic and Hispanophobic Spanish representations.
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Although largely forgotten now, in the sixteenth century Antonio de Guevara (1481-1545) was possibly the best-known Spanish chronicler and moralist in Europe. His first work alone, the *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio* (1528), enjoyed immediate massive popularity with five more editions in Spain over the next two years and Spanish editions in Antwerp and Paris (1529).
and Rome and Venice in 1531 and 1532. Translations quickly followed into French (1531), English (1535), Italian (1543), Dutch (1565), German (1599), Latin (1601), Hungarian (1610), Swedish (1616) and even Armenian (1738). His second work, the *Relox de príncipes* (1529), received similar acclaim. By 1593, 102 editions and translations of the *Relox* were in circulation, making it slightly less popular than the *Libro áureo*, which counted 130 editions and translations at that time. By 1700 Guevara’s oeuvre of eleven works was represented by no fewer than 300 editions and translations.

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

---

1 This work was pirated and published without Guevara’s authorization in Seville. Mezzatesta, ‘Marcus Aurelius’, p. 625; Vosters, *Antonio de Guevara y Europa*, p. 682.


3 One-third of the *Relox* was based on his earlier *Libro áureo* (De la Fuente Merás, ‘Antonio de Guevara’, p. 12).


7 Each role was discussed in a separate section in the *Relox*. The first section discusses the necessity for a prince to be a good Christian, the second the way a husband and father should deal with his wife and children and the third the correct governance by a ruler of the state with a special emphasis on justice and the maintenance of peace. For more on the fictitious nature of the *Libro áureo* and its successor *Relox de príncipes*, see Anderson, *Anatomy of the Libro aureo*; Del Valle, ‘La prosa novelizada del Relox de príncipes’.

8 Guevara served Charles V as a royal preacher from 1523 and as royal chronicler from 1526 (Blanco, ‘Fray Antonio de Guevara’, p. 103).
your desires, and as a competitor in your undertakings. Charles V took this encouragement seriously: under his guidance the image of Aurelius and symbols that alluded to the Roman emperor were used in triumphal arches, portraits and statues to foreground his similarity with the Roman emperor, Charles V’s exemplary moral and political leadership being regarded as synonymous with that of Aurelius. Charles’s son Philip II (1527-1598) and important Spanish noblemen and generals such as the Duke of Alba (1507-1582) used the same imagery to elevate their own status, imagining Aurelius as the perfect ancient ‘Spaniard’ to whom any member of the Spanish elite was ideally connected. Marcus Aurelius thereby became an important part of the royal image of the Habsburg Empire and the Relox a valuable symbol of the exemplarity of the princes of Spain and Spain as a whole.

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

---

9 Grey, Guevara, pp. 1-2; Mezzatesta, ‘Marcus Aurelius’, p. 624; Guevara, Relox de príncipes, p. 44 (‘por ayo en su mocedad, por padre en su governación, por adalid en sus guerras, por guión en sus jornadas, por amigo en sus trabajos, por exemplo en sus virtudes, por maestro en sus sciencias, por blanco en sus desseos y por competidor en sus hazañas’).


11 Baldwin, ‘The Translation of Political Theory’, p. 112.

12 In the ‘Comiença el Prólogo’, Guevara argues that Aurelius is a native of Spain. Guevara, Relox de príncipes, p. 44 (‘Tomé también motivo de escrivir deste Emperador Marco Aurelio, a causa que su naturaleza fue de España’).
Englishmen and would allow her Spanish husband to seize control because as a woman she was inferior in power to a man.\(^\text{13}\) The elevation of Spaniards seems even less logical in the Dutch translation (1578) of the Relax by Johan Baptist Houwaert (1533-1599), published ten years into the Dutch Revolt (1568-1648). As the revolt was started by people who were dissatisfied with the rule of Spaniards in particular, regarding them as Aurelian seemed out of the question. Besides, the dedicatee of the Dutch translation, William of Orange (1533-1584), had positioned himself as the revolt’s leader and the orchestrator of an extensive anti-Spanish propaganda campaign that cast his legitimate king Philip II and other high-ranking Spaniards as tyrants who had nothing in common with Aurelius.\(^\text{14}\)

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

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

When Thomas North’s English translation of the Relax, the Diall of Princes, was published in December 1557, the dedicatee, Mary Tudor, had been prince of England for over four years.\(^\text{15}\) Still, her legitimacy as queen regnant of England continued to be under pressure after her accession in July 1553 due to the simple fact that she was a woman and therefore not educated to rule. Mary was raised with the idea that she was subordinate to men,
with silence and obedience as a woman’s ideal virtues. Her teacher Juan Luis Vives (1493-1540) deemed her male counsellors responsible for the government of the realm in the unlikely chance Mary would accede to the throne because state matters should be of no concern for women. When she did accede to the throne, Mary immediately made sure her power was equal to that of her Protestant predecessor Edward VI (1537-1553) in The Act Concerning Regal Power (1554), which declared that the imperial crown could be invested in both men and women. Yet, the extent of the imperial power of women was still under debate as well as the consequences of a queen regnant marrying an imperial power such as Spain. As marriage, a necessity for any monarch, traditionally made women subordinate to men, it was feared that by marrying Philip II, Mary would lose her claim to the crown and Philip would replace her as prince of England. To prevent this, it was carefully stipulated in the marriage contract between Mary and Philip that Philip would fulfil a subordinate role in the governance of England as a king consort. He was barred from appointing foreigners to positions in the English government, from drawing England into a war with France and from inheriting the English crown should Mary predecease Philip. The Act Concerning Regal Power, moreover, ensured that she wielded the same political authority over her husband as she did over her subjects. A final measure was Mary’s continuous stress on the benefits of the match for both England and Catholic Christendom in general, fashioning Philip as powerless king consort whose main aim was the re-Catholicization of England and the fathering of an English heir to the throne. He was a fellow Englishman as the descendant of John of Gaunt (1340-1399) and therefore unable to be identified as a foreign tyrannical usurper.

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

17 Whitelock, “A Queen, and by the Same Title, a King Also”, pp. 94-95; Duncan, Mary I, pp. 54, 58-59.
18 Duncan, Mary I, pp. 145-164.
19 In pageants honouring Mary’s mother, Catherine of Aragon (1501), and Mary’s uncle, Charles V (1522), the shared descent of John of Gaunt, the fourth son of King Edward III of England (1327-1377), was also used to stress the familiar ties between English and Spanish royals. Richards, ‘Mary Tudor as “Sole Quene”’, p. 914, n. 101; Samson, ‘Changing Places’, p. 766; Streckfuss, “Spes Maxima Nostra”, pp. 145-157.
20 In martial sports, tournaments and ceremonies surrounding the Order of the Garter and the creation of knights in the first years of the Anglo-Spanish marriage, Philip also assumed
Philip's request was initially met with fierce opposition by Mary's Privy Council in March 1557, his war enjoyed widespread support amongst the nobility of England, and on 5 July 1557 Philip crossed the Channel with a force of 1200 horses, 4000 foot soldiers, 1500 pioneers and 200 minors. Men who previously had opposed Philip’s accession as king consort of England by fighting in the Wyatt Rebellion (November 1553-February 1554) now rallied behind him to seek pardon and display their loyalty, accepting him as king of England. Yet, fears that Philip would no longer be satisfied with his role as king consort and would seize the English crown and usurp control of English government also emerged in 1557 after a 1555 rumour started circulating again that Mary was planning to crown Philip as her equal. In response, Protestant exile Thomas Stafford (1533-1557), who had earlier defied Mary’s rule and the Spanish marriage by participating in the Wyatt Rebellion, invaded Scarborough Castle in April 1557 with a force of English and French rebels to depose Mary. He denounced the Spanish marriage, proclaimed Englishmen would be enslaved by Spaniards and argued that Mary was the ‘unrightful and unworthye Quene of England’ who showed herself ‘a whole Spanyarde, and no Englyshe woman, in loving Spanyardes, and hatinge Inglyshemen, inrighinge Spanyardes and robbinge Inglyshemen’.

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

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


22 Duncan, Mary I, p. 136.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

30 North, *Diall of Princes*, p. Ar.
32 North, *Diall of Princes*, p. Ar.
33 Schutte, *Mary I*, p. 65.
35 See *The Pathe of Obedience* (1553) by James Cancellar, *The historie of wyates rebellion* (1554) by John Proctor, and *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware rebellion* (1553) by John Christopherson. Bourchier’s translation was called *The Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius* (1535) and had reached its ninth edition in 1557 when North published his *Diall of Princes*. Samson, ‘Culture under Mary I and Philip’, p. 165; Schutte, *Mary I*, pp. 52-61; Underhill, *Spanish Literature*, pp. 118-119.
Nonetheless, the other prince of England, the Spanish Prince Philip II, was also not regarded as part of North's audience. North does not mention the prince anywhere in the text, although, given the relationship of the prince to the origins of the book and North's father, he would have been a more logical prince to dedicate the book to. Not only was the *Diall* the only Spanish work that North translated during the joint reign of Mary and Philip, but North had a personal connection with Philip II as well through his father Edward North (c. 1496-1564), who waited upon Philip II when he arrived in Southampton on 19 July 1554. The translation of a well-known Spanish book that venerated both Philip's father Charles V and Philip II would therefore have been the perfect way for North to get into the new king's good graces. That it could be profitable to translate Spanish books during Mary's and Philip's joint reign was in fact proven by Richard Eden (1521-1576) and his translation of Pedro Mártil de Anglería's *De Orbe Novo Decades* (1511), *The Decades of the Newe Worlde or West India* (1555). He was appointed to a prominent position in Philip's English treasury through the help of some Spanish nobles while he was working on the translation and showed his thanks in the Latin dedication of the final product, praising Philip and his Spanish predecessors extensively.

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

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

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

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

North took his chances when he presented his view of the correct governance of England to Queen Mary Tudor. Although he retained the original form of the Spanish *specula principum*, he changed the framing of the book, making the wisdom of Marcus Aurelius especially appropriate for counsellors of princes instead of princes of Spain. Not the queen, the ‘princesse’ of England, but those men who counselled her in the ‘vulgare tongue’ were the new Marcus Aurelii. North therefore had no problem with the content of the *Relox* or the Spanish author himself, praising both extensively in his dedication to Mary. ‘Don Antony of Guevara’ should be rewarded with the greatest fame for his ‘holsome doctrine’ as⁴⁶:

> there is no Auctor (the sacred letters set aparte) that more effectuously setteth out the omnipotencie of God, the frailty of men, the inconstancie of Fortune, the vanity of this worlde, the miserie of this life, and finally that more plaineely teacheth the good, whiche mortal men ought to pursue, and the evil that al men ought to flye.⁴⁷

North therefore translated the *Relox* faithfully when he ‘Englysed’ it, changing only the passages in which solely the prince of Spain Charles V was regarded as Marcus Aurelius.⁴⁸

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

---

⁴⁶ North, *Diall of Princes*, p. Ar.
⁴⁷ Ibid., p. Av.
⁴⁸ North, *Diall of Princes*, title page.
Countries, Philip II sent a new governor to the Low Countries together with a Spanish army. This governor, the Duke of Alba, quickly became known for his tyrannical governance through the establishment of the Council of Troubles or ‘Bloody Council’ (‘Bloedraad’) in 1567 and through the drastic fiscal reform of the Low Countries by the plans to impose new taxes such as the ‘tenth penny’ (‘tiende penningh’). In pamphlets and prints vices such as cruelty, haughtiness, ambition and tyranny were attributed to Alba, and he was portrayed as the destroyer of the peace of the Low Countries through his pillaging of the countryside and the raping and murdering of its inhabitants with his Spanish soldiers.49

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

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

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

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

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

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

55 Spotprent op het standbeeld van Alva.
56 It is during this confinement that Houwaert probably became familiar with the work of Guevara and started to prepare his adaptation. Bock, Johan Baptista Houwaert, p. 6; Vosters, Antonio de Guevara y Europa, p. 276.
58 Blouw, ‘Willem Silvius’, p. 22; Porteman and Smits-Veldt, Een nieuw vaderland, p. 72.
59 Houwaert, Milenus Clachte, p. Aiiir (‘Soo Aurelius die Wetten en Policije / Redresseerde in Danubij landouven, / O doorluchtighe Grave van Nassouwen, / En sult door u wijsheyt, en deught vol trouwen / Over u vyanden triumpheren, noch, / En van hier verdryven die ons benouwen, / En in ruste des landen doen floreren, noch’).
This framework of tyrannical Spaniards whose behaviour had to be punished is embedded in the entire adaptation of the *Milenus Clachte*, which in fact has so little resemblance to the original *Relox* that it should be defined as an adaptation rather than a translation. Although in total 78 per cent of *Milenus Clachte* was based on the original Spanish *Relox*, the changes were so significant that the text became almost unrecognizable. First of all, Houwaert changed the title of the work, presenting the book not as a mirror for princes but as a complaint about tyrannical rulership. The work now focused on 'the great tyranny of the Romans', on 'how destructive the tyrannous governors are' and on diverse 'classical scenes, in which the godless governments of tyrants are clearly described, together with the right means to govern a land in prosperity'.60 The analogy with current times was obvious. Secondly, the three prologues to Charles V were replaced by a dedication to William of Orange and a dedicatory poem by Willem van Haecht (1530–1612) to Houwaert, completely obliterating the name of Charles V. The book was divided into three parts, and the original prose of the *Relox* was transformed into verse, expressed in 24 poems. Four of these poems focused on Marcus Aurelius, in particular.61 In addition, seven poems were originals by Houwaert.62 The total of 31 poems discussed various examples of both exemplary and tyrannical rulers and the necessity of being faithful to the former.63 Furthermore, neither the original author, Antonio de Guevara, nor the original title of Houwaert’s Spanish source are mentioned anywhere in the book. Although Houwaert does admit that his work is not completely original, arguing that William of Orange possibly has read the book already in a different language, it is still recommended by Orange’s main advisor, Philips Marnix of Saint-Aldegonde (1540–1598), as a cure for depression.64 Chances that William of Orange was in fact familiar with the original book were quite high since he was educated at the court of Charles V in Brussels from 1545 until 1551 and was friends with Henry of Bréderode (1531–1568),

60 Ibid., title page (‘Milenus Clachte, Waer inne de groote tirannye der Romeynen verhaelt, ende den handel van desen tegenwoordighen tyt claerlijck ontdect wordt. Met ghelijcke Clachte, Vanden Ambassadeur der Hebreen vermellende hoe schadelijck, de tirannighe gouverneurs sijn. D’Antijcke Tafereelen, Daer in men claerlijck gheschildert ende beschreven siet de godloose regeringe der tirannen, midsgaders den rechten middel om dlant in goeden voorspoet te gouverneren’).
61 I started counting from the poem ‘Milenus’s Complaint’. He appears in poems 1, 4-5 and 28.
63 Poems which are critical of rulers are poems 1-7, 9-13, 15-18, 21, 23, 25-26. Poems 8, 14, 19, 24 and 27-31 are about exemplary rulers while poems concerning religion are poems 20 and 22.
who possessed the French translations of Guevara’s *Relox de príncipes* and *Libro áureo* in his library in his castle at Vianen, a place Orange frequently visited with other nobles.\textsuperscript{65}

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

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


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

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

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


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

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

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

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

---

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

No one's property: Aurelius as universal exemplar

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

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

76 Houwaert, Declaratie van die triumphantie Incompst, pp. 53-54 (‘Tot vele plaetsen daer [...] zeer begheirden Prince’).
77 This translation was in fact a translation of the Relax and not an adaptation like Houwaert’s Milenus Clachte. It was based on the German translation of the Relax, the Fürstlichen Weckuhr und Lustgartens (1599) by Aegidius Albertinus (1560-1620). Vosters, Antonio de Guevara y Europa, pp. 547-553.
78 D.W.C., Den vorstelijcken last-hof, vv.
could have Hispanophilic and Hispanophobic interpretations, exemplifying foremost how versatile the afterlife of Spanish literature in Europe could be.
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