

Miguel José Deyá Bauzá

A BAROQUE VISION OF THE CONQUEST OF TUNIS
IN 1535: CARLOS V, SOBRE TUNEZ
BY JOSÉ DE CAÑIZARES

DOI 10.19229/1828-230X/4992020

ABSTRACT: *There is little doubt that Charles V and his supporters made use of the conquest of Tunis in 1535 to propagate a certain idea about himself and his political vision. There is ample proof of this, from the Emperor's subsequent journey around Italy to Vermeyen's tapestries. What might seem odd is the fact that almost two centuries later that military episode was used as the plot for a play by one of the most popular Spanish authors of the eighteenth century; an author who has been almost totally forgotten: José de Cañizares. It is even stranger that the author chose this military event for his play, as he seemed to prefer writing plays that dealt with very different topics. Also surprising is the fact that the play in question, entitled Carlos V, sobre Tunez (Charles V in Tunis), was still being performed many years after it was written and first performed. We know that the play was relatively successful in the second half of the eighteenth century, and during the War of Spanish Independence in the first few years of the nineteenth century. The aim of this paper is to analyse how that military operation, the Tunis campaign, was envisaged and depicted in Cañizares's play, with a view to establishing how far it reflects historical reality, and to study the way in which Charles V is portrayed as a Spanish King, Emperor and Christian leader against Muslim enemies.*

KEYWORDS: *War of Spanish Succession, War of Spanish Independence, theatre, Bourbon Spain.*

UNA VISIONE BAROCCA DELLA CONQUISTA DI TUNISI DEL 1535: LA COMMEDIA "CARLOS V SOBRE TÚNEZ" DI JOSÉ DE CAÑIZARES

SOMMARIO: *In questo articolo si analizza come José de Cañizares, uno degli autori più popolari del XVIII secolo, utilizzò e rappresentò la celebre campagna di Tunisi del 1535 all'interno della sua commedia "Carlos V sobre Túnez". Difatti, benché non vi sia alcun dubbio sul fatto che Carlo V ricorse alla conquista di Tunisi del 1535 per diffondere una certa idea di sé e del proprio progetto politico, sembra esser alquanto strano che quel medesimo episodio militare fu scelto due secoli dopo come trama di una commedia da parte di un autore non consono all'utilizzo di tali soggetti. Ripercorrendo la genesi e la diffusione di "Carlos V sobre Tunez", la presente indagine si propone, quindi, di perseguire due obiettivi specifici. In primo luogo, si vuole determinare la misura in cui l'immagine e la rappresentazione teatrale della conquista di Tunisi riflettano ciò che avvenne realmente nel 1535. In secondo luogo, invece, si analizza il modo in cui Cañizares rappresentò nella sua commedia una determinata figura di Carlo V, che si basava principalmente sugli archetipi del re spagnolo, dell'imperatore e del leader cristiano che lottava contro la minaccia musulmana.*

PAROLE CHIAVI: *Guerra di successione spagnola, Guerra d'indipendenza spagnola, teatro, Spagna borbonica*

* Acknowledgements: This research was funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science ((Project PGC2018-099152-B-I00) and conducted as an activity of the Institute of Early Modern Spanish Studies (Associated Unit CSIC-UIB).

The author, the play and the edition used

José de Cañizares was born in Madrid in 1676 and died there in 1750¹. He carried out his profession as playwright long after the historical episode he writes about. Throughout his life, which encompassed part of the reigns of Charles II and Philip V, and hence the War of Spanish Succession, Spanish foreign policy was not much concerned with North Africa, with the notable exception of the reconquest of Oran in 1732. It is therefore not very likely that the political events that unfolded while he was alive had much influence on his choice of topic for the play. The rekindling of interest in North Africa at the end of the eighteenth century and beginning of the nineteenth century is a different matter. Cañizares was undoubtedly among the major exponents of baroque theatre when attempts at introducing French and neoclassical culture into Spain were being made under the new regime of Phillip V, despite the fact that the elites as well as the masses preferred more traditional and dynamic plays along the lines of those written by Calderón and Lope de Vega². According to theatre experts, Cañizares's plays are related to those of Calderon. However, the play we are concerned with here has more to do with Lope de Vega's plays, and specifically with *El cerco de Viena y socorro de Carlos Quinto* [*Charles V comes to the aid of the besieged city of Vienna*]. Although there is no evidence that *El cerco de Viena y socorro de Carlos Quinto* was performed in Madrid between 1661 and 1819, this does not mean that he was unfamiliar with it³. From 1702 until his death, Cañizares held the position of *Fiscal de Comedias de Madrid* – that is he was a member of the Board of Theatrical Censors – and as a result of this he made enemies. He combined that role with another, as composer of Sacred Letters (mostly carols in the vernacular) for the Royal Chapel which he obtained in 1700 or 1701, although his official appointment to that position did not occur until 1736. Cañizares also held a military position as a Lieutenant in the cavalry, although this appears not to have lasted very long, but it could well have contributed to his interest in military topics⁴.

¹ A.V. Ebersole, *José de Cañizares, dramaturgo olvidado del siglo XVIII*, Editorial Insula, Madrid, 1975, p. 7.

² *Ivi*, pp. 8, 11.

³ A.M. Coe, *Catálogo bibliográfico y crítico de las comedias anunciadas en los periódicos de Madrid desde 1661 hasta 1819*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1935; R. Andioc, M. Coulon, *Cartelera teatral madrileña del siglo XVIII (1708-1808)*, Presses Universitaires du Mirail, Toulouse, 1996.

⁴ J. Herrera Navarro, *Catálogo de autores teatrales del siglo XVIII*, Fundación Universitaria Española, Madrid, 1993, p. 76.

There are several editions of *Carlos V, sobre Tunez*. The one we have used is the edition published by the printing house Santa Cruz de Salamanca, sometime in the eighteenth century according to the bibliographic description proffered by the National Library of Spain⁵. According to Jerónimo Herrera the work was printed under Cañizares's name in 1749, although the musician Inachi signed various receipts related to it dated 20 November 1730⁶, in other words, prior to the occupation of Oran and before Philip V's North African foreign policy achieved its first success. It should be noted that the work, at least at that time, required music and that it was not published until almost forty years after its first performances in 1711, which means it had obviously been written before that date. The play was performed on the 29th, 30th and 31st of January 1711 and between the 1st and 5th of February in the Corral del Príncipe, eight performances in all with an average daily attendance of 439 spectators⁷. Varey and Davis believe that the first of those performances was the play's premiere, and that the theatre company that managed all the performances was the one belonging to José Garcés⁸. These days, there seems to be no doubt that the year the play premiered was 1711⁹. It was performed again in October 1713, four times in the Corral del Príncipe by José de Prado's Company, with an average attendance of 653 spectators per performance¹⁰. There were further performances on the 25th, 26th and 27th of September 1717 in the Corral de la Cruz by Juan Alvarez's Company, with an average attendance of 635 spectators per performance¹¹. According to Andioc and Coulon it was shown once more in several theatres in Madrid – in El Príncipe, in the theatre De La Santa Cruz, and that of Caños del

⁵ Biblioteca Nacional de España, T/15061(8). This volume comprises the printed editions of several plays of the eighteenth century written by different authors. In the quotations that appear in this article both grammar and punctuation have been modernised. After each fragment we indicate inside brackets the page in the edition used. It is also worth noting that another edition was printed by the publisher Francisco Suriá, from Barcelona, in 1770. As we shall see, the play was performed on several occasions in that city. In fact, that edition was paid for by a theatre company which suggests that it must have been the same company who performed it. This is mentioned in the last page of the Catalan edition of the work which can be consulted in the Fondo Antiguo de la Biblioteca de Cataluña.

⁶ J. Herrera Navarro, *Catálogo cit.*, p. 78. This author refers to the play discussed here as a work written by Cañizares.

⁷ J.E. Varey, C. Davis, *Los libros de cuentas de los corrales de comedias de Madrid*, Tamesis Books Limited, Madrid-London, 1992, p. 62.

⁸ Ivi, p. 403 on the premier and 177 identification of the theatre company; J. Huerta Calvo (ed.), *Historia del Teatro Español*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 2003, p. II, 3021.

⁹ J. Huerta Calvo (ed.), *Historia cit.*, vol. II, p. 3021.

¹⁰ J.E. Varey, C. Davis, *Los libros cit.*, pp. 230, 385.

¹¹ Ivi, pp. 316, 385.

Peral – in the years 1722, 1726, 1728, 1730, 1731, 1732, 1734, 1737, 1748, 1762, 1763, 1766, 1768, 1773, 1774, 1777, 1781, 1787, 1789, 1792, 1794, 1798 and 1805, although they do not mention the number of performances each year nor do they include the audience numbers. It was also probably performed in Madrid in the years 1738 and 1786¹².

The power that Cañizares eventually wielded over the theatre, and the enemies he made during his time as theatre censor probably contributed to the fact that after his death his work was almost immediately forgotten. Another reason why the play fell into oblivion was the vogue for French classical theatre and consequent decline in popularity of Spanish Baroque plays and those written in the style of Calderon which were generally more popular and less elitist.

The play is divided into three acts. The first begins with Barbarossa's attack on Tunis and ends with the Emperor's departure from Barcelona. The second act focuses on the taking of the fortified islet of La Goleta, and the third on the occupation of Tunis, Charles V's victory and the treaty signed with the king (as he was usually called) of Tunis, Mulay Hassan. As mentioned earlier, we know that at least when it was first performed, the play included music¹³.

Genesis of the conflict between Charles V and Barbarossa, and development of the action

The beginning of the play presents the defeated Tunisian ruler, Mulay, who was deposed by Barbarossa in 1534. The corsair and Ottoman admiral is branded as a tyrant from that point on. Thus the cause of the war is presented as the consequence of the illegitimate seizure of power in Tunis. A foreign power that does not content itself with having dethroned the ruler – it also wants him dead:

No soldados os parezca
que cabalmente he vencido
si de mi furia sangrienta
huye Mulay y, así, para
que yo viva, Mulay muera (p. 1)¹⁴.

¹² R. Andioc, M. Coulon, *Cartelera* cit., p. 650.

¹³ J.E. Varey, C. Davis, *Los libros* cit., p. 385.

¹⁴ «Soldiers don't think / that I have fully defeated Mulay / if he flees from my bloodthirsty fury / For me to go on living, / Mulay must die» (p. 1).

In the same scene, an entirely fictitious female protagonist, Marfilia, provides us with vital information that defines Mulay, as the lawful and rightful ruler of Tunis. He is also given credibility by the fact that he spurns Marfilia, who loves him, because she is a sort of Sybil with supernatural powers, and he rejects her because of the spells she casts. The setting allows Charles V to be presented as the saviour who comes to set aright an illegal occupation by Barbarossa, referred to as «a pirate and a thief».

Two other characters who appear in the play were well-known personalities who participated with Barbarossa in the conquest of Tunis and other exploits: Sinan Reis, also known as Sinan the Jew, and Cachidiablo. Through the words of the latter we learn that Barbarossa is also angry with the Turks and with his overlord, sultan Suleiman. Barbarossa had sent Cachidiablo to Constantinople with gifts for Suleiman, including a hundred maidens, but his envoy returned to Tunis with this unwelcome news:

Visires y Belerveyes
 refutaron la propuesta
 de hacerte Bajá, diciendo
 que puesto de gran grandeza
 en un bárbaro corsario,
 que sólo en robos, y presas
 fundaba su gloria, estaba
 como con baldón y afrenta (p. 5).

Interestingly, this adheres closely to the narrative included in the sixteenth-century chronicle of Prudencio de Sandoval¹⁵.

Hence, Barbarossa is not only criticized by Mulay on moral grounds, and subsequently by Charles V and his collaborators, but also by the Turkish elite in Constantinople. Because of their refusal to raise him to the status he covets as Pasha, Barbarossa receives the title of Grand Admiral with disdain. He even threatens the sultan Suleiman, which turns him into a more evil and perfidious character¹⁶. Barbarossa goes on to describe some of his outstanding military operations, in particular his attacks on the Rock of Algiers, Sicily, Menorca, Ibiza and Valencia. In this, and throughout most of the work,

¹⁵ P. de Sandoval, *Historia de la vida y hechos del Emperador Carlos V*, Atlas, Madrid, 1955, vol. II, p. 471: «Viziers and Belerveys / refused the proposal / to make you a Pasha, saying / that such an honourable office / does not befit a barbarian corsair, / whose glory is based / only on robbery and predation, which is / an infamy and affront».

¹⁶ «Doesn't it suffice for Suleiman / that I should forgive him and through my bravery / fight for the Empires he rules over?» (p. 5).

Cañizares is remarkably loyal to the historical facts¹⁷. Cachidiablo then announces to Barbarossa that a fleet is being put together in Barcelona and Barbarossa proclaims him General.

In the following scene the action moves to Barcelona, where Charles V appears with his closest counsellors, among them, the Marquis of Vasto whom we are informed will contribute 14,000 veteran soldiers (including Italians and men from Saxony) to the campaign. The Genoese admiral of the imperial fleet, Andrea Doria, is to transport 6000 Flemings on his ships, in addition to 10,000 Spanish soldiers¹⁸. The figures given are plausible, although it continues to be a matter of debate. The author, not unnaturally, takes the opportunity to comment on the Spanish soldiers, whom he refers to as Lions and Goths. The lion was a symbol associated with Spain in the days of Cañizares, although less so in the times of Charles V. They are also called Goths because of the Germanic tribes known to have settled in the Iberian Peninsula before Spain became a nation. He attributes to

¹⁷ The Rock or Peñón of Algiers had fallen into Barbarossa's hands in 1529. J.F. Pardo Molero, *La defensa del Imperio. Carlos V, Valencia y el Mediterráneo*, Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, Madrid, 2001, pp. 239ff. This increased the danger for Spain as Barbarossa already had control over Algiers since 1521. From there he launched a series of attacks on the Spanish Levant, Sicily and Sardinia. M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, E. Sola Castaño, *La vida y historia de Hayradin, llamado Barbarroja*, Universidad de Granada, Granada, 1997, p. 18). It is worth mentioning the disaster of the Spanish squadron commanded by Portuondo which confronted Cachidiablo in the waters of Formentera (J.F. Pardo Molero, *La defensa* cit., p. 242) and the event, towards the end of August and beginning of September 1531, when Algerian vessels threatened the coast of Valencia and captured people from Mallorca and sixty others from Menorca (Ivi, p. 266).

¹⁸ The figure of 14,000 men, comprising both German and Italian troops seems to us plausible if we bear in mind that some 8000 lansquenets were sent over from German lands alone. R. González Cuerva, *La aportación centroeuropea a una empresa mediterránea*, in R. González Cuerva, M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, *Túnez 1535: Voces de una campaña europea*, CSIC, Madrid, 2017, p. 29. There were 12,000 Spanish soldiers (10,000 infantry and 2000 cavalrymen), 5000 Italians, 2000 Portuguese plus some Flemings and Albanese. A. de Ceballos-Escalera, *Guerra y nobleza en la jornada de Túnez. Los capitanes del César*, in A. Alvar Ezquerro, J.I. Ruiz Rodríguez (eds.), *Túnez 1535: Halcones y halconeros en la diplomacia y la monarquía española*, Gremio de Halconeros del Reino de España, Madrid, 2010, pp. 123-153 estimates the total as 27,000: 25,000 infantry and 2000 horses with their riders; Davide Maffi, *Las guerras de los Austrias*, in L. Ribot (ed.), *Historia Militar de España. Edad Moderna. Escenario Europeo*, Ministerio de Defensa, Madrid, 2013, p. 105 puts it at 28,000. To these should be added the crews from the ships, nobles and their retinues, adventurers and other people not belonging to specific units. The fleet consisted of 82 galleys, 2 Flemish hulks, 40 galleons, 25 Andalusian and Portuguese caravels, 100 ships and an indefinite number of minor vessels and or/auxiliary boats. To confront the Emperor's troops, there were 8000 Turkish soldiers (1000 of them engaged in the defence of La Goleta), 800 Janissaries, 7000 Muslim archers and 7000 lancers as well as 8000 Alabar horsemen. A. de Ceballos-Escalera, *Guerra y nobleza* cit., pp. 134-135.

the emperor a reflection on the special attributes of the Spaniards as soldiers:

Aquesta sí que es gente para todo,
que aunque Flandes, Italia y el Imperio
llenando de esplendor el hemisferio
encierran gente belicosa y fiera,
no sé qué tiene España que en su esfera,
los hombres, a pesar de la fortuna,
soldados nacen ya desde la cuna (p. 7)¹⁹.

Although he alludes to the international nature of the emperor's forces, the author thereby affirms the essential, Spanish nature of the campaign – contrary to more recent sources which underscore the expedition's European dimension²⁰. The expression "Spanish nature" remains relevant despite the participation of the Prince of Portugal, the Emperor's brother-in-law. In the play, prince Louis refers to Portugal as part of Spain. Although the union between Portugal and the rest of the Iberian realms did not take place until 1580 and lasted only until 1640. This identification between the neighbouring realms is not entirely surprising nor out of place, considering the close collaboration between the Spanish and Portuguese Monarchies over the centuries, particularly in the military arena, in the struggle against Islam²¹. What Cañizares does is to further enhance the reputation of Spain by making the Portuguese identify as Spaniards twice in the play. Before going into battle, Prince Louis remarks: «My Portuguese troops are also Spanish». It should be noted that the Emperor's praise for the Spaniards as excellent warriors not only served the purpose of exalting Spanish national feelings but also contributed to build up a picture of an Emperor who was becoming more Spanish-like in his ways. From that perspective, the references made to the Germans, Flemings and Italians besides adhering to reality, also provides another ingredient for the propaganda of a campaign in which the

¹⁹ «These people are indeed good for everything, / for although Flanders, Italy and the Empire / fill the hemisphere with splendour / and have combative and fierce warriors, / there is something special in Spain, though I know not what this is / because the men there, whatever their fortune, / are born soldiers». The aptitude of the Spaniards for war is mentioned elsewhere; specifically, in the second act when just before going into battle to take La Goleta, the author puts the following words into the Duke of Alba's mouth: «That which the Spaniards cannot accomplish, / do not expect soldiers from another nation to achieve» (p. 18).

²⁰ R. González Cuerva, M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, *Túnez 1535* cit.

²¹ P. Cardim, *Los portugueses frente a la Monarquía Hispánica*, in B.J. García, A. Álvarez-Ossorio (eds.), *La Monarquía de las Naciones. Patria, nación y naturaleza en la Monarquía de España*, Fundación Carlos de Amberes, Madrid, 2004, p. 367.

collaboration between the troops from different origin seems to have been minimal²².

Thereafter the action moves to Barcelona where fleet is being fitted, specifically to the Emperor's tent where the military leaders of the expedition – the Duke of Alba, the Prince of Portugal, the Marquis of Vasto, and the “Duke of Amalfi” come to discuss the expedition²³. The Emperor immediately informs them that the Turk has greatly expanded his domains in the preceding years, taking advantage of the fact that Charles V was otherwise occupied

en las guerras interiores
y en los domésticos bandos,
que mis pueblos dividieron
y mi Imperio sublevaron,
junto a las invasiones
de los vecinos Estados (p. 8)²⁴.

These verses clearly evoke the problems arising from the Lutheran Reform but also to the different rebellions within his lands, and the wars with France. The Emperor continues recalling how the Turks took Rhodes from the Knights of the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, but criticises the latter because they had «turned to France and the Pope for help, more so than to Spain»²⁵, and thus tries to minimise the opprobrium which Spain also deserved as no one helped the Knights. He also mentions the Ottoman invasion of Hungary and the death of his brother-in-law, king Luis, and notes that the rest of Europe did nothing against the Ottomans despite them penetrating into the heart of the continent. Here the author puts words into the Emperor's mouth which reflect eighteenth century notions of Europe. There are references to Christianity in general in the play, as in the case of the conversion of Muslim women, but Cañizares makes use of the concept of Christianity as if it was synonymous with Catholicism, again,

²² R. González Cuerva, *La aportación* cit., p. 42.

²³ By the Duke of Amalfi the author means Andrea Doria, one of the leaders of the campaign along with the Duke of Alba, the Prince of Portugal and the Marquis of Vasto. The confusion seems to arise from the fact that the author mixes up Andrea Doria's real title as Prince of Melfi and the Duchy of Amalfi.

²⁴ «When civil wars / and noble conflicts / divided my people / and caused rebellion in my empire / as neighbouring powers invaded».

²⁵ This represents not just criticism of the other Christian nations, France and the Pope but a genuine self-criticism of the Spanish Monarchy although the author subsequently states that the Emperor granted to them (the Knights of St John) Malta and the nearby isles of Gozo and Comino («three islands for one: Rhodes – the one they lost to the Turk»).

reflecting the views of eighteenth-century Europe rather than what was current from the sixteenth to the late seventeenth centuries.

The Emperor then makes a very important declaration concerning the ultimate reason why, after the seizure of Tunis by Barbarossa, he had decided to confront him. The previous conquests by the Muslims had been accomplished by a sovereign prince, albeit a barbarian, the Ottoman sultan:

Todas estas osadías,
 todos estos desacatos
 del Príncipe de los Turcos,
 capitanes y vasallos,
 aunque mi saña ofendieron,
 mi vanidad no irritaron;
 pues, aunque un bárbaro sea,
 basta verle coronado
 de la Dignidad suprema
 entre su rústico bando
 para que me den sus triunfos
 enojo, más no enfado (pp. 8-9)²⁶.

But the attack on Tunis was carried out not by a sovereign but a commoner, a man described as a mere potter – which is how Barbarossa is presented to the audience – who became a corsair. This was intolerable because it dishonoured the emperor to be defeated by someone of such lowly status:

Más [h]oy, ni mi pundonor,
 ni mi poder, ni mi garbo
 puede tolerar ultraje
 de un hombre que infame y bajo
 se atreve a mi Dignidad,
 sin que le cieguen sus rayos;
 no ya como Emperador
 de dos Mundos, como Carlos,
 a darle castigo aspiro,
 que es desdoro el que empleado
 un César y un Rey de España
 se mire contra un cosario,
 que ayer un pobre Alfarero,
 haciendo alhajas de barro,

²⁶ «All those bold, contemptuous acts, / committed by the Prince of the Turks, / along with his captains and vassals, / offended but didn't enrage me / for although he is a barbarian, / it suffices to see him among his rustic peoples / crowned and endowed / with supreme power / so that his victories irritate me / but do not anger me».

miseramente vivía
del sudor de su trabajo,
ese Aradín Barbarroja (p. 9)²⁷.

We should note here that there is a common element, a fundamental agreement even between the oligarchy in Istanbul and the Emperor: both sides show hatred and contempt for a man who is not from the nobility, but from the lower classes, who aspires to the highest status. The Ottoman oligarchy is opposed to proclaiming Barbarossa a Pasha; the Emperor is insulted not by Barbarossa's conquest of Tunis but by the fact that the conquest was accomplished by a man from a low social stratum. Disdain by the upper class towards the poor unites two cultures that clash in almost all other areas. It also creates another element in which the campaign is shown to right wrongs.

The second argument outlined by the Emperor to justify military intervention is the defence of Europe. Once again here he is referring not to Christianity but to a concept: the notion of Europe, an idea intelligible for the public of the 18th century, but far less so for the Spaniards in 1535 for whom the key concept would be Christianity²⁸.

In that same scene Charles V describes Barbarossa as a second Grand Turk threatening Europe, for which reason they should be able to count on the support of the Pope and the King of France²⁹, something that actually did not happen in the case of the latter and only on a very small scale in the case of the Holy Father³⁰. Subsequently, the first comparison is made, though subtly at this point, between Charles V and Scipio and also with Alexander the Great, the humanist and renaissance hero *par excellence*³¹, yet this does not prevent the first reference being made to the campaign as a holy war. At that juncture, the Emperor reveals the reason for

²⁷ «But today neither my honour, / grace or power / can tolerate insults / from a despicable and lowly man / who dares to attack my dignity, / untouched by its powerful rays / I long to punish him / not as Emperor / of two Worlds, but as Charles / for it is a dishonour for a Caesar and a King of Spain / to be attacked by a corsair / who only yesterday was a poor potter, / making jewels out of clay / living miserably and sweating from / his petty work, / that man called Aradín Barbarossa» (p. 9). The reference to Barbarossa as a potter is historically correct, since that was his father's profession. D. Nordman, *Tempête sur Alger. L'expédition de Charles Quint en 1541*, Ed. Bouchene, Condé-sur-Noireau, 2011, p. 74.

²⁸ «I am afraid he will gobble up Europe / unless I contain him» (p. 9).

²⁹ «...the Pope owes me his help, / as does France...» (p. 9).

³⁰ The Pope contributed with six galleys. R. González Cuerva, M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, *Túnez 1535 cit.*, p. 67.

³¹ «I bring four hundred ships, / and the best possible captains, / better than those that / Scipio or Alexander could gather» (p. 9).

summoning the counsellors to this meeting: to debate whether he should lead the expedition, and if not him, who? Here another aspect of the Emperor's sense of superiority crops up in the presence of his counsellors. As the Duke of Alba, the Marquis of Vasto and Prince Luis get into a dispute about their right to command the task force, the Emperor interrupts them, naming the crucified Christ as General of the expedition and himself as his lieutenant. That sense of superiority is confirmed in the following scene when, exhausted, he falls asleep as Mulay heads towards his tent. Charles V dreams that he is in front of Mulay and promises to return his crown and kingdom to him – a commitment he ratifies when he wakes up.

The second act unfolds in Tunis after their arrival. It is worth noting that at this point, when Charles V appears for the first time with Mulay, the latter calls him the Christian Caesar and even Grand Sultan, as if he were the leader of the Islamic world. These are curious words coming from the mouth of a Muslim. Then several historical references follow. Tunis is presented to us as the successor of Utica, the homeland of Cato the Wise – the grandson of the Censor – who chose to commit suicide rather than live under the rule of Julius Caesar after his victory over Pompey. Also, Tunis is obviously the heir to Carthage, presented here, among other things, as «the Mistress of half of Spain»³². The historical reference that follows this is even more significant and concerns the death of Saint Louis: Mulay informs the Emperor that it was in that very place where the king of France had died while engaged in a crusade against Islam³³. This is particularly interesting because the play hints at, though not as clearly as might be expected, the French king's refusal to participate in the military campaign of 1535. Likewise, it is worth emphasising that the play does not refer at all to the alliance between Francis I of France and the Turks in 1534. It would be odd if Cañizares – who was in other regards very well informed – was ignorant of these facts. The absence of explicit condemnation of France can perhaps be explained with reference to the political situation prevailing at the time

³² The author is referring to the Treaty of the Ebro whereby Rome and Carthage split up the Iberian Peninsula into two zones of influence for their mutual advantage.

³³ This attempt to emulate Alexander the Great, Scipio and St. Louis has already been noted by other authors: M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, *La conquista de Túnez por los cronistas españoles*, in R. González Cuerva, M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, *Túnez 1535* cit., p. 10. Deswarte-Rosa even asserts that in the contemporary accounts (more or less) on the conquest of Tunis, the parallels drawn between Charles V and St. Louis are as numerous as those between the former and Scipio the African. S. Deswarte-Rosa, *L'expédition de Tunis (1535): images, interprétations, répercussions culturelles*, in B. Bennisar, R. Sauzet (eds.), *Chrétiens et musulmans à la Renaissance*, Honoré Champion, Paris, 1998, p. 94 and 103 where she points out that the parallels with St. Louis appear in chronicles of that period such as that of Alonso de Sanabria.

the play was written. In 1711 Madrid had just been occupied definitively by troops of the French candidate to the Spanish throne, Philip de Bourbon, later Philip V.

Having used these historical arguments to exalt the Emperor, the play returns to the its moral theme, projecting Charles V's superiority through the order he gives to his troops to refrain from looting and other excesses, although we do know that excesses were actually committed³⁴. The play continues to highlight also the moral and military superiority of the Spaniards on the battlefield by attributing to them the demand that they should be allocated the most dangerous tasks on the one hand, while renouncing plunder on the other. Whereas the first of these might well be true, it is very unlikely that any of them abstained from plundering. This may be simply a touch of literary license³⁵.

Two aspects in the description of the taking of La Goleta by the imperial troops should be noted as they are crucial to the messages the play is attempting to convey. In the first place, it again portrays the Spaniards as lions, an identification that can be found in the contemporary chronicle of Sandoval, albeit more briefly. Here, as in many other aspects, the play follows a popular pattern in Spanish Baroque theatre: the exaltation of the values that Spaniards attribute to themselves, in this instance, their bravery³⁶. The second, and more important aim is to present a narrative of the battle that emphasises the importance of the emperor. It stresses that the assault was going badly for the Christians until the Emperor took his place at the head of the Spanish troops. Thus the turning point in the armed struggle, the success of this part of the enterprise is clearly attributed to the Emperor's presence on the battlefield. The second act ends with the

³⁴ For a selection of different accounts demonstrating how and why plundering was authorized see M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, *La conquista* cit., pp. 20ff. For a vision of the defeated (enemy) see A. Gafsi, *À propos des traces et des images de Charles Quint en Tunisie* in M.J. Rubiera (ed.), *Carlos V. Los moriscos y el Islam*, Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, Madrid, 2001, p. 271. In fact, Paul Achard and other authors consider the looting of Tunis as a typical example of that sort of military campaign. D. Nordman, *Tempête* cit., p. 253.

³⁵ Many contemporary sources and recent research state that quite the opposite happened, although some sources from that period or a little later point out that the Spaniards were more interested in the booty and blame the Germans in particular for the massacres: D. Nordman, *Tempête* cit., p. 253. Chronicles written by Germans who participated in the campaign, such as that of Niklaus Guldin assert quite the opposite, R. González Cuerva, *La aportación* cit., p. 43; R. González Cuerva, M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, *Túnez 1535* cit., p. 130. See also the semi-official chronicle of Perrenin in Ivi, pp. 98 and 14, which consists of seven dispatches sent by the Imperial Chancellery.

³⁶ The author puts the following words in the Emperor's mouth: «My lions from Spain/do not fear impossible tasks» (p. 22). P. de Sandoval, *Historia* cit., vol. II, p. 571. J.A. Maravall, *Teatro y literatura en la sociedad barroca*, Crítica, Madrid, 1972, p. 23 refers to «la exaltación de los valores que se atribuye la particular comunidad de los españoles».

imperial conquest of the fortress of La Goleta, which had been stoutly defended by the Jewish corsair Sinan, and with Barbarossa's flight towards the city of Tunis³⁷.

The third act essentially deals with two aspects: on the one hand, it describes the Emperor's victory in Tunis; and on the other hand, it offers and a more in-depth account of his moral supremacy which is shown to stem in part from his being a legitimate sovereign. It is the latter issue with which the act commences: a face-to-face encounter between the Emperor and Mulay in which Charles V asserts that «Kings are Deities» and that he considers Mulay a brother. Thus, it is implied that the similarity and bond between kings is above and beyond differences between a Christian and a Muslim. However, the Emperor reproaches Mulay for the violence he had inflicted on his own family when he seized power in Tunis before Barbarossa's invasion: he had poisoned his father and murdered his brothers³⁸. The play uses this to demonstrate the superiority of Western, Christian monarchies over their Muslim equivalents, in part because of the principle of primogeniture³⁹. It also serves to condemn Muslims as practitioners of barbaric acts and for abiding to customs that are the opposite of the rationality and fairness which are attributed to Christian monarchies.

To that must be added an element of the utmost importance, especially because of its novelty: Charles V's recrimination of Mulay for his arbitrary and unfair rule over Tunis in the past, which also serves to enhance the Emperor's moral and political superiority:

Vos sois cruel, ambicioso,
desconfiado, inconstante
y vengativo; no son
de Rey estas propiedades
no todo lo venga un Rey;
arte de reinar es arte
de disimular injurias,

³⁷ A detail that further illustrates the historical accuracy of the play in general.

³⁸ Many sources describe Mulay Hassan's cruelty both before and after the Emperor helped him to recover the throne: G. de Illescas, *Jornada de Carlos V á Túnez*, Rivadeneyra, Madrid, 1852, pp. xxi, 452. Some even assert that the hostility which some of the Tunisians felt towards him helped Barbarossa to conquer Tunis, P. de Sandoval, *Historia* cit., vol. II, pp. 472, 473, 474, 524. López de Gómara claimed that when Barbarossa was at the court in Constantinople, he said that Mulay's cruelty had facilitated the conquest of Tunis by the Ottoman-corsair forces: F. López de Gómara, *Guerras de mar del Emperador Carlos V*, Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, Madrid, 2000, p. 154. Other sources point to Mulay Hassan's tyranny as the cause of his own son's rebellion against him, A. de Ceballos-Escalera, *Guerra y nobleza* cit., p. 136.

³⁹ «...although it doesn't apply among the moors / (in Christian kingdoms) there reigns a just law / whereby the first son to be born is the heir...» (p. 25).

que pecados generales
 la Justicia en dos o tres
 los reprime y satisface,
 y queda el ejemplo a ser
 castigo de los restantes (p. 25)⁴⁰.

This encounter serves more than one purpose: it provides an opportunity for Charles to exercise a degree of self-criticism by recalling his own experiences when the revolt of the Comuneros erupted. He attributes it to his own mistake in giving his leading Flemish adviser, Chièvres, too much power⁴¹. Having acknowledged this, he goes on to say that when he crushed the rebellion and the Council proposed that two hundred people be sentenced to death, he reduced that number to six, demonstrating his clemency. His words exemplify another popular aspect of Spanish Baroque theatre, which represented the authoritarian and hierarchical social structure as just and fair⁴². It is also important to stress that the emperor refers to the *comuneros* (literally, commoners) not as traitors but as people who had been deceived. Nor does he accuse the nobility of disloyalty or disaffection during the conflict. In fact he admits that he wore his Crown thanks to the behaviour of the aristocracy during that rebellion, something that has been challenged by historians of the period, but which fits with the play's reiterated defence of the hierarchical social structure⁴³.

⁴⁰ «You are cruel, ambitious, / mistrustful, inconstant / and vengeful; such features / are not becoming in a king / for a king cannot take revenge over everything; / The art of ruling is the art / of dissembling when offence is given / for as regards general sins / the Law soon takes care of them / repressing and providing justice / setting an example / that serves as punishment for others».

⁴¹ Also at p. 25.

⁴² J.A. Maravall, *Teatro* cit., pp. 32-33.

⁴³ Elliot characterises the nobility's response to the revolt as cautious; Belenguer calls it inhibition, and Kamen emphasises the division of the sector into those who collaborated with the rebels and those who repressed it. J.H. Elliot, *La España Imperial*, Vicens Vives, Barcelona, 1983, p. 161; E. Belenguer, *El Imperio Hispánico (1479-1665)*, Grijalbo Mondadori, Barcelona, 1995, p. 161; H. Kamen, *Una sociedad conflictiva: España, 1469-1714*, Alianza, Madrid, 1984, p. 133. It is likely that with exceptions like the great Andalusian noblemen with rights over large tracts of land, most Castilian nobles remained passive at first, but supported the King when the rebels threatened their seigniorial rights and privileges. M. Rady, *Carlos V*, Altaya, Barcelona, 1997, pp. 64-65. The repression was harsher than is presented in the play but it would have dented the emperor's portrayal as morally irreproachable to have acknowledged this. Rivero argued that out of the 285 people excluded from the general pardon, 23 were executed, and that the consequences were more political than anything else. Á. Rivero, *El mito comunero y la identidad nacional española*, in B.J. García, A. Álvarez-Ossorio (eds.), *La Monarquía* cit., p. 727. Others claim it was severe without providing quantitative data: A.M. Bernal, *Monarquía e Imperio*, Crítica-Marcial Pons, Barcelona, 2007, p. 87.

Charles V continues criticizing Mulay for having personally participated in the looting of La Goleta, a disgraceful act unbecoming of royalty. In order for him to refrain from committing such an act again, the Emperor gives him 25,000 ducats. The Emperor's moral superiority is not only emphasised by the money given, but because he reprimands Mulay in private, as if a king could only be censured by another monarch without his subjects being witnesses. He goes on to reiterate that the wrath of a monarch must only be directed against another sovereign⁴⁴. He then demands as tribute from the Muslim king not the usual monetary payment, but the promise that Mulay will respect his vassals and act mercifully towards them⁴⁵.

At the end of that scene an attack by Barbarossa is announced and, despite the danger and against the advice of some of his advisers, the Emperor refuses to withdraw, deciding instead to confront him in order to achieve a goal that once more puts him in a morally elevated position: rescuing Barbarossa's twenty thousand Christian captives. A sharp contrast, also of a moral nature, is made between the Emperor and Barbarossa. Whereas the former appears in the play at the head of his troops on various occasions, the latter insults and abuses his men when the battle turns against him. When the Jewish corsair Sinan tries to justify his defeat at La Goleta, the Spaniards are again presented as lions, but otherwise, the arguments that Cañizares attributes to him are similar to those included in the chronicle of Illescas⁴⁶. At this point in the play, Barbarossa is presented in a more sinister light, ordering that if he is taken prisoner, the dungeons where the Christian captives are held should be set on fire⁴⁷.

During the battle that takes place as Barbarossa tries to retake La Goleta, Marfilia – the witch-like figure in love with Mulay – uses her magical powers to help the Spaniards:

las tropas de Carlos Quinto
deshacen y desbaratan
los turquesos escuadrones,
mas no con menos bizarra

⁴⁴ «Nobody other than another king / deserves to be the recipient of a king's enmity».

⁴⁵ «Pay homage to me in that / you will be merciful, / kind, attentive and affable, / towards your vassals / refraining from any blind passions» (p. 26).

⁴⁶ Compare Illescas's chronicle where Sinan declares: «I'm telling you, my Lord, that if I had to fight men, I wouldn't flee, but I was facing the devil and common sense told me to reserve myself for a more appropriate occasion» (G. de Illescas, *Jornada cit.*, p. 455), with the play (p. 30): «Had you ordered me / to fight men I would have had no fear, / but confronting invincible devils; / and facing the furies of hell, / is an impossible task for any man».

⁴⁷ K. Brandi, *Carlos V*, Editora Nacional, Madrid, 1943, p. 306, believes this to be true.

resolución Barbarroja
 los rehace y los restaura...
 Al conjuro de mi magia
 haré que se turbe el Sol
 y vagas nubes preñadas
 de menuda artillería,
 que el viento en su seno cuaja,
 dando a las morismas huestes
 la munición que disparan
 en el rostro mostraré,
 ya que no tengo otras armas,
 que por Mulay mis ardidés
 hacen todo lo que alcanzan (pp. 30-31)⁴⁸.

The play does not reveal whether the Emperor's victory was influenced by this spell⁴⁹.

After the battle, with the Emperor in control of La Goleta, the Spaniards are praised. The emperor grants one hundred escudos to Pichon, who is cast as the *Gracioso* (the low status, comic character) in the play which he rejects it as an insult,

Eso conmigo no se habla.
 Yo he venido a ganar honra.
 Un español no se paga
 con dinero, voto a Christo.
 Para tropas alquiladas
 es eso bueno. Dinero
 ni cuanto vale Alemania
 puede pagarme a mi un día
 de hambre, calor y galbanas (p. 33)⁵⁰.

⁴⁸ «The troops of Charles V / defeat and throw into disarray / the Turkish squads, / but with as much bravery / and resolution, Barbarossa/ reforms and restores them ... / With my magic spells / I shall obscure the Sun / and make vague clouds appear pregnant / with small artillery, / and with the help of the wind, / face the Moorish troops with the sight / of the ammunition they fire / being thrown back towards them / for I have no other weapons, / but to help Mulay / I will use all my cunning tricks to achieve this goal» (pp. 30-31).

⁴⁹ The involvement of magic is typical of baroque theatre, which was very popular in the first few years of the 18th century, particularly in Cañizares's plays, in which female characters played the role of magicians with extraordinary powers, E. Palacios, *El teatro tardobarroco y los nuevos géneros dieciochescos*, in J. Huerta Calvo (ed.), *Historia cit.*, vol. II, p. 1563.

⁵⁰ «I'll have nothing of that. / I came here to earn honour. / A Spaniard cannot be bought / with money, by God. / Money is good / to buy mercenaries / Neither money nor all the riches / of Germany / can compensate me for a single day / of hunger, sweat or idleness» (p. 33).

The Emperor marvels at the Spanish character while confirming the deeply rooted social hierarchy of the period:

Está bien que, aunque gente baja,
española ha de tener
esta honra y esta jactancia (p. 33)⁵¹.

The scene of Barbarossa's interrogation of the captive Spanish captain, Ripalda serves as a contrast and counterbalance to this encounter. Ripalda is a largely fictional character. He was not a captain but the commander of a regiment, and thus interacted closely with the emperor as it is shown in the play. He was a noble, not a commoner. He was wounded but not captured. Clearly the author changed the facts for dramatic effect⁵², and to create an unblemished, heroic character who explains and facilitates the fate of the Christian captives in Tunis. The captain refuses to reveal the Emperor's plans and Barbarossa orders him to be locked up in the alcazaba, which is to be set on fire rather than let it fall into Christian hands. Barbarossa's evil plans are thwarted by Ripalda who overpowers the guards taking him to the dungeons and frees the other captives, who rebel against their jailers. In fact, the rebellion of the captives in Tunis appears to have been engineered by a Spanish renegade⁵³. With this, Barbarossa disappears from the play.

In the next scene a new character appears linked to Charles V: Fame. The Emperor is presented as the new Scipio and the taking of the city is attributed to the heroic act of Captain Ripalda, who is now ennobled and given the much-coveted honour of a knighthood in a Military Order. This shows Charles V as king of Spain and head of the social hierarchy, the only one with power to confer nobility; it also identifies him as the champion of Christendom. While the hierarchical system is constantly reinforced, serving the Crown is presented as a way of transcending a lowly status.

⁵¹ «It is good that the Spaniards / though of lowly status / should have such honour and pride» (p. 33).

⁵² A. de Ceballos-Escalera, *Guerra y nobleza* cit., p. 144.

⁵³ The captives, estimated at between 16,000 and 20,000, were released as a result of the betrayal of the Spanish renegade Francisco de Medellin, who was pardoned by the Emperor as a reward, A. de Ceballos-Escalera, *Guerra y nobleza* cit., p. 137. All accounts – Muslim or Christian – agree it was a crucial factor in the Emperor's victory: K. Brandi, *Carlos* cit., p. 306; M.Á. Bunes, *La ocupación del Magreb por Hayreddin Barbaroja según el ms. 2459 de la Üniversite Küttüphanesi de Estambul*, in M.J. Rubiera (ed.), *Carlos* cit., p. 192; Seyyid Murad on the life of the Barbarossa brothers in M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, E. Sola Castaño, *La vida* cit., p. 124.

Political context, validity and significance of the play

On the 28th of September 1710 Madrid was occupied by the troops of the Archduke of Austria, remaining there until the 3rd of December. Is there a link between the situation in the capital in the months before the play was premiered and the play? We think it cannot be a coincidence, particularly since Cañizares did not produce many historical works. Let us not forget that the central character of the play was Charles V, the founder of the Habsburg dynasty of Spain. We get a sense of the importance that Charles V, and in particular the Tunis expedition, had for the two main contenders for the Spanish throne in that both Philip of France and Archduke Charles ordered reproductions of the famous Tunis tapestry series designed by Vermeyen, who had been with the imperial forces in 1535⁵⁴. While there is no direct evidence to link the play to the conflict for the crown, the fact that both contenders claimed the Emperor's inheritance for themselves gave the topic a contemporary relevance it would not have had otherwise. The play must have been written and its premiere organised during the period of Austrian ascendancy in the capital, which suggests that it could be interpreted as supportive of the Habsburg candidate, the Archduke Charles, a member of the same dynasty as the emperor. It is also worth noting that the text refers to Charles V as the Emperor (also as Caesar and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire) and not to Charles I of Spain⁵⁵. The fact that the play went ahead even after the French candidate, who became Philip V, recovered control of the capital, may have something to do with the fact that he too claimed to be the legitimate successor of Charles V. Quite possibly, Cañizares appeared above suspicion due to the multiple official posts he held. It is worth remembering, however, that the political ambiguity we can detect in the play may partly reflect the uncertainty of the times, and fits the curious situation whereby both candidates claimed descent from Charles V.

If the work was written as propaganda for the Austrian pretender, it is hard to explain the absence of criticism of the French and their past alliance with the Turks. However, it is worth considering that the

⁵⁴ M.Á. Bunes, *Vermeyen y los tapices de la Conquista de Túnez. Historia y representación*, in B.J. García García (ed.), *La imagen de la guerra en el arte de los antiguos Países Bajos*, Editorial Complutense-Fundación Carlos de Amberes, Madrid, 2006, p. 130.

⁵⁵ The House of Austria often resorted to literature on the subject of Charles V and specifically the Conquest of Tunis in 1535 to enhance its image, even as late as 1810 when the epic poem *Tunisia* was written in German by Johan Baptiste Ladislaus Pyrker. D. Nordman, *Tempête* cit., p. 306.

play was not performed in Madrid for nearly seventy years, between 1717 and 1787, which is odd since the author was the chief theatre censor in the capital until his death in 1750. This fact might indicate that the play and/or its performance was programmed at a specific political time that corresponded to the domination of Madrid by the Archduke of Austria, and was regarded as such. It was performed subsequently in a very different political context that saw no danger or harm in it. There are other factors that might have influenced the pattern of performances. The fact that it wasn't performed at the Court between 1717 and the death of Cañizares in 1750 might indicate that the author didn't much value the piece, or that it had been produced in haste to meet specific political circumstances and the author deliberately applied self-censorship once the situation changed⁵⁶. Nor can we entirely dismiss the possibility that the success of the play in 1711, 1713 and 1717 was due in large part to its scenic effects and not simply to its political topicality.

After these performances, we only have news of the play's revival in 1786 (Teatro de Santa Cruz), 1787 (performed on the 7th, 8th and 9th of September at the Teatro del Príncipe), 1798 (from the 11th to the 16th of November at the Teatro de Santa Cruz) and 1792 (from the 4th to the 9th of January at the Teatro de Santa Cruz)⁵⁷. Clearly, the play enjoyed a degree of success in the later years of the eighteenth century in terms of number of performances. This is supported by the fact that it was also performed several times in Barcelona between 1775 and 1777 – unfortunately we have no specific data relating to these⁵⁸. We do know that it was put on again on the 30th of January 1784⁵⁹, the 14th and 15th of November 1789⁶⁰, and the 9th, 10th, 30th and 31st of October 1790⁶¹. We can conclude that it was a successful play in Barcelona at the time, particularly in October 1790 with four performances, which was very unusual for the time. Its success there may have something to do with the fact that it was published by a printer from that city in 1790 at the request of a theatre company, as

⁵⁶ It must be stressed again that Cañizares wrote very few plays of a historical nature; the majority of his output dwelt on magic, saints and *zarzuelas*. J. Huerta, E. Peral, H. Urzáiz, *Teatro Español. De la A a la Z*, Espasa, Madrid, 2005, p. 126. We have already seen how this particular play includes some magical elements.

⁵⁷ A.M. Coe, *Catálogo cit.*, p. 38.

⁵⁸ A. Par, *Representaciones teatrales en Barcelona durante el siglo XVIII*, «Boletín de la Real Academia Española», 16 (1929), pp. 337, 339.

⁵⁹ Specifically, by the Italian company consisting of Mariana and Teresa Tomba, Francisco Antonucci, Ángel Vallí, Gasparo Angelini, Antonio Tossi, Josephe Gradotti, Josephe Campana, Jaime Panti and Adriana Garioni. Ivi, p. 497.

⁶⁰ Ivi, p. 597.

⁶¹ Ivi, p. 600.

already noted. It was not only Barcelona, however. In Valencia, the play was performed on the 3rd and 4th of July 1790, on the 10th of December 1795, on the 7th of September 1796 and on the 30th of August 1797⁶². In Seville, we know it was performed on the 24th of August 1800, on the 11th of August 1806, on the 21st of January 1808, on the 19th of May 1813, on the 29th and 30th of October 1814, on the 10th and 11th of June 1815 and on the 30th of November and 1st of December 1816⁶³.

This revival of Cañizares's play appears to date from between 1775 and 1777, and should be seen in the context of foreign relations between Spain and North African powers of that period. Although during the reign of Charles III various peace treaties were signed – one with Morocco (1766)⁶⁴ and another with the Sublime Porte (the Ottoman Empire, in 1782) – relations with Algeria are best characterised as *guerre couverte*, an undeclared war against the corsairs based there. Piracy was so prevalent it had led to the near collapse of navigation in the Western Mediterranean, endangering the interests of the Balearic Archipelago and much of the Spanish Levantine coast. The punitive strike by Spain in 1775 against Algiers, the same year when according to our sources the play was performed for the first time in Barcelona⁶⁵, was a total disaster that led to many complaints and a wave of vicious satires⁶⁶ that brought about the dismissal of the Marquis of Grimaldi. Against this background, Cañizares's play could be seen as a useful piece of propaganda, and government ministers were not unaware of the power of the theatre in this respect. It presented a king who happened to have the same name as the current King of Spain as victor over the Muslim enemy⁶⁷. The fact that Charles V's victory was in Tunis and not in Algiers wasn't of much importance: what mattered was the defeat of an infidel pirate, Barbarossa, at that time known as the King of Algiers, and therefore the embodiment of Algerian piracy. However, the confrontation

⁶² A. Zabala, *El teatro en la Valencia de finales del siglo XVIII*, Institució Alfons el Magnànim, Valencia, 1982, p. 285.

⁶³ F. Aguilar, *Cartelera prerromántica sevillana. Años 1800-1836*, «Cuadernos Bibliográficos», 22 (1968), p. 15.

⁶⁴ This treaty did not prevent the war with Morocco of 1774 which had a considerable influence on the decision by Spain to attack Algiers in 1775. E. Villalba, *O'Reilly y la expedición de Argel (1775). Sátiras para un fracaso*, in A. Guimerá, V. Peralta (eds.), *El equilibrio de los Imperios*, Fundación Española de Historia Moderna, Madrid, 2005, p. 571.

⁶⁵ The other two expeditions took place in 1783 and 1784.

⁶⁶ E. Villalba, *O'Reilly* cit.

⁶⁷ Jovellanos appreciated the value of history to nurture patriotism among the public, J.M. Caso, *Notas sobre la comedia histórica en el siglo XVIII*, in *Coloquio Internacional sobre el teatro español del siglo XVIII*, Piovani Editore, Padua, 1988, p. 129.

between Spain and the Regency of Algiers might explain the play's revival at the time, but not its enduring popularity after 1786 when a peace treaty was signed between the two states⁶⁸. The play's performances beyond that date must have been due to other factors. Firstly, we must point out that the work was publicised by being included in the catalogue of the companies that put on the play after 1775. Secondly, we must not forget that the public in the last quarter of the eighteenth century were very much in favour of historical plays, and particularly those with a military theme, and complex and baroque plots that were so different to those typical of neoclassical theatre⁶⁹. Cañizares's plays in general and this one in particular, fitted the new vogue⁷⁰.

The first few years of the nineteenth century and particularly those corresponding to the Spanish War of Independence saw another revival of *Charles V in Tunis*. The vindication of great military feats by one nation (Spain) oppressed by another (France) may have given it renewed topicality. The play was revived on the same day in Madrid and in Palma de Mallorca in the reign of Joseph I, Napoleon's brother⁷¹. During the performance in Madrid on the 2nd of November 1811 one scene in particular caused a great stir, raising the audience's patriotic spirits so much that the French authorities ordered it to be removed from the next day's performance. The scene is in the second act, when Captain Ripalda describes his men to the emperor in these terms:

aquéllos son españoles,
 gran señor, soldados viejos,
 los que en Italia os han dado
 a millares los trofeos.
 Aquellos rotos vestidos,
 aquellos semblantes negros
 de los soles del verano
 y de los fríos del invierno
 aguantados en campaña
 son, Señor, cuenta con ellos,
 que aunque no vienen galanes
 tiran bien y empujan recio.
 Aquellos pobres andrajos,

⁶⁸ E. Villalba, *O'Reilly cit.*, p. 585.

⁶⁹ D. Garcias, *Historia del teatro en Mallorca. Del Barroco al Romanticismo, 1600-1834*, Leonard Ed., Palma de Mallorca, 2005, p. 378.

⁷⁰ Ivi, p. 379.

⁷¹ M. Larraz, *Le Théâtre à Palma de Majorque pendant la guerre d'Indépendance (1811-1814)*, «Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez», 10 (1974), p. 347.

galas son de Marte horrendo,
 adornos son de su fama,
 porque tantos agujeros
 cuantos el vestido muestra
 tienen en rostro y pechos
 dados por vuestros contrarios;
 con solo esos cuatrocientos
 rotos y descamisados
 he de entraros, vive el cielo,
 en Túnez, aunque lo impidan
 más demonios (p. 19)⁷².

There was such an uproar in favour of its reinstatement that the authorities were forced to rescind the order and allow the scene to be reintegrated⁷³.

Conclusion

It is worth noting how, in the work of Cañizares, the Turks play a very minor role, although they remained a great power in the period the play was written. The author doesn't identify Barbarossa with the Ottomans who employed and supported him and under whose banner he fought. That runs contrary to the enduring Spanish tradition whereby the Turks were identified with Islam. As has been demonstrated, however, in general the play by Cañizares was loyal to the historical facts. Literary license is used, in particular to define the profile of the characters, especially that of Charles V. If there is a single feature that characterizes the Emperor in the play, it is his moral superiority. In that regard, the play makes use of one of the main

⁷² «Those are the Spaniards, / my Lord, veteran soldiers, / the men who gave you so many victories / in Italy. / Those men wearing ragged clothes, / their faces scorched by the summer sun / and by the cold of many winters / endured in your campaigns. / You can count on them, Sire / for although they are not well-dressed gentlemen / they are good shots and fight hard. / Their wretched rags / are the drapes of fearful Mars / and the ornaments of their fame. / As numerous as the holes / in their clothes / are the scars in their faces and chests / caused by your enemies. / With just four hundred of those / ragged, half-naked soldiers / God willing I will enter Tunis on your behalf, / even if there are more demons there / to prevent it» (p. 19).

⁷³ M. Larraz, *Le Théâtre* cit., p. 331. According to Hüseyin Güngör Sahin, the play had been performed in Madrid in November 1810 but he wrongly dates the play to 1769, nineteen years after the death of Cañizares and more than half a century after its premiere. G. Shahin, *Barbaros Hayreddin Pasha, llamado Barbarroja, en el teatro español y latinoamericano como un instrumento de la propaganda*, in Ö. Seçkin (ed.), *El viejo mundo y el nuevo mundo en la era del diálogo*, Universidad de Ankara, Ankara, 2014, p. 794.

characteristics of baroque theatre in the 17th century: glorifying the monarchy⁷⁴. Thus, in the case of Mulay, portrayed as the legitimate King of Tunis, the Emperor is presented to the audience (and thus behaves) like a superior being not only because of his status as emperor and the fact that he is providing military assistance, but also because of his magnanimity since he gives Mulay back his kingdom. And more importantly, because he advises the Muslim king to change the way he rules, and to control his emotions when making decisions about government. Charles V's superiority vis-à-vis the nobles who appear in the play is also clear, and not just because the highest-ranking aristocrats cannot decide which of them has greater claim to lead the military operation, but because of the way the emperor settles the matter by saying that he will lead the campaign not as commander but as lieutenant of Christ, whom he sees as the true Captain General of the expedition⁷⁵. It is further worth noting in this regard that all the noblemen who appear in the play are of relevance not because of who they are but because the Emperor had delegated authority to them. Only a fraction of the nobles from diverse lands who accompanied Charles V in the campaign are included here such as Alba, Vasto and Doria⁷⁶. This enables the playwright to establish the supremacy of the king over his noblemen, and the pre-eminence of military expertise over the *nobilitas* inherited by birth. Likewise, important servants of the Emperor with no military functions who participated in the campaign are left out of the play, even the imperial secretary of state, Nicolas Perrenot de Granvelle, who witnessed the agreement between Mulay and Charles V⁷⁷, or his counterpart, Francisco de los Cobos. What is especially surprising is that Garcilaso de la Vega, an

⁷⁴ J.A. Maravall, *La función educadora del teatro en el siglo de la ilustración*, in *Estudios dedicados a Juan Peset Aleixandre*, Universidad de Valencia, Valencia, 1982, vol. II, p. 624. The same author revealed the way that monarchies and some republics in the eighteenth century created what he calls *resources of persuasion*, the basis of the culture of the Baroque within which there would be a propagandist attitude to disseminate it by various means; in the case of theatre by trying to integrate the public socially so that it supports the existing political powers. J.A. Maravall, *Teatro* cit., pp. 14-16, 22, 25, 26, 31ff.

⁷⁵ This episode appears in many other contemporary accounts, and after the event.

⁷⁶ For further information about the noblemen of the different territories under the rule or auspices of Charles V who participated in the Tunis Campaign see P. de Sandoval, *Historia* cit., vol. II, pp. 490-494. Some sources point out that the Tunis campaign was the last time that the noblemen were requested to participate in such military expeditions (A. de Ceballos-Escalera, *Guerra y nobleza* cit., p. 146). According to Nordman over 1,500 Spanish nobles participated in the campaign (D. Nordman, *Tempête* cit., p. 147).

⁷⁷ A. Alvar Ezquerro, *Los Mediterráneos de Carlos V y la empresa de Túnez*, in A. Alvar Ezquerro, J.I. Ruiz Rodríguez (eds.), *Túnez 1535* cit., p. 218.

outstanding man of letters who participated in that war and was wounded in battle⁷⁸, does not appear⁷⁹.

Cañizares's work reflects the portrayal of Charles V in Tunis that can be found in the official chronicle of Perrenin, recently published and analysed by Miguel Ángel Bunes, who summarises it thus:

A ruler who exercises his function as a military commander to perfection; a fair judge and a man who defends his soldiers and nobles ... His treatment of a Muslim prince (Mulay Hassan) as an ally exemplifies a sovereign who respects rulers who practice a religion contrary to that of the Emperor providing that they accept the supremacy and boundaries of Christianity⁸⁰.

It is remarkable that we should find this in the work of Cañizares, written almost two hundred years after the event. It indicates not only the continuity in the image and portrayal of Charles V in Spain, but also the endurance of values personified in the character of the emperor, which are presented as timeless and endowed with exemplary moral superiority.

⁷⁸ Marqués de Sierra Bullones, *Garcilaso: cuatro apuntes en la ocasión de recordar su participación en la Jornada Imperial de Túnez de 1535*, in A. Alvar Ezquerro, J.I. Ruiz Rodríguez (eds.), *Túnez 1535* cit.

⁷⁹ P. Girón, *Crónica del Emperador Carlos V*, CSIC, Madrid, 1964, p. 59.

⁸⁰ M.Á. Bunes Ibarra, *La conquista* cit., p. 13.